

THE AVRAHAM HARMAN INSTITUTE
OF CONTEMPORARY JEWRY
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY
OF JERUSALEM

MODERN JEWS
AND THEIR
MUSICAL AGENDAS

STUDIES IN
CONTEMPORARY
JEWRY
AN ANNUAL
IX

1993

Edited by Ezra Mendelsohn

Published for the Institute by
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
New York • Oxford

Education for Jewish Girls in the East: A
Portrait of the Galata School in Istanbul,
1879–1912

Esther Benbassa
(UNIVERSITY OF PARIS-SORBONNE)

The Galata School in Istanbul belonged to the educational network set up by the Alliance Israélite Universelle during the years 1862–1914. The express purpose of these schools was to promote both the emancipation of the Jews and their moral, intellectual and material improvement. In principle, Alliance institutions were open to all regardless of religion, nationality, sex or socioeconomic background.¹ Except for its being restricted to girls,² this was true of the Galata establishment.

Evidence indicates that the Galata school had a significant impact not only on its graduates but on the surrounding community as well. In the discussion that follows, the special role of this institution will be examined within the general context of a heterogeneous cultural and social environment of an Istanbul neighborhood, and the more specific context of the Istanbul Jewish community during the years under discussion.³

Demographic and Social Features of the Galata Quarter

Galata during the late nineteenth century was one of a number of well-defined neighborhoods in Istanbul, then the capital of the Ottoman empire. Its population in 1862 numbered 237,293, of whom some 110,000 were listed as “foreign subjects” (most of whom were actually subjects of the Ottoman empire but whose interests were represented by foreign embassies). Between one-fifth and one-quarter of the people were Muslims; most of the rest were Christians of various ethnic origins (e.g., Armenian and Greek). The Jews of Galata—some ten percent of the total population (22,865)—accounted for half the Jewish population of Istanbul.⁴ Known as a commercial center, Galata was a magnet for many middle-class Jewish fami-

A somewhat different version of this article, in French, appeared in *Histoire, Économie et Société* 4 (1991), 529–559. It appears here courtesy of the Centre de documentation universitaire et société d'édition d'enseignement supérieur réunis, under whose auspices the journal is published.

lies, both because of its proximity to the prestigious European quarter of Pera and because of the generally favorable economic conditions prevailing there. Jewish families moved to Galata from more crowded districts, such as Hasköy and Balat, that were located on either side of the Golden Horn.⁵

Beginning in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the ranks of native Istanbuli Jewry were swelled by immigrants from Russia, Rumania and Poland who were fleeing from antisemitism and poverty. There were also smaller waves of immigration from Bulgaria (during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878) Corfu (as a result of a blood libel case in 1891) and Thrace (during the Balkan War of 1912). The immigrants from Eastern Europe settled primarily in the less desirable sections of the Galata quarter, where cheaper rents and employment were relatively easy to find. The women worked as servants, laundresses and seamstresses, while many of the men were employed either as domestics or guards.⁶ The new residents lived either at the foot of the road that led to Yüksek Kaldırım and Voyvoda Street or in the adjoining streets located near regions known for crime and prostitution.⁷ Fellow residents are on record as having negative attitudes toward these newcomers, who were accused of being unclean, greedy and badly dressed. The women were accused of a general lack of virtue since they were employed in the local houses of prostitution (run, so it was said, by Polish Jews).⁸ The East European Jews were also accused of being active in the white slave trade, which flourished in Galata.⁹ Indeed, the settlement of such Jews in the Galata district was a distinct cultural shock for the native Istanbuli Sephardic Jews. Religion was the only thing the two groups had in common, and even here there were significant differences in custom and observance.

Institutional differences already existed within the established Istanbuli Jewish community. Members of the two major subgroups, Ashkenazim and Sephardim, often referred to each other as “enemy brothers,”¹⁰ and within each subgroup there were further divisions. In 1885, the Ashkenazim numbered some 2,500, most of whom lived in Galata.¹¹ They were divided between the Ottoman Ashkenazim (*Aschkenasische Kultusgemeinde*) and the foreign, or Austro-Hungarian Ashkenazim (*Oesterreichisch-ungarisch-israelitische Kultusgemeinde*). While these two groups were formally united in 1890, they remained distinct for many years thereafter. The Sephardim, numerically more significant, were divided into the “Spanish” and “Italian” (Francos) communities.¹²

Intercommunal disagreements of a cultural or institutional nature exacerbated already existing social antagonisms. Among the Ashkenazim, the more veteran well-to-do “Germano-Israelites” were pitted against the poor, mostly working-class immigrant families.¹³ Similarly, among the Sephardim the long-term residents of the quarter formed a kind of aristocracy while the newcomers from the Golden Horn brought with them, so it was charged, “their [different] way of life and their retrograde spirit,” which was deemed “incompatible with the spirit of progress” that was professed by the locals.¹⁴ In other words, the new arrivals were strongly attached to Jewish traditions and thus did not fit in with the Western-oriented, “modern” Jewish image promoted by the wealthier and more intellectual circles of Jewish society.

Schooling and Gender Differences in the Ottoman Empire

Although there are no precise data regarding school attendance among the Jews of the Ottoman empire, it is known that a significant number of boys went to *talmudei torah* (in Judeo-Spanish, *meldarim*).¹⁵ Here they acquired basic religious instruction, some knowledge of reading and writing in Judeo-Spanish and Hebrew, and the fundamentals of arithmetic. In 1904, out of 1,030 Jewish children attending school in Galata, 585 went to Jewish schools, including the *talmudei torah*.¹⁶ In Istanbul as a whole, 1,420 out of a total of 4,700 went to *talmudei torah* and 600 to European schools.¹⁷ Such data demonstrate how deeply rooted were the traditional modes of education among the Jews, particularly where boys were concerned.

Jewish girls were far less likely to receive any formal education, traditional or otherwise. No institute of the *talmud torah* type existed for them. During the nineteenth century, daughters of the rich were educated either at home or at foreign schools. Protestant mission schools accepted some of the poorer girls, whose attendance was encouraged by gifts of money and goods to the parents.¹⁸ There were also nursery schools that sometimes kept children until a rather advanced age.¹⁹ But the majority of Jewish girls received no formal education whatsoever.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, such a situation was becoming more and more anachronistic even in the backward Ottoman empire. Thus in 1881, Sultan Abdulhamid II (ruled 1876–1909) spoke out in favor of education for girls.²⁰ Between 1867 and 1895, the number of Muslim girls attending school in the empire doubled and reached 253,349.²¹ It is not surprising that this development affected the Jewish population as well. The first girls’ school of the Alliance in Turkey was founded in Edirne in 1870, and between 1875 and 1882, the first elementary schools for girls were established in the main quarters of the capital.²²

The Galata School: Aims, Social Profile and Curriculum

In 1877, a committee made up of the local Jewish female elite was established to found a new girls’ school in the Galata quarter. The committee, assisted by the Alliance, raised the necessary funds and continued to be involved in the school’s administration even after its establishment. The avowed aim of the school was to westernize and modernize its pupils, to train them to play a useful role in society both as wives and mothers and as members of the working class—while at the same time protecting them from the undesirable influence of the missionary schools.²³

From the very beginning, the Galata school’s population was marked by strong cultural differences. This feature persisted throughout the school’s history, rendering the teachers’ task particularly difficult. Thus we are informed that, in 1882, seventy-five girls followed the German (Ashkenazic) tradition while seventy-three were Sephardim.²⁴ In order to prevent intrareligious conflicts and promote integration, the students of different groups were divided equally among the classes. Moreover, Sephardic students were required to learn German, and Ashkenazim to study “Hebrew in the Spanish idiom” (i.e., Judeo-Spanish).²⁵ French, considered

“neutral,” was the main language of instruction and the main vehicle of the integration process.

Since the acceptance of non-Jewish girls was seen as contributing to the “moral integration of the different elements of the population,”²⁶ a number of Christian girls also studied at the Galata school, largely to benefit from the French-language instruction. There were no Muslim girls, perhaps because they were not expected to work outside the home and therefore had no need of foreign languages. Muslim boys, however, did attend the Alliance schools for boys in the empire.²⁷

The socioeconomic profile of the student was also far from being homogeneous. Originally it had been thought to establish two separate schools, one for the rich and one for the poor.²⁸ This plan failed for lack of funds, although in 1909 a framework of parallel classes for wealthy students was actually implemented. During the school's first twenty years, nonpaying pupils outnumbered those who paid tuition. In addition to dealing with a perennial budget deficit, the school administration had the constant challenge of convincing wealthy parents (including some of the members of the founding committee) not to withdraw from the school simply because they wished their daughters to avoid contact with children from disadvantaged homes.²⁹ Throughout, the staff remained dedicated to the goal of providing even the poorest of students with the type of instruction necessary for social and economic advancement.³⁰ Gradually, as the school established itself as an important institution in the community and as more middle-class parents became convinced of the need to educate their daughters, an increasing share of the school's budget—by 1912, fully 82 percent—was covered by tuition. During the period under discussion, the proportion of girls from poor families was never more than 23 percent of the entire student body.³¹

Naturally enough, the headmistress played a key role in the school. Serving in an intellectual and professional capacity, she symbolized the westernizing, “civilizing” mission of the school while at the same time seeking to conform to the behavioral patterns of the respectable woman of the Orient. Assisting the headmistress was a teaching staff that consisted of general teachers and specialized teachers of sewing, German, Turkish and Hebrew (the last were usually rabbis). In later years, many of the teachers were themselves graduates of the school. The headmistress sought to imbue her staff with basically liberal pedagogical methods. In this regard the only conflicts were with the teachers of Turkish, who resisted the western model imposed on the Galata school.

The Galata school was open five days a week and closed on Saturday and Sunday. Classes began at 8:00 or 8:30 a.m. and lasted until noon, then resumed at 1:00 or 1:30 p.m. until 4:00 or 5:00 p.m. During winter months, there were no classes on Friday afternoons. Teachers taught between six and seven hours a day, and the headmistress was required to teach a minimum of twenty-four weekly hours in addition to her administrative chores. School holidays followed the Jewish calendar. During the summer months the school remained open, in contrast to other schools in the quarter. Only at the beginning of the century did it close for ten days during the latter part of August. Teachers were entitled to six weeks' vacation a year, which they took in turns.

Children were accepted to the Galata school at age six. In its early years, the school was divided into four divisions corresponding to four age groups. As the number of children wishing to attend the school increased, additions were made—first a kindergarten and, in 1906, an advanced class for those who had completed the regular curriculum (at the age of 15) and who, it was feared, might continue their education in church-related institutions. In 1900, a special division was created for Ashkenazic children of Russian and Rumanian origin.³² Moreover, in another departure from the original egalitarian and integrationist aims of the school, “private” classes were established in 1909 for the wealthy students, at the same time as a bilingual German-French class was started for the benefit of the poorer pupils, most of whom were slated to become saleswomen in the shops of Pera.³³

Since the Alliance mandate was to provide for the “moral, intellectual and economic uplifting” of its Jewish students, the course of studies at the Galata school included both academic and nonacademic subjects. Indeed, the main emphasis was on “socialization,” the creation of a model western bourgeois woman adapted to local conditions.³⁴ This might mean training the well-to-do girls, who were likely to take the traditional path of becoming wives and mothers, in modern hygiene and progressive techniques of child rearing. For the poorer pupils the main concern was to provide vocational skills to enable them to attain respectable positions in the working world after the completion of their studies. A good deal of ingenuity was marshalled in order to avoid creating “outcasts” who would be trapped between the conflicting worlds of school and home.

The basically bourgeois model presented by the school was reinforced by the presence of students from wealthy homes; nonetheless, the proximity of houses of prostitution in the neighborhood was a constant danger. One of the main concerns of the school administration was to encourage pupils to remain in school for as many years as possible. Not only would the school's pedagogic program be better served in this way, but early marriages, which tended to preserve the cycle of large families and poverty, would be less likely. However, the school's success in holding on to pupils past the age of fifteen or sixteen was rather limited.

As for the curriculum, it was basically similar to that of French schools, with the addition of Jewish studies and local language instruction. The Galata school emphasized nonacademic subjects (such as sewing and home economics) more than was customary in schools for boys. In principle, the language of instruction in Alliance schools was French, although this principle was not always followed (in Baghdad, for example, English was employed). In the Galata school, German was taught at a very early stage to accommodate the needs of the Yiddish-speaking Ashkenazim. Yiddish and Judeo-Spanish, however, were deprecated as dialects, notwithstanding the fact that Judeo-Spanish was taught to the Ashkenazic children as part of the school's program of encouraging integration.³⁵ By the turn of the century, a number of subjects—e.g., natural history and geography—were taught in German. Several Sephardic notables affiliated with the Alliance deplored this development as signaling the “Germanization” of the school.³⁶ In fact, the decision to expand the use of German probably resulted from the desire both to compete with the local Protestant-run schools and to discourage Ashkenazic families from joining the *Hilfsverein der*

deutschen Juden, which was making plans to establish its own school.³⁷ It is also known, from a report of 1884–1885, that the Alliance was worried about the fact that most Ashkenazic children in the area attended non-Jewish schools.³⁸

Turkish was a late addition, placed in the curriculum only in 1909–1910 (shortly after the revolution of the Young Turks, who, among other things, promoted modern Turkish nationalism). School administrators were not particularly enthusiastic about the introduction of Turkish, claiming that Jewish girls had no need for it. Many parents, however, saw knowledge of Turkish as a springboard to full social integration. Their pressure, combined with the concern that the school might otherwise appear to be unpatriotic, led eventually to the introduction not only of Turkish language studies but also of Turkish history and geography.³⁹

The attainment of encyclopedic knowledge was not subscribed to by the Galata school, where the motto was to “learn little, but [learn it] well.” Those disciplines demanding a certain intellectual effort, such as arithmetic, history and science, were taught in simplified form.⁴⁰ Development of an aesthetic sense, however, was considered very important. For this reason, singing and solfège (sight reading) were made part of the curriculum, and as early as 1888 a piano was purchased so that children of wealthy families would not absent themselves from school in order to attend music lessons. Art history was introduced in 1909–1910 in a effort to engender a sense of “decorum” that was “so neglected in the Orient.”⁴¹

Jewish studies occupied a relatively minor role in the curriculum. Apart from Hebrew and Judeo-Spanish, a course on postbiblical Jewish history was taught. The main purpose of these studies was to instill the spirit of the Bible in a way that would allow pupils to transcend the simple observance of tradition, which was considered old-fashioned.

Great emphasis was placed on nonacademic courses that were designed to enhance pupils' homemaking and/or vocational skills. One to two hours a day were devoted to needlework. It was felt that future mothers should be skillful in sewing and dressmaking; moreover, such skills were applicable to the local employment market. Different headmistresses stressed different programs of nonacademic studies, based in part on their assessment of local needs and future employment prospects. As noted, the shops of Pera were eager to employ the school's graduates—more so than Greek or Armenian girls—because of their reputedly higher moral standards, good manners and knowledge of foreign languages. With the relative growth of certain economic sectors in the first decade of the twentieth century and the mobilization of young men during the Balkan War, other opportunities opened up for women.⁴² Responding to these new conditions, the school introduced a course in business in 1910–1911; in subsequent years it added courses in typing, stenography, calligraphy, accounting, commercial correspondence and English.

As early as 1888, a course that later developed into a home economics program was introduced. Basic principles of childcare and child rearing were also taught. Hygiene was a particularly important subject, given the high mortality rate during the harsh winters in Istanbul and the various epidemics that sometimes caused the school's temporary closing (from 1898, children attending the school had to bring a certificate of vaccination). The teaching staff did its best to expand the concept of

hygiene from housecleaning alone to cleanliness of body and basic practical medicine.⁴³

In short, the wealthier pupils were given the tools to become modern mothers and the intellectual equals of their spouses, while the poorer ones were given a practical education that would allow them to be absorbed into the labor market as saleswomen, secretaries or even domestics.

From the outset, headmistresses of the school sought to combine utility and pleasure in the teaching program, starting with the very youngest pupils. In the kindergarten, children were treated with “goodness and gentleness.” Staff members followed the Fröbel education method, which insisted on the “harmonious equilibrium of the children's faculties” and the importance of spontaneity.⁴⁴ Inspired to a degree by Rousseau, the pedagogic philosophy was to awaken the child's interest through enjoyment rather than coercion. Whenever possible, teachers relied on presenting concrete examples. Geography, for example, was taught in the context of “longing for someone far away,” and arithmetic through the use of chestnuts, hazelnuts and almonds. A proposal was made to exclude physical and natural sciences from the curriculum precisely because of the lack of concrete materials and the difficulty of making class excursions.

Lessons were transformed into discussions to arouse the attention of the young listeners. Dictations were used to transmit oral teachings, and Jewish history was taught in everyday language. Lessons that were intensive or particularly serious in nature were interrupted by talks or anecdotes designed to give the children's minds a rest. When language study based on grammar proved unsuccessful, teachers shifted their approach and spoke to the pupils in the language being studied.⁴⁵ Abstraction and conceptual thinking played only a minor role in the curriculum, while emphasis was placed on instilling habits of neatness and order. The guiding principle was that, since girls had been excluded for so long from formal education and were more accustomed to practical teaching in the home, such methods were more useful than those based on the development of critical thinking skills.

Games played an important role in the school's curriculum, since these allowed the children to expend surplus energy, exercise their bodies and rest their minds—while affording teachers opportunities for more informal observation.⁴⁶ Based on what they saw, the teachers would attempt to guide each child according to her natural inclinations. Careful observation of the pupils was considered extremely important, as was offering personal attention to each child. Children who rarely spoke up in class, for example, were not blamed for their shyness; instead, their teachers were urged to be less strict and more considerate with them so that in the long run their silence would be overcome by trust and affection.

The school's policy on homework often clashed with the views of the wealthier parents, who generally retained the belief that the quality of a school was to be measured by the quantity of homework assigned.⁴⁷ Since the school's administrators believed in the importance of household work, they preferred to limit the amount of homework so that students could help out with chores and/or the care of younger siblings. Moreover, many poorer families went to bed immediately after supper in order to save on electricity and heating fuel. Girls from such families thus

had little time for homework, nor could they expect much help from their parents, since the latter were often illiterate.⁴⁸ Finally, correction of homework was one more burden on an already overworked teaching staff. For this reason alone, homework most often consisted of a small copying exercise or a page of calligraphy.

Concerning discipline, the preferred method of dealing with misbehavior was to give a private, gentle reprimand. If this failed, teachers could resort to more open reprimands, retention of students after school hours or temporary expulsion. In general, however, discipline was not a major problem. Most students were described as gentle, submissive and obedient, their main failing being a lack of regular work habits.

A widely used "punishment" was deprivation of a pupil's weekly library book.⁴⁹ Reading at the Galata school was considered both a "civilizing agent" and a source of pleasure. School officials regularly sent order lists to Paris so that they could enrich the library with new, useful and enjoyable publications. Students were introduced not only to classic authors such as Rousseau, Voltaire, Hugo and Saint-Simon but to serious contemporary writers. The emphasis here, as always, was on the moral aspect; novels judged to be cheap or tendentious were discouraged. Reading was considered to be so important that the school even sponsored a library project for its graduates, subsidized by the Alliance.

Since moral rather than academic excellence was the primary aim of the Galata school, no school prizes, honor rolls or medals were awarded to outstanding pupils. The aim was to promote an egalitarian spirit rather than to highlight differences in achievements. Prizes and the like were branded "dead concepts that ought to be dropped."⁵⁰ Examinations, however, were an integral part of the curriculum, since these were the means of determining how well pupils were learning. Children were examined orally each week and semester examinations were gradually introduced. From 1898, students were made to write compositions on subjects taught during the previous trimester. Parents were given semester reports, and the children's progress was regularly elevated. After protracted negotiations, the Alliance agreed in 1890 to grant a French diploma (Certificat d'Études et Brevet) to graduates of the school.⁵¹ For some students, such a diploma represented the crowning achievement of their academic efforts.

From its inception, a main purpose of the Galata school was to provide for the future livelihood of the poorer pupils. With this aim in mind an unsubsidized workshop was opened for former Galata students in 1882, followed two years later by subsidized Alliance apprenticeship programs in Galata and other neighborhoods.⁵² The first workshop program was designed to teach dressmaking skills such as cutting, ironing, sewing and mending. Subsequent programs that were introduced with varying degrees of success included antique embroidery (a craft that until then was practiced exclusively by Armenians),⁵³ hat-trimming, bookbinding and tapestry weaving. During most of the years of the workshop program, between thirty and sixty girls served as apprentices.

The decision to focus on dressmaking and related crafts reflected ideological as well as pragmatic concerns.⁵⁴ Girls in the workshops would benefit from enhanced employment opportunities as seamstresses, sewing teachers, saleswomen or domestic servants, or else they would be able to put their skills to good domestic use.

Moreover, the school was limited in the kinds of courses it could offer. Since working women were not generally viewed with approval,⁵⁵ the only respectable avenues of employment were those in commerce or domestic service.

Although a fair number of girls found work after their apprenticeship,⁵⁶ the program as a whole was not entirely successful, largely because it offered mostly traditional trades that were low-paying and devoid of opportunities for advancement. In 1902, the dressmaking workshop was closed, although a lacemaking workshop was still operating in 1909. Far more successful were the business courses that the school began to offer in the following year.

Conclusion

Operating during an era of social and economic change, the Galata school served in many ways as a model for communal harmony and openness. Its avowedly integrationist policy—the mixing of Ashkenazic and Sephardic, wealthy and poor students—stood in marked contrast to the often fractious relationships of various Istanbul Jewish congregations, while its blend of progressiveness and pragmatism reflected the aspirations of the neighborhood's growing Jewish middle class. An Alliance inspector's annual report for 1884–1885 noted that the Galata school was the best of its kind in Istanbul.⁵⁷ One measure of its success was the fact that many of its students remained affiliated with the school after graduation, either through the apprentice program or in an educational or volunteer capacity. During the latter years of its operation, the Galata school was also attended by many daughters of graduates. As a report from 1897–1898 notes approvingly, the positive influence of the school could be seen both in the mothers' personalities and in their relationship with their children.

Budgetary restrictions limited the school's recruitment among the poorer residents of Galata; many of those who did attend the school were often forced to drop out early. The school's success in advancing these girls' economic status was mixed, in part because of traditional attitudes opposing women's work outside the home. Nonetheless, the Galata school can be viewed as a pioneering institution in its commitment to providing vocational as well as academic and domestic training. In this way, it served as a forceful agent of change within the Istanbul Jewish community, providing many girls of limited means with the tools for economic and social advancement.

Notes

1. *Instructions générales pour les professeurs*. Pamphlet of the Alliance israélite universelle. (Paris: 1903), 63.

2. There were, however, certain years in which several young boys were admitted, and at one time it was proposed to make the school coeducational for the fourth through seventh grades. See Archives de l'Alliance israélite universelle (henceforth AAIU), France XVII. 28, annual report by Victoria Sémach (headmistress of the Galata School), 1903–1904. Concerning coeducational classes, the secretary of the Alliance in Paris noted in the margins, "I don't think so."

3. Although the school was in operation until 1925, very little information is available after 1912.

4. For statistical material, see Steven Rosenthal, "Minorities and Municipal Reform in Istanbul, 1850–1870," in *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, vol. 1, ed. Benjamin Braude and Bernard Lewis (New York and London: 1982), 390 and Kemal H. Karpat, *Ottoman Population, 1830–1914* (Madison: 1985), 147. According to the *Bulletin de l'Alliance israélite universelle* (henceforth *BAIU*) 1 (1st semester 1880), 57, there were 10,000 Jews in Galata.

5. AAIU, France XVII. 28, annual report by M. Fresco (director of the boys' school); *ibid.*, letter from Sémach, 15 November 1897.

6. AAIU, Turkey LXX. E., letter from Sémach, 4 July 1912.

7. *Ibid.*, Turkey I. C. 1, letter from M. Halévy, 1 December 1889.

8. *Ibid.* Also see Halévy's letters of 3 January and 12 March 1890.

9. Edward J. Bristow, *Prostitution and Prejudice: The Jewish Fight Against White Slavery 1870–1939* (New York: 1982), 181–191, *passim*.

10. For a historical analysis of this question and its repercussions in the twentieth century, see Esther Benbassa, *Haim Nahum effendi, dernier Grand Rabbin de l'Empire Ottoman (1908–1920): son rôle politique et diplomatique* (Ph.D. diss., University of Paris, 1987), 391–412, 606–609.

11. *BAIU* 10 (2nd semester 1885/1st semester 1886), 70.

12. The administrative separation of the Italian Jews from the Sephardic community dated from 1862. See Archives of the Italian Community (Istanbul), letter of M. Cerruti (in Italian) to the Italian Royal Delegation to the foreign Israelite community of the Spanish and Portuguese rite at Constantinople, 2 May 1862. A further division within the Sephardic community was between the native "Stambulis," who followed the Spanish-Portuguese rite, and the foreign "Selaniklis." See AAIU, France, XVII. 28, annual report by Hélène Salzer (headmistress of the Galata school), 1885–1886.

13. AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, letter from Sémach, 15 November 1897.

14. *Ibid.*

15. On the *talmudei torah*, see Aron Rodrigue, "The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Attempt to Reform Jewish Religious and Rabbinical Instruction in Turkey," in *L'Alliance dans les communautés du bassin méditerranéen à la fin du 19^e siècle et son influence sur la situation sociale et culturelle*, ed. Simon Schwarzfuchs (Jerusalem: 1987), 53–70.

16. AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, annual report by Fresco, 1903–1904.

17. *Ibid.*, 1904–1905.

18. *Ibid.*, annual report by Sémach, 1902–1903.

19. *Ibid.*, Turkey LVIII. E., letter from Lévy, 12 April 1888.

20. Nermin Abadan-Unat, "Social Change and Turkish Women," in *Women in Turkish Society*, 2nd. ed., ed. N. Abadan, D. Kandiyot and Mübeccel B. Kiray (Leiden: 1981), 7.

21. Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey* (New York: 1978), vol. 2, 112. Also see Justin McCarthy, *The Arab World, Turkey and the Balkans, 1878–1914: A Handbook of Historical Statistics* (Boston: 1982), 117, where figures are given for the number of male and female students in Istanbul and the empire as a whole for the years 1895–1896.

22. The first school was founded in Hasköy in 1875. The girls' school and a coeducational school, both in Galata, opened in 1876. Other schools were established in Daghmamami (1880), Ortaköy (1881) and Balat (1882). See *BAIU* 7 (2nd semester 1883), 37–38, 66. Also see Aron Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews: The Alliance Israélite Universelle in Turkey, 1860–1914* (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985), 174 for statistics on the percentage of girls attending school in the cities of Edirne, Istanbul and Izmir during the years 1879–1909.

23. AAIU, Turkey XXV. E., letter from H. Fernandez to S. Fernandez, July 1877.

24. *Ibid.*, France XVII. 28, letter from Salzer, 22 February 1882.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Jacques Bigart, *L'action de l'Alliance israélite Turquie* (Paris: 1913), 23.

27. AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, annual report by Fresco, 1899–1900.

28. *Ibid.*, 1906–1907.

29. *Ibid.*, letter from Sémach, 15 October 1909.

30. *Ibid.*, 15 November 1910.

31. The Galata school had three sources of revenue: the Alliance, tuition fees and revenues from the local Jewish community, all of which fluctuated widely. See *BAIU* (1-37), 1880–1912. Poor children are defined as those who participated in the food program sponsored by Baroness Clara de Hirsch (many of these students also benefited from clothing and medical care provided by volunteer organizations connected with the school). In 1896, 35 out of 330 pupils received meals through the food program; in 1905, with the Alliance also providing aid, 125 out of some 750 participated in the program. See AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, letter from Salzer, 17 February 1882, Sémach's annual reports of 1903–1907 and 1911–1912, and her letter of 15 October 1909.

32. AAIU, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 6 January 1901.

33. *Ibid.*, France XVII. F. 28, letter from Salzer, 1 November 1890 and letters from Sémach, 15 October 1909 and 15 November 1910.

34. *BAIU* 10 (2nd semester 1885/1st semester 1886), 76.

35. *Ibid.*, 69.

36. AAIU, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 27 February 1908.

37. *Ibid.* The Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, founded in 1901 by leaders of German Jewry for the uplifting and improvement of East European Jews, established several schools in the Ottoman empire. A rival (albeit an undeclared one) of the Alliance, the Hilfsverein was responsible for a certain strengthening of German language and culture in the empire.

38. *BAIU* 10, 70–71.

39. *BAIU* 34 (1909), 93–94; AAIU, Turkey LXX. E., letter from Sémach, 14 May 1909.

40. AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, letter from Sémach, 15 July 1912.

41. *Ibid.*, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 2 May 1898; *ibid.* LXVI. E., letter from Salzer, 15 March 1888; *ibid.*, France XVII. F. 28, letter from Sémach, 15 October 1909.

42. *Ibid.*, 15 July 1912. See also Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, 2nd ed. (London: 1979), 229.

43. AAIU, France XVII. 28, annual report of Sémach, 1904–1905.

44. *Ibid.*, letter from *idem*, 15 October 1909.

45. *Ibid.*, annual report of *idem*, 1904–1905.

46. *Ibid.*, 1898–1899.

47. *Ibid.*

48. *Ibid.*, letter of 15 July 1912.

49. *Ibid.*, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 9 January 1899.

50. *Ibid.*, France XVII. F. 28, annual report of Sémach, 1906–1907.

51. The pupils became eligible for a Certificat d'Études et Brevet after passing an exam at the French embassy.

52. *BAIU* 11 (2nd semester 1886), 41; *ibid.* 13 (1st/2nd semester 1888), 58.

53. AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, annual report of Sémach, 1898–1899; *ibid.*, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 6 March 1900.

54. Apprenticeship in manual work, it was believed, would combat idleness and make the girls into "honest" women. See AAIU, France XVII. F. 28, annual report of Salzer, 1885–1886.

55. AAIU, Turkey LXIX. E., letter from Sémach, 6 July 1898.

56. See *ibid.*, LXX. E., letter from Sémach, 8 May 1905 for a full report on where some 200 apprenticeship graduates found employment. Among the statistics provided: 13 were working abroad (in the United States, Egypt, France and Russia), mostly as seamstresses; 15 were maids; 33 seamstresses; 23 independent dressmakers; 18 hat-making apprentices; 15 sales trainees in commercial establishments in Pera; and approximately 50 had left Istanbul, with no information provided on their place of residence or occupation.

57. *BAIU* 10 (2nd semester 1885/1st semester 1886), 69.