

The Frankaus of London: A Study in Radical Assimilation, 1837-1967

Todd M. Endelman

I

The disappearance of entire families from Jewish communal life was not an uncommon occurrence in Western and Central Europe between the Enlightenment and World War II. Inter-marriage and conversion removed the names of thousands of families from the rosters of religious, cultural, and philanthropic organizations. In recent years there has been renewed interest in this kind of radical assimilation, sparked perhaps by contemporary anxiety about the future of diaspora communities in demographic decline.¹ Historians who have written on the subject, myself included, have found that there are serious obstacles, largely inherent in the nature of the evidence that survives, to gaining a clear picture of both the scope and the character of defection from the Jewish community.

In the case of liberal states like England and France, where no government or church agency gathered data on conversion and inter-marriage, historians must reconstruct the course of radical assimilation on the basis of so-called anecdotal evidence. Consequently, the precise contours of the phenomenon remain unknowable. Yet even when historians can make use of statistical evidence, which is the case in regard to Jewish communities in Central Europe, there are limits to what such figures can reveal. For example, they cannot be made to disclose the subjective experience of conversion, that is, how Jews experienced their transformation into Christians and how they regarded their Jewish origins in later years. Nor, of course, can they illuminate how former Jews fared once they had left the community and presumably been integrated into gentile society. In addition, quantitative methods reveal little about changes in attitude and behavior

that occurred in earlier generations, among parents and grandparents, the cumulative impact of which made possible a definitive break with the community. This is a critical point because radical assimilation was in most cases the outcome of changes over several generations rather than a sudden, sharp break with traditional beliefs and affiliations.

One strategy that allows historians to overcome the limitations of quantitative data is to follow the transformation of Jewish practice, affiliation, and consciousness in a single family over three or more generations. This method, of course, cannot disclose the extent of radical assimilation in a community but can provide a wealth of detail about the road to conversion, the concrete circumstances in which it occurs, and the success of former Jews and their descendants in shaking off their Jewish antecedents. A number of studies in German Jewish history – David Landes’s “Bleichröders and Rothschilds,” Fritz Stern’s *Gold and Iron*, Werner Mosse’s *The German-Jewish Economic Elite*, and Steven Lowenstein’s “Jewish Upper Crust and Berlin Jewish Enlightenment” – suggest the fruitfulness of a multigenerational perspective on radical assimilation, although that may not have been their primary object.²

The chief obstacle to employing this research strategy is a paucity of evidence regarding Jewish consciousness and observance in successive generations of one family. For historians of English Jewry like myself, the problem is even more acute, for English Jews, in comparison to their German counterparts, were strikingly reticent about recording their experiences, attitudes, and emotional states. Memoirs, journals, and correspondence illuminating English Jewish history outside the public arena are not plentiful. I was, thus, fortunate several years ago to stumble across the Frankau family of London, which, over the course of four generations stretching from the 1830s to the 1960s, produced a remarkable succession of writers who addressed questions of Jewish identity in their work. Moreover, because several of the Frankaus and their relations were minor public figures, other persons in the public limelight recorded what they did and said, thus leaving an additional source with which to reconstruct the Frankaus’ departure from Jewish history.

II

The first member of the Frankau family to settle in England was Joseph Frankau (1813-1857), a native of Diespeck, a village in Middle Franconia, near Neustadt a.d. Aisch.³ Like many young village Jews whose opportunities were limited by occupational and residence restrictions, Joseph migrated to Frankfurt am Main and then, in 1837, moved to London.⁴ In 1841, when the first British census was conducted, he was living in Great Prescott Street, in the home of Frankfurt-born Joseph Geiger (d. 1870), a cigar merchant, and his sister Amelia (1813-1863), first cousins of the Reform rabbi Abraham Geiger and his brother Solomon, a

prominent figure in Frankfurt orthodoxy.⁵ Great Prescott Street was in the heart of the Jewish quarter of London, just to the east of the City boundary. Its residents were almost entirely Jews of modest but respectable means – small merchants, cigar manufacturers, jewelers, opticians, pencil makers, glass dealers, umbrella makers.⁶ Perhaps the Frankau and Geiger families were already acquainted in Frankfurt before Joseph moved to London. In any case, it is not surprising that he lodged with the Geigers during his first years in London, given their common background.

Joseph Geiger was already doing business as a manufacturer and importer of cigars when Joseph Frankau settled in London. This was a new and rapidly expanding area of trade at the time and one in which Jews, especially recent immigrants from Germany, quickly made their mark. In the eighteenth century, cigars were practically unknown in England. Their use was introduced after the Peninsular War (1807-1814), when British officers who had served in Spain and Portugal returned home with a taste for smoking tobacco in what was then a novel form. The new habit did not become popular at once, however, since the duty on cigars was prohibitive. In 1823, for example, only 26 pounds of manufactured cigars were imported into Britain. The duty was then reduced and cigar consumption began to rise almost immediately: in 1824, 15,380 pounds were imported. In 1829, the rate was slashed in half, and the following year 253,882 pounds were imported. In the 1830s, cigar smoking replaced snuff taking in the world of fashion, and by the 1850s what had been an aristocratic luxury had become an integral part of the social ritual of the male middle class – one half of the tobacco smoked in English cities in the 1850s was in the form of cigars.⁷

Jews, both English- and German-born, entered the London cigar trade in its infancy and prospered as the habit of cigar smoking grew in popularity. As was frequently the case in Europe and America, their previous experience in the marketplace – as peddlers, shopkeepers, wholesalers, and importers – made them sensitive to shifting tastes and developing markets. The migration of Geiger and Frankau to London was part of a larger movement of German Jewish traders to what was then the richest consumer market in the world. In the middle decades of the century, hundreds of German Jewish merchants established businesses in London (and the provinces to a much lesser extent) to supply its middle-class residents with pianos, cigars, antiques, picture frames, jewelry, stationery, leather goods, furniture, and various other “fancy goods.” In the case of cigars, Jews in Germany were already prominent in the importation and distribution of tobacco, and this may have encouraged their entry into the cigar trade in London.

It is not clear whether Frankau worked for his future brother-in-law when he first arrived. If so, he did not remain in a dependent position with him for long, for by 1840 at the latest he was in partnership with Lesser Friedlander, in Haydon Square, the Minories, importing leeches and cigars.⁸ This arrangement lasted for

only a few years, for by 1844 he was doing business as Joseph Frankau & Co., importer of leeches and cigars, at 33 Great Alie Street, in the same immediate neighborhood.⁹ His decision to set out on his own was undoubtedly connected to his marriage, in March 1843, to Joseph Geiger's sister Amelia (or Emilie, as she appears in some sources). The wedding ceremony took place at the Western Synagogue in St. Alban's Place, Haymarket, and was performed by H. A. Henry (1800-1879), minister of the congregation.¹⁰

That the couple were married in the Western Synagogue, which was a mile west of the City and whose members lived primarily in the Strand, Covent Garden, Soho, and Pall Mall, and not in one of the City synagogues, which were an easy walk from their home, is peculiar. It is impossible to know whether Geiger and Frankau belonged to the congregation or worshipped there regularly, since most of the congregational records for the period have disappeared. One possibility – and it is only that and nothing more – is that they were attracted to the Western Synagogue because it was viewed as more liberal than other congregations and more sympathetic to the newly established West London Synagogue of British Jews, the first Reform congregation in Britain. In 1842, a few days before the consecration of the West London Synagogue, Chief Rabbi Solomon Hirschell issued what was in effect a *herem* against the secessionist group and ordered that it be read in all the synagogues of Britain. The Western Synagogue, alone among London congregations, refused to do so. Moreover, it also undertook a program of cosmetic reforms designed to improve congregational decorum and correct other abuses.¹¹ Its minister was also sympathetic to moderate reforms. He preached regular sabbath sermons in English – a novelty at the time – and after he left the congregation in 1849 to settle in the United States served congregations in Cincinnati and San Francisco that also introduced moderate reforms.¹² (Membership in the Reform congregation would have been out of the question – its membership was drawn almost exclusively from the wealthier strata of London Jewry.)

It is impossible to say much about the religious outlook and behavior of Joseph and Amelia Frankau. We know for certain that they lived in a Jewish neighborhood early in their married life. But some time between 1847 and 1851, they moved their residence from the Goodman's Fields area to a substantial row house in Duncan Terrace, Islington (not far from the present-day Angel underground station), a clear sign of their increasing prosperity.¹³ Although middle-class Jews began settling in Islington in the 1840s, the Jewish ambiance there and in other North London neighborhoods to which Jews were migrating was much less pronounced than in the old areas of settlement in the City and the streets immediately to the east. In 1853, there were only two other Jewish families (at most) living in Duncan Terrace.¹⁴ Moreover, at the time of the Frankaus' move there were no synagogues or other Jewish institutions in the immediate area. A congregation was established in Upper Street, Islington, only

in 1860 – by which time the Frankaus had departed for a more exclusive area north of Regents Park.¹⁵ In 1854 or 1855, the family moved to Benario Villas in Upper Avenue Road (now Avenue Road), where there were even fewer Jews than in Islington.¹⁶ Yet, it would be incorrect to infer from Joseph's and Amelia's desire to live in choice neighborhoods that they were eager to escape all contact with other Jews. Their son, Arthur (c. 1848-1904), received part of his education at the Realschule der israelitischen Gemeinde in Frankfurt, and the four of their five children who married all took Jewish spouses.¹⁷

Word of Joseph Frankau's business success apparently encouraged others in his family to try their luck in London as well. His unmarried brother Henry, then age 21, was living with him at the time of the 1851 census and was then employed as his clerk. In the early-1850s, a Sidney Frankau, who almost certainly was also a brother, lived in Claremont Square, Islington, a few minutes walk from Duncan Terrace, where Joseph was living. Sidney moved to a house in Upper Avenue Road at the same time that Joseph did. He was in business initially with a third brother, Adolph (c.1823-1856), but later set up on his own as an importer of fancy goods and meerschaum pipes with an office in Bishopsgate Street in the City.¹⁸ Nothing more is known about Sidney and Henry Frankau or their descendents (if there were any); it is possible that they returned to Germany.

Adolph, on the other hand, remained in England, where he, like his brother Joseph, prospered, thus providing the material basis for his descendants' integration into the English middle class. Initially, Adolph, along with a Nathan Frankau (another brother in all likelihood), had migrated to the United States, settling in the early 1840s in New Haven, Connecticut, where a small community of Bavarian Jews had formed at the beginning of the decade. Like thousands of other Jewish immigrants at this time from southern and southwestern German states, Adolph and Nathan started their business careers as peddlers, but they did not remain itinerant traders for long. In city directories for 1844-45 and 1845-46, Nathan appears as a pedlar, but in the directory for 1846-47 he, Adolph, and Henry (d. 1895) and Louis Feldman (1814-1893) are listed as partners in a dry goods business. (In 1856, Henry Feldman, then a merchant living in New London, Connecticut, married Bavarian-born Frederica Frankau, a resident of New Haven and in all likelihood a younger sister of Nathan and Adolph.) Nathan remained in New Haven and became a successful retailer. He also became an active member of Congregation Mishkan Israel, which he joined soon after his arrival, unlike his brother Adolph, who remained distant from Judaism. During the Civil War, Nathan served briefly as a captain in the Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteers but was dishonorably discharged in New Orleans in November 1862 for taking bribes to issue passes to disloyal persons.¹⁹

Adolph undoubtedly intended to remain in the United States and make his fortune there, for he became a naturalized citizen in New Haven in 1844. But for some reason he changed his mind and in 1847 recrossed the Atlantic, settling

permanently in London.²⁰ He carried on a successful business in the City as an importer of meerschaum pipes and smoking accessories. In 1853, about the time that his brothers Joseph and Sidney moved to Upper Avenue Road, he married and moved into a newly built semi-detached house in nearby Adelaide Road, just north of Primrose Hill. His wife, Rosetta Neuberger (c.1816-1880), was a native of Wurzburg who had lived previously in Nottingham with her brother Joseph (1806-1867), a successful merchant. Adolph died in 1856, at age 36, leaving her with two infant children.²¹

Rosetta Frankau was an ambitious woman, alienated from Jewish practice, as her deceased husband had been, and eager to see her children rise in the world. In Nottingham, where she had spent much of her adult life before marriage, there were no synagogues and few Jews who observed the Jewish religion. Most of the German Jewish lace and hosiery merchants there were either Jews in name only or members of the Unitarian chapel.²² In London, she was a member of the Rossllyn Hill Unitarian chapel in Hampstead. Her son, Frederick Joseph (1854-1933), was sent to Rugby School in the 1860s, when professing Jews would not have been welcome there. He did not enter the family business, which continued to prosper after Adolph's death under the management of Louis Blumfeld, a native of Wurtemberg who had been Adolph's clerk and was still boarding with the family at the time of the 1861 census. Instead, Frederick chose (or was encouraged to choose) a path that took him far from the German Jewish merchant network into which he had been born. After Rugby, he went on to Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, became a barrister, and married an Englishwoman. Neither he nor his two children, both of whom were educated at Rugby, had any links to Jewish life. The elder, George Neuberger Frankau (1881-1969), became a mechanical engineer; the younger, Sir Claude Howard Stanley Frankau (1883-1967), was a distinguished surgeon. His sister, Gertrude (1856-1913), never married, continued to live in Hampstead, and like her mother and Louis Blumfeld was a member of the Rossllyn Hill Unitarian chapel.²³

Rosetta's brother, Joseph, was equally committed to a course of complete integration into English society and, indeed, may have encouraged or even guided his sister's assimilationist bent. A native of Wurzburg, Neuberger served a commercial apprenticeship in Frankfurt and then Hamburg. In the late-1820s, he was sent by an uncle in Hamburg to Nottingham.²⁴ This was a common strategy at the time among German firms that distributed English goods on the continent. With agents and warehouses in the major textile manufacturing towns of England – Manchester, Leeds, Bradford, and Nottingham – they hoped to gain greater control over the quality and cost of goods they handled. Shortly after settling in Nottingham, Neuberger was made a partner in the firm, which prospered and made him a wealthy man. But material success alone failed to satisfy him. As he later remarked, a businessman who satisfies only his “meaner half” and fails to provide for his “spiritual life” must of necessity become “blinded,

dwarfed, stupefied.”²⁵ To quench his thirst for the “spiritual life,” Neuberg, though a recent immigrant, took a keen interest in current political and cultural affairs and played a leading role in middle-class philanthropic efforts in Nottingham to enlighten and uplift the working class. In particular, he actively supported the Nottingham Mechanics’ Institution, serving for some years as head of its literature section. He secured the appearance of guest lecturers and himself spoke frequently on literary themes, including, on one occasion, the work of Thomas Carlyle, whom he especially admired.²⁶

In December 1839, Neuberg wrote an enthusiastic letter of appreciation to Carlyle, thanking him for the way he interpreted “German thoughts to our English brethren.”²⁷ Carlyle responded warmly and at length. There matters rested until, in December 1847, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who was a guest in Neuberg’s home while on a lecture tour of England, offered to arrange a personal meeting between the two men when he became aware of Neuberg’s esteem for Carlyle. Rosetta Neuberg (as she was then) apparently told Emerson that Neuberg “would give his little finger to know Carlyle.”²⁸ When Emerson was in London the following spring, he brought the two men together. They met for the first time at Carlyle’s home in Chelsea and thereafter a friendship developed. In a letter to Emerson in December 1848, Carlyle described his visitor as “a welcome, wise kind of man.”²⁹

The following summer Neuberg decided to retire from business and devote himself wholly to literature and, in particular, to Carlyle. He was sufficiently prosperous by now to be able to live on the income of his investments – he described his occupation in the 1861 census as “fundholder”³⁰ – and there was nothing to keep him in Nottingham. (His wife, Mary Ann Stirland, who was of Scottish background, had died several years before after only six years of marriage.)³¹ He moved to London, took up lodgings in Church Row, Hampstead, and, until his (Neuberg’s) death in 1867, served as volunteer research assistant, secretary, translator, and companion to Carlyle. He did research for him at the British Museum and the Public Record Office, performed secretarial work at his Chelsea home, and served as his companion on long walks in London. He handled the practical arrangements for and accompanied him on trips to Germany in 1852, when Carlyle was gathering material and impressions for his biography of Frederick the Great, and in 1858, when he wanted to visit the scenes of Frederick’s great battles. He also translated *Past and Present*, *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, and the bulk of *Frederick the Great* into German.³²

Neuberg was devoted to Carlyle, whom he idolized and whose utterances and pronouncements he treasured. In letters to his sister Rosetta, he quoted at length from his conversation and offered details about meals and other mundane domestic matters in the Carlyle home. For his part, Carlyle was a warm, sympathetic, and generous “employer” who valued Neuberg’s companionship and services. After Neuberg’s death, he wrote to Rosetta Frankau: “No kinder

friend had I in this world; no man of any day, I believe, had so faithful, loyal, and willing a helper, as he generously was to me for the last twenty or more years.”³³

Neuberg’s attachment to Carlyle was remarkable in several respects. First, it was unusual at the time for Jews in England to take an active interest in cultural matters outside their own community. Most were not well educated; few received an advanced secondary education and even fewer attended university. They contributed little – either as patrons or producers – to the literary or artistic life of the nation, in marked contrast to their counterparts in Germany, who believed (wrongly, as it turned out) that their cultural achievements would accelerate their political and social acceptance. In this sense, Neuberg’s enthusiasm for literature reflected the influence of his German upbringing rather than his English surroundings.

Second, Carlyle was capable of expressing great hostility to Jews in his work.³⁴ He was not an obsessional or systematic antisemite, blaming Jews for the social ills or political upheavals of the day. Nor was he a proponent of government measures to restrict Jewish rights. But he did share the prejudices of his time and gave vent to them in his work, frequently identifying Jews with those things he especially disliked, such as capitalist materialism. In *Past and Present* (1843), for example, in which he compared the contemporary world with that of a twelfth-century monastic community, he equated Jews with insatiable greed. He described how Abbot Hugo, in need of funds to repair the fabric of St. Edmundsbury abbey, was forced to turn to “usurious, insatiable Jews, every fresh Jew sticking on him like a fresh horseleech, sucking his and our life out.”³⁵ Similarly, in *Sartor Resartus* (1833), a fantasy about an imaginary German transcendentalist philosopher and his treatise on the “philosophy of clothes,” he associated the Jewish old clothes dealers of Monmouth Street, London, with the forces of materialism and superficiality. He wrote:

We too have walked through Monmouth Street, but with little feeling of ‘Devotion,’ probably in part because the contemplative process is so fatally broken in upon by the brood of money-changers who nestle in that Church and importune the worshipper with merely secular proposals.³⁶

His illiberalism and hostility to Jews also led him to oppose, though not publicly, legislation to permit Jews to enter political life. He wrote in 1847 to his friend Richard Monckton Milnes, a keen supporter of Jewish emancipation, that “a real Jew” could be neither a citizen nor a legislator of any country “except his own wretched Palestine, whither all his thoughts and steps and efforts tend – where, in the Devil’s name, let him arrive as soon as possible, and make us quit of him!”³⁷ One can only assume that Neuberg had ceased to be “a real Jew” in his eyes.

It is not unusual to encounter assimilationist-minded Jews belonging to anti-

semitic circles or paying homage to Jew-baiting geniuses. The conductor Hermann Levi (1839-1900) worshipped Richard Wagner and thus endured his and his entourage's taunts, while Leonard Woolf (1880-1969) patiently suffered his wife's and Bloomsbury's snide remarks.³⁸ How did Neuberg deal with Carlyle's hostility to Jews? Perhaps he convinced himself that he was exempt from his comments since he had broken with Judaism and the Jewish community. Had he not forsaken the pursuit of material gain to devote himself wholeheartedly to the cultivation of spiritual matters? Indeed, it is possible that he even drew some comfort from Carlyle's anti-Jewish remarks, for they offered a benchmark against which he could confidently measure his own distance from what was commonly believed to be "Jewish."

But even if we put Carlyle's anti-semitism aside, Neuberg's uncritical admiration for him is remarkable in another respect. Neuberg, similar to other middle-class European Jews, owed his wealth and social advancement to the decline of ancien régime ideas and institutions. Without their demise, Jewish emancipation and embourgeoisement would have been impossible. Most middle-class Jews understood this and rallied to the banner of liberalism. Neuberg, on the other hand, devoted himself to an illiberal, anti-rationalist, romantic visionary who scorned democracy and laissez-faire capitalism. He idealized the organic, feudal society of the middle ages – a society, it should be added, in which Jews were marginalized and persecuted. Perhaps Neuberg found in Carlyle's attacks on contemporary materialism and superficiality another way in which he could distance himself from what in truth he really was – a successful Jewish capitalist. If so, there was in his indiscriminating embrace of Carlyle and his views a strong element of self-contempt.

Interestingly, Neuberg was not the only highly assimilated Jew in Victorian England to find such views attractive. In his three political novels of the 1840s, *Coningsby*, *Sybil*, and *Tancred*, Benjamin Disraeli expressed political and social views that were similar to those of Carlyle: reverence for great men who can change the course of history, nostalgia for organic communities of an earlier period, disenchantment with liberalism, urbanization, and industrialization.³⁹ Like Neuberg, Disraeli's enthusiasm for illiberal ideas reflected his distance from mainstream Anglo-Jewry, which was then struggling to gain full political emancipation and had pinned its hopes for success on the triumph of liberalism.

III

The connection between the family of Adolph Frankau and the English Jewish community was severed within one generation. The descendants of Adolph and Rosetta blended successfully and, to all appearances, painlessly into the professional middle class and their subsequent history need not detain us. Joseph's offspring, on the other hand, maintained a connection to the community

for one more generation and even after formally abandoning Judaism discovered that their Jewishness was not easily left behind.

Like his brother Adolph, Joseph Frankau died early, at age 45, leaving five young children. The business he had founded continued to operate under the management of clerks, one of whom, German-born Joseph Grünbaum (1835-1908), married Della Frankau (1845-1898), Joseph's and Amelia's eldest daughter, in 1868. Eventually, Grünbaum and his brothers-in-law, Arthur and Edwin Frankau (1854-1903), became partners in the firm.⁴⁰ Arthur, the elder son, whose descendants will be the focus of the remainder of this essay, was very much the model of the self-denying, hard-working, family-oriented, successful Jewish businessman of popular legend. According to his son Gilbert (1884-1952), he was personally abstemious, saving his money or spending it on his family rather than himself. He never owned a horse, abhorred personal debt – the one occasion on which Gilbert saw him lose his temper was when he discovered that Gilbert had not paid an overdue bootmaker's bill – and, after moving the family to Mayfair, with money he had inherited from his unmarried brother, Edwin, failed to derive pleasure from the upscale surroundings. In Gilbert's words, he "had no zest for the Mayfair game." Not surprisingly, he was a Liberal in politics (unlike his Tory wife and son, about whom more later).⁴¹

Although educated for a time at a Jewish school in Frankfurt, Arthur Frankau was not sympathetic to the Jewish religion. He was, according to Gilbert, an agnostic whose only fault was "a slight bias against certain members of the faith which his conscience had rejected."⁴² When he married Julia Davis (1859-1916) in 1883, the ceremony took place at the Reform synagogue, to which his mother-in-law, Isabella Davis (c. 1824-1900), belonged. He himself joined the congregation the month before his wedding, but his own extreme religious views soon brought him into conflict with its leaders. When his son Gilbert was born in 1884, he refused to have him circumcised, even after being ordered to do so by the wardens of the synagogue. Circumcision, in his view, was an unenlightened practice, while the bylaw requiring male circumcision was "an interference with matters which should be beyond the prescription of any congregation." Realizing that the wardens would not yield, he resigned his membership in 1885 (without, however, failing to enclose a six guinea check to settle his account).⁴³

Arthur Frankau's aversion to circumcision was no coincidence. In the second half of the century, circumcision was viewed as the defining mark of the body of the male Jew throughout Europe. In the discourse of the medical sciences, as Sander Gilman has shown, the Jewish male was represented as not quite whole because of his severed foreskin: he was not only different but deformed, damaged, and incomplete. Currents in medical literature saw in his circumcised penis the marker of his allegedly diseased character and associated it with syphilis and masturbation. At the same time historians, anthropologists, social theorists, and other writers who drew on developmental, evolutionary thought

linked circumcision to earlier, more primitive periods in the history of civilization. A writer in the *Westminster Review* in 1863 noted that Jews continued to practice “the barbaric rite of circumcision” while “the great bulk of intelligent men throughout Europe” had abandoned it. For the historian Goldwin Smith, writing in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1878, “the primaeval rite” of circumcision was the mark of the Jews’ tribal separation, the sign of Judaism’s failure to evolve beyond the stage of tribalism to religious universalism.⁴⁴ No wonder a radical assimilationist like Arthur Frankau, eager to shed the taint of Jewish tribalism, refused to have his son circumcised.

Frankau’s refusal placed him outside the pale of institutional Judaism, even the liberal wing of Reform Judaism. Although some radical reformers condemned the practice as a crude cultic holdover from Judaism’s youth – for Abraham Geiger, it was “a barbaric, bloody act which fills the father with fear”⁴⁵ – its deep psychological hold mitigated against its elimination. No Reform synagogue, synod, or congregational association in Europe or America ever claimed that it was not religiously binding. Arthur Frankau’s repudiation of Jewish practice went further, however, than failing to initiate his son into the covenant. Having broken with the synagogue, he and his wife ensured that Gilbert and his siblings would be absorbed into upper-middle-class English society. They raised their children in the Church of England and sent them to elite private schools, although they did not have Gilbert baptized until he was 13 (!) and thus “old enough to understand things for himself.” Remarkably, they did not tell Gilbert that he was of Jewish ancestry until he was “more than 16.” To cement his own break with Judaism, Arthur instructed that when he died his body was not to be buried in a Jewish cemetery.⁴⁶

Arthur Frankau’s wife, Julia, shared his devotion to radical assimilation, despite her own religious upbringing. Her father, Hyman Davis (1824-1875), came from a well-established Anglo-Jewish family, some branches of which were wealthy. He had hoped to make a career as a painter, but the demands of supporting a family forced him to abandon this idea. He practiced dentistry in Dublin from 1849 to 1863 and then, after returning to London, worked as a portrait photographer, with a studio in his home, first in Bruton Street in the West End and then from about 1870 in Warrington Crescent, Maida Vale. The family belonged to the West London Synagogue of British Jews, but it would be wrong to infer from this that they were, therefore, indifferent to religious tradition. The London Reform congregation was more conservative in both theology and practice than Reform congregations in Germany and the United States, and the native Jewish middle class in general in the Victorian period (in contrast to middle-class Jews of German origin, like the Frankaus) was more observant than its counterparts elsewhere. In the Davis home, the children recited early morning prayers daily and faithfully attended synagogue on the sabbath. Julia and her younger sister Eliza (1866-1931) were educated at the strictly orthodox Belisario

school. Miss Belisario, “a Jewess of the most rigid kind,” Eliza recalled, would enter the classroom during a thunderstorm and upbraid her charges for failing to pronounce the traditional Hebrew benediction on hearing thunder.⁴⁷

Julia Davis received little formal education after leaving the Belisario school. For a while she was tutored at home by a Mr. Gilmour and by Laura Lafargue, the daughter of Karl Marx, but this ended around the time of her father’s death, when she was about 12.⁴⁸ Energetic, imaginative, talented (she began writing stories as a child), she found the largely Jewish social milieu in which she was growing up narrow and conventional, but as a woman there were few avenues of escape available to her, except marriage. However, through her older brother James (1853-1907), she managed to glimpse an exciting world outside her own. James Davis was a well-known man-about-town and popular figure in bohemian circles. Educated at University College, London, he built up a lucrative practice as a solicitor from 1874 to 1886 but eventually gave up the law for journalism, theatre, and racing. He owned and edited a number of society journals, including *The Bat*, *The Cuckoo*, and *The Phoenix*, wrote drama criticism and reported on horse racing for *The Sporting Times*, and from 1893 wrote the librettos for several successful comic operas. However, his major interest – one might say obsession – was the race track: most of the money he earned from his writing was gambled away or went to purchase and train racehorses. In addition, he entertained lavishly and was overly generous to friends in the racing world and journalism, as a consequence of which he was perpetually in debt. In fact, his pseudonym, “Owen Hall,” was said to have been derived from his usual financial predicament of “owing all.”⁴⁹

Although James Davis married within the fold (his wife, Esther Andrade [1854-1946], was from a Sephardic family), as an adult he had no connection to Jewish institutions and moved largely in non-Jewish circles. Through him, Julia, then in her late-teens and early-twenties, was introduced to a broader social world. While James was still living at home, he brought to the house literary and theatrical figures, including Oscar and Willie Wilde, who would play tennis in a nearby public garden with Julia and Eliza. After James married, the sisters were allowed to attend the remarkable parties he hosted at his house in Curzon Street, Mayfair. These evenings attracted an unconventional mix of persons – journalists, dramatists, novelists, actors, music hall comics and singers, aristocrats, sportsmen, “pretty ladies of high and low degree” (to use Eliza’s words), and assorted hangers-on. The novelist George Moore remembered them fondly for their champagne, late hours, evening clothes, passionate discussions of literature and art, and “fabulous bohemianism.”⁵⁰

In 1887, about two years after she and her husband had quit the Reform synagogue, Julia Frankau, using the pen name Frank Danby, published her first novel, *Dr. Phillips: A Maida Vale Idyll*, an unflattering portrait of the social milieu in which she had been raised, written from a radical assimilationist

perspective.⁵¹ The central figure in the novel, the charming Jewish physician Benjamin Phillips, “the pet of Maida Vale drawing rooms,” has built up an extensive, although almost exclusively Jewish, practice. He is greedy and sensual. Repulsed by his unattractive, overweight, infertile (but wealthy) German-born wife, he finds an outlet for his sensuality in his slim, fair, beautiful gentile mistress, who bears him a child. He finds himself hopelessly in love with her but cannot continue to support two households in the wake of some ruinous investments. In order to marry his mistress and at the same time save himself from financial disaster, he murders his wife with an overdose of morphine as she is recovering from surgery for an ovarian tumor. His mistress, who has meanwhile grown to loathe him, rejects him for an athletic, handsome, Eton-educated young man who is heir to his uncle’s landed estate. When the Jews of Maida Vale learn of his extramarital affair, they abandon Dr. Phillips as well.

The Jews in Frankau’s novel are repugnant. They are almost without exception uneducated, narrow, clannish, vulgar, materialistic, and tasteless. They live in large overfurnished houses filled “with floating suggestions of a Bond Street showroom,” in marked contrast to the comfortable, tasteful, Liberty-decorated rooms inhabited by Phillips’ gentile mistress. They gesticulate and talk at the top of their voices, especially in public places, dance ungracefully – “Judaea, when it dances, is an ungainly spectacle” – and, in the case of women, tend to obesity and a taste for bright colors and blazing diamonds. They are ignorant of politics, literature, and art; indeed, they take no interest in the world beyond their families and friends, businesses and homes. They stick together, admitting few non-Jews into their company. In “the heart of a great and cosmopolitan city,” they constitute “a whole nation dwelling apart in an inviolable seclusion.” “There are houses upon houses in the West Central districts, in Maida Vale, in the City, which are barred to Christians, to which the very name of Jew is an open sesame.” Their most common mode of social intercourse is playing cards at each other’s houses, informal gatherings to which “it was decidedly unusual to invite any but Jews.”⁵²

The root cause of Maida Vale Jewry’s corruption, according to Frankau, is its inordinate love of money. In a passage reminiscent of Karl Marx’s identification of Judaism with self-interest, huckstering, and money in *Zur Judenfrage* (1844), she writes:

The great single Deity, the “I am the Lord thy God, and thou shalt have no other,” that binds Judaism together, is as invincible now as it was when Moses had to destroy the Golden Calf on Mount Horeb. And that Deity is Gain.

And that deity is never more ardently worshipped than at the card table.

The red light played on the money, on the cards, on the diamonds, on eager faces and grasping fingers. The play went on almost in silence; no light jest or merry quip, no sacrilegious sound of laughter disturbed the devotion of Judaism to its living God.

Indeed, Frankau's Jews take little interest in amusements at which no money changes hands. At a tennis tournament at Eastbourne, a seaside vacation spot popular with London Jews, the men immediately begin placing bets with each other on the competitors in the final round; one of them even offers odds to bystanders who are otherwise strangers, provoking a few "audible observations about Jews."⁵³

The Jewish religion, as distinct from the Jewish people, also fares poorly in *Dr. Phillips*. It is identified with Dr. Phillips' heavy, foreign-born, stupid wife, whose kindling of sabbath candles prompts her husband to berate her for "devoting your very limited intellect to keeping up all the exploded traditions invented by fools for fools." Phillips himself has "drifted away from many of the forms that bound him to his race" and has discovered that he manages just as well without them. This, in fact, seems to be true for most of Frankau's Jews. They do, however, worry about their children marrying outside the community, a concern that is for Frankau the very essence of their narrow-minded tribalism. Thus, she mocks Mrs. Collings, who "would rather see one of her children dead than married to a Christian" and Mrs. Detmar, who "would not go quite so far as that, only she would, certainly, rather see hers married to the poorest Jew that ever walked, even to an absolute pauper." Those who oppose intermarriage are "entirely unemancipated," that is, shut off from the world beyond "their people," while those who break with the clan attain new levels of understanding. When young Florie Collings experiences romantic rapture in the company of her gentile suitor, Alec Murphy, she is transformed:

How wide a vista opened out in the mind of the little Jewish girl, as she lay there in the arms of Christianity. How centuries of bigotry and generations of prejudice melted away in the flame of her passion.⁵⁴

There is a suggestion here that Jewish-Christian unions can lift Jews out of their tribal isolation and cure them of their shortcomings.

As a novelist, Julia Frankau was much influenced by French naturalism, to which she was introduced by George Moore, whom she first met through her brother.⁵⁵ This influence can be seen in her harsh delineation of character and frank treatment of sexual themes. No sentimental "lady novelist," she believed that "the realistic representation of life was the only desideratum of novel-writing, the only consideration that would make it worthwhile."⁵⁶ These convictions undoubtedly contributed to the unflattering manner in which Jews are presented in *Dr. Phillips*. (Frankau's gentile characters are also morally, but not physically, unattractive: Phillips' mistress is a vicious schemer and a terrible mother while Alec Murphy is vapid and naive.) And, in all fairness, there was a kernel of truth in what she said. Maida Vale Jewry was *nouveau riche* in the literal sense of the term. Most middle-class Jews at this time were not well-educated or inclined to take an interest in art, literature, or science. Nor was Frankau alone in attributing to English Jewry an excessive devotion to card-playing. Among others, the Rev.

Simeon Singer of the Bayswater Synagogue, who could hardly be described as a self-hating Jew, thought the community was “far too much addicted to card-playing as the one unfailing resource to kill the demon of ennui.”⁵⁷

And yet it is also obvious that this is no measured account of middle-class Anglo-Jewish life. Frankau’s hostility to the milieu of her upbringing is crude and unrelenting. What seems to be driving her is a strong desire to escape identification with the common run of Jews by distancing herself from them. The Jews in *Dr. Phillips* embody all the negative qualities that contemporaries associated with them and that Frankau feared could be attributed to her by virtue of her background. By assigning these flaws and failings to other Jews, she was both reassuring herself and announcing to the gentile public that she was different, that she had escaped the tribal compound. Indeed, she made it quite clear in *Dr. Phillips* that exceptional Jews could transcend the narrowness of their origins if they exerted themselves:

Sections of [middle-class Jewry] are trying very hard to struggle against this race-barrier, and with a modicum of success. But they have much to contend against.⁵⁸

Julia Frankau’s novel was a milestone in public presentations of Jewishness in Britain. With the notable exception of Benjamin Disraeli, English Jews were not accustomed to airing their innermost feelings about Jewishness in public forums. If they struggled to resolve conflicts in their personal identities, they did so in private, without giving literary expression to their anguish. Becoming English, it seems, was a more private affair than becoming German and probably an easier, less tension-ridden task as well. It is difficult, for example, to locate English Jewish figures who struggled with or expressed alienation from their Jewishness in the public way that Rahel Varnhagen, Heinrich Heine, Ludwig Börne, Karl Marx, and other tortured German Jews did.⁵⁹ In particular, English Jews seemed to have been less prone to neurotic self-loathing than their continental cousins, which is not surprising, given the differences in their legal and social positions. The only significant literary expression of Jewish self-hatred before the 1880s is found in Samuel Phillips’ novel *Caleb Stukeley* (1841), in which shabby, dirt-encrusted, dark-complexioned, grasping Jewish tradesmen appear in minor roles. Phillips (1814-1854), the son of a London Jewish tradesman, joined the Church of England while a young man and after a checkered career eventually became literary critic for *The Times*.⁶⁰ He was unusual, however: few converts in England were moved to express hostility to their former coreligionists in order to demonstrate their bona fides. In any case, it failed to obscure his Jewish origins. His critical reviews of several works of William Makepeace Thackeray in the 1850s, for example, led the latter to harp on the converted critic’s origins in correspondence with friends.⁶¹

Dr. Phillips was the first of several novels by Jewish (and half-Jewish) authors in the late-Victorian period that incorporated negative representations of Jews and

Judaism. It was followed by Amy Levy's *Reuben Sachs* in 1888, Cecily Ullman Sidgwick's *Issac Eller's Money* in 1889 and *Lesser's Daughter* in 1894, and Leonard Merrick's *Violet Moses* in 1891. This body of work registers the shift that occurred in the climate toward Jews at the end of the century. While it is not possible in this essay to enter into the current debate about the character of anti-semitism and the emancipation experience in England, there is a consensus that anti-semitism was more overt and focused in the last decades of the century than before. The arrival of tens of thousands of East European immigrants and the penetration of Jewish financiers and Randlords into high society (especially the Prince of Wales's circle), along with the spread of racial thinking and the crisis of liberalism, combined to focus public attention on Jews to a degree hitherto unknown in Britain. Jews like Julia Frankau, Amy Levy, and Leonard Merrick, eager to break away from the communal fold, were sensitive to the shift that was occurring. A young Jewish journalist in Merrick's *Violet Moses* confesses that he is reluctant to admit he is a Jew because "one is always afraid the genial faces will harden, and the cheery smiles grow chilly, and fade away."⁶² One response was to assert their difference from ordinary Jews – in the case of these novelists, by offering for public consumption critical views of the group to which they were linked by birth.

The publication of *Dr. Phillips* brought Julia Frankau notoriety rather than fame. The reviews were mostly hostile. The *Athenaeum*, for example, deplored the "unsavory topics," "repulsive personages," and "dreary crudities of Mr. Danby's pages" and detected in the author's animus toward Jews "a personal grievance" rather than "a conscientious effort after impartiality." *Punch* dismissed her work summarily: "It should never have been written. Having been written, it should never have been published. Having been published, it should not be read."⁶³ Within the Jewish community, it created a storm. According to Eliza Aria, publication of her sister's novel "fluttered the doves of Maida Vale" and "rattled the skeletons in the cupboards and the stout ladies at the card-tables." To many Jews, Frankau was a traitor and turncoat, feeding the fires of anti-semitism with her lurid descriptions of Jewish clannishness, materialism, and lust. When several London dailies "swallowed" her portraits as "true representations of Jewish life" and, a decade later, the anti-alien publicist Arnold White thrice cited *Dr. Phillips* as evidence of "the aloofness of Israel" in his strident tract *The Modern Jew*, their worst fears came true.⁶⁴

The scandal of *Dr. Phillips* was compounded by publication the following year of Amy Levy's *Reuben Sachs* (1888).⁶⁵ Levy was almost as harsh in her delineation of Jewish manners and morals, and the two works became linked in public discussion, the notoriety of each reinforcing that of the other. In his column in the *Jewish Standard*, Israel Zangwill, who was no communal apologist, denounced Frankau and Levy in tandem for their propensity to view the community in either black or white terms. In his view, they had been "goaded into indiscriminating hostility by the cramping materialism around them" and

had “painted Jews as if they were as destitute of any redeeming quality as a two-year-old pawnticket.”⁶⁶ The outcry was such that Frankau felt compelled to deny she hated Jews in a preface to a second edition that appeared the same year. She claimed the book was not “an attack upon a body of people whom I both respect and esteem.” Rather, it was “a picture of a small and little known section of society before it yields to the influences of advanced civilization and education.”⁶⁷

Adding to the sensation created by the novel were rumors that Frankau had based the character of Dr. Phillips on Ernest Abraham Hart (1837-1898), an eminent physician, medical journalist, and public health campaigner. In her memoirs, Eliza Aria denied that the novel ever “merited the popular suspicion that the hero was taken from life,” although conceding in another context that her sister Julia preferred living models for her characters and “took them unconscionably.” Gilbert, on the other hand, often stated that his mother had used Hart as a model and claimed that she had known him intimately. Furthermore, when the manuscript was first brought to the publisher Henry Vizetelly, it bore the title *Dr. Abrams*, which he insisted be changed because it was too close to Hart’s middle name. And when the fictional physician and his alleged model are compared, the similarities are, in fact, striking. Both take scores of prizes as students, serve as editors of medical journals, win fame as expert diagnosticians, and love luxurious surroundings. In addition, Hart’s first wife, Rosetta Levy, died suspiciously in 1861 at age 26 from accidental poisoning, and rumors circulated in medical circles for years afterward that Hart had murdered her. His second wife, like the fictional Phillips’ mistress, was a Christian. Still, Frank Vizetelly, son of Julia Frankau’s publisher, claimed that she had never met Hart and knew nothing about the conditions under which his wife had died.⁶⁸ In the end, whether true or not, the rumors contributed to the novel’s notoriety.

The unpleasantness created by *Dr. Phillips* convinced Frankau to abandon, at least temporarily, Jewish themes. She continued to write – reviews, novels, and three studies of eighteenth-century engravings (which she also collected)⁶⁹ – but she did not produce another Jewish novel until 1903, when *Pigs in Clover* appeared. A response, in part, to the rich-Jew anti-semitism ignited by the Boer War (1899-1902), this novel offered more differentiated constructions of the Jew. The central figure, Karl Althaus, son of a Wardour Street bric-à-brac dealer, has made his fortune in South African diamond mines. Although willing to use dishonest methods in making his millions, he is at heart a generous if uncultured fellow who learns in the course of the novel that promoting British imperial interests is better than making money. As an English woman with whom he is in love realizes, “there pulsed beneath these sordid, grasping, greedy Jews... a wealth and warmth of goodness, of generosity, of which the colder, slower, Northern men were scarcely capable.” Frankau indicates that Karl is not a practicing Jew. Indeed, he repudiates Judaism, viewing it less as a religion than,

in words that reflect Julia's own outlook, "a thing of forms and foods, a race habit," "a tradition, an obstinacy," "an empty thing of ceremonies." He wishes he could believe in Christianity and dreams of bringing the story of Jesus to London's immigrant Jews so they can attain the belief he longs for. To achieve this end, he considers establishing a theater in Houndsditch to stage passion and miracle plays, as in Oberammergau. Though this scheme brings him "much *undeserved* obloquy" [my emphasis], the author adds that there is in his idea "a germ that may some day bear fruit."⁷⁰ This would appear to be a conversionist blueprint for the radical assimilation of the English Jewish masses, destined, in Frankau's fantasy, to follow in her children's footsteps.

In *Pigs in Clover* – in contrast to *Dr. Phillips* – there are both "good" Jews and "bad" Jews, the latter represented by Karl's charming, well-mannered half-brother, Louis. Unlike Karl, who wishes to serve both British imperialism and the Christian religion, Louis resists redemption to the end. Unscrupulous and manipulative, completely without morals, he bears responsibility for the suicide of Karl's Christian wife, the most sympathetic character in the novel. In words echoing accepted communal wisdom, a well-born Member of Parliament and victim of Louis notes: "It is the misfortune of the Jews that one of their community cannot misbehave without earning opprobrium for their whole body."⁷¹ If so, can "good" Jews be blamed for separating themselves from their "bad" brethren, especially when their religion is dead?

Although Julia and Gilbert Frankau belonged both in terms of income and background to the prosperous Jewish merchant class, they were not content to remain within its social boundaries. Julia was an active, energetic hostess, particularly after the death of her husband in 1904. Her guests were drawn from the largely gentile worlds of journalism, publishing, literature, theater, and the arts. Her friends included the novelists George Moore and Ada Levenson, the editor Frank Harris, the actor Henry Irving (her sister Eliza's lover for many years), the publisher Sidney Pawling, the humorist Max Beerbohm, the essayist and journalist A. B. Walkley, Marie Belloc Lowndes, sister of the notorious antisemite Hillaire Belloc, and the dramatist and critic Malcolm Salaman, one of the few Jews in her circle, aside from her siblings James and Eliza. Her work on eighteenth-century engravings brought her into contact with well-born and frequently titled collectors, and in the preface to her study of the engraver John Raphael Smith she emphasized that her chosen field of collecting put her in an elite group of cultivated persons. Her subject, she wrote, appealed only to a small "cultured, perceptive public."⁷² In Central Europe, Jews who moved in these worlds could not escape the company of other Jews, but in Britain Jews were much less prominent in artistic, literary, and intellectual life, whether as creators, patrons, or interpreters. Thus, even if she had not been fleeing her Judaism, she would have found herself in overwhelmingly gentile precincts, simply by virtue of her cultural interests.

In conversation, as in her novels, Julia Frankau distanced herself and her husband from their origins. She boasted to Marie Belloc Lowndes that her husband's fine qualities were due to the German Lutheran stock from which he came and the absence of any Jewish blood! (Lowndes was convinced that she was being absolutely truthful.) She also enjoyed gossiping to Lowndes about "unpleasing traits" in the characters of well-known Jews of the day, as if to demonstrate by her willingness to betray the flaws of the Jews that she was not really one of them. In politics as well, she detached herself from the mass of Jews. While most middle-class Jews at this time, including her husband, were liberals, she was a strident supporter of conservative measures and an ardent imperialist. During the coal miners strike of 1912, she told Arnold Bennett: "Of course I'm feudal. I'd batten them down. I'd make them work. They *should* work. I'd force them down."⁷³

Julia's sister Eliza also became a writer, but in her case from necessity. At age 18, in the wake of Julia's marriage and departure from home, she rushed into an ill-fated marriage with David Bonito Aria (c.1860-1913), a handsome, charming young man, slender alike in waist, intellect, and integrity, as she later wrote. They were wed in the Reform synagogue in March 1884, he having been admitted a member one month earlier. From the start the marriage was a disaster. Aria was a poor businessman and an inveterate racetrack gambler. When he lost, he pawned their wedding gifts and her jewelry and borrowed money from her family. Their love for each other cooled, and after five years they separated, her family paying his way to South Africa and taking care of his creditors.⁷⁴ With a young daughter to support, Eliza responded positively to a suggestion from a family friend in the newspaper business that she try writing. She started with weekly contributions on fashion and shopping to *Jewish Society*, a short-lived, iconoclastic rival to the *Jewish Chronicle*.⁷⁵ After its demise in November 1890, her fashion articles began appearing in the *The Gentlewoman*, a journal for which her sister Julia was already writing. She then went on to edit the fashion pages of *Hearth and Home*. Finally, with financial backing from Harry H. Marks (1855-1916), proprietor of the *Financial News* and son of the Reform minister D. W. Marks, she launched her own fashion monthly, *The World of Dress*, which featured fashion news from Paris, Vienna, and New York and interviews about dress with famous people. She also contributed a gossip column ("Mrs. A's Diary") for many years to Henry Labouchere's biweekly *Truth*, which was known for its exposés of fraudulent enterprises, including Jewish moneylending schemes, and did free-lance work as well for half a dozen newspapers.⁷⁶

Described by the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1900 as "perhaps the most successful lady journalist of the day," Eliza was a "personality" (her term) on the London social scene. Her "great capacity for friendship, ... coupled with her social gifts both as guest and hostess, made her welcome in any circle she cared to penetrate." For more than 30 years, she presided over a salon where the worlds of literature, art, and theater mixed. Her regular guests included the dramatists Alfred Sutro, Cecil

Raleigh, and John Van Druten, the actors Henry Irving, Herbert Beerbohm Tree, and Sybil Thorndyke, the poet and critic Humbert Wolfe, and the novelists Harold Begbie, Michael Arlen, G. B. Stern, Ford Madox Ford, and H. G. Wells. Her obituary in *Truth* noted that “she knew most of the leading writers, actors, and actresses of the last few decades.” She never remarried but eventually succeeded Ellen Terry as Henry Irving’s mistress and remained with him until his death.⁷⁷

Like her sister, Eliza Aria removed herself from the Maida Vale milieu of *Dr. Phillips*, but unlike her she felt no need to distance herself from that world in her writing or in other public forums. In her memoirs, for example, which appeared in 1922, she recounted her Jewish upbringing in straightforward language, free from mockery or contempt. She continued to identify herself as a Jew throughout her life and became a member of the Liberal (radical Reform) synagogue established in 1911, in whose cemetery she was buried. Nonetheless, she welcomed antisemitic writers like Wells into her circle, turning a blind eye presumably to their disparagement of Jews and Judaism. Eliza’s only child, Nita (d. 1923), married a non-Jewish imperial official who served in Burma for many years.⁷⁸

IV

Julia and Arthur Frankau had four children. One son, Paul Ewart (1890-1917), known as Jack, became an unsuccessful farmer in Rhodesia and died in battle during World War I, in Allenby’s attack on Gaza – and, thus, ironically, is buried in the Land of Israel. The other three, it would appear, inherited the drive of their Jewish forebears and achieved prominence in their respective fields. Ronald (1894-1951), who was sent to Eton and then studied for a short time at the Guildhall School of Music, became a comedian, first in revues and musical comedies and then, from the late 1920s, on radio. If his Jewish background troubled him, he kept it to himself. Aline (1896-1986), known as Joan, was educated at Wycombe Abbey, in Hamburg and Paris, and then at Girton College, Cambridge, where she obtained a first in English. In 1920, she married Stanley Bennett, a fellow of Emmanuel College, and herself became a fellow of Girton and lecturer in English. In a period in which few women were prominent in the academy, she won acclaim for her work on the metaphysical poets, George Eliot and Virginia Woolf. A student at Cambridge in the 1940s recalled that for Bennett Jewishness was “not even a memory, but simply a genealogical fact, a documentation that she had been born of Jewish parents.” She made no effort to hide her antecedents; in fact, she took some pride in them, but she was totally ignorant of all things Jewish, having been raised outside of any Jewish context.⁷⁹

For first-born Gilbert, however, knowledge of his Jewish ancestors was troublesome. He was educated in elite society at Eton, where he could not escape

references to his origins. Although he himself was silent on this score, which in itself is significant, other assimilated Jewish writers of his generation who were at public schools have testified to the abuse directed at Jews, baptized and unbaptized alike. Indeed, the poet E.H.W. Meyerstein (1889-1952), the converted son of a stockbroker father, felt that he became the target of wounding schoolboy taunts at Harrow precisely because he was neither fully Jewish nor fully Christian.⁸⁰

Despite a strong record at Eton, Frankau left, in 1901, before reaching the sixth form. He entered the family cigar business, then flourishing but soon to suffer a serious reversal, when it ceased to be the exclusive agent for Upmann cigars in Great Britain. The loss of sole agency was a great blow, which, according to Gilbert, hastened his father's death in 1904. Since the only surviving partner, Gilbert's uncle Joseph Grünbaum, was then almost 70, Julia bought him out and a new company was formed, with Gilbert, just 21, as managing director.⁸¹ Gilbert worked hard and sales remained solid, but he lacked his father's commercial judgment. He made an incautious investment in a cigarette manufacturing firm in Brixton and lavished money unnecessarily on refurbishing the Frankau warehouse and office in Gracechurch Street. In the end, the profits earned from selling cigars were not sufficient to cover the losses sustained from manufacturing cigarettes. Following Julia's death in 1916, both the cigarette factory and the family cigar business were sold.

While not successful in business, Gilbert Frankau was a commercial, if not artistic, success as a novelist and journalist. He began writing before the war, but after the sale of the firm and his discharge from the army he made it his full-time profession, winning almost immediate recognition. His second novel, *Peter Jackson, Cigar Merchant* (1919), sold over one hundred thousand copies. In 1926, the critic Patrick Braybrooke described him as "one of the most widely read novelists of the present day," attributing his appeal to his perfect knowledge of "what the ordinary man and woman want to read." In 1932, Q. D. Leavis bracketed him with Rudyard Kipling and Arnold Bennett as three of the most successful, bestselling novelists of the time. In her view, of course, this was not praise, since she thought popular novelists like Frankau menaced cultural standards by pandering to herd prejudice and debasing "emotional currency by touching grossly on fine issues." But this kind of criticism failed to discomfit Frankau, who was contemptuous of what he called "highbrow" intellectuals and saw himself, in the words of his daughter Pamela (1908-1967), as "a paid entertainer, who must never for a minute lose sight of his public." Unlike her "highbrow friends," he did not regard himself as "a hothouse-blooming genius." For him, writing was a commercial venture, like selling cigars, at which he labored methodically. *Punch's* judgment that he was "perhaps as good a storyteller as we have in England at the moment" (1940) was high praise by his lights.⁸²

Frankau's fiction reveals that he remained concerned about his Jewish origins throughout his life, despite having been raised, at least formally, as a Christian. Like Heine and Disraeli, he was unable to set aside his biological Jewishness, that is, his awareness that he had descended from Jews, and merge effortlessly into Christian society.⁸³ In the novels he wrote in the late-teens and twenties, he introduced minor Jewish characters, with exaggerated and often crude stereotypical features, whose presence, as Jews, was incidental or irrelevant to the stories he was telling. In his first novel, *The Woman of the Horizon*, published in 1917, the cigar merchant Peter Jackson, who is calling on potential customers abroad, meets a young English Jew working as a shop assistant in Port Said, who is described "as lacking in personal reticence as any other of his race." The Jewish cigarette manufacturer Marcus Bramson in his next novel, the best-seller *Peter Jackson*, is stout, voluble, wheedling, and gesticulating, wears shabby, greasy clothes, and, although worth a quarter of a million pounds, spends nothing and is content to live "in an eighty-pound villa at Maida Vale." Roddy Marks, a swarthy, olive-skinned, dark-haired entertainment mogul in *Life – and Erica*, published in 1925, is associated with sexual danger and corruption. The innocent Erica is horrified and nauseated when she discovers that her old school chum Doffy has become Roddy's mistress. She admits that his face is handsome, that most women find his kind of face attractive. Yet, for her, it is "a trifle too swarthy, perhaps; a trifle too eager-eyed, too red-lipped, too – she hesitated over the description – oriental."⁸⁴

Frankau's recourse to stereotypical language like this may have been a half-conscious strategy to emphasize his own Englishness and, at the same time, to demonstrate his independence from Jews. Alternatively, it may have been a reflection of his immersion in English circles in which such representations were commonplace and deployed unthinkingly. Whatever the cause, he continued to use crude stereotypes throughout his writing career. In addition, he incorporated elements of racial thinking into his fiction, insisting, contrary to what one might expect, on the persistence of Jewish racial traits in the descendants of former Jews. For example, he described the cousins Peter Jackson and Francis Gordon in his first novel as almost like brothers in appearance. "In each, a trace of the same Hebrew strain – legacy of a mutual grandmother on the distaff side – was apparent." More than physical appearance is at stake, however. Jewish blood, no matter how diluted, continues to influence behavior generation after generation in Frankau's fiction. In Hong Kong, Francis is about to offer financial help to an expensive whore with whom he has fallen in love, but then decides otherwise. "His own money sense – despised legacy of the Hebrew strain which had saved him so many of the youth-follies of his kind – woke to rare consciousness in his brain." Later, when he learns that the family firm is failing and that he will have to live more modestly, he wonders how he will manage. "The blood of his Hebrew grandparent" asks, "Could one get five per cent with safety?" Similarly, at the end of *Peter Jackson*, when the eponymous hero, who has been wounded

in battle and is unfit to resume military duty, must decide what to do with his life – the family cigar firm has been sold – “the Jew in him” urges him to exploit the commercial possibilities of the country property he has acquired.⁸⁵

It is curious that Frankau gave credence to racial notions that denied the efficacy of cultural and social assimilation. One would have thought that a convert from a radical assimilationist background like his would have taken the opposite view, arguing that the leopard could indeed change his spots. One explanation is that racial thinking was part and parcel of the mental landscape of the period and few writers, including Jews, escaped its baleful impact. While true, however, there is more to Frankau’s “racism” than this. In his case, his repeated insistence on the indestructibility of racial traits and their power to reassert themselves even in the most deracinated representatives of Jewry reads like an autobiographical confession, a statement of his own psychological inability to set aside his Jewish past. Unlike his sister Joan, to whom Jewishness was “a genealogical fact” and not much else, his Jewish antecedents were a mental burden, a source of discomfort and unease. Racial thinking helped him to understand his powerlessness to be free of his Jewish past.

From the mid-twenties on, Frankau used a further strategy to protect himself from being associated with so-called Jewish traits. In his writing he began to distinguish between “good” Jews and “bad” Jews – as his mother had two decades earlier in *Pigs in Clover*. In *Masterson* (1925), a political novel influenced by Italian fascism, one of the central characters, Adrian Rose, is a model of the right kind of Jew. He is an Eton-educated successful playwright, a decorated war hero who would have been awarded the Victoria Cross if he had not been a Jew. In physical terms, he is “a forceful rock of a man,” with “only slightly Hebraic nostrils” and “an even less Hebraic mouth,” who looks “more like an old-time prize-fighter than a modern playwright.” In the context of the novel, what distinguishes Rose from “bad” Jews is his politics. Like Masterson, he is a right-wing patriot – anti-union, anti-communist, anti-socialist, pro-imperial. He is convinced that the Labour Party has been captured by “a heterogeneous mass of arid intellectuals, sterile agitators, sentimental old women, disgruntled office-holders, renegade Irishmen, renegade Jews and renegade Parsees,” “backed, bolstered and Bolshevized by the infamous I.L.P.” To save Britain and the empire, Rose founds and directs the right-wing Fellowship of Loyal Citizens. “Bad” Jews, of course, are left-wing Jews, which, in interwar Britain, meant a great many Jews of East European origin. Rose explains to Masterson that “these Bolshevik Jews are the dregs of my race” and that they are “just as much anti-Gentile as the dregs of yours are anti-Semite.”⁸⁶ Given the prominence of the Bolshevik theme in political anti-semitism in the 1920s,⁸⁷ Frankau’s willingness to exploit this association indicates how divorced he was from the mass of Jews, as well as how desperate he was to distinguish between patriotic and disloyal Jews. And yet, at the same time, he also

reaffirmed the racial character of Jews, even “good” Jews like Rose and, presumably, himself. Masterson, who admires Rose and considers him an intimate friend, cannot forget that he is a Jew, “a creature altogether unlike himself,” although he reprimands himself – “damned unfair of me, of course” – for thinking like this. Still, Frankau concludes, between Masterson and Rose “there yawned that deep gulf which separates, and will always separate, the soul of the Christian from the soul of the Jew.”⁸⁸

In the 1930s, Nazism in Germany, violence in Palestine, and Blackshirt campaigns in the East End focused unprecedented attention on Jews. As EM. Forster noted at the end of the decade, “Jew-consciousness” was in the air. It was thus increasingly difficult for public figures with Jewish “blood” to ignore their origins. Some who had been indifferent to Jewish matters in the past were now roused to embrace Zionism, campaign against anti-semitism, or aid refugees. But Gilbert Frankau experienced no such change of heart. He kept his distance and continued to draw invidious comparisons between acceptable and unacceptable Jews. The most notorious instance occurred in an article in the *Daily Express* in May 1933 with the provocative title “As a Jew I Am Not against Hitler.” Here he argued that the outcry against Hitler was overdone and that his attempts to rid Germany of Jews who were not “good” Germans were justified. Writing as an Englishman “of Jewish blood, though not of the Jewish faith,” he maintained that there was a “substratum of truth” to the Nazi charge that Jews were not Germans. “Many German Jews,” he wrote, “are entirely out of sympathy with the aspirations of the Nordic tribes among which they have made their homes.” As evidence, he cited the communist movement, largely fomented by Jews, in his view. Such Jews imperilled every country they inhabited, and Hitler was certainly justified in kicking them out. Fortunately, he added, British Jews were patriotic, proud of their country, loyal to its flag, free of the “ghetto-spirit” still found in their co-religionists in Germany.⁸⁹

In two works of fiction from this period, Frankau also commented explicitly on radical assimilation. In both, the central male Jewish characters are presented as strikingly “un-Jewish,” which is undoubtedly how Frankau himself wished to be seen. Harold Ingram in the short story “An Outlier from His Tribe” (1927) is “even less of a Jew than the name implies.” He is over six feet tall and his hair, “though there’s a trace of curl in it, is very nearly Viking-colour.” His eyes are also “Viking-colour” – “blue, with the far-away-sea-look.” His nose, the critical marker of Jewishness for self-hating Jews, “except for a queer dilation about the nostrils, is almost pure Greek.” Having done “three pretty good years at the Front,” he still “carries himself like a soldier.” David Lewis, the hero of the novel *Farewell Romance* (1936), moves like an athlete; neither his black but straight hair, prominent nose, nor vocal inflections betray his “racial origin.”⁹⁰

In social and religious terms, Ingram and Lewis have broken their Jewish links. Most of Harold Ingram’s friends are Christians, and, “like most people

nowadays,” he is an agnostic. Thus, “one wouldn’t go far wrong in describing him as an outlier from the main tribe.” And like all outliers, “his bias... was primarily against rather than for his own tribe,” although, Frankau hastens to add, Ingram “was never one of your Jew-hating Jews.” Yet when he finds himself in a pub “which is *the* Mecca of [his] tribe at Christmas time,” surrounded by Jews, “just a bit more flamboyant about their clothes, just a little less restrained of voice, than the other people,” radiating their own particular “clan-atmosphere,” he resents their presence. “These aren’t *my* people,” his eyes seem to say. “These are the people I’ve broken loose from. And I’m glad I broke loose from them. They’re not my kind.” David Lewis, a successful wholesale draper, has severed his communal ties as well. His wife and close friends are not Jewish, and, like his father, he is a scoffer, for whom religion is “just superstition, bred by fear out of ignorance.” When solicited to contribute to a fund for German Jewish refugees, he wonders about his relationship to them – “were those people his?” “The question puzzled, irritated, confused him. Admittedly, he was sorry for these ‘poor wretches.’... But could he feel any kinship with them?” “Definitely, no,” he decides, “because I neither worship their god nor speak their language.”⁹¹

Nonetheless, despite their distance from other Jews, both Ingram and Lewis are unable to sever themselves completely from “the clan-folk.” For Jewishness, Frankau now explains in “An Outlier from the Tribe,” is reducible to neither blood nor religion. Rather: “It’s a mental attitude; a soul-tie; a bond of psychological and atavistic kinship.” It is inescapable and, in the end, resistant to even the most radical assimilation. Ingram, “for all his outlying habits,” is “very nearly as much of the tribe as your latest immigrants into Whitechapel or Jaffa.” Engaged to marry the well-bred granddaughter of the former owner of what is now his country house, Ingram rejects her at the last moment for the strawberry blonde, “un-Hebraic looking” Doris Mendelson. When push comes to shove, he is unable to resist “the tribal deities.” Similarly, David Lewis finds himself drawn, almost against his will, into rescue work on behalf of German Jews. Although he continues to protest that he is an Englishman first and a Jew second, he increasingly reacts to events, personal and political, in “Jewish” ways. When his wife dies, his emotional self-control – in Frankau’s mental economy a marker of authentic Englishness – dissolves and he weeps unashamedly. Later he wonders: “Queer, how he had given way like that. So Jewish of him. Well, why not? He had never been ashamed of being a Jew.” But there are limits to his reclaimed Jewishness. While supportive of Palestine as a refuge from persecution, he balks at becoming a Zionist. “Too emotional. Too fanatical.” Fearful of being seen as too much the Jewish partisan, he attributes the economic development of Palestine to British rather than Jewish efforts and, in a final try to distance himself from total identification with Jews, declares that “we” English must see that “fair play” is done to both sides, Jews and Arabs, in Palestine.⁹²

These emotionally reserved, faultlessly groomed, “un-Hebraic looking,” strong Jewish men mirror the face that Frankau presented to the real world. In terms of his social habits, personal tastes, and political attitudes, he resembled a mix of diehard Tory squire and feckless aristocratic buck more than a Jewish businessman. (His work habits alone remained bourgeois.) Eschewing his father’s frugality, he lived beyond his means and was in constant debt, despite the large sums he earned from his writing. He married three times (in each case a gentile), which in itself was an extravagance. His second wife, Aimée de Burgh, for example, spent £1,000 a year on clothing and landed him in court in 1931 when her dressmaker’s bills went unpaid. Insufferably arrogant, dashing and tough like the men in his novels, Frankau fished and hunted and motored, acting as if he were a born-aristocrat. In a promotional pamphlet he wrote for the cigar trade in 1925, he associated cigar-smoking (and himself) with “the born leaders of mankind,” those of reliable judgment who accepted responsibility, “the dominant type which is more than ever needed in the higher branches of our present-day existence” to prevent the planet from sinking into “mere food-hunting barbarism.” Is it surprising that he was “much read by the governing class,” according to Q. D. Leavis? But a good deal of this was a pose: he confessed to his closest friends that he was terrified of riding, that he was haunted by the fear that at bottom he was really a coward.⁹³

Before World War I, Frankau was apparently indifferent to politics, but after the war he acquired a passionate interest, veering strongly to the right. Impressed by Benito Mussolini and Italian fascism on a visit to San Remo in early 1923, he became a public speaker for extreme right-wing groups. He introduced fascist ideas into his novels *Gerald Cranston’s Lady* (1923) and *Masterson* (1925) and the short-lived illustrated weekly, *Britannia*, that he edited from November 1928 to April 1929. In the latter he served up standard fascist fare, minus anti-semitism: party politics were weakening national resolve, trade unions were too powerful, capital and labor needed to cooperate, free trade was harmful to workers, strong imperial ties were Britain’s last hope against its enemies abroad. For Frankau, imperialism was an especially attractive vehicle for asserting his Englishness, as it was for many assimilationist-minded Jews, like Rufus Isaacs (1860-1935), viceroy of India from 1921 to 1926, and Edwin Montagu (1879-1924), parliamentary undersecretary of state for India from 1910 to 1914 and secretary of state for India from 1917 to 1922. It allowed them to identify vicariously with Anglo-Saxon racial superiority and the divine mission of the British to govern lesser races. Frankau remained a man of the right until his death, but once he understood what the Hitler regime was about he came to see fascism as a threat to liberty and had no more truck with it. In his memoirs (1939), he referred to it as a “virus” and admitted he had been “too intolerant, too intransigent, too much the diehard” 15 years earlier.⁹⁴

Gilbert Frankau’s complex and, for the most part, negative response to his Jewish origins stands in sharp contrast to that of his daughter Pamela, the

younger of his two daughters by his first wife, Dolly Drummond-Black, and the most gifted novelist in the Frankau family. For Pamela, the presence of Jews in the family tree was not a source of distress or discomfort. Indeed, the opposite was true. She went out of her way to defend and identify with Jews, although raised an Anglican and then, in 1942, baptized a Catholic. She once remarked, in explaining her enlistment in the Auxiliary Territorial Service during World War II, that she loved her country "with the peculiarly ardent love of England that is felt by some English Jews." In 1935, she wrote, "If I were capable of cataloguing my preference among people I should head the list with writers and Jews." A few years later she became active in relief work for German Jewish refugees, which annoyed her father, with whom her relations were often testy. At a party she gave in support of Tythrop House (a farm in Oxfordshire where young German refugees received agricultural training before emigration to Palestine), Gilbert told her that he was "bored" by her rush to identify herself with "the Jewish race," particularly, he added, when he had taken the trouble to provide her with a Christian mother. In reflecting on his remark, she summed up the difference in attitude between them thusly: "Gilbert took his Jewish blood more lightheartedly than I took my half-share." She then recounted a story he had told her. When an English admiral in Malta said to him, "You'll agree with me, Frankau, about these damn Jews," he responded with a loud laugh. She asked her father whether he told the admiral that he was a Jew. He replied that he certainly had not, that it was none of the bastard's business, to which she responded by saying that she would always "weigh in," that it was cowardly not to.⁹⁵

Pamela Frankau erred in suggesting that her father took his Jewishness more lightheartedly than she. If his background had been a matter of true indifference to him, he would have responded differently to the admiral in Malta and then forgotten the incident altogether. Nor would he have been upset that his daughter devoted herself to Jewish refugee work. Indeed, the truth is the opposite of what Pamela suggested: it was Gilbert, not she, whose attitude toward Jewishness was obsessive. Not that she was indifferent, of course. In her fiction, she defended Jews from the casual anti-semitism that was endemic in middle-class English society. In *A Wreath for the Enemy* (1954), when the conventional, unimaginative Mr. Bradley makes snide remarks about a Jew being made master of the local hunt, his son replies that he is a great horseman, knows the country backwards and forwards, and has done more for the hunt than anyone else. Mr. Bradley retorts that that is the way parvenu Jews always get in, to which his son responds: "The racist would do well to remind himself once a day that Our Lord was a Jew." And in *The Winged Horse* (1953), the sculptor Anthony Carey recalls a regimental dinner when a half-Jewish officer stood up to protest some anti-Jewish remarks and talked for half an hour, becoming angrier and angrier and making his fellow officers increasingly uncomfortable. When someone suggested that it was bad manners and that he should have kept quiet (as Gilbert Frankau had in Malta), Carey answered that "he would have felt like a coward,

sitting there, letting some chucklehead talk about ‘kikes’ and pretending it didn’t touch or concern him.”⁹⁶

Pamela Frankau could also wax rhapsodic about Jews, which would have been impossible for her father. For example, in *The Devil We Know* (1939), the part-Jewish Sally Fisher muses about the fate of the Jews and her relationship to them:

She thought with affection of the race of whose blood there was a little in her; loving them for their kindness, for their easy slant into melodrama, for the gentle, elusive quality that the best of them had, for their childish defiance of the world that was their imposition.

Their purpose is now clear to her. They are “the leaven of the human race, the secret of its liveliness.”⁹⁷ This mode of thinking about Jews is, of course, as essentialist as her father’s, for it assumes that Jews possess innate (racial?) characteristics, manifestations of an essential Jewishness. What separated Pamela from Gilbert – and this is critical – was that for her these traits were admirable rather than unfortunate and embarrassing. She could also write with sensitivity about emotionally tortured, self-hating Jews. The scriptwriter Philip Meyer in *The Devil We Know*, the nephew of assimilation-minded German-Jewish textile merchants in Bradford and the object of anti-Jewish witticisms since grammar school, describes himself as a “hateful, ill-mannered little Jew.” He goes mad, so consumed is he with self-loathing, though regains his sanity, as he is reconciled with his Jewishness, by the end of the novel.⁹⁸ (The great love of Pamela’s life and her lover for nine years, the poet and critic Humbert Wolfe [1886-1940], came from a radical assimilationist background similar to the fictional Meyer’s.)⁹⁹

Pamela Frankau was able to feel more comfortable about her Jewish antecedents than her father because she had been raised in unambiguously Christian surroundings. (Her parents divorced when she was a young child and she saw little of Gilbert and his relatives until she was an adult.) Her “ethnic” identity was fixed from birth and not open to question. Her connection with her Jewish background was thus a matter of choice, not an emotional obsession from which there was no escape. As a child and adolescent, she was too distant, in every sense, from Jewish or once-Jewish circles to suffer from assimilationist anxieties. Her father, on the other hand, was raised in a home that was neither Jewish nor Christian. His younger siblings were able to emerge from this social and religious indeterminacy without apparent difficulty. But for Gilbert, less resilient perhaps and made of a different mettle, the ambiguous character of his upbringing continued to exert its influence throughout his entire life. His Jewishness was not something he took lightheartedly, whatever he told himself or others. Perhaps if public interest in Jews had been less acute in interwar Britain, if “Jew-consciousness” had not been in the air, he would have been able to do so. But, then, we cannot choose the times in which we live.

V

The story of the Frankaus and their relatives lends itself to two broad interpretations. On one level, it can be read as a success story, testimony to the openness of English society (often seen, incorrectly, as closed and inflexible) and its toleration of ambitious newcomers. The children, in-laws, and grandchildren of the economically successful immigrants Adolph and Joseph Frankau entered non-commercial upper-middle class society, where they made their mark in a diverse group of fields: law, medicine, engineering, literature, scholarship, journalism, and entertainment. Their ascent was rapid and, it would appear, unencumbered by their Jewish and, in some cases, German background. Whatever the level of hostility to Jews in English cultural and political discourse – and it was considerable – it had little impact on the rise of the Frankaus, although it influenced, to be sure, their own self-image and attitudes toward other Jews. Even Carlyle, who represented Jews in his work as materialistic and unspiritual, tolerated, indeed embraced, Joseph Neuberger as friend and soul mate. In this sense, the representation of Jews in cultural and political discourse is not a reliable guide to how flesh-and-blood Jews fared in concrete social terms.

But there is a less celebratory interpretation of this story as well. The Frankaus did not enter upper-middle-class English society as observant Jews but, rather, as disaffiliated Jews, converted Jews, and children of converted Jews. This raises the question of whether their success was predicated on their renunciation of Judaism, their radical assimilation. Was there a *quid pro quo* at work in their successful integration? Were they expected to disavow Judaism and Jewish attachments in exchange for acceptance? In a formal sense, no. With the completion of legal emancipation in the mid-nineteenth century, no statutory barriers to Jewish integration remained. Nor, in practice, were occupational and social advancement closed to Jews because of informal or bureaucratic discrimination. To be sure, Frederick Joseph Frankau would not have been able to attend a public school like Rugby in the 1860s if he had remained Jewish, but there were other avenues to the bar that were open to professing Jews. In fact, for every successful Frankau, it would be possible to cite numerous parallel cases of entry into the non-commercial middle class in which Jewish affiliations remained intact.¹⁰⁰ Heine's oft-cited aphorism – “the baptismal certificate is the ticket of admission to European culture” – does not ring true in the British case.

However, in this context it should be remembered that the Frankau brothers, their wives, and Joseph Neuberger were immigrants from Germany. In the period of reaction that followed Waterloo and the Congress of Vienna, German Jews remained an actively persecuted minority, the despised, harassed targets of legal discrimination and social contempt. It was not uncommon for Jews raised in these circumstances, especially those without firm religious commitments, to experience their Jewishness as a burden or misfortune. Those who immigrated to Victorian Britain often brought with them attitudes like these and behaved as if

they were still living in their homeland, where radical assimilation was a common response to discrimination and denigration. Prisoners of their earlier experiences, they were unable to assess in a dispassionate way Anglo-Jewish status and their own opportunities for advancement. Hoping to remove what they thought was an obstacle to their acceptance, they rejected or loosened their Jewish ties.¹⁰¹ I would argue that the assimilationist behavior of the immigrant Frankaus fits this pattern, with an exception or two, of course, like Nathan Frankau, who settled in New Haven, Connecticut, and became a pillar of the local Jewish community.

But this explanation does not illuminate the behavior of Julia and Gilbert Frankau or the English-educated children of the immigrant generation, although in the latter case it can be assumed that parental attitudes were of some importance. Given the absence of barriers to Jewish integration, why did Julia and then Gilbert, who was, after all, a member of the Church of England, find their Jewishness so troublesome? The answer is linked to the reading of the Frankau story that emphasizes their loss of Jewishness rather than their social and occupational attainments. Although few obstacles blocked Jewish integration into the non-commercial middle class, English culture in the broadest sense was hostile to expressions of cultural diversity. Jews and Judaism continued to be represented in negative terms in literature, drama, sermons, political debate, and other forums. Circles and institutions willing to tolerate Jews as intimate associates were familiar with, tolerated, and disseminated these representations. Convinced, moreover, of their own superiority to other peoples, indeed, incapable of cultural relativism in any sense, Englishmen up and down the social ladder were unwilling to endorse the perpetuation of a separate Jewish culture or to see any value in the customs or beliefs of the Jewish religion. As Jews came to figure more prominently in the public eye from the 1870s on, these attitudes hardened and were expressed with greater sharpness and frequency. As a consequence, it became more common for Jews in the throes of full absorption to express publicly their contempt for and distance from the group they had left behind. Gilbert Frankau's contemporaries Leonard Woolf and Edwin Montagu were just as eager as he to resist association with the mass of Jews. Woolf, in fact, was so embarrassed by his background that he refused to invite his own mother to his wedding.¹⁰²

In this light, the Frankau saga cannot be accounted a success story. It exposes the narrowness of English cultural horizons, including contempt for Jewish particularism, and the pressure this exerted on individuals wishing to participate in social and cultural spheres outside the Jewish community. Even if this pressure to conform was muted and subtle in comparison to other states, it took its toll nonetheless. In the case of persons like Julia and Gilbert Frankau, the road to integration was unpleasant and troubled, at least at the psychological level. Reminded of their Jewishness by the increasing attention paid to Jews in public

discourse, the Frankaus felt compelled to return to it repeatedly, if only to stress how little they resembled other Jews. There is, then, a tragic or somber dimension to the Frankau story. What can be said in mitigation is that in its extremes it was not typical of the course of Anglo-Jewish integration before World War II, if only because most Jews, their feet firmly planted in the world of business, were content to enjoy each other's company and remain largely within the social boundaries of the Jewish community.

NOTES

I would not have been able to complete this article without the help of Miriam Cohen and Noah Siegel, my undergraduate research assistants in 1990-91 and 1991-92 respectively. I also wish to express my gratitude to the following friends, colleagues, and local historians who generously responded to requests for references and comments: Bryan Cheyette, Werner Hirsch, Aryeh Newman, Meri-Jane Rochelson, Sheldon Rothblatt, and Nadia Valman.

1. See, for example, Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany, 1983), chap. 6; Todd M. Endelman, ed., *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World* (New York, 1987); Deborah Hertz, *Jewish High Society in Old Regime Berlin* (New Haven, 1988), chap. 7; Jonathan I. Helfand, "Passports and Piety: Apostasy in Nineteenth-Century France," *Jewish History*, 3:2 (Fall 1988): 59-83; Peter Honigsmann, *Die Austritte aus der Jüdischen Gemeinde Berlin, 1873-1941* (Frankfurt a. Main, 1988); idem, "Die Austritte aus dem Judentum in Wien, 1868-1944," *Zeitgeschichte* 15 (1988): 452-66; idem, "Jewish Conversions – A Measure of Assimilation? A Discussion of the Berlin Secession Statistics of 1770-1941," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 34 (1989): 3-39; Todd M. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945* (Bloomington, IN, 1990).
2. David Landes, "Bleichröders and Rothschilds: The Problem of Continuity in the Family Firm," in *The Family in History*, ed. Charles E. Rosenberg (Philadelphia, 1975), 95-114; Fritz Stern, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder, and the Building of the German Empire* (New York, 1977); W. E. Mosse, *The German-Jewish Economic Elite, 1820-1935: A Socio-Cultural Profile* (Oxford, 1989); Steven M. Lowenstein, "Jewish Upper Crust and Berlin Jewish Enlightenment: The Family of Daniel Itzig," in *From East and West: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750-1870*, eds. Frances Malino and David Sorkin (Oxford, 1990), 182-201.
3. In 1837, the year in which Joseph Frankau migrated to London, there were 270 Jews in Diespeck, about one-third of the village population. In 1867, there were only 117 Jews, migration having taken its toll in the intervening thirty years. *Pinkas ha-kehillot: entsyiklopediyah shel ha-yishuvim ha-yehudiyim le-min hivasadam ve-ad le-ahar shoat milhemet ha-olam ha-sheniyyah – Germanyah – Bavaryah* [Encyclopedia of Jewish Communities from their Foundation till after the Holocaust of World War II – Germany – Bavaria], ed. Baruch Zvi Ophir (Jerusalem, 1972), 319.
4. Paul J. Jacobi, "The Geiger Family," mimeographed (Jerusalem, November 1964), unpaginated.

5. 1841 census, HO 107/716/8, Public Record Office, London (hereafter PRO); Alexander Dietz, *Stammbuch der Frankfurter Juden: Geschichtliche Mitteilungen über der Frankfurter jüdischen Familien von 1349-1849* (Frankfurt a. Main, 1907), 101.
6. *The Post Office London Directory for 1844*, 257-8; Vivian D. Lipman, "Jewish Settlement in the East End of London, 1840-1940: The Topographical and Statistical Background," in *The Jewish East End, 1840-1939*, ed. Aubrey Newman (London, 1981), 27.
7. F. W. Fairholt, *Tobacco: Its History and Associations* (London, 1859), 213, 220; George L. Apperson, *The Social History of Smoking* (London, 1914), 137, 139, 166; Edward H. Pinto, *Wooden Bygones of Smoking and Snuff Taking* (London, 1961), 48-9, 56, 59.
8. *The Post Office London Directory for 1840*, 98. In the directories for 1838 and 1839, Frankau does not appear as a partner of Friedlander. In 1837, Friedlander was doing business as Friedlander & Beyfus, importers of cigars and leeches, at the same address as in 1840. *The Post Office London Directory for 1837*, 210. In his autobiography, Gilbert Frankau errs in writing that the firm J. Frankau & Co. was founded by his grandfather in 1837 to import leeches from France. Gilbert Frankau, *Self-Portrait: A Novel of his Own Life* (London [1940]), 16. Joseph Frankau did not set up on his own initially and when he did he appears to have imported both cigars and leeches from the start.
9. *The Post Office London Directory for 1844*, 680.
10. Entry for 19 March 1843, register of marriages, 1837-1863, Western Synagogue, London, 20. When I examined the register, it was kept at the Western Synagogue in Crawford Place. Since then the synagogue has merged with the Marble Arch Synagogue.
11. Arthur Barnett, *The Western Synagogue through Two Centuries (1761-1961)*, (London, 1961), 181-8.
12. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Henry, Henry A."
13. 1851 census, HO 107/1501/62, PRO. Joseph's and Amelia's daughter Ida was born in 1847 (Jacobi, "The Geiger Family") in Whitechapel (according to the 1851 census, which gives incorrect ages for the three Frankau children alive at the time.) Thus, the family must have moved to Islington after her birth but before the census enumerator called in 1851.
14. *Watkins's Commercial and General London Directory and Court Guide for 1853*, 602. The other possible Jews in the street were D. N. Henriques and George Wulff.
15. *Jewish Chronicle* (hereafter *JC*), 18 December 1863.
16. *Post Office London Directory for 1854*, 1895; *Watkins's Commercial and General London Directory and Court Guide for 1855*, 1762. Joseph died in 1857 and by 1859 his widow had moved from Upper Avenue Road. *Post Office London Directory for 1859*, 722. I have been unable to trace Amelia's movements between 1859 and her death in 1863.
17. Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 24; Jacobi, "The Geiger Family."
18. 1851 census, HO 107/1501/62, PRO; *Post Office London Directory for 1854*, 876, 1895; *Watkins's Commercial and General London Directory and Court Guide for 1855*, 198; *Post Office London Directory for 1856*, 2162B; *Post Office London Directory for 1866*, 1039.
19. Werner Hirsch of New Haven, CT, kindly provided me with information about the Frankaus in New Haven from his own research on early New Haven Jewry in city directories, synagogue archives, army records, newspapers, and other local sources. See also Rollin G. Osterweis, *Three Centuries of New Haven, 1638-1938* (New Haven, 1953), 213, 217. I should point out that there is no firm evidence indicating the nature of the relationship among Adolph, Nathan, and Frederica Frankau. However, given the rarity of the family name Frankau, their common roots in Bavaria, and the close business ties among Adolph, Nathan, and Frederica's future husband, it is difficult to believe that they were not siblings.

20. Adolph was naturalized on 1 April 1844 at the city court in New Haven, CT. The naturalization document records his age as 21 and lists his surname as "Frankan." Connecticut naturalization index, National Archives – New England Region, Waltham, Massachusetts. Interestingly, in the 1841 census, his brother Joseph appears as Joseph "Frankan" but in the 1843 Western Synagogue marriage register as Joseph "Frankau." It would appear that the family name became standardized only from the late-1840s on.
21. Adolph Frankau & Co., *100 Years in the Service of Smokers: Adolph Frankau of London Celebrate their Centenary* (London, 1947), unpaginated; Frankau family tree and biographical notes, in possession of John Howard Frankau, Cobham, Surrey; register of death of Adolph Frankau, 5 November 1856, Hampstead registration district, General Registry Office, London; 1861 census, RG 9/91/44, PRO; *Post Office London Directory for 1855*.
22. C. C. Aronsfeld, "German Jews in Nottingham," *AJR Information*, 10:12 (December 1955), 8; William Howe Wylie, *Old and New Nottingham* (London, 1853), 141. On the affinity of German Jews in provincial cities for Unitarianism, see Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 121-3.
23. Frankau family tree and biographical notes; Adolph Frankau & Co., *100 Years in the Service of Smokers*; 1861 census, RG 9/91/44, PRO; Rosslyn Hill Chapel, list of members, 1 January 1875, RNC 38.189, and minute book, 1907-1922, RNC 38.132, Dr. Williams's Library, London. Blumfeld was eventually made a partner in the firm, a position he held until 1899, when the business was converted into a limited company. He then became director and chairman.
24. Townsend Scudder, ed., *Letters of Jane Walsh Carlyle to Joseph Neuberg, 1848-1862* (London, 1931), v; Aronsfeld, "German Jews in Nottingham," 8. It appears that Scudder's source was Neuberg's nephew, Frederick Joseph Frankau, who was in his late seventies when Scudder's book appeared. It cannot be mere coincidence that the introduction fails to mention that the Neubergs and the Frankaus were Jewish.
25. Quoted in Aronsfeld, "German Jews in Nottingham," 8.
26. *Ibid.*, 8; "Carlyle and Neuberg," *Macmillan's Magazine* 50 (August 1884), 280.
27. Joseph Neuberg to Thomas Carlyle, 5 December 1839, *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*, ed. Charles Richard Sanders, 18 vols. to date (Durham, NC, 1970-), 11: 231-232.
28. "Carlyle and Neuberg," 280.
29. Scudder, *Letters of Carlyle to Neuberg*, vi; Thomas Carlyle to Ralph Waldo Emerson, 6 December 1848, *The Correspondence of Emerson and Carlyle*, ed. Joseph Slater (New York, 1964), 446.
30. 1861 census, RG 9/91/44, PRO.
31. Scudder, *Letters of Carlyle to Neuberg*, vi. After his wife's death, Neuberg unsuccessfully courted Barbara Leigh Smith (later Bodichon), a leader in the women's movement. Hester Burton, *Barbara Bodichon, 1827-1891* (London, 1949), 93.
32. Fred Kaplan, *Thomas Carlyle: A Biography* (Ithaca, 1983), 388, 389, 396, 416, 418; "Carlyle and Neuberg," *passim*.
33. "Carlyle and Neuberg," 297.
34. See T. Peter Park, "Thomas Carlyle and the Jews," *Journal of European Studies* 20 (1990): 1-21.
35. Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, book 2, chap. 4.
36. Thomas Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*, book 3, chap. 6.
37. Thomas Carlyle to Richard Monckton Milnes, 30 December 1847, quoted in Kaplan, *Thomas Carlyle*, 527. Carlyle's hostility to Jews, along with his inability to appreciate lyric poetry, also made him an implacable foe of Heine. See Sol Liptzin, *The English Legend of Heinrich Heine* (New York, 1954), 28-30, 69, 78-9, 105, 107.

38. Peter Gay, "Hermann Levi: A Study in Service and Self-Hatred," in *Freud, Jews, and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture* (New York, 1978); Leonard Woolf, *Letters of Leonard Woolf*, ed. Frederic Spotts (London, 1989), 470.
39. For Disraeli's political trilogy and the ideology of Young England, see Robert Blake, *Disraeli* (New York, 1967), chap. 9; for the relationship between these ideas and his Jewish birth, see Todd M. Endelman, "Disraeli's Jewishness Reconsidered," *Modern Judaism* 5 (1985), 109-23.
40. Jacobi, "The Geiger Family"; Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 79.
41. Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 16, 33, 38, 79.
42. *Ibid.*, 24.
43. Register of marriages, 1842-1889, entry no. 248, 28 March 1883; members accounts, 1870-1880, entry for 11 September 1870; minute book of the council, 1875-1888, entries for 25 February 1883 and 29 November 1885; minute book of the wardens, 1882-1893, entries for 22 July and 12 August 1884; Arthur Frankau to Isidore Harris, 23, 25, and 29 July 1884, AJA/59/9/16; resignations of membership, AJA/59/10/12; West London Synagogue of British Jews. At present, the archives of the West London Synagogue of British Jews are held in two different locations. Incoming correspondence has been deposited in the Anglo-Jewish Archives, which are now housed at the University of Southampton. Other materials, including outgoing correspondence, remain at the synagogue.
44. Sander Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York, 1991), 91-6, 155; Bernard Cracroft, "The Jews of Western Europe," *Westminster Review*, April 1863, and Goldwin Smith, "Can Jews Be Patriots?," *Nineteenth Century*, May 1878, quoted in David Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840-1914* (New Haven, 1994), chap. 3.
45. Quoted in Michael Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (New York, 1988), 96.
46. Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 24, 97; *JC*, 24 March 1916.
47. Louis Hyman, *The Jews of Ireland from Earliest Times to the Year 1910* (London and Jerusalem, 1972), 134-5; Eliza Aria, *My Sentimental Self* (London, 1922), 3-4, 9; 1871 census, RG 10/11/45, PRO. The school, which attracted children from the Sephardi community in particular, was kept by the four daughters of Abraham Belisario, a Jamaica merchant. One of the sisters, Miriam Mendes Belisario (c.1820-1885), compiled a Hebrew and English vocabulary for the daily prayers and wrote *Sabbath Evenings at Home*, a collection of dialogues on Judaism. Malcolm Brown, "The Jews of Hackney before 1840, *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* (hereafter *TJHSE*) 30 (1989): 84; *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Belisario, Miriam Mendes."
48. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 10-11.
49. Hyman, *The Jews of Ireland*, 134-5; *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Davis, James"; *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. "Davis, James"; *JC*, 12 April 1907; Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 7, 15-20.
50. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 17-18; George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man*, ed. Susan Dick (Montreal, 1972), 184-7; Derrick Rossmore, *Things I Can Tell* (London, 1912), 125-128.
51. The novel was completed by summer 1886. *JC*, 30 June 1916.
52. Julia Frankau [Frank Danby], *Dr. Phillips: A Maida Vale Idyll* (London, 1887), 5, 55, 82, 168.
53. *Ibid.*, 15, 148-9.
54. *Ibid.*, 27, 29, 112, 165, 192.
55. Bryan Cheyette, "The Other Self: Anglo-Jewish Fiction and the Representation of Jews in England, 1875-1905," in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, ed. David Cesarani

- (Oxford, 1990), 103. George Moore was a major proponent of French naturalism in England in the 1880s. His publisher, Henry Vizetelly, also brought out *Dr. Phillips*. In 1885, he was jailed for three months for publishing English translations of two classics of French naturalism, Emile Zola's *L'Assommoir* and *Nana*.
56. Malcolm C. Salaman, "A Personal Tribute," *JC*, 24 March 1916.
 57. Simeon Singer, *The Literary Remains of the Rev. Simeon Singer*, ed. Israel Abrahams, 3 vols. (London, 1908), 1:107. For further examples, see Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 93.
 58. Frankau, *Dr. Phillips*, 61.
 59. The most recent study of Jewish self-hatred is Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore, 1986), which is concerned almost exclusively with the German language cultural orbit.
 60. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 103.
 61. S. S. Prawer, *Israel at Vanity Fair: Jews and Judaism in the Writings of W.M. Thackeray* (Leiden, 1992), 342-3.
 62. Leonard Merrick, *Violet Moses*, 3 vols. (London, 1891), 1: 151.
 63. *Athenaeum*, March 19, 1887, 376; *Punch*, quoted in Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 23.
 64. *Jewish Standard*, 8 March 1889, 7; Arnold White, *The Modern Jew* (New York, 1899), 60, 165, 168. Three years after the novel's publication, *Jewish Society* (14 February 1890) noted that the initial fuss had "quite died out" but that "everyone" had "a surreptitious, much-thumbed copy, which they read and abuse at intervals."
 65. On the construction of Jewishness in *Reuben Sachs*, see Bryan Cheyette, "From Apology to Revolt: Benjamin Farjeon, Amy Levy and the Post-Emancipation Anglo-Jewish Novel, 1880-1900," *TJHSE* 29 (1988): 260-2. See also his pathbreaking study "Construction of The Jew" in *English Literature and Society: Racial Representation, 1875-1945* (Cambridge, 1993).
 66. *Jewish Standard*, 1 March 1889, 9-10. To his brief criticism, Zangwill added a satiric ballad – "Dr. Reuben Green: A Study of the Maida Vale Jewish Colony" by Amy Danby. The ballad in turn provoked controversy and forced the newspaper to articulate its attitude toward Levy and Frankau: "We are not of those who think that a Jewish writer dealing with his own people is bound to paint everything in a glowing rose colour and to give us a picture suffused with light and no shade. That would be bad art and untrue to nature. But we do object to the bipedal cuttle-fish squirting its nauseous black fluid on to clean paper and calling the result a picture. The writers of the novels referred to are not persons whose age [Levy and Frankau were both in their twenties] and experience of human life entitle their opinions to any respect. They have simply sacrificed truth to the desire of being thought smart, or, as some may think, scabrous. To take them or their effusions, compounded of ignorance and spite, seriously, would be ridiculous." *Jewish Standard*, 8 March 1889, 7.
 67. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 22; Julia Frankau, *Dr. Phillips*: 2nd ed. (London, 1887), 3.
 68. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 22, 56; *JC*, 30 June 1916. For Hart, see the obituaries in the *JC*, 14 January 1898, and *The Lancet*, 15 January 1898; Stephen Lock, "Introduction," *Dr. Phillips*, British Medical Association ed. (London, 1989); Peter W. J. Bartrip, *Mirror of Medicine: A History of the British Medical Journal* (Oxford, 1990), 63-7, 76-80; genealogical material in the Sir Thomas Colyer-Fergusson Collection, Jewish Museum, Woburn House, London. In *Dr. Phillips*, see 28, 71, 209, 309. Marie Belloc Lowndes, an intimate friend of Julia Frankau from about 1900, wrote in her memoirs that Dr. Phillips was based on a well-known doctor and that he "must have felt the cap fitted his head, for he bought up and destroyed every copy he was able to procure." *The Merry Wives of Westminster* (London, 1946), 57. This may account for the relative scarcity of copies today.

69. *Eighteenth-Century Colour Prints: An Essay on Certain Stipple Engravers and their Work in Colour* (London, 1900); *An Eighteenth-Century Artist & Engraver: John Raphael Smith – His Life and Works* (London, 1902); *Eighteenth-Century Artists and Engravers: William Ward, A.R.A., and James Ward, R.A. – Their Lives and Works* (London, 1904).
70. Julia Frankau [Frank Danby], *Pigs in Clover* (London, 1903), 95-6, 114, 343-4.
71. *Ibid.*, 278.
72. Frankau, *An Eighteenth-Century Artist & Engraver*, v.
73. Belloc Lowndes, *The Merry Wives of Westminster*, 58-60; Arnold Bennett, *The Journals of Arnold Bennett*, ed. Norman Flower, 3 vols. (London, 1932-1933), 2:45.
74. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 27-30; idem, *Woman and the Motor Car: The Autobiography of an Automobilist* (London, 1906), 18-22; register of marriages, 1842-1889, entry no. 261, 26 March 1884, and members accounts, A-J, October 1880-August 1891, West London Synagogue of British Jews. Some of the details in the account of her marriage in *Woman and the Motor Car* are fictionalized.
75. It was rumored at the time that Julia Frankau was connected with *Jewish Society*, even that she was its nominal editor or proprietor. Hermann Adler told contemporaries that he believed that she was a front for an unknown person or persons who were opposed to his election as chief rabbi. (See the correspondence columns in the *JC*, 8, 15, 22 December 1916). It was even claimed that the paper ceased publication once Adler was elected (in May 1890), although, in fact, it continued to appear for another six months. (Forty-four issues were published between 31 January and 26 November 1890.) Cecil Roth repeated this rumor, as fact, in *The Jewish Chronicle, 1841-1941* (London, 1949), 161. Given the views expressed in *Dr. Phillips* and her own uninvolvedness in communal life, I find it difficult to believe that she would have become associated with a Jewish periodical, however critical of the communal establishment it was. Still, there may have been some basis to the rumors.
76. Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 32, 33, 35, 37.
77. *JC*, 27 April 1900; Aria, *My Sentimental Self*, 7; Susan Lowndes, ed., *Diaries and Letters of Marie Belloc Lowndes, 1911-1947* (London, 1971), 25-6; Susannah York, "Introduction" to Pamela Frankau, *The Willow Cabin* (London, 1988), v; Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 187, 400; interview, Diana Raymond, 1 September 1989, Hampstead. The obituary in *Truth* was reprinted in *JC*, 18 September 1931. Aria's salon is described in Laurence Irving, *Henry Irving: The Actor and his World* (London, 1951), 611-12.
78. *JC*, 18 September 1931; *Observer*, 11 February 1923. On Wells, see Bryan Cheyette, "H. G. Wells and the Jews: Antisemitism, Socialism and English Culture," *Patterns of Prejudice* 22:3 (1988), 22-35.
79. *The Times*, 12 September 1951; M. C. Bradbrook, "Queenie Leavis: The Dynamics of Rejection," *The Cambridge Review*, 20 November 1981, 56-7; Aryeh Newman, "Jewish Identity: Cambridge, 1941-44," *The Cambridge Review*, 25 October 1983, 176; idem, personal communication, 8 June 1983.
80. On anti-semitism in late-Victorian and Edwardian public schools, see Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 98-9, 138-9, 141.
81. The fortunes of J. Frankau & Co. and Gilbert's conduct of the firm are thinly fictionalized in his first two novels, *The Woman of the Horizon* (1917) and *Peter Jackson, Cigar Merchant* (1919). The initials of the central figure in the former novel, Francis Gordon, when reversed, are those of Gilbert Frankau. Details on the demise of the firm can be found in Gilbert's memoir. Grünbaum's two sons were not interested in business and became distinguished physicians. Albert Sidney (b. 1869), a pathologist, died before World War I. Otto Fritz (1875-1936), an authority on diabetes (the disease that killed his aunt Julia), married a Christian, changed his name from Grünbaum to

- Leyton in 1915, and was buried as an Anglican. *The Times*, 24 January 1938. Their sister, Ida Florence (b. 1879), who changed her name to Greenwood, spent two terms at Newnham College, Cambridge, and then taught at Nottingham High School. A. B. White, ed., *Newnham College Register, 1871-1950*, vol. 1, 1871-1923 (n.p., [c.1983]), 166.
82. Patrick Braybrooke, *Novelists: We Are Seven* (London, 1926), 60, 72; Q. D. Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public* (London, 1965), 67, 197-8; Pamela Frankau, *Pen to Paper: A Novelist's Notebook* (London, 1961), 185-8; *Punch*, 17 January 1940, 82. Frankau, who hero-worshipped Rudyard Kipling and considered him "the supreme present-day craftsman" in English literature, claimed that his "main power" could be traced to the fact he "never pandered to the highbrow." "Rudyard Kipling," *London Magazine*, August 1928, in Roger Lancelyn Green, ed., *Rudyard Kipling: The Critical Heritage* (London, 1971), 364.
 83. Benjamin Braude has dubbed this phenomenon "the Heine-Disraeli syndrome." See his "The Heine-Disraeli Syndrome among the Palgraves of Victorian England," in *Jewish Apostasy in the Modern World*, 108-41.
 84. Gilbert Frankau, *The Woman of the Horizon* (New York, 1923), 23; idem, *Peter Jackson, Cigar Merchant: A Romance of Married Life*, 26th ed. (London, 1922), 103-6; idem, *Life – and Erica*, The Definitive Edition of Gilbert Frankau's Novels and Short Stories (London, n.d.), 87.
 85. Frankau, *The Woman of the Horizon*, 9, 119, 277; idem, *Peter Jackson*, 380.
 86. Gilbert Frankau, *Masterson: A Story of an English Gentleman* (London, n.d. [1925]), 85, 89, 132, 201, 202.
 87. Sharman Kadish, *Bolsheviks and British Jews: The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution* (London, 1992), chap. 1.
 88. Frankau, *Masterson*, 99, 102.
 89. E. M. Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy* (London, 1951), 25; *Daily Express*, 9 May 1933.
 90. Gilbert Frankau, "An Outlier from His Tribe," in *Twelve Tales* (London, [1927]), 121; idem, *Farewell Romance* (London, 1936), 8. "An Outlier from the Tribe" was republished in *Yisroel: The First Jewish Omnibus*, ed. Joseph Leftwich (London, 1933). See also the portrait of the fox-hunting converted Jewish millionaire Sir Albert Bandon in "One Day in the Shires," also in *Twelve Tales*.
 91. Frankau, "Outlier," 121-2, 134-5; idem, *Farewell Romance*, 222, 302.
 92. *Ibid.*, 122, 135-7; idem, *Farewell Romance*, 476, 496.
 93. *The Times*, 21 November 1931, 5 November 1952; Gilbert Frankau, *The Dominant Type of Man* (London, 1925), 6-8, 16; Leavis, *Fiction and the Reading Public*, 282, n. 26; *Dictionary of National Biography, 1951-1960*, s.v., "Frankau, Gilbert"; Frankau, *Pen to Paper*, 201.
 94. *Britannia*, 26 October 1928, 386-7; Frankau, *Self-Portrait*, 262. On Jewish enthusiasm for British imperialism, see Robert A. Huttenback, "The Patrician Jew and the British Ethos in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries," *Jewish Social Studies* 40 (1978), 49-62.
 95. *The Times*, 9 June 1967; Pamela Frankau, *I Find Four People* (London, 1935), 277; idem, *Pen to Paper*, 202-3.
 96. Pamela Frankau, *A Wreath for the Enemy*, Virago Press ed. (London, 1988), 108-9; idem, *The Winged Horse*, Virago Press ed. (London, 1989), 381-2. See also the scene between the part-Jewish Sally Fisher and her Christian husband in *The Devil We Know* (New York, 1939), 470-1.
 97. Frankau, *The Devil We Know*, 487-8.
 98. *Ibid.*, 92.
 99. Humbert Wolfe, *Now a Stranger* (London, 1933); idem, *Upward Anguish* (1938);

- Norman Bentwich, "Humbert Wolfe: Poet and Civil Servant," *Menorah Journal* 31 (1943): 34-45; interview, Diana Raymond, 1 September 1989, Hampstead.
100. See, for example, Asher Tropp, *Jews in the Professions in Great Britain, 1891-1991* (London, 1991).
101. This point is developed at length in Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, chap. 4.
102. Woolf, *Letters of Leonard Woolf*, 157-8.

University of Michigan