A HISTORY OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN HUNGARY

by

ANDREW J. ROBINS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation for the degrees of Rabbi and Master of Hebrew Literature.

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

New York

1953

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to present a full account of the history of the reform movement in Hungary.

As far as this writer could ascertain, this is the only complete and objective presentation of the Reform Movement in Hungary, whether in Hungarian or any other language.

I should like to thank Professor Guido Kisch for his guidance and generous help while engaged in writing this thesis.

A. J. R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL SURVEY

From 1686 to 1839

The eighteenth century marched on in the annals of mankind, poor in great achievements but rich in dramatic events. In vain did Louis XIV, King of France, struggle--at the beginning of the century--against the Austrian dynasty; the great power of the Hapsburgs developed and took root everywhere around the middle of the Danubian basin. It is true that Emperor Charles VI, as Hungarian King Charles III, the only surviving male member of the House of Hapsburg, could not retain Spain, but he held his own victoriously against the French, squeezed the Turks further out and made peace with the Magyars. His daughter Maria Theresa (1740-80) defended her inheritance, governed her dominions with a strong centralistic tendency and painstaking conscientiousness.

The incipient rise of enlightenment demanded the reformation of the social system, but the military kept a careful and successful watch on any attempt at disturbing the prevailing system. Only in France, ruined by her kings, did things mature to such an extent that her citizens drew the sword

against the centuries-old feudalism. The French Revolution caused great bloodshed and ever-recurring wars, but eventually it created a new world on the ruins of the old.

What was the lot of the Hungarian nation? How did they live after the expulsion of the Turks? How did the Hapsburgs treat Hungary? All these questions are answered by the fact that in 1703 the Magyars were again up in arms against the court of Vienna. This rebellion of George Rakoczy II shows how deeply the Magyars resented the absolutism of the Emperor. The fight did not end in victory; but by the Peace of Szatmar (1711) the nation succeeded in defending its constitution, and the principle of freedom of religion.

The peace of Szatmar was a turning point in the internal life of the country. The previous two centuries had been passed amid constant bloodshed, but the eighteenth century was a period for the gathering of national strength. Tired and decimated by perpetual warfare, the nation craved for peace and submitted to the House of Hapsburg.

Constitutional law did not bother the nobility, and it caused little trouble because the Diet was not convoked, so that when Maria Theresa's empire was in mortal peril the whole country enthusiastically took up arms in its defense.

The Empress dedicated her life to the material and spiritual development of her peoples. With her stern Catholic policy she caused, however, great sorrow to the Protestants, and her senseless anti-Jewish feelings made the life of the Jews miserable. Her tenacious centralistic efforts achieved a great deal of success. Although, primarily, she was concerned with improvements in the hereditary provinces only, nevertheless, progress in Hungary in consequence of her firm government and timely reforms is admitted and even praised by historians.[1]

Her son Joseph II (1780-90), ignoring tradition, refused to be crowned as King of Hungary or to convoke the Diet. He restricted the power of the Catholic clergy and with the money he obtained from the confiscated property of the monasteries established schools. He emancipated the Protestants and the Greek-Orthodox Church from oppression, and improved the status of the Jews by means of his Edict of Toleration and eased the burden of those who were in agricultural servitude. His activities stunned the nation; here and there were disturbances. His war against the Turks (which was started in consequence of the alliance with Catherine II) dragged on without any result; Belgium revolted and drove the Austrian

troops out. The spirit of rebellion spread in Hungary also, the nobility indignantly demanding the convocation of the Diet. Joseph II lived to see the failure of all his efforts, and in 1790 he revoked all but three of his Acts: religious tolerance, the settlement of the affairs of the Clergy and the improvements of the lot of the Jews and the serfs.

A heavy task awaited his brother, Leopold II (1790-92). He was forced to make peace with the embittered Hungarian nobility and he had to define clearly his foreign policy.[2] He offered peace for the rebellious Belgians, made peace with the Turks, and appeased all other nations. He came to agreement with the Magyars also; he gave promises that he would re-establish the old constitution, would listen to their grievances as well as to the desires of the privileged classes. Nothing seemed more urgent to the Diet of 1790-91 than the preservation of the quasi-feudal life as settled by Maria Theresa's Urbarium.[3] This Diet eagerly strengthened the ancient constitution by a long series of new laws.

Francis I (1792-1835), son of Leopold II, was an enemy of the free spirit. He ascended the throne as a staunch defender of the old system of feudal privileges. The nobility readily voted him their financial contribution to

carry on the French war. Meanwhile (1794), the police of Vienna arrested those Hungarian democrats who were members of Martinovics' secret society which was formed to propagate French republican ideas. The Hungarian judges considered the plot to be treason, and sentenced many of the offenders to death. After the suppression of this movement, reform was out of the question. The Diet was still convoked, but now only to vote more money and more troops.

The establishment of the Holy Alliance ushered in open absolutism. Political oppression was uninterruptedly strong till the middle twenties of the century. The Government at Vienna broke the laws one after the other; several counties began to stir. Chancellor Metternich's officials had to use the military to carry through the orders from Vienna. After such preliminaries, Francis I convoked the 1825-7 Diet at Pozsony; by this he pacified the nobility. This Diet, engaged in prolonged oratorical harangues, acted very little, although there were many there who felt that Hungary's regeneration should be prepared--but there was no program, there was no leader.

In the 1832-6 Diet a great number of noblemen gathered who wanted reform, but few of the magnates and the high

dignitaries of the Church in the Upper House supported its cause. However, laws proposed to ease the burden and raise the human dignity of the serf received the support of the magnates; but then, suddenly, the Government opposed these proposals and accepted only very few of them. The Court was so inimical to every attempt at improvement that even the most moderate of the deputies were filled with bitterness.

The Austrian statesmen did what they liked with the peoples of the Empire. The government of Francis I reduced Hungary to a raw material-producing colony of Austria. It closed the frontiers and watched the liberal-minded with great anxiety. If anyone dared to complain, the well-organized Vienna police soon laid hands on him. The nobility cursed this government among themselves and considered the Austrian a hated enemy, and they looked with suspicion upon the Emperor.

After the death of Francis I, his son Ferdinand V (1835-48) became King of Hungary. During his reign, Metternich continued to minister to the peoples of the Empire with unabated, unbridled absolutism. This mighty prince, in order to crush the spirit of liberal thought, appointed willing magnates and complying noblemen to high

offices, issued ruthless orders, persecuted the bolder elements, and jailed many of his opponents. But he could not stop the spread of liberal thought. He had to view with impotence, during the Diet of 1839-40, a distinguished band of liberal leaders carrying through many and important reforms. By this time the conservative elements also started to organize themselves as feverishly as the liberals. Their program was the preservation of their privileges. The liberals, on the other hand, wanted radical reforms. In the Diet of 1843-4, they succeeded in creating laws which enabled a non-nobleman to purchase and own land and bequeath it to his heirs and to assume any office open to noblemen. At the same time they passed a law which replaced Latin by Magyar in law courts and schools.[4]

At that time the country's attention was focused on the great political and literary battle between Count Stephen Szechenyi and Ludovic Kossuth. The former was the protagonist of careful reform, while the latter advocated rapid transformation. This battle attracted and involved more and more prominent politicians both from the Diet and County Assemblies.[5]

The Diet of 1847-8 was epoch-making. The liberals made

new laws which transformed the whole political and social aspect of Hungary; they also forced the House of Hapsburg to accept a constitutional system of responsible government based on the Western model. On April 7, Ferdinand V appointed the first constitutionally responsible Magyar government and on the 11th he ratified the new laws. The constitution of the Estates was transformed into that of the whole nation, the Diet transformed into a Parliament elected by the whole people, the serfs were emancipated, and all--except the Jews--became equal before the law. Freedom of the press was declared, and Transylvania became part of Hungary.[6]

On July 5, 1848, the first Hungarian parliament voted the requested 200,000 troops for the defense of the realm. These raw recruits succeeded in defeating the invading forces of General Jellacic, the Croatian patriot and statesman who on September 11 crossed the river Drave at the head of his troops to attack Hungary. The King vainly tried to dissolve Parliament, but the deputies held together. Finance Minister Kossuth, the brilliant orator and journalist, the passionate radical campaigner for Hungarian independence, decided to counteract the intrigues of the Court. He created a Committee of National Defense, and the nobility took over the organization

of the army. In the autumn of 1848 Ferdinand V abdicated and his nephew Francis Joseph I (1848-1916) ascended the throne. The Budapest Parliament refused to acknowledge the title of the new sovereign, declaring it to be invalid under Hungarian law and called the nation to arms to resist this encroachment on Hungarian law. Thereupon the army of Windischgratz entered Hungary on December 15 and was allowed to occupy the Western counties and Budapest (January 5, 1849) with little opposition, the Hungarian government and Parliament retired to Debreczen behind the Tisza. Fortune, however, returned to the Magyar forces, and in the spring of 1849 they achieved a great victory. When an imperial edict declared Hungary a part of Austria, the Parliament at Debrecen deposed the Hapsburgs and appointed Kossuth Governor of Hungary. The Austrian court turned to Russia for assistance and ~~the~~ Tsar Nicholas dispatched an army of 200,000 men, under Prince Paskevitch, to crush the Magyars. This force succeeded in uniting with the Austrian forces of the ill-famed General Haynau, a man of violent temper and fanatical hatred of revolutionary movements. Against this greatly superior force there was no hope of victory. The soldiers of General Gorgey laid down their arms before the Russian generals at Vilagos on August 13, 1849.[7]

At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, Hungary was rightly called the paradise of the nobility. The person of the nobleman was inviolate. He could not be called to military service, his duties toward the state were few, he did not have to pay wages to have his land tilled and worked. On the contrary, his unpaid laborers, the serfs, had even to give him a part of their own produce. By far the greatest part of the Magyar-land belonged to this nobility, although they were only one-twentieth of the total population. While the peasant and the burgher spent their lives in exacting and difficult labor, the nobleman lived like a little monarch.[8]

Compared with the pre-revolutionary Western countries, the noble families in Hungary were far too many. During the reign of Joseph II there were seventy-five thousand noble families, while in contemporary France there were, at the most, not more than twenty-eight thousand families belonging to the nobility. France, however, had four times as many inhabitants as Hungary. There were approximately four hundred families of magnates.[9] The members of this high aristocracy forgot their mother tongue and rather spoke German and French even in their homes. They lived mainly in

Vienna and neglected their political and social duties toward their fatherland. The common nobility was happy in their villages. Their religious outlook gave them spiritual comfort while their material well-being made them gay. Their serfs did all the hard work under the supervision of the bailiffs. On the other hand, the poor nobility worked the land themselves or became artisans in the towns; some entered the ministry, became teachers, lawyers or minor clerks. The number of those among the nobility who had no land at all was very great.

The lot of the peasant was a hard one. His landlord was his judge, and could at times act as both judge and litigant. Furthermore, great barriers were erected in the path of the peasant when he wanted to use his right of free movement. Although the lot of the serf in various other countries was still worse, nevertheless, the Magyar peasant's life was far from being an easy one. At best, he had to do 52 days corvee (unpaid labor by serf) per year for his landlord, serve the county for twelve and his priest for six days. Besides this hard work, he had to give from his own produce a ninth to the landlord, and a tenth to his priest, while also paying the state and county taxes, keeping the roads in order, and doing

military service. Even the cost of the deputies' expenses at the Diet was exacted from him.[10] Only the good will of his landlords could mitigate the severity of these conditions, but there were too few of such well-disposed landlords. The peasant son's social advance in the towns, should he desire to become an artisan, was hampered by great difficulties. The guilds were well organized and they selected very carefully whom they would admit as apprentices. Even when selected, he had to labor incessantly. He was free only on Sundays and other holidays, while on all the other days of the week he had to work from five in the morning till eight in the evening--all this for board and lodging and a miserable pittance in cash as fixed by the guilds.[11]

The intellectual of peasant or burgher origin resented his unprivileged status in such a feudalistic society. Though this "honoratior" might be a divine, professor, lawyer, doctor or engineer, nevertheless, he was not considered equal to even the lowest of the peasant-nobles.

The burghers lived in the cities where they were not subject to the rule of the nobility.[12]

The Jews were quite outside the constitution. How did the Hapsburgs treat the Jews of Hungary? How did the Magyars

treat the Jews of Magyar-land? The sorry answer is in the historical facts.

Suleyman the Magnificent's armies sealed the doom of Hungary as an independent kingdom on the bloodstained fields of Mohacs (1526). The Jews of Hungary who lived under Ottoman rule enjoyed--unlike their brothers living in that part of Hungary still under Christian rule--full civic and religious liberties. They were taxed heavily, but had permission to travel and trade unmolested through the vast Ottoman Empire. But after the fall of Buda (1686), Turkish rule quickly collapsed. With the re-establishment of the imperial Christian rule, Jewish life and fortune again immediately deteriorated. Leopold I, a zealous Catholic, guaranteed civil rights and comparative freedom to his Catholic subjects only.

Although at the beginning of his reign he confirmed the privileges of the Jews (1658), and repeated his assurance of their protection, nevertheless with his marriage (1660) to Margaret Theresa, a Spanish princess, the nature of this treatment changed. The Queen exerted her influence against the toleration of the Jews. Her attitude was reinforced by the fanatical Bishop Count Kollonitsch who urged upon the King the deprivation of Jewish rights.

At length the emperor yielded to the demands of the citizens of Vienna, and ordered the expulsion of the Jews from the city and from the provinces of Lower and Upper Austria. All Jews were required to leave the capital by July 25, 1670, and those living in the country were expelled the following spring. In Hungary, too, Bishop Count Kollonitsch, soon to become Primate, induced the King to expel the Jews from the Royal Free Boroughs, to enforce the decree passed by the Diet imposing double taxation on the Jews, to exclude them from agricultural pursuits and real-estate holdings, and forbidding them to hire Christian servants.[13]

This pattern of treatment ~~toward~~ of the Jews had been repeated again and again. Given a growing centralization of state power, combined with the newly arrived German industrial and mercantile citizenry, the persecution of the Jews became inevitable. The Jews could only look to the privileged high aristocracy and the Magyar-minded County Assemblies for succor. Both these groups distrusted the growing power of the Crown.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, during the reign of King Charles III,[14] Jews were restricted to only the Royal Free Boroughs of Bartfa, Buda, Gyor, Koszeg, Modor,

Szapolcza, Szarmarnemeti, Szentgyorgy and Trencsen. It is interesting to note that in the important Royal Free Borough of Pest,[15] where the Jews had fled with the defeated Turkish forces (1686), for more than a century the City Council refused permission to allow a single Jew to return. Furthermore, the leading Royal Free Boroughs of Pozsony and Sopron forbade the return of any Jews since their expulsion under Queen Maria following the battle of Mohacs (1526)[16] two centuries before.

A few years later, by the order of Queen Maria Theresa (1740-80), all the Jews--including the "protected" Jews--of Buda were expelled (June 17, 1746). It was thus that the oldest Jewish community in the land ceased to exist for the next sixty years.[17] Only on the vast estates of the magnates could the majority of the 11,621 Jews of Hungary find peace, livelihood and hope. The Karolyis and the Esterhazys led the way in this rescue of Hungarian Jewry by settling them on their estates, in their own hamlets, villages and small townships.[18]

Right from the beginning of the reign of Leopold I to that of Joseph II the economic, spiritual and social life of Hungarian Jewry went from bad to worse. The sources of their

income were reduced year by year. Great commercial centers were forbidden to give them shelter even for a single night. In spite of all this, the Queen, Maria Theresa, hard pressed by the financial burdens of the Seven-Year War, imposed the so-called toleration tax on the Jews (1744) which forced them at first (1746) to pay a per-capita tax of two gulden. The collection of this personal tax, however, met with great difficulties. The Office of the Vice-regency, therefore, began negotiations with the Jews in order to find some kind of a solution to the problem. After protracted negotiations it was agreed (1749) that the Jews should collectively pay a sum of 20,000 gulden annually and that they themselves be responsible for its collection. After a few years (1760), however, this sum was raised to 30,000 gulden, twelve years later (1772) it was raised again to 50,000 gulden and six years later (1778) it became the unbearable sum of 80,000 gulden.[19]

The reign of Joseph II (1780-90) ameliorated the condition of Hungarian Jewry. In 1783 he issued his "Systematica gentis judaicae regulatio"[20] which greatly benefited the Jews. They could practice their religion freely now, the doors of the public schools were opened to them; so were the gates of the Royal Free Boroughs (with the exception of the Royal Mining

Cities). Henceforth they were allowed to lease and purchase land. They could also engage in the trades and the professions. This was not emancipation by any means, nor did it resemble it, but it certainly was its herald. It was during the reign of this monarch that, after one hundred and fifty years of compulsory absence, three Jewish families were permitted to settle again in Pest. Although the system of Joseph II collapsed with his death, the gates he opened for the Jews stayed open and became more widely opened as the years went by. This was demonstrated when some of the Royal Free Boroughs unsuccessfully tried to reinstitute their anti-Jewish charters. Public opinion in the land, together with the will of the government, prevented them from turning back the clock of history.[21]

The Diet also, during its 1790-1 session, decided to regulate and protect the existing status of the Jews. It was enacted[22] that they should continue living exactly under the same conditions in the Royal Free Boroughs and everywhere else (except the Royal Mining Cities) as they had lived on January 1, 1790. In the case of those localities where they had been expelled permission was granted for their return and resettlement.

Although this law was meant to be but a temporary measure, it remained the only one to govern the lives of the Jews for the succeeding fifty years. The committee, mentioned in the Act, began its work as instructed. Under the chairmanship of Count Haller the committee provided exceptionally liberal provisions in the future Act. Unfortunately the Bill never came before the Diet for discussion due to the procrastinating tactics of the Court.

Although the Magyar Diet never discussed the Haller proposals, Magyar public opinion thereafter debated the question of Jewish emancipation at great length in pamphlets, in the press and, most important of all, in the County Assemblies which were the strongholds of Magyarism and the bastions of the Hungarian gentry. These discussions did not culminate in new laws, but they created conditions which made Jewish emancipation inevitable. During these fifty years (1790-1840), the Jews moved freely in the land, settled in many cities and became the integral part of the urban population. But civil rights were not yet forthcoming. The "toleration tax" was still in force and its arrears ran into millions which the Jews could never pay. The "Jewish Oath," so repugnant to the Jews, continued to remain in force.

Apart from this, however, the Magyar people did their best to open the gates of opportunity to the Jews. The Jews responded and took full advantage of given possibilities and opportunities. The Jewish population increased by leaps and bounds, so that by 1840 there were 200,000 Jews in the country.[23] Strong assimilationist movements began at this time. In Pest (1844) the Jews founded the Society for Magyarization. The result was that a more cultured, Magyar-reading Jewish public was created. Here and there the names of Jewish writers could be seen; some congregations even introduced preaching in the Hungarian vernacular. When the great events of the forties broke, most of the Jews of Hungary considered themselves Magyars to all intents and purposes. Where only fifty years before they were a Judeo-German speaking alien group embedded in the midst of the Magyars, they had now become a well-integrated and Magyar-minded integral part of Hungary.[24]

Important changes in the lives of the Hungarian Jews came as the result of the enactments of the Diet of 1839-40. By an overwhelming majority the Lower House of the Diet decided to emancipate the Jews of Hungary. The fight to achieve this important legislation was led by the most

prominent liberal political leaders of the time--Francis Deak, Gabriel Klauzal, Maurice Szentkiralyi, Odon Beothy, etc., etc. Under the influence of the Camarilla in Vienna the Upper House of the Diet refused to accept the proposals of the new Bill. It considered the Jews not yet ready for emancipation. This view was even shared by the distinguished leader of the conservatives, Count Stephen Szechenyi, to the great surprise of all concerned. Out of the clash between these two Houses the Diet enacted a compromise Bill[25] (Act: 1840: XXXIX) similar to Joseph's II "Systematica gentis judaicae regulatio" except that now they were permitted to purchase, not merely lease, property.

The Act runs as follows:

"Until the Law will act in greater detail concerning the status of the Jews, the following is decided:

1. All those Jews who were born in the land or in the territories attached thereto, as well as all those Jews who received legal permission to reside here, if there is no proven and substantial moral charge against them, they may live anywhere freely in the land, except in those mining cities mentioned in Act: 1790: XXXVIII. They are at present

not permitted to reside there because of the mines and mining institutions there existing and because of the old legalized custom.

2. Subject to the existing conditions Jews can establish factories; they can engage in commerce and industry either by themselves or with the assistance of employees of their own faith. They may also instruct their sons in these occupations. Those sciences and arts which they have practiced hitherto they may henceforth continue to practice unmolested.
3. They are hereby obliged to acquire permanent surnames (family names), and all children born must be recorded in a Registry kept by the rabbi.
4. All documents and contracts must be written in the language of the land, or in those of the attached territories.
5. In those cases where Jews already possessed rights to own land, this practice can be approved for the future also."

This new legislation soon was followed by the abolition of those two hated institutions: the toleration tax and the Jewish Oath. In 1842 Hungarian Jewry appealed to the Crown

asking for the abolition of the toleration tax and the remittance of the arrears. The Court was quite willing to abolish the tax, but insisted on either the payment of the arrears in installments or its redemption. After prolonged negotiations and bargaining between the Court and the Jews, it was agreed in 1846 that the tax would cease and that the arrears would be paid into the treasury in yearly installments. The decisive events of the late forties soon absolved the Jews even from this detested obligation.

It was during this period that reformation in the inner life of Hungarian Jewry began.

From the Diet of 1839-40 to the Emancipation of 1867

It was the Diet of 1839-40 which first urged the Jews to reform their religion and thus facilitate their assimilation into the Magyar people. Samuel Kocsi Horvath and Paul Nagy, prominent delegates to the Diet, demanded that the Sabbath be transferred to Sunday. Another delegate, Sarkozy, expressed his conviction that the status of the Jews should not be changed till they would forswear several of their rituals. The delegate representing the Roman Catholic Arch-Capitular of Kalocsa also insisted that the Jews' political improvement

should depend on the transformation of their religion.[26] Ever since this Diet, the press and many public bodies constantly emphasized the necessity for Jewish religious reform. These voices inside and outside the Diet were motivated by the strong desire of making Hungary Hungarian, and that the ethnic Magyar population should be substantially increased. The Magyar people was surrounded on all side by ethnic groups (Slovaks, Ruthenians, Rumanians, Croats, Serbs, some Schwabs and Germans) within the borders of historic Hungary that refused to assimilate, and--at this very time--were going through a process of national regeneration. Hungarian public opinion felt that granting full citizenship to yet another unassimilable national minority group would ill-serve the highest national interests.[27] Hence the agitation for the reformation of the Jewish religion, so insistently demanded even by Kossuth. Kossuth maintained that not until Jews eat pork, deny the Sabbath, eat and drink with their gentile neighbors and intermarry with them can the Jewish problem be solved in Hungary.[28] Leopold Low, Chief Rabbi of Nagykanizsa,[29] in a letter in the Pesti Hirlap, challenged and denied Kossuth's views that eating pork and other denials of basic Judaism are necessary for the Jew to become a good Magyar citizen. He

points at the English and French Jews who are faithful to the basic laws and practices of Judaism yet they are considered by their fellow citizens as good Englishmen and Frenchmen.[30] But Low's faint voice could not change the prevalent opinion. It is therefore not surprising that the county of Komarom in instructions to its delegate in the Diet of 1843, demanded that "Jewish oddities" must be "smoothed out" first before the Jews could be emancipated. In the same year the county of Gyor decided that the Jews could become burghers in the cities of Hungary, but only on condition that they would deny their religion. In 1844 the county of Ugocsa, situated near the Galician border, refused to vote for the emancipation of the Jews until they would eliminate all "grotesqueness" from their religion; this they should do in order to conform to the times, in order that they might become an integrated part of Magyar social life, and finally in order that they could be assimilated with all the other denominations.[31]

Pamphlets, written by Gentiles, urging the Jews to reform their religion were numerous, too. Most of them are of no historical value. A more serious pamphlet, however, was published by a certain Janos Barandy with the title "Judenreform."

This was an extract of a Memorandum he submitted to Chancellor George Apponyi on April 4, 1847. (Judenreform von Barandy. Auszug aus der am 4 April, 1847 dem königl. ung. Hofkanzler Grafen Georg Apponyi vom Verfassern als Manuscript überreichten Denkschrift, Pressburg, 1848.) This Barandy demands the reformation of the Jewish religion, the proclamation of a Jewish Credo, a secular and university education for the rabbis, and that the Universities of Vienna, Prague and Budapest should establish professorships in Judaism in their respective institutions. In 1826, some prominent Jews of Pest established, on the pattern of the new Temple in Vienna, a new kind of synagogue. In this so-called "Chorschule" the cantor was aided by a choir, several prayers and piyutim were omitted, and decorum, solemnity and order were introduced.

Ever since the establishment of this Temple the tendency for liberalism and the reformation of outworn religious practices grew apace. The demand for more and more reform within Jewish life increased. The tremendous pressure from outside and the vehement, youthful pressure from inside split Hungarian Jewry into two factions: one party favored it, not so much as an urgent inner necessity to safeguard the faith, but rather as a means for obtaining emancipation, both legal and social;

the other party abhorred reform. The Jews of the county of Ugocsa, situated near the Galician border, declared on February 26, 1847, that they would rather forego a happy future than make the slightest change in the ancestral faith. They would not agree even to a change in the ritual.[32]

Some of the congregations, Arad, Lugozs, Nagybecs Kerek, Nagyvarad and Pecs, responded to the spirit of reform. Even in Pozsony (Pressburg), this unconquerable fortress of orthodoxy, there were a few people who accepted reformation.[33] But the overwhelming majority of the Jews in Hungary, like the Jews of the county of Ugocsa, expressed only unwavering hostility to reform.

Among the rabbis there was only one, Leopold Low, who championed reform. In his Zsido Vallaselvek (Principles of the Jewish Faith) he declared the reformation of the Jewish religion an indispensable condition of emancipation.[34]

In no other community did people have so much enthusiasm for reform as in the Jewish community of Pest. University students, teachers, doctors, and businessmen were the early reformers. Following the discussions in the Diet of 1839-40, the idea was conceived among the Jewish medical students at the University of Pest that an organization should be established,

the aim of which would be to instill in the Jews a love for the Hungarian language, feeling and spirit. By 1843, they had the plans and bylaws all prepared and submitted them to the Elders of the Jewish community for their approval. On the recommendations of the Chief Rabbi of Pest, Low Schwab, both the plans and the by-laws were approved. On May 8, 1844, the Magyarito Egylet (Magyarizing Society) was established by the Jewish community of Pest.[35] Its first president was the director of the Jewish Hospital of Pest, Dr. Philip Jacobovics. Soon this society became the rallying point for all those who had inclinations for reform.[36]

Among the members of this Society, there was a rabbinical student by the name of Ignatz Einhorn. He fought with unsparing enthusiasm for the honor of the Jews, and for emancipation, as well as for the reformation of the Jewish religion. Einhorn's[37] rabbinical knowledge was limited, but he was a young man of high culture and great intelligence. Few such people were found in contemporary Hungary.

His liberality of thought and his devotion to the concept of reform can be adduced from a letter written to his friend S. L. Brill, rabbinical assessor (Dayan) in the congregation of Pest: "Never, but never, shall I let my mind be

shackled, my eyes blindfolded, my neck put under the yoke of ecclesiastical tyranny and orthodox intolerance. As long as there is breath in my body and God gives me life and strength, and as long as there remains one single spark in my mind, I shall avoid the company of these unworthy people and shall maintain my freedom 'et si desunt vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas.' Success depends on God under whose care and protection we all live."[38]

The dream of Einhorn and of all the other reformers was fulfilled during the feverish days that followed the revolution of March 15, 1848.

During these revolutionary days the Hungarian liberal political leaders decided to change feudal Hungary into a democracy and immediately effected basic changes in the very structure of the country.

These basic changes of 1848 which altered Hungarian political, economic and social life so drastically, necessarily affected the status of the Jews. Very soon after the great events of March, 1848, demanding voices were heard in the new Parliament for complete, unconditional emancipation of the Jews.[39]

Meanwhile, however, the citizenry and the populace of

some of the cities,[40] especially those of Pest, staged a series of bloody anti-Jewish riots. When Bertholomew Szemere, the newly appointed Minister of the Interior, arrived in Pest on March 25, he learned with consternation that on the previous night pogrom-like anti-Jewish riots shook the city. Young industrial workers had indiscriminately ill-treated all the Jews they could lay their hands on and had plundered their property. The citizens of Pest, fearing Jewish industrial competition, turned against the Jews with such fury that the new and well-known liberal Prime Minister, against the protestations of the Minister of the Interior, had to concede and was forced to issue restrictive ordinances against the Jews. Prime Minister Batthyany publicly declared his strong disapproval of the behavior of the citizens of Pest, and declared himself in agreement with the poet laureate Petőfi, who had charged such events were shameful and a disgrace to the movement of freedom. Nevertheless, the Prime Minister issued an order, giving as his reason the grave and widespread anti-Jewish riots in Pest, forbidding the Jews to join the newly recruited national militia;[41] and in an "agreement" made with the leaders of the Jewish community of Pest, it was decided

that those who have already joined the militia would immediately resign. At the same time he issued orders that participants in any further anti-Jewish disturbances would be most severely punished.

Soon, however, the latent antagonism between the Hungarian government and the Camarilla in Vienna became more and more acute so that public opinion soon forgot this artificially created new Jewish question. In spite of this fact the government did not have the courage to emancipate the Jews.

Neither these tragic incidents nor the government's refusal to meet its obligation deterred Hungarian Jewry from their path of assimilation. In the autumn of 1848 and at the beginning of 1849, they supported with all their strength the War of Independence. Economically they went far beyond what was expected of them as a patriotic duty; their children, mainly those of progressive parents,[42] streamed to the banners of the new Hungarian freedom in greatly disproportionate numbers.[43]

New currency had to be issued by the new government. To create this new currency an issuing National Bank was established. It needed funds for the reserve. The Jewish Community

of Pest was the new bank's greatest contributor with 50,000 guldens, and it went on to collect among its members a further 30,000 guldens. Most congregations of the land put their valuables, their sacred silver vessels, and their fortune at the disposal of the government. Leopold Low, Chief Rabbi of Papa,[44] became chaplain of the armed forces. Hungarian Jewry unequivocally sided with freedom and liberalism at the side of revolutionary government.[45]

However, Russian intervention sealed the fate of the Hungarian revolution, and two weeks before the final surrender, Parliament, sitting at Szegedin, finally emancipated the Jews (July 28, 1849). This new law[46] declared that the Jews of Hungary are to enjoy henceforth all political and civil rights just as the other citizens of other faiths do, that marriages contracted between Jews and Christians are legal and valid and have to be performed before the civil authorities, and finally that a conference should be convoked, made up of rabbis and elected laymen whose duty would be to reform and proclaim the principles of the Jewish faith and to modernize the Jewish ecclesiastical organizations.

The loss of the War of Independence hit the Jews at

least as hard as the other citizens. They found themselves emancipated by a unanimous vote of the national assembly, which, within a fortnight, had neither the power nor the time to execute the laws it created.

Vienna decided to wreak merciless vengeance on the Jews for their part in the revolution. As a reprisal, the infamous Austrian general Haynau demanded an indemnity of 2,300,000 gulden from the Hungarian Jewish communities.[47]

The demand for this incredible sum was withdrawn by an imperial order dated September 20, 1850.[48] This same order, however, compelled the Hungarian Jewish communities to pay one million gulden into the Treasury. This sum was set aside, by an imperial order dated March 29, 1856, as a school fund.[49] The fund was devoted to the following purposes: (1) establishment of a rabbinical seminary; (2) a training school for teachers, as well as elementary schools for poor Jews; (3) establishment of institutions for the poor, deaf, dumb, and blind Jewish children.[50]

After the dismissal of the ruthless Haynau, by order of the government in Vienna, the Jewish communities were reorganized. Their leaders were appointed by the government. The Government's attitude at this time was one of vacillation

--now pro-Jewish, now anti-Jewish. Generally, however, the Jews suffered with the other denominations of Hungary the restrictive measures of Vienna.

Interior Minister Bach forbade the importation of Hebrew prayer books or any other Hebrew books. For no accountable reason, he also resurrected the hated Jewish Oath, which remained in force till emancipation (1867) abolished it forever.

An imperial order was published on November 29, 1852, which ordered that no Jewish marriages could take place anywhere in Hungary without the previous consent of the civil authorities, that the groom must not be younger than 24, and the bride 18, years of age, and that both the age of the groom and bride must be officially certified. Since only a few communities kept an official Registry of Births and Deaths, this order caused very great hardships and secret Jewish marriages became widespread.[51] Yet another imperial order in 1853 forbade the Jews to acquire landed property; in a few years the cause of emancipation reached such a low ebb that the status of the Jews at this period was similar to the humiliating and restricted existence of the pre-liberal era. This lasted five years. Finally in 1859, Jewish employers were allowed to employ Christian apprentices and servants. The restrictions

on marriages were also revoked, and the new industrial law, published on December 20, 1859, allowed all inhabitants, irrespective of their religious faith, to practice commerce and industry anywhere in the imperial domain. In January, 1860, certain occupations (apothecary, selling of alcoholic beverages and distilling) were again opened to the Jews. In February, 1860, the law forbidding Jews to buy land was annulled.[52]

In 1861, a noticeable rapprochement between the Magyars and Vienna set in. The results of such peace moves were most beneficial and gratifying to the Jews. Within six months a series of laws were issued from Vienna which enabled the Jews to enjoy all the rights and privileges of the other inhabitants, except one: they had no political rights. But within six years, the national parliament, its Lower House without debate, its Upper House by a vote of 64 to 4, emancipated the Jews of the land in sixty-four Hungarian words, in the following terms:[53]

1. The Israelite inhabitants of the country are declared as having the same privileges in the exercise of all civil and political rights as the Christian inhabitants.

2. All laws, practices and decrees which are contrary to this provision are hereby repealed.

In spite of the fact that the Law of Emancipation gave only legal sanction to established facts, still, through implication, it was later to have far-reaching consequences in the life of Hungarian Jewry.[54]

CHAPTER TWO

STRAWS IN THE WIND

The period of twenty-three years between the Diet of 1825-7 and the revolutionary year of 1848 can be considered one of the most crucial periods pertinent to the development of Modern Hungary.

It was during this period that the Hungarian emancipation movement flourished. Its purpose was to give the Jews, who had found themselves shackled by civil disabilities, full equality before the law.

By the year 1825 Pest had become the capital city of Hungary and the Jewish community of Pest was considered the leading congregation in Hungary.

On June 24, 1826, Yisrael ben Sh'lomo Wahrmann, the beloved and universally respected rabbi of the congregation, died. No sooner was he buried, than dissension, long latent, broke out openly. Religious differences became so marked that they eventually determined the course of Hungarian Jewish religious history to our own day.

In 1826 the congregation of Vienna built a new temple.[1] The Jews of Pest who visited Vienna and worshiped in the

temple came back as if from a fairyland. They were overwhelmed by the physical appearance of this beautiful building, its interior, the solemnity of the service, and the decorum. They were especially impressed with the preaching of Rabbi Isaac Noah Mannheimer (1793-1865) who, in 1824, was elected as preacher of this new temple in the Seitenstettengasse.[2] Some well-to-do and cultured Jews of Pest, under the leadership of the respected Gabriel Ullmann,[3] decided that some similar house of prayer should be established in Pest. Within a few months the synagogue of the Chesed N'Urim Society, with premises in the "Feher Lud House" in the Kiraly Street, established its services on the Vienna pattern. In this "Chorschule" (generally it was called "Cultus Templom" in Hungarian) the cantor was assisted by a choir; several prayers and piyutim were omitted, and decorum, solemnity, and order were introduced.[4] The first cantor of this Cultus Templom was Edward Denhof[5] the pupil of Cantor Salomon Sulzer (1804-90), the father of modern synagogal music.

The Elders of the Jewish community, however, looked upon the harmless innovations as very dangerous acts of reform and sought to abolish it. But all their efforts met with

failure. The leaders of the Cultus Templom successfully withstood calumny, insult, libel, misrepresentation and defamation. As a result the very Elders who, for four years decried the temple as a "useless luxury," were obliged to recognize it (April, 1830) as a constituent member synagogue of the Jewish community. This recognition meant that the new temple received its full support, including financial aid. This was a great achievement in those days when the suppression of the slightest deviation from the accepted was considered a pious and holy deed.

The ritual, the furnishings and the customs of the Vienna temple were scrupulously followed by the Cultus Temple. But the whole new idea would have been incomplete without a preacher. They needed no rabbi, in the then sense of the word, who was an accomplished talmudical scholar and a person of undoubted piety. What they needed was a man of culture who could express his thoughts in the language of Goethe and Schiller. The leaders were guided in this desire not only by their own cultural and esthetic background, but also by their zeal for the general welfare of Hungarian Jewry. In the synagogues of Hungary, in the towns, villages and hamlets, the language of preaching was

the Judeo-German jargon. Even the friends of the Jews could not defend them from the factual charge that they had not assimilated themselves linguistically.[6] How could the Jews become part of society when they refused to speak the language of the land? Hence the desire for a preacher of higher culture who could speak perfect German.

So it came to pass that this new kind of synagogue of the Chesed N'urim Society in their new premises on Orczy Street elected Joseph Bach as their temporary preacher. Bach, born in O Buda (Alt Ofen),[7] Hungary, in 1784, was not much of a scholar, still less a good preacher.[8] To his enthusiastic audiences, however, his sermons were masterpieces. What mattered was that he preached in German--still another great step toward emancipation.

He went still further and became a pioneer in Hungarian preaching, an unheard-of innovation. His first Hungarian speech, a eulogy over a young university student delivered in the courts of his Alma Mater, was of such import that even Kossuth's Pesti Hirlap[9] deemed it necessary to mention it. This was the first time that Hungarian was used by a Jewish preacher in his official capacity.[10]

Inside the synagogue, however, the language of the prayers

was Hebrew, and the sermon was delivered in German. Hungarian prayers were unheard of, till on April 19, 1840--in the city of Szegedin/Markfi Hermann Bauer, the secretary of the congregation, recited the prayer for the King in Hungarian.[11] The first Hungarian sermon was not to be delivered, however, until 1844 by Leopold Löw, Chief Rabbi of Nagykanizsa.[12]

Meanwhile, in Pest, grave laxity in religious observances became most noticeable in the mid-thirties of the last century. The principle that liberalism should also be applied to religion was professed by many Jews. It resulted in widespread non-observance of religious principles and rituals. The rabbinical assessor (Dayan) of the Religious Court (Beth Din), Simon Oppenheimer, in his official capacity as a minister of religion, lodged a complaint on May 8, 1831, with the congregation.[13] In it, he called upon the congregation to intervene in order to prevent several Jewish storekeepers from opening their stores on the Sabbath and Holidays. The main congregation complied by issuing an order forbidding these grocers and tobacco-merchants the opening of their stores on the Sabbath and Holidays. This, however, brought little results. Religious non-observance became more and more widespread as the weeks passed.

In 1832, even Moses Sofer--rabbi of Pozsony (Pressburg), the world-famous author of the "Ch'tam Sofer"--decided to intervene in the internal religious life of the Pest Jews. It happened that some people, with the approval of one of the Judge-assessors (Dayan), put tombstones on the graves of their relatives on which graven human images were to be found. Rabbi Sofer ordered the tombstones removed because it conflicted with the spirit of Judaism, basing his order on the dictum that no Jew was allowed to utter supplication and prayer before a statue. The Jews of Pest simply ignored what they considered to be the great rabbi's unwarranted intervention.[14]

The same year (1832) they went even further, and the congregation issued an order [15] that the dayanim in the employ of the congregation could officiate at weddings performed only in the synagogues, and not in the courtyards of private dwellings. The older generation was outraged by this innovation and considered it a major breach of Jewish law. They blamed all this "religious decay" on the Cultus Temple. They became convinced that religious life in Pest could be rebuilt only on the ruins of this new type house of worship. And when, in 1832, the Jews of Prague wanted to

build a synagogue on the Vienna and Pest pattern, the ultra-orthodox elements felt that their chance to close down this modern temple had come. Through the office of the Vice-regency in Prague, the Jews of Prague attempted to find out all they could about the Cultus Temple of Pest: the source of their finances, the language of the prayers and sermon, the character and behavior of its leaders and members. Their inquiry was passed on to the Hungarian office of the Vice-regency, who in turn passed it on to the City Council of Pest for comment. The City, in turn, requested the president of the Cultus Temple to give the necessary information. Naturally, he thought very highly of the administration and the administrators of the Cultus Temple. The orthodox element became aware of what was going on. In order to destroy both the existing liberal temple of Pest and the prospective liberal temple of Prague with one blow, they again asked for Rabbi Moses Sofer's intervention. They asked him[16] to seek the help of Simon Edler von Lämel (1766-1845), the Austrian Jewish patriot and industrialist who often used his great influence at the Court in Vienna for the benefit of his Jewish brethren.[17] Lämel should inform the government in Vienna:

(1) that great and many irregularities were committed

at the founding of the Cultus Temple,

(2) that it was established not with the approval of the government, but by bribing members of the City Council,

(3) that, whereas in Vienna such a temple received the approval of most of the congregation, in Pest two thirds of the congregation opposed it,

(4) that members of the Cultus Temple were so overburdened with their temple dues that they were incapable of paying their toleration taxes.

But all these machinations availed naught: neither Rabbi Sofer nor Lämel could do anything. The Cultus Temple was here to stay. Bach continued to preach in German as the elected preacher of the Jewish community of Pest, although it was obvious that as soon as the main congregation would elect a Chief Rabbi of Pest, subsequently Bach's fame and fortune would wane.

This growing congregation searched for a rabbi for ten years. They desired a man who was pious, peace-loving, and at the same time a strong personality who could reconcile differences; whose culture, preaching ability and rabbinic knowledge would satisfy both the orthodox and the progressive elements.[18]

By 1836, the winds of liberalism had already reached Hungary. Hungarian nationalism and liberalism deeply affected the Jews of the country. The progressive groups insisted, that their rabbi must not be of Polish or of Galician origin, and the orthodox elements were forced to accept this view. The country was flooded at this time with rabbis of Polish descent. Although possessing great rabbinical knowledge, masters of talmudical dialectics and from the point of view of religio-ritualistic behavior beyond reproach, many of these rabbis showed themselves incapable of dignified behavior. They also showed a fondness for congregational quarrels and inter-congregational dissensions, while all of them had a bitter hatred for secular culture.[19] Many were the candidates for this coveted high office. The man elected had to be a most exceptional person, for he had to satisfy both the conservatives and the more advanced elements. They were looking for a rabbi all over Europe. It is believed[20] that it was Leopold Zunz who recommended Low Schwab, Rabbi of Prossnitz. After years of struggle, dissension and indecision, the congregation finally succeeded in electing Rabbi Schwab unanimously, as their rabbi. He occupied his pulpit on January 26, 1836.

Schwab proved to be equal to the immense task which awaited him. He succeeded in bridging the gap between the extremes of both the orthodox and liberal elements. His peace-loving nature, his great piety and unquestioned religiosity impressed his congregations. During his ministration the Jewish community of Pest received its official seal whose motto was quite properly "Concordia." Schwab successfully initiated widespread educational, cultural and philanthropic programs.

It was at this time that the Diet of 1839-40 assembled. This time the Jews expected their full emancipation. But the Lower House of the Diet encountered opposition from two reactionary bastions of the realm, the Crown and the Upper House of the Diet where only few magnates were in favor of emancipation. Only Baron Joseph Eotvos labored and spoke (March 31, 1840) for emancipation, but to no avail. Both the Crown and the Upper House readily listened to the protestations of the Royal Free Boroughs, the arch-enemies of Jewish emancipation.[21] Instead of full emancipation this memorable Diet lessened the burdens of Jewry.[22] The lower nobility were greetly displeased by the negligible results, and Kossuth expressed their feelings when he[23] wrote "this tiny result of big words."

Though the Jews were disappointed they were more than surprised by the genuine good will and sympathy of the Diet. Such paternal inclinations of the nobility (the real "populus hungaricus," source of all legislative power) motivated the Jews toward a more rapid magyarization. Though the Diet was prepared to recognize the merits of the Jews, they tactfully hinted that assimilation to the Hungarian nation would be welcome and desirable.[24]

The Jews listened to these benevolent admonitions and began their magyarization in earnest. Strenuous efforts were made to make up for past neglects. The teaching of Hungarian in the Jewish schools was extended and intensified.[25] The Pentateuch was translated (1840) into Magyar by Moritz Bloch-Ballagi, while Moritz Rosenthal translated (1841) the prayer book, the Book of Psalms and the Ethics of the Fathers. All these books, printed and published in Pest, were most eagerly read. "Hungarian Reading Circles" were formed in various congregations. Soon Hungarian language and dress were adopted by many Jews. Numerous congregations used Hungarian on their seals and recorded their minutes in this language. Finally, some of the rabbis, Rabbi Leopold Low in Nagykanizsa since 1844, Rabbi Jacob Steinhardt in Arad since 1845, and Rabbi

Mayer Zipser in Szekesfehervar since 1847, began preaching in Hungarian.[26]

This process of self-magyarization became most widespread in Pest. Chief Rabbi Schwab, in a most surprising speech on the occasion of the King's birthday, April 19, 1840,[27] strongly urged his congregants to learn the Hungarian tongue. These words found fertile ground in the hearts and minds of the young. As we have seen the Magyarito Egylet (Magyarizing Society) was founded whose avowed purpose was to spread the knowledge of the Hungarian tongue, Hungarian literature, and Hungarian history among the Jews. During the succeeding few years the leaders of Hungarian Jewry were busy with similar projects which they believed would accelerate full emancipation. Great was their hopes that emancipation would be granted them by the Diet of 1847-8 deliberating in Pozsony.[28]

But suddenly history began to march. The French spark of February, 1848, had its momentous results in Hungary, also. In Vienna, a bloody revolution broke out on March 13 and a bloodless revolution in Pest on March 15. The revolutionary spirit gripped the minds of the Jews, too.[29] On March 17, 1848, the "Representatives of Hungarian and Transylvanian

Jewry" or as they called themselves, in short, the "Executive Committee" issued a proclamation[30] in which they called upon Hungarian Jewry to be good patriots, to consider themselves Hungarians of the Jewish faith, and that their community organizations should serve only religious and cultural ends. But the Diet of 1847-8 came to a close on April 11 without bringing the case of Jewish emancipation one step further.[31] Therefore the "Executive Committee" convoked a general meeting of all the Jewish communities in Hungary for June 4, 1848. It had to be postponed because many communities could not send their representatives in time. The assembled delegates, however, elected a temporary committee whose duty was to make all preparations for the meeting re-scheduled for July 4. This was a well-represented assembly. It held its sessions from July 5 till July 10. The sole item on the agenda was emancipation. The assembly appointed a committee to contact and deal with Parliament and the government. This committee was charged to urge the government to grant the Jews emancipation, but not, under any circumstances, to enter into any discussions about religion or religious matters.[32] And if emancipation could only be obtained through concessions in religion, they should tell the government that the Jews would

rather not have emancipation.[33] They did not know that the Hungarian government was unwilling to emancipate the Jews. Therefore, it resorted to all kinds of excuses to delay the matter. Eventually on August 3, 1848, Parliament postponed Jewish emancipation "sine die."[34]

During these feverish months many Jews of Pest felt that in this historic era of national reform the time had come for the inner reorganization and reformation of Jewish community life. Although the Jewish community of Pest had fulfilled the request of the "Executive Committee" dated March 17, 1848, and declared itself solely a religious and cultural organization,[35] nevertheless, many members of this community felt that this was not quite enough. The sentiment that much more than such a declaration was needed grew so rapidly and spread so far and wide that the Elders of the community had to appoint (April 8, 1848) a committee of forty "to reform the administration of the Jewish community of Pest."[36]

CHAPTER THREE

RISE AND DOWNFALL

Many members of the Jewish community were unwilling to accept a mere reform of the administration, and insisted upon religious reforms as well. The leaders of the Jewish community of Pest, however, refused to consider the matter. As a result, those Jews desiring such religious reforms decided to act on their own.[1]

At the beginning of April, 1848, some of these discontented and progressive people addressed an open letter to the Jewish university students calling upon the youth of the country to initiate a reformation of the Jewish religion. This open letter was signed "Die Alten Judischen Kampfer fur Reform des Judentums."[2]

At first they wanted to transform the method and substance of the liturgy. Prayers should be in Hungarian and accompanied by a choir and music, and the congregation should worship with uncovered heads.[3]

In case the Jewish community would not let them have a synagogue for this purpose, they should acquire one by forming a new cultural organization with headquarters in Pest and with

branches in every county. At the same time, they advised the youth to form a committee for the sole purpose of seeking guidance from the German Rabbinical Synod and reform organizations.[4]

"The University Students of Mosaic faith" answered this call on April 20, accepting the charge and the challenge, thanking the leaders of the Society for the trust placed in them and declared themselves ready to act.[5]

Those who initiated this Hungarian reform movement were certainly not clear concerning their aims. They were convinced that somewhere along the line of reform lay the answer to their doubts in the faith of their fathers, and to their hopes as future Hungarian citizens.

On April 28, these supporters of the reform movement founded a small committee presided over by Ignacz Einhorn. Other members were Diosy, Eisler, Engel, Fanta, Gletzinger, Dr. Kollinsky, Ligeti, Mayer, Dr. Pollak, Dr. Saphir, Dr. Schlesinger and Strasser.[6] This committee was empowered to render a report within eight days.[7]

The next day Subscription Lists were passed around containing the following declaration: "We, the undersigned, Hungarians of the Mosaic faith, hereby declare our sincere

desire that in our religious rituals such changes should be made that are in accord with our own time, and furthermore, customs that evoke the accusation of self-segregation should be abolished."

They also issued a proclamation to all the congregations in the provinces. But the results were very meager, indeed. From the answers received it became apparent that no congregation would countenance the radical reformation of Judaism.[8]

At the same time the committee addressed a letter to Rabbi Samuel Holdheim, the spiritual leader of the Reform Society of Berlin, requesting him to send them a copy of the constitution of his society, together with all other pertinent documents. They also asked for the prayer books and musical material used in his temple.[9]

But Holdheim's reply was greatly delayed. It was therefore decided to have a "temporary" program published, based entirely on the speeches and writings of Holdheim. On June 25, 1848, this "temporary" radical program was published. In it they expressed their desire: (a) for the transformation and omission of certain prayers, (b) that only the first day of the holidays, and of the fast days only Yom Kippur, were to be observed, (c) for the transfer of the Sabbath to another

day, (d) for the abrogation of the dietary laws, (e) for a declaration that circumcision was not compulsory and some other means should be found by which a child can be received into the faith, and finally (f) for the permissibility of mixed marriages.[10]

This program was challenged from many quarters. Even many of those who belonged to the movement did not favor all these proposals. It was, therefore, not surprising that their new preacher, Einhorn, issued a correction,[11] especially concerning the radicalism toward the Sabbath and circumcision. He declared that reform was desirable not only in externals, but inside Judaism as well. "However, there can be no question of abolishing the sacred manifestations of our divine religion; only their transformation to suit our time is our purpose." This was an indication that not all reformers were clearly in accord concerning the extent of reforms.

Hundreds of reform-minded individuals in Pest signed application forms declaring themselves willing to support the reform movement.[12] All this had occurred within two months. Thus the leadership, feeling justified and encouraged, called a general meeting for Saturday, July 8, 1848. This meeting in Pest of the signatories of the application forms[13] estab-

lished the "A magyar izrealita kozponti reform egylet" (The Hungarian Jewish Central Reform Society), and elected a temporary slate of twenty-five officers and trustees.[14]

Under the signature of these temporary officers, Dr. Joseph Rozsay (Rosenfeld), president; Dr. Schwarcz, first secretary; and Joseph Ligeti, second secretary, an announcement was published addressed[15] to "The Hungarian Israelites" which reads as follows:

> "With great numbers as befitting a holy cause and with ardent heart and soul we the undersigned decided to enact radical reforms in our religion. We do this deeply convinced of the necessity for the total reformation of our whole religious philosophy. For in no other way are we able to satisfy in our bosoms the holy fire craving for religion. We have no ulterior motives. Only the highest interests of Jewry are in our hearts."[16]

This ponderous statement did not give details concerning the intended reforms. It was composed of non-committal generalizations and promised that a future pamphlet would deal with particulars. Until that time the German reform movement and its literature was to be considered as the temporary basis

for their reforms. Unwilling to detach themselves from the main congregation, the reformers petitioned the Jewish community to cover the cost of their new enterprise, furthermore requesting that they be considered a branch of the main congregation.

Because of its very nature, the Elders of the main congregation delayed the answer to this most disturbing petition. The new Society angry at the delay acquired their own building to hold services therein. To cover the cost, collections were held among their members.

Meanwhile, considerable progress was being made; and on August 10 the Society elected the rabbinical student of exceptional ability, great learning and pioneer fighter for reform, Ignatz Einhorn,[17] as their rabbi; they drew up a constitution and adopted the rituals, prayers, attitudes, principles and creeds of the Berlin Reform Society, and immediately sent Einhorn to Berlin to consult with Holdheim and bring back all the necessary information and material.[18]

Of course, this could not have been otherwise. For not until 1848 was there a serious movement to transform, radically change and reform the Jewish religion in Hungary. It is true, that the well-known Rabbi of Arad, Aron Chorin, was active in

alleviating the abuses in religious Jewish practice, but his activities by their very nature aimed not at the total reformation of the highest accepted principles of Judaism; nor did the various attempts by rabbis in several communities to improve, beautify, and add dignity to the divine service really amount to reform.

During the first four decades of the nineteenth century the mass of Judeo-German-speaking[19] orthodox Hungarian Jewry was dispersed all over rural Hungary. With a notable exception of a thin strata of urban,[20] hastily self-magyarizing, German-speaking intellectuals, rich businessmen and industrialists, these masses were outside the influence of European education, culture, and civilization--the prerequisites for indigenous radical religious reformation of Judaism.

How different were things in Germany. German Jewry by the turn of the century was brought once again into touch with the life and culture of the world. In all the larger communities of Germany at first hundreds and as time went on thousands of men who had acquired the new learning began to appear. By 1815 Jacobson's House of Prayer had been established wherein prayers and sermons were recited by German-speaking

Jews in German, where a choir and an organ were introduced. Furthermore, in the thirties there were a number of university-educated rabbis active in German lands. In 1835 Geiger launched his theological magazine, and the various rabbinical conferences (1844-46) created a receptive atmosphere for reformation. Such an atmosphere was totally lacking in Hungary.

All these important historical and religious factors had to be considered by the Elders of the community whom, as we have seen, the Reform Society petitioned that they be considered as a branch, and consequently be aided financially or otherwise by the main body.

The Elders had to delay the answer not only for the tactical purpose of gaining time in order to shape their attitude to such an unheard of manifestation in Hungarian Jewry, but also to have expert opinion in such grave matters. They asked their own scholarly rabbi, Low Schwab, to render his opinion on this problem concerning the request of the Reform Society.

Rabbi Schwab issued his answer in a pamphlet (it was later in the year printed and published) entitled "Gutachten an den israelitischen Gemeinde-Vorstand zu Pesth in Betreff der daselbst sich gebildeten sogennanten Central Reform-Genossenschaft."[21]

This opinion was forwarded to the Reform Society on August 15, 1848, and was accompanied by a friendly but firm letter. In this letter the Jewish community and Rabbi Schwab recognized the necessity for reform, but not the arbitrary subjective kind of reforms to be found in the Society's program. It further promised (permissible-megengedheto) improvements to be executed as soon as the status of the Jews had been settled. They would rather await political settlement first so that people might not claim that reformation was the necessary condition for the political happiness of the Jews.

In the pamphlet, Rabbi Schwab weighed all reform declarations, plans and practices. In his opinion these declarations and practices proved that the reformers almost completely deserted tradition. He further maintained it showed tendencies towards Karaitism by declaring the Bible (by mere arbitrary selection and rejection of religious laws) as their only source for faith and practice. He questioned their motives and denied their contention that they are urged towards reformation by their love of Judaism. On the contrary, he stated that they were trying to reform Judaism to please the Christians and to advance the cause of

emancipation. He bewailed the fact that in Hungary ignorant, untrained andunqualified persons can call themselves rabbis. Further, that when the reformers called for the transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday they were dealing a death-blow to the very essence of Judaism. Similarly, by tampering with the holidays, with the sacred marriage laws, by denying the basic laws of circumcision, by throwing other old and cherished traditions to the wind such as Tzitzit, T'fillin and the use of Hebrew, together with multitudes of other laws, customs, practices and ceremonies, the reformers deserted the Jewish fold and consequently were not to be considered as Jews until they would scrap their seditious program.[22]

The Elders of the Jewish community at their meeting of August 13, 1848, adopted their rabbi's opinion as their own. But the opinion of "this medieval zealot"--as the reformers called Rabbi Schwab--did not satisfy these young men and they reiterated their determination to go on with their radical plans. On Saturday, September 23, they wrote a letter to the Elders of the community informing them that their plans had been followed by deeds, and that they have already elected a rabbi (this, of course, was Ignatz Einhorn) for themselves. They went on to say in this letter that their

motivation was not vanity and it was not their purpose to quarrel with the main congregation or to draw material benefits from their actions. On the contrary, they were motivated by truth, by the desires of their souls, by their thirst for religiosity, by their cravings to ennoble and to preserve their ancient religion. With this letter all connection between these two bodies ceased.[23]

In a few short weeks the High Holy Days approached. By the time Rosh Hashanah was to be celebrated, the Society procured a House of Prayer, which was solemnly dedicated on Rosh Hashanah Eve, September 27, 1848.

The dedication ceremony was an interesting one. It began with the choir singing in Hungarian, accompanied by the organ. This was followed by a Hungarian sermon in which their preacher, Einhorn, spoke on unity and peace. The choir then sang in German. The service was concluded with German prayers.[24]

During the High Holy Days a temporary "Rules and Regulations Concerning Services" was distributed. These temporary regulations dealt not only with order and decorum during the services but also with their form and substance.

The regulations prescribed that services on both days of Rosh Hashanah and on Yom Kippur were to begin at 9:00 A. M.

On Pesach, Shavuot and Succoth, as well as on Saturdays and Sundays, services would start at 10:00 A. M. Afternoon services would be held on Yom Kippur only. The festival eves to be celebrated would be Rosh Hashanah Eve and Yom Kippur Eve at 6:00 o'clock.

The seats on the right in the House of Prayer would be occupied by the women, while those on the left by the men. Similar rules would apply to the balconies. The seats would be unnumbered, and the worshipers could sit where they pleased.

When men entered, they were to remove their hats and place them in a receptacle provided for this purpose. The white funeral robe (shroud-kittel) and the tallit were not to be worn at any time. The shofar was not to be blown, nor would the ethrog and the lulav be used. The Torah reading was based on the three-year cycle, and it was to be recited in two languages, namely, Hebrew and German during the German services, and in both Hebrew and Hungarian during the Hungarian services.

The Torah reading was to be followed either by a German or Hungarian sermon. Kaddish would be recited but once a week. Deaths and Yahrzeits would be communicated to the preacher so that he might memorialize the names of the deceased. The

birth of a boy or a girl was to be celebrated on the first day the mother entered the Temple. This happy event would be communicated to the preacher in writing. He in turn would name the child from the pulpit and perform the consecration.[25]

These same principles, enlarged and slightly elaborated, are to be found in a long promised, brief pamphlet written and published by the preacher, Einhorn.[26] We find both the ideas and the principles almost identical with those of the Berlin Reform Society. According to Einhorn the basic principle of reform was that only the essence and spirit of divine revelation and its derivatives concerning the moral life were to be considered of divine authority. To all intents and purposes the positive purity of Jewish God-cognition which had become intermingled with many superstitions was to be restored. Jewish religion was a means and not an end toward sanctifying human life.

In order that the Jewish religion should be preserved, that it should not suffer irreparable damage, that it should be embraced by an ever-widening circle, it was imperative that radical changes be effected. Commandments, customs and ceremonies, whether found in the Bible or in the Talmud, which in the course of time became obsolete, meaningless and not

conducive to the pure religiosity of the Jews of our time, should be reformed, transformed, omitted and even rejected. The sources of the Jewish religion were indeed the Bible and Jewish tradition, but they were subject to the spirit of the age, which is in itself a constant revelation of God. Hence customs and ceremonies, which in themselves were but expressions of the religious spirit, had to be accommodated to the changing needs of the age. Customs and ceremonies, Einhorn continued, were not ends in themselves. They were but a means to the attainment of higher purposes. As such they could not be immutable. Commandments, prohibitions and symbols that may have been needed to educate, impress and remind a primitive people were no longer needed by a civilized people which have already attained that standard of moral and ethical life these commandments, prohibitions and symbols meant to bestow on them. It is for this reason that customs and ceremonies must change in all aspects of Jewish life, especially in the House of God. Since sacrificial prayers and prayers for the Messiah evoked no response from the new Jew, they were to be omitted. The civilized person of his age needed the vernacular, both in prayer and preaching. The organ and choir, order and decorum in the House of Prayer were also considered necessary. It

was for all these reasons that the meaning of the tallit, eating unleavened bread (matzoh) on Passover, the redemption of the first-born (pidyan ha-ben), circumcision, the Sabbath, the dietary laws, the use of Hebrew, covering the head during worship, the booth (sukkah) during the Feast of Tabernacles, together with the lulav and ethrog, and finally the shofar at the New Year (Rosh Hashanah) season were to be declared meaningless and superfluous, hence to be rejected.

These were the principles. But in his summary and immediate program for Hungarian Jewry, in order to adapt them to the environment of the time (and lest he antagonize even some of his own adherents with such a radical program) slight modifications were made. The Sabbath, for instance, he maintained was holy; only for those Jews should it be transferred to Sunday, who could not worthily celebrate it because of inability to attain proper and adequate Sabbath rest. On Passover unleavened bread was optional, during the Feast of Tabernacles a booth (sukkah), lulav and ethrog were optional, too. As to circumcision it was not absolutely necessary and also optional. As to Hebrew, he still maintained that it is superfluous and unnecessary both in prayers and religious instruction. A few sentences, however, expressing the basic

tenets of Judaism, should be recited in Hebrew in the synagogues.[27]

Almost a year later the author, with neither hesitancy nor moderation, decided to publish the essence of this German pamphlet in Hungarian. The radical principles were to be immediately put into practice. The Sabbath was completely and unconditionally transferred to Sunday; circumcision now was abolished; unleavened bread on Passover, the Succah, lulav and ethrog on the Feast of Tabernacles were to be abolished. His aim, he declared, was the assimilation to, and the fusion with, other denominations. For this very purpose he not only approved of mixed marriages, but recommended them.[28]

This radical reform movement in Hungary was not only a religious but also a political movement. The Diet, the Press and many public bodies constantly emphasized the necessity of Jewish religious reformation as the sole means of their political emancipation and their social assimilation into the Magyar people. This vital fact prevented it from becoming a much more popular movement.

We have already referred to the procrastinating tactics of the government in the matter of emancipation. One of the requirements was the reformation of the Jewish religion.[29]

The National Jewish Executive Committee vigorously protested against such conditions.[30] And when the friends of the reform movement reiterated their wish to abolish all the customs that evoked the Gentiles' charge that the Jews were separatists who would not merge into the nation, the greater part of Hungarian Jewry raised its voice in protest. A storm of protest broke out again when the Reform Society officially issued its principles. They were immediately accused of selling their ancient religion for political emancipation.[31] The Reform Society resented these accusations, and, on August 5, 1848, published a protest against a resolution by the Parliamentary Committee which met to prepare the Bill of Emancipation. This resolution demanded that the government begin negotiations with the "intelligent Jews" concerning the reformation of their religion. "We decidedly refuse emancipation unless it is given to every Jew in Hungary unconditionally" says the protest.

Although the Reform Society of Pest protested against the charges of selling their faith for civil rights, the situation was markedly different in the provinces. There religious reform was openly desired in order to facilitate emancipation.[32] The first city in the province to begin a reform movement was Arad, the city of Aron Chorin. The declaration of the "Magyar

Jews of Arad," dated and published on April 24, 1848, contains the following:[33] "... In order to obviate the objection and the not unfounded accusation that the Jews adamantly separate themselves in and by their religious rituals, and in order that our religious institutions should not create even the smallest amount of friction in our social life, our Jewish religion must be radically reformed." In six points they declared their aims; the sixth paragraph was its summary: "It was declared in the Bible that the only laws binding on the Jews are those in the Ten Commandments; only these laws are a direct revelation to Moses by God. From this it naturally follows that any and all other laws, commandments, religious rituals, and the Talmud and other adopted customs are invalid."[34]

At the same time the reformers of Arad addressed a letter to Holdheim[35] in Berlin asking him if after having adopted these six radical points they could still be considered Jews. In his reply, Holdheim not only approved all their ideas, but also encouraged them in their endeavors and declared that they stood on firm Jewish foundations.[36]

But soon the Jews of Arad had more important things to do than reform their religion. The city of Arad was a Magyar city surrounded by other nationalities, mainly Roumanian, but

also German and Slav.[37] The Jews considered themselves Magyars.[38] Therefore, when these Germans and Slavs began to stir, and later broke into open rebellion, the Jews together with the other Magyars, took up arms to defend the Fatherland. And when, on October 3, 1848, the Imperial Government declared the Hungarian Government a revolutionary government, the commander of the garrison in the Fort of Arad declared himself an imperial loyalist, and began to bombard the open city on October 7. Thereafter, the Jews of Arad had to occupy themselves with the war, while their internal problems were indefinitely postponed.

The Jews of Pecs, like their brethren in Arad, did not mince words when they declared their desire to have their religion reformed. They formed the Israelite Reform Society (Izraelita ujito egylet). In a petition to the City Council they stated:

> "Since Parliament declared its desire that the Jews try to assimilate by giving up their peculiar customs, some Jews living in Pecs formed themselves into a Society, the purpose of which is the transformation and reformation of their religion."

The petition went on to ask the city fathers to allow them to secede from the main congregation and to form their own in which they proposed to introduce the following innovations:

> (1) This reforming society considers its aims is to omit all those ridiculous and low rituals that crept into our religion together with those prayers that are inconsistent with humanity. Its aim, furthermore, is that the prayers and services recited in the synagogue should be executed by a well-organized choir. In short, we want to be in intimate contact with the Reform Society of Pest, which is now being organized.
>
> (2) In order that the magnanimous Magyar nation should be convinced that the members of this Reform Society want to be worthy of being called loyal patriots, this Society considers as its main duty to ascertain that as soon as possible all services be conducted in Hungarian, and as soon as finances permit, they engage a person who shall preach in Hungarian. These steps will help our children speak Hungarian more perfectly, and to assimilate ourselves more speedily. It will be our endeavor to place our ecclesiastical (Egyhazi) laws under the jurisdiction of the laws of the Hungarian people, i. e., if needed we shall be ready to offer up our lives and our fortunes on the nation's altar even on our holidays (this could not have been done hitherto without breaking our religious laws) happy in the knowledge that we shall be performing our patriotic duty.[39]

In their reforming and patriotic zeal, these Jews of Pecs committed the grave error of imputing that the majority of the Jews of Hungary who did not wish to reform their

religion were prevented by their religion from being good patriots. Their ignorance of Jewish law was only equaled by their ignorance of the attitude of the most orthodox of rabbis that in times of crisis, patriotic duty comes first, and even the laws of the Sabbath and the laws of Yom Kippur may be violated.

However, this rather overzealous attempt of the reformers of Pecs met with a setback. The city fathers declined their request for secession until they could prove that their reforms were based on the Pest pattern, and that it was approved by the appropriate governmental authorities. But there again, the perilous days--the agony of the nation bleeding in war nipped this attempt in its bud, and the dissidents returned to the main congregation.[40]

The "Reformed Israelite Church" of Nagyvarad[41] fared a little better for it lasted two years. In August, 1847, several members of the main congregation seceded and in the Szerldahelyi House they established a House of Prayer in which the cantor was accompanied by a choir, and the sermon was delivered in Hungarian by a teacher of religion, Rabbi Leopold Rokonstein. And when, in the spring of 1848, the wind of freedom began to blow much stronger than before,

the leaders of the "Reformed Israelite Church" came into the open, and requested the Minister of Religion and Education to convoke a "Jewish Synod" in order to settle the religious life and the ecclesiastical affairs of the Jews of Hungary. This appeal met with no response. Thereafter, the War of Independence dominated their minds; religious problems had to wait. Many other plans had to be abandoned, too. Their spiritual leader, now Dr. Leopold Rokonstein, joined the army with the rank of second lieutenant so that the spiritual leadership of the congregation was left in the hands of the cantor. The war prevented expansion and development; membership never exceeded fifty. In 1849, in the general debacle, the Israelite Church disappeared, never to be heard of again.[42]

In 1848, the movement for reform was started in Nagybecskerek. Its leader was Moses Brick, who published a pamphlet entitled "Reform des Judenthums. In 100 Thesen dargestelt, erläutert and motiviert durch Moses." Unfortunately, Brick died in 1849, a hero's death, as an officer of the army; the Reformed Society was not strong enough to survive his death.[43]

Thus we see that the only strong and independent Hungarian reform congregation was that of Pest.[44] For in

June, 1849, Mihaly Horvath, Minister of Religion and Education, issued his order:

> "The reformed Israelites of the city of Pest seceded from the old religion and formed their own congregation. This has been approved by the government. Now, therefore, it is hereby ordered that both the county and city of Pest, as well as any other community which shall address any order, request, or any other communication, should send it not only to the Jewish Community of Pest, but also to the Reform Society. It is further ordered that all certificates issued by the Reform Society shall be considered valid."[45]

In yet another order the Minister decreed that the spiritual leader of the Reform Society, like any other minister of religion, should be allowed to give religious instruction to the children of its members.[46]

As we have already noted, the Society's first spiritual leader was Ignatz Einhorn, who served his congregation with great devotion and self-sacrifice. His burning patriotism prompted him to enlist in the army, and toward the end of 1849 we find him in Komarom, as a chaplain with the retreating

Hungarian forces under Gorgey. After the surrender of the fortress of Komarom in September, 1849, Einhorn, in possession of letters of safe conduct, left for Germany.[47]

It took the Society some time to find a successor. The aftermath of defeat with all its tragic consequences gravely disrupted the religious life of the community. During this interval the Society was ministered to by William Schonfeld, the temporary preacher. At long last, in January, 1852, the Society elected Dr. David Einhorn,[48] Chief Rabbi of the Grand Duchy of Schwerin, Germany, as their spiritual leader. But he was only able to hold his position for less than one year.

The short duration of Einhorn's ministry was a result of a series of events that were to come following the defeat in the War of Independence. It was at this time that the Elders of the Jewish community received a request[49] from the City Council of Pest to render a full account of the history, finances and religious practices of the Reform Society.

The main congregation gave their answer to the City on October 3, 1849. The City forwarded it to the Office of Vice-regency by the end of October. Meanwhile, the city decided to act. It knew that the Reform Society was never really formally recognized by the Imperial Government. Therefore, by an order

issued October 15, 1849, the Society was dissolved and its Temple closed; "for," ran the City's order, "the Society not being either a legitimate or tolerated religion, therefore under the prevailing martial law secular meetings and assemblies are to be prohibited." But Vincze Szentivanyi, the Lord-lieutenant of the county, had the order rescinded. He did not consider the reasons given by the city sufficient or justified, and the order was given to reopen the Temple.

Meanwhile, in order to show that they were performing a useful service to a substantial number of Jewish citizens, the Society submitted its constitution to the government. Baron Geringer, supreme imperial Civil High Commissioner of Hungary, having seen the petition and having read the constitution, found the further existence of the Society justified, and issued the imperial permission for it to function till further notice.[50]

Thus the Society became a tolerated, but not legal, institution.[51] The main congregation soon saw to it, however, that the Reform Society was deprived even of this precarious existence.

The main congregation, of course, was mainly motivated by its religious convictions. It held that the reformers were

not even Jews. But there was another more important reason for the dissolution of the Society. The Jewish community had made prodigious sacrifices for the Fatherland during the War of Independence. By the end of the war its treasury was completely empty. Then came the ruthless demand for an incredible sum as indemnity, payment of which would have meant the ruin of the Jewish community. The Elders wanted every Jew, especially those well-to-do members of the Society, to pull their weight. They asked Baron Geringer, Civil High Commissioner, to issue an order compelling members of the Society to share the heavy burden of the community. Though these members did contribute, it was considered insufficient; and not in accordance with their opulent means.

To the great pleasure of the main congregation, good fortune had come their way. What plotting and intriguing could not do chance events succeeded in accomplishing.

In order to settle several Jewish religious and ecclesiastical problems, the government convoked a meeting at Buda[52] for the months of September and November, 1851. It was presided over by Councilor Sacher of the Office of the Vice-regency. Its members consisted of four rabbis and four laymen. The rabbis were Low of Szegedin, Schwab of Pest, Zipser of

Szekes-Fehervar and Freyer of Gyor. The laymen were Dr. Loeblin, prominent educator of Buda, J. H. Kassovitz, President of the Jewish community, Dr. Schwimmer, and Barnay, Secretary General of the Jewish community of Pest. During these discussions the Reform Society was also discussed. Without much ado, it was declared to be a sect. Hence, it had to be destroyed, and its dissolution was proposed in the following terms composed by Rabbi Low[53] (Section 245 of the proposed Constitution for the Jewish Congregations):

> "Concerning the founding and supervision of societies, the law and its provisions are strictly to be observed. Sects are not to be tolerated. Sects are such societies in which men and women worship together; where typical prayers (t'fillat chova) are omitted from the liturgy, or where people worship on the pattern of the so called reform societies."

The plan was that this proposed constitution written by Low should be issued as an imperial edict after having been ratified by the emperor. It never received the imperial sanction however. Nonetheless, paragraph 245, the proposal concerning the Reform Society, was executed. The Minister of

Culture and Religion dissolved the Reform Society of Pest, giving as his reasons paragraph 245 of the proposed constitution, and the ruthless and bitter attacks against the Society by Rabbi Schwab in his memorandum to the Office of the Vice-regency. This ministerial order was communicated to the mayor of Pest on October 25, 1852, ordering him to take the necessary action.[54]

The Society's board of management refused to accept a defeat. They appealed to the Emperor for annulment of the order, and to the Office of the Vice-regency for permission to continue functioning until they might hear from the Emperor. However, both these requests were rejected.[55]

This was the end. The board of management formed a committee[56] to wind up its own affairs in dignity and honor. The committee saw to it that all undertaken commitments and obligations were met, all contracts honored and bills paid.

On November 10, 1852, they transferred to Rabbi Schwab the Registry of Births and Marriages. This was followed by members of the Society rejoining the main congregation. They were received back into the main body of the Jewish community at a special congregational meeting in a festive and pacific mood.

With this conciliating act the Reform Society of Pest ceased to exist forever.

NOTES

CHAPTER ONE

(1) Gyula Szekfu, Magyar Tortenet (Hungarian History), Budapest, 1934, VI, 380; Henrik Marczali, Magyarorszag tortenete II Jozsef koraban (The History of Hungary During the Reign of Joseph II), Budapest, 1885, pp. 48-58.

(2) Szekfu, op. cit., VI, 450.

(3) Urbarium was a regulation of the rights and duties of the serfs in their dealings with their landlords. It was published by Maria Theresa in 1767 without the consultation or co-operation of the Hungarian Diet. The Urbarium granted serfs the right to settle anywhere in the country, also permitted their children to be educated for any profession they might choose. Furthermore, this ordinance fixed the maximum the serfs could be asked to pay in taxes and services. The burden on the serfs continued to be heavy enough but at least now they were able to invoke definite legal protection against the tyranny of their masters. Cf. H. Marczali, Hungary in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 191-192.

(4) Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 38.

(5) Ibid., pp. 60-82. Geza Ballagi, A nemzeti allamalkotas kora 1815-47 (The Period of Hungarian National Regeneration, 1815-47), Budapest, 1897, pp. 145-157.

(6) Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 223 ff.; Mihaly Horvath, Huszonot ev Magyarorszag tortenetebol, 1823-tol 1848-ig (Twenty-five Years of Hungarian History 1823-48) 3 vols. Pest, 1868, III, 345 ff; Akos Beothy, A magyar allamisag fejlodese, kuzdelmei (The Development and Struggles of Hungarian Statehood), 3 vols., Budapest, 1900-06, II, 403 ff.; E. O. S., Hungary and its Revolutions, London, 1848, p. 252 ff., gives a most detailed account of these events.

(7) Cf. Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 300.

(8) Lajos Mocsary, A magyar tarsas elet (Hungarian Social Life). Pest, 1856, p. 105 ff. Szekfu, op. cit., VII, p. 18 ff.; Ballagi, op. cit., II, 22.

(9) Elek Fenyes, Magyarorszag Statistikaja (The Statistics of Hungary), 3 vols., Pest, 1842, I, 28. ff.; Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 64; Marczali, Magyarorszag tortenete II Jozsef koraban (The History of Hungary During the Reign of Joseph II), p. 164 ff.

(10) Imre Palugyay, Megye-rendszer hajdan es most (The County System Past and Present), 2 vols., Pest, 1844, I, 73 ff. Cf. especially the fascinating article "The History of Our Peasantry." Cf. Szekfu, op. cit., VI, 286-293, 378-381. VII, 131 ff. See also Fenyes, op. cit., II, 105, concerning all the urbarial dues the peasant had to pay in money, kind and service. See also Horvath's (op. cit., I, 363 ff.) analysis of these dues and their bearing on the political events of the forties of the last century. Janos Hetenyi's Robot es Dezsma (Corvee and Tithe). Pest, 1845, is a classic on the subject.

(11) Palugyay, op. cit., II, 55.

(12) Fenyes, op. cit., I, 28 ff.

(13) Lajos Venetianer, A magyar zsidosag tortenete (The History of Hungarian Jewry), Budapest, 1922, pp. 56-58; Szekfu, op. cit., VI, 350.

(14) See Henrik Guttman's scholarly study A magyarorszagi zsidok III Karoly koraban (The Hungarian Jews During the Reign of Charles III), M. ZS. L., 1939, p. 58ff.

(15) M. ZS. L., art. "Pest"; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 64; Sandor Büchler, A zsidok tortenete Budapesten (The History of the Jews in Budapest), Budapest, 1901, pp. 332-340; Bela Bernstein, Az 1848-49-iki magyar szabadsagharcz es a zsidok (The Hungarian War of Independence of 1848-9 and the Jews), Budapest, 1898, p. 28; M. ZS. SZ., 1931, p. 104; 1932, p. 140.

(16) M. ZS. L., art. "Pozsony," "Sopron"; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 66.

(17) M. ZS. L., art. "Buda"; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 68. Buchler, op. cit., p. 251 ff.

(18) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 66; see the contract between the Jews of Galanta and Count Eszterhazi, dated January 1, 1729, in the M. ZS. SZ., 1928, p. 160.

(19) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 57 ff.; M. ZS. L., art. "Turelmi ado" (Toleration Tax); Bernstein, op. cit., p. 24; Büchler, op. cit., p. 285.
The census of 1720 shows 11,621 Jews in Hungary. While the next census, sixty-five years later (1785) shows a vast increase in their number, the total this time was

75,000. Bernstein, op. cit., loc. cit. It would seem that the Government had in mind just over a gulden per person in taxing the Jews.

(20) The full text of the "Systematica" is published in its Latin original in M. ZS. SZ., 1896, pp. 367-374.

(21) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 77; Buchler, op. cit., p. 336. Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 98 ff.; Ballagi, op. cit., 499, and especially Gyula Farkas, A "fiatal Magyarorszag" Kora (The Age of "Young Hungary"), Budapest, 1932, p. 97 ff.

(22) Act: 1790: XXXVIII "De Judaeis" was signed by the King on January 10, 1791. The text runs as follows: "In order that the status of the Jews should be properly cared for while their case in general and their relation with the Royal Free Boroughs in particular is being discussed by a National Committee which will have to report to the next Diet, and after which His Majesty the King and both the Estates will properly decide what to do: Both Estates hereby decide, with the consent of His Majesty the King, that the Jews living in Hungary and in its attached territories

should live exactly under the same conditions in the Royal Free Boroughs and everywhere else (except the Royal Mining Cities) as they lived the first of January 1790, and if they had been expelled they should be readmitted." See M. ZS. L., art. "De Judaeis"; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 94. Buchler, op. cit., p. 353 ff.

(23) Fenyes, op. cit., I, 82; M. ZS. L., art. Magyarorszagi zsidosag (Hungarian Jewry).

(24) A. Z. d. J., IV, (184), 601; VIII (1844), 519; IX (1845) 155 ff.; M. ZS. L., art. "Magyarasodas" (Hungarianization); "Magyarito Egylet" (Hungarianizing Society); Venetianer, op. cit., 135 ff.; Buchler, op. cit., 440. Bela Bernstein, Az 1848-49-iki Magyar szabadsagharcz es a zsidok (The Hungarian War of Independence of 1848-9 and the Jews) Budapest, 1898, p. 20ff.

(25) Ignatz Einhorn, Die Revolution und die Juden in Ungarn, Leipzig, 1850, p. 37; Leopold Löw, Der Jüdische Congress in Ungarn, Pest, 1871, p. 177; Buchler, op. cit., 462; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 13 ff.; M. ZS. L., art. "Jogkiterjesztes" (Law-extension).

(26) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 150ff.; Buchler, op. cit., p. 434 ff. Bernstein, op. cit., p. 19 ff.

(27) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 150, writes: "Hungarian public opinion--with the exception of Deak, Klauzal, Eötvös and Szentkiralyi, four of the most prominent liberals--under the impact of the debates in the Diet and the Press began to believe that unless the Jews reform their religion and thus facilitate not only their cultural assimilation but also intermarriage, they will always constitute an alien, unassimilable element in the Magyar population."

(28) Pesti Hirlap, May 5, 1844.

(29) Cf. A. Z. d. J., VII, (1843), 613, 673; X (1846), 393; Emanuel Schreiber, Reformed Judaism and Its Pioneers, Spokane, Wash., 1892, pp. 255-271.

(30) Bernstein, op. cit., p. 19 ff.; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 148. Cf. Leopold Low, Zur neuern Geschichte der Juden in Ungarn, Budapest, 1874, p. 183.

(31) Buchler, op. cit., p. 434.

(32) "Wenn unsere Umständeverbesserung, auch nur von der

Mindensten Änderung unserer Religion, es seÿ die Fundal Gesetze oder die Ceremonial Gebräuche betreffend, abhängen soll; so thun wir Verzicht auf alle glücklichere Aussichten, und wollen lieber in unsern bisherigen Verfassungen bleiben" wrote, in their own kind of German, the Jews of Ugocsa to the Jews of Pest; quoted by Buchler, op. cit., p. 440.

(33) Ibid., p. 441.

(34) Leopold Löw, Zsido Vallsaelvek (Principles of the Jewish Faith), Papa, 1848, p. 3, declares "Emancipation and reform are indivisible."

(35) The Jewish community of Pest at this time numbered approximately 9,000 members. A. Z. d. J., VII (1843), 446.

(36) Einhorn, op. cit., p. 108; Buchler, op. cit., p. 444.

(37) Ignatz Einhorn, later known as Horn Ede, was born in Vagujhely, Hungary, September 25, 1825, died in Budapest, November 2, 1875. His parents wanted him to become a rabbi. He was sent to the well-known Yeshivoth of Nyitra, Pozsony and Prague. While pursuing his theological

studies in Prague, he also took courses in secular subjects. Soon he became known as as a young man of exceptional ability and great learning. While he was still in Pozsony he wrote several articles in the Orient, Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums and the Pressburger Zeitung. Later he went to Pest, and studied the liberal arts at the University of Pest. While a student at the University he helped to found the Magyarito Egylet (Magarizing Society). In 1847 he wrote Zur Judenfrage in Ungarn, and in 1848 together with two others--Marton Diosy and Mor Szegfy--he published the Elso Magyar Zsido Evkonyv (The First Hungarian Jewish Yearbook). In the same year he became the editor of the short-lived Der Ungarische Israelit. See infra, Chapter Three, note 47; also, M. ZS. L., art. "Horn Ede."

(38) M. ZS. SZ., 1899, 266.

(39) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 171.

(40) These riots actually started on March 19, 1848, in Pozsony (Pressburg). The populace, encouraged by the citizens, whose latent hatred for the Jews was aroused by the fact that the Jews leaving the ghetto around the

Castle of Pressburg were settling in the city itself. The Jews insisted on their rights given to them by the already quoted Act: XXXIX, 1840: to settle anywhere in the land except in the Mining Towns. But the populace and the citizenry were determined to resist the law. On March 19 the mob broke the windows of all the houses where Jews lived. On the 20th this lawlessness developed into pilferage, theft, and outright robbery. The police stood by, refusing to intervene. Only the energetic intervention of some deputies of the Diet and their secretaries put an end to this lawlessness. These events had a most unwelcome effect on the Diet then deliberating in Pozsony. The House was debating and was about to pass a law that would have given the franchise to every Hungarian irrespective of his religion. But under the impact of these well-timed riots a different law was passed denying the Jews their franchise. Other restrictive laws were also passed against them. These laws were published in the newspapers on March 24. The Jew haters seeing that they could intimidate even the Diet, the next and subsequent days riotings broke out in many cities, the worst riots

being staged in Pest. Numerous were also the cities that enacted restrictive local regulations against the Jews. Eventually the Prime Minister's warning had its effect and the disturbances ceased. A. Z. d. J., XII (1848), 286, 288, 292, 332; Einhorn, op. cit., p. 16, 72, 74; Cf. Bernstein, op. cit., p. 46 ff. who deals extensively with these riots. See also Buchler, op. cit., p. 450 ff.; Venetianer, op. cit., 166 ff; Horvath, op. cit., II, 515; Pesti Hirlap, March 24, 1848; M. ZS. SZ., 1884, 413.

(41) The Prime Minister's order is quoted verbatim by Bernstein, op. cit., p. 96; Cf. Einhorn, op. cit., p. 77 ff. who writes in detail about these events.

(42) Series ZSP in the Archives of the Jewish Community of Pest, quoted by Buchler, op. cit., p. 465.

(43) "Among the 180,000 Honveds (Militia) there were 2,000 Jews. This was confirmed even by Kossuth. That is tc say the Jews constituted one ninetieth of the total. But the Jews constituted only one thirtieth of the total population of Hungary" according to Venetianer, op. cit., p. 198; Einhorn, op. cit., p. 116, writes in similar vein.

(44) On Rabbi Low and his progressive congregation, see A. Z. d. J., X (1846), 84.

(45) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 201; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 265 ff. Buchler, op. cit., p. 470 ff.

(46) See Appendix I.

(47) Cf. A. Z. d. J., XIII (1849), 689; XIV (1850), 59, 70, 173, 619.

(48) Einhorn, op. cit., p. 13.

(49) A. Z. d. J., XV (1851), 248.

(50) Bernstein, op. cit., 280; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 205.

(51) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 208.

(52) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 210.

(53) This Act of Emancipation is quoted verbatim by Einhorn, op. cit., p. 129, and by Low, op. cit., p. 187.

(54) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 242 ff.

NOTES

CHAPTER TWO

(1) Cf. Low, op. cit., p. 107.

(2) Cf. David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, New York, 1907, p. 103.

(3) Cf. Low, op. cit., p. 108.

(4) This report in Der Orient, 1847, p. 349, is indicative of the traditional rabbi's attitude to decorum. "...It is not only allowed but it is the duty of a good Jew to engage in conversation in the Synagogue during services- פלפ
said the new rabbi of Balassagyarmat."

(5) See his biography in I. Reich, Beth El, 2 vols., Budapest, 1868, II, 519.

(6) Buchler, op. cit., p. 399; M. ZS. L., art. "Reform Mozgalom"(Reform Movement).

(7) His autobiography is in Reich, op. cit., I, 46-55.

(8) See his Homiletische Erstlinge, Pest, 1827. It is reviewed by Low, op. cit., pp. 108-11.

(9) March 7, 1844.

(10) Buchler, op. cit., p. 410.

(11) M. ZS. L., art. "Bauer, Markfi-Herman."

(12) Der Orient, 1844, p. 286; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 20.

(13) Buchler, op. cit., p. 401; M. ZS. L., art. "Pest."

(14) M. ZS. L., art. "Cheszam Szofer"; M. ZS. SZ., 1891, p. 111.

(15) M. ZS. L., art. "Pest" and "Esketes" (Weddings).

(16) Buchler, op. cit., p. 401. wrong: Lämel is correct.

(17) On Lammel (sic!), see the special supplement, written by an anonymous Catholic, issued on the occasion of his death, in A. Z. d. J., IX (1845), Beilage 40.

(18) M. ZS. L., art. "Pest."

(19) A. Z. d. J., VI (1842), 247; VIII (1844), 468, 520; Der Orient, 1847, 296; Buchler, op. cit., p. 411.

(20) M. ZS. SZ., 1891, 109-118.

(21) A. Z. d. J., X (1846), 394; Einhorn, op. cit., pp. 41-42. Eotvos' complete speech can be found in the Nemzeti Ujsag (National Gazette), April 29, 1840, and in Baro Eotvos Jozsef beszedei (The Speeches of Baron Joseph Eotvos), 3 vols., Budapest, 1886, I, 16.

In the second number of the new periodical, "Budapesti Szemle" (The Budapest Observer), Eotvos published his A zsidok emancipacioja (The Emancipation of the Jews). This is an elaboration of the speech he delivered in the Upper House. It was reprinted several times, and made a beneficial impact on Hungarian public opinion. It was translated into German as Die Emanzipation der Juden, Pesth, 1841; cf. Der Orient, 1841, nos. 29, 30, 31, 32; on the debates in both Houses of the Diet see "Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung," 1840:85:97; cf. Vilag (Light) 1841, 48:51; Horvath, op. cit., II, 168; Ballagi, op. cit., 488-499; Szekfu, op. cit., VII, 214. A fascinating series of articles appeared in the Nemzeti Ujsag (National Gazette), 1847: Nos. 530, 532, 535, 537, 540, 543, 546, where the whole Jewish problem in Hungary is, more or less impartially, discussed. An anti-Jewish view, however, is maintained in numbers 579-80. Cf. Marczali, op. cit., p. 359; Horvath, op. cit., II, 168,

III, 253. See further Bela Bernstein's study: Az 1848-49-iki szabadsagharc es a zsidok (The 1848-9 War of Independence and the Jews) in Emlekkonyv dr. Blau Lajos 65-ik szuletesnapja es 40 eves iroi jubileuma alkalmabol (Studies in Honour of Dr. Blau's Sixty-fifth Birthday and Fortieth Year of His Literary Activities), Budapest, 1926. Also, by the same author: A zsido kerdes 1848 elott (The Jewish Question before 1848), in Tanulmanyok Blau Lajos emlekere (Studies in Memory of Ludovic Blau), Budapest, 1938, pp. 56-68. As to the attitude of the liberal press towards the Jewish Question, see Imre Csetenyi's study in the just cited "Tanulmanyok," pp. 68-81, entitled: A negyvenes evek liberalis sajtoja es a zsidokerdes (The Liberal Press of the Forties and the Jewish Question). It is a remarkably useful study.

(22) On the position of the Jews in the forties of the 19th century, see the very comprehensive article, Ueber die Juden-Emanzipation in Ungarn in the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, 1844:36. Also Pesti Hirlap (The Pest Gazette) edited by Kossuth, 1844:11, 35, 74, 915-916. See further the articles Jogkiterjesztes (Law-extension) and De Judaeis, pp. 419 and 192 respectively in M. ZS. L.

(23) Pesti Hirlap, August 24, 1841; cf. Low, op. cit., 176.

(24) Buchler, op. cit., p. 431; Erno Ballagi, A Magyarorszagi zsido-emancipacio elozmenyei (The Historical Preliminaries of the Jewish Emancipation in Hungary), in Emlekkonyv nehai Dr. Kohn Samuel pesti forabbi szuletesenek 100-ik evfordulojara (Memorial volume in Celebration of the One hundredth anniversary of the Late Chief Rabbi of Pest: Dr. Samuel Kohn), Budapest, 1941, p. 64 ff.

(25) Einhorn, op. cit., p. 47; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 136.

(26) "They preached in Magyar, although the majority of their listeners could not understand them" according to Einhorn, op. cit., p. 48. Einhorn also says (op. cit., loc. cit.), and he is quoted by Philipson, op. cit., p. 380, that in addition to Low, Steinhardt and Moritz (it should be: Mayer) Zipser, Edward Ehrlich in Lengyeltoth, Daniel Pillitz in Szegedin and Leopold Rosenstein in Grosswardein (=Nagyvarad) also preached in Hungarian. After a great deal of search I cannot confirm this from sources written in the Hungarian language or from any other source. Lengyeltoti (sic!) was and is a tiny village in the county of Somogy. Its population at that time was 1,500 souls

all told, which number included the twenty odd Jewish families. Among the lists of Hungarian rabbis or rabbis who ever practiced in Hungary, or in the M. ZS. L. the name of Edward Ehrlich cannot be found. As to Rabbi Daniel Pillitz, the director of the Jewish School in Szegedin, he never really occupied a pulpit in a local synagogue. He preached only occasionally as a guest speaker mostly in German, rarely in Hungarian. As to Rabbi Leopold Rosenstein, the correct name is either Rockonstein or Rokonstein but certainly not Rosenstein. As we shall show in Chapter Three of this thesis, he was a teacher of religion in Nagyvarad. When the Reformed Israelite Church was founded in 1847, Rokonstein became its rabbi and he preached in Hungarian during the brief period of this Church's existence. At this point of our story, however, we are concerned with established congregations that followed more or less their traditional ritual and whose rabbis occupied a permanent pulpit, and preached in Hungarian. Cf. M. ZS. L., art. "Lengyeltoti"; Pillitz, Daniel"; "Rokonstein, Samuel"; Cf. Bernstein, op. cit., p. 247.

(27) Rede Zur Feier des Geburtstags Seiner Majestat des aller-

Kaisers und Konigs, Ferdinand I (V) gehalten in dem israelitischen Tempel zu Pesth, an 19 April, 1840, von Low Schwab, Oberrabiner, Pesth, 1840, p. 10 ff.; M. ZS. L., art. "Schwab, Low"; Buchler, op. cit., p. 432.

(28) See Ferecz Pulszky's articles in the Pesti Hirlap, July 16 and 18, 1847. This highly respected Magyar liberal politician sums up brilliantly the complex problem of Jewish emancipation. In his opinion total emancipation of the Jews is in the interests of Hungary. He admits, however, that he is writing to influence the deputies at the Diet of 1847-8.

(29) Cf. Der Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, May 21, 1848.

(30) See Appendix II. The original text is confused. The meaning seems to be that the Jews are not a nation living amid the Hungarian people but that they are Hungarians of the Jewish faith. The proclamation is quoted verbatim by Bernstein, op. cit., p. 39. See the remarkable similarity between this proclamation and that of the Moravian leader Hirsch quoted by Salo W. Baron, in his article "The Revolution of 1848 and Jewish Scholarship" in Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, XX (1951), p. 40.

(31) The truth of the matter is that the instructions given to the majority of the deputies of this last Hungarian Diet of 1847-8 were that they should oppose Jewish emancipation; cf. Bernstein: Az 1848-9-iki szabadsagharc in "Studies in Honor of Dr. Blau" quoted above. See also Ballagi: op. cit., p. 8, where the events are given in great detail and are well documented, and Venetianer, op. cit.; Bernstein, p. 164, 168 ff.; A zsidokerdes 1848 elott, also in "Studies in Honor of Dr. Blau," p. 65; Cf. Zs. Groszman's article, "Emancipacio" in M. ZS. L.

(32) Minutes of the general meeting in the Archives of the Congregation of Pest. Zsp. II. 1848, quoted by Buchler, op. cit., p. 410. This committee dealt in secret with the reformers. On July 26, they decided to invite Einhorn to their meetings. And in their circular dated July 31 and addressed to all the congregations of the land, they recommended "Der Ungarische Israelit," the mouthpiece of the reform movement, as a most worthy Jewish weekly deserving of widespread patronage. Buchler, op. cit., p. 425.

(33) Low, Gesammelte Schriften, V. 108, ff. IV, 353-69. Bernstein, op. cit., 219; Buchler, op. cit., 440;

Venetianer, op. cit., 148ff.; Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, VIII (1844), 452.

(34) Kozlony (Information), August 19, 1848; Einhorn, op. cit., p. 55, 105; A. Z. d. J., XII (1848), 511; Erno Ballagi, op. cit., p. 17 ff.; Venetianer, op. cit., 172 ff.

(35) M. ZS. SZ., 1894, p. 286.

(36) Minutes of the Jewish Community of Pest, March 26 and April 8, 1848; quoted by M. ZS. SZ., 1898, p. 58.

NOTES

CHAPTER THREE

(1) Einhorn, op. cit., p. 109; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 226.

(2) A. Z. d. J., XII (1848), 288; Einhorn, op. cit., loc. cit. Buchler, op. cit., p. 446.

(3) Bernstein, op. cit., p. 226; Buchler, op. cit., p. 450.

(4) Der Ungarishe Israelit, April 16, 1848. Special supplement: "Anruf an die hochherzige ung. Universitäts-jugend mosaischer Confession." This weekly was founded by Einhorn.

(5) Pester Zeitung, April 20, 1848.

(6) Marton Diosy (1818-1892), was a well-known journalist who played a prominent role in the life of the Jewish community of Pest. During the feverish days of 1848 he became a secretary in the Office of the Prime Minister, and during the Revolution was Kossuth's secretary. After the defeat of the Hungarian cause he emigrated to London where he became a wine merchant. Cf. Ferencz Pulszky,

Eletem es Korom (My Life and My Age), 2 vols., Budapest, 1881, II, 7; M. ZS. L., art. "Diosy, Marton"; Dr. Henry Pollak (1821-94) was a physician by profession. He was a well-known patriot, humanist and prominent Jewish religious and communal leader to the last days of his life. M. ZS. L., art. "Pollak, Henrik"; of all the other members of the committee, with the exception of Einhorn, of course, no data are available in New York.

(7) Der Ungarishe Israelit, April 28, 1848.

(8) Pesti Hirlap, May 3, 1848.

(9) Der Israelit des XIX Jahrhundrets, 1848, p. 164.

(10) Der Ungarische Israelit, June 25, 1848; Der Orient, 1848, p. 149, 195.

(11) Der Ungar, August 16, 1848.

(12) Bernstein, op. cit., p. 229.

(13) "How many were at the meeting and who were the people could not be established," according to Bernstein, op. cit., loc. cit.

(14) Einhorn, op. cit., p. 109.

(15) Der Ungarische Israelit, July 12, 1848; Pesti Hirlap, July 14, 1848.

(16) Announcement by the Reform Society dated August 4, 1848, published in Pesti Hirlap, August 10, 1848. It is quoted verbatim in Der Orient, 1848, p. 279.

(17) On Einhorn, see supra, Chapter One, note (37) and infra, Chapter Three, note (47).

(18) Buchler, op. cit., p. 458.

(19) See the comprehensive articles, probably written by Einhorn, in A. Z. d. J., X (1846), 351, 513.

(20) A. Z. d. J., VI (1842), 204; IX (1845), 345; X (1846), 600.

(21) The date of the Opinion is August 11, 1848. Against it wrote Holdheim:

Das Gutachten des H. L. Schwab, Rabbiner zu Pest, uber die Reformgenossenschaft daselbst. Berlin, 1848. Einhorn attacked him, too, in his: Einige Bemerkungen uber die Gutachten des Herrn L. Schwab, Rabbiner der Israelitischen Gemeinde zu Pest, von J. Einhorn,

Rabbiner der Isr. Reformgenossenschaft daselbst. Pest, 1848. Both David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, New York, 1907, p. 385, and Salo W. Baron, op. cit., p. 84, overlooked this important publication of Schwab's.

(22) For Baron: op. cit., loc. cit., to describe Schwab as a reformer is manifestly misleading.

(23) Minutes of the Jewish Community of Pest, 1848, 1073, quoted by Bernstein, op. cit., p. 237.

(24) Barnay, the Secretary of the Jewish community, was there and he writes: "Es ist in demselben durchaus nicht der Typus einer Judischen Kirche zu erkennen. Man ist hier wohl in keiner christlichen, aber auch in keiner judischen Kirche." Bernstein, op. cit., p. 237.

(25) Der Ungar, September 26, 1848. "Vorlaufiges Kirchen-reglement fur die Pesther Israelitische Reformgemeinde."

(26) J. Einhorn: Grundprinzipien einer gelauterten Reform im Judenthume, Pest, 1848. The Introduction is dated November 10, 1848. This pamphlet is divided into eight chapters: (1) Das Reform Prinzip; (2) Die Aufgabe des

Judenthums; (3) Unser Streben; (4) Unsere Religionsquellen; (5) Allgemeine Religions- und Sittenlehre; (6) Das Zeremonialgesetz im Allgemeinem; (7) Einige Zeremonialgesetze besonders; (8) Der öffentliche Gottensdienst.

(27) Einhorn: Grundprinzipien, pp. 40-55.

(28) A reformalt Izraelita Vallas elvei (The Principles of the Reformed Israelite Religion) by Ignatz Einhorn, Preacher of the Hungarian Reform Society, Pest, 1849.

(29) Even Low in his introduction to the already cited Zsido Vallaselvek (Principles of the Jewish Faith), Papa, 1848, p. 3, declares: "Emancipation and reform are indivisible."

(30) See Erno Ballagi, op. cit., p. 13. He deals in some detail with the extensive literature that appeared dealing with the subject, "no emancipation without religious reformation." See also M. ZS. SZ., 1936, p. 180, where Bela Bernstein deals with the same subject.

(31) Bernstein, op. cit., p. 240.

(32) Philipson, op. cit., p. 382, is manifestly wrong when he

says: "However, although there is no likelihood that religious reform was entered upon with the thought to secure civil emancipation thereby, still there can be no doubt that the movement for civil emancipation gave an impetus to the institution of religious reforms." Cf. also Einhorn, Die Revolution, passim, and Groszman's article: "Reform Hitkozseg" (Reform Congregation), in M. ZS. L., pp. 784-5.

(33) See Philipson, op. cit., p. 387 ff.; Venetianer, op. cit., 154, who deal with the Arad reformers in some detail.

(34) Pesti Hirlap, May 3, 1848.

(35) 300 Jewish families lived there, according to Einhorn, Zur Judenfrage in Ungarn, Ofen, 1847, p. 16.

(36) Details in Philipson, op. cit., p. 389ff.

(37) Der Israelit des XIX Jahrhund., 1848, pp. 164 and 181.

(38) See Baron, op. cit., p. 83.

(39) City Archives of Pecs, 1848, No. 5126. Archives of the congregation of Pecs, No. 897, quoted by Bernstein, op. cit., 247.

(40) M. ZS. L., art. "Pecs."

(41) Einhorn, Die Revolution und die Juden in Ungarn, p. 48.

(42) Bernstein, op. cit., p. 248.

(43) Schreiber, op. cit., p. , quotes passages and part of Brick's program. It is a radical program, very similar to that of the Pest Reform Society. The Sabbath was transferred to Sunday, male worshippers had to uncover their heads during worship, dietary laws were abolished, etc.; Cf. M. ZS. L., art. "Nagybecskerek"; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 250; Concerning the minor external reforms executed by Moses Brock in Lugoss, see A. Z. d. J., XI (1847), 347, and Einhorn, op. cit., p. 110.

(44) See Philipson, op. cit., p. 387.

(45) Kozlony (Information), June 25, 1849. The Reform Society kept a Registry of Births and Marriages. In four years there were 62 births and 5 marriages. A Registry of Deaths was not kept. Perhaps because they did not have their own cemetery.

(46) Archives of the City of Pest, 1849, Mixed Bundle No. 25, Serial No. 1436, quoted by Buchler, op. cit., p. 449.

(47) In 1850 we find him in Leipzig. He wrote there his Die Revoluzion und die Juden in Ungarn, a fairly useful work. In 1852 he was active as a journalist in Brussels, while a little later he moved to paris. There he won recognition as journalist of distinction. He also played a prominent part among the Hungarian refugees in the French capital. In Brussels he got married, and true to his published views that Jews should intermarry, he married a Catholic woman. His two daughters were brought up as Catholics, and both his sons, Emil and Odon, as Jews, who, however, converted to Catholicism early in their youth. Einhorn returned to Hungary in 1869 where he was immediately elected Member of Parliament. In 1874 he was appointed Under Secretary of State for Commerce, a year later he died. M. ZS. L., art. "Horn, Ede"; "Horn, Emil"; "Horn Odon"; Bernstein, op. cit., p. 323. See supra, Chapter One, note (37).

(48) David Einhorn, rabbi, foremost leader of reform, writer and great preacher was born in Dispeak, Bavaria, Germany, in 1809, and died in New York City in 1879. Received the title "Morenu" at the age of seventeen from the Yeshivah at Fürth, and continued his studies at the Universities

of Wurzburg and Munich. His liberal views brought him into conflict with both the Orthodox Jews and the conservative governments of Germany. At the Rabbinical Conferences (Frankfurt and Breslau, 1845-46), he manifested fervid enthusiasm for reform. To escape from religious and political conservatism he gladly accepted the call of the Reform Society of Pest (1852). Of his activities there very little is known. After the disappearance of the Society not long after his arrival Einhorn left for the United States where he became the rabbi of the then small Har Sinai congregation in Baltimore. Under his leadership it soon became one of the leading Reform congregations in the United States. He was the editor of Sinai magazine (1856-62) which spread his influence through the East. In 1858 he published his prayer-book "Olath Tamid," which was the prayer-book used for many years by Reform organizations. He was a vigorous opponent of slavery, had to flee for his life, and took refuge in Philadelphia (1861). There he became rabbi of the Kenesseth Israel Congregation. Five years later he accepted a call to the Adath Yeshurun Congregation in New York City, where

he remained in active service until a few months before his death. He wrote in addition to many articles and essays Prinzip des Mosaismus und desser Verhältniss Zum Heidenthum und rabbinischen Judenthum, Leipzig, 1854. (Based on art. "Einhorn, David" in the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 4.)

(49) M. ZS. L., "Reform Egylet" (Reform Society); Buchler, op. cit., p. 465; Venetianer, op. cit., p. 168.

(50) M. ZS. L., loc. cit; Buchler, op. cit.; Venetianer, op. cit., loc. cit.

(51) Der Orient, 1850, p. 4; A. Z. d. J., XV (1851), 327.

(52) A. Z. d. J., XV (1851), 488; XVI (1852), 6.

(53) The whole text of the proposed constitution can be found in Low, op. cit., pp. 225-74.

(54) Low, op. cit., p. 186 ff.; M. ZS. L., art. "Pest."

(55) Archives of the City of Pest, No. 6678, 1852, quoted by Buchler, op. cit., p. 480; Cf. A. Z. d. J., XV (1851), 270. The order for the closing down the Society's Temple

is quoted verbatim by Low, op. cit., p. 186.

(56) "Liquidations-Comite der ehemaligen Pester Genossenschaft fur Reform in Judenthum."

CONCLUSION

With the disappearance of this radical Reform Society of Pest religious reform, as conceived by the German theologians and as realized in the United States, remained unknown in Hungary to our own day.

The Reform Society's main contribution to Hungarian Jewish life during its brief existence was not in the field of religion but in the political and cultural fields. All its members were devoted fighters for Jewish political and civil rights, and all of them were zealous Hungarian patriots. It was these young men who were the standard-bearers, par excellence, of the magyarization of Pest Jewry, a mostly Judeo-German and German-speaking population. It was in their synagogue that the first Hungarian sermon was delivered. In the field of religion, however, they, together with the four other reform congregations, went to extremes; their ultra-radical movement was not a response to the inner spiritual cravings of a substantial part of Hungarian Jewry.

What the Jews in the larger urban areas needed at the time was a slowly developing moderate reforming process which would eliminate the anachronisms of Jewish life, inside and outside the synagogue. Because of their haste and extremes,

the reformers could not realize this goal.

Furthermore, their movement was so intimately connected with political and social emancipation that they were not unjustly charged with tampering with their ancient heritage for political and social expediency.

Thus, after four and a half years of valiant striving, the reformers were obliged to relinquish their program and aims, and close their temple. They faded from Hungarian Jewish life, which thereafter resumed its traditionalist mode of religious practice. However, some of the rabbis continued to preach in the vernacular and some cantors were still accompanied by male choirs; nevertheless, in a general way, the basic authority of the Shulchan Aruch was officially recognized as binding by the practicing rabbis and their respective congregations.[1]

But after emancipation in 1867, the latent disaffection from the official and rigid Judaism based on the Shulchan Aruch came to the fore.

On February 16, 1868, Baron Joseph Eotvos, Minister of Education and Religion,[2] called a small representative group of Jewish lay leaders into conference, and urged upon them the convocation of a national congress for the purpose of regulating

the organization of the Jewish communities and schools. The Congress met on December 16, 1868, in Budapest. Although this Congress of 220 deputies was convoked for the sole purpose of regulating the administrative and organizational life of Hungarian Jewry, nonetheless, it was soon obvious that religion and purely religious matters were to play an important and decisive part in its deliberations and decisions.

The orthodox element consistenly viewed educational and civil matters in the light of strict Jewish tradition. On religious grounds, this orthodox minority refused to agree to the establishment of Jewish congregational (parochial) schools, a teacher training college, or a theological seminary for the training of rabbis. And when on February 5, 1869, the Congress refused to recognize the Shulchan Aruch as the basis of Judaism, the forty-eight orthodox deputies left the chambers. Nonetheless, the Congress continued in session until February 24, 1869, with complete victory for the progressives.[3] The orthodox congregations rendered a strong minority report. When it was presented to the Minister of Education and Religion the orthodox representatives informed him that they would never abide by the decision of the Congressional majority. Parliament, however, approved only the majority report of Congress and granted a

single charter for Hungarian Jewry. The National Israelite Chancery was established to represent all the Jewish congregations in Hungary. This law was put into operation when the King ratified the Act on June 14, 1869. Eotvos immediately warned the orthodox congregations that they must obey the law. The orthodox, insisting on freedom of conscience and religion, spurned the admonitions of the Minister. A long struggle ensued. Eventually Parliament recognized the grievances of the orthodox and granted them a separate charter in 1871. They, too, soon organized themselves on a national scale and established the Orthodox Israelite Chancery.[4] The congregations which declined to join any of these national organizations continued with their religious life just as they did before Congress was convoked; they called themselves "status quo ante" congregations, and received their charter from Parliament in 1929.[5]

Thus it came to pass that Hungarian Jewry was split into three main religious, educational and cultural groups: the "Congress" (commonly called "neolog") congregations, the orthodox congregations, and the "status quo ante" congregations.

How unprepared Hungarian Jewry was for reform, as the term was used in Germany and the United States, is manifest

in the official declarations of the progressive "Congress" party. They consistently maintained[6] that the Shulchan Aruch was the guide if not the basis of their Judaism, and that the foundation of their religious life was Jewish tradition. However, these were but official declarations. In practice they deviated both from tradition and from the Shulchan Aruch in many respects. In the "neolog" temples the rabbi wore a gown and his head was covered with a "biretta." He preached in Hungarian, and not necessarily on the Sidra of the week, and only rarely on halacha. The choir, often mixed, was accompanied by an organ; many piyyutim and prayers were omitted, and more and more prayers were recited in Hungarian. Marriages were performed in the temple; at funerals songs were recited, and in the cemeteries ornate crypts and floral decorations were sanctioned.[7]

Hungarian Jewry, neolog, orthodox, and "status quo" were about to settle down to a more or less religiously traditionalist, conservative practice when a final attempt was made to challenge this traditionalist world of the Magyar Jews.

Towards the end of the year 1884, the scholarly rabbi of the neolog congregation of Ujpest,[8] Rabbi Albert Stern[9]

(later he magyarized his name to Sterenyi), expressed such radical reform views from his pulpit that he was forced to resign. He immediately began to organize a reform congregation on the American model.[10] By February 8, 1885, about three hundred[11] persons, mostly lawyers, functionaries and business employees, met in Budapest and founded the Reformed Israelite Church (=Egyhaz). They elected a temporary slate of officers and trustees, who were empowered to ask the Minister of Education and Religion to approve their program and by-laws, and to grant them a charter so that they, too, like the neolog and orthodox congregations could have absolute religious autonomy.[12]

This petition of the Reformed Israelite Church began by informing the Minister that about three hundred citizens of Budapest "met and decided that the reformation of the Jewish religion was an urgent necessity. This reformation was necessary in order to save the Jewish religion from being wrecked on the one hand, and to harmonize synagogal services, with the realities of daily life, on the other." It further expressed the hope that this Church in Budapest would soon become the prototype for many more throughout Hungary. The reformers justified their founding of a new Church by saying

that they really did not want anything new, neither did they want to deprive Judaism of its basic principles. On the contrary, this new movement sought to restore Judaism to its pristine purity by eliminating customs and ceremonies that were not in harmony with the spirit of the age. Their program, furthermore, differed from that of the former Reform Society of Pest on two important points. First, Hebrew would be used in the services extensively, and second, the vernacular used during the services would be Hungarian exclusively.[13] The petition was signed by Rabbi Albert Sterenyi, Dr. Andrew Nagy, Secretary pro tem, and Dr. Simon Herzfeld, President pro tem.

Attached to the petition was their program, or, as it was called by the Church, "The Basic Tenets of the Church." It ran as follows:[14]

(1) The basic laws of the Church are the Laws of Moses.

(2) Of the Laws of Moses the following are obsolete and not valid any longer:

(a) the dietary laws (with the exception, that the eating of unleavened bread on the first day of Passover is obligatory).

(b) the laws concerning the cessation of work on the Sabbath or Holidays. (On Rosh Hashanah

and Yom Kippur, however, cessation from work is obligatory.)

(c) marriage laws that conflict with the laws of the state.

(3) Neither the Talmud nor the post-talmudical literature has authority any longer.

(4) Only the laws of the land are to be obeyed in one's relationship with one's fellow man and the state.

(5) The mother's religion determines the religion of a child. Circumcision is obligatory, although it should never serve as a criterion to determine whether one is Jewish or not.

(6) Confirmation at the age of thirteen is introduced for both sexes.

(7) The Church does not recognize the second day of any holiday except that of Rosh Hashanah.

(8) The vernacular of the divine services in the synagogue is to be Hungarian.

(9) Women take part in the divine services on equal footing with men.

(10) The Bill of Divorcement ("Get") is optional. "Chalitza" is unnecessary.

(11) At funerals, "Kaddish" must be recited by the Rabbi or his deputy. All other usual ceremonies are not obligatory.

(12) "Shiva" is reduced from seven days to one day. If so demanded by the family of the departed, prayers may be recited for the deceased.

The Minister of Education and Religion requested (June 8, 1885) the National Israelite Chancery to render an opinion on that part of the Church's petition which dealt with its laws and dogmas. Uncertain of their qualifications, the Chancery transmitted (June 11, 1885) the Minister's request to the Faculty of the National Rabbinical Seminary in Budapest.[15]

The Faculty's Opinion, rendered on November 3, 1885, was signed by the president, Dr. Moses Bloch and by the secretary, Dr. William Bacher. The conclusion of this Opinion was as follows:

"... these very principles, creeds and arguments which are found in this program immediately exclude this Reformed Israelite Church from Jewry. Neither can it be called Israelite as the word is commonly known by scientific and popular definition.... What we are dealing with is

certainly a new doctrine, for they arbitrarily select and reject religious laws, thus denying the dogmatic foundations of Judaism; hence it lacks historic foundations, and therefore it cannot be described as a positive religion...."[16]

Trefort, the Minister of Education and Religion, convinced by the Faculty's arguments that this new Church had nothing to do with Judaism, considered the Reformed Israelite Church an attempt to found an absolutely new religion. He therefore refused it his recognition (January 12, 1886).[17]

Thus it came to pass that once again governmental intervention, urged and supported by the established Jewish ecclesiastical and theological order, nipped in the bud this last attempt to form a Jewish reform movement in the land of the Magyars.

NOTES

CONCLUSION

(1) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 270.

(2) Ibid., p. 287; M. ZS. L., art. "Zsido kongresszus" (Jewish Congress).

(3) Venetianer, op. cit., p. 298; Philipson, op. cit., p. 395; M. ZS. L., bc. cit.

(4) M. ZS. L., loc. cit.; also art. "Kongresszusi szervezet" (Congressional Organization); "Orthodox szervezet" (Orthodox Organization); Venetianer, op. cit., p. 330; Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, art. "Hungary," passim.

(5) M. ZS. L., art. "Status quo ante."

(6) Ibid., art. "Neolog."

(7) Ibid., loc. cit.

(8) Ujpest (=New Pest) was a growing, prosperous, industrial city not far from Budapest. All its industries were founded by Jews. The membership of the neolog congregation

comprised two hundred families. The small orthodox congregation was established in 1866. M. ZS. L., art. "Ujpest."

(9) Rabbi Albert Stern was born in Nagykanizsa, Hungary, in 1826 and died in O Buda (Alt-Ofen) in 1888. He studied in the well-known Yeshivoth of Pozsony (Pressburg) and O Buda, where he received his ordination as rabbi. His father-in-law was the distinguished Rabbi Fassel Hirsch, Chief Rabbi of Nagykanizsa. Stern was elected (1850) rabbi in Lengyeltoti, from where he went (1867) to Ujpest to occupy the pulpit of the neolog congregation there. He was a gifted scholar and a theologian of repute. He was the editor of the Hebrew magazine Hamishmar of which only three volumes appeared (1877-79). In accordance with his strong assimilationist views he changed his name to "Sterenyi" (according to M. ZS. L., "Szterenyi"). His two sons, Hugo Szterenyi, a noted biologist and Baron Joseph Szterenyi, a wealthy industrialist and a former Minister of State, left the ancestral faith and embraced Christianity. M. ZS. L., art. "Stern Albert," "Szterenyi Hugo," "Szterenyi Jozsef, baron"; Venetianer, op. cit., 375ff. From none of the available sources could I find out who Dr. Andrew Nagy and Dr. Simon Härzfeld were.

(10) Cf. A. Z. d. J., XLIX (1885), 157, where it is erroneously reported: "The former rabbi of Ujpest, Albert Sterenyi (sic !) has been very busy the last few months trying to organize a reform congregation on the model of the Reform Society of Berlin."

(11) Ibid., loc. cit., is definitely wrong when it says: "He succeeded in winning over to his cause over one hundred people, mostly lawyers, functionaries and business employees." The correct number is "approximately three hundred." What is the basis of this statement?

(12) M. ZS. SZ., 1886, p. 145 ff.; Members also called this Church the "Mosaic Society," according to A. Z. d. J., loc. cit., p. 719.

(13) M. ZS. SZ., loc. cit.

(14) Ibid., loc. cit.

(15) Ibid., loc. cit.; A. Z. d. J., XLIX (1885), 529.

(16) M. ZS. SZ., loc. cit.; A. Z. d. J., L (1886), 59; Venetianer, op. cit., loc. cit.

(17) A. Z. d. J., loc. cit., 408; "On the occasion of a

Parliamentary banquet given at the residence of Herr Wahrman, president of the Jewish Community of Buda-Pesth, and a member of the Chamber of Deputies, the Minister Herr von Trefort observed: 'I shall never recognize this Jewish Reform sect as a legal body. It appears to me that the moral interests of the State demand that everyone shall remain loyal to his religion. It is also true that no service can be rendered to the morality and the loyalty of citizens by an arbitrary idea of reform. Whosoever seeks to swindle God/brings into suspicion his fidelity as a citizen,' quotes the Jewish Chronicle of London, February 26, 1886."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Joseph Bach, Homiletische Erstlinge. Pest, 1827.

Erno Ballagi, "A magyarorszagi zsido-emancipacio elozmenyei" (The Historical Preliminaries of the Jewish Emancipation in Hungary) in Emlekkonyv nehai Dr. Kohn Samuel pesti forabbi szuletesenek 100-ik evfordulojara (Memorial Volume in Celebration of the One hundredth Anniversary of the Late Chief Rabbi of Pest, Dr. Samuel Kohn), Budapest, 1941.

Geza Ballagi, A nemzeti allamalkotas koro (The Period of Hungarian National Regeneration, 1815-1847), Budapest, 1897.

Salo W. Baron, "The Revolution of 1848 and Jewish Scholarship," in Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research, XX, 1951.

Akos Beothy, A magyar allamisag fejlodese, kuzdelmei (The Development and Struggles of Hungarian Statehood.) 3 vols., Budapest, 1900-1906.

Bela Bernstein, Az 1848-49-iki magyar szabadsagharcz es a zsidok (The Hungarian War of Independence of 1848-49 and the Jews), Budapest, 1898.

Bela Bernstein, A zsidokerdes 1848 elott (The Jewish Question Before 1848) in Tanulmanyok Blau Lajos emlekere (Studies in Memory of Ludovic Blau), Budapest, 1938.

Sandor Büchler, A zsidok tortenete Budapesten (The History of the Jews in Budapest), Budapest, 1901.

Ignatz Einhorn, Zur Judenfrage in Ungarn, Ofen, 1848.

_____, Die Revolution und die Juden in Ungarn, Leipzig, 1850.

_____, Grundprinzipien einer geläuterten Reform in Judenthume, Pest, 1848.

_____, A reformalt izraelita vallas elvei (The Principles of the Reformed Israelite Religion), Pest, 1849.

E. O. S., Hungary and Its Revolutions, London, 1848.

Baron Jozsef Eotvos, Beszedei (His Speeches), 3 vols., Budapest, 1886.

Gyula Farkas, A "fiatal Magyarorszag" kora (The Age of "Young Hungary"), Budapest, 1932.

Elek Fenyes, Magyarorszag Statistikaja (The Statistics of Hungary), 3 vols., Pest, 1842.

Janos Hetenyi, Robot es Dezsma (Corvee and Tithe.) Pest, 1845.

Mihaly Horvath, Huszonotev Magyarorszag tortenetebol 1823-tol 1848-ig (Twenty Five Years of Hungarian History, 1823-48), 3 vols., Budapest, 1868.

Leopold Löw, Zsido Vallaselvek (Jewish Principles of Religion), Papa, 1848.

_____, Der Jüdische Congress in Ungarn, Pest, 1871.

_____, Zur neuern Geschichte der Juden in Ungarn, ~~6 vols.,~~ Budapest, 1874.

_____, Gesammelte Schriften, 5 vols., Szeged, 1889-1900.

H. Marczali, Magyarorszag tortenete II Jozsef koraban (The History of Hungary During the Reign of Joseph II), Budapest, 1885.

_____, A legujabb kor tortenete, 1825-1880 (The History of Modern Times, 1825-80), Budapest, 1892.

_____, Hungary in the Eighteenth Century, Cambridge, 1910.

Lajos Mocsary, Magyar tarsas elet (Hungarian Social Life), Pest, 1856.

Imre Palugyay, A megye rendszer hajdan es most (The County System Past and Present), 2 vols., Pest, 1844.

David Philipson, The Reform Movement in Judaism, New York, 1907. Ed. 1931 was to be used.

Ferencz Pulszky, Eletem es Korom (My Life and My Age), 2 vols., Budapest, 1881.

I. Reich, Beth El, 2 vols., Budapest, 1868.

Emanuel Schreiber, Reformed Judaism and its Pioneers, Spokane, Wash., 1892.

Gyula Szekfu, Magyar Tortenet (Hungarian History), 7 vols., Budapest, 1934.

Lajos Venetianer, A magyar zsidosag tortenete (The History of Hungarian Jewry), Budapest, 1922.

LEXICONS

Magyar Zsido Lexicon (Hungarian Jewish Lexicon), Budapest,

Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1948.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums.

Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung.

Budapesti Szemle (The Budapest Observer).

Der Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.

The Jewish Chronicle, London.

Kozlony (Information).

Magyar Zsido Szemle (The Hungarian Jewish Observer).

Nemzeti Ujsag (The National Gazette).

Der Orient.

Pesti Hirlap (The Pest Gazette).

Pester Zeitung.

Der Ungar.

Der Ungarische Israelit.

Vilag (Light).

ABBREVIATIONS

A. Z. d. J. = Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 1837.

M. ZS. L. = Magyar Zsido Lexicon, 1929.

M. ZS. SZ. = Magyar Zsido Szemle, 1883.

APPENDIX I

Proclamation of the National Executive Committee

Honored Compatriots! Great events have just taken place which almost everywhere else was accompanied by bloodshed. Let it be mentioned to the honor of our two brotherly countries and their capital cities that the great changes that took place in this country were executed by the unanimous good will of the people, by peaceful and legal means. Similar success, we hope, shall follow all over the land, based on the energetic but sober-minded love of freedom of the Hungarian people.

Neither during the great event nor now is any discrimination due to rank, person or religion noticeable. We have seen how the brave Jewish student element, together with all the other segments of the Jewish urban population, from the very first moment, united with the rest of the people; some of them even occupying important positions within the ranks of the temporary Peoples Council; many of them, truly armed, are performing their duty as members of the National Guard. They are Hungarians and not Jews by nationality. All of us shall only then be regarded as a denomination when our prayer-houses shall serve only as places where we pour forth our thanks and innermost gratitude to the Almighty for the

great mercies bestowed on our country and our own selves. But in any other aspect of life, both political and social, all segregation must cease, for we are nothing but citizens (honfiak) and magyars, since our country received us to her bosom and makes us equal with her other inhabitants. Lo and behold! What a half century ago the Legislature only envisaged, now, thank God, became a reality.

Beloved co-religionists! The Jewish communities, because of these glorious events, ceased to exist as closed corporations; there shall be no need for them to fight any longer against restrictions and discrimination, for, thank God, all the inhabitants of the land have only one law. One kind of measure is used for all of them. Namely, is he a man of honor, and is he a Hungarian?

The Jewish communities, henceforth, as the Jewish community of Pest has already done, will exist and function as a cultural entity only. Their sole duty is to execute these thoughts and to interpret them correctly. It is their duty, furthermore, to encourage their members to join the national movement with a pure heart and a strong will. It is incumbent upon them to warn their members that all this should be performed without overzealous eagerness or unnecessary obsequiousness. They should behave calmly and with dignity. In short, they should behave as becomes decent, law-abiding citizens.

APPENDIX II

The Law of Emancipation of 1848

In the name of the Fatherland. An Act has been passed by Parliament concerning the Jews. It reads as follows:

Law Concerning the Jews

1. Based on the principle that no discrimination exists against any citizen due to his religion, it is hereby declared that all those persons of the Mosaic faith who were born in this country or were allowed to settle here according to the law are henceforth to enjoy all political and civil rights just as the other citizens of other faiths do.
2. The conditions upon which people can settle here shall be temporarily regulated by the government by Orders in Council.
3. Marriages contracted between Christians and persons of the Mosaic faith are henceforth to be regarded as valid by the law of the realm. Such marriages are to be performed by secular authorities. The temporary rules and

regulations of such civil marriages will be prescribed by Orders in Council.

4. The Minister of the Interior is hereby instructed to call a conference, consisting of rabbis and elected representatives of the people, whose duty should be partly to declare their religious tenets and reform them, and partly to make the necessary improvements in their future ecclesiastical organization, which improvements should be in consonance with the spirit of the times.

The execution of this Law is ordered upon the condition that, subject to suitable regulations, people of the Mosaic faith will be guided to practice handicraft and agriculture.

LEOPOLD PALOCZY
Speaker of the Lower House

I hereby proclaim this Law. I order and command that everybody respect it, obey it, and act according to its provisions. The Minister of the Interior is hereby ordered to execute it.

Szegedin, July 28, 1849.

LUDOVIC KOSSUTH
Lord High Governor

Countersigned:
BERTHOLOMEW SZEMERE
Minister of the Interior