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This thesis examines American Jewish cookbooks from the 1870s through the 1930s as artifacts of acculturation—in particular, the acculturation process of Jewish women as distinct from that of Jewish men. These cookbooks are gendered primary documents in that they were written by women and for women, and they reflect messages about women’s place in society coming from the broad American cultural climate and from Jewish sources. In serving charitable ends, the cookbooks mirror the American Protestant notion that women’s spirituality is expressed through good deeds of philanthropy. They also reveal lessons about health and hygiene directed at new immigrants to make them and their children accepted in mainstream society, and fads and fashions of hostessing that were being imitated by Jewish women. These elements of “becoming American” were more significant in the acculturation process of Jewish women than of Jewish men.
Cookbooks, particularly those of the fund-raising charitable variety, were instruments for building women’s sense of community. Through community cookbooks, women in the sisterhoods of synagogues as well as in other philanthropic groups could assert control over a portion of the budget of the synagogue or charitable institution. The cookbooks are a window into what those female-centric communities were about. Beyond sharing recipes, the contributors to the community cookbooks shared humor, cooperative leadership, and, usually, lack of rabbinical input.

American Jewish cookbooks reflect varying ideological stances vis-à-vis kashrut. Some assert that kosher restrictions are no barrier to serving as elegant a meal as one’s gentile neighbor, while others say that anything that is healthy is acceptable and not treyf (non-kosher). In general, the early cookbooks display a more lax attitude toward kashrut than most American Jewish cookbooks today and feature more distinctly treyf ingredients.

Cookbooks also reflect linguistic acculturation. As the immigrant Jewish population shifted from German to Eastern European, cookbooks—particularly commercial cookbooks promoting products—moved to Yiddish, then to Yiddish and English, and then (much later) to English translations of Yiddish cookbooks. The socio-economic status of the intended audience also played a role in the selection of recipes and of practical advice.

The voices of American Jewish women from a variety of religious, ideological, and socio-economic backgrounds can be heard in these cookbooks. Sometimes the voices are slyly anti-male and proto-feminist. This thesis argues that through the cookbooks Jewish women asserted their sphere of agency, which was in their kitchens, in the
management of their homes, and in their sisterhoods. There they created their own women’s communities and subcultures, which were uniquely Jewish, American, and female.
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Introduction

“Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

The iconic words of Emma Lazarus’s poem “The New Colossus,” emblazoned on the Statue of Liberty, have shaped Americans’ perception of the identity and motivation of the masses of immigrants who came to the United States in the period of peak immigration from 1881 to 1924. Yet as Hasia Diner has shown in her book Hungering for America: Italian, Irish, and Jewish Foodways in the Age of Immigration, those who came to America were neither “the wretched refuse,” the most impoverished inhabitants of their native lands, who lacked the means to travel, nor the best-off, who could afford to stay. Rather the immigrants were those in-between masses driven by economic disasters, such as the Irish potato famine, crop failures in Italy, and growing impoverishment of Jews in Eastern Europe, to seek greater economic and food security in the United States. What they found was food in abundance and variety exceeding anything they imagined. Diner observes, “They [the immigrants] had come to America from places where everyone, including those who were fairly well-off, ate less than ordinary Americans.”

---

2 The years 1881-1924 were the high tide of Jewish immigration to the United States, with some two million Jews arriving from Central and Eastern Europe, following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II of Russia in 1881. The passage of the 1924 Johnson-Reed Act limited immigration among Jews, as well as among Italians, Greeks, Poles, Slavs, and other Eastern Europeans, by establishing quotas by national origins of 2 percent of the foreign-born population as of 1890. An earlier immigration law in 1921 had established national quotas, but the Johnson-Reed law was more restrictive and longer-lasting. The law was revised in 1952, and the national origins quota system was abolished by the Hart-Celler Act of 1965. See https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act.
The abundance, variety, and unfamiliarity of certain foods challenged the newcomers to adapt to America. Like other immigrants, Jews went through several stages of acculturation to American foodways. For Jewish immigrants this acculturation process meant both accommodation to new foods available—for example, salmon replacing carp in gefilte fish in the Pacific Northwest—and adjustment to new norms of kashrut, the dietary regulations of Jewish law, in a new land, such as using vegetable shortening instead of butter or animal fat.

Who would guide the recent arrivals through the plethora of new products and produce? How would the immigrants respond to American standards of hygiene and cleanliness and adapt to more mechanized methods of food preparation? Their coreligionists and their landslayt (those from the same country) who arrived before them judged themselves to be best suited to bridge the gap. For Jews from Eastern Europe in the late nineteenth century, it was often German-speaking Jews who had come only a few decades earlier who provided this guidance. Sometimes this aid was offered in a spirit of generosity and concern; sometimes, it came with condescension or fear that native-born White Protestant social workers would instead be the “agents of assimilation.” Often, evolving foodways were indicative of landmarks along the journey to becoming American.

This thesis will explore how food, cooking, and the domestic lives of East European immigrant women informed their acculturation. I focus on women because the

---


pathways to Americanization differed along gender lines, as both American and immigrant cultures had clear-cut notions of distinctive gender roles at this time. In a traditional Jewish household, men were responsible for religious matters in the synagogue and study house, while women were in charge of the domestic religion—keeping a kosher home, preparing for Sabbath and holidays, and lighting the Sabbath candles. In America, economic necessity required that most immigrant women work outside the home, in factories, sweat shops, and stores. Yet they still shouldered the predominant share of the labor in the kitchen and the home. Fulfilling the expectations of these differing roles aroused conflict for the women, as they sought to excel in both.

Historical source materials relevant to Jewish immigrant women’s experience come from many sources, including letters, diaries, and contemporaneous fictional works, but these tend to reflect the elite or more literate strands of society. Closer to the everyday lives of ordinary Jewish women during the era of high immigration were the cookbooks written by or for them. The cookbooks written for them were sometimes prescriptive; those written by them were the work of women unknown beyond their cookbook creations. We know their recipes but not their lives. We have to tease out their lived experience through their recipes.

Cookbooks offer a window into the Jewish home as an understudied locus of acculturation. As Ruth A. Abusch-Magder has observed, “the home was not an exclusive site of either assimilation or tradition but an institution that was able to encompass both.”6 It was, she continues, “a flexible space in which what were often portrayed as

---

opposing forces could be simultaneously accommodated.”7 It was in the home, and particularly in the kitchen, that Jewish women had authority, and could assert their religious and cultural principles.

**Artifacts of Acculturation**

Many of these cookbooks were created, at least in part, to facilitate acculturation into America. Examining them as “artifacts of acculturation” provides a broad framework in which to understand them. These cookbooks were not simply collections of recipes, but often guides to how to “run a traditional Jewish household.”8 More accurately, they instruct how to run a bourgeois to upper-middle-class Jewish household. Esther Levy’s *Jewish Cookery Book*, the earliest Jewish cookbook in America, contains chapters on “Arrangement of the Table”9 and “Hints to Housekeepers”10 and suggests the necessity of at least one domestic servant to run such a household. The advertisements that accompany even the commercially published cookbooks also tell us about the lifestyles and domestic furnishings of Jewish homes in this era. They give a portrait of the everyday lives of Jewish women in ways that memoirs or letters would likely overlook.

At the same time, these cookbooks provide evidence of the tensions or dislocations that accompanied acculturation to a new country. For example, recipes for “matzo kugel” and “matzo pudding or shalet”—clearly dishes associated with Passover

---

7 Ibid., p.35.
8 The title of a book by Blu Greenberg, published in 1983, which dealt with home-centered rituals and observances, from a Modern Orthodox perspective.
10 Ibid., p. 171.
because of their use of unleavened bread—are presented in a chapter entitled “Easter Dishes” in “Aunt Babette’s” Cook Book by Bertha F. Kramer in 1889. Similar dishes—and more of them—are listed as “Passover Dishes” in the 1918 Jewish Cook Book by Florence Kreisler Greenbaum, which is more traditional, and as “Special Dishes for Holidays” in the Jewish Cook Book created by the Young Ladies Sewing Circle of Temple Beth Israel in Houston, Texas. The names for Passover dishes may differ by locality of origin: Are Florence Greenbaum’s kremslekh similar to Aunt Babette’s chrimsel? The differences reflect different strains of Yiddish or German and different intended audiences.

Not only the recipes, but the languages in which the cookbooks are written—Yiddish, English, or German—are extremely significant, in that they indicate who could use the recipes. Some product-sponsored cookbooks were bilingual—in Yiddish and in English—so that both Yiddish-speaking mothers and their English-speaking daughters could work together on the same recipes. Furthermore, the type of Yiddish used indicates the degree of acculturation. A 1930 cookbook produced by the B. Manischewitz Company of Cincinnati features parallel recipes in English and in Yiddish, but the Yiddish is full of Anglicized words such as “strawberry shortcake,” “cutlets,” and “popovers.” The person who used the Yiddish side of this book must have had familiarity with English, but was able to read best in Yiddish.

**Gendered Views within Cookbooks**

The early cookbooks were written by women and clearly directed toward a female audience, and so were inherently gendered. That is to say, they expressed an articulated
or assumed view of the proper roles for men and women. For example, “Aunt Babette’s” *Cook Book* opens with a preface that declares: “I think it the duty of every woman to be the head of her household, as much as it is the duty of the man to be the head of his place of business or counting room.”[11] The classic *Settlement Cook Book* of 1903, by Mrs. Simon [Lizzie Black] Kander and Mrs. Henry Schoenfeld, which went through forty editions and sold more than 2 million copies, had as its subtitle, *The Way to a Man’s Heart*. Was the subtitle suggesting that food was an aphrodisiac? Or was the title merely a tongue-in-cheek nod to promoting solidarity among women? Did it suggest that only women could have a place in the kitchen, or that women’s dominion in the kitchen existed for the exclusive purpose of pleasing men?

Because they were written both by and for women, these cookbooks are ideal historical source documents for examining the lives of ordinary Jewish women during the period of mass migration. Puzzles like the bilingual Manischewitz cookbook and the “Easter Dishes” from Aunt Babette point to the dichotomies in Jewish women’s lives. These cookbooks tell us not only what Jewish women cooked and ate, but how they accommodated to their new circumstances and how they saw their domestic roles changing in a new land.

I will explore this understudied treasure trove of domestic data through the following outline:

I. A history of early American and American Jewish cookbooks
II. Settlement houses and the cookbooks they produced

III. Charity cookbooks created by sisterhoods of service

IV. Product cookbooks and other Yiddish cookbooks

I will interpret the cookbooks of the early immigrant era as vehicles of acculturation and simultaneously as preservers of traditional Jewish foodways. In addition, I will examine the assumptions about gender roles for Jewish women and men that these cookbooks reveal.
A History of Early American and Early American Jewish Cookbooks

What motivated the writing and the publication of a cookbook in centuries past? A housewife who was literate would likely have her own collection of recipes (or receipts, as they were often called), for both culinary and medicinal purposes. If she was illiterate, she might still have many recipes in her head, learned mimetically from her mother. But an aspiring mistress of a household with money might wish to own a cookery manuscript containing someone else’s recipes. The desire to own a written recipe or collection of recipes seems quite ancient and widespread. Today historical culinary manuscripts are prized additions to university and museum collections because they shed light on domestic practices and dietary and medicinal knowledge. Extensive collections are now available online and provide a comparative basis for examining culinary history through cookbooks and manuscripts. In this chapter we will examine comparatively British Jewish and American Jewish cookbooks as well as American mainstream and American Jewish cookbooks to observe how the differences reveal distinctive domestic cultures and evolving foodways.

The earliest culinary manuscript in English goes back to the fourteenth century; the *Forme of Cury*, attributed to the “chief Master Cooks of King Richard II,” is dated to

---

1 For example, the Chef Szathmary Culinary Arts Collection at the University of Iowa, with 20,000 items, and the Janice Bluestein Longone Culinary Archive at University of Michigan, with 25,000 items. See http://collguides.lib.uiowa.edu/?MSC0533; https://www.lib.umich.edu/culinary-archive. Rutgers University Libraries have 39 cubic feet of New Jersey cookbooks in their Special Collections and University Archives; a listing of the titles may be found at http://www2.scc.rutgers.edu/ead/snjc/njcookbooksf.html.

approximately 1390. The archives of the Virginia Company of London contain two volumes of British recipe books that came to America as early as 1620. The book claiming to be the “first American cookbook,” by Amelia Simmons, was not published until a century and a half later, in 1796. Was there no need for a cookbook that took into consideration the differing food offerings of the new continent as contrasted with England? As Mary Tolford Wilson observes in her introduction to the facsimile version of this cookbook, “The originality of Amelia Simmons’s work lies in its recognition that an American could not find in a British cookbook recipes for making dishes that she as an American had known and eaten all her life.” A new country, with new natural ingredients available, needed a new set of recipes. Thus while some of Simmons’s recipes seem to be “outright borrowings from British cookery books of the period, particularly Susannah Carter’s,” seventeen others feature distinctively New World ingredients such as corn meal and pumpkin.

A Comparison of the Two Earliest Kosher Cookbooks in English

A similar relationship of mimicry and innovation, between Old and New Worlds, may exist between the two earliest kosher cookbooks in English—one from England and one from the United States. The Jewish Manual, a British Jewish cookbook by Lady Judith Cohen Montefiore, was published in 1846, and the first Jewish cookbook published in America, Jewish Cookery Book, by Esther Levy, was published in 1871 in Philadelphia. Plagiarism between these two works does not seem to be an issue. Both

---


4 Ibid., p. xi.
have recipes for items that today would be hard to find in a kosher cookbook, such as mock turtle soup and mulligatawny soup, but their ingredients are kosher, and their instructions are not identical. On the other hand, Montefiore’s “Kugel and Commean” does closely resemble Levy’s “Coogle or Pudding, and Peas and Beans”—both related to *cholent*, the traditional Sabbath stew put in the oven overnight to be eaten on the Sabbath day. And Levy’s “lemon stewed fish” seems a lot like “fish stewed white” in *The Jewish Manual*—both representing classical English Jewish culinary traditions.

Both Montefiore and Levy had as their mission “to demonstrate the compatibility of Jewish ritual requirement and modern efficiency,” as Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has observed. Montefiore’s recipes, while predominantly Ashkenazic, draw on both Ashkenazic and Western Sephardic traditions, reflecting her own family history. Her husband came from a distinguished Sephardic lineage, and her father was an officer of the Great Synagogue, the leading Ashkenazic synagogue in London. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett suggests that in their first years of marriage the Montefiores were not strict in their observance of *kashrut*, especially when traveling abroad, thus providing Lady Montefiore a basis for comparison in creating kosher dishes that imitated non-kosher cuisine. In her discussion of making pastry dough, for example, she says, “It is a great mistake to imagine lard is better adapted for pastry than butter or clarified fat.” On some

---


fine points of *kashrut,* her recipes may be at odds with strict halakhic standards. For example, she instructs how “to clarify suet,”\(^8\) but suet is usually understood to be *helev,* fat from a part of the animal that is forbidden by the laws of *kashrut.*

A comparison of these two cookbooks clearly points to differences between the socio-economic milieus of British and American Jews. Lady Judith Montefiore, as her title suggests, embodied the virtues of newly upper-class gentry; she came into possession of her title when her husband, Sir Moses Montefiore, was knighted by Queen Victoria. The mid-nineteenth century, when *The Jewish Manual* was published, was a time of rapid social mobility among English Jews.\(^9\) Montefiore’s goal in assembling this book, as she states in the “Editor’s Preface,” is “to guide the young Jewish housekeeper in the luxury and economy of ‘The Table,’ on which so much of the pleasure of social intercourse depends.”\(^10\) Her intended audience includes “even … those ladies not of the Hebrew persuasion.”\(^11\) Some of her instructions are directed to the “cook,” who manages the kitchen and the acquisition of ingredients, but there is also mention of a “trustworthy zealous servant” who carries out the preparation of the meals. Clearly, this cookbook is targeted to an upper-class or high bourgeoisie woman, not necessarily of the Jewish religion.

---

\(^8\) Ibid., p. 55.


\(^10\) Montefiore, op. cit, p.8.

\(^11\) Ibid., p. 9
Lady Montefiore traveled extensively, and her recipes reflect her cosmopolitan worldview, as well as a predilection toward French terminology, for which she offers a glossary at the beginning. Her instructions as to proper femininity extend beyond the kitchen to the “toilette.” The latter twenty pages of the manual—fully one-ninth of the book—focus on instructions for care of the skin, teeth, and hair, proper diet, and interestingly, development of the mind and the inner life. The final chapter, entitled “Influence of the Mind as regards Beauty,” exhorts women to keep their passions under control and to pursue the “exercise of the intellect and development of noble sentiments.”

She quotes an unnamed “clever writer” to the effect that “[b]eauty is but another name for that expression of the countenance which is indicative of sound health, intelligence, and good feeling.” She insists that guides to external beauty will only be effective if they reflect an inner beauty based upon intellect and character. She writes, “Let those females, therefore, who are most solicitous about their beauty, and most eager to produce a favourable impression cultivate the moral, religious, and intellectual attributes, and in this advice consists the recipe for the finest cosmetic in the world.” These words, which conclude her book, show that Montefiore thought of it as a guide to shaping a proper “moral, religious, and intellectual” lady, and within that gender ideal, recipes and kitchen conduct were but a small part.

12 Ibid., p. 178.

13 Ibid., p. 179. This quotation is very similar to a sentence in a chapter on tight-lacing of corsets in a book entitled Searchlights on Health by B.G. Jefferis and J.L. Nichols. See http://www.ubooks.pub/Books/ON/B0/E577R2581/040MB577.html.

14 Ibid., p. 180.
More than an ocean and a few decades separate Esther Levy from Lady Montefiore. Levy, from a humbler class and economic background, has far skimpier firm biographical data. “Born Esther Jacobs, Mrs. Levy was an English Jew living in Philadelphia,” Joan Nathan tells us in her introduction to the facsimile version of the cookbook. “According to the Philadelphia census of 1870, an English-born Esther Levy lived in the home of Judah Isaacs, a Dutch physician, and was a clerk in a store.”

Levy’s book bears a publication date of 1871, Philadelphia, published by W.S. Turner, No. 808 Chestnut Street. After that date, Levy disappears from the census and leaves no paper trail. Her cookbook is her first and last mark for posterity.

The book’s title page tells us a great deal about her intended audience and purpose for writing. The subtitle reads, “Principles of Economy adapted for Jewish Housekeepers.” But most surprising is that the supra-title is in Hebrew: “Melekhet habishul b’derekh nakhon u’kefee mitzvot da’ateinu hakedosa” (A work of cookery in the correct way and according to the commandments of our holy religion). Did Levy think that her “Jewish housekeepers” would be able to read the Hebrew? Or was the Hebrew intended as a sort of rabbinic seal of approval, a haskamah? In any case, the Hebrew text marks the book as unabashedly Jewish.

Although Levy’s subtitle, “Principles of Economy,” suggests a humbler audience than that of Lady Montefiore, her introduction still refers to maids who became housekeepers and servants. Her book was directed to the aspiring middle-class Jewish

---

housewife. She insists that “knowledge of family management” is vital for a married
woman and “direction of a table is no inconsiderable branch of a lady’s business.”  
She also advises keeping a sharp eye out for merchants who might be tempted to cheat the 
customer. She writes, “Without suspecting any one’s honesty, still, as mistakes may have 
been made unintentionally, it is prudent to weigh meats, sugar, etc., when brought in, and 
compare with the charge.”

Practicality and frugality are watchwords throughout her book, which ends with 
instructions on the quotidian aspects of housekeeping, such as how “to remove stains 
from silver,” or “how to clean carpets” or how “to keep away house vermin.” Her recipes 
include “how to give a gloss to shirt bosoms” and how to create “a good bug poison.” By 
contrast, Lady Montefiore suggests many “receipts” (recipes) for “improving the skin,” a 
“lotion for removing freckles,” “cold cream,” and “lip salve.” These differing concerns 
suggest that Levy’s readers were middle-class and had to be more self-sufficient in caring 
for their homes and families, while Montefiore’s were of higher status and had more time 
and resources to expend on their appearance. In Montefiore’s upper-class circles, a 
woman’s appearance (even if influenced by her inner qualities of intellect and character, 
as suggested in the final chapter) was a key to her standing in society, and that standing 
was a significant part of what she brought to a marital match. In Levy’s world, these fine 
points of status were less important than her ability to run an efficient household.

---

17 Ibid., p. 7.  
Both Montefiore and Levy include a section on “Receipts for Invalids” (or in the latter, “Diet for Invalids”). In the former, the nature of the sickness is not described beyond pertaining to “delicate persons or weakly children.” In the latter Levy offers specific home remedies for illnesses ranging from coughs and colds, chills and fever, to diphtheria, scarlet fever, and measles. The American book’s more extensive repertoire of “Medicinal Recipes” suggests that the services of a doctor may have been harder to obtain in the more dispersed American environment. “Sickness may occur in every family,” Levy writes, “when the services of a physician cannot be had immediately; something must be done in the meantime, while waiting for the doctor.” Therefore she offers remedies, not limited to food, for everything from frost-bitten limbs to mosquito bites. There are even cures for bad breath (from onions) and instructions on “How to Extinguish Fire on a Person.”

Levy’s cookbook differs from Montefiore’s, and resembles later charitable cookbooks, in that it features a substantial advertisement section at the back of the book. Some of the ads are cooking-related, such as those for “China, Glass, and Crockery Ware,” or “Cooking Utensils.” Others are for local merchants such as a “German pharmacy,” “ice cream and dining rooms,” a “cosher butcher” (also written in Hebrew letters), and two different spas. The advertisers are all from Philadelphia, where Levy lived and the book was published; their presence gives the book the feel of belonging to a local community. The absence of the ads in the Montefiore cookbook places it in a more aristocratic milieu, where ads were not needed to fund the publication.

19 Ibid., p. 151.
20 Levy, p. 125.
21 Ibid. p. 133.
What culinary traditions did Levy draw upon? Her sources seem varied. Her recipe for “lemon stewed fish” seems Mediterranean or Sephardic. Her Yorkshire pudding and Irish stew would likely be of British origin, as would be the “excellent trifle.” Her German dumplings (*dampf-nudeln*) and “sauer krout” suggest a German lineage. And succotash, corn bread, and baked apples seem indigenous American. The variety of dishes in Levy’s cookbook suggests the diversity of the American Jewish table already in the late eighteenth century, even before the period of mass immigration.

Both Montefiore and Levy offer quite a few puddings and a great variety of meats. The puddings include both the sweet type for dessert—such as tapioca pudding, apple pudding, or boiled raspberry and currant pudding—and savory puddings, such as minced meat, baked suet pudding, or potato pudding, for the main course. Meat cuts include lamb, mutton, veal, tongue, turkey, duck, chicken, giblets, brisket, calves feet, and steak. The whole animal was used, so that no edible parts were wasted. In addition to preparing soups, meats, bread, and pastry dishes, the mid-nineteenth-century housewife needed to know how to make butter and cheese, preserve fruit into jams and jellies, and pickle cucumbers—basic commodities that moderns purchase and take for granted. Montefiore records recipes for pickling cauliflower, cucumbers, melons, red and white cabbage, mushrooms, and even walnuts. Levy instructs how to preserve butter, fruit, and jellies. The necessity for this pickling and preserving was to store food over longer periods of time without refrigeration.

---

22 This connection was suggested by Joan Nathan in the introduction to her book, *Jewish Cooking in America*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1994, p.11.
Of course, there are in both cookbooks archetypical “Jewish recipes,” meaning recipes tied to a holiday or Sabbath. For Passover, Levy records a “matzo cleis soup,” with instructions on how to make matza balls to go in any other soup, and a “matzas charlotte,” a sweet kugel-like dish with matzas, raisins, sugar, cinnamon, custard, and fruit. For Shabbat, there is “coogle or pudding and peas and beans,” which seems to be a sort of cholent, and “frimsel soup, as that will keep best over night.” For Friday night, Levy reports that it is customary to drink raisin wine for the Kiddush, but she does not give a recipe for it, suggesting that she did not make her own. Interestingly, the menu for Sunday dinner is more elaborate than that for Shabbat, because “[t]his is the day the husbands are at home, then something good must be prepared in honor of the lords of the household.” This might imply acculturation to the gentile day of rest, meaning that the Jewish men of Levy’s community worked on the Sabbath and did not make it home for Saturday lunch. Alternatively, it might simply mean that the men went out to synagogue on Saturday, and only on Sunday were they home the entire day and so available to participate in a long, elaborate meal. In either case, the needs of the “lords of the household” set the dining schedule for the weekend.

Levy does not just offer recipes that fall within the bounds of kashrut, but also gives instructions for how to run a traditional Jewish household with its varied mitzvot, or ritual commandments. She begins the introduction by noting the requirement to affix “on the door posts, the name of the God of Israel, written on parchment, in Hebrew” — that

23 Levy, op. cit., p. 95. Note the variant spellings of matza and matzo in different recipes.
24 Ibid., p. 177.
30. Ibid., p. 178.
26 Ibid., p. 5.
is, a mezuzah. She explains the intricacies of kashering meat, from having the cow slaughtered by a kosher butcher to removing the arteries and sinews of the hindquarter, to draining the blood. She goes on to discuss the necessity of preparing food for Shabbat beforehand, breaking off a piece of the loaf before baking (taking challah from the dough), and lighting Sabbath lamps with a blessing to mark the beginning of the holy day.

She goes into great detail in describing the preparations the Jewish housewife must make for Passover—emphasizing that “every particle of leaven must be out of the house by ten o’clock of the preceding morning.”27 She describes the scrubbing and the cleaning and the preparation of the symbolic foods for the Seder, but puts an upbeat spin on it, assuring the Jewish housewife that all the work is worthwhile: “With what pleasurable emotions a Jewish woman must anticipate the time when she will see everything looking so brilliantly clean, and mostly new. Indeed, we all should be delighted, when we reflect that so much cleanliness is a preparation for becomingly celebrating our wonderful deliverance from bondage.”28

A passage such as the above indicates that Esther Levy was a woman of faith, not simply a housewife of Jewish extraction. She understood the tenets of her religion, and even showed some knowledge of the biblical text and stories. In the preface, she traces the connection of Jewish women and food all the way back to Sarah, the first of the matriarchs, who “when her husband bids her ‘make cakes’ for his celestial guests … [did

27 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
28 Ibid., p. 8.
not disdain from]… attending to culinary matters.”\textsuperscript{29} Levy is paraphrasing the story of Abraham and the angels in \textit{Genesis 18:6}, and seems to know the text well. She follows that story with a quotation from the \textit{Book of Proverbs} describing the “Woman of Valor” (\textit{Eishet Hayil}): she “riseth while it is yet night and giveth provision to her household.”\textsuperscript{30} It is highly unlikely that Levy read about these women in the original Hebrew; the translation most available to her would have been Isaac Leeser’s \textit{Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures}, published in 1853, the first American Jewish translation. In fact, the Leeser translation of \textit{Proverbs 31:15} matches Levy’s quotation.

It is telling that Levy chose as her role models, out of the many women of the Bible, Sarah at her most domestic moment and the “Woman of Valor,” perhaps the most bourgeois and conventional of female portraits. The energetic, industrious, and family-supportive woman of \textit{Proverbs 31} was, of course, an idealized picture of a woman in any age, but it matched well the domestic ideals of the late nineteenth century. Esther Levy could have seen in these verses a reflection of her own efforts to please her spouse, support her family, and enhance the Jewish atmosphere of her home.

Levy’s purpose in creating this cookbook was to preserve and defend Jewish home-centered rituals and food-related traditions, as stated in her preface: “Having undertaken the present work with the view of proving that, without violating the precepts of our religion, a table can be spread, which will satisfy the appetites of the most

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., p. 3.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., p. 4.
fastidious.” To do so, she felt she needed to impart expertise in household management and in the cycle of the Jewish year. At the back of her book are comprehensive lists of the “Culinary Utensils, Etc.: Articles that should be in all kitchens” (some 180 items, not including food) and the holidays and fast days of the Jewish calendar, listed in knowledgeable detail. Esther Levy knew her kitchen tools and knew her Jewish traditions, and saw no contradiction between her competencies in both arenas. Both, in her view, were needed to run a traditional Jewish household.

**A Comparison of Esther Levy’s Cookbook to Jennie June’s**

Around the same time that Levy was writing her assertively Jewish cookbook, Jennie June, the pseudonym of Jane Cunningham Croly, an American journalist, wrote a more circumscribed book of cookery. In 1870, Croly, the founder of the Sorosis Club of New York (which later became the General Federation of Women’s Clubs) and the Woman’s Press Club of New York City, wrote *Jennie June’s American Cookery Book*. June/Croly was not Jewish, yet she chose to include toward the back of her manuscript a chapter on “Jewish Receipts,” sandwiched between “The Dairy” and “Favorite Dishes of Distinguished Persons.” Why did she single out these recipes, which could easily have found a home in other sections of her book? The items seem generic and not especially “Jewish”—e.g., “white stewed fish,” “brown fricassee chicken,” and a number of puddings. Only “Purim Fritters”—which seem closer to French toast than to hamantaschen—have a Jewish holiday context.
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June/Croly says these recipes “are all original and reliable—the contribution of a superior Jewish housekeeper in New York.” Did Jewish recipes have some sort of special cachet at this time in New York? Or had Ms. Croly had the good fortune to have hired a skilled cook who happened to be Jewish as her personal chef? She also has a section on “Sorosis Receipts,” which features recipes from “one of the best cooks and housekeepers in the country, and the Chairwoman also of the Executive Committee of Sorosis.” Perhaps Croly was an avid collector of recipes from “best cooks.” Croly also presents a great deal of housekeeping wisdom from “how to starch shirts” to “how to take ink out of linen” to “how to make hens lay in winter.”

While both Croly’s and Levy’s books are called “Cookery Books,” they both survey a much wider range of topics that deal with household management. It is significant to compare the two as source documents for a definition of “housewifery” in Jewish and Christian middle-class homes of the mid-nineteenth century. According to Nina E. Lerman, “‘Housewifery’ in the 19th century denoted all of the tasks of running a household, such as cooking, cleaning, sewing and laundry,” but the exact nature of the tasks depended on the socio-economic status of the household and one’s position within it. Levy records many directives dealing with cleanliness, including how to clean carpets, how to take stains out of marble, silver, and linen, and how to revive the color of black silk. Croly focuses on the larger tasks of economical household management, such as
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buying in large quantities to avoid running out or arranging cooking so as “to save fuel as much as possible.” Whether these differences reflect the personal predilections or the societal norms of the two authors is a question open to speculation, but both cookbooks describe gendered expectations for the woman of the house that go far beyond cooking.

_A Comparison of Esther Levy’s Cookbook to “Aunt Babette”_

“Jennie June” was not the only popular American cookbook writer of the mid-nineteenth century to use a pseudonym. Under the name “Aunt Babette,” Bertha F. Kramer, a Reform Jew of German descent, created a cookbook reflecting the religious outlook of Reform Judaism that characterized many of the Central European Jewish communities from which Jews immigrated to America in mid-century. Ostensibly addressed to “the young housekeepers of America,” suggesting a broad, multi-ethnic audience, this cookbook was subtly directed to a Reform Jewish audience. It featured a Jewish star on its title page, and the publisher was Bloch Publishing and Printing Company of Cincinnati and Chicago, a company closely associated with the moderate wing of Reform Jewry in America. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise, a founder of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and Hebrew Union College and author of the _Minhag America_ prayer book, was married to a sister of Edward Bloch, who had established the publishing company in 1855. It was the ideological stance of the American Reform movement under Wise that held the Jewish dietary laws were no longer applicable, and
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35 Croly, op.cit., p. 3.


certain categories of *treyf* (non-kosher) foods were permitted (but not others). This view was evident in the foods served at the dinner for the ordination of the first class of Hebrew Union College, including four types of forbidden foods (clams, crabs, shrimp and frogs legs, but no pork), that became known as the “*trefa* banquet” of 1883, which led to the formation of a more traditional Conservative Judaism as distinct from Reform Judaism. “Aunt Babette” similarly had no qualms about including recipes for oysters, lobster, ham sandwiches, and even “royal ham sandwiches” in her cookbook, which was published in the same decade as the famous banquet. She, like her intended audience of Reform Jews of German descent, wished to be able to serve sophisticated dishes in keeping with the popular trends of her day and to dine with non-Jewish neighbors. The word “trefa” appears once in the alphabetical index at the beginning of the book, but it refers only to “valuable hints” and does not occur later in that section of the book. The concept of *treyf* was not ideologically or practically meaningful to Kramer.

First published in 1889, *Aunt Babette’s Cook Book* ran 520 pages (as compared with Levy’s 200 pages), went through eleven editions, and remained in print for over twenty-five years. Its popularity could be attributed to its comprehensive collection of recipes both simple and sophisticated. In her preface, Kramer describes herself as having gathered recipes by having “hoarded them up as treasures for my own daughters and grandchildren,” as if the cookbook with its well over a thousand recipes were an accidental byproduct. Yet it is clear from the same introduction that her collection and sharing of recipes was a means to an end: to promote her view of clearly defined gender
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roles to a wider public and to aid in their implementation. The cookbook was her vehicle. Addressing an audience that was explicitly female, she wrote:

I think it is the duty of every woman to be the head of her household, as much as it is the duty of the man to be the head of his place of business or counting room, wherein to rule means to understand his position and duties. This same rule is applicable to the household. In order to govern and command the respect of your servants and to show them that you are not ignorant of the duties you expect them to perform, you must first learn the management of a household yourself.

The more and better educated you are the more fit you are to perform the duties of helpmate to your dear husband…. A young lady ignorant of housekeeping and its duties is as unfit to be married as a man that has not the certainty of providing for a family.  

With such clearly defined gender roles, a cookbook was not only about cooking and food preparation but about household management, which meant directing a well-established, bourgeois household with servants. Before ever recording recipes, “Aunt Babette” offers advice about “Servants,” “Marketing,” “Work,” and “Dish-washing.” At the end of the book there is an extensive section on medicinal cures and the proper stocking of a family medicine chest, as well as how to “Remove Dandruff,” “Repair Injured Furniture,” “Clean Diamonds,” and “Remove Ink Stains.”  

It is clear that being “head of her household” was a full-time job with many and varied facets. These practical directives are similar to the “housewifery” sections of Esther Levy’s and Jennie June’s cookbooks, with a bit more emphasis on health and personal hygiene in “Aunt Babette’s” volume.

After the Jewish star on the title page, few recipes in this cookbook mark it as a Jewish cookbook until one comes to a section in the far reaches of the book (pages 475-

40 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
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entitled “Easter Dishes.” which are unmistakably Pesach recipes—including everything from chocolate macaroons to matza kugel to sponge cake. The opening section of this chapter addresses “How to Set the Table for the Service of the ‘Sedar’ on the Eve of Pesach or Passover.” Here in great detail are instructions for preparing the ritual foods of the Seder plate: the matzas, the hard-boiled egg, the shank bone, the horseradish, the parsley, the salt water, and the sweet haroset—which word, surprisingly, appears in Hebrew type. While Kramer does not describe the “cleaning for Passover” efforts in as great detail as did Levy, it is clear that this festival meal was an important celebratory event in her household. Following the preparatory instructions are some nineteen recipes that are clearly “kosher for Passover,” though not so labeled.

Why then is this section entitled “Easter Dishes?” Is this a sign of acculturation to America or a hiding of Jewish distinctiveness? Well-to-do Jews in Germany had celebrated Christmas and Hanukkah together, under the heading “Weihnacht.” The family of Gershom Scholem, for instance, had a Christmas tree and considered the holiday a German Volksfest. Perhaps a similar melding of Easter, the spring holiday most frequently celebrated in America, into Passover was at work here. Passover recipes were recorded under the generic heading of “Easter,” by which Kramer meant the major religious holiday of the spring. This merging of the two holidays did not in this case result in the dominance of the majority culture and the diminution of the traits of the minority culture. As we can infer from the long-standing popularity of Kramer’s

42 Ibid., p. 475.

cookbook, she succeeded in reaching a broad Jewish and non-Jewish readership who wanted to learn how to cook and serve food like an American.

*Greenbaum’s Jewish Cook Book Compared with Aunt Babette’s*

The same publisher who issued *Aunt Babette’s Cook Book* in 1889 and kept it in print for twenty-five years, published in 1918 Florence Kreisler Greenbaum’s *Jewish Cook Book*, a kosher cookbook with the subtitle “1600 Recipes According to the Jewish Dietary Laws with the Rules for Kashering.” Curiously, the “Publishers’ Note,” proclaims this book to be “the direct successor to the ‘Aunt Babette’s Cook Book’ which has enjoyed undisputed popularity for more than a generation.” Despite the ascribed lineage, the publisher, Bloch, argued for the superiority of the latter cookbook because it “is much larger and the recipes are prepared strictly in accordance with Jewish dietary laws.” The audiences for the two books were overlapping but not identical. Both were aimed at Jewish housewives conversant in English, but *Aunt Babette’s* were mostly Reform, while Greenbaum’s were more likely Orthodox or traditional.

Yet Greenbaum’s publisher presented her as no greenhorn balabusteh, but as an educated and scientific cook. In contrast to Kramer, who presented herself as a domestic cook who hoarded up recipes to pass on to her daughters, Greenbaum was described by her publisher as a “household efficiency woman, an expert Jewish cook, and thoroughly understands the scientific combining of foods.” She was described as college-educated
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with a degree from Hunter College in diet and food chemistry, and was an instructor at the Young Women’s Hebrew Association of New York, the Association of Jewish Home Makers, and the Central Jewish Institute. That the publishers considered such achievements worthy of touting indicates the assimilation of contemporary American values of formal credentialing over the traditional method of gathering recipes from one’s family and friends.

Greenbaum’s approach to the tension between traditional Jewish cooking that stayed within Jewish law and exposure to the culinary ways of other ethnic groups was to embrace both whenever possible within kosher dietary restrictions. She states in her preface that she will “lay special emphasis on those dishes which are characteristically Jewish—those time-honored recipes which have been handed down the generations by Jewish housewives (for the Sabbath, Passover, etc.).”47 However, she added recipes from a wide variety of sources including “Germany, Hungary, Austria, France, Russia, Poland, Roumania, etc.; also hundreds of recipes used in the American household.”48 Of course, her Jewish recipes are almost entirely Ashkenazic, as that was the ethnicity of the Jews she knew. In addition, we find recipes for “Home-made Chicken Tamales,”49 “Hungarian Vegetable Salad,”50 “Kartoffel Kloesse (Potato Dumplings),”51 and “Sole with Wine

47 Ibid., second unnumbered page.
48 Ibid.
49 Ibid., p. 67.
50 Ibid., p. 157.
51 Ibid., p. 173.
indicating that she learned many new dishes from her multi-ethnic neighbors in America.

It is likely that she didn’t learn to cook within all those varied ethnic cuisines by looking in her neighbors’ pots, but rather from collecting—and likely appropriating without attribution—recipes from a wide range of sources. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett notes that “Greenbaum lifted entire recipes verbatim from Levy’s cookbook, for example, ‘English lemon stewed fish,’ without ever crediting Jewish Cookery Book.”

If Greenbaum could engage in plagiarism vis-à-vis a Jewish cookbook that was likely out of print by 1918, she might likewise have “borrowed” from other ethnic cookbooks without her publisher, Bloch Publishing Company, being aware of it. Nevertheless, she had to choose carefully among those other ethnic recipes in order to stay within the bounds of the Jewish dietary laws. In her preface, she seems proud and not defensive that her cookbook is both kosher and “International.”

Her recipes have lived on. In fact, her recipe for “Creamed Mushrooms” was cited by chef William Sitwell in his book, A History of Food in 100 Recipes (Little, Brown, 2012). He writes, “‘Cooked like this,’ Greenbaum tells us, ‘mushrooms have more nutritive value than beef.’” For Greenbaum, this was a statement of fact confirmed by the domestic science of the day, but for Sitwell, this was a recipe for a delicious dish, remembered by a food writer a century later.
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In contrast to the earlier cookbooks by Montefiore, Levy, and Kramer, Greenbaum’s book is much more focused on recipes and not on general advice about how to run a bourgeois home, direct the servants, and heal whatever ails those in the family. Such advice was superfluous, as there were no longer servants to direct, and health concerns might be taken to a doctor. The only directions she offers other than recipes are “Rules for Kashering” and “General Directions for Making Cakes.” Does this suggest that Greenbaum had wanted to limit the role of the woman to the kitchen and not to the home in general? In any case, this was simply a recipe book and not a guide to the “Jewish home beautiful.”

Greenbaum’s book enjoyed a long life and many returns to the presses. By 1937 it had sold over 100,000 copies. By then, it found itself in competition with another variety of cookbook that had as its goal turning the massive waves of Eastern European Jews who had recently arrived on American shores into healthy, thrifty, and acculturated Americans both in their eating habits and their personal habits.

The books examined so far were each the product of a single woman with a vision of what a Jewish woman should be and how she should conduct herself as the domestic head of household. Taken together, they express “a culinary rhetoric of class—that is, culinary practices and domestic arrangements [that] are concrete ways of dramatizing social distinctions,” as Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has observed. They range from the (newly) aristocratic Lady Montefiore, who is as interested in cosmetics as in recipes, to the haute bourgeois Esther Levy, who manages her household with one or two
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servants, to the decidedly middle-class Florence Kreisler Greenbaum, who offers only recipes, but sees them as a part of “domestic science.”

The next group of cookbooks grew out of the institution of the settlement house and expressed the views of a well-meaning group of female social workers and volunteers who wanted to imprint their vision of American Jewish womanhood on the immigrant masses.
Settlement House Cookbooks

While the cookbooks examined heretofore were the creations of individual Jewish women who wished to preserve recipes from their past or create new ones to accommodate American food choices, the cookbooks in this chapter were the products of a particular Americanizing institution of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—the settlement house. These cookbooks emerged to fit the programmatic needs of the settlement house as well as to raise funds for its institutional maintenance. While the names of two women, Mrs. Simon Kander and Mrs. Henry Schoenfeld,1 were attached to the most famous of these settlement house cookbooks, *The Settlement Cook Book*, which was first published in 1901 and went through some 40 editions, the stamp of the institution rather than the individual comes through strongly. To understand these cookbooks, one must understand the history and *raison d'être* of settlement houses. An examination of the settlement house movement tells us a great deal about the acculturation pressures on late nineteenth-century American Jews and how programs to “Americanize” the new immigrants varied by gender.

*The Settlement House Movement*

The settlement house movement began in England with the opening of Toynbee Hall in East London in 18842 and was a response of a group of idealistic middle-class reformers to the widening gap between rich and poor and the proliferation of urban
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slums. The founder of the movement, Canon Samuel Barnett, believed it was necessary to connect “the centres of learning with the centres of industry” and therefore sent university-educated social workers to settle and live among the urban poor.\(^3\) The university, cooperating with the neighborhood, would figure out the needs of the slum-dwellers, and a partnership would ensue between them—or so he hoped.

In America, settlement houses began appearing in tenement neighborhoods in the late 1880s, with most of the workers being young, college-educated women from old-line Protestant families. Among the leaders were Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, and Mary Simkhovitch. Addams, in particular, gained her inspiration for the founding of Hull House in Chicago from an 1888 trip to England, where she visited Toynbee Hall. She expressed her vision for the mutually beneficial outcomes to be gained from the exposure of dissimilar classes to one another this way:

A social settlement may be defined as an attempt to make social intercourse express the growing sense of the economic unity of society and as an effort to add the social function in democracy. It is based on the theory that the dependence of the classes on each other is reciprocal . . . the mere foothold of a house, easily accessible, ample in space, hospitable and tolerant in spirit, situated in the very midst of the industrial quarters of large cities, is in itself a serviceable thing, and that, given a starting point, many educated people can find various outlets for a certain set of unexpressed activity.\(^4\)

Addams and her college friend (and alleged lover\(^5\)) Ellen Gates Starr founded Hull House in 1889 and moved in themselves, along with some 25 other women. At its
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\(^5\) The question of whether Addams and Starr had a lesbian relationship is discussed in Blanche Wiesen Cook, “‘Women Alone Stir My Imagination’: Lesbianism and the Cultural Tradition,” Signs 4: 4, 1979.
height, Hull House served about 2,000 people a week and provided a venue for research, cultural events, an adult education program, an art program, a book bindery, and an employment office. The recipients of these benefits came from many different European-based ethnic groups, although the Hull House neighborhood was primarily Italian.

The settlement houses served the needs of the rich or middle-class women who came there to help as well as those of the poor who found food and sustenance there. It allowed the young social workers to get training and experience with a variety of immigrants, and by close contact and interaction, come to know their clients better. As Mary Simkhovitch, a founder of Greenwich House in Greenwich Village in New York City, stated:

The settlement ought to be the matrix of a more adequate understanding of what goes on … its permanent value is not so much in the rendering of specific services … as in the fruitful knowledge obtained through firsthand contact with the people in the neighborhoods.\(^6\)

A gender difference between male and female social workers manifested itself, with the men more interested in improving the physical and technological aspects of the tenements while the women were more empathetic “look[ing] at the tenements with eyes of a woman and as a possible home.”\(^7\) Women involved in the movement stayed longer in their settlement houses than did the men, who, because they had more professional degrees, had more opportunities to go elsewhere. Of thirteen women who were heads of settlement houses, the average length of service was 24 years, while for the fifteen male headworkers, the average length was eight. For the men, working in settlement houses was “a kind of experimental station for an examination of the ghetto society” while the
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“women married the settlement.” Of 21 female heads of settlement houses, only two married men.

**Settlement Houses and their Jewish Supporters**

Jewish women who became involved in settlement house work came from similar economic strata as did their gentile counterparts, but their motivations and their interactions with their new immigrant clients were somewhat different. One such settlement leader, Lillian Wald, the Cincinnati-born daughter of middle-class German Jewish parents, trained as a nurse and was beginning medical school to become a doctor. She was asked by Mrs. Solomon Loeb, wife of a wealthy Jewish banker, to demonstrate home nursing techniques to immigrant women on the Lower East Side. There she encountered a very sick woman, “so wretched and so pitiful,” in Wald’s words, that the experience “determined me, within half an hour, to live on the East Side.”9 She persuaded another nurse to come live with her in this neighborhood and to “identify ourselves with it socially, and in brief contribute to it our citizenship.”10

Wald’s Nurses Settlement became a full-fledged settlement house in 1895 when Jacob Schiff, a wealthy German Jew who was Mrs. Loeb’s son-in-law, provided the funding to buy the building at 265 Henry Street, which became known as the Henry Street Settlement. Wald welcomed both Jewish and non-Jewish immigrants and never envisioned the house to be a Jewish communal setting. When she allowed a Christmas party to take place with a Christmas tree, Schiff, an observant Jew, became furious.
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However, for the most part Lower East Side Jews felt more comfortable in the Henry Street house than in other settlements because they could be assured that there would be no Christian missionizing there. And Henry Street Settlement became a philanthropic channel for upper-class German Jews like Schiff to provide classes and nursing services for the poorest Jews. More radical Jews, such as Emma Goldman, disdained the settlement’s offerings, saying “settlement work was teaching the poor to eat with a fork.”

Middle-class Jewish women also supported and worked in the settlement houses through their benevolent organizations. “Sisterhoods of Personal Service,” launched in 1887 by the women of Temple Emanu-El of New York, stated as their goal: “overcoming the estrangement of one class of the Jewish population from another.” The National Council of Jewish Women, founded in 1893, saw Jewish-run settlements as central to their mission of philanthropy and education by and for Jewish women. NCJW leaders Hannah Solomon and Sadie American helped start the Maxell Street Settlement in a Jewish neighborhood of Chicago, while Mrs. A Leo Weil of the Pittsburgh chapter of NCJW established the Columbian School, which became the Irene Kaufman Settlement. In New York City NCJW president Rachel Hays Sulzberger helped create Recreation Rooms for Girls on Orchard Street, with the mission “to Americanize while preserving Jewish traditions.”
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The Jewish women who founded and participated in settlement houses came from similar social classes as their Protestant peers, but their relationship to their beneficiaries was closer and more personal. NCJW insisted that its volunteers receive proper training before going into the settlements and that they approach the immigrants with an attitude of respect. Members of NCJW’s Committee on Immigrant Aid were told to “visit the girl in the same way they would visit someone recommended by a personal friend, without patronage and in the friendly spirit.”¹⁴ This friendliness, however, was accompanied by a sense of noblesse oblige as well as a self-interested need. One NCJW woman explained her motivation, based upon the Reform Judaism which she and most of the Jewish settlement workers learned and practiced, as follows:

In no other religion is charity linked up with the idea of social justice as in ours. The Jewish philosophy that is expressed in the adage, “The whole world rests upon the Torah, the practice of religion, and the practice of social justice,” is so inextricably interwoven with the idea that it is our religious duty to give to the poor with a view to helping them to rehabilitate themselves that it completely dominates our conception of philanthropy. The abandonment of this controlling idea might indeed be tantamount to weakening our Jewish social structure.¹⁵

The obligation of the wealthier class of Jews to take care of the poor among them was thus conceived of as a religious duty and yet tied to the welfare and stability of the Jewish community as a whole. Sometimes this belief was expressed more crudely as, “we should enter civic fields as a matter of self-defense.”¹⁶ The settlement volunteers felt they must shape the immigrants’ attitudes and behaviors to avoid stoking anti-Semitism, which, while directed toward the Eastern European Jews, might affect them. Sometimes


¹⁵ Bertha Rauh in Jewish Woman, April 1922, quoted in Rogow, op. cit., p.132.

¹⁶ Jennie Franklin Purvin, in Rogow, ibid., p. 134.
this fear was expressed as hostility toward the immigrants themselves, as one NCJW woman put it: “We, who are the cultured and refined, constitute the minority, but we shall be judged by the majority, the Russian Jews, the children of the ghetto.” Such condescension did not make for warm relationships between clients and benefactors.

Nevertheless, as the tide of immigration from Eastern Europe grew, beginning in the 1880s, the settlement volunteers felt a need to become more proactive and to teach the immigrants on a practical level how to become American. The services offered in Neighborhood House, the first settlement house in St. Paul, Minnesota, included health care, English lessons, sewing classes for girls, manual training for boys, a public library station, and a mothers’ club. As this list demonstrates, there were clearly different offerings for male and female clients, based upon middle-class gender role expectations. The young men were to be trained for physical labor jobs, to enable them to be breadwinners, while the women were taught housewifely skills such as cooking, sewing, and healthy living. The classes were even gender-segregated by floors, as Elizabeth Ann Lorenz-Meyer observes about the St. Paul house:

Men and women met in different parts of the settlement house. Jewish women met in upper-floor classrooms to learn about the connections between cleanliness and civic pride. Men’s classes, which often met in the basement, were more likely to be oriented towards job training.

These differing activities reflected the gender role beliefs of the settlement house workers, but not necessarily those of their clients.

17 Rogow, op.cit, p. 134.
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Gender Role Expectations and the Need for Domestic Arts Classes

An inherent contradiction lay at the heart of the goals of the settlement house workers for their female charges: On the one hand, they wanted the girls to become self-supporting, and to do so they had to be trained in marketable skills, such as dressmaking or domestic service. On the other hand, they hoped to marry the girls off at a “respectable” age and to teach them the virtues of “proper Jewish womanhood” such as modesty, thrift, and charity. As Nancy Sinkoff observed,

Though the benevolent women who administered the Home [the Clara de Hirsch Home for Working Girls] were acutely aware of the immigrants’ economic responsibilities for their families and for themselves, they had internalized the nineteenth-century ideals of middle-class American womanhood and sought to inculcate those values in their East European charges. The tension between self-support and homemaking was inherent in the reformers’ ideology. 20

Training young women in the domestic arts could fulfill both purposes: The immigrant girls might find employment in upper bourgeoisie households, thus meeting a labor need for their volunteer benefactors, and the young women might more skillfully manage their own homes. However, these roles, while not entirely incompatible, required different skill sets and modes of operation. The German Jewish women’s intentions were mostly noble: They wanted to lift their charges from working class into middle-class domesticity through marriage—but, of course, every wedding ring did not come with a silver platter.

The domesticity agenda of the settlement houses accounts for the need for cooking classes for young immigrant women, who likely were already doing some
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cooking at home—to teach them the rules, methodologies, and recipes of an American home. It is telling that Chapter 1 of the 1903 Settlement Cook Book opens with “Rules for the Household.” It begins by defining food as “anything that nourishes the body,” and then gives an (inaccurate by today’s standards) estimate of minimum daily requirements of the various food groups (protein, starch, fat, salt, and water). It also measures the “relative value of foods”—that is, the relative efficiency of staples such as beef, turkey, eggs, oysters, milk, butter and cheese to provide “Muscle Making” and “Heat and Fat Making.”22 The emphasis on rules and food groups reflects an intention to be precise, scientific, and professional in the teaching of the domestic arts.

The rules the immigrant woman needed to know included guidelines for “Measuring,” “Setting the Table,” “Placing the Dishes,” “Waiting on the Table,” “To Clear the Table after a Meal,” “Washing Dishes,” and even “To Build a Fire” and “To Dust a Room.”23 These skills were necessary to carry out the role of a female domestic servant, who first and foremost served the householder, and only secondarily cooked the meals. Interestingly, the 1931 version (nineteenth edition) of The Settlement Cook Book gives a much fuller description of the “Directions for Serving” than did the 1903 version—distinguishing between “Where There Is No Maid,” “When Guests Are Expected,” “Platter Service,” “Buffet Service,” and “Formal or Russian Service.”

________________________________________________________________________


22 Ibid., p.1.
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Evidently, the formality of the households in which the young women worked had risen during the almost three decades in between.

Nonetheless, it was for its recipes that The Settlement Cook Book was primarily known, and this treasured collection created such a demand that it went through some 40 editions and sold over two million copies. To understand its popularity and to trace the arc of its growth, one must examine the life and volunteer career of its primary author, Lizzie Black Kander (whose name appears on the cover as “Mrs. Simon Kander”—the preferred title of a married woman of her day). The changes in this iconic cookbook tell us about changes in gender role expectations and Jewish immigrants’ acculturation to America over the early years of the twentieth century.

**Lizzie Black Kander and The Settlement Cook Book**

Lizzie Black Kander was born in Milwaukee in 1858, the daughter of two Jewish farmers, John and Mary Black, who lived near Green Bay. Although most German Jewish immigrants of the first half of the nineteenth century settled in the major urban centers, a smaller number headed to the small towns and cities of the Midwest, and some engaged in dairy, fruit, or general farming in areas adjacent to cities. Lizzie attended Milwaukee public schools, graduated as valedictorian, and married Simon Kander, a businessman who later became a member of the Wisconsin State Assembly. Having the financial means to pursue her aspirations rather than to work for necessities, she pioneered social work among the Russian Jewish immigrants to Milwaukee. She helped establish the Milwaukee Jewish Mission in 1896, using borrowed space in two Reform
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synagogues. The settlement she founded changed its name and location several times, from the Jewish Mission to the Abraham Lincoln House to the Jewish Community Center of Milwaukee. She was a hands-on volunteer, teaching classes as well as serving on the board of directors. In her cooking class, she insisted on exact measurements and scientific management techniques. In order to help her students remember the precise measurements of dishes she prepared, as well as to give them texts in English that they would want to read, she assembled a booklet of recipes in 1901. It was a compilation of recipes only, with no table of contents or index.

A friend of Kander’s, Augusta Stark Yewdale, persuaded her husband to print Kander’s collection of recipes and cooking instructions for $18 ($500 in today’s currency), but the Settlement’s board of directors, at the time all male, rejected the outlay of funds. They were interested, however, in receiving any profits made from the sale of the book. Undeterred, Kander and the publisher, Merton Yewdale, sold advertising space in the book to businesses in the German-Jewish community. Some 20 pages out of the first edition’s 174 pages were ads. With the money from the ads, they were able to publish the first edition of The Settlement Cook Book, and within the year the first run of 1,000 copies sold out. The second edition, published in 1903, contained an index and a subtitle: “The Way to a Man’s Heart.” This subtitle suggested that the goal of good cooking was to win over a husband, not to earn a living as a domestic servant. In 1907 a third edition of the cookbook appeared, and the Settlement House moved to a new
location. The new setting became known as the Abraham Lincoln House, and a first edition of Kander’s cookbook was placed in the cornerstone of the building.  

Kander wanted the Settlement House to be self-sufficient, and so insisted that the profits from the sale of her cookbook be reinvested in the settlement movement. “The $6,000 royalties the book brought were turned over to help build the Lincoln house,” an unknown newspaper report of June 27, 1920, stated.  

Another news article expressed amazement at … the story of a Jewish community center in Milwaukee which was built and is being largely supported from the proceeds of a cook book. Written by Mrs. Cantor [sic], the director of a culinary class in the Milwaukee Jewish Center, without any expectation of any extensive sale, Mrs. Cantor awoke one morning to find she had written a book which was a best seller. And it is still one of the hits of the publishers’ lists.  

Kander’s success as a cookbook writer gained her stature and independence within her local community. She was elected to the Milwaukee School Board, and was a founder of the Girls Trade and Technical High School and the Milwaukee nursery school system. She was also president of the Settlement House (under its various names and incarnations). When she was president, the chairman of the Cooking School Committee was Mrs. Henry Schoenfeld, who was listed as Kander’s co-author on the early editions of the cookbook, but not mentioned in the 1931 and 1944 editions. The sixth edition ascribes authorship to “Mrs. Simon Kandor assisted by Mrs Henry Schoenfeld, Mrs.
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26 Unknown newspaper article, “Mrs. Kander to Head Cookery,” June 27, 1920, Lizzie Black Kander Papers, 1875-1960 (Milwaukee Area Research Center, Milwaukee Mss DN, Clippings 1879-1929, Box 1 Folder 6).

27 Undated and unknown newspaper article, “San Michele and Mrs. Cantor,” Lizzie Black Kander Papers, 1875-1960 (Milwaukee Area Research Center, Milwaukee Mss DN, Clippings, undated, Box 1 Folder 8).
Nathan Hamburger-Behal, and Mrs. Isaac D. Adler.” Its title page states: “Containing Many Recipes used in The ‘Settlement’ Cooking Classes, the Milwaukee Public School Cooking Center, and gathered from various other Reliable Sources.” It would seem that The Settlement Cook Book was a work in progress, but with Kander’s imprimatur always on it.

**How The Settlement Cook Book Changed over Time**

The Settlement Cook Book grew from 174 pages in 1901 to 623 pages in 1931 and 1944. How did it change and what do the changes tell us about its purpose, its audience, and its aspirations? The earliest versions of the cookbook did not include the subtitle “The way to a man’s heart.” Later editions not only carried the subtitle, but illustrated this idea with a line of apron-clad female chefs reading the cookbook and marching into a heart at the top of the cover page. The notion that recipes were the path to romance might have seemed a bit overstated even then, but reflected a bourgeois notion of women’s role as keeper of the house and hearth. The 1954 New Settlement Cook Book omits the subtitle and the long line of chefs; only one aproned female cook and one heart decorate the cover of the final edition. The gendered perception of the target audience still obtained, but had been toned down considerably.

Both the 1903 and the 1931 editions begin with an “Index,” but the former is a sequential table of contents while the latter features an extensive alphabetical index. The 1903 version includes a cross-referenced index to the “Course of Instruction as given by the Settlement Cooking Classes,” noting where in the cookbook the recipes taught in each lesson could be found. The later edition contains no such mention of the cooking classes,
as the audience was now far-flung and not local, and likely Kander no longer was teaching in the settlement house. Another difference pointing to a shift from a local to a national audience is the advertisements. The earlier version contains ten pages of ads after the index, with most of the advertisers being local, Milwaukee-based merchants. The later edition has twelve pages of ads at the back, mostly for cooking-related products such as baking powder, chocolate syrup, pots and pans, ranges and heaters, and KitchenAid mix-masters. Both books were still in part fund-raising vehicles, but the later edition’s ads were more commercial and appealed to a wider audience.

Both books open with “Household Rules” (1931) or “Rules for Household” (1903), but the former are much more extensive than the latter. The differences reflect the changes in modern appliances and food technology over the years. The earlier cookbook explains how “To Build a Fire” and how “To Dust a Room.” The 1931 edition offers a choice of methodologies for cooking: “To Start a Wood and Coal Fire,” “Directions for Use of Gas Range,” “Directions for Use of Oil Stove,” “Directions for Use of Electric Range,” how “To Regulate Oven Heat,” and “How to Use a Pressure Cooker.”28 Clearly, as kitchen appliances proliferated, the knowledgeable cook had to be proficient in the use of all of them. Immigrants from rural or small town environments needed to be acculturated into the use of these modern appliances.

Chapter II of the 1903 edition is the beginning of the recipes per se, while Chapter II in the 1931 book is about “Feeding the Family” with extensive instructions for feeding infants, feeding the sick, and planning menus for a family of five, two, or 40. This

chapter in the later book tries to appear scientific, dividing food into food groups and specifying the protein, fat, and carbohydrate content of various foods, as well as the calories. The appeal to science seems intended to counter the faulty habits and practices learned mimetically in the home, yet the scientific information conveyed is often erroneous by modern standards. For example, a strict schedule of four or five feedings a day is prescribed for a five-month-old baby, with breast feeding at specified times only. For those on restricted starch and sugar diets (low-carbohydrate diets), vegetables “cooked three times” and cracked cocoa are recommended as having “no food value.”  

While the validity of the nutritional information is questionable, the message aimed at the immigrants in the settlement house was clear: Food preparation required planning; every meal should include a variety of foods from different food groups; and “food should be served in the most pleasing manner possible.” The application of scientific knowledge to domestic practice developed into the home economics or domestic science movement, which sought to teach methodologies to rationalize the running of a home formally in high schools and in college. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Home_economics.

Some of the advice given was just plain common sense: “Do not serve food the same way too often. Disguise it in different sauces.” Or, “In summer, when fruits and vegetables are plentiful, buy in quantities. Serve fresh, and can the remainder at the same time, for future use.” While Kander’s “Table of Food Values in the Daily Diet” in the
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29 Ibid., pp. 31, 42.
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31 The application of scientific knowledge to domestic practice developed into the home economics or domestic science movement, which sought to teach methodologies to rationalize the running of a home formally in high schools and in college. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Home_economics.
32 Ibid., p. 28.
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later editions was much more detailed and explicit than her earlier listing of the “Relative Value of Foods,” both grew out of her belief in scientifically backed use of ingredients and the necessity for precise measurements in cooking as opposed to the old-fashioned approach of “a pinch of this and a sifter-full of that.” Precision in measuring and in planning characterized Kander’s cooking classes (and The Settlement Cook Book) and were basic to her approach to acculturating immigrant women to American-style cooking.

The Settlement Cook Book expanded by adding new recipes and new food groupings. For example, the later book has chapters on “Appetizers,” “Sandwiches,” and “Gelatine Puddings,” which do not appear in the earlier version. The desserts section was greatly expanded to include fresh and stewed fruits, puddings, ice cream, candies, pastries and pies, as well as all sorts of cakes and cookies; these chapters run from page 328 to page 521, almost a third of the book. In the 1903 cookbook the dessert recipes ran from page 97 to page 164, a slightly higher percentage of the total pages, but fewer actual pages. Perhaps the way to a man’s heart really was through his sweet tooth. The bourgeois hostess could show off her mettle through festive cakes with elaborate frostings and fillings.

Can The Settlement Cook Book Be Considered a Jewish Cookbook?

The Settlement Cook Book grew out of a Jewish-sponsored institution in Milwaukee, but it never presented itself, in either title or contents, as intended primarily for a Jewish audience. Neither did it deny its Jewish roots. It reflected accurately the Jewish identity of the German-American Jewish upper and middle-class women who

35 Kander and Schoenfeld, 1903, op. cit., p.1.
worked in the settlement houses helping their immigrant co-religionists. Out of respect for their clientele, and because they knew the Eastern European Jewish women would stay away from the settlement house kitchen if it were not kosher, the settlement cooking classes observed kashrut (kosher practices) to attract religiously observant students. However, *The Settlement Cook Book*, intended for a wider audience, included from the beginning clearly non-kosher recipes, such as oyster cocktails, shrimp a la creole in casserole, broiled live lobsters, and *hasenpfeffer* (German rabbit stew).

Over the years, the board that oversaw later editions of the cookbook received requests for many specific recipes to be included in the book. However, according to Kander, there was never a “cry” for a “kosher textbook.” She held out her vision of a simple, international, and non-parochial cookbook. When asked what made *The Settlement Cook Book* so popular, she replied:

> Because *The Settlement Cook Book* is primarily a home cook book. The recipes are tested in a home kitchen. They are practical, economical, and reliable. The directions are given in simple language and are easy to follow. Because of America’s cosmopolitan population, the dishes of all nationalities have been included.\(^{36}\)

> It would seem that Kander’s vision of an American Jewish cookbook was inclusive, gathering the recipes of the many nationalities and ethnicities that made up America of her day, and, of course, including Jews as an ethnic group among them.

The 1903 edition has a few recipes whose Jewish roots are visible. For example, *kugel* and *matzos* pudding are found under “Hot Puddings.”\(^{37}\) Gefilte fish, a classic

---

\(^{36}\) *Wisconsin Life*, a segment on Wisconsin Public Radio, see www.wi101.org/objects/settlement-cook-book/.

\(^{37}\) Kander and Schoenfeld, op.cit., p. 106.
Ashkenazic Jewish dish, appears under its translated title, “Filled Fish.” Kuchen, a yeast-dough cake of German origin with Jewish variations, is the subject of an entire chapter in the early edition. Passover recipes, which play a prominent part in most cookbooks of Jewish origin, are missing from the early edition except for the reference to a “matzos pudding.”

The Jewish content in the 1931 edition is more extensive and more visible, in part because within its over-600 pages there is room to give space to Jewish recipes among the many international recipes represented. The index at the front of the book has a section for “Passover Cookery,” which references recipes throughout the volume that can be used for Passover. These include potato flour and matza-based dishes that would likely be used only on Passover, as well as neutral foods such as salads and fish that could be eaten on Passover or during the year. Putting these recipes together in the index shows an awareness of the requirements of Passover cooking, but does not make it easy to find all the possibilities in one place. For instance, the recipe for “Charocis for Sedar” is tucked away in the chapter on Appetizers, which technically it is, but this dish would be served only on Passover. What was considered “Jewish food” has always been influenced by the culinary cultures in which Jews have lived. The 1931 cookbook, which is more international and cosmopolitan than the earlier version, contains recipes whose origins are East European, reflecting the mass immigration of Jews from those regions. For example, there is a recipe for “Kashe with Roast Chicken” which is labeled

38 Ibid., pp. 51-52.
39 Kander, op. cit., p. XXVII.
40 Ibid., p. 318.
“Russian,” but which we might think of as Eastern European Jewish. Another recipe is labeled alternatively “Creplich or Pierogi Filled,” acknowledging the similarity of these two dishes coming from different backgrounds. There are also recipes for “Carrot Zimes,” “Matzos Kloese (Dumplings)—our matza balls—and “Beet Soup (Russian Style) Milchik,” which we would call borscht.

The 1931 cookbook is also decidedly more multi-cultural than its predecessor, with recipes for “Chinese Noodles (Chow Mein),” “Frog Legs,” and “Mexican Chili Con Carne.” The pancakes section is an international meeting place, with French pancakes, Russian pancakes, Norwegian pancakes, German pancakes, Scotch pancakes, Chinese pancakes (egg foo yung), and “blinces” (blintzes). There are also distinct sections for ham and pork recipes and for shellfish—foods that are explicitly forbidden under kashrut rules. Their inclusion indicates that Kander did not see the Jewish clientele of the Abraham Lincoln House—whose kitchen, which she taught in, was kosher—as the primary audience for her cookbook. The true intended audience was Americans of every background and ethnicity, not unlike The Joy of Cooking by Irma von Starkloff.
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Rombauer, first published in 1931. Of course, Kander was also addressing German-American Jews like herself, who were either Reform or secular, for whom dietary restrictions were not meaningful. She probably believed that her Eastern European students would soon be following in their footsteps and acculturating into the American mainstream.

*The Settlement Cook Book*, like the settlement house from which it evolved, had a goal of acculturating new immigrants to American norms of food, vocation, and manners. The acculturation process was not gender neutral, however. It included gender-based assumptions that shaped which skills were taught to immigrant women and which to immigrant men. The women were taught skills necessary to work in domestic service, but not those for cooking in a large restaurant or commercial setting. The hope, expressed in the subtitle “The way to a man’s heart,” was that the students taught through the settlement house would rise to the middle class by marrying into it. How this was to be accomplished was hard to specify, but domestic arts were a part of the path.

*Other Settlement House Cookbooks*

*The Settlement Cook Book* was not the only cookbook to be created in a settlement house environment. *The Neighborhood Cookbook*, compiled by the Portland Section of the Council of Jewish Women, in 1912, sold out within ten months. A second edition came out in 1914, and a third, which was further revised and enlarged, in 1932. It resembled *The Settlement Cook Book* in that it had advertisements, both local and national, including ads for “ham, bacon, and lard,” and a comprehensive index. Like its Milwaukee sister, it showed the influence of the German-Jewish women who created it,
with sophisticated dishes such as wine soup. It featured many non-kosher recipes, particularly for shellfish, which were abundant on the Oregon coast, but also included not one but two recipes for “matzo charlotte.”

The Portland cookbook has been described as “one of the earliest Jewish charity cookbooks,” 52 but I would reserve that description for the cookbooks in the next chapter, which were created by Jewish women’s groups collectively to raise funds for a given charity. The cookbooks that came out of the settlement houses had a programmatic function within the settlement house agenda, to Americanize the (mostly) Jewish immigrants and to acculturate them in a way fitting to the gender role assumptions of the day. They played a vital role in the acculturation process, which went far beyond raising money for a favorite charity.

Community-based Charity Cookbooks

The authors of the settlement house cookbooks examined in the previous chapter shared certain gender-based conceptions of the proper roles for women in philanthropy and in the acculturation of immigrants to American society. The creators of the cookbooks in this chapter held similar gender-based ideas about women’s need to engage in charitable work, but their relationships to their audience, to their product (the cookbooks), and to the institutions they were supporting were quite different from the settlement house model. These charity cookbooks were the shared handiwork of groups of women who thought of themselves as “sisters,” not as social workers or teachers. Their cookbooks provided a means to raise money for charitable causes and to build ties of community among themselves. We will examine these much more numerous but more ephemeral cookbooks to see what they tell us about the communities from which they emerged.

The philanthropic motivation for both sorts of cookbooks arose from both the traditional Jewish value of tzedaka (charity, or literally, justice) and the widely held nineteenth-century view, common among Christian (largely Protestant) denominations, that women were inherently more benevolent and more spiritual than men. Women in late nineteenth-century America were seen as the “civilizing and moralizing forces in society.”¹ But as women turned their philanthropic efforts from private, domestic acts of charity, such as visiting the sick or feeding the hungry, to public activities such as creating and supporting public libraries or advocating for women’s suffrage or birth

control, social activism became a more prominent focus of their charitable work. Cunningham Croly, the founder of the Sorosis clubs for professional women, predicted in 1898, “When the history of the nineteenth century comes to be written, women will appear as organizers, and as leaders of the great organized movements among their own sex for the first time in the history of the world.” Out of a desire for female solidarity and for a public role for women in philanthropy, American Protestant women were drawn into a variety of women’s clubs, ranging from Young Women’s Christian Associations (YWCAs) to Women’s Christian Temperance Societies. These organizations, as their names indicate, left Jewish women on the sidelines, even if they were not explicitly barred from membership.

Enterprising Jewish women, however, soon found ways to create the Jewish (or “Hebrew”) equivalents of some of these philanthropic groups. Beyond YW/YMHAs, they formed “sisterhoods” which fulfilled a variety of purposes—to provide services to meet the needs of their synagogues, to help the poor, to visit the sick, to teach in religious schools, and to provide mutual assistance in times of difficulty. By calling themselves “sisterhoods of personal service,” they emphasized collegiality as well as the charitable aspects of their activities. Sisterhoods within synagogues were telling indicators of the Americanization of an individual synagogue, emphasizing social over ritual activities. “A congregation without a sisterhood… is like a home without a mother,” observed Rabbi
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Joseph Lookstein of Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun, a large Orthodox synagogue on the Upper East Side of New York City.  

**Sisterhoods of Personal Service**

Several of the oldest synagogues in New York City were the sites of the earliest sisterhoods of personal service. In 1820 the women of Congregation Shearith Israel, the oldest Jewish congregation in the U.S., formed a Female Hebrew Benevolent Society to provide financial help to “indigent females particularly.” In 1850, the *Tugendhafte Frauen*, the Society of Righteous Women, of Ahawath Chesed Congregation in New York, took upon themselves to visit the sick, provision the poor, and prepare the deceased for burial, based upon a “solid foundation of sisterly affection and a broad idea of mutual assistance to each other, to the Widow, the Orphan, and the Suffering.” In 1887, Rabbi Gustav Gottheil of Temple Emanu-El in New York City preached a sermon in which he outlined the notion of a charitable society of women. His son wrote of his father’s influential speech:

> [M]y Father had founded the Emanu-El Sisterhood of Personal Service. He had preached a sermon one Saturday on the value of personal service to those in need. He made the point that prayers were not the only things needed for a religious life. Acts of goodness and of kindness had to be added to them. He sketched what he thought a society of women with such ideals ought to do, with the idea that he might stimulate some women in the congregation to carry out his thought. When the service was over, a number of women came up to him, their eyes bright with the inspiration with which his words had fired them. … They said that they were
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ready to carry out his idea and offered their services to gather the nucleus, which very soon became the “Sisterhood.”

This idea, conceived by a man but brought to fruition by his female congregants, soon spread to other synagogues, until in 1896 a Federation of Sisterhoods was formed. The middle- and upper-class members of these early sisterhoods were influenced not only by their rabbis but also perhaps more by late-nineteenth-century notions of “scientific charity,” which sought to dispense skills that could lead to employment rather than money to meet immediate needs. These notions animated the programs offered in the settlement houses, as well as the kindergartens, mothers circles, English lessons, sewing classes, and employment agencies that the sisterhood women organized for the benefit of their less fortunate “sisters.”

The sisterhood model spread across the denominational spectrum, from Orthodox to Reform. The Federation of Sisterhoods coordinated with the United Hebrew Charities (UHC, later Federation), and the UHC assigned geographical sections of Manhattan to the various sisterhoods. During the height of the immigrant influx from Eastern Europe, in the 1880s and 1890s, this system worked well, providing programs and services to thousands of new Jewish immigrants. A B’nai Jeshurun historian recorded that in 1907 alone more than 500 families were aided by the sisterhoods, and sisterhood members personally visited half of those recipients.

However, over the next decade, the nature of the sisterhoods changed, as the tide of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe slowed, first because of World War I and

8 Felicia Herman, op.cit., p.1265.
later due to the restrictive immigration law of 1924 (the Johnson-Reed Act, including the National Origins Act). Sisterhoods turned inward, becoming an operational wing of the synagogue. They took responsibility for setting out the refreshments after services, decorating the synagogue or reception hall with flowers, and arranging events such as Purim carnivals or model Seders. Although there were parallel men’s clubs that also served the synagogue in an auxiliary fashion, the tasks assigned to the sisterhoods were very much in keeping with the gender role stereotypes of the day. Both the sisterhoods and the men’s clubs created conviviality among same-sex members of synagogues, and the social ties often formed stronger bonds to the institutions than did the religious and educational functions of the synagogue. Among the various supportive functions of sisterhoods, fundraising for the synagogue was very important, especially when women were not expected to pay dues or give tzedaka directly. Thus creating and selling cookbooks was a well-suited vehicle both to raise money for the synagogue (or other local Jewish institutions) and to promote the ties of sociability among the sisterhood members.

**Synagogue Sisterhood Cookbooks**

The earliest known American Jewish sisterhood cookbook, according to Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, was *The Fair Cook Book*, produced in 1888 by the women of Temple Emanuel in Denver, Colorado. Created in conjunction with a fair that the sisterhood ran, the cookbook raised money to pay off the temple’s mortgage. Temple
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Emanuel had been established in 1874 and was the only synagogue in Denver at the time. Most of its congregants were from Germany, with others from Russia, Poland, France, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire; less than a quarter had been born in the United States. Philanthropy was a significant way in which German Jews expressed their Jewishness, and for women it was a way both to express Jewish values and to be in the public sphere. The women prepared a “merchants’ lunch” for the fair, advertised to be “the finest lunch ever served in this city.” After eating such a delicious lunch, the participants would ask for the recipes—and *The Fair Cook Book* was prepared to meet that request and to bring in additional funds for the temple.

Recipes in the cookbook were signed by the women who contributed them, unlike most of the recipes in the *Settlement Cook Book*, which were anonymous. Women who took pride in their cooking enjoyed both the competitive aspect of this practice and the conviviality of sharing their best recipes. In keeping with Reform Jewish practice and ideology, there was no requirement that recipes be kosher, and oysters, suet, and the mixing of meat and milk were featured prominently in the recipes. As Kirshenblatt-Gimblett observes, “In the Reform movement, the rejection of *kashrut* was a matter of principle, rather than indifference.” The fair, and the cookbook, were opportunities for the Temple community to demonstrate how well they fit into the larger non-Jewish community. Dr. Donald Fletcher, president of the Chamber of Commerce, gave an address in which he praised “the women of the Israelitish church from the dawn of
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history” for their role “in the home, the church, and the state.” Thus, the cookbook, besides being a fundraising vehicle, was also a means for Denver Jews to assimilate into the surrounding non-Jewish community.

Some charity cookbooks proclaimed their fundraising goals right up front. A 78-page book published by Temple Israel, a Reform congregation in Omaha, Nebraska, in 1901, was entitled *Cook Book Compiled for the Benefit of Building Fund*. It contained a section labeled “Easter Desserts,” which were actually Passover desserts, with the same switch of nomenclature that we observed in “Aunt Babette’s” *Cook Book* by Bertha Kramer in 1889. The recipe collection is heavy on desserts, and the dessert section is written in German, in Gothic typeface, with some of the German dessert recipes translated into English. This linguistic choice shows that the women leaders of this Reform congregation knew German as their first language, but could translate into English if need be. As was common in Reform practice, recipes for oysters, lobster, and shrimp were included.  

The sisterhood or women’s auxiliary might call itself by another name, as in the case of the *Jewish Cook Book: Receipes [sic.] of Worth and Dependence*, prepared by the Ladies Sewing Circle for the Benefit of Temple Beth Israel, in Houston, Texas. Whether the women actually sewed or simply engaged in activities for the benefit of their congregation cannot be ascertained. The charitable function of this cookbook was made clear on the title page, which proclaimed, in all caps and underlined type, “DON’T
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LEND THIS BOOK."[14] Interspersed throughout the text was the reminder: “This cookbook is being sold ‘for charity.’ Tell your friends to buy one. Don’t lend yours!” The tone of this admonition suggests that the cookbook was the shared handiwork of a group of friends, far less didactic than the *Settlement Cook Book*. (See illustration on page 102.)

The women’s sense of humor comes through in a tongue-in-cheek section of the cookbook entitled “How to Cook and Serve a ‘Possum Dinner.” The text observes wryly, “Unfortunately for the animal that plays the title role, ‘possum dinners have suddenly become very fashionable.”[15] The popularity of the dish, the text suggests, was due to “the famous Atlanta dinner of Mr. [President William Howard] Taft [at which] more than a hundred … were served.” As a result, “you had better give your order to the butcher a long time in advance if you can.”[16] This section provides evidence of when this undated cookbook was compiled, as Taft’s presidency ran from 1909 to 1913. More significantly, it reveals that the cookbook’s creators were very *au current*, aware of popular trends in the surrounding non-Jewish culture, and desirous of imitating them.

The “possum dinner” was one of the many dishes reflective of the local setting of this cookbook. As Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett observes, “The regional American cast of the volume is clear not only from the possum dinners, but also from such inclusions as crab gumbo, green turtle soup, creole shrimp gumbalier, prairie chicken, salmi of game, tamales, chili of cooked meat, candied yams, stewed okra with tomatoes, and pecan
pralines.”17 These recipes are a far cry from Ashkenazic classic dishes such as cholent (Sabbath stew) or gefilte fish, and are for the most part clearly treyf. Yet the recipes are reflective of the Reform Judaism of the day, which rejected kashrut, but preserved traditional dishes, especially those associated with Passover, in a section called “Special Dishes for the Holidays.” In this section, with regard to the Seder table, the anonymous cookbook editor states, “In some families hard boiled eggs are distributed after the sedar (Easter eggs).”18 Was this practice a conflation of two different Jewish and Christian food customs around the springtime holidays, or was this a renaming of the Jewish practice of dipping hard-boiled eggs into salt water to make it seem more American?

The Temple Beth Israel “ladies” were clearly interested in fitting into the surrounding cultural milieu with regard to manners, mores, and the proper socialization of their children. In a section entitled “Trials of a Hostess,” the author asks, “Is there one small irritant more potent to give a hostess qualms than the carelessness of guests who sit down dripping punch glasses on polished table tops, satin-draped mantel shelves or the covers of ornamental books?”19 The anonymous author of that section must have had “polished table tops, satin-draped mantel shelves” and “ornamental books” that she cared about enough to want to protect. Another section offers suggestions for raising “Well-bred Children.” The requirements seem to center on the dinner table: “Little children should be taught not to sit sideways on the edges of the chairs, or to lean back in them or to put their elbows on the table…. Show them how to break a potato with a fork; how to

18 Ibid., p.9.
19 Young Ladies Sewing Club, op. cit., p. 5.
carry a fork to the mouth. Teach them to take soup quietly from the side of the spoon.”

The ladies of the sewing circle put a premium on the teaching of manners over intellectual or moral instruction. These sections reveal how important was the emphasis on middle-class decorum as a necessary prerequisite to fit in to America.

If the creators of the *Jewish Cook Book* of Temple Beth Israel of Houston expressed humor in publishing instructions for “How to Cook and Serve a ‘Possum Dinner,” the authors of *The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles*, published in 1902, by the Ladies of the Temple Bazaar, included an even more tongue-in-cheek ode to “How to Cook a Husband.” (The temple referred to but not named was the Wilshire Boulevard Temple in Los Angeles.) This ten-stanza poem expressed, in rhyming couplets, a witty and highly gendered view of the universe. Note that by following traditional home-centered roles, women have dominion over men.

In this progressive age of ours, so wise we all are growing,
A hint for cooking I’ll give you, well worth the price of knowing;

Tho’ many a housewife may excel in baking, brewing, frying,
Yet how to cook a husband well, she never thinks of trying.

But first to maidens, let me say, when for a husband looking,
Be careful to select a man that’s worth the cost of cooking,

And, as tastes are apt to differ some, depend upon no other,
But choose your husband for yourself, don’t even trust your mother.  

Note the sly anti-male implication that husbands, while worthy of being murdered, are nonetheless a necessary and highly significant choice in a woman’s life.
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The same clever worldliness is displayed in the introduction to each of the chapters, which open with a quotation from Byron or Shakespeare. For example, the chapter on soups begins: “Famished people must be slowly nurst and fed by spoonfuls, lest they always burst” (Byron).

The recipes are sometimes attributed to specific women, identified by their initials, their first name, or their married surname; but most often they are left anonymous, and in a few cases, they are attributed to an already published cookbook, such as *The Council Cook Book* or *The Century Cook Book*. Copyright concerns did not seem to bother the compilers of this cookbook. As in other Reform temple-based charity cookbooks, non-kosher recipes for lobsters, crabs, shrimp, and oysters are numerous, so much so that there is an entire section labeled “Shell Fish.” There is even an occasional recipe for ham, but there are also recipes for “matzo kloesse” (matza balls) and matzo pancakes. Advertisements are scattered throughout the cookbook, for everything from olive oil to coffees and teas to gas and electric fixtures. There is an advertisement for Occidental College, which offers three courses—classical, literary, and scientific—leading to a B.A., a B.L. or a B.S., as well as a school of music. A tongue-in-cheek ad for a local café suggests, “We would like to draw your attention to a little advice of ours that in case any of the recipes herein should not agree with your constitution, always remember the PALACE CAFÉ.” The tone of this cookbook, both in its compilation of recipes and in its advertisements, is cheerful, neighborly, and comfortable.

---

22 Copyright law was less broadly applicable before the Copyright Law of 1976. The Copyright Law of 1909 covered only those works that had been registered for copyright, and did not cover works in the public domain or works published before July 1, 1909 that were not already copyrighted. See [http://www.kasunic.com/1909_act.htm#one1](http://www.kasunic.com/1909_act.htm#one1).
in its environment. It suggests a community that is integrated into its surroundings and knowledgeable of popular culinary trends.

The trope of cooking husbands was not limited to *The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles*, nor did it always appear in rhyming verses. *The 1914 Cookbook* of B’nai Zion Temple Guild of Shreveport, Louisiana, also included “An Old, But Good Recipe for Cooking Husbands,” but this one was expressed in prose paragraphs. As Deborah Dash Moore and Noa Gutterman quote from the 1914 twenty-seven-page booklet:

“A good many husbands are utterly spoiled by mismanagement. Some women go about it as if their husbands were bladders, and blow them up. Others keep them constantly in hot water. Others let them freeze by their carelessness and indifference. Some keep them ni [sic] a pickle all their lives. It cannot be supposed that any husband will be tender and good, managed this way, but they are really delicious when properly treated.”

“In selecting your husband you should not be guided by the silvery appearance, as in buying a mackerel, or by the golden tint, as if you wanted a salmon. Be sure to protect him yoursel, as tastes differ. Do not go to market for him, as the best are always brought to your door. It is far better to have none, unless you will patiently learn how to cook him.”

The quotation marks indicate, Moore and Gutterman suggest, that this “recipe” was copied from earlier cookbooks, without attribution beyond the quotation marks. The origin is uncertain, but the text appears a number of times between 1898 and 1905.  

---


24 Ibid., p. 135, and footnote, p. 155. The footnote identifies the earliest reference to be in an 1880 manuscript, Ms2010, Special Collections, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
including in an Amish cookbook. The advice tendered in the “recipe,” while not original to the women of B’nai Zion, expresses a number of modern—or at least contemporary—notions of male-female relations. Women can “manage” their husbands by applying care and thoughtfulness, and they are better off without one than with an inferior specimen. Moreover, the cookbooks, a distinctly female text, are meant to convey not only information about cooking, but also about gendered roles in general: A woman needed a husband.

It would be a mistake to assume that sisterhood cookbooks were uniquely the province of women of the Reform Movement. Conservative synagogues from this period also produced cookbooks, and it is interesting to note the tonal differences between them and those of the Reform women. One such Conservative Movement sisterhood cookbook was *The Center Table* compiled by the Sisterhood of Temple Mishkan Tefila. First published in 1922, it was revised in 1929 and came out in a third edition in 1950.

A comparison of the 1922 edition to the 1950 publication reveals a growth of almost 50 percent, from 213 pages to 313 pages, and an increasing emphasis on edification of Jewish practice. Both the 1922 and the 1950 editions open with essays on “The Jewish Home,” which are not identical. Both are identified as being written by Mignon L. Rubenovitz, and both feature discussions of the major and minor holidays, identical (approximately) in content but different in layout. In the 1950 edition this section is followed by a short essay on “The Function of Ritual in Jewish Life” by Dr. Israel J. Kazis, the rabbi of Mishkan Tefila. Next are instructions for the Friday evening

---

Sabbath rituals in the home, including the blessings for candles, wine, and bread in Hebrew and in English. This addition turns the cookbook into a kind of prayer book, a vehicle for not only preparing the Sabbath meal but also for carrying out the rituals associated with it.

This suggests that by the 1950s the function of the sisterhood cookbook had shifted from being a fund-raising vehicle—the 1922 edition had advertisements scattered throughout the book—to being a teaching mechanism for the women of the congregation. There is an explanation of the function, for example, of *cholent*, the Sabbath stew, which goes beyond its ingredients and preparation steps. A “Menu for the Seder Night” is found in both editions, preceded by instructions in how to set the Seder table with the ritually necessary objects. While the earlier edition has six pages of Passover recipes, the later one contains 17 pages, indicating how much the preparation of Passover desserts had become a popular growth industry. There are also recipes for other Jewish holidays, including Purim, Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur eve, Hanukkah, and Shavuot.

Were there differences in religious sensibilities, besides adherence to the laws of *kashrut*, between sisterhood cookbooks of the various denominations within Judaism? To answer that question, one might compare the introductory essay offered by Rabbi Israel Kazis to *The Center Table* with the preface to the *South Fallsburg Sisterhood Kosher Cook Book* penned by Rabbi Julius Kreitman. The latter sisterhood cookbook was created by the women of an Orthodox synagogue, the South Fallsburg Hebrew Association, and the rabbi’s introduction functioned as a sort of *haskama*, a seal of approval. In it, Rabbi Kreitman commended the sisterhood for this “combined effort of the entire membership”
(which was, in fact, the effort of the female portion of the membership) and then laid out the theological basis for kashrut from an Orthodox perspective. He stated, “The Alm-ghty has determined that which is proper for the Jew to eat and that which is not proper…. By adhering to these divinely ordained laws, the Jew fulfills [sic] his true mission in life.”

In Rabbi Kazis’s introduction, by contrast, these same observances were labeled “customs” which “[i]n addition to their survival value, … have great psychological significance in the home.” Thus, according to their rabbis, the religious aspect of the Conservative sisterhood cookbook was lauded for its utilitarian function, while the same practices from the Orthodox perspective were seen as ordained by God and central to a Jew’s purpose in life.

In the South Fallsburg cookbook, a second introduction by a person identified only as “E.R.C.” states that the sisterhood’s “aim [is] to bring more Yiddishkeit to all who come within our realm. Where better than in the Jewish home….” This cookbook contains a section labeled “Holiday Maichles” (as well as a section for “Waistline Control.”) While recipes in the former section are identified with their appropriate holidays, there are no instructions as to how to observe the holidays and the Sabbath, as in The Center Table. That knowledge was taken for granted or expected to be found in a different source.

It is worth noting that sisterhood cookbooks from Reform congregations, such as The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles from the Wilshire Boulevard Temple, did not

---


28 South Fallsburg Sisterhood Kosher Cook Book, op.cit., p. 11.
carry a rabbinic foreword, but simply a note from the compilers themselves. This difference might imply that the women of the Conservative and Orthodox synagogues felt a greater need for a statement of approval from their rabbis than did the women of Reform congregations (although the examples are too limited to make a broad generalization). Nevertheless, in all these cookbooks, it was the women of the sisterhoods who provided the precise instructions while the rabbis contributed the interpretive framework.

Interestingly, *The Flower City Cook Book* of 1911 carried an introduction by a medical doctor, an “Ira S. Wile, M.D. of New York City”—a male authority figure of a different sort—a Rochester-born physician who was an active supporter of the early birth control movement. “Flower City” was the designation given to Rochester, New York, and the cookbook was prepared “under the auspices of the Sisterhood affiliated with Congregation Berith Kodesh.” Berith Kodesh (today Temple B’rith Kodesh) is the oldest synagogue in Rochester. Founded in 1843 by German Jews, it began as an Orthodox synagogue but quickly became Reform. The compilers of this cookbook were listed as “Mrs. Henry Leiter and Miss Sara Van Bergh.”29 (Note the difference in the honorific titles given to each woman, indicating different marital statuses.) It is worth recording that Congregation Berith Kodesh held the first Jewish-Christian Thanksgiving congregational service in the United States in 1873.30 Newspaper reports tell of a joint Thanksgiving and Hanukkah celebration observed in 1888, when the two holidays fell

---


together. These indications of Americanization make it plausible that the cookbook would contain a “melting pot” of recipes.

The cookbook contains distinctively Jewish recipes such as “matzo fritters” and “matzo crimsel” (page 136) as well as recipes typical of other ethnic groups such as Hungarian noodle charlotte (page 136), German pancakes (three varieties, page 14), and Irish stew (page 66). Distinctly non-kosher recipes go beyond the usual clam soup (page 38) and lobster a la Newburg (two versions, page 46) to include recipes for boiled and broiled ham (page 63), pork sausages (page 65), and roast leg of pork with apple sauce (page 64). There are no references to Jewish home or Jewish ritual practices, only “Household Rules” (page 1) and “Household Hints” (page 2). Clearly this cookbook was intended for an ecumenical audience.

Charity Cookbooks Not Associated with Synagogue or Temple-based Sisterhoods

Not all Jewish charitable cookbooks were the creations of synagogue-based sisterhoods. The model of a communally-produced, advertisement-laden cookbook was seized upon by other types of Jewish women’s philanthropic groups to raise funds for their charitable goals. The group might have been the local chapter of a national organization, such as the National Council of Jewish Women or Hadassah, or it might be working to support a local institution such as a home for the aged or a nursery. The group was defined by its charitable goals rather than by its denominational affiliation.

31 https://archive.org/stream/flowercitycookbo00leit#page/158/mode/2up.
The *Joplin Cook Book*, for example, was compiled by the Hebrew Ladies’ Aid Society of Joplin, Missouri, in 1912. Although its cover price was only 25 cents, it probably made most of its money from its many advertisements. The introductory section, addressed to “the long-suffering public”—thanks the “many ladies who contributed recipes,” “the business men for their liberal advertisements,” and “the editor who so kindly aided in accomplishing our work.” It does not, however, offer any hints about the identity of the recipients of the Hebrew ladies’ aid.

The creators of the recipes were individually acknowledged for their contributions. If they lived locally, their address was sometimes given, so that one could go to the woman’s home and ask a question. A number of the recipes came from towns other than Joplin, and their origins—from Texarkana, Texas, Shreveport, Louisiana, Yates Center, Kansas, and McAlester, Oklahoma—indicate that the Joplin women had a wide social network or perhaps other cookbooks from which they borrowed. This broad network also suggests that in a region with scattered Jews, a cookbook could bring together women as both contributors and collectors of recipes. Acknowledging the local recipe contributors, of course, provided an advantage to the local user, who would know the best local chefs. Naming individual contributors created a sense of community that was lacking in the more formal *Settlement Cook Book*.

The recipes in the *Joplin Cook Book* are very Americanized, with nary a matzah ball or Hungarian noodles to be found. There are no instructions for how to create a “Jewish home,” but there are “Useful Hints” as to how to “preserve eggs,” “take out

---

32 https://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/a38a4eb0-4a2d-0131-41cc-58d385a7b928/book#page/5/mode/2up,p. 4.
mildew,” and “remove tar from cloth.” In fact, the only indication that this is a Jewish cookbook comes from the title page, which states that the volume was “compiled by the Hebrew Ladies’ Aid Society.” This lack of distinguishing Jewish features may indicate a highly acculturated group of Jewish women, or it might mean that they believed they would sell more cookbooks and get more advertising if they played down their Jewish roots. The only other hint of their Jewishness lies in the names of the officers of the society: Mrs. Cohn, Mrs. Klein, Mrs. Goldstein, and Mrs. Mose Weiler.

A cookbook entitled *Pots, Pans and Pie-Plates and How to Use Them: A Collection of Tried Receipts* was published in 1905 to benefit the Hebrew Day Nursery of Baltimore. The book gives no indication as to what sort of “day nursery” was being supported—a baby nursery, kindergarten, or primary grade school—but the advertisements for high-heeled shoes, diamonds, and “costumes for theatrical plays” suggest an upwardly mobile community. The recipes include shellfish—lobster, crab, oysters, and shrimp—but also a section of “Passover Receipts” consisting of four recipes, all by a Mrs. Louis Levin. Incidentally, almost all of the women who signed their recipes did so using their husband’s first name; consequently, the women’s own first names are unknown to posterity.

Similarly, *The “Best by Test” Cook Book* compiled by Mrs. Alfred Loeb of New York in 1914 does not preserve her first name. However, it is more explicit than most charitable cookbooks in mentioning the recipients of the charitable efforts of the book—the Hebrew Infant Asylum. The preface states:

33 Ibid., pp. 101-2.
The Hebrew Infant Asylum is one of the noblest institutions ever dedicated to God or man. There can be no deception in this work, for helpless infancy cannot deceive, and you, who have aided us, will find a supreme satisfaction and contentment in the knowledge that you have contributed your mite toward this splendid charity.\textsuperscript{34}

This cookbook breaks the mold of the previous charity cookbooks in that it does not include any advertisements, nor does it list the names of multiple contributors of recipes. It does not contain any advice—neither on how to raise children nor how to celebrate Jewish holidays—but only some “Weights and Measures” and cooking timetables. It contains no distinctively Jewish or holiday-related recipes, but does include shellfish and oysters, yet no ham.

Quite a few of the early charity cookbooks that have survived were produced by local sections, or chapters, of the Council of Jewish Women (the forerunner of today’s National Council of Jewish Women) or local Hadassah groups. These were quite popular with a built-in base among the organizations’ activists. *The Neighborhood Cook Book*, compiled by the Portland section of the CJW, published first in 1912, was sold out within ten months. A second edition “revised and enlarged, many choice recipes being added” was issued in 1914, and a third edition was published in 1932. Despite the claim of enlargement in the introduction to the second edition, both first and second editions were exactly 333 pages long, but the latter had fewer ads.

The German Jewish background of the creators of *The Neighborhood Cook Book* is evident from the inclusion of *nudelfransen, gansegrieben brod torte, schnecken*, and *pfeffer nusse*. And their Americanization is on display with the inclusion of okra gumbo

\textsuperscript{34} https://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/1401f6d0-7634-0131-abda-58d385a7bbd0/book?page_start=left#page/5/mode/2up
soup, corn timbales, and Lord Baltimore cake. Their vision of kashrut follows that of German Reform Jews: An entire chapter is devoted to shellfish, yet no recipe for pork is to be found. A number of recipes are clearly intended for Passover, such as matza sponge cake and matza charlotte, but they are not labeled as related to Passover. This combination suggests that the book presents a true portrait of what the Jews of Portland were eating, but reveals their hesitation to call attention to their Jewish origins.\textsuperscript{35}

The Los Angeles section of the National Council of Jewish Women in 1928 published \textit{Helpful Hints to Housewives}, compiled by seven women—Juliette Guggenheim Frank, Evelyn Rosenthal Magnin, Anita Keiler May, Mattie Harris Stern, Berdie Spier Stodel, Helen Eiseman Wolff, and Florine Hellman Wolfstein. Note that all the women used their first and last birth names and their married last names, not their husbands’ names with Mrs. in front of it. One could read that choice as proto-feminist in supporting women’s independent identities, though that was probably not their intention. The National Council of Jewish Women, in its agenda and their publications, espoused an early feminism similar to that of their Protestant peers.\textsuperscript{36} The volume opens with a photograph of girl campers at a summer camp sponsored by National Council. Next come 11 pages of advertisements with everything from Manischewitz matza to Maxwell House coffee to a solid silver tea set—suggesting a range of income levels among the cookbook readers.


Before the recipes begin, true to its title, the book offers 17 pages of “Helpful Hints for Housewives,” which range from the obvious (“Leftovers can be used to good advantage in the preparation of entrees.”) to the surprising (“To clean bottles, use coffee grounds.”) to the innovative (“Old maps pasted on heavy cardboard and then cut into small, irregular pieces make interesting and instructive puzzles for the kiddies”). There seems to be little rhyme or reason to the order of the “helpful hints” until the final pages, where they are arranged in sections that advise the reader on how to “Stop Weeping” (from cutting onions); how “To Prevent Sticking;” “Cleaning and Painting;” “Refrigeration, Cleaning and Canning;” “Care of Clothes and Linens;” and “First Aid to the Injured.”

Chapter II, before the recipes, gives instructions on “How to Measure,” “Time for Roasting Meat,” and a “Time Table for Vegetables.” It soon becomes clear that the book’s authors took a maximalist position on the scope of the role of the housewife.

The recipes are quite varied, ranging from pâté de foie gras sandwiches to “Queen Victoria’s Favorite Soup” (combining chicken and chicken stock with a cup of light cream), to “Gefulte Fish of Fish Balls.” There is an entire chapter on “Passover Dishes” followed immediately by a chapter on “Spanish, Italian, and Mexican Dishes.” After instructions on canning, preserving, and pickling foods, there is a chapter on “Diabetic Receipts.” This was the first reference to the relationship between dietetic choices and health outcomes among the cookbooks we examined. The final chapter of “Menu


\[38\] Ibid., pp. 40-41.
Suggestions” goes on for ten pages, and filet mignon, loin of pork, and baked ham are all on the menu.

**What Makes a Cookbook Jewish?**

After examining this variety of American Jewish sisterhood cookbooks, one cannot help but ask, “What makes these cookbooks Jewish?” Is it a matter of authorship, or intended audience, or content of specific interest to Jews? One definition offered is “a collection of recipes in some way associated with Judaism and/or Jewish people,” but this blurry description hedges the differences between the creators and the project. Many of the sisterhood cookbooks examined here were created by Jewish women but are very similar in structure and content to non-Jewish charitable cookbooks of the same era. Nevertheless, they are “Jewish” by dint of having been collected by Jewish women and published to raise funds for a charitable cause they deemed worthy and that had a connection to the Jewish community.

Each cookbook is, in fact, an artifact of a particular all-female social network that came together in order to create a recipe book as a means of pursuing a philanthropic goal. We can learn something about Jewish women’s social patterns from these books, such as: Whose recipes appeared most frequently? Did the women use their birth names (in part or whole) or did they identify as “Mrs. Husband’s Name”? Was a place of honor in the cookbook reserved for the rabbi’s wife or for the editor/project manager of the book? Were some recipes identified by their author while others remained anonymous?

---

Did the women have more in common than merely being allied with the same charitable cause?

One can learn something about the social and economic milieu from which the cookbooks emerged by examining the advertisements that helped pay for the publication. Were they mostly local stores or national chains? Were the advertisers largely local merchants whose businesses the women of the sisterhood patronized? Were the advertisers mostly Jewish?

Examining the cookbooks as sociological artifacts of a particular community of Jewish women gives these books an importance beyond the content of their recipes or the “Helpful Hints” published before or after the recipes. The fact that most of the cookbooks were so Americanized that they were barely distinguishable from Protestant church cookbooks of the same era tells us that the Jewish cookbook creators were both very acculturated and wanted their cookbook to appeal to a wide audience.

If one examines the content of the sisterhood cookbooks, they run the gamut from those having few distinguishing Jewish recipes—such as the Omaha, Nebraska, *Cook Book Compiled for the Benefit of Building Fund* or *The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles* or *The “Best by Test” Cook Book* compiled by Mrs. Alfred Loeb of New York—to the ritually instructive *Center Table* cookbook from Congregation Mishkan Tefila in Boston, Massachusetts, which features sections on “Holiday Cooking” and “Passover.” A number of the cookbooks include Passover dishes, which are not identified as such but are, from their ingredients, clearly for that holiday. For example, *The Neighborhood Cook Book* features recipes for “matzo sponge cake” and “matzo charlotte.”
The observance of the laws of kashrut in these cookbooks is largely in the breach. This is not surprising, as most of the sisterhood cookbooks examined were the products of women affiliated with Reform temples. The Reform Movement had questioned the dietary laws, as well as (more extensively) the observance of the Sabbath, as early as the German Reform rabbinical conference of Breslau in 1845. German Reform rabbi and theologian David Einhorn concluded that, except for the prohibition against eating blood or animals that had died a natural death, the dietary laws were no longer binding. The rabbis of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, meeting in 1885 in Pittsburgh, rejected Jewish dietary laws entirely, stating:

We hold that all such Mosaic and rabbinical laws as regulate diet, priestly purity, and dress originated in ages and under the influence of ideas entirely foreign to our present mental and spiritual state…. [T]heir observance in our days is apt rather to obstruct than to further modern spiritual elevation.

Two years earlier, at a dinner to celebrate the ordination of the first four American rabbis from Hebrew Union College, the menu had included “soft-shelled crabs” and “salade of shrimps” as well as ice cream following a meat course. This dinner, intended as a unifying moment for American Jewry, became known as the “trefa banquet” and led to the more traditional rabbis exiting and forming, in 1886, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the bastion of Conservative Judaism. There is some disagreement as to whether the menu of shellfish was an intentionally defiant statement or a caterer’s mistake. American Jewish historian Jonathan Sarna argues that the appearance of many
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non-kosher shellfish was not “the product of careful planning and prearranged advertising. They resulted instead from carelessness and lack of proper oversight.” The caterer, having served at other Jewish banquets, had observed a standard of kashrut that eliminated pig products but allowed shellfish. This would suggest that late nineteenth century American Jews made a distinction between the permissibility of ham and pork products and the permissibility of shellfish.

The cookbooks that we have examined argue otherwise. They are “on-the-ground” historical artifacts of how American Jewish women collected recipes and cooked from them, and they include both shellfish and ham products, although shellfish recipes predominate over pork and ham recipes, and some cookbooks feature only shellfish. The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles and The Flower City Cook Book from Rochester include pork and ham recipes, while The Neighborhood Cook Book has an entire chapter on shellfish but nothing from pigs. The women who contributed to these cookbooks were reporting what they cooked, and the recipe collections are an unintended trove of information about their culinary habits.

Sisterhood Cookbooks as Records of Community

In fact, it is as records of women’s communities and of everyday life within them that the sisterhood and charity-based cookbooks are most valuable. Unlike the settlement house cookbooks, which were pedagogic in purpose, intended to teach immigrants how to acclimate to America, the sisterhood cookbooks provide an unobstructed view of the

recipes that their multiple authors actually cooked and took great pride in. They show a rapidly acculturating group of women who still remembered how to make German specialties such as schnecken and pfeffer nusse, but also had adopted American staples like okra and corn. They have fewer dishes specifically linked to a religious practice, such as cholent or hamantaschen, but for their creators, these cookbooks were a statement of their Jewish identity.

The recipes themselves were not the focal point of these cookbooks. Instead, they were intended to build community and to support local Jewish needs more than to teach a novice how to cook or to share recipes among housewives. Unlike single-author cookbooks, these volumes frequently offered several versions of the same dish. For example, The Center Table’s chapter on cakes lists two jelly rolls, three or four sponge cakes, and two spice cakes. The members of a given community were likely to know who were the better cooks and whose recipes could be trusted to be accurate.

As historical documents, the sisterhood cookbooks capture a moment in the life of a congregation and a view of how women could contribute to their Jewish community. They provide a gendered way of participating in the Jewish life of their community that was both domestic, dealing with kitchen matters, and public, in that the purpose was to raise money for communal needs. Most of the cookbooks (with The Center Table being an exception) had little content that was explicitly religious or self-coded as Jewish, yet they reflected core Jewish values in trying to raise funds to meet communal needs. The popularity of this type of cookbook, and their continued production down to today, indicate that they provide a way for Jewish women to weave the ties of community
through the tasks of cooking and homemaking—and that this may be part of what
“sisterhood” was and is about.
Commercial Product-based, Yiddish-English and Yiddish Cookbooks

If the cookbooks in the previous chapter were unpretentious creations of communities of women trying to raise money for charitable goals, many of the cookbooks in this chapter came into being from an entirely different impulse in origin and purpose. These cookbooks were created by commercial corporations interested in selling their products to American Jewish women and were essentially a form of advertising. Their existence tells us that there was a sufficiently large and distinctive market among American Jews in the 1920s and 1930s to make it economically worthwhile to design cookbooks targeting that audience.

The uniqueness of these commercial cookbooks lies in their specificity of ingredients—using the products of the sponsoring company in almost every recipe—and in the languages of publication, English and Yiddish, or a combination of the two. The choice of languages reveals a great deal about the acculturation of the perceived audience. The Yiddish-only texts were aimed at recent immigrants. The sponsoring companies that published parallel texts in English and in Yiddish hoped to attract both the Yiddish-literate and the English-literate Jewish market. They envisioned, it would seem, enabling two generations of Jewish women—the immigrant and the first-generation women—to cook and to plan family meals together. Behind this appealing intergenerational image, these companies sought to acculturate their targeted audience to American food products and, in particular, to their own brands.

*Ba’tam’te Idishe Maykholim* (Tempting Kosher Dishes) Manischewitz

Passover Cookbook
It is easy to understand why a collection of Passover recipes would be an excellent marketing tool for the Manischewitz company, which made, and still makes, matzas, matza meal, and matza cake meal—all ingredients that are required for Passover, when ordinary flour that is made into bread is forbidden by Jewish law. Passover, more than any other Jewish holiday, requires a restricted diet and yet calls for celebratory and “company-worthy” dishes. Therefore both experienced cooks and neophytes would appreciate cookbooks that specified the products available in America and illustrated, through photographs, elegant ways to serve the prepared dishes. (See illustrations and recipes from the 1930 edition on pages 113 and 114.)

A brief publication history of the editions of Tempting Kosher Dishes, the Manischewitz Passover cookbook, is in order. The first edition seems to have been published in 1926, but no facsimile copy could be located in WorldCat.org. A second edition, published in 1928, bore the subtitle “112 choice recipes collected from housewives in America and Europe—tested and approved in our own kitchens by a domestic science expert.” Since the title page stated that this edition had been enlarged, one can presume a smaller first edition. The 1930 third edition was again expanded, this time to 250 recipes, and the name of the domestic expert given as “Miss F. O. Gahr, B.S. . . .Graduate in Institutional Management.” A fifth edition published in 1944 lacked the color photographs of the earlier editions. A 1949 sixth edition ran 84 pages and had a fresh, matza-resembling cover. A 1969 edition was completely rewritten and revised by Deborah B. Ross, illustrated by Gene Szafran, and published by Walker and Company in New York. Before offering any recipes, it featured two long introductory essays on “Jewish Cookery as It Reflects Jewish Life” and “Passover Through the Years and
Around the World.” There were also instructions on preparing the house, setting the Seder table, and planning menus. This later cookbook took itself very seriously as a guide to Jewish ritual, and while it did promote Manischewitz products, it did not feature matza in every recipe.

The 1930 Manischewitz Passover cookbook, by contrast, managed to incorporate matza meal into dishes as diverse as chocolate soufflé (pg. 40), tamales (pg. 61), and an asparagus wheel (pg. 78). Despite the prevalence of matza-based recipes, the foreword insisted, “While primarily intended for everyday use, most of the recipes may be used during Passover.”

With eight sponge cake recipes, seven versions of knoedels (matza balls), four matza pancake recipes, and two matza kugels, the “tempting dishes” could get repetitious. In contrast to contemporary Passover cookbooks, which, given today’s greater health-consciousness, try to vary the menu away from carbohydrate-heavy matza-based products and toward fresh fruits, vegetables, meat, and fish, this cookbook sought to maximize the use of matza and matza meal even in squash soufflé, baked salmon, and meat balls. (Despite greater awareness today of the dangers of excessive carbohydrates, it is doubtful that any observant Jew ever lost weight over the holiday.)

The foreword seeks to convey an air of modernity by stating that every recipe had been “tested in our own kitchen.” But the recipes had been solicited from the readers, who were “paid liberally for such recipes as are accepted for publication.” No wonder that so many of the recipes were similar variations on the classical Passover favorites.

---

That the creators of this cookbook knew their targeted audience is indicated by the fact that the recipes do not call for the use of *kitniyot*. *Kitniyot* are legumes, including rice, corn, beans, peas, soybeans, sunflower seeds, and sesame seeds. These items have been forbidden by Ashkenazic rabbis to be eaten on Passover since the Middle Ages, but are consumed by most Sephardic communities. The absence of *kitniyot* from the Manischewitz recipes proves that they were clearly aimed at an Ashkenazic Jewish audience.

On the other hand, the recipes do not conform to the practice followed in some Hasidic communities to avoid *gebrokts*, a term denoting what happens when fully baked matza or matza meal comes into contact with water. (Sephardic Jews and most non-Hasidic Ashkenazim do not follow this stringency, but most Hasidic communities do.) The reason for inclusion of *gebrokts* recipes such as matza balls is simple and commercial: Their exclusion would greatly limit the usage of Manischewitz products such as matza and matza meal. In fact, a large proportion of the recipes are *gebrokts*. The intended audience was not Hasidic.

Interestingly, although the 1930 cookbook proclaims the expertise of a “domestic science expert” on the title page, it does not mention any sort of rabbinic authorization for the recipes. That, too, is in keeping with its perceived audience, who would be more interested in nutritional knowledge than in a rabbinical stamp of approval.

---


It is also worth noting that while the cookbook had an advertising purpose, it was not given away for free. The title page of the 1930 edition proclaims its price as $1.50.

**Other Passover Cookbooks and Passover-Related Artifacts**

Manischewitz was not the only food company to recognize the opportunity that Passover presented to reach out to a Jewish audience in both Yiddish and English. Planters Edible Oil Company, the makers of Planters Hi Hat Peanut Oil, created a cookbook entitled *40 Oyfanim far Besere Peyseh Maykholim* (n.d., probably in the 1940s)—and it came with rabbinic approval. The 26-page booklet assured the reader that at the company’s plant in Suffolk, Virginia, Rabbi Hirsh Cohn of New York was in charge of kashrut supervision and ensured that the product was both “Kosher L’Pesach and Parave” [so it was written] and “therefore it can be used for both dairy and meat dishes.”

There may have been a need for such a rabbinic stamp of approval, because some authorities declared peanuts a legume, and the liquid derived from a legume (*mai kitniyot*) was variously pronounced acceptable or unacceptable for Passover use.

The product, peanut oil, had a variety of uses, and could be suggested as an ingredient in everything from meat dishes, to fried pancakes and other fritters, to salads. Despite the variety of food groups among the recipes, the actual number was quite limited; there were only ten pages of recipes in English and ten in Yiddish. Each page had a one-line endorsement of the product at the bottom of the page. For example, “Planters Hi-Hat Peanut Oil is also more economical; because of its excellent quality it

---

can be used several times with equally good results." The peanut oil cookbook may have been an advertising give-away, as no price was mentioned in its pages.

Another product that had a potential *kitniyot* problem for Passover was coffee. Coffee beans were thought to be legumes, until Joseph Jacobs, the advertising director of the Yiddish paper the *Forverts* in the 1920s, solicited the opinion of some rabbis who declared the coffee beans to be seeds of a stone fruit, not legumes. With this rabbinic approval, Maxwell House coffee began to advertise in the *Forverts*. Maxwell House, like Manischewitz and Planters, wanted to reach a Jewish audience during their holiday season when they were in heavy buying and consuming mode. Rather than create another cookbook—because how many ways are there to make coffee?—Maxwell House created a Haggadah, which they gave away free with the purchase of a can of coffee. The first edition of the *Maxwell House Haggadah* was published in 1932, and another has been published every year until the present, with the exception of two years after World War II, due to a paper shortage. Over the years, some 50 million copies of the *Maxwell House Haggadah* have been published. This was a publishing and an advertising success if ever there was one, because many Jews automatically associated Maxwell House with its Haggadah.

Both the Manischewitz and Planters Peanuts Passover cookbooks and the *Maxwell House Haggadah* are artifacts that demonstrate how Passover was understood to be a central celebratory time for most American Jews and therefore a perfect time to

---

5 Ibid.
market these companies’ products.

**Other Product-based Dual-Language Cookbooks**

The need for a Yiddish-English cookbook to be shared by mother and daughter was not limited to Passover, and one commercial firm found this format ideal for marketing the kosher suitability of its product. Proctor & Gamble, the makers of Crisco vegetable shortening, wanted to target Jewish housewives to inform them that their product was a healthier substitute for *schmaltz* (chicken fat) and permissible by Jewish law. Although it looked like lard, it was derived from vegetables. In 1933 Proctor & Gamble published a dual-language cookbook, *Krisko resepyes far der idisher baleboste* (Crisco Recipes for the Jewish Housewife), to achieve that purpose. (Later editions were published in 1935 and 1940.) This 77-page book was chock full of recipes for traditional Jewish dishes such as *chremslach*, *eierkuchel*, and *helzel*—and it offered a healthier—by the nutritional consensus of the day—*pareve* version minus the animal fat or butter.

Here was a targeted marketing campaign that carried a true health benefit. The introduction to the cookbook claimed:

It [Crisco] fills a great need, taking the place of heavy fats and oils which have been used in Jewish foods for hundreds of years. Goose-fat, chicken-fat, and olive oil were good enough when there was nothing to take their place, but when it became possible to obtain a Kosher and Parave fat in the form of Crisco, Jewish women quickly appreciated its merits.⁶

Furthermore, the introduction emphasized that Crisco “bears the Hechsher (certificate) of a prominent Orthodox rabbi”—who remains unnamed. The lack of

---

identification does not mean, however, that rabbinic certification was lacking. In fact, as early as 1911 Rabbi M.S. Margolies of New York and Rabbi S. Lifsitz of Cincinnati visited the Crisco plant and declared the product to be kosher. A contract to that effect between Procter & Gamble and the two rabbis, dated September 22, 1911, is to be found in the Yeshiva University archives.\(^7\) To ensure that the kashrut of their product was known, Proctor & Gamble took out ads in the Forverts and the Morgen Journal in the days before Hanukkah 1911 stating in a Yiddish article that Crisco was kosher and pareve.\(^8\)

Proctor & Gamble had a competitor for its Crisco product in Rokeach’s Nyafat, but Rokeach also offered a wide range of other products aimed at the kosher market, including oil, honey, cocoa, chocolate pudding, strawberry preserves, and cleaning supplies (kosher soap, silver polish, scouring powder, and aluminum cleanser). It is not surprising, therefore, that Rokeach, in 1933, published a Yiddish and English cookbook, highlighting recipes that used its products. The founder and president of the company, Isaac Rokeach, stated in the introduction that his aim was to “help Jewish daughters to follow in the footsteps of their mothers and to perpetuate the traditions of kashrut for the maintenance of cleanliness and health in the Jewish home.” The tone of Rokeach’s message was laudatory of the tradition, yet the contemporary values of “cleanliness and health” were also emphasized.

Given the company’s wide product range, the Rokeyah Kokh Bukh (Rokeach Cook Book) covered everything from soup to salad dressings to desserts, including


Passover dishes, in its 96 pages. Classic Jewish foods associated with home rituals, such as challah and hamantaschen, appeared next to doughnuts and blueberry pie. There was even a calendar of the Jewish holidays and a couple of pages devoted to the laws of salting kosher meat. (Salting meat to drain the blood was a process done at home, not at the butcher’s store or the slaughtering house, at this time.) This cookbook viewed as its audience Jewish women who took kashrut and the maintenance of religious laws seriously, yet were interested in adapting to new American culinary trends.

Another bilingual product-related cookbook, published later than our time frame, was Reytsende gerikten (Tempting dishes) from Wolff’s buckwheat products company. Published in 1946 and again in 1948, this 48-page booklet contained recipes for using buckwheat groats in everything from pancakes to kugels to soups to stuffed cabbage. There were also recipes that incorporated Wolff’s pearled barley. With a more limited product line than Rokeach, this cookbook offered fewer recipes but included a five-year calendar for the Jewish holidays.

A Yiddish-Only Product-Related Cookbook

At least one food-related commercial firm felt that it had a large enough market of Yiddish speakers to make it worthwhile to publish a cookbook promoting its product entirely in Yiddish. This was the Washburn-Crosby Company of Minneapolis, Minnesota, which published Vashboyrn-Krosbi’s Gold medal kokh-bukh (Washburn-Crosby’s Gold Medal Cookbook) in 1921. Their 70-page booklet offered recipes for a

wide variety of foods not necessarily requiring flour—including salads, fish and meat sauces, ice cream, pickles, and ketchup. The recipes were aligned tightly on a page, sometimes without a list of ingredients preceding the instructions. Scattered throughout the book were illustrated ads for Gold Medal flour, and at the end were coupons to order additional cookbooks for friends or family.

It is worth noting that this all-Yiddish cookbook was created about a decade earlier than the parallel English-Yiddish cookbooks discussed above. This difference likely reflects a linguistic shift in the community for which they were intended. At an earlier date, the Eastern European immigrant community and particularly its women, who were the target market, were Yiddish-only speakers, but by the thirties, many were fluent in both Yiddish and English, or the mothers were Yiddish-literate and the daughters English-literate. Thus the progression from all-Yiddish cookbooks to dual-language cookbooks reflects very concretely a process of linguistic acculturation or assimilation.

**Non-Product-Related Yiddish Cookbooks**

Of course, Yiddish-language American Jewish cookbooks were not limited to those created by commercial companies marketing their products. One non-commercial example was *Der froy’s handbukh: der praktisher kokh-bukh* (The Woman’s Handbook: The Practical Cookbook) by Adella Kean Zametkin (1863-1931), published in 1930. This 648-page book was not exclusively about recipes; only 177 pages were in the cookbook section, relegated to the back of the book. However, earlier sections also provided instruction about food and healthy eating, with charts showing the protein and carbohydrate contents of various foods, giving their vitamin content, and a calorie count.
The book took as its mission to teach immigrant women about hygiene, birth control, and child-rearing. Zametkin, a socialist, was one of the founders of the daily *Forverts* newspaper, which wrote about her, “She taught thousands of women simple things that are very necessary for the average working woman.”

Another all-Yiddish cookbook, published in 1914, was *Dos familyen koh-bukh: bearbeytet nokh Amerikanishe, Frantsoyzishe, Italyenishe un Daytshe koh-bikher spetsyel far der Idisher kikh* (The Family Cook-book: In the Style of American, French, Italian and German Cook-books specially for the Jewish Kitchen) by H. Braun. The author, a nutritionist, wanted to help immigrant women integrate their cooking habits into the ways of their new country. Appended to the back of later editions (1915, 1922, and 1928) was a brief English section authored by Alexander Harkavy and David Moses Hermalin, both popular and prolific Yiddish writers. The 1914 cookbook, directed toward the Yiddish-speaking immigrant, reveals their progressing linguistic acculturation to America, in that some Yiddish words are transliterations of English words, such as “sandwiches.” These women spoke some English and were accommodating to American products such as Crisco, but were more comfortable reading recipes in Yiddish. The 25-page English supplement in the later editions suggests a growing Americanization of the target audience—or a desire to capture a market of both immigrant and first-generation American Jewish women.

The 1914 cookbook was recently translated into English by Bracha Weingrod, with an introduction by Hasia Diner, and is available from the Yiddish Book Center at

---

The translated work contains only a representative sample of the recipes in the Yiddish version, and is less than 50 percent the size of the original (153 pages compared with 368 pages). The purposes of the two editions—the earlier one to acculturate the immigrant woman to America and the later to provide a historical keepsake—could not be more different.

Weingrod notes in the preface to the translated edition that “Braun set out to raise the standard of cooking … and to teach her readers the English terms (written in Yiddish) they would need to negotiate the American kitchen and through that the American way of life.”¹¹ That this cookbook was intended as a vehicle of Americanization is clear from the explanations that go with the recipes. For example, under soups, a simple stock is called an “American-English Jewish Stock Soup,” and is explained: “The best class of Jews from England and America who maintain a kosher kitchen yet wish to cook like their neighbors have developed various types of ‘stock soups,’ as follows.”¹² Under “Sandwiches” the author opines: “Sandwiches play a great role in the diet of Americans. And this is very important. The sandwich takes up little space and often contains enough nourishment to sustain life.”¹³ Under “Breads,” there is an entry called “Cookies,” with the explanation that “[t]his is an English and American delicacy.”¹⁴ But some of the Old World folk wisdom remains, as under “Fat from a Stuffed Goose,” the author states, “The

---


¹² Ibid., p. 10.

¹³ Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 97.
stuffed goose is usually slaughtered in the winter.”15

Included in *Dos familyen kohk-bukh*/The Yiddish Family Cookbook are many classical Ashkenazic Jewish dishes such as gefilte fish, kneidlekh (matza dumplings), Romanian holeshkes (stuffed grape leaves), and p’ tcha (jellied calf’s foot). Distinctions are made, however, between how these foods were prepared in “the Old Country” and how in America. Braun comments: “The truth is that Jews in the Old Country seldom had the opportunity to eat good, well prepared fish. Jews, mostly poor, ate the cheapest fish available, which was … carp. An American would never eat carp, even if you paid him!”16 After discussing the varieties of fish available in Jewish fish markets of North America, the author goes on to describe gefilte fish in condescending terms as overcooked and hard to digest. The author also recommends Crisco as second only to butter in suitability for frying. Clearly, even for traditional dishes, the direction of the recipes is toward adaptation to the norms and available food choices of America.

*The Yiddish Family Cookbook* features a rather large section devoted to meat dishes. (Of course, only kosher meats and kosher cuts are included.) H. Braun seems to be a rather enthusiastic proponent of eating fleisch (meat), saying:

Until such time [as] our scientific knowledge reveals exactly what can take the place of meat in our diet, people will and should partake of meat. … Not only does the human body require meat, but the digestive system in particular needs meat for orderly processing.

Meat is therefore our best and most nourishing food. The meat-eating nations are among the most talented and progressive peoples. The Chinese, the

---

15 Ibid., p. 47.
16 Ibid., p. 24.
Russians, and the people of the Balkans eat very little meat.\textsuperscript{17}

It seems that Braun had strongly held if not empirically verified views on the nutritional value of meat and the cultural superiority of meat-eating nations. From the polemical tone of the above, it would seem that the health benefits or liabilities of eating meat were a subject for debate in Yiddish-speaking circles. H. Braun even recommended eating raw beef as a prescription for certain illnesses. This recommendation comes within the context of an entire chapter on how to cook for a sick person.

Taking the other side of this debate about the health benefits of eating meat were two vegetarian cookbooks: the \textit{Kokh-bukh far gezuntheyt} (Cook-book for health) by Lena Brown, published in New York in 1931, and the \textit{Vegetarishe koh bukh} (Vegetarian cook book) by A. B. Mishulow and Shifrah Y. Mishulow published in 1926. The former contains not only recipes but advice about natural healing, markers of sickness and of health, and highly specific information about nutrition. The latter featured a poem about vegetarianism and a 193–page health and nutrition guide.

Both of these vegetarian cookbooks were reminiscent of the \textit{Vegetarish-Dietisher Kokhbukh: 400 Shpeizn Gemakht Oysshislekh fun Grinsn} (Vegetarian-Dietetic Cookbook: 400 Recipes Made Exclusively from Vegetables), the creation of Fania Lewando, who owned a dairy restaurant in the Jewish quarter of Vilnius (then Vilna to Jews) between the world wars. Originally published in Yiddish in 1938, it recently was translated into English (and abridged) by culinary ethnographer Eve Jochnowitz and republished by Schocken Books in 2015 as the \textit{Vilna Vegetarian Cookbook}. The original

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 35.
manuscript and the newly reissued book are both graced by beautiful, colorful drawings of vegetables such as kohlrabi, cabbage, radishes, beets, and tomatoes—illustrations from seed packets so luscious as to make one want to go vegetable shopping immediately. This aesthetically pleasing cookbook grew out of a restaurant that was a gathering place for artists and poets, including the painter Marc Chagall. Lewando also taught nutrition classes, and tried to interest the British branch of H.J. Heinz in her recipes.18

What Yiddish-English Cookbooks Tell Us about Acculturation

The Yiddish-English segment of the Jewish cookbook field provides a revealing window to the process of acculturation to America. The shifts from Yiddish to English and the comparisons offered between the food choices in America and those available in Eastern Europe show in very concrete terms how the immigrants were accommodating to America during the early decades of the twentieth century.

The fact that there were dual-language Jewish cookbooks at this time, whereas there were English-only Jewish cookbooks during the earlier German and West European waves of Jewish immigration, demonstrates two distinct differences between the immigrants of each era. First, the East European Jewish influx to America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was much larger than the previous Sephardic, Central European, and West European waves of immigration. Therefore, there was a large enough target audience to make it worthwhile for product manufacturers of goods such as Manischewitz matzas to create commercial cookbooks highlighting their products

18 http://jewlicious.com/2015/05/jewlicious-eats-the-vilna-vegetarian-cookbook-pays-homage-to-fania-lewando/ on 5/27/2015,
to a Yiddish-speaking market. Second, this Jewish market was considerably more traditional than the previous Jewish community, which did not want to emphasize their differences but rather their similarities with other American sub-communities. As the total size of this more ethnic Jewish community grew, their needs became more visible, and they were able to ask for, or demand, commercial products to meet them.

The dual-language cookbooks conjure images of mothers and daughters cooking together using different parts of the same cookbook and the same products. In all likelihood, the process was less shared and more overlapping, as perhaps the same cook moved gradually from one side of the language divide to the other. A more subtle effect of presenting both languages was to legitimate both cultures—to acknowledge that the food needs of Jewish Americans, particularly around Passover but also at other times, were different than those of other Americans, and that the products available in America, such as Crisco or better varieties of fish, were superior and more healthy than those they had known in Europe. This would lead to the conclusion that the everyday food needs of American Jews could better be met in America than in Europe and that its culinary specialties could be preserved (as well as expanded) in America.

These cookbooks suggest a different relationship between the immigrant Jewish communities of this era and their surrounding culture than the earlier settlement house or sisterhood cookbooks had expressed. Those had an agenda to Americanize the immigrants and teach them the ways of American cuisine. These later cookbooks wanted to preserve the traditional dishes but update them to the products available in the United States. It is telling that a commercial motive—the desire to sell products—caused these
companies to be more attentive to traditional ways than were the idealistic reformers who worked in the settlement houses. Both, of course, ultimately contributed to the Americanization, modernization, and sophistication of Jewish food culture.
Conclusion

The cookbooks examined in this thesis provide a window into the daily lives of American Jewish women from the 1870s to the 1930s and into the relationship between their American and their Jewish identities. They are an underutilized primary documentary source for understanding how Jewish women acculturated to America, and they provide strong evidence that the process by which Jewish immigrants became American had a gendered aspect: Women were expected to learn new domestic habits, health concerns, and manners, and pass these on to their families. More subtly, they were expected to adapt to an American, largely Protestant, notion of the proper way for women to express their religious values by doing acts of charity and domestic service.

The American norms to which these cookbooks appealed varied from locale to locale, from decade to decade, and from community to community. The elements of acculturation went beyond choosing typically American food products that were seasonally and regionally available; they included notions of the proper domestic roles for women and their responsibility for the health, sustenance, and religious quality of life of their families. Gendered definitions of women’s roles varied across the cookbooks we examined, but they often featured a push for Jewish women to reconcile notions of modernity and science with those of “tradition.” These same tensions have long been part of the story of Jewish acculturation to America—and to modernity more generally—but in the cookbooks we see how the Americanization process played out from the perspective of women.
Furthermore, the cookbooks show how Jewish women related to one another, created communities of peers, and established institutions where more acculturated Jewish women helped their newly-arrived kin adjust to America. These books were both the products of particular women’s communities and an instrument through which such communities were formed. Sharing recipes, homemaking advice, and knowledge of Jewish religious practice were what brought the women together, through their sisterhoods and sewing circles, creating the women’s equivalent of the male-dominated shuls, heders, and landsmanschaften.

**Varying Goals of American Jewish Cookbooks**

The first American Jewish cookbook, Esther Levy’s *Jewish Cookery Book*, stated explicitly that its goal was “proving that, without violating the precepts of our religion, a table can be spread which will satisfy the appetites of the most fastidious.”¹ This purpose may sound a bit apologetic or defensive, but she was staking a claim that demands of the laws of kashrut and the mores of her surrounding bourgeois Philadelphia society were not incompatible. She was sufficiently steeped in Jewish foundational texts to argue that just as the matriarch Sarah baked cakes for the “celestial guests” who came to visit her husband, so modern Jewish women should “not disdain … attending to culinary matters.”² Her introductory chapter includes explicit instructions as to how to kasher meat and how to take a portion of the dough from challah—both ritual acts mandated by Jewish law—as well as how to set a proper table with “fine damask,” finger glasses, tumblers, and silverware. The halakhic strictures for keeping kosher and the conventions

¹ Esther Levy, *Jewish Cookery Book*, op. cit., p. 3.
² Ibid., p. 3.
of an elegantly arranged dinner table were equally necessary sets of knowledge for a proper Jewish housewife, in Levy’s view.

Her book’s subtitle, “Principles of Economy Adapted for Jewish Housekeepers.” is a nod to the American middle-class status of her audience. She cautions the housewife to use “judgment in expenditure” and to check the weights of meat and other staples delivered by merchants. The advertisements at the back of the book—for cooking utensils, sewing machines, and a kosher butcher—indicate these merchants felt they had a customer base among her readers. Her intended audience was wealthy enough to have their own maids, yet domestic enough to raise their own chickens (and to know how to fatten them).

Beyond providing instructions in how “to cook well” and how “to preserve the health and to embrace the pleasures of home,”3 Levy saw her book as having a higher purpose—one that would “redound to the spiritual welfare of our co-religionists.”4 Through her cookbook, she asserted that Jewish kosher cookery, despite its restrictions, could be as delicious, sophisticated, and varied as any other American cuisine. Thus Levy acculturated to America by bringing Jewish traditions into harmony with American middle-class lifestyles.

While Esther Levy’s book clearly targeted a kashrut-observing American Jewish audience, two decades later the next major cookbook in our study, Aunt Babette’s Cook Book: Foreign and Domestic Receipts for the Household, stated inclusively on its frontispiece: “To the young housekeepers of America this book is respectfully
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3 Ibid., p. 4.
4 Ibid., p. 4.
dedicated.”⁵ “Aunt Babette,” the pseudonym of Bertha F. Kramer, clearly sought a much wider readership and offered a much more extensive collection of recipes. Her cookbook was over twice the length of Levy’s, 520 pages as compared with 200, and far exceeded it in popularity, going through eleven editions and staying in print for 25 years. The publisher, Bloch Publishing and Printing Company, a German-American Jewish firm with ties to the leadership of the Reform Movement,⁶ featured a Jewish star as its trademark logo on the title page, and saw as its market the burgeoning ranks of American Reform Jewry. These Jews, mostly of German origin, had no qualms about eating oysters, crabs, quails, and ham sandwiches, because they believed that the culinary strictures of kashrut no longer applied to them. Judging by the much wider sales of Aunt Babette’s Cook Book than Jewish Cookery, one might infer that the Reform segment of the Jewish community was growing and outstripping the traditionalists. This was true, especially in the Midwest, in cities like Cincinnati and Chicago, where a new kind of Jewish identity was being shaped, as reflected in this cookbook.

The rejection of the observance of kashrut, however, did not necessarily mean wholesale assimilation into the American mainstream, but rather an incorporation of Jewish food-related practices into American lifestyle events. For example, a late chapter of Aunt Babette’s Cook Book, entitled “Easter Dishes” (perhaps to give it a seasonal context understandable to all), describes in great detail how to set the Seder table with the symbolic Passover foods. There then follow some thirty classically “kosher for Passover” dishes, from sponge cake to macaroons, The Passover Seder, with its many food-specific


requirements, was an ideal setting to shape the identity of American Reform Jews, who would find in its formality, its finery, and its family-centeredness something that they had seen their non-Jewish neighbors create around Christmas and Thanksgiving. By contrast, Esther Levy’s description of Passover focuses heavily on the cleaning before and after, and “the pleasurable emotions a Jewish woman must anticipate … when she will see everything looking so brilliantly clean, and mostly new.” Interestingly, shortly after Kramer’s description of the Passover Seder come menus for a Thanksgiving dinner, a “kaffee klatch,” and a “pink tea”—all celebratory meals that were much in vogue in bourgeois society of her day. Thus as heavily scripted and as symbol-laden as the Passover Seder was, it still fit into the American notion of celebrating holidays with special foods and with friends and family, but within a specifically Jewish context.

While Kramer’s “pink teas” and “kaffee klatches” seem very modern and stylish, her notions of gender-determined roles seem rather old-fashioned, though reflective of both general and Jewish stereotypes of the day. In the preface she states, “I think it the duty of every woman to be the head of her household, as much as it is the duty of the man to be the head of his place of business or counting room.” This separation of realms of authority seems very classically Jewish (with differentiated mitzvot, or commandments, for men and women) as well as very turn-of-the-century American, but there is no question whose role takes priority. Kramer tells women, “The more and better educated you are the more fit you are to perform the duties of helpmate to your dear husband.”

The word “helpmate,” with its echo of the story of Adam and Eve after their sin, implies

8 Kramer, Aunt Babette’s Cook Book, op. cit., p. 5.
9 Ibid., p. 5.
that the needs of the man come first. On the issue of separation of sexes, both Levy and Kramer are proponents of separate spheres, but this means vastly different actions in different circumstances.

Viewed in their broad strokes rather than on a recipe-by-recipe basis, these two cookbooks capture the flavor of the two emerging streams of American Judaism in their era—Orthodox/traditional Judaism and Reform/liberal Judaism. Esther Levy’s religious identity is expressed in punctilious observance of the laws and practices of kashrut and an embrace of the entire calendar of the Jewish year, including all the festivals, fasts, and Rosh Hodesh (New Moon) celebrations. And she believes that even though her culinary habits differ from those of her neighbors, she is not unlike them in being an industrious, health-conscious, and cleanliness-concerned housewife.

“Aunt Babette,” by comparison, is open to a wider swath of American influences—in intended audience, in choices of food, in types of festive meals, and in origins of recipes. Not believing herself to be bound by the laws of kashrut, Kramer casts a wider net for recipes from non-Jewish sources. At the same time she is influenced by the celebratory propensity of her surrounding culture to make an elaborate feast of the Passover Seder. Jewish identity in this cookbook is tied to creating memorable, family-centered meals around some but not all of the Jewish holidays. “Aunt Babette,” like Esther Levy, sees the Jewish woman as having her sphere of influence in the home, and leaving the public realms of Judaism to men.

When Is a Cookbook Really a Public Policy or a Community Organizing Tool?
The inward-turned, domestic emphasis in the earliest American Jewish cookbooks was counterbalanced by the community cookbooks created by activist Jewish women who wished to address social issues of their day. The most famous and long-lived of the community-based charitable cookbooks was *The Settlement Cook Book*, by Mrs. Simon (Lizzie Black) Kander, which grew out of a class she was teaching to Russian Jewish immigrants at the Milwaukee Jewish Mission.

The goal of the settlement house work that Kander and other German Jewish middle-class women engaged in was to acculturate Eastern European Jewish women especially, but other immigrant women as well, to American norms and to the English language. Thus the cookbook itself served as an instrument of acculturation, and scholars have long debated whether the motivation of the German Jewish women was altruistic or self-serving. The argument for benevolent motivation places the settlement house work in the tradition of “sisterhoods of personal service,” which saw as their goal “overcoming the estrangement of one class of the Jewish population from another.”10 This notion of responsibility of Jews for fellow Jews was and is deeply ingrained in the Jewish psyche, based on historical experience and textual commentary. The contrary view, espoused by radical reformers such as Emma Goldman, was that “settlement work was teaching the poor to eat with a fork.”11 The critics would also claim that the acculturated German Jewish women wanted to train their Eastern European cousins to be maids in their homes and thus not to become recipients of charity.


11 Ibid., p.1232.
The notion of “sisterhoods of personal service,” while certainly having a basis in Jewish values of tzedaka/charity and responsibility of the wealthy for the poor, could also trace its roots to Christian, and particularly Protestant, teachings about gendered ideals for religious expression. During this era American Protestant denominations taught that the best way for women to express their spirituality was through charitable works and helping the less fortunate. It seems likely that this message about women’s spiritual roles reached Jewish women through their interactions with non-Jewish women of faith. Thus the settlement house movement, while run by and for Jewish women, was influenced by American Protestant ideals of womanhood of the day.

The Jewish women who volunteered in the settlement houses were generally from the same social class as the Protestant women in charitable sisterhoods, but the Jewish women were closer to their clients culturally, which created both ties and tensions. Most of volunteers were affiliated religiously with the Reform movement, while their clients were more likely Orthodox or traditional. It was the secular National Council of Jewish Women that created and ran many of the settlement houses, particularly outside the Northeastern part of the U.S., but they insisted that their volunteers be adequately trained and treat their students with respect.

After examining The Settlement Cook Book, one might well ask what was Jewish about it. Yes, it was written by two German Jewish women—Lizzie Black Kander in the first edition and later Kander and Mrs. Henry Schoenfeld (her first name unrecorded) in subsequent editions—for use in classes comprised largely though not entirely of Eastern European Jewish women. Here and there among the recipes, one could find a Jewish-sounding dish such as a “kugel” or “matzos pudding,” but these instances are dwarfed by
the number of recipes involving “forbidden foods” (according to the laws of kashrut), such as “oyster stew” or “cream of crab meat.” There are no references to the Jewish holidays, whether described in traditional terms as in Esther Levy’s book or celebratory reports in “Aunt Babette.” There are instructions on how “To Clear the Table,” how “To Dust a Room,” and even how “To Build a Fire,” but no directions as to how to set the Seder table, as prescribed in the earlier cookbooks. This book is a detailed guidebook as to how to cook, clean, and serve in the American style, preparing the immigrant to find a job in domestic service, in a commercial restaurant, or as a housewife. But it makes no direct reference to Jewish culture as expressed in food, in holidays, or in life-cycle events. *The Settlement Cook Book* is the ultimate assimilatory document, teaching immigrants—not only Jews, but ethnic minorities of all sorts—how to fit into America.

Over several decades, the “sisterhoods of personal service” moved beyond the settlement houses to other settings for their philanthropic energies—feeding the hungry, visiting the sick, and assisting those in their synagogue who needed their help. In creating these small-scale charitable groups, the women met their own social and religious needs, influenced in part by the contemporary Protestant views that women’s spirituality was expressed through philanthropy. Jewish women, barred traditionally from leadership positions in the synagogue or the study house, found in their local sisterhoods meaningful alternative communities. Let the men run the *shuls*, they seemed to say, as long as we run the sisterhoods. Under their own leadership, the women could decide which charities and projects they would support and how much money they would give to strengthen them. Often the vehicle for raising funds was a self-produced cookbook with members’ recipes and advertisements from sponsors.
These cookbooks not only were successful fund-raisers, but they also built community, through women sharing their recipes and developing camaraderie. They could express their creators’ sense of humor, as well as local color of a community or its ethnic Jewish background. For example, the turn-of-the-century cookbook prepared by the Ladies Sewing Circle of Temple Beth Israel, in Houston, Texas, included a recipe for “How to Cook and Serve a ‘Possum Dinner.”¹² Another synagogue sisterhood affiliated with the Wilshire Boulevard Temple of Los Angeles produced The Unrivalled Cook Book of Los Angeles, which featured a rhyming-couplets recipe on the theme “How to Cook a Husband.” Only a group of women who knew and trusted one another could publish such a poem.

Because the best recipes were recognized and prized, many of these charitable cookbooks were passed down from generation to generation, often marked up and weather-beaten. Especially for small local sisterhoods, these cookbooks remain the only tangible record of the existence of their women creators and their desire to make a mark on the world. They are historical artifacts that show which institutions had strong female contingents, and what philanthropic causes particularly attracted large numbers of middle-class women. The practice of creating local cookbooks to raise funds spread to many types of female-run philanthropies—Hadassah chapters, National Council of Jewish Women, and sisterhoods of synagogues of every stripe—and continues to this day. These cookbooks, though mostly humdrum in their recipes, provide valuable documentary evidence of changes in culinary styles, in practice of kashrut, and in

affiliation patterns over the decades. They record the names of the leaders of these female-directed groups and their best cooks. (For example, in a later period, Susie Fishbein edited *The Kosher Palette*, a fundraising cookbook for Joseph Kushner Hebrew Academy and Kushner Yeshiva High School in New Jersey (2000), whose popularity encouraged her to produce nine commercially successful cookbooks in the *Kosher by Design* series.) Cookbooks also reveal the tensions between traditional Jewish cuisine and newly popular fads (such as the ‘possum)—that is, between tradition and assimilation—over the years.

*Can One Cook in Mama Loshen in America?*

A different sort of tension between the old and the new can be seen very obviously in the cookbooks written in Yiddish or matching Yiddish and English pages. Linguistic acculturation is a very visible marker of the integration of immigrants into a new country. It is noteworthy that the earlier Jewish cookbooks examined were all in English, indicating that they were written by and for women who were already literate in English. In the early decades of the twentieth century, after the arrival of large numbers of Eastern European Jews, there appeared a number of product-centered cookbooks in Yiddish or in Yiddish and English, intended to promote the sale of specialized food items, to targeted Jewish audiences. Unlike the settlement house genre of cookbooks, which had an agenda to Americanize its readers, these cookbooks met the immigrants at their cultural and linguistic comfort level, offering recipes in both Yiddish and English, because their goal was simply to increase sales of their product.
However, not all Yiddish-language cookbooks published in America were product-based. *Der froy's handbukh: der praktisher kokh-bukh* (The Woman’s Handbook: The Practical Cookbook) by Adella Kean Zametkin, a Socialist activist and contributor to the *Forverts* newspaper, conveyed a broad range of practical information on topics—including women’s health, birth control, and sexual hygiene— in addition to its collection of healthful recipes. Zametkin, the wife of socialist leader Michael Zametkin, the first editor of the *Forverts,* “devoted her whole life” to “humanitarian work among the underprivileged Jewish people of New York City.” Her book included articles written over the years in the *Forverts,* and only secondarily featured recipes. Coming from a socialist perspective, Zametkin had a very different belief as to what immigrant women needed to know than did the ladies of the Milwaukee Settlement House. Zametkin’s choice to publish in Yiddish was in keeping with her progressive views, as well as a practical choice, as Yiddish was the *mama loshen* of most of her audience.

Of course, the use of Yiddish was in flux among the immigrant generation and their first-generation offspring, giving rise to a number of cookbooks with parallel texts in English and in Yiddish. The rationale for this layout was that mothers and daughters would cook together, the mother using the Yiddish and the daughter using the English text. However, as the number of Yiddish speakers declined over the decades of the twentieth century, the necessity or even the usefulness of this arrangement disappeared.


Yiddish cookbooks thus track the linguistic acculturation of Jews into America. The recent translation into English and republication of a number of Yiddish-American cookbooks—Dos familyen koh-bukh: bearbeytet nokh Amerikanishe, Frantsoyzishe, Italyenishe un Daytske koh-bikher spetsyle far der idisher kikh (The Yiddish Family Cookbook) by H. Braun and Vegetarish-Dietisher Kokhbukh (Vegetarian-Dietetic Cookbook) by Fania Lewando, published in English as the Vilna Vegetarian Cookbook—suggest an interest in return to Ashkenazic roots, and evidence that emotional ties to Yiddish remain even among those who no longer speak the language.

*Artifacts of Acculturation, Artifacts of Agency*

The cookbooks we have examined express a variety of models of acculturation to America by Jewish women of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as well as a common underlying desire to “do it my way.” Esther Levy and “Aunt Babette” (Bertha Kramer) both wanted to show that Jewish upper-middle-class housewives could set as elegant a table and serve as varied and delicious a feast as their non-Jewish peers. Levy demonstrated her culinary expertise within the boundaries of kashrut; Kramer, a Reform Jew, cast a wider net for recipes, including many that Levy would consider treyf. Yet Kramer greatly expanded her emphasis on the Passover Seder, to make it the celebratory equal of a Thanksgiving or Christmas feast prepared by her neighbors. Each expressed the American bourgeois domestic ideals of her day, shaped by their differing religious sensibilities.

At the same time, both Levy and Kramer asserted strongly that the kitchen was the woman’s domain, and it was, in Kramer’s words, “the duty of every woman to be the
head of her household.” This agency was expressed through frugal expenditure for food and household necessities (a matter of great concern to Levy), proper management of domestic servants, and sole control of the kitchen.

The Jewish women who participated in sisterhoods of personal service were also mirroring ideals of noble womanhood learned, at least in part, from their Protestant neighbors, who saw philanthropic service as the natural religious expression of all women. The women of the settlement house movement chose as their charitable service goal the acculturation of immigrants, many of whom were fellow Jews, and their preparation for the American workplace. The Settlement Cook Book was the epitome of acculturation, with ethnic and religious differences downplayed or eliminated. The sisterhoods created within synagogues or to raise funds for Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America, or for the National Council of Jewish Women, were also influenced by the Protestant sisterhoods of personal service. However, in choosing where the funds from their cookbook campaigns would go—whether to organizations with outward-focused, societal-changing goals or to meet the needs of their synagogues—Jewish women were making public policy decisions and wresting control of a part of their synagogue’s budget and functioning from the hands of all-male boards.

By creating sisterhoods within the synagogue, women were defining a place of their own within a previously male-dominated space. Sometimes the women would permit the (male, of course) rabbi to write a brief introduction to their cookbooks, but more often they did not bother. The local cookbooks provide a glimpse into a shared community in the making, among women who had in common philanthropic priorities, shared recipes, and a desire to assert themselves.
The Yiddish cookbooks also captured a moment in the acculturation of American Jewish women when dual-language Yiddish-English cookbooks were of optimal use to mother-daughter teams. Soon, however, this linguistic accessibility shifted, and the same products would be advertised only in English. Linguistic acculturation to America came rather quickly to the Jews, with knowledge of Yiddish retained mostly among a Socialist and Yiddish intellectual elite.

Cookbooks, then, are cultural artifacts of how Jewish women of different socio-economic levels and cultural backgrounds acculturated to America. Their path led through the kitchen but also beyond to settlement houses, synagogues, and philanthropic and political organizations. The messages that Jewish women received through their cookbooks about how to become American were influenced by their Christian neighbors, but many voices also insisted that they could still be fully Jewish. In fact, the cookbooks represented a positive presentation of the strength and beauty of Jewish life to the non-Jewish world—in Esther Levy’s words “to satisfy the appetites of the most fastidious”—and thus were conducive to feelings of pride in Judaism and self-esteem. They spoke to an aspirational ideal of being both stylishly and healthfully American and proudly and distinctively Jewish, and the cookbooks made the combination seem attainable, through the medium of recipes and “helpful hints,” to generations of Jewish women.
TOMATOES WITH CHICKEN SALAD

Soak the tomatoes in boiling water one minute to remove the skins. Allow one large tomato for each person. Place them on an earthen platter on ice until very cold. Place them ready to serve cut the top off of each one, scoop out the insides, and fill the cavity with chicken salad. Lay each tomato on a lettuce leaf or on a bed of mayonnaise over each one with a whole or sliced chicken. Serve ice cold.

TOMATOES WITH SHRIMP.
Upside Down Cake

1 1/4 cups sugar
1 cup shortening
1/2 cup fine bread crumbs
3 cups cake flour
2 teaspoons baking powder
1 1/2 cups milk
1/2 teaspoon salt
1/2 teaspoon cinnamon
1/2 teaspoon nutmeg
1/4 teaspoon cloves
1/4 teaspoon ginger
1/4 cup catsup
2 1/2 cups radio water

Mix together the milk, radio water, sugar, and shortening. Add the
flour, salt, baking powder, and spices. Add the catsup. Pour into a
round cake pan. Bake in a moderate oven for 30 minutes. Serve hot.

Asparagus Wedge

1 1/2 pounds asparagus
1 cup prepared mustard
1/4 cup sugar
1/4 cup vinegar
1/4 cup catsup
1/2 teaspoon salt
1/2 teaspoon pepper
1/2 teaspoon dry mustard

Boil the asparagus for 10 minutes. Cool in cold water. Drain in a
colander. Mix the mustard, sugar, vinegar, catsup, salt, pepper, and
dry mustard. Pour over the asparagus and mix. Sit out until cold.
Serve cold.
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