

Norbert Glässer



“Our King, Who You Sent Like Moses...”

*The Veneration of Ruler, Confessionalization Process and Patriotism in the
Hungarian Jewish Denominational Press before 1944*

Habilitation treatise
(Theses)

Jewish Theological Seminary – University of Jewish Studies
Budapest
2017

1. The Jewish community perception of Francis Joseph was determined by the duality of Jewish attitudes towards the religious traditions of Judaism and the modern ideals of nation.
2. Besides religious traditions the attitude towards Francis Joseph was also coloured by the role the ruler played in the late confessionalization process of the Jews and his symbolic gestures during the internal debates among the different trends.
3. Neology and Orthodoxy attributed to the ruler's merit besides their own institutionalisation, also the social integration of the Jews, the granting of equal civil rights and their acceptance as an established denomination.
4. In the cultural memory of Neolog Jews 1848 is the symbol of becoming one with the modern Hungarian nation. Although the symbolic politics of independence appeared in Jewish public discourse, it was not directed against Francis Joseph but was intended to express belonging to the Hungarian nation within a system of multiple loyalties.
5. The rabbis and publicists shaping Jewish symbolic politics based their position on the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867.
6. The role of patron extended to the dynasty was also reflected in Orthodox and Neolog news items.
7. In Habsburg Austria, just as in Hungary, all the Jewish trends identified with the aims of the Monarchy in the world war.
8. . The Francis Joseph image in the Judaised royalist, state-patriotic discourse followed the time view of the liturgy and the homilies.
9. The press perception of Charles IV was determined by the premodern traditions of succession to the throne and the question of presenting the attainment of equal rights.
10. In the spirit of confessionalization and equal rights, the 1916 Roman Catholic coronation ceremony was reinterpreted according to the traditions of Judaism and its symbols traced back to Judaism.
11. In the interpretations given by the press the coronation of Charles IV was regarded as the culmination of a historical process along the line of the historical development and advancement of Hungarian Jews.
12. The relationship between the religious king and political Catholicism was a recurring topic in the Neolog press.

13. We find numerous examples in Hungarian history and symbolic politics of the royal authorities and national leaders opposing anti-Semitic attacks affecting the community with positive gestures towards the Jews.
14. In Jewish interpretations between the two world wars the period of Francis Joseph became a lost golden age



Abstract

The Objectives and Problems

The Jewish community perception of Francis Joseph was determined by the duality of Jewish attitudes towards the religious traditions of Judaism and the modern ideals of nation. Just as Hungarian symbolic politics in the time of the Dual Monarchy was determined by the memory of 1848–49 and the debate over constitutional law, so the Jewish adaptation of Hungarian symbolic politics was shaped by the events of 1867, 1868–69 and 1895: its themes were drawn from the constitutional law milestones of emancipation, the Jewish Congress held under the auspices of Baron József Eötvös and the reception. The question of the image of the ruler held by Jews in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy is a story of “changes”. The religious interpretations of the crowned head had their origin in the Jewish interpretation of galuth, the myth of the “royal ally” and Judaisation of the veneration of rulers in Antiquity. Europe’s modernising society added nuance to the phenomenon. And the symbolic manifestations of feudal traditions in cases intertwined or clashed with the modern nation ideals.

Rather than creating a rigid opposition between religious cults and symbolisations and historical/political cults and symbolisations, it is more expedient to build the frame of the analysis on the question of how the two phenomena are intertwined. Two key concepts of this can be *civil religion*, and *the myth of the “royal ally”*. Robert N. Bellah traces the concept of civil religion back to *Rousseau*, who declared that every society needs a profession of purely civil faith. For *Bellah* civil religion is the modern alternative occupying the place of religion, that modern society fills with content. Civil religion is the sum of religious beliefs, symbols and rites. These are located in the transcendent dimension and are rooted in historical experience. Its function is to legitimate, integrate and share. It is based on particular events in national

history declared to be significant. It (re)interprets them in the light of the current aspirations of the given time and places them in a normative frame. András Gerő interprets civil religion in the frame of symbolic politics. *Symbolic politics* can represent alternative history in face of the existing power constellations of “*real politics*” (interest politics, power politics, economic politics, social politics, etc.), spiritual power in face of the power interpretation of “real politics”. Civil religion appearing as a part of symbolic politics within the frame of the ideal of nation that arose in the 19th century and national traditions – the society’s purely secular civil religion – is an immanent religion in the sense that the given ethnic group makes its own history, past, present or future the subject or source of faith, thereby sacralising things of this world, creating a secular religion following religious structural patterns. Civil religion’s function was to bridge and overwrite feudal, religious and corporate fracture lines in the modernising society. Civil religion as a phenomenon is embedded in the context of cultural memory; the characteristics of that memory determine its operation. Its rites are rooted in the feudal and religious feast, while the widely known concepts of the Bible and liturgy serve as its language.

The Sources and frames

The press is both an instrument and a mechanism of the changes of modernity. According to Sara Abrevaya Stein the press became the forum for issues related to the changed social and cultural circumstances, and often itself became an assistant of change. However, the opinions and strategies appearing in the press should not be confused with the everyday practice of the actual communities. Only the opinion-shaping intention of the journalism elite can be detected behind the press. We know relatively little about the readers. Even the letters from readers are the results of a process of editing. Nevertheless, the opinion of the journalism and publishing elite is not independent of the real community life. It was not only the press but also the institutional system above the communities that created the new phenomenon of modernity. The elite editors and journalists of the Hungarian-language Jewish papers in Budapest were in close contact with the Central Offices, as secretaries, legal consultants or in some other capacity. The papers had differing functions, they adapted to the given social circumstances and were influenced by the political and economic changes. One thing they all had in common was that they represented group interests in face of the new trends of modernity. The examined papers were all papers targeting specific groups in Budapest and dealt on one hand with middle-class problems and on the other with institutional strategies.

Under the influence of the ideals of the Jewish enlightenment that placed the emphasis on denominational self-definition, and encouraged by the state and internal community aspiration for the attainment of equal rights, the Jews of Hungary defined themselves within the frames of the ideal of the modern assimilative Hungarian nation. Although there were numerous differences between the trends in the adaptation of the new national, confessional frame, those frames determined the attitude towards king and nation. The cardinal issues of politics at that time – the question of restructuring the economy, the question of creating a bourgeois, national middle class and its composition, the question of national consciousness, the question of minorities, the relationship to the Dynasty – appeared together with the cause of the social situation and the Hungarianisation of the Jews. In this way, in the press both the traditions and models of earlier periods and the new phenomena of modern civil political thinking together shaped the Jewish veneration of the ruler and the internalization of the modern Hungarian nation-religion.

The study examines the Hungarian Jewish adaptations of the Hungarian and Austrian image of Francis Joseph, the collective denominational memory and Judaism's veneration of the ruler as a hierarchy of loyalties, as reflected in leading articles, news reports, homilies, small prints and prayer books. It asks *how the opinion-shaping Jewish confessional elite in the period of the Dual Monarchy adapted the symbolic self-interpretations of the modernizing Hungarian society, the premodern symbolism of power and law, and the symbols and rites of modern symbolic politics: the publicists of the middle classes in liberal professions and rabbis leading/employed by the religious communities. What rites, remembrance practices and material manifestations arose in the course of adaptation within the frame of Judaism of the phenomena of the secularizing Christian society in the sense of sociology of religion? How did the historical periods as changing frames influence these?* Thinking in terms of a process model, the 1916 coronation has special significance for its intertwining of feudal and modern national traditions. On the basis of this example the study examines *how the Jewish confession in Hungary adapted and interpreted a rite symbolizing statehood that was performed within the frames of the Roman Catholic confession, as part of the coronation mass. What was the response within the synagogues to loyalty and homage manifested within confessional frames? And what place did this have within the historical order of the Neolog community? How did they represent the topos of progress and the betterment of society with regard to their own situation? How did the coronation become a celebration of equal rights and belonging to the nation?*

Results of the research

(1) Veneration of the crowned head arose from the religious traditions of Judaism. In Orthodox Jewish communities, mainly in Galicia and Bukovina, appearing before the ruler with the Torah scrolls (*intrada*) was part of the reception of the crowned ruler even during the First World War.

The question of Hungarian civil religion that was emerging in that period is a good example of the attitude towards the state and legislation. The connection made between respect for the crowned ruler and the Torah can be understood if placed in the context of religious tradition. The Torah carried by the delegations coming to express homage is an objectified symbol of the revealed Teaching. The liturgy and the literature on religious ethics can throw light on the question. Religious law prescribes a blessing when the king is seen: “Blessed are You our Everlasting God, King of the world, who gives of his glory to mortal man.” The Hebrew-Hungarian version of the festive prayer books (*mahzor*) in the series of prayer books published by József Schön and widely used in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as the Neolog Jewish prayer book contains a prayer said for Francis Joseph, for the ruling dynasty and the homeland. This prayer was also found in everyday and Sabbath prayer books (*siddur*) and in prayer books for women (*tehines*). The Sabbath and feast day prayer said for the well-being of the state or the ruler raised the prayer said for the non-Jewish secular power into the dialogue conducted with the Everlasting. The prayers said during services were substitutes for sacrifices in the sanctuary. The prayer said for the ruler was therefore an important expression of the relationship between the Jews and the authorities. Prefigurations can be found in Antiquity. Pavla Damohorská regards it as the Judaisation of Egyptian and Roman non-Jewish practice. Variants of the *Hanoten teshua* texts appearing from the 18th century showed the relationship between the community and the wider sociocultural system. The crowned ruler was a pale reflection in this world of the glory of the Creator. He was also the guarantee of social order and the safety of the Jews. This was expounded in a readily understandable way in Hungarian by S. Leo Singer Orthodox chief rabbi of Rimaszombat (now Rimavská Sobota, Slovakia) in his reworking of the *Chovot HaLevavot* published in 1907 under the title *Kötelelességtan* [The Study of Duties]. Besides the religious precedents, it must not be forgotten that the premodern Jewish communities were under the protection of rulers or landowners. The Jewish citizens of modernizing monarchies could also hope for support from the ruler in their community affairs. In his handbook on religious ethics brought into line with the bourgeois world, Chief Rabbi Singer devoted special attention to respect for the crown and the authorities under the title of *K’vod haMalchut* (Respect of kingship). He deduced respect for the king from the Ethics of the

Fathers (Pirkei Avot III. 2.): “Pray for peace, salvation and a happy life for the king and the authorities, because if he was not feared, one [person] would swallow the other.” The Mishna attributes the saying to Rabbi Chanina, the chief priest’s deputy. Chief Rabbi Singer also gives the text a religious interpretation in *Kötelességtan*: “Our sacred religion commands us to show grateful respect to the king and the authorities, because by providing equal justice they guard the peace of us all so that evil men do not disturb us in our useful work.” Besides the blessing to be said when seeing the crowned ruler, Chief Rabbi Singer also wrote about loyalty to the king. He deduced this from the Book of Proverbs. “Fear the Lord and the king and do not join with the rebellious.” (Proverbs 24:21) Chief Rabbi Singer saw respect for the king as respect for the order of the country. In his book Chief Rabbi Singer draws a picture of the ruler legitimated by God. This premodern ruler stood outside society, but nevertheless manifested its order. In Hungary the Löw family of rabbis was highly influential in shaping modern Jewish symbolical politics. The prayer book published by Immanuel Löw in Szeged in 1903 under the title *Imádságok zsidók számára* [Prayers for Jews] included two Hungarian-language versions of the prayer to be said for the king. Both prayer texts represented the structure of society, from the king to the praying “congregation”. They asked for God’s blessing for the representatives of power, for the nation, the town and the community. Immanuel Löw cited the *Ethics of the Fathers* and the *Book of Proverbs*. In the published prayer texts the concepts of the king (Francis Joseph), the Hungarian nation and the homeland were intertwined. This was the case for the prayer variants of both the “1848” veteran rabbi, Leopold Löw and his son Immanuel Löw.

(2) In the course of the 19th century in the Jewish communities modern nation ideals and social changes had to be reconciled with the traditional frames of Judaism. The representation of interests at court, that is, the institution of *stadlanut* and respect for the crowned ruler were part of European Jewish community traditions. However, with modernity the institution itself changed. The premodern ruler, outside society and legitimated by divine right entered the social processes, the persons acting as *stadlan*, representing the community at the court of the ruler and familiar with the customs and relations of the outside Christian community, acting as spokesmen, changed: they became suppliers to the imperial and royal court or learned men at home in modern politics and secular sciences. The Jewish group strategies that were taking shape in the early 20th century became institutionalised after the split that occurred at the Jewish congress convened in Hungary in 1868–69 with the aim of achieving a uniform denominational political representation. The attitude towards Francis Joseph was also coloured not only by

religious traditions but also by the role the ruler played in the late confessionalization process of the Jews and his symbolic gestures during the internal debates among the different trends.

(3) Neology and Orthodoxy attributed to the ruler's merit besides their own institutionalisation, also the social integration of the Jews, the granting of equal civil rights and their acceptance as an established denomination. In this way Francis Joseph came to be regarded as a defender of the Jews, a deeply religious Catholic ruler.

Among the many news items Francis Joseph's attitude towards the cause of modern rabbi training was of special significance for the history of memory. The dynasty also supported the demand for a school on the part of the modern Jewish trend that was loyal to the state and wished to integrate into the majority society, and in 1850 Francis Joseph used the tolerance tax arrears collected in 1849 to set up the "Jewish Education Fund". The Jüdisch-Theologische Seminar opened in 1854 in Breslau by the Maskilim in Germany later served as a model for the establishment of a modern Jewish education institution in Hungary. The visit by the ruler that legitimated the institution was later commemorated a number of times in the gazette of the National Rabbi Training Seminary set up in Budapest. The Orthodox-Neolog divide was one of the spectacular breaking points in the question of rabbi training. In the matter of the Talmudic schools and the Orthodox rabbis, papers representing the opinion of the Orthodox Office strove to emphasise both their separate position and the recognition they received from the ruler. The communities and the Orthodox Jewish publicists reinterpreted the events of the royal visits as the ruler's recognition of traditional Jewish religiosity. The rabbi of Balassagyarmat, Áron Dávid Deutsch (1812-1878) was among the Orthodox leaders of the *Taylung* (split) at the time of the 1868-69 Jewish Congress. He also took part in the talks with Francis Joseph. In 1894, as another declaration of the king, he had engraved on a marble commemorative tablet the words the ruler addressed to the Balassagyarmat Orthodox delegation that came to express its respects. "Religious difference does not form a dividing wall in my feelings for my peoples. You too can therefore count at all times on my royal grace and protection." The transformation of a declaration by the king interpreted as a gesture of protection into a community memory was a more general practice. The *Zsidó Híradó* held this up as an example to be followed by Orthodoxy in Hungary. In this frame of interpretation the gestures of the religious Catholic ruler became symbolic answers given to the Neolog efforts for unification. In the press debates during the period of the dual monarchy, the yeshivas and the Orthodox rabbis were often accused of being unpatriotic and disloyal. Orthodoxy and the Talmudic school in Pozsony represented the official line of the Orthodox institutional system in Hungary. The appearance

in the press of patriotic sentiments loyal to the king was embedded in respect for the heads of the Schreiber dynasty in Pozsony. The religious interpretations kept alive through the chain of generations further strengthened the positive view of the ruler. Predominant among the religious models were the Talmud and Mishnah prefigurations of the exile.

(4) Emancipation and their undertaking of a role in society made it possible for Central European Jews to identify with the modern ideals of nation. They also included various expectations of loyalty, loyalty conflicts and hierarchies of loyalty. Among the Jews of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy there was a difference between Habsburg Austria and Hungary in the forms of loyalty to the state. In the Central European states the Jews who had won civil rights identified with the modern nation ideals, albeit within differing frames. Habsburg Austria was organised on the basis of political, dynastic principles, consequently in the Austrian part of the Monarchy at the state level there was no nationalism in either the ethnic or the linguistic and cultural sense. Austria's Jewish citizens were able to remain loyal to the state without having to accept any particular national identity. In contrast with Habsburg Austria, the Hungarian political elite defined Hungary as a nation state and its Jewish inhabitants adopted the dominant Hungarian concept of nation based on language and culture. Throughout the period of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy Hungarian public discourse was shaped by the debate on constitutional law. In the case of the image formed of Francis Joseph, that debate was conducted as "*kuruc*"-type Hungarian symbolic politics. Lajos Kossuth and his Hungarian followers opposed the Compromise reached between the Dynasty, the liberal Hungarian nobility and part of the Austrian citizenry. Those opinion-shaping veteran revolutionaries who saw in the Compromise of 1867 the restoration of constitutionality, the ordering of the relationship between the nation and the ruler could be found in other groups of society. In Neolog cultural memory 1848 is the symbol of the melding together of the modern Hungarian nation. Although the symbolic politics of independence appeared in Jewish public discourse, it was not directed against Francis Joseph but was intended to express belonging to the Hungarian nation within a system of multiple loyalties. The "*kuruc*"-type national and the royalist state patriotic discourse were present side by side in the Neolog and Orthodox press throughout the period. Nevertheless, in the case of conflicting loyalties, respect for the king legitimated by religious models prevailed.

(5) With the Enlightenment and the emergence of modern political civil consciousness, Jewish synagogue speeches reflecting on major events of the majority national history and adaptations of the symbolic politics of the surrounding world within the frame of Judaism also appeared.

On the name day and birthday of the ruler, and at religious services as part of the rites for anniversaries in the life of the ruling family the synagogue sermons of many rabbis reflected on similarities in Holy Scripture and in the events of the Compromise. The rabbis and publicists shaping Jewish symbolic politics based their position on the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867.

(6) The publicists sought justification for loyalty to the king in the founding community memory, the texts of Holy Scripture. This offered the common basis for common interpretation capital both inwards and towards the Christian outside world. The Orthodox press regularly published stories, folkloristic writings, texts full of miraculous elements about the gestures made by Francis Joseph as ruler towards the Jews, and his greatness. These also appeared in the Neolog *Egyenlőség*. Francis Joseph looked on himself as protector of the unity of his peoples and empire and defender of peace among the denominations. The role of patron extended to the dynasty was also reflected in Orthodox news items. Prefigurations of this topos can be sought in publications marking anniversaries of the ruler and under the patronage of members of the ruling family, as well as the texts of prayers said for the well-being of the ruler and the state, and in religious explications regarding loyalty to the authorities.

(7) In Habsburg Austria, just as in Hungary, all the Jewish trends identified with the aims of the Monarchy in the world war. The Neolog Jewish weekly paper *Egyenlőség* published in Budapest also attributed the peace among the peoples and denominations of the Monarchy to the dynasty, presenting it as an institution above nations and religions that alone bore responsibility for preserving the unity of the Empire. Neology placed individual actors from the royal family in Hungarian symbolic politics. Wartime publicistic writings in *Egyenlőség* portrayed Hungary as a Holy Land, the Hungarian Jews as the brothers of the other, Christian members of the Hungarian nation, and Jews going off to war as free, included and fighters for their new home. The Jewish middle-aged generation of the Great War took equal rights of citizens for granted because they had been born into this as a new generation that grew up after the reception and during the war, as members of one of the recognised denominations they could demonstrate their loyalty to the nation, the empire and the ruler. Neolog propaganda during the First World War emphasised full identification with the nation, as well as the dynastic grievances and loyalty to the king. Even before the Jewish census in Germany in 1916 the Jews were often accused of being incapable of heroic, self-sacrificing deeds. In Central Europe too the accusation of evading military service was often levelled against the Jews. The

refutation of this was incorporated into the Jewish adaptation of war propaganda and also into the later Hungarian Jewish hero cult.

(8) In his prayer the Pest rabbi Simon Hevesi compared Francis Joseph to Moses who led the Jews in their wandering in the wilderness. The Francis Joseph image in the Judaised royalist, state-patriotic discourse followed the time view of the liturgy and the homilies. It sought parallels in the founding memory. It showed the essential identity between Francis Joseph and the kings of Scripture. This was overlaid with the image of the king based on Hungarian historical memory of the Compromise and the positive experience of contemporary Jews.

(9) Mourning for Francis Joseph and the coronation of the new emperor as king of Hungary were intertwined both at the level of the hinterland and in the interpretations given by the Jewish confession. Francis Joseph became a symbol of continuity with the past and of a prosperous era. Although veneration of the crowned ruler had been present in Judaism, the succession to the throne in 1916 created a new situation for the Jews who had been raised to the rank of recognised denomination under the previous ruler and who had become equal subjects of the Kingdom of Hungary. At the same time Jewish denominational news items on the coronation also attempted to present the expected impact the coronation of the new ruler would have on the future of the Jews. If we regard the wider social frame of the news items, we find that they were written in the capital city in mourning. Because of the social changes that had occurred in the lives of Jews, Francis Joseph was compared even in his lifetime to Moses, and this became a recurrent topos in the speeches of rabbis in connection with the death and succession, showing parallels to the liberation from Egyptian bonds. The editor-in-chief of *Egyenlőség*, Lajos Szabolcsi, who followed his father in that post, used comparisons to Moses and Joshua in writing on the connection between Francis Joseph and the heir to the throne Karl Franz Joseph. Just as Moses could not enter Canaan after the years of wandering in the wilderness, so Francis Joseph could not see the new world. After their long journey full of trials but with the promise of victory, his people(s) were being led on the road to peace by Charles, the heir to the throne who had grown up beside him and represented the new generation, like Joshua. Mourning for the great ruler who “liberated” the Jewish denomination and attention paid to the symbolic gestures of the new ruler were present in parallel in the press. The articles attempted to trace the attitude of the new ruler towards the Jews, from the process of preparation for the coronation right up to his first constitutional actions affecting the Jews. The prototype was the wartime perception of Francis Joseph, and his memory. He became the model and expectation regarding the new ruler. Charles IV was compared to him in emphasising continuity. The declarations

made by the emperor on ascending the throne were presented as condemnation of the accusations questioning the participation of Jews in the war. The interpretation of the coronation and homage in the Neolog *Egyenlőség* reflected not only religious traditions but also the social reality of the age and were addressed to the ruler acting in a social space, endowed with a personality and known from his declarations as heir to the throne. In its articles on the coronation and its later interpretations, the figure of Charles IV was associated with his role of ensuring full equality and preserving denominational peace that, according to the paper, arose from the king's world-view and his personal conviction.

The coronation, that no longer took place as the state religion, merely as a constitutional ceremony conducted by the Catholic church as one of the denominations, became an occasion for attacks in the struggles over church policy. Parallel with the reception, as part of the church policy struggles, the Catholic People's Party paper, *Alkotmány*, launched by the group led by the conservative aristocrats Nándor Zichy and Miklós Móric Eszterházy, constantly attacked the modern social trends and liberal political aspirations. According to Tibor Klestenitz one of the most important characteristics of the struggle over church policy was the increasingly coarse tone of public life. The Catholic People's Party stood on the basis of the Compromise of 1867, but at the same time the fracture lines in national politics divided the Catholic movement, and on the whole it did not represent either the clergy or the politically active Catholics. The paper's pieces attacking the Jews, liberalism and modernity with its western intellectual roots often led to series of articles in *Egyenlőség* protecting interests and presenting counter arguments. A political debate arose over the appointment to the position of Palatine – which had also been a problem at the time of the coronation of Francis Joseph – due to the fact that the prime minister, Count István Tisza belonged to the Calvinist denomination. The opposition strove to implant in public opinion the idea that the coronation was a strictly Catholic ceremony that would be desecrated by the participation of Tisza as a Protestant. It is in this context that the Neolog Jewish press apologetics on the denominational role of the Jews is to be understood. It was sparked by László Márkus, a publicist for the Catholic People's Party organ, *Alkotmány*, who wrote about the approaching constitutional event as the Jews' coronation. In the articles of *Egyenlőség*, the coronation became a demonstration of belonging to the nation.

(10) According to the Joshua comparison made in *Egyenlőség*, the role of ruler inherited by Charles IV predestined him to be the defender of equal rights for the Jews. For this reason its interpretations of the coronation were intertwined with references to the creation of the new Jewish institutional system simultaneously with the creation of the frames of the modern civil state. The Neolog Jewish life-world of the coronation was determined by the Great War and the

thought of the struggle undertaken together with the nation, as an equal part of it. In Jewish collective memory the equality won with emancipation became a recurring point of reference in judging and interpreting the challenges faced by the community. Emancipation and the ideal of equality shaped Jewish public discourse and became the frame of interpretation for the community response to many challenges.

Even earlier writings on historical themes in *Egyenlőség* had been marked by the romantic view of history of the Hungarian nobility influenced by the German historicism of Ranke. The historian and rabbi Sámuel Kohn adapted to Hungarian Jewish relations the dynastic, tribal evocation of the past that had its roots in Central Europe and Germany. The Hungarian-Jewish collective founding memory was formulated in the spirit of the millenary anniversary of the Magyar settlement in Hungary and strongly reflected the contemporary reality of emancipation and reception. In the process of becoming Hungarian the social demand for the presentation of the shared establishment of the country, shared origin, the arrival together in the new homeland and a thousand years of shared Hungarian-Jewish collective fate also appeared in the loyal Neolog Jewish interpretations of the coronation.

The last coronation in the Kingdom of Hungary took place in the social reality of the Great War. The event was documented with modern means, it was interpreted by numerous opinion-setting groups through the press and also recorded in works of art and easily reproduced popular souvenir objects. The collective rites of symbolic politics were carried out along the lines of the division of contemporary society into denominations and associations. In the case of a coronation being held in the hinterland of a war – where the self-image of feudal Hungary and the demand of modern society for representation appeared together – it can be said that the distinctive life-world of the Jewish denominational interpretations could also be identified. Veneration of the crowned ruler had its roots in the religious traditions of Judaism, while the interpretations of the coronation also indicated that the new Jewish institutional system was being created at the same time as the frames of the modern civil state. Writing in the Neolog Jewish weekly *Egyenlőség*, Arnold Kiss, a Jewish poet and Neolog rabbi in Buda, following the Jewish concept of time that sought fundamental similarities of events, drew a parallel between the figure of Charles IV and the coronation itself, and Biblical times. This was also generally true for the coronation homilies of Neolog rabbis and publicistic writings in the Jewish press. As Buda chief rabbi Arnold Kiss saw it, that crown: “the crown of loyalty and love”, that according to the tradition interpreting the scripture of Judaism the pharaoh did not wish to receive from the delegation of Moses and Aaron, will be an ornament on the head of Charles IV before the Everlasting. In the interpretation of the chief rabbi of Buda, the crown

that was of divine origin according to oral Teaching appears again as a sign of the unbroken loyalty of the Hungarian Jews to the king.

The publicists writing in *Egyenlőség* made a clear distinction between the veneration and homage that was to be given on the basis of religious tradition – that they illustrated by citing the coronation ceremonies of King Matthias and Francis Joseph – and participation in the coronation on the basis of equal civil and denominational rights. They experienced the coronation held at the end of 1916 as part of the nation, and the Neolog rabbis who shaped denominational publicistics regarded it as important. Neolog rabbi Béla Bernstein, a historian belonging to the new generation in the age of reception, who shaped Hungarian Jewish memory of independence, expressed this thought from the angle of the history of the denomination.

In connection with the coronation, practitioners of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* representing biblical criticism and historicism placed in the service of moderate religious reform of the community also published writings on the Jewish religious bases of the coronation. The remarks made by Neolog rabbis in country towns drew links between the present coronation and parallels of founding memory. Chief rabbi of Kaposvár, Manó Herczog, analysed the coronation chalice in a psalm of King David, folklorist Bernát Heller drew a connection between the coronation mound and Talmudic legends. In this way they placed the Catholic feudal ceremony within the religious frames of Jewish citizens of the modernising state. They sought the ancient Jewish roots of the Catholic elements, and ordered the historical, folkloristic and historical knowledge of the time into rational historical knowledge. Supporting the aspirations of the community, the *Meturgeman* column that published applied science and took its title from the readily understandable interpretation of scriptures, showed the “Jewish origin” of various elements of the coronation ceremony. In further arguments written in response to the reactions to these, the editor-in-chief Lajos Szabolcsi made a clear link to individual statements coming from outside that represented the historicism of the nobility but questioned the need for a Jewish denominational role in the coronation ceremony. And right from the beginning of preparations a whole series of occasional historical articles evoked Jewish participation in earlier Hungarian royal coronations.

The adaptation of the coronation ceremony at religious community level was achieved by including coronation services before the Sabbath morning prayers. Mihály Guttmann, a teacher at the Rabbinic Training Institute – continuing the tradition of a prayer said for the ruler – wrote a coronation prayer that the paper published on a full page. *Egyenlőség* covered the national and local Jewish aspects of the coronation, from Hanukkah news items until after Pesach, as well as the new king’s symbolic gestures that affected the Jews. These reports included extracts

from the rabbis' speeches, and also mentioned the participation of persons of other denominations in official state positions and other socially prestigious posts in synagogue services following coronation day. The Neolog press interpreted the coronation service speeches made in Hungarian in different Orthodox centres as a sign of Hungarianisation, as confirmation of Neolog homiletics and the adoption of the national language, as support for the Neolog strategy and a sign of progress confirmed by the "new times". The services after the coronation were held with the intention of providing an opportunity to attend for dignitaries of other denominations who had not been able to attend earlier because of their participation in the coronation ceremony. The symbol of "Hungarian Maccabees" participating with the nation in the common struggle was used as an allegory in the press in declaring the loyalty of the Jewish denomination to the king.

The state patriotic veneration of the king that formed part of the symbolic politics of the Dual Monarchy met with religious traditions of Judaism regarding the crowned ruler. In this way the deceased Francis Joseph became an active participant who understood the attainment of equal rights for the Jews, and the 1916 coronation became a celebration of Hungarian-Jewish equality.

(11) The debates on denominational politics that arose over interpretations of the coronation were of news value for the weekly *Egyenlőség* as violations of equal rights. The presentation of the coronation narrative was not unequivocal even within the Neolog Jewish life-world. Differing traditions and frames of interpretation can be found in the formulation of the texts. The Neolog rabbis presented the events of their time through religious tradition and community memory. Charles IV – like the deceased Francis Joseph – acquired the image of biblical kings, that conveyed the hopes the denomination placed in him as subjects, as well as the role that had been played by Francis Joseph. The professional lawyers or writers who wrote the publicistic interpretations of the coronation through the liberal political thinking of the Dual Monarchy, modern constitutional theory, and the enlightened universalist and egalitarian ideals of the Haskalah. Nevertheless the Jewish confessionalization of the coronation, based on religious traditions reinterpreted within the frame of equality of civil rights in the modern state and internalised through rational historical enquiry, was realised through the participation in church and state ceremonies by the central offices representing the network of Neolog and Orthodox religious communities and in the form of coronation services held within community frames. In this way, through constant reference to his symbolic statements made in the direction of the Jews and to earlier coronations, the figure of Charles IV represented a span of historical development in which the Jews acquired civil rights and became part of the nation. Through the person of Vilmos Vázsonyi, a man of Jewish religion appointed minister

by the new king, this progress topos was also reflected in the debates on voting rights in an image of the future in which the inclusion of the Hungarian peasantry into the political nation would be the merit of a Jew included in the Hungarian nation.

(12) The relationship between the religious king and political Catholicism was a recurring theme in the Neolog press. This was articulated in the form of references in part to Hungarian and in part to Austrian political Catholicism and anti-Semitic phenomena. Together with the expression of homage this too played a role in showing the king's gestures with which they strove to emphasise equal rights, the received denominational status and the ruler's good will. *Egyenlőség* reported on the king's journeys in all parts of the monarchy and the Jewish delegates who went out to receive him. In the reading of the editorial board, what was important in these visits was not the details of the *intrada*, but the image of the king who shook hands with the rabbis, enquired about the life of the religious communities and gathered information about the situation of the Jewish denomination within the empire.

(13) The myth of the "royal ally" may have been a further community topos behind the historical experience: it was an important theme of 20th century Jewish historiography, both in its historical depth and in the evolution of Jewish political thinking. The historiographer's problem of the "royal ally" arose from the historian Salo Wittmayer Baron who was born in Galicia during the time of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and was further developed by his student Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi. In his interpretation, the "myth of the royal ally" offered the Jews consolation and hope. In the news items about Charles IV the figure of the young king selectively handling the rigid forms of court behaviour in his contacts with his subjects was able to give a new layer of meaning to the "royal ally" topos. The manifestations of the ruler's behaviour described as "democratic" in the Neolog press also appeared in the Catholic canon of remembrance. The myth of royal ally represented a reality offering real protection, depending on the stability of the ruler's power. Parallel with reports on the king, the maintenance of denominational equality and the awaited peace, the discourse launched by *Huszadik Század* in 1917 on the "Jewish question" in Hungary was also followed by *Egyenlőség* where it was given a prominent place in publicistics. The anti-Jewish manifestations of soldiers returning from the front and agitation by political Catholicism were also covered in leading articles, commentaries and news items. We also find numerous examples in Hungarian history and symbolic politics of the royal authorities and national leaders opposing anti-Semitic attacks affecting the community with positive gestures towards the Jews.

(14) In Jewish interpretations between the two world wars the period of Francis Joseph became a lost golden age, while at the same time the Jewish denomination reinterpreted state patriotic veneration of the king and national politics that used Christian elements, within its own religious frames, drawing on the language and community memory of Judaism. In contemporary and commemorative speeches Francis Joseph assumed the figure of a scriptural king who came to resemble the great figures in the canon of Jewish memory because of the community experience of the attainment of social and denominational equality that occurred during his reign. This interpretation was reinforced by the social and political changes after the First World War that in the memory voiced by community forums appeared as a gradual social erosion of equality within new frames.

Lessons

The study examined the question of veneration of the king, confessionalization and state patriotism in the Jewish denominational press before 1944 through the example of the attitude towards the ruler and the authorities of the Jewish communities interpreting themselves in the historical life-world of the diaspora. The historiographic conception of the “royal ally” myth provided the frame of interpretation in which the symbols of state patriotism in the traditions of Judaism and the life-world of modernising Austro-Hungarian Jews became objects of analysis. The state patriotic veneration of the king was not present in itself but was ordered into hierarchies of loyalty together with phenomena manifested in concrete situations of national symbolic politics.

We can understand the role of the press and the symbolic politics it represented if we examine it from the angle of the impact that general social trends had on the internal life of the Jewish communities. The Eötvös congress that resulted in the split was the consequence of the aspirations in the 19th century for the creation of a modern state and society, that led to the institutional differentiation, that is, the separation of the different institutional spheres from each other. The organisational religious changes led to the creation as a modern institution of the Neolog and Orthodox organisation over the centralised communities. The involvement of individuals in religious affairs can be best observed in the functions of officials of the modern organisation, the appearance of editors and journalists representing the affairs of the Jewish central/national offices, and in the ad hoc appearances of secular authorities, scholars, engineers and artists affecting religious and denominational affairs. Hungarian symbolic politics and state patriotic veneration of the king were maintained and shaped on the one hand by the rabbis and

on the other by persons in careers in law/politics representing institutional/community affairs, and the world of the Jewish middle classes became the wider social context.

The myth of the “royal ally” and the concrete forms of manifestation of loyalty to the king reach back to Antiquity in both their religious and historical aspects with successive layers of meanings and practices, but their concrete manifestations were determined by the life-world of the given period, not by the historical perspective. The historical discussion of the relationship to the king took place either in the course of the preparation/commemoration of concrete rites, as in the case of the 1916 coronation, or with the aim of marking a separation from the present, as for example in the publicistics concerning the autumn revolution of 1918.

The life-worlds of the Monarchy experienced on a denominational basis fundamentally determined the experiences, possibilities for action, interpretations, discourse tradition and perspectives of their members. In the case of the Jews the ways in which denominational discourse traditions were shaped and the ways of relating to the broader social environment were influenced by the traditions of Judaism, the possibilities and limitations of the changing society, and by the appearance of modern ideals of nation. The appearance of Hungarian-language weekly papers close to the institutions and proclaiming the ideals was a phenomenon parallel to the above in the Neolog and Orthodox Jewish trends. At the time when the Jewish denominational trends were institutionalised, state patriotic veneration of the king was determined by three different traditions of interpretation: 1) the religious teaching of divine glory reflected in the person of the crowned ruler, 2) the reshaped premodern institution of *servi camerae*, and 3) the historical experience of the role played by the king in confessionalisation. While the first represented religious legitimation, the second was a social model, the actual operation of which became a function of strong/weak royal power. The third layer of interpretation was linked in the case of Neology to the attainment of equal rights for the Jews, and in the case of Orthodoxy to royal support for the existence of the autonomous organisation. These traditions acquired meaning within the frames of the Jewish life-world in Hungary under the Monarchy, and became part of the canon of remembrance.

The publicists of the middle class in liberal professions and the rabbis leading/employed by the religious communities adapted the symbolic self-interpretations of the society of modernizing Hungary, the premodern symbolism of power and the law, and the symbols and rites of modern symbolic politics. The Christian privileged groups of the premodern society were attached to the state and its ruler on a feudal, dynastic basis. The Jews who were resettled following the 17th century also appeared in feudal society with collective obligations and concessions, under the protection of the ruler, bishop or landowner. The vertical alliance forged

with emperors, monarchs and popes ensured protection, stability and order for Jews in the Middle Ages. The power symbolism of the feudal world was linked to religious eschatology, and drew its legitimation from the basic narratives of religious memory. The self-interpretation of the Jews and their relationship to the local power was also traced back to the basic narratives of Judaism, with the reading of the *galuth* in the centre: punishment – conversion – salvation. The Christian society of the *galuth* and its legislation also interpreted the legal status of the Jews guaranteed by the ruler within symbolic frames, “translated” into the basic narratives of Christian religion. Christian eschatology justified the benefits derived from the power exercised over Jews with topoi that also nourished anti-Semitism. The enlightened Habsburg rulers brought a radical change to the manner of the relationship to the Jews in their empire. And the public symbolic gestures of Francis Joseph represented a break with the mediaeval manner of that relationship. As Apostolic king of Hungary, in contrast with the mediaeval manifestations of the rite of *intrada* – that at times shamed the Torah and the community – he kissed the Torah scroll and the soil of Jerusalem, made donations for the construction of synagogues, visited synagogues and in recurring declarations assured the delegations paying homage of their equal rights. In the Jewish canon of remembrance his figure gave a new layer of meaning to the title *King of Jerusalem*. The practice of *intrada* itself remained alive up to the end of the Great War. Printed reports on the rite have survived for some of the Jewish communities. The reports on Charles IV, while noting the premodern customary actions of the *intrada*, also spoke of the ruler’s informal, personal gestures that eschewed the manifestations of hierarchy required by court protocol: for example, he shook hands with the Jewish innkeeper, turned round in his carriage as he departed to wave to the Jewish delegation that had come to pay tribute. The modern ideals, the individual views formed concerning ruling, and the social changes together acted to give a new layer of meaning to the procession with the Torah scrolls before the ruler, with the changing frames of the life-world. The Torah represented the revealed divine teaching: for the Jewish community it was a sacred object, for the Christian ruler it represented the Old Testament. In this way the attitude of the ruler towards the Torah and the delegation paying tribute was interpreted in reports sent to the denominational press as confirmation by the crowned ruler – who reflected divine glory and the order of society – of the situation of the Jewish community, in the spirit of equality and the ruler’s recognition.

At the same time Francis Joseph and Charles IV were also historical figures in community memory. Besides the religious readings, the ingrained models of societal organization and historical experiences in the memory of generations must also have been of

importance for the subjects. Today's Hungarian historiography has transformed the static image of Francis Joseph formulated in terms of opposite pairs into a process model; the contemporary assessment of Francis Joseph speaks of his changes depending on the situation. In the case of the Jews these changes can be followed only in part, in connection with the Compromise of 1867. Before the Compromise for the most part the religious models were decisive: veneration of the king and Talmudic respect for the laws of the state not directed against the Jewish religion. This is also confirmed by the example of Lipót Löw remembered as an enthusiastic supporter of the freedom struggle and Hungarianisation: before 1859 the rabbi who advocated preaching in Hungarian in synagogues published his two speeches on the subject of Francis Joseph in German, and also wrote a poem about the ruler in Hebrew. Mention can also be made here of the numerous synagogue services held for the recovery of the ruler following the attack by Libényi motivated by sentiments of Hungarian national independence. Following the Compromise the figure of Francis Joseph was judged within the context of the question of constitutionality, and rabbis and Jewish publicists in Hungary adopted a position on the basis of the Compromise. The role played by the ruler in the life of the denomination, that could differ in the different trends, was also part of historical experience. Neology saw in the ruler the bringer of equal rights, while Orthodoxy saw him as the guarantee of autonomy. Other – recurring – topoi were recognition by the ruler of Jewish charity, family life and religiosity, and his public condemnation of anti-Semitism.

A layer of interpretation that can be identified in the image of the ruler formed according to the above logic was the search for essential identity between past and present. Its context was homiletics and publicistics borrowing from homiletics. The religious prefiguration of the identity between things of the distant past and the present was *Kohelet* 3,15 that Rashi referred to the unchanging nature of norms, sins, rules and punishments defined by the Everlasting. Drawing parallels between the figure of the ruler and biblical kings and persons is a reference to the order of historicity and to the community's view of time. Approached from the angle of historicity, self-definition in the light of things of the distant past and revealed divine teaching can be mentioned; when seen from the angle of the time view of community rites, regarding the quality of times the connection made between the time of the founding memory and the sacred or significant time of the present can be stressed.

In this way Francis Joseph became similar to the biblical kings in Jewish discourses, or with reference to emancipation, to Moses who led the people out of slavery to freedom, while Charles IV became Joshua who would lead the Jews, among the peoples entrusted to him, after the victorious war into the ideal society and land of promise in Central Europe. The connection

made between the tragedy of the royal family and the country, and the royal sufferings with the sufferings of the Jews was also placed in the same narrative frame. This too helped to shape the narrative formulation of the binary opposites in community memory. In the case of Charles IV the human traits that were presented in the remembrance canon of the Horthy era and in part continued to exist after 1945 as a topos of the king's negative side (weak, unsuited, arrogant, licentious, easily influenced), in the Neolog and legitimist remembrance canon became topoi of positive features (democratic, empathic, informal, bringing peace, having a human touch). In the case of Orthodoxy, we can identify the opposite pairs of the "excessively religious" in the liberal "*kurucz*" canon of the Horthy era and the image of the *religious Catholic ruler who was good to the Jews*. Using the comparison of Moses and Joshua they translated historical experience of becoming equal into the basic story of becoming the chosen people. However all this was not a uniquely Jewish experience. Hungarian symbolic politics applied the Moses comparison to Lajos Kossuth, while civil religion, as an immanent religion translated its messages into the familiar basic religious texts.

The community rites manifesting loyalty to the king were of varying historical depth: ancient, mediaeval and early modern age layers can be observed up to the end of the Monarchy. The *intrada* and the *laudes* can be regarded as the oldest, having roots that reach back to Roman times. It is thought that the prayer said for the ruler goes back to before the second Temple, although the earliest printed prayer texts date from the 17th century. The blessing to be said on seeing the crowned ruler as the reflection of divine glory is part of religious tradition and there are various theories about its origin. They were published in the publicistic writings and reports of the opinion-setting Jewish denominational elite during the Dual Monarchy. Even before Francis Joseph, enlightened Habsburg rulers visited Jewish institutions on occasion as a gesture in support of the reforms within Judaism. In 1802 when on a visit to Pozsony (now Bratislava), Francis I visited the synagogue together with his wife and court retinue; in 1830 Ferdinand V visited the Jewish primary school in Pozsony.

Portrayals of heraldic two-headed eagles appearing on Torah ornaments were symbols of local secular power and a means of manifesting loyalty. Their modernisation can also be followed on Jewish liturgical new year's greeting cards, propaganda papers and in the form of prayers and photos published in the press at the turn of the 19th to 20th century. Religious services to be held on the name days and birthdays of the king and queen were among the news items in the Jewish press, as were rites of various categories linked to important events in the lives of members of the ruling family. Through them the phenomena of Christian society in the process of secularisation in the sense of sociology of religion were adapted into the frames of

Judaism. After the disintegration of the Monarchy the commemoration practices manifested in the Jewish press and the objects in the Jewish Museum not only conveyed references to the memory of the Monarchy but also the reflections of the community on the changing frames of their time. During the First World War Jewish publicists who defined themselves as part of the nation incorporated the memory of the generation of the emancipation and reception into Jewish Great War propaganda. The memory of the generation of Jews who took part in the Monarchy's war also became part of the community's historical consciousness and memory in the interwar years. In this process stories and topoi that were becoming elements of discourse were reprinted from other Jewish papers or from earlier volumes of the same weekly. The differences in nation-ideals and national symbolic politics that could be observed among Jews living in Hungary and other regions of the empire did not appear in striking form in the veneration and remembrance of emperor-kings. The Jewish press printed news, historical facts and folklore texts from all parts of the empire. Gestures made by the ruler towards the Jews of Vienna or Galicia appeared together with examples from Hungary in the frame of Jewish universalism within the Monarchy. The image after the change of system in Hungary in 1989 of the "Hungarian Jewish golden age" has been shaped in part by memory of the Shoah and in part by the establishment at the end of the 19th century of the Jewish denominational institutional system. Seen from the angle of research on the Holocaust, the positive association of the concept of "golden age" in the interwar years is questioned with the fact of the establishment of an anti-Semitic party during the time of the Dual Monarchy, anti-Semitism and considerations articulated within the conceptual frame of the critique of class society. Approached from the angle of the community's reworking of the Jewish past, the "golden age" acquired positive meaning from the social, cultural and artistic achievements of the Jewish denomination. The latter was independent of the anti-Semitic topos of the Dual Monarchy as a "Jewish golden age". The "emigration" became the vehicle of another memory. The figure of Francis Joseph still lives in the remembrance canon of emigrant Orthodox communities with roots in Hungary as *melech shel hesed*, merciful king.

The root of the expression is biblical, its basis is acts of benevolence by the ruler towards Orthodoxy. The biblical background is 1 *Kings* 20,31. The servants of Ben-Hadad defeated at the hands of the sons of Israel in their defensive war against Aram call the "kings of the house of Israel" "merciful kings". The thought also appears in *Exodus* 34,6–7 and *Proverbs* 20,28. According to the blessing to be said for the ruler, the crowned head was regarded as a reflection of the divine glory. One of the thirteen attributes of the Everlasting is *hesed*, mercifulness. A Viennese version of the prayer said for the king expresses the thought that the divine attributes

reflected in the person of the king come from the Everlasting: “may the Merciful give mercifulness in the heart of the king and his ministers and advisors, so that they may do good to us and the whole of Israel, in his days and in our days and may Israel live in peace.” The verse mentioned in *Proverbs* calls just and merciful behaviour of the king the support of his throne: “Mercy and truth preserve the king: and his throne is upholden by mercy.” Because of the civil liberties and freedom of religion the modern western states also appeared as merciful kingdoms (*malchut shel hesed*) in Orthodox responsory and historical literature.

Selected publications

Foreign Language Publications

GLÄSSER, Norbert

2014 “Jüdische Kriegerdenkmale und Zivilreligion in Ungarn (1914–1944),” *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica* 59 (2): 407–416.

2016 “»Bless Our King, Who You Sent Like Moses«: Jewish religious interpretations of loyalty to Hungarian King Francis Joseph,” *Religion, Culture, Society* 3: 77–96.

GLÄSSER, Norbert – ZIMA, András

2015 The emperor-king’s Hungarian Maccabees. The components of Hungarian Jewish First World War propaganda. In: Z Karvalics, László (ed.): *Information History of the First World War*. L’Harmattan Kiadó, Budapest. 149–168.

Hungarian Language Publications

GLÄSSER, Norbert

2013 Dinasztikus és nemzeti kultuszok a magyar nyelvű budapesti orthodox zsidó sajtóban (1892-1944). In: Szöllősi László (ed.): *Pro Scientia Aranyérmesek XI. Konferenciája*, Szeged, 2012. november 8–10, Előadások, Pro Scientia Aranyérmesek Társasága, Budapest. 243–247.

2015a Előszó. [Foreword]. In: Glässer, Norbert – Glässerné Nagyillés, Anikó (eds.): *Mózes kőtáblái a hármashalmon. Zsidó hagyomány és szimbolikus politika határán*. [The tablets of Moses on the trimount. On the border of Jewish tradition and symbolic policy] (Szegedi Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 50., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 19.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 9–14.

2015b Dinasztikus és nemzeti kultuszok a magyar nyelvű budapesti orthodox zsidó sajtóban (1892-1944). [Dynastic and national cults in the Hungarian-language

Budapest Orthodox Jewish press (1892–1944)]. In: Glässer, Norbert – Glässerné Nagyillés, Anikó (eds.): *Mózes kőtáblái a hármashalmon. Zsidó hagyomány és szimbolikus politika határán.* [The tablets of Moses on the trimount. On the border of Jewish tradition and symbolic policy] (Szegei Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 50., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 19.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 17–26.

- 2015c Az integráció politikai liturgiái Szimbolikus politika és hazafiasság Löw Immanuel beszédeiben. [Political liturgies of integration: Civil Religion and Patriotism in Homiletics of Immanuel Löw] In: Glässer Norbert – Glässerné Nagyillés Anikó (eds.): *Mózes kőtáblái a hármashalmon. Zsidó hagyomány és szimbolikus politika határán.* [The tablets of Moses on the trimount. On the border of Jewish tradition and symbolic policy] (Szegei Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 50., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 19.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 27–46.
- 2015d Konfliktusok és lojalitások határán egy új impériumban. Az erdélyi orthodox izraelita hitközségek a budapesti orthodox sajtóban 1925–1944. [The Image of “Occupied Territories” in the Jewish Press of Budapest.] In: Jakab Albert Zsolt – Kinda István (eds.): *Aranykapu. Tanulmányok Pozsony Ferenc tiszteletére.* Kriza János Néprajzi Társaság; Szentendrei Szabadtéri Néprajzi Múzeum; Székely Nemzeti Múzeum, Kolozsvár. 891–900.
- 2016a Az isteni dicsőség visszatükröződései. A koronás fő izraelita értelmezései. [The reflection of divine glories: Israelit interpretations of the crowned head] In: Glässer Norbert – Zima András – Glässerné Nagyillés Anikó (eds.): [On the Well-treaded Path of Loyalty to the King... Symbolic Changes of Feudal Bonds between 1867 and 1918] „A királyhűség jól bevált útján...” *Rendi és nemzeti kötődések szimbolikus változásai 1867 és 1918 között.* (Szegei Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 54., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 25.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 405–422.
- 2016b A messiási kor előjelei? Az antiszemitizmus vallási értelmezései a két világháború közötti budapesti orthodox zsidó sajtóban. [The auguries of the Geulah: The religious interpretations of the antisemitism between the two World Wars in the Orthodox Jewish Press in Budapest] *Emlékeztető* 2016: (3-4): 14–20.
- 2017 „Égből szállott mireánk ez a korona, Isten küldte azt neked miáltalunk”. IV. Károly koronázásának neológ izraelita diskurzustradíciói. [The Neolog discourse traditions of the coronation of Charles IV] *Ethnographia* 128 (2): 79–95.

GLÄSSER, Norbert – ZIMA, András

- 2015a Híd a jelen sivárságából a múlt verőfényéhez. Monarchianosztalgia a két világháború közötti budapesti zsidóság körében. [Bridge from the bleak present to the sunny past. Nostalgia for the Monarchy among Budapest Jews in the interwar years]. In: Glässer, Norbert – Glässerné Nagyillés, Anikó (eds.): *Mózes kőtáblái a hármashalmon. Zsidó hagyomány és szimbolikus politika határán.* [The tablets of Moses on the trimount. On the border of Jewish tradition and symbolic policy]

(Szegedi Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 50., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 19.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 47–58.

- 2015b Magyar Makkabeusok a császár- király seregében. A dinasztia és nemzet iránti hűség összeegyeztetése. [The emperor-king's Hungarian Maccabees. The components of Hungarian Jewish First World War propaganda.] In: Glässer, Norbert – Glässerné Nagyillés, Anikó (eds.): *Mózes kőtáblái a hármashalmon. Zsidó hagyomány és szimbolikus politika határán.* [The tablets of Moses on the trimount. On the border of Jewish tradition and symbolic policy] (Szegedi Vallási Néprajzi Könyvtár 50., MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport A vallási kultúrakutatás könyvei 19.) MTA-SZTE Vallási Kultúrakutató Csoport; SZTE BTK Néprajzi és Kulturális Antropológiai Tanszék, Szeged. 79–102.



