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Being Jewish in Columbus, Georgia: The Business, Politics, and Religion of Jacob and Isaac Moses, 1828–1890

By

Scott M. Langston*

In 1828 seventeen-year-old Jacob I. Moses moved from Charleston, South Carolina, to Columbus, Georgia, a frontier town located on the state’s western border. About twenty years later, his younger brother, Isaac I. Moses, then twenty-eight, joined him. Together they built a successful business and made significant contributions to the city’s development.¹ Their experiences provide insight into some of the motivations, challenges, and long-term impact of antebellum Jews who relocated to new places in the South. For six decades, they developed a multidimensional Jewish identity rooted in business and entrepreneurial pursuits and unlimited by regional or political concerns.

Jacob’s arrival in Columbus coincided with its founding. The town began when the United States dispossessed the Creek Nation of its lands in Georgia and part of Alabama through the highly disputed treaty of Indian Springs. After gaining possession in 1825, the Georgia General Assembly moved quickly to consolidate its hold.² It divided the Creek land cession into five sections, redesignated in December 1826 as Lee, Muscogee, Troup, Coweta, and Carroll Counties. By December 1827, the assembly created Columbus as a “trading town” to be located in Muscogee County at the fall line of the Chattahoochee River. Early in 1828, surveyors platted the new town, with lots sold at public auction in July.

* The author may be contacted at s.langston@tcu.edu.
Already by spring, approximately nine hundred people lived there.³

Jacob seems to have been drawn to Columbus more for economic opportunities than land prospects, initially establishing a business under the name Jacob I. Moses & Co. Unfortunately, the exact nature of this business is unknown.⁴ Despite his father, Isaiah, being a successful Charleston grocer and merchant and owning a 794-acre plantation, Jacob, like many others, faced diminishing prospects for prosperity in his home state. Declining economic opportunities and the opening of new lands prompted many people to leave the state beginning in the 1820s, with most heading for Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi.⁵ Jacob followed this pattern.

Building a Business and Town, 1828–1839

Jacob quickly grew his business and developed connections among some of the new town’s more prominent citizens. For most of the next two decades, he participated in Columbus’s public life,
holding a variety of positions and contributing to its economic growth. His connection with Hervey Hall, a native of Vermont who had also come to Columbus in 1828, proved to be the most significant and long-lasting. These men entered into a partnership to establish the hardware company Hall & Moses, which continued in business, although under different names and owners, from 1832 until well into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{6} Despite his New England upbringing, Hall, an early member of Trinity Episcopal Church, became an ardent southerner. His partnership with Jacob Moses was so strong that Hall’s obituary noted: “These two men so long connected in business were like brothers, although their temperaments were directly the opposite, Mr. Hall being impulsive, positive and energetic; Mr. Moses cool, suave, deliberate.”\textsuperscript{7} Jacob even named one of his children Hervey Hall Moses.\textsuperscript{8}

In the April 21, 1832, edition of the \textit{Columbus Enquirer}, Jacob posted a notice that during his absence Hall would act as his agent. In that issue, and since at least January 7, Hall had advertised that he had just received a steamboat shipment of products made from tin, copper, iron, lead, zinc, and brass, offered both at

\textit{Columbus Enquirer, December 15, 1832.}

\textit{Hall & Moses advertisement.}

\textit{(Courtesy of the Digital Library of Georgia.)}
wholesale and retail. In June the pair announced their copartnership under the name Hall & Moses. They offered for sale “a general assortment [of] tin-ware” and appealed especially to the “country merchants,” promising they could be “supplied low and on liberal terms” that could be obtained “at the old stand.” By the end of the year, their hardware store advertised “a large assortment of Tinware offered at wholesale Northern Manufactory prices.” Their extended line of merchandise included various locks, hinges, screws, saws, irons, vices, axes, knives, spoons, pans, kettles, plates, urns, castings, molds, guns, paints, oils, glass, Japan ware, a variety of sheet metals (including sheet iron, copper, brass, zinc, and lead), and more. They provided customers with basic and essential items for building their lives and communities in a city that prided itself as a “builder’s paradise.”

As these ads suggest, the company functioned within a broader national and international network of production and distribution at a time when the commercial system was undergoing dramatic change. The early decades of the nineteenth century witnessed a transition from all-purpose urban merchants responsible for importing, exporting, wholesaling, retailing, insuring, shipping, and distributing a wide variety of goods into a system characterized by business people who specialized in one line of products such as hardware or dry goods. The westward expansion of the country, along with its growing population, improving transportation system, and increasing manufacturing capacity, encouraged and even required the new system, including the rise of specialized wholesalers. Industries such as hardware that produced large quantities of generic goods (like locks, hinges, screws, etc.) required a means to get goods to a growing, extended, and diverse market. The hardware trade came to depend on a variety of middlemen known by diverse terms such as wholesalers, commission merchants, factors, and jobbers to buy and distribute goods to stores in smaller communities. The middlemen, in turn, sold to individuals. The Hall & Moses ads reflect that the partners acted not only as retail hardware merchants, selling goods directly to individuals living in the Columbus area, but also as wholesalers, passing goods on to the country merchants in smaller
communities. Located on a major waterway on the edge of land only recently opened to white settlement and designed as a “trading town,” Columbus functioned as a regional distribution center in this evolving marketing system. Hall & Moses took its place in this system intending to capitalize on the opportunities. The partners’ success required numerous skills, including establishing connections with northern manufacturers and importers, since New England acted as the center of domestic tinware production, and most other antebellum hardware was imported.\textsuperscript{12}

Hall & Moses continued to grow along with the town. As 1834 came to a close, a \textit{Columbus Enquirer} columnist reflected that a stranger visiting the town at the beginning of the year would hardly recognize it at its end.\textsuperscript{13} Hall & Moses participated in this expansion, moving during fall 1835 into a “new brick store” located on the east side of Broad Street in the central business district, adjoining the lot on which Trinity Episcopal Church was built a few years later. This site served for decades as the business’s main location, easily identified by a “sign of the Padlock” outside the store.\textsuperscript{14}

The same factors that had drawn Hall and Moses to Columbus now drew them across the river to the newly established settlement of Girard, Alabama.\textsuperscript{15} Hoping to capitalize on the surge of settlers spilling across the Chattahoochee, they purchased lots in Girard on at least two occasions and subsequently improved them, probably by erecting buildings for housing or commerce. This marked the beginning of the Moses family’s contribution to Girard’s and the surrounding area’s development, an undertaking that extended well into the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{16}

In 1835, as American schemes to defraud the Creeks of their Alabama lands increased, the War Department halted sales and opened a land-fraud investigation. The speculators, of course, resisted, and they successfully thwarted an investigation in early 1836. Circumstances, however, continued to deteriorate, and war with the Creeks broke out. The Columbus Guards, formed the previous year to patrol the town’s streets at night, were mustered into the United States military in January 1836. Jacob Moses served as a private. By year’s end the war had ended, and
thousands of Creeks were forcibly removed to lands west of the Mississippi River, a trek known as the Creek Trail of Tears. Hall’s and Moses’s business aspirations contributed to this removal. Recognizing an economic opportunity, they joined other Americans who clamored for Creek land. If slave ownership, as some historians contend, “marked Jews as part of the dominant group” in the South, then so did ownership of Native American land. This particular marker, however, was not confined to the South, but extended throughout the United States.

As the 1830s came to a close, Hall and Moses were poised to expand further. In 1840 their business owned three slaves, $2,500 in real estate, and $10,500 in stock. Furthermore, by the late 1830s or early 1840s, the partners had expanded to Montgomery, Alabama, under the name of Hall, Moses & Roberts. The latter partner, Israel W. Roberts, was a Presbyterian from Maine who came to Columbus around 1832 before moving to Montgomery around 1839. At least as early as 1836, Roberts served as their agent while the partners were outside Georgia. In the new business venture, Hall & Moses furnished thirty thousand dollars in capital, and Roberts moved to Montgomery to run the hardware store.

Beyond business pursuits, Jacob formed connections by participating in political activities. In 1834 he attended a Fourth of July celebration hosted by the local State Rights Party, a new organization created in response to Andrew Jackson’s expansion of executive power, especially as it related to nullification. The nullification crisis arose in 1832 over South Carolina’s effort to abrogate the federal government’s raising of import tariffs, dubbed by its opponents as the Tariff of Abominations. By November 1833, many former Democrats took steps to organize the State Rights Party throughout Georgia, and on March 26, 1834, people living in and around Columbus formed the State Rights Association of Muscogee County. The meeting adopted a constitution composed by a committee that included Mirabeau B. Lamar, the founder and editor of the Columbus Enquirer and future president of the Republic of Texas from 1838 to 1841. The constitution’s preamble decried growing federal power, especially “a bill com-
monly known as the ‘force bill,’ having for its object the forcing into submission a sovereign and free state of this confederacy.”

Congress had passed the Force Bill in 1833, authorizing the president to use force against South Carolina if it refused to pay the new tariffs. For state rights advocates, this bill symbolized the dangers of a powerful federal government.

The celebration began at the Methodist Church, where the crowd heard a reading of the Declaration of Independence and an oration delivered by a local judge. Following a barbeque, formal toasts praised the American Revolution and its heroes, the nullification doctrine, and free trade, while denouncing federal efforts to initiate internal improvements, the Bank of the United States as a monopoly, Jackson’s so-called proclamation speech against nullification given in 1832, and the Force Bill. All of these reflected support for John C. Calhoun, Jackson’s one-time vice president and now a senator from South Carolina, in opposition to the president. Next, individuals in the audience spontaneously offered toasts. Jacob Moses extolled “the Senators who vetoed Andrew Jackson’s abuse of Executive power. The people are with them.”

He likely had in mind at least two recent actions taken by the U.S. Senate. The new Senate seated in December 1833 had censured the president—the only time in U.S. history—and, for the first time, rejected a cabinet nominee, Roger Taney as Secretary of the Treasury. Both actions were in response to Jackson’s attack on the Second Bank of the United States, an action that many believed reflected an unconstitutional assumption of executive powers. Southerners in particular viewed the issue more in terms of presidential overreach than economic policy.

Jacob’s attendance at an event sponsored by the State Rights Party, as well as his negative evaluation of Jackson’s actions, clearly align him with those who opposed a strong federal government. As Daniel Feller has observed, “Jackson’s strident nationalism affronted southern-rights extremists in and out of South Carolina.”

Across the nation, Democrats had already begun departing their party and adopted the term Whig to describe their opposition to Jackson and his growing presidential power. By the end of the decade, most of Georgia’s state righters joined
“King Andrew the First.”
Following the nullification crisis and his veto of the bank bill, this 1832 cartoon depicted Andrew Jackson as a tyrannical king, trampling on the Constitution.
(Library of Congress.)
the Whig Party, but for the moment, this gathering represented a first step away from the Democrats. In a broader sense, Moses had participated in the initial stages leading to the Civil War. The theory of nullification developed by Calhoun and others became one of the two key constitutional principles next to the right of secession that to southerners justified their departure from the Union. The radical positions taken by Moses, furthermore, are typically associated with the planter class. This essay thus provides a somewhat unusual case study of how the views and needs of merchants converged with the planter elite.25

Whether or not Jacob ever fully embraced Whig ideas remains unclear, but he had taken a step toward his future election as Columbus’s mayor largely with Whig support. Jacob’s initial foray into elected office, however, did not go well. In 1838, in the city’s first municipal election after subdividing the town into six wards, Jacob received the nomination as alderman for Ward Three (also known as the St. Clair Ward) but lost.26 Undaunted, the following year he and John L. Lewis, a future mayor with whom Jacob would come into conflict, were elected Third Ward aldermen, with Jacob appointed to standing committees on contracts and the hospital.

Jacob’s work on the council, not surprisingly, reflected local issues. His most significant contribution may have been his influence in organizing and structuring the city’s preparedness and response to firefighting. Fires, a scourge to antebellum cities, started easily and spread quickly, wiping out businesses and residences. Responding to a citizens’ petition requesting that the council take action to protect the city against fire, Jacob offered a resolution asking that an ad hoc committee study and report back on the best means of protection. He and two other aldermen were appointed, and soon thereafter he presented the committee’s report to the city council. It concluded that the citizens exhibited “very great indifference” toward fire prevention and protection, while the city itself was unprepared to deal effectively with a fire. Complicating matters was the city’s inability to afford water works and two or more fire engines with hoses. The committee recommended prohibiting more than two kegs of powder in any
building, constructing a powder-storage magazine, and establishing a board of fire wardens composed of the mayor, aldermen, and a representative from each ward who would be responsible for preventing and fighting fires in their home districts. The council adopted the committee’s recommendations.27

By the end of the decade, Jacob had made important local business and political connections that served him well in coming years. Yet he still lacked a strong local group through which he could express his Jewish heritage. There was no Jewish congregation in Columbus until 1854, and few Jews lived in the town during its early years. Thus he retained his connection to the Charleston Jewish community. On December 4, 1839, he married Rihah J. Ottolengui of Charleston, the daughter of Abraham and Sarah Jacobs Ottolengui. Although Jacob grew up in a traditional Jewish household, this is the first appearance in the historical record of a connection to his Jewish heritage. His father, Isaiah, was one of five board members who held lifetime appointments at Charleston’s Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim (KKBE). His father-in-law, Abraham Ottolengui, also served on KKBE’s board and was president of the congregation from 1840 to 1850. Jacob’s father ardently opposed efforts to implement reforms at KKBE (although his father-in-law did not) and eventually joined the new congregation, Shearit Israel, after traditionalists lost control in the 1840s. Whether or not Jacob shared his father’s views is unclear.28 Nevertheless, his return to Charleston to marry a Jewish woman demonstrates how important it was to him to marry within the faith and how he remained connected with people and events in his hometown. Rihah gave birth during their first year of marriage to a daughter who later died and was buried in the KKBE Coming Street Cemetery. Only members of KKBE could be interred in its cemetery, but Jacob’s father-in-law asked the congregation board for an exception.29 While the absence of Jewish institutions and community in Columbus challenged his ability to participate in a fully Jewish life, a decade on Georgia’s frontier had not erased Jacob’s Jewish identity. Rather than intermarrying and acculturating, he looked back to his childhood community for help in maintaining his heritage, thereby demonstrating how an estab-
lished Jewish community helped sustain his Jewish identity on the frontier.

National Issues on a Local Level, 1837–1848

The 1840s brought tremendous change for Jacob Moses. During these years, he played an increasingly prominent role in Columbus, dealing with local, state, and national issues that affected the city as well as his hardware business. Whereas he had come to the city as an unmarried seventeen-year-old, by 1840 he was an established businessman living with his wife, three slaves (one female adult and two children), and an unidentified adult male in his twenties.30

He clearly had prospered during the 1830s, but between 1837 and 1844 the country endured a severe cycle of recession, recovery, and depression. The demand for cotton and consequently its price had been high since 1834, but beginning in 1837 the demand plummeted, helping usher in extreme economic hardship for Columbus, whose economy revolved around the crop. In addition, Andrew Jackson’s veto of a bill to recharter the Second Bank of the United States, coupled with his Specie Circular of 1836, helped drain gold and silver coins from the American economy and created widespread distrust of paper currency. As people increasingly sought to exchange paper notes for specie (minted coins), New York banks suspended specie payments in May 1837. The effects rippled across the nation as other banks instituted the same policy. Merchants and individuals increasingly refused bank notes or checks as payment for goods, services, or debts, thereby reducing the amount of available credit. By fall 1838, however, the economy had begun to recover, only to be hit a year later with another panic, another suspension of specie payments, and even more severe economic contraction that lasted through 1844.31

During these years, Whigs, Democrats, and other political parties vigorously debated economic policies and the federal government’s role. Georgia’s State Rights Party had routinely refused to associate nationally with any party. Its stance began to change with the 1840 presidential election, which pitted Democratic incumbent Martin Van Buren against the Whig candidate,
William Henry Harrison. Many State Rights leaders argued that their organization had to associate with a national party in order to exercise greater influence. Yet few party members found either candidate to their liking. Most objected to Van Buren because of his association with Andrew Jackson—he had been Jackson’s Vice President—and his support of high protective tariffs. Harrison and the Whigs, on the other hand, represented strong federal power, abolitionism, the Bank of the United States, and a high protective tariff. Most ultimately joined forces with the Whigs, although a small contingent led by Georgia congressmen Edward J. Black, Mark Anthony Cooper, and Walter T. Colquitt (from Columbus) refused to follow. When State Rights members held an anti–Van Buren convention in Milledgeville, Georgia, on June 1–2, 1840, and endorsed Harrison while excluding Black, Cooper, and Colquitt from its slate of candidates, its “extreme particularist wing” followed the shunned congressmen into the Democratic Party.32 Jacob Moses was among that group.

Within two weeks of the anti–Van Buren convention, twenty-eight citizens from Columbus, including Moses, published “A
CALL!!!” in the Columbus Sentinel & Herald, a Democratic newspaper, with a request that all papers throughout the state republish it. They expressed alarm at the “daring attempt” made at the most recent convention “to transfer the State Rights party to the support of their old opponents the Northern Federalists.” Furthermore, the anti–Van Buren convention’s decision not to place Black, Cooper, and Colquitt on its slate of candidates angered them. The citizens deemed the trio to be “the most [republican] portion of our Delegation” and charged that they “have been indignantly proscribed, and dismissed from the confidence of the Convention on account of their POLITICAL PRINCIPLES.” They believed that the convention dismissed the congressmen because they insisted on adhering to the principles of the State Rights Party and “because they would not permit themselves to be drilled into the support of Gen. Harrison, with a full knowledge that he is a candidate of the enemies of the Constitution, and of the enemies of the South.” They charged the anti–Van Buren convention with invoking the name of the State Rights Party in order to deceive State Rights adherents into supporting “Federal men and Federal measures.” According to them, the convention had been commandeered by those representing the

“A Call!!,” as printed in the Federal Union, Milledgeville, GA, June 16, 1840.
(Courtesy of the Digital Library of Georgia.)
“Opposition party,” coalescing with “that portion of the Union party who were Federalists” and advocates of the Bank of the United States, the tariff, internal improvements, abolition, and strong federal power. The twenty-eight Columbus citizens, therefore, urged the State Rights Party not to “capriciously jeopardize their own principles in the immolation of those three statesmen, who are now, and ever have been, true to the Republican cause.” They invited all those opposed to the Bank and “amalgamating with Northern Federalists” to meet at Milledgeville on July 3 to adopt measures to preserve the party’s principles and save “these three honest and able statesmen.”

Sixty-one representatives from twenty-three Georgia counties attended the State Rights Party Convention. Muscogee County sent nine delegates, second only in number to Putnam County, and Muscogee’s Seaborn Jones acted as convention president. Jacob Moses, however, was not among the delegates. The delegates reaffirmed all the issues and principles outlined in “A Call!!!” and expressed support for Van Buren (despite having opposed him in the 1836 election), while recognizing that some good State Rights men would not be able to support either presidential candidate. The following day the Democratic Republicans (that is, the Democrats) held their state convention in Milledgeville, with several of the Muscogee County State Rights delegates participating as Democratic delegates. This convention also endorsed Van Buren and placed Black, Cooper, and Colquitt on its slate of congressional candidates.

A few weeks later, the Democratic Republicans held a meeting in Columbus in support of Black, Cooper, and Colquitt. About fifteen hundred to two thousand people attended, including Jacob Moses, who served as one of twelve vice presidents for the assembly. Colquitt and others gave speeches followed by several toasts. Similar rallies took place across the state. The Democratic Republicans, however, were unable to stop the Whigs, who won a significant victory both nationally and in Georgia. Colquitt managed to retain his seat in Congress, but Black and Cooper did not.
Despite being on the losing side in the election of 1840, Jacob began to take on a more public role, sometimes through Hall & Moses and sometimes under his own name. He had clearly identified with the most conservative political faction in his state, but its small size led him and those who shared his views to reluctantly partner with larger parties. Thus he was at odds politically with most in his state, at least in terms of the principles that defined party identities. Yet in the upcoming years, he worked with or opposed both Whigs and Democrats, as well as his fellow State Rights cohorts, on the basis of more practical matters. Local issues, more than mere party associations, drove Jacob, who appears not to have entertained political aspirations beyond Columbus. Therefore, while he indeed deserves the label of a State Rights Democrat, his political profile is more complicated. Any characterization of his political principles must be tempered with his concern for local business and economics.

In the year following the 1840 presidential election, the Columbus city council elected Jacob to serve as a port warden, charged with overseeing activities related to the city’s river traffic. In the ensuing months, as the economic situation worsened, Hall & Moses headed a list of eighty-eight businesses and individuals declaring that they would no longer receive or pay out any change bills other than those issued by the Columbus city council. Change bills were part of a complicated antebellum currency system consisting of a mix of specie, paper bills, and notes issued by banks, governments, businesses, and individuals in varying denominations. As Lynn Willoughby explains: “In the absence of a uniform currency provided by the federal government, every local economy had a distinctive currency which originated from scores of businessmen who held disparate assets—and consciences.” To further complicate matters, businesses that required small change as part of their transactions often had to buy coins from a broker at high prices. To compensate, “individuals, municipalities, businesses, and banks issued ‘change bills’ in the amount of one dollar and less.” Change bills, also known as shinplasters, amounted to promises to pay the
bear the bill’s face value either in specie or bank notes upon presentation to the issuer. To say this fostered a complicated and chaotic commercial system is an understatement. Willoughby observes:

Merchants or bankers offered [change bills] as change to their customers who tendered them to other storekeepers in payment of their debts. The latter had little choice but to accept them and pass them along as change to their customers. Therefore, by trading his pieces of paper for something of actual value the man who initiated the change bill had the use of another’s money free of charge. Furthermore, the originator would never have to re-pay a certain percentage of this amount since few people bothered to redeem a bill for six and a quarter cents or the like, and many were lost or destroyed in the process of circulating.38

The need for change bills increased during financial panics like that of 1837, when the number of coins in circulation decreased. When coins were more readily available, the number of change bills in circulation declined. People, however, generally preferred bank notes over change bills because they were backed by specie, although variations in the supply of such coinage created problems.39
For Columbus’ merchants struggling to remain solvent during economic depression, the “great amount and variety” of change bills represented “a great and growing evil.” Responding to the merchants’ announcement, the Columbus Enquirer’s editor asserted that the proliferation of change bills threatened “to do a good deal of mischief” to the country’s business. He called for immediate action, especially since these “shinplaster establishments” were proliferating yet remained unregulated. Columbus’s merchants had acted to address the untenable situation. Jacob Moses’s participation in these actions placed him in opposition to Democrats, despite having sided with them in the 1840 presidential election. Economic realities and implications for his business proved more influential than party associations. This opposition to Democrats began his involvement in a series of economic issues that culminated in his election as Columbus’s mayor. However complex, the issues are important for understanding his election, as well as the influence of local business and economic concerns on his actions.

In addition to the exchange bill problem, Hall & Moses attempted to address the related exchange rate issue. The multiple forms of currency in circulation were not interchangeable at equal values. Businessmen like Hall and Moses who traded outside of their economic region had to exchange their local currency for that used in the area where they were transacting business. Attempting to exchange depreciated currency put them at a disadvantage. Before New York’s banks suspended specie payments in 1837, the exchange rates, that is the price or rate at which one type of currency was converted to another, were nominal, often being set at 2 or 3 percent. After suspension, however, they soared, commonly reaching 15 to 20 percent or higher. Columbus merchants, therefore, struggled to make a profit and pay their creditors, often located in the Northeast. In spring 1841, the Columbus Enquirer called the exchange rates “intolerable” and “insufferable,” and as 1842 began, it deemed the currency situation “truly deplorable.” The newspaper pointed out that the only money circulating in the area were notes from the Central Bank of Georgia and Columbus’s Planters’ and Mechanics’ Bank, with the exchange rate for the
former being 12.5 percent, while the latter went at 25 percent. Half of the farmers and most of the merchants possessed these bills, and many had no choice but to transact business with them.41

By the summer, Hall & Moses and forty-nine other merchants took more drastic steps to overcome the devastating impact of depreciated currency. In another announcement published in the Columbus Enquirer, they gave notice of their intention “to receive no Bank or individual Bill in any contract whatever, made after that date [September 15, 1842], except at the specie value.” In order to offset the “enormous Tax imposed upon us in the high rate of Exchange, which all are compelled to pay who contract debts from home,” as well as to compel the state’s specie-paying banks “to give us a share of their circulation,” the group pledged “to take a determined stand.” Merchants in other Georgia towns such as Macon, Talbotton, and Greeneville took similar actions. When the Jeffersonian reprinted the Columbus merchants’ announcement, it commented, “If the people will keep the ball rolling, we shall have a sound currency in this section in time for the coming Cotton season.”42 A few months later, Columbus merchants appointed Hall & Moses and six others to a board of trade that would “report weekly a corrected Exchange table, as a guide to Merchants and those trading to Columbus.”43 Designed as a tool to help businesses make informed decisions, this table reflected the current value of notes and bills issued by various banks and businesses, whether they were trading at a premium, discount, face value, or were worthless. Hall & Moses’s appointment to this board reflects its influence and standing in Columbus’s business community. Despite these efforts, the economic crisis worsened, while political maneuvering between the city’s Whigs and Democrats increased.

The situation came to a head when on November 16, Columbus’s Democratic representative, Jacob M. Guerry, introduced a bill in the Georgia House of Representatives expanding the authority of Columbus’s mayor and city council to tax individuals and property. It also imposed a large additional tax on brokers and banks. Many in Columbus suspected this was an attempt to drive out the city’s specie-paying banks and protect Georgia’s
Central Bank. Whigs believed that Democrats’ efforts to protect the Central Bank contributed to higher rates of currency exchange that in turn further depreciated the local currency. Guerry’s new bill, therefore, aroused Whig suspicions.44

By November 23, the House had passed Guerry’s bill, causing concern and agitation to grow, especially among Columbus merchants. Six days later, a petition protesting the bill and reportedly signed by several hundred people, including four-fifths of the city’s businessmen, was sent to the state legislature. The next day, however, Columbus’s mayor, John L. Lewis, with whom Jacob Moses had served on the city council in 1839, assembled the aldermen and sent the legislature a message asking it to ignore the petition and pass Guerry’s bill. Citizens called a public meeting that evening in response to the council’s action.45

With “a very respectable portion” of the city’s businessmen in attendance, the meeting began with the election of Jacob Moses as secretary. Five resolutions passed nearly unanimously and were sent to all the local representatives in the state legislature, instructing them to use every effort “to arrest the Legislation, which seeks to rob us of our ONLY sound circulating medium, the bills of specie paying banks whose agencies are located among us.” The following night, the mayor called another public meeting in which he pushed for a resolution praising and supporting Guerry. Once again, Jacob served as secretary. The crowd debated the mayor’s counterresolution until “a late hour,” overwhelmingly rejected the mayor’s resolution, and reaffirmed their original statement.46

Yet any sense of accomplishment was short-lived, because Muscogee County’s state senator refused to present the resolutions to the legislature. Undaunted, the resolution’s supporters turned to Whig legislators for help. Despite two long speeches given by Guerry in the senate in which he denounced the Columbus petitioners, the senate ultimately rejected the bill on December 23.47 Jacob’s opposition to Guerry’s bill demonstrated again his concern for the local business and economic environment over party politics. It further reflected his willingness to work with
Whigs, a group that would play an important role in the upcoming mayoral race.48

As the struggle over Guerry’s bill came to a resolution, Columbus prepared to elect a new mayor. Given the city’s economic distress, the Columbus Enquirer considered the election to be “one of the most important that has ever taken place since our incorporation in 1828.” Several possible mayoral candidates had surfaced including many Whigs. The Enquirer’s editors, R. T. Marks and T. Ragland, urged the Whigs to nominate “their strongest and best men.” They also pointed to the recent events surrounding the Guerry bill as proof that the current Democratic officeholders would “for the sake of perpetuating political power” trample “every interest of the merchant, mechanic and artisan.”49

By December 28, Marks and Ragland feared that the “friends of a good currency” had been circumvented and inadvertently had given the city’s Democrats an opportunity to remain in power. Thus they now called upon their “friends” to show their devotion to “Whig doctrines, principles and measures” by repudiating their enemies’ claims and uniting to nominate “such a candidate as can secure the strength of their party, and gain the day.”50 It is unclear where exactly Jacob Moses was positioned in the middle of this political maneuvering, including at what point he became a mayoral candidate, but his name appeared on the ballot, and he won the election. The Enquirer’s editors, however, were not entirely happy, noting that they “did all we could do, with propriety” to sway their Whig friends to vote for another candidate. They attributed Jacob’s victory to the mayoral election not being “a party question, so far as the Whigs were concerned” and to a large number of Whigs having voted for him.51 The editors explained:

In reference to the Mayor elect, as we have taken some pains to prevent his election, justice requires us to say that we have done so without the slightest disposition to detract from his character, or to lessen the high reputation which our fellow citizens have awarded him. Under other circumstances than those which we conceived to exist, there is scarcely any man in the city to whom we would have given a more cordial support. But believing, as
we honestly did, that his nomination (we should rather say the
vote given for his nomination) was secured by the interposition
of those who were alike opposed to our party and to the best in-
terests of the city, and who had not the slightest disposition
towards a compromise, we could not countenance his election. It
remains to be seen whether our fears are groundless or well sus-
tained.52

The Enquirer’s assessment of Moses, combined with the
events since 1840, provide insight into his relationships, motiva-
tions, and political associations. Clearly by the time of the election,
Jacob had gained the trust and respect of many in Columbus. The
editors opposed his candidacy because of his support from Demo-
crats rather than from any personal objections. His identity as a
Jew apparently played no role in this opposition. His economic
views, principles, reputation, and contacts, however, were critical
to his election. His early political activities seem to be rooted pri-
marily in political principles, especially belief in state power over
federal. Before joining Georgia’s State Rights Party, he likely em-
braced either the Clark or Crawford/Troup parties, two state
factions that loosely identified with the Democrats on a national
level.53 He then moved into the Democratic fold in 1840 rather
than embrace the Whigs. Yet as the economic crisis deepened, his
concern with economic policies, especially their impact at the local
level, caused him to blur political boundaries. In short, he had no
problem allying with Whigs against his Democratic compatriots
and even depended on Whig support to get elected. While he may
have objected to the Whigs on a national level, he found them im-
portant allies in taking economic actions he believed beneficial for
Georgia and Columbus, although he was not sufficiently aligned
with the Whigs to garner the Enquirer’s support. His ambivalent
political identity suggests that the practical realities of running a
business ultimately shaped his politics. His actions as mayor con-
tinued to follow this pattern.

As mayor, Moses continued to deal largely with local issues.
After taking the oath of office on January 9, 1843, he and the
city council, with its Whig majority, got to work.54 The city’s pop-
ulation had grown to almost seven thousand, but the current
economic situation made it more difficult to meet its needs. Among the issues to contend with were a smallpox outbreak, the city’s lack of protection against arson and robbery especially at night, the theft of at least fifty thousand dollars from the Western Insurance and Trust Company office, and the murder of Burton Hepburn by Daniel McDougald, both prominent city leaders from whom Hall and Moses had bought land in Girard, Alabama, in the 1830s. The city’s indebtedness, however, proscribed much of what the council could accomplish. When an alderman made a motion at an early council meeting to install seven water pumps at a cost of up to three hundred dollars, the council vote resulted in a tie. The alderman reasoned that since the city’s income totaled about twenty-five thousand dollars, citizens should receive some benefit from the large amount of taxes they paid. The tie among the aldermen gave Jacob an opportunity to cast a vote. He decided the issue by voting against it.55

A very significant issue during Jacob’s time as mayor concerned the “water lots,” an area fronting the river and divided into thirty-seven lots stretching four blocks between Franklin and Crawford Streets (now Tenth and Fourteenth Streets). This controversy again illustrates the prioritization of economic concerns over political principles in guiding Jacob’s actions. In the events leading to his election as mayor, he worked with and depended on Whigs, even though he had previously aligned with Democrats. Now he would both oppose and then partner with one of his old State Rights’ cronies, John H. Howard. Howard helped form the State Rights Party in 1833 and served on its central committee responsible for statewide organizing. He had joined Jacob in issuing the 1840 call denouncing State Rights members who endorsed Whig presidential candidate William Henry Harrison. Yet when Howard and his business partner, Josephus Echols, sought to purchase the water lots, controversy ensued.56

The river location made the lots’ economic potential great, prompting the *Columbus Enquirer* to assert that “the future weal or woe of our whole community” may depend on how the city council disposed of them. If handled properly, it could, in the newspaper editors’ opinion, propel Columbus to become the
Surveyor’s sketch of 1842.

Jacob Moses resigned as mayor of Columbus after a dispute over selling city property known as the water lots. This surveyor’s sketch shows the location of the lots and their proximity to the Chattahoochee River, which accounted for their value.

(Courtesy of the City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA.)
region’s business and trading center, enhance property values, bring jobs, and replenish the city’s treasury. If handled poorly, it “may produce disasters to the city, and to the people, from which years of toil and [enterprise] may not relieve them.” In 1841 the council had sold all even-numbered water lots to Howard and Echols with the provisos that within five years they erect a dam across the Chattahoochee River and a canal running from the dam through all the lots “for the purpose of propelling machinery.” This, in turn, was supposed to make the lots prime locations for manufacturing projects that required access to water power. The following year, the council voted to sell the remaining lots. In May 1843, during Moses’s term as mayor, the council adopted a report by the Committee on City Improvements that recommended accepting John H. Howard & Company’s offer to buy the remaining lots. The council, however, was divided on the issue, with some believing that Howard’s offer was a paltry amount in comparison to the lots’ value.

After several weeks of debate, the council met again on July 8 to address the water lots. After discussing the propriety of taking up the resolution, Mayor Moses asked “if the motion would be pushed at the present meeting.” Being told that it would, he thanked the council “for the courtesy uniformly extended to him,” expressed “his regret that any question should have arisen which made it necessary for him to dissolve the official relations” between himself and the council, and then resigned.

The council split primarily over how best to deal with the city’s indebtedness, either by taking significantly less money at that moment for the lots or waiting and hoping that in the near future their price would approach more closely their supposed value. Moses resigned in order to stop the sale to Howard, siding with those who felt it was short-sighted. He succeeded at least temporarily, because after he left the council meeting, the aldermen decided to postpone further action on the water lots until election of a new mayor. Nine days later a group of citizens opposing the sale met to nominate a candidate. They first passed a resolution indicating that they “heartily approve the conduct
of the late Mayor” and other council members seeking to stop the sale.61 A second resolution stated:

Resolved, That the late Mayor, Jacob I. Moses, in resigning his station to prevent the consummation of said contract, manifested the highest regard for the general good of the City, and is entitled to the unqualified thanks and approbation of its citizens.62

Those present at the meeting offered to nominate Moses for reelection, but he declined “for reasons exclusively private.” They then nominated Henry T. Hall, a Whig businessman, to replace Moses.63 In the long run, however, Moses’s actions failed. His opponents ultimately prevailed, and the sale eventually passed.

Moses’s agreement with Howard on political principles did not prevent him from opposing his friend on economic lines, and his opposition did not preclude him partnering with Howard in future ventures. Howard made good on his commitments regarding the water lots’ development. Within two years, he had completed most of the required construction related to them and had begun attracting manufacturing businesses to Columbus. Things went so well that in 1845 the Columbus Enquirer noted in regard to the lots’ development, “We are greatly indebted to the energy and forecast of Maj. John H. Howard for the favorable circumstances around us.”64 That same year, the Georgia General Assembly granted Howard and his partners permission to incorporate the Water Lot Company of the City of Columbus, the instrument he would use to further develop the area into what would eventually become the town’s manufacturing center for decades. Two years later, he formed the Howard Manufacturing Company, purchased one of the lots, and began building a cotton factory. Hervey Hall, Jacob Moses’s business partner, was one of the new company’s directors, and Jacob even became a stockholder.65

In keeping with the larger national revolution in transportation and internal improvements, Howard and Moses also worked together to help establish the Muscogee Railroad Company beginning in 1845. Steam locomotives came into use elsewhere in the United States during the late 1820s, while Georgia did not issue charters for railroad companies until 1833. Although the state’s
first lines were completed during the early 1840s, no railroad extended into southwestern Georgia to service its lucrative cotton fields. To fill this gap, the state legislature chartered two railroads in 1845, the Southwestern, which began constructing a line from Macon to Albany, and the Muscogee Railroad, designed to connect Columbus and Macon.66

Connecting with the state’s railroad network was crucial for Columbus’s development and prosperity. The Savannah News aptly stated its importance: “It will open to us [Savannah] an extensive new trade, while it will give to Columbus an immense advantage, by affording her speedy access, at all times to one of the largest and best cotton markets in the Union.”67 Initially, the Muscogee Railroad’s leaders raised funds to finance construction. When its incorporators met in late August 1846, with John G. Winter as chairman, they announced that the company would have seven hundred thousand dollars in capital stock, divided into seven thousand shares of one hundred dollars apiece. They named Jacob Moses, John H. Howard, and three others as commissioners who would receive stock subscriptions in Columbus. Commissioners also were appointed for Talbotton, Thomaston, Macon, and Savannah, Georgia, who subsequently forwarded the collected sums to the Columbus commissioners for deposit in a bank. Having raised the necessary startup funds, the stockholders met in late October and elected seven directors, one of whom was Jacob. Financial needs nonetheless continued to delay construction. In 1848 the directors solicited “one hand subscriptions,” a campaign in which subscribers contributed the money necessary to support one worker during the year. By November, the company published a list of nearly one hundred subscribers, proclaiming that the list “warrants us in assuring the public that the long delayed enterprise will be steadily and successfully prosecuted.” Jacob Moses and Hervey Hall were among the subscribers. Also that year, the Columbus City Council appointed a committee to canvass local taxpayers to determine if they would support a special tax to help finance the railroad. Hall and Moses joined 339 other citizens in supporting the tax, while only twenty-seven opposed it. Jacob strongly supported the railroad, undoubtedly
because of its potential economic impact on the city and his business as well as potential profit from the stock.\textsuperscript{68}

Moses’s interactions with Howard demonstrate how business concerns, more than party politics, usually shaped his actions. He did indeed reflect one of the leading characteristics of antebellum southern identity—ardent support of state rights—but his evaluation of an issue’s local business and economic impact exercised greater influence. In fact, his political identity as a member of the most conservative element of Georgia’s State Rights Party provides less insight into his actions than do his local business and economic decisions. The latter concerns led to his most lasting impact—building Columbus’s economy and infrastructure.

\textit{Local but Cosmopolitan, 1847–1854}

The firm of Hall & Moses weathered the economic crisis of 1837–1844 in reasonably good shape and in succeeding years did quite well. Whereas in 1840 the business had thirteen thousand dollars in stock and real estate, by 1847 the commercial credit reporting agency R. G. Dun estimated its value at forty to fifty thousand dollars, and over the next seven years it ranged as high as one hundred thousand dollars. At the time of Jacob’s death in 1854, his interest in Hall & Moses was valued at over one hundred thousand dollars.\textsuperscript{69} The business even rebounded from a fire on March 3, 1847, that destroyed its Broad Street building and stock. The fire started in a nearby building and spread quickly, burning for two to three hours and partially damaging or completely destroying numerous businesses. Within a couple of days, however, Hall & Moses advertised in the \textit{Columbus Enquirer} that it already had a fresh stock of hardware “on the way from England and the North,” and it had secured the building next door where it would resume business as soon as the new stock arrived. In the meantime, its customers could purchase items from its second store, J. I. Moses & Co, located in “the new block of buildings up town.”\textsuperscript{70} Two weeks later the new stock, consisting of a wide variety of hardware goods, had arrived and was ready for sale. Within three more weeks, the partners advertised that since the fire they had received over twenty thousand dollars’ worth of hardware,
“which makes their stock as complete as any ever offered in Columbus.” By mid-October they moved into their new store, rebuilt in its original location, and boasted that they offered “the best stocks of hardware ever brought to Georgia,” with fresh goods arriving weekly from New York and Europe.\(^7\)

Hall & Moses’s ability to receive goods consistently and quickly from as far away as Europe was further enhanced when Jacob moved to New York City sometime between 1845 and June 1847. Advertisements touting the business noted that with Jacob “being constantly in New York,” it now had “an advantage not possessed by any other House in the State.” The partners assured customers that this move allowed them to keep in stock a complete line of hardware purchased at the best terms.\(^7\) Jacob’s relocation to New York demonstrates that while he may have focused on local issues during his two decades in Columbus, he certainly was not an isolated, parochial southern storekeeper. He illustrates, in fact, the point made by Mark K. Bauman that Jews in the South were “anything but provincials” but instead “migrated from place to place and were strongly linked by ties of family, business, religious institutions, and ethnic identity.”\(^7\) Jacob lived out his life within an urban triangle demarcated by Charleston, Columbus, and New York. Given that almost all antebellum hardware was imported from England and Germany, and that
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_Hall & Moses advertisement indicating that a partner, Jacob Moses, will be “constantly in New York.”_ (Courtesy of the Digital Library of Georgia.)
New York City was the nation’s commercial center, Jacob likely had been making buying trips there and dealing with international dealers since the 1830s. In the late 1840s, he apparently began to devote all his energy to purchasing, financing, importing, and shipping the hardware to Columbus, while his business partner, Hervey Hall, dealt with local sales and direct management of the stores. While not an unusual business arrangement for the era, this division of responsibilities reflected the firm’s growing strength.74

Jacob returned to Columbus from time to time, but New York City was now his home.75 A stipulation placed in his will reflects how thoroughly he seems to have embraced his northern home. Jacob drew up his will in 1851 in New York City, although it was probated in Muscogee County. He specified that twenty thousand dollars be placed in trust for his three sons, Montefiore, Moultrie, and Rynear, and be invested by three “respectable & responsible gentlemen” of New York. As each son turned twenty-one, he would receive a third of the money. Jacob instructed that each son be “raised and educated” in New York until they turned seventeen, “when if considered more advantageous to the completion of their education they may be placed elsewhere at College.” He wanted them to remain under his wife’s care “as long as she continues in New York” or until she remarried, at which time they would be placed under the direction of the three “respectable & responsible gentlemen.”76

Jacob’s last will and testament reflects his belief that New York City offered better opportunities for his sons than did Columbus or even Charleston. Despite having spent most of his life in the South, he preferred to raise his family in the North. Four of his eight children were born in New York. Not bounded by geographic region, he moved out of the South in order to better his business, but he then took steps to insure that his sons would remain in the North even if that meant being separated from their mother. In much the same way that his business and economic concerns caused him to cross political boundaries, partnering with Democrats, Whigs, and State Rights members in order to advance local priorities, they also led him to cross regional
boundaries. His business actually was only partially located in the South. While he sold merchandise to southerners, he had to engage and negotiate with northerners and Europeans. Relocating to the North, therefore, brought advantages that living in the South did not.

Before and after moving to New York, Jacob drew on connections outside of his immediate locale to support his Jewish identity. The Charleston Jewish community remained an important conduit to his Jewish heritage. When his wife, Rinah, died in 1845 while in Charleston, she was buried in the same KKBE Coming Street Cemetery in which their infant daughter had been buried five years before. Three years later, Jacob married his deceased wife’s sister, Sarah. The ceremony apparently was held at KKBE, but as nonmembers the couple had to get permission from the congregation’s board. Abraham Ottolengui, who was the congregation’s president, explained that his daughter would soon marry Jacob, but “it might occur, that circumstances beyond his control would render it necessary or expedient to deprive him of the pleasure to have the ceremony performed” by the congregation’s rabbi, Gustavus Poznanski. He had notified Poznanski, who “kindly [yielded] to the proposal.” The board then “unanimously granted the permission specified” in article six of KKBE’s constitution.

By this time KKBE had embraced reforms. Both Ottolengui and Poznanski supported the reform efforts, while Jacob’s father did not, choosing to leave and join Shearit Israel. Perhaps these potentially awkward circumstances explain Ottolengui’s comments. It is not known who officiated at the wedding, but one possibility is Jacob’s brother-in-law, Jacob Rosenfeld, hazan at Shearit Israel and an advocate of tradition. After the ceremony, Jacob returned with his new wife to New York. Just over a year later, the couple had their first child, Hervey Hall Moses. The child, however, died in 1850, and once again Jacob used KKBE’s Coming Street Cemetery for the burial. Finally, when Jacob died in 1854 at the age of forty-three, his funeral was held at his brother Abraham’s house in Charleston, with burial in the Coming Street Cemetery.
Jacob appears to have maintained not only his Jewish identity throughout his life, but also his connection to traditional Judaism. It is not known if he joined a congregation in New York, but he apparently was well-acquainted with Isaac Leeser, the leader of the traditionalist faction within the American Jewish community. He was a charter subscriber in 1843 to Leeser’s *The Occident and Jewish American.*\(^8^1\) In an 1866 article in *The Occident*, Leeser mentioned a conversation he had with Jacob sometime around 1851. That article addressed the lack of trained men to lead America’s Jewish congregations and the need for American Jews to take steps to educate leaders. According to Leeser:

> We need Rabbis, preachers, Hazanim or readers, school-masters, editors of religious journals, secretaries of congregations and religious societies, Shochatim, and, more than all, an intelligent and pious laity. . . . Indeed, it is now about fifteen years ago that the late Jacob I. Moses, at one time Mayor of Columbus, Georgia, had a conversation with us about establishing a college, and he wanted to enlist the co-operation of Solomon Cohen, Esq., of Savannah, and of other men of mind and means, in the task; but his death, which soon after occurred, delayed, but we trust frustrated not, the good work. Had our friend lived, we have no doubt that his energy and pious zeal would have accomplished much, at least he could have awakened in others a kindred desire to see the work firmly established.\(^8^2\)

Leeser had been thinking about establishing a rabbinic school for several years, and in 1867 his efforts led to the opening of Maimonides College. Years before, though, Jacob had aspired to develop a similar institution. He also contributed to the founding of the Jews’ Hospital in New York, later renamed Mount Sinai Hospital. In January 1854 he served on a committee that organized a banquet and ball to raise money for the hospital’s construction. In addition, he designated in his 1851 will that one hundred dollars be given to the hospital should it be founded within five years of his death. It was, with construction begun in early 1854 and completed the next year.\(^8^3\) His commitment to Judaism, therefore, led him to exert significant effort to follow traditions and to build Jewish institutions.
Columbus Enquirer, April 10, 1855.

Hall & Moses announcement of the dissolution of the original partnership following the death of Jacob Moses and the firm’s reformation with Isaac Moses in his brother’s place. (Courtesy of the Digital Library of Georgia.)

Isaac I. Moses Builds on His Brother’s Work, 1850–1890

Jacob’s death did not mean the end of the Hall & Moses hardware business. His younger brother, Isaac I. Moses, helped continue it under the name Hall, Moses & Company. Isaac had been in Columbus since at least 1850 when, at the age of twenty-eight, Hall & Moses announced that he would be “our authorized attorney” while the founding partners were absent from the state. Isaac continued as a business partner for almost two decades, nearly as long as Jacob. Other family members also worked in the business. At the time of Jacob’s death, another brother, Ezra I. Moses, worked in Savannah as a commission and forwarding merchant. By 1859 he was in Columbus working for Hall, Moses & Company, along with Jacob’s son Moultrie. After the Civil War, Ezra returned to Savannah and partnered with sister Adeline Moses’s husband, Adolph J. Brady, as commission merchants before moving to Philadelphia in the 1870s.
Brady, who served as one of the executors of Jacob’s will, had partnered in the 1850s with Solomon Solomon in a pioneer hardware business in Atlanta and eventually moved to New York, performing much the same role that Jacob had for Hall & Moses.86 Finally, in 1859, another brother, Abraham, and two other partners purchased the Montgomery hardware store Hall, Moses & Roberts. Isaac played a significant role in financing the reorganized Montgomery firm, now named Wyman, Moses, and Company.87

Without giving a detailed analysis of Isaac’s actions, a brief consideration of his business, political, and religious ventures provides greater context for understanding Jacob’s activities, their larger impact, and their web of connections. The hardware store constituted the center of Isaac’s business activities. When Hall & Moses was reconstituted as Hall, Moses & Company, the partnership consisted of Isaac, Hervey Hall, Jacob P. Hendricks (also spelled Henricks), and William A. Beach.88 Isaac and Hendricks were first cousins, their mothers being sisters.89 Beach, a non-Jew, was from Connecticut, but his family had long been friends with the Isaac Clifton Moses family, as well as Raphael J. Moses.90 He and Hendricks began as clerks in Hall & Moses before becoming partners. The business apparently carried on much as it had prior to Jacob’s death. It maintained an office in New York, although none of the partners moved there permanently.91 Isaac Moses and Beach primarily oversaw the business following Hendricks’s death in a duel near Savannah in 1857.92 Hervey Hall then moved to Brazil after the Civil War, reportedly because he felt it better to leave the country rather than live in a defeated South under northern rule.93 This partnership lasted until 1871, when it was dissolved by mutual consent, with Beach continuing the business under the name of Wm. Beach.94

Among his significant accomplishments, Isaac helped Hall, Moses & Company expand into the foundry business. In late 1855, the firm began advertising that it now made a large variety of castings, including mill and gin gearing, plates, balls, sugar and bark mills, and iron railing, with the promise that “we will sell cheaper than Railing made at the North.”95 This likely reflects a
relationship established between Hall, Moses & Company and Brown’s Foundry, an operation owned by William R. Brown. Earlier in the year, the two companies had advertised that orders for various iron products placed at Hall, Moses & Company would receive “prompt attention.” The company’s involvement in the foundry business actually began in 1853 when Brown, who had begun working in Columbus’s fledgling foundry industry during the 1840s, met with Hall, Moses, and Beach and founded the Columbus Iron Works. Three years later, Hendricks joined them in incorporating the works, and by 1858 advertisements appeared indicating that the Columbus Iron Works Company—formerly Brown’s Foundry—continued to be fully operational.

Development of the foundry before the war reflected southern attempts at industrial independence from the North. When the Civil War came, the Columbus Iron Works played an important
role in supporting the Confederate war effort. It manufactured a few artillery pieces before being leased by the Confederacy in 1862 as a naval iron works facility. It then produced several types of steam engines, iron fittings, boilers, and other types of machinery, becoming the Confederacy’s largest manufacturer of naval machinery. According to John S. Lupold, the engines and boilers of the C. S. (Columbus) Naval Iron Works “drove at least half of the steam-powered vessels built by the Confederacy, including the gunboat Chattahoochee and the ironclad Muscogee.” Despite being destroyed in 1865 by fire set by United States troops, the company, under Brown’s leadership, quickly resumed operations after the war on a larger scale. It remained in existence until 1965 and played an important role in Columbus’s economy.98

Isaac Moses contributed in other ways to the Confederacy’s manufacturing needs. Georgia Governor Joseph E. Brown took note of Isaac’s efforts in an address to the state General Assembly on November 6, 1861:

So great are our necessities for arms and such the difficulties attending their importation, that I again call the attention of the General Assembly to this important subject, and suggest the propriety of either establishing a State Foundry for their manufacture, or of guaranteeing to such Company as will engage to manufacture them, such an amount of patronage as will secure success. I am informed that Col. Isaac I. Moses, a citizen of Columbus, of sufficient capital and great energy of character, acting in conjunction with Mr. John D. Gray, of Catoosa county, whose reputation for energy and enterprise is well known to our people, is perfecting preparations to manufacture at Columbus, excellent Rifles in large numbers, within the next two or three months. It is said they have already made considerable progress in their enterprise and that Mr. Gray can furnish stocks quite rapidly, and that with his aid Col. Moses will soon be able to turn out the guns complete. Should it be found on a thorough investigation of this subject by the military committee, that the enterprise of Col. Moses and Mr. Gray will be successful, I recommend that a contract be entered into with these gentlemen, or with any others who may be prepared to furnish the arms, for such supply as the future necessities of the State may require.99
The governor’s statement not only reflects Isaac’s industrial support for the Confederacy but his connections with those in the highest levels of Georgia’s government.100

By all appearances, Isaac reflected and supported the southern cause. In addition to his efforts to provide much-needed manufacturing facilities, he also owned slaves.101 Furthermore, he and his brother Ezra, as well as Hall, Moses & Company, joined with other individuals and businesses to form the Georgia Importing and Exporting Company in order to trade directly with foreign countries. This demanded running the federal blockade.102

The picture, however, is not completely clear. In October 1864 John G. Winter, a wealthy and prominent Columbus businessman who supported the Union, wrote from London to Andrew Johnson, who at the time was Abraham Lincoln’s vice-presidential running mate. Winter was also a friend and business partner with Raphael J. Moses, even having sold Raphael his Columbus plantation home, Esquiline. Winter was happy that federal troops had finally reached “the heart of my beloved state.” Lamenting “the sufferings of the friends of our Country, residing in Davis’ Dominions,” Winter hoped to save from “annihilation” those he could by giving Johnson “the names of those who have never given any more aid & Comfort to the Enemy than they were compelled to do by the tyranny of their neighbors.” He appended to his letter a list of all those in Columbus and Montgomery he remembered “as being faithful among the faithless & as I learn from authentic sources have never in heart surrendered. Some have been very quiet, but still true & only are awaiting an opportunity of folding the old Flag to their hearts.” Isaac and his brother Ezra were among those identified by Winter as Union sympathizers.103

Isaac’s application for a federal pardon in August 1865 appears to confirm Winter’s assertion. He explained that after Georgia seceded he “took no active part in the war but his sympathies were with the South.” Nonetheless, he opposed secession but “fell into the tide of popular opinion.” Furthermore, even though he was eligible for conscription, he “never entered the service actively” and instead employed a substitute, a claim supported by a newspaper ad run in 1862 by Hall, Moses & Company for “an able
While Isaac could have simply been telling the federal official what he needed to obtain a pardon, the combination of his explanation with Winter’s letter suggests he was not. In some ways, his embrace of the Confederate cause reflects more of a survival strategy than wholehearted support. Openly opposing secession would have made it difficult to remain in Columbus and carry on a successful business. Rather than leave Columbus, as Winter did, and despite having reservations about the path his fellow southerners had chosen, he acquiesced.

For some historians, slave ownership and commitment to state rights and the Confederacy reflect “distinctly Southern cultural forms” that caused Jews living in the South to differ “markedly from their counterparts elsewhere in the United States.” They argue that while the institutional, economic, and business activities and patterns of southern Jews differed little from other American Jews, their acceptance of southern cultural forms set them apart. The experiences of Jacob and Isaac Moses, however, reflect a more complicated situation. Both embraced these “distinctly Southern cultural forms.” Both supported the South. Yet, they also acted in ways that subordinated these so-called distinctive actions to other concerns. Jacob’s economic, business, and family priorities eventually led him to leave the South, while Isaac used support for the Confederacy to maintain and enhance his business and family circumstances. Thus the mere presence of these characteristics does not indicate a distinctively southern Jewish identity. As Anton Hieke has demonstrated, many Jews living in the region during Reconstruction had “an ambivalent Southern identity” that reflected southern cultural forms but was not fixed and unchanging. Hieke emphasizes the geographic mobility of Reconstruction-era Jews, arguing that they possessed a “somewhat trans-regional identity as they moved freely between the individual regions of the United States.” Jacob Moses illustrates an antebellum example of this transregional identity, while Isaac Moses demonstrates how a Jew living his entire life in the South could also possess an ambiguous southern identity.
As the South emerged from the Civil War, some of the region’s leaders called for developing a New South based especially on business, manufacturing, and industrialization. Jacob and Isaac Moses represent forerunners of this movement. They engaged in national and international commerce while constantly seeking new business opportunities that also helped build the region’s economic and physical infrastructure. Like his brother, Isaac participated in activities that benefitted Columbus and the surrounding region, investing in and helping organize ventures related to railroads, manufacturing, financial institutions, and real estate development. By combining entrepreneurial endeavors with infrastructure development, the Moses brothers acted similarly to other Jewish businessmen, such as Moses Elias Levy, who helped develop the Florida community of Micanopy in conjunction with his nearby sugarcane plantation, and his son, David Levy Yulee, who helped facilitate construction of the state’s railroad system.

Isaac also followed his brother’s pattern by helping to grow the area in and around Girard, Alabama. Jacob’s activities, however, consisted primarily in expanding his hardware business into the developing town, whereas Isaac diversified his local commercial pursuits. He built one of the first homes in nearby Brownsville, Alabama (modern day Phenix City), by about 1860. After Columbus’s Eagle Manufacturing Company began building houses in Brownsville for its workers, Isaac too built several tenements, with one area dubbed Moses Row. Several years later, in 1882, the Columbus Sunday Enquirer described Isaac as “highly esteemed as a landlord,” noting that “his houses always find tenants at reasonable rates.” In addition, he participated in the founding of a building and loan association in Girard, as well as starting a newspaper in Brownsville. He personally benefited from these endeavors, but so too did these Alabama communities.

Beyond Isaac’s postwar business efforts, he played an important role in public education, helping establish public schools in both Girard and Columbus. After Georgia’s General Assembly passed a bill in late 1866 allowing Columbus to establish a public...
school, the city council appointed Isaac among the school’s first trustees. He remained in this position until his death in 1890, the only original board member still serving. During those years, he exerted tremendous influence on Columbus’s public school system. One of his first actions came when he was appointed to a committee charged with raising money to purchase the old Presbyterian Church building, which was to be converted into a school. The committee successfully raised the funds, with Isaac contributing one hundred dollars. Also during the school’s first year, the trustees debated the type of devotional exercises to open and close the school day. Some wanted to require daily Bible readings, but this proved controversial. Years later, Isaac explained that “as an Israelite,” he proposed the Lord’s Prayer (Matthew 6:9–13; Luke 11:2–4) in place of Bible readings. The majority of the board found this acceptable and approved it. Isaac did not explain his rationale for suggesting the Lord’s Prayer. Although the Lord’s Prayer is thoroughly Christian in its use and origin, its text contains no Christological language. Its title does, but it is not part of the biblical text, having arisen in later Christian usage. The prayer’s sentiments are theologically neutral, at least in terms of reflecting distinctions between Judaism and Christianity. Plus, certain elements contained in the prayer also appear in Jewish liturgy. It was perhaps not an ideal selection for Isaac and the Jews of Columbus, but it was better than a steady diet of New Testament readings with more pronounced Christological sentiments. Whatever the reason, as the only non-Christian board member, Isaac cleverly managed to lessen Jewish students’ exposure to more objectionable elements of Christianity. He essentially used Christian scripture to blunt Christian teachings.

In 1876 questions arose over Isaac’s eligibility to serve on the board given that he had a home outside the state. He contended that his Alabama house was merely a summer home and that he remained a citizen of Columbus. His explanation satisfied most because he continued to serve on the board with widespread support. The issue flared up again in 1888 when an individual wrote a letter to the Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun charging that the school board was “a self-perpetuating body” because it had the power to
fill its own vacancies. In a clear reference to Isaac Moses, the writer asked, “Can a citizen of one state, with his interests entirely in a foreign state, enact laws for another state?” A few days later, another letter appeared, pointing out that three of the city’s wards had no board representation, while Isaac did not even live in Columbus. At the next city council meeting, one alderman proposed that the council fill all future school board vacancies, while another suggested that a committee be appointed to determine whether Isaac lived in Georgia or Alabama. John Peabody, the board’s chair, responded with a letter to the newspaper in which he explained that when the city council made its original appointments in 1867, it paid “great attention to the religious opinions of the trustees, and so made their selections as not only to give every religion a representative, but also, as far as practicable, to equalize the influence of each sect.” The original board was comprised of three Baptists, three Methodists, two Presbyterians, and one Jewish, one Catholic, and one Episcopalian representative. Subsequent boards had tried to follow a similar policy in order to ensure harmony in the city. Peabody also defended Isaac’s eligibility by asserting that his permanent residence was in Columbus. Despite this support, Isaac resigned. He explained, “After more than twenty-one years’ service in the board of trustees as Jewish representative of my fellow-citizens of Columbus without a murmur of disapproval, and without a single religious complaint, but with an established and increasing moral respect and brotherhood among pupils of different faiths in the public schools, I now resign my position as member of the board, leaving you to select, from the earnest educators among my co-religionists, my successor.” He also expressed “grave apprehensions” over the proposed change to the board’s power to fill vacancies.

Isaac used a technique that his brother had employed forty-five years earlier in the dispute over the water lots—resignation. By resigning he removed himself from the controversy but subtly put pressure on the board to select another Jew to replace him. The city council seemingly addressed both issues when it made Isaac a lifetime honorary member of the school board, thereby
making his residency irrelevant in terms of representation and restoring Jewish representation on the board. The school board subsequently affirmed the council’s action, although it stipulated that Isaac could perform all functions of a regular trustee with the exception of voting. Two months later, it elected L. H. Chappell, an Episcopalian and future six-term mayor of Columbus, to replace him. While Isaac still represented the Jewish community on the board, he now served only in an advisory capacity. This situation, however, was not permanent, because when another vacancy arose in October 1891, the school board elected Louis Buhler, a prominent Jewish businessman. Columbus’s Jews rou-
tinely held a place on the board well into the twentieth century, and, on more than one occasion this expectation was explicitly expressed. For example, after the death of Sol Loeb, another prominent Jewish businessman, in 1917, the Columbus Ledger noted that “[it] has been the custom for a number of years to have the different religious denominations represented on the board, and it is very probable that some member of the Jewish faith will be selected to succeed Mr. Loeb.” Similar to the way David Mayer helped carve out a “Jewish seat” on Atlanta’s school board during the exact same period, so did Isaac Moses help establish and maintain one in Columbus, ensuring Jewish influence on the city’s public education for decades to come. Mayer, however, was not selected because he was Jewish, and Jewish representation in Atlanta was implied rather than formally stated.

Isaac’s role as the Jewish community’s representative on the school board is just one indicator of the value he placed on his Jewish heritage, as well as the maturation of Columbus’s Jewish community. By the 1850s, the community had grown large enough to begin forming institutions. Organizing a synagogue, Temple Israel, in 1854, Columbus’s Jews purchased and converted a house into a synagogue five years later. By that time approximately twenty Jewish families resided in the city. In upcoming years, they created other organizations including a chapter of B’nai B’rith (1866), a social organization named Columbus Concordia (1870), and a charitable society called the Daughters of Israel (1874). Isaac took his place within this community. In 1856 he married within the faith, wedding Columbus’s Hannah Maria Moses, the daughter of Raphael J. Moses. She died in 1860, and nine years later he married his former wife’s maternal cousin, Mary Alice Moses, Charles Brown Moses’s daughter. When Isaac drew up his will in 1881, he included the proviso that should any of his children “marry out of the Jewish race and faith,” they would forfeit their interest in his estate. Like his older brother, Isaac subscribed to Leeser’s Occident, as well as the Jewish Messenger, a traditionalist newspaper produced weekly in New York.
Isaac, though, had one advantage that Jacob lacked—the presence of an established Jewish community. Unlike Jacob, he was not dependent on the Charleston community but instead interacted with other local Jews, especially through their organizations. Both his weddings, for instance, took place in Columbus, and he was buried in the Jewish section of the city’s Linwood cemetery.

The development of a Jewish community, however, meant that he maintained a higher public profile as a Jew than did his brother and contributed not only to Columbus’s overall development but also to its Jewish life. He therefore elevated the visibility of
the Jewish community in Columbus in ways that Jacob could not.123

Conclusion

Today few people know of Jacob and Isaac Moses. In 2014 the Columbus Museum staged an exhibit about the Jewish community in the Chattahoochee Valley. While the exhibit mentioned that Jacob served as mayor, it gave no other details about his life or contributions. The situation with Isaac is similar. In 1933 Phenix City began constructing the Moses Memorial Bridge, named after Isaac, across Holland Creek on Broad Street. Completed in 1935, the bridge’s name likely arose from the efforts of his son, also named Isaac I. Moses, who was president of the Russell County, Alabama, Board of Roads and Revenue and a former mayor of Girard, Alabama. Other than acknowledging that Isaac was an “outstanding citizen,” accounts of the bridge’s dedication did not explain what made him outstanding. In short, the Moses brothers are significant because, despite their relative anonymity among historians and most locals, they helped to create Columbus and the surrounding area. In doing so, they demonstrated the complexities and sophistication of nineteenth-century Jewish life rooted in, but extending beyond, the South.124

This essay illustrates several important themes and breaks new ground in others. By providing a case study of the movement of Jews across the country, it demonstrates that mobility did not necessarily break ties with places of origin. In fact, as Mark K. Bauman, Leonard Rogoff, and others have argued, Jewish communities in Baltimore, Charleston, New York, and similar enclaves served as centers for peripheral Jewish life.125 Beyond religion, intra- and cross-regional Jewish/family networks facilitated the success of business ventures especially in difficult times like Reconstruction. The move of Jacob Moses to New York as the agent for his southern business reinforces the pattern delineated by Elliott Ashkenazi.126 In terms of business and economic history, the extended Moses family involvement in the hardware business offers for future exploration a new economic niche into which Jews entered. Extension of the business to other communities and
further investments in internal improvements and land development reflect typical growth patterns for Jewish economic mobility.

Historians often list Jewish office holders but fail to explain their specific policies and activities. Jacob Moses’s experience in the public sphere sheds new light on the role of Jews in political parties and offices. Specifically it elucidates a Jewish merchant’s position in relation to the tariff, monetary policy, state rights, and a factious political party system while placing these in the context of his financial priorities. Isaac Moses’s experiences demonstrate a transition into a greater local Jewish consciousness on the parts of Jews and non-Jews. He and those Jews who followed him on the school board held office as Jewish representatives and pursued policies as such. This essay thus goes beyond Bauman’s findings, since in Atlanta ethnic politics was not specifically defined in contrast to the situation in Columbus.

In a broader sense, the story of the Moses family demonstrates that Jews in the South were cosmopolitan, economically and geographically mobile, and willing to take controversial positions. They fit into and contributed to southern communities even as they retained their distinctiveness. Their identity with the South, therefore, was conditional in relation to religious, economic, and familial priorities.

NOTES

Many people have helped me in researching and writing this essay. I especially want to thank the many archivists who assisted in finding important information. I also am grateful to Jean Kiralfy Kent, Kay Broda, Gina Satlof Block, and Linda Kennedy, all of Columbus, Georgia, who gave valuable and hospitable assistance. As always, Mark Bauman has provided indispensable guidance.

1 There were actually three unrelated Moses families from Charleston, South Carolina, that resided in Columbus, Georgia, at about the same time and eventually intermarried with each other. Jacob and Isaac represented the first of these families. Their father, Isaiah Moses, was a native of Hanover, Germany, and immigrated to England during the 1790s, where he lived for a few years before immigrating to Charleston sometime just before 1800. See Judith Alexander Weil Shanks, Old Family Things: An Affectionate Look Back (Washing-
Raphael J. Moses represented the second family. He was the son of Israel Moses and grandson of Philip Moses. See Malcolm Stern, First American Jewish Families: 600 Genealogies, 1654–1988 (Cincinnati, 1978), 212; Stern’s genealogies are searchable online, and individual pages can be downloaded from The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives (hereafter cited as AJA), http://americanjewisharchives.org/publications/fajf/, accessed January 13, 2015. The third Moses family consisted of various descendants of Isaac Clifton Moses, who was the son of Myer Moses. This group included Isaac Clifton’s daughter, Eliza Matilda, who married Raphael J. Moses. James William Hagy indicates that Myer Moses, who was born in 1735, came from England in 1767 and that Isaac Clifton Moses, born in 1781, was a member of Charleston’s Reformed Society of Israelites. See James William Hagy, This Happy Land: The Jews of Colonial and Antebellum Charleston (Tuscaloosa, 1993), 50, 62, 137, 160; Stern, First American Jewish Families, 205, 207, accessed January 13, 2015. Stanford S. Moses, grandson of both Jacob I. and Raphael J. Moses, wrote in an unpublished work about a visit that his grandparents, Raphael and Eliza Moses, made in 1844 to Stamford, Connecticut. Eliza’s father, Isaac Clifton Moses, had died and was buried there ten years earlier while visiting friends, the Beach family. Stanford observes: “This incident appears to mark the beginning of the long friendship of the Beach family with three separate, unrelated Moses families, except as related by marriage: the Isaac C. Moses family, the Raphael J. Moses family and the family of Jacob I. Moses.” Stanford S. Moses, “Raphael J. Moses. His Life and Letters, with Notes and Comment,” 49–50, Historic Columbus Foundation Collection, Columbus, Georgia. See also Raphael Jacob Moses, Last Order of the Lost Cause: The True Story of a Jewish Family in the “Old South,” ed. Mel Young (Lanham, Md., 1995), 61–62. The September 25, 1834, editions of both the Southern Patriot of Charleston, SC, and Charleston Courier indicate that on September 3, 1834, Isaac C. Moses died near New Haven. He is buried in the Branford Center Cemetery, Branford, New Haven County, Connecticut.


3 John S. Lupold, Columbus, Georgia, 1828–1978 (Columbus, GA, 1978), 3–6; Gerald L. Holder, “State Planned Trading Centers in Pioneer Georgia,” Pioneer America 14 (September 1982): 120–22. Beginning in March 1827, a land lottery was held in order to distribute the Creek lands. Regarding the city’s population, the Macon Telegraph reported on March 17, 1828, that there already were eight to nine hundred people living in Columbus.

4 John H. Martin, Columbus, Geo., from its Selection as a “Trading Town” in 1827, to Its Partial Destruction by Wilson’s Raid, in 1865, v. 1, Part 1. 1827 to 1846 (Columbus, GA, 1874), 16. While neither county nor city records reflect Jacob’s purchase of lots in 1828, mentions of his business in various issues of the 1828 Columbus Enquirer indicate his presence in the town.

5 Hagy, This Happy Land, 94–95, 176–177; Theodore Rosengarten and Dale Rosengarten, eds., A Portion of the People: Three Hundred Years of Southern Jewish Life (Columbia, SC, 2002), 102–103.
Whenever the term Hall & Moses appears in this essay, it refers to the business. The phrase Hall and Moses refers to the individual owners, Hervey Hall and Jacob Moses.

“Hervey Hall,” Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun, January 24, 1878; See also, “The Georgia Press,” Macon Weekly Telegraph, October 28, 1873; “Trinity Episcopal Church,” Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun, September 3, 1882; Lynn Willoughby, A Power for Good: The History of Trinity Parish Columbus, Georgia (Macon, GA, 1999), 8. Note that in older sources Hall’s first name often is misspelled as Harvey. The same applies for the middle initial in Jacob I. Moses’s name, as well as his brother, Isaac I. Moses: the I often appears as a J.

Barnett A. Elzas, The Old Jewish Cemeteries at Charleston, S.C. (Charleston, 1903), 54; Stern, First American Jewish Families, 211, accessed January 13, 2015. Hervey Hall Moses lived only a short while, being born on August 22, 1849, and dying on June 10, 1850. Stern indicates that the child was born in New York City, where Jacob and his family were living at the time, although the child does not appear in the 1850 New York City federal census, as it was conducted after his death.

Columbus Enquirer, April 21, 1832.

Columbus Enquirer, June 2, 1832, and December 15, 1832.


An exceedingly large number of products made up the hardware industry as a whole, so it is difficult to delineate precisely when American-made hardware collectively exceeded foreign imports. Nonetheless, this likely did not occur until after the Civil War. See William H. Becker, “Wholesale Hardware Trade Associations, 1870–1900,” Business History Review 45 (Summer 1971): 181; Lewis E. Atherton, “Itinerant Merchandising in the Ante-Bellum South,” Bulletin of the Business Historical Society 19 (April 1945): 49. Much of the imported hardware came from England and Germany and, according to Edward C. Simmons, in 1850 as much as four-fifths of the country’s hardware was imported. See Edward C. Simmons, “The Hardware Trade” in One Hundred Years of American Commerce, 1795–1895, ed. Chauncey M. Depew, vol. 2 (New York, 1895), 633–634.

“Our Town,” Columbus Enquirer, December 27, 1834. See also, John S. Lupold and Thomas L. French, Jr., Bridging Deep South Rivers: The Life and Legend of Horace King (Athens, GA, 2004), 9; “Prosperity of Columbus,” Columbus Enquirer, August 4, 1832.

“Removal,” Columbus Enquirer, November 20, 1835. By 1836 Hall & Moses routinely identified their store’s location in advertisements as “Broad Street, sign of the Padlock”; see, for instance, the advertisement in the Columbus Enquirer, April 15, 1836. Hall & Moses bought one-sixth of lot 170 on February 20, 1835; see James C. Sullivan to Hall & Moses, February 20, 1835, Deeds vol. A, 226, Office of the Muscogee County Clerk of Superior and State Courts, Columbus, GA. Lot 170 was later redesignated as 96 Broad Street. Hall &
Moses had since at least 1865 been identified with 96 Broad, although businesses on Broad Street had been using street numbers since at least 1853. See Hall & Moses’s advertisement in the September 16, 1865, *Columbus Enquirer*, where their location is identified as “No. 96, Old Stand, Broad Street.” In 1886, 96 Broad Street became 1120 Broad Street when Columbus renumbered its streets, and Broad Street’s name was later changed to Broadway. “The City Fathers,” *Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun*, March 4, 1886. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from 1885 and 1889 also reflect this change. I am grateful to David Owings and the staff at the Columbus State University archives in Columbus, GA, for helping confirm that lot 170 on Broad Street, 96 Broad Street, and 1120 Broadway are all the same location.

15 Lupold and French, *Bridging Deep South Rivers*, 57. The founding of Girard grew out of the 1832 Treaty of Cusseta, which required Creek Indians to relinquish claims to all of their Alabama lands but included the promise from the United States that it would survey all the land and open it to white settlement, with the exception of certain parcels allotted to particular Creek chiefs and heads of households. According to John T. Ellisor, of all the dangers confronting the Creeks, “the greatest danger came out of Columbus, Georgia” in what amounted to “one of the dirtiest land grabs in U.S. history.” See John T. Ellisor, *The Second Creek War: Interethnic Conflict and Collusion on a Collapsing Frontier* (Lincoln, NE, 2010), 47–59, 63, 98. See also, Green, *Politics of Indian Removal*, 181.

16 Jacob I. Moses to [Hervey] Hall, March 4, 1838, Deeds, Book C, 408–409, Russell County Office of Probate, Phenix City, AL; James C. Watson, Daniel McDougald, Robert Collins, and Burton Hepburn to Hervey Hall and Jacob I. Moses, December 19, 1839, Deeds, Book C, 410, Russell County Office of Probate, Phenix City, AL.


19 “Notice,” *Columbus Enquirer*, September 29, 1836; Tax book, 1840, City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA; Moultrie Moses et al., plaintiffs in error, vs. Isaac I. Moses, executor, defendant in error, 50 Ga. 9, 16 (1873). According to his obituary, Roberts came to Columbus in 1832 and then moved to Montgomery in 1839, where he organized the first hardware store in Montgomery, which was Hall, Moses & Roberts. “Death of Mr. Roberts,” *Montgomery Advertiser*, July 17, 1901. Hall, Moses & Roberts was dissolved in 1859, and its public announcement stated that they had been in business for eighteen years. This suggests that they began business in 1841. “Dissolution,” *Daily Confed-
eration (Montgomery, AL), April 18, 1859. Roberts also appears as a witness on the 1838 and 1839 transactions involving the purchase of lots in Girard.

The term *state rights* reflects antebellum terminology for both the issue and the formal name of the political party. This stands in contrast to modern usage, which prefers *states’ rights*. The *Columbus Sentinel & Herald* asserted in a column from March 7, 1839, that the Union Party marched under “the banner of Union and State Rights. . . . We believe in the Union of States, so long as that Union can be preserved without infringing at all upon the rights of the individual states.” Formerly known as the Clark Party, the Union group was “friends of the present administration [Martin Van Buren’s]; the opponents of Henry Clay, Gen. Harrison, a United States Bank,” and an advocate of the “Subtreasury system.” The paper explained a year later that both the Union and State Rights parties embraced Republican principles, especially as laid down in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798–1799, but that the State Rights Party was “more ultra in their Republican doctrines.” *Party!* *Columbus Sentinel & Herald*, May 30, 1840.

“State Rights Meeting,” *Columbus Enquirer*, March 29, 1834. See also, “Great Meeting of the State Rights Party,” *Georgia Journal* (Milledgeville), November 16, 1833; “Political,” *Georgia Journal* (Milledgeville), January 1, 1834. The Muscogee County group’s constitution also laid out its organizational structure, including stipulating quarterly meetings in January, April, October, and on the Fourth of July. Thus when Jacob Moses attended the Independence Day celebration in 1834, he was also participating in a quarterly meeting of the new party.


“Fourth of July at Columbus,” *Columbus Enquirer*, July 12, 1834.


*Columbus Enquirer*, January 4, 1838, and January 11, 1838. On December 25, 1837, the Georgia General Assembly amended Columbus’s charter to provide for its division into six wards. Ward Three was located south of Randolph Street and north of St. Clair Street and encompassed the area in which Hall & Moses’s main store was located (at the time designated as lot 170 on Broad Street). See “An Act to amend the several Acts of the Legislature of this State incorporating the city of Columbus, in the county of Muscogee, and to lay off the said city into Wards, and to point out the mode of electing the Mayor and Aldermen thereof,” *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, Passed in Milledgeville at an annual session in November and December, 1837*, vol. 1 (Milledgeville, GA, 1838), 55–58,
“Council Chamber,” *Columbus Enquirer*, October 30, 1839. See also, “Council Chamber,” *Columbus Enquirer*, October 23, 1839; *Columbus Sentinel & Herald*, January 17, 1839; “Council Chamber,” *Columbus Sentinel & Herald*, November 6, 1839; Martin, *Columbus, Geo.*, 1:99–103. The report also gave instructions for how citizen patrols should respond when a fire broke out, as well as required tenement owners to supply the city, when necessary, with two leather buckets to help fight fires. Additionally, the committee created a process for investigating and reporting on the causes of fires.

“Married,” *Charleston Courier*, December 7, 1839; Hagy, *This Happy Land*, 84, 129, 246, 265–266; Rosengarten and Rosengarten, *Portion of the People*, 103–106; Jean Kiralfy Kent, *Temple Israel of Columbus, Georgia* (Columbus, GA, 1999), 4. When KKBE voted on July 28, 1841, to change its constitution so the organ could be used on all occasions, Isaiah Moses cast the only dissenting vote.

Minute Book of Congregation Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim, November 29, 1840, 142, Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim (Charleston, SC) Records, 1764–1977, 1800–1928, AJA. It is possible that this Jacob Moses refers to someone else, but a survey of the Coming Street Cemetery done in 1974 indeed reflects that an unnamed infant daughter of Jacob and Rinah Moses is buried there. While the gravestone is difficult to read, surveyors thought the death date was 1840. Kahal Kadosh Beth Elohim (KKBE) Coming Street Cemetery, Jewish Historical Society of South Carolina, http://www.jhssc.org/Charleston_KKBethElohim_ComingStreet_Cemetery.html, accessed January 30, 2015. Hagy notes that occasionally KKBE members requested Jewish burials for non-members. After railroads became more common, former Jewish residents of Charleston often arranged for their interment in the cemetery. Hagy, *This Happy Land*, 181–182.

Sixth Census of the United States, 1840, Muscogee County, Georgia.


“A CALL!!!,” *Columbus Sentinel & Herald*, June 13, 1840. The statement was subsequently reprinted in papers across the state, including the *Georgia Argus* (Columbus), the *Federal Union* (Milledgeville), and the *Macon Telegraph*.

“State Rights Convention” and “The Marriage,” *Columbus Sentinel & Herald*, July 11, 1840; “State Rights Convention” and “Democratic Republican Convention,” *Macon Georgia Telegraph*, July 14, 1840, and *Federal Union* (Milledgeville, GA), July 14, 1840; “Editor’s Correspondence,” *Columbus Enquirer*, July 8, 1840. For a mocking assessment of the conventions, see “A Look at the Convention,” *Columbus Enquirer*, July 15, 1840.
35 “Democratic Republican Meeting,” Columbus Sentinel & Herald, August 1, 1840; “Democratic Meeting,” Columbus Sentinel & Herald, August 8, 1840.

36 “Council Chamber,” Columbus Sentinel & Herald, January 13, 1841; List of City Officials, 41, City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA.

37 Lynn Willoughby, Fair to Middlin’: The Antebellum Cotton Trade of the Apalachicola/Chattahoochee River Valley (Tuscaloosa, 1993), 54, 56.

38 Willoughby, Fair to Middlin’, 57.


40 Announcement and “Change Bills,” Columbus Enquirer, November 24, 1841. Milledgeville’s Southern Recorder also took note of the Columbus merchants’ announcement. Its editor criticized Democrats in Georgia’s legislature for failing to authorize specie-paying banks to issue bills under five dollars that were redeemable with specie. In his opinion, passage of such a bill would truly reflect support for a “sound currency.” Southern Recorder (Milledgeville, GA), November 30, 1841. Willoughby indicates that John G. Winter, “the most prominent capitalist in Columbus,” was the worst offender when it came to circulating massive quantities of change bills. When Winter was convicted of violating state law regarding the circulation of change bills, he hired “a sly lawyer,” Raphael J. Moses, who successfully challenged his conviction. Moses succeeded in the early 1850s in getting a new law passed by the Georgia General Assembly that benefitted Winter. See Willoughby, Fair to Middlin’, 59–60.


42 Columbus Enquirer, June 9, 1842; “The Currency,” reprinted in the Southern Recorder (Milledgeville, GA), August 30, 1842. The Southern Recorder identified the source of “The Currency” only as the Jeffersonian. This likely refers to the Georgia Jeffersonian of Griffin, Georgia. The action taken by the fifty Columbus merchants was referenced in the April 26, 1874, edition of the Sun and Columbus Daily Enquirer in its column, “Recollections of 1842.” The paper observed that the determination to receive only bills and notes that could be redeemed “on a gold basis” was taken due to the “ruinous price of exchange.” For actions by merchants in other towns, see Columbus Enquirer, August 17, 1842.

43 Columbus Enquirer, September 14, 1842.

44 “The Central Bank” and “The Central Bank and the Constitutionalist,” Columbus Enquirer, August 10, 1842; “The State Currency,” Columbus Enquirer, September 28, 1842. The Central Bank, chartered in 1828, redeemed its notes in specie until 1839, when it suspended these payments. During that same year, Georgia’s General Assembly, with its Democratic majority, authorized the bank to dramatically increase the number of notes it issued. Guerry voted in favor of this bill. A Columbus Enquirer writer explained in the September 28, 1842, issue: “By this amendment, the flood gates of financial ruin were opened. . . . To this amendment of the bank charter we are indebted for the present ruinous depreciation of our State currency.” Although Whigs repealed the bill when they gained control of the legisla-
ture in 1840, the Democrats promptly restored it the next year when they regained the majority.


46 “The Currency. Movements of the People,” and minutes of the November 29 and November 30 meetings, Columbus Enquirer, December 7, 1842.


48 Note that by the late 1830s, the Whigs and Nullifiers, or State Rights Party, had largely merged in Georgia. Carey, “Jacksonian Party System,” 812–813; Skelton, “States Rights Movement,” 402.


52 Ibid.

53 Carey explains that Georgia’s early politics were based on particular individuals. During the early nineteenth century, William H. Crawford and George M. Troup led one party, while John Clark led the other. During Andrew Jackson’s presidency, the two parties essentially dissolved and initially coalesced together in support of him, but as disagreements arose over Jackson’s actions, the Union and State Rights parties emerged. Carey, Parties, Slavery, and the Union, 19–28.

54 Ordinances and Resolutions Record Book, 1841–1846, January 9, 1843, 85, City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA.
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56 Carey, Parties, Slavery, and the Union, 26, 31, 67, 144. Carey describes Howard as a “Columbus hotspur.” Howard was one of thirteen members placed on the Central Committee of the State Rights Association of Georgia on November 13, 1833, and he also attended both the 1840 State Rights and Democratic Republican conventions held in Milledgeville. See, “Great State Rights Meeting,” Southern Recorder (Milledgeville), November 20, 1833.

57 “City Election,” Columbus Enquirer, December 30, 1840.
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Ibid. See also, “To the Members of the City Council,” Columbus Enquirer, July 26, 1843.

There is no indication that Henry T. Hall was related to Jacobs’s partner Hervey Hall.

“Columbus Water Lots,” Columbus Enquirer, April 30, 1845.


The Muscogee Railroad’s original charter indicated that it was to build the line from Columbus to West Point, but in 1850 the Georgia General Assembly gave permission for the Muscogee to connect with the Southwestern at Fort Valley. See, “An act to authorize and empower the Muscogee Railroad Company to connect their Railroad with the Southwestern Railroad, and for other purposes therein named,” Acts of the State of Georgia, 1849–1850, vol. 1 (Milledgeville, GA, 1850), 245, http://metis.galib.uga.edu/ssp/cgi-bin/legis-idx.pl?sessionid=29cec5f8-043f8a4673-0870&type=law&byte=24801892, accessed June 2, 2015.


“The Railroad,” Columbus Enquirer, September 2, 1846; “Muscogee Rail Road Company,” Columbus Enquirer, November 11, 1846; Columbus, Georgia, Board of Aldermen Minutes, January 19, 1848, and January 24, 1848, Record Book A, 233, 235–237, City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA; “Council Chambers,” Columbus Enquirer, March 7, 1848; “The Muscogee Railroad,” Columbus Enquirer, November 7, 1848; “Railroad Meeting,” Columbus Enquirer, November 21, 1848.
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“Destructive Fire” and “A Card,” Columbus Enquirer, March 9, 1847.
Hall & Moses advertisements, *Columbus Enquirer*, March 23, April 13, and October 12, 1847.
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Examples of southern Jewish business families that opened offices in New York City include the Seligmans and Lehmans. The Seligmans ran country stores in Alabama during the 1840s before opening an importing firm in New York. The Lehman brothers, who were involved in the cotton business in Alabama, opened an office in New York in 1858. See Elliott Ashkenazi, “Jewish Commercial Interests Between North and South,” in *Dixie Diaspora: An Anthology of Southern Jewish History*, ed. Mark K. Bauman (Tuscaloosa, 2006), 197–199.

Jacob Moses and his family appear twice in the 1850 federal census, being enumerated both in Columbus and New York. Seventh Census of the United States, 1850, New York, New York and Muscogee County, Georgia. The enumeration for New York was done on August 21. Living with Jacob and his family were two older, New York-born teenagers, Elias and Theophilus Mullison, who were working as clerks, likely for Jacob. The enumeration for Columbus was done on October 25. Jacob was living with his younger brother, Isaac, and another relative, J. P. Hendricks, both of whom were working as clerks, probably for Hall & Moses. The family immediately preceding them on the enumeration was that of William Beach. After Jacob’s death in 1854, Isaac, Hendricks, and Beach partnered with Hervey Hall in running the hardware business.

Will of Jacob I. Moses, Will Book A, 187–193, Muscogee County Probate Court, Columbus, GA.


In addition to marrying Jacob I. Moses’s sister, Leonora, Rosenfeld performed the wedding ceremonies for at least two of Jacob’s sisters and two brothers: Cecilia Moses to Abraham A. Solomons in 1843; Adeline Moses to Adolph J. Brady in 1845; Isaac I. Moses to Hannah M. Moses in 1856; and Abraham J. Moses to Annie Jonas Moses in 1859. See Barnett A. Elzas, *Jewish Marriage Notices from the Newspaper Press of Charleston, S.C., 1775–1906* (New York, 1917), 21–22; Marriage license of Isaac I. Moses and Hannah M. Moses, vol. D, 128, Muscogee County Probate Court, Columbus, GA; Marriage license of Abraham J. Moses and Annie Jonas, vol. 22, 222, Hamilton County Probate Court, Cincinnati, OH; “Married,” *Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, November 24, 1859. Rosenfeld emigrated from Lissa, Posen, Prussia, in 1842 and became a naturalized citizen at the age of thirty-two...
on December 21, 1846. Note that the naturalization papers record his last name as Rosenfeldt. Record of Admissions to Citizenship, District of South Carolina, 1790–1906, Ancestry.com, accessed February 28, 2015. Rosenfeld left Charleston and went to Cincinnati’s Kahal Kadosh B’nai Jeshurun to serve as the hazan. He then went to Savannah’s Mickve Israel from 1853–1862, and while there was, according to Gary Zola, “anything but a reformer.” Gary Phillip Zola, “The Ascendancy of Reform Judaism in the American South during the Nineteenth Century,” in Jewish Roots in Southern Soil: A New History, ed. Marcie Cohen Ferris and Mark I. Greenberg (Lebanon, NH, 2006), 172–173. See also, Saul Jacob Rubin, Third to None: The Saga of Savannah Jewry, 1733–1983 (Savannah, GA, 1983), 111–117.


81 “First List of Subscribers (1843),” Occident and American Jewish Advocate 1 (July 1843): 214–216. Jacob’s father also appeared as a subscriber, as did Rosenfeld and Poznanski. One other person in Columbus, Elias Simpson, subscribed.


84 “Notice,” Columbus Enquirer, June 25, 1850. In 1890, Isaac’s obituary indicated that he came to Columbus nearly fifty years before, suggesting that he arrived sometime during the 1840s. “Death of Mr. Isaac I. Moses,” Columbus Enquirer-Sun, December 14, 1890.

85 Advertisement for Ezra I. Moses, Columbus Enquirer, November 14, 1854; Advertisement for Brady & Moses, Columbus Enquirer, October 10, 1868; “Death of Mr. E. J. Moses,” Savannah Morning News, May 4, 1877; Columbus Directory for 1859–1860 (Columbus, GA, 1859), 57.


87 “Dissolution,” Daily Confederation (Montgomery, AL), April 18, 1859. Wyman, Moses, and Company consisted of Benjamin Leon Wyman, Abraham J. Moses, and Israel W. Roberts. They gave twenty-nine promissory notes to Isaac Moses, each for $1,625, totaling $47,125. The debt was paid off on April 13, 1863. See, I. W. Roberts, Abram J. Moses, and B. L. Wyman to Isaac I. Moses, April 15, 1859; Israel W. Roberts to Isaac I. Moses, January 10, 1861; and cancellation of notes by Isaac I. Moses, April 13, 1863, Deeds Book 13, 110–112, Montgomery County Probate Office, Montgomery, AL.

88 “Dissolution” and “Copartnership Notice,” Columbus Enquirer, February 20, 1855.
Jacob P. Hendricks’s mother was Esther Phillips, who married Isaac Hendricks of Augusta, Georgia. His grandparents, as well as Isaac and Jacob Moses’s, were Jacob Phillips and Hannah Isaacks. See, Stern, *First American Jewish Families*, 247, accessed March 1, 2015.

See n.1 above for the connection between the Beach and Moses families.

All four partners appear, at one time or another, in New York City directories for the years leading up to the Civil War. See, for instance, *Trow’s New York City Directory for the year ending May 1, 1857* (New York, 1857), 59, 346–347, 375, and 595, Ancestry.com, accessed February 9, 2015. Separate entries appear for all four partners, as well as Hall, Moses & Co. and Hall, Moses & Roberts. The address is the same for each entry, 55 Cliff, but each individual’s home is given as Columbus, Georgia.

“Probably Fatal Duel,” *Columbus Tri-Weekly Enquirer*, February 24, 1857; “Death of Mr. Henricks,” *Columbus Tri-Weekly Enquirer*, February 26, 1857; “Another Fatal Duel,” *Savannah Daily Republican*, February 24, 1857. According to the February 25, 1857, edition of the *Savannah Daily Republican*, Hendricks’s funeral was held at the residence of “Mr. Solo- mons.” Rumors had circulated for several days that Hendricks and O. S. Kimbrough, who lived in Columbus, would duel. In order to prevent it, the authorities attempted to arrest both men, but they slipped out of the city and held the duel at a place identified as Screven’s Fall. The March 7, 1857, edition of the *Macon Weekly Telegraph* reprinted a story from the *Augusta Constitutionalist* indicating that Hendricks’s mother, sister, and brother lived in Hamburg, South Carolina. Isaac Moses served as executor of Hendricks’s estate, and his brother Ezra helped put up the necessary bond. Hendricks is buried in Laurel Grove (North) Cemetery in Savannah.

“Hervey Hall,” *Columbus Enquirer-Sun*, January 24, 1878. Hall died on October 29, 1877, in Brazil and is buried in Cemitério dos Americanos in São Paulo.


Advertisement for Hall, Moses & Company, *Columbus Enquirer*, December 4, 1855.

Advertisements for Hall, Moses & Company and Brown’s Foundry, *Columbus Enquirer*, July 3, 1855. The two companies ran advertisements positioned next to each other from 1855 to 1858.

cites Isaac Moses and William Beach as “early associates” in the Columbus Iron Works. See “W. R. Brown Passes Away,” Columbus Daily Enquirer, March 29, 1902. For examples of the goods produced by the Columbus Iron Works, see its advertisements in the March 30, 1858, and July 6, 1859, editions of the Columbus Enquirer.


99 “Governor’s Message,” November 6, 1861, Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, at the Annual Session of the General Assembly, Begun and Held in Milledgeville, the Seat of Government, in 1861 (Milledgeville, GA, 1861), 27, http://docsouth.unc.edu/imls/gasen61/gasen61.html, accessed March 4, 2015. Gray began manufacturing rifles in Columbus in 1862, although it is not known if Isaac Moses partnered with him. Joseph B. Mahan, Columbus: Georgia’s Fall Line “Trading Town” (Northridge, CA, 1986), 58; Standard, Columbus, Georgia, in the Confederacy, 40; Gordon L. Jones, Confederate Odyssey: The George W. Wray Jr. Civil War Collection at the Atlanta History Center (Athens, GA, 2014), 107. Isaac also had an indirect connection to the establishment of Louis and Elias Haiman’s sword factory, another Jewish-owned firm that helped arm the South. The Haiman brothers, immigrants from Prussia, settled in Columbus and opened a tinsmith shop, but when the war started they began producing pistols and swords, eventually becoming the Confederacy’s largest sword manufacturer. In 1856 Isaac had purchased for five hundred dollars at public auction the lot on which the Haimans’ factory eventually stood. At the time of Isaac’s purchase, the lot contained buildings and equipment associated with an earlier iron works facility, the Union Foundry. The following year, Isaac helped open the Muscogee Iron Works on this site, but then sold it one year later at a nice profit for $7,500 to the Columbus Iron Works, which in turn sold it to the Haiman brothers in 1862. Isaac’s initial purchase is found in William H. Lamar to Isaac I. Moses, August 5, 1856, Deeds, vol. K, 143–144, Office of the Muscogee County Clerk of Superior and State Courts, Columbus, GA. See “Muscogee County,” Columbus Enquirer, July 29, 1856, for the advertisement of the public sale of the Union Foundry lot. See also, Isaac I. Moses to Columbus Iron Works Co., May 26, 1858, Deeds, vol. K, 143, Office of the Muscogee County Clerk of Superior and State Courts, Columbus, GA. For the establishment of the Muscogee Iron Works, see advertisement for Muscogee Iron Works, Columbus Tri-Weekly Enquirer, November 12, 1857, and “Georgia, Muscogee County,” Columbus Daily Enquirer, June 17, 1859. For the Haiman brothers’ purchase, see
Columbus Iron Works Co. to L. Haiman & Brother, April 1, 1862, Deeds, vol. L, 178–179, Office of the Muscogee County Clerk of Superior and State Courts, Columbus, GA. This transaction indicates that the lot contained “the building known as the Muscogee Iron Works.” Throughout all of these transactions, the lot is identified as lot #214 situated at the corner of Oglethorpe Street (now Fourteenth Street) and Franklin Street (now First Avenue). A historical marker now identifies the site.

100 In 1863 Isaac also helped found the Calhoun Iron Works in Alabama to mine and manufacture iron and, in the war’s final months, the Alabama Petroleum and Lamp Company. “An act to incorporate a mining and manufacturing company,” December 8, 1863, Acts of the Called Session, 1863, and of the Third Regular Annual Session of the General Assembly of Alabama (Montgomery, 1864), 197–98; “An act to incorporate the Alabama Petroleum and Lamp Company,” February 8, 1865, Acts of the Session of 1865–6, of the General Assembly of Alabama (Montgomery, 1866), 265–266. In 1873, the Alabama Petroleum and Lamp Company was renamed the Alabama Coal and Iron Company. See “An act to amend the first, second and third sections of an act entitled ‘an act to incorporate the Alabama Petroleum and Lamp company,” April 19, 1873, Acts of the Session of 1872–73, of the General Assembly of Alabama (Montgomery, 1873), 481–483. Isaac Moses’s obituary indicates that he served on Governor Joseph E. Brown’s staff, supervised Georgia’s railroad system during the war, and provided manufactured goods from the Iron Works of Selma and the Columbus Iron Works. “Death of Mr. Isaac I. Moses,” Columbus Enquirer-Sun, December 14, 1890.
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In 1859, Hall, Moses & Company supported developing a railroad connection from Columbus with the Atlanta & LaGrange Railroad, while in 1866 Isaac Moses was appointed as one of the delegates to represent Columbus at the Savannah and Memphis Railroad convention held in Macon. Hall, Moses & Company also owned stock in the Mobile and Girard Railroad, as well as in the Eagle Manufacturing Company. Isaac owned stock in the Muscogee Building and Loan Association. “Railroad Connection,” Columbus Daily Enquirer, October 20, 1859; “Savannah and Memphis Railroad Convention,” Columbus Daily Sun, August 30, 1866; Transferred Stock—Mobile & Girard R. R. Co., 8, City of Columbus Clerk of Council’s Office, Columbus, GA; “Meeting of Stockholders of the Eagle Manufacturing Compy,” Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun, November 5, 1874; Isaac I. Moses to Muscogee Building and Loan Association, March 1, 1860, Deeds, vol. K, 403, 406–408, Office of the Muscogee County Clerk of Superior and State Courts, Columbus, GA.


Isaac Moses purchased land in Russell County, Alabama, at least as early as 1859 and continued to do so throughout most of his life. According to the Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun, in 1860 Browneville (also spelled as Brownville) was “an old field, formerly cultivated by Dr. Ingersoll.” It came into existence after the uptown bridge in Columbus was completed in 1858 (i.e., the Bryan Street bridge; see Martin, Columbus, Geo., 88), and the first house built there was “a little brown tenement on the right side of the road (i.e., that led from the bridge) which was constructed by Mr. Isaac I. Moses.” In 1883, the Alabama General Assembly incorporated the town. In 1889, its name was changed to Phenix City and later, in 1923, to Phenix City, at which time it merged with the city of Girard. Prior to 1923, part of Browneville/Phenix City was located in Lee County and part in Russell County. S. M. Ingersoll to Isaac I. Moses, March 3, 1859, Deeds, vol. K, 534–535, Russell County Probate Office, Phenix City, AL; “Our Alabama Suburbs. Brownville,” Columbus Daily Enquirer-Sun, June 8, 1879; “An act to incorporate the town of Browneville,” February 23, 1883, Acts of the General Assembly of the State of Alabama (Montgomery, 1883), 574–583; “An act to change the name of Brownville, in Lee County,” February 19, 1889, Acts of the General Assembly of Alabama (Montgomery, 1889), 458.
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For common elements between the Lord’s Prayer and Jewish liturgy, see Kaufmann Kohler’s article on the Lord’s Prayer in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York, 1904), http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/10112-lord-s-prayer-the, accessed June 2, 2015. Kohler, for instance, indicates that the prayer’s opening phrase—“Our father”—appears in the Shemoneh Esrei/Amidah and other liturgical texts.
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