

# 7

## THE JEWISH FAMILY Continuity and Change

Arnold Dashefsky  
Irving M. Levine

You may recall that in the musical about Eastern European Jewish life, *Fiddler on the Roof*, the protagonist, Tevye, compares life in his village of Anatevka to a fiddler on the roof trying to keep his balance. What prevents the fiddler from falling off the slanted roof and what keeps the Jewish people by analogy from losing their balance in a changing world? "Tradition!" Tevye says. "Without our traditions our life would be as shaky as a fiddler on a roof." Of course, the paramount integrative institution of traditional Jewish society was the family.

A discussion of the evolutionary changes of the Jewish family requires an understanding of the dramatic transformations of Jewish societal and communal life across nearly four millennia of history. In the first section of this chapter, an overview of that history is provided to demonstrate effects on the continuity of the Jewish community and the persistence of Jewish identity to which the family has been linked as the central institution.

### THE EVOLUTION OF THE JEWISH FAMILY: BIBLICAL AND POST-BIBLICAL ROOTS

The evolution of the Jewish family is congruent with the evolution of Jewish society throughout the history of the Jewish people. That

**Authors' Note:** Thanks are due to Bernard Lazerwitz and Howard M. Shapiro for valuable insights provided on this topic over a long period of time. In addition, the authors wish to thank Dana Kline and David Zeligson for their research assistance and Linda Snyder and Celeste Machado for their help in typing the manuscript.

history can be divided into two halves, the Biblical period, more familiar to many, and the even more important post-Biblical period, from the point of Jewish history.

While it is not possible to present an accurate sociological description of Jewish societal and familial life in Biblical times because of the absence of hard data, an examination of literary passages of the Bible can provide a rough idea of family life.<sup>1</sup> Whatever one's own religious and theological views, it is important to understand that the Hebrew Bible, or *Tanach*,<sup>2</sup> is at one level a literary document that sees Jewish history as a trinitarian relationship among the People of Israel (*am yisrael*), the Land of Israel (*eretz yisrael*), and the Religion or Law of Israel (*dat yisrael*) as embodied in the keeping of the precepts of the Torah. A large portion of the time these three elements are not synchronized, that is, the Jewish people are not living in the land and observing the Torah.

Jewish family life was rooted in the culture of the ancient Near East and as such was patriarchal, patrilocal, patrilineal, polygynous, and endogamous (Patai, 1977). The stories of the Bible, beginning with the patriarch Abraham, reveal a view of Jewish life rooted in a pastoral nomadic or seminomadic existence but not anchored to an independent political state. These wanderings across western Asia took place, it is thought, between 2000 and 1500 BCE (Before the Common Era). The stories emerged as a part of the Hebrew oral tradition and were recorded centuries later and included in the Bible. These migrations included the sojourn in Egypt, the Exodus, and the subsequent conquest of Canaan. With the conquest is evident a transformation of Jewish societal life from nomadic shepherders to sedentary farmers. Eventually these farmers formed an independent nation with an urban population in cities, such as Jerusalem, as revealed in the stories of David and Solomon, who established the first Jewish commonwealth about 1000 BCE. This Jewish commonwealth survived civil war, insurrections, and partial conquest of the northern kingdom by the Assyrians until the Babylonian occupation and destruction of the Temple (the center of Jewish religious life), culminating in the exile of many Jews, such as the prophet Jeremiah.

In the Biblical metaphor God is viewed as the parent who punishes the child, the *People* of Israel for not obeying the *Law* of Israel, and exiles them from the *Land* of Israel. Mirroring this view of God as the father, the Jewish family in Biblical times was patriarchal in structure. In this period, the epics are pastoral in nature, reflecting the nomadic or seminomadic existence of the patriarchs who tended their flocks.

Marriage as seen in the Bible was for the purpose of companionship and procreation and was fundamentally monogamous, as in the

story of Adam and Eve, even though polygamy appears under extenuating circumstances or among the upper class. While the wife was viewed as the property of her husband, as was the custom of nomadic Middle Eastern peoples, Jewish tradition established a contractual basis between husband and wife and accorded the wife certain protections as specified by the husband's ten obligations toward his wife and the four rights owed to him.<sup>3</sup> The frequent expressions of the prophets against the oppression of the widow and the orphan suggest an idealized concern for the weak that may have been more honored at times in its breach than in its observance.

The entire Biblical period spanned nearly two millennia, from the early patriarchal tales in the Torah to the last sections of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, or Writings. In the subsequent period Jewish life was dominated by the decline of the priestly class and the emergence of the rabbis as arbiters of Jewish religious life and law, embodied in the *halachah* (the religious code of conduct that defined the Jewish normative system, literally, the way or path of religious practice); hence the first post-Biblical phase of Jewish history is called the *rabbinic period*.

Modern scholars believe that the Hebrew Bible was standardized in its present form during the Roman period at the beginning of the Common Era. During this period the *Mishnah*, the oral law or rabbinic commentary on the Torah, was written down. In addition, the Talmud, consisting of the *Mishnah* and its commentary, the *Gemara*, was compiled. From these sources we learn of the importance of priestly families adhering to strict genealogical standards as well as the purity and mutual responsibility of individuals in family life. Rabbinic writing is replete with pithy aphorisms that express this integral relationship, such as, "whosoever, brings disrepute upon himself brings disrepute upon his whole family" (Num. R. 21:3). Consider another example, "A family is like a heap of stones. Remove one, and the whole structure can collapse" (Gen. R. 100:7).<sup>4</sup>

In Judaism, unlike in Christianity, which valued celibacy, marriage and the family were praised. According to Rabbi Hillel, the minimum number of children was two, one boy and one girl. Indeed, marriage and family life were seen as full of joy and blessing. The Talmud includes such statements as "He who has no wife lives without joy, without blessing, and without goodness"; and "Of that man who loves his wife as himself, honors her more than himself, who guides his sons and daughters in the right way, and arranges for their early marriage, Scripture says, 'and thou shalt know that thy tent is peace'" (Job. 5:24).<sup>5</sup>

The post-Talmudic period in Jewish history overlaps the Middle Ages<sup>6</sup> in European history. During this *medieval period*, rabbinic literature consisted of *sh'elot v'tshuvot*, answers to questions about

Jewish religious law submitted by questioners to rabbinic authorities. They are commonly called the *Respona*, and contain valuable economic and social information. During this period, for example, monogamy was rabbinically sanctioned as the religiously prescribed form of marriage, even though it had been the common practice among Jews for centuries. The axis of Jewish life shifted from Palestine and Babylonia to the Muslim-controlled areas of Spain and the Mediterranean basin under the Moors. Here Jewish intellectual life flourished in a healthy and protected interchange with Islamic thought and culture as exemplified by the Jewish physician and philosopher, Maimonides, Moses Ben Maimon.

During the emergence of the early modern period of exploration and scientific discovery, anti-Semitism led to the expulsion of the Jewish people from Western European countries (such as Spain in 1492), and they migrated to Eastern Europe. These Jews turned inward and developed a rather rigid Orthodoxy that only began to buckle as the French Revolution of 1789 heralded a new *modern period*. The effects of the Revolution gave Jews their first opportunity to participate as full and equal citizens in the life of their country. Under certain conditions it meant that Jews could leave the urban ghetto and small village, or Eastern European *shtetl*, and participate politically, economically, socially, and culturally in the life of the larger society. It was a period of unprecedented opportunity for Jewish people and a time of unparalleled threat to the perpetuation of Jewish tradition. This modern period of emancipation and enlightenment produced the great German Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, who was a strictly observant Jew; ironically, his grandchildren, including the composer, Felix Mendelssohn, were raised as Christians.

The best summary of the significance of the family in traditional Jewish life is expressed by the author of the article on the family in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971: 1172):

The constant insistence upon the value of the family as a social unit for the propagation of domestic and religious virtues and the significant fact that the accepted Hebrew word for marriage is *kiddushin* ("sanctification"), had the result of making the Jewish home the most vital factor in the survival of Judaism and the preservation of the Jewish way of life, much more than the synagogue or school.

Through the various sayings and stories, legends and folklore, the rabbis traditionally instructed Jews in the basic values of Jewish family life, which was closely intertwined with Jewish religious life. As Heinrich Heine, the German poet, has suggested, the Jewish

people have a "portable religion," which can be easily transported in their wanderings; it is the Jewish home. In the modern period further equality brought with it the possibility of further assimilation. Nowhere could this tension and its effect on the family be more interesting to observe than in the United States.

### **THE AMERICAN JEWISH FAMILY: 1654-1984**

While Jewish life in America can be traced more than three centuries back to 1654, when a small group of Portuguese Jews fled Brazil to the Dutch province of New Amsterdam, in reality most of the population and its characteristics have roots barely a century old.<sup>7</sup> During much of the European colonial domination of America, Jews were a rather small population of Spanish and Portuguese origin, called *Sephardim*, numbering about 3000 at the time of the American War of Independence. Economically, they were primarily part of the merchant class. Socially, they assimilated to Anglo-Saxon culture and experienced little anti-Semitism as legal bars to political participation were eventually removed. Religiously, they maintained the dignified Orthodoxy they brought with them. Politically, the Jews initially experienced restrictions, but as time progressed these declined. With respect to marriage and family life among the very small Sephardic community, many intermarried, as did the first American Jew, Jacob Barsimon. This situation of a small Sephardic Jewish population continued for nearly 175 years (more than half the period of Jewish settlement in North America), from 1654-1825.

It is estimated that in 1825 about 10,000 Jews resided in the United States. During the next 50 years, from 1825 to 1880, the population increased 25-fold, swelled by large numbers of German Jews escaping the instability and upheaval in Central Europe. While the Sephardic Jews were relatively comfortable, the German Jews adjusted economically by relying on peddling as a primary means of making a living. Socially, they assimilated but maintained a separate religious community, carrying on the tradition of German Jews or *Ashkenazim*, which initially was Orthodox. As the years went by and the numbers increased, Reform Judaism was introduced from Germany. This denomination gained a greater number of adherents particularly as the migration of Eastern European Jews began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Reform Judaism became an attractive option because it permitted a sharp distinction between the relatively uneducated, more traditional Eastern European immigrants and the more established German Jews, while retaining a unique Jewish religious expression. During this period, anti-Semitism was not widespread. What characterized this period was the great amount of

freedom German Jews enjoyed, and this extended to marriage and family life as well, with intermarriage not uncommon but not as great as among the smaller Sephardic community (Sachar, 1958).

In the 40-year period between 1880 and 1920 (about 12 percent of the total period of Jewish sojourn in America), the population grew about 1200 percent, from approximately 250,000 to 3,000,000. This tidal wave of humanity was part of the great Atlantic migration from Southern and Eastern Europe to the United States. In the case of the Jews they fled the increasing anti-Semitism of the czarist regime beginning in 1881 and subsequent pogroms, uprisings, and the Bolshevik revolution. Economically, these Eastern European Jews adjusted by becoming factory workers and artisans. Socially, they assimilated to American political and economic norms but maintained separate territorially defined communities in part imposed by external hostility and in part by internal choice. Like the Germans, the Eastern European Jews were also Ashkenazim (in contrast to the Sephardim), but they maintained their own generally more rigid interpretation of Jewish law. This migration produced a distinctly American denominational innovation — Conservative Judaism. (Both Orthodoxy and Reform were imported.) Politically, the mass migration of Jews and others was associated with growing anti-immigration sentiments, racism, and anti-Semitism, which already existed in Europe. During this period, for example, a Jew was lynched in Georgia for alleged rape and only vindicated when an eyewitness exonerated him nearly seventy years later, in 1982. In terms of the family this period marked the beginning of the weakening of the authority and control exercised by the family and particularly the father over the children as they became more American than their parents.

The period following World War I, 1920-1945, marked the end of open immigration to the United States and the slowing of the growth of the Jewish community. The Jewish population of the United States grew from about 3 million to 5 million. Economically, Jews became more mobile, moving from manual occupations to clerical and sales positions and to the free professions. Socioculturally, assimilation increased, even though Jews continued to reside in identifiable neighborhoods. Politically, anti-Semitism peaked as America participated in the war to overcome the racist Nazi regime in Germany. Religiously, this period marked the rise of Conservative Judaism, which had emerged in the second decade of the twentieth century as a middle road between the existing alternatives of a rigid Eastern European Orthodoxy and an assimilated German Reform. Politically, Jews experienced more anti-Semitism; and increased exclusivistic practices barred Jews from certain neighborhoods,

resorts, clubs, businesses, and professions. As far as the family was concerned, this period marked an erosion of the significance of the extended family in kinship relations and the growing independence of the nuclear family.

The contemporary, postwar period began with two traumatic and dramatic events that once again transformed Jewish life: the destruction of much of the European Jewry (one-third of the total world Jewish population) in the Holocaust and the rebirth of an independent Jewish commonwealth in the State of Israel in 1948 for the first time in nearly 2000 years. Between 1945 and the present the Jewish population of the United States grew from 5 million to 5.9 million (1980) but the proportion of Jews in the U.S. population began to decline, from 3.7 percent in 1937 to 3.5 percent in 1947 (Sklare, 1971) to 2.6 percent in 1980 (Chen Kin and Miran, 1980). Economically, Jews continued their upward mobility, extending themselves in the business and professional strata; nevertheless, this mobility involved a shift from less to more bureaucratized modes of employment and its associated loss of autonomy in the workplace. Socioculturally, with the rising affluence of American Jews, assimilation increased along with a greater residential dispersion in various regions of the country as well as within metropolitan areas. Politically, overt anti-Semitism declined in terms of employment and social practices, and more Jews gained office as both elected and appointed officials. In the religious sphere of Jewish life, the Conservative movement consolidated itself as the largest denomination (24 percent), but Reform Judaism began to emerge as the fastest-growing denomination (17 percent). Orthodoxy was the least popular denomination (7 percent) among American Jews belonging to synagogues (Lazerwitz, 1979).

Is the American Jewish family that distinctively different from the American family in general? Is it just the *American* middle-class family *par excellence*, or is it a variation of the traditional *Jewish* family? To some extent it is both. The American Jewish family is an amalgam of traditional Jewish roots transplanted to the fertile but rocky soil of the United States. For example, in the contemporary period the family embodies the American middle-class version of the nuclear family, yet it retains the Jewish characteristics of the interdependence rather than the separation of generations. As Sklare (1971: 87-89) has suggested, there is a movement away from this *extension* of family ties. Nevertheless, the growth of the *Havurah* (religious fellowship) movement may be distinctively Jewish response to this American challenge in that the *Havurah* represents a surrogate family that provides a sense of togetherness in the observance of Jewish festivals and rites of passage.

A question that frequently arises in reviewing the Jewish experience in America is how Jews managed to become so successful

so quickly in comparison to other groups that arrived at the same time (between 1880 and 1920) from Eastern or Southern Europe. Table 7.1 shows, for example, that one-third of American Jews in 1971 were professional owners and managers. Sometimes the question may imply that the success of the Jews can be explained by their stereotypical characteristics of being "too sly, too cunning in business, and too smart!" (Stereotypes generally include a positive redeeming virtue.) If we compare the situation of Jews to other religioethnic groups that arrived at more or less the same time, we find that Jews when they arrived were more urbanized, literate, and occupationally suited for the rapidly industrializing post-Civil War U.S. society. While migrants from other countries came from rural agricultural backgrounds where literacy was not common, Jews came from small towns and big cities; and while they generally could not read or write English, they could read or write Hebrew or Yiddish, Polish, Russian, or some other language. Moreover, the Jews found an ongoing Jewish community that had roots more than 200 years old. Furthermore, while many other migrants also came with a minority religious background — Catholicism — they initially encountered more anti-Catholic sentiment than anti-Semitism. In addition, Jews had less strong opposition to birth control than Catholics and more quickly limited their family size, which aided upward mobility. Finally, Jews came to the United States with thousands of years of accumulated sociocultural heritage in adapting as a minority group in a new society going back to the Babylonian and Roman Exiles. By contrast, for the disadvantaged Catholic migrants who arrived at about the same time this was the first experience with minority group status, that is, with living in a land where the language, religion, and culture that predominated were not their own. Of course, for Jews, as for some other groups, the principal institution that simultaneously provided socioemotional support as well as instrumental adaptiveness in a precarious new situation was the family.

The fact that each succeeding generation of American Jews became more assimilated was true for the Sephardim in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the German Jews in the nineteenth century, and the Eastern European Jews in the twentieth century. The major factor in halting the "straight line" of assimilation to the dominant Protestant culture was each successive wave of migration. While Jews go back over 300 years in American history, much of the organizational and denominational basis of Jewish life today is less than 100 years old.

What this brief overview of the family in the context of world and American Jewish history points out is the evolutionary nature of the social, cultural, and religious life of the Jewish people. The great



**TABLE 7.1 Demographic and Social Characteristics by Denominational Identification and Affiliation of Jewish Adults, NJPS, 1971**

Characteristics	Total Adult Sample	Orthodox Member		Conservative Member		Reform Member		No Identification	
		Member	Not Member	Member	Not Member	Member	Not Member	Member	Not Member
Sex — % Women	56%	57%	51%	54%	68%	56%	50%		
Age									
20-39 Years	30%	27%	27%	20%	24%	48%	37%		
60 and Over	27%	36%	24%	38%	24%	19%	29%		
Family Status									
Married with Children under 16 Years in Household	43%	30%	57%	29%	57%	38%	38%		
Generations in U.S.									
Foreign-Born	21%	52%	24%	27%	7%	11%	17%		
Both Parents U.S. Born	20%	5%	16%	13%	25%	24%	37%		
Socioeconomic Status									
College Grads.	35%	23%	34%	18%	52%	40%	41%		
Professional	33%	31%	30%	23%	39%	38%	38%		
Owners and Managers	29%	29%	44%	43%	20%	16%	17%		
Family Income \$20,000 or more	24%	16%	24%	12%	33%	28%	28%		
n	4,305	399	1,160	616	841	548	475		

SOURCE: Lazerwitz and Harrison (1979: 659). Reprinted by permission.

migrations and transformations have of necessity forced change on the Jewish family structure. The major problem for Jews throughout their history has been how to maintain — and for scholars, how to explain — the cohesiveness of community and the persistence of identity. Traditionally it has been the family that has linked individual Jews to the chain of generations of Jewish religious and communal life. Will it continue to be that cohesive link in 1984 and beyond? In the subsequent sections the current state of the American Jewish family will be assessed from a variety of perspectives, and the basis for an answer will be framed.

### **DEMOGRAPHIC DIMENSIONS: FERTILITY AND MORTALITY**

The Hebrew Bible or *Tanach* provides in the first chapter the traditional Jewish view of family size: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. 1:28). With this commandment the rabbis explained the obligations to provide for the care of children, including daily needs, education, and training for a trade or profession. Originally all these applied to sons only, but in later times they applied to daughters as well. In recent generations, as American Jews have become more middle and upper-middle class, they have adopted the custom of smaller family size, being concerned more with the quality of care and education of the children than with the quantity of births or high fertility.

Of course, it is a long way from the Biblical view of fertility in the Book of Genesis to *Look* magazine's article on "The Vanishing American Jew." (Morgan, 1964), which noted the decline of Jewish fertility among other variables as contributing to the disappearance of American Jews. Fortunately for American Jews, *Look* disappeared before they did. Nevertheless, the issue of Jewish fertility remains very central to the size and proportion of the Jewish population in the United States.

Goldstein (1974, 1980) has reviewed the available literature comparing Jewish fertility to that of other Americans. He reports that as early as the late nineteenth century the Jewish birthrate was lower than that of other religious groups. Reliable data on the American Jewish population as a whole are difficult to obtain. While the decennial U.S. Census is forbidden by law to ask questions about religion, a sample population survey was conducted in 1957. It confirmed the previous findings of other more small-scale studies. While the cumulative fertility rate (of women 45 years of age and over) was 3.1 for Catholics and 2.8 for Protestants, it was only 2.2 for Jews. This figure is very close to the 2.1 figure usually associated with the

notion of zero population growth (ZPG), which needs to be sustained for 70 years. Indeed, Goldstein (1974: 107) concludes: "For the immediate future, all available evidence continues to point to inadequate birth levels among Jews, insuring little more than token growth. This being so, the total Jewish population is not likely to increase rapidly beyond its present six million level."<sup>8</sup>

The natural increase of a population is not just dependent upon fertility but also on *mortality*. Goldstein (1974: 102) reports that "differences exist between the age-specific death rates, life expectancy, and survival patterns of Jews and of the total white population, generally more so for males than for females." For example, Jewish mortality is lower in the younger age categories and higher in older age categories. Nevertheless, Goldstein (1980, 1974) concludes that the existing differences are not sufficient to account for the slow rate of natural increase of the Jewish population. Lower-than-average fertility for Jews compared to the rest of the American population remains an important aspect of family life and continues to be an issue of concern in the organized Jewish community.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, while most Jews have adhered to the ZPG movement, consciously or not, others have argued that Jews have a special right to exempt themselves from this moral and social concern, since one-third of the world's Jewish population was destroyed by the Nazis during the Holocaust. They have emphasized that on the eve of World War II there were 18 million Jews in the world, and by the end of the war only 12 million remained. In the ensuing postwar period, over nearly 4 decades, the world Jewish population is estimated to have risen only to about 14 million. At that rate with no increase in fertility it will take another 75-80 years for the world Jewish population to reach the level it had already attained in 1939!

## **SOCIOLOGICAL SCENE: MIGRATION AND MOBILITY**

As the introductory sections have suggested, migration is central to an understanding of the dynamics of Jewish history, society, and family life. The first extant written attempt to explain the emergence of the Jewish people begins with the twelfth chapter of Genesis (12:1): "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will show thee." The emergence of an independent Jewish state with its own legal system was associated with a second migration, the Exodus from slavery in Egypt. Successive waves of suffering, oppression, destruction, exile, and return migration punctuated the course of Jewish history so frequently that migration has become a regular pattern of Jewish life.

While much of the migratory experience of Jews has been of necessity, today much migration is by choice (see Elazar, 1982).

In the American experience immigration has served to invigorate the institutions and culture of American Jewry, as in the case first of the German and later of the great Eastern European migration. Nevertheless, such migration has slowed down in the contemporary period. Indeed, while in earlier periods the migrants were more traditionally oriented than the natives, recent migrations of Soviet and Israeli Jews have brought less traditionally oriented persons. Much of the significant migration in the Jewish community has been internal, either of interurban or intraurban types.

The behavioral dimensions of migration and geographic mobility can take many forms. One indicator is place of birth. As Goldstein (1974) has pointed out, a number of studies in Detroit, Providence, and Springfield found that from two-fifths to two-thirds of persons living in these communities were born elsewhere.

A second dimension of mobility involves the regional redistribution of population. Farber et al. (1981) report that since World War I the northeastern and north central states have lost Jewish population to the southern and western regions, especially Florida and California. For example, between 1930 and 1980 the northeastern states' Jewish population has declined from 68 percent to 57 percent of the national total, and the north central states from 20 percent to 12 percent. In the same period the population in the South grew from 8 percent to 16 percent, and the West had a whopping increase from 4 percent to 15 percent (1930 figures from Farber et al., 1981; 1980 figures from Chenkin and Miran, 1980).

A third indicator of mobility is length of residence. Here Goldstein (1974) reports a high degree of residential mobility based on studies in Boston and Milwaukee, where approximately 50 percent to 60 percent of the population had lived at their current address for less than ten years.

Within urban areas a fourth aspect of geographic mobility has been the suburbanization movement, which began to flourish in the post-World War II period. Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) found that Jewish suburbanites have higher rates of intermarriage, nonaffiliation, and no Jewish education, and lower scores of ritual observance than city residents. Nevertheless, most research suggests that synagogue (or church) attendance tends to increase as people move to the suburbs.

A fifth dimension to understanding mobility and migration is that of the density of the Jewish population. In a study of the Jewish community of Columbus, Ohio, Mayer (1970) found only about one-fourth of the population lived in a neighborhood that was 50 percent

Jewish. Nevertheless, respondents preferred living in sections with a higher proportion of Jews, such as a 50-50 split. Jews living in the more concentrated areas tended to have higher levels of traditional beliefs and practices. Yet in a study of St. Paul, Minnesota, Dashefsky and Shapiro (1971) found that living in a Jewish neighborhood was significantly correlated with a higher level of Jewish identification only for an older generation studied, not for the younger generation. This was so even though 77 percent of the older generation lived in the Jewish neighborhood, and only 45 percent of the younger generation did. Perhaps the interpersonal dimension (the number of close friends who are Jewish) may be more crucial than the ecological dimension (residence), especially in small to medium-sized Jewish communities.

What has precipitated these rapid changes in migration and mobility? Largely they have resulted from economic changes in the larger society and in the Jewish community. The growth of industrial, commercial, and technological enterprises in the South and West has produced a demand for highly educated personnel. At the same time, second-, third-, and fourth-generation Jews were increasingly pursuing higher education, which is the gateway to other jobs. The result has been a growing dependence of Jews in the professional and managerial sectors on employment in bureaucratic organizations, such as corporations, government agencies, and universities, where transfers and career growth frequently require repeated moves.

What then are the effects of mobility on the individual and family life? Some research suggests that it takes as long as five years for a migrant to achieve the same levels of participation in a community as a native (Zimmer, 1955). Consequently, mobility may attenuate ties to Judaism and the Jewish community, and further reduce socioemotional support to the family on the move.

On the other hand, the movement of migrants into smaller Jewish communities may serve to heighten the family members' own sense of Jewish identity and in turn strengthen the Jewish community.<sup>10</sup> As Goldstein (1974: 139) has stated: "All this suggests the need for greater concern with the role of migration than of intermarriage in the future of American Judaism. The latter may largely be only a by-product."

### **SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: FAMILY AND IDENTITY TRANSMISSION<sup>11</sup>**

It is a sociological axiom that the family is the basic agent of socialization. However, some sociologists note a lessening influence

of the family on its members. While recognizing that the family "has been the prime mechanism for transmitting Jewish identity," Sklare (1971: 99) argues further: "This system of identity-formation is currently on the decline. The emerging crisis of the Jewish family in identity-formation is in part due to the newer limitations on the family as a socialization agent — limitations that affect all other Americans as well." Even if one grants this, it appears that the family is still the most important factor in Jewish identification. Furthermore, the family is not only the chief "mechanism" by which this attitude is transmitted, but the most important *source* of Jewish identification as well. In other words, the content of family life, the attitudes and practices of family members, contain many of the transmitted elements of Jewish identification. This appears to be what Sebald (1968: 290) means when he writes, "Jewish family life is interwoven with ethnic practices, thus giving children the immense psychological benefit of a number of meaningful rituals and ceremonies that mark religious observances, holidays, family events, and rites of passage."

Starting with Mead (1934), the notion of the attitudes and expectations of others as a central element in the formation of an individual's attitudes has been central to sociological social psychology. The literature on roles emphasizes the effect of expectations on the individual's behavior (see Biddle and Thomas, 1966) and those of significant others are the most important. Based on this perspective, Dashefsky and Shapiro (1974) assessed the degree to which family members perceived by their respondents as significant others expected them to participate in Jewish activities during adolescence. The measure used, an Index of Jewish Expectations (IJE), was correlated to the Jewish Identification (JI) scale and was statistically significant.<sup>12</sup>

The Index of Jewish Expectations indicates something of the extent to which the family's, and particularly the parents', attitudes were important for Jewish identification. It does not reveal, however, the extent to which individuals actually engaged in Jewish-related activities with their parents. A number of leading attitude theorists have argued and provided evidence for viewing behavior as a determinant of attitudes in contrast to the more popular opposite view (Festinger, 1957; Bem, 1970). They see attitudes as forming to coincide and be consistent with the actual behavior of the individual. Dashefsky and Shapiro (1974) measured Jewish activities undertaken with one's parents during adolescence. They found that their Index of Jewish Activities was significantly correlated with the Jewish Identification Scale.<sup>13</sup>

Family members constitute the primary significant others and reference groups for most Jewish adolescents. The family provides

both the mechanism and the content for Jewish identification. This is true in spite of much popular reference to the "generation gap." Dashefsky and Shapiro found the family's expectations that their son participate in Jewish activities (measured by an Index of Jewish Expectations) and the actual activities that the adolescent engaged in with his parents (measured by an Index of Jewish Activities) to be determinants of Jewish identification. Both family expectations and activities with parents were significantly related to the Jewish Identification scale. Focusing on individual family members as significant others, they found that those respondents having older brothers had significantly higher JI scale scores than those who did not. The most important individual in the family was, however, as one would expect for sons, the father. In particular, the father's religiosity and the father's own JI scale score were related to the respondent's JI scale score.

In sum, Dashefsky and Shapiro found family, peers, and Jewish education in that order to be key determinants of Jewish identification. Indeed, in their final regression analysis of family influence over Jewish identification, they were able to explain 28 percent of the variance in their measure of Jewish identification. Of this total amount, family variables explained about two-thirds or 18 percent, with friends' expectations explaining 6 percent and Jewish education 4 percent. This means that the family was 3 times as important as friends, and 4.5 times as important as Jewish schooling. These prior socialization variables, however, become less significant in the explanation as they provide a framework for subsequent adult patterns of Jewish identification through religious organizational involvement, primarily in synagogue life.

While the family remains the most important agent of socialization to Jewish identification, its ability to function in this way depends in part on the internal dynamics of the life-cycle change and the external pressures of societal change. Sklare and Greenblum (1967) report that when the children reach school age, more active involvement in the Jewish community is noted. Cohen (1981), in analyzing data from a 1975 Boston community study, found a decline in Jewish involvement associated with the growth of alternative households — singles, childless, and divorced. Nevertheless, while the family plays the primary role in identity formation more or less effectively (depending on the stage of the life cycle or degree of conventionality), other communal institutions provide a framework for reinforcing Jewish identification (Waxman, 1982). Such institutions would include the synagogue, Jewish schools, and youth programs after school and at summer camps. All of these socialization factors may leave a lasting imprint on Jews that distinguish them from their neighbors.

### **CLINICAL CONTEXT: PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF CHILD REARING AND FAMILY LIVING**

From a clinical point of view, religioethnic attachment involves conscious and unconscious processes that fulfill a deep psychological need for identity and a sense of historical continuity. It is transmitted by an emotional language within the family and reinforced by the surrounding community (Giordano and Giordano, 1977). It is a profound and abiding aspect of human experience.

As McGoldrick (1982) has suggested, there are a number of factors that influence the way ethnic or religioethnic patterns surface in families:

- (1) the reasons for immigration, that is, what the family was seeking and what it was leaving behind (religious or political persecution, poverty, wish for adventure, and so on)'
- (2) the length of time since immigration and the impact of generational acculturation conflicts on the family;
- (3) the family's place of residence — whether or not the family lives or has lived in a homogeneous neighborhood;
- (4) the order of migration — whether one family member migrated alone or whether a large portion of the family, community, or nation came together;
- (5) the socioeconomic status, education, and upward mobility of family members;
- (6) the political and religious ties to the group;
- (7) the language spoken by family members;
- (8) the extent of exogamous marriage; and
- (9) the family members' attitudes toward the values of the group.

Religioethnic differences not only persist as family life phenomena but are probably more crucial in the area of child rearing than previously believed. Research to date indicates that different groups do differ not only in their behavioral approaches to child rearing, but in their expectations and aspirations for their children as well (see Bartz and Le Vine, 1978; Caudill and Frost, 1972; Freedman, 1979; Greenglass, 1971). For example, Freedman's (1979) research indicates that these differences do not disappear after a generation or two, but can be observed in fourth- and fifth-generation Americans. Thus, based on the differing structures of families in our culture, it is understandable that different cultural trends would affect these forms differently.



Some of these trends may be described psychodynamically, especially in the case of the Jews. Because of their socioeconomic status, Jews are more likely to rely on some forms of psychotherapy. For example, Herz and Rosen (1982) state that Jews are also more willing than members of other ethnic groups to accept a family definition of their problems. Moreover, Jewish parents tend to have democratic relationships with their children and less rigid generational boundaries than most other groups. Psychotherapists describe Jews as placing high value on verbal explanations and reasoning in child rearing. Therefore, therapists are asked to be alert to the meaning of parents' desire to reason out issues and to be sensitive to the pride that Jewish parents take in their children's verbal skills, intelligence, and ability to think things out logically (Herz and Rosen, 1982).

Clinicians list some typical characteristics of Jews who are in therapy that reveal aspects of family life:

- (1) Jews will value talk, insight, and recognition of complex levels of meaning.
- (2) They value the gaining of wisdom and have a long tradition of consulting with a wise person, or several wise people, always remaining themselves the final judges of the opinions they hear.
- (3) Raising successful children is the major responsibility of the parents, particularly the mother; and underachievement or more serious problems are often felt to reflect not only on the family but on the ethnic group as a whole.
- (4) Parents are expected to make great sacrifices for their children, and when children grow up they are expected to repay their parents in *naches*, a special pleasure one gets only from the success and happiness of one's children (Herz and Rosen, 1982).

Jewish-Americans, in particular, seem more affected by the "crisis of expert testimony" than other groups. Many Jewish parents seem preoccupied with doing what is "psychologically right" for their children. Jewish parents (and particularly Jewish women) also seem to have particular difficulties with separation issues. Based on the strong dependence that Jewish women have traditionally sustained with their children (Blau, 1974), some now appear highly conflicted about the desirability of leaving their children to pursue personal careers or goals and often seem guilty over whichever path they choose.

Indeed, one of the most popular themes in depicting Jewish family life has been that of the self-sacrificing Jewish mother, who raised successful sons as doctors, lawyers, professionals, and businessmen. These same women today, however, who have internalized the values

of success and education, now have the opportunity to succeed on their own (Herz and Rosen, 1982). Perhaps the extent to which their husbands support them in their choices and the children in child rearing will determine the specific outcome.

By contrast, Irish-American women, for example, appear very concerned with issues related to discipline. Right and wrong are very important to the value system in which these women grew up, and changing from a traditionally "strict" family style is often confusing and difficult for them. Nevertheless, respect for the authority of the father remains very important in black, Italian, and Hispanic families. How to integrate this respect into new family patterns perhaps more permissive and egalitarian than their own families seems especially stressful.

Observers have noted significant differences between those who are actively involved in a religioethnic community and those who are not. Parents living within a tight-knit community seem on the surface less conflicted than those who do not live in such communities. Thus, for example, one does not find readily apparent the same soul-searching about child-rearing practices among many Orthodox Jewish parents. There is an acceptance of a basic value system rooted in an entire system of belief. Thus there is some place to turn for support as the community sets a standard and strives to support members in their attempts to sustain themselves within the value system.

This sense of security has also been observed among Irish Catholics who have maintained strong ties to the church and among blacks who are actively involved in church life. Moreover, clinicians and parents alike report that religioethnic background and family history become quite influential in times of stress. People report that they act in ways totally out of character with their *intended* child-rearing style when they are under stress. They "hear themselves saying things that their parents said" and that they "swore they would never say" to their own children. Lack of awareness of the strong influence of one's past often leads to guilt and ambivalence about a person's ability in child rearing.

What concerns many leaders and members of the organized Jewish community is how to reconcile changing sex roles and still retain the relatively successful model of family cohesion and high achievement of children. The retention of these prized elements of traditional family life seem threatened by the growing incidence of separation, divorce, and intermarriage. Additional research may yield clues to a better understanding of the dynamics of Jewish family cohesion and disruption.

## THE EROSION OF JEWISH FAMILIAL AND COMMUNAL LIFE: ROLE OF DIVORCE AND INTERMARRIAGE

In their study of Eastern European Jews, Zborowski and Herzog (1952: 290) comment on the sacredness of marriage in Jewish society:

Marriage is both the climax and the threshold. From birth on every step is directed with an eye to the [k]hupa [marriage canopy], and if that goal were missed, life itself would seem to be bypassed. Once attained, however, marriage is merely the background for the great goal, the great achievement, the great gratification — children.

Indeed marriage is seen in Jewish tradition as a sacred act, and the Hebrew word for it, *kiddushin*, comes from the Hebrew root, *holy*. While divorce is permitted in Jewish religious law, it traditionally has not been regarded positively. In his qualitative study, *Divorce and the Jewish Child*, Cottle (1981) even found one child who thought divorce was against Jewish law and not permitted.

Many popular commentators and scholars have suggested that in the past decade or two a crisis has gripped the Jewish family. Forces that have disrupted the cohesiveness of the American family in general have penetrated to the Jewish family. Indeed, as one sociologist has suggested, the Jewish family is on the “SCIDs,” that is, single, childless, intermarried, and divorced; still, Jews have increased in numbers, as the New York Jewish population survey reveals (Cohen, 1982).

No current national data exist, however, to compare Jewish and non-Jewish divorce rates. Nevertheless, Goldstein (1974), in examining the 1957 U.S. sample census that included a question on religion, found that the proportion of divorced persons in the total population was nearly twice as great as the proportion for Jews. For males the proportion divorced for the total population was 1.8 percent, compared to 1 percent for Jews; for females it was 2.3 percent for the total population and 1.4 percent for Jews. In their study of the Providence Jewish Community, Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968: 108) found a “*lack of clear-cut generation changes and the general stability of Jewish families in such generation.*”

Relying on more recent data (NORC surveys of 1977-1978), Cohen (1981) reports that the proportion of ever divorced in the 35-44 age group was 20 percent for Protestants, 15 percent for Catholics, and 10 percent for Jews (the highest proportion for any age category, with 5 percent for the 55-64 age category being the lowest percentage). While these percentages are substantially higher for Jews than reported overall in the 1957 U.S. sample census, they are also higher for

non-Jews. Certainly they are not as high as some might expect, given the reports in the mass media. This may be so because the popular figure frequently cited is the ratio of current divorces to marriages, rather than the ratio of divorces to ever-married individuals. As Cohen (1981: 144) concludes, "While Jews (like Christians) are divorcing more frequently than they have in the past, they are still divorcing less often than their non-Jewish counterparts. Moreover, the proportional gap between Jewish and non-Jewish divorce rates has been remaining steady, since non-Jewish rates have climbed faster than Jewish ones."

The effects of divorce on the religioethnic identity of the children appear varied. As one teenage boy told Cottle (1981: 5): "When my father told me they were separating and would probably get divorced, one of the first crazy thoughts I had . . . was well, you don't have to be Jewish anymore." On the other hand, a teenage girl told Cottle (1981: 21): "I'm staying [at the temple religious school] because everything having to do with being Jewish is the only thing not being moved around."

The equally vexing question of intermarriage, and its effects on Jewish family life, has been the subject of much controversy in the organized Jewish community as well as among the researchers who study it. The traditional Jewish response of the parent whose child intermarries has been to observe many of the practices associated with mourning for the deceased. In addition, conversion of non-Jews has generally not been encouraged.

Most studies have found a relatively low *overall* rate of intermarriage. According to Lazerwitz's (1981) analysis of the 1971 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS), 7 percent of ever-married Jews had or were intermarried.<sup>14</sup> Generally, intermarriage in the Jewish community is viewed as the marriage of one spouse not born of Jewish background and one spouse who is of Jewish background. This is a sociocultural definition and not a Jewish legal or religious definition.

Local community studies usually reveal an increase of proportions of intermarried persons for more recent generations. The most dramatic evidence of a possibly radical change in Jewish adherence to endogamy was the NJPS finding, as reported by Lazerwitz (1981), that the proportion of Jewish persons who intermarried in the most recent period was 14 percent of married Jews under age 35 (twice the overall rate). Some recent community studies have found even higher rates.<sup>15</sup> Such intermarriage is more likely to occur for individuals who have achieved only low levels of Jewish education, have lived in areas of lesser Jewish population, and have come from backgrounds with low levels of religious observance and other forms of Jewish identification.

The increased intermarriage raises the question of whether it is a threat to Jewish family cohesion and Jewish community survival. As a study prepared for the American Jewish Committee by Mayer and Sheingold (1979: 30) found: "Differences of religious background do not seem to contribute to estrangement from parents or to conflicts in family decision-making, including decisions about child-rearing. Relationships between both born-Jewish and born-Gentile respondents and their parents were consistently reported to be close and harmonious."

With respect to the effect of intermarriage on Jewish community survival, however, there is a falling off of the intention to give a Jewish education, comparing in-married (85 percent) to intermarried persons (71 percent) as reported by Massarik and Chenkin (1973). Furthermore, in-married adults are more religiously observant than those in mixed marriages and more organizationally involved.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that a major variable explaining the subsequent relationship of the intermarried family with respect to the Jewish community depends on whether the Gentile spouse converts to Judaism. As Mayer and Sheingold (1979: 29) found:

On every index of Jewish attitudes and practice, couples whose born-Gentile spouses have converted to Judaism scored higher than other intermarried couples. Indeed, based on what is known about the religious and ethnic life in endogamous marriages, the family life of conversionary marriages is more consciously Jewish, both in religious practice and in formal and informal Jewish acculturation of children.

The factor most responsible for the Jewishness of intermarried families — including the conversion of the born-Gentile spouse — would seem to be the extent of Jewish background, knowledge and commitment of the born-Jewish spouse.

Finally, Mayer and Sheingold (1979: 30) conclude:

The findings summarized above tend to reinforce the fear that intermarriage represents a threat to Jewish continuity. Most non-Jewish spouses do not convert to Judaism; the level of Jewish content and practice in mixed marriages is low; only about one-third of the Jewish partners in such marriages view their children as Jewish; and most such children are exposed to little by way of Jewish culture or religion.

All of this suggests that despite much research on the subject of intermarriage, there is still more research that needs to be done,

especially to examine its effects on the children.<sup>16</sup> But as Goldscheider (1982: 39-40) has reminded us:

It is not the level of Jewish intermarriage per se that challenges the sociodemographic survival of Jews in America. . . . Rather it is the specific demographic context within which intermarriage rates operate in America that is of paramount significance. The combination of low fertility, geographic dispersion, minimum potential sources of population renewal . . . declines in family cohesion, *and* relatively high intermarriage rates have resulted in issues associated with the demographic vitality of Jewish Americans.

All of this evidence suggests that intermarriage, divorce, and the other factors cited are symptoms and not causes of the erosion of Jewish familial and communal life in a rapidly changing society wherein urbanization, secularization, bureaucratization, industrialization, and assimilation have predominated during the recent past. Certainly more research is needed to uncover the complex interrelationships of the variables studied. Indeed, the facts suggest that the family alone is not able to function as a socialization agent as effectively as in the past without external supports.

### **FAMILY CONSERVATION: THE JEWISH EXPERIENCE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR OTHER RELIGIOETHNIC GROUPS**

The significance of the family for Jewish life has been that it has served as the crucial link in building a relationship between the Jewish identity of the individual and the larger Jewish community. Now, perhaps more than ever, the family in general needs to have the social support of other communal institutions within the particular religioethnic community as well as society at large.

The case of the Jewish family is particularly illuminating because despite its centuries of sociocultural experience in cushioning minority group status, it is afflicted by all of the woes of modernity, with some special strains brought about by the even greater rapidity in Jewish life of occupational, geographic, and sex-role changes. Jewish adaptability has in the past been a virtue, but current adaptations may have disastrous consequences for Jewish family life.

In addition, the Jewish family's nurturing function has been weakened by the diminution of close relationships with grandparents and other relatives and the emotional intensification of relationships between parents and children. Sklare (1971: 100) acknowledges that while the Jewish family may have been weakened in its capacity to rear and sustain emotionally stable individuals, "it is the shrinking

contribution of the family to Jewish identity-transmission that constitutes its essential weakness." This weakness arose due to the combination of high acculturation of Jewish parents and the limited access to more Jewishly committed and competent relatives. Sklare notes that even the extended family has been diminished in its capacity to assure Jewish distinctiveness, partly as a result of the process of acculturation and also because of the effects of the growing rate of intermarriage. Very few Jewish family networks do not have non-Jewish members, whose presence tends to result in some dilution of the centrality of Jewish customs and practices.

Beginning in the 1970s, there was a reaction against the disintegrative drift in the Jewish community and a movement to preserve Jewish family life. A new consensus emerged even among "liberal" Jewish analysts, rooted in Tevye's call in *Fiddler on the Roof*: "Tradition." How to integrate tradition with change became a concern not just of the more traditional Jewish groups but also of the less traditional.

In *Consultation on the Jewish Family*, the American Jewish Committee (1977: 3) discusses the relationship of the family to Jewish identity and community:

It is fruitless to compare "traditional" and modern families in an arbitrary fashion. It is important, however, to consider and define the acceptable range of Jewish family structures at various periods and recognize the changing norms. It would then be possible to recognize a variety of family structures which are "resonant with Jewish perspective" and allow for continuity.

If the Jewish family is to serve as a vehicle of Jewish identity transmission, then it must be expected to resist external pressures of current trends and apply some of the constraints of tradition.

The organized Jewish community has had some experience in adapting to the changing needs of families. While some of these experiences may apply more to the specific needs of the Jewish family, the following series of suggestions may have application to other religioethnic communities. These suggestions are based in part on a report by the American Jewish Committee's Jewish Communal Affairs Department on the consultation mentioned above (American Jewish Committee, 1977: 18-20).

The first set of suggestions focuses on creating structural conditions for helping families cope with changing roles, by:

- (1) upgrading parenting and recognizing the societal benefits of child care by providing *social security coverage* and/or other *pension and disability benefits* for the primary homecare person as well as supporting in particular the responsibility of the father as a nurturant parent;

- (2) providing *quality day care facilities*;
- (3) promoting *flexi-time job opportunities*;
- (4) developing *family support systems* by bringing into the home retired men and women as surrogate grandparents;
- (5) encouraging the development of *extrafamilial support systems*, such as the Marriage Encounter movement (and the Jewish community's *Havurah* or fellowship movement), which are ongoing group structures that provide an opportunity for the intimate expression of family and/or marital solidarity;
- (6) creating "*welcome wagon*" programs (such as the Jewish community's "*shalom wagon*") within the particular religioethnic community to integrate newcomers; and
- (7) recognizing the special needs of *single and divorced persons* and providing special programs for them oriented toward coping with family living as well as integrating them into community events frequented usually by intact families.

The second set of suggestions focuses on offering cultural opportunities through educational programs, by:

- (1) providing *family education programs* that emphasize sharing aspects of the particular religiocultural tradition in a relaxed and informal family setting at a weekend retreat (a "Shabbaton" in the Jewish community) or an afternoon family holiday preparation program (as in a "Hanukkah workshop," where the families work together to make holiday ceremonial objects and prepare for the observance of the holiday in the home);
- (2) elevating the stature of *formal religioethnic education* for youth with an emphasis on the positive experiential aspects of the particular tradition and the role of the family (as in the "Hebrew school");
- (3) supplementing the formal with *informal religioethnic education* through teen and youth programs after school, on weekends, and in summer camps (as in Hebrew-speaking and other Jewish religious and cultural camps);
- (4) utilizing the *mass media* to illustrate ways in which the religioethnic tradition can enrich family living; and
- (5) offering *courses in family-living skills* in high schools and colleges — both public and private.

Many of these kinds of activities need to be pursued not just in the specific religioethnic community but in the general community as well. Governmental agencies can have a role to play in protecting



young children and ensuring them the opportunity for healthy development. Private religious and welfare agencies certainly should have a role in the establishment of national as well as local family centers to focus attention on the family. Such family centers could coordinate needed research, assess social policies, provide public relations, and develop educational and training programs for effective family living (American Jewish Committee, 1977: 20). Indeed, the American Jewish Committee, for example, took its consultation report seriously and established a National Jewish Family Center shortly thereafter.

Finally, we come back to the issues raised in the beginning sections of this chapter. Will the family disintegrate? Will the fiddler fall off the roof? Will the cohesiveness of community and the persistence of identity endure among Jews? It appears likely that the family will endure although the proportion of conventional families in the population will decline. It is likely that the Jewish family, though altered — as it was many times before — will continue as the primary socialization agent, although it will need more assistance from other societal agents and communal support systems to function effectively.

You may ask whether this is a pessimistic or optimistic account of family life. Do you remember the difference between the pessimist and the optimist? As one pundit put it, “The pessimist sees the difficulty in every opportunity; the optimist sees the opportunity in every difficulty.” Perhaps, through wise planning and investment of resources, the community can create the support systems to sustain the family to “stay on course” in a time of change. Thus, in that way, the fiddler will not fall from the roof.

## NOTES

1. The *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971) article on the family provides a detailed account of the traditional Jewish family as seen in the Bible and post-Biblical literature and provides a basis for this section of the chapter.

2. TaNaCH is a Hebrew acronym used to refer to the Bible. T stands for *Torah*, or the Five Books of Moses (“Pentateuch”); N for *Neviim*, or the eight books of “Prophets”; and CH (K) for *Ketuvim*, the Hagiographa or eleven additional “Writings.”

3. The common Biblical and modern Hebrew word for wife is *ishah*, or “woman,” and the Hebrew word for husband is *baal*, or “master.” Nevertheless, one rabbi observed that when the Hebrew letter *yod* is removed from the word for man *ish*, the remaining letters spell the Hebrew word for “fire,” *esh*. Similarly, remove the Hebrew letter, *hai*, from the word “woman,” *ishah*, and the remainder also spells the Hebrew word for fire, *esh*. But the two removed Hebrew letters *yod* and *hai* spell a Hebrew word for God, *Yah*. This implies, sermonized the rabbi, that when God departs from the marriage, only the fire of contention remains.

4. Quoted in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971: 1170).

5. Quoted in the *Encyclopedia Judaica* (1971: 1171).
6. An excellent account of Jewish life in the middle ages is provided by Abrahams (1958).
7. A good social history of American Judaism is provided by Glazer (1957), whose work provides the basis for this section of the chapter.
8. Other reports such as that of Della Pergola (1980) estimate that Jewish fertility in the early 1970s was below replacement level. Cohen (1981) also reports lower Jewish fertility compared to Protestants and Catholics based on an examination in part of NORC General Social Surveys 1972-1978. There is, however, about one-quarter of the Jewish community who tend to have higher fertility than the rest; these are persons who attend synagogue frequently and who have an Orthodox or Conservative preference (Lazerwitz, 1980). Indeed, Waxman (1982) suggests that some segments of the American Jewish population, such as members of the various Hasidic sects and other Orthodox Jews, are underrepresented in sample surveys; and they tend to have much larger families than is typical of the rest of Jews.
9. For a more in-depth analysis of Jewish mortality and fertility with comparisons to Protestants and Catholics see Goldscheider (1982).
10. Additional details are available in Goldstein (1980) and Goldscheider (1982).
11. This section is adapted from Dashefsky and Shapiro (1974: 53-55, 58), with permission of the coauthor.
12.  $r = .30$ .
13.  $r = .24$ .
14. Massarik and Chenkin (1973) report 9 percent also using NJPS data.
15. For example, Farber et al. (1979) report that for persons aged 20-24 in metropolitan Kansas City in 1976, 70 percent of males and 45 percent of females had intermarried (as reported by their parents). Of those aged 25-29, 39 percent of males and 23 percent of females had intermarried, and of those aged 45-64, 30 percent of males and 6 percent of females had intermarried. Of course, Kansas City is not necessarily a prototypical community.
16. At the time of this writing, the American Jewish Committee was in the process of evaluating recent data on the effects of intermarriage on the children.

## REFERENCES

- Abrahams, I. (1958) *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*. New York: Meridian. (Originally published in 1896.)
- American Jewish Committee (1977) *Consultation on the Jewish Family: Its Role in Jewish Identity and Continuity*. New York: Institute of Human Relations.
- Bartz, K. W. and E. S. LeVine (1978) "Childrearing by black parents: a description and comparison to Anglo and Chicano parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 40 (November): 709-719.
- Bem, D.J. (1970) *Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Biddle, B.J. and E.J. Thomas (1966) *Role Theory: Concepts and Research*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blau, Z. S. (1974) "The strategy of the Jewish mother," pp. 167-187 in M. Sklare (ed.) *The Jew in American Society*. New York: Behrman House.
- Caudill, W. and N. Frost (1972) "A comparison of maternal care in infant behavior in Japanese American and Japanese families," pp. 329-342 in U. Bronfenbrenner (ed.) *Influences on Human Development*. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden.
- Chenkin, A. and M. Miran (1980) "Jewish population in the United States," pp. 170-171 in M. Himmelfarb and D. Singer (eds.) *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Cohen, S. M. (1982) "The demographic dimension." Presented at the International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization, Jerusalem, June.

- (1981) "The American Jewish family today," pp. 136-154 in M. Himmelfarb and D. Singer (eds.) *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 82. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Cottle, T.J. (1981) *Divorce and the Jewish Child*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Dashefsky, A. and H.M. Shapiro (1974) *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- (1971) *The Jewish Community of St. Paul*. St. Paul, MN: United Jewish Fund and Council.
- Della Pergola, S. (1980) "Patterns of American Jewish fertility." *Demography* 17, 3: 261-274.
- Elazar, D. (1982) "Jews on the move: the new wave of Jewish migration and its implications for organized Jewry." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 58 (Summer): 279-283.
- Encyclopedia Judaica (1971) "Family." Vol. 6: 1164-1172.
- Farber, B., L. Gordon, and A.J. Mayer (1979) "Intermarriage and Jewish identity: the implications for pluralism and assimilation in American society." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2 (April): 222-230.
- Farber, B., C. H. Mindel, and B. Lazerwitz (1981) "The Jewish American family," pp. 350-383 in C. H. Mindel and R. W. Habenstein (eds.) *Ethnic Families in America*. New York: Elsevier.
- Festinger, L. (1957) *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Freedman, D. (1979) "Ethnic differences in babies." *Human Nature* 2 (January): 36-43.
- Giordano, J. and G. Giordano (1977) *Ethnocultural Factors in Mental Health*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Glazer, N. (1957) *American Judaism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldscheider, C. (1982) "Demography of Jewish Americans: research findings, issues, and challenges," pp. 1-55 in M. Sklare (ed.) *Understanding American Jewry*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Goldstein, S. (1980) "Jews in the United States: perspectives from demography," pp. 3-59 in M. Himmelfarb and D. Singer (eds.) *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 81. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- (1974) "American Jewry, 1970: a demographic profile," pp. 97-162 in M. Sklare (ed.) *The Jew in American Society*. New York: Behrman House.
- and C. Goldscheider (1968) *Jewish Americans*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greenglass, E. R. (1971) "A cross-cultural comparison of maternal communication." *Child Development* 42, 3: 685-692.
- Herz, F. M. and E. J. Rosen (1982) "Jewish families," pp. 364-392 in M. McGoldrick et al. (eds.) *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Lazerwitz, B. (1981) "Jewish-Christian marriages and conversions." *Jewish Social Studies* 43, 1: 31-46.
- (1980) "Religiosity and fertility: how strong a connection?" *Contemporary Jewry* 5, 1: 56-63.
- (1979) "Past and future trends in the size of American Jewish denominations." *Journal of Reform Judaism* 26 (Summer): 77-82.
- and M. Harrison (1979) "American Jewish denominations: a social and religious profile." *American Sociological Review* 44 (August): 656-666.
- McGoldrick, M. (1982) "Ethnicity and family therapy: an overview," pp. 13-30 in M. McGoldrick et al. (eds.) *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Massarik, F. and A. Chenkin (1973) "United States National Jewish Population Study: a first report," pp. 264-306 in M. Fine and M. Himmelfarb (eds.) *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 74. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Mayer, A.J. (1970) *Columbus Jewish Population Study: 1969*. Columbus, OH: Jewish Welfare Federation.

- Mayer, E. and C. Sheingold (1979) *Intermarriage and the Jewish Future*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, T. B. (1964) "The vanishing American Jew." *Look* (May 5): 4288.
- Patai, R. (1977) *The Jewish Mind*. New York: Scribner.
- Sachar, H. M. (1958) *The Course of Modern Jewish History*. New York: Dell.
- Sebald, H. (1968) *Adolescence: A Sociological Analysis*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Sklare, M. (1971) *American Jews*. New York: Random House.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and J. Greenblum (1967) *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*. New York: Basic Books.
- Waxman, C. I. (1982) "The family and the American Jewish community on the threshold of the 1980's: an inventory for planning," pp. 163-185 in M. Sklare (ed.) *Understanding American Jewry*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Zborowski, M. and E. Herzog (1952) *Life Is With People*. New York: Schocken.
- Zimmer, B. (1955) "Participation of migrants in urban structures." *American Sociological Review* 20, 2: 218-224.