

**The Origins of Jewish Emancipation in Hungary:  
The Role of Baron Joseph Eötvös\***

Slightly over a century ago, in 1867, an act of the Hungarian Parliament declared that "the Jewish population of the country is herewith to be regarded as equal to the Christian population in the exercise of all civil and political rights;" and that "all statutes, customs and decrees contradictory to this [law] are null and void"<sup>1</sup>. This was a great achievement, behind which lay long decades of struggle, frustration and defeat. There were many who had fought for this cause, but when emancipation came, no one could claim more credit than the great Magyar thinker, statesman and reformer, Baron Joseph Eötvös.

Surprisingly, emancipation came almost as a matter of course in 1867<sup>2</sup>. Most of the debate and struggle occurred during the 1830's and 1840's, and few would question that the foundations for Jewish emancipation were laid at that time. Consequently, even though the appraisal of the events of 1867 may be put into historical perspective it is necessary to look at the period of the Hungarian *Vormärz* and to examine the beginnings of Jewish emancipation, including Eötvös's role therein. Such an examination, however, must be preceded by a brief discussion of the position of Hungarian Jewry during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, including some remarks about earlier centuries as well.

1

Jews have resided in the country ever since the beginnings of the Hungarian state<sup>3</sup>, and some of them may even have accompanied the conquering Magyars to the Carpathian Basin<sup>4</sup>. During the thousand years of

---

\* I wish to record my gratitude to Professors P. S. Wandycz (Yale University), P. T. Mason (Dequesne University) and T. L. Szendrey (Gannon College) for their respective comments and helpful suggestions in the preparation of this study.

<sup>1</sup> Act XVIII: 1867, in: *Weszprémy* pp. 42—43; 1865 — 7 — *dik évi* p. 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Venetiáner* pp. 247—251.

<sup>3</sup> A thorough, detailed and scholarly survey of the history of Hungarian Jews is still lacking. *Venetiáner's* above-cited work is a good summary, but is too short and undocumented. The one major undertaking by *Kóhn A zsidók története* has never been completed. As title of this first volume suggests, it stops in 1526. Most of the other existing works are either cursory surveys, local histories or monographic studies dealing only with specific aspects of Hungarian Jewish life. Some of the most useful, though not always easily accessible studies of general nature on the pre- and post-emancipation periods include: *Löw*; *Kovács*; *László, Nikolaus*; *Róth*; *Sós*; *Márton Az emancipáció*; *Márton A magyar zsidóság*; *Schickert*; *Lévai*; *McCagg Jewish Nobles*. *Ernö Márton's* above-mentioned study *The Family Tree of Hungarian Jewry* has also appeared in English translation in:

living among the Magyars, their position had never been enviable, but it was at least at times tolerable. There were brief periods of persecution now and again, some of them even worse than the eighteenth century, when the Hungarian Jews reached one of their most difficult periods, as did European Jewry in general<sup>5</sup>. In Hungary this low point was a result of the expulsion of the Turks and the extension of Catholic Habsburg rule over the Carpathian Basin.

Pressures against Hungarian Jewry already had begun during the Wars of Liberation (1683—1699). In 1689 Cardinal Leopold Kollonitsch proposed to Emperor Leopold I that certain restrictive measures be introduced against them, in order to free the country from their presence<sup>6</sup>. Apparently, the increasing pressure from Vienna failed to win for them the sympathy of the Magyars, since not even Ferenc Rákóczy's *kurucz* rebels were favorably disposed toward the Jews<sup>7</sup>.

In the course of the eighteenth century a large majority of the royal free boroughs expelled them, and they were not permitted to reside within seven miles of any mining town. Nor could they engage in manufacture or industry. Their activities were restricted to petty trade, usury and to the distilling and selling of alcohol<sup>8</sup>. In 1716 Emperor Charles VI, con-

---

HJS (1966) pp. 1—59. This volume contains two other relevant studies: László, Ernő pp. 61—136; Katzburg Hungarian Jewry, pp. 137—170. In addition there are a number of relatively recent articles, written outside Hungary, which throw some light on this period of Hungarian Jewish history. These include among others the following: Ben-David; Brockwell; sections of Salo W. Baron's two studies: *The Impact, and The Revolution*; Goldhammer; Kann; Katzburg *Anti-Semitism*; idem *The Struggle*; Kutas; Friedmann; Braham *Hungarian Jewry*; idem *Legitimism*; McCagg *Hungary's "Feudalited" Bourgeoisie*; Barany. The most significant collections of documents on Hungarian Jewish history are: Scheiber (Ed.); Kováts, Grünwald, Scheiber (Eds.). The above work covers the period up to the middle of the eighteenth century. The twentieth-century catastrophe is covered by Braham (Ed.) *The Destruction*. No such documentary collection exists for the nineteenth century, and therefore a student of the pre- and post-emancipation period of Hungarian Jewish history must rely heavily on contemporary pamphlets, memoirs, monographic studies, sections of general histories, a few journal articles, and on sources scattered in several documentary collections of various types. Some of these documents, along with numerous excellent articles, are to be found in the journal *MZsSz*, the most important Hungarian Jewish periodical of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century.

<sup>4</sup> Kóhn *A honfoglaló*, pp. 3—10; idem *A zsidók története* pp. 12—26.

<sup>5</sup> In addition to the works of Kóhn; Venetiáner; Kovács; Lévai and Márton cited in note 3, see also the essay *A zsidók Magyarországon*, in: *RNL* vol. 19. pp. 746—748. For the "demoralized" state of the European Jewry during the eighteenth century, see: Graetz vol. 5. pp. 212—267; Dubnow vol. 1. pp. 188—241; 336—389.

<sup>6</sup> Venetiáner pp. 56—57; *RNL* vol. 19. p. 747.

<sup>7</sup> Bernstein *A zsidók története*, pp. 169—170.

<sup>8</sup> For a general description of the Jews in the eighteenth century, see: Marczali *A magyarországi zsidók*, pp. 353—355; Márton *Az emancipáció*, pp. 9—10.

ferring a special favour on the Court banker, made Samson Wertheimer a sort of national chief Rabbi (Landesrabbiner). Being an orthodox and a learned Jew, Wertheimer had even before acted on behalf of his co-religionists; now he gladly accepted this title for their sakes. He also was an advocate of Palestinian Jewry and had, amongst others, the right to the title of "Prince of the Holy Land". Wertheimer's considerable property, as well as his titles, after his death went to his son-in-law, Bernath Eschkeles (Eshkeles). He styled himself "Rabbi of Nikolsburg and Moravia, Eisenstadt and Hungary and of the district of Mayence (Mainz)", but actually had not once been to Hungary. Both these men commanded a considerable influence at Court and were thus able to help with individual complaints or cases. But this did not, in fact, alter and neither did it improve the legal status of Hungarian Jewry in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The death of Bernath Eschkeles in 1753 was followed by the abolition of that office<sup>9</sup>. In the meantime, the growing atmosphere of intolerance<sup>10</sup> and the financial strains of the War of Austrian Succession prompted Empress Maria Theresa to impose upon the Jews the infamous "toleration tax". Though renamed "Kameral Tax" by Joseph II this Jewish blood tax remained in force in Hungary until 1846<sup>11</sup>.

Their shortcomings notwithstanding, the reforms of this enlightened emperor considerably improved the conditions of Hungarian Jewry. He opened up the gates of the royal free boroughs and permitted them to engage in industry; at the same time, they had to serve in the armed forces, to assume German family names, and to educate their children in German schools<sup>12</sup>.

After Joseph II's death, the Hungarian diet of 1790—1791 acquiesced in many of his reforms, and guaranteed to the Jews most of the privileges obtained from this emperor<sup>13</sup>. This action, however, did not elicit a similar display of toleration from the populace. The dislike of the Jews was widespread among them, and this antipathy grew steadily during the first half of the nineteenth century<sup>14</sup>. Paradoxically, the growing dislike of the Jews coincided with the birth and rise of Magyar liberalism, which for the first time put forth the demand for Jewish emancipation.

<sup>9</sup> RNL vol. 19. p. 747.

<sup>10</sup> A climax to this growing intolerance was the notorious "blood trail" of Sáros county in 1764, which was only one of several such, though less publicized, trials. Cf. Kóhn Rituális vérvád, pp. 348—351. Hundreds of related documents are to be found under Miscell. Fasc. 86, no. 612 in the Hungarian National Archives, Budapest.

<sup>11</sup> Marczali A magyarországi zsidók, pp. 355—363; Bernstein Szabadságharc, pp. 23—27; Wespéry pp. 41—42 Marczali Hungary, p. 319.

<sup>12</sup> Marczali A magyarországi zsidók, pp. 355—363; Venetiáner pp. 76—83; Hellbling p. 305.

<sup>13</sup> Leopold II., Decretum I (Anni 1790), Art. 38, in: Wespéry p. 41; Katzburg Hungarian Jewry, pp. 138—139. See also: Venetiáner pp. 85—92.

<sup>14</sup> Hóman, Szekfű vol. 5. pp. 250.

## 2

The rising antipathy toward the Jews was closely linked to the rapid influx of a new element — the poverty-stricken Galician Jew — into the country. Even the uneducated majority among them knew something about Jewish cultural and religious traditions (the “Amharazim”); yet, contemporary Christian sources almost invariably describe them as unsophisticated. Jewish immigration from Galicia had begun during the last decade of Maria Theresa’s rule, when the acquisition of that Polish province opened the passes of the northeastern Carpathians. The various enlightened reforms of Emperor Joseph II gave another impetus to this Jewish immigration, as did the relatively tolerant stand of the Hungarian diet of 1790—1791. Starting with the 1770’s, therefore, the growth of the Jewish minority in Hungary was unusually rapid, and exceeded by far the rate of any other ethnic group. Thus, in 1720 there were only 11,000 Jews in the country. By 1785 their number grew to 75,000, and progressed rapidly after that, reaching 128,000 in 1805, 244,000 in 1840, and 368,000 in 1850. By the end of the century they numbered 826,000 and constituted about five percent of Hungary’s population<sup>15</sup>.

This rapid influx of a group which contemporary Hungarian society regarded as culturally and religiously alien, was in itself sufficient to create resentment. This resentment, in turn, led to the growth of an anti-Jewish sentiment, which subsequently became even more intensified when a growing number of the immigrants began to acquire controlling influence in certain areas of economic activity. To be sure, they were able to do so only because of the full acquiescence of the nobility (“who looked down on industry and commerce although they were ready enough to participate in profiteering”)<sup>16</sup> and the servile status of the peasantry, which prevented the latter from engaging in such activities. But the Christian population failed to understand the reason behind the rapidly acquired economic power of the recently arrived immigrants, and vented its anger in antisemitic manifestations and demonstrations.

Many of the new immigrants became innkeepers, and leased from the landowners privileges (*regalia*) for the wine trade. This transition was so fast that by the early nineteenth century the majority of the inns in the wine-producing Tokaj region were in Jewish hands<sup>17</sup>. Contemporary accounts — including the report of a royal commissioner appointed by Jo-

<sup>15</sup> Weszprémy p. 47; Szekfű Három nemzedék, p. 157; Weidlein (Ed.) p. 9. See also the slightly different statistics, in: László Hungarian Jewry, p. 166.

<sup>16</sup> Kann p. 366. See also Jászi p. 173.

<sup>17</sup> Hóman, Szekfű vol. 5. p. 251; and Szekfű Három nemszedék, p. 157. Innkeeping and the wine trade had been one of the chief occupations of the Hungarian Jews even prior to the great Galician immigration. As an example see their role in the city of Szombathely (Sabaria). Cf. Bernstein A szidók története, p. 254. For a typical contract between a landowner and a Jewish wine merchant see the agreement between József Vácsi and the lord of Szigetvár, May 15, 1800, in: MZsSz 1 (1884) pp. 540—541.

seph II to study the causes of impoverishment among the peasants of northern Hungary — generally contend that the wine trade was responsible for a number of undesirable consequences, such as usury, alcoholism, and a marked decline in the peasants' living conditions. Although these consequences were linked to wine trade itself, especially as it was rapidly growing, the fact that it was now largely in non-Magyar hands contributed much the Hungarians' mounting dislike of the Jews<sup>18</sup>.

The incoming Jews moved from innkeeping to the grain and wool trade, and by the turn of the nineteenth century the immigrants and their descendants gained a near-monopoly over it. The economic boom resulting from the Napoleonic Wars further strengthened their position. This is indicated, among other things, by the fact that references to the so-called *Kornjuden* (grain Jews) in contemporary official documents were becoming more and more numerous<sup>19</sup>. The Jewish grain traders appear to have become almost the sole link between Hungarian rural society and its agricultural markets<sup>20</sup>. Some of them became permanently attached to one or another of the large estates, and were known as *Hausjuden* (house Jews). Others, still known under this name, served several "houses," depending on the size of the estates. Some members of the landed nobility carried this relationship even further. They leased their estates, along with their seigniorial rights over the peasants, to Jewish financiers to free themselves from the burdens of estate administration<sup>21</sup>. This may have been a sound economic move, but it placed the Jewish leaseholders in an unenviable position, comparable to that of the Greek or Armenian tax farmers in the Balkan lands of the Ottoman Empire. The resentment of the peasants was turned against them, and it grew proportionately with the unscrupulousness of a particular leaseholder. The greatest tragedy in this relationship was the misdirected anger of the peasantry, which concentrated not only on the culprit, but on the Hungarian Jews in general.

Such problems notwithstanding, the above picture was only the bright-side of the conditions of the Hungarian Jews. The other side was much

<sup>18</sup> For some contemporary observations on the Jews on the alleged negative effects of the Jewish immigration, see: Csondor; Berzsenyi; Kölcsey vol. 6. pp. 20 ff; Vörösmarty; and Royal Commissioner Joseph Ürményj's report to Emperor Joseph II on the causes of the impoverishment of the Nyitra region in the northern part of Hungary in 1787, in: Marczali Hungary, p. 30.

<sup>19</sup> Fényes vol. 1. p. 82; Hóman, Szekfű vol. 5. p. 250. The reasons for the rapid Jewish economic triumph (among which industriousness and frugality ranked high) are discussed by the contemporary Count Desseffy p. 201. See also: Mérei pp. 35—36.

<sup>20</sup> The Jewish merchant class, which settled primarily along the main grain trade routes in Hungary, constituted the largest single group which traveled abroad during the 1830's and 1840's. Cf. Szekfű Három nemzedék, p. 159; idem Iratok, p. 185.

<sup>21</sup> Csondor pp. 71, 83; Fényes vol. 1. p. 82; Hóman, Szekfű vol. 5. p. 251. For the growing dependence of the Hungarian aristocracy and the wealthier county nobility on Jewish credits, see: Mérei pp. 35—38.

darker, and its shadow loomed ominously over the Jewish people. Contrary to general belief, only a limited number of the incoming Jews were able to reach that degree of affluence which placed them among the well-to-do social classes. Most of them continued to live in misery, privation and ignorance. These less fortunate Jews spent their lives wandering from village to village as petty peddlers, and suffered the hate and contempt of the Christian population<sup>22</sup>. Moreover, all Jews, irrespective of their wealth, lacked civil rights and were subject to many discriminatory measures. Nonetheless, as long as the Hungarian peasants lived under comparable or even worse conditions, the deprivation of the Jews in Hungary was not so conspicuous. But when the peasant classes began to feel the effects of liberalism, attention was bound to be focused on the position of the Jews as well. Men of liberal and humane convictions soon recognized that although "their [the Jews'] sweat fell on this soil, they could not really call this land [Hungary] their own"<sup>23</sup>.

### 3

Although Jewish emancipation had been discussed for several decades, there were no substantial steps taken toward the solution of this question until the diet of 1839—1840. True, there were two consecutive diets during the first decade of the nineteenth century (1807 and 1808) which discussed the Jewish problem, but these debates resulted only in the imposition of additional duties on the Jews, without granting them corresponding rights<sup>24</sup>.

The important reform diet of 1825—1827 pondered the possibility of Jewish emancipation, but it did so amidst an already growing sentiment in favor of curbing the rapid Jewish influx into the country. Although this sentiment did not gain ascendancy at this diet, neither was the proposed reform scheme accepted — even though it stopped short of full emancipation<sup>25</sup>.

The 1820's and 1830's passed without notable achievements, even though at the diet of 1832—1836 some members of the young liberal generation did raise the question of Jewish emancipation<sup>26</sup>. By the time of the diet of 1839—1840, however, conditions had changed considerably. The gradual

<sup>22</sup> In addition to being mistreated by Christian society, the Jewish masses were also exploited by the Jewish oligarchy. This phenomenon was particularly widespread among the Polish and the Galician Jews. Cf. Márton *Az emancipáció*, pp. 8—11. On the wretched conditions of the Jewish lower classes among the recent immigrants to Hungary, see: Eötvös. Eötvös's study on the Jewish emancipation in Hungary will be discussed below.

<sup>23</sup> Eötvös Works, vol. 12. p. 272.

<sup>24</sup> Franz I, Decretum V (Anni 1807), Art. 1, and Decretum VI (Anni 1808), Art. 6. Both, in: *Weszprémy* p. 41. See also: *Venetiáner* p. 94.

<sup>25</sup> For the details of the proposed reform of 1825—1827, see: *Marczali A reformok*, pp. 484—485. See also: Eötvös Works, vol. 12. p. 272.

<sup>26</sup> See *Bartha* p. 157; *Barany Stephen Széchenyi*, pp. 282, 284, 307; *idem Magyar Jew* pp. 4—5; *Venetiáner* pp. 95—96.

rise of capitalism, manifested among others in Count Stephen Széchenyi's economic reform activities, and the growth of liberalism, had created an atmosphere favorable to Jewish emancipation. Given the reluctance of the nobility to engage in economic activities and the absence of a sizable and viable bourgeois class, the Hungarian Jews constituted one of the most significant groups in Hungarian society who were willing and able to accept the challenge presented by the coming of competitive capitalism. Naturally, under these circumstances it was against the interest of the country to keep in partial bondage this ethnic group which was ready to satisfy the demands of the industrial and commercial revolutions<sup>27</sup>. Thus, by 1839—1840, many members of the diet were convinced that the civil status of the Jews must be improved. At this point the main questions were: How extensive should their emancipation be? And, should there be conditions attached to this emancipation?

Regarding the first of these questions, many of the progressives were in favor of granting full legal equality to the Jews. Others, however, favored only partial emancipation<sup>28</sup>. At the same time, however, not even the most vocal liberal spokesmen (with one exception: Joseph Eötvös) proposed emancipation without conditions attached — the most important of these being a definite curb on Jewish immigration.

The idea of limiting Jewish influx into the country was not new in 1840. It had been discussed at the diet of 1825—1827. But more than this, the spokesmen of the Magyar cultural, political and economic renaissance began to call attention to the alleged dangers of this unchecked immigration as early as the latter part of the eighteenth century. Some of these spokesmen looked upon the Jews as potentially dangerous to the emerging Magyar nationality (e. g. A. Dugonics, B. Virág, L. Kuthy); others regarded them simply as economically dangerous (e. g. J. Ürményi, J. Csondor, J. Dessewffy); while still others viewed the growing Jewish influence as a threat to both the economic and the moral well-being of the Magyar nation (e. g. D. Berzsenyi, F. Kölcsey, M. Vörösmarty, I. Széchenyi, L. Kossuth). One of them — Imre Vahot — went so far as to reject Jewish participation in the Magyar literary renaissance<sup>29</sup>. Naturally, under these conditions the

<sup>27</sup> Szekfű Három nemzedék, pp. 246—247. See also the relevant section of Sombart; and a critique of this work by Blau.

<sup>28</sup> Ballagi pp. 499—500.

<sup>29</sup> András Dugonics, a prominent figure of early Magyar literary revival, warned of the dangers of unchecked Jewish immigration as early as 1790. His younger contemporary, the noted writer and historian Benedek Virág, expressed similar fears in 1798, and declared that unless the unlimited Jewish influx is checked, "soon they [the Jews] will be more numerous than the descendants of Árpád [the Magyars]". Cf. Marschalkó p. 30. A generation later Lajos Kuthy saw the Jews (in his novel *Hazai rejtelmek* [Secrets of the Fatherland]) as "the most hated enemy of the Magyar race". Cf. Farkas p. 60. Contrary to the above cited authors, others were less concerned with the so-called racial dangers, and more with the negative economic consequences of unchecked Jewish immigration. Still others believed in the presence of both

atmosphere that surrounded the Jewish immigrants and their descendants (most of whom did not share in the riches of their more fortunate kinsmen) was one of distrust and suspicion. In this friendless and ambivalent atmosphere there was only one voice raised for their unconditional emancipation in the name of justice, freedom and equality: the voice of Baron Joseph Eötvös.

Joseph Eötvös was a unique and lonely figure of his generation<sup>30</sup>. Reared by an artistically inclined, emotional German mother of deep humanitarian convictions, tutored by a former Hungarian Jacobin conspirator of radical political and nationalist leanings, encouraged by the warm friendship of a number of prominent literary and political leaders of the early Magyar national revival period, and motivated by the overpowering influences of French Romanticism with its Hugoesque social Messianism, Eötvös turned out to be "one of the most attractive figures," and "most truly liberal statesmen" of the nineteenth century<sup>31</sup>. His libe-

---

racial and economic dangers. For the views of Joseph Ürményi, János Csondor, Dániel Berzsenyi, Ferencz Kölcsey, Mihály Vörösmarty and Count Joseph Desseffy see the sources cited in footnotes 18 and 19 above. Count Stephen Széchenyi's relatively moderate views are to be found in his parliamentary speech, April 24, 1844, in his *Beszédyi* [Speeches], ed. Zichy Antal, Budapest 1887, p. 352; and in his *Hitel* [Credit], ed. Iványi-Grünwald Béla, Budapest 1930, pp. 67, 247, 467. I cannot fully agree with Nathaniel Katzburg's statement to the effect that Széchenyi had expressed "absolute opposition to Emancipation," although Katzburg is quite correct in stating that "to Széchenyi, the problem was not one of external assimilation, but of an inner spiritual merger with the national values". See Katzburg *Hungarian Jewry*, p. 141. The fiery liberal, Louis Kossuth, generally went further than Széchenyi in his criticism of the Jews and Jewish immigration. In one of his early studies (1828) on hunger among the Hungarian peasants he referred to the latter as in effect slaves of Jewish innkeepers, who — through the misuse of easy credits — ensnare them permanently. Later Kossuth moderated his views, but still made Jewish emancipation dependant on the reform of the Jewish faith. Cf. Ujhelyi Géza, Kossuth Lajos értekezése az 'éhségmentő intézetek'-ről [Louis Kossuth's Study on the 'Institutions to Prevent Hunger']. *Régi Okirat és Levélek Tára* [Repository of Old Documents and Letters]. 1 (1905), no. 1. pp. 19—23, and no. 2. 10—17. For his later views see Kossuth's editorial in the *Pesti Hírlap*, May 13, 1844. The writer Imre Vahot gave vent probably to the most extreme variant of the anti-Jewish feeling current among the Hungarian intellectuals of that time. He expressed the belief that their alien (non-Magyar) background prevents the Jews from understanding and appreciating Magyar spiritual values, and therefore they have no right to form opinions about Hungarian literature and culture. As an example, Vahot once refused to accept criticism from a Jewish literary critic, declaring, "He has no right to judge my work, for he has never paid any recognition to an Hungarian or a Christian drama." Cf. Farkas p. 60. See also Weidlein [Ed.] pp. 14—15.

<sup>30</sup> On Joseph Eötvös see Menczer; Reményi; Radvánszky; Weber; Bódy Baron Joseph Eötvös and His Critique; idem: Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization; Vardy, Steven Baron T. Eötvös: The political Profile; Vardy, Steven Baron T. Eötvös on Liberalism; idem Baron Joseph Eötvös: Statesman.

<sup>31</sup> Viator; Seton-Watson pp. 126, 212.

ralism was characterized by deep humanitarian convictions, idealism, and by a rarely faltering faith in the basic goodness of man. Having devoted his life to the cause of the underprivileged, during his three decades of public life, E ö t v ö s came to be known as the most outstanding champion of socially oppressed classes and religious and national minorities. His name became permanently linked to such diverse achievements as serf emancipation, parliamentary representation, ministerial responsibility, universal education, and religious equality. Moreover, he attempted to find a satisfactory solution for the nationality question, and fought unflinchingly for the civil equality of the Jews. Believing that Hungary and its Austrian superstructure could be transformed into a state worthy of higher human ideals, E ö t v ö s spent his whole life in the fulfillment of this dream.

As far as contemporary evidence reveals, E ö t v ö s made known his interest in Jewish emancipation for the first time only in 1839, when at the age of twenty-six he occupied his hereditary seat in the Upper Chamber (Chamber of Magnates) of the diet<sup>32</sup>. Yet, the urgency and tone of this appeal on behalf of the Jewish cause on this occasion leave little doubt that his interest in this area must have had older and deeper roots. Although direct evidence is lacking, there are indications that his emotional link with the Jews — which found its climax in his Law of Jewish Emancipation of 1867 — reached back to his early youth, and possibly to a specific episode of those years<sup>33</sup>.

## 4

The diet of 1839—1840 has generally been regarded as successful both from the liberal and national points of view<sup>34</sup>. Its successful defence of the freedom of speech and parliamentary immunity against M e t t e r n i c h ' s

<sup>32</sup> E ö t v ö s ' s parliamentary speech of March 31, 1840, to be discussed below.

<sup>33</sup> An incident that might qualify as a turning point in E ö t v ö s ' attitude toward the Jews was recorded by his friend and close political collaborator, the noted Jewish Hungarian publicist, M i k s a [Max] F a l k . Allegedly this episode occurred in 1824 when the eleven year old E ö t v ö s entered the gymnasium (secondary school) at Buda. Although obviously innocent of any political misdeeds, the young boy was not well received there on account of his father's and grandfather's political reputation. (Their indiscriminate devotion to the Habsburg dynasty had earned for them a bad name in Hungarian nationalist circles). The story goes that the young aristocrat was immediately seated in the front row of his class, as contemporary etiquette demanded. But as soon as he took his place all youngsters in his proximity left their seats, allegedly refusing to sit next to the grandson of a "traitor." All but one, that is; the exception being a Jewish boy, who himself being but a tolerated member of society, apparently felt a natural compassion for the ostracized youth. This incident must have left a profound impression on the young boy's mind. And in conjunction with his sincere humanitarianism and sensitivity it might have started him toward becoming the most vocal and passionate champion of Jewish emancipation in Hungary. Cf. F a l k pp. 214—215.

<sup>34</sup> H o r v á t h vol. 2. pp. 109—190; A r a t ó pp. 200—203; B a r a n y The Hungarian Diet.

10 Ungarn-Jahrbuch

absolutism, its lessening of the burden of the peasant-serfs with an eye on their eventual emancipation, and its economic and financial laws giving impetus to the rise of capitalist economy, were all achievements of great importance. Yet, no less significant were its debates on the religious question, which paved the way for the Law of Religious Equality of 1844 (Act III: 1844); nor its promulgation of the first important law on the Jewish problem (Act XXIX: 1840), which extended partial emancipation to that persecuted minority.

The proposal on Jewish emancipation, as formulated and approved by the Lower Chamber, contained two main points: one calling for the abolition of the toleration tax, and the other asking that the Jews be given civil rights equal in scope to those possessed by the non-noble but free inhabitants of the country<sup>35</sup>. The only exception was to be in the realm of religion, where the Jewish faith was still not to be accepted as one of the "established" religions — as demanded, among others, by the "instructions" of the comitat of Pest<sup>36</sup>. But in light of a major improvement in their civil status, this was only a minor flaw, especially since the Law of Religious Equality was not yet a reality. At this early stage of the Jewish struggle for emancipation, civil rights were much more important than gains in the realm of religious recognition. The Jewish leaders themselves were fully aware of this. Their petition of January 15, 1840, limited itself to asking the diet "to improve their civil status," and to extend to them "the right of citizenship." They made no references to the religious question<sup>37</sup>.

The bill obtained the expected support in the Lower Chamber, but it had to face a serious challenge in the Chamber of Magnates. The fear of a complete Jewish economic takeover was strong, and the opposition was correspondingly marked. Some members of the Upper Chamber felt that even partial emancipation might be detrimental to the nation, for as Count Joseph Teleki asserted, it would be an incentive for more Galician Jews to settle in the country. This consideration prompted him to argue for only minimal and gradual concessions to the Jews<sup>38</sup>.

Apparently, the otherwise tolerant and liberally inclined Széchenyi also had reservations about the bill as approved by the Lower Chamber. Though his specific contributions to this debate in the Chamber of Magnates are unavailable, his earlier speech to the Pest county assembly on these matters makes it amply clear that he questioned the timeliness of Jewish emancipation<sup>39</sup>. He believed that the Magyars, who were still fighting an uphill struggle for their own rights, should not fragment their strength

<sup>35</sup> Bernstein Szabadságharc, pp. 9—11. See also Ferencz Deák's report from the diet of 1839—1840 to his native county of Zala, July 27, 1840, in: Kónyi vol. 1. pp. 538—539.

<sup>36</sup> Ballagi p. 499.

<sup>37</sup> Lów p. 174.

<sup>38</sup> Ballagi pp. 499—500.

<sup>39</sup> Széchenyi delivered this speech on April 20, 1839. For that day he has the following entry in his diary: "Ich spreche gegen die Juden Emanzipation". Cf. Viszota [Ed.] vol. 5. p. 271.

by devoting their attention to an essentially alien cause. At that time he allegedly declared that

until Magyar is recognized as the language of the state [of Hungary], which is still very far in the future, and until it becomes the vehicle of everyday conversation, we are still too weak to permit ourselves to be concerned about other nations<sup>40</sup>.

He acknowledged that many of the Jews were in the process of acquiring the Magyar language, which could conceivably make them eventually Magyars, but he did not believe that this applied to the majority. As a matter of fact, he was convinced that most of them learned Magyar only as a matter of convenience: that is "out of affectation, and in order to render conditions for emancipation more favorable." He doubted that most of them "would be turned into Magyars through emancipation," or that "they would be willing to mix with a true oriental stock [the Magyars]"<sup>41</sup>. In fact, he feared that they were more inclined toward Germanization, which would simply strengthen the position of that already influential minority in the country<sup>42</sup>.

Naturally, under these circumstances, the atmosphere for emancipation was much less favorable in the Chamber of Magnates than in the Lower House. It was in this unfriendly environment that on March 31, 1840, young E ö t v ö s delivered his memorable speech on Jewish emancipation<sup>43</sup>. He soon followed it up with a brilliant and moving essay that placed him in the forefront of this struggle<sup>44</sup>. Although the results were not immediately evident, one can say without exaggeration that E ö t v ö s' s efforts in general, and this essay in particular, did more than anything else to arouse the conscience of the nation, and to ensure the ultimate emancipation of the Jews.

## 5

E ö t v ö s described his motive for championing the Jewish cause in lofty and idealistic terms: "My heart had rebelled against all forms of oppression since the early years of my youth," he said.

I hated tyranny not because I was convinced of the blessings of liberty, but rather because of an innate instinct [of my hearth]. It

<sup>40</sup> A brief and unofficial German version of Sz é c h e n y i speech is to be found in the footnotes of his diary, *ibidem* pp. 271—272.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*. See also B a r a n y Széchenyi, pp. 171, 272, 357—359, 363; and *idem*: Magyar Jew pp. 10—12.

<sup>42</sup> Due to the heavy concentration of the Jewish intellectuals during the 1840's around German language newspapers in Hungary, they were generally regarded as the representatives of Germandom. See F a r k a s pp. 56—60; and Weidlein (Ed.) pp. 14—15.

<sup>43</sup> For the Text of E ö t v ö s' s speech see his Works vol. 9. pp. 14—19.

<sup>44</sup> E ö t v ö s vol. 12. pp. 102—158. German and Italian editions soon followed: Die Emancipation der Juden. Pest 1840 and 1841, and Dissertazione sulla emancipazione degli ebrei. Pest 1842.

was this instinct that turned my attention to the question of Jewish emancipation, even before it became a public issue in our land<sup>45</sup>.

With these ideals in mind, Eötvös attacked the problem from two directions. He played upon the sentiments of his countrymen; and later followed this up with an appeal to their reason. This pattern is clearly present both in his parliamentary speech and also in his essay.

Eötvös began by depicting the misery of the Jews, portraying them as the innocent victims of millenniums of oppression. He called them "a nation without country," which "wanders unceasingly . . . like a soul without its body, finding only enmity and hate — as if a great curse were hanging over its head"<sup>46</sup>. He pointed out that only the Jews were still compelled to live in the darkness of the middle ages. "They are alone among the oppressed", he said, "whose woes find no response, and whose sufferings elicit no sympathy"<sup>47</sup>. This utter hopelessness of the Jews appeared inexcusable to Eötvös, particularly as hope was not denied even to the lowest of criminals. He believed that a Jew was "a hundredfold more miserable than he who had lost his public respect through his own evil deeds." Contrary to a crimianl, a Jew

can never hope to improve. The sins he was born with will never be forgiven by the cruel and heartless world. He may follow the path of virtue, he may travel the road of honesty, he may remain in poverty, but he will never cease to be a Jew<sup>48</sup>.

Having appealed to the emotions, Eötvös continued his plea by turning to reason. He enumerated, discussed, then logically and methodically refuted the arguments generally voiced against Jewish emancipation. In his view these arguments could be reduced to three broad allegations: that the Jews were morally corrupt and therefore undeserving of freedom; that clinging to their separate national identity they would always constitute an anti-national minority; and that their emancipation would be impossible without permanently endangering Christianity and the material position of the Christian population<sup>49</sup>.

Needless to say, Eötvös regarded these allegations as largely baseless and stemming from prejudice and ignorance. Regarding the argument concerning the alleged immorality of the Jews, he held that even if this were true, freedom is not something that is given to an individual or a nationality as a reward. Rather, it is a natural right of mankind. Eötvös fully realized that individuals can and are being deprived of their freedom for misconduct, but in his view the misbehavior of certain members of an ethnic, nationality or religious group could in no way be construed into a right to deprive the whole group of its right to freedom. Above and beyond

<sup>45</sup> Eötvös Works, vol. 12. p. 114.

<sup>46</sup> Ibidem p. 109.

<sup>47</sup> Ibidem vol. 9. p. 14.

<sup>48</sup> Ibidem vol. 12. p. 110.

<sup>49</sup> Ibidem vol. 12. pp. 115, 124—125, 135; vol. 9: p. 15.

this question, the allegation that the Jews were innately immoral appeared ludicrous to E ö t v ö s. He acknowledged that there were a number of recent Jewish immigrants who in many instances acted without scruples. But in his view this simply demonstrated that "nations under oppression tend to lose their [public] morality"; which, in turn, only strengthened his own case in demanding equal civil rights for the Jews<sup>50</sup>.

To prove his point about the demoralizing effects of oppression, E ö t v ö s took pains to retrace Jewish history and to cite examples of their constant and brutal mistreatment at the hands of the Christians. At the same time he pointed out that corruption through oppression was not limited to the Jews. He acknowledged that many among the Jews have become fraudulent due to millennia of oppression, and that they nurture distrust and hidden hostility toward their Christian oppressors. But he found this quite natural. In the light of Jewish history even Shylock's vengeance appeared understandable to him, for at times this history had demanded "not a pound of Christian flesh, but the blood of a thousand Jews"<sup>51</sup>.

E ö t v ö s further demonstrated the fallacy of the argument about the innate immorality of the Jews by pointing out that if this allegation was to be used as a pretext against their emancipation, then in the name of justice the morality of the Christians must also be examined. Those found wanting must likewise be deprived of their civil rights, for Christianity or Christianization *per se* does not necessarily make anyone moral.

Having placed much of the burden for the demoralization of the Jews on the shoulders of Christian society, which had kept them in bondage, E ö t v ö s went on to claim that the keys for the "betterment" of the Jews were also held by that society<sup>52</sup>. All it would have to do is permit this long-oppressed, unfortunate people to share in the rights and privileges extended to its other members. If lack of freedom was the cause of their alleged immorality, then surely a share in freedom must put an end to it.

Nor was E ö t v ö s satisfied with a simple refutation of the allegation of immorality. He showed that despite all assertions to the contrary the Jews were in possession of personal and group traits which could serve as examples to many Christians. Their religiosity and their attachment to their ancient creed and culture appealed to E ö t v ö s, as did their exemplary family life. Thus, a Jew may be heartless toward the oppressive Christian society, and he may try to exploit some of its less capable and less fortunate members. He would seldom be, however, anything other

<sup>50</sup> Ibidem vol. 12. p. 115, 117.

<sup>51</sup> Ibidem p. 119.

<sup>52</sup> In E ö t v ö s' s mind "betterment" did not mean Magyarization — as a noted authority suggested — but simply moral improvement. Motivated by a sincere humanitarianism, E ö t v ö s wished to elevate the incoming Galician Jews from their alleged state of "demoralization" to which they had sunk in the course of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. There can be no doubt that he hoped that the Jews would eventually become good Magyars, but his "Magyarization" had no relationship in his mind with their moral improvement or "betterment." Cf. K a n n p. 364.

than a loving father, devoted husband, and a good friend to his own kind. Though he may show fear and be a flattering sycophant when facing his oppressors, he would often suffer death for the faith and moral heritage of his forefathers. All these demonstrated to E ö t v ö s that "the corruption of the Jews, if it exists at all, could serve only as a pretext but not as a reason against their emancipation"<sup>53</sup>.

The second argument against Jewish emancipation was the accusation that clinging to their separate nationality the Jews would always constitute an anti-national minority in the country. This belief was fed by certain allegedly anti-Jewish pronouncements of such European statesmen as Sir Robert Peel and Lord Belgrave<sup>54</sup>, which were quickly picked up and disseminated by various antisemitic pamphleteers<sup>55</sup>. The influence of some of these propagandists apparently had left its mark on the thinking of many Magyar national leaders. Some of them were quick to point out that if the pamphleteers were correct, and Jewish emancipation does have an adverse effect even on English and German nationality, this danger would be much greater in the case of Hungary where "it would come into contact with a still-developing nationality"<sup>56</sup>. E ö t v ö s was enough of a patriot to declare that if this danger were really there, he too would be forced to reconsider his stand on emancipation. But he did not detect such a danger. In fact he believed that the many real and prolonged adversities withstood by the Magyars during their one thousand years of history should make all such allegations appear absurd<sup>57</sup>.

Some Magyar leaders felt that if this anti-national attitude of the Jews were true, their emancipation would in fact mean rewarding a nationality which professed no feeling of community with the Magyars. E ö t v ö s thought otherwise. He believed that in this case one could not really speak about "rewards," but only about redressing a long-standing injustice. He questioned the assertion that the Jews alone were to be blamed for their isolation from Christian society. In his view this was due less to the reluctance of the Jews to merge with the Magyars, than to the unwillingness of the latter to accept the Jews into their midst. "What was there after all in our nationality that could have endangered their sympathy, or that could have made them love this country"<sup>58</sup>? asked E ö t v ö s. He found little to encourage him. In fact he thought that Hungary had seldom shown itself to be a "fatherland" to its Jewish subjects. He warned his compatriots,

<sup>53</sup> E ö t v ö s Works, vol. 12. pp. 118—124.

<sup>54</sup> Both Sir Robert Peel and Lord Belgrave voted against Jewish emancipation in 1830. Sections of their parliamentary speeches of May 17, 1830, are quoted by E ö t v ö s, in: *ibid.* pp. 124—125.

<sup>55</sup> E ö t v ö s cites three contemporary pamphlets which were influential in Hungary in spreading antisemitic views, but without giving full bibliographical details for each of them: Paulus; Hartmann; Streckfuss. I was unable to locate any of these works.

<sup>56</sup> E ö t v ö s Works Vol. 12. p. 125.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem* pp. 125—126.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibidem* p. 128.

lest they forget that they "can engender patriotism only if everyone within the borders of the fatherland is permitted to share alike in the blessings of the constitution"<sup>59</sup>. In his view this had been demonstrated in western Europe, where the extension of Jewish rights was generally followed by the latter's growing loyalty to their country and newly found nationality<sup>60</sup>. He saw no reason why this should be otherwise in Hungary.

The third most commonly cited argument explored by E ö t v ö s had to do with the alleged dangers that Jewish emancipation would pose to Christianity and Christian society. This argument was generally supported by quotations (and misquotations) from the teachings of the Talmud, many passages of which appeared to be in direct contradiction with the principles of Christianity and Christian morality. E ö t v ö s found these arguments more amusing than convincing. At the same time, however, he was fully aware of the potential harm they could do to the cause of emancipation. This was precisely the reason why he went out of his way to point out that — while presented under the guise of a genuine concern for Christianity — these arguments were motivated less by such concern than by ignorant antisemitism. "It is an old custom," he wrote, "to connect the most evil of causes with the most sacred one. Therefore, I am not amazed in the least that the defenders of [Jewish] oppression — as the criminals in the past — seek security before the altar"<sup>61</sup>. To E ö t v ö s this was pseudo-Christianity; the very denial of the most important Christian teaching: the idea of love.

In connection with the last argument, E ö t v ö s also explored the merits of the complaint that Jewish emancipation would undermine the economic and material interests of the Christian members of society. Though seldom mentioned, in his view this was a most important reason for the prevalent anti-Jewish sentiment. All other considerations — whether of moral, religious or national nature — now dwindled to a position of only peripheral importance when compared with material interests. As E ö t v ö s observed:

Who would fail to sacrifice all his noble principles in defense of his economic well-being? . . . Woe be to him who undertakes his reforms not in the name of usefulness but in the name of justice<sup>62</sup>.

E ö t v ö s knew quite well that justice can seldom prevail against material interest. Yet, he thought it his duty to speak up for its cause. Moreover, since justice could not serve as an effective motivating force for Jewish emancipation, he also felt compelled to explore the alleged adverse economic consequences of such an emancipation.

<sup>59</sup> Ibidem p. 129.

<sup>60</sup> E ö t v ö s cited among others Prince Karl August von Hardenberg's letter to one Count G r o t, January 4, 1815, in which the former stressed the heroism of the Prussian Jews in Prussia's struggle against Napoleon. Cf. ibidem p. 131.

<sup>61</sup> Ibidem p. 146.

<sup>62</sup> Ibidem p. 149.

He immediately pointed out that the question did not revolve around economic monopolies, but simply equal opportunities for the Jews, which in itself harbored no major economic dangers. He recognized that there were certain areas of economic activity, in which the Jews appeared to excel over Christians, but he felt that this stemmed from the limitation of their activities to those areas for centuries. Moreover, even if the Jews were proven to be innately more gifted in such activities than the Christians, it would not alter their natural right to emancipation and civil equality. The law should never be used as a pretext to harbor and to protect ignorance, incompetence and mediocrity against talent, because if this were to be permitted, the whole human society would soon degenerate. But more to the point, if the Jews are to be excluded from citizenship due to their talents, then in all justice talented Christians must be treated likewise. That, however, seemed just as unthinkable to Eötvös as using the talents of the Jews against them in their struggle of civil equality<sup>63</sup>.

Analyzing the special Hungarian aspects of this question, Eötvös pointed out — as Stephen Széchenyi before him — that the growing Jewish economic predominance in the country was the result not of some vile conspiracy, but rather of the peculiar class spirit of the Hungarian nobility. The noble-dominated Hungarian society had excluded the Jews from the free professions (with the exception of medicine) and limited them to trade and other economic activities. At the same time the noble class, which might have had the capacity and learning to engage in such undertakings, refused to do so on the grounds that all such activities were below its dignity. This left the field open to the Jews, who naturally moved into the vacuum, and soon established an important hold over the economy. This proved to Eötvös that “the whole economic orientation of the Jews . . . [was] the result of discrimination against them.” He further believed that

if through their emancipation new paths were to be opened up for them, then this purely commercial spirit of theirs . . . would diminish in strength<sup>64</sup>.

Although nourishing no hope for immediate success, Eötvös did not close his essay (nor his earlier parliamentary speech) without a note of expectation. He expressed his belief that “society cannot be unjust to anyone without fear of repercussion,” and that “everything that is truly good and just must triumph.” He was fully aware that he had begun a difficult and relentless struggle, and that those who fight for this unpopular cause “shall become subject to slander and vile hate.” But he resolved to continue the struggle, for he believed that justice must always prevail, and that “he who fights prejudice with truth is invincible”<sup>65</sup>.

<sup>63</sup> Ibidem pp. 150—151.

<sup>64</sup> Ibidem vol. 9. pp. 17.

<sup>65</sup> Ibidem vol. 12. pp. 155, 157.

## 6

During the parliamentary debate on the Jewish Law of 1840 in the Chamber of Magnates Eötvös found support in the brilliant and noble leader of the Young Conservatives, Count Aurél Desseffy. Desseffy's speech of March, 31, 1840, almost rivaled Eötvös in importance, and it unquestionably reflected many of Eötvös ideas. Yet they differed on one major point. Contrary to Eötvös, who appealed for emancipation without strings attached, Desseffy, like most Magyar political leaders, wished to couple emancipation with some orderly curb on immigration. Moreover, he wished to see a law, which in addition to limiting their numbers, "would provide some guarantee regarding the wealth, morality and professional competence of the immigrants." Desseffy feared that in the absence of such a curb the country would be inundated by the "beggar Jews," whose presence, and the consequent economic strain on the country, "would be in the interest of neither the Magyars, nor the native Jews"<sup>66</sup>.

Although Eötvös's appeal, supported by Desseffy, made a considerable impression on the Chamber of Magnates, the Lords still found the proposal as approved by the Lower House too extensive. Few of them questioned the righteousness of the goals involved, but most of them expressed their preference for a "gradual" and "thoughtful" solution<sup>67</sup>. No doubt they were influenced in this direction by the growing antisemitic demonstrations in Hungary's German cities, which feared the rising economic competition of Jewry<sup>68</sup>. Even so, the Magnates' version of the proposal, had it been accepted by Vienna, would have resulted in notable gains for the Jews. But apparently the imperial government regarded the diet's concessions too extensive and went ahead to prune them down even further. It was this twice-mutilated proposal which became the Jewish law of 1840 (Act XXIX: 1840), and started them on the road toward emancipation<sup>69</sup>.

With certain minor limitations (e. g. important mining centers) the Jews were now free to reside anywhere in the country, though they were still obliged to pay the toleration tax. At the same time they were permitted to engage in any form of trade, industry and profession, and to establish factories. Attempts were also made to integrate them more thoroughly into Hungarian society by compelling them to accept the use of family names, to introduce permanent birth registers (to be kept by their rabbis), and to draw up all deeds and agreements in the customary language of the region of the country in which they resided<sup>70</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> Ferenczy pp. 263—264.

<sup>67</sup> Bernstein Szabadságharc, pp. 12—13.

<sup>68</sup> Marczali A reformok kora, p. 486. For specific examples of such antisemitic manifestations see: MZsSz 1 (1884) pp. 413—414, 476.

<sup>69</sup> On the details of the birth of this law see: Löw p. 179. See also: Katzburg Hungarian Jewry, p. 139.

<sup>70</sup> For the text of Act XXIX: 1840 see Bernstein Szabadságharc pp. 13—14. See also: Marczali A reformok kora, p. 486.

The Jewish Law of 1840 fell far short of full emancipation, and therefore from Eötvös's point of view it was acceptable only as a temporary compromise<sup>71</sup>. Yet it still constituted a few steps in the right direction. What was inexcusable to him was the fact in some areas of the country not even its meager provisions could be implemented. Many of the towns and some of the counties refused to comply with the law, and thus demonstrated — as Kossuth aptly observed — "how those lofty principles which during the debate... proclaimed... our humanity throughout Europe were thwarted in practice"<sup>72</sup>.

## 7

The diet of 1839—1840 was followed by a natural pause in the drive for emancipation. The calm was broken only by the publication of Eötvös's essay immediately following the diet, and by his continued activities on behalf of the Jewish cause. These took various forms. One of the secret police reports of 1840 on the affairs of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences states, for example, that Eötvös was responsible for engineering the election of Moritz Ballagi (Bloch), a Jewish linguist and lexicographer, to membership in that institution. The same report also notes that such and similar actions were encouraged by Eötvös to speed up the emancipation and assimilation of the Hungarian Jewry<sup>73</sup>.

At the same time Eötvös took up the Jewish cause in his major sociopolitical novel, *The Village Notary*<sup>74</sup>. While depicting the evils of the socially and politically corrupt county system in Hungary, he took time out to portray — in the person of the novel's wandering Jewish peddler — the miserable and debased existence of the Jewish masses in Hungary. In this portrayal he demonstrated that the arguments against Jewish emancipation were based on realities which, in addition to being unflattering, were the direct results of the restrictions placed on the Jews by the Christian world.

Although the activities of Eötvös and his supporters increased the sympathy for the Jewish cause, the diet of 1843—1844 did nothing to advance the cause of emancipation. If anything, compared to the achieve-

<sup>71</sup> Although Eötvös was dissatisfied with the meager achievements of this diet in the area of Jewish civil rights, Act XXIX: 1840 was more than welcome to the Jews. As an example see the anonymous pamphlet *Empfindung*. The Hungarian born Austrian poet Karl Beck dedicated his greatest epic poem to Eötvös in gratitude: Beck. Cf. Várdy Agnes pp. 148—150.

<sup>72</sup> Helfy; Kossuth [Eds.] vol. 12. p. 145.

<sup>73</sup> Secret police report about the activities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, August 27, 1840, in: Bártfai-Szabó [Ed.] vol. 1. p. 362. That this policy of integration and assimilation was successful is evident from the prominent position occupied by the Jews in the Academy within a few decades. Cf. Banóczy pp. 394—396.

<sup>74</sup> *A falu jegyzője*, in: Eötvös Works, vol. 2, 3. This work also appeared in German and English translations.

ments of 1840, the results of this diet represented a retreat. A Jewish petition for emancipation was not even debated until almost the end of its session (September 8), at which time it was rejected by a vote of 35 to 13<sup>75</sup>. The roots of this setback can be traced to a change in the general attitude of the Magyar political leaders. Apparently, during the intervening four years an increasing number of them took position — enunciated by Kossuth in May of 1844 — that Jewish emancipation must be coupled with a reform of the Jewish faith, which they regarded as being responsible for the alleged conflicting loyalties of the Jews<sup>76</sup>.

The setback of 1844 as a bitter blow to Jewish hopes for a quick emancipation, but it failed to dishearten the Hungarian Jews. Nor did it deter them from showing their loyalty to Hungary and the Magyar national cause. One of the most visible manifestations of this effort was the foundation of the "Association for the Promotion of the Magyar Language among Native Israelites" (*A honi izraeliták között magyar nyelvet terjesztő egylet*) in Budapest, which, established during the sessions of the diet of 1844, grew and prospered during the subsequent years, publishing its first yearbook in the revolutionary year of 1848<sup>77</sup>.

The year 1846 brought some relief to the Hungarian Jewry in the form of the abolition of the toleration tax<sup>78</sup>. True, the government agreed to the abolishment of this blood tax only in return for certain monetary compensation, but at least the Jews were now freed from that ignominious, degrading and constant reminder of their status of inferiority<sup>79</sup>. With this achievement behind them, they were justified in nurturing high hopes for the diet of 1847—1848; hopes which soon turned out to be premature.

<sup>75</sup> Hirnök, September 10, 1844. Cf. Bernstein Szabadságharc, p. 18—19.

<sup>76</sup> Kossuth's editorial in the *Pesti Hírlap*, May 13, 1844. For Rabbi Leopold Löw's futile attempts to change Kossuth's views see: Löw pp. 183—184, and *Pesti Hírlap*, June 2, 1844. See also Baron *The Revolution*, p. 86.

<sup>77</sup> The alleged purpose of this organization was to serve the cause of the Magyar language among the Jews by establishing a reading room, a library and a kindergarten, and providing cost free instructions in Hungarian. Cf. *Első magyar zsidó naptár* pp. 53—90. See also Bernstein Szabadságharc pp. 20—21. Also interesting is the secret police report to Vienna, dated June 16, 1846, which has this to say about the Magyarization efforts among the Jews of Hungary: "Eugen Beóthy, Gabiel Klauzál, Stephan Bezerédy, Graf Gedeon Ráaday und Ludwig Kossuth sollen mit den Häuptern des sehr zahlreichen Judenthums in Ungarn einen Pakt geschlossen, und ihnen die Emanzipation "in Aussicht gestellt haben, wenn sie sich gänzlich magyarisieren". Diess hat zur Folge, dass in den jüdischen Haushaltungen zu Pest, nur ungarisch gesprochen, nur das ungarische Theater besucht, die ungarische Literatur gepflegt, alles Deutsche aber verfolgt wird". Cf. Barta p. 258.

<sup>78</sup> For details on the abolition of the toleration tax see Bernstein Szabadságharc, p. 23—27. The text of the appropriate royal rescript of June 24, 1846, is found, in: Löw p. 195.

<sup>79</sup> The compensation, amounting to 1,200,000 forints, was levied according to a quota system. Each Jewish community was to pay a certain set sum over a period of eleven years. The quota of each country and larger community is listed, in: *Budapesti Híradó*, August 6, 1846. Following the formation of the

As soon as the royal rescript of September 17, 1847, announced the convening of a diet at Pressburg starting November 7<sup>th</sup> of that year, the "Permanent Committee of the Hungarian Jews" dispatched circulars to all country assemblies and royal free boroughs, asking them to instruct their deputies to take up the cause of emancipation<sup>80</sup>. A few of the counties did so, but a good number of them — along with most of the royal free boroughs — took a diametrically opposite position. Some of them (notably the counties of Szabolcs, Moson and Veszprém, and the city of Székesfehérvár) went so far as to instruct their deputies "to oppose effectively Jewish emancipation condition [meaning, their religion in the present form]"<sup>81</sup>. A majority of the "instructions" also demanded an effective termination of Jewish emancipation at this diet, and to do so as long as the Jews "continue to adhere to their present condition [meaning, their religion in the present form]"<sup>81</sup>. A majority of the "instructions" also demanded an effective termination of Jewish immigration.

The anti-Jewish feeling was particularly strong among the deputies of the royal free boroughs (most of them heavily German inhabited), whose burghers saw in the Jews only economic competitors. In the course of January and February 1848, the antisemitic tone of the diet reached an emotional pitch. Several attempts were made to place legal limitations on Jewish immigration, and to keep the Jews from acquiring even limited suffrage rights. One of the deputies from the county of Szatmár went so far as to label the Jewish religion a "pagan faith" which deserves no consideration, and warned his countrymen that if they must tolerate presence of the Jews, they should at least try "to accustom them to civilization, and . . . make them aware of the principles of Christianity." As a liberal correspondent of the *Pesti Hirlap* (then under the influence of Eötvös and his supporters) remarked, the worst thing about these developments was that such "extreme and unjust declarations against the Jews were received with great ovations"<sup>82</sup>.

These were then the conditions that confronted the Hungarian Jews in March of 1848 when the revolution swept away the fabric of the old "feudal" society bringing new hopes to that persecuted minority. But these hopes proved to be ephemeral once more. The shocking anti-Jewish riots on the streets of some of Hungary's largest cities<sup>83</sup>, and the reluctance of

---

first responsible Hungarian government in April 1848, these payments were suspended by Kossuth in his capacity as minister of finances. With the Jewish emancipation in July 1849, they were abolished altogether. See the relevant documents of Kossuth's ministry, in: Beer [Ed.] pp. 748, 759, 793.

<sup>80</sup> Copies of this circular were also dispatched to the prominent newspapers of the country, many of which reprinted it in its entirety, or at least commented on it. Cf. Bernstein Szabadságharc, p. 29—30.

<sup>81</sup> Ibidem p. 30.

<sup>82</sup> *Pesti Hirlap*, February 24 and March 2, 1848.

<sup>83</sup> On the widespread anti-Jewish riots in 1848, which were not limited to Hungary, see Baron Jewish Emancipation, and idem: Jewish Scholarship pp. 83—87. See also Horváth pp. 392—393, 461—464.

the newly elected first popular parliament to carry out its duty in the area of human equality, dashed the re-emerging hopes of the Hungarian Jews. Granted, during the sessions of this parliament proposals for Jewish emancipation were introduced on three separate occasions (July 19, 1848 at Pest, May 12, 1849 at Debrecen, and July 28, 1849 at Szeged), but of these attempts only the last resulted in an emancipatory decree (Act IX: 1849)<sup>84</sup>. The Hungarian government blamed this unwarranted delay on the alleged dangers that could follow emancipation due to a widespread anti-Jewish sentiment in the cities, and on the lack of time in such a period of crisis for the preparation of an adequate legislation<sup>85</sup>. Whatever the merits of these arguments, these delaying tactics resulted in the postponement of the much-needed emancipatory decree until "happier times" — as demanded, among others, by a petition of the German burghers of Pressburg<sup>86</sup>. But as it turned out, these "happier times" were not so happy at all. When on July 28, 1849, the "Szeged Parliament" granted full citizenship to the Jews in recognition of their contribution to the Hungarian Liberation War<sup>87</sup>, the revolution was already doomed. The imminent Magyar defeat made this law inoperative, and the emancipation turned out to be a vain gesture. But what was even

<sup>84</sup> Minutes of the Pest Parliament, July 26, 1848; Minutes of the Debrecen Parliament, May 12, 1849; and Reports on the Szeged Parliament, July 28, 1849, in: Beér [Ed.] pp. 163, 425, 476. For the text of the first two proposals, both introduced by Ödön Kállay, see: MZsSz 12 (1894) p. 286. The text of Act IX: 1849 is reprinted, in: Beér [Ed.] p. 876.

<sup>85</sup> As Kossuth declared in connection with Lajos Schneé's request for a law on Jewish emancipation on March 31, 1848: "There are impediments which not even the gods can overcome at certain moments. To regulate the Jewish question at this point [through emancipation] would mean placing a great many of these people at the mercy of their enemies' fury" (*Pesti Híralp* April 7, 1848). See also Barta [Ed.] p. 706; and Bernstein Szabadságharcz, p. 50.

<sup>86</sup> Petition of the royal free borough of Pressburg, August 1848. Cf. Minutes of the Pest Parliament, August 18, 1848, in: Beér [Ed.] p. 191.

<sup>87</sup> Act IX: 1849, which granted emancipation to the Jews of Hungary, was presented to the Szeged Parliament with the following accompanying words by the Minister of the Interior Bertalan Szemere: „There exists no religious denomination which would have failed to contribute heroes and great benefactors to our Liberation War. [Yet] there is hardly a nationality group which could exceed the Jews in their faithfulness and efforts on behalf of our national struggle. [Therefore, while] the proclamation of equality is a necessary consequence of our rebirth, when we apply this [principle] to the followers of the faith of Moses, then, beyond complying with simple human and civic duties, we are also rewarding [them for their] patriotic merits". Cf. Beér [Ed.] p. 871. For Jewish reaction and contribution to the Hungarian national cause in 1848—1849 see: Baron Jewish Emancipation, pp. 240—241; idem Jewish Scholarship, p. 88—96; Einhorn. And Bernstein Szabadságharcz, pp. 87—216. It should be noted here that while most Hungarian Jews remained faithful to Hungary and the Hungarian national cause in 1848, due to the widespread anti-Jewish sentiment in the country, some of them began to advocate the idea of emigration to America. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 83—89; and Goldhammer. See also the 1848—1849 issues of *Der Ungar* (Pesti), which devotes considerable attention to the pros and cons of emigration.

worse, this gesture from the revolutionary government may have discredited the whole idea of Jewish emancipation in the eyes of the victors<sup>88</sup>.

## 8

Concerning Eötvös's role in these events, it is difficult to trace his specific actions — particularly during his brief tenure in the revolutionary government of 1848 (April 11—September 29). By the time of the appearance of his *The Village Notary* in 1845, Eötvös and his followers, the Centralists, had already gained control over Kossuth's *Pesti Hirlap*, which thereafter became the most important forum of doctrinaire liberalism in Hungary, demanding among others full citizenship for the Jews<sup>89</sup>. Eötvös wrote extensively in this paper, but as many of his articles appeared unsigned, it is virtually impossible to distinguish between Eötvös-written and Eötvös-inspired writings<sup>90</sup>.

Eötvös did not participate in the ungenerous diet of 1847—1848, and therefore he could hardly have influenced the course of events there. At the same time, however, he was a member of the country commissions which drew the "instructions" for the deputies representing the comitats of Pest and Békés; and both of these documents reveal his influence and contain the demand for legal equality for all classes and groups — including the Jews. Moreover, following the eruption of the revolution in March, Eötvös took an active part both in the preparation of the "March Laws" and in hammering out the "April Compromise" with Vienna, which delayed the threatening armed clash between the Magyars and the Habsburgs<sup>91</sup>.

After the "April Compromise" Eötvös became a member of the first "independent" Hungarian government, heading the newly formed Ministry of Religion and Public Education. Being the most vocal spokesman for Jewish emancipation without strings attached, he would have liked to see the immediate implementation of this goal. But as Jewish citizenship was regarded a civil and not a religious question, it fell within the competence

<sup>88</sup> This view is expressed by Baron Jewish Scholarship, p. 84.

<sup>89</sup> The Centralists were a small group of young intellectuals, headed by Joseph Eötvös, who were the earliest and most vocal spokesmen for popular representation, parliamentarianism and governmental responsibility in Hungary. The *Pesti Hirlap*, founded by Louis Kossuth in 1841, fell under their control in July 1844, and there it remained until 1848. Cf. Beksiacs. See also Vardy Steven Eötvös: *The Political Profile*, pp. 61—101; and idem Eötvös Statesman, pp. 108—109.

<sup>90</sup> In 1846 Eötvös collected many of his political articles written for the *Pesti Hirlap*, and published them in a work entitled *Reform (Pest 1846)*. This work also appeared in Germany under the title *Die Reform in Ungarn*. Leipzig 1846. Others were published, in: *Eötvös Works*, vol. 17 but many still remain to be identified and collected.

<sup>91</sup> For these details and for Eötvös's activities in 1848 in general see Vardy, *Steven Eötvös: The Political Profile*, pp. 102—146. See also: Hajdú, Ferenczi pp. 156—170; and Sötér pp. 211—242.

of the Ministry of Interior, headed by Bertalan Szemere, who was in full agreement with Kossuth's views on this question. Consequently, Eötvös had no direct control over the affairs of the Jews. He could and did influence the course of events indirectly (at least during his short stay in the ministry), but his relationship to the emancipation bill introduced by Ódön Kállay on two occasions — which, as mentioned, failed to pass — is still not clear.

Eötvös's belief in religious equality was portrayed both in the decentralized structure and the multi-religious composition of his ministry<sup>92</sup>. We may assume that it was only the delay in Jewish emancipation that prevented him from appointing Jews also to the staff of his office. This can be deduced from his attempt to have them represented wherever legally permissible. As an example, when after a nationwide competition he selected sixteen Hungarian teachers as fellowship recipients for further study at the famed Prussian teachers training colleges, the list included six Catholics, three Calvinists, two Lutherans, two Greek Orthodox, one Greek Catholic, one Unitarian and one Jew — roughly representative of their numbers in the country<sup>93</sup>. (Only the ruling Catholics were under-represented). Moreover, while devoting his few furbulent months in the ministry to the thorough reform of Hungary's educational and cultural institutions, and while straining his influence to prevent a violent confrontation between the Magyars and the Habsburgs supported by the national minorities, he still found time to convene several religious synods — Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox and Jewish — to tackle the problems confronting each of these denominations. His plans for a Jewish synod were connected with a June 1848 petition of the Reform Jewish Community of Nagyvárad (Grosswardein), which asked for such a national synod "to put their religious affairs in order"<sup>94</sup>. Due to the rapid deterioration of the military situation in the country, however, this synod never assembled. By early September (the proposed date of the synod) the Magyars were fighting Ban Jellačić's invading forces, and Eötvös — who detested violence and had no desire for the disintegration of the Habsburg realm — was at the end of his physical and moral strength. During that month, when despair drove Count Stephen Széchenyi to insanity, Eötvös himself was but a step away from mental derangement. He left Hungary and the revolution, which he regarded as misguided, on the 29<sup>th</sup> of September, and did not return until the end of 1850. "I was not created by Heaven to be a revolutionary," said he later in justifying his forsaking the revolution. "No matter what lofty goals might be before me, I cannot disregard the sufferings of human

<sup>92</sup> The files of Eötvös's Ministry of Religion and Public Education are located in the Viceroyalty Section, Hungarian National Archives, Budapest. For a discussion of the structure and composition of his ministry, see: Hajdú pp. 38—58; and Vardy, Steven Eötvös: The Political Profile, pp. 117—123.

<sup>93</sup> *Pesti Hírlap*, May 11, 1848; and *Közlöny* July 17, 1848.

<sup>94</sup> Bernstein Szabadságharc, p. 247.

beings. I am convinced that brute force — though utilized by every revolution — is not the means that advances the cause of humanity”<sup>95</sup>.

Eötvös's departure from Hungary prevented him from participating in the long overdue emancipation of the Jews by the Parliament in July of 1849. But since the Magyar defeat of that year made this law inoperative, it was still Eötvös who finally turned Jewish emancipation into a reality in 1867, and did so without the slightest conditions or limitations on Jewish immigration<sup>96</sup>.

While highly commendable, this unqualified emancipation, or rather the lack of additional legislation following the enactment of this law, may have carried the seeds of future difficulties. Apparently, doctrinaire liberalism had not reached the point of social consciousness where provisions could have been made for the care of the backward and poverty-stricken Jewish masses streaming in increasing numbers across the Carpathians into Hungary, and thus prevent the growth of political antisemitism. Amidst this general “liberal” unconcern — to quote Professor Szekfű — “only the noble soul of Baron Joseph Eötvös turned with anxious care toward these forgotten masses, and did what he could for the education and elevation of the Jewish people”<sup>97</sup>.

## 9

Precisely how decisive Eötvös's role was in bringing about the emancipation of the Hungarian Jews, is somewhat difficult to assess. While some compare his role to that of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Christian Wilhelm Dohm in Germany, others argue that under the peculiar conditions created by the progressive triumph of romantic liberalism, emancipation was bound to come sooner or later — irrespective of Eötvös's activities<sup>98</sup>. Even if the latter assertion were correct, it could not alter the fact that the ground for emancipation had to be prepared, and that Eötvös had a lion's share in the preparation and implementation of this emancipation. Furthermore, notwithstanding the theories which hold that Jewish emancipation throughout Europe was simply the logical result of the triumph of liberalism, Eötvös personally was motivated not only by a doctrinaire logic, but also by a genuine humanitarianism — rare even among the adherents of French Romanticism. To deny this would be to strip Eötvös of his personality, which makes him even by Marxist standards “one of the

<sup>95</sup> Eötvös to Antal Csengery 1850 (?), in: Eötvös Works vol. 20. p. 30.

<sup>96</sup> The reference here is to Act XVII: 1867. Cf. W eszpr é m y, pp. 42—43 E ö t - v ö s left Hungary in September 1848, and did not return until December 1850. Therefore, Professor K a n n's assertion that „he... was thus primarily connected with the first [1849] as well as the second [1867] emancipation of the Hungarian Jews,” is technically incorrect. Cf. K a n n p. 363, n. 9; and my dissertation, pp. 143ff.

<sup>97</sup> Szekfű Három nemzedék, p. 252; Weidlein [Ed.] p. 20.

<sup>98</sup> Márton Az emancipáció, pp. 39—40; Bernstein Szabadságharc, p. 17.

greatest . . . humanitarians of Hungary"<sup>99</sup>. His aim was "not to please, but to be of use," as he himself had put it in one of his essays on *V i c t o r H u g o*<sup>100</sup>. This consideration made him reject all self-contained art, expressed in the formula *l'art pour l'art*. Though a significant poet and novelist, to him literature without a useful purpose was meaningless. He believed that all forms of creative expression should be "the lament of the whole human race" in its "constant yearning for good"<sup>101</sup>.

E ö t v ö s carried this romantic humanitarianism into the fight of Jewish emancipation. His speeches, writings, and particularly his classic essay on this question, are unparalleled expressions of his attachment to human freedom. Their effect in Hungary was somewhat similar to that of *Lessing's* "Nathan the Wise" (1779) and *Dohm's* "On the Improvement of the Civil Condition of the Jews" (1781) in the German-speaking world. *Lessing* — who became a champion of Jewish emancipation under *Moses Mendelssohn's* influence — attempted to create an emotional link between Christianity and Judaism, to bring these two seemingly alien and antagonistic worlds together in a realization of their common humanity<sup>102</sup>. E ö t v ö s had a similar aim in mind when he portrayed the Jews as the suffering and debased children of the one common God, and appealed to his fellow Christians to practice their "religion of love".

At the same time, E ö t v ö s knew that references to moral obligations may mean very little. Thus he also attacked the problem from a more utilitarian point of view. In this he imitated *Dohm*, who likewise approached the Jewish question from the viewpoint of social usefulness, and whose noted essay — according to *Graetz* — "was the first literary production that contributed toward lifting the heavy yoke from the neck of the Jews"<sup>103</sup>.

Thus, whereas *Lessing's* approach was emotional and *Dohm's* utilitarian, E ö t v ö s was a combination of both. All three men wrote out of deep personal convictions, but unlike *Lessing* and *Dohm*, E ö t v ö s did not have a *Mendelssohn* to urge him on toward this realization. He had to arrive at this conviction through his own personal inclination.

As far as merits are concerned, *Lessing's* and *Dohm's* are immense, but E ö t v ö s achievements are hardly less significant. As a matter of fact, in their Hungarian context, his activities went further than those of the other two in the German world. E ö t v ö s was fortunate enough, because of his involvement in Hungarian political life, to become the actual executor of Jewish emancipation in 1867. His actions in this respect were a living testament to his beliefs.

<sup>99</sup> Introductory study, in: *Felkai* [Ed.] p. 66.

<sup>100</sup> *E ö t v ö s Works*, vol. 12. p. 226.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibidem* p. 224.

<sup>102</sup> For the impact of *Lessing* and *Dohm* on Jewish emancipation, see: *Graetz* vol. 5. pp. 299—338.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibidem* p. 325.

*Bibliography*

- Arató, Endre [u. a.] Magyarország története a feudalizmusról a kapitalizmusra való átmenet korszakában 1790—1849 [The History of Hungary in the Period of Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism 1790—1848]. Budapest 1957.
- Ballagi, Géza A nemzetállamalkotás kora 1815—1847 [The Era of National State Formation 1815—1847]. Budapest 1897.
- Bánóczy, József A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia [The Hungarian Academy of Sciences], in *MZsSz* 1 (1884) pp. 394—396.
- Barany, George The Hungarian Diet of 1839—40 and the Fate of Széchenyi's Middle Course, in: *Slavic Review* 22 (1963) pp. 285—303.
- Stephen Széchenyi and the Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791—1841. Princeton 1968.
- Magyar Jew or: Jewish Magyar?, in: *CASS* 8 (1974) pp. 1—44.
- Baron, Salo W. The Revolution of 1848 and Jewish Scholarship, in: *PAAJR* 18(1948—1949). pp. 1—60; 20(1951) pp. 1—100.
- The Impact of the Revolution of 1848 on Jewish Emancipation, in: *JSS* 11(1949) pp. 195—248.
- Barta, István [Ed.] Kossuth Lajos az utolsó rendi országgyűlésen 1847/48 [Louis Kossuth at the Last Feudal Diet 1847—1848]. Budapest 1951.
- Bártfai-Szabó, László [Ed.] Adatok Gróf Széchenyi István és kora történetéhez 1808—1860 [Documents Concerning Count Stephan Széchenyi and his Age 1808—1860]. Vol. 1—2. Budapest 1943.
- Bartha, István A fiatal Kossuth [Young Kossuth]. Budapest 1966.
- Beck, Karl Jankó, der ungarische Roßhirt. Leipzig 1841.
- Beér, János [Ed.] Az 1848/1849 évi népképviselői országgyűlés [The Popular Representative Parliament of 1848—1849]. Budapest 1954.
- Bekszics, Gusztáv A magyar doctrinairek [The Hungarian Doctrinaires]. Budapest 1882.
- Ben-David, J. Beginning of Modern Jewish Society in Hungary during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century (Hebrew), in: *Zion* 13 (1952) pp. 101—128.
- Bernstein, Béla Az 1848/49-iki magyar szabadságharc és a zsidók [The Hungarian War of Liberation of 1848—1849 and the Jews]. Budapest 1898.
- A zsidók története Vas megyében [The History of the Jews in Vas County], in: *MZsSZ* 30 (1913) pp. 161—208; 243—274.
- Berzsenyi, Dániel A magyarországi mezei szorgalom némely akadályáról [Some of the Impediments to Agricultural Diligence in Hungary]. Pest 1833.
- Blaau, Lajos A zsidók a gazdasági életben [The Jews in Economic Life], in: *MZsSZ* 30(1913) pp. 9—23.
- Bödy, Paul Baron Joseph Eötvös and his Critique of Nationalism in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848—1854, in: *The Historian* 28 (1966) pp. 19—47.
- Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization of Hungary, 1840—1870, in: *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society. New Series* Vol. 62. Part 2. Philadelphia 1972.
- Braham, Randolph L. Hungarian Jewry: An Historical Retrospect, in: *JCEA* 20(1960) pp. 3—23.
- Legitimism, Zionism and Jewish Catastrophe in Hungary, in: *HYB* 6(1964—1965) pp. 239—252.
- [Ed.] *The Destruction of the Hungarian Jewry: A Documentary Account*. Vol. 1—2. New York 1963.
- Brockwell, R. Hundred Years of Hungarian Jewry, in: *Central European Observer* (31. Dez.) 1947.

- Csondor, János Gazdaságbeli számadó és számvető tisztii utasítások [Accounting and Auditing Directives of Bailiffs in Estate Management]. Keszthely 1819.
- Dessewffy, Joseph A "Hitel" című munka taglalata [A Critique of the Work Entitled "Credit"]. Kassa 1831.
- Dubnov, S. M. History of the Jews in Russia and Poland from the Earliest Times Until the Present Day. Philadelphia 1916—1930.
- Einhorn, Ignatz Die Revolution und die Juden in Ungarn. Nebst einem Rückblick auf die Geschichte der Letzteren. Leipzig 1851.
- Empfindungen eines Israeliten nach dem Schlusse des glorreichen Landtages im Mai 1840. Pest 1840.
- Eötvös, József A zsidók emancipációja [The Emancipation of the Jews], in: Budapesti Szemle 2 (1840) pp. 110—156, reprint, in: Eötvös Összes munkái [Complete Works] Vol. 1—20. ed. by Voinovich, Géza. Budapest 1902—1904.
- Falk, Miksa Kor-és jellemrajzok [Age and Character Sketches]. Budapest 1903.
- Farkas, Julius Der ungarische Vormärz - Petőfi's Zeitalter. Berlin 1943.
- Felkai, László [Ed.] Eötvös József válogatott pedagógiai művei [The Selected Pedagogical Works of Joseph Eötvös]. Budapest 1957.
- Fényes, Elek Magyarország statistikája [Statistics of Hungary]. Vol. 1—3. Pest 1842—1843.
- Ferenczi, Zoltán Bárány Eötvös József 1813—1871. Budapest 1903.
- Ferenczy, József Gróf Dessewffy Aurél összes művei [Complete Works]. Budapest 1887.
- Friedmann, Isaiah The Austro-Hungarian Government and Zionism: 1897—1918, in: JSS 27(1965) pp. 147—167, 236—249.
- Goldhammer, Leo Jewish Emigration from Austria-Hungary in 1848—1849, in: YASS 9(1954) pp. 332—362.
- Graetz, H. Popular History of the Jews. 4th ed. Vol. 1—6. New York 1930.
- Hajdú, János Eötvös József báró első minisztersége 1848 [Baron Joseph Eötvös's First Ministry]. Budapest 1933.
- Hartmann, Anton Theodor Grundsätze des orthodoxen Judenthums. o. Eo. o. J.
- Helfy, Ignác; Kossuth, Ferencz [Eds.] Kossuth Lajos iratai [Papers]. Vol. 1—13. Budapest 1880—1911.
- Hellbling, Ernst C. Österreichische Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte. Wien 1956.
- Hóman, Bálint; Szekfű, Gyula Magyar történet [Hungarian History]. 7th ed. Vols. 1—5. Budapest 1941—1943.
- Horváth, Mihály Huszonöt év Magyarország történelméből 1823-tól 1848-ig [Twenty-Five Years from Hungary's History from 1823 to 1848]. 2nd ed. Vol. 1—3. Pest 1868.
- Jászi, Oscar The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chicago 1929.
- A falu jegyzője [Der Dorfnotar]. Pest 1848.
- Kann, Robert A. Hungarian Jewry during Austria-Hungary's Constitutional Period (1867—1918), in: JSS 7(1945) pp. 357—386.
- Katzburg, Nathaniel The Struggle of Hungarian Jewry for Religious Equality in the 1890's (Hebrew), in: Zion 22(1957) pp. 119—138.
- Anti-Semitism in Hungary and its Place in Politics, 1883—1887 (Hebrew), in: Zion 30(1965) pp. 79—114.
- Hungarian Jewry in Modern Times, in: HJS 1966. pp. 137—170.

- Kóhn, Sámuel A zsidók története Magyarországon a legrégebb időktől a mohácsi vészig [The History of the Jews in Hungary from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Mohács]. Budapest 1884.
- A honfoglaló magyarok és a zsidók [The Conquering Magyars and the Jews, in: MZsSZ 1(1884) pp. 3—10.
- Rituális vérvád a múlt században [Ritual Blood Trial in the Past Century], in: MZsSz 1(1884) pp. 348—351.
- Kölcsey, Ferencz A szatmári adózó nép állapotáról [On the Condition of the Taxpaying Population of Szatmár], in: idem. Minden munkái [Complete Works]. Pest 1848.
- Kónyi, Manó [Ed.] Deák Ferencz beszédei [Speeches]. 2nd ed. Vol. 1—6. Budapest 1903.
- Kovács, Alajos A zsidók térfoglalása Magyarországon [The Expansion of the Jews in Hungary]. Budapest 1922.
- Kováts, Ferenc; Grünwald, Fülöp; Scheiber, Alexander [Eds.] Monumenta Hungariae Judaica. Vol. 1—8. Budapest 1903—1965.
- Kutas, E. R. Judaism, Zionism and Anti-Semitism in Hungary, in: JCEA 8(1949) pp. 377—389.
- László, Ernő Hungarian Jewry: Settlement and Demography, in: HSJ 1966, pp. 61—136.
- László, Nikolaus Die geistige und soziale Entwicklung der Juden in Ungarn in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Berlin 1934.
- Lévai, Jenő Zsidósors Magyarországon [Jewish Fate in Hungary]. Budapest 1948.
- Löw, Leopold Zur neueren Geschichte der Juden in Ungarn. Budapest 1874.
- Marczali, Henrik A magyarországi zsidók II. József korában [The Jews of Hungary in the Age of Joseph II], in: MZsSZ 1(1884) pp. 353—363.
- Marczali, Henrik A reformok kora [The Age of Reforms]. Vol. 11. Budapest = Marczali, Henrik [ed.] A nagy képes világtörténet [The Great Illustrated World History]. Vol. 1—12. Budapest 1898—1904.
- Marczali, Henry Hungary in the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge 1910.
- Márton, Ernő [et. al.] Az emancipáció múltja és jövője [The Past and Future of Emancipation]. Kolozsvár 1942.
- Márton, Ernő A magyar zsidóság családfája [The Family Tree of Hungarian Jewry]. Kolozsvár 1942; erschien auch engl., in: HJS 1966 (New York) pp. 1—59.
- Marschalkó, Lajos Országhódítók [State Conquerors]. München 1965.
- McCagg, William O. Jewish Nobles and Geniuses in Modern Hungary. New York 1972.
- Hungary's "Feudalized" Bourgeoisie, in: JMH 44(1972) pp. 65—78.
- Menczer, Béla Joseph Eötvös and Hungarian Liberalism, in: Slavonic and East European Review 17(1939) pp. 525—538.
- Mérei, Gyula Mezőgazdaság és agrártársadalom Magyarországon, 1790—1848 [Agriculture and Agricultural Society in Hungary, 1790—1848]. Budapest 1848.
- Első magyar zsidó naptár és évkönyv az 1848-ik szökőévre [The First Hungarian Jewish Calendar and Yearbook for the Leap Year 1848]. Pest 1848.
- 1865-7-dik évi országgyűlési törvények [The Parliamentary Acts of 1865—1867]. Vol. 1—18. Pest 1868.
- Paulus, H. E. G. Die jüdische National-Absonderung nach Ursprung, Folgen, und Besserungsmitteln. Heidelberg 1831.

- Radvánszky, Anton Baron Josef Eötvös, ungarischer Statsmann und Denker. Köln, Detroit 1959.
- Reményi, Joseph Baron Joseph Eötvös, Writer and Statesman, in: Molnar, August J. [Ed.] *Hungarian Writers and Literature*. New Brunswick, N. J. 1964. pp. 117—126.
- Róth, Sándor *Juden im ungarischen Kulturleben in der zweiten Hälfte des XIX. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin 1934.
- Schickert, Klaus *Die Judenfrage in Ungarn. Jüdische Assimilation und antisemitische Bewegung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Essen 1943.
- Schreiber, Alexander [Ed.] *Corpus Inscriptionum Hungariae Judaicarum, a temporibus saeculi III, quae exstant, usque ad annum 1686*. Budapest 1960.
- Sötér, István Eötvös József, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Budapest 1967.
- Sombart, Werner *Die Juden und das moderne Wirtschaftsleben*. Leipzig 1911.
- Sós, Endre *Zsidók a magyar városokban [Jews in the Hungarian Cities]*. Budapest 1940.
- Streckfuss, K. *Über das Verhältnis der Juden zu den christlichen Staaten*.
- Szekfü, Gyula *Iratok a magyar államnyelv kérdésének történetéhez 1790—1848 [Documents Concerning the History of the Question of Magyar State Language 1790—1848]*. Budapest 1926.
- *Három nemzedék [Three Generations]*. Budapest 1920.
- Várdy, Ágnes Mária *Karl Beck élete és költői pályája [The Life and Poetical Career of Karl Beck]*. Ph. D. Diss., University of Budapest 1970.
- Vardy, Steven Bela *Baron Joseph Eötvös: The Political Profile of a Liberal Hungarian Thinker and Statesman*. Ph. D. Diss. Indiana University. Bloomington. Ind. 1967.
- *Baron Joseph Eötvös on Liberalism and Nationalism*, in: *Studies for a New Central Europe*. Ser. II (1967—1968). Vol. 1. pp. 65—73.
- *Baron Joseph Eötvös: Statesman, Thinker, Reformer*, in: *Duquesne Review* 13(1968) pp. 107—119.
- Venetiáner, Lajos *A magyar zsidóság története a honfoglalástól a világháború kitéréséig [The History of the Hungarian Jews from the Conquest to the Outbreak of the World War]*. Budapest 1922.
- Viator, Scotus; [Seton-Watson, R. W.] *Racial Problems in Hungary*. London 1908.
- Viszota, Gyula [Ed.] *Gróf Széchenyi István naplói [The Diaries of Count Stephen Széchenyi]*. Vol. 1—6. Budapest 1925—1939.
- Vörösmarty, Mihály *Zsidóügy [Jewish Problem]*, in: *Pesti Divatlap [Pest Fashion Journal]* 13<sup>th</sup> May, 1848.
- Weber, Johann Eötvös und die ungarische Nationalitätenfrage. München 1966.
- Weidlein, Johann [Ed.] *Der ungarische Antisemitismus in Dokumenten*. Schorndorf 1962.
- Weszprémy, Kálmán *A magyarországi zsidók statisztikája [The Statistics of the Hungarian Jews]*. Debrecen 1907.
- Újhelyi, Géza *Kossuth Lajos értekezése az »éhség-mentő intézetek«-ről [Louis Kossuth's Study on the "Institutions to Prevent Hunger"]*. Régi Okirat és Levelek Tára Repository of Old Documents and Letters]. Vol. 1. Budapest 1905.
- *A zsidók Magyarországon [The Jews in Hungary]*, in: *RNL* Vol. 19. Budapest 1929, pp. 746—748.

*Abbreviations*

- CASS = Canadian-American Slavic Studies  
HJS = Braham, Randolph L. [Ed.] Hungarian Jewish Studies  
HYB = Herzl Year Book  
JCEA = Journal of Central European Affairs  
JMH = The Journal of Modern History  
JSS = Jewish Social Studies  
MZsSZ = Magyar Zsidó Szemle [= Hungarian Jewish Review]  
PAAJR = Publications of the American Academy for Jewish Research  
RNL = Révai Nagy Lexikona  
YAJSS = Yíro Annual of Jewish Social Sciences