



Pergamon

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SCIENCE @ DIRECT®

The History
of the
Family

History of the Family 8 (2003) 495–516

The Jews of early modern Marburg, 1640s—1800 A case study in family and household organization

Gerald L. Soliday*

School of Arts and Humanities, University of Texas-Dallas, Richardson, TX 75083-0688, USA

Abstract

This article examines Jewish household and family organization in a middle-sized German city, the Upper Hessian regional center of Marburg, the population of which ranged from 2500 to 6000 from the Thirty Years War to the end of the 18th century. Some general hypotheses about population development, household structure, and family life conveniently summarized by Toch [Toch, M. (1995). Aspects of stratification in early modern German Jewry: Population history and village Jews. In R. P. Hsia & H. Lehmann (Eds.). *In and out of the ghetto: Jewish-Gentile relations in late medieval and early modern Germany* (pp. 77-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press] serve as an organizational frame for the case study. In Toch's view, Jews' comparative wealth, as well as governmental restrictions on their settlement and marriage in central Europe, led to their having larger and more complex households than those of the Christian majority. While household enumerations over time confirm several of Toch's observations, especially the larger size of Jewish families, neither Hessian settlement policy nor local Marburg opposition prevented the Jewish minority of about 1% from keeping pace with general population growth. Moreover, Jews did not respond to their regulated living conditions and status as cultural outsiders with a family organization exhibiting remarkably more internal complexity than did Christian households.

© 2003 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Household organization; Jewish household; Christian household

1. Introduction

In early modern Central Europe, most Jews lived in villages and towns, not the large cities where their presence was so striking in the medieval period and then again from roughly the

* Tel.: +1-972-883-2760; fax: +1-972-883-2989.

E-mail address: soliday@utdallas.edu (G.L. Soliday).

mid-19th into the mid-20th century. True, there were still a few exceptionally large communities in major urban centers like Prague, Frankfurt, Worms, Hamburg-Altona, Vienna, and Berlin. Some had survived the pogroms and expulsions from the mid-14th through the early 16th centuries, while other large congregations developed later with the encouragement of 17th- and 18th-century governments eager for population and economic growth. From the late medieval period, however, the Jews remaining in the Holy Roman Empire were typically dispersed through its central and southwestern regions in smaller groups, usually under 10 families. Indeed, the economic historian [Toch \(1995\)](#) has estimated that over half of the localities still tolerating them had only one or two Jewish households, while another 25% housed between three and nine (p. 82). Current researchers are calling attention to the economic, social, and cultural lives of these rather neglected “rural Jews” (*Landjuden*), as they are often called, though [Battenberg](#) has rightly cautioned against overemphasizing their rural nature (in [Richarz and Rürup, 1997, pp. 9–35](#)). Their religious and commercial links with larger communities probably continued to give early modern German Jews a quasi-urban character, even as they ordinarily settled in villages and towns under the special protection of territorial rulers.

Always highly suspect in Christian society but also considered economically beneficial by some of its powerful elements, they were a marginal ethnic group subject to regulations codified in special Jewish ordinances. These and other laws set official limits on their numbers, places of domicile, means of earning a livelihood, and even social interactions with their neighbors—all with an eye to keeping the stubborn unbelievers religiously and culturally isolated as well as inhibiting their possible numerical growth and economic competition with the Christian majority. How did German Jewry fare under such restrictions? What responses to their precarious conditions enabled ordinary Jews to survive—in some circumstances to thrive, in others to fall into poverty and criminality? Unfortunately, still too little is known about “ordinary Jews,” especially in the early modern period. Much early research focused on major figures in Jewish religious and intellectual history, just as it emphasized the medieval period and then, more recently, has rightly examined the modern historical developments culminating in the horrendous crime of the Holocaust ([Richarz in Richarz and Rürup, 1997, pp. 1–8](#)). The past decade or so, however, has seen growing scholarly interest in a broader social history of Jews as a minority group, a subculture within German society, especially because the study of minorities reveals so much about the general culture of which they form a part. One need only consult the best recent summary, [Battenberg’s \(2001\)](#) volume on German Jews from the 16th through the 18th century in the *Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte*, to witness this increasingly important approach as well as the need to “fill the research gap” between the medieval and recent periods.

Thus, this article seeks to contribute to an expanding research agenda that includes “ordinary” Jews, explores the least known period of their history, and also examines this marginal group in its social context, comparing it wherever the data allow with the Christian majority. The microanalysis summarized here rests on a variety of sources for the city of Marburg, the economic, administrative, and cultural center for the region of Upper Hesse in the landgraviate of Hesse-Cassel. While few extant sources originated from Jews themselves, the municipal and state records used here have much to say about Jews and especially about

their relationship to the general population, which ranged between 2500 and 6000 during the early modern period. Several population lists or early censuses, a series of property and tax records, and even some genealogical information (unfortunately not in the systematic form characteristic of Christian parish registers but pieced together by local researchers, most notably Fowler) allow an analysis of household organization, economic activities, and relative position in the city's wealth structure at various points in time.

This article uses Marburg data to test some of the current hypotheses or the initial results put forward in other studies of Jewish social and economic life in the early modern period. Conveniently, [Toch \(1995\)](#) has summarized some general views about population, household structure, and family life on which I shall focus:

... a small community encompassing only a few licensed families did not necessarily indicate a small Jewish population in the locality. Jewish families tended to be considerably larger than non-Jewish ones, in part because licensed heads of households had to accommodate grown-up and married children not yet permitted to set up their own independent households. Family size therefore reflected a response to the official settlement policy rather than of demography proper. Also, licensed Jewish households belonged to the propertied strata of society and possessed the needs and the means to employ large numbers of male and female servants and tutors. (p. 83, n. 17)

After tracing general population levels from the 1640s to the end of the 18th century, I will look at household and family organization more closely to see how this case study reinforces or modifies Toch's general picture. Then I will also sketch an economic profile of the Jews in Marburg, to compare them with their Christian neighbors and with historians' general notions of their activities and wealth. Throughout these discussions an underlying theme will be their legal and political relations with the Christian community, where they remained outsiders, tolerated by state authorities but usually unwelcome to the city's artisans and merchants.

2. The Jewish population of Marburg, 1640s to 1800

Continuous settlement of Jews in Marburg seems to date from the Thirty Years War. Clearly there had been a medieval community large enough by the 14th century to support a synagogue, have a cemetery outside the city, and probably cluster near or in what was later the *Judengasse*—perhaps not a real ghetto but a small district in a rather undesirable part of the city north of the central market, clinging to the hill beneath the landgraval castle ([Erdmann, 1987](#); [Fowler, 1989](#)). There some Jewish families lived along the open ditch that carried waste from the castle down to the river Lahn. Few records still exist of these medieval Jews (archeological remains of their synagogue are the most striking), and possibly they fell victim to the wave of pogroms accompanying the Black Death in the mid-14th century. Exactly what happened to them is unknown; after 1350, however, the building used as a synagogue passed into Christian hands, and by 1375 the cemetery had become a garden. Thereafter we have only occasional references to individuals in the city,

especially the Jews Liebmann and Gottschalk from the late 1520s into the early 1540s. The two most knowledgeable researchers on the subject, however, agree that probably not enough Jewish families settled in Marburg after the mid-14th century to resume local religious services until the mid-17th century (Erdmann, 1987, especially pp. 21–23; Fowler, 1989, pp. 13–14).

Thus my attempt to document and reconstruct a continuous Jewish presence in Marburg over the early modern period can begin only with the Thirty Years War. During the 1620s military action in the region caused dislocations that led some Jews to join other Upper Hessian villagers in seeking protection within the city's fortifications. Then again in the 1640s, outsiders crowded into Marburg to avoid wartime dangers, and from this decade came the first two extant lists drawn up officially to specify the city's Jewish householders and their residences. These lists appear in city council minutes, which unfortunately do not make their exact purpose clear. A reasonable assumption is that the council wished to check that the six men had official letters patent (*Schutzbriefe*) from the landgrave, permitting their residence and economic activity in the city. Such patents placed Jews under landgravidal protection and under the special Jewish Ordinances (*Judenordnungen*) the Hessian rulers issued successively in 1539, 1679, 1739, and 1749.¹ In return for their privileges, the Jews paid special fees to both the landgravidal and local governments and were to abide by the restrictions placed on their activities in this avowedly Christian society. Keeping a careful eye on the Jewish population presumably lay in the interests of both the governmental officials responsible for state finances and the local authorities whose concerns focused more on citizen complaints about Jewish economic competition or violations of the ordinances than on the fees that might increase their budgets. Indeed, the ordinance of 1679 instructed both territorial officials and city councils to send annual enumerations of the Jewish households in their respective jurisdictions to the chancellery in Cassel, but some were sending reports even earlier (Demandt, 1980, p. 27; see Table 1 below). Such regular documentation might have provided unusually full statistics on Jewish households in Hesse-Cassel over the early modern period, but if annual reports were actually submitted, unfortunately only a fraction of them have survived.²

The tables here summarize data on Marburg's Jewish population and households from the 1640s through the late 18th century, information derived from lists of varying quality still found in the Hessian State Archive in Marburg (StAM). The sources consist, first and most importantly, of several territorial or municipal enumerations ranging irregularly over the entire period, with an unfortunate gap in the mid-18th century yet also quite methodical listings between 1781 and 1800. They also include a few counts of the city's

¹ See Battenberg (1983) for a penetrating general discussion and Demandt (1980, pp. 24–38) for an excellent comparative summary of the stipulations in the different Hessian ordinances.

² An earlier Jewish ordinance dated 5 October 1646, which was drafted, printed, but apparently not circulated or implemented, had already ordered the detailed annual lists of Jews (including all members of each household) that were insisted upon in 1679. See StAM Verordnungen Abt. 14: Judensachen 1646–1814 for that ordinance as well as a group of further decrees (in 1696 [referring back to an earlier one in 1689], 1722, 1726, 1744, 1799) that lament either the absence or the poor quality of *Judenlisten* local officials were supposed to send the *Rentkammer*. On the 1646 ordinance itself, compare Erdmann (1987, p. 212) and Battenberg (1983, p. 88).

Table 1
The Jewish Population of Marburg, 1640s to 1800

Year	Month	Households	Persons	Source in StAM
1646	Feb	6		330 Mbg A I 33: Ratsprot. 5 Feb 1646
1648	Jun	6		330 Mbg A I 34: Ratsprot. 29 Jun 1648
1657	Dec	3	23	19b 1215
1659		3	24	19b 1157
16??		3	25	40a Rubr. 16 Gen. 2
1666	Mar	5	24	17 ¹ 799 (19 Mar), 805; 19b 1215 (8 Jan)
1667	Nov	3	19	19b 1215
1674		7	34	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg
1676		6	35	19b 1215
1677		5	30	19b 1215
1678		5	30	19b 1215; 40a Rubr. 16 Gen. 1
1679	Dec	5	28	19b 1215
1680	Dec	5	26	19b 1215
1681		5	28	19b 1215
1682		5	26	19b 1215
1683		4	23	17e Mbg 421
1684		4	22	19b 1215
1685		4	22	19b 1215
1688		4	19	19b 1215
1696	Jan	4	32	319 Mbg 74, 75
1699	Jan	5		40a Rubr. 16 Gen. 3
1701	Jan	3	18	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg
1702	Jan	5	26	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg
1704	Feb	4	20	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg
1710	Feb	4	20	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg
1721		6		330 Mbg A I 125; KoR 1721–22, S. 21
1726	Jan	7		19b 11
1727	Feb	6	43	330 Mbg B 229; 40a Rubr. 16 Gen. 2
1730	Oct	5	42	40a Rubr. 16 Mbg: Kunckells Tabelle
1730		7	52	19b 1544
1731	Oct	7	45	40a Rubr. 29 Nr. 110
1735	Jul	7		330 Mbg B 229
1736		7	50	40a Rubr. 16 Gen. 1
1744	Aug	8		Demandt in Hess Jb 23 (1973): 305, 312
1771		8	42	49d Mbg 379
1781	Jul	10	36	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1781
1783	Feb	10	41	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1783
1785	Jun	10	41	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1785
1788	Feb	10	42	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1788
1788	Dec	11	44	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1788
1789	Mar	11	39	330 Mbg A II 103: Populationsliste 1789
1789	Jun	13	52	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1789
1790	Aug	13	51	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1790
1791	Dec	13	47	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1791
1794	Feb	13	57	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1794

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Year	Month	Households	Persons	Source in StAM
1794	Apr	12	56	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1794
1795	Oct	11	46	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1795
1795	Dec	11	48	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1795
1796	Nov	11	50	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1796
1798	Oct	12	56	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1798
1800	May	13	66	330 Mbg A II 107: Populationsliste 1800

StAM = the Hessian State Archive in Marburg.

Fifty-one sources list 365 households.

Forty-four lists enumerate 1600 individuals in 320 households.

entire population (1696, 1731, 1771, 1790), some state and local tax assessments (1721 and 1726), as well as three special cadastral surveys (1677, 1721, and 1771). Altogether some 51 sources document 365 Jewish households at different points in time over the entire period. Forty-four of the 51 lists I have used enumerate 1600 individuals in 320 household constellations; they provide the detailed information on household composition requested in the Jewish Ordinance of 1679, while the others are less informative about family members or servants. Of course, the usual danger of omissions exists in these lists as elsewhere in population counts. During an impressive territorial visitation of 1666, for example, two official lists of Jews (prepared respectively by the local *Rentmeister* and the regional *Vorsteher* of Jewry) named three men with letters patent of landgravidal protection and privilege in Marburg. In its own report to the visitation commission, however, the city council listed the three with their household members, indicated their economic activities and harmful competition with citizens, and then complained pointedly about two “sneaky foreign” Jews with illegal households in the city. (They were the unmarried but independent son of one of the three privileged householders as well as a widow and her two sons.) Table 1 includes all five entries, of course, and rests generally on the assumption that early modern enumerators were probably less likely to omit members of this distrusted minority than they were, say, to undercount marginal groups like poor veterans or single women in their general population counts.

What conclusions may we reach about Jewish population developments in Marburg over the early modern period? First, Table 1 shows that the number of households ranged from three to a high of 13 by 1789 and averaged seven over the entire century and a half.³ During the same period, the number of individual Jews living in Marburg at any one time fluctuated between 18 and 66. In the 18th century, then, for which I can be fairly confident about general population estimates, Jews usually made up a little less than 1% of the city’s residents (see Table 2). Even if they may have constituted as high as 1% in late 1730 and again in 1800 (only possible for these dates if we use the 1731 population total as well as a rough population estimate of 6000 for 1800), they were still below the estimated level

³ Erdmann’s (1987) crude table (p. 45) attempted to indicate the number of Jews in the city but is unclear, unhelpful, incomplete, and inaccurate (especially since the author omitted any reference to the sources of his information).

Table 2
Jews in the Marburg Population

Year	Total	Jews	%
1731	5270	45	0.85
1771	5050	42	0.83
1790	5750	51	0.89

of 1.8% reached in the nearby small town of Kirchhain or by all Jews in the entire Electoral Hessian population at the end of the old regime (Schubert, 1987, p. 12; Horwitz, 1913, p. 99). Totalling not quite 1% of Marburg's residents over the 18th century, then, Jews appear to have remained a fairly stable but tiny minority in the city's overwhelmingly Christian populace, keeping pace with but certainly not outdistancing general population growth.

The data for Marburg do corroborate Toch's observation that Jewish communities were larger in the 18th century than earlier, although his explanation for this development seems to hold only partially for Hesse-Cassel. Using evidence from the Palatinate, Toch (1995) argued that larger Jewish communities resulted from "a growing population and only a marginal increase in the number of places of residence where Jews were permitted to live. . ." (p. 83). Unlike the Palatine counts, however, the Hessian rulers permitted more settlement locations—contravening their own ordinances of 1679 and 1739—and also allowed individual communities to increase in size.⁴ In the case of Marburg, the landgraves tolerated more Jewish residents than the city's artisans, retailers, or government wished and, indeed, more than the three households they themselves agreed would be the limit there. Already in the 1650s the city sought expulsion of the Jews taken in, temporarily it had thought, during the Thirty Years War. Apparently in 1659 Landgrave Wilhelm VI assured the council that only in exceptional circumstances would more than three Jewish householders receive permission to live in Marburg. For decades the council appealed to this assurance when it opposed Jewish applications for *Schutzbriefe* (Erdmann, 1987, pp. 57, 217, n. 69; compare Cohn, 1933, p. 8), but as Table 1 reveals, only 5 of the 51 extant records list as few as three households. Unfortunately, the lists do not always indicate whether household heads were licensed Jews or interlopers. As already mentioned, the city council's bringing people "without protection" to the government's attention in 1666, and enumerators should always have brought this important point out, had a Jew been living in the city without special permission. The Jewish Ordinance of 1739 eventually stipulated that privileges would go only to the eldest sons of already privileged Jews, young men who had reached at least age 25, controlled property (by

⁴ Horwitz (1913, p. 85) presents gross statistics from 1646 to 1726 that indicate an increase not only in the number of households in the landgraviate but also in the number of settlement locations from 42 to 149. According to Kießling's count (1995, p. 157), the 1744 list of Jews published in Demandt (1973) shows entries for 177 places of settlement in Hesse-Cassel (with 148 of those locations having five households or fewer). In addition, Horwitz (1913, p. 98) traces an increase in the number of households tolerated in the capital city of Kassel itself.

inheritance or marriage) worth at least 500 Rtlr., and were of good reputation (Demandt, 1980, p. 26). How early or how consistently such policies were enforced is difficult to determine: obviously the government was interested in having only householders who could pay well for their privileges, and there are earlier instances of heirs being denied official protection because of their precarious economic circumstances or prospects (for examples from 1687 and 1722, see Erdmann, 1987, pp. 46, 55). Because of incomplete records and uncertain naming practices, conclusions about genealogical linkages are extremely difficult, though clearly not all new householders were the sons of already established Jews. Consistency between official policy and administrative practice was rare among old-regime governments, in any case, and we also find poor sons (e.g., Jacob, second son of the Jew Samuel of Rauschenberg, in 1659: see 330 Mbg B 229) who did receive official protection. Furthermore, while Jews without permission were supposed to be expelled, the lists make clear that some remained for a considerable time without acquiring official sanction (the widow Freitche with two children from 1666 to 1676, for example, or Isaac Samuel from 1726 until late 1730).

Most importantly, however, the lists throughout the entire period show that the Hessian government not only overlooked some unqualified Jews, perhaps because they were related to already licensed householders. It also went further and simply increased the number of privileged households over time. From three on the lists from 1659 through 1667, they had risen to five by 1676. While the number of officially licensed Jews then fluctuated between four and five into the early 18th century, by the 1730s six or seven householders were appearing on lists of official *Schutzjuden*. On an enumeration for 1744, all eight Jewish households appeared with this privileged status. After an unfortunate gap in the evidence between 1744 and 1771, late 18th-century lists are particularly helpful in providing household information but rather unclear about the legal status of the listed Jews. From 1781 to 1800, however, their number seems to have fluctuated between 7 and ten privileged householders. Over the unwavering protests of Marburg citizens and somewhat less insistent petitions of the city council (Erdmann, 1987, pp. 53–58), then, the Hessian rulers proved quite willing to tolerate the growth of the Marburg Jewish community. But did this pragmatic toleration alone account for its size over the early modern period?

3. Jewish households and families

As mentioned earlier, Toch (1995) has pointed to another possible explanation: the internal composition of Jewish families and households. He has emphasized that governmental restrictions on settlement and marriage could result in larger households than those of non-Jews, just as their relative prosperity could result in an unusually large number of servants. Over four-fifths of the extant reports for Marburg are detailed enough to allow closer scrutiny of the Jewish households and, specifically, to see how they might sustain or modify Toch's generalizations. Here comparisons that situate Jews within the general population are the major concern, of course, though they are possible only at a few points in time when appropriate data from a large sampling of the city's residents are available. At the present

state of my research, these points usually fall in the 18th century, especially 1721, 1731, and 1771.

Let me begin with the question of household size summarized in Table 3, which presents the range, mean, and median for each of the 44 lists that enumerate individual members. The arithmetic mean itself varied from a low of 3.6 in 1781 to highs of 8.3 in the early 1660s and 8.4 in 1730. The average size for all the Jewish household constellations listed from 1657 to 1800 was five. With systematic counts of the city's population for 1731 and 1771, however, direct comparisons are possible between Jewish and other Marburg households. Table 4 reveals that Jews inhabited larger than average households in both years, even though 1771 included a single-person household. For the entire century and a half only 26 such one-person entries appear on lists of Jews, and they involve only six persons at different points in time. Two of the six were in the same family at different stages: Ephraim ben Israel, a rabbinic and talmudic tutor at the university, either was unmarried or had an absent wife in 1771; then his widow appeared alone some eight times between 1785 and 95. Since 9 of the 10 widows who headed Jewish households over the early modern period had children (or occasionally a servant) with them, only this last one lived alone. Almost all Marburg Jews lived with other family members, and only once in my sample (in the case of Ephraim himself in 1771) was the proportion of Jews equal to the 12.5% of others in the community living in single-person households. In 1731 no Jew lived alone, while some 14.4% of all Marburgers were doing so. Moreover, 30.3% of those Christians living alone in 1731 had never married.

By contrast, all but four of the Jewish householders I located in Marburg over the entire period were or had been married. The earliest of the four exceptions to this rule appeared in 1666, listed initially as a member of his father's household, but interestingly enough, the Marburg city council corrected that record. In a special report, it complained indignantly about Männell, the older son of the properly licensed Jew Seeligman, who—without official permission—had established an illegal business trading horses and—without being married—had set up his own household.⁵ Before vanishing altogether from Marburg documents, the same “Mänle” reappeared the following year, whether listed by error or by adherence to council expectations, within his father's household, an indication perhaps of early modern social norms linking household formation with marriage. The three other unmarried Jews in independent households appeared in the late 18th century. An English teacher affiliated with the university, Isaak Bach, showed up on 9 of the 16 extant listings from 1781 to 1800 (occasionally described as a “*Sohn*” rather than a fully adult head of his single-person household), while Saara Leckes received a careful separate listing as a single person outside her widowed brother's family from 1781 to 1789, when officials then listed her clearly within it. Finally in 1796, there was a one-time entry for Jüdin Rahel, probably an unwed mother and thus the only Jewish participant I have found in the growth of illegitimate fertility in 18th-century Marburg. These four exceptional cases underscore the special significance of marriage for Jews themselves (Katz, 1959, p. 13). While they shared this social norm with

⁵ StAM 17¹ 805: “*ob er wohl noch unverheuratet, doch sein eigenen Tisch helt*” (13 March 1666).

Table 3
Jewish Households in Marburg, 1657–1800

Year	<i>N</i>	Size			Extended Fam. Hh.	<i>N</i> with Servants	<i>N</i> with Nonrelatives
		Range	Mean	Median			
1657	3	4–10	7.67	9.00	1	3	0
1659	3	4–11	8.00	9.00	3	3	0
16??	3	4–11	8.33	10.00	2	3	0
1666	5	1–9	4.80	3.00	2	2	0
1667	3	3–9	6.33	7.00	0	3	0
1674	7	2–10	4.86	5.00	1	3	0
1676	6	3–11	5.83	5.50	2	2	0
1677	5	4–10	6.00	5.00	1	2	0
1678	5	4–10	6.00	5.00	3	1	0
1679	5	3–10	5.60	5.00	1	3	0
1680	5	3–8	5.20	5.00	1	2	0
1681	5	3–9	5.60	5.00	2	1	0
1682	5	4–9	5.20	5.00	2	2	0
1683	4	3–8	5.75	6.00	0	1	0
1684	4	4–7	5.50	5.50	0	3	0
1685	4	3–7	5.50	6.00	0	2	0
1688	4	3–8	4.75	4.00	0	1	0
1696	4	2–14	8.00	8.00	2	2	3
1701	3	5–7	6.00	6.00	1	1	0
1702	5	2–7	5.20	6.00	1	2	0
1704	4	3–7	5.00	5.00	1	3 ^a	0
1710	4	3–7	5.00	5.00	0	1 ^a	0
1727	6	4–11	7.17	7.00	1	5	1
1730	5	7–11	8.40	8.00	1	5	1
1730	7	3–11	7.43	8.00	1	6	0
1731	7	3–9	6.43	7.00	0	5	0
1736	7	2–12	7.14	7.00	1	5	0
1771	8	1–8	5.25	5.50	0	5	0
1781	10	1–8	3.60	2.50	0	4	0
1783	10	1–9	4.10	3.50	0	4	1
1785	10	1–8	4.10	4.00	0	3	1
1788	10	1–7	4.20	4.00	0	4	0
1788	11	1–8	3.55	3.00	0	4	0
1789	11	1–8	3.55	3.00	0	4	0
1789	13	1–8	4.00	4.00	1	5	0
1790	13	1–8	3.92	3.00	1	6	0
1791	13	1–7	3.62	3.00	1	9	0
1794	13	1–7	4.38	5.00	1	8	0
1794	12	1–7	4.67	5.00	2	8	0
1795	11	1–7	4.18	4.00	1	6	0
1795	11	1–7	4.36	4.00	1	6	0
1796	11	1–7	4.54	4.00	2	6	0
1798	12	2–8	4.67	4.00	1	6	0
1800	13	1–8	5.08	5.00	2	7	0

^a One household with a brother as servant (Crahmdiener; Knecht u. Ladendiener).

Table 4
Mean size of households

Year	All	Jewish
1731	4.23	6.43
1771	4.02	5.25

Christians, of course, marriage formed the basis for almost 95% of the Jewish households tolerated in Marburg.⁶

Such strong adherence to that norm can bring us back to issues of the internal make-up of those households. The Marburg data confirm Toch's view about the generally larger size of Jewish households, something seen further in the average numbers of children per household in Table 5. Without parish registers we have no information on completed families for Jews, of course, but the mean number of coresident children was higher than that for the general population both in 1731 and 1771. (Even if the comparison is with Christian households formed only by marriages, as were the Jewish in those 2 years, the figures are 1.97 and 1.99 coresident children, respectively, and remain well below the averages for Jewish families).

Toch's argument about household size points, however, in a somewhat different direction with regard to children: because of limited access to settlement privileges, he writes, Jews often had to maintain grown and even married children who were not permitted their own independent households. While Jewish access to Marburg increased throughout the early modern period, it was certainly not free or unlimited, and we may well ask if Jewish householders kept young people, say aged 20 or older, in their homes. Unfortunately, only a few of the Marburg lists reveal the ages of coresident children. In 1685, a 20-year-old lame daughter lived with her elderly parents, and one of the sons residing with the widow Behla had reached 20. Using the ages for 1685, we can calculate that the two sons in Behla's household 3 years later were 23 and 21. In 1696, two sons among the 15 children in Jewish households were 25 and 22, and in 1727, the widow Hanna had a son 22 and a daughter 24, Levi had a son 22, and Isaac had two brothers aged 23 and 21 in his

⁶ In his exemplary study based on civil registers for the Jewish population of Metz during the 18th century, Meyer (1993) addresses several beliefs or "myths" about Jewish demography propagated by writers such as the Abbé Grégoire and Louis-Sébastien Mercier, who feared a Jewish population explosion resulting from a distinctive pattern of universal marriage at very early ages as well as high fertility and low mortality rates. For his urban setting with a population between 24,600 and 33,600 throughout the 18th century, anyway, Meyer has rejected that whole incorrect picture, based as it was largely on the assumption that actual demographic practices conformed with the *halakha*, traditional Jewish norms and prescriptions. Rebutting the hypothesis of universal marriage, for example, Meyer (p. 190) finds that 12.6% of the men and 7.6% of the women in the Jewish population in 18th-century Metz were never married. By contrast with Metz, Marburg saw near conformity with universal Jewish marriage, perhaps because of social and ethical norms but also because of the Hessian government's increasing toleration, despite official policy stated in the *Judenordnungen*, of Jewish household formation in the smaller, underpopulated, and economically weaker city.

Table 5
Mean number of coresident children

Year	All Households		Jewish Households	
	Range	Mean	Range	Mean
1731	0–9	1.83	0–6	3.60
1771	0–10	1.78	0–4	2.50

household. Nine years later, in 1736, much more striking than Wolff's two sons at 24 and 21 were Hanna's daughter Adleck aged 27 and two of Isaac's brothers still living with him at ages 34 and 31.⁷ Although today, all 16 of these young people might well be considered "grown up," to use Toch's term, probably only 5 were over the usual marriage age and thus the usual time for establishing independent households in Central Europe. Although I have not yet calculated the mean age at first marriage in Marburg itself, I would be surprised to find it below 25 for males and 23 for females. In any case, without systematic civil registers, such a calculation for Jews seems impossible, and we can probably never know if they married earlier or later than others in the city.⁸ Nevertheless, a 1696 list enumerating most of the city's residents, with exceptionally rich information like ages and family relationships, allows for comparison of Jews with the majority population in this matter of grown children residing at home. In that year 46 sons and 54 daughters aged 20 and older lived in their parents' households and made up almost 7% of all coresident children in the city. While a higher proportion (13.3%) of resident Jewish children in 1696 was "grown," as Toch's model suggests was the usual case, remaining at home past the age of 20 was not rare for either Jewish or Christian young people in Marburg.

But what about married children living in their parents' households, something Toch might lead us to expect in Central European Jewish families? While I do not have absolute proof that the practice never occurred, no extant list I have found indicates two married couples living in a Jewish household in Marburg. Not only were all coresident children and servants single, but the kin living with conjugal families were also unmarried. Table 6 indicates the number of such kin (3.3% of all enumerated Jews) as well as their relationships to the heads of households (only male householders come into question, by the way, since no Jewish

⁷ Although the records are difficult to decipher, these individuals—the daughter and the two brothers here—seem not to have been the same persons as those on the 1727 list.

⁸ Meyer (1993, pp.219–26) has calculated mean ages at first marriage in 18th-century Metz as 23.3 for Jewish women (1760–1789) and 28.6 for men (1770–1789). He also compared these figures to those (ranging from 22 to 26.25 for women and 26.6 to 28.26 for men) in four studies of other Jewish populations in France, those (ranging from 25.7 and 26.6 for women and 27.2 and 28.6 for men) among Christians in Metz, and those (ranging from 25 to 27 for women and 27 to 28 for men) in several Christian populations of Lorraine during the second half of the 18th century. Thus he found the mean age was close for Jewish and Christian men, while Jewish women married "on the average two to 4 years earlier than either Lorraine women or old-regime French women in general" (p. 220). Most importantly from his point of view, Meyer proves that Jews did not marry in their teens, as the *halakha* recommended or French 18th-century writers assumed.

Table 6
Members of Jewish households in Marburg, 1640s to 1800

Year	N	Conjugal Family				Servants		Kin		Non-Kin
		Men	Women	Sons	Daughters	Male	Female	N	Relation to HH	
1657	23	3	3	4	7	2	2	2	Father, mother-in-law	0
1659	24	3	3	3	7	3	2	3	Mother, 2 mothers-in-law	0
16??	25	3	3	2	7	6	2	2	Mother, mother-in-law	0
1666	24	4	4	4	6	3	1	2	Mother, mother-in-law	0
1667	19	3	3	4	5	3	1	0		0
1674	34	5	7	7	9	2	3	1	Son-in-law	0
1676	35	5	6	7	10	2	2	3	Mother, brother, brother-in-law	0
1677	30	5	5	7	8	2	2	1	Mother	0
1678	30	5	5	8	7	1	0	4	2 grandchildren, 2 cousins	0
1679	28	5	5	6	6	3	2	1	Grandchild	0
1680	26	5	5	7	5	2	1	1	Father-in-law	0
1681	28	5	5	7	8	1	0	2	Father-in-law, cousin	0
1682	26	5	5	6	7	1	0	2	Father-in-law, cousin	0
1683	23	4	4	6	7	1	1	0		0
1684	22	3	4	5	7	1	2	0		0
1685	22	3	4	6	6	1	2	0		0
1688	19	3	4	3	7	1	1	0		0
1696	32	4	3	7	8	2	2	2	Sister, wife's brother	4
1701	18	3	3	6	3	0	1	2	Sister, brother	0
1702	26	5	5	7	5	0	2	2	Sister, brother	0
1704	20	4	4	5	2	1 ^a	3	1	Sister	0
1710	20 ^b	4	4	7	1	1 ^a	1	0		0
1727	43	5	6	12	10	2	5	2	Brothers	1
1730	42	5	5	16	8	0	5	2	Brothers	1
1730	52	6	7	19	9	3	6	2	Brothers	0
1731	45	6	7	16	9	4	3	0		0
1736	50	5	7	16	14	0	6	2	Brothers	0
1771	42	8	6	11	9	3	5	0		0
1781	36	6	6	10	9	1	4	0		0
1783	41	6	8	9	9	4	4	0		1
1785	41	6	8	11	10	2	2	0		2
1788	42	6	8	11	11	2	4	0		0
1788	44	8	8	11	11	2	4	0		0
1789	39	7	7	9	10	2	4	0		0
1789	52	10	10	12	11	3	5	1	Sister	0
1790	51	10	11	11	9	3	6	1	Sister	0
1791	47	11	9	9	8	0	9	1	Sister	0
1794	57	12	11	12	13	0	8	1	Cousin	0
1794	56	11	10	13	12	0	8	2	Mother, Cousin	0
1795	46	10	9	11	9	1	5	1	Cousin	0
1795	48	10	9	11	9	1	7	1	Cousin	0
1796	50	10	9	14	7	1	7	2	Brother, Cousin	0

(continued on next page)

Table 6 (continued)

Year	N	Conjugal Family				Servants		Kin		Non-Kin
		Men	Women	Sons	Daughters	Male	Female	N	Relation to HH	
1798	56	12	12	10	9	3	9	1	Cousin	0
1800	66	13	12	13	13	3	10	2	Brother-in-law, cousin	0
Totals	1600	272	279	391	357	79	159	52		9
%		17.0	17.4	24.4	22.3	4.9	9.9	3.3		0.6
Totals		551 adults		748 children		238 servants		52	kin	9
%		34.4		46.8		14.9		3.3		0.6

^a Brother as servant (1704 and 1710).

^b Two children without indication of sex.

widow had kin under her protection). Although kin coresidence among Jews chiefly involved siblings and widowed parents of the head or his spouse, it also extended laterally to in-laws (*Schwäger/innen*) and cousins (*Vetter/Kusinen*) as well as downward to grandchildren. Fortunately, once again, the 1696 data also allow comparison with other inhabitants of the city. Although the population list does not always make precise living arrangements obvious, in most cases the entries allow reasonable guesses. Table 7 even permits distinguishing between kin living directly in the same quarters and those in separate apartments or rooms in the same house.

What general conclusion about kinship may we make from the information in these two tables? Although usually larger, Jewish households were not more complex than others in the community. At least the 320 households for which we have detailed information over the period displayed much the same coresident kin groups as the overwhelmingly Christian population in 1696. Indeed, Jewish household structure was slightly less complex, if compared with that of the Christian carpenter Wilhelm Prott, who headed the only multiple family household I found in early modern Marburg (his in-laws,

Table 7

Relation of coresident kin to heads of Marburg households, 1696

Same quarters	Separate apartments (rooms) in house			
Grandmother	1	Grandmother	2	
Father	2	Father	1	Spouse's father
Mother	8	Mother	11	Spouse's mother
Wife's mother	1	Mother's sister	1	
Wife's stepmother	1	Brother	1	Spouse's brother
"Siblings"	3	Sister	12	Spouse's sister
Son	1			Sp. Sister's husband
Son's wife	1			Sp. Sister's children
Son's child	1	Son-in-law	4	Sp. Sister's daughter
[Widowed] Daughter	1	Wife of son-in-law	1	Sp. Sister's son
Daughter's son	1			
Nephew	1	Female cousin	1	Unclear

alte abgelebte Leute, lived with the carpenter Wilhelm Prott and his wife Anna Catharina) or with the three Christian households that extended upward as far as the head's grandmothers. What I find most impressive, however, is the broadly similar pattern of kinship relations within households, contrary to Toch's predictions. The kinship structure of Jewish households cannot explain their larger size, in my view, as effectively as the number of their children.

On the other hand, as Toch has reminded us, the presence of servants could also have contributed to the larger than average size of Jewish households. His argument is a logical one, given is generally known about the correlation between wealth and household size in early modern Europe. Specifically, Toch writes of privileged Jews as propertied people, with both "the needs and means to employ large numbers of male and female servants and tutors." Before looking at Jewish economic activity and wealth, I want to compare briefly the keeping of servants by Jews and non-Jews in Marburg. Table 8 summarizes the data on servants for all the Jewish households I have found and then for the entire population in 1731 and 1771. Only two Jewish householders ever appear on our lists with more than three servants, hardly a large number, but consonant with usual practice in the city, where few others kept more help in my sample years. We should note, though, that Jews had a somewhat better chance than their Christian neighbors of employing one or two servants. After 1749, Hessian Jews were not legally permitted to employ more than two *Dienstknechte* in their trading activities (Demandt, 1980, p. 26), but in Marburg only one Jewish householder on my lists ever hired more, even before the ordinance. On occasion, both Jews and Christians engaged siblings as servants (the two Jewish brothers from the early 18th century had counterparts in the two brothers, five sisters, three sisters-in-law, and niece working as servants in Christian households in 1696), but one type of employee seems to have been unique to Jews. Since their children probably did not attend any of the various schools in the city (Soliday, 1993), Jewish parents hired private tutors who presumably provided religious instruction as well as elementary education. Sixteen of the 79 entries for male servants in Jewish households were teachers, and the two *Rabbis* mentioned in the early 18th-century lists (as boarders, not servants) probably served the same function. Interestingly enough, the last tutors listed as servants appear on the 1730 list, while the *Informator* of 1783 was no longer counted as a servant. Thereafter I found no

Table 8
Marburg households with servants

N of servants	Jewish HH 1657–1800		All households in 1731		All households in 1771	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	155	48.4	770	63.3	821	65.3
One	109	34.1	249	20.5	289	23.0
Two	42	13.1	120	9.9	87	6.9
Three	12	3.8	48	4.0	41	3.3
Four or more	2	0.6	27	2.2	19	1.5
Total	320	100.0	1214 ^a	99.9	1257	100.0

^a One case unknown.

Jewish tutors, although rabbis appeared on almost every list from 1783 to 1800. The special cultural role for several servant–tutors earlier as well as the presence of about twice as many female as male servants in Jewish households lead me to consider their religious and domestic requirements much more important in the keeping of servants than a need for employees in training with the family business.⁹

4. Economic activities and wealth

Such a view in no way detracts, of course, from Toch's emphasis on the economic security of privileged Jews as an explanation for their need and ability to maintain servants in large households. Indeed, a quick comparison in Table 9 of Jews' wealth with that of all other taxpayers and of the Jews' nearest competitors, the burghers in the Retailers Guild, confirms his view that Jews were well situated. In my sample years, the mean value of their total taxable assets always far exceeded the Marburg average. It also surpassed the retailers' mean wealth in the early 18th century only to slip below that of their chief economic rivals by 1771. As might be expected, their specific assets distinguished the Jews somewhat from others in the community.¹⁰ Take houses as a first example. Apparently during the Thirty Years War they could only rent lodgings, but Erdmann (1987, p. 48) has found that the Jew Itzig bought a house as early as 1660. He remains the only Jew I can find assessed for a house in the 1677 cadaster. Jews were forbidden from dwelling in the same house with Christians unless dire conditions made it necessary (Cohn, 1933, p. 15; Demandt, 1980, p. 29). Thus by 1721 five of the six Marburg Jews owned homes, scattered through the city not clustered in the *Judengasse* (compare in general Cohn, 1933, pp. 12–14), although the average assessment on Jewish houses never reached the mean tax value of other people's in my 18th-century samples. Besides their living in less valuable houses, the Jews did not own the garden plots, brew the beer, or distill the brandy that showed up in Hessian tax records for other residents. Only two Jews enjoyed income from capital investments in 1731; 40 years later, only one collected feudal dues in kind (grain) from rural sources. So what accounts for their economic success?

The earning power (*Handthierung*) from their occupations was clearly most important: it always showed the highest mean value among their taxable assets and, at the same time, ranked their average income far above that of most Marburg residents. Moreover, the Jews' mean income from trading compared favorably with that of retailers in the Marburg

⁹ While their Christian neighbors joined in keeping more female than male servants—for the entire population, the figures were 55% in 1731, and then 61.2% in 1771—a full two-thirds (66.8%) of the servants in all early modern Jewish households I have found were female.

¹⁰ Contrast Erdmann (1987, p. 49), who declared that the city's Jews were situated “financially and economically in the broad middle ranks [*Mittelfeld*] of ordinary Marburg citizens”—without any concrete evidence, indeed after a brief but appropriate discussion of the difficulties of estimating their wealth relative to that of the Christian population.

Table 9
 Mean assessments of taxable wealth of Jews in Marburg (mean values in Stfl.)

Taxable assets	All taxpayers	Jews	Retailers guild
<i>1721</i>			
Houses	60.23	54.00	90.60
Brewing	156.36		
Gardens	16.86		14.00
Feudal dues in kind ^a	174.61		33.50
Capital investments	287.93	51.00	83.53
Income from trade	126.50	283.33	233.43
Animals	3.81	2.00	4.27
Total assets	201.38	345.67	313.61
<i>1731</i>			
Houses	59.81	53.60	78.78
Gardens	17.55		17.78
Income from trade	125.00	287.14	224.63
Total assets	131.09	325.43	264.71
<i>1771</i>			
Feudal dues in kind ^a	26.43	71.00	34.67
Brewing	63.08		71.50
Distilling	51.52		34.00
Houses	64.62	50.00	96.53
Gardens	16.33		17.37
Income from trade	100.63	195.71	201.92
Total Assets	121.12	224.29	271.77

Sources: StAM 330 Mbg A I 125: Renovierter Steuerstock der Stadt (1721); 40a Rubr. XXIX Nr. 110: Volkszählung (1731); and 49d Mbg 379: Specificatio derer Menschen ... (1771).

^a Payments in Grain (Fruchtgefälle).

guild, exceeding it handsomely early in the 18th century, then turning slightly lower in 1771. Accounting for this later decline vis-à-vis the Christian retailers is not easy: why should the general economic malaise still lingering after the Seven Years War or the great subsistence crisis of the early 1770s have affected Jews more than their rivals? Here, however, my task is not to address that specific problem but to point to the occupations of Marburg's Jewish population. The Hessian landgraves granted Jews economic privileges, as already pointed out, in the expectation that they would prosper and could thus pay well for their protected status. At the same time, they were not to injure local handicrafts and trades where they gained domicile, and the territorial government therefore spelled out restrictions on matters like charging interest on loans, the retailing reserved for other privileged groups like guilds, or even keeping servants (see Demandt, 1980, pp. 26–36, for such regulations). Historians are properly skeptical about early modern governments' ability to enforce all such regulations (Demandt, 1980, p. 35), and in any case, policy toward Jews was as contested an issue in Hesse-Cassel as elsewhere. Citizen petitions

lodged against Jewish settlement and competition provide documentation of firm and then plaintive opposition (summarized in Erdmann, 1987) to Hessian governmental policy that grew more moderate over time (Demandt, 1980, pp. 38–42; Battenberg, 1983). In fact, to learn about Jewish economic activities we usually have to rely on such guild petitions, city council reports, or informal position papers within governmental agencies. Even individual letters patent for privileged Jews do not usually indicate just what trades they were permitted to practice. So the two lists presented in Table 10 are rare glimpses of Jewish occupations, since they include the entire group in Marburg and offer comments on the substance and success of individual trading.

Here there are no real surprises, however, for the activities mentioned fit the usual profile (I might even say the stereotype) for early modern German Jews. They were never members of guilds, of course, and sold items like cloth or clothing made by others. This feature and the usually small scale of most of their operations made them similar to Christian retailers. What probably distinguished them from their more specialized competitors organized within the local retailers guild was selling old clothes, dealing in

Table 10
Jewish trading activities, 1726 and 1771

Name	Houses (Tax Value in Stfl.)	Income	Comments on trade
<i>1726</i>			
Wolff Jacob	50	300	deals in retail and all kinds of wares
Leucus Abraham	60	420	deals in all kinds of retail goods, also gold and silver
Abraham Moses	48	300	deals with all kinds of retail goods, gold, silver, currency exchange, and the like
Jacob Isaac	50	160	trades horses
Jew Schmuel's Widow	60	290	deals with all kinds of retail goods
Isaac Samuel			deals in his mother's name with all kinds of goods
Hanna Jew Hahn's Widow		100	deals in old clothes
<i>1771</i>			
Aron Leucas	60	350	deals with cloth, pawned goods, cotton, and all kinds of silk cloth, also stockings
Abraham Meyer	20	50	is ruined and has nothing worth trading
Salomon Jacob		100	same as previous [entry]
Levi Salomon		70	just a little trade, makes living with students, when they want to pawn something, then he resells to others
Jacob Schafte		50	a ruined Jew, so has nothing to trade
Jacob Sostmann	50	300	has pretty good trade with all kinds of things, but small goods
Jacob Wolff	70	450	trades cloth, cotton, pawned goods, and also does other things
Ephraim [ben Israel]			"Jewish Professor" [not taxed on income]

Sources: StAM 19b 11 and 49d Mbg 379.

pawned items, and trading such a wide variety of goods. Perhaps most striking in the entries in [Table 10](#) is the frequent mention of their selling “all kinds of goods.” Probably equally important was their itinerant peddling, in both the city and the surrounding countryside, brought up—often with considerable contempt—in other sources from the period ([Erdmann, 1987, p. 47](#), and *passim*). But the table should call attention not only to these differences from the majority community but also to diversity among the Jews themselves. Not all were successful and wealthy: while only the widow Hanna was assessed below the mean value of incomes in 1721, four of the seven Jews with income assessments in 1771 ranked below the city average (the eighth, though not really a professor, was a special teacher attached to the university, whose privileged personnel paid no tax on income). In other words, the Marburg Jewish population was much more polarized in the economic hard times of the early 1770s than earlier, a social division that characterized many 18th-century Jewish communities (for a Hessian example, see [Demandt, 1980, pp. 43–44](#)).

5. Conclusions

In this article some of Toch’s generalizations about Jewish population and family households have served as an organizational frame for my own case study of Jews in a middle-sized German town. The Marburg data confirm many of his views: Jewish communities were dependent on governmental settlement policy, on one hand, and benefited on the other from an economic position relatively more secure than that of most of their Christian neighbors. While they remained cultural and social outsiders, the Jews filled a distinctive economic niche of value to the majority population: peddling or otherwise supplying a wide variety of retail goods. And although the rewards of their trading activities were unevenly distributed, they were sufficient to allow the community to pay the price for official toleration and, indeed, to grow throughout the early modern period.

In the Marburg case, that growth was opposed by the local citizenry but not hindered by governmental policy, which allowed the number of privileged Jewish households to increase over the 18th century. This pragmatic toleration meant that a tiny Jewish minority of about 1% kept pace with general population developments. Yet its response to Hessian policy did not require or involve the kind of family household organization that Toch has posited. True, Jewish households were usually larger than average in Marburg, but the data do not reveal the kind of internal complexity Toch leads us to expect. No married coresident children formed multiple family households among the Marburg Jews. While their families did house a higher proportion of grown children (aged 20 and over) than Christian households in 1696, the only sample that allows direct comparison, the presence of such young adults living at home was not rare in the majority population. Family extension appears, moreover, to have been a bit less complex in Jewish than in the Christian households I have sampled. While Jews had a better chance than was usual in Marburg of hiring one or two servants, even if not the large number Toch emphasizes in his general description, a more striking feature of their households was the number of coresident children in conjugal families. Servants made up 14.9% of

all Jews (Table 6), only slightly more than the 14.6% and 13.9% of the entire city population in service during the sample years of 1731 and 1771. Dependent sons and daughters, on the other hand, made up 42.4% (1731) and 44.2% (1771) of all Marburgers, but an even higher 46.8% of all Jews.¹¹ This proportion of coresident children seems to imply, contrary to Toch's argument, that "demography proper" could have played a role—indeed, as significant a role as Hessian settlement policy—in determining the larger than average size of Jewish households in Marburg. Although the sources are insufficient to allow careful examination of Jewish fertility and mortality over the 17th and 18th centuries, this inference from data on family organization seems safe enough to further modify the profile Toch proposed. Demographic features probably did join economic conditions, social norms, and the Hessian political authorities' pragmatic toleration to influence the number and shape of Jewish households in Marburg.¹²

6. Uncited references

Battenberg, 1996
 Händler-Lachmann and Werther, 1992
 Kurschner, 1938
 Mack, 1974

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Bad Godesberg, Germany), the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the University of

¹¹ Interestingly enough, the sex ratios for dependent sons and daughters were reversed for Jewish households and the general population: while males made up 48.4% (1731) and 45.4% (1771) of coresident children in Marburg, they constituted 52.3% of dependent children among all Jews. This exceptional situation could have resulted from demographic features (sex differentials at birth or in infant and child mortality), something we cannot know, but also from the probability—consistent even with more tolerant Hessian practice than Toch posits generally—that settlement policies and economic conditions would have made finding places for males either as servants or as householders more difficult than placing females outside their birth families.

¹² Just as frustrating as the absence of systematic records of Jewish births, marriages, and burials for family reconstitution and demographic analysis are the sparsity of information on places of origin and the unclear naming practices that make genealogical linkages uncertain. The last problem has thwarted my initial attempts to test an important hypothesis of local researchers like Erdmann (1987, pp. 44–46) and Fowler (personal correspondence). From their attempts (unsystematic and unclear in Erdmann, more extensive and reliable in Fowler) to collect scattered genealogical references into a kind of general *Stammtafel* for the city's principal Jewish families, both scholars propose that three big lineages, originating with the holders of the three letters patent from the mid-17th century, formed the core of the Marburg Jewish community over a long period of time. If such lineages existed and dominated other families (say, through intermarriage, economic relief, or the cultural patronage of providing teachers and space for religious rituals in lieu of a synagogue), the wider implications of kinship and patronage might add significantly to the present analysis based on household organization.

Texas at Dallas for financial support of the research for this article. A preliminary draft was presented at the October 2000 meeting of the Social Science History Association in Pittsburgh and the December 2000 meeting of the Dallas Area Social History Group. Further archival work led to considerable revisions, which were presented initially in a public lecture to the *Verein für hessische Geschichte und Landeskunde* at Marburg in July 2002. For their generous help in Marburg thanks go especially to Angus Fowler, Gerhard Menk, and Elke Matijeich.

References

- Battenberg, J. F. (1983). Judenordnungen der frühen Neuzeit in Hessen. In C. Heinemann (Ed.), *Neunhundert Jahre Geschichte der Juden in Hessen* (pp. 83–122). Wiesbaden, Germany: Kommission für die Geschichte der Juden in Hessen.
- Battenberg, J. F. (1996). Strukturen jüdischer Bevölkerung in Oberhessen im 17. Jahrhundert. *Menora: Jahrbuch für deutsch-jüdische Geschichte*, 7, 267–298.
- Battenberg, J. F. (2001). *Die Juden in Deutschland vom 16. bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*. München, Germany: Oldenbourg.
- Cohn, A. (1933). *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden in Hessen-Kassel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Marburg: Originally Dissertation, University of Marburg 1931.
- Demandt, K. (1973). Die hessische Judenstätigkeit von 1744. *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte*, 23, 292–332.
- Demandt, K. (1980). *Bevölkerungs- und Sozialgeschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde Niedenstein 1653–1866*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Kommission für die Geschichte der Juden in Hessen.
- Erdmann, A. (1987). *Die Marburger Juden: Ihre Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart dargestellt anhand der staatlichen Quellen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Dissertation, University of Marburg.
- Fowler, A. (1989). Beiträge zur Geschichte der Juden und zum jüdischen Leben in Marburg im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit (bis etwa 1800): Kritische Bemerkungen zur Dissertation von A Erdmann. Unpublished typescript.
- Händler-Lachmann, B., & Werther, T. (1992). Vergessene Geschäfte—verlorene Geschichte: Jüdisches Wirtschaftsleben in Marburg und seine Vernichtung im Nationalsozialismus. Marburg: Hitzeroth.
- Horwitz, L. (1913). Die Entwicklung der jüdischen Bevölkerung in Kurhessen. *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden*, 9, 81–86, 97–104.
- Katz, J. (1959). Family, kinship, and marriage among Ashkenazim in the 16th to 18th centuries. *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 1, 4–21.
- Kießling, R. (1995). Zwischen Vertreibung und Emanzipation—Judendörfer in Ostschwaben während der Frühen Neuzeit. In R. Kießling (Ed.), *Jüdische Gemeinden in Schwaben im Kontext des Alten Reiches* (pp. 154–180). Berlin, Germany: Akademie.
- Kürschner, W. (1938). Die Stellung der Juden in einer hessischen Stadt (Marburg) von den Anfängen bis zur Neuzeit. *Hessenland*, 49, 119–125.
- Mack, R. (1974). Jüdische Universitätsverwandte und Studenten in Marburg im 18. Jahrhundert. *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte*, 24, 191–227.
- Meyer, P. -A. (1993). *La Communauté juive de Metz au XVIII^e siècle: histoire et démographie*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy.
- Richarz, M., & Rürup, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Jüdisches Leben auf dem Lande*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schubert, K. (1987). *Juden in Kirchhain: Geschichte der Gemeinde und ihres Friedhofs*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Kommission für die Geschichte der Juden in Hessen.
- Soliday, G. L. (1993). *Aus schlechten Christen werden gemeinlich auch schlechte Unterthanen*. Die Schul-

bildung der Marburger Handwerker in der frühen Neuzeit. *Hessisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte*, 43, 107–137.

Toch, M. (1995). Aspects of stratification in early modern German Jewry: Population history and village Jews. In R. P. Hsia, & H. Lehmann (Eds.), *In and out of the ghetto: Jewish–Gentile relations in late medieval and early modern Germany* (pp. 77–89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.