THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

VOLUME II NO. 2 NOVEMBER 1960

CONTENTS

PUBLISHED TWICE YEARLY

on behalf of the World Jewish Congress
by William Heinemann Ltd, 15–16 Queen Street, London W1

Annual Subscription £1.1.0 (post free)—Single Copies 12s 6d net

Applications for subscription should be addressed to the Managing Editor, The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 55 New Cavendish Street, London W1

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BUTLER AND TANNER LTD
FROME AND LONDON

NEW CONDITIONS OF LIFE AMONG JEWS IN THE DIASPORA

Jacob Lestschinsky

THE WHOLE FACE of the Jewish people has changed radically before our eyes: in its geographical distribution over continents and countries, as well as its concentration in various localities; in its biological potentialities; in its socio-economic structure and differentiation into classes; its political position, problems, and trends; in its linguistic and cultural milieu and hence its opportunities for national creativity, and in its balance between assimilationist and nationalist forces.

Jewish history abounds in massacres and wholesale expulsions, in persecutions and mass migrations, which in relatively short periods of time produced radically new situations and completely altered the geographical, political and cultural circumstances of the majority of the people. Suffice it to mention the decline of the highly developed and influential Spanish-Portuguese Jewry, which gave the Jewish people its medieval philosophy and rich Hebrew poetry. Overt apostasy of a large part of this Jewry, and the marranism of another considerable part, led to the liquidation of a large portion of the creative energies of an exceptionally gifted branch of the Jewish people. Those who remained true to their faith settled in backward countries, with the result that the creative springs of this wing of Spanish-Portuguese Jewry very soon ran dry.

Nevertheless, there has never been such profound and thoroughgoing change in the living conditions of the great majority of the Jewish people as in the last few decades, and particularly in the last twenty years. For, although European Jewry alone suffered the great catastrophe of the recent past, the destruction of this abundant and gushing fountainhead of political, social, national and historical values and movements had the deepest and most far-reaching effect upon the national fate of the Jewish people; a most comprehensive effect with

respect to the possibilities and prospects of national creativeness in the newly arisen Diaspora centres, but equally with respect to the further political and economic development of the State of Israel and of its future spiritual and cultural complexion.

The following prime factors led to the revolutionary change in the life of the Jewish people:

(*a*) Migration and, in the last stage, *aliyah* (migration to Israel). The stream of Jewish wanderers in the past hundred years, and particularly in the last decades, was of such scope and of such profound and many-sided influence on all aspects of Jewish life, that this phenomenon must be regarded as the most important and powerful factor in the evolution of Jewish life.

From 1840 to 1953 over five million Jews, or half a million more than the total Jewish population of the world in 1840, left their old homes. This is apart from the more than five hundred thousand Jews who migrated within the limits of Europe from East European countries to Western Europe. The picture becomes even more vivid if we take only the last sixty years. During this period over four million Jews left their old homes and took up the wanderer's staff. No other people in the world has known such a degree of intensive migration.

Migration is a two-sided process. On the one hand, Jewish wandering in the last hundred years scattered the existing Jewish communities over scores of countries and regions. On the other, it created new centres of Jewish life. The wandering in the main affected East European Jewry, which contained the great majority of the Jewish people, a majority deeply rooted in its own national customs and creative processes. This historic Jewish centre existed in political, economic, cultural, and spiritual conditions highly favourable to a national creative life. To be sure, it was not only migration which adversely influenced the East European Jewish centre; no less a role in the reduction of the national potentialities of East European Jewry was played by the dismemberment of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, the two conglomerates of peoples and ethnic groups where the Jewish minority found objective possibilities of remaining true to itself.

We are speaking here of the objective conditions of Jewish life and cultural creativity. That economically and politically Jews fared very badly in Russia and in certain parts of Austria (such as Galicia) is well known. Historically viewed, external fears and internal creativity are not mutually contradictory.

Indeed, the Jewish migrations of the last period are the best and clearest proof of how apposite the words 'out of the strong came forth sweetness' are to Jewish life in the Diaspora. Did not the Jewish mass emigration from Eastern Europe (which was opposed by not a few representatives of the Jewish intelligentsia, both the assimilated and

the nationalist but anti-Zionist, as well of a whole political school of thought in Jewish life, the Bund) virtually save the lives of millions of Jews? The physical rescue of millions of Jews made possible the rise of two new centres: the numerical one in North America and the spiritual one in Israel. Migration produced two new centres in place of the one in Eastern Europe.

(*b*) The great massacre, which is unequalled both in the number of victims it claimed and in its methods of murder, and which mechanically altered the balance of forces within the Jewish people. It wiped out one-third of the Jewish people, and virtually the whole East European wing, especially that part of it where, after the Bolshevik Revolution (which itself cut off a very large part of this centre), there was concentrated almost the whole energy of this wellspring of Jewish creativeness. Of Polish-Lithuanian Jewry not more than 10 to 12 per cent survived.

The recently arisen Jewish settlements are still in the initial stages of adapting to new conditions and cultural environments. The destruction of East European Jewry is fraught with grave consequences for the State of Israel also, for in the last thirty years the Russian, Polish, and Lithuanian Jews were the principal builders of the Jewish State and the most enthusiastic proponents of the Zionist ideal. The loss of the influx of cultural and spiritual forces from Poland and Lithuania, and partly from Rumania and Hungary, is no doubt felt much more keenly in the Diaspora communities than in the State of Israel, where being on one's own ground inspires courage and confidence in what is already present and in the new forces and potentialities which daily spring up. From a broader national viewpoint, however, and from the standpoint of a spiritual centre resting on a large Jewish population, the situation in the State of Israel is much more tragic than in the Diaspora, where the national and cultural prospects are regarded even by optimists as not very rosy.

So much for the two basic developments which have radically changed the face of the Jewish people. Let us now turn to the results of these changes, so that we may have a clear picture of the national resources in the countries of the Diaspora and probable national prospects in the new situation.

The following fundamental developments are the chief result of the manifold changes which have taken place.

(*a*) Nearly all the old deeply-rooted Jewish communities have disappeared—communities with thousand-year-old traditions, equipped with societies, organizations, and institutions, politically and culturally adapted to their environment. Nearly 90 per cent of all the Jews are now to be found, geographically, politically, economically, and culturally, in wholly new countries. As communities they have been living in these countries at the most for half a century or so, but in many

cases only for the last score of years. It follows that the vast majority of the Jewish people are now living in conditions which are unfavourable to an organic continuation of the past. Many of the national and spiritual values accumulated in particular circumstances are bound to be lost in the new conditions. In many cases it is necessary to begin all over again. What is perhaps the oldest people in the world is faced with practical and cultural tasks which are usually the fate of a young people just launched upon its historical course.

We include among new Jewish communities those Jews who still live in their own homeland (the Ukraine, White Russia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, and in part also Rumania and Hungary), because the great majority of them were uprooted and had to begin life anew after the war in completely altered conditions, in the face of the total destruction of their traditional institutions, and in circumstances which do not admit of their complete revival.

(*b*) On the eve of the First World War, which brought about the first radical turn in the fortunes of the Jewish people, because with it began the disintegration of the East European branch of world Jewry, more than 75 per cent of the Jewish people lived so compactly and so isolated from the non-Jewish population, were so concentrated in particular areas of economic life, as to create favourable objective conditions for their own ways of life and for their own national cultural creativity. In addition, these compact and isolated masses of Jews lived among peoples with the low assimilative potential and the weakest linguistic and cultural influence. On the eve of the Second World War, a considerable part of the Jewish people, perhaps some 40 per cent, were still living in the conditions just described, although many changes occurred in the intervening period in the life both of the majorities of the general populations and of the Jews as well.

In the new countries of the Diaspora absolutely different conditions developed. There the Jews live among peoples with the highest assimilative potential and cultural influence; geographically, socially and economically, too, they live in quite different conditions of integration. To be sure, geographical compactness also marks the Jews in some of the new countries or regions, but it is a compactness without isolation, and a geographical compactness unaccompanied by socio-economic density; isolation loses most of its influence.

(*c*) Owing to the altered objective environment, the process of assimilation became intensified in all its manifestations. The weakening of the religious bond and the dying out of the Yiddish language—two of the most tried and important historical factors of national cohesion and national creative energy in the past—are a universal phenomenon. Intermarriage is increasing in absolutely all Jewish communities; it is more prevalent in the small and isolated communities, but the phenomenon as such is everywhere widespread. Intermarriage, the children

born of which are in most cases reared in the religion of the Christian spouses, ceases to be a Jewish family tragedy. On the contrary, the Christian spouse is easily integrated into the family and received with love and respect. This is further proof of the steady weakening of national sentiments and of the national fear of the estrangement of the coming generations, which was so characteristic of the Jews for thousands of years.

So much, in broad outline, for the principal negative processes: assimilation and disintegration. But there is also another side, a positive process. We shall now briefly sketch these developments.

(*a*) The rise of the State of Israel is a gain of tremendous nationalist influence upon the Jewish communities of the Diaspora, but it is impossible to evaluate it now in the first period of the life of the State. To be sure, the incredibly difficult process of the fusion of the exiles, of welding together and amalgamating Jews not only from the four corners of the earth but from forty languages and cultures, customs, and traditions, will for a long time to come absorb the best energies of the Jewish State. This colossal historic task is unparalleled in the annals of man. For this is not a question of creating a new people by blurring and ultimately absorbing altogether the cultural remnants and fragments brought over by the immigrants, as was the case, for example, in the United States. Rather it is a question of reviving an old people, of discovering and activating as much as possible those deep common cultural values which are capable of transforming the estranged and long-separated brothers into children of one people, into members of a single national body.

Nevertheless, the first signs of a considerable cultural influence are already noticeable. The study of Hebrew, as the living everyday speech of the State of Israel, has more than doubled in the Jewish schools of the Diaspora. Today it is simply impossible for even the most radical anti-Zionist school to exist without including instruction in Hebrew and, in the more advanced classes, in Hebrew literature. The teaching of Hebrew in public high schools and in colleges and universities, is growing from year to year, and this affects the spread of Hebrew among the Jewish population. The struggle for Eretz Israel and the birth of the State are accepted as proper studies in absolutely all Jewish schools throughout the world—and the heroism of the builders of the *kevutzot* and the *kibbutzim*, as well as the physical valour of the heroes of the war of Liberation, are the principal topics of these studies. It is impossible to appraise the profound influence which the studies may, and it is to be hoped will, exert upon the rising generation.

The Hebrew seminars for teachers in the Diaspora, held in Israel or the Diaspora, are creating a bridge between the State of Israel and the *Galut*. In the past six years more than three thousand teachers of Jewish schools in Diaspora countries went through such an Israel-and-

Hebrew course. The term 'Hebrew courses' does not convey the whole content of the seminars. No doubt great stress is put on the Hebrew language, which is to become the elementary bridge between Israel and the Diaspora, but this does not exhaust the great task of creating intimate spiritual ties between Israel and the rest of Jewry. The problem is much deeper and, indeed, is so regarded by the Jewish Agency, which is the founder of and driving spirit behind these projects. The main purpose is to weave into Jewish education in the Diaspora and keep alive and active in it the ideals and aspirations, the most distant as well as the most immediate, which are bound up with the needs and tasks of the historic moment and which inspire Israeli Jewry as a whole.

(*b*) The Great Catastrophe of European Jewry has no doubt powerfully shaken the whole Jewish people. This came to clear expression not only in the active support in money and blood which the Diaspora gave to the struggle of Eretz Israel with the Arabs and to the establishment of the State of Israel, but also in the strengthening of national consciousness which had an effect on nationalist processes in the Diaspora countries.

We use the words 'national' and 'processes' as if these have long been clear and pronounced phenomena of Jewish life in the Dispersion. In our opinion, this has actually been the case. It is enough to glance through the recently published minutes of the New York *Kehillah*, which the late Dr. J. L. Magnes founded in 1912 and which barely managed to exist until 1922, in order to be easily convinced that already at that time a deep national uneasiness gripped a large group of Jewish intellectuals in the United States. The establishment of the New York *Kehillah*, which as such soon ceased to exist, left deep traces in the sphere of Jewish education, the most important sphere of Jewish life. This was an organic result of the national uneasiness, which appears even more striking in the minutes of the Achvah organization, which was headed by Dr. Magnes, Professor Israel Friedlaender, Professor Mordecai Kaplan, and quite a large group of the most prominent Jewish intellectuals who later played a great role in the life of American Jewry. This group came into being a few years before the establishment of the *Kehillah*. Its object actually consisted of holding discussions on the Jewish question, which meant concretely how to resist waves of assimilation which were already inundating Jewish life in America and threatening to become even more powerful and engulfing.

The Great Catastrophe undoubtedly had an enormous effect in this respect: national uneasiness has now more strongly gripped and penetrated far more deeply the souls not only of the chosen few and of professional communal workers, but of much broader masses. Spontaneously, the uneasiness manifests itself in the intense interest in Jewish education. The number of Jewish children attending Jewish schools in the Diaspora has greatly increased. What is infinitely more important, the

qualitative aspect of the studies has undergone a thorough revolution in the last decade. We have already pointed out that the study of the Hebrew language and things Hebrew, in the sense of the culture of Israel, has become an indispensable part of the curriculum of the Jewish schools of absolutely every type and trend. However, the observance of Jewish holidays, including Israel's Independence Day, and of many Jewish customs and traditions, has also become an organic part of Jewish school life. The Communist Yiddish schools wherever they exist have been forced even to introduce Bar-Mitzvah training because the parents of the boys demand it. We are well aware of how little all this is—but we know that the uneasiness which has called forth parental concern with Jewish holidays, as well as with Jewish customs and traditions, can be harnessed and intensified and at least used to check the advance of assimilation.

National uneasiness manifests itself in a particularly original manner in the sentiments of large circles among the assimilated and semi-assimilated Jewish intelligentsia. Journals have sprung up in English which concern themselves especially with the Jewish religion and national problems; they have no clear-cut programmes, but they painfully and diligently seek paths to Jewishness. The development of serious Jewish literature in English, as is exemplified by the publication of monumental works on Jewish religious philosophy in this language, attests that national uneasiness is spreading and deepening and leading to a national awakening on a considerable scale.

APPENDIX

The table below is almost self-explanatory. In 1840, the areas of high assimilation contained not more than approximately 18 per cent of the Jewish people; at present two-thirds live in countries with a high assimilation potential. We have also to take into account the fact that the assimilation potential became more intensive. It is hardly possible to compare the attraction of the English or even the Russian language in 1840 with that in 1960.

The same must be said about the two remaining groups. The attraction, for example, of the Ukrainian and White-Russian languages, was almost non-existent in 1840, while at present they are of some importance, weak in comparison with the strength of attraction of Russian, but nevertheless exerting some degree of influence on the Jewish minority.

The table shows all the processes which not merely changed Jewish life but virtually revolutionized it; people who were throughout Diaspora history spiritually self-sufficient, became so attracted by their environment, however backward culturally, that it is no longer possible to think about spiritual self-sufficiency in the Diaspora. And if the Jewish people in the Diaspora do not want to lose their national, or better, their spiritual identity, they ought to give more and more attention to the last but one line of the table which bears the proud and ancient word *Hebrew*. This is a new revolutionary factor which grew, it can be said, in the last quarter of the century (in 1925 there were only 60–70 thousand Jews in the Holy Land). The situation is desperate enough. The Jews living in the Hebrew linguistic and cultural environment of Israel, constitute at present no more than 15 per cent of the entire Jewish people.

The distribution of the Jews according to linguistic and cultural environment, 1840–1960

	1840 %	*1900* %	*1960* *Absolute Nos.*	*1960* %
A. Areas of high assimilation				
(1) English-speaking	2·3	12·3	6,125,000	48·1
(2) Russian	0·9	2·3	2,000,000	15·7
(3) French	1·6	0·8	300,000	2·4
(4) Italian	0·8	0·3	30,000	0·2
(5) German	11·0	8·5	30,000	0·2
(6) Scandinavian	1·3	1·1	70,000	0·5
Sub-total	17·9	25·3	8,555,000	67·1
B. Areas of middling assimilation				
(7) Hungarian	5·4	5·9	120,000	0·9
(8) Polish	25·4	19·8	35,000	0·3
(9) Czech	0·6	0·6	15,000	0·1
(10) Rumanian	2·9	2·6	200,000	1·6
(11) Spanish–Portuguese	0·1	0·7	700,000	5·5
Sub-total	34·4	29·6	1,070,000	8·4
C. Areas of low assimilation				
(12) Ukrainian	27·5	21·0	500,000	3·9
(13) White-Russian	7·0	5·9	100,000	0·8
(14) Baltic	1·1	3·3	25,000	0·2
(15) Arabic	5·5	4·0	450,000	3·5
(16) Turkish	1·2	0·8	50,000	0·4
(17) Persian	0·4	0·4	80,000	0·6
(18) Greek	0·5	0·6	8,000	0·1
(19) Other	4·5	9·1	50,000	0·4
Sub-total	47·7	45·1	1,263,000	9·9
Total (Diaspora Jewry)	100·0	100·0	10,888,000	85·4
The area of Hebrew language and culture	—	—	1,860,000	14·6
Grand Total	—	—	12,748,000	100·0

JEWISH ART AS A MINORITY PROBLEM

Heinrich Strauss

I

THE title begs several questions. First, is there such a thing as 'Jewish art'? And what do we mean by a 'minority problem' in this context?

Both Jews and non-Jews have written on the existence of a specifically Jewish art, and frequently in contradictory terms. Let us mention, to begin with, the diametrically opposed views of two well-known Jewish scholars. David Pinkerfield, in an essay entitled *On Jewish Art*, written in 1923, affirmed definitely that there was such a thing as Jewish art, though there were some people, motivated no doubt by anti-Jewish feelings, who denied its existence.[1] The extreme opposite opinion is held, among others, by the art historian Bernard Berenson, who categorically denies the existence of national characteristics in the plastic arts as practised by Jews.[2] Since this unequivocally negative opinion was expressed by a Jew, it cannot be explained away—as Pinkerfield tried to do—as antisemitism.

Another view is put forward by Karl Schwarz who, in his book *The Jews in Art*, regards Jewish artistic creation as a task yet to be performed rather than as an accomplished fact.[3] Ernst Cohn-Wiener, on the other hand, in the introduction to his *Jewish Art* evades the problem by making the surprising assertion that in art history too much stress was often laid in the past upon form as against content (in this case, Jewish content).[4] He accordingly affirms the existence of Jewish art on the basis of content alone. But this conceptual shift with regard to the constituents of the plastic arts should be opposed. 'A work of art is a measure of space, it is form; that is the crucial point.'[5]

The definition of the concept of 'Jewish Art' in the book *Omanut Yehudit* ('Jewish Art'), edited by Cecil Roth,[6] is even more surprising.

This anthology deals with works of art not only of Jews but also of artists of Jewish origin; it includes Jewish cult objects and buildings, irrespective of whether or not they were created by Jews. But what relation is there between Jewish art and, for example, the head office of the German Reichsbank built by a converted Jew in Berlin (plate 384); or the paintings of the Nazarene Philipp Veit (another baptized Jew who worked in neo-Catholic Romantic circles in Rome at the beginning of the nineteenth century)? What purpose is served by an *ad hoc* definition which includes such works within the framework of 'Jewish Art', and in a book of this title?

These five mutually contradictory definitions from the works of well-known Jewish art historians illustrate the prevailing vagueness of the concept of Jewish art. In view of this vagueness, our best plan will be to consider the attitude of the Jews to the plastic arts in historical perspective; this historical treatment may enable us to answer the question of the existence of a Jewish national art in the past. But when considering the Jewish people in historical perspective, we find that the decisive factor has been its minority status. In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, it should be emphasized that we are dealing here with the Jews as a cultural and not as a political minority. They remained a cultural minority—an island in a sea of ancient Oriental and later Hellenistic-Roman culture—even in times of political autonomy.

> Our people was not allowed to choose its place on earth and its hour in history. . . . To remain young while burdened with so much that is old; to preserve freedom under restriction, to remain faithful to the command 'Be true to Yourself', those were its tasks. One of the main objects of this book is to relate how far these tasks have been fulfilled in the realm of art.[7]

These words, written by Georg Dehio in connexion with the art of the Germans, are even more valid for a typical minority people such as the Jews.

II

When the desert tribes of the B'nei Israel penetrated into Canaan, they found there an art whose development we are now able to assess in the light of the archaeological excavations of the last few decades. This homogeneous Canaanite-Phoenician culture (as shown by finds in Ugarit, Northern Syria) was closely linked with Mesopotamia and perhaps even more so with Egypt. It formed a part of the 'international' civilization of that time. In the fifteenth century B.C.E. we find a Hurrian hymn to the Babylonian goddess Nikkal in Ugarit translated into the North-Canaanite language. And an Egyptian physician and architect was to be employed by an Anatolian prince.[8]

Egyptian and Mesopotamian influences predominate in the choice of artistic themes of the period; finds along the Phoenician coastline

seem more Egyptian in character, those of Northern Syria, more Mesopotamian.[9]

In the course of the invasions which poured into Southern Syria at the turn of the thirteenth and twelfth centuries B.C.E., the Phoenicio-Canaanite population was, within half a century, deprived of the greater part of its territory: the Philistines, from across the sea, occupied the Southern coastal plain; the Aramaeans started their migration which led to the conquest of vast areas of Southern Syria, and the Israelite desert tribes penetrated into Palestine to settle there permanently. Nevertheless, Canaanite enclaves in the Plain of Jezreel and in other parts of the country remained in existence for a considerable time afterwards.

This overwhelming pressure of consecutive invasions drove the Phoenicio-Canaanites out to the sea. Led by Tyre and Sidon, they founded under their King Hiram I in the mid-tenth century colonies and industries in Cyprus, Sardinia, Sicily, North Africa, and Southern Spain. These settlements flourished up to the eighth century B.C.E. when Assyrian pressure on land and Greek competition at sea seriously weakened the Phoenicians and their colonial empire disintegrated. After 660 they also lost cultural leadership in the Mediterranean area.

We find here that, while the political connexion of the home country with the dispersed Phoenician colonies along the shores of the Mediterranean was lost at an early date, the colonists nevertheless did not forget their ancient roots, no more than the Jews were to do a thousand years later. When Augustine, one of the Church Fathers, who lived in the fifth century, i.e. one and a half millennia after the Phoenicio-Canaanite emigration, asked some peasants of Hippo, his African See, who they were, they replied: 'Canaanites.'[10]

Owing to their flourishing trade, we find Phoenician works of art throughout the Mediterranean area: in Cyprus, Greece, and Etruria, to mention but a few of the most important sites. The objects in question often show Egyptian motifs, but used purely for decorative purposes and irrespective of their religious significance.[11] It is worth stressing this indifference to the original significance of the motifs used, since we shall encounter the same phenomenon in the case of the Jews, both in their homeland and in the Diaspora.

For our purposes, the most important aspect of Canaanite art lies in its impact upon the Israelite immigrants.

Though Israel made no independent artistic contributions of its own, so far as we know, and though its spiritual leaders appear rather consistently to have rejected or at least neglected graphic art, it was part and parcel of the Syro-Phoenician material culture of the day. All through Palestine we find stray objects of art from Phoenician workshops. The statement that Israelite art was Phoenician does not, of course, mean that there were no Israelite artists; it merely indicates that the Israelites imported objects of Phoenician

workmanship, that some Israelites may have worked in Phoenician shops or have founded ateliers of their own, where they faithfully followed Phoenician techniques and traditions.[13]

I have quoted Professor Albright verbatim, since the Jewish practices he describes in relation to the Phoenicio-Canaanites are equally characteristic of the Jews' relationship to foreign artistic influences in later times. To prove his point Albright emphasizes the close connexions which must have existed between Egyptian, Phoenician and Israelite artisans: an ivory carving from Samaria, worked in the Phoenician style, bears the Hebrew inscription 'Eliashib' in hieroglyphics.[13]

Albright then arrives at a conclusion which may seem something of an overstatement: that, at the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, and for a century afterwards, 'its artistic level was still higher than that of Greece, as we know from seals, Astarte figurines, proto-Aeolic pilaster-capitals, and decorated objects of copper or ivory'.[14] This assertion, while not doing full justice to archaic Greek art, nevertheless proves the high artistic standards of Jewish finds of that period.

The most significant monument to Phoenician-Canaanite artistic influence upon Israel is beyond doubt to be found in the Temple of Solomon. The collaboration of Phoenician artists and artisans in the building of the Temple is expressly mentioned in the Bible. In 1936, the Chicago Oriental Institute excavated a small ninth-century temple at Tell Tainat, Northern Syria. Its plan bears a striking resemblance to the Biblical description of Solomon's Temple, leaving no room for doubt as to the Phoenician character of the latter's style.[15] But in spite of all similarities, one fundamental difference remains: in contrast to the Canaanite temples, the *cella* of the Temple of Solomon did not contain an image of the deity.[16] The adoption of Canaanite-Phoenician artistic expressions, and the material changes resulting from a settled way of life and the erection of a permanent structure for the previously nomadic Ark of the Covenant, did not affect the fundamentals of the religion the Israelites had brought with them from the desert—first and foremost, the concept of the invisible God. The first encounter with a world culture, that of the Ancient Orient, thus led to the adoption by the Israelites of the artistic expressions of their new environment without their surrendering the central tenets of their cultural heritage.

III

The encounter of Judaism with the Greco-Roman world was to last a millennium (from about 350 B.C.E. to 650 C.E.), or even longer, since the Arab culture of the Middle Ages was also largely based on the classical heritage. We accept this time scale for practical purposes, but it is not possible to draw exact lines of demarcation as far as the plastic

arts are concerned; in the later classical period, oriental stylistic elements, for some time thrust into the background but always perceptible beneath the surface, again come to the fore. This period of a thousand years can be sub-divided, both for Jewish and general history, into two more or less equal sections, with the turning point in the second century C.E.; in Jewish history, it is a series of catastrophic events, in Eretz Israel under Titus and Hadrian, and in the Golah under Trajan; in the Greco-Roman world the critical Marcomannic wars of Marcus Aurelius made the first cracks in the proud edifice of the Roman Empire. In our consideration of Jewish art, we shall deal, first, with the period starting with the Hellenization of the Orient and ending with the destruction of the Temple and the Bar Kochba rebellion; then with subsequent developments in Palestine up to the Arab conquest and, finally, with art in the Diaspora up to that time.

At the time of the Persians we already find evidence of contact between Judaism and Greek culture. Under the rule of the Achaemenians, many regions with limited political autonomy had the right to strike coins; and thus we find coins bearing an Athenian symbol, the owl, or figures of Zeus and Aphrodite, together with the inscription 'JAHD'.[17] The fact that the Jews (or others for them) struck coins showing human and animal representations, or that they at least overstamped foreign coins of this type, seems to prove that the religious prohibition of pictorial representation of man and beast was not at that time very strictly enforced; any real danger of reversion to idolatry had not existed since the return from exile, and therefore Jewish communal leaders could afford to take a lenient view of this practice.[18]

Archaeological excavations have brought to light much of artistic value from buildings, burials and other sites of this period. In addition, we have Jewish literary sources of the time, e.g. on the Temple of Herod, and the works of the historian Josephus Flavius, previously treated with caution by scholars but surprisingly vindicated in recent excavations of the fortress of Herod at Massada.

On the basis of all this evidence, an expert on the period, Maximilian Kon, has expressed the opinion that in the Herodian era the Jews were showing signs of developing a national art, but that this development was, so to speak, nipped in the bud, by subsequent political upheavals. Most of the artistic treasures of the Herodian period, Kon believes, were purposely destroyed after the suppression of Bar Kochba's rebellion by the populace of Aelia Capitolina (the Roman city founded by Hadrian in place of Jerusalem which had been razed to the ground); but the surviving remnants of architecture, grave decorations, and other objects seemed to show a deviation from the prevailing Alexandrian style with a greater emphasis on naturalism by the addition of indigenous compositional elements.[19] Whether, given peaceful development, these beginnings would in fact have led to an indigenous Jewish art it is

impossible to say, and historians are inclined to shrink from such hypotheses. Archaeologically, the region has been only very scantily explored and there is a possibility that the pagan art of the area may show similar deviations from the Alexandrian style and that these were taken over by the Jews at the time of Herod. As we shall see presently, the synagogue paintings of Dura-Europos, two centuries later in date, have also been regarded as evidence of an indigenous Jewish graphic art whereas they are painted in a clearly pagan Syrian style. Recently, Temple frescoes painted two centuries earlier were discovered on the same site, and there can be no doubt that they served as models for the later synagogue paintings. Kon points to Persian influence in the upper part of one of the most important articles of synagogue furniture: the seven-branched candelabra; as to its foot, he regards the carving of the candelabra on the Arch of Titus as authentic in detail, but believes that the columns of the famous Temple of Apollo at Didyma, dating from the same period, served as a model.[20] Other objects of synagogue furniture, depicted on ancient coins, are also modelled on Greek prototypes.[21] Thus, synagogue furniture does not support Kon's hypothesis of an indigenous Jewish style; on the contrary, the influence of the international art of the surrounding world is particularly evident in this sphere.[21a]

IV

Evidence of Jewish artistic creativeness in Palestine after the destruction of the Temple is to be found in still surviving and excavated synagogue ruins, chiefly in Galilee. Here the artistic achievement lies in the adaptation of the Roman basilica, which served profane communal purposes, to the needs of Jewish religious and secular community life. This can be seen in the fact that the axis of the building was made to point in the direction of Jerusalem; also in the removal of the *tribuna* from the anterior wall of the inner room which, in the Roman basilica, had served as the elevated seat of a judge (tribunal!) or other authority. In contrast to the sacrificial service in the pagan temple, the Jewish priesthood had hardly any religious functions to perform in the synagogue; and in contrast to the Christian basilica, *apsis* and *tribuna* are not developed into a special, frequently raised, platform reserved for the clergy.[22] Nevertheless, the influence of these synagogues upon early Christian basilica architecture in the Near East is clearly discernible.

Any consideration of Jewish art of this period must take into account the great work of Professor Goodenough,[23] in which the archaeological and literary material is collated in exemplary fashion. Goodenough's basic theories were concisely summarized by Cecil Roth in his review of the first three volumes. He wrote:

> The immediate purpose of the study, in the author's words, is to 'try to discover the religious attitudes of the Jews in the Greco-Roman world'—

not the theoretical attitudes of the Hebraically-learned minority who compiled the Talmud and the allied literature, but those of the masses of the scattered people who built the synagogues and are commemorated in the Catacombs and manufactured the amulets and whose archaeological and artistic relics are distributed from the Euphrates to the Atlantic. For Goodenough is convinced that this popular religion was not the religion of the Rabbis, and was, in many cases indeed, in sharp contradiction thereto. It was a sort of mystery religion, embodying a host of pagan symbols and conceptions, which dominated Judaism in the Roman Empire outside the walls of the Rabbinical schools, by which it was but little affected. And it was because of the existence of this wide-spread mystery-Judaism that Christianity was able to develop and to triumph, along the same lines, within such a short period of its establishment.

I have quoted from Cecil Roth's summary of Goodenough's theories at some length because they are so completely opposed to the observations made here regarding the attitude of the Jews to the art of their environment. If Goodenough is right, the Jews of the Greco-Roman era did not use the pagan symbols of their environment only for decorative purposes but (with the exception of a small rabbinical minority) were also essentially and significantly influenced by them in their religious views. This interpretation will therefore have to be subjected to detailed scrutiny.[24]

Goodenough proceeds from the doubtless correct observation that the archaeological finds under review do not begin to exhibit pagan symbols to any considerable extent until the second and third centuries of the Christian era. These symbols mainly depict human beings and animals and seem to indicate that the legal authorities exercised greater laxity towards such representational art after the Bar Kochba rebellion. To explain this development, Goodenough assumes that the rabbis were reluctant followers of a public opinion which had largely become emancipated from their leadership. On the archaeological evidence and the change in rabbinical attitude there is far-reaching agreement between Goodenough and his critics; but they part company with him when it comes to interpretation.

First of all, it must be remembered that the Jews formed minority communities everywhere in the Roman Empire—and after the Bar Kochba rebellion even in Eretz Israel. At the time of Constantine and his successors some eight per cent of the inhabitants of the Roman Empire were Jews.[25] In Palestine, particularly, we find, in addition to the tremendous numerical decline in the Jewish population as a consequence of the war, an internal migration of Jews from the countryside into the flourishing pagan cities. There they became artisans and had to compete in the market with non-Jews following the same trades; in short, they had to consider the tastes of their non-Jewish customers. The rabbis, no longer worried about the dangers of a reversion to

idolatry, facilitated competition for Jewish artisans by mitigating the Halachic prohibition with regard to artistic representation of man and beast.[26]

Furthermore, Goodenough does not seem to attach sufficient importance to the fact that synagogue ornaments, regarded by him as symptomatic of the 'pagan-Jewish' tendency, were *mass produced* by artisans, with the result that the symbolic value of the representations had, in the course of numerous reproductions, been either weakened or completely forgotten. In accordance with Diocletian's famous maximum wage scale of 301 C.E., sculptors (in marble, bronze, clay, and stucco), mosaic workers and painters of frescoes were to be treated as only slightly elevated building labourers and their wages calculated on that scale—plus an extra remuneration which was however fixed collectively for the workers and not given to each individual artist on his merit. This method of rewarding work already argues against its valuation as individual works of art and leads to the conclusion that they were regarded as objects of mass production. Besides, we know from ancient accounts of the martyrdom of Claudius that Diocletian commissioned animal and human statues (e.g. figures of Cupid and Victory) from his Pannonian marble quarries, to be made on the spot. These were staple products. Therefore, if we find such objects in synagogues, it does not necessarily follow that we are dealing with specially commissioned works of art. Finally, Jewish and Christian mosaic floors have been discovered which seem to indicate a common provenance from the same workshop, similar in all but specific religious symbols, such as the cross and the seven-branched candelabra. It appears that such religious symbols were added in the workshop in accordance with the religious requirements of the prospective customers.[27] In view of these facts, it can hardly be argued that some of the figures portrayed in all these mosaics (e.g. peacocks) had a definite 'pagan-Jewish' symbolic value.

It could be argued, however, that even very common objects can preserve their symbolic value for the faithful; today the cross is often mass produced, even by non-Christians, but for the Christian it nevertheless retains its symbolic significance. Hence, our main object will be to prove that, as regards even the examples cited by Goodenough, the representations in question had for the Jews only a purely decorative, and certainly not any religious symbolic significance. Of course, as Goodenough rightly says in his reply published in *Judaism*,[28] nobody is in a position to say with absolute certainty what exactly a Jew of that time felt when contemplating such representations. But there are certain indications which lead us to believe that the Jews felt quite indifferent to such symbolic values. Cecil Roth points to the remarkable fact that many of these 'pagan' symbols have been found in graves at Beth Shearim, where the Palestinian Patriarchs, i.e. the leaders of the rabbinical movement, are buried.[29] We also have in Jewish literature

(*Mishna Aboda Zara* 3, 4) Rabbi Gamaliel's reply to the philosopher Proklos, which clearly shows that the rabbis quite correctly assessed the frequently purely decorative purposes of pagan statues. When Proklos asked Rabbi Gamaliel in the baths at Acre how he, a Jew, could bathe in a place containing a statue of Aphrodite, the rabbi replied that the statue had been put there not for the purpose of worship, but purely as decoration: '*Afroditi noy l'merchatz*' (as it was placed near the outlet of the baths where men relieved themselves).

This highly sophisticated view of when a statue served idolatrous purposes and when it did not, also explains why Caligula's edict for the erection of his statue in the Temple drove them almost to rebellion, whereas, several centuries later, the father of Mar Samuel of Nehardea in Mesopotamia could say his prayers in the Shaf ve-Yatib synagogue without any religious qualms in spite of the fact that it contained a statue of the Persian king.[30] It does not follow that in later times there was greater laxity with regard to idolatry; the contrast in the reaction of the Jews, however, points to a decisive difference: the erection of a statue of Caligula was an aspect of Roman emperor worship; the emperor was venerated as *divus*, a god. The Persian kings, on the other hand, were Zoroastrians and theirs was an iconoclastic religion. The royal statue in the Nehardea synagogue could therefore be only a symbol of Persian temporal rule and never amount to veneration of a pagan idol. Since the Jews of Mesopotamia recognized Persian sovereignty, they saw nothing inconsistent in praying in a synagogue adorned in this manner.

We can see that the Jews of this period knew very well how to distinguish between the decorative, political, and liturgical purposes of an image or statue. Its presence in a synagogue does not prove any religious significance. Today, we may register surprise when we see the floor of the Beth Alpha synagogue decorated with a mosaic of Helios and his team of solar steeds; for the Jews of that time it was no more than the natural centrepiece of an ornament depicting the heavens in the conventional manner. The artistic form was accepted, the intrinsic significance ignored. We shall find the Jews exhibiting the same indifference in the plastic arts again in later times.

V

There are many different facets to Jewish art in the Diaspora up to the Islamic conquest, depending mainly on the social status of the Jews. The synagogue of the great and wealthy community in Alexandria was famed for its splendour many centuries after its destruction by Trajan: 'The words of Rabbi Yehuda: "He who has not seen the twin gallery of Alexandria has never in his life seen a great honour bestowed upon Israel . . ." ' (*Tosefta Sukkah* 4, 6).[31]

This accords with the, no doubt exaggerated, legendary description of seventy-one golden chairs with which this synagogue was said to have been furnished.

The position of the Jews in imperial Rome was very different, as we know from ancient writers. Martial charged that the Jew was 'brought up to beg by his mother'; the Jews were settled outside the city precincts, living on alms and superstitions—a pariah existence not dissimilar to that of present-day gypsies.[32] There may have been well-to-do Jews in Rome, but the overall impression is very different from that in Alexandria; there is a striking contrast, also, between Jewish places of burial and worship preserved in the Roman Catacombs and the magnificence of the synagogue in Alexandria.

Many synagogue ruins remain from the Hellenistic world; but they are of greater archaeological than artistic interest. As in Palestine, we also find in Diaspora synagogues mosaic floors clearly showing the stylistic influence of a pagan or Christian environment. Works of art housed in these synagogues were either destroyed or looted in wars and pogroms; up to the present, the only exception—and therefore of special art-historical significance—is the synagogue of Dura-Europos with its famous frescoes.[33] The fact that these frescoes have been preserved is due to an accident, not unlike that of Pompeii where the lava in the wake of the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius submerged the buildings but preserved the paintings. During the last Persian siege, the synagogue of Dura-Europos, situated next to the city wall, was filled up in order to increase the wall's resistance to ramming from the outside. When the city was excavated during the 1920s and 1930s, the frescoes were discovered, detached from the walls, and transferred in their original sequence to a specially built room at the Damascus museum.

These accidentally preserved frescoes, painted around the middle of the third century C.E. in a small synagogue (with room for fifty men and thirty women) in an insignificant township on the outskirts of the Roman Empire, sparked off a controversy among art historians. The decisive question was whether these frescoes were evidence of Jewish artistic proficiency and of an indigenous art which withered in Talmudic times under the pressure of strict religious taboos, but nevertheless gave rise to the development of early Christian painting (frescoes in Catacombs, mosaics, and miniatures), or whether both—the Jewish frescoes of the Dura-Europos synagogue as well as early Christian paintings—were the products of a pagan Syrian school of painting, differing completely, sometimes even diametrically, from the Hellenistic-Roman school.

The view that we are dealing with an indigenous Jewish art, from which early Christian painting developed, is held by Sukenik and Baron.[34] In this they follow the Viennese art historian Strzygowski, who already at the beginning of this century concluded from the fact that

Catacomb paintings depict Old Testament subjects almost exclusively that they had their roots in a Jewish-Oriental art. Since we are not able to go into this very complicated question, suffice it to point out that even if a stylistic connexion were regarded as established between the Dura-Europos frescoes and early Christian painting, this would not necessarily amount to proof of the indigenous significance of Jewish art. In fact, Rostovtzeff, in his book *Dura-Europos and its Art* (London, 1938), describes the frescoes in the temple of the Palmyrian Gods and in that of Zeus Theos, painted some two centuries before those of Dura-Europos, in terms almost identical with those used by Max Dvorak twenty years earlier when describing Christian Catacomb paintings in Rome; terms, such as linear, two-dimensional front-view, expressiveness of faces showing an inner spiritual life, which would be equally applicable in a description of the synagogue frescoes of Dura-Europos. There is thus no need to search any further for the models of this 'indigenous' Jewish style.[35]

The view held by this writer, that the synagogue paintings of Dura-Europos originate in the pagan Syrian style, is shared by Talbot-Rice[36] who finds oriental stylistic elements, for instance, in the vertical projection and the disproportionately enlarged scale used for the main figures in these frescoes (e.g. Moses in comparison with his followers). Talbot-Rice also finds a 'Syrian style' in the treatment of figures—reminiscent of the Dura-Europos frescoes—in a series of Christian manuscript miniatures comprising the *Sinope Fragment* (in Paris), the *Cotton Genesis* (in London), the *Rabula Gospels* (in Florence), and the *Vienna Genesis*.

The Dura-Europos frescoes also clearly illustrate that the Jews availed themselves of the artistic modes of expression of their environment, the Syrian pagan style, for the representation of Jewish themes—of their cultural heritage. In relation to early Christian art, they may have been the transmitters of this style, which was opposed to the classical ideal; just as, in earlier times, the Phoenicio-Canaanites had transmitted ancient oriental artistic forms, and as the Arabs were to do in the Middle Ages with forgotten classical style elements to the West.[37]

VI

In the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era, rabbinical practice became less lenient towards pictorial representations of man and beast. Whereas pictorial representations in synagogues had formerly been tolerated, they now fell victim to an iconoclastic movement;[38] the influence of iconoclastic tendencies in the oriental environment becomes more pronounced. Nearly two thousand years after the penetration of the iconomachal Israelite tribes into the cultural domain

of the Near East, the region was overwhelmed by another wave of iconoclastic invaders from the desert: the Islamic conquerors from the Arabian peninsula whose triumphal advance carried them east into Central Asia and west as far as southern France.

The iconoclastic movement made only slow progress in regions where the classical tradition was strong; even the desert castles of the Omayad Caliphs (e.g. Khirbat al Mafjar) of the eighth century still contain representations of human figures; but in the castles of the Abassid Caliphs, built from the ninth century onwards, such decorations are entirely absent.

In Christian Byzantium the iconoclastic wing comes to the fore in the course of the eighth century, leading to a separation between the Roman and Greek Churches. In view of this development it is not surprising that, among Jews too, iconoclastic tendencies became more pronounced. They were, after all, in line with an age-old tradition, only occasionally suppressed by environmental pressures. In the Islamic world in particular Jewish art now became non-representational and purely decorative.

The Arab warrior caste formed the ruling class of the feudal Islamic state. They appreciated and surrounded themselves with beautiful objects. Does not the Koran quote Mohammed as having said, when faced with rich men not clad in accordance with their station, that the Almighty, when conferring wealth upon a man, liked 'to see visible signs of it on him'?[39] Thus, the Arab ruling class also enjoyed living in beautiful houses, furnished with magnificent carpets and artistic objects, without exhibiting any curiosity—let alone investigating—whether these works of art had been produced by their co-religionists or others. On the contrary, the pursuit of such crafts was considered beneath the dignity of an Arab gentleman, and in consequence creative artists were mostly slaves or aliens not enjoying equal civic rights, such as Jews, Copts, and Armenians. It is however not possible to ascribe any of the works of art of mediaeval Islam to one or the other of these subject peoples unless an inscription, or the specific purpose of a particular object, furnishes a clue in this respect.[40] Thus, objects of 'Jewish art' in Islamic countries can only be identified as such by inscriptions or by the use for which they were presumably intended.

The reconquest of Spain by Christianity did not bring about an immediate change in this respect; churches were built in the characteristic *Mujedar* style, a Christian style strongly permeated by Moorish elements. This is not really surprising since the same artisans' families which had until then worked for the Moslem overlords, now worked for their Christian successors. The goldsmith's and silversmith's crafts remained Jewish monopolies in Spain, at first shunned also by the Christians. (Conditions were similar in the Yemen, an anachronistic survival of mediaeval feudalism, until its Jews emigrated to Israel just over ten

years ago.) As a result, the Jews were the producers of Christian religious objects for centuries to come. Not until 1415 was this prohibited in Spain by the Anti-Pope Benedict XIII, and in 1480 Queen Isabella of Castile appointed a court painter one of whose duties was to ensure that 'no Jew or Moor be allowed to create an image of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus of Nazareth or of the Holy and Blessed Virgin Mary'.[41] Only then was abandoned the 'naïve' attitude, taken over from the Arabs, which did not see anything offensive in the manufacture of religious objects by followers of other faiths. In its place we find an emotional resistance to this practice which is quite in tune with modern ideas on the subject. The change of mind may well be due to the religious revival which characterized the later Middle Ages—a result of the sermonizing and educational activities of Mendicant Orders among the masses. Besides, the rise of cities had brought with it the immigration of artisans from Christian communities. These artisans made a breach in the traditional Jewish monopoly. (The Moors, members of a former ruling class, were not involved to the same extent.) Since the art of that time chiefly served ecclesiastical purposes, Queen Isabella's prohibition meant, for the Jews, a considerable fall in the demand for the products and led to a deterioration of their economic position. Twelve years after the appointment of the court official mentioned above, the expulsion decree against the Jews of Spain was promulgated from Granada.

The great synagogue of Toledo, which later became the church of S. Maria la Blanca, was built around 1200 when the city had been back in Christian hands for over a century. With its horseshoe arcades above pillars decorated with volutes and fir-cones, it represents so pure a Moorish style that this synagogue is frequently regarded (e.g. by Cohn-Wiener[42]) as the crowning glory of Jewish art in the Islamic Middle Ages. This proves the strength of the Moorish tradition in art even after the reconquest by Christianity. The small synagogue in Cordoba contains so many Islamic stylistic elements that the niche of the *Aron Hakodesh* could easily be taken for an Islamic prayer niche (*Mihrab*) were it not for the Hebrew inscriptions.

Such a typical Moslem *Mihrab* and its furniture (oriental hanging lamp and two tall candles) can be clearly identified in an illustration of synagogue furniture (*menorah*, etc.) on a Samaritan prayer hanging, produced in Damascus two centuries later. The artist was influenced by the Islamic environment to the extent of using the symbols of an alien religion for an illustration of the most venerated and traditionally sacred objects of synagogue furniture.[43]

In the course of time Christian stylistic elements naturally tend to come to the fore in Spain. The second synagogue of Toledo, built some 150 years after the great one (subsequently the church of El Transito), contains, beneath Moorish arcades, decorative convolutions of tendrils

and vines, naturalistic leaf ornaments deriving from the Gothic church architecture of France. This influence is easily explained by the close links between Catholic Spain and its northern neighbour. Increasing French influence can also be seen in the Spanish-Jewish manuscripts of the period which contain pictures of human beings, in contrast to earlier manuscripts written when Islamic prohibitions were in force. The best known of the later manuscripts is the so-called 'Sarajevo Hagada', taken to the Bosnian capital by Spanish Jews after the expulsion and kept there to this day. The imaginative leaf ornamentation attests to its origin in the High Gothic period; the characteristic hanging lamps and the Negress crouching on the floor next to the table in the picture of the *Seder* provide the local colour of the Islamic-Spanish environment. As in the El Transito synagogue in Toledo, we find here a mixture of styles characteristic of Jewish art in Christian Spain in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

We have shown that, once again, the Jews took over the external art forms of their environment—even the characteristic mixture of styles from various sources—for use in their own artistic creations. The Oriental-Islamic cultural influence can be found in the works of Sephardi Jews long after their ancestors' departure from Islamic countries.

VII

We can see from the oldest remaining synagogue ruins, e.g. that of Delos, built in the second century B.C.E., that no special place was provided for the *Aron Hakodesh* which housed the Scrolls.[44] The *Bimá* (in Arabic, *Almemor*), from where the rabbi preached and interpreted the scriptures, was situated in the centre and formed the focal point of the synagogue. Medieval synagogues largely preserved the character of this room as a centre of teaching; throughout the Middle Ages the *Bima* was used for teaching, administrative and judicial purposes as well as for prayer.[45]

Church architecture developed along different lines. The central part of Christian ritual was the Mass, celebrated by the priest at the high altar in the presence of the faithful. The development of one end of the nave into a raised platform, visible from all parts of the church, followed logically. This evolution also affected synagogue architecture. In the oldest remaining synagogues of the High Middle Ages we find the *Aron Hakodesh* fixed in a prominent position on the east wall, i.e. in the direction of prayer; there is reason to assume that this development was influenced by church architecture. Nevertheless, the *Bima* retained its central position in synagogue architecture until modern times. An instance is provided by the Altneuschul synagogue in Prague where the benches in the men's section were not arranged in the direction of prayer, but made to face the *Bima*; and thirteenth-century miniatures

from Northern Spain, depicting synagogue scenes, show the *Bima* in the centre of the congregation, and only rarely the *Aron Hakodesh*.

Like the churches of the mendicant friars in late medieval times, synagogues were also frequently built with double naves (e.g. Altneuschul in Prague; the synagogue at Regensburg [Ratisbon]), though this sometimes resulted in the *Aron Hakodesh*, situated in the centre of the east wall, being partly or completely obscured by the central row of columns along the length of the nave. Eventually the Orders of mendicant friars abandoned the pre-eminent position of the High Altar for reasons similar to those of the Jews: their churches, too, were intended as communal meeting places, where the faithful could be made receptive to the word of the preacher, thus achieving a more profound and personal Christian experience rather than for an exclusively religious service with the congregation participating only as passive onlookers.

While, therefore, Occidental Jews in the early Middle Ages made only selective use of architectural elements in their environment and adapted them to their own requirements, early medieval iconoclasm gave rise to another phenomenon: 'Medieval Judaism was not hostile to art but, like the mendicant friars or the early Protestants, exhibited *indifference* towards the plastic arts as such.'[46] This indifference had surprising results. One might have expected that in the late Middle Ages the Jews would have ceased the practice of using new artistic modes of expression of their environment. Subjected to special legislation and confined to the ghetto, they no longer participated in the intellectual development of the Christian Occident. The period from the late twelfth to the early thirteenth century—with the evolution of a Christian secular culture, increased city development, etc.—was a time of transition for the West. It might be reasonably assumed that the Jews, cut off from these significant developments, would from then on have gone their own way in art and no longer adopted environmental artistic forms.

What we find in fact is a continuation of this adoption. Synagogues were built in the Gothic style, though the *shul* had nothing whatever in common with the Christian symbolism of Gothic architecture which saw in the Gothic cathedral the image of a heavenly Jerusalem.[47] The Jews adopted the soaring vertical prospects of the Gothic style, but not the celestial cathedral symbolism of which it was an expression.

In his essay, *On the History of Jewish Manuscript Illustrations*,[48] David Kaufmann refers to the author of Codex 653 of the *Derossiana* of Parma. This artist, unquestionably Jewish, was so intimately acquainted with the style of Gothic churches and buildings that he might have been a member of a mason's lodge; he himself drew a plan of the complete façade of a Gothic chapel, accurate in every detail (p. 221).

A Gothic tower with cross-like flower-bosses, water-spouts, dragons' fights, and grimacing devils: all these details well known from Gothic cathedrals are said to be present in this *Machsor* manuscript. But it must

be emphasized once again that this Gothic symbolism, used by Jews for artistic purposes, did not affect Judaism itself.

The use of foreign stylistic elements is particularly striking in miniatures in Hebrew prayer books. The question whether these were painted by Jewish artists trained in Christian workrooms, or by non-Jews commissioned by Jews to illustrate the manuscripts, may remain unanswered. What is certain is that the Jews commissioning the pictures regarded their execution as satisfactory; therefore, even if executed by non-Jews, they can be regarded as evidence of the Jewish attitude to this art.

An element of mystery is introduced into these illustrated Hebrew prayer books by pictures of human beings with birds' heads. Two of the most important manuscripts, both originating in the thirteenth century, are now in Jerusalem; one, in the Bezalel Museum, is an illustrated Passover Hagadah by an anonymous author from the Rhineland. The miniatures exhibit a strong French influence. In his commentaries to this manuscript the late Mr. Narkis, Director of the Museum, says: 'The strangest fact of all is that all the heads except those of non-Jews and angels are the heads of birds.'

The second of these thirteenth-century prayer books, now in the possession of the Hebrew University, the so-called *Wormser Machsor*, also contains such birds' heads. In this case they appear in the margin of the page of *Piyut 'Yotzer'*, at the beginning of the *Sharachit* prayer for Shevuot. Some of the figures are shown with birds' beaks and pointed Jewish hats, and next to each figure there is one of the commandments in small letters. Particularly striking are two gesticulating figures, obviously engaged in lively conversation; these are in fact somewhat spiteful and exaggerated caricatures, such as may be found in the anti-semitic press. These 'bird faces' are by no means uniform; there are pronounced individual differences. A lean old woman, for example, has the beak of a vulture.[49]

The manner in which the illustrations are incorporated into the text leads to the assumption that both text and pictures are the work of the same artist or artists. On fol. 133, Vol. I of the manuscript, three writers with Jewish names are expressly mentioned, one of them, Shmaya Hazarfati, bearing a name denoting French origin. Our stylistic analysis of similar Hagadah illustrations can therefore claim to be well documented.

But how is one to explain the fact that the Jews themselves represented Jews as 'birds', wildly gesticulating with their hands, and achieving what can almost be described as antisemitic caricatures? A detailed examination of the Bezalel Hagadah reveals that, in addition to Jewish noses caricatured as birds' beaks, these bird faces sometimes have the ears of animals, even of pigs. In short, they show faces with component features deriving from more than one animal, a frequent phenomenon

in medieval illustrations. In his commentaries to the Hagadah, Narkis explains the bird faces as resulting from the iconoclastic tendencies then prevalent among Jews in that particular region of Germany. He quotes Rabbi Meir of Rotenburg who, in a famous decision, prohibited the representation of human faces in the synagogue, basing himself on Rambam who had however permitted pictures of birds and animals. But Narkis himself points out that, in the book in question, Pharaoh and his suite, as well as the angels, the sun, and the moon, are shown with human faces. There is no rabbinical decision in existence which prohibits the representation of Jewish faces only, but allows those of non-Jews and angels, let alone of the sun and the moon.

A totally different interpretation of the representation of human beings with animal features is given by Zofia Ameisenova.[50] Gods with animal heads, a frequent phenomenon in the Orient, also appear in the Bible, in Ezekiel's famous vision of God who was riding in a carriage drawn by a cherub with four animal heads. These animal heads could therefore be regarded as a symbol of divine origin or special divine grace, and the author cites Jewish and Christian pictures of angels and saints in support of her theory. But a comparison of an illustration of the sacrifice of Isaac in the Bezalel Hagadah with that in a Hebrew manuscript Bible from thirteenth-century Germany (also quoted by Mrs. Ameisenova) shows beyond question that her interpretation cannot be valid for the two manuscripts now in Jerusalem.[51] In the Hagadah only the angel has a human face, whereas in Mrs. Ameisenova's manuscript the angel has the head of an eagle while Abraham and Isaac show human faces. Nor does her theory explain why, in these manuscripts, Jews are singled out for caricature in this manner. In contrast to the other illustrations cited by Mrs. Ameisenova,[52] this element of caricature is also present in the illustration of the story of Ruth in a German manuscript dating from the first half of the fourteenth century.

All the tentative explanations of this phenomenon so far offered must therefore be regarded as unsatisfactory. My own view—which cannot be accepted as proven unless and until similar Christian manuscripts are discovered—is that these Jewish caricatures originated in the medieval theatre and portray a Jewish type often found on the stage. The birds' beaks and pigs' ears could well represent theatrical masks. (The story of Ruth seems particularly suited to dramatization.) In the medieval theatre the Jews are often shown as figures of fun.[53] In contemporary manuscript illustrations, each social class (knight, burgher, peasant) has its characteristic prototype and the gesticulating animal-masked figure, if taken from the stage, would suggest that Jews were frequently thus portrayed. However, final proof for this hypothesis is lacking as long as similar representations of Jews are not found in Christian manuscripts.

We may find it difficult to understand why the Jews themselves adopted, for use in their Hebrew prayer books, a Jewish prototype originating from a hostile environment. But if we remember that this cultural minority had in the past often adopted artistic forms from its environment without regard to their original meaning, this phenomenon becomes much less startling. After all, the Jews used Hellenistic religious symbols, Gothic cruciform ornaments—in other words, artistic forms which by religious (then the only decisive) standards were much more dubious than bird faces. The two Nuremberg Hagadot in the Schocken Library in Jerusalem contain illustrations showing vividly that German Jews, in spite of their cultural isolation, continued to use the non-Jewish artistic expressions of their environment for centuries afterwards. Though the lower marginal illustrations in the older Nuremberg Hagadah were mostly cut out by some iconoclastic zealot, animal and plant ornamentation, such as can also be seen in contemporary German manuscripts, remains interspersed with the Hebrew text; at the same time, some, from the religious point of view, rather questionable human figures also found their way into this Hebrew manuscript, e.g. a representation of a divinity with arrows, a picture of Hellenistic origin (Helios and the rays of the sun, or Zeus with flashes of lightning?). In the other Nuremberg Hagadah there is an illustration, reminiscent of that in the Bezalel Hagadah, of Pharaoh's army in contemporary soldiers' garb, and, on page 7, we even find a pig—one of the most obnoxious animals to Jews—in a scene showing the second glass of wine being drunk on the Seder, intended to illustrate the warning 'not to get drunk like a pig'. (There may also be a connexion with the Midrash on Noah's drunkenness.)[54]

Further evidence of the overwhelming impact of their environment upon the art of the Jews can also be found in the so-called *Rothschild Manuscript*, now in the Bezalel Museum (No. 24). The illustrations are painted in a style characteristic of Northern Italy in the late fifteenth century. The Purim page, portraying Haman and his ten sons hanging from a tree, shows, in its almost repellent naturalism, the unmistakable influence of Pisanello's famous drawings of the gallows. These were studies for the Santa Anastasia frescoes in Verona, painted some thirty years before the *Rothschild Manuscript*. For our purposes it is immaterial whether the illustrations of this manuscript were painted by Jews or non-Jews; the Jewish customers who had commissioned them, at any rate, considered their execution satisfactory.

All these examples, and particularly the adoption of the basically antisemitic bird type by the Jews, go to show that, towards the end of the Middle Ages, the Jews of the ghetto had ceased to adapt the artistic expressions of their surroundings to their own needs, but simply made use of them uncritically and indifferently. This is shown, for example, in the reappearance of human representations, since there was no Jewish

tradition in this field. Such a tradition existed only in synagogue architecture and furniture, and thus we find that this is the only sphere in which we may be able to speak of an indigenous Jewish artistic development in the following centuries.

VIII

For the Jews of the Occident the Middle Ages did not come to an end until the turn of the eighteenth century; the social position of Polish and Lithuanian Jews in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was in many respects not dissimilar to that of the Spanish Jews under Islamic and Christian medieval feudalism. Eastern European Jews provided most of the artisans and other urban workers in an essentially agrarian feudal state, just as the Jews of the Iberian Peninsula had done centuries earlier. Thus we find Jewish architects of Polish synagogues (side by side with some Gentiles, particularly Italians) as well as Jewish wood carvers and painters who decorated the interiors of these buildings. Here, the two essential prerequisites—an autonomous Jewish culture and artists rooted in Judaism—were present, and an indigenous Jewish art could develop.

In this connexion, it is interesting to see that the Gothic tradition, which had penetrated from the Altneuschul in Prague as far East as Cracow, was abandoned in the Slavonic environment and succeeded by local stylistic influences in the synagogues built in the seventeenth century. In the case of stone buildings, military considerations of defence against Tartars and Cossacks, or against an unruly mob, dictated the need for reinforced foundation walls with corner pillars and a wall-like cornice on the roof. These synagogues, built in the Polish Renaissance style, looked more like fortresses than houses of worship. This fortress-like character is a good illustration of the uncertainty of the Jewish position at the time.

But the most original Jewish artistic work of the period is to be found in the Polish and Lithuanian timber synagogues. In the eighteenth century this type of synagogue was also built in Germany when, in the wake of Polish pogroms, some Jews returned from Poland to Germany. These synagogues were built of wood because it was easier to obtain a building licence for such structures; the Polish clergy opposed the erection of splendid stone synagogues by the Jews. The wooden synagogues are strongly influenced by East European timber building styles. The structurally plain and unadorned entrance of the Chodorow synagogue reflects the influence of the prevailing style in portals of Polish profane and religious architecture (to be seen, e.g., in Jaroslav).

In the regions east of the Vistula, the wooden mansions of the gentry are equipped with two, or sometimes four, corner pavilions, which may well be derived from medieval architecture. The wooden synagogues in

that part of Poland also have corner pavilions, in an obvious imitation of this style. Other synagogue features, such as the flat roof, barrel vault, and cupola, can also be found in Polish churches. Finally, synagogue paintings by Jews (frequently documented by inscriptions) were also strongly influenced by Polish art.[55]

These similarities show clearly that, in this region, too, the Jews adopted the modes of expression of their environment as far as construction and style are concerned; but these stylistic features became largely 'Judaised', i.e. adapted to the needs of Jewish ritual in a highly artistic fashion. Elements of the then ubiquitous baroque, found in the curves and arches of the *Aron Hakodesh* in Wolpa, or in the *Bima* of Gwodziecz, are used in a very characteristic manner which takes us back via the ornaments of Spanish synagogues to the naturalism of Hellenistic leaf ornamentation in the grave architecture of the Second Temple period. So much for ornamentation. But in architecture, too, we find that the specific technical potentialities of wooden structures, permitting a wider span of the vaulting than in contemporary stone building, were used to effect a return to the rectangular central building. The *Bima* again becomes the focal point of the interior, without thereby interfering with the central colonnade of the double-naved structure (as it did, e.g., in Regensburg or the Altneuschul). We are reminded here of the synagogue in Delos, in which the *Bima* also occupied a pre-eminent position. It was built before the adoption of the oblong nave from the Roman basilica, which was to move the *Bima* from its central position in the synagogue.

We can sense in this adaptation of ornamental and structural features the working of a national tradition which used the European baroque style as well as architectural elements from the local environment in fashioning what may be described as an original Jewish style; a style more in tune with the religious and secular needs of the Jewish community than the Gothic formerly used.

IX

With the decline of Jewish communal life in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century, this particular phase of Jewish artistic creation came to an end.[56] Only once more was an attempt made to create a Jewish art style in the Golah: after the Russian revolution of 1917, the Jews, in common with other minorities in the Soviet Union, thought that the time of national liberation within the great supra-national Russian federal state had come for them too. A circle of Jewish artists, of whom Nathan Altmann, Yissachar Rybak, Eliezer Lisitzki, Marc Chagall and the theatrical designer Yizchak Rabinowitz were the foremost, participated in this movement which was closely linked with the

Yiddish art theatre in Moscow and the Habimah theatre (then also still in Russia). They tried to carry on Jewish popular and folkloristic traditions.[57] But political events in Russia stifled all such attempts. Altmann was condemned to obscurity by a new artistic development in the Soviet Union—'socialist realism'; Lisitzki died in a Russian prison camp in 1941, victim of one of the Stalinist 'purges'; Chagall and Rybak emigrated to Paris and worked there as independent artists. While Judaism remained alive in their art as a romantic memory, the works of these individuals cannot be described as 'Jewish art'. In Chagall's paintings the Jewish influence appears as a dream element, and he was fortunate in finding in surrealism a style particularly suited to the dichotomy of his artistic personality. He used the methods of a contemporary art style which, by its inherent contradictions, did not exclude the romantic dream image of the erstwhile Jewish Shtetl; on the contrary, it added some piquancy to Chagall's art. But romantic dream images do not amount to the revival of a national art.

It can be said that, since the emancipation, Jewish artists on the whole have been working purely as individuals. There certainly have been Jewish artists—remarkably many if one remembers that the doors of the ghetto have not been open very long—but there has not been a Jewish art. A survey of Jewish communal, and particularly synagogue, architecture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries shows that the Jews used the most diverse building styles: Egyptian tomb architecture (as in the gate of the Jewish cemetery at New Haven, Connecticut[58]); synagogues, built in the Neo-Classical period, reminiscent of Greek temples (Budapest, Charleston); Byzantine-Mauresque (Berlin, Oranienburgerstrasse) and Romanesque synagogues (Berlin, Fasanenstrasse, expressing German imperial pomp in the taste of the ruling Emperor William II); Gothic synagogues—in short a haphazard medley of all existing styles of ecclesiastical architecture, and just as ugly as most of the churches built at the time in imitation of historical prototypes. It is not surprising that these church imitations almost invariably failed to meet the special requirements of the Jewish religious service; inspired by the position of the Christian High Altar, the *Bima* is moved away from the centre and placed in front of the *Aron Hakodesh*. The consequence was that, contrary to Jewish tradition, the Torah was no longer read in the midst of the congregation but in front of it. The climax of this uncritical imitation of Christian building styles was reached by the Jewish architect Max Fleischer who built the synagogue in Budweis. This 'pure Gothic' synagogue even boasts two towers—a Jewish parish church as it were![59]

Present-day synagogues, especially those in America, are not much more than club houses with a few additional rooms; the following quotation from an essay by Gamili on *Synagogue Architecture in our Time* shows how far they are removed from the Jewish cultural tradition: 'The

motor car and its use by reform Jewry have done away with the obstacle of distance; many communities in city and suburb acquire building sites on the outskirts, frequently chosen for their attractive scenery.' [60] Here there is no longer any trace of the adaptation of an environmental style to specific Jewish requirements, such as we found in the golden age of Jewish synagogue architecture; all we have now are communal buildings of greater or lesser beauty, lacking any individual Jewish note, with the contemporary international building style holding undisputed sway.

This development is most clearly discernible among Jewish painters and sculptors of the nineteenth century for whom a Jewish communal impetus was almost invariably lacking. After the emancipation, the Jewish communities of Central and Western Europe began to disintegrate; in Eastern Europe the process started with the twentieth century. Today, the Jewish artist stands alone when confronted with international modern art movements. Camille Pissaro, the Sephardi Jew from San Thomé in the West Indies was, as a painter, a one hundred per cent French Impressionist; a Berlin Jew, Max Liebermann, was the leader of German Impressionism. Both were conscious Jews who did not deny their origins, but in both of them the Jewish element was too insignificant to obtrude in their work and give their Impressionism a specific Jewish slant.[61] But two Jewish artists of modern times have managed to express their Jewishness in their work; they are Josef Israels in Holland and Lesser Ury in Germany. Both have attempted a synthesis between modern art and their Jewish heritage, expressed in the manner in which they portray Jewish subjects, i.e. in the iconographic content of their pictures. In Lesser Ury's case, this attempt must be regarded as a total failure; his paintings of Jewish subjects are among his weakest. But on a deeper level he may have been more successful in achieving this synthesis than any other Jewish artist; this is revealed in his last tragic self-portraits, magnificent testimonies to Jewish self-analysis, executed in the contemporary artistic idiom.

The Jewish artists from Eastern Europe, now mostly settled in Paris, also reveal (as mentioned in the case of Chagall and Rybak) their Jewishness in the manner in which they handle Jewish subjects, but the direction in which modern art is developing impedes an intensification of this tendency. With the rise of movements such as abstract painting, art becomes more and more dissociated from specific subjects; in place of individual styles, we have the international uniformity of the 'School of Paris', a generic term for the various modern artistic currents which, starting in Paris, conquered the world. Even in Israel where Jews, as in ancient times, no longer form a political minority, and where the process of social normalization is well advanced, they nevertheless inhabit, as far as the plastic arts are concerned, a small island in an ocean of international artistic currents. We too, in common with other nations, young and old, are threatened with complete submersion by the international con-

temporary style. On the other hand, there are among certain modern Israeli artists indications of the development of a local style, deriving from the experience of Israel, its landscape and people, its colours and atmosphere. The three millennia old struggle between a world style and 'Jewish art' has not yet come to an end.

NOTES

[1] *On the Tracks of Jewish Art* (Hebrew), Sifriyat Hapoalim, Mrechavya, 1957, p. 143.

[2] 'As a matter of fact Israel through the ages has manifested nothing essentially national in the plastic arts, neither in antiquity nor through the Middle Ages, nor today.' *Aesthetics and History*, 1948, reprinted 1954, p. 178.

[3] *Die Juden in der Kunst*, Berlin, 1928, pp. 215, 220.

[4] *Die Juedische Kunst*, Berlin, 1929, p. 11.

[5] H. Focillon, *La Vie des Formes*, German edition, Berne, 1954, p. 8.

[6] Massada Publication, Tel Aviv, second edition, 1959 (Hebrew), p. 30.

[7] Georg Dehio, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kunst*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1919, introduction, p. vi.

[8] W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, Baltimore, 1940, p. 159.

[9] H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, The Pelican History of Art, 1954, p. 188.

[10] Jochanan Levy, *Olamot Nifgashim* ('Meeting of Worlds') (Hebrew) Studies of the position of the Jews in the Greco-Roman world, Jerusalem, 1960, p. 62.

[11] Frankfort, op. cit., p. 195 '. . . It would seem that a preoccupation with richness of decoration rather than with religion explains the peculiarities of Phoenician art. In particular the deviations from the Egyptian norm seem due to an inconsequential treatment by craftsmen indifferent to the meaning of their foreign patterns.'

[12] W. F. Albright, *Archeology and the Religion of Israel*, 4th edn., Baltimore, 1956, p. 13.

[13] Albright, op. cit., p. 180, note 16 to p. 13. The ivory carvings found in the palace of Ahab in Samaria are altogether characteristic of the then prevailing international style in arts and crafts.

[14] Ibid., pp. 13 f.

[15] Albright, op. cit., p. 143; R. P. R. de Vaux, 'Notes sur le Temple de Salomon' (Hebrew), published in *Kedem*, Studies in Jewish Archeology, Vol. 2, p. 50, Jerusalem, 1945.

[16] I Kings viii. 12: Solomon's declaration at the consecration of the Temple: '*Adonay amar lishkon baarafel*. The Lord hath said that he would dwell in the thick darkness.'

[17] Jochanan Levy, op. cit., p. 4.

[18] This point of view is stressed in a very important essay by Prof. E. E. Urbach, 'The Rabbinical Laws of Idolatry in the second and third centuries in the light of archaeological and historical facts', *Israel Exploration Journal*, Vol. 9, Nos. 3 and 4, p. 154 and *passim*.

[19] Maximilian Kon, 'Jewish Art at the Time of the Second Temple' (Hebrew) in *Haomanut Hayehudit*, Massada, Tel Aviv, 1959, pp. 133, 134.

[20] Against Kon's belief in the historical accuracy of the candelabra foot as represented on the Arch of Titus, see Heinrich Strauss, 'The History and Form of the seven-branched candlestick of the Hasmonean Kings', *Warburg Journal*, Vol. XXII, p. 16, footnote 40. But the interpretation of the candelabra foot (as representing three animal claws) accepted in this essay derives from ancient Oriental and Hellenistic prototypes, i.e. it can by no means be regarded as evidence of an original Jewish style.

[21] For the identification of the washing utensils of the priests, the 'Kiyor', with the amphora depicted on coins minted in the two rebellions, see H. Strauss, 'A new interpretation of the Amphora in Jewish Antiquities' (Hebrew) in the *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society*, Vol. XXIV (1959), No. 1, p. 60. Coin impressions seem to indicate that other items of synagogue furniture were also Hellenistic in style.

[21a] Minorities other than the Jews also adapted the pagan international style to their ritual needs. A particularly impressive example is the Ionic temple of Jandial near Taxila, in present-day Pakistan, built by Bactrian Greeks in the second century B.C.E. No traces of plastic decoration, such as would be usual in such temples, have been found in its ruins, but there is a deep solid mass of masonry near the inner sanctuary which presupposes the existence of a tower or some other elevated superstructure, presumably a ziggurat for fire worship which was quite a usual feature of the temples of Magians or Zoroastrians. In other respects 'its plan is unlike that of any temple yet known in Pakistan or India, but its resemblance to the classical temples of Greece is striking'. Sir John Marshall, *A Guide to Taxila*, 4th edn., Cambridge, 1960, p. 85. A similar interpretation is given by Franz Altheim in *Zarathustra und Alexander*, Frankfurt and Hamburg, 1960, p. 115:

'Bestimmte Eigentuemlichkeiten der Anlage und voellige Abwesenheit der Bilder zeigen, dass dieser Bau weder fuer griechische noch fuer indische Gottheiten errichtet wurde: er war als Feuerheiligtum errichtet worden. Die Zarathustrier haben demnach wie sie ihre heiligen Texte mit griechischen Buchstaben schrieben, auch griechische Bauformen fuer ihre Heiligtuemer verwandt.'

The use of foreign stylistic forms, noted among non-Jews in the case of the Phoenicians, is therefore no more a Jewish peculiarity in the Hellenistic period.

[22] On the development of synagogue architecture, see also: R. Krautheimer, *Mittelalterliche Synagogen*, Frankfurt, 1928, pp. 40 ff.; M. Avi-Yonah, 'Early Synagogue Architecture in Eretz Israel' (Hebrew), *Omanuth Yehudit*, op. cit., pp. 135 ff.

[23] E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1953–1958; so far, eight volumes have appeared, with two more to come. Detailed reviews of this work have been published, *inter alia*: Vols. 1 to 4, Prof. M. Avi-Yonah, *Israel Exploration Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1956, pp. 194 ff.; Cecil Roth (Vols. 1 to 3) in the American quarterly *Judaism*, Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 179; Vols. 4 to 8, Heinrich Strauss, *Judaism*, Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 81 and Vol. 8, No. 4, p. 374; particularly revealing is Goodenough's reply to my first critical review and my reply to Goodenough (*Judaism*, Vol. 7, pp. 177–80). For the present analysis I am not only making use of Goodenough's data, but owe him special thanks, since the idea for this study arose out of our exchanges.

[24] In his reply to my first critical review (*Judaism*, Vol. 7, p. 177) Goodenough admitted that symbols had sometimes been adopted for purely decorative purposes; I, on the other hand, am quite willing to admit that, in certain instances, the Jews adopted the symbols of their environment and, in my review, even quoted some examples not mentioned by Goodenough. But can it really be claimed that this occasional adoption of symbols resulted in fundamental changes in Judaism, giving rise to a special 'Jewish-pagan' faction, only later suppressed by the rabbis?

[25] H. W. Haussig, *Kulturgeschichte von Byzanz*, Stuttgart, 1959, p. 37.

[26] Urbach, op. cit., p. 161 and *passim*.

[27] At Shellal in the Negev, some ten miles from a site near Kibbutz Nirim where the mosaic floor of a synagogue was recently excavated, Australian soldiers had during the First World War discovered a very similar Byzantine church mosaic (see Goodenough, op. cit., Vol. 3, illustration No. 911).

This 'Shellal Mosaic' now forms part of the Australian War Memorial in Canberra. Trendall's brochure on this monument (second edition, Canberra, 1957) contains on page 22 (picture No. 5) a photograph of a rather similar mosaic from the Armenian church in Jerusalem!

[28] Vol. 7, p. 177.

[29] *Judaism*, Vol. 3, p. 181.

[30] S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Vol. II, Philadelphia, 1952, p. 317.

[31] Quoted by Avi-Yonah, *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 137.

[32] Jochanan Levy, op. cit., p. 197; Ludwig Friedlaender, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, Vienna, 1934, p. 935: 'In gelegentlichen Erwaehnungen erscheinen die roemischen Juden armselig und zigeunerhaft, als Bettler und Wahrsager.'

[33] C. H. Kraeling, *The Synagogue*; The excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report VII, Part I. Yale University Press, 1956.

[34] E. L. Sukenik, *The Synagogue of Dura-Europos and its Paintings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1947; Baron, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 14; Vol. 2, p. 11.

[35] Max Dvorak, *Katakombenmalereien. Die Anfaenge der christlichen Kunst* (1919), reprinted in *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, Munich, 1924; also my detailed analysis of the question in a review of Kraeling's book in *Al Hamishmar*, 25.9.1957 (Hebrew) and in *Mitteilungsblatt* (Bitaon Ltd., Tel Aviv), 2.8.1957: 'Das Problem der Dura-Europos Synagoge.'

[36] David Talbot-Rice, *Byzantine Art*, Pelican Books, 1954, pp. 110–11, 132–3.

[37] On the Arab's role in this respect, see Riegl, *Stilfragen*, 1893, p. 331, and illustration No. 188.

[38] Krautheimer, op. cit., p. 71.

[39] Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tuebingen, 1922, p. 357.

[40] L. A. Mayer, 'Jewish Art in Islamic Countries' (Hebrew), *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 347.

[41] Quoted by Cecil Roth in 'Jewish Art and Artists before the Emancipation' (Hebrew), *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 455.

[42] Cohn Wiener, op. cit., p. 137.

[43] L. A. Mayer, 'A Sixteenth Century Samaritan Hanging' (Hebrew), *Bulletin of the Jewish Exploration Society*, Vol. XIII, 1947, p. 170, picture No. 5; also shown in *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 334, picture No. 200.

[44] Krautheimer, op. cit., p. 49; Avi-Yonah in *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 150.

[45] Krautheimer, op. cit., pp. 91 ff.

[46] Ibid., p. 18.

[47] M. Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, Zurich, 1950; Chapter III: Die Kathedrale als Abbild des Himmels, pp. 95–166.

[48] *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 3, pp. 173 ff.

[49] Reproduced in *Juedisches Lexikon*, article on 'Buchwesen', Vol. I, p. 1210; a better colour reproduction in Rahel Wischnitzer-Bernstein's *Gestalten und Symbole der juedischen Kunst*, Berlin, 1933.

[50] *Warburg-Journal*, Vol. XII, p. 21.

[51] Z. Ameisenova, *Warburg-Journal*, op. cit., reproduction *O* in Table 16.

[52] Z. Ameisenova, *Warburg-Journal*, op. cit., Table 17 on p. 31.

[53] Hans Rost, *Die Bibel im Mittelalter*, Augsburg, 1939, p. 303; Cecil Roth, Caricature of Norwich Jews 1233 (Public Record Office) in 'Portraits and Caricatures of Medieval English Jews', *The Jewish Monthly*, Vol. 4, 1950, p. iii. (The theatre curtain can be easily recognized in the drawing which shows the Jews of Norwich being carried off by devils.)

[54] Wischnitzer-Bernstein, op. cit., p. 105 and reproduction No. 3.

[55] 'Die Bemalung der Holzdecke der Kirche in Kozy ist ein Beweis dafuer, dass die bei den Synagogenmalereien verwendete Technik im Lande gebraeuchlich war. Ranken, mit Blaettern und Blueten geschmueckt, bilden das Grundmotiv des Ornamentes' (Breyer, Eisler und Grunwald, 'Holzsynagogen in Polen', published in the monthly *Menora*, Vienna, 1932, p. 132). See also the excellent illustrated Polish official publication, first issued a few years ago, by Maria i Kasimierz Piechotkowie, *Boznice Drewniane*, Warsaw, 1957.

[56] This epoch is too close to the present for a thorough art-historical analysis. This short survey is intended only to outline the trends which developed up to the present day.

[57] Roditi, 'Jewish Artists of our Times' (Hebrew), *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit., p. 679.

[58] Goodenough, op. cit., Vol. 4, reproduction No. 64; for my review of his misinterpretation of this gateway, see *Judaism*, Vol. 7, pp. 83–4.

[59] Reproduced in Karl Schwarz, *Die Juden in der Kunst*, second edition, 1936, p. 220.

[60] *Omanut Yehudit*, op. cit. (Hebrew), p. 670.

[61] See also Heinrich Strauss, 'On Jews and German Art' (The Problem of Max Liebermann) in *Year Book II* of the Leo Baeck Institute, London, 1957, where the above-mentioned developments in German Jewry are considered in detail.

IMPRESSIONS OF FRENCH JEWRY TODAY

Georges Levitte

NO SERIOUS statistical study of French Jewry has yet been made. The chief difficulty has been that during the past hundred years French censuses have asked no questions about religious affiliation, in keeping with the separation between Church and State. In general, the extremely complex structure of French Jewry makes it almost impossible for anyone to write a satisfactory survey. The complexity—both demographic and social—springs from the multiplicity of the origins of French Jewry and its present-day distribution in the country, from the great variety of ideological trends, and from the high proportion of Jews who no longer have any connexion with organized Jewish activities. It must be stressed that for these reasons the facts set out in this paper are working hypotheses and rough approximations, subject to check by future inquiries. (Virtually the only serious recent sociological studies of French Jewish communities have been undertaken by Community Service, which is sponsored by the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the American Jewish Committee, and the Anglo-Jewish Association, and these only on small and medium-sized Jewish communities.)

Population

The most plausible estimate of the present-day Jewish population of France is 300,000–350,000, or less than 1 per cent of the 45 millions in the country. It can be assumed that 150,000–180,000 Jews live in the Paris area, but about one-third of them are scattered in small suburban settlements, which means that a good number form very small and practically isolated communities. Some 30,000 Jews are to be found in the three *départements de l'Est* (Moselle, Bas-Rhin, and Haut-Rhin), which have a special status and where local Jewish traditions have been relatively well preserved. In the rest of France there are 50,000–60,000 Jews living in towns where there are Jewish communities or at least some elements of Jewish community life. We may mention Lyons and its suburbs (13,000), Marseilles (8,000), Toulouse, Bordeaux, Nice (5,000), and Lille (2,000). Finally, there are some 30,000 Jews living in virtual isolation in towns and villages throughout the country.

At the end of the eighteenth century, when Jews became citizens, there were about 3,500 Jews in Paris. In general they came from the three regions of France where the Jews had formed permanent settlements: Alsace-Lorraine, Comtat Venaissin (a Papal State incorporated in France during the Revolution), and Bordeaux-Bayonne (in this case Portuguese Jews). These three regions form the ancient seat of French Jewry.

The communities of Comtat Venaissin practically disappeared in the course of the nineteenth century. Many Jews were converted, and most of the others, e.g. the Crémieux, Lunel, and Milhaud families, moved elsewhere. In the Bordeaux-Bayonne area the communities underwent the same experience in a milder form, but here there have persisted local traditions to which newcomers to the region have been able to assimilate. Alsace-Lorraine Jewry has survived in a most lively fashion even though many of its members swarmed into France (and even into Belgium and Switzerland), especially after the attachment of these provinces to Germany in 1871.

German Jews came into France in the middle of the nineteenth century, but the major waves of immigration began with the arrival of Jews from Eastern Europe. Six thousand arrived in Paris between 1881 and 1900 and 15,000 between 1901 and 1914. Moreover, during the same period there arrived some 10,000 Sephardim who had for the most part learned French in Alliance Israélite Universelle schools. It has been estimated that about 70,000 Jews from Eastern Europe immigrated to France between the two wars, and that some 10,000 Sephardim came from the Balkans and Asia Minor. Many Jewish refugees from Germany passed through France, but few stayed there; today they are thought to number barely 5,000.

The Second World War, of course, changed the demographic composition of French Jewry. About 120,000 people were deported. As a result of deportations and post-liberation population movements, the geographical distribution was completely altered; but, on the whole, the relative proportions of the different origin groups remained largely the same, with one major change in recent years: the immigration of Jews from North Africa, some 40,000 of whom have settled in France. They are all French-speaking. Some of them are highly educated and rich, others are working class. Movements from Eastern Europe as well as emigration from France (both to Israel and elsewhere) are now on a very small scale.

Occupations

The absence of census data makes it very risky to speak about the occupational distribution of Jews in France and of the part they play in economic and cultural life. The information given here is even more subject to caution than the data on population in the last section.

Jews are to be found in all branches of economic life. However, at the present time they seem to play a greater part in certain tertiary activities (liberal professions and commerce) and to be most numerous in some secondary activities (notably in certain industries and especially in such trades as ready-made clothes and leather goods).

The attention paid to certain outstanding names in economic life must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the great majority of the Jews belong either to the lower middle class or the higher stratum of the working class. It is certainly true that the economic role of the Rothschilds and the Péreires in the nineteenth century was very considerable, especially in the development of railways and some of the major industries. Other 'Jewish' banks have since then been founded and still exist, but neither do they form a coherent banking network nor do they exercise a dominant influence in the world of French banking. In the nineteenth century the greater part of French Jewry, especially in Alsace-Lorraine, lived close to the countryside, where they traded in animals and generally acted as small business men and craftsmen.

Some of the large stores (e.g. Galeries Lafayette) are run by Jews, and have Jewish capital. Jews keep a good number of shops and are strongly represented among travelling salesmen in the provinces. The Jewish share of the total volume of French retail trade is, however, quite small, although in some branches and in some towns this share may appear relatively large. There are comparatively few Jews in the food trade; there are more of them in clothing, fancy leather goods, watches and jewellery, electrical goods, furniture, and furs.

In some fields of economic activity Jews have been the agents of innovation. One need mention only the names of André Citroën for the motor industry and Bleustein-Blanchet for advertising and publicity (Publicis, Regie-France, etc.). In other fields (ready-made clothes and footwear, for example) development has been greatly helped by the existence of a predominantly Jewish skilled labour force.

Jews of French origin and those of foreign extraction who have become assimilated to French culture, have tended to abandon small trade and the crafts for the liberal professions, at least when they have had the chance to do so. Generally, Jewish parents of humble origin urge their children on to higher studies in a manner which is not paralleled among non-Jews of comparable status. It is quite likely that in the French universities as a whole Jews form 5 to 6 per cent of the student body. Jews form a significant proportion of doctors and lawyers, although in France taken as a whole this proportion must be definitely below 10 per cent for doctors and even lower for lawyers. A considerable number of Jews have turned to engineering (there is quite a large proportion in atomic research, for example), the teaching profession, and such careers as public relations, the press, broadcasting, and the cinema. Antisemitic propaganda has greatly exaggerated the number and power of the Jews

in these occupations simply by stressing the outstandingly successful (Lazareff of *France-Soir*, Lazurick of *Aurore*, a few film directors and radio producers). Finally, we should note that a few Jews have reached very high positions in the civil service.

Only a very small number of Jews are professional politicians. However, there have been a few successes among them which have given a false idea of the scale of Jewish participation in this field: there have, for example, been three prime ministers, Blum, René Mayer, and Pierre Mendès-France.

Cultural Life

It is almost impossible to evaluate Jewish participation in French cultural life. In order to make a thorough study of this question it would be necessary to distinguish between two kinds of Jewish writers and artists: first, those who have been consciously Jewish or who have at least expressed something Jewish in their work, and second, those for whom the accident of Jewish birth has not marked their work.

In the nineteenth century there was an outstanding French school of scholars of Hebrew and Semitics (Munk, Cahen, Darmstetter, Neuebauer, etc.). At the end of the last and at the beginning of the twentieth century *La Revue des Etudes Juives*, for example, bore witness to the flourishing state of these activities. In contrast, literary works which could be said to be French-Jewish were either non-existent or at least second-rate.

The generation which had grown up under the influence of the reaction to the Dreyfus Affair tried, however, to create a Jewish literature in the French language. The inter-war period was the epoch of Fleg, Spire, Henry Hertz, and Albert Cohen. It was this period which gave birth also to a series devoted to Jewish literary works, generally translated from English or Hebrew, and which produced Jewish literary reviews some of which have survived.

It is also worth noting that in this period, after Péguy and Léon Bloy pointed out the role of Jews in Christian civilization, the Jewish character made his appearance in the work of non-Jewish novelists in contrast to the nineteenth century when the 'literary Jew' was merely a stereotype. We see this in certain works by Proust (himself a half-Jew), Duhamel, Roger Martin du Gard, etc.

Since the end of the Second World War and especially in recent years the publication of Jewish works has greatly increased. It is still too early to judge the value and the significance of this literary work. On the other hand, we must note the very lively rebirth of Jewish studies illustrated by the names of Georges Vajda and Andre Néher. Behind these two masters one feels there is growing up a whole generation of historians, sociologists, Hebraists, and thinkers, auguring well for the future of Jewish knowledge in France.

Series of Jewish books and gramophone records have multiplied. The

subjects most commonly dealt with are the State of Israel, Biblical studies, religious thought, the Nazi period, and Jewish history. This proliferation meets both the curiosity of the non-Jewish public and the needs of a rising new Jewish generation.

At the end of the last century, when the generation of Jewish Hebraists died away, Jewish scholars began to play a part in certain general fields of study and thought but, in the majority of cases, their work showed no particular Jewish influence: in sociology (Lévy-Bruhl, Durkheim, and more recently Gurvitch and Raymond Aron); in philosophy (Bergson and later Brunschwig, Jean Wahl, and Jankelevitch); in history (Glotz, Halphon, Henry Berr, and above all Marc Bloch); in cultural anthropology (Lévi-Strauss); in mathematics (Mandelbrojt, Laurent Schwartz); in physics; and in medicine (Weill-Halle, Debré, Baruk, etc.). It needs no stressing that these and the names that follow are merely illustrative, and by no means a complete listing.

Jews have not played a prominent role in French literature. The first Jew to be admitted to the Académie Française was the dramatist Porto-Riche at the beginning of this century; since then, apart from Bergson, only André Maurois has been elected. One must note, however, the great influence of Marcel Proust on contemporary literature. As for painting, hardly a week goes by in which the work of a dozen Jewish artists is not on view. Several great Jewish names appear in the Ecole de Paris: Modigliani, Pascin, Chagall, Soutine, and Kisling. Among the younger painters beginning to make an international reputation for themselves are Atlan, Arikha, Maryan, and Spitzer. A good many of these artists identify themselves as Jews and belong to the Association de Peintres et Sculpteurs Juifs de France. Some of these, such as Chagall, draw their inspiration from Jewish subjects (Benn, Mané Katz, Kolnik, etc.). In music, in the more classical genre we may recall for the last century the names of Meyerbeer and Offenbach and for this century that of Darius Milhaud who has drawn for his inspiration in part on Provençal Jewish life. One of the exponents and practitioners of 12-tone technique in music is René Leibowitz who lives in France. A number of French-Jewish composers and performers have devoted themselves to Jewish traditional and synagogal music (e.g. Algazi). Let us note finally that some Jews have made a name for themselves in the teaching of music (e.g. Gedalge), and in its performance and in musical criticism. Many Israelis have come to study at the Paris Conservatoire.

In the French theatre the Jews are not particularly outstanding today. There are many Jewish actors but none of them today enjoys the renown of a Rachel or a Sarah Bernhardt. Among producers, however, let us mention Jean Mercure and some organizers of new companies, such as Marcel Lupovici. Special mention should be made of Marcel Marceau, who has done much for the art of mime throughout the world. There are few first-rank names among cinema actors (Simone Signoret) or

producers (Cayatte, Alexandre Astruc). On the other hand, Jews have considerable influence in film production and distribution. A few Jewish radio and television producers have been responsible for new ideas and have achieved unusual success.

The number of Jewish singers and music hall performers has increased in recent years (Marie Dubas, Gainsbourg, Georges Ulmer, some of les Compagnons de la Chanson, Agnès Capri who has started the fashion of poetic songs 'à la Prevert', etc.).

Relations with Non-Jews

On the whole, as will have been seen from the last section, Jews have been closely integrated into French life. Again on the whole, one can say that at the present there is no discrimination in French behaviour or law. Nevertheless, the Occupation and German propaganda left their trace in the minds of the French people, supporting certain 'habitual' French xenophobic tendencies. Antisemitism still remains a useful argument for the extreme right, which is as violent as it is weak; nor is it unknown, in much milder form, in certain milieux on the left. The French temperament is inclined to a rather parochial distrust of all that seems 'different', and antisemitism, as a 'customary' tendency to keep Jews at arm's length, persists.

Lately, as a reaction to the wartime massacres and the rebirth of Israel, there has grown up an enormous interest in everything Jewish. This interest has been recently reinforced by political events in the Mediterranean. More and more French thinkers, especially religious, puzzle over the meaning of Israel's 'survival' and 'martyrdom'. Youth groups (students and trade unionists) are eager to make study tours in Israel, and often ask for information about the building of the young State. The number of Catholics and Protestants learning Hebrew in order to gain a better understanding of the Bible has considerably grown, and this interest is not solely due to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. At Easter 1959 there was even a special congress of two hundred representatives of Catholic groups learning Hebrew. A general interest is also witnessed by the sharp increase in the sale of serious books and records giving information about Israel and Jewish thought.

Jewish Life

It is very difficult to establish exactly the extent and intensity of Jewish life in France. First, despite the greater co-ordination achieved in recent years, there is no organization which can claim to embrace all Jewish activities. Second, we are now in a period when Jewish activities, in almost all fields, are growing very noticeably, and this movement, which augurs well for the future, is only in its early stages.

As we have seen, outside Alsace-Lorraine France has no old tradition of a spiritual, intellectual, social, and communal Jewish life. The ancient

communities of Comtat Venaissin have practically disappeared; in the Bordeaux area the old Portuguese tradition persists, but on the whole communal life here is not now very strong. The late nineteenth century was the period when Jews moved into French life with, from the start, a marked tendency to assimilate. With certain rare exceptions, established Jews have accepted the standards of nineteenth-century Jewry. Expressions such as 'Frenchmen of the Mosaic Religion', 'Israelites inside the Synagogue, French citizens outside it' are becoming obsolete, to some extent, but the mood they signified remains. Jewish communal and family life gave way to individual piety in a period of enlightenment when religion was in retreat. Becoming simply an aesthetic and sentimental emotion (when it was not just a matter of filial piety or of moral education) religion degenerated to a thing without value or power, without being replaced by any other reason for being Jewish. This phenomenon, common enough in Western Europe, was accentuated in France, despite the crisis of the Dreyfus Affair, because of conditions peculiar to the country: the law of separation of Church and State and of a strong tendency to individualism. In countries such as England everyone belongs to something—clubs, political parties, religious congregations. In France the done thing is to belong to nothing; Jewish life clashed with the general framework of French life. In the best case French Jews contented themselves with 'doing their duty' by registering with the Consistory (in order to keep up their morale and have their religion represented at official ceremonies) and with donating a little money to good causes.

The situation remained very different in Alsace-Lorraine where the Jewish communities, often rural, maintained their own traditions which fitted into the ordinary life of the region. Moreover the three *départements de l'Est* continued to enjoy the benefits of a special concordat in the matter of religion.

Before the last war the state of French Jewry was in some measure marked by the immigration of a relatively large Jewish population with a lively consciousness of *Yiddishkeit*. French Jewry was not at once able to integrate these immigrants, who lived on the fringes of local communities and slowly became assimilated to French ways. The organizations peculiar to Eastern European Jews (*Landsmannschaften*, Yiddish groups, etc.) gradually lost their importance, although their influence is still to be seen in social and cultural activities, Zionist and local.

At the Liberation things had changed. The children of immigrants had become French by nationality and education. If to a great extent these young people had suffered the demoralization of the war and were looking for nothing but a 'life without history' in which they might simply pursue riches and amusements, one could no less perceive certain sturdy signs of renaissance: spiritual disquiet, religious study, attempts to understand 'why I am a Jew', a (perhaps vague) feeling for

the need of values to be protected. This fitted in with a certain post-war trend in French thinking, but its Jewish expression was sharper. The creation of the State of Israel, the War of Independence, and the opening of the Israel Embassy in Paris produced a new mental shock, of which the several Zionist movements could not take advantage because of warped ideology, the habit of seeing everything from a political point of view, lack of proper contact with the country, and also, it must be said, mediocrity and lack of sustained effort. For all that, the experience of the State of Israel, concurrent with a certain spiritual renewal, the changes in behaviour, the rise of a new and more demanding generation, radically modified the picture of Jews and Judaism in France. Vigorous attempts to reorganize the structure of French Jewry in the same period have in some measure provided a framework for this renaissance.

The Organization of Judaism

Since Napoleon created the *Consistoire Central* in 1808 it has represented the Jewish religion. It is made up by local consistorial organizations in France and Algeria. The Paris Consistory has a little fewer than 6,000 members and the provincial consistories together count scarcely more, although this figure in most cases indicates families and not individuals. The Consistory follows a conservative line, tending somewhat to a greater orthodoxy in recent years. In consistorial synagogues men and women are separated but organ music as well as the mixed choir is allowed. Orthodox Jews, then, are to be found outside the consistorial synagogues; and there are many small prayer-houses grouping people of the same countries of origin. Orthodox groups are federated in the *Conseil Traditionaliste du Judaïsme en France* which maintains very good relations with the Consistory and has become more active, notably in the field of education, especially in the last few years. The Liberals, also not belonging to the Consistory, are organized in the *Union Libérale Israélite* which belongs to the World Union for Progressive Judaism. This is a very active but relatively small movement with 600 members.

In reality the Consistory, which is in a sense 'the official body of French Jewry', plays a more considerable role than one might suppose from the number of its members: an administrative role (various certificates, burial, *Shechita, Kashrut*); a legal role, in that by French law the Chief Rabbi of France is elected by the Consistory; an educational role, in that the Jewish Seminary (Rabbinical School) is dependent on it; and a prestige role, because it stands for the tradition of French Jewry and continues, as in the last century, to be led by the 'great families'. (In the nineteenth century it could be said that the Rothschilds *were* the Consistory; while they still take a leading part in it, the saying is no longer accurate.)

It should be added that in recent years the Consistory has made

serious efforts in many fields of activity which have greatly enhanced its position in the community: an effort to recruit new members; an effort in education (improvement and extension of the system of courses in religious instruction); and an effort to adapt itself to present-day conditions—the Consistory is no longer the exclusive affair of a few 'notables'. It has striven to welcome and integrate into French religious life the recent refugees from North Africa and Egypt, while before the war it gave the impression of being wary of newcomers. Having come down from its ivory tower, the Consistory is now collaborating more and more with the whole body of Jewish organizations in France.

The Consistories of the three *départements* of Moselle, Bas-Rhin, and Haut-Rhin are independent. In this region the rabbis and major religious officials are appointed by the State. Religious instruction is given in the schools by all religious denominations. As we have seen, local traditions have survived here more vigorously.

Other forms of Organization

French Jewry was for a long time shy of Zionism, despite the notable exception of Edmond de Rothschild. Before the war Zionism had not really taken a hold except among people with a strong Jewish awareness—in the East of France and among the unassimilated immigrants from Eastern Europe. The war and the creation of the State of Israel inspired a general support for Israel. This has been further enhanced in recent years by the close political ties between France and Israel. The growth of the Zionist movement in France, however, did not match the scale of sympathy for Israel, although the Zionist Federation of France has tried to group together all parties, including 'non-political elements'. But the Zionist leadership, press, and propaganda machine have remained subject to political considerations, and the number of 'non-party' members has not kept pace with expectations. Leaving aside the youth movements (with which we shall deal later), one should note the importance of the membership of WIZO (12,000), the success of the annual celebration of Israel's Independence Day, and the growing number of tourists going to Israel from France. We should also mention that the *Magbit* reaches more people (12,000 donors of a total of Fr. Francs 250,000,000) than the bodies collecting for local needs; and to these contributions must of course be added the money brought in by the Keren Kayemeth Leisrael, WIZO, etc. In a few words, one may say that French Jewry is at present unanimously pro-Israel and that it feels very close to it.

Philanthropic works and welfare have always been important Jewish activities. In the nineteenth century they consisted generally of the Rothschild Foundations (hospitals, homes, orphanages, etc.). In Paris the most important charitable body, the *Comité de Bienfaisance Israélite de Paris*, was created as a parallel to the Consistory and has remained

closely tied to it. On the eve of the Second World War, in face of the influx of refugees first from Eastern Europe and then from Germany, French sections of the International Jewish Social organizations O.S.E. and O.R.T. were set up, as well as bodies founded by independent groups. In 1950, on the initiative of the American 'Joint', there was founded a co-ordinating fund-collecting body for local needs, the *Fonds Social Juif Unifié*, which at the same time has become the central organization for distributing to member-bodies the funds coming from its own collection and that of the 'Joint'. In 1959 the F.S.J.U. consisted of thirty parties and bodies, and collected Fr. Francs 300,000,000 (twenty millions in Strasbourg) from 10,000 donors. The thirty welfare work member-bodies of the F.S.J.U. permanently support 5,000 families (war victims, unemployable refugees, social and medical cases), shelters 1,200 old people in sixteen homes, has resettled 22,000 refugees from North Africa, Egypt, Hungary, and Poland, and looks after 1,000 orphans and abandoned children.

Bringing together the most varied groups and movements, the F.S.J.U. has assumed a most important role in the Jewish communities of France. It has succeeded, notably, in developing cultural services and co-ordinating many activities in the fields of education and youth work. Besides, it has set up a cultural action commission for distributing Claims Conference funds in France and for establishing a programme to extend the system of social and cultural work.

Schools and Youth Organizations

Every synagogue runs courses of religious instruction or a Talmud Torah. In Paris 2,400 children attend the weekly two-hour courses organized by the Consistory, about 200 the courses run by the Liberals, and 300 the courses run by the Orthodox; and a few hundred are catered for by different religious bodies. In addition, other courses have been established by non-religious associations—e.g. the Federation of Jewish Societies, *Landsmannschaften*, Bund, etc.—which look after 1,000 children in Paris. It is difficult to measure the extent of these part-time courses in the provinces. The proportion of children attending part-time courses in the *départements de l'Est* is especially high; elsewhere the non-religious sponsored courses are comparatively less important than in Paris (500 children in the whole of the provinces); while the religious sponsored courses are spreading, thanks to the rebirth of certain provincial communities, to the installation of Rabbis, travelling teachers, and the creation of correspondence courses.

There are four Jewish full-time schools in France: one primary and two secondary schools in Paris and one primary and secondary school in Strasbourg. More than 1,000 pupils follow the usual courses of French studies in these schools while living in a Jewish setting and give five to eight hours of their weekly time-table to Jewish instruction (Hebrew,

Jewish history, Bible, etc.). In all these religious schools the teaching is generally of a high standard. Besides these, there are half a dozen *Yeshivot* in France with four to five hundred children. In some of these the pupils are children from North Africa. Others of these schools are *Yeshivot-Lycées* where the children are prepared for the official French examinations at the same time as they pursue Talmudic studies.

At the higher level there are many different institutions: the Jewish Seminary of France, including the Rabbinical School, the School for Cantors, and the Jewish Teacher-Training School (this last preparing teachers at the same time to be able to fulfil other functions in small communities); the Ecole Normale Israélite Orientale training teachers for the 132 Alliance Israélite Universelle schools with 45,000 students scattered over the Mediterranean area; the Institute of Higher Hebraic Studies, training Liberal Rabbis for the World Union of Progressive Judaism; a Chair of Jewish History and Literature at Strasbourg held by Professor André Neher; and numerous study groups. In addition, at the Gilbert Bloch School at Orsay young students spend a year following their university studies and acquiring a firm foundation for a Jewish life.

In the whole of France youth movements number about 5,000 members, of whom half belong to several Zionist youth movements and half to the Jewish scouts. In addition, there are associations of which the most important is the *Union des Etudiants Juifs de France* which has 800 members in Paris alone and conducts important activities in certain provincial university towns.

Holiday camps take in about 6,000 children every year. These camps are primarily social in purpose; but more and more they are introducing programmes of Jewish activities.

On the whole, the proportion of Jewish children who receive some Jewish instruction before the age of Barmitzvah can be put at 40 per cent and the proportion of young people who receive Jewish instruction after this age at 8 per cent. Of course, in Alsace and Lorraine these figures are much higher. If the statistics appear disheartening they must be at once put into the context of the recent development of French Jewry. For the last five or six years the pupils at Jewish schools and members of youth movements have been growing very appreciably in number. This growth is due to two factors: first, a demographic factor—there has been an increase in births and the immigration of North African families with a strong Jewish consciousness; second, a psychological factor—a slow but sure rebirth of Jewish awareness in France. Parallel to this growth, the quality and standard of teaching is constantly rising.

So that, while the proportion of children receiving Jewish instruction is still small, it is important to realize that it is growing all the time and that it gives the child a Jewish awareness which is deeper and more lasting than the ordinary preparation for Barmitzvah. We can say, therefore, without being exaggeratedly optimistic, that as an ever-grow-

ing number of children who have received a Jewish education of increasing intensity enter into adult life, the Jewish awareness to which we have referred will further take root in France.

All this is the truer because for the last four years the Jewish community of France has been at pains to establish youth and community centres with funds from the Claims Conference and technical aid from the 'Joint'. These centres have been set up in many different parts of the country, sometimes attached to synagogues and sometimes independently of them. All sections of the Jewish population, irrespective of ideology and origin, are able to feel themselves at home in these centres. People can go there either just to meet other Jews or to follow courses in Hebrew, history, the Bible, etc. An organizational framework has been slowly developed in response to the new institution and the fresh and attractive material with which it has been provided.

As we have seen, religious awareness is still foreign enough to the great mass of French Jewry, despite the fact that it is deepening and gaining ground. Lectures always draw a regular public especially in the provinces, where there are few distractions, but they are sporadic and do not reach more than a small proportion of the people. Jewish newspapers and periodicals are very numerous in France. There are three Yiddish dailies—one Zionist, one Communist, one Bundist—which also circulate outside France. There are Zionist weeklies (published by the Zionist Federation, the General Zionists, Mizrachi, etc.). There is an independent Zionist fortnightly with 6,000 subscribers, and another fortnightly put out by the Central Consistory. There is a monthly, *Evidences*, of high intellectual standard, and a well-illustrated monthly magazine, excellently produced, *l'Arche*, which has 10,000 subscribers. Finally, there are community bulletins and the publications of various associations (Alliance Israélite Universelle, World Jewish Congress, Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, etc.). Many provincial communities also publish local bulletins. But the abundance of publications should not give us any illusions about the numbers of readers; they remain in all between ten and fifteen thousand, the greater part of them taking several papers. On the other hand, these figures are an advance on the pre-war situation. We have seen the same in the fields of Jewish education. Finally, a determining factor, as we have already seen, is the sympathy for and active interest in Israel which is expressed both in *Magbit* and in the growing number of tourists going to Israel. And while the scale of *aliyah* remains minute, capital investment in Israel is increasing very appreciably.

Conclusion

Barely a quarter of French Jewry actively expresses its consciousness of being Jewish. This detachment, which is very striking to somebody acquainted with countries where Jewish awareness is high, has very deep

psychological roots. Jews living in France assimilate themselves to French individualism. Moreover, the dispersion of Jewish settlement, the ease of social and political assimilation, the high level of French cultural life and the respect in which this cultural life is held by the mass of the French people, the demoralization brought about by the war, the complex problem of French politics and the attractiveness of Marxism to intellectuals and young people—all these have been separate forces combining to produce the same result: to turn Jews, and particularly young ones, away from a Jewishness which seems to them as outworn as French Judaism was at the end of the nineteenth century, and to put them on the road to eventual total assimilation. The forms taken by this assimilation can be various, but they all converge: political assimilation, as, for example, through Jewish Communist movements; social assimilation to native French Jewry which itself has a marked tendency to melt away into general French life; general assimilation into the French environment. For the sake of the record, let us mention the efforts made by proselytizing missions—Catholic, Protestant, and secular—which have been more spectacular than dangerous, except in the case of certain intellectuals.

However, for the last few years this pessimistic picture has not been altogether accurate. A deeper knowledge of religious thought, a restructuring of the organization of French Jewry, and unanimous sympathy for Israel have together changed the history of French Jewry even if the statistical data have not yet altered basically in response.

The Jewish birth-rate, like the French birth-rate in general, has risen. It is generally understood that we live in a time neither of the total Jewish life of the *Shtetl* and the ghetto nor of an abstract religion detached from the flow of ordinary life. Because of the sentiment for Israel and because the second and third immigrant generations are no longer ashamed of being Jewish, Jewish identification is not now something to be concealed. Parallel to this reassertion of Jewish awareness there has developed, as we have seen, a more vigorous and rational organization of Jewry in France. Finally, the quality of most Jewish activities has appreciably risen, especially in teaching.

It can be said that at the present time French Jewry has largely passed out of its dismal period into a period of reconstruction. There is a long way to go before this reconstruction is solid enough and before community life becomes attractive. The difficulty is that the effort required must be comprehensive and find a general formula to attract to community life the large public in which the establishment of Israel has inspired a Jewish pride. And in order that such a community life may survive it is necessary to plan for a Jewish intellectual élite of the future which will be deeply imbued with traditional Jewish culture and able to express it at a level not below that of the great tradition of French culture.

THE ROMAN JEWISH COMMUNITY: A STUDY IN HISTORICAL CAUSATION

Stephen P. Dunn

THIS PAPER contains the results of a study of a Jewish population in Rome. The claim of this population on my attention —and on the reader's—is twofold. First, it represents an exceedingly pat case of historical causation in its simplest and most obvious terms. It has been subject historically to various pressures, of political and philosophical rather than purely social origin. These pressures were applied by legislative and juridical methods; hence they are matters of record, and their nature can be specified with a precision not usually attainable in social science. In turn they have left unmistakable traces on the social customs and ways of life of the population—traces corresponding more or less exactly to the verifiable historical nature of the pressures applied. These same social customs and ways of life—and the social solidarity and identity which they embody—have been maintained over many centuries, and are being maintained now under conditions which would seem to be highly unfavourable. Second, the population as a whole shows sociological features which appear to run squarely counter to the generalizations usually made about European Jews.

This study, which follows two partial reports,[1] is sociological in concept but anthropological and historical in method. In its original form, it used the intellectual tools of sociology and drew sociological conclusions, but relied on documentary evidence and on free interviews with individual informants, rather than on predetermined questionnaires and statistical surveys. In what follows I have omitted the theoretical framework and most of the conclusions, leaving the social facts to stand by themselves.

I. NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRESENT ROMAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Jewish community of Rome is generally supposed to be the oldest one extant on the European continent, probably dating from 130 B.C.E. As it stands, it consists in effect of two communities—one a tightly organized social nucleus surrounded by a loosely organized fringe group of entirely different character. Beginning with the establishment of the Italian monarchy in 1871, Rome, as the capital of a major modern nation, attracted large numbers of people from other parts of the country, including a number of Jews.[3] These included representatives of all walks of life and all social classes; they settled in various parts of the city, as their means and preferences dictated. On the other hand, the original Jewish population of Rome remained largely centred in the district with which it was historically identified, a small area not more than ten square city blocks on the left bank of the Tiber between the base of the Capitoline hill and the river. This area, with its population, forms a distinct enclave whose existence, social separateness, and special quality are recognized by its members and by many of their Christian neighbours, although denied with some vehemence (an interesting and significant point) by most other Roman Jews. I call this enclave the 'nuclear community' to distinguish it from the larger and more loosely knit 'peripheral community' which indeed is hardly a community at all in any real sociological sense. Both are parts of the legal entity, the *Comunità Israelitica di Roma*, which denotes a quasi-governmental corporate body automatically including every person of Jewish descent resident in metropolitan Rome, unless he takes legal steps to have himself removed from its rolls. This body is empowered to levy a tax (now nominal) on its members, out of which it pays the salaries of the rabbi and other officials, the expenses of religious observance, and maintains vital statistics on behalf of the national government. I shall refer to the legal entity as the *Communità* to distinguish it from the small social one which I studied.

The Physical Setting.—The district occupied by the nuclear community is still called the ghetto except among the members of the peripheral community who usually object to the term. It has a distinctive appearance and atmosphere, and these have their bearing on the peculiar nature of the population. The district occupies a part of the low-lying valley between the classical Seven Hills, which from neolithic times onward has presumably been a meeting place for inhabitants of the ancient villages from which the city was originally constituted. Remains of public baths, temples, markets, and other installations dating from Republican and Imperial times are found there, often as fragments incorporated into more modern structures. The district is one of the few in Rome which has been continuously occupied throughout history even when, as in Cola di Rienzo's time, the city contracted to the area

and population of a large village. Then and later, what is now the ghetto area was the site of the *palazzi* of many well-known Roman feudal families—the Costaguti, the Boccapaduli, and Mattei among others—whose names survive in those of various streets and squares. Many of these medieval *palazzi*, including some of magnificent architecture, are still in use as multiple dwellings, divided into apartments, usually of one or two rooms. Since no important modifications have been made in these buildings, or in most cases could be made without demolishing them completely, cooking and sanitary facilities are of the most meagre. Often the toilet is merely an open pipe leading directly into the sewer, running water is available at only one point in the building, or from the fountain in the square, and one sparsely equipped kitchen must serve several family units.

Rents in the district are understandably low, and congestion is extreme; many single rooms are inhabited by nine or more persons. Even in the relatively modern buildings on the Via Portico d'Ottavia, traditionally the upper-class section of the ghetto in relation to the others because it was less subject to floods, the rents are certainly proportionately lower than those for comparable premises elsewhere in the city, although I have no concrete data on this point.

It is clear from all this that, while the ghetto area would certainly be classified by a conscientious American city planner as a slum, it is just as certainly not what we ordinarily think of as such. It is neither a shantytown nor a district tenanted by a drifting, mobile, socially anarchic population. On the contrary, it is the ancient home of a firmly settled and, considering its privations, extraordinarily stable social group. Its buildings were made to last, and despite overcrowding, poor repair, and disasters natural and man-made, they have lasted. Much the same could be said of the people.

Distinguishing marks of nuclear-community members, collectively and individually.—The characteristics of the nuclear community are briefly the following: geographical concentration, use of a particular area of the city as a centre for social activities, a high proportion of native Romans and of persons of purely Roman ancestry for an indefinite number of generations, strong occupational specialization in the fields that lie on the boundary between petty retail trade and mendicancy, generally low socio-economic status and level of education, recognition of its existence by its members and by some but not all other Roman Jews. The indices of membership for an individual are residence, or more accurately a combination of birthplace and the circumference within which major social activities are carried on, and descent, or spouse's descent. The other factors cited above, while diagnostic of the nuclear community as a whole, cannot be used as criteria with regard to individual members of it. With some exceptions, a person is a member of the nuclear community if he says he is.

There is a point here that needs a word of explanation. Especially after the Second World War, many poor Jews moved from the ghetto out into the *borgate* (suburban slums) where they live in clusters of various sizes. Some of these people still spend the major portion of their waking hours in or around the ghetto area; many come there almost every day; most can be found on Friday evenings and Sunday mornings walking the Via Portico d'Ottavia or in the neighbourhood of the synagogue, or sitting in the tavern. The minor Jewish settlements in the *borgate* can therefore be considered as in a real sense colonies of the nuclear community.

Of course there are other peculiarities of this community which may be important but which cannot be used as indices, either because they are difficult to demonstrate empirically or because I have no way of telling to what extent they are distinctive to the community rather than, say, standard lower-class Roman or Italian. It is worth emphasizing that religion as such, that is the practice of Judaism, is not an index of membership in the nuclear community, although of course it is a precondition for it. Many Roman Jews do not belong to the nuclear community; for our immediate purposes here, these members of the peripheral community are part of the population at large. These same individuals will appear under a quite different aspect when we come to consider the special and important role which they play in the lives of nuclear-community people through the various organizations and institutions which they control and administer.

Empirical conditions and methods of the study.—The social data summarized in what follows were gathered in conjunction with a biological (chiefly serological) investigation under the auspices of the Institute for the Study of Human Variation, Columbia University, by its head, Professor L. C. Dunn, and with the co-operation of various scientists and scientific organizations in Italy. Although this investigation was independent of my own, nevertheless some of the conditions of the social study were dictated by the requirements of the biological one. For instance, the same basic population sample was used in both cases, although for the purposes of the social study it was expanded along certain specific lines. Our final sample consisted of 656 families, each one represented by a card in our file. On these cards was entered a variety of vital statistics. The source of most of this information was the file maintained by O.S.E. (Organizzazione Sanitaria Ebraica) in which are registered all children examined and treated at the O.S.E. clinic since its inception in 1946. This includes automatically all pupils at the Jewish elementary school (Scuola Vittorio Polacco) during that period. The biological sample was augmented by adding various individuals who were cared for in community institutions (orphanage, home for the aged, etc.; these will be described in detail later) and a few who came uninvited for blood tests; the social sample was

augmented by personal contact on my part through the O.S.E. nurse. Finally, all data entered on the file cards were checked against the official records of the *Comunità*.

II. SOCIAL DATA ON THE NUCLEAR COMMUNITY

Geographical Concentration.—Table 1 shows the character and original provenance (whether made up of native Roman Jews, Jewish immigrants to Rome, or Catholics) of the families in the population sample in relation to their residence. It will be seen that in the sample as a whole, families of native origin on both sides predominate by a ratio of more than four to one, and furthermore that the proportion of families originating from outmarriage is somewhat higher among residents outside the small-community area, although the difference is not very striking.

TABLE 1

Provenance of 656 pairs of parents from O.S.E. records

Husband	*Wife*	*Ghetto*	*Trastevere*	*Other*	*Total*
Member	Member	234	148	168	550
Member	Outside	8	3	9	20
Outside	Member	15	13	11	39
Outside	Outside	1	2	4	7
Member	Catholic	4	5	15	24
Catholic	Member	5	—	11	16
		267	171	218	656

TABLE 2

*Occupations of heads of families**

Occupation	*Inside district*	*Outside district*
Itinerant pedlars	100	30
Shopkeepers	83	34
White collar (shop assistants, messengers, clerks, etc.)	34	32
Chauffeurs (all kinds)	13	3
Artisans (shoemaker, carpenter, book binder, mattress maker, etc.)	13	14
Unskilled workers	8	4
Manufacturer†	7	1
Professional (rabbi, physician, engineer, lawyer)	6	5
Ragpicker‡	4	1
Salesman (door to door) and commercial agents	4	6
Miscellaneous	5	0
	277	130

* In 309 cases the information was not in the files. This is explained by the lack of regular occupation and/or sporadic employment at different sorts of work.

† The line between manufacturer and artisan is not sharply drawn.

‡ The preliminary interview indicated a larger group for this occupation.

Source: Records of O.S.E. (Jewish Health Organization) of the Jewish Community.

It will also be noticed that I divide the small-community area into two sections, the boundary between which is the Tiber. Only one of these, the ghetto, is universally recognized by both Jews and Catholics as a Jewish district both according to its present character and for historical reasons. In Trastevere the concentration of Jews is by no means uniform over the whole *rione* (the smallest political unit in that part of Rome which is bounded by the Aurelian wall) which indeed is the largest in the city and which contains middle class, proletarian, and sub-proletarian neighbourhoods. The Trastevere portion of the small-community area thus presents itself as a mosaic of small Jewish concentrations in a predominantly Catholic setting. It is only when it is compared with the remainder of Rome that its character as a centre of Jewish population becomes apparent. In view of the fact that the heaviest Jewish concentration in Trastevere is located directly opposite the ghetto area and near the river, I conclude that this part, at least, of the Trasteverine Jewish population is a spillover from the original ghetto subsequent to 1849 when it was temporarily evacuated because of a flood of the Tiber.

The various facilities—religious, medical, and educational—maintained by the *Comunità Israelitica di Roma* are about evenly divided between the two sides of the river: elementary school, kindergarten, nursery, orphanage, and children's clinic on one; synagogue, *Comunità* and welfare offices and adult clinic on the other; hospital on the island in the middle. People who live in that part of Trastevere nearest to the old ghetto are regarded as members of the small nuclear community; the social centre of their lives is in the ghetto. The same thing is true, as we have seen, of a large number of former ghetto families who may have moved even much greater distances away from their original homes to the working-class districts on the outskirts of the city, some of them as much as ten kilometres from the centre. Many come regularly to trade at the local shops, especially the kosher butcher's and one confectioner's, which is well known throughout Rome, and to ask assistance at the welfare agency or treatment at the clinic. Children from all over the city attend the elementary school, and all except those who come directly from the Trastevere districts must pass through the ghetto to get to it. This centring of Jewish agencies and facilities in and near the traditionally Jewish district has undoubtedly played its part in perpetuating its function as a centre of social life as well.

Occupational specialization and economic attitudes.—It has been noted previously that the members of the nuclear community show a strong preference for certain occupations as against certain others, and connected with this, an attitude toward work and economic behaviour generally which is specific to them. The first is well illustrated by data in Table 2 which shows the occupations of heads of families in our sample (in those cases where this information was available) in relation

to their residence, whether within or outside the nuclear-community area. It will be noticed that this area is not divided into 'ghetto' and Trastevere; I did not consider the occupational sample big enough to warrant this distinction. The lines of demarcation between some of the occupations listed in Table 2—merchant (*commerciante*) and pedlar (*venditore ambulante*), or pedlar and ragpicker (*cenciaiuolo* or *stracciaiuolo*) —seem to be vague; these distinctions are probably matters of prestige. Certainly the answers to my questionnaire and the preliminary interviews indicated a much higher proportion of ragpickers than is revealed in the table.

The special attitudes toward work referred to above and other aspects of economic life were difficult to pin down since, being attitudes strongly disapproved by most outsiders, they could not be elicited from members of the nuclear community in direct expression. Accordingly most of my information on this score comes from informants in what I call the 'observer category'—members of the peripheral community in professional contact with the nuclear one, or complete outsiders like the director of the orphanage (a Pole), the director of the vocational high school (a Yugoslav), and finally, persons who, though they were born and brought up inside the nuclear community and may even still live there, show some degree of dissociation from its traditional ways of thinking and feeling. There are naturally pitfalls involved in using such informants. They are precisely the ones who object most strongly to the kind of psychology which they describe as characteristic of nuclear-community members, and are therefore likely to exaggerate in describing it. Nevertheless, the evidence seems to me sufficiently strong, especially when considered in conjunction with the actual distribution of occupations, to warrant the ascription of a peculiar set of economic attitudes to the small community. The expression which I heard most often from my informants in this regard was to the effect that the Roman Jew 'doesn't like to work', or 'won't work' because 'he considers it unworthy of a man'. (The situation for a woman is somewhat different, as I shall show later.) It soon became apparent that the word 'work', as it was used here, carried with it an unexpressed modifying clause, namely 'with his hands and for wages'. There are, as the table shows, a fair number of shop assistants and other lower-echelon white collar workers in the nuclear community, and the calling of ragpicker or pedlar is at least as strenuous by any standards as that of mechanic or artisan. The use of the verb 'to work' with this special limitation was confirmed when, after remarking on the high rate of unemployment apparently revealed by the answers to my first questionnaire, I was told that the expression 'unemployed' did not mean that the respondent had no occupation and no source of income; it simply meant that he had no employer, that he was not a wage-worker. This distinction is carried over even into the ritual field, with no basis in Judaic ritual law as

far as those versed in such matters can see. People are perfectly willing to operate pushcarts, pick rags, or wait on customers in stores on Saturday, but they will not do anything which can be termed manual labour. The result is that even those who possess manual skills, chiefly girls and women who do fine sewing, will not work in non-Jewish enterprises. This illustrates incidentally another peculiar aspect of the mentality of nuclear-community members—their tendency to retain and emphasize precisely those parts of their religious heritage (as they understand it, with or without benefit of scriptural authority) which make it most difficult for them to adjust themselves to their non-Jewish environment.

There is one economically minor but culturally important exception to the nuclear-community occupational pattern. Many women do fine sewing and invisible mending, or produce items of lingerie by assembly-line methods at home, when the opportunity offers.[3] These skills were probably originally connected with the trade in second-hand clothing, which was long traditional among the Jews of Rome.

The ghetto Jews are commonly accused of being improvident and financially short-sighted, likely to spend immediately whatever cash they have in hand. In so far as this is true, it is probably a consequence of extreme and long-continued poverty. When asked what disposition they would make of a hypothetical win on the national lottery or the football pool, most informants replied that they would buy a house, or that they would 'get the children settled', which ideally involves procuring dowries for the girls. These are answers which indicate at least some awareness of the principles of investment and the rational use of money—in the latter case, of course, in nuclear-community terms.

I asked many women whether, by preference, they traded at Jewish shops. Some answered without hesitation that of course they did. Several, however, drew my attention to the curious fact, for which I afterwards found an historical explanation, that there are no Jewish food shops except the kosher butcher's. There are sweet shops, two well-known restaurants, a bar, and a tavern, but, strictly speaking, the trade in staple foods, even in the heart of the ghetto area, is in the hands of Catholics. Since a large proportion of the expenditure of these low-income families falls into this category (they live largely on the various forms of *pasta*) this puts an important limitation on what might otherwise be the economic self-containment of the small community.

Self-identification.—In this regard, as I have already remarked, I encountered a curious phenomenon. There is a basic disagreement in the total Jewish community concerning the extent of the nuclear community's distinctness and even of its very existence. Some of my informants from the peripheral community attempted to deny the separateness of the nuclear community altogether (this was often

phrased in such terms as to indicate that this viewpoint was a result of ideology in the Marxist sense); where they could not deny it they attributed this separateness solely to economic causes, and seemed to think that thereby they had scored a point.

The poorer individuals, on the other hand—that is, most members of the nuclear community—showed no such attitude. They were fully conscious of living in a distinctive social milieu and in a specific neighbourhood; they spoke of it readily and used the word *ghetto* and its alternative *tempio* (temple, from the synagogue) without apology or self-consciousness. This was true in particular of one of my best informants, a man born and brought up in the small community who, while now in good circumstances economically, has always remained a member of it both geographically and socially. He is cantor of the synagogue and occupies himself continuously with the provision of charity in the ghetto and Trastevere areas. Often, when asked where they lived, ghetto informants would reply 'right in the middle', or some such phrase, leaving the interviewer to complete the thought.

Traditionalism in social mores.—In the absence of adequate comparative data on non-Jewish working-class Romans, what is said in this section can only be sketchy and approximate. However, the nuclear community's social mores, when compared with those of the peripheral community, as these are described in, or inferred from, the statements of members, show certain interesting features.

The traditional Jewish insistence on ratification of marriage by the transfer of a dowry gave rise, in many Jewish communities, to two characteristic institutions, both of which existed in Rome until the devaluation of the currency before the war reduced the whole complex to vestigial form. The first was marriage-brokerage as a recognized profession; the second was a fund to provide dowries for poor girls, called *doti purim* (Purim dowries, from the date of its distribution). This fund was collected by means of contributions, awarded on a lottery basis to a number of infant girls each year, and then invested on their behalf until the time of their marriage. Its present status was a matter of dispute among my informants, some of them claiming that it had gone out of existence, others that it was still operative, but even these admitting that the dowries it provided nowadays were symbolic rather than of any practical value. There is plenty of evidence in the interviews, however, that the custom of giving dowries and of prearranging marriages is psychologically still very much alive in the nuclear community. Nearly all informants took it as a matter of course that marriages were prearranged and that brides should, if at all possible, bring dowries with them, although I could not find any woman who had had a dowry herself or who expected to be able to provide her daughter with one. Those who differed from this attitude, usually on ethical grounds (infringement of individual rights, etc.) were mostly

persons whose training had alienated them to some extent from the prevailing 'ghetto' ethos and personality-type.

With regard to relations between the sexes, two conflicting tendencies seem to be operative in the nuclear community. The first is toward some degree of seclusion of women; this, according to my impression, is standard working-class Italian. At the same time, women appear to bear a large part of the responsibility of holding families together, and even in some cases of breadwinning. This may be a consequence of the war, with its attendant social dislocation and shock; be that as it may, there is no doubt that the woman is the dominant and stabilizing influence in many families. It is worth remembering that the role of the woman has always been a prominent one in Sephardi Jewry, and indeed in the whole Jewish tradition; from Biblical times onward, her status has never been as subordinated as some authorities have sought to prove, witness the celebrated passage on the ideal wife in Proverbs.

It is worth noting that the nuclear community, in comparison with the peripheral one, appears to contain few if any persons who are 'fallen away' in a religious sense. Some amount of synagogue-attendance is looked upon as a badge of good standing. The rabbi and various other people even told me, without seeming to realize at all the implications of what they were saying, that the poorest and most ignorant Jews in Rome were also the most devout. However, Judaism sits lightly on most nuclear-community people, and can easily be forgotten when this seems convenient.

The present members of the nuclear community bear a limited number of surnames which other Romans recognize as indicative of ghetto origin. The thirteen most frequent names accounted for 634 individuals, or 48 per cent of the sample of 1,330 members. The derivations of these names provide interesting evidence on the historical development of the Roman Jewish population. Of the 13 most frequent surnames, Zarfati is of Hebrew origin (meaning Frenchman), and probably Efrati also, although I have not been able to make certain of this (cf. the Ephrathites, one of the ten Israelitic tribes). Astrologo is occupational, and Caló was said by one informant to be a Greek name, although this went unconfirmed, and no meaning was given for it. All the others are toponymous, and all refer to towns in the vicinity of Rome, except di Porto which is Spanish or Portuguese.

The limitation in numbers of family names is reflected also in the frequency of marriages between persons of the same surname; and both of these indicate a high degree of endogamy within the nuclear community. This conclusion was confirmed by examination of the records of marriages performed in the synagogue. Of 174 marriages during 1951–3, 163 involved a community member as one party, and in 83 per cent of these both parties were members of the *Comunità*. The records do not differentiate between members of the nuclear and peripheral

communities except as residence reveals this. However, the evidence already presented in Table 1 provides conclusive evidence that the nuclear community is an endogamous one. Of 616 marriages of Jews within the faith, 550 (or over 90 per cent) were between members of the nuclear community. Only 6 per cent (40 out of 656) of the nuclear-community families of the Table 1 sample originated in marriages of a member with a Catholic. This does not measure the total rate of outmarriage (which must be higher) since it takes no account of Jews who left the community after marriage.

Biological evidence[4] indicates that the population of the nuclear community today differs significantly from non-Jewish Romans and from other Italians in the frequency of certain blood-group genes. Such differences could be maintained only by a continuous and consistent mating system by which the nuclear community descends prevailingly from marriages between members.

An important question only superficially explored through informants is the attitude of community members to marriages outside the faith. All informants spoke in emphatic disapproval of them, more on apparently practical grounds than on explicitly ethical or religious ones. Most seemed to feel simply that such marriages were unlikely to be successful. The best evidence for community endogamy is the rarity with which outmarriage occurs in the community records. The community has certainly lost members by outmarriage and defection to Catholicism, especially during the Nazi persecutions. But the fact is that an active Jewish community has survived in the ghetto, recognizable by many objective criteria, both social and biological.

III. ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS IN THE NUCLEAR COMMUNITY

The nuclear community is served by numerous institutions of varied nature and function. Three aspects of these institutions interest us chiefly: (1) their histories; that is, whether they were derived from institutions existing in the old (1555–1849) Roman ghetto, or were developed in response to needs felt only after emancipation; (2) their scope and source of membership, management, and support, whether local, national, or international; and (3) the extent and nature of their influence in the present social situation of the nuclear community. For convenience I shall divide the organizations and institutions functioning within the nuclear community in an admittedly arbitrary manner into three categories: religious, welfare, and educational.

Religious institutions

(*a*) *Società dei Compari* (Society of Godfathers) or *Milà Bambini Poveri* (Circumcision for poor children). This is the local Roman version of an

institution which is, or was, to be found in many Jewish communities in various parts of the world. I need not detail the religious, cultural, and social importance of circumcision, or of the sponsor at circumcision, in the Jewish tradition. These were in fact considered so important by the Roman Jews of past centuries that the *Società dei Compari* was organized for the express purpose of providing sponsors and covering the costs of circumcision for families which could not afford to do so themselves. The actual funds dispensed, of course, were originally donated by those of the members who could do so. There is some dispute as to whether this institution still exists. The social worker of the *Deputazione di Carità* assured me that its functions had been taken over by that organization, yet I saw several families which had availed themselves of the service since the war, and I was told by one informant that her father had been president of the *Società dei Compari* and that her brother was now a member of it. It is likely, on the analogy of what has happened in other similar cases, that the actual cash dispensed by the *Società* now comes from the *Deputazione*.

(*b*) *Doti Purim* (Purim Dowries) or *Doti Povere Ragazze* (Dowries for Poor Girls). This was discussed in more detail earlier in connexion with the marriage pattern in the nuclear community.

Welfare institutions

(*a*) *Deputazione di Carità* (Committee of Charity). This is the chief welfare unit in the Roman Jewish community. It is composed for the most part of well-to-do peripheral community members, and its funds and supplies are administered by a full-time professional worker. This arrangement dates from after the Second World War when the *Deputazione* began to be supported in large part by donations of funds and supplies from the United States. Historically the *Deputazione di Carità* originated in the consolidation of a variety of previously existing charitable organizations at about the turn of the century. Since that time it appears to have gradually absorbed all those agencies whose business is the direct dispensing of material assistance to the population. These include the *Società dei Compari* and the *Doti Purim* as mentioned above, and also organizations to provide for the burial of paupers (analogous to the Catholic *Frati della Misericordia*) and to supply the poor with the requisites for observance of the Jewish festivals. Many of these organizations still survive on paper, as entries in the books of the *Deputazione*. This is very definitely a peripheral-community organization, and hence is on terms of friendly animosity with its nuclear-community 'clients' who show no compunction in hoodwinking it when they can. Despite this, however, there is a very deep sense in which they feel the *Deputazione* as something belonging to them.

(*b*) *Ospedale Israelitico* (Jewish Hospital). This was founded in 1895, and is administered by a special committee drawn from the peripheral

community, but it serves the nuclear community almost exclusively. The technical direction is from outside the nuclear community in all cases since a physician is almost *ipso facto* a peripheral community person.

(*c*) *Ospizio dei Vecchi* (Old People's Home) is located in the same buildings as the hospital and is administered with it, but is actually much older as an institution. It stems from the *Ricovero Poveri Invalidi* (Shelter for Poor Invalids) which is one of the classical institutions found in most if not all Jewish communities, and here dates from long before the opening of the ghetto.

(*d*) *Organizzazione Sanitaria Ebraica* (O.S.E.) (Jewish Health Organization) is the outpatient clinic serving the nuclear community and to some extent its colonies in the suburbs. Officially known as O.S.E. Italia, it is the Italian branch of an international organization with headquarters in Geneva. As far as I was able to determine, the various branches are administered independently by people on the spot—in the present case by a board of trustees under the presidency of a prominent peripheral community member—but all funds to cover such items as salaries, personnel, physical plant, and materials come from one central source. O.S.E. Italia, founded after the Second World War, was for a time supported by the American Joint Distribution Committee, but since the end of the immediate postwar medical emergency, the amount of this support has diminished. In view of the recent date of its institution, it would be premature to make any statement concerning the social role played by O.S.E. in the nuclear community; it is worth noting, however, that the waiting room of the children's clinic has become a frequent meeting place and a kind of occasional club for women. It does not seem that O.S.E., despite its peripheral community administration and largely foreign financing, is among those institutions which are tending more or less consciously to disintegrate the nuclear community by contravening its values or by attempting to open up avenues of escape from it.

(*e*) *Orfanotrofio* (Orphanage). In its present form it dates from the early twenties of this century. It is housed in a handsome old *palazzo* in the Trastevere district at some distance from the centre of the Jewish population. The orphanage takes in not only orphans in the strict sense of the term, but in special cases children, one or even both of whose parents are still living. In an interview the director told me that at present the severest punishment with which a troublesome child could be threatened was that of being sent home. He told me in elaboration that the children at the orphanage now had a richer and more secure life than those on the outside. I had no opportunity to investigate internal conditions at the institution, but all natural allowance for the informant's bias being made, this does appear to be the case. Certainly it is corroborated by the statements of those 'graduates'

of the orphanage whom I interviewed, and by their observed personal characteristics, which in almost all cases showed marked deviation—often self-consciously expressed—from the usual nuclear-community ways of thinking and acting.

Educational institutions

(*a*) *Scuola Elementare Vittorio Polacco* (Elementary School) was founded in 1925 as a response to the increased control by the Catholic Church of the public school system which took place under the Gentile Law (Giovanni Gentile, Minister of Education) of that year. Legally the school functions as a part of the public school system. The pupils are given standard examinations; the teachers are chosen competitively on the same basis as elsewhere. However, all of the teachers in the school at the time of the study were Jewish, and most of them bore names characteristic of the nuclear community. Registration at the school in 1953–4 numbered approximately 500 pupils, of whom, according to the principal, about 350 came from the nuclear community. The figure of 500 includes about 100 students accommodated, except for examinations and assemblies, in a smaller building in another part of the city which serves the suburban areas, and generally the children of economically better situated families. Registration had been on the increase since the war when it stood at a record low figure, and when operations were actually suspended for one school year. There is some evidence that the balance of pupils was shifting in favour of members of the peripheral community. A city-wide bus service was established in 1953, and the same informant quoted above said that even parents who were only nominal Jews as far as their personal observance was concerned, preferred to send their children to the Jewish school if it was at all feasible. All informants were agreed that most nuclear-community children attended the Jewish school, and furthermore that those who did not attend it showed a markedly different attitude toward the Judaic tradition and the nuclear-community ethos. Certainly a strong majority of those respondents to the questionnaire whose age permitted it claimed one or more years of attendance. The force for social cohesion which the school exerts cannot be accurately measured solely by the time devoted to formal instruction in Judaic culture and religion. Throughout the year all major Judaic festivals are communally celebrated, and the students' attention is drawn on many occasions to their cultural and religious heritage. In view of this, it may seem like a paradox to speak of the school as an institution tending to disintegrate the nuclear community. However, two salient facts must be borne in mind: first, the school, despite its proportionately heavier representation from the nuclear community, crosscuts the boundary between it and the peripheral community, and aims at the welding of the two into an organic unit; second, inasmuch as one of the dis-

tinguishing marks of the nuclear-community member is low level of education, anything which tends to raise this, not only in Judaic terms but also in common Italian ones, must operate as a cosmopolitanizing factor, and therefore as inimical to the survival of the nuclear community as such. On the face of it, and by analogy with similar situations elsewhere, the more education a man has, the less likely he is to be content with the kind of life which the nuclear community can offer him.

(*b*) *O.R.T.* (*Organizzazione Rehabilitazione Tecnica*) is a school for training young Jews as skilled workers and technicians, run by an international organization. The total student body is about 150, which means that even if all of them came from the nuclear community, the proportion of nuclear-community youths receiving secondary education would be much smaller than that receiving primary education. Many of the students have great difficulty following the courses because of inadequate preparation. Furthermore, the avowed aim of the school runs directly counter to deep-seated prejudices and tastes in the nuclear community. This makes its social effect in this context highly problematical.

The institutions functioning in the nuclear community can be classified in regard to their relation to the traditional social order prevailing here. Some, like the orphanage and the O.R.T. high school, were established and are run with the expressed purpose of breaking down the social unity of the nuclear community and merging it with the general population, including the peripheral community, and such institutions are clearly having the intended effect. Others, like the circumcision society and the dowry fund, leaving aside for the moment the question of whether these exist objectively at the present time, are descended from ancient prototypes, and consciously express and embody this same social unity. Still others—the elementary school, the clinic, the hospital, the welfare agency—must be considered ambivalent in the sense that although originally established with expressed educational, medical, or humanitarian aims, they produce effects in part opposed, or at least unrelated, to these. These institutions, despite their being supported from outside the nuclear community, are felt as their own by members of this community, and so serve as foci for the crystallization of its in-group feelings, even though their actual purpose is to reduce its degree of apartness by raising its level of education, degree of physical well-being, and standard of living.

IV. THE HISTORY OF THE ROMAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

This history is a complex one, excruciatingly well documented in most respects.[5] We cannot enter here upon the details of the story; its essentials are in any case available elsewhere. Instead let us merely

summarize those historical factors which are particularly relevant to our present purpose. The Jewish community of Rome dates from pagan times, a large part of it having been imported as slaves and prisoners of war following the destruction of the Temple in 80 C.E. The epigraphic evidence indicates a high degree of acculturation to Roman mores during the remaining pagan centuries, including even a considerable dilution of the Judaic religious ideals. The treatment of the Jews by imperial authorities during this period was characterized by complete tolerance, save in a few instances; in some respects the Jews were even granted a privileged status. With the ascendancy of Christianity this situation changed, the Jews being placed, on theological grounds, in a protected but subordinate status vis-à-vis the total population. Their civil rights, economic, religious, and professional activities were severely restricted, and they were set apart from the population in various ways having to do with dress, habitation, and social intercourse. The effectiveness of these restrictions varied directly with the degree of stability of the civil government in the area, and especially with the political power of the papacy, which was the chief proponent of the restrictive measures. Following the political reforms of Hildebrand (Gregory VII) these measures gained ground, culminating in the Bull *Cum nimis absurdum* of Paul IV which relegated the Roman Jews to a ghetto and forbade them to carry on any profession save the trade in second-hand goods. Regardless of occasional amelioration in their position, the main features of this legislation remained in force until 1849. Meanwhile the papacy carried out a programme of fiscal spoliation in which taxes and forced loans were levied upon the Jews on a communal basis. This in turn gave rise to a large body of legislation enacted within the community itself, and also to a considerable esprit de corps. There is no evidence that the papal legislation concerning the Jews at any time reflected a widespread antisemitic attitude or value within the culture of the total population, such as existed almost everywhere in Northern and Eastern Europe during the same period. We must, therefore, assume that these papal policies were the outcome of formal theological reasoning in conjunction with the material interests of the papacy as a political entity.

In the surviving remnant of the historical Roman Jewish community we find certain modes of thought and behaviour which correspond to the effects of the legislation imposed upon it. We find, for example, a heavy specialization in those lines of economic endeavour which were consistently left open to the Jews by papal policy, and a completely negative attitude toward those which were consistently prohibited. We find also a degree of localization and corresponding emotional attachment to a given locality which can be directly accounted for by extremely low rents obtaining in the area of the historical ghetto—the result in turn of papal legislation decreeing a perpetual freeze on rent

in the area. The esprit de corps which persists in what I have called the nuclear community appears to be based largely on its extremely low socio-economic status, reflecting the effects of papal fiscal policy which kept the community destitute.

NOTES

[1] For the previous treatments, see L. C. Dunn and S. P. Dunn, 'The Roman Jewish Community', *Scientific American*, March 1957, and S. P. Dunn. 'An outsider visits the Roman Ghetto', *Commentary*, February 1958.

[2] At the last census there were about 40,000 Jews in Italy, about 12,000 of whom lived in metropolitan Rome; Rome's share of the total population of Italy is considerably less than this—1.75 out of 47.5 million by the 1951 census.

[3] This was revealed by an economic and demographic questionnaire circulated in both the peripheral and the nuclear communities by the American Joint Distribution Committee. This survey was not completed, nor its results available to me, until near the end of my stay in Rome; I was therefore unable to check the information directly with a sufficient number of informants.

[4] L. C. Dunn and S. P. Dunn, op. cit.; see note 1.

[5] The literature is voluminous but of uneven quality. The following references are the most important: Abraham Berliner, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom von der aelteste Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols., Frankfurt a/M., 1892, and Paul Rieger and Herrmann Vogelstein, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, 2 vols.. (the second by Rieger alone), Berlin, 1895–6—both panoramic works in the great tradition of German historical scholarship, though unfortunately somewhat out of date now; Emmanuele Rodocanacchi, *Le Saint-Siège et les Juifs: le ghetto a Rome*, Paris, 1892—more sprightly and popular in style than either of the foregoing, and written with a good deal of historical acumen, but also with an annoying lack of documentation on certain essential points; Moritz Stern, *Urkündliche Beiträge über die Stellung der Päpste zu den Juden*, 2 vols., Kiel, 1894–6—a valuable and fascinating compilation of source materials. In addition to these, there are two extremely important series of articles: one published in the *Revue des Etudes Juives* between 1883 and 1909 by J. Bauer, P. L. Bruzzone, H. P. Chajes, C. DeJob, and other authors, and containing a large amount of material transcribed from original manuscript sources; the other published in the *Rassegna Mensile di Israel* (Rome) during the 1930s by Dr. Attilio Milano, now of Ramathaim, Israel (probably the foremost modern authority in this field) and containing indispensable statistical and demographic data and transcripts of several important documents. Regrettably, not much can be said for the English-language literature on this topic. Cecil Roth's *History of the Jews in Italy* (Philadelphia, 1947) is usually cited as a standard source, but it lacks documentation.

TRENDS IN ANGLO-JEWISH OCCUPATIONS

V. D. Lipman

1. UP TO 1880

'SHTICK it in mit putty for sixpence' was the familiar cry in London's Jewish quarter, between a hundred and fifty years ago, of the itinerant Jewish glazier or window-salesman. 'From morning to night he makes his round in streets and market-places, with a boxful of glass on his back, and with his eyes raised to the lofty walls, seeking out a broken window. Wherever he turns he encounters ten compatriots looking for what he cannot find.'[1] The glazier is an example of an Anglo-Jewish calling that has disappeared with the development of modern methods of window-fitting. But in the 1860s the Board of Guardians referred to the 'vast company' of glaziers and other unskilled or semi-skilled workers, whose employments were liable to 'alternations between constantly recurring periods of slackness and earning only just sufficient to maintain the family in a greater or less degree of poverty'.[2] In 1872, glaziers formed over 10 per cent of those receiving casual relief from the Board of Guardians, but the figures gradually declined until by the beginning of the present century there were only a handful of them.[3] Yet the itinerant glazier is of interest not only because he represents a vanished Anglo-Jewish occupation, but also because he symbolizes characteristic features of a certain stage in the economic development of the mass of Anglo-Jewish immigrants. It was an occupation peculiarly suited to the recent immigrant. It required little, if any, previous skill, no premises, little expenditure on stock-in-trade, and the worker was his own master and could fix his own days and hours of work: a particular attraction for the orthodox Jew. Many of these features—particularly the independence of the occupation—will be met again and again in the economic life of Anglo-Jewry.

Commoner, however, for the recent immigrants were the similar occupations of peddling in the countryside and hawking in the towns. From the early eighteenth century, it was the itinerant pedlar who largely built up the provincial communities of Anglo-Jewry. The first

pedlars began to hawk their wares through the countryside. As soon as one had established himself sufficiently to set up a permanent shop, probably as a silversmith, jeweller or watchmaker, in some country town, he would provide a centre from which other pedlars would set out, often selling the goods he stocked. The history of the Cornish community of Falmouth provides a typical example—as recounted by a certain Israel Solomon, who was born there in 1803 and whose grandfather had settled there in the middle of the eighteenth century.[4] The founder of the community, Alexander Moses (known as Zender Falmouth) started business as a silversmith about 1740; he then arranged with a number of Jewish itinerant pedlars in the countryside that he would set them up with a stock of cutlery, jewellery, and so on, if they would make Falmouth their headquarters and return there each Friday to make *minyan* for him. Gradually these pedlars in turn made enough to open shops for themselves and settle down.[5] Many other Anglo-Jewish provincial communities were founded in this way and by the end of the eighteenth century the Jewish pedlar became a familiar figure in the English countryside, depicted by Rowlandson and other artists, fulfilling a useful economic function in retail distribution of cheap jewellery, trinkets, ribbons, laces, watches and so on, before the days of the railways.[6] If they could not spend the Sabbath in an organized community, they had arrangements with an inn-keeper to keep a locked set of utensils for their use. The young immigrant who arrived single from the Continent would marry the local Jewish shopkeeper's daughter or occasionally the daughter of a local farmer, who would become a convert—often a most faithful one—to Judaism.[7]

The itinerant pedlars, travelling the countryside with their packs on their backs, continued into the nineteenth century, reinforced by new immigrants from Central Europe.[8] But the coming of the railways reduced their numbers to a few hundred by the middle of the nineteenth century, though even in the 1850s recent immigrants were still tramping the Yorkshire Moors.[9] In some areas, however, especially the North and the Welsh valleys, the rural 'travellers' continued to the end of the nineteenth century and later. Indeed, in Edinburgh, as late as the 1920s, there were 'itinerant pedlars of anything from sewing needles to ready-made dresses' who went out daily by the slow trains from Edinburgh along the Fife coast to Dundee: these were the 'trebblers' whose Scots-Yiddish dialect David Daiches has described in his autobiography.[10]

From the end of the eighteenth-century onwards, the small provincial communities had their groups of resident shopkeepers and craftsmen, following what were the characteristic Anglo-Jewish provincial occupations up to the mass immigration of the 1880s. There were watchmakers, jewellers, and silversmiths—half of the individuals whose occupations are listed in Dr. Roth's *Rise of Provincial Jewry*

followed these occupations; in the seaports there were naval agents, who supplied ships with stores, and slopsellers selling seamen's clothing and other suppliers of marine goods. In 1816, for instance, the Navy List records the names of over 140 naval agents in London and the naval ports such as Plymouth, Portsmouth, Chatham, and Sheerness.[11] Other provincial Jews were engravers, or miniature painters.[12] There were also dentists and chiropodists, opticians and instrument makers.[13] These formed the nucleus of a group of artists and professional men. On the other hand, there were relatively very few Jewish tailors in the provinces before about 1850.[14]

The recent immigrants were, no doubt, originally induced to settle in the provinces in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries because of the difficulty of starting retail trade in London. At that time only freemen could open retail shops in the City of London and, until 1831, Jews were normally not admitted to the freedom of the City. Those who remained in London, therefore, often had to start as urban hawkers, later perhaps progressing to a stall, before eventually rising to a proper shop. The rural pedlar was thus paralleled by the urban hawker. Some of these were Jews from Morocco (via Gibraltar) or other parts of the Mediterranean, dressed in picturesque costume and selling slippers, rhubarb, and medicinal spices.[15] Less picturesque were the old clothes men, also well recorded in current prints, with several hats piled on their heads (the English custom for denoting the dealer in old clothes which antedates the Jewish old clothes man); or by the boys, who hung about the streets and inns, when passengers arrived and departed and 'most pertinaciously offered oranges, lemons, sponges, combs, pocket-books, pencils, sealing-wax, paper, many-bladed penknives, razors, pocket mirrors and shaving boxes, as if a man could not possibly leave the Metropolis without requiring a stock of such commodities'.[16] In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the overcrowding of the London streets with poor immigrants who could not make a living led some to crime, such as passing counterfeit coins, receiving stolen goods, and even occasionally robbery with violence, as in the case of the Chelsea murder and robbery of 1771.[17]

The evil brought its own remedy. The communal authorities paid great attention to apprenticeship and the teaching of trades. The *Neveh Zedek* Orphan Asylum provided from 1806 for teaching of trades, including a shoe workshop and shoemaker's room.[18] Various charities were concerned with apprenticing, including the Talmud Torah of the Great Synagogue, from which the Jews' Free School developed. The manuscript Minute Books covering the period from 1791–1818 have many references to apprenticeship, these being arranged by the charity when the boy reached the age of 13, the indenture fee (usually five guineas, sometimes ten) being paid by the charity. The trades recorded appear to be mainly tailoring, pencil-making, and glass-cutting.[19]

Other trades in which boys were apprenticed up to about 1850 were those of carvers, gilders, upholsterers, broom and brush makers, hat-makers, manufacturing jewellers, cabinet-makers, chair-makers, turners, and watch finishers.[20] The efforts made to apprentice boys to these artisan callings undoubtedly had an effect in creating an indigenous industrial proletariat among English Jews by the middle of the nineteenth century.[21]

Another development tending to reduce the number of Jews in the street trades was the competition by poor Irish immigrants who undercut them. Again, the replacement of second-hand clothing by cheap ready-made clothing—a process in which Jews played an important part—also reduced the importance of the second-hand clothes markets and second-hand clothes trade generally. Finally, all observers record the energetic attempts by the Jewish street traders to better themselves and rise to economic stability and independence. As a result, by 1850 there were probably only about 1,000 Jewish street traders of all kinds in London, out of a total Jewish population of 20,000, whereas in about 1800 out of a London Jewish population of, say, 15,000, there were 1,000 or 1,500 old clothes men alone, apart from the street dealers in oranges, nuts, lemons, cheap china and glassware, laces, ribbons, pencils, and trinkets of various kinds. By 1880 hawkers and general dealers comprised probably less than a fifth of the total London Jewish earners in the lower income groups. At that date, in these lower income occupations, tailoring had the highest percentage (about 25), boot and shoe making represented about 10 per cent, and cigar-making (a trade especially followed by Dutch Jews), about 10 per cent. It will thus be seen that during the nineteenth century up to the eve of the great immigration of the 1880s, there had been a steady change in the nature of the Jewish working class occupations and that, whereas at the beginning of the century the average Jew was engaged in peddling or hawking of one kind or another, the normal occupation was now an artisan craft, though in a relatively limited range of callings.[22]

What were the occupations in the next higher income groups, the lower middle class or middle class, up to about 1880? Broadly speaking, the pedlar, hawker or street trader would tend to set up a shop selling the goods he had previously sold in the streets or possibly, with a little capital, start manufacturing them. Thus, apart from watch-makers, jewellers, and silversmiths, who were to be found in London as well as in the provinces, there were many general dealers who supplied storekeepers, pedlars, or costermongers, and to some extent also carried on the manufacture of jewellery and trinkets of various kinds, crockery, cheap furniture and so on. There were also a number of embroiderers and gold and silver lacemakers, especially concerned with military uniforms. Others dealt in retail and wholesale trade, in oranges, nuts, and lemons, which Jews had long been noted for selling in the streets.

Jewish wholesalers were active at Covent Garden in supplying retail fruiterers, while the street vendors went to Duke's Place with their supplies; there the whole square was occupied by Jewish shops dealing in fruit and nuts. Other Jewish merchants dealt in various other items traditionally stocked by the Jewish street traders—sponges, quills, toys, ostrich feathers, and shells.[23] Jews set themselves up also both in London and the provincial centres, such as Birmingham, as manufacturers of trinkets, sealing-wax, pencils, brushes, looking-glasses, sticks, and umbrellas. The second-hand clothes trade was from about 1820 to about 1860 progressively replaced by the supply of new cheap clothing. The big retailers, almost department stores, with various branches, were the firm of E. Moses and Son, whose headquarters were in High Street, Aldgate; their advertising technique included the issue of booklets in doggerel verse and they have been immortalized by Thackeray's poem 'Mr. Smith and Mr. Moses', recounting how, after his flight, the exiled French monarch, Louis-Philippe, equipped himself at their store 'where the poor are not done and the rich are not fleeced by E. Moses and Son' and 'their cloth was first-rate and the fit such a one, as only is furnished by Moses and Son'.[24] Similar retail shops were run by the firm of Lawrence Hyam (late Halford). Another Moses firm—owned by the family that later changed their name to Beddington—were manufacturing clothiers in Cannon Street and Monkwell Street. Their practice of sub-contracting for making up of clothes, including the use of outworkers, gave rise to some public criticism in the 1840s and was the cause (although the real offenders were another, non-Jewish, firm) of Thomas Hood's 'Song of a Shirt'. Mention should also be made of the part played by the wholesale textile dealers, many of German-Jewish origin, in building up the Lancashire and Yorkshire export trades.[25]

The discussion so far has been from the lowest paid callings upwards and includes many in which the participants had worked their way up from below. Nothing has been said so far about what contemporary opinion often regarded as the representative Jewish occupation (though only followed by a small percentage of the community at any one time): finance. This is a broad term and the object will be not to give biographical detail, but to try to identify what were peculiarly Jewish activities in the financial and mercantile fields.

Many of the early Anglo-Jewish merchants and financiers resembled the contemporary Court Jews (*Hofjuden*) of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Like them, they acted as royal bankers, purveyors and Army contractors. Some of them, indeed, remained in England for only part of their lives and much of their activity was on the Continent. Antonio Fernandez (Abraham Israel) Carvajal, generally known as the first English Jew of the resettlement period, was not only a merchant with wide commercial connexions, but also held the con-

tract for supplying the Commonwealth Army with corn.[26] The story of Sir Solomon de Medina's association as Army contractor with Marlborough during the War of the Spanish Succession is well known. Perhaps less familiar is the work of Don Jose Cortissos, a Portuguese Jew from Amsterdam who settled in England in 1712, and supplied both the Portuguese and English armies in Spain during the same war. William III's commissariat in his Irish campaigns of 1689–90 had been organized by the Dutch-Jewish firm of Machado and Pereira. During the Seven Years War Abraham Prado was in charge of the military commissariat, and was assisted by a group of Sephardim.[27]

A second main activity among the Jewish upper class in the earlier years was large-scale import and export, especially with countries in which there were relatives or associates of Jews settled in England. First, in the Restoration period, the trade with Venice and Leghorn included the import of both Italian and Turkish goods, brought to Leghorn by Jews from Constantinople.[28] Jews were particularly prominent in trade with the West Indies, and many families, especially Sephardim, moved from London to the West Indies, or *vice versa*. Another important trade was that in precious stones; it was particularly appropriate for Jews, both because of their association with the retail trade as jewellers, and also since they had connexions with the main exporting centres of diamonds during the eighteenth century—India (especially Madras) and Brazil. The Indian gem trade was one in which Ashkenazim as well as Sephardim were concerned. There was a small group of Ashkenazi gem merchants, mainly of Hamburg origin, who were members of the London Hambro' Synagogue.[29] The diamonds were often bartered in India for coral, which was also exported by Jews from Leghorn where it was prepared for sale. Other wealthy Jewish jewellers of the early period were Samuel Heilbuth and Aaron Franks.[30]

Pursuit of these occupations was often undertaken with that of broker on the Royal Exchange. When the Exchange was reorganized in 1697, provision was made for, in addition to 100 English brokers, twelve Jews and twelve non-Jewish aliens, the latter groups of course having brokers far in excess of their proportion to the population.[31] These brokers, who were concerned in wholesale dealing in commodities, were not supposed to job in stock themselves, though in fact they did so through deputies. Jews in the eighteenth century were much drawn to speculative occupations in finance—selling lottery tickets among them —so it was inevitable that they should speculate in Government securities and in such joint company stocks as were then commonly dealt in (Bank of England, East India Company, and the South Sea Company). As the eighteenth century went on, stock-jobbing became a separate occupation, whose followers first met in coffee houses, until the Stock Exchange was organized in the latter part of the century. Jews soon took to stock-jobbing, especially in Government securities.

The outstanding and characteristic mid-eighteenth-century Jewish stock-jobber was Sampson Gideon. The Government needed money which it raised by loan from the City through Government loan contractors or private bankers. It was Sampson Gideon's particular contribution first to organize a list of Jewish subscribers for Government loans, and then to become increasingly prominent as an adviser to the Government on the floating of loans and all matters concerning their placing on the market.[32] It was as contractors and subscribers to Government loans that Jews were particularly active in finance in the latter part of the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth century. The rise and fall of the brothers Benjamin and Abraham Goldsmid and the rise of Nathan Mayer Rothschild indicate the important role the Jews could play in raising money for the Government, especially as they could call on financial resources (often Jewish) from abroad. It was the international character of the Rothschilds that especially contributed to their success. Later on in the nineteenth century, the interests of this class of financier widened. Sir David Salomons, for instance, was also an underwriter and a founder of the Westminster Bank, an entry into the field of deposit banking, as distinct from merchant or foreign banking in which the Jewish financiers had specialized. Sir Moses Montefiore was also a founder and director of a deposit bank—the Provincial Bank of Ireland. He too, with his brother-in-law, Nathan Mayer Rothschild, founded the Alliance Insurance Company;[33] Montefiore was the founder and President also of the International Continental Gas Association, a pioneering step in technical development which brought him the Fellowship of the Royal Society. Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, nephew of the brothers Abraham and Benjamin, carried on the traditional activity of financing Government loans—this time especially for foreign governments, notably that of Portugal. He also took some part, as did other Jews in the 1830s and 1840s, in the financing of the new railways and docks.[34]

But while thus in the nineteenth century up to about 1880 Jews had branched out from the Stock Exchange into the Board room, and founded a number of important companies, they were not notably concerned with the basic industries, though there were a few exceptions.[35] As a result, even in 1880, finance in its various branches remained the outstanding occupation among the Jewish upper and middle classes, at any rate in London, with perhaps 10 per cent among those classes covered by the Stock Exchange and the City of London brokers; the 200 in this group, of course, represented a far higher proportion of those with the higher incomes. The nineteenth century, however, did bring a significant change in the growth of a small professional class. From the seventeenth century onwards there had been a number of doctors, at first from, or at least having graduated, abroad. Some of these, such as Fernando Mendes, physician to Catherine of Braganza and Charles II,

Myer Löw Schomberg and Philip de la Cour, had fashionable practices; others like Isaac de Sequeira Samuda and Jacob de Castro Sarmento had a considerable scientific reputation and were elected members of the Royal Society; others, such as Hart Myers and the van Ovens, were better known inside the community, although nearly all physicians and surgeons of the period held some sort of communal appointment. Even though in the nineteenth century the number of physicians and surgeons increased, it was not until the end of the century that they became really prominent in their professions. From the eighteenth century there were also a number of dentists and oculists, though these were more practical craftsmen than academically trained professional men like the physicians.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century there were a few notaries and from the end of that century one or two solicitors. The number of the latter increased in the nineteenth century until by about 1880 there were about fifty Jewish solicitors in London.[36] The first Jewish barrister was called in 1833; about five barristers were called in the next fifteen years and there were only about thirty in London in 1882.[37] There were also a few Jewish architects; the best known professing Jewish architect in the first half of the nineteenth century—George Basevi was brought up as a Christian—was probably David Mocatta, a pioneer of railway architecture, the architect of many stations on the London to Brighton line, including Brighton itself.[38]

But, in spite of the development of a small professional class, Anglo-Jewry in 1880 found the professional man as the exception rather than the rule. The figures given by Joseph Jacobs of London Jewish occupations in the early 1880s show that, among even the middle and upper classes, only 5 per cent were professional men compared with about 22 per cent who were manufacturers, 21 per cent merchants, 16 per cent brokers and 39 per cent in retail trade.[39]

II. AFTER 1880

The mass immigration from Eastern Europe, which began in 1880 and brought some 100,000 immigrants to this country between 1881 and 1905, had certain important effects on the occupational distribution of Anglo-Jewry. In the first place, because so many of the immigrants followed a relatively narrow group of callings, it retarded the process of diversification of trades which had been steadily progressing up to then. In the second place, it created in London and a number of provincial towns solid blocks of immigrant labour, following a few trades, with characteristics so marked that they became known as immigrant trades. It is true that an industrial class had already been developing, at least among London Jewry, from both the native-born and the Russo-Polish immigrants who arrived earlier between about 1865 and

1880. But it was the mass immigration which intensified this development. In the third place, certain trades, for instance, boot and shoe-making, cabinet-making and furs, which had not previously employed many Jews, now gave employment to a much higher proportion of Jewish labour.

Since the recent immigrants so greatly outnumbered the pre-1880 community and their descendants, the distribution of occupations among the immigrants had a decisive significance for Anglo-Jewry as a whole. Yet among the immigrants the range of occupations was very limited. In 1901 the census figures of Russo-Polish aliens in London showed that roughly forty out of every 100 males who were gainfully employed were tailors, another twelve or thirteen were in the boot, shoe, or slipper trades, and another ten in the furniture trade, mainly cabinet-makers.[40] Even in these trades the actual range of employment was limited. The newcomers were engaged in small workshops (except in Leeds where workshops were larger) and there was intense subdivision of labour. Immigrants were mainly concerned with the making of ready-made clothing for merchants and wholesale clothiers; they were not engaged in the high class bespoke trade (which kept to one man, one garment) or in the very cheap production of slop clothing. In the boot and shoe trade, the Jews were in the small workshops, being progressively edged out at the end of the century by the more efficient and economical factory production. Indeed the displaced boot and shoe operatives in the small workshops had to turn to other forms of small workshop production and slipper-making and, in London and Manchester, cap-making—which was virtually entirely a Jewish immigrant trade.[41]

Why was there this concentration of immigrants in so limited a range of trades? First, these were already the trades of East London and provincial towns, such as Manchester and Leeds, when the immigrants came there. It was natural, therefore, that immigrants, joining their co-religionists in these areas, tried to adapt themselves to the trades prevailing locally. Secondly, they were sometimes at least the trades of the immigrants before emigration. Statistics of some 9,000 recent immigrants answering questionnaires at the Jews' Temporary Shelter, between 1895 and 1908, showed 29 per cent as having made garments of one kind or another, 23 per cent were in trade and commerce, 9 per cent in boot and shoe trades, and 7 per cent were carpenters. It is true that these immigrants answering questionnaires might have exaggerated their mastery of any particular craft, but the figures do suggest a correlation between trades followed in Eastern Europe and those adopted in England. Thirdly, they were trades which did not require physical exertions of which the immigrants were incapable, and they also involved a number of repetitive operations, so that those without skill could readily begin as learners. Fourthly, since they were trades in which many Jews were already engaged, the immigrants were not

faced with difficulties of language or religious prejudice and could settle down in a familiar atmosphere. Finally, they were trades which, in the circumstances of the particular time and place, could be operated on a small scale, often in improvised workshops, backrooms, or sheds by a small number of operatives. They gave the immigrant what he had always wanted—a prospect of becoming his own master, in however small a way.

Developments since 1914 are practically impossible to measure, because of the lack of reliable statistical evidence, and only the general trends can be discerned. *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* made possible some comparisons between the occupations of the mass of London Jewry in 1900 and 1932; the data suggest that between those dates the proportion of the gainfully employed Jewish male population in London who were in the tailoring trade decreased—though it was still around 25 per cent or some 20,000. On the other hand, the number of London Jewish females employed in tailoring rose disproportionately from a few thousands in 1900 to about 20,000 in 1932. It was then estimated that men represented nearly 50 per cent of all men occupied in the industry, and women about one-sixth of all women occupied in the industry in London. Furniture-making had increased in prominence as a Jewish trade, relatively to tailoring, and there were six or eight thousand Jews in furniture-making in the East End alone; the number of Jews employed in the furniture industry, however, tended to decline in London in the years immediately before the war.[42]

In the twentieth century, the Jewish role in the economic life of Britain generally has been the organization of mass production and distribution of consumer goods. Where Jews have been leaders of industry—as distinct from operatives—has obviously been in building up new consumer goods industries on the basis of new technical methods of mass production and in imaginatively seizing upon the new needs of a growing industrial population. Just as the characteristic Jewish magnate of an earlier period engaged in wholesale foreign trade or in the financing of Government loans, so his counterpart in the present century may be regarded as the organizer of the mass production and distribution of consumer goods. It is not possible here to chronicle the building up of so many famous undertakings by Jews since 1880 or 1900. It may, however, be pointed out that so many of them have had connexions with, or origins in, occupations in which Jews were concerned in earlier years. What has been new has been the imagination to strike out on a new line of development and the energy to build up a large organization. Marcus Samuel, the founder of Shell, began with the importation of shells from the Pacific and Indian Oceans—an occupation in which a number of Jews in England had been engaged. The difference was that he had the idea of using his marketing organization in the East to distribute oil on a global scale. Michael Marks,

hiring a stall in Leeds market in 1884, was, on the face of it, entering a traditional Jewish occupation; but he entered it with a difference, which was the idea of selling items of general use at a single fixed price (then 1*d.*). Montague Burton, opening a ready-made clothing shop in Chesterfield in 1900, was again following a familiar example. His new contribution was to adapt to bespoke tailoring the idea of factory production and retail distribution through a chain of branches—a development indeed which had been pioneered for ordinary ready-made clothing by Jewish firms such as Moses and Hyam, half a century earlier. Bernhard Baron, joining Carreras in 1903, was entering an industry with which Jews had long been associated. His contribution was the expert knowledge of tobacco and his imagination in applying it.[43] To quote these examples is in no way to detract from the genius of these pioneers but it does draw attention to the fact that they were engaged in forms of industry with which Anglo-Jews had been traditionally associated; and it stresses the common factor of seizing upon a hitherto unsuspected idea and exploiting it to the full.

To turn again to the rank and file occupations, there is only the most general evidence for the trend of occupations in recent years. There are two surveys available but each of them is admittedly based on too limited and unrepresentative a sample. The first, conducted during the Second World War for the Trades Advisory Council by Dr. N. Barou, was based on the analysis of trade and telephone directories and similar works of reference, for 'Jewish' firms—defined as those with a majority of Jewish directors or in which the major part of the capital was in Jewish hands. The survey covered London, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow, Cardiff, and Newcastle—with 80 per cent of the total Jewish population of the country. The investigation, which covered 11,000 firms regarded as Jewish, was bound to be affected by the high proportion of Jewish firms (estimated at a third of the total in the clothing trade) which went out of business during the war, and the fact that a considerable proportion of the small Jewish furniture firms were 'concentrated' during the war.

The other survey was one of individuals, conducted through questionnaires for the *Jewish Chronicle* between 1950 and 1952, the results being published by Dr. H. Neustatter in *A Minority in Britain*. For occupational data, the survey had to exclude all questionnaires other than those for Hull and Sheffield and those completed by members of the Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women. The reduced sample, covering about 4,000 gainfully employed individuals, therefore heavily overweighted the small provincial communities and the younger age-groups.[44]

Both surveys suggest that the main Jewish trades today appear to be textiles (including, however, now drapery and the fashion trades as well as tailoring, and the older types of clothing trade), furniture,

jewellery, footwear, furs, cosmetics and toilet preparations, and radio and electrical goods—the last being a new development. The *Jewish Chronicle* survey suggested that just over one in five of the gainfully occupied males was in clothing, tailoring, etc., the next highest groups being 7 or 8 per cent each of the total for drapery, textiles, fashion trade and for furniture. The number for the boot and shoe trade, however, was minimal. Of the males gainfully employed in the professions, nearly 30 per cent were in medicine and dentistry, and about 10 per cent each in accountancy, chemistry, engineering, and law.[45]

The two surveys differ in the estimates they make of the percentage of Jews gainfully employed who were in business on their own account. The Trades Advisory Council survey put this at 15 per cent of the total of Jewish concerns; this figure was probably too low because of the wartime closing of Jewish businesses. On the other hand, the *Jewish Chronicle* survey put it at 75 per cent of the males in trade and 50 per cent of those in the professions. These figures, in their turn, are probably too high because they overweight the provincial towns where the small firms are likely to predominate, and also because people filling in a questionnaire may tend to upgrade their status. On the other hand, the figure of 15 per cent given by the other survey looks too low, yet it compares with a national average, according to the 1951 census, of only 6 per cent. This evidence therefore confirms the view that Jews tend to work on their own as self-employed or as masters of small businesses.

It is probable that the adoption by Jews of certain occupations in recent years has been stimulated by the prospect of early or immediate independence which they offer; for instance, the number of Jewish hairdressers and taxi-drivers (it is said that one-quarter of London's taximen are Jews) may be due to this cause. Certainly the experience of the London Jewish Board of Guardians has been that hairdressing was very popular among apprentices because of the possibility of becoming a master quickly, as well as of the short training period (three years), high wages and tips during training.[46] In general one can discern the movement of Jews to occupations where the intelligent use of small capital makes possible rapid improvement. This is a factor common to other callings not so far described—pawnbroking, the ownership of small property, bookmaking, moneylending, and certain forms of hire-purchase trading.

Some slight indication of the distribution of trades among the smaller independent business men can be drawn from the statistics of the Board of Guardians Loan Department. For instance, over the five years 1951–5, 675 loans were granted to enable small business men, handicapped by lack of capital, to start, carry on, or develop businesses by the grant of loans, free of interest, in cases where financial help could not be obtained from other sources. These figures are not, of course, necessarily a representative sample of small Jewish business men in London, and

there may also be duplication where one business man has received a loan in more than one year. The figures do not show much variation in the distribution of trades from year to year. Of the 675 in this five-year period, 193 (28·5 per cent) were in the clothing trade (men's, women's or children's, but exclusive of footwear), either as traders or dealers (111 or 16 per cent) or as makers of some kind or other—tailors, milliners, etc.—82 or 12 per cent. Significant also was the figure of 65 market traders (10 per cent). Other occupations having around 4 or 5 per cent of the total each were furniture-makers and repairers (33), hairdressers (30), fruiterers and greengrocers (30), tobacconists and confectioners (27), and drapers (25). In other words, 60 per cent of the small business men were in a handful of occupations, all (except hairdressers) familiar in Anglo-Jewry for over a century. There were, however, hardly any in boot and shoe-making and repairing. This suggests that the boot and shoe trade, as a calling, had its prominence for Anglo-Jewry only for a limited period during the mass immigration at the end of the nineteenth century, when it was still a small workshop trade and while it was possible for the small workshops to compete with factory production.

Some idea of future occupational trends can perhaps be gained from another set of figures of the Board of Guardians—those of boys who are helped with apprenticeships. These figures again are not a representative cross-section of Jewish school leavers as a whole, but they do give some indication of the choice of career in a group ranging from the professions to the skilled artisan and covering a fairly wide range of educational achievement below university standard. During the six years 1952–7 inclusive, there were 408 boys apprenticed or articled by the Board. By far the largest group (88, over 20 per cent) were apprenticed to the diamond trade; next came 54 hairdressers. Older Jewish trades were represented by 38 tailors and 19 watch-makers; other traditional occupations, but now represented by small numbers, were those of 14 furriers, 8 cabinet-makers and carpenters, 5 goldsmiths and jewellers, 3 upholsterers, and a silversmith. Other groups of craft occupations were 18 electrical and other engineers, 16 radio and television mechanics, 8 motor mechanics, and five surgical instrument-makers. Particularly significant was the development of articling of boys to professions; there were 27 accountants, 18 solicitors, a chartered auctioneer, and a surveyor. To some extent these figures represent policy on the part of the Board, rather than an unfettered choice on the part of the boys themselves. It has been the policy of the Board to discourage boys from going into the luxury trades, such as jewellery; on the other hand they encourage apprenticeships in the highly skilled trades, especially those in modern industry, such as electronics, plastics, or chemical engineering. The considerable number of applications from boys of good educational standard—a fair number have matriculated or have obtained the General Certificate of Education—was responsible for the fact that

something like 20 per cent of the boys went into the professions, as well as those training as engineers. The popularity of accountancy—covering more than half of those going in for the professions—is attributed to the fact that it is possible to earn during articles.

Is it possible to discover any common trends running through the history of what is known of Anglo-Jewish occupations? In the first place, these occupations are generally characteristic of immigrants. This means that they are occupations that can be started easily, require little initial capital or skill or that enable the immigrant to make use of some skill (for instance, engraving) which he practised in his previous home. Since they are immigrant occupations, they are not connected with the soil (such as agriculture) or with natural resources (such as mining) or with other basic industries. Indeed, they are generally not associated with the provision of absolute necessities, other than clothing. The trades are almost always concerned with consumer rather than capital goods. A newcomer can gain an entry into the economic life of the country either (*a*) by means of a luxury trade, especially one where foreign connexions are an advantage or lend even a positive *cachet*; or (*b*) where the trade is a new one (such as radio or electrical goods in modern times), in which both the strongly established native and the relative newcomer can start on equal terms; or (*c*) if the newcomer can apply to an existing trade new methods of production or distribution (e.g. in the clothing trade by the subdivision of labour introduced in production by the late nineteenth-century immigrants). Second, one may note the prominence, particularly in the early years, of trades where foreign connexions were of special importance. Thus the Jewish merchant trading with the West Indies or with Italy had the advantage of co-religionists, perhaps even relatives, in the countries with which he was trading. The financier, acting as a contractor for Government loans, was able to call on financial resources on the Continent, an advantage which also enabled Jews to act as contractors for Army pay and provisions during Continental campaigns.

A third characteristic is that the Anglo-Jewish occupations have generally provided opportunity for self-employment and, even where the business is quite small, of becoming one's own master. The proportion of self-employed and employers is manifestly higher, on all the evidence available, among Jews than comparable sections of the population.

A fourth tendency is that of the particular trades or occupations to reappear constantly, though in different contexts. To take the clothing trade as an example, Jews appear in it first in second-hand clothes dealing, then as retail clothiers, again as manufacturers of clothing in small workshops, finally as pioneers of the manufacture and distribution of clothing on a mass production basis. A Jew who begins peddling trinkets or pencils ends by manufacturing them. The association of Jews, of varying origins, and at very different levels, in the tobacco

industry has been noted. But even this tendency of Jews to be associated, in one capacity or another, with a relatively limited number of trades may be due to the attraction of previous associations. The newcomer, isolated by language or religious observance, or sometimes by hostile prejudice, tends to join an occupation where he can find others of the same minority; thus Jews have tended to become associated with the same calling in generation after generation.

Fifthly, one must note the late development of the professions, other than medicine; and the probability that medicine still predominates among the professions followed by Jews. The proportion of professional men is higher with the Jewish than with the general population, and the considerable number of school leavers going into the professions has been mentioned. These phenomena, however, may be due to the fact that the Anglo-Jewish community today is, to a considerable extent, a middle class one.

Finally, in spite of all these indications of the limited range of occupations, and the tendency of one calling to recur in one generation after another, one can note a progressive diversification in the occupational structure of Anglo-Jewry. This has been due partly, at any rate in the earlier years, to positive acts of policy on the part of the communal authorities in fostering apprenticeships; but it is also largely due to the removal of the barriers of religious restrictions and popular prejudice, to the relaxation by Jews themselves of religious observances which had previously been an impediment to many types of employment, and to the progressive adaptation or assimilation of Anglo-Jewry to life in the general community.

NOTES

[1] Joel Elijah Rabbinowitz in *Ha Melitz*, 10/22 December 1886, cited by L. P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914*, London, 1960, p. 60. The late Mr. W. S. Samuel told me about the glazier's 'cry'.

[2] Board of Guardians, *Annual Report*, 1865, p. 59.

[3] Ibid., 1874, p. 24. Glaziers receiving casual relief were in 1872, 132; 1882, 118; 1892, 75; 1902, 31; 1912, 5; 1922, 3; 1932, 2; 1942, 1.

[4] Israel Solomon, *Records of My Family*, printed for private circulation, New York, 1887.

[5] See Alex M. Jacob, 'The Jews of Falmouth—1740–1860', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, XVII, pp. 63–72. This also tells the probably apocryphal story of the pious clockmender—a little man doing the rounds of the country houses on a large horse. He used to say his afternoon prayers on horseback and trained his horse to take three steps back at the end of the *Amidah*, though on one occasion both horse and rider ended up in the ditch!

[6] See the prints listed in Alfred Rubens, *A Jewish Iconography*, nos. 1489–1543. These include both rural pedlars and urban hawkers and street sellers. See also the same author's *Portrait of Anglo-Jewry*, 1959, especially pp. 4–6.

[7] For an account of these eighteenth-century pedlars, see Lucien Wolf, *The Yates and Samuel Families of Liverpool*, pp. 3–4.

[8] There are a number of china, porcelain, and wooden figures showing Jewish pedlars: see *Catalogue of an Exhibition of Anglo-Jewish Art and History*, 1956, nos. 429–33. No. 430, a figure in Staffordshire ware, shows a pedlar with a silk hat,

holding an open box, and the base is inscribed 'By a vach'.

[9] Joseph Harris, *Random Notes and Reflections*, Liverpool, 1912, pp. 23–7, recounts how, arriving from Poland in 1853, he set out travelling in watches, with a few words such as 'will you buy', which he did not understand but had been taught to say. From travelling in watches he eventually rose to manufacturing them.

[10] e.g. 'Aye mon, ich hob' getrebbelt mit de five o'clock train', David Daiches, *Two Worlds*, London, 1957, pp. 117–29.

[11] *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XIII, 186. The Jews regularly used to go out in boats to meet incoming ships; these boats, at Falmouth at least, were known locally as 'tailors' cutters'. On Friday afternoon, 10 February 1758, 11 out of 12 Portsmouth Jews, returning home in bad weather from a ship—presumably in a hurry to be back for the Sabbath—were drowned. On the other hand, at Sheerness in 1812, a number of local Jews who had not been able to finish their business on a Friday, went aboard again on the following day and not only sold merchandise to the crew, but settled up with them and even wrote down their accounts. (Ibid., p. 164; Cecil Roth, *Rise of Provincial Jewry*, p. 97.)

[12] See Alfred Rubens, 'Notes on Early Anglo-Jewish Artists', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XVIII, pp. 102–10, for information about artists at Plymouth, Bath, Bristol, Portsmouth, and Liverpool.

[13] For instance, J. Abraham proclaimed himself on his trade card 'Optician and mathematical instrument maker to His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester and His Grace the Duke of Wellington'. He was also the inventor of a prism for microscopes. A silhouette of him survives. (Alfred Rubens, *A Jewish Iconography*, pp. 79, 115.)

[14] In a paper to the Jewish Historical Society of England (as yet unpublished) Mr. I. Finestein has listed only 3 tailors out of over 50 shopkeepers in mid-nineteenth-century Hull.

[15] Some of these Sephardi street sellers were familiar characters of the London scene. Among them were Israel Aga, an oriental Jew, in his turban, and Jacob Kimchi who, apart from selling slippers at the Royal Exchange, wrote learned Hebrew books and criticized the orthodoxy of the communal authorities. See A. M. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England*, London, 1951, pp. 179, 215; Alfred Rubens, *Anglo-Jewish Portraits*, No. 8; *A Jewish Iconography*, No. 1507C.

[16] Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor*, 1861 ed., II, p. 118.

[17] Seven men were tried and four hanged for a robbery at Hutchins' Farm (roughly on the site of Carlyle Square on the north side of King's Road, Chelsea). The gang arrived at night, tied up the maids, struck Mrs. Hutchins so forcibly as to loosen a tooth, and made her hand over 64 guineas. The manservant, who had been shot, came up to Mrs. Hutchins saying, 'How are you, Madam, for I am dead'; and promptly died. See Thomas Faulkner, *An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea and its Environments*, quoted by William Gaun, *Chelsea*, p. 153.

[18] Lucien Wolf, 'Early Ashkenazic Charities' in *Essays in Jewish History*, 1934, p. 198.

[19] S. S. Levin, 'The Origins of the Jews' Free School', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XIX, pp. 108–9.

[20] *Jewish Chronicle*, 13 June 1851.

[21] One early indenture is in the Jewish Museum, London, dated 25 November 1799; it provides for the seven-year apprenticeship of Michael, son of Levy Myers, of Rupert Street, Goodman's Fields, to Jacob Levy of Tyler Street, to learn glass-cutting. The fee of 15 guineas was presumably paid by the Great Synagogue trust founded by Lazarus Simons, which is mentioned as a party to the indenture. The apprentice was to receive food and lodging, 6*d.* a week during the first year, 1*s.* during the 2nd year, 1*s.* 6*d.* during the 3rd year, 2*s.* 6*d.* during the 4th year, and thereafter 3*s.* a week.

[22] For further information, see V. D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England*, pp. 31, 81.

[23] For instance, Marcus Samuel founded in 1831 the firm dealing in shells, shell-covered boxes and painted shells from the Pacific and Indian Oceans. He was the father of the first Viscount Bearsted, who gave the name of the article in which his father had first dealt to the great oil combine which he founded. See Paul Emden, *Jews of Britain*, p. 240.

[24] This poem was originally printed in *Punch*. The E. Moses family later became Marsdens.

[25] See A. R. Rollin, 'The Jewish Contribution to the British Textile

Industry', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XVII, pp. 45–51.

[26] A. M. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England*, pp. 11–14.

[27] The letters of one of these, David Mendes da Costa, have survived. See Cecil Roth, *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, pp. 136–40.

[28] Moses Vita (or Haim), grandfather of Sir Moses Montefiore, who came to London from Leghorn in the middle of the eighteenth century, was an importer of Italian straw hats.

[29] Marcus Moses (Mordecai Hamburger), son-in-law of Glückel of Hameln, and founder of the Hambro' Synagogue, spent several years in Madras and may have been concerned with the sale of the Pitt diamond.

[30] Cecil Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, pp. 22, 26, 62.

[31] For the 12 Jewish sworn brokers, see the list in *Misc. J.H.S.E.*, III, pp. 80–94.

[32] Lucy Stuart Sutherland, 'Sampson Gideon: 18th Century Jewish Financier', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XVII, p. 82.

[33] The story is that the company was founded by Montefiore and Rothschild to provide for their brother-in-law, Benjamin Gompertz, F.R.S. Gompertz was an infant prodigy as a mathematician, who became a member of the Stock Exchange, and specialized in insurance mathematics. He was as a Jew refused the post of actuary by the Guardian Assurance Office and it is said that Montefiore and Rothschild formed the insurance company for him. Paul Emden (*Jews of Britain*, p. 173) has suggested that the advantages to bankers of promoting an assurance company would have led to its formation in any case, especially as the 1820s saw the foundation of many similar assurance companies.

[34] A. M. Hyamson, 'An Anglo-Jewish Family', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XVII, p. 7. Harold Pollins, 'The Jews' Role in the Early British Railways', *Jewish Social Studies*, XV, 1953, has suggested that I. L. Goldsmid's part in financing railways has been over-estimated.

[35] One was the mine owner, Daniel Jonassohn, the first Reform Jew to be elected a member of the Board of Deputies, oddly enough as Deputy for Sunderland (a community since noted for its adherence to religious orthodoxy).

[36] E. R. Samuel, 'Anglo-Jewish Notaries and Scriveners', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, XVII, pp. 113–59, lists up to 40 notaries and 6 scriveners admitted between 1731 and 1845. For early Jewish solicitors see H. S. Q. Henriques, *Jews and the English Law*, p. 205.

[37] The first Jewish barristers were Sir Francis Goldsmid, Serjeant Sir John Simon (called in 1842), Jacob Waley (called in 1842), Sir George Jessel (called in 1847), and the Rt. Hon. Arthur Cohen (called in 1857).

[38] For Anglo-Jewish architects of the nineteenth century see Edward Jamilly, 'Anglo-Jewish Architects', *Trans. J.H.S.E.*, pp. 132–9.

[39] Joseph Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics*, 1891.

[40] The corresponding proportions for the Anglo-Jewish community as a whole in 1880 were probably 25 out of 100 tailors, 10 in the boot and shoe trade, one or two cabinet-makers; on the other hand there were about 10 out of 100 in the tobacco trade, which was not heavily represented among the immigrants, except for cigarette-making; this last was favoured by the Russo-Polish immigrants, as distinct from the cigar-making associated with the Dutch Jews of an earlier generation.

[41] For the immigrant trades generally, now see L. P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914*, especially chapter III.

[42] *New Survey of London Life and Labour*, II, Part I, pp. 218–19.

[43] For these and similar examples see Paul Emden, *Jews of Britain*, under the names of individuals concerned; see also D. B. Halpern in the *Jewish Quarterly*, London, no. 13, pp. 35–8.

[44] Information from these surveys is given in *The Jews in Work and Trade* by N. Barou and *A Minority in Britain*, edited by M. Freedman, London, 1955, pp. 124–32.

[45] This suggests that there were between three and four times as many doctors and dentists as lawyers. This figure is in general agreement with the findings of a survey of Jewish students just before the war (who were the professional men of the period after the war) which showed that there were just over four times as many studying medicine or dentistry as law; of course, many lawyers, especially solicitors, do not study at the universities. See G. D. M. Block, *Sociological Review*, XXXIV, Nos. 3 and 4, 1942.

[46] London Jewish Board of Guardians, *Annual Report*, 1957, p. 32.

THE OTTOMAN LEGACY TO ISRAEL

Edwin Samuel

FOR exactly four centuries the country now known as Israel was under Ottoman control. Then came thirty years of British rule—from 1917–18[1] till 1948—the immediate prelude to the Jewish State. The British Mandatory period saw a rapid economic development but gave rise to such acute political problems that the improvements in the arts of *government* passed almost unnoticed.[2] What little development there was in the arts of government in the Ottoman period has been largely obscured by the more dramatic achievements under British rule. Most regimes are disinclined to pay tribute to their predecessors; and the British in Palestine were no exception. In any case, there is a great shortage of documentation on the Ottoman period. The Turkish archives in Istanbul have only recently been opened to research workers.[3] For the first time this year, the Hebrew University has included a study of Israel under Ottoman rule in my course in the Department of Political Science in the Kaplan School of Economics and the Social Sciences. I have therefore had to rely on subsidiary sources.[4]

The Religious Field

It is perhaps in the field of religious organization that the Ottoman legacy to Israel is most strongly felt today. The conquering Turks in Anatolia were good soldiers and peasants but poor business men and bankers. They encouraged their minorities—Jews, Greeks, Armenians, etc.—to fill this gap and then found difficulty in governing them. A system of devolution was therefore developed whereby the Jewish community and some fourteen different Christian Sects were each recognized as a separate *Millet* or 'people'. The head of the community—in the case of the Jews, the *Hacham Bashi* or Chief Rabbi in Constantinople—was held personally responsible for the good behaviour of all his flock. In return, each *Millet* was allowed to maintain its own courts where the religious law of the community was applied in matters of personal status—marriage, divorce, alimony, guardianship, wills, and religious endowments. This is the origin of the Rabbinical Courts in Israel today and of the high official position held by the two joint

Sephardi and Ashkenazi Chief Rabbis.[5] Although, with the establishment of the State of Israel, there has been a persistent demand—in particular by women—for concurrent *civil* jurisdiction in matters of Jewish marriage and divorce, the Rabbinical monopoly is too strongly entrenched. The Rabbinical Courts in Israel today still have exclusive jurisdiction in matters of marriage, divorce, alimony, and wills drawn up in Jewish traditional form.[6] This is thus not an Israeli invention or a British Mandatory invention: it is an Ottoman legacy to Israel.

Similar privileges in Israel are now accorded to the Moslem community.[7] They have their own religious courts and judges (*kadi*). The Ottoman system of the autonomous administration of Moslem charitable bequests (*Waqf*) was continued under the British Mandate by the creation of a Supreme Moslem Council. But, since 1948, the Moslem *Waqf* in Israel have been administered directly by the Israel Government. This is now being changed as a result of Israeli Moslem protest; and Moslem leaders are allowed to have a say in the disposal of the extensive revenues from this source.

The remaining religious matter in Israel in which Ottoman influence is still felt is the Holy Places. There, the *status quo ante*, largely developed in Ottoman days, is religiously followed by the Israel Government in determining the conflicting rights of the different communities—largely Christian—in the Holy Places.[8]

Jewish Communal Organization

The original four Jewish Holy Cities—of Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias, and Safad—had their own *kehilla* committees tacitly recognized by the Ottoman administration. But, when Jewish rural settlement began in Palestine in the 1880s, each village set up a local management committee of its own. These committees provided several elementary village services, such as a school, a cemetery, a water supply, and watch and ward. Like the urban *kehilla*, they had no basis in law and no tax powers. Nevertheless, the village committees raised local revenues under the force of social pressure, combined, where necessary, by the threat of cutting off the water supply from recalcitrants.

But it took a long time for any *central* Jewish lay authority to arise in Palestine. In 1903[9] an elected *Knessia* (or assembly) of seventy-nine representatives of Palestine Jewry met at Zichron Yaaqov, near Haifa. A permanent central committee for the whole *Yishuv*,[10] meeting at Jaffa, and five district committees, were set up. But the organization was riven by the Herzl-Ussishkin fight over 'Uganda versus Palestine' and it collapsed.

In 1907, there was a new plan for a permanent *Moetzah* (or Council) of twelve representatives of Jewish organizations in Palestine with an executive of five, meeting weekly at Jaffa. But that, too, collapsed.[11]

In 1908, the World Zionist Organization established a 'Palestine

Office' in Jaffa under Dr. Arthur Ruppin. He promptly created an advisory committee which became known as the *Vaad Temidi* (the Permanent Committee), and in the First World War as the *Vaad Politi* (the Political Committee). This can be regarded as the ancestor in Ottoman days of the *Vaad Leumi* (the National Committee of the Jews of Palestine) that came into existence under the British Mandate.[12] It was the principal Jewish authority for education, health, and social welfare, from which three of the seventeen Ministries in Israel have developed to handle these three subjects.

Immigration

From the Ottoman period, too, came the tradition of restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine, abolished only in 1948. The Ottoman Government was afraid, not so much of nascent Jewish nationalism, as of an increase of the influence in Turkey of foreign States whose citizenship most Jewish immigrants retained. Turkey had enough trouble in any case over the Capitulations,[13] and, in 1892, officially banned *all* Jewish immigration into Palestine. The ban was evaded, largely through bribery; but it lasted for the twenty-six years ending with the establishment of a British civil administration in Palestine in 1920, when Jewish immigration became wholly free again. But, as a result of an economic crisis in Palestine in 1921, an economic limitation to Jewish immigration was imposed in 1922. Following the Arab Rebellion of 1936–8, a political maximum was imposed as well by the White Paper of 1939. Jewish immigration into Palestine only became free again in 1948, after a lapse of fifty-six years, broken only by the two years of 1920–2.

Defence

Jewish self-defence started in Ottoman days with the creation of a force called *Hashomer* at Sejera, near Tiberias, in 1909.[14] This force was the precursor of the *Hagana* and the other Jewish underground organizations in Palestine under British Mandate. Together with the Palestinian Jewish officers and men who served in the Jewish Brigade and in other British units in the Second World War, they formed the basis of the Israel Defence Forces as they are today.[15]

Jewish Colonization

It was, of course, under the Ottoman regime in Palestine that Jewish colonization began. In 1870, an agricultural school was founded at Mikveh Israel ('The Hope of Israel'), south-east of Jaffa, by the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*; it still proudly exists. Eight years later, the first Jewish village was established—at Petah Tikvah ('The Gateway of Hope'), north-east of Jaffa. Then came Rishon LeZion ('The First in Zion') in 1882, and, one by one, the remaining 'colonies' of Judaea,

Samaria, and Galilee. Helped out of their agricultural inefficiencies and impoverishment by the generosity of Baron Edmond de Rothschild and, after 1900, by the Jewish Colonization Association with its Baron Hirsch millions, they are today all thriving Jewish townships. From the date of the creation of the World Zionist Organization in 1897 and, in 1901, of the Jewish National Fund for land purchase and development in Palestine, the speed of agricultural settlement quickened. Almonds gradually gave way to vines and later to oranges wherever the soil was favourable. Eventually the dairy-farm took precedence outside the citrus belt and still maintains it.

Most of the Jewish industrial enterprises in Turkish days failed. The only one that developed steadily from then till now is wine-making. Before 1918, the Ottoman Government in Palestine was both obscurantist and venal. Anyone making money was heavily taxed. There was no legal provision for protective tariffs, or even for customs drawback on imported raw materials for the manufacture of goods in Palestine for subsequent export. The commercial legislation available was inadequate and, even when it existed, was not used. Enterprising Palestinian and Lebanese Arabs, both Moslem and Christian, emigrated by the tens of thousands to North and South America. Only the Jews infiltrated steadily into Palestine, drawn by the magnet of Zion.

Local Government

Local Government in Israel today is a mixture of elected self-governing bodies at the bottom and nominated officials of the Central Government at the top. These officials administer the sub-districts and districts;[16] while the municipal councils, local councils, rural councils, and village committees are elected.

The sub-district (*Nafa*) is the basic unit of district administration in Israel today as much as it was in the days of the British or the Turks (when it was called a *Kaza*). It was the Turkish *Kaimakam* in charge of a *Kaza* who was replaced in 1917–18 by the British Sub-District Officer who, in 1948,[17] was replaced by the *Memouneh al HaNafa* ('the one appointed to be in charge of the *Nafa*'). The sub-district was—and still is—the area for which separate land registers and tax registers were maintained by the Ottoman, British, and Israel administrations.

The sub-districts (*Kaza* or *Nafa*) were grouped into districts, known as a *Sanjak* by the Turks and as a *Mechoz* in Israel. The Turkish *Mutessarif* in charge of the *Sanjak* was easily replaced in 1917–18 by the traditional British Colonial District Commissioner who was himself replaced in 1948[18] by the Israeli *Memouneh al HaMechoz*.

Palestine, as delimited under the Mandate, was not a separate administrative unit under the Ottoman regime. It consisted of the three *sanjak* of Acre,[19] Nablus, and Jerusalem. Of these, the two northern *sanjak* of Acre and Nablus formed part of the Ottoman *Vilayet* (or Pro-

vince) of Beirut, administered by a Turkish *Vali*. The independent *Sanjak* of Jerusalem, however, was attached direct to the Ottoman imperial administration at Constantinople owing to the special interest of the Christian Powers in the Holy Places and the religious communities in Jerusalem and Bethlehem.

The northern and southern frontiers of 'Palestine' have changed but little since Ottoman days. In the north, the Metullah salient with the head-waters of the Jordan River were taken over by Palestine from Lebanon in 1924. The international frontier with Egypt from Rafa to Eilat remains practically intact. But to the east, the hill country from Nablus to Hebron, including Ramallah, Bethlehem, and the Old City of Jerusalem, was occupied in 1948 by the Jordanian Arab Legion and has been lost to Israel.

Below the *Sanjak* (District or *Mechoz*) and the *Kaza* (Sub-district or *Nafa*) there used to exist a smaller Ottoman territorial unit called the *Nahie*. Whereas the *Kaza* had on the average about sixty villages, the *Nahie* had about ten, supervised on horseback by a subordinate Turkish official called a *Mudir*.[20] With the arrival of the British, with their motor-cars, and the building of village roads, the *Nahie* and its *Mudir* were found unnecessary by the British and were abolished. This small unit has been revived by Israel as an elected body called the *Moetza Ezorit* (Area Council).[21]

Israel is now divided into some fifty of these rural council areas, each with some thirteen villages, Jewish and Arab. The Rural Council has the legal powers of an Israel urban 'Local Council' which enables the villages collectively to tax themselves—for example, for the construction and maintenance of inter-village roads. Although the area of the *Moetza Ezorit* in Israel is of the order of size of the Ottoman *Nahie*, the *Moetza Ezorit* owes its existence more, perhaps, to the *Gush* ('Block') Committees established by the *Hagana* largely for defence purposes towards the end of the Mandate.[22]

The Local Council in Palestine was a British invention—a sort of junior municipality created in the smaller towns and larger villages under an Ordinance of 1921. Tel Aviv started as a Local Council[23] in 1921 within the Jaffa Municipal area, achieving the status of an independent Municipality of Tel Aviv only in 1934.[24]

The only form of urban self-government under the Ottoman regime was the Municipality, under a law of 1877. By 1914, there were twenty-two Municipalities in the areas that eventually became Palestine of the Mandate. Of these, nine are in the area under Jordan rule and thirteen are in Israel.[25] Since 1948, many then existing Local Councils have become Municipalities and many large villages and small towns have achieved Local Council status. There are thus today in Israel twenty Jewish and two Arab[26] Municipalities; and eighty-eight Jewish or Arab Local Councils.

In the Jewish and some of the Arab villages that have not yet acquired Local Council status in Israel, there are elected Village Committees with no legal taxing powers as such.[27] The remaining Arab villages are administered by the village elders and by the village *Mukhtar*. This is a title inherited from the Ottoman period and means a recognized headman or agent of the Government. The *Mukhtar* is not necessarily the richest or most influential man in the village; but he usually belongs to the ruling party or clan. He keeps the village registers of births and deaths (for a fee); notifies the police whenever a crime is committed; notifies the Medical Officer of Health of all cases of infectious disease; and collects animal and other minor taxes, again for a fee. He receives visiting Government officials[28] and undertakes all kinds of mundane duties, such as supplying barley for the horses of mounted police patrols.

Parliamentary Institutions

Neither the Ottoman nor the British regime in Palestine provided much training for Palestinians in Parliamentary government. There was no Turkish Parliament before 1912, and then it was in Constantinople. Five delegates in all represented the *Sanjak* of Jerusalem—two from Jerusalem, two from Nablus, and one from Jaffa.[29] There were 160,000 voters in the *Sanjak*, all male Ottoman subjects.[30] The five delegates were all Moslem, much to the disgust of the Christian Arabs; and all were members of old-established aristocratic families, prepared to condone the inefficiency and corruption of the Turkish officials in Palestine, who consequently helped to manœuvre their election.

In addition to the Turkish Parliament at Constantinople, a *Mejliss Umumi* (Provincial Assembly) was set up in each *Vilayet*. There was one for the Beirut *Vilayet* and another for the independent Jerusalem *Sanjak* (which was accorded the status of a *Vilayet* for this purpose). Elections were held only once, in 1910, on the basis of one delegate for each 12,000 male Ottoman taxpayers. The leading Moslem families of Jerusalem—the Husseinis, the Nashashibis, and the Alamis—again captured most of the seats. One Christian Arab—Zakariya—was elected; but a Jewish candidate, Albert Antebi (the local representative of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* of Paris), failed to get elected, as most Jews in Jerusalem retained their former foreign nationality and were thus ineligible to vote. The *Mejliss Umumi* sat for only forty days in the year, under the chairmanship of the *Mutessarif* of Jerusalem. It had very limited authority and was suspended altogether during the First World War.

From 1918 till 1920, Palestine was under a British military administration with no legislature whatsoever; Proclamations and Orders were issued over the signature of the Chief Military Administrator. But from 1920 till 1922, a mixed British and Palestinian Advisory Council considered all draft Ordinances before they were signed by the High Commissioner. An offer of an elected Legislative Council in 1922 was re-

jected by Palestinian Arab nationalist leaders, because they claimed that acceptance implied their recognition of the Balfour Declaration. A second offer in 1936 was rejected by the Jewish leaders because it would have given power to an Arab majority to stop Jewish immigration. Hence, from 1922 till 1948, the only legislature in Palestine was a nominated Advisory Council composed entirely of British heads of departments: no debates were held. Only in 1948 did the population of Israel achieve representative and responsible government. The *Knesset* thus owes little or nothing to Ottoman or British tradition in Palestine. The training schools for its members were the Zionist Congresses, the *Va'ad Leumi*, the *Histadrut* (General Federation of Jewish Labour), and the Tel Aviv Municipal Council. Unfortunately the proportional list system of elections used in the Zionist Congresses was also adopted by the *Knesset*; and a switchover to constituency elections on the British model is now one of the planks in the platform of *Mapai*, the Prime Minister's party. The Israel Government has also inherited the use of a 'party key' when making civil service appointments. This system, used by the Jewish Agency, the *Va'ad Leumi*, the *Histadrut*, and the Tel Aviv Municipality, is only gradually being replaced by a merit system based on open competition.

Towards the end of the Ottoman regime, a *Mejliss Idare* or Consultative District Council was set up in each *Kaza* (District). Such Councils were established at Jerusalem, Jaffa, Hebron, Gaza, Nablus, and Acre, each under the local *Kaimakam*. The members included the local *Kadi* (Moslem judge) and *Mufti* (Moslem jurisconsult); the Turkish officials in charge of finance, public works, and the *Kaimakam's* secretariat; heads of the non-Moslem religious communities (Jewish, Orthodox, Armenian) and certain elected members. In Jerusalem, the Jewish Community succeeded in electing Rabbi Haim Eliashar as a member. It would not be a bad idea if in Israel similar mixed nominated and elected official and non-official District Councils were established to take over the duties of the *Memouneh al HaMechoz* (District Commissioner). Ultimately they might become the district education and police authority, on the lines of the County Council in Britain.

The Law

The Ottoman law, even by the First World War, was an amalgam. Based originally on Moslem *Sheria* law, it had been partly modernized and secularized in the second half of the nineteenth century, taking models from the French and Swiss law. After 1920, during the Mandatory period, large sections of the Ottoman law were repealed and replaced by British colonial law; and this process of revision has continued since 1948. But certain Ottoman laws, for example, parts of the *Mejelle* (the Ottoman Civil Code) and the laws dealing with land[31] and with the registration of societies,[32] are still in force today.

The Judiciary

The Israel courts are arranged in three tiers, as under the Mandate: Magistrates' Courts, District Courts, and the Supreme Court. Under the Ottoman regime there were no Magistrates' Courts, only Courts of First Instance at Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Nablus, each consisting of a President and two Judges. They had concurrent criminal, civil, and commercial jurisdiction. Until 1910, appeals from these courts were heard solely in Beirut. But in 1910 a Court of Appeal was established at Jerusalem, with a President and four Judges, with a further right of appeal to the Ottoman Supreme Court in Constantinople. The Presidents of all these courts were Turks, who rarely knew Arabic; and much time was wasted in translations.[33] Under the Capitulations, foreign Consular Courts were empowered to hear all civil cases where both parties were nationals of the country concerned. Where one party was a foreigner and the other an Ottoman subject, the case was heard by the Government court, with a consular assessor.

The British regime swept away all these Capitulations. But Articles 58–67 of the Palestine Order-in-Council, 1922, provided that, when a foreigner appeared before a Magistrate's Court, the Magistrate should be British; and when before a District Court, that a majority of Judges should be British. This proviso was abolished in the last days of the Mandate, while the grant of magisterial powers to district administrative officials has been abolished in Israel.

The Turkish judiciary was notoriously corrupt. Having usually bought their posts, they had to recoup their investment. The level of the judiciary under the Mandate was far higher, all Magistrates and Judges being drawn solely from the Bar. In Israel the standard is even higher and there is no shadow of suspicion against either their honesty or their impartiality.[34]

The main defect of the Israel courts—as with those under the two previous regimes—is the endless delay in getting a hearing and in reaching a decision.

There are no juries in Israel; nor were there any under the Mandate or under the Ottoman regime. The Turks could not rely on any twelve men to be incorruptible; the British were afraid of juries in inter-'racial' cases splitting along 'racial' lines. But as several Judges sat—and still sit—together in the District Courts and in the Supreme Court under the Ottoman, British, and Israel regimes, there is no risk of a man being convicted in a serious case on the judgement of one man alone.

Taxation

Taxation under the Ottoman regime was very primitive. Most of the revenue was extracted by contractors from the peasantry in the form of a tithe[35] of their produce in kind; and an additional tax on their animals. A property tax[36] was levied on all urban and rural land and buildings.

Customs dues were levied at all ports.[37] Part of the revenue of the State, such as tobacco excise, salt excise, and stamp duty, was diverted to a separate Ottoman Public Debt Administration to provide for the payment of interest and amortization due to foreign bond-holders by an almost bankrupt Ottoman Government.

The British administration in Palestine swept away the separate Ottoman Public Debt Administration and replaced the tithe in kind by a tithe in cash. In 1927 the tithe was replaced altogether by a graduated rural land tax based on the *potential* value of the land; while the burden of taxation as a whole was shifted more and more on to the urban population. Indirect taxation through customs and excise, etc., rose from 21 per cent of the total revenue at the beginning of the Mandate to 50 per cent at the end. Income tax was introduced only in 1942 and, by 1948, produced one-tenth of the total revenue.

The Ottoman administration was run on a shoe-string. Its officials were grossly underpaid and often went altogether unpaid.[38] The British regime was far more elaborate and expensive—a cause for continuous Arab complaint. The State budget by 1948, after discounting inflation, was ten times what it had been in 1921–2; while the State budget for 1959–60 for the would-be Welfare State of Israel is ten times what it was in 1948 (in stable currency). As the population has only quadrupled since 1918, the amount paid per head in stable currency has multiplied twenty-five fold, a remarkable tribute to the rapid increase of prosperity in Palestine and Israel in the past forty years, and to the patience of its taxpayers.

Land Registration

The Ottoman land registry[39] was notoriously inaccurate. Owners of, say, a thousand *dunam*[40] would register them as one hundred to reduce the land tax. In the absence of large-scale cadastral maps there was, in any case, no means of identifying any particular plot. Boundaries were given in such elementary form as 'To the north, a *wadi*:[41] to the east, a tree: to the south, a road: to the west, the land of Yusuf'; but *which wadi*, tree, road, and Yusuf was rarely stated with precision. Much land was held in common; other areas were uncultivated waste land or natural forest claimed by the Government; here and there were plots dedicated centuries earlier as Moslem charitable bequests (*waqf*). The egalitarian Moslem law of inheritance divided and sub-divided holdings of *Miri* land (the most frequent form of holding) in each successive generation until ownership became infinitely complex and was frequently in dispute. In such circumstances of uncertainty, mortgages on land were hard to obtain. The volume of agricultural credit available in any case was very small and usury flourished in consequence.

Many of the Ottoman land registers were lost during the First World War. Under the British Mandate, most of the cultivable land in Palestine

was accurately mapped and a new system of land registration was introduced, using the Australian (Torrens) method. Much Arab land held in common was divided; land disputes were settled by roving land commissions and new title deeds were issued. This was one of the less spectacular yet most valuable *British* legacies to Israel; so valuable, in fact, that before it withdrew, in May 1948, the British administration had all its precious land registers throughout Palestine microfilmed and copies deposited for safe-keeping outside the country lest the originals be destroyed in the impending Arab-Jewish civil war.

Communications

Caesarea and Athlit were developed as harbours by the Romans and Crusaders respectively. Under the Ottoman regime the rocky reef off Jaffa was used to provide shelter for lighters serving ships that anchored a mile or so off the coast. The Jaffa 'port' was further developed under the British regime, and new warehouses and equipment were installed. It is still in use today, largely during the citrus export season. During the Arab rebellion of 1936–8, when it became dangerous for Jews to appear in Jaffa, a lighter basin was established at Tel Aviv by a private Jewish company, now bought out by the Government of Israel.

In the north, Acre was gradually replaced by Haifa as the main harbour as soon as a spur of the Hejaz Railway reached Haifa.[42] A jetty extending 340 metres out to sea under the shelter of the Mount Carmel range was built by the Ottoman administration. Between 1929 and 1935, the British administration built a breakwater extending for 2,250 metres at a cost of over £1,000,000 sterling. They had been advised by British harbour experts that only at Haifa would a harbour not be silted up by the sand and mud brought up from the mouth of the Nile by the northerly current off the straight Palestinian coast. Eighteen hundred men at the peak period were employed hewing and transporting stone blocks from Athlit; and one hundred acres of land were reclaimed from Haifa Bay in the process, on which the modern port area of Haifa has been built. It then became second only to Alexandria in the Eastern Mediterranean and its facilities have been further improved by the Government of Israel. The harbour at Eilat and the proposed new harbour between Jaffa and Ashkelon are both wholly Israel creations.

The coastal lighthouses of Israel are a legacy from the Ottoman regime, having been built by a French concession company almost a century ago. Under the Mandate the company used to receive half the fees received from ships using Palestinian harbours. The company has now been bought out by the Israel Government.

The first railway in Israel—from Jaffa to Jerusalem—was also built by a French concession company, between 1890 and 1892. It was cheaply constructed, to narrow gauge without any tunnels, for £340,000

sterling. The promoters based their calculations on 6,000 pilgrims to the Holy City each year; but, by 1910, it carried 33,000 passengers (not all pilgrims, of course). The Ottoman Government widened it during the First World War to 105 cm.—the intermediate gauge of the Hejaz Railway with which it was linked up for strategic reasons.[43] Between 1918 and 1920, the British army widened it to broad gauge to link up with the new Kantara–Haifa railway which it had built (see below). The Jaffa–Jerusalem railway was eventually acquired by the Palestine Government from the French concession company for the sum of £565,000 sterling, which included war damage reparations.

The second railway built in Palestine under the Ottoman regime was an extension from the Hejaz Railway that ran from Damascus to Medina. Ostensibly built to facilitate Moslem pilgrimages to Medina and Mecca, and financed by popular subscriptions from Moslems throughout the world, it was, in fact, intended to strengthen the Ottoman Government's control over the unruly Beduin tribes of Central Arabia. The gauge used—105 cm.—was unique. The spur from Deraa in Trans-Jordan to the Mediterranean via Semakh, Beisan, Afuleh, Haifa, and Acre was opened in 1906. It was later extended by the Ottoman Government from Afuleh to Nablus, Tulkarm, Ramleh, and Beersheba. The British dismantled the Tulkarm–Ramleh–Beersheba section; but the Ramleh–Beersheba embankment has been re-used by the Israel Government for its own broad-gauge extension to Beersheba. The Afuleh–Nablus–Tulkarm section had little traffic under the British Mandate. With the severing of all communications between Israel, Syria, and Jordan, the Semakh–Beisan–Afuleh–Haifa section is now out of use as well.

The Kantara–Lydda–Haifa broad-gauge railway was built by the British army in the First World War to supply its forces advancing along the coast from Egypt across the Sinai Desert against Turkish-held Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria. In the Second World War, the line was extended northwards along the coast to Beirut and Tripoli. It is now cut at both ends by Lebanon and Egypt and runs only from Nahariya in the north of Israel to Rehovot in the south, with an extension to Beersheba.[44] It is linked at Lydda with the old Tel Aviv (Jaffa)–Jerusalem line. A new line has been built from Hadera direct to Tel Aviv, avoiding Lydda, and much new equipment has been bought; nevertheless, the railway does not pay. It is very small (450 kilometres in length) but still has to employ expensive technical staff for each branch (locomotives, permanent way, commercial management, etc.). Road competition, as in Britain, is fierce; and were it not for its use for defence purposes, it is doubtful if the railway would be maintained at all by the Israel Government.

The traditional methods of transport in Palestine are the camel, horse, mule, donkey, and on foot. Surprising as it may seem, there were

no carriage roads in Palestine at all before the 1860s, when the German Christian Templars settled at Wilhelma, Sarona, and elsewhere, bringing with them their Württemberg carts. Shortly afterwards, the Ottoman Government built the first carriage road, from Jaffa to Gaza. But the contractor, as usual, was a scoundrel; and the road fell to pieces almost at once.[45]

The first real permanent road was on the pilgrim route from Jaffa via Ramleh to Jerusalem. Other metalled all-weather roads were built from Jerusalem eastwards to Jericho and across the Jordan; northwards from Beersheba through Hebron, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Ramallah, Nablus, Jenin, and Afuleh to Nazareth. Another transverse road in the north was built from Haifa through Nazareth to Tiberias; and a northern coastal road from Haifa was built through Acre and Ras en Naqura (now Rosh HaNikra, on the frontier) and to Beirut. All these roads were second-class roads of a total length of only 450 kilometres: the total investment by the Ottoman administration in these roads was only £50,000 sterling. By 1914 there was only one motor-car in the whole of Palestine—the property of an oil prospecting company.

The British army built many new metalled roads in Palestine in the First World War, especially in the hills north of Jerusalem, leading to the front line; but they were of little value in peace-time. The Palestine Government had an extensive road programme and, by the end of the Mandate, had extended the all-weather network to 2,300 kilometres, by building roads in the south from Beersheba south-westwards through Auja el Hafir (now Nitsana) across the Sinai Desert to Ismailia on the Suez Canal; in the north along the Jordan Valley from Beisan northwards through Tiberias and Rosh Pina to Metulla; and a new transverse road westwards from Rosh Pina to Safed and Acre. In the Emek another transverse road was built from Nahalal eastwards through Afuleh to Beisan in the Jordan Valley and a new link north-eastwards from the coastal road at Hadera across the Emek at Afuleh and via Sejera to join the Haifa–Tiberias road. A coastal road was built linking Gaza with Jaffa, via Rehovot; but the main Jaffa–Haifa coastal road parallel to the main railway line was delayed by railway opposition until the Arab Rebellion of 1936–8 made it impossible for Jews to travel any more from Tel Aviv to Haifa by the roundabout route via Jerusalem, Nablus, and Nazareth.

The frequent crises in and around Palestine were responsible for much road-building. The economic crisis in 1921–2 led to the building of the Samakh–Tiberias road as a Jewish unemployment relief work. The 1925 Druze Rebellion in Syria led to the building of the road to Metulla to enable British troops to prevent the Druze from infiltration into the Hulch salient. The 1929 Wailing Wall riots and the attacks on Jewish settlements all over Palestine led to the building of the security road through the Emek from Nahalal through Afuleh to Beisan. The

Arab Rebellion of 1936–8 not only forced the Palestine Government at long last to build the direct Jaffa–Haifa coastal road but also to construct some £370,000 sterling worth of other security roads at the British taxpayer's expense. In the Second World War a further £850,000 sterling worth of roads were built by the British army. The value of all roads built by the Palestine Department of Public Works was £2,200,000 sterling and the total value of roads built in Palestine from 1900 to 1948 was about £5,000,000 sterling.[46] The total length of this road network in 1948 was 2,660 kilometres.

At the partition of Palestine, in 1948, Israel lost a considerable part of this network, especially in the Nablus and Hebron hills; and from Jerusalem through Jericho to the Jordan. The international links across the Gaza Strip to Egypt and northwards and eastwards to Lebanon and Syria became of little value. On the other hand, new roads have been built by the Israel Government to Sdom on the Dead Sea and to Eilat. The total length of first-class roads is now 3,000 kilometres, plus another 640 kilometres for local authority roads.

There were no telephones in Palestine under the Ottoman administration. The British military administration provided telephones only for official use; but, in 1920, the Palestine Government introduced a public service that by 1948 had 26,000 subscribers. The figure for Israel ten years later had risen to no fewer than 91,000 subscribers. The first automatic rural exchange was built in 1932, at Ain Harod: the first rural urban exchanges were built in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv in 1937. Owing to the vulnerability of telephone wires to sabotage during the frequent disturbances in Palestine, many of the overhead trunk lines were put underground and were supplemented by radio telephone links.

Telegraphs were introduced into Palestine by the Ottoman regime as part of a scheme to control its far-flung empire. It formed a separate telegraph department, employing many Christian Arabs. The telegraph network was extended by the British army in the First World War to 10,000 kilometres and was taken over by the Palestine G.P.O. in 1920. The acceptance of telegrams by Arab operators in Arabic and English presented little problem; but telegrams in Hebrew script, even when transliterated into Latin characters, was another matter. There were very few trilingual operators. A Hebrew teleprinter was eventually developed and, after a long political struggle, telegrams in Hebrew script were accepted and delivered in the main Hebrew-speaking areas.[47] The number of telegrams handled reached 956,000 a year at the end of the Mandate, and is now at the rate of 1,500,000 a year. But the service did not pay under the Mandate and does not pay today.

The Ottoman postal service was not very efficient. Very few postmen could even read Latin characters, so that, in Jerusalem, for example, a separate postal section had to be set up largely with non-Moslem staff

to handle foreign mail. Foreign states were allowed, under the Capitulations, to set up their own post offices within the Ottoman Empire; and Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, and Italy availed themselves of this opportunity, using their own overprinted postage stamps.

All this was swept away on the British occupation of Palestine. From 1918 Egyptian Expeditionary Force stamps, printed in English and Arabic in Egypt, were introduced into Palestine. When the Palestine civil administration was set up in 1920, the same stamps were still used, overprinted 'Palestine' in English, Arabic, and Hebrew. Only in 1927 was a Palestine series of postage stamps used.[48] In the conservative British tradition, no other designs were ever made, considerable philatelic revenue being thereby forgone, as Israel's subsequent efforts have shown.

Education

Education was one of the few fields in which the Ottoman administration in Palestine made any considerable effort. By 1918, there were 242 State primary schools in Palestine; the headmasters and the language of instruction were Turkish. As a result of nascent Arab nationalist pressure, an Arabic secondary school was established in Jerusalem during the First World War; but it closed when the Turks withdrew. The level of Ottoman public instruction was low; only ten teachers a year were admitted from Palestine to the sole Government Teachers' training college in the Levant, at Damascus.

The Jewish and Christian communities patronized their own schools.[49] As a result, the numbers of children of elementary school age attending school were 142 per thousand for Jews, 120 for Christians, and only 4 for Moslems. There were a few Moslem private schools; but many Moslem families sent their children to Christian or Jewish schools or to Syria or Egypt for their education.[50]

Government education was financed by a special education tax of which the proceeds were spent under the supervision of an advisory education committee in each *Sanjak*—the *Maarif Mejlessi*. It was appointed by the *Mutasserif* and met under his chairmanship, the other members being learned Moslems or representatives of the leading Moslem families. It was this committee that appointed the *Sanjak* Director of Education—the *Maarif Mudiri* who, in Jerusalem, by exception, was an Arab—a concession to Arab nationalist opinion.

Under the British Mandate in Palestine, the *Yishuv* had its own educational network and the Palestine Government concentrated largely on the provision of schools for the Arab population. Men and women teachers' training colleges were established by the Palestine Government to remedy the shortage of Arab elementary school teachers. There was always a shortage of Arab secondary school teachers, as none had been trained under the Ottoman period. Those Palestinian Arabs who

graduated from foreign Universities[51] were snapped up by the Palestine Government at once for service as Inspectors of Education or as District Officers and could not be spared for work as secondary school teachers. The Palestine Government built only five Arab schools during the whole twenty-eight years of its existence, all the remaining Government schools being housed either in ancient Ottoman buildings or in hired premises.

Under Israel, Arab education has been taken over by the Ministry of Education and Culture, together with the State Hebrew elementary schools (both religious[52] and secular).

Health

The Ottoman health service in Palestine was very primitive. The Health Inspector (*Sahiye Mefeteshi*) was concerned largely with quarantine control at Jaffa and Haifa. In the towns sanitation was supervised by a part-time municipal doctor. Hospitalization was provided by missionary or charitable institutions. Little attempt was made to cope with Palestine's endemic diseases—malaria, trachoma, and syphilis. Consequently, it was found that among the prisoners of war taken in Palestine in 1917 and 1918, 40 per cent of the Turks and 60 per cent of the Germans had malaria. Between April and October 1918, 8,500 of the advancing British troops went down with malaria, and the normal *weekly* rate was 300 new cases for each division. Extensive anti-malaria work was started by the British army and continued by the Palestine Department of Health until by 1948 the disease had been practically stamped out. In this work—as well as in hospitalization and training—valuable aid was given by the American Zionist Medical Unit which arrived in Palestine in 1918 and eventually became the Hadassah Medical Organization.

All this goes to show that the development of Palestine, which started on such a slender scale under the Ottoman regime, grew rapidly during the British Mandate, and has now blossomed under the independent State of Israel. The population has quadrupled in the last half century, and prosperity has increased even more remarkably. Yet, much in Israel—good and bad—is still the legacy of the four centuries of Ottoman rule.

NOTES

[1] 1917 for the south; 1918 for the north.

[2] See Norman Bentwich, *England in Palestine*, London, 1932; and more recently my own monograph *British Traditions in the Administration of Israel*, London, 1957.

[3] For example, to Professor Bernard Lewis of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London; but he is interested largely in the earliest period of Ottoman rule in Palestine.

[4] Such as Sir George Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, Oxford, 1905–6; and A. Heidborn, *Manuel de Droit Public et Administratif de L'Empire Ottoman*, Leipzig, 1908–9. I am also indebted to Professor Uriel Heyd, of the Hebrew University, for allowing me access to old copies of the Ottoman Government's Imperial Calendar in his possession; to Mr. Ben Zvi, the President of Israel, for drawing my attention to a chapter on Ottoman administration by Mr. D. Ben-Gurion in the Yiddish volume *Eretz Yisroel*, produced jointly by them in New York in 1918; and to a Hebrew pamphlet, also by Mr. Ben-Gurion, on the same subject, published in 1913; and to Mr. Yehoshua of the Ministry for Religious Affairs in Jerusalem, who went through his private files of the Palestine Arabic newspapers collected by him prior to the British occupation and abstracted for me in Hebrew all available references in the Arabic press of those days to the Turkish administration and administrators in Palestine.

[5] The Rabbinical Courts were officially recognized in Palestine under the British Mandate by the Jewish Communities Regulations issued in 1927 under the Religious Communities (Organization) Ordinance of 1926 which was itself based on articles 52–7 of the Palestine Order-in-Council, 1922.

[6] All other matters of personal status are now dealt with by the civil courts.

[7] Once dominant in Palestine not only in numbers but by virtue of the fact that Islam was the official religion of the Ottoman Empire.

[8] With the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in the Old City of Jerusalem and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem now in the hands of the Government of Jordan, Israel's concern with Christian holy places (in their general sense) is largely limited to Nazareth and the Sea of Galilee.

[9] The early development of Jewish secular authorities in Palestine has been well covered by Moshe Burstein (now Dr. M. Avidor) in his thesis *Self-Government of the Jews in Palestine since 1900*, printed in Tel Aviv in 1934.

[10] Jewish community of Palestine.

[11] It continued, however, to have a shadowy existence as the first Jewish arbitration tribunal in Palestine.

[12] Under the same Regulations as the Chief Rabbinate and the Rabbinical Courts, referred to above.

[13] Which gave most foreign subjects special rights in the Ottoman Empire, such as trial by Consular Courts.

[14] Information on *Hashomer* and on many other aspects of Jewish life in Palestine under Ottoman rule, based on contemporary diaries and other records, is to be found in the English version of Avraham Yaari's *The Goodly Heritage*, Jerusalem, The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Zionist Organization, 1958.

[15] Few Palestine Jews ever served in the Turkish army. They bought themselves out by paying a special tax called *Badl Askari*, equivalent to about £10 sterling—quite a large sum in those days.

[16] On lines similar to those followed by the *sous-préfets* and *préfets* in France.

[17] By 1948, all the Sub-District Officers were Palestinian Arabs (Christians or Moslems) or Jews.

[18] In the Arab areas of Israel there is also a military governor, the *Moshel Zvaï*.

[19] Until the construction of the Hejaz Railway branch line from Trans-Jordan to Haifa in 1906, Acre was the traditional capital of the north and Haifa an insignificant fishing village. When Trans-Jordanian wheat began to be exported from Haifa with its sheltered bay, Acre started to lose its pre-eminence both as a harbour and as a provincial capital.

[20] Which merely means a manager: similarly there was an Ottoman *Mudir el Maaref* (Director of Education) in Jerusalem.

[21] Which resembles the Rural District Council in Britain by providing services beyond the scope of a Parish Council or a Parish Committee.

[22] As at Nahalal for the Western Emek and at Ein Harod for the Eastern Emek.

[23] It called itself a Township—and was politely so called by the British—although no such term existed in Palestine law.

[24] In 1948, the Municipality of Tel Aviv absorbed the former Municipal area of Jaffa when its inhabitants fled.

[25] Some of them were in such small towns that their having full municipal powers today is hardly justified. Beisan, in the Jordan Valley, has thus been demoted by Israel to the status of a Local Council.

[26] Nazareth and Shefa 'Amr (now called Shfar Am).

[27] They pay rates to the Rural Councils.

[28] Most Arab villages have their own *Madafeh* or guest house where each family in town provides food for visitors, free of charge. Where there are several *Hamuleh* or clans in the same village, each may have its own *Madafeh*.

[29] Much to the disgust of the inhabitants of Hebron and Gaza, who remained unrepresented.

[30] The Beduin around Beersheba paid no taxes and hence were disfranchised.

[31] One of the Ottoman categories of land-holding called *Miri* lays down the obligatory shares which devolve on widows and children.

[32] The Ottoman Law of Societies requires only notification to the Government and not licensing. When a proposal was recently made in the *Knesset* to introduce licensing, it was defeated as a threat to political liberty.

[33] As with the British Presidents of Palestinian courts under the Mandate.

[34] All Civil Magistrates and Judges in Israel are nominated by a committee composed of the Minister of Justice as chairman and one other Minister elected by the Cabinet as a whole; the President of the Supreme Court and two other Supreme Court judges elected by the Supreme Court as a whole; two members of the *Knesset* elected by the *Knesset* as a whole; and two members of the Council of the Bar Association elected by the Council as a whole. Political bias is thus almost impossible and the age-old Jewish tradition of absolute justice is carefully maintained.

[35] With war-time additions, actually one-eighth, by 1918.

[36] *Werko*, in Turkish.

[37] In addition to a municipal *octroi* on all goods brought into each town.

[38] After waiting for eight months for his salary, the Ottoman Government schoolmaster in the large village of Selfit closed the school and went home. To keep alive, Ottoman postmen habitually charged a fee for the delivery of each letter equivalent to one-tenth of the value of postage stamps it bore.

[39] Known as *Tapu* and corrupted in both English and Hebrew into *Tahboh*.

[40] A *dunam* is a quarter acre.

[41] A gully, dry except during the rains.

[42] See note 19.

[43] The Turkish attack on the Suez Canal in 1915.

[44] As part of a plan for a link with Eilat and with the Dead Sea.

[45] It was because of the venality of the Ottoman civil service that two separate bodies were set up for road construction —each to watch the other—the Directorate of Public Works and the Road Inspectorate. Contractors then had to bribe both.

[46] In addition to urban roads and village access roads built by the local authorities.

[47] By the end of the Mandate there were 83 telegraph offices in Palestine, of which 41 accepted and delivered telegrams in Latin or Hebrew characters; 26 in Latin or Arabic characters; and 16 in all three languages. 39 per cent of the telegrams were in Latin characters, 36 per cent in Hebrew script (plus 1 per cent transliterated into Latin characters), and 26 per cent in Arabic script.

[48] With four designs by Ben-Or Kalter, showing Rachel's Tomb, the Dome of the Rock, the Citadel of Jerusalem, and the Sea of Galilee. No pictures were used of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem or the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem for fear of offending Christian sentiment!

[49] For Christians these schools were provided by the churches, missionaries, and religious orders; for Jews by such overseas bodies as the Anglo-Jewish Association; the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* and the *Deutscher Hilfsverein*.

[50] 300 children from Nablus alone were at school outside Palestine at one period.

[51] There has never been an Arab University in Palestine.

[52] The *Agudat Israel* maintain their own elementary schools, with a State grant. There are also many private schools, some of them church schools.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE LIGHT OF POLISH ANALYSES*

Jan Czekanowski

ALL HUMAN populations which have been examined as to their anthropological composition as well as from the serological point of view appear to be biologically hybrid. An analysis of the various population groups into their anthropological components makes possible a simple comparison between those groups.

My friend and pupil, the late Dr. Salomon Czortkower, carried out analyses of a large number of anthropological samples contributed by several investigators. These have enabled a general survey of the anthropological structure of the Jewish people to be made. It is based on the fact that the Jews in Europe (including the Mediterranean and the Orient) can be divided into three main population groups: (1) the Oriental, (2) the Caucasian, and (3) the Central European.

They all consist of the same anthropological components as the rest of the European population of the Mediterranean basin. They show no greater range of anthropological structures than do other European populations. Even the large difference between the Jewish populations of Egypt and the Yemen can be compared with the range found among the indigenous populations of the Iberian peninsula. In both cases the wide variations are probably partly the result of the influence of the Arab population.

The only peculiarity of the Jews is that both in the Caucasus and in Central Europe there are still clear anthropological traces of the old connexion with the population of the Eastern Mediterranean. The fact that they fall clearly into three population groups is doubtless a consequence of the influence of the autochthonous populations in the Caucasus and in Central Europe. The great changes in anthropological structure caused by historical processes are shown in the analytical results in Table 1.

* Based on a paper read at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 1957, in the Section 'Demography of the Jews'.

TABLE 1

Population groups	*Anthropological Components*				
	Nordic %	*Mediterranean* %	*Armenoid* %	*Lapponoid* %	*Oriental* %
Oriental					
Jews from Mesopotamia	2·8	30·0	15·0	5·1	46·5
from Baghdad	—	31·9	24·2	2·9	41·7
Caucasian					
Jews from Urmia	—	14·4	57·7	8·1	19·7
Transcaucasian Armenians	13·8	21·2	51·6	13·1	—
Central European					
Jewish Students, Lwów University	20·0	12·9	20·0	36·7	9·9
German, Keuper Franks from Bavaria	19·6	12·2	21·4	46·8	—

This analytical material can only mean that in Mesopotamia the original anthropological structure of the Jews has remained up to the present less changed than elsewhere. The last two population groups show the effects of later changes. It is also clear that at present the majority of the Jewish people belong to the Central European population group. The other two are relatively few in number.

Both in the Central European and in the Caucasian population groups the Oriental components which are so characteristic of the Semites and Hamites have greatly shrunk in numbers. In the Caucasus this anthropological change has led to a strong concentration of the Armenoid component. In Central Europe, on the other hand, the mixed population group which is characteristic of that area has won the day, with the Lapponoid component to the fore. This shows the South German and Slav influence.

The shrinking of the Oriental component in Europe occurs everywhere, and not only among the Jewish people. It has also been found in the Basques, where traces of neolithic waves of the Hamites play the major role. It is improbable that the later Arab expansion which flooded the greater part of the country in the Middle Ages has managed to leave anthropological traces so far North. Unfortunately we have as yet no analytical results which could give exact evidence of the part the Oriental components have played in the present Spanish and Portuguese population. All we know is that it is at least as strong as among the Jewish population of Central Europe.

We know little more about the strength of the Oriental component in the Apennine Peninsula. It is certain that even today it plays a prominent part in the south, especially in Sicily. It is particularly strong in Malta, where the population speaks a mixed romanic-semitic language. It would seem that the Oriental component reaches as far north as Naples.

The shrinking of the Oriental components on European soil is probably conditioned by the unfavourable influence of the foreign geographical surroundings. Similarly, the Mediterranean components are gradually decreasing in Europe north of the Alps.

The problem of the social-anthropological strata of the Jews has not yet been examined. The Lwów sample proves that very great differences have become apparent which must be explained historically. They are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Sample	*Anthropological Components*				
	Nordic %	*Mediterranean* %	*Armenoid* %	*Lapponoid* %	*Oriental* %
Jewish University students in Lwów	20·0	12·9	20·0	36·9	9·9
Keuper Franks from Bavaria	19·6	12·2	21·4	46·8	—
Poorest Jewish population in Lwów	12·1	19·9	42·4	16·6	9·4
Ossetes from Caucasia	11·8	23·6	40·8	23·6	—

This table shows that the Jewish upper class from which the Lwów university students are drawn has remained very similar in its anthropological structure to the Frank population of Bavaria. This is shown by the Frankish dialect spoken by their forefathers. The poorer class of the same cultural community, on the other hand, represents the Caucasian population group. The structure of the poorer class population coincides with that of the Ossetes of the Caucasus and anthropologically belongs more closely to Karaitic series of the Taurus Peninsula rather than the Jewish.

The Karaites of the Taurus can be considered as Judaised remnants of the Turkish (Hun) Khazars who have been strongly influenced by the Caucasians. One can therefore conclude that the poorest stratum of the Jewish population of Lwów forms part of the Judaised remnant of the Khazars, just as the Karaites of the Crimea. The same anthropological structure shows in the Jews of Polesia, where the population of the Ukraine fled in order to escape the horrors of the seventeenth-century Cossack wars. It is therefore probable that the poorest Jews of Lwów are descendants of these refugees who did not manage to recover economically in the following three centuries. These anthropological differences seem to prove that the old Jewish population of the Ukraine consisted to a large extent of descendants of Judaised Khazars. This explains also the obvious anthropological shift of the Jewish population of Poland and Lithuania towards the present biologically isolated Karaites.

As a large part has been played in the history of the Jews by the

Judaised Khazars and the closely related Karaites, the latter must be briefly discussed. We know something about their anthropological history. Originally they were a Jewish sect in eighth-century Babylon, whence they emigrated in several directions. Those who went to Egypt were strongly influenced anthropologically by the native population. The same applies to the Karaites in the northern Caucasus, where the Turkish Khazars were converted to Judaism. As a consequence the language of the Karaites was influenced by the Turks. Anthropologically they attached themselves most closely to the Caucasian Iranians, the Ossetes, and have thus remained intact in the Crimea (Tauria). Further north in the Ukrainian steppe they became influenced by the Iranian Alanes. That is shown by the anthropological structure of the Karaites of Volhynia and Lithuania, and explains the presence of Iranian words in the Karaite language.

The analysis of the peoples of Egypt and the Yemen, Jewish as well as Karaite and Arab, is marked by the occurrence of a colour mixture. This complication of anthropological structure must be the consequence of a later infiltration. It cannot be original and must therefore be interpreted as a result of Arab influence, as the Arabs always had large numbers of Negro slaves.

The above facts bring one to the conclusion that the Jews originally had a Mediterranean-Oriental anthropological structure, and that this has withstood the storms of history through thousands of years, with the smallest changes occurring nearest to their original home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARANZADI, T., 'Els cranis i demés restes humans', *Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Seccio istorico-archeologica*, 1923, Annuari MCMXV–MCMXX, pp. 531–5.

BUNAK, W., 'Crania Armenica', *Trudy Antropologicheskogo Izsliedovatelnogo Instituta*, Moscow, 1927, Vol. II.

CHANTRE, E., *Recherches anthropologiques dans le Caucase*, Paris-Lyon, 1887, Vol. IV, pp. 154–82.

CIPRIANI, L., 'Osservazioni antropometriche su indigeni asiatici e africani', *Archivio per l'Antropologia e la Etnologia*, 1930–1, Vol. LX–LXI, pp. 136–86, Florence.

CZEKANOWSKI, J., *Człowiek w czasie i przestrzeni*, Biblioteka Wiedzy, Vol. IX, Warsaw, 1937.

KRECHOWIECKI, A., *Czaszki Żydowskie ze zbiorów Muzeum Anatomicznego we Lwowie*, Gdansk, 1947. Dissertation.

MATIEGKA, J., 'Prispevky ku kraniologii Ziduv', *Anthropologie* (Prague), 1926, Vol. IV, pp. 163–219.

SALLIER, K., 'Die Keuperfranken. Eine Anthropologische Untersuchung aus Mittelfranken', *Deutsche Rassenkunde*, 1932, Vol. II, Jena.

SALLER, K., 'Beitrag zur Anthropologie der Ostjuden', *Zeitschrift für Anthropologie und Morphologie*, 1909, Vol. XLII, pp. 85–102.

WANKE, A., *Z badań antropologicznych nad popisowymi dawnych powiatow Drohiczynskiego i Kobrynskiego*, Anthropological Institute, University of Wrocław.

WEISSENBERG, S., 'Die Jemenitischen Juden', *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1909, Vol. XLI, pp. 309–27.

WEISSENBERG, S., 'Zur Anthropologie der nordafrikanischen Juden', *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 1912, Vol. XLII, pp. 85–102.

See also works by Czortkower, S., listed in Appendix II below.

APPENDIX I

Analytical results of Salomon Czortkower's investigations

Population Groups and Samples	*Anthropological Components*					
	Nordic %	*Mediterranean* %	*Armenoid* %	*Lapponoid* %	*Oriental* %	*Negroid* %
Oriental						
1. Karaites from Egypt	5·6	44·7	10·8	—	24·6	15·2
2. Jews from Yemen	—	41·3	7·0	—	40·0	12·6
3. Jews from Egypt	5·4	24·5	13·0	5·9	40·0	12·0
4. Arabs from Yemen	6·7	17·7	21·6	4·2	35·4	14·8
5. Jews from Damascus and Aleppo	14·1	20·4	17·2	3·0	46·9	—
6. Sephardim from Jerusalem	6·5	22·6	14·9	7·5	48·3	—
7. Jews from Kurdistan	7·2	27·0	11·7	9·2	46·3	—
8. Jews from Mesopotamia	2·8	30·0	15·0	5·1	46·5	—
9. Sephardi women, Jerusalem	—	25·8	16·9	13·0	44·7	—
10. Jews from Baghdad and Urfa	—	31·9	24·2	2·9	41·7	—
Caucasian						
11. Basques, Bronze Age, Spain	—	21·3	42·7	7·3	30·1	—
12. Jews from Urmia, Persia	—	14·4	57·7	8·1	19·7	—
13. Jews from Dagestan, Caucasia	—	7·2	61·6	12·7	18·4	—
14. Jews from Grusia, Caucasia	—	7·1	61·6	19·8	11·8	—
15. Karaites of the Crimea	2·6	9·6	44·8	23·5	20·0	—
16. Karaites, Crimea, skulls	5·0	11·5	40·0	22·0	21·5	—
17. Polesian Jews, Drohiczyn	9·5	16·0	34·8	24·6	15·1*	—
18. Jews from Lwów, poorest	12·1	19·9	42·4	16·6	9·4	—
19. Ossetes from Caucasia	11·8	23·6	40·8	23·6	—	—
Central European						
20. German, Keuper Franks from Bavaria	19·6	12·2	21·4	46·8	—	—
21. Jewish students, Lwów, University	20·0	12·9	20·0	36·7	9·9	—
22. Karaites, Luck, Volhynia	8·8	39·3	17·8	16·1	17·8	—
23. Karaites, Troki and Wilno	10·5	22·0	23·0	22·5	22·5	—
24. Jews from Prague, seventeenth century	14·1	18·1	24·5	26·9	15·5	—
25. Jews from Troki, Lithuania	19·2	25·6	15·3	25·9	14·1	—
26. Jewish women from Troki	20·8	21·4	18·7	24·9	15·0	—
27. Jews from Warsaw	26·3	21·0	20·2	18·3	14·1	—
28. Jewish women from Warsaw	25·8	18·8	21·3	20·0	13·3	—
29. Jewish students from U.S.A., Goettingen, 1933	24·4	10·9	21·8	14·0	28·4	—

* Analysed by A. Wanke.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—The terms Nordic, Mediterranean, Armenoid, Lapponoid and Oriental are the names of races or sub-races into which European peoples have been classified on the basis of a number of associated anatomical characters. The Nordics are characterized by high average stature, blond skin, hair, and eyes, a medium round skull, etc., as found in Scandinavia, for example. Mediterraneans are defined as relatively short in average stature with long skull, dark hair and eyes; Armenoids as medium in stature, with dark hair and eyes, a short skull with flat occiput, and prominent nose; Lapponoids, as short in stature, with dark pigmentation, short skull and broad face; Orientals are characterized by high stature, dark pigmentation, curly hair, medium long skull, and narrow face and nose. In a general way these racial types express the average physique of inhabitants of particular geographical areas, but there is great individual variation within each region.

APPENDIX II

Salomon Czortkower: A Biographical Note

Born in Lwów in 1903, the son of a well-to-do orthodox Jewish family long settled in that city, Salomon Czortkower entered the Jan Kazimierz University in Lwów after completing the period of his military service and obtaining a commission as lieutenant in the 6th Podhale Rifle Regiment. Originally he intended to study medicine but, for some technical reason, having failed to be admitted to the Medical Faculty, he started to study anthropology and prehistory; very soon he became captivated by these two disciplines and forgot all about his earlier plans.

He obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1931 for his dissertation *Prehistoric Spain in the Light of Anthropology*. Owing to his meticulous care in details and a general synthetic approach, this work in its final version appeared in print as late as 1936 in the form of a monograph, *Racial Character of the Prehistoric Population of the Iberian Peninsula*. This monograph gave a general picture of the changes in the anthropological structure of the population of that region so closely connected with the Mediterranean sphere of the African continent. The most important result of this work was to show that a specific characteristic of the Spanish population is a frequent occurrence of an Oriental component which is a characteristic feature of the Hamito-Semitic people, a feature which began in the neolithic age, grew stronger in the bronze age and was weakened in later times. The concentration on the Oriental component brought Czortkower to an intensive preoccupation with the anthropology of the Jews. This preoccupation delayed the completion of his dissertation and obtaining his doctorate. Before publishing his dissertation, Czortkower wrote an analytical essay surveying the field of the anthropology of the Jews. It was published in the German journal *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* in 1932 under the title 'Anthropologische Struktur der Juden'. This paper was later completed by detailed analytical surveys of the Jews in Caucasia, Yemenite Jews, various groups of Polish and Lithuanian Jews, American immigrant Jews, and Polish and Crimean Karaites. Czortkower also published many essays devoted to the question of the origin of blond Jews and on the anthropological elements influencing the stature of the Jewish population. Working incessantly, Czortkower travelled all over Poland gathering observational material. He also received grants to go abroad, but his work there did not yield the expected results. He could not obtain the support of the Jewish communities in Denmark or Holland. He had to give up his plan to write an anthropological study of the European Diaspora. The material he was able to gather and work out analytically was intended for the 'habilitation' thesis which was to secure for him the Chair of Anthropology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This was promised to him during one of his visits to Vienna where he gave an account of his researches. He was regarded abroad as one of the most authoritative anthropologists among those who took an interest in the racial problems of the Jewish people. In the publication of the Czech Academy devoted to the problem of equality of all European races, Czortkower was asked to write the eighth chapter, devoted to Jews. The eminent Czech Slavist, Lubor Niederle, there wrote about Slavs in general and I myself on the Polish population.

In addition to the preparatory work for his 'habilitation' thesis Czortkower undertook other scientific studies. Taking an interest early in his studies in the problems of archeological anthropology, he shifted his interest to the problems of early history and prepared another work on this subject, of which he published only a small fragment devoted to the crania from Ulwówek, which was published in the memorial volume to the very eminent Czech anthropologist, Jindřich Matiegka, as well as an essay about the Dniester Crania dating from the historical period. The main theme of this substantial work was to be an analysis of the crania of the population of the Czechy-Wysocko culture collected by Czortkower during the excavations undertaken by Professor Tadeusz Sulimirski. However, he did not succeed in the analysis of these crania, as it required painstaking conservational measures which were interrupted by the outbreak of the war. The crania were excavated in a stage of considerable decay having been buried for a long time. The only information about the anthropological structure of the present inhabitants of Wysocko village where the excavated

prehistoric cemetery was found is given in my book *Man in Time and Space*. In the same manner other analytical fragments from his work were saved as, for example, those referring to the Basques of the bronze age, the people of the string culture at Gross-Tschernosek, Ossetes of Caucasia, Jews buried in the Prague cemetery of the seventeenth century, the present Polish population from the neighbourhood of Olkienniki in Lithuania, the crania of alleged Goths from the Black Sea from the third century C.E., as well as those of Greeks from the ancient colony at the mouth of the Dnieper, excavated in Maricyn village.

In the thirties Czortkower worked voluntarily at the Institute of Anthropology at the University of Lwów and as an assistant at the Stomatological Clinic, being at the same time a Secretary of the journal *Polska Stomatologia*. He published a number of papers on the margins of anthropology and stomatology; to mention only a few: an assessment of the age of a cranium on the basis of the state of its dentition, a general survey of anthropological researches in the field of stomatology published in the journal *Zeitschrift fuer Stomatologie*, with an extensive summary in *Wiener Klinische Wochenschrift*, a longer paper on heredity as an element in the creation of various anthropological and constitutional types, and a shorter paper on heredity. Besides his purely scientific and research work, Czortkower wrote many popular articles in the field of anthropology. They were published in the literary and scientific supplement of the most popular Polish daily, *Ilustrowany Kurier Codzienny* in Cracow. Written in a vivid, popular, and interesting style, they contributed in no small measure to the popularizing of the research work of the Lwów school of anthropology and contributed to the wide interest in it among our intelligentsia. The popularity of anthropological publications which maintained a high scientific standard was to a very large measure the result of Czortkower's popularizing activities. The outbreak of the war found Czortkower in Lwów. I managed to secure for him the position of lecturer in Statistics and Anthropology at the University in spite of the rather unfriendly attitude of the new University authorities. For example, they did not allow Czortkower to deliver a lecture at a scientific session of the University on the anthropology of Jews. However, until the German occupation we were allowed to work more or less peacefully. The Germans closed the University and we were prohibited from entering the library and laboratory of the Anthropological Institute.

In the first period of the German occupation, after twenty-six professors and lecturers had been murdered on the night of 3 and 4 July 1941, Czortkower took the position of Director of the Statistical Office of the Jewish Kehilla. For the time being I maintained contact with him. He was in a depressed state of mind, and once in the summer of 1942 he asked me to convey his farewell to the Institute of Anthropology with which he had been connected for so many years of his scientific activity. In spite of our efforts to take him out of the ghetto, he insisted on staying for the sake of his parents and sisters, whom he loved dearly. His wife, who was non-Jewish, obtained permission from the Germans to live in the ghetto to share the fate of her husband.

Salomon Czortkower was 'liquidated' some time early in the spring of 1943.

List of the main scientific works of Salomon Czortkower

'Anthropologische Struktur der Juden', *Anthropologischer Anzeiger*, 1932, Vol. IX, pp. 250–63.

'Lebky z Ulwówka', *Anthropologie* (Prague), 1932, Vol. X, pp. 212–18.

'Podłoże rasowe Żydów kaukaskich', *Archiwum Lwowskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego*, 1933, Vol. VI, pp. 143–76.

'Ustalenie wieku czszki', *Polska Stomatologia*, 1935, Vol. XI, pp. 325–34.

'O dziedziczności progenii', *Polska Stomatologia*, 1935, Vol. XII, pp. 207–16.

'Hiszpania przedhistoryczna pod względem rasowym', *Przegląd Antropoligiczny*, 1934, Vol. VIII, pp. 97–109.

'Z badań nad problemami rasowymi Żydow', *Miesięcznik Żydowski*, 1934, Vol. IV, pp. 510–49.

'Żydzi Amerykańscy—Studenci pod względem rasowym', *Przegląd Antropologiczny*, 1935, Vol. IX, pp. 97–109.

Die Rassen Zentraleuropas, VIII. Die Juden. Symposium of the Czech Academy in Prague, 1935.

'Naddniestrzański czaszki historyczne', *Wiadomości Archeologiczne*, 1936, Vol. XIV, p. 91.
'Ergebnisse anthropologischer Untersuchungen in der Stomatologie', *Zeitschrift fuer Stomatologie*, 1936, Vol. XXIV, pp. 577–93; summary in *Wiener Klinische Wochenschrift*, 1936, Nos. 31–2, pp. 980–3.
'Charakter Rasowy przedhistorycznej ludności półwyspu Pirenejskiego', *Archiwum Lwowkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego*, 1936, Vol. X, pp. 359–454; summary in *Sprawozdania z posiedzień Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie*, 1937, Vol. XVII, pp. 180–2.
'Wzrost Żydów jako funkcja rasy i środowiska.' *Almanach Zdrowia Tozu i Szpitala Żydowskiego*, Lwów, 1937; separate offprint, pp. 1–37.
'Die Herkunft der blonden Juden', *Przeglad Antropologiczny*, 1938, Vol. XII, pp. 521–532.
'Skład Rasowy Żydów z Jemenu', *Przegląd Antropologiczny*, 1938, Vol. XII, pp. 521–32.
'Pochodzenie i Struktura Rasowa Karaimów', *Przegląd Antropologiczny*, 1938, Vol. XII, pp. 678–80.
'Dziedziczność jako czynnik powstawania typów antropologicznych i konstytucyjnych ze stanowiska stomatologicznego', *Polska Stomatologia*, 1938, No. 4, pp. 127–44.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CONVERTS OF SAN NICANDRO

Alfredo Ravenna

(Review Article)

THE GARGANO PROMONTORY is the spur of the boot of Italy. It consists almost entirely of a mountain nearly three thousand feet high, hollowed out by caves and channels which swallow up the rainfall. It is difficult of access, and has long been an isolated area. Only with the draining in recent times of the contiguous Tavoliere delle Puglie, a marshy and malarial zone, and the building of new roads has the isolation of Gargano been broken.

Local myths tell of heroes and ancestors who came from over the sea. The region has been occupied since prehistoric times. In classical times the Greeks colonized the coastal areas, while the highlands were inhabited by shepherds who left their richly forested heights only in the winter, when they came down to trade. On Mount Drione there was a sanctuary which some historians consider to have survived as the Christian sanctuary of San Michele, and which became a place of pilgrimage for warriors and believers setting out for the Holy Land. From the monasteries established in the area sprang the villages of the south-easterly part of the promontory.

In the tenth century the coastal people were attacked by Saracens and Slavs and withdrew inland. It was from this movement that San Nicandro Garganico originated. In the eleventh century the mastery of Gargano was disputed between Normans and Greeks. In the next century it became a fief of the Queen of Sicily; it was then divided among a number of noble families and became linked to the destiny of the Kingdom of Naples.

The population of San Nicandro grew rapidly. Forty-eight households in 1532 became 426 households in 1648 and 657 households in 1735. In 1443 Alfonso I of Aragona instituted royal taxes on sheep and forbad the cultivation of lowland pastures from November to May. In the highlands the forests grew even thicker. This system, the cause of great misery for the population, lasted with slight modifications until 1865.

When in 1798 Cardinal Ruffo retook the Kingdom of Naples from the French, many peasants from Gargano helped to fill the ranks of his bands. The abolition of feudal privileges under Murat did not change the poverty-stricken condition of the *cafone*. The peasants had nothing to lose in becoming outlaws. The bandits recruited in the villages and got help from them. They were active during the Napoleonic period and in the first years of the Bourbon

restoration, and again after 1860 in the early period of Italian unity when the Bourbons tried to win back their throne. The legitimist cause was merely an excuse for pillaging and kidnapping; the violence was a protest of wretchedness against secular injustice. The oppression by the Piedmontese forces was brutal and opened up a gulf between the North and the South of Italy that could not easily be closed. In any case, the land was now in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the change in government meant no improvement in the lot of the peasants. From 1880 the peasants became day labourers and organized themselves in leagues which invaded fields hitherto reserved to the clergy: they took part in the ceremonies of marriage and death. Nonetheless, the people remained very religious.

There are references to Jewish settlements in Apulia in antiquity and the Middle Ages. There was a famous talmudic school at San Sivero, Siponto, which later moved to Manfredonia. The Jews were expelled from the Kingdom of Naples in 1541 when they emigrated to Corfu and northern Italy. The late Raffaele Giacomelli, the linguist, has pointed out similarities between the dialect spoken by the Jews in Ferrara and the dialect of Foggia, a fact which I myself noted during my stay in Gargano.

In her book *San Nicandro** Mme Elena Cassin has given us a careful and objective study of the conversion of some of the Apulian peasantry to Judaism. Jews had nothing to do with this conversion, for Manduzio, the main character in the story, believed to begin with that the Jews had long since passed from the face of the earth. The conversion really sprang from the spread of Protestantism and the increase in local population. When at the end of the nineteenth century the draining of the Tavoliere transformed the economy of the area, local resources became even scarcer and many peasants were forced to emigrate to America. Here some of them came in contact with Protestant movements and were sent home with considerable sums of money to evangelize in their native villages. In this manner were formed the nuclei of Pentecostal and many other Protestant sects. The isolated people of this area felt the need of a more intimate and personal link with God—a need which the Catholic church could not satisfy.

San Nicandro Garganico, the birthplace of Donato Manduzio, is situated at the north of the Gargano promontory, has about 17,000 inhabitants, is thirteen kilometres from the sea, and is linked to San Severo by a branch railway line. When I visited it in 1950 I also found a bus service in operation. The country round about falls into two distinct parts: the part near the sea is fertile but malarial, the part near the mountain is healthy but stony and infertile. The area is very backward. When I arrived there the first time, in 1945, and asked for a newspaper, I was given one several days old. On the next occasion (1946) things were better. Since the end of fascism, political parties had started up again, and their activity had awakened an interest in newspapers. In the summer months children are often to be seen playing naked in the streets. While there are some decent houses near the centre (which are closed up because their owners are living in Rome or Naples) and farther out some villas belonging to prosperous emigrants returned from

**San Nicandro. The Story of a Religious Phenomenon*, translated from the French by Douglas West, pp. viii + 200, Cohen & West, London, 1959, 21*s*. The original French version was published by Plon, Paris, in 1957.

America, the local houses usually consist of a single high storey which is divided horizontally by planks, the lower part often being shared with the animals.

Donato Manduzio, nicknamed Caccaba, was born in 1885 into a humble family of agricultural workers who owned a small piece of land. His parents were too poor to send him to school, and he remained illiterate until the First World War. In 1910 he married Emanuela Vocino but had no children. He was conscripted during the war, and had to learn to read and write in order to keep in touch with his family. He told me that a little girl taught him the alphabet and that he then learnt what he needed by himself. He came home crippled before the end of the war. It is not known how he came by his injuries. Hostile gossip asserts that they were self-inflicted; some people say that he was wounded in battle in 1917. At any rate, he returned from the war with a pension which, together with what he got from his land, enabled him to live. Having lost the full use of his legs, he became an avid reader of books on magic and popular romances. As a result he acquired the reputation of being a healer, a common enough thing in the region, where every village has its magician and healer. Manduzio was also a very able storyteller, and during the long winter evenings, when the peasants were kept indoors, he would put on plays based on the romances he had read.

In 1930 came the event which was to change his life. In the words of his journal: 'Qui si racconta una piccola storia luminosa, come un cammino di tenebre uscí una luce, una luce che brilla nella tenebre e nell'ombra della morte.' On the night of 10–11 August he had a vision. He heard a voice in the dark saying, 'Behold, I bring you a light', and he saw a man holding an unlit lamp. Manduzio asked him why he did not light the lamp, but the man replied, 'I have no match, but you have one.' And Manduzio realized that he was holding a lighted match; he lit the lamp. The next day a friend came to him with a Bible which he had got from a Protestant. 'I do not understand it,' he said, 'but you will, as you know so many more things than I.' 'Afterwards,' Manduzio's journal goes on, 'a light was lit in my heart, and remembering the dream of the night before I thought that it was an omen and that the Bible was the light. . . . Immediately I proclaimed the One God and the word of Sinai to the people and told them how the Creator rested on the Sabbath. And I confirmed the oneness of the Creator who took counsel from nobody, for nobody existed apart from Him. And I celebrated the holiness of the Creator in the fullness of the heavens.'

Donato was then in a period of religious crisis. He was tired of his books of magic, and he prayed: 'If there is a being who has created the world and is Lord over it, I would serve Him in truth.' What he found in the Pentateuch was what he had sought: a God who creates, governs, and is just. The final break with Christianity came a little later, over a dispute with the Protestants about the observance of the Sabbath, which had become a basic point in his preaching.

He experienced another important vision: outside his house he heard a voice from the inside calling him 'Levi'. Looking towards his house he saw a square lamp with twenty-eight candles, seven on each side. From that moment he knew that he had been entrusted with a mission, like that of Moses, to guide his brothers. Many times he told me: 'The One who directed Moses

is the One who directed me.' He thought himself to be in direct communication with God through his visions, singing, 'No one can boast dominion over me, but the One is at my side.'

The first followers, Cerrone Bonfitto and others, answered his call. One day in 1931 they heard from a pedlar that there were many Jews in the towns. Manduzio wrote to the Rabbi of Rome, Dr. Angelo Sacerdotti, who thought it was a joke and replied only to the third letter. He asked Manduzio how he had heard the Holy Word. Manduzio answered: 'I have not heard the Word from anyone. God Himself has revealed the Word to me, as He did to our father Abraham.' In 1932 two new-born daughters in the small band of converts were called by biblical names. The Protestants urged the converts to join them, but their efforts availed nothing against Manduzio's influence and his solicitude for his followers.

Some time later (precisely when it is difficult to say, because Manduzio was hazy about dates in his journal), a real Jew came to find out what was afoot in Gargano. He brought several copies of the paper *Israel*. From that time on contact was unbroken. Manduzio was visited many times by 'Jews born in the Law', and he tried to help them when the racial laws made life difficult for them. The converts began to clash with the authorities. They had to pay a fine of 260 lire for a meeting held without prior permission. Manduzio paid the fine, and there for the moment matters rested.

A more important difficulty arose over the Talmud. Constantino Tritto, one of the converts, had an Italian translation of Coen's compendium of the Talmud. Manduzio having found in it too many things 'unsuitable for a son of God whose spirit is weak', forbad it to his followers. According to Mme Cassin, while the Bible fully met the spiritual needs of the group and the Scriptural stories penetrated their imagination, their mentality was too remote from Talmudic reasoning. Similarly, Mme Cassin notes, Donato was alienated from Christ's preaching to townspeople. Manduzio thought of God as a shepherd (the theme of sheep constantly recurred in his visions), or as the owner of a large estate of which he himself was the bailiff.

In 1936 Raffaele Cantoni, on behalf of Rabbi Prato, went to San Nicandro intending to regularize the position of the converts, but nothing happened. Antisemitic propaganda had begun in Italy, and from Rome came advice to await better times. With the promulgation of the racial laws (1938) the group of converts, under surveillance by the police and considered to be outside the law, were at a critical juncture. Cantoni and the Rabbi tried to convince Manduzio's followers that they could not be reckoned as Jews racially. Manduzio protested, felt himself abandoned, and got in touch again with the Protestants, only to realize how he differed from them. At this period the little community was assailed by petty quarrels and illness. Manduzio believed that the sickness was due to breaches of the commandments. Acts of penitence and promises to sin no more would restore health. Manduzio divined the fate of the sick in his visions.

During the war the authorities, being otherwise preoccupied, left the converts unmolested. In October 1943 Gargano was liberated by Allied forces. One day some jeeps passed which were marked with the Shield of David. At once the converts made a blue and white flag with the Shield of David on it which they hoisted to attract attention. Some Palestinian soldiers saw the

flag and went into Manduzio's house; further visits followed, but the soldiers could not understand the converts. A military chaplain, Dr. Urbach, came on the scene who, after a long discussion, asked Manduzio whether he wanted to become a Jew. He replied: 'I wish to live by the Law God gave to the Jews.' Among the soldiers was the martyr Enzo Sereni who visited Manduzio many times.

The visits of the soldiers caused new disagreements in the group. Donato was jealous of them and disapproved of their plans to get the converts to emigrate to Palestine after the war. In his view, emigration should wait on the fulfilment of the messianic promise, especially since he hoped to make more converts in Gargano. In 1945 the Union of Italian Jewish Communities sent me to San Nicandro to attempt a reconciliation, and a 'peace treaty' was signed on 15 August. Shortly afterwards Manduzio wrote: 'Visions have begotten us and the Law of Sinai has led us to the light.' [Note the perfect parallelism between vision and Law.] And a little later he wrote: 'I, Manduzio D.L.M. [meaning Donato Levi Maestro], cannot say that the God of Prophets is not my God. He lies who says that the Holy One does not reveal Himself, because the Creator is just and will be just. If He does not reveal Himself, it is because we do not seek Him either in the Law or in the Prophets.'

Discussions went on with Tritto, Cerrone, and Marocchella. They took their complaints against him to Rome, and he for his part wrote letter after letter asking that their position be regularized by circumcision. On 29 July 1946 I was sent to San Nicandro to arrange the ceremony. Dr. Arnaldo Ascarelli performed the *milot* of thirteen men, some on 4 August and some on 8 August. Manduzio was not operated on because of his age and poor health. A few days later the ritual bath took place in the sea at Tor Miletta. Thus Manduzio realized his great dream and could await his end in peace. He died on 13 March 1948. The followers then received training for emigration to Israel, and those who had not been circumcized underwent the operation. By 1949 nearly all had left for Israel. A very few remained in San Nicandro with Manduzio's widow. They carried on their usual meetings on Friday nights and Saturday mornings.

Before leaving for Israel Marocchella lived for a while in Apricena, a village near San Nicandro, somewhat less backward but still very poor. Here he taught his new faith and converted some twenty agricultural labourers and organized them in the same way as the converts of San Nicandro had been organized. They too wanted to emigrate to Israel. I went to stay with them for a few days in 1950. The would-be elect told me of their poverty-stricken existence and their misery, and I returned to Rome not greatly convinced of their faith. For a while they insisted on being accepted, and then they stopped writing. In spring 1951 the Jewish Agency agreed to their request; but when I wrote to them they replied that they preferred to stay as they were. Their attempt was certainly attributable only to their hope of finding a better life than the one they knew.

For the converts of San Nicandro *aliya* was a leap in the dark. They abandoned their houses. Cerrone and Marocchella, who had some land, left it to go waste. When they reached Israel they settled at Alma in the Galilee, near Safed, where there was a *moshav* of Italian-speaking *olim* from Tripolitania. They were in the care of a young Tunisian rabbi of Italian origin, Rabbi

Goez, who lived in a nearby village and who looked after them with great understanding. From an agricultural point of view Alma was similar to San Nicandro. In spite of all this, they did not like the life, and presently the group broke up. Cerrone went to Acre, to a house which had belonged to Arabs, to live with his sons who had fought in the War of Liberation. When his daughters married in Jerusalem he followed them there; there too were Marocchella and his wife working as dressmakers. Others chose to live in the Negev near the Egyptian border. I visited them there in 1953 on behalf of the Israel Ministry of Religious Affairs. They all seemed happy. They had learned the language. The children went to school. They were well adjusted to the new conditions. Only Ciro di Salvia left his family and went back to die in San Nicandro; he was a disabled soldier of the First World War and was in financial difficulties, not being able to get his pension.

Mme Cassin devotes a chapter of her book to the visions referred to in Manduzio's journal and to the many prayers he composed. She believes that because there were no possibilities of revolt or emigration in the Fascist period, all that was left to the peasants of Gargano was religious speculation —whence such phenomena as Manduzio and Padre Pio da Petralcina. While it is possible to point to other converts to Judaism in South Italy and the Islands who were of a higher intellectual calibre than Manduzio, he is a special case in that his strength of personality allowed him to gather around him men and women who had already joined and then left various Christian denominations. He gave them a faith which defended them both against the Protestants who wished to attract them and official Judaism which was separated from Manduzio by 2,500 years of religious development. Donato takes us back to the times of the Patriarchs. Thanks to him the encounter of the peasants of the Gargano with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob has been fruitful. Mme Cassin ends her book on this religious reformer of the atomic age with the following words: 'The heaven he opened to his followers has never been closed.'

This is a book which, for its objectivity and careful presentation, everyone, whatever his religious persuasion, should read.

SAN NICANDRO: A SOCIOLOGICAL COMMENT

Joseph Ben-David

(Review Article)

I

PROPHECY is almost an extinct phenomenon in the Western World. Mme Cassin's book, reviewed in the last article by Rabbi Ravenna, presents, therefore, an exciting challenge to students of society and human personality. What social conditions made prophecy a possible role in a twentieth-century European community? If social conditions for prophecy existed (a matter which can be tested by the existence of other contemporary prophets) what types of individuals became prophets? Why did Manduzio choose the 'return' to Judaism rather than remain within the fold of Christianity? Who joined the sect and why? What was the effect of joining the sect on the social behaviour of its members?

Mme Cassin does not specify the particular questions which she is going to answer. By what she defines as a partly ethnographic, partly historical approach (p. 8) she boldly sets out to explain everything without specifying anything. There is in consequence a great deal of material which is irrelevant, and suggestions which are misleading. Yet her main point is convincing and original, a genuine contribution to the sociological study of religion. I shall attempt, therefore, to separate the various threads which run through the second, explanatory part of the book ('Setting and History', pp. 101–78), by presenting first what I believe is the core of the explanation, following the author in the main but trying to make explicit some of the things which are only implied in what she writes, and then by examining one after the other the author's subsidiary hypotheses and some other pertinent questions which have not been raised in her book.

The explanation takes the form of a concise account of the mythology and social history of the Gargano promontory and often of Apulia (to which Gargano belongs) as a whole. Mention made of the region in classical mythology and the account of its ancient and most of its medieval history do not contribute anything to the understanding of the prophecy of Donato Manduzio. Still, events seem to take on significance from the surprisingly early period of the fourteenth century. 'Gargano at this period of the Middle Ages and for some time to come was in the main stream of European history. Then stagnation set in and the currents of history passed it by. More and more the region sank into an antiquated economic equilibrium which was incapable of any kind of evolution' (p. 113).

The crucial event was the establishment of the Tavoliere land system

which gave exclusive rights of pasturage over large tracts of land to shepherds who paid a certain toll to the king. Besides this right of pasturage shepherds had the enviable right of coming under the jurisdiction of an official of the king, instead of being subject, like the peasants to baronial jurisdiction. In consequence, the 'region once rich and fertile was condemned to an obsolete pastoral economy'. Progressive impoverishment of the land then created a social structure which prevented all possibility of reform. The mechanism seemed to work like this: the shepherds destroyed the livelihood of the peasants by grazing their sheep on their land. They could not do otherwise, since without the pastures in the plains their sheep would have perished. The peasants were unable to defend their interests against the shepherds protected by the king. The king and the barons were not interested in reform either. The shepherds' toll was still a sure income for the Crown in the eighteenth century, and the land barons earned their income by ruthlessly exploiting the peasant. Thus the only class which had an immediate interest in change were the peasants. They were, however, so oppressed, isolated, and backward that they were not only unable to help themselves, but could not even conceive of rational plans for bettering their station in life.

To these classes of the society there was soon added another one, the brigands. Brigandage seems to have been endemic to the region at least since the sixteenth century (p. 126). The brigands came from the peasants and the shepherds, who had little to lose, and sometimes much to gain by becoming outlaws. In this situation where there was no way for the poor man to better himself as long as he acted according to the law, he could escape his fate only through illegal means. The brigands were not simple criminals; they were the heroes of the poor, for whom they represented the knightly way of life of the medieval legends which had remained until the present century the only reading material of the lower classes. The peasants helped them against the authorities and they in their turn often shared their loot with the poor. The Crown and the nobles used the brigands whenever it suited their purpose and destroyed them whenever they became too powerful. Brigandage thus contributed to social stagnation: it drained off the enterprising and the strong into deviance devoid of collective purpose; it morally justified the oppression of the poor whose élite the brigands in a way were; and it hopelessly alienated the poor from any social class above them. Thus strife between the classes became endemic, and created an unsurmountable obstacle for the formation of civic consciousness and responsibility.

This fateful connection became especially clear in the nineteenth century when the peasants under the leadership of brigands fought on the side of the Bourbons and the Pope first against the liberals, and subsequently against the French and the Piedmontese. Not that the peasants accepted the monarchist philosophy. They were only used by the nobles as they had been used by them in their private feuds for hundreds of years. Impervious to any of the warring ideologies, the peasants readily identified the rising urban middle class as their exploiters and enemies (which they in a sense were, having become the new owners of the land) and fought their age old quixotic battle against all established order under the banner of the Old Régime.

These were the conditions which maintained what can be described perhaps as a state of 'societal fixation'. The peasant population of a whole

area had continued to live well into the present century in a medieval world. The poor were poor, and the rich rich, the law was private, and the world unchangeable except by God. The ideologies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries could not penetrate this world. Medieval chronicles, legends of saints, and popular magic were the intellectual environment in which Manduzio grew up in the first decades of this century.

Even as a description of the emergence of a subculture, and an analysis of the forces which maintain its balance, this is exceptionally interesting material. But Mme Cassin also succeeds in showing that the whole religious movement to which Manduzio belonged sprang out of the background of this subculture. The connexion is as follows. The closed world of the peasants seemed to have opened up at the turn of the century. Redistribution of the Church, domanial, and 'mixed' lands (those shared by the barons and the communes), designed to some extent for the benefit of the peasants, only led to their greater concentration in the hands of capitalist landowners. The poor peasants who lost their customary rights of wood-cutting, gleaning, and pasture now became a small town proletariat living on seasonal labour. At the same time immigration to America opened new horizons of social advance. People pried loose from their rural isolation and their ancient ways of livelihood suddenly brought into contact with the image of a much larger and more advanced world than the one they had known were ready to join secular social movements and abandon their traditional religion. The syndicalist leagues provided the peasant labourers with a social framework alternative to the Church for celebrating holidays and such personal events as birth, death, and marriage. Thus the clergy, who had never been too popular, rapidly lost their hold on the spiritual life of the peasants. They became an indistinguishable part of the 'enemy' middle and upper classes (pp. 147–53).

However, all these beginnings of social change were stopped before they could gather momentum. Italian immigration to the United States was severely restricted in 1921, and Fascism put an end to syndicalism and social reform. 'These were the years when evangelical preaching began to bear fruit in Gargano and Apulia' (p. 167).[1] It was as if the interrupted movement of social betterment through emigration and political action transformed itself into a movement of seeking personal redemption in religious revival. A wave of religious ecstasy swept through Southern Italy in the twenties and the thirties, manifesting itself in a proliferation of Protestant sects and popular Catholic saints.[2] Manduzio's prophecy was part of this general wave of seeking salvation.

All the data and—I believe—the essence of this interpretation are Mme Cassin's (pp. 167–71), though they are interspersed with other data which, as it will be shown later, are largely irrelevant.[3] Sociologically this is a plausible explanation. A society 'stranded . . . on the margins of history' (p. 177) emerges at the beginning of this century from a practically medieval world. Some of the circumstances of the process are reminiscent of the rise of seventeenth-century English Puritanism. In both cases there are religious ecstasy, preaching by both men and women, scenes of adult baptism, lack of dignity and restraint during the services, and claims to revelation. In both cases these phenomena are characteristic of a class which had lost its rural roots in the near past as a result of changes in land tenure; became alienated

from traditional religion and official clergy; had been oppressed cruelly by a ruling class; and brought into contact with powerful ideological movements and the vague vision of a rapidly expanding world which destroyed the hold of medieval, local magic upon the soul. In both cases the reaction to the situation by ecstatic religion was preceded or accompanied by widespread delinquency and violent strife between the classes.[4]

The scale and the sequence of the events were different in both places. While the English Puritans fought the Establishment with their new religion, the Italians only escaped into religion when they had to cease fighting—and the wave of religious ecstasy seems to have come to an end, with the change in political conditions since the end of the Second World War.[5] Also the class structure of England in the seventeenth century was already more complex than that of Southern Italy at the beginning of this century. There is a complete lack of middle-class Puritanism—or of a middle class in the seventeenth-century English sense at all—in most parts of Southern Italy. Although one of the sects, the Christian Brethren, is of a non-ecstatic character whose behaviour reminds one of the calculating rationalism and ostentatious piety of middle-class Presbyterianism, the members of this sect also come from the lower classes. At best, therefore, Italian Puritanism is but a faint echo of seventeenth-century England, and will probably remain but a passing episode in history. But all this makes it a no less interesting case for the sociologist who tries to understand the recurrent regularity of social events: elements which once produced a well-known historical situation re-appear in a different sequence and different proportions in a changed historical context producing phenomena which belong to the same general kind as those which appeared in the original situation.

II

This interpretation then places the San Nicandro Jewish sect right into the Protestant movement of Southern Italy. It explains the emergence of the movement and the conditions which made prophecy a possible social role in this twentieth-century community. Thus the case of Manduzio and his sect can be placed into a broad category which includes phenomena ranging from English Puritanism to presumably the various Messianic movements which thrive nowadays in Oceania and Africa. The Italian case should be an important link between the two ends in the comparative study of these movements.

But the explanation of the general phenomenon does not yet explain the particular case. Why did Manduzio hit upon ancient Judaism—as no one else did before—in the general movement of return to the Bible as a religious source? Was this pure chance or was there something which predisposed either Manduzio as an individual or Southern Italians as a group to make this discovery? Mme Cassin considers both possibilities. She considers chance as a possible explanation: '. . . Donato's movement seems more or less normal, a return, like Protestantism, to the original sources. He merely went further back than the Protestants' (p. 173). But this does not seem quite a satisfactory explanation. If this was just another case of going back to the sources, then others ought to have come to the same conclusion before. It was

a too obvious possibility to be missed by so many seekers of the truth since the seventeenth century. Of course knowledge of actual Judaism by other would-be discoverers could explain why they discarded return to Judaism as a solution for their seeking of redemption. But there were presumably others in seventeenth-century England and twentieth-century Italy who knew nothing of living Jews, and furthermore Manduzio stuck to Judaism even after he found the Jews and in spite of his awareness that his was a different Judaism from theirs.

Mme Cassin seems to be aware of the need of further explanation and suggests (pp. 31–5) that there was an affinity between the timeless world of the Gargano peasants and shepherds and the pastoral life of ancient Jews. She apparently reaches this conclusion partly on the basis of intuition and partly on the basis of the imagery of Manduzio's visions which often read as genuinely Biblical. This interpretation has to be rejected. Nothing in the life of the urbanized peasant proletariat resembles the life of the Hebrew nomads or the Biblical Jewish kingdoms. All the empirical evidence which the author produces, some of it with the explicit purpose of proving her view that Manduzio's discovery of Judaism was a socially plausible phenomenon and that his prophecy found social response, proves the opposite. As a matter of fact all the other cases of return to Judaism in Southern Italy were, by her own account (pp. 173–4), obviously influenced by the dramatic events of the establishment of the State of Israel, and belong therefore to an entirely different category from Manduzio. Besides, the account of the sect and its disintegration, the small numbers of its members even at the peak of its development, and the lack of any impression which it left on the people of the town, all show that the author's sociological view, which is so satisfactory in explaining the Protestant movement in general, is definitely misleading in the explanation of the particular case of Manduzio's Judaism.

This question then has to be left open. The preceding considerations definitely point towards the need of a psychological explanation. Unlike the general phenomenon of the spread of Protestantism, which was a social phenomenon, Manduzio's discovery of Judaism must be explained by some quality of his unique personality. In Mme Cassin's book he emerges as something different from the numerous other visionaries of modern times. There seems to be no trace of deception in him; his perception of religious truth was always clear and firm, not to be shaken by either opportunity or authority.[6] And the often complete blending of his prophetic imagery with Biblical situations and figures (Abraham, who was the first to whom God revealed Himself; Joseph, who was abandoned by his brothers; Moses, the leader and Elisha, the healer) suggests that it was a unique psychological affinity which led Manduzio to the Jewish prophets.[7] But a much more detailed biography of Manduzio and a much more rigorous analysis of his visions and writings is needed to say anything definite on the subject.

III

Parallel to this historical-sociological explanation or intertwined with it runs another theory: that the visions of Manduzio and others of his contemporaries were a manifestation of some peculiar religious genius endemic

to the region which could not find adequate expression in the Catholic religion because catholicism in Italy had become too much identified with everyday life and politics. Mme Cassin tries to prove this with an imposing array of data about the saints and visionaries of the area ranging from the dawn of history through the Middle Ages. Unfortunately all this erudition which takes up much of the second part of the book misses the point, since similar data about the same periods of history can be produced about practically any part of the world. Besides, had the religious revival been the result of a permanent characteristic of the region, one would have expected it to be a lasting phenomenon and prevalent in all the classes. Since it was confined to a relatively short period and to the lower classes, the explanation cannot be true.

IV

There still remain the questions: who among the lower classes joined which sect or no sect at all, and why? And what was the effect, if any, of joining the various sects upon the behaviour of people in work, at home, or in any other non-religious situation?

These questions are barely touched by the author, but her few remarks on the subject are suggestive. The already noted differences in religious behaviour between the San Nicandro Jews and Pentecostals, both of whom were inclined to visions and ecstasy, and the Christian Brethren who were not so inclined, were accompanied by differences between the general social behaviour of the adherents of the various sects. Members of the visionary sects are described as generally anarchic, quarrelsome, and spontaneous. The Christian Brethren on the other hand were characterized by their frugality, cleanliness, and reserve.

Thus conversion to Protestantism or Judaism did not alter the behaviour of the members of the visionary sects. They continued to behave as poor (Catholic) peasants and artisans typically behave in Southern Italy. Members of the Christian Brethren, on the other hand, seem to have acquired typically middle-class manners (p. 156).

The differences may be related to economic success. Unfortunately no economic comparisons are made between the Catholics and the Protestants. But there is an interesting remark about the two Protestant groups. Although both come from the same social strata, the Pentecostals (and the Jews too?) seem to be usually poorer than the Christian Brethren (p. 157). Is this because the latter are recruited from socially mobile people? Or is their 'rational' behaviour, as well as their relative success, the result of the discipline imposed upon them by the sect? One cannot answer these questions on the basis of Mme Cassin's material. But if her scantily documented observations are valid, then Southern Italy may well be the place for the investigation of Max Weber's hypothesis about the influence of Protestant *ethos* on the rationality of economic conduct.[8]

V

A different clue to the understanding of why different people joined different sects is furnished by the scattered glimpses one gets about differences

in the relationship between the sexes in the visionary sects (Jews, Pentecostals) on the one hand, and the Christian Brethren on the other hand. It has to be emphasized that this factor is obviously one that Mme Cassin has not taken into consideration, and therefore the information she provides on the subject is incomplete and unsystematic. The interpretation to be put forward has therefore no claim to empirical validity. It seems, however, to have some explanatory value, and it was strongly suggested—at least to this reader—by some of the descriptions in the book.

Among the members of the visionary sects conjugal dissensions are perpetual; the Christian Brethren, on the other hand, lead harmonious family lives (p. 156). These differences in the relations between the sexes within the family go together with differences in the participation of the sexes in the activities of the sects. Women seem to be more active and equal in the visionary sects than amongst the Christian Brethren.

They were prominent amongst Manduzio's following. They joined the sect or stayed in it sometimes without their husbands (pp. 43–4). From a brief description of a visit to the house of a Pentecostal leader, where the author was followed by a 'number of women, either friends of B. (the leader) or simply curious . . .', one of whom told her of a vision of hers (as did some of the men present), one gains a similar impression of equal and common participation of the sexes in the religious community. On the other hand, at a service of the Christian Brethren the sexes were segregated, and women wore veils (pp. 155–7).

Thus while the family lives of the members of the visionary sects appear as unstable and unsatisfactory, with the authority of the husband often impaired, the sect itself strikes one as a large family. Manduzio was a real patriarch, the head of a 'family' of 'brothers' and 'sisters' and adjudicator in their continuous quarrels. And there is a similar family atmosphere in the Pentecostal service just cited. One gets the impression that the sect supplemented the family group. It seems as if joining a sect centred around a strong patriarchal leader was a solution of the conflict faced by people, especially women, whose families were unable to enlist their loyalty as demanded by local tradition.[9]

This interpretation is not at variance with the explanation of the adherence to the different sects on the basis of class differences. Indeed, it may provide one of the connecting links between class situation and joining the sect, since the weakness of the nuclear family, and of the authority of the husband, is itself a result of class situation, namely of extreme poverty and social immobility.[10]

VI

The book ends on a hopeful note: ' . . . a society thrown back on itself and stranded by circumstances on the margin of history, an anachronistic society and in some way "underdeveloped", displays its extraordinary vitality at a time when the industrialized world offers merely ready-made solutions. Yet when Donato Manduzio wrote that the San Nicandro conversions were like "the miracle of the Creation", he was in one sense right. He himself was the miracle. . . . Thanks to him the encounter of the Gargano peasants

with the God of Abraham, and of Isaac and of Jacob has been fruitful . . . The heaven he opened to his followers has never been closed' (pp. 177–8). Rabbi Ravenna who quotes the last sentence of the passage, seems to share Mme Cassin's evaluation of the San Nicandro story.

The facts do not support their feelings. One can agree that Donato Manduzio was a miracle. But he was a miracle because he was able to create a religious world of his own and maintain his integrity in spite of being aware that his prophecy was not accepted by either the Jews or the people of his hometown—or in other words, because of his conduct in failure rather than his success.

With his departure, to use Mme Cassin's own simile, the heaven he opened has been closed. There did not emerge a school of prophecy, there were practically no new converts to Judaism, and his few original followers became dispersed and secularized. Emigration and social changes since the Second World War have short-circuited the religious revival of Southern Italy. People have as a matter of fact preferred the 'ready-made solutions' of the industrial world to their religious visions, and perhaps this could not be otherwise. No conceivable purpose is served by concealing that as a religious movement (as distinct from an achievement in personal integrity) the San Nicandro conversion was a freak. This makes the story no less interesting, nor does it detract from Mme Cassin's merit in presenting it well and explaining its broad historical and social background with insight and erudition. One only hopes that she or someone else will take up the story again and clarify the questions which still remain unanswered.

NOTES

[1] The missionaries were former Italian immigrants to America who were converted to Protestantism and then returned to the old country to spread their new faith (p. 167).

[2] Including a case of a false Messiah. Santa Rosa of Rodi prophesied the precise date of her own death and of the end of the War for 1942 (pp. 171–2). Her failure was as dramatic a public event as the failures of various false Messiahs were in the Middle Ages.

[3] Cf. also the summary of her views in Cassin, H., 'Quelques facteurs historiques et sociaux de la diffusion du protestantisme en Italie méridionale', *Archives de Sociologie des Religions, 2,* Juillet–Décembre 1956, pp. 55–72.

[4] Cf. Davies, G., *The Early Stuarts: 1603–1660,* Oxford, 1937, pp. 193, 272 ff.

[5] According to a recent report, the continuity of the Pentecostal movement in Southern Italy is seriously threatened by desertion of the people to the more 'respectable' sects. Cf. Miegge, M., 'La diffusion du Protestantisme dans les zones sous développées de l'Italie méridionale', *Archives de Sociologie des Religions, 8,* Juillet–Décembre, 1959, p. 91.

[6] One may even speculate whether by the standards of Jewish religious law he should be considered a 'true' prophet; he was never apparently proved wrong (pp. 44–5).

[7] In this connexion it is worth mentioning that in one of his letters to the (Chief?) Rabbi (of Italy?) Manduzio suggested the opening of a school of prophecy (p. 176).

[8] A recent investigation of this hypothesis in the U.S. did not prove conclusive. Cf. R. W. Mack, R. J. Murphy, and S. Yellin, 'The Protestant Ethic, Level of Aspiration and Social Mobility: An Empirical Test', *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 21 (1956), pp. 295–300. But Italian Protestantism today may be more comparable to seventeenth-century English Puritanism, than the present-day American one.

Interesting evidence for the class interpretation of the differences between

the sects comes from Miegge. According to his data, the Pentecostal movement is almost entirely confined to Southern Italy, while of about a 100 communities of Christian Brethren there are only 23 in the South. He also reproduces parts of an autobiography (of Francesco Chironna), a man belonging to the generation of Manduzio (12 years his junior) who eventually became a leader in one of the communities of the Christian Brethren. He is definitely what one would call a person predisposed to social mobility. As a ten-year-old, he persuaded his father to emigrate to the U.S., and had it been up to him, they would have remained there. He also discovered the truth through reading the Bible, but shunned visions and used 'reasoning' in his search for religion. Cf. op. cit., pp. 83, 92–4.

[9] On the overwhelming moral importance of the nuclear family in Southern Italy, cf. Banfield, E. C., *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*, Glencoe, Ill., 1958.

[10] Cf. Smith, R. T., *The Negro Family in British Guiana*, London, 1956, pp. 240–54.

SHORTER NOTICES

Premier Colloque Méditerranéen de Florence, Proceedings of a Conference organized in Florence, 3–6 October 1958, by the Congrès pour la Paix et la Civilisation Chrétienne et la revue 'Etudes Méditerranéennes', 144 pp., Congrès Méditerranéen de la Culture, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence.

Sociologically and perhaps in other ways, the notion of 'the Mediterranean' is in the air. I know of three recent enterprises in the direction of studying or contemplating it and endowing it with the status of an 'area', and no doubt there are others of which I do not know. Why should all this have happened? I suppose one can see the answer if one supposes that the image-evoking cultures of America—New England Yankees, the Deep (Tennessee Williams) South, the French Canadians, plus, say, the Navaho and the Iroquois and one or two recent immigrant groups—had all been concentrated along the climatically and visually most attractive part of the States, the Southern Californian coast, instead of being inconveniently scattered in cold, hot or arid zones. If this were so, we should no doubt have seen a *real* proliferation of cross-cultural whatnot studies on the spot. But now that money is beginning to flow this side of the Atlantic, I can see it all coming: Culturally Conditioned Psychosis in Naples, the Perception of Time in Algeria, The Changing Role of First Cousins in the Lebanon (all these are real examples).

The volume under review contains the proceedings, the 'minutes' (as the editorial note remarks, employing the English word in inverted commas), of a Conference held in Florence in October 1958. The list of contributors is impressive, and includes men of the highest academic distinction and, also, of the greatest political importance. This was a Conference at which Professors and Statesmen (and some who can claim to be both) met, and it was clearly inspired by the hope that ideas, intellectual comprehension and some kind of sense of Mediterranean unity, would help solve, or reduce the bitterness of, contemporary conflicts. The Mediterranean was credited with the parentage of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Humanism, and the hope was fostered that the notion of 'the Mediterranean' would be a clue to the resolution of the conflicts occurring in this geographical area. The Arab-Israeli and the Franco–Algerian conflicts, an acute awareness of which runs as the main theme through the more than thirty contributions, provide a very poignant substance for what might otherwise have been a set of formal postprandial speeches.

The fact that this was essentially a political occasion, even if one in which the attempt was made to elevate current conflict by raising it to a higher level of historical

and social awareness, makes the volume both more and less interesting. Though it does contain some ideas, it does not contain scholarly analyses or documentation in support of them: and given the context and the limitations of space, it could not be expected to. On the other hand, it is of historical interest as a record of what persons playing a crucial role in contemporary history were prepared to have on the record in 1958. Morocco, for instance, was represented by three of its most crucial figures (Prince Moulay Hassan, Allal al Fassi, and Mehdi ben Barka).

It was, no doubt, a very great achievement to get FLN Algerians and French Senators, Israelis, and Arabs to take part simultaneously and engage in a dialogue, however cloudily. The Conference proceedings tell us almost nothing about the hidden real history of it, the absences, conditions, informal relationships, and lack of relationships. It would be interesting to know about these. It would also be nice to be able to share the hope—*Spes contra spem* is the motto of the volume—that historical sociologizing and cultural philosophy really could have the political efficacy expected from them.

ERNEST GELLNER

MICHAEL BANTON, *White and Coloured, The Behaviour of British People towards Coloured Immigrants*, pp. 223, Jonathan Cape, London, 1959, 21*s*.

The American reviewer studies Dr. Banton's important book with an eye towards American comparisons, though the book makes none systematically. Comparison is an anthropological tool, and justifiable here the more because of the export of American ideas. As the book is learned, imaginative, useful, and gracefully presented, it invites appraisal by comparisons.

The greatest point of contrast with the American biracial scene is the English concept, which Dr. Banton presents illuminatingly (chap. v, especially p. 76), of the coloured as 'strangers' in the traditional class-organized society—hopelessly so, for 'it is hard, very hard, for a stranger to become British' (p. 78). In the U.S., whether class-structured South or egalitarian North, Negroes are among the oldest of Americans, and other newcomers are potential Americans. The traditional burden that American Negroes bear is 'keeping their place', for their place *is* in America, named first by a system of slavery, then by a system of discrimination. Britons feel the coloured place is *not* in the U.K. precisely because they are not-Britons but *foreigners*, as is readily signalized by complexion.

To the American, 'coloured' means Negro, i.e. American-born descendants of enslaved Africans; Negro is the paradigm for all other non-European Americans like Indians, Orientals, Mexicans; but only Negroes are much valued. In Britain, 'coloured' *includes* Negroes with almost every other group in the British colonies, Commonwealth, and other lands bordering the Mediterranean, even some Jewish Caucasians. This leads Dr. Banton to isolate two great polarities of U.K. society: 'British' and 'foreign'. To Americans, 'foreigners' live overseas; upon entering the U.S., if not White-Anglo-Saxon Protestants (termed WASPS by some Californians), they become categorical 'minorities', and so, watchdogs of WASP liberties.

Dr. Banton argues convincingly that U.K. exclusion of 'foreigners' results from a view of human dignity that esteems the man retaining his traditional identity (p. 78). The comparable U.S. view contrarily honours the man adopting ways of the new land, to moderate his 'difference'. A great manifold apparatus of Americanization continually enunciates instructions to further 'assimilation', and success lies in older Americans acknowledging, 'I never would have guessed. . . .' Opposed to American explicitness, is British tacitness, Dr. Banton's 'unspoken language' (Part II), compounded by a reluctance to assimilate. Thus, British tacitness and American explicitness about culture are tested by new immigrants, whose arrival tests also contrasting views of national responsibility towards them. Britons and Americans treat coloured today as they do comparable others, U.K. 'strangers' or U.S. 'minorities', but more harshly (cp. pp. 84, 101). The coloured colonial is the 'stranger par excellence' (pp. 90–1, but Dr. Banton indicates that this is now altering, p. 95).

Radical differences between coloured-white situations in the U.K. and the U.S. are the smallness of the numbers in the U.K. (less than half of one per cent of U.K. population, against 10 per cent of the U.S.), which means that ultimate absorption there is a real possibility, repeating prior absorptions in western European history; and the recency of arrival in the U.K. (50 years in the U.K. against 350 in the U.S.), which means that confusion and discomfort prevail there rather than a firm system of discrimination, repeating earlier experiences with mass immigration into the U.K. American Negro life is integral with the general American society and culture; Dr. Banton shows that 'solidarity' of coloured life in Britain lies only in affirming opposition to whites (p. 124).

In the U.S. both coloured and white know the score in biracial situations. In the U.K. nobody does, and Dr. Banton therefore offers a manual called 'Ten Commandments of Inter-Group Relations' (pp. 187–94)—thus violating his own fine exposition of traditional British tacitness, avoidance of issues (pp. 111–13), and liking for 'ambiguous' behaviour (p. 184). The Commandments are one of the first compilations by a Briton systematizing interracial actualities in the U.K. This, and the growing responsibility assumed by ruling groups over biracial events, give the present U.K. scene an aspect like that evolving in the U.S. (and opposed to that of the Union of South Africa) where situations are structured less by race ranking than after the usual models, though evaluated tacitly and spontaneously by yesterday's traditions of race ranking.

The great American sanction on race difference is the persisting taboo on intermarriage, matching the old English one on class intermarriage. The same sex clichés of depreciation flourish in the two countries, attributing to male Negroes extra-human potency, making them 'non-persons' (pp. 130–1) in the U.K., and animals-criminals in the U.S. Hence an American marvels at Banton's puzzlement over middle-class Englishwomen professing physical repugnance for Negro males (p. 144) when comparable fears of American womanhood flourished and contributed to a poignant literature and a fierce epoch of lynching. Dr. Banton's concluding query about U.K. 'shabbily' treating coloured otherwise liked (p. 210) also seems to an American to have an answer, since 'loving Negroes' in the old South rarely seemed there sufficient cause for respecting them.

RUTH LANDES

S. ADLER-RUDEL, *Ostjuden in Deutschland 1880–1940*, xii + 169 pp. 1959. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen. (*Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Institute of Jews from Germany 1.*) DM. 21.

This small, but comprehensive, work records yet another chapter in the tragic history of the Wandering Jew in twentieth-century Europe. It is an original, well-documented analysis of those Eastern European Jews (*Ostjuden*) who passed through or settled in Germany between 1880 and 1940; it examines their political, economic, and social background, their legal status in Germany, their reception by German Jewry—to whom until then the *Ostjuden* were merely an academic subject—and the welfare organizations founded for their benefit, which in the final years, alas, had to cater also for their creators.

The study, the contents of which should be widely known, surveys the subject chronologically, highlighting the specific problems of successive waves of migrations. Germany before the First World War was usually regarded by those *Ostjuden* fleeing from Russian pogroms as a stepping-stone, and the *Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden* endeavoured to speed their onward journey, being criticized at the same time for its lack of hospitality. Eventually, the problem of mass-immigration became so acute that the fear was expressed that these Wandering Jews would have to be returned to their 'homelands' unless international Jewry came to their aid. But, the author shows, German Jewish antipathy to their co-religionists made even this difficult, as detailed for example in a letter from the historian H. Graetz, and in at least one place (Frankfurt), fund-raising was therefore a clandestine activity. In spite of German Jewry's lack of hospitality, nevertheless, some immigrants, especially young intellectuals,

attempted to settle as they realized that only in Germany, and more particularly in Berlin, would they be able to pursue their studies. But even there they were cold-shouldered by their Jewish fellow-students, and, generally taking no part in the life of the community in which they dwelt, they created their own Zionist Russian-speaking *Verein*. In contradistinction to these students were those who entered the theological seminaries of Berlin and Breslau, and made their impact on German-Jewish life. Thus, even in spite of hostility and police measures, the movement westwards continued until 1914, by which time there were 90,000 foreign Jews in Germany, mainly living in the larger towns, concentrating in a few districts and contributing to German industry and commerce. Their cultural links with German Jewry were however few, and for this our author blames again the latter's chilly attitude towards the *Ostjuden*, whom they tended to regard as inferior, and, although they had to pay communal taxes, they were debarred from the franchise, and discouraged from taking part in cultural or Zionist activities, except in the smaller communities where they were sometimes not unwelcome as *Minyan*-men. Thus segregated by their intolerant co-religionists, they formed their own societies, receiving occasional encouragement from German Jews, especially journalists, who endeavoured to show their countrymen the treasures and heritage of Eastern Jewry's culture.

At the outbreak of war in 1914 foreign Jews were either enlisted or interned (history was to repeat itself in 1940 when 'enemy aliens' were interned in Great Britain). Simultaneously, Jews from the border-lands were driven east by the advancing German army and persecuted in Poland, or transported westwards to help the German war effort, on the understanding that they would not be repatriated until the end of the war. This 'arrangement' was not fully understood at first by all the workers, who eventually escaped and found their way to Berlin, thereby creating a new problem—that of the Polish Jewish worker in Germany—which became the concern of Julius Berger whose endeavours found recognition by the Prussian authorities and who was instrumental in the establishment of the *Sekretariat für Ostjüdische Arbeiter*. By the end of the war, moreover, the refugee problems had become so multitudinous that German Jewry had at last to take note. At the same time, the war had served to bring back to Judaism Jewish servicemen who had seen the intense Jewish life of Poland, had perhaps even married Polish Jewish girls while there, and now returned to Berlin. These young people formed the Berlin *Volksheim*, which functioned as a Zionist youth centre giving educational and vocational guidance, and which in its decade of existence trained hundreds of *halutzim*, youth leaders and social workers. At the same time also, many Polish Jews were ousted from their jobs by returning German soldiers, and while some were forced to return, others managed to remain, the authorities distinguishing between the pre- and post-1914 arrivals.

In spite of all obstacles, however, Polish-Jewish life in Germany gradually became organized; the Prussian authorities recognized the manifold problems of the *Ostjuden*, and the *Arbeiterfürsorgeamt*, a union of twelve existing Jewish organizations, was brought into being in which the *Ostjuden* were directly represented (!). Leading German Zionists, and more especially those of the Poale Zion, in recognizing the social problems, advocated that all welfare problems should be the concern of one central office, and that existing organizations, such as for example the *Jüdisches Arbeitsamt* (an employment agency), and the *Schomrei Schabbath*, should amalgamate. The *Arbeiterfürsorgeamt*, in which Adler-Rudel was a leading figure, and which outlined its plans in a series of publications, concerned itself mainly with the legal position of the *Ostjuden*, maintained archives, obtained transit papers for emigrants, opened the Berlin *Flüchtlingsheim* in 1920 to alleviate the housing shortage, secured employment for unskilled workers who had lost their jobs to returning soldiers, and in various ways strove to stem the tide of antisemitism. Gradually also with the settlement of Jews from certain districts in *da-heim* in certain districts, cultural life was reorganized, reading rooms were opened, German and Yiddish plays were staged, magazines such as the *Jüdische Arbeiterstimme* (1921) were published, the Berlin Poale Zion house was founded and the representative *Verband der Ostjuden* was formed in 1920. The new post-war influx of intellectuals, often from Russia, presented special problems of integration and employment, which were partly and comparatively rapidly alleviated by the welfare organizations themselves, which employed the refugees as clerks, statisticians, welfare officers, and social workers. The *Vereinigte Komitee für jüdische*

Auswanderung, in particular employed many Russian Jews, while others worked independently as journalists, writers, poets and in other cultural pursuits, to such a degree that the Berlin of the 1920s witnessed a rich harvest of Yiddish literature and cultural phenomena which served to break down finally the barrier between east and west. By now the Eastern Jewish intellectuals felt that there was not even enough encouragement and scope for their talent among German Jewry, and so they founded their own literary club 'Schalom Aleichem' in 1924. However, the *Ostjuden* saw the gathering clouds of Nazism early, and by the end of the 1920s much of this activity ceased and the large-scale movement westwards recommenced, forming again an international problem; the Eastern Jews' legal position rapidly deteriorated, arrests and deportations ensued and during the economic depression many left for Northern France, Alsace, and Lorraine. The *Arbeiterfürsorgeamt* continued to be recognized by the Prussian government, and at the death in 1924 of its leading spirit, F. M. Kaufmann, underwent within a few years a complete reorganization and reallocation of positions in which our author was also involved. Gradually the economic condition of German Jewry also worsened, foreign financial help had to be accepted, social welfare organizations catered for the needs of *Ostjuden* and *Westjuden*, and the *Hauptstelle für jüdische Wanderfürsorge* was established in 1925 to deal with social problems whatever and wherever their origins. Social work now became an aspect of communal life and a specific type of Jewish social worker emerged, who had received his training as a Zionist youth leader, student, and worker, and who saw in social welfare work the obvious culmination of his training and upbringing. By 1930 enough social welfare machinery was in existence to cope with the 1933 catastrophe, and thus organizations created by German Jewry for Eastern Jewries served to succour their very founders. The dissolution of German Jewry was preceded in 1938 by the transportation eastwards to No-man's-land of some 17,000 Polish Jews, and the *Nacht der langen Messer*, after which as the author so poignantly writes in his last chapter, *Das Ende*, '. . . *Deutsche Juden und ausländische Juden erlitten das gleiche Schicksal*'.

Adler-Rudel (i.e. Rudolf Bertram), a leading and experienced Jewish welfare worker and Zionist, profoundly absorbed and occupied by this many-faceted Jewish problem, writes from detailed first-hand knowledge of his subject, bringing to his aid documents, facts, and figures without overburdening the text, thus making the book fascinating reading and vividly bringing back to mind those harassing days in pre-war Nazi Germany. Although intimately connected with the subject, the various organizations, and individuals concerned, the author is generally objective, although his emphasis on certain points and elaboration of others shows his own affiliations and leanings, at the expense of fuller reference to omitted factors. Nevertheless, in spite of such omissions the work remains a valuable contribution to the social history of modern European Jewry. The production of the book is beyond criticism, although it seems difficult to comprehend why it should have been printed and published in Germany, and why its cost is so prohibitive.

RUTH P. LEHMANN

FERDYNAND ZWEIG, *The Israeli Worker*, viii + 305 pp. 1959. Herzl Press and Sharon Books, New York, $5.00.

There must be few countries in the world in which the texture of workaday life appears to be as full of contradictions and paradox as it is in Israel. Professor Zweig, who is well known for his perceptive studies of the British worker, has given us a fascinating picture of the diversity of outlook, the complex pattern of work attitudes, and the unique form of the institutional arrangements that have been developed by Israeli workers.

The Israeli worker, who is the subject of study in this book, is a Jew who might have been born in Palestine (12.2 per cent), in any of the European countries (58.3 per cent), in America or the British Commonwealth (1.0 per cent) or in Asia or North Africa (28.5 per cent). The 'Ingathering of the Exiles' from seventy-two countries, with their many languages and dialects, has produced, as Professor Zweig stresses, an unmatched pattern of group relations. The Jewish immigrant has come from the East and the West, from Christian and Moslem cultures, from the most advanced and

the most backward communities. Among the immigrants have been idealists, refugees and settlers, peasants and professional men, traders and business men. The Israeli worker is compounded of all the races and cultures which have been bound 'together by the common ideals, religious inheritance and the indefinable spiritual aspirations' of the Jewish people. At the same time as he is a passionate believer in the concept of Israel, as a Jewish state, the Israeli worker is also a passionate individualist, highly concerned with his own personal history and destiny.

The Israeli worker with a European background is intellectually a socialist and the political and social structure of Israel has been much influenced by this fact. But a strong ideological preference for socialism has not prevented the development of the most restrictive conditions of employment, designed to promote and protect the interests of a highly privileged class of workers. Whilst the Israeli citizen has accepted a more egalitarian wage and salary structure than that of any other country, a large proportion of workers are employed on a casual basis at lower pay and with lower social security benefits than is provided for the permanently employed élite. Professor Zweig points out that Jewish socialism does not lack romantic appeal. 'But it has great economic drawbacks which may be fatal to the future development of the country. In the long run, even its moral drawbacks become more and more apparent as many unworthy claimants abuse and misuse its principles.'

Will not the Israeli worker from North Africa and Asia, who mainly belongs to the less fortunate category of employees, sooner or later revolt against conditions that are manifestly unjust? Can the Israeli economy continue indefinitely to tolerate the fantastic rigidities imposed by the prevailing employment policies? What is the future of the Histadrut? This remarkable organization, which is literally a state within the state, has certainly played a major role in cementing together the social structure of Israel. But Professor Zweig shows that many basic dilemmas have emerged. One dilemma stems from the conflict between narrow professionalism and a broader concept of a workers' organization serving the nation; another lies in the conflict between trade union and political ends; a third dilemma arises out of the power of the bureaucracy and the demands for a more democratic system of government; a fourth dilemma springs from the many-sidedness of the Histadrut; can the Histadrut continue to represent, at the same time, interests that are in violent conflict? Professor Zweig concludes that as the 'state machinery grows stronger, more experienced and more confident, the Histadrut is bound to relinquish some of its functions and to surrender them to the state'. This may well happen, but it is likely to be a painful process, since power is rarely given up without a struggle.

It may seem unfair to suggest that the author of an excellent book might have extended his analysis to a deeper level of motivation and provided more fundamental explanations of the paradoxical behaviour of workers and the structure of industrial relations in Israel. It would, however, have added greatly to the value of Professor Zweig's study had he tested his findings against such hypotheses, as, for example, suggested by Professor Dunlop, that the behaviour of workers and the forms of their organization are determined primarily by the technology of industry and the character of the product market. One would like to know whether it is really true, as is so often suggested in Israel, that economic and social theories developed elsewhere do not apply to Israeli conditions.

B. C. ROBERTS

PIERRE FLAMAND, *Les communautés israélites du Sud-Marocain*, 380 pp. *Quelques manifestations de l'esprit populaire dans les juiveries du Sud-Marocain*, 219 pp. + photographs.

These two volumes, supported (*honorés de souscriptions*) by an impressive list of Jewish, Moroccan, and French institutions, and printed in Casablanca, do not appear to have a publisher, price, or date of publication: the introduction of the second, smaller volume seems to imply that the work was ended in 1958 and carried out during the preceding ten years. Curiously, the only explicit sign implying that the two volumes are intended to form a unity—apart from the identity of author, subject-matter, format, and the supporting organizations—is a little acknowledgement

concerning photographs at the end of the first and larger volume, which refers to *les deux volumes* as having the common title *Diaspora en Terre d'Islam*. But this title or sub-title, which can be found at the top of pages and, though not very prominently, at the beginning of the first volume, is absent from the title pages of the second. The lack of an index is aggravated by the fact that the tables of contents fail to indicate the number of pages on which the various chapters are to be found.

Nevertheless, this is an extremely valuable and usefully organized collection of material. (But why, for instance, does the map inserted between pages 32 and 33 of the first volume employ in its classification of Southern Moroccan ghettoes the confusing trichotomy 'living', 'agricultural', and 'dead', where the second group clearly cuts across the distinction between the first and the third categories? And why does this map ignore some *mellah* which are no smaller than some which *are* included, and which moreover are referred to elsewhere or even included in the photographs?) One sometimes has the impression that one has come across not a book, but an uncompleted work, and one looks around for the author to tie up the loose ends. Nevertheless, this clearly is *the* source book for information about Southern Moroccan Jewry, and also the starting point for any further sociological interpretations.

The major part of the work appears to have been done prior to the coming of Moroccan independence in 1955–6. Some of the general trends and events of the post-Independence period, are however alluded to, but not really in adequate detail. For instance, the proscription of organized emigration to Israel is mentioned, but not the fate of those unfortunate collectively migrating communities which were caught in the pipe-line on Moroccan territory. In general, one has the impression that the wholly new situation arising in and after 1956 should have been dealt with either more fully or not at all, avoiding what seems like—and perhaps could not but be—a half-hearted attempt to bring the material up-to-date. On the other hand, it is a pity that one is not given fuller information concerning the disabilities, and resistances to them, imposed on Moroccan Jews during the Vichy period.

Southern Morocco, the author remarks, accounts for one third of Moroccan Jewry, the rest being equally divided between Casablanca and the other larger towns. (This again is a little misleading, as rural communities do exist in the North, including Berber-speaking ones in the Rif.) 'To leave the Atlantic coast amounts to employing a time machine.' Certainly, Southern Morocco has preserved archaic forms to a remarkable degree, including Jewish ones. The speed of the time machine, however, is difficult to check, given the obscurity of Southern Moroccan history, well brought out by the author in a cautious sketch of the speculations and legends, both amongst locals and amongst scholars, on this subject, which range from tie-ups of Biblical history with local places to interesting and plausible, but still unsubstantiated, speculations about Berber Judaism prior to Islam.

The author classifies the Southern Jewish communities into three groups, employing categories which seem to me wholly apposite and sociologically valid: there are the urban *mellah*, towns within towns; there are the primarily commercial, medium-sized communities of the pre-Saharan oases; and finally there are the small groups of artisans, and sometimes even peasants, subsisting within the territory of the Berber mountain tribes. Both the inner life and the nature of the symbiosis with the Muslim environment were in the nature of things different in the case of each of these three categories. The fate and safety of the large urban ghettoes reflected the fluctuating strength of the central government. The other two must have depended on subtler mechanisms for their self-maintenance. The pacification of Southern Morocco seems to have not merely brought them safety, but also undermined the economic bases of the oasis trading centres, by releasing full Muslim competition in the commercial sphere. (The old anarchy of Southern Morocco seems to have brought into being, within the world of warring tribes, three kinds of pacific population—the Jews, the negroid oasis cultivators, and the holy lineages. It would be interesting, though by now very difficult, to attempt a comparative study of the way in which each complemented the social structure as a whole. The Pax Gallica, and the modern Moroccan state which inherited its organs, brought safety but also deprived some of them of their near-monopolies in their respective functions. . . .) Concerning the small mountain communities, the author remarks that in their case, the impact of the modern world is lesser for the Jews than the Muslims. This is probably an

exaggeration, but the mere fact that this impact is, anyway, no greater amongst the Jews, is in sharp contrast with the situation in the plain and particularly along the coast.

The second volume complements the first by a collection of legends, proverbs, games, etc.

This study does not tell one all one might wish to know about the internal organization or external relations of Southern Moroccan Jewish communities. Its interpretations are sometimes of an abstract kind, referring to adaptation, influences of surrounding cultures, etc., without sufficient specificity. Nevertheless, it is a unique source of economic, demographic, cultural, and other information, ably if sometimes untidily assembled, and of great value.

It also raises the general practical problem which this subject cannot but suggest to anyone—the future of Moroccan Jewry—and throws light on the factors which will determine its development. Maghrebin Jews, of whom the Moroccans are the largest section, are of all sizeable Jewish communities the one involved in the most unstable social situation, and the most precarious. It is the largest community embedded in an under-developed country (and a dramatically developing one at that), the largest within Islam and within the Arab world, one of the closest in time to a 'mediaeval', pre-emancipation situation, and one of the most rapidly changing ones. The author occasionally expresses pessimism concerning the prospects of some of the communities he has investigated, and it would be difficult to maintain that such a pessimism is unfounded.

ERNEST GELLNER

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

BEN-DAVID, Joseph, M.A., Ph.D. Lecturer in Sociology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Formerly Research Officer, Israel Ministry of Social Welfare. Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, 1957–8. Author of papers in sociological journals and co-author (with S. N. Eisenstadt) of a Hebrew textbook of sociology. Dr. Ben-David is now working on the sociology of science (especially the development of science as a profession) and on intellectuals and ideology in Israel.

CZEKANOWSKI, Jan, Ph.D, Sztandar Pracy I Cl. Member of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Professor Ordinarius of Anthropology, University of Poznan. Author of *Forschungen im Nil-Kongo-Zwischengebiet*, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1911–1927; *Wstęp do Historii Słowian*, 2nd edn., Lwów, 1957; *Zarys Antropologii Polski*, Lwów, 1930; *Zarys metod statystyczych w zastosowaniach do antropologii*, Warsaw, 1913; and many other books and papers in Polish, German, French, Italian, English, and Russian. At present Professor Czekanowski is engaged in research on the anthropology of Europe, with special reference to historical problems.

DUNN, Stephen Porter, B.A., Ph.D. Research Associate in Russian Anthropology, Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies, Fordham University, New York. Author of 'An Outsider Visits the Roman Ghetto', *Commentary*, Feb. 1958; (with L. C. Dunn) 'The Roman Jewish Community', *Scientific American*, March 1957; poems and other works. Dr. Dunn is at present working on a survey of current Russian ethnography.

LESTSCHINSKY, Jacob. Compiler of *Current Events in Jewish Life*, Institute of Jewish Affairs, New York. Contributor to *Forward*, New York. Author of numerous works in Yiddish, Hebrew, Russian, German, and English on Jewish demography and sociology, among which are: *Der Yiddisher Arbeiter in Rusland*, 1906; *Di Yidden in Soviet-Rusland*, 1940; *Dos Natsionale Punim Funem Galut-Yiddentum*, 1956. Mr. Lestschinsky, now living in Israel, is engaged on the second volume of his work on Jews in Soviet Russia (to cover the period 1941–60).

LEVITTE, Georges. Director of 'Community Service', Paris. Editor of 'Aleph' series, Editions de Minuit, Paris. Formerly Head of the Cultural Department of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié. At present Mr. Levitte is engaged in sociological research on European Jewry and a French translation of the Bible.

LIPMAN, V. D. See 'Notes on Contributors', Vol. I, no. 1.

RAVENNA, Alfredo. Dr. of Chemistry. Rabbi, Ospedale Israelitico di Roma. Professor in the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano. Author of *L'ebraismo post-biblico* and other works. Rabbi Ravenna is engaged in research on Semitics and Judaism.

SAMUEL, The Hon. Edwin Herbert, C.M.G., B.A. Lecturer in the Political Science Department, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Principal, Israel Institute of Public Administration. Member of the Palestine Civil Service, 1920–48. Author of *The Theory of Administration*; *The Jewish Communal Villages of Palestine*; *Problems of Government in the State of Israel*; *British Traditions in the Administration of Israel*, etc. Mr. Samuel is engaged in research on Palestine under the Turks and the British, British institutions, welfare states, the British Commonwealth, and civil services.

STRAUSS, Heinrich, Dr. rer. pol. Retired District Court Judge in Germany, living in Israel. Author of 'On Jews and German Art', *Year Book II* of the Leo Baeck Institute of Jews from Germany, London, 1957; 'The History and Form of The Seven Branched Candlestick of the Hasmonean Kings', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. XXII, nos. 1–2, 1959; 'Eine neue Deutung der Amphora auf juedischen Denkmaelern der Antika', *Zeitschrift fuer die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. 72, pt. 1, Berlin, 1960, etc. Dr. Strauss is working on art history (especially Jewish), landscape painting, Pieter Breugel, etc.

CHRONICLE

Prepared by

P. Glikson

The long-standing conflict in Israel over 'Who is a Jew?' was formally ended on March 20 when the Ministry of the Interior issued its new regulations on the subject. According to these regulations a Jew is a person born to a Jewish mother whether or not the father is a Jew. A person born to a non-Jewish mother is not Jewish even if the father is a Jew. A convert must prove his Jewishness with documents issued by an authorized rabbinate. An important clause in the new regulations states that any person who has declared himself to be a Jew but is subsequently proved to be a non-Jew will lose all his rights under the Israel Law of Return. All such cases will be brought before the courts to decide whether or not the person should be expelled.

*

There are at present about 40,000 Jews in Turkey, the majority of whom are organized into five communities. The smallest is that of Adrianopolis with 800 members. The 2,000 Jews living in Ankara (both Ashkenazim and Sephardim) are largely assimilated, and there is frequent intermarriage between Muslims and Jewish women. The 5,000 strong Jewish community of Izmir is mostly Sephardi. The *Consejo Orthodoxo Judio* in Istanbul has 25,000 members, the majority of whom are descendants of the Spanish Jews who sought refuge in Turkey at the time of the Spanish Inquisition. There are about 1,000 Ashkenazi Jews whose ancestors came from Russia, Poland, and Rumania and settled in Turkey in the seventeenth century. Scattered Jewish groups are to be found along the Black Sea coast.

According to a recent official survey, Ladino is the mother-tongue of 29,207 people in Turkey. The use of it is, however, declining. The younger generation

speaks Turkish while the upper class uses French as its first language. Both Jewish weeklies, *Shalom* and *La Vera Luz*, as well as the bi-monthly *El Tiempo*, are still published in Ladino but also include Turkish sections.

*

The number of Jewish immigrants who went to Canada in 1959 was 2,686, as compared with 2,290 in 1958, according to statistical data released by the Canadian Department of Citizenship and Immigration. This constitutes an increase of 396 (or 17 per cent) on the 1958 Jewish immigration, while the total number of immigrants decreased by 17,923 from 124,851 in 1958 to 106,928 in 1959. The total figure of immigrants for 1959 is 62 per cent below the 1957 figure of 282,164 admissions.

It also appears from these figures that the number of Jewish immigrants to Canada who indicated Israel as their last country of residence has substantially increased during the last four years. Of 1,632 Jewish immigrants admitted to Canada in 1956, 309 gave Israel as their last country of residence; in 1957, a total of 5,472 Jewish immigrants included 482 'from Israel'; in 1958, the number of Jewish admissions dropped to 2,290, but among them were 577 'from Israel' and in 1959 there were 1,577 immigrants from Israel among the 2,686 Jewish immigrants admitted.

The statistics for the first three months of 1960 put those of Jewish origin at 523 (against 324 for the corresponding period of 1959). 360 of these gave Israel as the country of their last permanent residence. The figure for the corresponding period of 1959 was 125. Another analysis reveals that 366 of the new immigrants to Canada hold Israel citizenship, as against 140 in the corresponding period of 1959.

*

The Jewish community of Indonesia has dwindled from 200 in January 1959 to about eighty members, according to a report received by the World Jewish Congress. Emigration in the near future is expected to reduce the number of Jews in Indonesia to about thirty. A decade ago, some 2,000 Jews were living in the country. A number of families have recently left for Israel and Australia, while about ten families are awaiting their visas for Israel. When they have left it is estimated that between twenty and twenty-five Jews will remain in Surabaya and about six in Djakarta.

*

Exports from Israel are now paying for about half the cost of imports (which in itself is a remarkable improvement since 1948); the gap is still about $290m. (approximately £103·5m.) a year. This was made up last year by the sale of Government bonds ($50m.); public and private contributions from world Jewry ($50m.); United States economic aid in various forms ($50m.); German reparations (about $70m.) and payments to Israel citizens as compensation for property and other rights in Germany and elsewhere (about $70m.).

Israel has a total foreign debt of about $550m., of which the sale of bonds over the past 10 years accounts for about $350m. Israel's reserves of foreign currency, which increased by about $25m. last year, now stand at about $125m. In these circumstances the sale of Government bonds obviously cannot be extended indefinitely.

The contribution of world Jewry is a somewhat fluctuating asset. United States economic aid is largely derived from the sale for Israel currency of surplus stocks, and is almost certain to decline. German reparations begin to tail off in 1962, and will fall away steeply in 1964 before ending completely in 1965, although some pensions are likely to continue for some 15 or 20 years.

*

'Compared with the Jewish communities of Argentina and Uruguay, Chilean Jewry is linguistically the most assimilated in communal life', according to a survey of recent developments among the Jews in Chile, just published by the World Jewish Congress Institute of Jewish Affairs. The high degree of linguistic assimilation is ascribed to the fact that to many newcomers Chile was already the second Latin American country of settlement and that leading positions in the Jewish community have been taken up by 'the younger element, born in Chile or Argentina'.

According to the survey, there are now 30,000 Jews living in Chile, the bulk of them

residing in Santiago, the capital, with another substantial community in Valparaiso. Jews from Eastern Europe and their descendants make up more than half of the Jewish population, Jews from Germany 'considerably less than half', whilst the balance consists of Sephardi Jews. The official Zionist organ is a Spanish-language weekly, *Mundo Judio*, but there is also a Yiddish publication appearing twice a week and a German periodical.

There is a large Spanish-language Jewish school, now in the process of being expanded, in which Jewish history and Hebrew are taught in addition to the ordinary Chilean syllabus. The school has an enrolment of 1,200. The Director of the school is a teacher from Israel. Jews from Germany and Sephardim on the whole prefer to send their children to their own religious schools and courses.

*

A survey published by the Tunisian Ministry of Education shows a total of 11,803 pupils in the secondary schools of the country for the year 1959–60. Of these, 11,121 are registered as Muslims, 345, or approximately 3 per cent, as Jews, 150 as French, and 187 under the heading 'Miscellaneous'. The percentage of Jewish pupils in secondary schools is about double the proportion of the 50,000 Jews in Tunisia (who constitute 1·66 per cent of the country's total population of 3,000,000). It is believed moreover that some of the pupils registered as 'French' and 'Miscellaneous' are also of the Jewish faith. There is also a 'substantial number' of Jewish university students.

*

The first Convention of the newly formed United Synagogue of India was held in Bombay recently. It was attended by twenty-two of the twenty-five Jewish congregations of India, and elected Mr. Baruch B. Benjamin as its President. The new organization, with headquarters in New Delhi, is the first central organization of Jews in India.

*

Of the 8,000 Egyptian refugees who came to Britain following the Suez crisis, one quarter were Jews. According to the Jewish Refugees Committee with whom they are registered, they comprise some 622 families representing 1,937 individuals. 338 families are of British nationality, although in most cases they had never been in Britain before the Suez crisis and were, therefore, in need of every kind of assistance. They were, however, eligible to receive help from the Anglo-Egyptian Settlement Board established in 1957 to deal with British expellees. (The Board wound up its activity in April, 1960.) The remaining 284 families, comprising approximately 930 persons who are either stateless or of other nationality, were helped, in a great number of cases, by the Central British Fund for Jewish Relief and Rehabilitation.

The number of Hungarian refugees registered with the Jewish Refugees Committee is approximately 980 families, comprising 1,800 individuals.