

Ludwik Hass

THE SOCIO-PROFESSIONAL COMPOSITION OF HUNGARIAN FREEMASONRY (1868 - 1920)

Freemasonry, which had been suppressed in the Habsburg Monarchy from 1795, resumed its activity in the Hungarian part of the Monarchy Transleithania in 1868 and from that time it began to develop semi-legally in the Austrian part Cisleithania, mainly in Vienna. Till 1920, when it was suppressed again in Hungary, the geographical disposition of the Lodges was changing and the number of members in particular regions fluctuating (see Table 1 - 3). In Transleithania, a percentage of persons from the traditional property owning classes (gentry, bourgeoisie, well-to-do lower middle class) was gradually diminishing — from 38.3% to 15%, but the number of members from middle strata was on the increase. A similar tendency occurred in the Lodges in Vienna, subject to the difference that at the beginning (1868 - 1885) the percentage of the traditional strata was higher (53%) and by the outbreak of the World War I had decreased to only 38.1% (Table 4 - 8).

The Grand Symbolic Lodge of Hungary (*Magyarországi Symbolikus Nagypáholy*), the official name given to the central organization of the Freemason movement in Austria - Hungary, was formed in March 1886. Together with its predecessors, the St. John Grand Lodge of Hungary (formed on 30 January, 1870) and the Grand Orient of Hungary (formed on 25 November, 1871) to which nearly all Masonic Lodges in Hungary belonged, for half a century the Grand Symbolic Lodge was the only stable and numerically strong Freemason organization in East-Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkans (Greece excepted). Its activity was not confined to Hungary alone, on the contrary, it helped to establish Masonic lodges in neighbouring states. In the Romanov Empire, Freemasonry was outlawed in 1822 and the ban remained in force till the overthrow of the Russian Monarchy. Up to 1906 it continued to exist in residual form only, as a small

secret organization of an obviously exclusive nature.¹ In Rumania, Freemasonry was relatively more numerous, but owing to internal differences and personal intrigues it played no significant role in society. In Serbia and Bulgaria, individual lodges did exist at intervals, but they were subject to centres abroad (the Grand Lodges and Grand Orients). This was the origin of contemporary rumours alleging that great, in fact vast influence was exerted by Freemasonry on life in the Habsburg Monarchy in general, particularly on political life, the state apparatus, the press, literature, art, etc. These rumours were spread mainly by Catholic publications, even the most serious ones.² Without great cause, Catholicism saw its most dangerous opponent in the Masonic movement. The ritual practiced during Lodge sessions was shrouded in relative secrecy, relative, because as from the 1880's information about Freemason ritual was repeatedly published in print by opponents of the movement. Inaccessibility of the Organizational press to non-members, the secrecy in which the Organization and its membership was shrouded, had caused that all information about Freemasonry was accepted uncritically by the public, both as concerns alleged membership of nearly all the most prominent figures in different fields of public life in the Organization, and its almost unlimited power and influence. This was practically a universal conviction in Catholic and reactionary circles which ascribed all kinds of destructive intentions to the Masonic movement. The same trend was continued in Hungary under Horthy's rule, by traditionally right-wing and fascist elements, despite the fact that the Grand Lodge had been dissolved by the government in May 1920. Neutral and progressive circles had far less belief in the omnipotence of Freemasonry. Some of them were even prepared to admit its salutary role, at any rate in the struggle against clericalism and reaction.

Historiography has not dealt with this problem so far. An old study which was done by Masonic circles, partly avoided the problem and partly confirmed old rumours by the lack of clarity in its formulations.³ Part of

¹ L. H a s s, *Rosyjskie wolnomularstwo lat 1906-1918 (Fragment z dziejów liberalizmu w Rosji)* [*Russian Freemasonry between 1906 and 1918 (Fragment of the History of Liberalism in Russia)*], "Studia z dziejów ZSRR i Europy środkowej", vol. VII, 1971, pp. 127-178. Same author, *Działalność wolnomularstwa polskiego w latach 1908-1915 [Activity of Polish Freemasonry between 1908 and 1915]*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny," 1967, No. 4, pp. 1045-1063.

² E. g. K. K o l l e r, *Die ungarische Freimaurerei seit 1867*, in: *Die Freimaurerei Österreich-Ungarns*, Wien 1897; series of articles by K. H u s z á r in: "Bonifatius Korrespondenz," in the years 1912-1913.

the archives of Hungarian Freemasonry have been preserved (941 items: 70.1 current metres). Made available to students of the problem in 1967, these documents provide an opportunity to study the question scientifically.⁴ But before this great mass of material can be fully investigated, membership lists published earlier provide a good idea of the socio-professional composition of lodges and partly of their member component. This, combined with other materials available, provided a good starting point for answering the fundamental question concerning the role and influence of Freemasonry. The official 1920 publication contained only an alphabetical list of Freemasons living at the time, with their date of birth, date of acceptance and name of the Lodge to which the given member belonged at the beginning of 1919,⁵ but the alphabetical list compiled later by a long-standing employee of the Hungarian Ministry of the Interior, contained the names of members of the Organization since its foundation in 1868.⁶ Unfortunately, this list is not complete. It is based exclusively on information supplied by Hungarian Masonic press organs, which consisted mainly of announcements about the initiation (ritual of acceptance) of new members, obituaries and notices of exclusion, but important gaps exist in relation to the first 10 to 15 years of the Organization. Later, these gaps grew smaller.⁷

³ J. Balassa, *A szabadkőművesek története*, Budapest [1924]. From 1914 the author was deputy to the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Hungary. Following its delegalization in May 1920, he was the actual open leader of what still remained of Hungarian Freemasonry.

⁴ P. Lajosné, *A szabadkőműves szervezetek levéltára. Repertorium*, Budapest 1967.

⁵ *A Magyarországi Symbolikus Nagy-Páholy főhatósága alatt dolgozó szabadkőműves páholyok tagjainak-névsora*, Hivatalos kiadás, Kiadja a Magyar Királyi Belügyminiszter, Budapest 1920.

⁶ J. Palatinus, *Szabadkőművesek Magyarországon*, Budapest 1944. In this work, the author confronts information on six Lodges with archive documents on Hungarian Freemasonry, demonstrating that gaps exist in the information provided by both sources. Establishment of a relatively complete membership list of Hungarian Freemasons would require examination of various other sources of information.

⁷ Of the 4,854 members accepted between 1870 and 1885 (see Table 3), the list contains information on 996 (20.5 percent), more than half of them accepted in Vienna Lodges. The proportion of Transilvian members listed is very small, only about 13 - 14 percent. Members accepted between 1886 and 1895 are listed almost in full, those between 1896 and 1914 in 82 percent (out of the 8,599 members accepted between 1896 and 1913, plus another estimated 500 in 1914, 7,446 in the Palatinus list). The number of members accepted between 1915 and 1918 is not known.

Information about some initiations was intentionally withheld, owing to the position held by the initiates. Discretion was usually practiced in the case of persons in exposed positions, whose career might have been harmed by disclosure of their Masonic affiliation. Alongside every name listed, the member's profession or occupation is given, the date of his initiation or re-integration (putting a member again on the list from which he was cancelled), the date of expulsion, and the date of death.

From this information it is not possible to establish the socio-professional composition of Freemasons belonging to the Grand Lodge at specific times, but it is possible to establish the socio-professional origins of members accepted by the Lodges in different chronological periods. Such statistics provide a clearer picture of changes in the recruiting base of Freemasonry in Austria - Hungary than information on the socio-professional composition at any given time. This in turn provides some measure of information on changes occurring within different professional groups and in entire social classes. Combined with information on specific persons belonging to Masonic Lodges obtained from other sources, this permits to define not so much the actual influence but the possibilities Freemasonry had to exert influence on various domains of social and intellectual life. As concerns people whose date of death or of exclusion from the Organization is known, the following principle has been adopted: half of the members belonging to a given profession in the same chronological period have been listed as accepted in the Organization in that period, the other half as accepted in the preceding period.

The Galician Lodge in Lvov ("For Sincere Friendship" — "Zur aufrichtigen Freundschaft"), of short duration only, has not been taken in consideration here, owing to its entirely separate national and territorial status. The same applies to the short-lived Lodges in Bukovina, the Croatian Lodge in Zagreb (two more were formed there in 1913 - 1914, the semi-Italian Lodge in Rieka (Fiume) and to foreign nationality Lodges, e.g. the short-lived German Lodge in Bucharest, two Serbian Lodges in Belgrade and Nis and the Lodge in Izmir (Turkey), which was of mixed nationality. Also, no account has been taken of the secret Italian Masonic groups in Triest and Tridentor or of Masonic groups in Bohemia which depended of the Grand Lodge in Germany and took no part at all in Masonic life in the Habsburg Monarchy. Lodges formed immediately before the outbreak of World War I in Vienna and Bohemia which belonged to the so-called Reformed Freemasonry and had very few members (Frei-

maurererbund zur Aufgehender Sonne: F.Z.A.S.) and other small Masonic organizations (Co-Masonry, etc.) have also been omitted. Names of members of these Lodges and groups do not figure on the list under discussion. The total of 12,000 members taken in account (see Tables 4 - 8) provides sufficient statistical data, far in excess of a mere statistical sample. From this, with the exception of the period between 1870 and 1885, it is fully possible to formulate an opinion on the overall number of members in the organization under investigation. Certain probably insignificant differences may exist in some of the upper socio-professional strata (state high officials, the judiciary and public prosecutors). The proportion of newly accepted members from these groups may have been somewhat above that listed in the Tables.

BEGINNINGS AND INITIAL PERIOD OF DEVELOPMENT (1868 - 1885)

Freemasonry had been banned in the Habsburg Monarchy since 1795, on account of suspicions that it had connections with revolutionary movements. To this, the motive of the Arch-Catholic Dynasty came to be added after the Napoleonic Wars. Freemasons accepted in Lodges abroad lived in the country and new adepts were occasionally initiated secretly. During the 1848 revolution, Masonic Lodges were formed in Vienna, Budapest and Prague, but they were not active after victory of the counter-revolution. The next effort to restore Freemasonry in Hungary came in summer 1861, in the liberal climate and hope of obtaining a constitution raised by the first session of the Hungarian Parliament to be held for the first time since many years. It was then that the "Szent István" Lodge was formed in which aristocrats such as Counts Tivadar and Kálmán Csaky, Count Ede Karolyi and Prince István Esterházy were members, as well as politicians Gyorgy Komáromy and Pál Almassy, the surgeon Sándor Lumnitzer, former army doctor, subsequently university professor, and several others.⁸ Owing to subsequent events, namely the dissolution of Parliament and consolidation of absolutism, this Lodge was very short-lived. In that same period, German Freemasons in Budapest were members of Lodges in

⁸ M. Gelléri, *Zur Geschichte der Freimaurerei*, "Bundesblatt" 1 December, 1913, No. 21, p. 661; *Die Freimaurerei in Ungarn*, "Latomia," September 1864. Reproduced in: A. Neut, *La Franc-Maçonnerie soumise au grand jour de la publicité*, 2nd ed., vol. II, Gand 1866, p. 334; *La Franc-Maçonnerie en Hongrie*, "Bulletin" [AMI], August-September, 1922, No. 3, p. 57.

Germany or of the local "Zur Morgenröte" Lodge, which was formed in 1848 and did not survive the year. Here, the principal role was played by Ludwig Lewis, professor of English philology at the local University, a Freemason of long standing who also served Austrian authorities as an informer. He began initiating new adepts secretly at the beginning of the 1860's, and at the end of 1863 endeavoured to obtain permission to found a Lodge in Budapest, but this was refused by the authorities.⁹

The situation changed when Austrian absolutism crumbled on the battlefields of Lombardy in 1859 and at Sadova in 1866. Austria became a "Dual Monarchy," in which Hungary, Slovakia, Transylvania, Transcarpathian Ukraine, Vojvodina and Croatia formed what was called Transilvania (Transleithania) (countries belonging to the Crown of St. Stephen). The rest was known as Cislitavia (Cisleithania). A different legal system existed in each of the two parts. Nearly all political emigrants who fought for independence and had taken part in the 1848 revolution, now returned to Hungary. Among the most prominent repatriates there were former Freemasons, initiated — mostly according to the Scottish Rite — in Paris, Italy and Switzerland, people like Count Gyula Andrassy who became Prime Minister of the first Hungarian government on 17 February, 1867, former Secretary of State Ferenc Pulszky, Generals Istvan Türr, Gyorgy Klapka and Antal Vetter de Doggenfeld, Colonels Miklós Kiss de Nemeskeri, Gyorgy Rényi and Anatol Schneider and Major Dénes Desewffy. Some of the repatriates belonged to the Hungarian Lodge "Ister" formed in Geneva in 1863, which was now automatically dissolved owing to repatriation of its members.¹⁰ In the new political climate established by the

⁹ "Latomia," 1848, No. 23, p. 114; 1849, No. 24, p. 196; *Die Freimaurerei Österreich-Ungarns*, p. 257; A. Neut, *op. cit.*, p. 334; *Allgemeines Handbuch der Freimaurerei*, 3 Aufl. II, Bd. II, Leipzig 1902, p. 473.

¹⁰ Archives of the Grand Logde of France (Paris), record R. L. No. 6, "Mont Sinaï," invitation to a session on 16 October, 1849 and 26 April, 1850; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Fonds Maçonniques (Hereinafter as B. Nat.) FM² 849, fasc. "Kassa," list of 20 March, 1870; A. Luzio, *La Massoneria e il Risorgimento Italiano*, vol. II, Bologna 1925, p. 21; M. Gelléri, *op. cit.*, p. 661; L. Abafi [L. Aigner], *A Cervin Mátyás szabadkőműves-páholy huszenötéves története 1869 - 1894*, Budapest 1894, p. 8. See L. Hass, "Diaspora" *polskiego wolnomularstwa* ["Diaspora" of the Polish Freemasonry], "Przegląd Historyczny" 1971, No. 3, pp. 212 - 213. Ludwig Kossuth, leader of the Hungarian revolution of 1848, was accepted in "Cincinnati" Lodge No. 133, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A., on 18 November, 1852. *Das Aufnahmegesuch Ludwig Kossuth's*, "Die drei Ringe" March 1925, No. 3, pp. 64 - 65.

dawn of the Constitutional Era, repatriates and their political friends, former members of the "Szent István" Lodge, conceived the idea of restoring Freemasonry in Hungary. Without waiting till a Lodge was formally established, they began accepting new adepts, at least from the end of July 1867, at emergency "open-air" meetings, namely outside of ritually dedicated Lodge premisses, which as yet were non-existent.¹¹

But the German group was quicker to take concrete organizational steps. The ground had been prepared by Lewis, who, with official permission, gave a series of lectures on Freemasonry in Budapest and other towns. On 25 May, 1868, Lewis founded the "Einigkeit im Vaterlande" Lodge in Pest. In October the same year, the statute of this Lodge was confirmed by Baron Béla Wenkheim, Home Secretary in Andrásy's Government. In accordance with the principle of continuity of law, binding in Hungary, new Lodges which accepted this statute were automatically legalized.¹² Thanks to Lewis, six more Lodges were formed in the provinces up to the end of January 1870, in Transylvania and Slovakia. Concurrently with the Budapest Lodge they founded the St. John Grand Lodge of Hungary (Magyarországi Jánosrendű Nagypáholy) on 30 January, 1870, as their directing centre. Between 1870 and 1874, 16 more Lodges joined this centre, including three in Vienna and one in Croatia (see Table 1). By summer 1872, their overall membership approached eight hundred, but later stagnation began and an ebb-tide set in. At the beginning of 1873, at least half the 714 members did not attend Lodge Meetings and gradually began leaving the Organization. This led to the dissolution of some Lodges in subsequent years.¹³

The Hungarian group founded its first Lodge a year after the German group: on 23 May, 1869 the "Corvin Mátyás" Lodge was formed in Pest. Its statute was confirmed by Baron Venkheim's successor, Home Secretary

¹¹ The same procedure was followed when G. Joannovics, Secretary of State at the Ministry of Religious Denominations and Education was accepted on 30 July, 1867; merchant I. Eisenstädter and lawyer M. Niamesny were analogously initiated by A. Schneider on 28 June and 30 October, 1868. (Both came from Timișoara in Transylvania). *Allgemeines Handbuch...*, Bd. I, Leipzig 1901, p. 505; B. Nat., FM² 849, fasc. "Arad," list of 20 March, 1870; FM² 850, fasc. "Temesvar," list of 22 March, 1870.

¹² *Allgemeines Handbuch...*, 2. Aufl., Bd. IV, Leipzig 1879, pp. 24, 129, 177; K. Koller, *op. cit.*, p. 293.

¹³ *Allgemeines Handbuch...*, pp. 177 - 178.

Pál Rajner.¹⁴ By the end of November 1871, six more Lodges were formed, one in Buda, two in Pest and one each in Košice in Slovakia, Oradea in Transylvania and Oravicza in Vojvodina. Together with the “Corvin Mátyás” Lodge, they formed their own separate centre on 25 November, 1871, namely the Grand Orient of Hungary (Magyarország Nagy Oriens). This new Obedience (Union of Lodges) expanded rapidly, particularly in Budapest, and attained a peak in 1875, when it had 15 Lodges with an overall membership of one thousand. Later, some Lodges were dissolved and by summer 1877 the membership had fallen to 640.¹⁵

This first crisis, which developed in both Masonic groups in Hungary and resulted in a drop in membership, was a normal occurrence in the history of all new Masonic organizations. The original relatively large flow of members was due to great but unspecified and vague hopes which these organizations gave rise to. But early disillusionment caused a proportion of members to leave the Lodges after a year or two.

Existence of two separate Masonic organisms in Hungary had its formal justification in the differences of ritual and dogma between the Grand Lodge and Grand Orient. The former practiced the St. John or symbolic rite, as demonstrated by the name, which meant that it recognized only the first three craft or symbolic Degrees (Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft and Master Mason). The latter on the other hand, adhered to the Scottish rite, which meant that in addition to these three it had another 30 degrees, known as degrees of higher initiation. The former entertained relations with conservative Masonic organizations and aligned its aims accordingly. The first Lodge of the former type obtained its patent from the United Grand Lodge of England. It constituted itself into an independent Grand Lodge with the support of the National Grand Lodge of Germany. The aims of the Grand Lodge were correspondingly formulated in its statute of 1868: “Propagating public morality, spreading education among the people, spreading love of one’s neighbour and doing good.”¹⁶ The Grand Lodge required all its members to believe in the Great Architect of the Universe (a Masonic name of God) and in the immortality of the soul.¹⁷ On the

¹⁴ B. Nat. FM² 850 fasc. “Oravicza,” letter to the Grand Orient of France of 15 March, 1871; L. Abafi, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁵ *Allgemeines Handbuch...*, Bd. IV, p. 180, 181.

¹⁶ *La Franc-Maçonnerie en Hongrie*, *op. cit.* p. 57.

¹⁷ Die Bibel als gr. L. “Bauhütte,” 5 November, 1898, No. 45 p. 355.

other hand, the section grouped in the Grand Orient was tied with the progressive Grand Orient of France. Its first Lodges obtained their patent letters from that organization, which also sponsored their union into an independent Masonic organism. Following the French example, stress was laid on participation in social life. When their statutes were revised in the mid-1870's, the obligatory formula of belief in the Great Architect and immortality of the soul was omitted. The same happened in the Grand Orient of France in 1877.¹⁸

This division within the Masonic movement reflected the differences of nationality, as well as social and political differences existing in Hungarian society, which was in the process of changing from a feudal to a bourgeois model. In Lodges which followed the Scottish rite, Hungarian national elements were dominant. They consisted largely of country gentry, often Calvinist, defined at the time as "Komitat" elements.¹⁹ Scions of great Hungarian families were also found among the members. The majority of members practiced intellectual professions (see Table 4), mostly the free professions. A relatively large number were professional officers,²⁰ on the other hand the proportion of the bourgeoisie and prosperous lower middle class was insignificant. Members of Scottish Lodges, as a rule sympathised with opposition groups, with the extreme Left, later known as the 1848 Party or the Left-Centre Party led by Koloman Tisza, which wanted complete independence from Austria. In the Grand Lodge on the other hand, the German bourgeois element was dominant, which included people of Jewish origin.²¹ But here also Hungarian members existed almost from the very beginning although they were less numerous, people like the repatriate Pulszky or Assistant Professor Tivadar Bakody, the homeopathist. At first, a large proportion of the Grand Lodge membership consisted of the bourgeoisie and prosperous lower middle class, whereas members of the intelligentsia were a minority. Many members held no strong political

¹⁸ See above; B. Nat. FM² 849, fasc. "O'Buda," "Arad," "Kassa;" FM² 850, fasc. "Oravicza" and "Temesvar," *passim*.

¹⁹ Komitat — an administrative unit. Following the Austro-Hungarian agreement of 1867, the Komitat self-government, in which section of the nobility opposed to the agreement was centred, was restored. Hence the term "Komitat elements."

²⁰ In all probability the proportion of officers was greater than shown in Table 4. Owing to lack of information, the numerically strong "Corvin Mátyás" Lodge, to which many officers and retired officers who took part in the 1848 revolution belonged, was not taken in account.

²¹ K. Koller, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

opinions, others favoured an Austro-Hungarian compromise, or a moderate form of opposition. Most of them sympathised with the ruling Ferenc Deák Party. In Lodges which observed the Scottish rite, Hungarian was the dominant language, whereas German played a secondary role. In the St. John Lodges, the position was reversed. For the above reasons, in 1870 Scottish Lodges wrote of their Masonic rivals: "Our national opponents."²²

Thus for the first time in a Masonic history, the question of nationality became such an important organizational problem.²³ Theoretically speaking, the question should not have arisen at all, since candidates were not questioned about their nationality. In practice however, the question of a candidate's national allegiance was discussed preceding the ritual of initiation and every Lodge had its own specific method of settling it. It was only in the complicated national situation which arose in the 19th century in East-Central Europe, that the problem of nationality acquired political significance. In Hungary, the two dominant nations, Hungarians and Germans, soon found a common language in the Masonic organization, but right to the end of its existence, neither Serbians nor Rumanians were accepted for membership. This was due to a combination of the Masonic principle of obedience to the laws of the given country and the old centralistic national doctrine professed by Hungarian liberals, which was legally sanctioned by the Law on Nationalities of November 1868. According to this law, in the political sense "all citizens of the Hungarian State, formed indivisible part of one single Hungarian nation."²⁴

In the latter part of the 1870's, both Masonic organizations overcame the organizational crisis, but until their fusion in March 1886, they did not restore their former numerical strength in Transilvania (see Table 2, ethnographical Hungarian territories and territories under Hungarian and German domination). Out of the about 1,000 members of the Grand Orient in 1875, only 443 remained 11 years later. The greatest losses occurred

²² B. Nat. FM² 849, fasc. "Arad," letter addressed to the Grand Orient de France by "Corvin" Lodge on 27 April, 1870.

²³ To a lesser extent it was also on the agenda in Galicia in the 1770's and 1780's, and in Warsaw at the end of 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. In both cases it resulted from Polish-German relations. See L. H a s s, *Ze studiów nad wolnomularstwem polskim w ostatniej ćwierci XVIII w.* [*Studies on Polish Freemasonry in the Last Quarter of the 18th Century*], "Kwartalnik Historyczny," 1973, No. 3, pp. 606 - 607.

²⁴ This principle did not apply to public or Masonic life in Croatia, since that country was an autonomous province.

in non-Hungarian territories: all the Lodges in Transcarpathia and Vojvodina were dissolved, and membership in Slovakia, and even more so in Transylvania, fell significantly. It would seem that where Hungarians were the dominant national minority, they were far more inclined towards nationalistic ideology than on ethnically Hungarian territories. It was also there that the contradiction between nationalistic anti-Semitism and intolerance towards other nationalities and the Masonic ideology of fraternity between all peoples, or at any rate indifference to nationality questions, was most pronounced. This tended to cut the very roots of existence of local Lodges. Losses sustained by the Grand Lodge were incomparably smaller: out of roughly 800 members in 1872, 715 or about 80%, remained in 1885. It would even seem that in some non-Hungarian territories membership slightly increased. Of the 1,861 initiated and affiliated members (members who join a Lodge after being initiated in another Lodge) who joined the Grand Orient between 1870 and March 1886, only 516, or 27.7% remained in March 1886. In the Grand Lodge, the corresponding figures were 2,293 and 1,315, or 33.9%. These figures demonstrate the great fluctuation of membership (see Table 3). Things were similar with the Lodges as such. Out of 30 Lodges existing in the Grand Orient system in 1869, only 12, or 40%, remained at the time of fusion. The corresponding figures for the Grand Lodge were 27 and 17, or 63%.

The turn towards the Right taken by property-owning classes, expressed by the formation of the Hungarian National Party in 1877, growth of anti-Semitism following the Tisza-Eszlar trial for ritual murder (1882 - 83) and the conciliatory attitude towards the Habsburg Dynasty, not only diminished the flow of new candidates significantly, but also influenced the nationality structure of Freemasonry. In the latter half of the 1870's, the flow of Hungarians to the moderate Grand Lodge increased, whereas aristocrats gradually left the Grand Orient. Both Masonic organizations recruited their members from analogous socio-professional groups, although the inner proportion of new adepts continued to differ. In the decade between 1876 and 1885,²⁵ most new members belonged to free professions (see Table 4)²⁶ the bourgeoisie remaining the second most numerous group. The group represented by state and "Komitat" officials was only slightly less

²⁵ Data in Table 4 include four-fifths of new adepts initiated between 1876 and 1885.

²⁶ Analysis of concrete information on Hungarian Freemasonry leads to the conclusion that university lecturers and journalists were listed among members

numerous. Small merchants, hotel-keepers, restaurant owners, owners of transport businesses and artisan-workshops, represented one-eighth of new members. In the slightly less numerous group of privately employed white-collar workers, business managers and assistants, trade managers and other higher private officials were dominant. The actual role they played in Lodges was greater than statistical figures would imply: many an ordinary ranking white-collar worker at the time of initiation, would in time attain a leading position. Only few teachers, from different type schools, joined Masonic Lodges. The social component of new Masonic adepts in the Hungarian capital and provinces was roughly identical, but in the Hungarian provinces of Transilvania the proportion of bourgeois and lower middle class candidates was slightly higher. In the whole of Transilvania, slightly more than one-third of newly accepted members (35.3%) belonged to traditional property-owning classes (the bourgeoisie and prosperous lower middle class). As many as 38% of them joined Lodges in non-Hungarian provinces. The remainder consisted of different categories of intelligentsia, who usually belonged to the more prosperous groups. Given the contemporary structure of Hungarian society in which the aristocracy was the uppermost class, this meant that the majority of Freemasons belonged to the educated middle class. Following fusion of the Tisza and Deák Parties which formed the mildly conservative Liberal Party in 1875, this party gained the support of the majority in both Masonic organizations, which fact, combined with the similar social component, was one of the reasons of their fusion in March 1886, to form the Grand Symbolic Lodge of Hungary.

Hungarian Lodges had no members from among the workers, peasants and poorest strata of society in general. This was a universal characteristic of Freemasonry, a consequence of its organizational structure and ideology. Although in accordance with the universally accepted Masonic principles formulated in the "Old Charges" at the beginning of the 18th century, social origin and the profession practiced were no obstacle to acceptance by a Lodge, they were in fact taken in consideration at initial discussions preceding initiation. In addition, there was the understandable, occasionally statutory requirement, that the candidate's standard of education should allow him understanding of the symbolism and rites involved. Initiation fees, fees payable on attainment of consecutive degrees of initiation

belonging to the free professions (doctors, lawyers, engineers). Hence, the statistical figures in this work give a lower figure in these two categories than was the actual case.

and monthly contributions, were fairly high. They had to cover the costs of upkeep of the Lodge and its contribution to central expenditure. All this, combined with the overall Masonic principle that as a society it represented the moral and spiritual élite, had obvious social consequences — Freemasonry embraced the educated prosperous only.

The large proportion of intellectuals from various walks of life in Masonic Lodges caused that between 1870 and 1886, there were always at least 20 Freemasons in Parliament. Some, like Elek Bokross and Friedrich Podmaniczky for instance, occupied important positions in Parliament and in their Party, either on their own merit or thanks to discreet support given them by the Lodge. In connection with this, certain groups of public opinion became convinced that Freemasonry exerted direct influence on matters of policy, a conviction gleefully supported by their opponents on the Right. But in fact, Freemasonry always stressed its apolitical non-party nature and engaged in no direct activity in Parliament, where it had no official representation. Its members in Parliament carefully followed every move in Parliamentary majority to support its own ends, but managed to give direction from “up above” to Parliamentary Lobbies in matters of fundamental concern to them, such as freedom of conscience and laicisation. Many Freemasons attained high positions in the state machinery, became under-secretaries of state and even ministers, thanks to their personal merit and talents.²⁷

In Cislitavia, the other part of the Habsburg Monarchy, the course of events shaped differently. The few Freemasons living in Vienna belonged to Lodges abroad, but they also were thinking of forming their own Lodge. Encouraged by the liberal movement which reached a peak in the mid-19th century, by the struggle for freedom and justice during the reactionary period after 1848, they endeavoured to obtain official permission, after the Imperial Diploma of October 1860 was issued, to reactivate the “Zum heiligen Joseph” Lodge, first opened in October 1848, which was active only till August the following year. But consecutive Prime Ministers, Anton von Schmerling and Count Richard Belcredi, whom they approached in this matter, gave no reply to their requests. The only result of further chan-

²⁷ According to J. Palatinus (*op. cit.*, p. 3) the first Prime Minister of the Hungarian government which followed the Austro-Hungarian agreement, Count G. Andrassy, was accepted in the “Corvin Mátyás” Lodge in 1870, and resigned from it on 23 February, 1888. In fact, his acceptance was an affiliation, since Andrassy was initiated in the “Mont Sinai” Lodge in Paris on 2 May, 1854.

ges of the system which took place in 1867 and 1868, was the decree of 24 January, 1868. The text of the oath required of all state officials and people holding doctor's degree in all university departments since 1801, by which they had to swear they belonged to no secret organization (including Freemasonry), was substituted by a formula whereby they declared under oath that they belonged to no foreign organization with political aims.²⁸ By the same, Freemasonry was no longer a clearly forbidden society, therefore became a permissible organization.

In view of persistent failure to obtain permission to form a Lodge, Viennese Freemasons formed the "Humanitas" Society in Vienna on 26 June, 1869, which obtained legal recognition in December. This Society only accepted members who belonged to Masonic Lodges abroad or to those recently formed in Hungary. In March, 1871, members of the Society formed the "Humanitas" Masonic Lodge in the Hungarian locality of Laytha Szent Miklos, just across the border. In this way, an issue from the situation was found. The Vienna police knew that ritual sessions of the Lodge were held on Hungarian territory, where new adepts were initiated and successive degrees of initiation bestowed. On the other hand, sessions devoted to organizational matters and ideological problems were held in Vienna, in the legal "Humanitas" Society. In February, 1872, the "Humanitas" Lodge joined the St. John Grand Lodge of Hungary.²⁹

The new Lodge developed rapidly. Within a year, its membership attained 100 and at the end of 1873 beginning 1874 — 300 members.³⁰ The crisis experienced by Freemasonry in Transilvania in the mid-1870's did not extend to the Vienna branch, which continued to develop undisturbed. In view of the constant flow of new adepts, two more Lodges were formed in 1874 and two further ones the following year. Another two were formed

²⁸ A. Neut, *op. cit.*, p. 335; G. Kués, B. Scheichelbauer, *200 Jahre Freimaurerei in Österreich*, Wien 1959, p. 111; *Harmonie*, Prag 1870-1930 (Prag 1930), p. 39. In court procedure, Art. 150 of the Austrian Penal Code, which gave grounds for imposing sentences for membership in a Masonic Lodge, was not applied. This article was abolished by decree of the Council of State (House of Deputies) on 4 March, 1895. *Die Aufhebung des Freimaurer-Paragraphen im neuen österr. Strafgesetz*, "Schlesisches Logenblatt," 30 March, 1895, No. 17, p. 57.

²⁹ *Allgemeines Handbuch...*, Bd. IV, pp. 128-129; K. Kués, B. Scheichelbauer, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

³⁰ H. Glücksmann, *Humanitas*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," August 1919, No. 8, p. 10; *Die ersten zehn Jahre. Festschrift zum zehnten Gründungstage der Loge "Zukunft" im Or. Pressburg*, Wien 1884, p. 5.

in 1877 and the eighth, six years later. None of these Lodges were dissolved. The number of their members increased steadily to 473 in mid - 1881 and 589, four years later. Gradually, the organization emerged beyond Vienna City limits: in the 1870's, small groups of a few members each existed in the Styrian capital of Graz, the Karinthian capital Klagenfurth, in Neuhaus near Linz in Upper Austria and in outlying localities in Translitavia: Bór in Bohemia, Jiglava in Moravia, Bielsko in Tiešin Silesia, Tropava in Opava Silesia and in Trieste.⁸¹ The Austrian police knew all about this formally illegal movement and watched its members closely, but, apart from petty annoyances, took no reprisals against them.⁸²

Contrary to conditions in Translitavia, here, more than half the members were recruited from bourgeois classes, one-third from the bourgeoisie (32.9%) and one-fifth (20.1%) from prosperous members of the lower middle class. On the other hand, far fewer members were recruited from among the free professions, ten times fewer from among state and local officials and less than half the number from among Translitavian school teachers (see Table 4). These differences were due to the entirely different social situation than the one existing in Hungary, including the capital Budapest. Vienna had a rich and prosperous middle class, strongly individualistic, free-thinking, and since the 1848 Revolution, deeply attached to the liberal movement. Strong anti-clerical and philo-Semitic trends also existed. The Constitution of 1867 had assured the Viennese upper middle class, the Viennese bourgeoisie together with all German bourgeoisie in Austria, the status of one of the ruling classes. Hence, it prospered economically and with it, the Viennese lower middle class prospered also. With the growth of prosperity, after 1867 the middle classes began breathing an atmosphere of freedom. Freemasonry, with its 150 years history of anti-absolutist traditions, seemed to them a worthy cause. The disfavour shown this organization by the ruling Dynasty, only served to add to its power of attraction. And again, the distance separating the middle class from different groups of professional intelligentsia was far less pronounced than in Hungary — with the possible exception of state officials. They all had mutual family and social ties.

⁸¹ C. van Dalen's *Kalender für Freimaurer auf das Jahr 1886*, Leipzig 1886, pp. 219 - 220; "Mistria" (Bucharest), April 1874, No. 6, p. 105; *Allgemeine Handbuch...*, Bd. IV, pp. 75, 97, 104, 190.

⁸² H. Oberhumer, *Die wiener Polizei*, Bd. I, Wien 1937, p. 304. Characteristic episode — *Hledající v temnotách*, Praha 5932 [1932], p. 50.

In these circumstances, it was not surprising that the Viennese middle class not only flocked to Masonic temples but also played a dominant role in the Lodges.³³ State officials on the other hand, concerned for the opinion of their superiors and careers, were loath to join an organization viewed askance by the Imperial Court, whose legality was at best doubtful. As for the intelligentsia, only individual people and groups closest to the middle class joined the organization. That was why, as opposed to conditions in Hungary, there were no high officials, no well-known influential politicians or aristocrats among Viennese Freemasons, but in compensation, big businessmen took an active part in Lodge activity, for instance Victor Schmidt (senior), Victor von Offenheim, Philip von Schöller, Hugo von Noöt, also popular theatre and opera artists such as Theodor Lebe, Wilhelm Knaach and Emil Scaria, as well as writers and journalists popular with the middle class, such as Carlos von Gagern, Ferdinand Gross, Vincenz Chiavacci, well-known lawyers Max Neuda and Ludwig Schanzer, prominent citizens like the City Councillor Donat Zifferer, and so on and so forth.³⁴

PEACEFUL YEARS (1886 - 1906)

During the relatively peaceful period known as *La belle Époque*, which in Western Europe continued till the outbreak of World War I, but in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy ended in 1905, the bourgeoisie and most of the middle classes grew prosperous. After 1905, under the influence of the revolution in Russia, social and nationality conflicts gained in strength. The struggle of the proletariat and peasant masses for universal voting rights, shook the state to its very foundations. In the latter part of 1880's, the industrial revolution was drawing to a close. In the Hungarian part of the Habsburg Monarchy, the industrial revolution increased the role of the bourgeoisie and social groups connected with it, at the cost of

³³ Of the 13 heads of Lodges and their deputies in 1881, three were merchants, two were industrialists, one was a pensioner (*rentier*) and one a factory director. *C. van Dalen's* [...] *auf das Jahr 1882*, pp. 266 - 267. The leading role played by the bourgeoisie in Masonic Lodges was also stressed by *Oberhummer* (*op. cit.*, p. 304).

³⁴ J. Reiss, *Die österreichischen Freimaurer*, Wien 1932, p. 62; "Bauhütte," 5 February, 1910 No. 6, p. 48; *Historischer Kalender*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," 1919, No. 4/5 p. 4, No. 10, p. 11; 1920 No. 3, p. 5, No. 4, p. 8. It would seem that the only Masonic member of Parliament at the time was Dr Richard Forreger, of the Progressive Party.

the nobility. In 1892, for the first time in history a man of middle class origin, Sandor Wekerle, became head of the government.

For Freemasonry, this was a period of peaceful, unspectacular but nonetheless systematic development. In the course of 20 years (March 1886 - June 1906), 32 new Lodges were opened in Transilvania, more than the total which existed at the time of fusion, when there were 29 Lodges in all. This meant that on an average, three new Lodges were formed every two years. True, 14 Lodges previously in existence were dissolved, but these had long been inactive. In the final account, the number of Lodges increased by 18, which, compared with the fairly fictitious state of affairs in March 1886, was an increase of 62%. This increase was not distributed evenly over different territories. In both relative and absolute terms, the largest increase was noted in Budapest (eight Lodges: 80%), followed by Hungary proper (five Lodges: 63%). Least progress was attained in the non-Hungarian provinces of Transilvania (five Lodges: 39%). Here, the principal success was reconstruction of the Organization in Vojvodina which began in 1891 and in Transcarpathia in 1902. In both these provinces the organization had been virtually non-existent for many years past.

In Transilvania, the membership increased from 1,158 members, in March 1886 to 1,557 in mid-1893 (an increase of 399 members or 34.5%), to 2,366 at the end of 1900 (an overall increase of 1,208 or 104.3%; 809 members, or 52% joined between 1893 and 1900), and to 3,450 at the end of 1907 (an overall increase of 2,292 members, or 197.9%; 1,084 new members, or 45.8%, joined between 1901 and 1907). Thus, in under 22 years, the membership nearly trebled. The average annual increase in membership during this period amounted to 9.1%. Compared with conditions in March 1886, in the three sub-periods mentioned, it shaped as follows: 4.8%, 9.3% and 13.4%. On the other hand, compared with conditions at the beginning of each sub-period, it shaped as follows: 4.8%, 6.9% and 6.4%.³⁵ The highest rate of increase was between 1893 and 1900.³⁶ In all provinces the rate of membership increase was in advance of the analogous index for the number of Lodges, which implied that Lodges were gaining in strength and that by and large the membership of each

³⁵ The adjective "symbolic" used in the name of new Grand Lodge, meant that the Lodge recognized and practiced the first three degrees of initiation only, which were known as symbolic or St. John degrees of initiation.

³⁶ It has been accepted that the whole period was equal to 21.75 years, and the consecutive sub-periods equalled 7.25, 7.5 and 7.0 years respectively.

Lodge was increasing. But, as mentioned above, the increase in membership was not distributed evenly over different provinces: in Budapest it amounted to 246.7%, in Hungary proper to 182.4% and in non-Hungarian provinces to 137.9%. From then on, Budapest remained the strongest centre of Freemasonry in the whole of Austria-Hungary. The role of Budapest as the largest Masonic centre in Transilvania, also increased systematically. Whereas in 1877 and 1878 two-fifths of all Masons in that part of the Monarchy belonged to Lodges in Budapest (42.1%), in spring 1886 this proportion had increased to almost 50% and in summer 1893 to 57.9%. At the end of 1900 it was still 57.3% and at the end of 1907 it had fallen slightly, to 54.9%. At the end of 1900, there was 1.4 member of a Lodge to every 10,000 members of the population in Transilvania, but in Budapest there were 18.5 whereas elsewhere 0.6 only. Taking in account the population of Hungarian and Austrian nationality only, since practically speaking, Lodge members belonged to these two nationalities only, the corresponding figures would change to 2.2; 19.8 and 1.0.⁸⁷ The proportion of Masons living in Budapest and elsewhere in the Transilvian part of the Habsburg Monarchy was somewhat different: many people from localities where no Masonic Lodges existed for one reason or another, joined the Budapest Lodges. Membership did not depend on the place of domicile.

Compared with the previous period, the significantly smaller proportion of members resigning from Lodges or expelled from them was a clear sign of stabilization in the Organization. Whereas up to March 1886, the overall losses in membership, including Vienna, Croatia, etc., amounted to 62.3% of the total of initiated and affiliated members, in the five years between 1886 and 1890 losses fell to 14.4%, between 1891 and 1895 they mounted again to 22.9%, between 1896 and 1901 they were 18.8% and between 1902 and 1911, 29.0% (see Table 3).⁸⁸ It may be surmised that the significant upward rise of the index in the last sub-period mentioned, was mainly

⁸⁷ Indices were calculated in relation to the strength of population on 31 December, 1901. A single year's increase in population could not have altered them.

⁸⁸ For periods after 1886, the proportions were calculated in relation to the overall number of newly accepted and affiliated members and members belonging to the organization at the beginning of each given period. Although, owing to lack of other information, the proportions were calculated for the organization as a whole, changes in them provide a fairly accurate reflection of the degree of fluctuation in Transilvian membership, since the proportion between the number of members in Transilvania and in other provinces were not subject to any significant oscillation.

due to fluctuation of members in its latter part. An important flow of new adepts was noted in that time, which, similarly to the period between 1870 and 1886, was accompanied by a relatively large number of resignations, due to early disillusionment.

A moderate trend was dominant in the Masonic Organization of Austria-Hungary after the fusion of 1886. This trend had been a characteristic feature of the former St. John Grand Lodge of Hungary, which at the time of fusion with the Grand Orient of Hungary had more than two and a half times as many members as the Grand Orient (1,308 members as against 502). This trend laid greatest emphasis on the philosophical, contemplative, moderate nature of the movement, hence on the ritual, on a philosophical interpretation of symbols and on charitable work,³⁹ an attitude which could attract individuals but hardly larger groups. The marked enlivenment in public life, proved i.a. by sharp discussions and clashes on the problem of marriages at the registrars office on the state take — over of Church registry offices, demands of equal rights for people of the Jewish religion and increasingly sharp attacks by Catholics on Freemasonry (e.g. the Anti-Masonic League formed in 1886), forced the Organization to abandon its freely adopted attitude of isolation.

Beginning with the mid-1890's, more radical trends began to gain sway, aimed at more active participation of Freemasonry in public life and social affairs. The circular issued by the Grand Lodge on 1 October, 1897, outlined new tasks for the Organization, closely connected with politics in the broad sense of the word.⁴⁰ This new attitude increased the flow of new adepts to Transilvian Lodges and brought about changes in their socio-professional component. During the ten years from 1886 to 1895 when the moderate trend was still dominant, these changes remained relatively insignificant. Compared with the period between 1868 and 1885 and particularly with the ten years from 1876 to 1885 (see Table 4), the socio-professional component of new adepts joining Lodges in provincial towns in ethnically Hungarian territory did not change (see Table 5). In Budapest and in Hungary proper, the proportion of members belonging to the free profes-

³⁹ E. Lennhoff, O. Posner, *Internationales Freimaurerlexikon*, Zürich 1932, column 1616; *Die Schicksale der ungarischen Freimaurerei*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung", May 1927, No. 5, p. 23.

⁴⁰ M. Gelléri, *op. cit.*, p. 337; *Ungarn*, "Bauhütte," 15 January, 1898, No. 3, pp. 23 - 24; *Von der ungarischen Freimaurerei*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," October-November, 1927, No. 10/11, p. 33.

sions and similar occupations increased by 3.8% respectively. In Budapest itself, many writers, journalists and artist of different type joined Masonic Lodges. The proportion of white-collar workers in private employment joining Masonic Lodges in both Budapest and the Hungarian countryside also increased by about 5%. These people came from groups which had tied their future with the bourgeois social order; their joining the Masonic movement was a sign of the increase in their numbers and their social activeness. In both cases, this was a result of the industrial revolution. On the other hand, the proportion of state and local officials among new adepts fell by 8.7% and that of school teachers by 5.9%. In the case of senior officials, this was due to the negative attitude of the reigning Dynasty towards Freemasonry and officials who belonged to Masonic Lodges, which of course could not leave them indifferent.⁴¹ The shift of the property owning classes towards the Right caused a fall of 3.2% in the proportion of bourgeois and prosperous lower middle class members in Masonic Lodges on Hungarian territory. But in Budapest itself, this proportion in fact increased by 0.5%. Merchants and owners of businesses were to be found only among the leadership of Masonic Lodges in Budapest, elsewhere, lawyers, doctors and state officials were dominant. In Translitavia as a whole, a slight shift of position occurred between groups traditionally independent professionally and the remaining groups in the ten years from 1886 to 1895. The proportion of the former among new initiates fell from 35.3 to 32.1%, and of the latter, increased from 63.5 to 66.6%.

Compared with the previous decade, the radical process in the Masonic organization in Translitavia after 1895, caused significant changes in the socio-professional component of new adepts who joined the organization between 1896 and 1905 (see Table 6).⁴² In course of these ten years, the social component of Translitavian Freemasons changed significantly. To some extent, this was intended by the recruitment policy conducted by progressive Masonic groups, who set themselves the task of winning over landowners, judges, public prosecutors and school teachers to the movement.⁴³ This policy was successful only with school teachers: their proportion

⁴¹ J. Balassa, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁴² In view of the subsequent expansion of the organizational network to areas outside of Budapest, the flow of candidates can only be compared with that in the previous period for Translitavia as a whole, since candidates from the provinces who previously joined Budapest Lodges and represented a social structure specific to the provinces, now joined provincial Lodges.

⁴³ *Hebung des Niveaus der Freimaurer*, "Bauhütte," May 1897, No. 18, p. 143.

in Lodges almost doubled from 7.1% to 13.3%. Over a third of new adepts (35.2%) belonged to the free professions and similar groups (previously this proportion was 30%). The proportion of officials continued to fall, from 13.7 to 13.2%, and the proportion of white-collar workers in private employment also fell slightly. Lack of interest in the Masonic movement displayed by the bourgeoisie and lower middle class, was a constant feature. Their proportion fell by 10.6%, equivalent to one-third of their strength in the previous decade. This was due to growth of reactionary trends in some and to loss of interest in public affairs in others. The relatively largest number of new adepts from among the middle class joined the Budapest Lodges (32.6%) but this was below the number of recruits from among the free professions in Budapest (32.8%). By and large, during the ten years from 1896 to 1905, a clear shift occurred in the proportion of new adepts from groups traditionally independent professionally (32.1 and 21.5%), and from the intelligentsia (66.6 and 77.1%). In fact, Hungarian Freemasonry was becoming similar to the French model,⁴⁴ which was known for its progressiveness and was growing increasingly further apart from German Freemasonry, conservative in the majority, in which the traditional property owning classes represented 56.3% of the overall membership, and from the Swedish and Norwegian Freemasonry in which adepts from these classes represented 43.3% of the overall membership.

Many reasons existed why the number and role of Freemasons holding high positions in the Hungarian government was not very significant. Their position in the House of Representatives of the Hungarian Parliament was incomparably stronger. In the 1892 elections, of the total number of 453 members (413 elected members and 40 delegated from the Croatian Parliament), 40 Freemasons were elected, and in the 1896 elections, 42. Subsequently, the number of Masonic deputies fell to 40 in the 1901 elec-

⁴⁴ No exact information exists on the social component of French Freemasonry at the end of the 19th century or in the 20th. Former deputy-secretary of the Grand Orient de France at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, considered that at that time, members of this organization recruited from among merchants, different categories of privately employed intellectuals, office workers and less well-to-do doctors and lawyers, in other words, from among the petty bourgeoisie and less prosperous members of the free professions. J. Bidegain, *Le Grand Orient de France*, Paris 1905, p. 155. See remarks on changes in the membership component of the *Loge des Amis du Progrès* in Le Mans. A. Bouton, *Les luttes ardentes des Francs-Maçons Manceaux pour l'établissement de la République 1815 - 1914*, Le Mans 1966, p. 256.

tions and to 34 in 1905. Thus, they represented between 7.5 and 9.3% of the House, and between 8.2 and 10.2% of its elected members. Most Masonic deputies belonged to one of the two dominant parties in the House of Representatives, namely the Liberal Party and the Independence Party (Year 1848). In the 1892 - 1896 Parliament, there were 26 Freemasons in the total of 243 Liberal Party deputies, or 10.7%, and 9 in the total of 86 deputies of the Year 1848 Party or 10.5%. In the next Parliament, there were 30 Masonic deputies in the total of 290 Liberal Party deputies, or 10.3%, and 17 in the total of 159 of the Year 1848 Party deputies, or 10.7% in the 1905 - 1906 Parliament.⁴⁵

In Vienna, two more Lodges were opened between 1886 and 1906 (an increase of 25%) and membership increased by 350, or 59.4%, between June 1885 and December 1907. Compared with Budapest, the other capital of the Monarchy, where, given an almost equal start (Vienna — 589 members, Budapest — 546), membership increased by 246.7%, the rate of development was four times slower (annual average was 2.7% compared with 11.3% in Budapest). Whereas in 1885, Vienna was still the largest Masonic centre in Austria-Hungary, in mid-1893 it was outdistanced by Budapest, despite the fact that Lodges in that city were gradually transferring members domiciled in the provinces to Masonic Lodges being opened locally. Compared with the number of members in June 1885, in Vienna the average annual increase in membership between 1885 and 1893 amounted to 2.1%, between 1893 and 1900 to 4.0%, and between 1901 and 1907 to 1.9%, whereas the corresponding figures for Budapest were 8.4, 11.1 and 14.1%. At the end of 1900, for every 10,000 members of the population there were 5.2 Freemasons in Vienna and 18.5 in Budapest.

The relative lack of success of the Masonic organization in Vienna was due to changes of opinion which occurred mainly among the property owning classes. The lower middle classes in Austria, which from the end of the 1880's had increasingly felt the consequences of capitalist concentration of production, fatal to many small businesses, craftsmen and artisans, turned away from the principal supporters of unrestricted capitalist development, namely the all-powerful Liberalism. They transferred their allegiance to the nationalist Pan-German movement and the conservative Christian-Social movement. Contrary to the Liberal camp, both these move-

⁴⁵ *Ungarn*, "Bundesblatt," 18 March, 1892 No. 6, p. 120; *Ungarn*, "Bauhütte," 13 February, 1897, No. 7, p. 56; *Ungarn*, "Bundesblatt," 15 September, 1905, No. 16, p. 529.

ments were anti-Semitic and anti-Masonic. In effect, this brought about dissolution of Masonic groups in Austrian provincial towns and influenced both the fall in the number of new adepts and their social component. In the decade between 1886 and 1895, this component differed little from the previous period, the differences did not exceed 1.6%. But between 1896 and 1905, the proportion between adepts from different groups changed very significantly. At that time, 40.6% of new adepts came from the traditional middle class environment (the bourgeoisie and lower middle class), compared with 51.4% in the previous decade, whereas 36% came from the free professions, compared with 22.8% in the previous period. The group represented by teachers also consistently diminished, from 3.7% originally, to 2.1 and 1.0%. On the other hand, the proportion of the small group of state and local officials and that of the far larger group of privately employed white-collar workers, showed little change. Thus, members of independent professions became a minority among new adepts in Vienna only between 1896 and 1905 (40.6), whereas in Budapest Lodges they were in the minority right from the beginning, 33.1% between 1868 and 1885, and less than one-fourth of the overall number of new adepts in the period under discussion (24.3%).

In Viennese Lodges, groups of the bourgeoisie and lower middle classes which remained faithful to Liberalism were dominant. Towards the end of the 1880's, individual Austrian Social-Democrats began joining the Masonic movement: Franz Schumeier was initiated in 1889, Dr Karl Ornstein in 1896.⁴⁶

Due to the weakness and disorganization of the Liberal camp in Austria, there were almost no Viennese Freemasons in Parliament or among important politicians. On the other hand, Freemasons played a fairly significant role in the liberal press and the world of art.

YEARS OF FLOURISHMENT (1906 - 1914)

Under the influence of the 1905 revolution in Russia, the political struggle in Hungary grew sharper and more intense. The struggle concentrated on two fundamental problems which the bourgeois-democratic revolution had so far left unsolved, namely the agrarian question and the problem of national minorities, and was reflected in the Masonic organi-

⁴⁶ V. K r a u s z, *Aus der Geschichte der Loge "Sokrates"*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung" May-June 1925, No. 5/6, p. 26; J. P a l a t i n u s *op. cit.*, pp. 140, 171.

zation also. In spring 1909, the organization abandoned the contemplative philosophical attitude previously adopted by the majority of Lodges and members, in favour of an active attitude committed to the social struggle against the aftermaths of feudalism. This increased the movement's power of attraction and its membership began growing. As concerns numerical strength, in 1911 the Grand Lodge of Hungary held eighth place in Europe, after England, Scotland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy and Sweden.⁴⁷ In Autumn that year, the leadership of the Grand Lodge of Hungary set the organization the priority task of attaining the total of a hundred Lodges and a membership of 10,000, all actively engaged in the movement.⁴⁸ This aim was partly attained by mid-1914, when the Grand Lodge of Hungary had 101 Lodges (one in Izmir, Turkey), but the overall membership only amounted to approximately 7,400 members.⁴⁹

Between 1906 and 1914, 35 new Lodges were opened in Transilvania, while one was closed down. The organization's network increased from 47 to 81 Lodges, that is by 72.3%. 12 new Lodges were opened in Budapest and 9 in provincial towns on Hungarian ethnical territory while one was dissolved, the remaining 14 were opened in non-Hungarian territories. Compared with the number of Lodges in existence in mid-1906, this denoted an increase of 66.7, 72.7 and 77.8% respectively. Formation of so many Lodges outside the capital was the result of consistent efforts conducted by the Grand Lodge of Hungary. For instance, by decision of the General Assembly of 27 April, 1912, newly formed Lodges in the Provinces obtained various financial facilities. Membership increased more rapidly than in previous periods. In the six years from 1908 to 1913, ranks increased by 3,900 new members, that is by 60.5%, compared with the end of 1907. The average annual increase was 10.1%. This increase was not distributed evenly, for instance in Budapest it amounted to 49.4% (annual average 8.2%), on ethnically Hungarian territories it was 67.9% (annual average 11.3%), and on non-Hungarian territories 78.2%, or an annual average

⁴⁷ *Statistisches*, "Bundesblatt," 1 March, 1913, No. 5, p. 140.

⁴⁸ G. Schmiedl, *Die Kulturarbeit der ungarischen Freimaurer*, "Dokumente des Fortschritts," June 1911, fasc. 6, pp. 376, 379 - 380; "Zirkel", May 1911, fasc. 29, p. 429. *Freimaurerei*, in: "Bonifatius-Korespondenz," 15 April, 1912, No. 8, p. 118. *Zwei Grossversammlungen der Symb. Grossloge von Ungarn*, *ibidem*, December 1913, No. 23, p. 376.

⁴⁹ On 1 January, 1915, the total membership of these Lodges was 7,414. C. van Dalen's [...] *auf das Jahr 1916*, Leipzig 1916, p. 263. During the war years, increase in membership was insignificant.

of 13%. In all likelihood, in the last seven months of peace the rate of increase remained unchanged everywhere with the exception of Budapest, where it fell sharply.⁵⁰ This time, new adepts joining the Masonic movement proved it was no passing whim on their part: in 1912 - 1913 only 13% resigned. This proved that fluctuation was less than half of what it had been in the period 1902 - 1911, when it had reached 29%.

From the point of view of social origin, new adepts initiated between 1906 and 1914 differed little from their predecessors accepted in the previous decade (1896 - 1905). The proportion of state and local officials fell from 13.2 to 12.3% and that of middle class members from 21.5 to 20.4%. The proportion of privately employed white-collars increased slightly, the increase being relatively highest in Budapest. School teachers continued to represent about one-seventh of new adepts, or 13.3%. This high proportion was a calculated result of the recruitment policy.⁵¹

Only 31 Masons were elected in the Parliamentary election held in June 1910. This was the smallest number in the last 20 years.⁵² A novel feature was that after 1905 several outstanding Social-Democratic leaders joined the Masonic movement, people like Zsigmond Kunfi, Peter Agoston, Ernő Czóbel, Jozsef Diener-Dénes, Jozsef Pogány, Imre Pogány, and Zoltan Ronai.⁵³ At the same time, extreme radicals from the bourgeoisie also joined the movement, including Oskar Jaszi, the leading bourgeois sociologist, from 1911 head of the Martinovics Lodge in Budapest, known as the Sociologists' Lodge.

The animation in social life which accompanied social and nationality conflicts in Cislitavia after 1905, also accelerated the development of the Masonic movement in that part of the Habsburg Monarchy. An 11th Lodge was formed in Vienna in 1907, and two more were opened in 1913. In

⁵⁰ A conclusion reached from the number of members at the beginning of 1915 (see Table 2), which in all probability did not differ significantly from figures at the outbreak of War.

⁵¹ Teachers were accepted in Lodges without payment of the entrance fee and did not have to pay the monthly contribution. Ungheria, "Rivista Massonica," 15-30, November 1910, No. 17/18, p. 416.

⁵² *Ungarn*, "Bundesblatt," 1 October, 1910, No. 17, p. 610; "Orient," June-July, 1910, No. 6/7, p. 169. M. Gelléri (*op. cit.*, p. 668) mentions 35 Masonic deputies. It may be surmised that the 31 Freemasons elected in the 1910 elections were later joined by four more deputies accepted in Lodges during the Parliamentary term.

⁵³ J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*, sub voce; *Die Schicksale...*, p. 24.

1909, members of Viennese and Hungarian Lodges living in Bohemia, together with Prague Freemasons who previously belonged to Lodges in Germany, formed the "Hiram zu den drei Sternen" Lodge in Prague, which joined the Grand Lodge of Hungary. Seven of the 42 founder members of this Lodge were Czechs.⁵⁴ Thus, by mid-1906, the number of Lodges in Cislitavia belonging to the Grand Lodge of Hungary — excluding Bukovina which led a separate existence — had increased to 10, and to 14 on the eve of the outbreak of World War I. This increase of 40% was below that in Translitavia. Masonic circles were re-opened in the provincial Austrian towns of Salzburg in 1906 and Linz in 1911. The rate of increase in membership was only half that in Translitavia, from 9,039 at the end of 1907, to 1,292 at the end of 1913, an increase of 30.9%, giving an annual average of 5%.

Adepts joining Lodges in Cislitavia between 1906 and 1914 came from the same social group as their predecessors in the 1896 - 1905 decade. The proportion of candidates from traditional middle class circles fell by 2.5%, from 40.6 to 38.1%, on the other hand, the proportion of representatives of various intermediary groups, above all the free professions, increased from 36.0 to 37.9%. Although representatives of the prosperous middle class no longer formed the majority in Viennese Lodges, their number still remained double that in Translitavian Lodges and they continued to play an important role. Among the heads of the eleven Viennese Lodges in 1907, three were industrialists and one a merchant; in 1911, one was an industrialist and two were merchants.⁵⁵ To some extent, the strong position of the middle class in Lodges was due to the system of recruitment. Here, no efforts comparable to those in Transilvania were made to win over prominent figures to the movement: the usual practice was that members recruited their relatives, friends and relations. Prosperity greatly facilitated acceptance: if a candidate was rich, less importance was attached to his personal qualities.⁵⁶ Due to these circumstances, Viennese Lodges were relatively more conservative than others and far less concerned in matters of current policy. Nevertheless, they

⁵⁴ A. Hartl, *K historie pražské lóže "Hiram,"* "Svobodný zédnář," 20 June, 1935, No. 7, p. 131; Analogously to Vienna Lodges, formally the Lodge was located in Bratislava on Translitavian territory.

⁵⁵ F. Stauracz, *Wesen und Ziele der Freimaurerei*, Wien 1912, pp. 6 - 67; C. van Dalen's [...] *auf das Jahr 1912*, Leipzig 1912 p. 299.

⁵⁶ "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," May 1919, No. 1/3, p. 6.

had several deputies in the Council of State (Lower House of the Cislitanian Parliament) in the last two Parliaments, in the Liberal and Radical groups: Dr Stefan Licht, Otto Günther, Ernst Victor Zenker, August Denk and others.⁵⁷ Several Austrian Social-Democratic trade union movement leaders became Freemasons between 1906 and 1914. Most prominent among them were Ferdinand Hanusch, member of Parliament from 1906 till 1918, the Free-Thinkers leader Ludwig Wutschel, member of Parliament from 1911 till 1918, Georg Schmiedl and Ludwig Brügel, who later wrote a five-volume history of the trade-union movement.⁵⁸

DECLINE AND FALL (1914 - 1920)

Mobilization and the outbreak of World War I prevented further development of Freemasonry in Austria-Hungary. In Transilvania, Lodges turned their premises over to military hospitals and concentrated on charitable work. Misunderstanding a police order, following the outbreak of War, Freemasons in Vienna suspended all activities with the exception of charitable work. Normal activity was not re-opened till the beginning of 1916. In both parts of the Monarchy, Freemasons opted in support of the war and gave full support to the government. In these circumstances, no time was left for organizational activity. As a result, no new Lodge was formed in the first two years of War, and the number of members fell slightly from 7,414 at the end of 1914 to 7,350 at the end of the next year. It was only when the Grand Lodge of Hungary began action in support of peace at the end of 1916, an action which eventually gained great momentum, that the Masonic movement revided. By the end of 1917, the number of members had increased to 7,447, slightly above the total at the end of 1914. But this slight improvement concerned Transilvania only. In Hungary proper, a new Lodge was formed, in Nyiregyháza. In the Vienna Lodges, however, the number of members fell from 1,174

⁵⁷ J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*, *sub voce*; F. Hergeth, *Aus der Werkstatt der Freimaurer und Juden im Österreich der Nachkriegszeit*, Graz [1927], pp. 11, 120.

⁵⁸ J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*, *sub voce*; O. Trebitsch, *In memoriam Br. Georg Schmiedl*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," July-August 1929, No. 7/8, pp. 18 - 19.

at the end of 1914 to 1,044 at the beginning of 1919, a fall of 11%.⁵⁹ The number of new adepts joining Vienna Lodges during the War was insignificant and did not change the social component.

New Masonic adepts accepted in Transilvian Lodges during the War (see Table 8), came from somewhat different social groups than their predecessors in the period immediately preceding War. The proportion of representatives of the free professions and affiliated groups was far lower (28.5%) than in the last period before the War (34.4%). This meant that the constantly growing trend in these professional groups to join the Masonic movement since its revival at the end of the 1860's, was over. On the other hand, groups of privately employed white-collar workers from among whom roughly one-sixth of new Masonic adepts (16 to 18%) had been regularly recruited since the 1880's, this time gave the Lodges over one-fourth (28.4%) of new adepts, equalling the free professions in this respect. Both in absolute and relative terms, they supplied the largest number of new members in Budapest Lodges 35.7% in fact, which gave them a 6.9% advantage over the free professions. The proportion of members from among state and local officials, which up till then had been systematically falling, now also showed an upward trend. Outside of Budapest, they supplied over one-fifth of the new adepts. In all likelihood, these were local "Komitat" officials. With the exception of Budapest, the proportions of members from the middle classes diminished everywhere, by one-fourth in fact on the national scale, from 20.4% between 1906 - 1914 to 15%, continuing the general downward trend in this group. The War also brought about a fall in the proportion of school teachers, from 13.3% in the period immediately preceding War, to 10.3%. The last year of War brought some change in the political affiliations of Hungarian Masons. The emergency congress of Hungarian Social-Democrats held on 10 February, 1918 forbade its members to join other political organizations and Masonic Lodges, thereby following the decisions taken by the Congress of the Italian Socialist Party held in Ancona in April 1914. As a result of this decision, Social-Democratic

⁵⁹ *Leben und Arbeit in den Logen*, "Schlesisches Logenblatt," 17 February, 1917, No. 4, p. 31; *C. van Dalen's [...] auf das Jahr 1922*, Leipzig 1922, p. 290; R. Schlesinger, *Sechs Jahre der Grossloge von Wien*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," April 1925, No. 4 p. 5.

members resigned from Masonic Lodges.⁶⁰ But radical bourgeois members, close to the Socialists, remained faithful.

During the half-century from 1868 till 1918, the social component of Freemasonry in Transilvania underwent clear and consistent change. Revived in the 1860's, at first Freemasonry failed to take firm root among the property-owning classes and groups typical of the 2nd half of the 19th century, namely the bourgeoisie and lower middle class. Masonic ties with these classes gradually grew weaker. Whereas at the turn of the 1870's beginning of the 1880's, one-third of new adepts joining Lodges (35.3%) came from those classes, in under 40 years the proportion had fallen by more than half, to 15%. Neither of these groups had traditions of their own in the struggle for national liberation or in the struggle with feudalism for social hegemony, hence they fell an easy prey to ideological backwardness and become infused with spirit of chauvinism. With the progress of these trends, cosmopolitan Masonic concepts — in the positive sense of the term — and humanitarian ideals gradually lost their appeal to them. Neither could such ideals get much response from the state bureaucracy, which still had strong ties with feudal or semi-feudal groups, particularly among the upper strata. The result was that Freemasonry obtained increasingly broad support from the new, rapidly developing intermediary strata who wanted reform of the semi-feudal and semi-capitalistic system in the country, from members of the free professions and affiliated groups and from "white-collar" workers. These groups, together with primary, vocational and secondary school teachers, at the end of the 1870's beginning of the 1880's provided Lodges somewhat more than two-fifths of the overall number of new adepts, and as much as two-thirds during World War I. Among 55 members of the Hungarian Masonic leadership (dignitaries of the Grand Lodge and Masonic Council) elected on 25 January, 1919, three were capitalist businessmen, eight were capitalist company directors, and the remaining 44 (80%) were secondary-school teachers and members of the free and affiliated professions.⁶¹ These circumstances largely influenced the nature of the movement and its attitude to current social problems.

⁶⁰ *Aus maurerischen Zeitschriften*, "Bundesblatt," 1 June, 1918, No. 1, pp. 233 - 234; *Die Schicksale...*, p. 24.

⁶¹ *A Magyarországi Nagy-Páholy...*, pp. 12 - 13. 23 members of the Masonic Council belonging to Vienna Lodges were mentioned in the list.

The situation in Vienna Lodges (including the one in Prague) was different. Here, the traditional property-owning classes lost their original majority of 53% at the turn of the century, but right up to the outbreak of War, and in all likelihood up to its end also, retained a strong minority of 38.1%. In addition, in the social conditions existing in Austria at the time, the free professions and a significant proportion of privately employed intellectuals, particularly those in higher positions, had stronger ties with the middle class than was the case in the Kingdom of Hungary.

The disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy at the end of World War I, had immediate repercussions on the structure of the Masonic organization. The Vienna Lodges, now confined within the borders of a completely separate state, demanded independence. The Grand Symbolic Lodge of Hungary gave its agreement by letter of 14 November, 1918 and on 25 January, 1919 issued the document of foundation (patent) to the newly formed Grand Lodge of Vienna. At the same time, the Grand Lodge of Hungary granted the request of Croatia Lodges to leave the organization on 1 December, 1918, and by special decision passed ten days later, freed them from its jurisdiction.⁶² In Hungary proper, Freemasonry obtained significant influence in the state administration of the Mihály Károlyi, Dénes Berinkey government (31 October, 1918 - 20 March, 1919) in which some leading Masons obtained important posts, including Ministries.⁶³ But these were the last successes of the movement. The government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic (21 March - 1 August, 1919) ordered the dissolution of Freemasonry, on the strength of its decree on the dissolution of all bourgeois societies. The building of the Grand Lodge was requisitioned and the organization suspended all activities. Following victory of the counterrevolution on building was restored, but the general political climate in the country, the hue and cry raised against anything of a progressive nature, prohibited resumption of Masonic

⁶² *Aus der Grossloge von Wien*, "Wiener Freimaurer-Zeitung," May 1919, No. 1/3, pp. 2 - 3; *Patent*, *ibidem*, January 1921, No. 1, p. 1; *Osnutak Velike Lože Srba Hrvata i Slovenaca, Jugoslavija*, "Šestar," October 1921, No. 2, pp. 10 - 11; L. H a s s, *Wolnomularstwo w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej po pierwszej wojnie światowej*, [*Freemasonry in East-Central Europe after World War I*], "Studia z Dziejów ZSSR i Europy Środkowej", vol. IV, (1968), p. 105.

⁶³ O. J a s s i, *The Rise and Fall of Hungarian Freemasonry*, "The New Age Magazine," January 1924, No. 1, p. 8. The author was a prominent Freemason, Minister in the Károlyi and Berinkey. Government. Berinkey himself was a Mason.

activity. Some of the Lodges found themselves on territories occupied by neighbouring states, territories which Hungary was later forced to cede by the peace treaty concluded at the Trianon on 4 June, 1920. The future of these Lodges was never formally settled, since by decree of the Home Secretary Michály Dömölör of 18 May, 1920, the Grand Lodge and all dependent Lodges were dissolved, their property requisitioned and their archives confiscated by the state.⁶⁴

(Tables to this article see pp. 102 - 117).

(Translated by Stanislaw Tarnowski)

⁶⁴ L. H a s s, *Wolnomularstwo...*, p. 106.

Table 1: Development of the Organization of Hungarian Masonic Lodges between 1868 and 1919

No.	Territory	1868—1874											
		Formed			Dissolved			State in Dec. 1874			Formed		
		GL	GO	Total	GL	GO	Total	GL	GO	Total	GL	GO	Total
1.	Budapest	6	8	14	—	1	1	6	7	13	—	2	2
2.	Hungarian provinces	4	1	5	—	—	—	4	1	5	1	3	4
	Ethnographically Hungarian territories (1—2)	10	9	19	—	1	1	10	8	18	1	5	6
3.	Slovakia	2	2	4	1	2	3	1	—	1	3	2	5
4.	Transylvania	7	5	12	—	2	2	7	3	10	4	1	5
5.	Transcarpathia	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—
6.	Vojvodina	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	2	2
	Territories under Hungarian and German domination (3—6)	9	11	20	1	4	5	8	7	15	7	5	12
7.	Croatia	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—
8.	Rieka (Fiume)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9.	Vienna	3	—	3	—	—	—	3	—	3	4	1	5
10.	Prague	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.	Moldavia (Bukovina)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
12.	Galicia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13.	Abroad	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^a	—	1 ^a
	T o t a l	23	20	43	1	5	6	22	15	37	14	11	25
		<i>Chain index in percentage figures</i>											
	Hungarian ethnographic territories	100.0	100.0	100.0	—	11.1	5.3	100.0	88.9	94.7	10.0	62.5	33.3
	Territories under Hungarian and German domination	100.0	100.0	100.0	11.1	36.4	20.0	88.9	63.6	80.0	71.4	71.4	80.0
	Vienna	100.0	—	100.0	—	—	—	100.0	—	100.0	133.3	×	166.7
	T o t a l	100.0	100.0	100.0	4.3	25.0	13.9	95.7	75.0	86.1	63.7	73.3	67.6

No.	Territory	1875—1886			1886—1906			1906—1914			1914—1917			1918—1919					
		Dissolved			State in March 1874			F	D	June	F	D	June	F	D	Dec.	F	D	1919
		GL	GO	Total	GL	GO	Total			1906			1914			1917			
1.	Budapest	2	3	5	4	6	10	9	1	18	12	—	30	1	1	30	—	—	30
2.	Hungarian provinces	2	1	3	3	3	6	9	4	11	9	1	19	1	—	20	—	2	18
	Ethnographically Hun- garian territories (1—2)	4	4	8	7	9	16	18	5	29	21	1	49	2	1	50	—	2	48
3.	Slovakia	—	—	—	4	2	6	4	4	6	3	—	9	—	—	9	—	—	9
4.	Transylvania	5	3	8	6	1	7	7	5	9	7	—	16	—	—	16	—	—	16
5.	Transcarpathia	—	2	2	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	3
6.	Vojvodina	—	4	4	—	—	—	2	—	2	2	—	4	—	—	4	—	—	4
	Territories under Hun- garian and German dom- ination (3—6)	5	9	14	10	3	13	14	9	18	14	—	32	—	—	32	—	—	32
7.	Croatia	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	2	—	3	—	—	3	—	3 ^f	—
8.	Rieka (Fiume)	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	1
9.	Vienna	—	—	—	7	1	8	4	2	10	3	—	13	—	—	13	—	13 ^f	—
10.	Prague	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	1 ^f	—
11.	Moldavia (Bukovina)	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	1 ^f	—
12.	Galicia	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13.	Abroad	1 ^a	—	1 ^a	—	—	—	2 ^b	1 ^c	1	1 ^d	1 ^e	1	—	—	1	—	—	1
	Total	10	13	23	26	13	39	41	20	60	43	2	101	2	1	102	—	20	82
	Hungarian ethnograph- ic territories	40.0	50.0	44.4	70.0	112.5	88.9	112.5	31.2	181.3	72.4	3.4	169.0	4.0	2.0	102.0	—	4.0	96.0
	Territories under Hun- garian and German dom- ination	62.5	128.5	93.3	125.0	42.9	86.7	107.7	69.2	138.5	77.8	—	177.8	—	—	100.0	—	—	100.0
	Vienna	—	—	—	233.3	100.0	266.7	50.0	25.0	125.0	30.0	—	130.0	—	—	100.0	—	100.0	—
	Total	45.5	86.6	62.2	118.2	86.7	105.4	105.1	51.3	153.8	71.7	3.4	168.3	2.0	1.0	101.0	—	19.6	80.4

F — formed; D — dissolved. The term "dissolved," applies to dormant lodges also. GL — Grand Lodge of St. John; GO — Grand Orient; ^a Bucharest; ^b Belgrade and Nis (Serbia); ^c Nis; ^d Izmir (Smirna, Turkey); ^e Belgrade Lodge became independent;

^f lodges which became part of the Masonic Organization (Obedience) in their respective countries.

Sources: P. Lajosné, *A szabadkőműves szervezetek levéltára*, pp. 16—152, *passim*.

Table 2: Territorial Distribution of Hungarian Freemason Members between 1877 and 1915

No.	Territory	1877—1878			June 1885			June	31 Dec.	31 Dec.	31 Dec.	1 Jan.
		GL	GO	Total	GL	GO	Total	1893 SGL	1900 SGL	1907 SGL	1913 SGL	1915 SGL
1.	Budapest	226	400	626	255	291	546	901	1,355	1,893	2,828	2,924
2.	Province of Hungary	176	185	361	133	94	227	289	429	641	1,076	1,181
Ethnographically Hungarian territories (1—2)		402	585	987	388	385	773	1,190	1,784	2,534	3,904	4,105
3.	Slovakia	68	60	128	171	38	209	80	154	265	419	477
4.	Transylvania	170 ^a	105	275 ^a	156	20	176	243	395	549	864	907
5.	Transcarpathia	—	60	60	—	—	—	—	—	32	120	133
6.	Vojvodina	—	37 ^b	37 ^b	—	—	—	44	33	70	229	235
Territories under Hungarian and German domination (3—6)		238	262	500	327	58	385	367	582	916	1,632	1,752
7.	Croatia	18	—	18	23	—	23	39	52	69	109	123
8.	Rieka (Fiume)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	47	80	88
9.	Vienna	396	26	422	530	59	589	683	860	939	1,175	1,174
10.	Prague	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	67	73
11.	Bukovina	—	—	—	40	—	40	11	—	—	12	39
12.	Galicia	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	24	—	—	—
13.	Abroad	—	—	—	—	—	—	58 ^c	42 ^d	30 ^d	18 ^e	16 ^e
Total		1,054	873	1,926	1,308	502	1,810	2,364	3,344	4,535	6,997	7,370 ^f

In percentage figures

1. Budapest	21.4	45.8	32.5	19.5	58.0	30.2	38.1	40.5	41.7	40.4	39.7
2. Province of Hungary	16.7	21.2	18.8	10.2	18.7	12.5	12.2	12.8	14.2	15.4	16.0
Ethnographically Hungarian territories (1—2)	38.1	67.0	51.3	29.7	76.7	42.7	50.3	53.3	55.9	55.8	55.7
3. Slovakia	6.5	6.9	6.6	13.1	7.6	11.5	3.4	4.6	5.9	6.0	6.5
4. Transylvania	16.1	12.0	14.3	11.9	4.0	9.7	10.3	11.8	12.1	12.3	12.3
5. Transcarpathia	—	6.9	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.7	1.7	1.8
6. Vojvodina	—	4.2	1.9	—	—	—	1.9	1.0	1.5	3.3	3.2
Territories under Hungarian and German domination (3—6)	22.6	30.0	25.9	25.0	11.6	21.2	15.6	17.4	20.2	23.3	23.8
7. Croatia	1.7	—	0.9	1.7	—	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.7
8. Rieka (Fiume)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.0	1.1	1.2
9. Vienna	37.6	3.0	21.9	40.5	11.7	32.6	28.9	25.7	20.7	16.8	15.9
10. Prague	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.0	1.0
11. Bukovina	—	—	—	3.1	—	2.2	0.5	—	—	0.2	0.5
12. Galicia	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.7	0.7	—	—	—
13. Abroad	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.4	1.3	0.7	0.2	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 2 contd

Index of development

Ethnographically Hungarian territories	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.5	65.8	78.3	120.6	180.7	256.7	395.8	415.9
Territories under Hungarian and German domination	100.0	100.0	100.0	137.4	22.1	77.0	73.4	116.4	183.2	326.4	350.4
Croatia	100.0	—	100.0	127.8	—	127.8	216.7	288.9	383.3	605.6	683.3
Vienna	100.0	100.0	100.0	133.8	226.9	139.5	161.8	203.8	222.5	278.4	278.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	124.1	57.5	94.0	122.7	173.6	235.5	363.3	382.7

GL—The St. John Grand Lodge; GO—Grand Orient; SGL—Grand Symbolic Lodge.

^a Lack of information on number of members in one Lodge in Aradea; ^b Lack of information on number of members in one Lodge in Bela Crkva (Fehertemplóm); ^c Lodges in Serbia (Belgrade and Nisz); ^d Belgrade; ^e Izmir (Smirna, Turkey); ^f Total number of members in the SGL—7414 (cause of difference unknown).

Sources: for 1877—1878—*Allgemeines Handbuch der Freimaurerei* 2nd ed., IV Bd., Leipzig 1879 *passim*; for 1885—C. van Dalen's *Kalender für Freimaurer auf das Jahr 1886*, pp. 205—220; for 1893—*ibidem*, für das Jahr 1894, pp. 223—240; for—1900—*Bericht der Symbolischen Grossloge von Ungarn über ihre Tätigkeit Geschäfts— und Kassa—Gebahrung im Jahre 1901*, pp. 75—76; for 1907—H. Walter, *Die Freimaurerei*, pp. 141—143; for 1913—*Bericht der Symbolischen Grossloge von Ungarn über Tätigkeit und Geschäfts-Gebahrung im Jahre 1913*, pp. 57—58 for 1915—C. van Dalen's *Kalender für Freimaurer auf das Jahr 1916*, pp. 267—270.

Table 3: Fluctuation in Masonic Membership in Hungary between 1870 and 1919

	1870 March		1886 April		Total						
	GL	GO	Total	1886— —1890	1870— —1890	1891— —1895	1896— —1901	1902— —1911	1912— —1913	1914— —1917	1918— —1919
At the beginning of the period	—	—	—	1,831/ 1,471 ^a	—	2,099	2,781	3,466	6,193	6,997	7,447
Accepted and affiliated members	2,993	1,861	4,854	981	5,475 ^a	1,506	1,490	5,260	1,849	.	.
Total	2,993	1,861	4,854	2,452	5,475	3,605	4,271	8,726	8,042	.	.
Died	} 1,678	} 1,345	} 3,023	} 353	450	137	211	643	} 1,045		
Excluded					63	9	4	3			
Crossed out					720	173	590	320			
Went into concealment,					2,143	505	1,567				
Became irregular											
Total	1,678	1,345	3,023	353	3,376	824	805	2,533	1,045	.	.
State as of the end of the period	1,315	516	1,831	2,099	2,099	2,781	3,466	6,193	6,997	7,447	6,124
Increase (+), Fall (-)	×	×	×	+628	×	+682	+685	2,727	+804	+450	-1323
<i>Annual Averages</i>											
Accepted and affiliated members	184	115	299	206	261	301	298	526	925	.	.
Left	103	83	186	74	161	165	161	253	523	.	.
Increase (+), Fall (-)	+81	+32	+113	+132	+100	+136	+137	+273	+402	+112	.

GL — St. John Grand Lodge; GO — Grand Orient, ^a it has been admitted that 360 honorary members were accepted between 1870 and 1886, hence this number was subtracted from membership figures for April 1886.

Sources: *Bericht der Symbolischen Grossloge von Ungarn über ihre Tätigkeit, Geschäfts- und Kassa-Gebahrung im Jahre 1901*, pp. 72—73; *Logenberichte und Vermischtes*, "Schlesisches Logenblatt", 25 April, 1891 No. 9, p. 77; *Ungarn*, "Bundesblatt," (Berlin) 1 May, 1896 No. 9, pp. 258—259; K. H u s z á r, *Die Freimaurerei in Ungarn*, in: "Bonifatius-Korrespondenz," January 1913, No. 1, p. 7; M. G e i l l é r i, *Zur Geschichte der Freimaurerei*, "Bundesblatt", 1 December, 1913, No. 21, p. 667; *Bericht der Symbolischen Grossloge von Ungarn über ihre Tätigkeit und Geschäfts-Gebahrung im Jahre 1913*, p. 58; C. van Dalen's *Kalender für Freimaurerei auf das Jahr 1922*, p. 290; *Annuaire de la Maçonnerie Universelle 1923*, Berne [1923], p. 271.

Table 4: Professional and Social Component of Hungarian Freemasons Who Joined the Movement up to 1885 inclusively

No.	Profession and social background	Translitavia			Total	Austria (Vienna)	Scottish Rite 1870—1871
		Budapest	Hungarian province	Other provinces			
1.	Lawyers, notaries public, doctors, veterinary surgeons, engineers, architects	61	17	23	101	69	41
2.	University lecturers, museum employees, librarians, archivists	4	—	—	4	—	—
3.	Writers and journalists	5	—	2	7	23	1
4.	Artists	6	—	2	8	19	—
5.	State and local officials	36	10	19	65	9	7
5a.	inc. ministerial officials	5	—	—	5	—	1
6.	The judiciary and public prosecutors	10	2	12	24	—	1
7.	Primary, vocational and secondary school teachers	18	6	17	41	19	5
8.	Managers and higher private officials	18	2	7	27	47	5
9.	Other privately employed intellectuals	15	7	4	26	57	12
10.	Industrialists and other businessmen	12	3	8	23	58	2
11.	Merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.	56	11	23	90	172	9
12.	Pharmaceuticians	1	3	5	9	2	—
13.	Owners and leaseholders of large land estates	4	2	1	7	2	2
14.	People with small private income and house-owners	6	4	4	14	22	1

15. Craftsmen	8	3	13	24	18	2
16. Small farmers	—	2	—	2	—	—
17. Members of Parliament	1	1	2	4	—	—
18. Officers and retired officers	1	—	—	1	—	9
19. Clergy	1	1	—	2	—	2
T o t a l	263	74	142	479	517	99

Social component in percentage figures

I. Free professions and similar (1—4)	28.9	26.5	19.0	25.0	21.5	42.4
II. State and local officials (5—6, 18)	17.8	14.9	21.8	18.8	1.7	17.2
III. Teachers (7)	6.8	9.5	12.0	8.6	3.7	5.0
IV. Privately employed intellectuals(8—9)	12.6	14.9	7.8	11.1	20.1	17.2
V. Bourgeoisie (10—14) ^a	19.4	19.0	21.0	20.5	32.9	9.1
VI. Lower middle class (11, 15—16) ^a	13.7	13.3	17.0	14.8	20.1	7.1
VII. Other (17, 19)	0.8	1.9	1.4	1.2	—	2.0
T o t a l	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Group 11 (Merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurants-keepers, etc.) has been included partly with the bourgeoisie and partly with the lower middle class.

Sources: Scottish rite — Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Fonds Maçonniques FM² 849, fasc. "Arad," list of 20 March, 1870; fasc. "O'Buda," list of 1 May, 1870; fasc. "Kassa", list of 20 March and 30 June, 1870; FM² 850, fasc. "Temesvar," list of 22 February, 1870; fasc. "Oravicza," list of 26 February, 1870. Other columns — J. Palatinus, *Szabdkömvéssek Magyarországon* Budapest 1944, *passim*.

*Table 5: Professional and Social Component of Hungarian Freemasons
Who Joined the Movement between 1886 and 1895*

No.	Profession and Social Background	Translitavia			Total	Austria	Germany ^a
		Budapest	Hungarian province	Other provinces		(Vienna)	1894—1895
1.	Lawyers, notaries public, doctors, veterinary surgeons, engineers, archi- tects	265	82	132	479	76	1,348
2.	University lecturers, museum employ- ees, librarians, archivists	28	2	13	43	1	31
3.	Writers and journalists	44	10	7	61	22	51
4.	Artists	41	4	11	56	21	275
5.	State and local officials	108	44	64	216	14	2,231
5a.	inc. ministerial officials	20	—	—	20	—	
6.	The judiciary and public prosecutors	20	11	44	75	—	
7.	Primary, vocational and secondary school teachers	56	35	60	151	11	846
8.	Managers and higher private offi- cials	106	22	38	166	56	642
9.	Other privately employed intellec- tuals	100	33	37	170	54	
10.	Industrialists and other businessmen	51	11	24	86	65	1,211
11.	Merchants, bankers, transport-busi- ness, owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.	224	63	73	360	159	4,159
12.	Pharmaceuticalians	20	13	10	43	2	465
13.	Owners and leaseholders of large land estates	11	12	42	65	4	432

14. People with small private income and house-owners	14	3	8	25	13	666
15. Craftsmen	52	15	31	98	22	487
16. Small farmers	3	2	—	5	5	216
17. Members of Parliament	8	4	2	14	—	—
18. Officers and retired officers	—	—	1	1	—	455
19. Clergy	1	3	8	12	—	57
T o t a l	1,152	369	605	2,126	525	13,572

Social component in percentage figures

I. Free professions and similar (1—4)	32.8	26.5	27.0	30.0	22.8	12.6
II. State and local officials (5—6, 18)	11.1	14.9	18.0	13.7	2.7	19.8
III. Teachers (7)	4.8	9.5	9.9	7.1	2.1	6.2
IV. Privately employed intellectuals (8—9)	17.9	14.9	12.4	15.8	21.0	4.7
V. Bourgeoisie (10—14) ^b	18.1	19.0	19.8	18.8	31.0	35.8
VI. Lower middle class (11, 15—16) ^b	14.5	13.3	11.2	13.3	20.4	20.5
VII. Others (17, 19)	0.8	1.9	1.7	1.3	—	0.4
T o t a l	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a The membership of the „Grosse National — Mutterloge in den drei Weltkugeln“

^b Group 11 (merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.) has been included partly with the bourgeoisie and partly with the lower middle class.

Sources: J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*; *Die Mitglieder nach Berufsarten*, “Bundesblatt,” 1 October, 1896, No. 1, pp. 17—18.

*Table 6: Professional and Social Component of Hungarian Freemasons
Who Joined the Movement between 1896 and 1905*

No.	Profession and Social Background	Translitavia			Total	Austria (Vienna)	Sweden Norway 1903 ^a
		Budapest	Hungarian province	Other provinces			
1.	Lawyers, notaries public, doctors, veterinary surgeons, engineers, archi- tects	329	137	191	657	126	492
2.	University lecturers, museum employ- ees, librarians, archivists	29	5	10	44	3	2
3.	Writers and journalists	28	1	4	33	23	8
4.	Artists	44	3	7	54	36	44
5.	State and local officials	67	65	84	216	9	—
5a.	inc. ministerial officials	19	—	—	19	—	177
6.	The judiciary and public prosecutors	22	19	36	77	—	—
7.	Primary, vocational and secondary school teachers	106	83	109	298	5	47
8.	Managers and higher private officials	124	31	35	190	55	708
9.	Other privately employed intellectuals	87	16	52	155	53	—
10.	Industrialists and other businessmen	48	10	24	82	57	846
11.	Merchants, bankers, transport-busi- ness owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.	138	26	63	227	130	81
12.	Pharmacuticians	11	14	11	36	6	76
13.	Owners and leaseholders of large land estates	10	15	10	35	1	71
14.	People with small private income and house-owners	12	2	5	19	8	11

15. Craftsmen	36	15	19	70	10	167
16. Small farmers	2	4	4	10	—	8
17. Members of Parliament	1	—	1	2	—	—
18. Officers and retired officers	—	—	2	2	—	151
19. Clergy	8	5	16	29	—	21
Total	1,102	451	683	2,236	522	2,910
<i>Social component in percentage figures</i>						
I. Free professions and similar (1—4)	39.0	32.4	31.0	35.2	36.0	18.8
II. State and local officials (5—6, 18)	8.1	18.6	17.9	13.2	1.7	11.3
III. Teachers (7)	9.6	18.4	16.0	13.3	1.0	1.6
IV. Privately employed intellectuals (8—9)	19.2	10.4	12.7	15.4	20.7	24.3
V. Bourgeoisie (10—14) ^b	13.6	12.0	11.9	12.8	26.2	35.9
VI. Lower middle class (11, 15—16) ^b	9.7	7.1	8.0	8.7	14.4	7.4
VII. Others (17, 18)	0.8	1.1	2.5	1.4	—	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a General condition of Freemason organizations.

^b Group 11 (merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.) has been included partly with the bourgeoisie and partly with the middle class.

Sources: J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*; *Schweden-Norwegen*, "Bundesblatt," 15 December, 1904, No. 22, pp.

704—705.

*Table 7: Social and Professional Component of Hungarian Freemasons
Who Joined the Movement between 1906 and 1914*

No.	Profession and Social Background	Transilvania			Total	Austria (Vienna) ^a
		Budapest	Hungarian province	Other provinces		
1.	Lawyers, notaries public, doctors, veterinary surgeons, engineers, architects	525	258	396	1,179	167
2.	University lecturers, museum employees, librarians, archivists	41	6	10	57	6
3.	Writers and journalists	52	7	9	68	24
4.	Artists	63	5	14	82	49
5.	State and local officials	135	92	160	387	11
5a.	inc. ministerial officials	15	—	—	15	—
6.	The Judiciary and public prosecutors	22	41	45	108	—
7.	Primary, vocational and secondary school teachers	166	170	202	538	16
8.	Managers and higher private officials	272	63	109	444	87
9.	Other privately employed intellectuals	151	46	83	280	40
10.	Industrialists and other businessmen	67	11	33	111	60
11.	Merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.	234	81	91	406	161
12.	Pharmacuticians	15	21	24	60	6
13.	Owners and leaseholders of large land estates	7	21	17	45	1
14.	People with small private income and house-owners	5	5	7	17	6
15.	Craftsmen	96	21	35	152	13
16.	Small farmers	2	20	9	31	—

17. Members of Parliament	1	—	—	1	—
18. Officers and retired officers	—	—	—	—	—
19. Clergy	5	19	40	64	1
Total	1,859	887	1,284	4,030	648

Social component in percentage figures

I. Free professions and similar (1—4)	36.6	31.1	33.4	34.4	37.9
II. State and local officials (5—6, 18)	8.4	15.0	16.0	12.3	1.7
III. Teachers (7)	8.9	19.2	15.7	13.3	2.5
IV. Privately employed intellectuals (8—9)	22.8	12.3	15.0	18.0	19.6
V. Bourgeoisie (10—14) ^b	11.4	11.1	9.8	10.8	23.6
VI. Lower middle class (11, 15—16) ^b	11.6	9.2	7.0	9.6	14.5
VII. Others (17—19)	0.3	2.1	3.1	1.6	0.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Including the "Hiram" Lodge in Prague.

^b Group II (merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.) has been included partly with the bourgeoisie and partly with the lower middle class.

Sources: J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*

*Table 8: Professional and Social Component of Hungarian Freemasons
Who Joined the Movement between 1915 and 1918*

No.	<i>Professional and social background</i>	<i>Transilvania</i>			<i>Total</i>	<i>Austria (Vienna)</i>
		<i>Budapest</i>	<i>Hungarian province</i>	<i>Other provinces</i>		
1.	Lawyers, notaries public, doctors, veterinary surgeons, engineers architects	113	46	55	214	1
2.	University lecturers, museum employees, librarians, archivists	7	—	1	8	—
3.	Writers and journalists	13	—	4	17	1
4.	Artists	19	—	2	21	1
5.	State and local officials	55	23	45	123	—
5a.	inc. ministerial officials	4	—	—	4	—
6.	Judiciary and public prosecutors	13	12	9	34	—
7.	Primary, vocational and secondary school teachers	38	24	32	94	—
8.	Managers and higher private officials	136	9	34	179	1
9.	Other privately employed intellectuals	52	23	5	80	3
10.	Industrialists and other businessmen	28	1	16	45	—
11.	Merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.	33	13	6	52	5
12.	Pharmacuticians	8	2	3	13	1
13.	Owners and leaseholder of large land estates	3	2	4	9	—
14.	People with small private income and house-owners	3	—	—	3	—
15.	Craftsmen	4	1	2	7	—
16.	Small farmers	1	4	3	8	—

17. Members of Parliament	—	—	—	—	—
18. Officers and retired officers	—	—	—	—	—
19. Clergy	1	1	4	6	—
Total	527	161	225	913	13
<i>Social component in percentage figures</i>					
I. Free professions and similar (1—4)	28.8	28.6	27.6	28.5	23.1
II. State and local officials (5—6, 18)	12.9	21.7	24.0	17.2	—
III. Teachers (7)	7.2	14.9	14.2	10.3	—
IV. Privately employed intellectuals (8—9)	35.7	19.9	17.3	28.4	30.7
V. Bourgeoisie (10—14) ^a	11.0	6.8	11.5	10.5	23.1
IV. Lower middle class (11, 15—16) ^a	4.2	7.4	3.6	4.5	23.1
VII. Others (17—19)	0.2	0.7	1.8	0.6	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Group II (merchants, bankers, transport-business owners, restaurant-keepers, etc.) has been included partly with the bourgeoisie and partly with the lower middle class.

Sources: J. Palatinus, *op. cit.*