



Routledge Studies in Modern European History

THE CREATION OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN MONARCHY

A HUNGARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Edited by
Gábor Gyáni

ROUTLEDGE



The Creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

Recent collection of essays discusses the historical event and the multifarious consequences of the 1867 Compromise (Ausgleich, Settlement), conducted between the Habsburg monarch, Franz Joseph and the Hungarian political ruling class. The whole story has usually been narrated from a plainly Cisleithanian viewpoint. The present volume, the product of Hungarian historians, gives an insight into both the domestic and the international historical discourses about the dual monarchy. It also reveals the process of how the 1867 Compromise was conducted, and touches upon several of the key issues brought about by establishing a constitutional dual state in place of the absolutist Habsburg Monarchy. The emphasis is laid not on describing and explaining the path leading to the final and “inevitable” break-up of the dual monarchy, but on what actually held it together for half a century. The *local* outcomes of self-maintaining mechanisms were no less obvious in the Hungarian part of the dual monarchy, despite the many manifestations of an overt adversity toward it. *The Creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy* will appeal to historians dealing especially with 19th-century European history, and is also essential reading for university students.

Gábor Gyáni, is professor emeritus at Research Centre for Humanities Institute of History and Loránd Eötvös University Budapest, and member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He is a social historian with a particular interest in the urban world, mentality history and historical theory.

Routledge Studies in Modern European History

Black Abolitionists in Ireland

Christine Kinealy

Sinti and Roma in Germany (1871–1933)

Gypsy Policy in the Second Empire and Weimar Republic

Simon Constantine

German Neo-Pietism, the Nation and the Jews

Religious Awakening and National Identities Formation, 1815–1861

Doron Avraham

Child Migration and Biopolitics

Old and New Experiences in Europe

Edited by Beatrice Scutaru and Simone Paoli

The Rhine and European Security in the Long Nineteenth Century

Making Lifelines from Frontlines

Joep Schenk

Garibaldi's Radical Legacy

Traditions of War Volunteering in Southern Europe (1861–1945)

Enrico Acciai

The Creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

A Hungarian Perspective

Edited by Gábor Gyáni

Postwar Continuity and New Challenges in Central Europe, 1918–1923

The War That Never Ended

Edited by Tomasz Pudłocki and Kamil Ruszala

For more information about this series, please visit: <https://www.routledge.com/history/series/SE0246>

The Creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy

A Hungarian Perspective

Edited by Gábor Gyáni

**Translated by Katalin Rácz and
Bob Dent**

First published 2022
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2022 selection and editorial matter, Gábor Gyáni; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Gábor Gyáni to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Conflict and Cooperation: 150 Years of the Austro-Hungarian Settlement (2017 : Magyar Tudományos Akadémia) | Gyáni, Gábor, editor. | Rácz, Katalin (Translator), translator. | Dent, Bob, translator.

Title: The creation of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy : a Hungarian perspective / edited by Gábor Gyáni ; translated by Katalin Rácz and Bob Dent.

Description: New York, NY : Routledge, 2022. | Series: Routledge studies in modern European history | Chapters 1-3, 5, 9-11 were translated from Hungarian into English--email from Publisher. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Subjects: LCSH: Austro-Hungarian Compromise, 1867--Congresses. | Hungary--Politics and government--1849-1918--Congresses. | Austria--Politics and government--1848-1918--Congresses. | Habsburg, House of--Congresses.

Classification: LCC DB945 .C66 2017 | DDC 943.6/044--dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021014144>

ISBN: 978-1-032-04914-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-04916-8 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-19516-0 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003195160

Typeset in Times New Roman
by MPS Limited, Dehradun

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	vii
<i>List of Contributors</i>	viii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xiii
 Introduction: Hungary's Contribution to the Creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy GÁBOR GYÁNI	 1
 PART I Experience, Memory and Historiography	 13
 1 Towards a Catastrophe with a Compromise? On the Connection of the 1867 Compromise and the Treaty of Trianon IVÁN BERTÉNYI, JR.	 15
 2 The Symbolic World of 1867: Self-representation of the Dual Monarchy in Hungary ANDRÁS CIEGER	 39
 3 Nation-State Building with "Peaceful Equalizing," and the Hungarian Historical Consciousness GÁBOR GYÁNI	 70
 4 Long Swings in the Historiography of the Austro- Hungarian Monarchy GYÖRGY KÖVÉR	 93

PART II Ideas and Institutions	117
5 Who Was the Father of the Compromise? ÁGNES DEÁK	119
6 Between Patriotism and Ethnicity: Hardships of Defining the Modern Concept of a Hungarian Nation at the Mid-19th Century LÁSZLÓ L. LAJTAI	149
7 Parallel Nation-Building in Transylvania and the Issue of the Union with Hungary Prior to the Austro-Hungarian Compromise JUDIT PÁL	174
8 The Compromise and the Potentials of the Constitutional Politics in Hungary GYÖRGY MIRU	200
PART III Emancipation and Identity	227
9 Jewish Emancipation as a Compromise MIKLÓS KONRÁD	229
10 The Influence of the Compromise on the Spirit of Ballhausplatz: The Formation of the Foreign Affairs Officials' National Identity ÉVA SOMOGYI	257
PART IV Economic Consequences	289
11 Territorial Disparities and Uneven Development in Hungary During the Time of Dualism GÁBOR DEMETER	291
12 Austrian and Hungarian Imperial Ambitions: Competition and Co-operation in Maritime Trade, 1867–1914 VERONIKA ESZIK	326
<i>Index</i>	345

Tables

10.1	Officials with Hungarian Citizenship in the Common Ministry of Foreign Affairs	271
10.2	Diplomats with Hungarian Citizenship in Charge of Missions Abroad	272
11.1	Difference in Profitability of Smallholdings and Large Estates in Hungary in 1865 (Cadastral Land Income Without Animal Husbandry)	294
11.2	The Effect of Corn Overproduction on the Trends of Prices and Consumption in the Monarchy	297
11.3	Change of Agricultural Indicators Between 1865 and 1910	299
11.4	Indicators Selected for Surveying the Stage of Development	309

9 Jewish Emancipation as a Compromise

Miklós Konrád

Senior Research Fellow, Research Centre for the Humanities, Institute of History, Budapest

With the implementation of the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, the emancipation of Jews in the Habsburg lands became unavoidable. In the framework of the constitutional setup based on equality before the law, legal discrimination against Jews could not be maintained. In the Cisleithanian part of the Monarchy, Jews were granted equal rights by the Fundamental Law on the General Rights of Citizens signed by Emperor Franz Joseph on December 21, 1867.¹ In Hungary Jewish emancipation was enacted in a separate law. The bill declaring the country's "Israelite" inhabitants "entitled to practice every civil and political right on an equal footing" with the Christian inhabitants was passed by the Lower House on 20 December and by the Upper House on 23 December 1867. The law was signed by Franz Joseph as king of Hungary on 27 December this year. The law titled *On the equality of Israelites in respect of civil and political rights* took effect the following day.²

The details of the emancipation law were discussed until the last minute. Yet as regards the principle of emancipation itself, the time for debate was by then over. When the bill was presented to the Lower House for the so-called general debate, no MP registered to speak on the issue.³ The proposal was almost unanimously adopted by the MPs standing up, with one MP remaining seated.⁴ During the debate in the Upper House, only five brief speeches were delivered, all supporting the motion. When it came to the roll-call vote, 64 voted for the proposal and four were against.⁵

In the absence of genuine debate, contemporaries failed to make clear whether they considered that the issue of the transformation of the Jews, deemed necessary by both – Christian and Jewish – sides, had come to a rest. This may seem surprising considering that by this time Hungarian political and cultural elites and Jewish intellectuals had been debating the expectations Jews should meet before – or after – being granted equal rights for nearly three decades. So why this silence? Did the two parties reach some kind of agreement in this regard? If they did, what were its terms? Which expectations were Jewish spokesmen ready to meet and which were the ones they rejected?⁶ Unlike existing scholarship on the Hungarian emancipation debates,⁷ our aim is not so much to expound

the views of the most famous participants in the debate, but to track the dynamics of Hungarian expectations and Jewish reactions. How did they evolve over time? Which were the issues that at different times came to the forefront or receded in the background?

In the case of Hungarian authors, besides liberal politicians and intellectuals supporting Jewish emancipation, we also considered the opinions of the – mostly urban – representatives who opposed emancipation at the national Diets, and more generally that of intellectuals hostile to Jews. With regard to Jews, we limited our analysis to “integrationist” Jews, that is those favorable to acculturation and social integration. The Jewish opinions taken into consideration include both direct reactions expressed in debates with Hungarians and indirect ones voiced in writings and speeches addressed to coreligionists.

The period from the beginning of the debates to the emancipation bill (1840–1867) is naturally divided into four stages. The 1839–1840 “Reform Diet” represents the moment in Hungarian *Vormärz* when the political elite was most favorably disposed toward the emancipation of the Jews. From 1841 to the outbreak of the revolution in March 1848, liberal politicians elite as well as public opinion in general grew more hostile to emancipation and became increasingly skeptical regarding Jews’ ability to integrate into Christian society. The Revolution and the War of Independence of 1848–1849 constitutes obviously a distinct period, and unsurprisingly also a time of radical assimilationist expectations. This period of intensified emotions was followed by a decade of neoabsolutist oppression, during which political debates on the “Jewish question” completely ceased, and then, from the beginning of the 1860s, by an era which can be qualified as more tepid and at the same time more favorably disposed toward Jews on the Hungarian side, while more and more impatient on the Jewish side.

Moral Regeneration and Magyarization (1839–1840)

At the 1839–1840 Diet, the liberal reform opposition introduced a bill in the Lower House that granted Jews equal rights with the country’s non-noble inhabitants. The Lower House, whose members belonged mainly to the landed nobility, passed the bill in March 1840,⁸ but the magnate-dominated Upper House rejected it and accepted only some partial ameliorations in the conditions of the Jews, such as removing most of the residence restrictions imposed on the Jewish population.⁹ King Ferdinand V restricted the new rights even further and that was how Law No. 29 of 1840 came about. Its most important measure was to lift almost all residency restrictions. With the exception of the mining towns, Jews were allowed to settle in all cities of the Kingdom.¹⁰

What is remarkable, considering how brief this period was, is that nearly the whole gamut of expectations set for Jews up to 1867 appeared in the parliamentary debates, the press articles and pamphlets published

at the time. Jews were called up to purify themselves morally, primarily by turning away from business, especially petty commerce, and taking up farming and handcraft. They were asked to learn Hungarian, and last but not least, they were requested to put an end to their social exclusivism and draw closer to their Christian compatriots. In case their religion represented an obstacle, it had to be reformed.

Among all the issues that popped up, the most frequently voiced expectation concerned the Jews' moral "regeneration." As elsewhere in Central Europe, the influence of Wilhelm Dohm's *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (1781) on the emancipation debates was obvious. The assumption that Jews' moral shortcomings did not arise from their inner character but had developed as a consequence of the morally corruptive oppression was certainly a progress in comparison with previous perceptions of innate immorality. Yet it also allowed fervent liberals to wrap up their anti-Jewish prejudices in loftily voiced meliorist disguise. Indeed, and once again as elsewhere in the region, nobody, not even adamant liberal reformers, doubted or even questioned the fact of the Jews' moral degeneration. On the liberal side, the only question was whether they should be emancipated before or after they demonstrated their ability to amend and better their character. Most politicians and intellectuals considered the moral elevation of the Jews as an indispensable prerequisite to their emancipation. This was the case of the young Ágoston Trefort,¹¹ or the historian and linguist István Horvát.¹² (This was also the case of some of the Lower House deputies who found in the argument of the Jews' indispensable prior improvement an easy way to oppose their emancipation without appearing as die-hard conservatives.¹³) Against this dominant view, the most prominent advocate of Jewish emancipation in Hungary, József Eötvös, stood nearly alone. In the speech he delivered in support of the emancipation bill in the Upper House on 31 March 1840, then in the extended version he published a few months later, Eötvös also did not question the moral depravity of Jews. Yet since he identified their deprivation from freedom as its only cause, he did not see any other remedy than their immediate and unconditional emancipation.¹⁴

In terms of its frequency, the wish for the linguistic Magyarization of the Jews lagged somewhat behind the urge for their moral regeneration, yet it certainly represented the most insistently voiced positive expectation, that is referring to a feature that Jews ought to acquire and not get rid of. It was all the more insistently voiced that the perspective of Jewish acculturation seemed much more realistic than those of other nationalities. In a country where "Hungarians," that is Hungarian-speaking population (ethnic Magyars) accounted only for 43% of all the country's inhabitants at the beginning of the 1840s, Jews lived largely scattered among Christian population, whereas Croats, Romanians, and Slovaks remained in rather homogenous enclaves. Moreover, while these

nationalities followed Hungarians with some delay on the road of “national awakening,” the Jewish population, though still remaining by and large untouched by acculturation, did not harbor nationalist aspirations.¹⁵ In the foreword he wrote to the pamphlet published by Móric Bloch in 1840 to advocate emancipation, the poet and playwright Péter Vajda was unambiguous: “Do not be neglectful with Magyarization. This is the only thing your new homeland is urgently asking you.”¹⁶ In an article of December 1840, besides the need for their moral improvement, István Horvát regarded it as essential that the Jews “feel drawn to our national language with unhypocritical love.”¹⁷ Four issues earlier Horvát had mentioned Magyarization as sole requirement, expressing his satisfaction that the Diet did not emancipate the Jews, yet hoping that this would come soon, “with the principal and essential condition” that Jews “provide evident and unmistakable indications of their progress in Magyarization.”¹⁸

As a matter of conclusion, it must be stressed that no full agreement was reached as to what precisely was expected from the Jews. The remark is valid for the whole period under study. The question of what Jews were *exactly* supposed to do in order to satisfy Hungarian expectations and be integrated in Hungarian society remained unanswered.¹⁹ While for some, linguistic acculturation was the primary expectation, others, as Ágoston Trefort for instance, envisioned some kind of global transformation.²⁰ There was a striking disagreement between those, including the general assembly of Temes County, who demanded that Jews reform their religion which, according to them, prevented social mixing, and those who considered that emancipation would automatically lead Jews toward social fusion. After all, it was unlikely, József Eötvös believed, that “they who are pleading so persistently for achieving equal status in Hungarian society want isolation.”²¹ To mention finally the two extremes, an irreconcilable difference of views separated those few who, like Eötvös, did not expect anything from the Jews *before* their emancipation, and those also rare voices who proclaimed that conversion to Christianity was the only possible way to integrate Jews into the Hungarian nation.²²

Although the adoption of Hungarian language superseded other positive expectations, there still were some Jewish emancipation fighters who left this out of consideration. The most striking example is Móric Bloch, the most prominent Jewish advocate of emancipation in the early 1840s. Bloch, who would convert three years later (then change his name to “Ballagi” in 1848), ended his aforementioned pamphlet with a “Jewish Appeal” addressed to the “Hungarian people.” Apparently he considered that the best way to win over Christian readers to the cause of emancipation was to deny the legitimacy of any criticism against or expectations set for Jews. He paid lip service to assimilationist expectations by declaring that Jews “want to submit to your customs and morals,” but he

did not speak of Magyarization, neither of formal acculturation, nor of cultural and spiritual adherence to the Hungarian nation.²³

These elements were also lacking in the German-language pamphlets published in 1841 and 1842, which should be mentioned here as their authors wrote them under the influence of the 1839–1840 Diet. Their recurrent theme was the internal reform of Hungarian Jews. As late followers of the *Haskalah*, the Jewish Enlightenment, their authors urged the modernization of Jewish education, they encouraged self-cultivation, the employment of rabbis and teachers with some secular knowledge, as well as the establishment of a modern rabbinical seminary. However they did not speak of Magyarization.²⁴

In contrast, Lipót (Leopold) Löw, who had moved to Hungary from Moravia a few years earlier and would become the leader of the Jewish emancipation movement after Bloch's conversion, had not even begun to learn Hungarian yet when in May 1840, he already pointed out in the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* that "the only way for the Hungarian Jew to be truly emancipated is by embracing (*Vermählung*) Hungarian nationality." His statement involved more than language acculturation, but it clearly also involved that.²⁵ Similarly to Lipót Löw, his father-in-law, Pest rabbi Löw Schwab also called upon his brethren to engage in Magyarization. Yet his synagogue address, delivered in German on the occasion of the birthday of Ferdinand V in 1840, demonstrates above all that the process of acculturation was still in its infancy. As it appears from his speech, Schwab still felt the need to convince his coreligionists that love of their homeland required them to be familiar with its history and literature. He advised them to turn their sons away from business towards the morally more beneficial skilled trades and farming. Finally he depicted the necessity of learning Hungarian, which Jews had to know since it represented the "greatest bond" able to fuse them and their Christian compatriots in "one family."²⁶ In other, clearer words, Magyarization was the price to pay for emancipation.

Increasing Expectations, Social Fusion, and Religious Reform (1841–1848)

The Diet assembled again in the spring of 1843. In September 1844, with 35 to 13 votes the Lower Chamber rejected the emancipation bill it had passed by a large majority four years earlier.²⁷ Meanwhile, enthusiasm for Jewish emancipation in the liberal camp had indeed diminished considerably. The reasons were partly economic (the increasing indebtedness of the land-owning nobility to Jewish creditors) and partly demographic (the significant Jewish immigration from Galicia).²⁸ At the last feudal Diet of 1847–1848, no bill on Jewish emancipation was even submitted to the Lower House.

The discourse about Jews was characterized in this period by decreasing good will, diminishing tolerance of their otherness, increasing

skepticism as to their integrationist abilities and generally speaking increasingly stringent expectations.

This was demonstrated in the calls for Magyarization, which remained unequivocal in their wording. "Let a Hungarian shake hands with the Jew who learns the language of the homeland well, as with a fellow citizen deserving to be freed," Endre Bajkay suggested in 1841 in *Pesti Hírlap* (*Pest News*), the most important liberal newspaper.²⁹ In his book published in 1842, István Gorove declared that "the nation expects the Jews to accept Magyarization," then reported that Hungarian Jews had allegedly decided between them that in 10 years, they would accept to marry only Hungarian-speaking couples. Needless to say, the statement had no basis whatsoever, nevertheless Gorove suggested that the next Diet could legislate in that sense.³⁰ And indeed, a somewhat similar provision was almost enacted. At the district session of the Lower Chamber on 6 September 1844, Gábor Klauzál proposed that Jews should be compelled to establish a rabbinical seminary instructing in Hungarian, and after a while to elect as new rabbi only someone who would have graduated from this seminary.³¹ On the basis of this proposal, articles 8–9 of the bill alleviating the plight of the Jews and passed by the Lower Chamber at the end of September decreed that they should establish in Pest a rabbinical seminary and a teacher training institute with Hungarian as language of instruction, while article 10 stipulated that three years after the law was promulgated, Jewish schools would be allowed to employ only Hungarian-speaking teachers, while 10 years after the promulgation, Jewish communities should only hire Hungarian-speaking rabbis.³² In the end nothing came of all this since the Lower House, complying with the request of the House of Lords, removed these articles from the bill.³³

The increasing stringency of expectations was also apparent in the multiplying appeals for occupational restructuring among the Jews. At the debate of the district session about Jewish emancipation in September 1844, Gábor Lónyay estimated that the Diet should propel Jews towards skilled trades and farming. Until that had happened, he refused to back their emancipation.³⁴

The most radical denial of Jewish difference was manifested in demands for their religious conversion. Proportionately, these calls were not more frequent than in earlier times. What changed, rather, was the nature of their secular justification. In 1840 János Udvardy Cserna justified the need for Jews to adopt Christianity by the immorality of their religion.³⁵ Three years later, the main reason advanced by a certain "Dr. J. G." was the *national* imperative. As the only wish of the dispersed Jewish nation was to be taken back by their Messiah to the Land of Canaan, it was absurd to expect from the Jews any kind of patriotic feeling toward the country they happened to dwell in. Jews would never amalgamate into "one nation" with Christians. The only solution was to demand conversion from Jews aspiring to civil rights.³⁶

Yet the clearest indication of the increasing distrust of Jews was the mounting accusation of Jewish social exclusiveness. Public debate about Jews became dominated by the charge that Jews did not “adhere” to Christian society, from which they deliberately kept their distance.³⁷ For most Christian participants in the debate, it seemed reasonable to refuse further rights to the Jews as long as they showed no improvement in this respect. Since it was also generally agreed that Jewish self-isolation resulted for their religious prescriptions, the expectation of social amalgamation led to the demand that Jews reform their religion.

In contrast with Germany, where traditional Jewish society was largely dismantled by the 1830s, in the Hungary of the 1840s the overwhelming majority of the Jewish population remained almost completely untouched by modernization. Their inclination for self-isolation can all the less be disputed that some of the Yiddish-speaking Jews did not even speak the language of their Gentile neighbors. Yet Jews were obviously not the sole responsible for the social chasm remaining between Christians and themselves. The underlying aim behind the accusation, namely the delay of emancipation, and the perhaps unconscious desire behind it, namely that Jews discard all features of their difference, are manifest in the very fact that Christians almost totally eluded the question of their own responsibility.

To illustrate the widespread accusation of Jewish exclusiveness and the consequential demand for religious reform, we will limit ourselves to mentioning a few declarations delivered at the Lower House in 1844. Ignác Zsoldos, deputy of Veszprém County, on 7 September: “We cannot grant civil rights [to those] for whom an article of faith commands isolation from other people. I wish they gained civic freedom, but the Spinozas and Mendelssohns should adapt their dogmas to the spirit of the times.”³⁸ Kornél Balogh, deputy of Győr County, on 27 September: “Jews constitute a separate, isolated nation due to their religion, customs, way of life and laws, that is to say to all their living conditions. [...] Consequently we cannot hope that granting them civil rights will bring the expected success.”³⁹ János Soltész, deputy of Torna County, on 28 September: “I wish for and want emancipation, but in such a way that they emancipate themselves first from the prejudice keeping them isolated from other inhabitants of the country.”⁴⁰ Menyhért Lónyay, deputy of Bereg County, on the same day: “Let a deputation be appointed which convenes the representatives of the Jews living in the country, whose task it shall be to inform [Hungarians] about their rituals and to bring about the changes that will ease rapprochement.”⁴¹

Few were those who advanced contradicting opinions, such as László Palóczy, deputy of Borsod County, who declared at the district session of the Lower Chamber on 10 October 1844: “Enlightenment is spreading among the Jews, too. If they isolate themselves, we are the cause. We shun and persecute them.”⁴²

In addition to, and generally intertwined with critics of social exclusiveness, the demand for a radical reform of the Jewish religion based on political grounds also appeared in these years. As the argument went, Jewish religion was theocratic, it commanded its followers to comply first and foremost with its own laws, which in turn prevented Jews from becoming law-abiding loyal citizens. As Judaism constituted a state within the state, Jews could not become faithful Hungarians. The theory was far from new, the idea of the "state within a state" had been voiced in Germany by opponents of Jewish emancipation, including Johann Gottlieb Fichte, since the end of the 18th century.⁴³ In Hungary too it was first brought up to counter Jewish emancipation.⁴⁴ Yet paradoxically, it was popularized by Lajos Kossuth, the would-be leader of the 1848 revolution. Kossuth expressed his views about Jewish emancipation in a column-long footnote published on 5 May 1844 in *Pesti Hírlap*, the daily of which he was the editor. His reasoning combined the political and social justification of the reform of Jewish religion. While theoretically supporting "political emancipation," i.e. the bestowal of equal rights, Kossuth gave voice to the suspicion that this could not be granted after all, since Judaism was "a political institution built on theocratic fundamentals, which cannot be politically harmonized with the current ruling system." The task fell to the Jews to refute this opinion, to provide information to their Christian compatriots regarding the issue, and if this opinion was not merely a "misjudgment," then to eliminate the theocratic elements of their religion through reform. As far as the ultimate goal, that is "social integration" was concerned, Kossuth no longer had any doubts: the "caste-like seclusion" stipulated by the dogma and rituals of Jewish religion constituted an insurmountable obstacle. (A month later, Kossuth made his opinion even clearer: as long as their religion prevented Jews from sharing a meal and wine with Christians, they could not be "socially emancipated," that is integrated in Christian society, "even if they were emancipated a hundred times politically.")⁴⁵ In conclusion Kossuth suggested that the Jews should convene a "universal Sanhedrin," by which he evidently referred to the Great Sanhedrin summoned by Napoleon in Paris in 1806. At this legislative assembly, they should "by suitable reforms" obliterate from their religion the "political" elements that stood in the way of their social "amalgamation."⁴⁶

Following Kossuth's intervention in the emancipation debate, the express demand or at least the strong wish for the reform of Jewish religion became general not only among opponents of emancipation, but among its liberal proponents as well. This was reflected in the text accompanying the aforementioned bill passed by the Lower Chamber in September 1844. The text stated that before a law were to grant Jews the rights enjoyed by the country's non-noble inhabitants, they had to bring down the "public walls" which isolated them from and prevented their fusion with Christians. Furthermore, it asked the king to ensure that the Jews would gather, confer, and remove all customs and rituals from their

religion which prevented their social life from complying with "the spirit of the advanced times."⁴⁷ The bill came to nothing. Ferdinand V, who dissolved the Diet on 13 November 1844, did not even react to it.

In the following four years, between 1844 and the outbreak of the 1848 revolution, writings on Jewish emancipation and assimilationist expectations did not raise new issues. Demands for occupational diversification became less frequent, calls for the moral regeneration came almost to a halt. The wish for the reform of Jewish religion continued to be frequently expressed, yet the most often recurring requirement in the 1847 deputies' instructions to the Diet was the demand, already expressed by Kossuth, that Jews disclose their principles of faith, in order to prove, as the general assembly of Máramaros County stated in its instruction to its deputies, that "they do not include anti-state dogmas."⁴⁸

Let us examine now the Jewish reactions. Understandably, linguistic acculturation did not – could not – raise opposition among integrationist Jews. On 8 May 1844, a few Jewish students founded *The Pest Society for the Propagation of Hungarian among the Israelites of the Homeland*, or as it was commonly called, the *Magyarizing Society*, which offered free language classes for adults.⁴⁹ In Jewish writings, the issue of Magyarization appeared in the form of encouragement or admonition directed at coreligionists. These texts rarely missed to indicate what was at stake. Móric Rosenthal, a teacher in Buda, achieved the second version of his prayer book in Hungarian in the summer of 1841. In the foreword, he conjured his coreligionists to pray "in the language of the homeland," and did not fail to point out that learning Hungarian was "the foundation stone of our future condition," that is of emancipation.⁵⁰ Lipót Löw began to learn Hungarian after he had been elected rabbi of Nagykanizsa in February 1841. He began to preach in Hungarian three years later. His first sermon in Hungarian was published in 1845. As he stressed in this sermon: "Speak to the Hungarian in his own language, even if [you do it] poorly. He will understand you and your words will resound in his compassionate bosom!"⁵¹ The incongruity of a speech urging Jews to learn Hungarian in Hungarian is only apparent. The aim, and the reason why Löw chose to publish his sermon, was obviously to persuade Hungarian readers that even if the Magyarization of Jewish masses was not yet on the cards, there was no shortage of goodwill.

In addition to calls urging linguistic acculturation, this was the period when Jews began to express the wish that their coreligionists not only *learn Hungarian*, but also *become Hungarians*. On the Christian side, this expectation was yet rarely formulated, and then only stipulated with some added qualifications, thus by István Horvát, who demanded that Jews become Hungarian with "their heart and lips."⁵² As paradoxical as it may seem, in this case, Jews went further, probably because on the Hungarian side, in spite of all the nationalist rhetoric or maybe precisely because of the essentialism inherently contained in all nationalism, even

liberal intellectuals and politicians could not yet seriously imagine that Jews really become Hungarians plain and simple. A year after Móric Bloch published his pamphlet, in which he tried to convince his Christian readers about the necessity of emancipation while completely ignoring issues of acculturation, he published in the beginning of 1841 an appeal calling for the establishment of a Jewish teachers' training college. He expressed his amazement at his fellow Jews who had not yet understood that people could unite to achieve a common goal only if they spoke the same language. He ended his writing by expressing his hope that "at last my fellow Jews begin to realize that if they ever want to become citizens of Hungary, they must not bring up their children to be either German, French or English, but Hungarian."⁵³ Three years later Lipót Löw set the task for his coreligionists "to become Jewish Hungarians instead of Hungarian Jews."⁵⁴

Besides Magyarization, the need for the Jews to turn toward "useful occupations" remained also on the agenda, usually intertwined with the abstract calls for moral improvement. The issue of occupational reorientation was the field where the first concrete initiatives were taken. The *Society for the Spreading of Heavy Handicraft and Agriculture Among the Israelites* was founded in Pest in 1842, two years before the Magyarizing Society.⁵⁵

Unsurprisingly however, Jews in this period were most concerned with the demands for the radical reform of their religion. Most reactions were categorically dismissive. Lipót Löw played here the leading role. Reacting to Kossuth's arguments in articles sent to the *Pesti Hírlap* in 1844 and 1845, Löw argued that Kossuth's concern stemmed from a misunderstanding of Judaism. Political motives could not justify its reform since the end of the Jewish state also entailed the repealing of its "theocratic laws." Jews could not constitute a state within the state, since they were subject to the Hungarian laws, just like everybody else.⁵⁶ With respect to social emancipation, freedom of conscience required that if no one criticized Catholics for not sharing the Protestants' "fleshy meal" on Fridays, so Jews should not be reproached for their own dietary laws.⁵⁷ As for social mixing, finally, Christian exclusivism was to be blamed.⁵⁸

In addition to Lipót Löw, unknown Jews too protested against calls to reform their religion, as well as against demands that Jews make public their religious dogmas.⁵⁹ Yet some articles also appeared which implicitly stood for religious reforms aimed at facilitating mixed social life.⁶⁰

As Gentile calls for Jewish religious reforms and the publication of the dogmas of Judaism did not stop, Löw Schwab wrote a short book summarizing the tenets of Judaism on the behest of the Pest Jewish Community. The 26-page booklet was published in February 1846 by the Pest Community, in both German and Hungarian. The national representative body of Hungarian Jews officially endorsed the book and recommended its widest possible distribution.⁶¹ Schwab's work did not

engage in polemics, but the chief rabbi, who was otherwise open to moderate reforms in the religious service, took a clear stand against any modification of religious laws. With the demise of the Jewish state, Schwab wrote, a "large part" of religious laws lost their validity. What remained was, on the one hand "moral laws," which were by their nature eternally binding, and on the other hand "individual religious obligations," including abstention from certain foods, which were "in no way connected" with the laws that had lost their validity, and thus remained "as God's commands, eternally obligatory to every Jew."⁶² The major part of the booklet turned around the idea of regeneration, the need of "moral advancement and improvement." The Pest rabbi urged his fellow Jews to love their country, learn Hungarian, internalize civic values, and conduct themselves as befits men of culture.⁶³ Despite its wide distribution, the book of the Pest chief rabbi did not curb the increasing unpopularity of Jewish emancipation, nor the unceasing demand for the disclosure of Jewish religious dogmas.

In the febrile atmosphere preceding the revolution, Jews too adopted more resolute positions. In a letter of 26 February 1847 sent to the Pest Jewish community, the Jews of Ugocsa County declared that if the improvement of their legal condition were to depend on the "slightest change" of their religion, they would rather renounce a happier future.⁶⁴ On the opposite side of this spectrum, Márton Diósy, secretary of the Magyarizing Society, declared in the autumn of 1847 that if the "fundamental pillars of the synagogue" had to be kept, the "plaster" applied in later times was to be removed. What Diósy wanted was Jews who not only spoke Hungarian but also "felt" Hungarian, all the more so since this was their only chance to see one day their hopes of emancipation come true.⁶⁵

Nothing demonstrates better the force of the pressure on Jews to reform their religion than the fact that even Lipót Löw, then already rabbi in Pápa, joined for a while the ranks of those who supported the idea of radical reform. In an article published in *Pesti Hírlap* on 22 June 1847, he turned to both the Diet and his fellow Jews with a proposal to each. He asked the Diet to pass a law commanding Jewish communities to hire after one year only rabbis able to read and write in another language than Yiddish, after three years only rabbis perfectly versed in Hungarian, and after six years only rabbis with a university degree. As for Hungarian rabbis, Löw asked them to sign a statement declaring among others that they consider as "outdated and invalid" everything in the Talmud which would contradict the idea that Hungary constitutes the "real and only" homeland of Hungarian Jews. This meant nothing less than asking Hungarian rabbis to officially discard the messianic belief of a return to the Holy Land, a fundamental pillar of Judaism. Considering that the overwhelming majority of Hungarian rabbis still lived in the world of Jewish tradition,⁶⁶ the real goal of Löw's completely unrealistic proposition must have been to win over Christian public opinion.

One can fairly suppose that this same goal was what prompted Löw to publish a Hungarian translation of the decisions of the Grand Sanhedrin convened by Napoleon. In the book's foreword, dated 27 December 1847, he continued to stand for "reforms." Yet what he understood under "reform" was now something very different. A superficial reader may have thought that Löw kept on arguing for the necessity of religious reforms. However Löw was in fact not speaking about effective reforms, rather about the "internal transformation," the moral obligation of "internal improvement" commanded by the *Haskalah*. When he wrote about Jews who "had performed on themselves the duty of reform," he merely meant enlightened Jews.⁶⁷

Pressure and Resistance (1848–1849)

During the revolution and the war of independence, demands for religious reforms that would promote social amalgamation came to totally dominate public discourse about what Jews were supposed to do to "deserve" equal rights. Over the course of 17 months, the demand appeared in a parliamentary bill, in a report of the central commission of the National Assembly, and finally in the emancipation law of 1849. Jewish religious reform became the avowed aim of the liberal nationalist political elite in power, a focal element of the Jewish policy of Hungarian revolutionary authorities.

In vain did the fourth of the 12 points summarizing the demands of the Pest rebels at the outbreak of the 1848 revolution ask for "equality before the law in civil and religious respects," the anti-Jewish demonstrations breaking out in Pozsony (Pressburg, now Bratislava) made the legislators back out. At the Diet session of 21 March, Lajos Kossuth proposed to delay Jewish emancipation and held the Jews implicitly responsible for the antisemitic disturbances, declaring that the cause of those disturbances was "not hatred, but fear," which in turn was elicited by the Jews, "because they isolate themselves in life."⁶⁸ On the same day, the Lower House prepared a bill which instructed the would-be independent Hungarian government to convene an assembly of Jews and Christians that would examine the "internal conditions" of the Jews and submit a bill "about the necessary reforms" of the Jewish religion to the next National Assembly.⁶⁹ The hastily compiled and almost immediately forgotten proposal did not even bother to justify why Jews should reform their religion.

The April Laws of 1848, which broke down feudal society and laid the foundation for modern Hungary, remained silent about the 340–400,000 Jews living in the country. In August 1848 the central commission of the freshly convened national parliament asked the government to submit a bill on Jewish emancipation, and meanwhile to contact the "more cultivated members of the Jewish class" with a view to "obviate the causes of the so conspicuous and harmful isolation, and mutual aversion by means

of a modern reform.”⁷⁰ In this case at least, it became clear why a reform would be needed. However, the question of what should be reformed remained unanswered. Of course, the central commission obviously meant Jewish religion, but it was not named, perhaps to put aside the delicate issue of why only Jewish religion should be transformed to obviate “mutual aversion.”

On 28 July 1849 the National Assembly in Szeged finally adopted a law of emancipation that bestowed equal rights to the Jew, a gesture that everybody knew was only symbolic, as the final defeat of the war of liberation was no longer in doubt. The gesture was all the less glorious that Hungary became the last Central European country to grant equality of rights to its Jewish population during the time of the 1848–49 revolutions. In addition, it did it in a unique way in so far as the very law that granted Jews equal civil and political rights limited their freedom of choice and conscience. Indeed article four of the law called upon the minister of interior to direct Jews towards “the practice of manual trades and farming,” as well as to convene a meeting of rabbis and elected representatives at which Jews should reform their “articles of faith.” As to why they should do so, the preamble of the law explained in a rather obscure way that “the Jewish institutions made in the age of theocracy [...] are an imperfect, even deficient way to convey the ideas, emotions and virtues of the modern age.”⁷¹

As we said, from the outbreak of the revolution, the issue of religious reform superseded every other topic in debates about what the Jews ought to do to be integrated in Hungarian society. But what kind of reforms did they precisely have to accomplish to foster their amalgamation? Some participants in the debate eluded the question,⁷² while others made it clear that they were primarily thinking of the elimination of dietary laws and the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday.⁷³

These exacerbated expectation of integration led quite naturally to the call for Jewish conversion as the ultimate way of putting an end to Jewish exclusiveness. Having lost their hope in the advent of emancipation, the president of the Pest Jewish community, Jónás Kunewalder and his nephew Manó Kanitz converted to Catholicism on 6 April 1848. Basing its information on urban rumors, the newspaper of the Industry Association, which was at this time the mouthpiece of Kossuth, reported that the two well-known businessmen lost their faith in their coreligionists, those “stubborn kosher eaters,” who did not even accept the Sabbath being transferred to Sunday. As the rumors went, a dozen wealthy Jews were about to follow their footsteps. “They want to convert,” the paper rejoiced, and concluded: “This is true emancipation!”⁷⁴

With this slip of the tongue (if that was one), the anonymous author got at the heart of the matter. For what, after all, could this social amalgamation so urgently called for by virtually the entire liberal camp really mean? It surely did not mean that the Jews should ambition to be

integrated qua Jews in the social and family network of the (would-be) Hungarian middle class, since even the most liberal Christians displayed very little willingness to actually accept them in their midst.⁷⁵ How then to explain, that in the 1840s calls for the social fusion of the Jews became much more frequent than the ones urging their Magyarization? After all, in a Hungary where Hungarians composed the minority of the country's population, the Magyarization of the Jewish population should have superseded all other expectations. Yet the trouble with Magyarization was that it had a more a less concrete meaning, and that this meaning, namely linguistic and cultural acculturation, was too circumscribed and less globally encompassing than what liberal nationalist politicians and intellectuals failed to say but in fact wished for: the transformation of Jews to such an extent that it would finally lead to their dissolution in the Christian Hungarian society.

In this stormy period, Jews longing for equal rights wavered between enthusiasm and desperation. After the outbreak of the revolution they were confident that emancipation was at hand, instead of which they were met with antisemitic disturbances.⁷⁶ In their despair, many of them converted. The first and proportionately the most significant wave of conversion in the history of Hungarian Jews between 1800 and 1914 took place at this time.⁷⁷ Others considered emigration. In the summer of 1848, nearly a hundred Jews from Pozsony left the country.⁷⁸ However, despite disappointment, much more numerous were those who took part in the revolution, then fought in the war of independence.⁷⁹

Jewish responses to expectations were reduced to a binary alternative: supporting or rejecting religious reform. Of course, the dilemma did not exist for the overwhelming majority of the Jewish population, who still lived in the more or less intact mental world of tradition, light years away from considering such radical reforms as the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday or the abolition of the dietary laws.

However, the reform associations established among others in Pest, Arad, Pécs, and Nagyvárad in the spring and summer of 1848 were willing to do so.⁸⁰ The only difference between the associations set up on the initiative of local merchants and young professionals was that while the Pest Jewish Reform Society denied the direct influence of political pressure,⁸¹ the other societies acknowledged it openly. As the Arad Reform Society stated in its declaration of 24 April 1848, "radical reforms" were needed in the Jewish religion "in order that the remonstrance and not entirely unfounded accusation that Jews obstinately isolate themselves in their religious rituals from other denominations would vanish."⁸² In the same vein, the Pécs Jewish Reform Society declared in November 1848 that they had gathered in "a society seeking to transform our religious structure," because the National Assembly had expressed the wish "that the followers of the religion of Israel abandon their exclusiveness and strive to amalgamate with the members of this homeland's other denominations."⁸³

The young intellectuals gathered in the Magyarizing Society were equally straightforward, declaring in a petition circulated in Pest in spring 1848 that “all those customs” for which “we are accused of exclusiveness” should be obliterated.⁸⁴

In opposition to the reform societies, the official representative body of Hungarian Jewry categorically rejected the idea of religious reforms carried out for mundane advantages. In July 1848 the delegates of Hungarian Jewry assembled in Pest and elected ten representatives from among themselves to lobby for emancipation. The representatives were clearly told that they were not to make any concession in matters of religion, even if the National Assembly were willing to grant emancipation only at the price of religious reform.⁸⁵

Benevolence and Disappointment (1850–1867)

During the oppressive Bach period (1850–1859) that followed the failure of the War of Independence, Jews were hardly mentioned in the barely existing Hungarian political debates. The revival of domestic political life in the early 1860s also brought about the resumption of debates on assimilationist expectations. However no issues elicited passionate discussions any longer. Radical expectations spectacularly ebbed. This can be partly explained by the fact that the issue of Jewish religious reform largely fell out of the agenda, as it had become obvious that the overwhelming majority of Jews was adamantly opposed to it. In addition, the beginning of mass acculturation among Hungarian Jews diminished the fears raised by their alienness, fears which had contributed to stir up demands for religious reforms. What could still seem utopian in the 1840s started to become reality in the 1860s. It is indicative that calls for linguistic acculturation increasingly gave way to local reports on the concrete state of Magyarization.⁸⁶

Besides this, the fundamental question whether Jews had to be given equal rights or not was no longer subject to debate. What still seemed uncertain in the 1840s had now the evidence of historical necessity. At the time of the National Assembly of 1861, a large number of the country’s most prominent liberal politicians and intellectuals took a stand in favor of Jewish emancipation, including Ferenc Deák, Gyula Andrássy, Kálmán Tisza, Ferenc Pulszky and Mór Jókai. If no law on Jewish emancipation was passed, this was primarily due to lack of time, since Franz Joseph, judging the claims of the Hungarian parliament unacceptable, dissolved prematurely the National Assembly on 22 August 1861. At its penultimate session, however, the House agreed unanimously with Kálmán Tisza’s proposal to declare in a solemn resolution that it considered the granting of full civil and political equality to the Jews as one of “its first and most important task.”⁸⁷ Jewish emancipation failed to be realized, but there could be no doubt about its imminent coming into force.

The last occurrences of the issue of Jewish self-isolation illustrate how times were changing – in favor of Jews. A motion submitted to the National Assembly by a parliamentary commission on 7 July recommended the preparation of a bill on Jewish emancipation which would also deal with the need “to remove the obstacles hindering the social merging of Christians and Jews.”⁸⁸ Compared to earlier texts, the wording was patently cautious. No mention was made of any reform, and nothing was said about whom was to be blamed for the “obstacles” that had to be removed. The motion was not even discussed by the House. Meanwhile, in the parliamentary debates the issue was raised only once – only to be refuted. As Frigyes Podmaniczky stated on 24 May: “By depriving [the Jews] of rights enjoyed by other citizens, we were the ones who compelled them to isolate themselves from us.”⁸⁹

The demand that Jews eliminate from their religion the supposedly theocratic elements that were deemed incompatible with the interests of the state completely disappeared. On a few occasions, some young liberals took care to refute charges about the theocratic nature of Judaism – that nobody laid any longer.⁹⁰ In the same way, calls for the moral regeneration of the Jews vanished almost entirely from the agenda. In his lecture given at the Academy of Sciences on 1 December 1861, Ágoston Trefort explained that the wealthier and better educated Jews deserved equal rights, but in the case of “lower-class Jews” who were still clinging to their “old views,” waiting was advised until their morals and customs approached those of Christian society. According to Trefort, the best way to achieve this moral improvement was – unsurprisingly – by turning away from “odious commercial practices” to farming or skilled trades.⁹¹ Trefort did not realize that times have changed and that Jews, precisely because they did advance on the road of acculturation and were now imbued with some civic self-confidence, would not remain silent. The lecture provoked a considerable outcry among the Jewish population, and Trefort had to explain repeatedly that he did not mean what he meant.⁹² In this respect too, the public mood was characterized by a more condoning and empathic attitude towards Jews, exemplified by Mór Jókai, who at the session of the National Assembly on 24 May 1861 considered it a “sin” to exclude Jews from the full enjoyment of civil rights “and then demand civic virtues of them.”⁹³

Following the dissolution of the National Assembly of 1861, public opinion’s interest in things Jewish declined rapidly. In fact, it did not really revive even in 1867, the year which finally brought emancipation to the Jews of Hungary.

Comparing Christian and Jewish discourses, it is striking that at no time in the period under study was the gap so large as in these final years preceding emancipation. While on the Christian side hardly any radical expectations were voiced, on the part of the Jews feverish calls for Magyarization reached their apex in the early 1860s. Even though the

promise of emancipation law was not delivered in 1861, this did not trouble Hungarian liberal elite very much. Clearly, they considered the issue as a settled matter, which only needed a little more time. In vivid contrast to this placid assurance, Jews were painfully and bitterly disappointed in 1861 by the failure of the political elite to grant them equal rights.

A novelty in this period was the publication of a Hungarian language Jewish weekly titled *Magyar Izraelita* (*Hungarian Israelite*). With this weekly, published intermittently from the beginning of 1861 to March 1868, integrationist Jews finally had at their disposal an almost regular forum for the dissemination of their ideas. Several of the weekly's young contributors, including Mór Mezei, Pál Tenczer and Adolf Ágai, were to be pillars of the Neolog Jewish establishment in the period of the Dual Monarchy.

In the months preceding the meeting of the 1861 Parliament and during its first sessions, integrationist Jews seem to have been convinced that time was ripe for emancipation. This ardent hope nourished their discourse which were replete with appeals to their fellow Jews to become fully Hungarian. Without any doubt, the requested transformation now much exceeded formal acculturation. As József Ligeti declared in the *Pesti Napló* in November 1860: "The Hungarian Jew must absolutely become Hungarian."⁹⁴ If Hungarian Jews were granted emancipation, Lipót Löw wrote in a book finished in December 1860, they would become Hungarian "in heart and words, in spirit and character, in their principles and their language."⁹⁵ While in the first issue of *Magyar Izraelita* Ligeti declared that "a Hungarian Jew must be Hungarian in sentiment, language, attire and customs,"⁹⁶ in the fifth issue, published at the end of January, Gyula Beck defined himself and his coreligionists as follows: "Our religion is our only distinctive feature – our bodies, souls, thoughts, and speech are Hungarian."⁹⁷ In his pamphlet published on the occasion of the opening session of Parliament, Zsigmond Krausz assured his Christian compatriots that everywhere where the Jew finds a home, in other words receives equal rights, "he is devoted to the nation with his heart and soul."⁹⁸

But what if he does not find a home? Already when the motion of the parliamentary commission was published, Mór Mezei warned in *Magyar Izraelita* that such a proposal will certainly not contribute in making Jews into "proselytes for the national cause."⁹⁹ Following the dissolution of Parliament and the failed hopes for emancipation, *Magyar Izraelita* ceased publication for a few months. In the weekly, which reappeared from the beginning of 1862, Mór Mezei concluded his first editorial with an explicit warning addressed to the "Hungarian nation": "Do not be surprised that where you sow discontent you will not reap gratitude. [...] Do not blame it then on the Jews' lack of patriotism."¹⁰⁰ Two weeks later he dryly acknowledged that the events of the previous year "had not augmented the affection of the Israelites for the

Hungarian element.”¹⁰¹ Unsurprisingly, the bitterness of the Jewish weekly was not softened by Ágoston Trefort’s lecture of December 1862, in which *Magyar Izraelita* primarily saw the revival of that ancient idea of partial emancipation, that it libeled as “the shame of the emancipators.”¹⁰²

Years passed but deception remained. In 1866 Lajos Lichtschein, assistant rabbi in Nagykanizsa was still expressing his – somewhat hypocritical – concern that another Jewish generation would grow up not knowing patriotism, because “it does not share its blessings.”¹⁰³ Yet others had already chosen to again point out the positive consequences of emancipation for the Hungarian nation. Resorting to the by then classical opposition between “good” Jews and “bad” nationalities, a pamphlet published in December 1866 noted: “A Jew does not gravitate outwards as a Romanian, a German and a Slav.”¹⁰⁴ But the blazing enthusiasm of the early 1860s no longer returned, not even after the so long awaited adoption of the emancipation law. At the beginning of 1868 Hungarian Jews held thanksgiving services all over the country to celebrate emancipation. Several speeches delivered by prominent rabbis were published in print. All of them touched upon the question of the Jews’ obligations toward their country. Yet neither the issue of moral regeneration nor, of course, that of religious reform were mentioned. Pest rabbi Sámuel Kohn was the only one to talk about the old issue of occupational diversification, namely the need for Jews to turn to farming. The rabbis mostly spoke about patriotism, in both vague and bombastic terms. There was only one concrete element that reappeared in several speeches: the political and moral duty to learn and adopt Hungarian language. Sándor Kohut went as far as declaring that the Jews did not gain emancipation earlier because they neglected their obligation in this matter and asked for equal rights “with foreign lips.”¹⁰⁵

Postscript

What was the situation then in 1867? Can we talk about an agreement defining the conditions of Jewish integration in Hungarian society?

From the very beginning, the fundamental expectation set for Jews was that they adopt Hungarian language and – this went clearly with it – declare themselves “Magyars” to strengthen the Hungarian element at the expense of the nationalities. In 1867, integrationist Jews had long been aware of that condition, they perfectly understood its primordial importance and fully accepted it. On what mattered the most, the two parties agreed.

However, as far as the most often and most vehemently debated issue was concerned, that is the radical reform of Jewish religion, the two sides never reached an agreement. In 1848, it became crystal clear that with the exception of a tiny minority, Jews would not bargain their religion. By the time the emancipation law was passed, Hungarian liberal elite had resigned itself

to it. The problem was that an essential disagreement lingered on concerning the degree of the Jews' acceptable otherness – since this was precisely what the issue of religious reform was all about. In this matter, there could be no arrangement since most Jews were not ready to reduce their otherness to the degree that would have satisfied the Hungarian political and cultural elite.

The coexistence of Christian and Hungarian Jews in the era of Dualism is the history of this sometimes latent, sometimes exploding, but never resolved disagreement.

Notes

- 1 Stourzh, "The Age of Emancipation," 204–205.
- 2 *Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának naplója*, 6: 282; *Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának irományai*, 3: 109.
- 3 *Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának naplója*, 6: 257.
- 4 Kemény, "Pest, dec. 23. 1867," no page number.
- 5 *Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés főrendi házáának naplója*, 308–311.
- 6 Historiography has hardly dealt with this issue. An exception is Viktor Karády, whose theory about a supposed "social contract of assimilation," which he formulated several times, is not discussed here, since the author has never given any empirical evidence to support its existence. See Karády, *Zsidóság*, 19–21, 84–85, 120, 156–157, 250.
- 7 For some of the works on the question, see Vardy, "The Origins of Jewish Emancipation;" Katz, *From Prejudice to Destruction*, 230–236; Kecskeméti, *La Hongrie et le réformisme libéral*, 172–96; Prepuk, "A zsidóemancipáció a reformkorban;" Sándor, "Az emancipáció történetéhez;" Miskolczy, *A zsidóemancipáció Magyarországon*; Gerő, "Zsidó utak," 13–28; Konrád, "Egyenjogúsítás feltételekkel."
- 8 *Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének írásai*, 3: 143–146.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 181–182.
- 10 *Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének írásai*, 4: 40–41, 243–244, 291, 297. For a summary of the events, see Groszmann, *A magyar zsidók V. Ferdinánd alatt*, 4–10.
- 11 Trefort, "Az oroszbirodalomban," 4.
- 12 Z. [Horvát István], "Mózes öt könyve," 82.
- 13 *1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének jegyző könyve*, 2: 291–292.
- 14 Eötvös, *A zsidók emancipációja*, 18–30. The study was first published by the *Budapesti Szemle* in its second issue of 1840, which in fact appeared in February 1841.
- 15 The percentage is for Hungary and Transylvania, but excluding Croatia and the Border Regions. Dobszay and Fónagy, "A rendi társadalom," 81; Varga, *Helyét kereső Magyarország*, 43–44, 70.
- 16 Vajda, "Előszó," XIX.
- 17 Z. [István Horvát], "Mózes öt könyve," 82.
- 18 Z* [István Horvát], "A'Sidokról," 110.

- 19 This point is also made by Endelman, *Leaving the Jewish Fold*, 3.
- 20 Trefort, "Az oroszbirodalomban," 40.
- 21 Singer, "Temesmegye," 151; Eötvös, *A zsidók emancipációja*, 43.
- 22 Udvardy, "A zsidókról," 687–695.
- 23 Bloch, *A zsidókról*, 44–45, 48, 52.
- 24 Löwy, *Worte zur Beherzigung*; Ehrmann, *Betrachtungen über Jüdische Verhältnisse*; Oesterreicher, *Der Jude in Ungarn*.
- 25 L. L. [Löw], "Die ungarische Nationalität," 262.
- 26 Schwab, *Rede zur Feier des Geburtstags Seiner Majestät*.
- 27 Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 6: 5–22.
- 28 Kecskeméti, *La Hongrie et le réformisme libéral*, 189; Prepuk, "A zsidó-emancipáció a reformkorban," 25–26; Varga, "Zsidó bevándorlás," 71–72.
- 29 Bajkay, "Nyilvános zsidó iskola," 282.
- 30 Gorove, *Nemzetiség*, 106, 108.
- 31 Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 6: 9–10.
- 32 *Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1843-ik esztendei pünkösöd hava 14-ik napjára rendeltetett magyarországi közgyűlésnek írásai*, 4: 70.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 91, 164.
- 34 Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 6: 7.
- 35 Udvardy, "A zsidókról."
- 36 G. J., *Némelly igénytelen nézetek*, 12, 17.
- 37 This accusation had been raised in Germany one decade earlier. See Katz, *Out of the Ghetto*, 202–203.
- 38 Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 6: 20.
- 39 *Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1843-ik esztendei pünkösöd hava 14-ik napjára rendeltetett magyarországi közgyűlésnek írásai*, 5: 196.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 209.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 210. Among the many similar declarations, see Nagy, "Vázlatok," 338–339; "Rövid közlések," 178; "Ugocsából," 264; –A, "A zsidók emancipációja," 277–278; Singer, "Temesmegye," 160.
- 42 Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 2: 552. A similar opinion was expressed at the 7 September 1844 district session by István Bezerédj, the representative of Tolna county. See Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 6: 13.
- 43 Katz, "A State within a State," 47–76.
- 44 See, for example, the speech of László Komlóssy, representative of Debrecen, at the 10 October 1843 district session of the National Assembly. Kovács, *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla*, 2: 547.
- 45 Löw, "Nyílt level," 376.
- 46 Fábrián, "Zsidó-emancipatio," 300.
- 47 *Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1843-ik esztendei pünkösöd hava 14-ik napjára rendeltetett magyarországi közgyűlésnek írásai*, 4: 69–70.
- 48 Zeller, *A magyar egyházpolitika*, 1: 2–3. For further demands for Jewish religious reform and presentation of articles of faith, see the debates at the 19 and 21 February 1848 district sessions of the Lower House: Zsoldos, *1848–1849 a magyar zsidóság életében*, 51–54.
- 49 Groszmann, *A magyar zsidók V. Ferdinánd alatt*, 14–15.
- 50 The work survives in manuscript form. Rosenthal, *Jesurun fohászai*.
- 51 Löw, *Jesájás korunk tanítója*, 22.
- 52 Z. [Horvát István], "Mózes öt könyve," 82.
- 53 Bloch, "Felszólítás," 86–87.
- 54 Löw, "Zur Emancipationsfrage," 360. Löw's response appeared in the first Hungarian Jewish periodical, *Ben Chananja*, edited by himself. There was

only one issue published in 1844, then Löw relaunched it in 1858 with greater success.

- 55 Groszmann, *A magyar zsidók V. Ferdinánd alatt*, 17–18.
- 56 Löw, “Nyílt level,” 375–376.
- 57 Löw, “A zsidókérdés,” 349.
- 58 Löw, “Még néhány szó,” 506.
- 59 Friedmann, “Az ugoicsai levelező,” 822; Muuk, “Zsidó-emancipáció II,” 281–282; Jogfi, “Mozaiták ügyében,” 289–290.
- 60 Weisz, “Néhány szó,” 838; [Ascher,] “Magyarhon,” 267.
- 61 Schwab, “Emlékeztetés,” 4–6. The national representative body of the Jewish communities, the *Representation of Israelites in Hungary* originally set up in 1839 to coordinate the struggle for emancipation.
- 62 Schwab, “Emlékeztetés,” 10.
- 63 Ibid., 15.
- 64 Büchler, *A zsidók története Budapesten*, 440.
- 65 Diósy, “A honi izraeliták között magyar nyelvet terjesztő pesti egyesület,” 86–88. The foreword is dated 20 October 1847.
- 66 Silber, “The Historical Experience,” 135.
- 67 Löw, *Zsidó valláselvek*, 1848, 3–11. The quotations are from pages 3–4.
- 68 “Pozsony, márt. 21-én,” 251.
- 69 Ibid., 252.
- 70 Zsoldos, *1848–1849 a magyar zsidóság életében*, 170–171.
- 71 Ibid., 263–264.
- 72 See, for example, Kolmár, *Nép szava*, 16–17.
- 73 “Győri napló,” 758–759; “Pest, ápril 7-én,” 309.
- 74 “Budapest,” 459.
- 75 Konrád, “Social Integration,” 818–849.
- 76 Kádár and Vági, “Hosszú évszázad,” 79–83.
- 77 Konrád, *Zsidóságon innen és túl*, 208–209.
- 78 Silber, “Hungary: Hungary before 1918.”
- 79 The most comprehensive overview of the period to date appeared in the work of the Szombathely rabbi Béla Bernstein, first published in 1898. Bernstein, *A negyvennyolcas magyar szabadságharc és a zsidók*.
- 80 For the social basis of the Pest Reform Society, see Silber, “The Social Composition,” 99–128.
- 81 Einhorn, *Grundprinzipien*, 32; Büchler, *A zsidók története Budapesten*, 455–56; Bernstein, *A negyvennyolcas magyar szabadságharc és a zsidók*, 136–37.
- 82 “Nem hivatalos rész,” 393.
- 83 Ibid., 138.
- 84 “Nem hivatalos rész,” 393.
- 85 Büchler, *A zsidók története Budapesten*, 453–455.
- 86 Vereby, *A magyar izraeliták*, 21–22; Eöttevényi, “A zsidó-kérdés hazánkban,” 325; Csetényi, “A hatvanas évek,” 106.
- 87 *Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés*, 2: 332–333. For the general public mood before the National Assembly and the issue of Jewish emancipation at its sessions, see Groszmann, *A magyar zsidók a XIX. század közepén*, 21–25; Szabad, *Forradalom és kiegyezés választóján*, 359–368, 509–510.
- 88 *Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés*, 3: 385–386; Szabad, *Forradalom és kiegyezés választóján*, 594–595.
- 89 *Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés*, 2: 33–34. For a few examples of intellectuals still asking Jews to reform their religion in order to be able draw closer to Christian society, see Eöttevényi, “A zsidó-kérdés hazánkban,” 305–306; Sztróka, *Magyarhoni korszerű eszmék*, 25–26, 28.

- 90 *Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés*, 1: 453; Toldy, *A zsidók emancipációjáról*.
- 91 Trefort, "A társadalom tudománya" 303–304.
- 92 "Vegyes közlemények s újdonságok," 1127; Mezei, "A zsidók Trefort Ágoston magyar társadalmában," 409–411; Löw, "Die ungarischen Juden," 425–430; "Különféle," 3.
- 93 *Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés*, 1: 477.
- 94 Quoted in Szabad, *Forradalom és kiegyezés választútján*, 361.
- 95 Löw, "A magyar nemzetiség" 43.
- 96 Ligeti, "Levelezések," 8.
- 97 Beck, "Mit akarnak tőlünk," 34.
- 98 Krausz, *Egy izraelita szózat*, 10.
- 99 Mezei, "A határozati javaslat," no page number.
- 100 (Fmt.), "Tájékoztató," 3.
- 101 (Fmt.), "Cél és feladat," 24.
- 102 Mezei, "A zsidók Trefort Ágoston magyar társadalmában," 411.
- 103 Lichtschein, *A zsidók közép-, jelenkori helyzetök- és viszonyaikról*, 27.
- 104 Egy hitrokon (A Fellow Believer), *A zsidók reformációja*, 8.
- 105 Löw, "Az Isten feloldá bilincseimet!" 13–14; Kohn, *Hogyan fogadjuk*, 10; Hochmuth, *Mit követel a hazaszeretet*, 10–16; Kohut, *Az új korszak*, 8–9; Handler, "Szónoklat," 23–25.

Bibliography

Archival and Manuscript Sources

Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Kézirattár (OSZK Kt)

Rosenthal, Móricz. *Jesurun fohászai. Újra fordította Rosenthal Moricz* [Jeshurun's Supplications. Retranslation by Móricz Rosenthal], 1841. Quart. Hung. 1243.
Toldy, István. *A zsidók emancipációjáról* [On Jewish Emancipation]. Quart. Hung. 1852.

Printed Primary Sources

1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének jegyző könyve [Minutes of the Hungarian Assembly Convened for the Second Day of the Month of Saint Stephen in the Year 1839]. Vol. 2. Pozsony: Belnay, Wéber és Wigand, 1840.

A. "A zsidók emancipációja," [The Emancipation of the Jews] *Pesti Hírlap*, 28 April 1845.

Ascher, Enoch. "Magyarhon műveltebb izraelitáihoz!," [To the More Educated Israelites of the Hungarian Homeland!] *Pesti Hírlap*, 22 April 1845.

Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés [The 1861 Hungarian National Assembly of 1861]. Vol. 1. Pest: Osterlamm Károly, 1861.

Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés [The Hungarian National Assembly of 1861]. Vol. 2. Pest: Osterlamm Károly, 1861.

Az 1861-ik évi magyar országgyűlés [The Hungarian National Assembly of 1861]. Vol. 3. Pest: Osterlamm Károly, 1861.

Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának naplója [Records of the National Assembly's House of Representatives for 10 December 1865]. Vol. 6. Pest: Emich Gusztáv, 1868.

- Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés képviselőházának irományai [Papers of the National Assembly's House of Representatives for 10 December 1865].* Vol. 3. Pest: Emich Gusztáv, 1868.
- Az 1865-dik évi december 10-dikére hirdetett országgyűlés főrendi házának naplója [Record of the National Assembly's Upper House for 10 December 1865].* Pest: Athenaeum, 1869.
- Bajkay, Endre. "Nyilvános zsidó iskola Pesten," [Jewish Public School in Pest] *Pesti Hírlap*, 28 April 1841.
- Beck, Gyula. "Mit akarnak tőlünk, mit akarjunk mi?," [What do they Want from Us? What should we Want?] *Magyar Izraelita*, 31 January 1861, 34.
- Bloch, Móritz. *A zsidókról [About the Jews]*. Pest: Trattner-Károlyi, 1840.
- Bloch, Móricz. "Felszólítás egy magyar-zsidó tanítókat képző intézet ügyében," [Request Concerning the Issue of a Hungarian-Jewish Teachers' Training College] *Pesti Hírlap*, 6 February 1841.
- "Budapest," [Budapest] *Hetilap*, 11 April 1848.
- Diósy, Márton. "A honi izraeliták között magyar nyelvet terjesztő pesti egyesület," [The Pest Society for Spreading the Hungarian Language Among the Israelites of the Homeland] in *Első magyar zsidó naptár és évkönyv 1848-ik szökőévre [First Hungarian Jewish Almanac and Year Book for the Leap Year 1848]*. Pest: Landerer és Heckenast, 1848. pp. 81–93
- Einhorn, I. *Grundprinzipien einer geläuterten Reform im Judenthum*. Pest: Druck von Basil Kozma, 1848.
- EöttevényiNagy, Ferenc]. "A zsidó-kérdés hazánkban," [The Jewish Question in our Homeland] *Delejtű*, 20 November 1860.
- Eötvös, József. *A zsidók emancipációja [Jewish Emancipation]*. Budapest: Magvető, 1981.
- Egy hitrokon [A Coreligionist]. *A zsidók reformációja [The Reformation of the Jews]*. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv, 1867.
- Ehrmann, Daniel. *Betrachtungen über Jüdische Verhältnisse*. Pesth: Trattner-Károlyi, 1841.
- Fábián, Gábor. "Zsidó-emancipatio," [Jewish Emancipation] *Pesti Hírlap*, 5 May 1844.
- (Fmt.)Mezei, Mór]. "Tájékoztatás," [Information] *Magyar Izraelita*, 10 January 1862.
- (Fmt.)Mezei, Mór]. "Cél és feladat," [Aim and Task] *Magyar Izraelita*, 24 January 1862.
- Friedmann, Gyula. "Az ugocsai levelező hibás logikája zsidók irányában," [The False Logic of the Correspondent from Ugocsa in Relation to the Jews] *Pesti Hírlap*, 1 December 1844.
- G. J., *Némelly igénytelen nézetek, vallásilag véve [Some Humble Views from the Perspective of Religion]*. Kőszeg: Reichard Károly, 1843.
- Gorove, István. *Nemzetiség [Nationality]*. Pest: Heckenast Gusztáv, 1842.
- "Győri napló," [Diary from Győr] *Hazánk*, 23 March 1848.
- Handler, Mark. "Szónoklat," [Oration] in *Jubiláris emlékmű Handler Mark tatai rabbi 40 éves hivatali jubileuma alkalmából [Jubilee Memorial Marking the 40 Years of Mark Handler as the Rabbi of Tata]*, edited by Simon Hevesi (Handler). Lugos: Handler Rudolf, 1904. pp. 21–27

- Hochmuth, Ábrahám. *Mit követel a hazaszeretet a honpolgároktól békés időben?* [*What does Patriotism Require from its Citizens in Times of Peace?*]. Veszprém: Ramazetter Károly, 1868.
- Jogfi, "Mozaiták ügyében," [On the Issue of the Followers of Moses] *Pesti Hírlap*, 2 May 1845.
- Kemény, Zsigmond. "Pest, dec. 23. 1867," [Pest, 23 December 1867] *Pesti Napló*, 24 December 1867.
- Kohn, Sámuel. *Hogyan fogadjuk és hogyan háláljuk meg az egyenjogositást?* [*How Should we Welcome and How Show we Show our Gratitude for Civic Equality?*]. Pest: Löwy E. M., 1868.
- Kohut, Sándor. *Az új korszak* [*The New Era*]. Pest: Löwy M. E., 1868.
- Kolmár, József. *Nép szava Isten szava* [*Voice of the People, Voice of God*]. Pozsony: Schmid F. és Busch J. J., 1848.
- Kovács, Ferencz, (ed.) *Az 1843/44-ik évi magyar országgyűlési alsó tábla kerületi üléseinek naplója* [*Records of the District Sessions of the Lower House of the Hungarian Assembly, 1843–44*], 6 vols. Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1894.
- Krausz, Zsigmond. *Egy izraelita szózat* [*An Israelite Appeal*]. Pest: Engel és Mandello, 1861.
- "Különféle," [Miscellaneous] *Magyar Sajtó*, 1 January 1863.
- Löw, Leopold.] "Die ungarische Nationalität und die Juden," *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, May 2, 1840.
- Lichtschein, Lajos. *A zsidók közép-, jelenkori helyzetök- és viszonyaikról* [*On the Situation and Relations of the Jews in Medieval Times and Today*]. Nagykanizsa: Wajdits József, 1866.
- Ligeti, [József]. "Levelezések," [Correspondence] *Magyar Izraelita*, 3 January 1861, 8.
- Löv, Leopold. "Nyílt levél a zsidó-emancipáció ügyében," [Open Letter on the Issue of Jewish Emancipation] *Pesti Hírlap*, 2 June 1844.
- Löv, Leopold. "Még néhány szó 'a zsidók erkölcselensége' s a zsidók polgárosítása fölött," [A Few More Words Concerning the 'amorality of the Jews' and the Citizenship of Jews] *Pesti Hírlap*, 25 July 1844.
- Löv, Leopold. "A zsidókérdés a jog, a lelkiismeret-szabadság, a józan politica és a nemzetgazdászati szempontjából," [The Jewish Question from the Perspective of the Law, Freedom of Conscience, Rational Politics and the National Economy] *Pesti Hírlap*, 29 May 1845.
- Löv, Leopold. *Jesájás korunk tanítója* [*Isaiah, Teacher of Our Time*]. Buda: Magyar Királyi Egyetem, 1845.
- Löv, Leopold. "Die ungarischen Juden vor dem Forum der ung. Akademie," *Ben Chananja*, 19 December 1862.
- Löv, Leopold. "Zur Emancipationsfrage," in *Gesammelte Schriften von Leopold Löw*, edited by Immanuel Löw, Vol. 4. Szegedin: Ludwig Engel, 1898. pp. 353–369
- Löv, Lipót. *Zsidó valláselvek. Megállapítva a nagy sanhedrin által, mely 1807-ik évi februárban Párisban tartatott* [*Principles of Jewish Faith. Established by the Grand Sanhedrin that Gathered in Paris in February 1807*]. Pápa: Ref. Főiskola, 1848.

- Löw, Lipót. “A magyar nemzetiség és a zsidók,” [*The Hungarian Nationality and the Jews*] in *Történelmi és vallástudományi értekezések [Treatises on History and Science of Religion]*. Szeged: Burger Zsigmond Bizománya, pp. 1–44, 1861.
- Löw, Lipót. *Az Isten feloldá bilincseimet! [God Will Release My Shackles!]*. Pest: Emich Gusztáv, 1868.
- Löwy, Moses A. *Worte zur Beherzigung an die Israelitischen Gemeinde-Vorstände in Ungarn*. Pesth: Philipp Korn, 1841.
- Mezei, Mór. “A határozati javaslat és a zsidó kérdés,” [The Decree Suggestion and the Jewish Question] *Magyar Izraelita*, 18 July 1861.
- Mezei, Mór. “A zsidók Trefort Ágoston magyar társadalmában,” [The Jews in Ágoston Trefort’s Hungarian Society] *Magyar Izraelita*, 19 December 1862.
- Muuk, Móricz. “Zsidó-emancipáció II,” [Jewish Emancipation II] *Pesti Hírlap*, 29 April 1845.
- Nagy Ferdinand. “Vázlatok az élet köréből,” [Sketches from the Sphere of Life] *Hasznos Mulatságok*, 23 October 1841.
- “Nem hivatalos rész,” [Unofficial Part] *Pesti Hírlap*, 3 May 1848.
- Oesterreicher, Elias. *Der Jude in Ungarn wie er war, wie er ist, und wie er seyn wird*. Pesth: Trattner-Károlyi, 1842.
- “Pest, ápril 7-én,” [Pest, 7 April] *Pesti Hírlap*, 8 April 1848.
- “Pozsony, márt. 21-én,” [Pozsony, 21 March] *Pesti Hírlap*, 24 March 1848.
- “Rövid közlések,” [Brief Notifications] *Pesti Hírlap*, 14 March 1844.
- Schwab, Löw. *Rede zur Feier des Geburtstags Seiner Majestät des allergnädigsten Kaisers u. Königs Ferdinand I. (V.)*. Pesth: Trattner-Károlyi, 1840.
- Schwab, Arszlán. *Emlékeztetés a vallásban nyert oktatásra. Az iskolából kilépő izraelita ifjúságnak ajándék gyanánt [Reminder about Education Gained in Religion, As a Present for the Jewish Youth Leaving School]*. Buda: Magyar Kir. Egyetem, 1846.
- Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének írásai [Documents of the Hungarian Assembly Convened for the Second Day of the Month of Saint Stephen in the Year 1839 in the Royal Free City of Pozsony]. Vol. 3. Pozsony: Wéber és Wigand, 1840.
- Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1839-dik esztendei Szent-Iván havának 2-dik napjára rendeltetett Magyarország közgyűlésének írásai [Documents of the Hungarian Assembly Convened for the Second Day of the Month of Saint Stephen in the Year 1839 in the Royal Free City of Pozsony]. Vol. 4. Pozsony: Wéber és Wigand, 1840.
- Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1843-ik esztendei pünkösöd hava 14-ik napjára rendeltetett magyarországi közgyűlésnek írásai [Documents of the Hungarian Assembly Convened for the 14th Day of the Month of Pentecost in the Year 1843 in the Free Royal City of Pozsony]. Vol. 4. Pozsony: Országgyűlési Irományok Kiadóhivatala, 1844.
- Szabad királyi Pozsony városába 1843-ik esztendei pünkösöd hava 14-ik napjára rendeltetett magyarországi közgyűlésnek írásai [Documents of the Hungarian Assembly Convened for the 14th Day of the Month of Pentecost in the Year 1843 in the Free Royal City of Pozsony]. Vol. 5. Pozsony: Országgyűlési Irományok Kiadóhivatala, 1844.

- Sztrókey, Béla. *Magyarhoni korszerű eszmék [Modern Ideas in the Hungarian Homeland]*. Pest: Müller Emil, 1861.
- Trefort, Ágoston. "Az oroszbirodalomban 1835-b. hozott zsidókat illető törvény," [The Law Relating to Jews Introduced in the Russian Empire in 1835] *Themis* 3, no. 3 (1839): 39–44.
- Trefort, Ágoston. "A társadalom tudománya és Riehl munkái," [The Science of Society and the Works of Riehl] *Budapesti Szemle*, 16, no. 53 (1862): 291–304.
- UdvardyJános Cserna]. "A zsidókról gazdasági tekintetben," [On the Jews from an Economic Perspective] *Ismertető Összművészetben, Gazdaságban és Kereskedésben*, 31, May 1840.
- "Ugocsából," [From Ugocsa] *Pesti Hírlap*, 18 April 1844.
- Vajda, Péter. "Előszó," [Foreword] in Móritz Bloch. *A zsidókról [About the Jews]*. Pest: Trattner-Károlyi, 1840. pp. III–XX
- "Vegyes közlemények s újdonságok," [Miscellaneous Communications and News] *Magyar Sajtó*, 7 December 1862.
- Vereby, Soma. *A magyar izraeliták jelene s biztos jövője [The Present of Hungarian Israelites and their Secure Future]*. Pest: Wodianer F., 1861.
- Weisz, Jöel. "Néhány szó a magyar héber közönséghez," [A Few Words to the Hungarian Hebrew Community] *Pesti Hírlap*, 8 December 1844.
- Z.Horvát, István], "Mózes öt könyve... [The Pentateuch ...]," *Tudományos Gyűjtemény* 24, no. 12 (1840): 82–91.
- Z*Horvát, István]. "A'Sidokról. Írta Bloch Móricz," [About the Jews, Written by Móricz Bloch] *Tudományos Gyűjtemény*, 24, no. 8 (1840): 109–117.

Literature

- Bernstein, Béla. *A negyvennyolcas magyar szabadságharc és a zsidók [The 1848 Hungarian War of Independence and the Jews]*. Budapest: Múlt és Jövő, 1998.
- Büchler, Sándor. *A zsidók története Budapesten a legrégibb időktől 1867-ig [The History of Jews in Budapest from the Oldest Times to 1867]*. Budapest: Izraelita Magyar Irodalmi Társulat, 1901.
- Csetényi, Imre. "A hatvanas évek és a zsidóság," [The Sixties and the Jews] *Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, 59–62 (1942–1945): 98–114.
- Dobszay, Tamás and Fónagy, Zoltán. "A rendi társadalom utolsó évtizedei," [The Last Decades of Feudal Society] in *Magyarország története a 19. században [The History of Hungary in the 19th Century]*, edited by András Gergely. Budapest: Osiris, 2003. pp. 57–124
- Endelman, Todd E. *Leaving the Jewish Fold: Conversion and Radical Assimilation in Modern Jewish History*. Princeton – Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Gerő, András. "Zsidó utak – magyar keretek a XIX. században. Liberálisok, antiszemiták és zsidók a modern Magyarország születésekor," [Jewish Paths – Hungarian Frameworks in the 19th Century. Liberals, Antisemites and Jews at the Birth of Modern Hungary] in *A zsidó szempont [The Jewish Perspective]*, pp. 13–40. Budapest: PolgArt, 2005.
- Groszmann, Zsigmond. *A magyar zsidók V. Ferdinánd alatt (1835–1848) [Hungarian Jews Under Ferdinand V, 1835–1848]*. Budapest: Egyenlőség, 1916.

- Groszmann Zsigmond. *A magyar zsidók a XIX. század közepén (1849–1870). Történeti tanulmány [The Hungarian Jews at the Middle of the Nineteenth Century (1849–1870). Historical Study]*. Budapest: Egyenlőség, 1917.
- Kádár, Gábor and Vági Zoltán. “Hosszú évszázad. Antiszemita erőszak Magyarországon, 1848–1956,” [A Long Century. Anti-Semitic Violence in Hungary, 1848–1956] in *A holokauszt Magyarországon hetven év múltán. Történelem és emlékezet [The Holocaust in Hungary Seventy Years After: History and Memory]*, edited by Randolph L. Braham, András Kovács. Budapest: Múlt és Jövő, 2015. pp. 76–110
- Karády, Viktor. *Zsidóság, polgárosodás, asszimiláció. Tanulmányok [Jewry, Embourgeoisement, Assimilation. Studies]*. Budapest: Cserépfalvi, 1997.
- Katz, Jacob. “A State within a State, the History of an Anti-Semitic Slogan,” in *Emancipation and Assimilation. Studies in Modern Jewish History*, Westmead: Gregg International, 1972. pp. 47–76
- Katz, Jacob. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Katz, Jacob. *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*. Cambridge, Mass. – London: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Kecskeméti, Károly. *La Hongrie et le réformisme libéral. Problèmes politiques et sociaux (1790–1848)*. Roma: Il Centro di Ricerca, 1989.
- Konrád, Miklós. “The Social Integration of the Jewish Upper Bourgeoisie in the Hungarian Traditional Elites,” *Hungarian Historical Review* 3, no. 4 (2014): 818–849.
- Konrád, Miklós. *Zsidóságon innen és túl. Zsidók vallásváltása Magyarországon a reformkortól az első világháborúig [Within and Beyond Jewishness. Jewish Conversion in Hungary from the Age of Reform to the First World War]*. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Történettudományi Intézet, 2014.
- Konrád, Miklós. “Egyenjogúsítás feltételekkel. A feltételes zsidóemancipáció eszméjének diadala és bukása,” [Emancipation with Conditions. The Triumph and Defeat of the Idea of Conditional Jewish Emancipation] *Múlt és Jövő*, 28, no. 3 (2017): 28–35.
- Miskolczy, Ambrus. *A zsidóemancipáció Magyarországon 1849-ben. Az 1849-es magyar zsidóemancipációs törvény és ismeretlen iratai [The Emancipation of the Jews in in Hungary in 1849. The 1849 Law on Jewish Emancipation and its Unknown Documents]*. Budapest: Múlt és Jövő, 1999.
- Prepuk, Anikó. “A zsidóemancipáció a reformkorban,” [Jewish Emancipation in the Reform Era] in *Történeti tanulmányok III [Historical Studies III]*, edited by Zsuzsa L. Nagy, Géza Veress. Debrecen: KLTE, 1994. pp. 15–33
- Sándor, Pál. “Az emancipáció történetéhez Magyarországon 1840–1849,” [On the History of Emancipation in Hungary, 1840–1849] *Századok*, 129, no. 2. (1995) 285–334.
- Silber, Michael. “The Historical Experience of German Jewry and Its Impact on Haskalah and Reform in Hungary,” in *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model*, edited by Jacob Katz. New Brunswick – Oxford: Transaction Books, 1987. pp. 107–157

- Silber, Michael K. "The Social Composition of the Pest Radical Reform Society (Genossenschaft für Reform im Judenthum), 1848–1852," *Jewish Social Studies* 1, no. 3 (1995): 99–128.
- Silber, Michael K. "Hungary: Hungary before 1918," *YIVO Encyclopaedia of Jews in Eastern Europe*, 2010. Accessed May 27, 2018. http://www.yivoencyclopedia.org/article.aspx/Hungary/Hungary_before_1918
- Singer, Jakab. "Temesmegye és a zsidók polgárosítása," [Temes County and the Embourgeoisement of the Jews] in *Évkönyv. 1907 [Yearbook, 1907]*, edited by József Bánóczy. Budapest: Izr. Magyar Irodalmi Társulat, 1907. pp. 145–162
- Stourzh, Gerald. "The Age of Emancipation and Assimilation: Liberalism and Its Heritage," in *From Vienna to Chicago and Back: Essays on Intellectual History and Political Thought in Europe and America*, Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press, 2007. pp. 204–223
- Szabad, György. *Forradalom és kiegyezés választóján (1860–61) [At the Crossroads of Revolution and Compromise, 1860–1861]*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967.
- Vardy, Stephen Bela. "The Origins of Jewish Emancipation in Hungary: The Role of Baron Joseph Eötvös," in *Ungarn-Jahrbuch*. Vol 7, edited by Gabriel Adriányi, Horst Glassl, Ekkehard Völkl. München: Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1977. pp. 137–166
- Varga, János. *Helyét kereső Magyarország. Politikai eszmék és koncepciók az 1840-es évek elején [Hungary Seeking Its Place. Political Ideas and Concepts in the Early 1840s]*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982.
- Varga, László. "Zsidó bevándorlás Magyarországon," [Jewish Migration to Hungary] *Századok*, 126, no. 1 (1992): 59–79.
- Zeller, Árpád. *A magyar egyházpolitika 1847–1894 [Hungarian Church Policy 1847–1894]*, 2. vols. Budapest: Boruth E., 1894.
- Zsoldos, Jenő (ed.) *1848–1849 a magyar zsidóság életében [1848–1849 in the Life of Hungarian Jewry]*. Budapest: Múlt és Jövő, 1998.