

the ruler than did their Austrian equivalents.<sup>92</sup> Meanwhile the army of resentful *émigrés*, though hardly more numerous than the Austrian exiles, lurked much closer at hand—many lived immediately across the Saxon border—and were less quickly assimilated into their foreign surroundings.

Bohemia on the threshold of the eighteenth century had almost healed the scars of the 1620s. The new edifice betrayed only minor internal divisions, and it exerted a real, albeit somewhat inscrutable, authority. But it was a more fragile solution than the Austrian one and might succumb to long-term threats. The issue of a major reconstruction had been side-stepped—no progress had even been made towards the institutional unity of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia—and old antagonisms could gradually revive in these, the richest of Habsburg possessions. Two pieces of symbolic evidence may clinch the argument: the pilgrimage church of the Servites on the White Mountain, begun shortly after the battle in 1620, took a full hundred years to complete;<sup>93</sup> while the Baroque décor in the Franciscan church of Our Lady of the Snows, though impressive, never quite reached to the top of its towering Gothic vault.

<sup>92</sup> The Jesuit was Jacques des Hayes, the tyrannical noble Count Guillaume Lamboy: Rezek, 'Dva pftispěvký', 15–28. Some (e.g. Grünberg, *op. cit.* i, 127 ff.) have viewed Leopold's *robot* patent issued in 1680 (and printed *ibid.* ii, 3–10) as a significant step towards reducing peasant burdens, but Marxist historians (e.g. Klíma, *op. cit.* 66–71) are surely right to question this interpretation. Cf. above, p. 168.

<sup>93</sup> Beckovský, *op. cit.*, pt. 3, 62 f.; Podlaha, *Pováhradní mláta*, v, 21–9.

## CHAPTER 7

## Hungary: limited rejection

Hungary was at once very simple and very complicated: a kingdom long established and distinctive, with well-defined historical frontiers (mainly mountains or rivers), but also widely divergent forms of settlement and culture; a notion to any contemporary and a separate entry in his reference books, but a blurred notion and usually a second-hand entry.<sup>1</sup> Provisionally after 1526, firmly after 1541, the country split into three parts: Habsburg territories in the west and north; Turkish vilayers in a great wedge through the centre; and to the east, Transylvania, earlier governed by a voivode, now a more-or-less independent principality. The arrangement was never an entirely settled one, as boundaries continued to fluctuate and some areas lived under dual sovereignty or no effective sovereignty at all. Nominally, perhaps, the dynasty could claim that it exercised a single kingship, held in trust for a happier future; it—or rather the indigenous nobility—enforced some rights over subjects under Turkish rule. But in practical terms the Habsburgs controlled, for most of our period, not more than 30 per cent of the total area; indeed a declining proportion, since Ottoman advance only reached its fullest extent in 1664 with the capture of Nagyvárad and Neuhäusel, while seven counties were ceded to Transylvania in the 1620s and again in the 1640s, on top of the substantial districts—known in quaint lawyers' Latin as the *Partium*—pledged to the principality since 1570.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Information would have been found (for example) in Martin Schödel, *Disquisitio historico-politica de Regno Hungariae* (Strasbourg 1629); *Respublica et status regni Hungariae* (Leiden 1634), a well-known but feeble compendium; P. Heylin, *Cosmographie*, i–ii (London 1653), ii, 182–90.

<sup>2</sup> The seven north-eastern counties (Abauj, Zemplén, Borsod, Bérég, Szabolcs, Szatmár, Ugocsa) passed for life to Bethlen Gábor (1621–9), and to György I Rákóczi (1645–8). The term *Partium* derives from the title assumed by the Transylvanian prince in respect of them: *Dominus Partium Regni Hungariae*. Few Western historical atlases have enough accuracy or detail to cope with Hungary; cf. *Történelmi atlasz*, pp. 12 f., 16 f.

Moreover, what the Habsburgs actually managed was highly variegated. Even the comparatively fertile and prosperous Transdanubia had a rich blend of nationalities (besides the many Germans, Sopron county numbered far more Croat parishes than Magyar) and a succession of terrains from the swampy flatnesses of the Kisalföld along the Danube to the friendly undulations of the Őrség on the border with Styria. South of it lay the ruins of old Croatia, the self-styled triune kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia: long amalgamated with the rest of Hungary; truncated, ravaged, and displaced by the Turks; it yet clung to shreds of autonomy around its capital of Zagreb.<sup>3</sup> North and east stretched the arc of Upper Hungary (the *Felvidék*), peopled by Magyars, Slovaks, and Ruthenes in the countryside, Germans, Magyars, and Slovaks in the towns, the many local identities being enhanced by mountain ranges and fast-flowing rivers. Everywhere the seventeenth century confused the picture further, bringing population flux, social dislocation, and a coarseness born of insecurity. These regional variations were no less in Transylvania, with its mixture of Magyars, Szeklers, Saxons, and Romanians. Only the vilayets of Buda, Temesvár, Eger, and Kanizsa had, through the heavy arm of economic and cultural oppression, eliminated much local colour; but the full history of Ottoman Hungary has yet to be written, and it will prove a tale of light as well as shade.<sup>4</sup>

One circumstance appears to introduce some clarity and a peg on which to hang arguments: the caesura of 1683; the siege of Vienna, followed by the expulsion of the Porte and the incorporation of Transylvania. Yet even the events of the 1680s (as I shall try to show in this chapter) provided at most a catalyst. Habsburg Hungary before 1683 formed the springboard for a renewed greater Hungary after 1683; the evolution was continuous, and the presuppositions were the same as elsewhere in the Monarchy, though the hindrances to the model were more formidable. Thus Hungary never came

<sup>3</sup> Vanyó, *Katholikus restauráció*, 60-3; Házi, op. cit., *passim*. As a result of Turkish advance Croatia was moved bodily north towards the Drava; much of its reduced territory came to form the Habsburg military frontier (cf. above, p. 149).

<sup>4</sup> The classic works on this subject are now somewhat antiquated: F. Salamon, *Ungarn im Zeitalter der Türkenherrschaft* (Leipzig 1887); S. Takats, *Rajzok a török világból*, i-iv (Bp. 1915-28). There is some good recent literature: e.g. Kathoná, op. cit.; and the *Studia Turco-Hungarica*, ed. Gy. Káldy-Nagy (Bp. 1974-).

near to being a political absolutism, either before or after the 1680s, despite the dynasty's most thoroughgoing attempt to impose it.

The Habsburgs were used to compromise in Hungary. With the Turks they pursued round after round of negotiations, one-sided affairs until the 1590s, and hazardous for Austrian emissaries. *Vis-à-vis* Transylvania they signed treaties in 1538 and 1570 as with a junior partner and came very close during the 1540s, through the clerical diplomat, 'Friar George' Martinuzzi, to confirming the rights of royal overlordship there. Having encountered stiffer opposition from Stephen Báthory they seemed to taste success again with his nephew Zsigmond, married to a Styrian archduchess and guided by a resourceful Jesuit. But Zsigmond's stormy, disordered behaviour and the ravages of both sides in the latest Turkish campaigns created growing resentment; by 1608 Bocskai's revolt had victoriously reasserted all the claims of Transylvanian independence and Hungarian separatism. After 1613 Bethlen Gábor elevated Transylvania into a real Protestant alternative for the whole of Hungary and fought a sequence of indecisive wars against the Habsburgs in the 1620s. György I Rákóczi was more stolid, but he saw a chance to exploit grievances in the 1640s, and a further evenly-matched campaign ended with the terms of the *modus vivendi* vindicated.

But *open* compromise, especially with built-in Protestant freedoms, was not to the Habsburg taste. Precisely because their political control was so tenuous, they yearned to place it on a reliable base. By the 1670s they found their opportunity: a collapse of Transylvania through the wild ambitions of György II Rákóczi; a weakening of the Turks; then evidence of treason among the Habsburgs' own subjects. The execution of magnates after the Wesselényi conspiracy began a decade of arbitrary rule paralleling the events of the 1620s in Bohemia (and it is no accident that Lobkovic and Martinic were involved).<sup>5</sup> Though less pretext existed, the execution of policy was in some ways more consistent: the constitution was suspended and power placed in the hands of a *Gubernium* of foreigners, headed by Johann Kaspar von Ampringen, Grand Master of the Teutonic order, and dominated by Chancellor

<sup>5</sup> Wolf, *Lobkowitz*; Dvořák (ed.), art. cit., nos. 58-62; Bogišić (ed.), op. cit. 171 ff., 192 ff., 209 f.; Gy. Pauler, *Wesselényi Ferenc nádor és társainak összeesküvése*, i-ii (Bp. 1876), ii, 360 f. and *passim*. For the actual conspiracy see below, pp. 261-3.

Hoher. Persecution of Protestants, with Calvinist ministers in the front line, reached its height when some forty were condemned to the galleys, thus creating a first real martyrology for Hungary's anti-Catholic opposition.<sup>6</sup>

The fate of the galley-slaves aroused also an international outcry, but otherwise these events are less well remembered than their Bohemian equivalent. The reason is not far to seek, for they ended in failure; indeed, they were thoroughly counter-productive. They called forth a new Bocskai in Imre Thököly and fanned the furious discontent of the next decades. In 1681, Leopold I had to recall the diet and re-establish the office of palatine. Military success between 1683 and 1686 against Turks and Thökölyites encouraged further pressure (again a Bohemian, Kinsky, was influential); it included the mayhem of a Hungarian Judge Jeffreys, General Caraffa—the very name a manifesto of foreign dictation! Yet the diet of 1687 registered only nominal advances: while the estates forswore their right of free election and their medieval grounds for resistance, subsequent developments soon showed how much that was worth. In the 1690s more guarded moves, directed by the largely non-Hungarian Kollonich circle, towards absolute rule over the whole crown of St. Stephen, with centralized administration and economic management, provoked even more violent unrest. In 1703 rebellion broke out over most of Hungary and Transylvania under Ferenc II Rákóczi (grandson of György II) and temporarily deposed the Habsburgs altogether. Eight years later the treaty at Szatmár, between two exhausted parties, returned the country to a state of suspended over-animation.<sup>7</sup>

Thus the Hungarian constitution survived, and with it a series of estates' organs. The bicameral diet (*országgyűlés*), usually well-attended, albeit irregularly summoned, could dispute royal propo-

<sup>6</sup> *Life of Leopold*, 74 ff.; Krones, 'Zur Geschichte Ungarns (1671-83)', 359 ff.; Hóman-Szekfű, op. cit. iv, 179 ff.; Gy. Ember, *Az újkori magyar közigazgatás története Mohácsról a török kiűztéig* (Bp. 1946), 107-12. Literature on the galley-slaves below, n. 32.

<sup>7</sup> The earlier events are carefully described in *Life of Leopold*, esp. 127-71, 197 ff. For the diets of 1681 and 1687: J. Bérenger, *Les 'Gravamina', remontrances des diètes de Hongrie de 1655 à 1681* (Paris 1973), 269-317; Okolicsányi, op. cit., appendix, 153-250. On the Rákóczi revolt: below, pp. 264-6. Hungary's General Caraffa was of the same Italian family as Bohemia's Cardinal Carafa, though the names are conventionally spelt slightly differently.

sitions and present its own hoary gravamina.<sup>8</sup> The palatine, lieutenant for an absentee monarch and chosen by the diet from among four royal nominees, executed the programme hammered out between sovereign and estates with the help of a *Consilium Locumtenentiale*. His deputy, the chief justice (*judex curiae* or *országbíró*) presided over the king's court of appeal, often known as *Tabula Septemvocalis*, while a further tribunal, the *Tabula Regia*, functioned under a dignity oddly named the *personális*. The counties, with their administrative offices of *comes* (*ispán*) and *vicescomes* (*alispán*), their bench of magistrates, and their largely elective local organization, held far more power than counterparts elsewhere in Central Europe, and each sent two deputies to the diet.<sup>9</sup>

Of course the Habsburgs had *poims d'appui* in Hungary, a mixture of traditional aspects of royal authority with some offshoots of the imperial administration. The shadowy chancery, directed by a high cleric, operated from Vienna. A Chamber in Pozsony ran the Habsburg regalia, especially the important mines of the *Févidék*, and could be influenced from outside, partly by pressure from the Viennese *Hofkammer*, partly through the creation of a rival cameral organization in the Zips (Szepes) for the eastern counties. Neusohl copper made some recovery under direct Habsburg management in the mid-seventeenth century, until its export trade was again blighted by war. War Councils in Vienna and Graz ultimately controlled army pay and appointments, including fortress commands and the captaincies-general of six military regions. But the practical efficacy, sometimes even the competence, of such organs

<sup>8</sup> Timon, op. cit. 604 ff.; Bérenger, 'Gravamina', 49-97. The published proceedings of the diet, *Magyar országgyűlési emlékek (Monumenta Comitatus Regni Hungariae)*, extend as yet only to 1604; but cf. above p. 52, n. 27. In important ways the *országgyűlés* differed from diets elsewhere in the Monarchy (and in Croatia and Transylvania): a bicameral assembly, it had official members, bishops, and magnates in the upper chamber; county and town delegates, chapter representatives, and the deputies for absent bishops and magnates, in the lower.

<sup>9</sup> On the palatine: V. Frankl, *A nádori és az országbíró hivatal eredete és hatáskörének kifejlődése* (Pest 1863), early history; Ember, op. cit. 91-106; L. Papp, 'Eszterházy Pál kancellárja', *LK* xx-xxiii (1942-5), 310-44. There seems to be next to no literature on the judiciary in this period, but see—on appeals from the free towns—L. Szentpétery, 'A tárnoki ítéltszék kialakulása', *Sz. lxxviii* (1934), 510-90. The word *personális* (Hungarian: *személynyök*) was another lawyers' corruption, from *personalis praesentiae* regiae in judiciis locumtenens'. On the counties: Ember, op. cit. 520-41.

is difficult to ascertain. For most purposes Hungary's rulers until the time of Maria Theresa had to work through indigenous institutions: even the deferential state council, *Consilium Hungaricum*, remained basically an estates' body.<sup>10</sup>

On the surface, therefore, we have an uneasy balance between conflicting political aims. Deeper down, the Habsburg régime in Hungary subsisted on elements of a hidden compromise: a community of interest, here too, between dynasty, aristocracy, and Catholic Church. The traditional bearer of the constitution had been the nobility as a whole—nobles alone counted in conventional parlance as the *natio Hungarica*—and the caste was quite large and fluid during the Middle Ages. A major feature of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was the emergence of a new magnate élite, assisted by royal favours and titles and by the right to individual representation in the upper chamber of the diet. But the magnates' real strength lay rather in a dominant socio-economic position won especially in Transdanubia, northern Croatia, and parts of the *Fehérvár*.<sup>11</sup> Their activities ensured that the crisis years after 1600 would be resolved neither as feudal anarchy (contrast events in nearby Poland) nor as absolutism. These families—perhaps thirty or forty in sum—came to control higher administration, both national and local; they were *comites* and judges, guardians of the holy crown and counsellors; their private *bandériás* maintained the lines against the Ottomans. Whereas in 1600 no more than a handful were Catholic (and most had derived some benefit from appropriated Church lands), after 1650 only a handful remained Protestant.

The inner circle of aristocrats was even more tightly circumscribed. Its membership seems to reduce itself, without undue simplification, to ten families, some of which we have already met.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See again the admirable work by Ember, op. cit. 75–91, 113–379, including a first serious investigation of the Szepes *kamara*. Srbik, *Exportandák, passim*, for the copper mines. Cf. above, p. 150 n. 83.

<sup>11</sup> By the mid-17th century, according to a recent calculation, 37 per cent of Hungarian villages were in the hands of thirteen families (Benda, 'Absolutismus', 109 n.). Cf. above, pp. 91–4.

<sup>12</sup> The main work of reference is I. Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, 13 vols. in 8 (Pest 1857–68), though it is uneven, with many small errors, and poorly annotated. *Kévi Nagy Lexikona*, i–xx (Bp. 1911–27), has some useful material; and much

The Esterházy were a unique phenomenon, an almost entirely parvenu line which rose to become the greatest of Hungary's nobility. Of course, they had a certain ancestry, as obsequious chroniclers took pains to demonstrate: one, with a perhaps misdirected enthusiasm, took it back to Artula. But by the sixteenth century the Esterházy lived as impoverished petty gentry in the shadow of powerful kinsmen. Only the career of Miklós, in the last mobile generation before 1620, transformed them.<sup>13</sup> Miklós (1583–1645) made a fortune as palatine, acquiring vast possessions around Eisenstadt and the near-impregnable fortress of Forchtenstein, and confirming the position of his house with a remarkable set of marital dispositions. Miklós himself took as second wife Krisztina Nyáry, the widow of Imre Thurzó, then wedded the son of his first marriage to her daughter, and the granddaughter of that first marriage to his own son by Krisztina. The latter son, Pál (1635–1713) likewise proved a highly astute politician, unflinchingly loyal to the Habsburgs, but with no hint of servility; his advance culminated in appointment as palatine at the fierce diet of 1681, a post which he held until his death. In 1687 the precedence of the Esterházy was confirmed by the title of prince of the Empire; and the plentiful progeny of Pál as well as of other branches in the clan ensured their continuing expansion, while a clutch of *Fideicommissa* laid an unshakeable material base. Pál built himself the first of the Esterházy mansions, that broad-shouldered palace at Eisenstadt which later would be so familiar to Josef Haydn.<sup>14</sup>

miscellaneous information, even about men who were not primarily writers, can be found in J. Szinyeyi, *Magyar irók élete és munkái*, i–xiv (Bp. 1891–1913). Würzbach is an honourable exception to the normal Austrian ignorance of things Hungarian: he uses Nagy, as well as independent information. There exist archival guides (*Levéltári leltárak*) for most of these families, produced in limited editions by the O.L., and containing reliable skeleton histories. For the *sui generis* clan of Rákóczi, see below pp. 264 f.

<sup>13</sup> On Miklós Esterházy: above, p. 51 n. 24. His own father had made some social progress, becoming *vécemes* of Pozsony county and having some highly-placed friends.

<sup>14</sup> On the Esterházy in general (the name can also be spelt 'Eszterházy'): *Trophaeum... Domus Esztorasiana* (V. 1700), with crude portraits, brief biographies, and documents (including, sig. Ee4–Mm2, the princely diploma, which covered only the senior branch of the family). J. Esterházy, *Az Esterházy-család és elődaiának leírása*, i–ii (Bp. 1901), is a comprehensive description. On Pál: L. Merényi and Zs. Bubics, *Herczeg Eszterházy Pál nádor*, i–iii (Bp. 1895–6), disappointing. On his mother: Ipolyi, *Nyáry Krisztina*; cf., for her first husband, who died young in 1622: above, pp. 56, 69.

By 1700 the Esterházy—like Liechtensteins in Austria and Lobkovic in Bohemia—were *primi inter pares*. Their rivals as owners of great estates in Transdanubia were the Batthyánys, Pálffy, and Nádasdy. The Batthyánys produced a series of ambitious and influential figures from Ferenc, the supporter of Ferdinand I, to Ádám (1609–59), convert and first count. Ádám's eponymous grandson, chief justice and ban (i.e. vicegerent) of Croatia, married a wealthy daughter of the Austrian Chancellor Strattmann, one of the more conspicuous unions of lineage and intellect in Habsburg history: their elder son became palatine, the younger—tutor to Joseph II—prince of the Empire; a grandson was primate of Hungary.<sup>15</sup> Pálffy and Nádasdy exhibit some similarity of development: both achieved prominence in sixteenth-century Habsburg service—one family Catholic, the other Protestant—while Miklós Pálffy and Ferenc Nádasdy were outstanding military leaders of the years before 1600 (helping their own prosperity by marriages to a Fugger and a Báthory respectively). Their successors maintained the impetus: Pál Pálffy, palatine in 1648, founded the inevitable *Fidei commissum* for his lands along the Austrian border; Ferenc Nádasdy (1623–71), the chief justice, following an equally inevitable conversion and marriage to Miklós Esterházy's daughter, added much of the surrounding countryside to his huge domains. At this point a dramatic divergence: whereas the next generation of Pálffy held high Hungarian court office, Nádasdy suddenly paid for leadership of the 1660s' conspiracy with his head and with confiscation of his lands. Yet the treason was surprisingly quickly redeemed; while Nádasdy never again quite enjoyed the favour lavished on the ultra-loyal Pálffy (the brothers Miklós (1657–1732) and János Pálffy (1664–1751) both became palatine), they continued to occupy high dignities in Church and state.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Genealogy in OSzK, MS. 95 fol. lat. (by Martin Kovachich, 1802); and see above, p. 93 and n. 29. This Eleonora (Lori) Strattmann became the bosom companion of Prince Eugene in his last years; one of her sons married another Strattmann, her niece.

<sup>16</sup> A huge article on the Pálffy in Nagy, *op. cit.*; cf. the mass of undigested documents in P. Jedlicska, *Eredeti részletek a gróf Pálffy-család okmánygyűjteményéhez* (Bp. 1910); and above, p. 50 n. 22. Maksay (ed.), *op. cit.* 175–239 describes the estates of the military commander of Pozsony castle, a Pálffy sinecure. There appears to be no history of the Nádasdy, but see *ibid.*, 83–130, 241–77, for some of their lands.

A striking, but very understandable feature of the Hungarian situation was the direct involvement of the entire aristocracy in vital military operations. It is evident with those families whose genealogies we have already examined; all their estates lay within range of Turkish sallies and almost every able-bodied male played some part in warding them off. Again the Esterházy stand a little apart: both Miklós and Pál were rather organizers and financiers than commanders; even so, four Esterházy fell in a single skirmish in 1652.<sup>17</sup> Belegured Croatia still more resembled an armed camp. There the most famous house was Zrinyi, with its warrior heroes Miklós IV, the defender of Szigetvár in 1566, and his great-grandson, Miklós VII (1616–64), scourge of the Ottoman lines along the Drava, inspired adventurer, and finest flower of Hungary's embattled frontier culture, in whom the line reached its apogee. The younger Miklós died as he had lived, savaged by a wild boar while hunting; and the mantle passed to his brother, Péter. But the latter, unequal in substance though equal in spirit, involved himself with the Wesselényi plot against the Habsburgs, and the family was extinguished shortly after.<sup>18</sup>

The Zrinyis had at least toyed with Protestantism; the Erdődy and Draškovič preserved an unswerving Croatian loyalty to the Roman Catholic Church which brought much benefit to both. The Erdődy—like the related Pálffy—owed their original emergence from obscurity to the patronage of a kinsman, the Renaissance cardinal, Tamás Bakócz, who granted them their extensive lands in western Hungary. Between 1547 and 1693 they produced four bans of Croatia and a long sequence of pious testators. Cardinal Juraj Draškovič (1525–86) performed a similar service for his family; his

<sup>17</sup> Examples of Miklós's involvement with the business of war in the 1620s and 1630s in OL, Esterházy család levéltára, P. 108, cs. 453–70. For Pál: Zs. Bubits, *Esterházy Pál Mars Hungaricus* (Bp. 1895), an abstract of his account of the war of 1663–4; and cf., on the later campaigns, OSzK, MSS. 463, 502, 505 fol. lat., correspondence with the emperor and *Höflichsprat*. The bishop of Pécs preached a sermon on the four victims of 1652, and it was published (V. 1653) at Ferenc Nádasdy's expense.

<sup>18</sup> Zrinyi equals Zrinski in Croat and 'Serini' in the contemporary foreign approximation to the name. From the vast literature on Miklós VII, especially on his writings, see most recently T. Klaniczay, *Zrinyi Miklós* (2nd edn. Bp. 1964). Péter's daughter Ilona appears below (pp. 264 f.); his son Boldizsár was closely watched by the government, detained at the fortress of Kufstein, and died—apparently insane—without issue in 1704.

nephew Ivan (died in 1613) became ban and patron of the early Jesuits in Zagreb; his great-nephews were a palatine and a leading Counter-Reformation bishop. The Erdődys made themselves equally at home in court service besides: for all but seven years between 1684 and 1748 three members of the clan acted as president of the Chamber in Pozsony.<sup>19</sup>

Habsburg Upper Hungary was marginally less feudal than Croatia; it had no precise equivalent to the large-scale commercial enterprises of the Zrinyis. But there too three families stand out in the seventeenth century (in addition to the Esterházy, who also owned large tracts of land on the left bank of the Danube). The power of the Illésházy, dated mainly from the spectacular career of István (1541-1609) who, despite deep friction with the Habsburgs, ended his life as count, palatine, and one of the country's richest landowners. István flourished as a firm defender of the Protestant cause, though that did not prevent his marrying into the Pálffy and the Erdődys and protecting an apostate nephew called Miklós Esterházy. His heir, Gáspár (1593-1648) maintained the same religious allegiance in more difficult times—we have already glimpsed him as a lukewarm adherent of Bethlen Gábor in the 1620s, loath to countenance any final break with the Habsburgs. After Gáspár's death his sons, Gábor and György, converted and helped strengthen the influence of Vienna along the broad valley of the river Vág.<sup>20</sup> A similar paradigm could confidently have been predicted for the neighbouring Thurzós of Bethlenfalva, where again the first seventeenth-century generation of a great Lutheran family returned

<sup>19</sup> Nagy and *Enciklopédia Jugoszlavije*, s.v., on the Erdődys, marginally the oldest magnate family in this group (Höman-Szekfü, op. cit. iv, 422). Bakócz (1442-1521) was archbishop of Esztergom from 1497. For the Draškovičs: above, p. 49, on Archbishop Juraj; and p. 77 n. 84, on the later prelate. Ivan married the daughter of Istvánffy and was one of the Hungarian translators of Guevara (Graz 1610, cf. above, p. 114); his son the palatine had the same Catholic fervour (Kazy, op. cit. ii, 105). See also *Hrvatska Enciklopedija*, v (Zagreb 1945), 245-50; and 'Szerémi', 'A Draškovičok trakostyani levéltárából', *IT* 1893, 342-66, 441-58. The Draškovičs later moved to Croatia, rather than Magyar patriotism, hence my use of the Croatian form of the name; that language was certainly often used by Juraj (e.g. A. Apponyi, *Hungarica: Ungarn betreffende, im Ausland gedruckte Bücher*, 1-iv (Munich 1903-27), no. 860, appendix).

<sup>20</sup> See above, pp. 51 f., 69; A. Károlyi, *Illésházy István hátlenségi pere* (Bp. 1883); Csapodi, op. cit. 51, 63. Marsina-Kusik (eds), op. cit. ii, 153-231; 251-79; Kazy, op. cit. ii, 161; Krones, *Jesuitenorden 1645-71*, 311-14 and nn.

to the Catholic faith; but the Thurzós died out in the male line in 1636.

The other domineering magnates of the *Felvidék* were Forgáches and Csáky. The brothers Ferenc and Zsigmond Forgách, as archbishop and palatine, had done much to aid Habsburg recovery after the revolt of Bocskai. Zsigmond's son Ádám (1601-81), field marshal and chief justice, created count in 1640, upheld the public status of the family, such that it was only slightly shaken by the rebellious actions of one of his sons, Simon (1669-1730). Similarly the Csáky, having migrated from Transylvania to Hungary, were sustained by a number of leading politicians—notably the chief justices László (died in 1655) and István (died in 1699)—against the more devious behaviour of other scions.<sup>21</sup>

With the kind of limited exception we shall consider below, these ten aristocratic houses proved loyal throughout the seventeenth century to the reality—not always the theory—of the Habsburg régime in the lands of St. Stephen. Necessarily so, since it could not function for long without them. They were not only *comites* in the counties, but *comites* by hereditary right, and they kept a firm hand on local administration, even though its executors had nominally to be elected. During the whole period between the re-establishment of the palatinate following Bocskai's revolt and its suspension by Maria Theresa in 1765 the office passed outside their charmed circle but once, and then to Ferenc Wesselényi (died in 1667), Count of Murány, who was only marginally inferior in rank.<sup>22</sup> The Wesselényis belonged to a group of families which grasped the reins of state rather more seldom. Some of them were long-established magnates entering a decline: Drugeth of Homonna and Széchy both died out in 1684; the Croatian branch of the Frangepans, hot-blooded peers of the Zrinyis, perished on the scaffold in 1671; the last of the Czobors squandered what remained of their fortune in

<sup>21</sup> Cf. above, pp. 51, 63. The Forgáches have one of the best of Hungarian noble histories: Bártfai Szabó, op. cit. F. Deák, *Egy magyar főúr a 17. században, gr. Csáky István* (Bp. 1883); cf., in general, *A kétrészeg és adomány gr. Csáky-család története*, 1-ii (Bp. 1919-21).

<sup>22</sup> The Illésházy were actually *főispánok* in two counties, Trencsén and Árva. For the effective powers of the office see (e.g.) Ferenc Nádasdy's instructions to the administration of Vas in the 1640s (I. Nagy in Sz. v (1871), 52 ff.). No palatine was appointed between 1667 and 1681 (when Nádasdy and Szelepcsényi acted as deputies), or from 1732 to 1741 (when Francis of Lorraine deputized).

the mid-eighteenth century; Balassas and Nyáry, Perényis and Révays settled into merely provincial dominance. The rest were a small constellation gradually rising in the political firmament: Koháry (a miniature version of the Esterházy, from the upstart *Felvidék* politician and general Péter (died in 1629) to the last princely heiress who married Ferdinand George of Saxe-Coburg in 1817), Andrássy, Apponyi, Barkóczy, Dessewffy, Károlyi, Keglevich, Széchenyi, Zichy.

With these names, plus a few Transylvanian aristocrats and two pure eighteenth-century parvenus (Festetics and Grassalkovich), we have a fairly complete register of the families which guided Hungary into the age of Maria Theresa and beyond. The native élite possessed an international dimension. Inter-marriage with nobles from elsewhere in Central Europe, not infrequent even before 1600, was now extended, the Pálffys leading the way. Hungarians settled in Moravia and Lower Austria—Ferenc Nádasdy's move across the border proved unwise in the circumstances, since he could be judged at his trial by Austrian law.<sup>23</sup> *Per contra*, many distinguished foreigners gained the Hungarian *indigenatus*, and some bought estates after 1683: Kaunitzes, Schönborns, Trautsons on one hand; mercenary interlopers from Prince Eugene to General Harrucker, son of a baker in Linz, on the other. But very few outsiders actually resided for long in Hungary, still less played a public role there. *Indigenatus*-statistics can be misinterpreted and the advent of a 'new nobility' much exaggerated. The point already made in the case of Bohemia needs reiterating, with greater emphasis, for Hungary.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Above, p. 93. The sons and grandsons of Miklós Pálffy and Maria Fugger married Puchheim, Mansfeld, Khuen, Harrach, Mollart, and Liechtenstein wives, and they began to have court weddings in Vienna (*Priarbrüffe*, i, no. 187; ii, no. 215 (p. 14)). The Pálffys also moved into Lower Austrian estates (*Handbuch der historischen Stätten*, i, 312, 350, 370, 404). On Moravian immigrants see above, p. 204; another example (but probably at a later date) would be the branch of the Transylvanian Kálnokys which produced an Austro-Hungarian foreign minister, Count Gustav (1832-98).

<sup>24</sup> Eugene scarcely ever visited his property at Ráckeve; the Kaunitzes sold up in 1730 (S. Drkal, 'Kounický velkostatek na Slovensku na počátku 18. věku', *ČMM* lxx (1951), 298-347); Trautsons died out in 1775, as did Harruckers (Harruckerns), in their second generation. Many similar cases could be cited. Among the few to stay were the Schönborns (see below, p. 293). Cf. Hóman-Szekfű, op. cit. iv, 421. One typical case of exaggeration is in B. K. Kurály, *Hungary in the late 18th century* (New York-London 1969), 25-9; another by I. Sinkovics in *Sz. cv* (1971), 411.

There can be no doubt about the Hungarian magnates' influence over their branch of the international Catholic Church, or about their devotion to it. Almost all were recent converts, with the characteristic fervour of those having a past to redeem, and the sincerity of their religious beliefs is not impugned by the fact that there were good material and social reasons why they held them. Nor is it necessary (given my earlier analysis) to underline the aristocrat's powers of patronage, or rehearse a list of monastic foundations and ecclesiastical careerists (usually, but not always, younger sons). Let us consider merely the high piety of three of the century's dominant political figures.

Miklós Esterházy, sponsor of the Jesuit church and the new university at Tyrnau, organized his own disputations in Eisenstadt and composed a long defence of the Catholic religion which reveals a thorough reading of the patristic and more recent apologetic literature. The recipient of his treatise, his son-in-law Ferenc Nádasdy, developed an equal commitment and strengthened it by a visit to Rome in 1665. He instituted a particularly tough Counter-Reformation on his lands, setting up a printing-press to publish devout writings, and settling Augustinians at Lockenhaus and Servites at Loretto.<sup>25</sup> The latter place passed after Nádasdy's death to his brother-in-law, Pál Esterházy, who occupied a uniquely central position in the ecclesiastical as in the secular life of late seventeenth-century Hungary. Continuously active at the local level (the family owned nearly half the advowsons in Sopron county alone) he took thousands of his subjects on a pilgrimage to Mariazell in 1692 and introduced such penitential orders as the Camaldulensian hermits onto his estates. The author and promoter of a battery of works to advertise the Marian cult, Esterházy's correspondence reveals close contacts with many prelates. Six of his children entered the Church (so, predictably, did two of Nádasdy's).<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Toldy (ed.), op. cit., prints the treatise by Esterházy. For Nádasdy: OSzK, MS. I duod. hung.: 'Diarium Itineris Romam', published in *TT*, 1883, 348 ff.; A. Mohl, 'Adatok Nádasdy Ferenc országbíró életéhez', *Sz. xxiv* (1900), 616-27; Krones, 'Jesuitenorden 1645-71', 297 n. 2, 299, 320. On his press: K. Semmelweis, *Der Buchdruck auf dem Gebiete des Burgenlandes bis zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Eisenstadt 1972), 73-7. On his Augustinians: Gavigan, *Austro-Hungarian province, 1, 98-103*; ii, 39-41, 181-3. On his Servites: A. Mohl, *Der Gnadenort Loretto in Ungarn* (Eisenstadt 1894), 33 ff.

<sup>26</sup> Vanyó, *Katholikus restauráció*, 85 ff.; Kelemen, op. cit. 46-50; Mohl, *Loretto* (continued)

At the same time, the Church was no aristocratic corporation. It offered the only chance for a lofty career to those of middling, even of lowest birth: Emmerich Sinelli is a classic example. In Hungary the episcopate remained distinctly less exclusive than elsewhere in the Monarchy, partly because most sees were impoverished (until the 1680s well over half, including the archdiocese of Kalocsa, existed in title **only**). ~~Even the~~ seventeenth-century primates of Esztergom trailed little purple: the well-connected Forgách was succeeded by the petty-noble Pázmány, then by Imre Losy (1637-1642), an obscure convert, György Lippay (1642-66), who left his family much less modest than he found it, György Szelepcsényi (1666-85), another petty noble, and György Széchenyi (1685-1695), who turned his kinsmen from marginal gentry into prominent Transdanubian landowners.<sup>27</sup> Only after the transitional figure of Count Leopold Kollonich (1695-1707) and the blue-blooded outsider, Christian August of Sachsen-Zeit (1707-25), do the prime ruling families take over: Esterházy, Csáky, Barkóczy, Batthyány. Otherwise nobility rubbed shoulders with some very unsung pedigrees.<sup>28</sup> Yet high political office might be at stake. Until 1706 the Hungarian chancellor was always a prelate; the *Consilium Hungaricum* was packed full of bishops, and of abbots taking their style from dimly-remembered houses long swept away by the Turks; clerics even codified Hungarian law, and all higher courts contained representatives of the cloth.<sup>29</sup> The archbishop of

66 ff. The Marian works are listed in Bubits, op. cit. Cf. A. Angyal, 'Fürst Paul Esterházy', *Südostdeutsche Forschungen*, iv (1939), 339-70; and the odd items in O.L., Esterházy cs. lt., P. 125, cs. 705, nos. 11931, 11935-7, 11956 (student exercises), etc. *Trophaeum... Domus Esterházyanae*, pt. 1, nos. 123-6, 131-2, (for the children).

<sup>27</sup> In general, N. Schmitth, *Archi-Episcopi Strigonienses compendio dati* (2nd edn. Tyrnau 1758). Pázmány's father may have been an *aispán*, but the case is not very clear. Lippay's father rose, rather like Himmelreich's (above, pp. 61 f.), as a royal secretary (Nagy, op. cit. s.v.; Marsina-Kušik (eds.), op. cit. i, 523). On the Széchenyis: L. Bártfai Szabó, *A gr. Széchenyi-család története*, i-iii (Bp. 1911-26).

<sup>28</sup> Several prestigious sees became mainly aristocratic in the 18th century: Eger, Vác, Győr; Pécs was dominated by foreigners for the first half of the century. Cf. L. Károlyi, *Speculum Jaurinensis Ecclesiae* (Győr 1747); J. I. Desericius, *Historia Episcopatus... Vaciensis* (Pest 1763); N. Schmitth, *Episcopi Agrinenses*, i-iii (Tyrnau 1768); A. Ganoczy, *Episcopi Varadiensis*, i-ii (V. 1776); J. Róka, *Vitae Vespriemium Praesulum* (Pozsony 1779); I. Katona, *Historia Colocensis Ecclesiae*, i-ii (Kalocsa 1800).

<sup>29</sup> 'High chancellor' was a mere title, always assumed by the primate; the 'cancellarius ordinarius' was another bishop, usually on the make; sometimes a third bishop might be appointed as vice-chancellor; see Ember, op. cit. 77-9, 113 f., with

Esztergom enjoyed many privileges, including extensive rights of ennoblement and legal immunity, the first vote in the upper chamber of the diet, and the dignity of *comes* in two separate counties.

This political base allowed the Church to launch a strong Counter-Reformation assault which culminated, like Habsburg absolutist pressure, in the 1670s. While Leopold I naturally sought to use the priesthood as a spiritual arm in his own campaign, there is plenty of evidence to show how many independent initiatives were taken by the Catholic estates: prelates and magnates. Lippay had been a hammer of the Protestant boroughs since the 1640s, and his successor Szelepcsényi, deputy-palatine between 1670 and 1681, soon acquired the same reputation; Esterházy, Nádasdy, Wesselényi, the Illésházys and Erdődy, were all notorious for ruthlessness in the countryside. Wherever possible, heretical towns were denied their right of ecclesiastical presentation and heretical citizens compelled to contribute to the maintenance of a priest.<sup>30</sup> In 1671, Bársony, Bishop of Nagyvárad, published a tract which advanced three legalistic arguments against continued toleration: Catholic rights—though guaranteed by treaty—are being infringed; the agreements of 1608 and 1647, since the clerical estate always resisted them, were never approved by the whole diet; Hungary's Lutherans and Calvinists have diverged from the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, and innovation is not allowed. Thus Bársony and his fellows proclaimed Protestantism unconstitutional (contrast the treason-thesis of the dynasty).<sup>31</sup> Persecution reached its climax with the trial of the galley-slaves, and that episode was widely and correctly blamed less on Vienna than on the native Catholic camp.

lists of these and other counsellors. On the law: above, p. 17; the *Corpus Iuris Hungarici* was later expanded by the Jesuit Szentiványi (Höman-Szekfü, op. cit. iv, 351).

<sup>30</sup> J. Korneli, *Quinque Lustra Georgii Lippai de Zombor* (Tyrnau 1722); M. Zsilinszky, 'Lippay György és a tokiái tanácskozmány', Sz. xx (1886), 400-24; Redlich, 'Pufendorf', 586-93; B. Obál, *Die Religionspolitik in Ungarn nach dem Westfälischen Frieden während der Regierung Leopold I* (Halle 1910), rather wild; Vanyó, *Nunaiusok*, nos. 97 seqq. *passim*. Cf. above, nn. 25-6, on Nádasdy and Esterházy. For the towns: A. Timon, *A párbér Magyarországon* (Bp. 1885), esp. 97 ff.; id., *Das städtische Patronat in Ungarn* (Leipzig-Bp. 1889), *passim*.

<sup>31</sup> György Bársony, *Veritas toti mundo declarata* (Kassa 1671, and later edns. in 1672, 1676, 1681, 1706, 1720?, 1725). There were several refutations: e.g. Okolicsányi, op. cit., appendix, 146-52.



When fortunes changed briefly in 1681–3, the Protestants' first thought was revenge on the Jesuits and the bloodthirsty episcopate, while Habsburg victory over the rebels promptly revived oppression from that quarter. Late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century diets imposed increasing restrictions on the public worship of 'A Catholics'.<sup>32</sup>

Nevertheless the long offensive did find considerable response: the other side of the coin is a real devotional resurgence within Catholicism, penetrating outwards from courts like the Esterházy's to the people at large. A vogue grew up for works of simple piety, sanctifying the basic truths proclaimed by Rome, either in a pure form, as with reissues of Thomas à Kempis, or poetically elaborated. One good example is the private spirituality—revealed by his prayer-books—and the public literary activity of Mátyás Nyéki Vörös (1575–1654): many editions appeared of his *Istenes énekek* (which included the finely-wrought religious verses of Balassi) and *Tininnabulum*, with its vivid evocation of the four last things.<sup>33</sup> The mood was helped by a series of notable converts, from Mihály Veresmarty soon after 1600 to Főris Ferenc Orokocsi (1648–1718), in whom this Counter-Reformation reaped one of its most extraordinary fruits: the former galley-slave transformed into a fervent Catholic propagandist.<sup>34</sup> Such cases continued to be surrounded by a cloud of controversy. Veresmarty's warnings and threats, reprinted in the 1640s, brought sharp Protestant rejoinders, as did the widely-publicized apostasy of Johann Kircher, who had migrated from Tübingen to Upper Hungary. But Kircher's blunt and pugnacious opponent, Zacharias Láni, had much of the wind

<sup>32</sup> A short Memorial of the ... *Sufferings of the Ministers ... in Hungary* (London 1676); *A brief Narrative of the State of the Protestants in Hungary* (London 1677); *Life of Leopold*, 74 f.; Okolicsányi, op. cit., sig. az<sup>v</sup>-ct; Lampe, op. cit. 447–96; Bod, op. cit. ii, 52–127. Cf. Hóman-Szekfü, op. cit. iv, 186–91; and the latest treatment: P. F. Barton and L. Makkai (eds.), *Rebellion oder Religion?* (Bp. 1977). On the aftermath: Krones, 'Zur ungarischen Geschichte (1671–83)', 397–444, *passim*.

<sup>33</sup> One of the translators of Kempis was Pázmány (*Összes munkái*, i, 207–370, first edn. V. 1624). For Nyéki Vörös: *Régi magyar költők tára*, II (Bp. 1962), 400 ff., with life and poems. His prayer-book is ÖNB, MS. n. 2602, a beautifully illustrated MS. with notes by the possessor. On Balassi cf. above, pp. 111 f.

<sup>34</sup> Above, p. 112, on Veresmarty. His contemporarily published writings are *RMK* 3, 431, 437, 697, 706, 721. F. F. Orokocsi, *Examen reformationis Lutheri et sociorum eius* (Tyrnau 1696); etc. There is a life of him by F. Fallenbüchli (Esztergom 1899). For converts see also Krones, 'Zur ungarischen Geschichte (1671–83)', 393 f.

taken out of his sails when his patrons, the Illésházys, changed sides, and by the end of the century the flame of Protestant disputation burned lower. The most furious assault on Orokocsi was penned, not in Central Europe, but in Oxford.<sup>35</sup>

Effective promotion of the Catholic cause owed most to a broad tradition: polemical, apologetic, and edifying, which stemmed from Pázmány. Learned but also direct, he gave his Church a maximum attractiveness as well as a keen cutting edge. The international orders offered a great opportunity to eager young spirits from a beleaguered country: study at the Collegium Hungaricum in Rome, perhaps, or the Pázmáneum in Vienna. Clever youths in the next two generations took advantage, then lent their shoulders to the wheel, like the Jesuit, Martin Szentiványi, who became rector of Tyrnau University.<sup>36</sup> Thus Hungary maintained intimate ecclesiastical links with the rest of the Monarchy. Provinces of orders were often undivided and exchanges of personnel took place—witness the early missions of the Piarists; Benedictine, Cistercian, and Premonstratensian houses in Austria and Bohemia took over lands recovered from the 1680s.<sup>37</sup> The highly controversial Cardinal Kollonich illustrates the point well. His family, originally from Croatia, was by the seventeenth century mainly Austrian, with fairly superficial Hungarian associations, including the *indigenatus*; Kollonich himself, the son of a spectacular convert, was born at Komárom, like Sinelli. His clerical career, begun among the knights of Malta (he remained one all his life), embraced Wiener Neustadt as well as Nyitra, Győr, Kalocsa, and Esztergom. President of the Pozsony Chamber in the 1670s, then

<sup>35</sup> Papistak melatlan Uldozese a' Vallasert (n.p. 1643, reprinted [Várad] 1657), 55 ff., lumps Veresmarty together with Cardinal Carafa. Z. Láni, *Szűrii Actologiae Kircherianae* (Trencsén 1641), a point-by-point confutation; cf. *RMK* II, 517; Ráas, op. cit. v, 546–94. Benjamin Woodroffe, *Examini et Examinantis Examen, sive, Reformationis ... Defensio adversus calumnias F. F. Orokocsi* (Oxford 1700).

<sup>36</sup> Steinhuber, op. cit., on the Collegium Hungaricum, which was soon united with the Collegium Germanicum. On the Pázmáneum: V. Fraknói, *A bécsi Pázmány-intézet megalapítása* (Bp. 1923). J. Serfőző, *Szentiványi Márton munkássága a XVII század küzdelmeiben* (Bp. 1942); cf. below, pp. 322 f.

<sup>37</sup> On the provinces, cf. above, p. 181; on the Piarists: below, n. 45. *Beneficentiarbuch*, 407 f.; *Cisterzienserbuch*, 100–2, 527 ff.; Fuxhoffer, op. cit. ii, 94–9, 123–8. The Cistercian monastery of Zirc was acquired by Lilienfeld as early as 1659, and later passed to Heinrichau (in Silesia); see also Békési, op. cit. Premonstratensians: *Chorherrenbuch*, 15–22, 144–99; Fuxhoffer, op. cit. ii, 3–68, *passim*.

the most thoroughly absolutist planner of the 1690s, Kollonich proved an indispensable, but very awkward asset. And he was succeeded as primate by a still more foreign body in the national Church, a Saxon prince fresh from diplomatic activity in the service of Vienna.<sup>38</sup>

\*

The international movement by itself could not have persuaded Hungarians. As elsewhere, it entered into a complex relationship with a parallel native movement. Religious orders reasserted their autochthonous character, above all the Benedictines at the archbishop of Martinsberg or—in modern parlance—Pannonhalma, south of Győr. As old as Hungarian Christianity, first to recover from the disasters of Protestantism and temporary capture by the Turks in the 1590s, Pannonhalma was resettled after 1638 under one Pálffy—a Cistercian from Heiligenkreuz, but the only Hungarian available. Despite many vicissitudes it expanded and revived filials at Tihany, Bakonybél, and Dömök in the early eighteenth century. Since Pannonhalma has received more historical attention than any other monastery in the former Habsburg Monarchy (and probably in Europe) I need not dwell on its story.<sup>39</sup>

Hungary possessed one entirely indigenous order. The Paulines (*Pálosok*), or more properly hermits of St. Paul of Thebes (though like the Augustinians they were not really eremitic), had been regularized as an institution in the thirteenth century and spread by the end of the Middle Ages to number over one hundred houses within the lands of St. Stephen, with more in Poland and even Germany. Decimated by the events of the Reformation, they clung to the vestiges of life and to much of their property, and after 1600

<sup>38</sup> J. Maurer, *Cardinal Leopold Graf Kollonitsch, Primas von Ungarn* (Innsbruck 1887), a detailed biography. Kollonich's father, a soldier, was supposedly brought back to the Church of Rome after miraculously recovering from temporary blindness in 1621 (*ibid.* 10–13). His family died out in 1751 with Johann Sigismund, cardinal archbishop of Vienna, grandson of a cousin of Leopold. Kollonich was president of the *Neo-Aquiritica* commission from 1688 and administrator of the *Hofkammer*, 1692–4; cf. Hóman–Székfü, *op. cit.* iv, 243–9. On Archbishop Christian August: below, p. 283.

<sup>39</sup> Erdélyi–Soros (eds.), *op. cit.*, cover the history of Pannonhalma and its dependent houses in twelve huge volumes. For those without Hungarian, there is a brief summary of the work by A. Schermann in *Stud. u. Mitt.* xxxviii (1917), 157–73; 398–408; cf. Fuxhoffer, *op. cit.* i, 7–157. The earlier Magyar name for this, the only *abbatia nullius* in Central Europe, was (Szent-) Mártonhegy.

they found new animation, backed by the spirit of Trent, a new constitution, and a sequence of Croat generals.<sup>40</sup> The restored Paulines became a strong force in the Counter-Reformation at local level: they were the coenobites most closely bound up with Hungarian traditions ('Friar George' Martinuzzi, for example, had been one) and most favoured by the nobility, both as suitable recipients of benefactions and, in some important cases, as the foundation for an ecclesiastical career. Their general alone, along with the abbot of Pannonhalma, represented the regular clergy at the diet. They began to recolonize the rest of Central Europe, being introduced to Bohemia by Pešina and to Moravia by the Liechtensteins.<sup>41</sup>

Still more important for the Catholic crusade were initiatives in education and publishing which conformed with local needs. The Jesuits took the first step from 1635 with their university at Tyrnau and its printing-press. A very modest enterprise in its early stages, the academy soon gained a reputation for cheap, efficient, and patriotic teaching, while the flow of texts which it issued swelled into a flood by the 1690s. This pedagogy was, of course, Latin-based and largely unoriginal,<sup>42</sup> but Jesuits were not behindhand in cultivating the vernacular, and here again Pázmány proved the great innovator. His *Kalauz* in particular is a *tour-de-force* of controlled invective, from the introductory admonition that the reader forsake frivolous novelties to the concluding satire—800 folio pages later—on the incompetent arguments of his Protestant

<sup>40</sup> E. Kisbán, *A magyar Pálosrend története*, i–ii (Bp. 1938–40), is a thorough general history (i, 203 ff. on the recovery). For the 17th century see also *Fragmen Panis Corvi Proto-Eremitici seu Reliquiae Annalium O.S.P.P.E.* (V. 1663), covering events to 1663; N. Bengel, *Annalium O.S.P.P.E. volumen secundum* (Pozsony 1743), with events between 1663 and 1727; F. Gallá, *Marrnavics Tomkó János boszniai püspök magyar vonatkozásai* (Bp. 1940); *id.*, *A Pálosrend reformálása a XVII században* (Bp. 1941, both separata from *Regnum*). These Paulines are not to be confused with the Paulines = Barnabites.

<sup>41</sup> On nobles and the order: *Fragmen Panis*, 345 ff.; Bengel, *op. cit.* *passim*; Kisbán, *op. cit.* i, 216 f., 239 ff., 285–9; Gallá, *Pálosrend*, 107 f. Archbishop Imre Esterházy of Esztergom (1725–45) was a Pauline; so was Archbishop Pál Széchenyi, mentioned below (p. 265). Berenger, *Gravamina*, 50 f. Zelený, *art. cit.* 14, 558 ff. (Pešina); *Fragmen Panis*, 364 f. (Liechtensteins). The order also bought a house in Rome; and cf. below, p. 426.

<sup>42</sup> The 18th-century Tyrnau press was notable for some of the very last Latin editions of obsolete treatises. For its Latin printing in this period see *RMK* ii; for its workings: Iványi–Gárdonyi, *op. cit.* 51 ff.

contemporaries, heavily buttressed with quotations from their writings. The brilliant blending of learned polemic with linguistic resource (as, for example, in the sections which seek to refute Protestant reliance on the authority of Scripture) has few parallels anywhere in Europe. It is, indeed, Pázmány's peculiar mastery over the Magyar language as a vehicle for Catholic truth which secures him a place among the greatest personalities of the Counter-Reformation, and yet has denied him international recognition of that place. Even when a famous Wittenberg theologian denounced the *Kalauz* at formidable length in Latin, Pázmány's blistering response was still couched in the earthy speech of the Hungarian peasant, while its precision and richness are remarkable for a man so caught up in affairs of state.<sup>43</sup>

Later Jesuits could never match Pázmány, but several, István Tarnóczy and András Illyés among them, were prolific in delivering and publishing the kind of homily which reached the common man, as well as in translating, mostly from Latin and Italian. Meanwhile the Catholic Bible translation by György Káldi confronted Calvinists on their own ground.<sup>44</sup> Equally productive, especially in preaching and books for the largely unlettered, were the Franciscans, while by the end of the century Hungarian schooling began to benefit from the strong commitment of the Piarists. Although the first members of that order only settled in the 1660s, it soon became a prime force in education, with deep local roots, and remained so until the twentieth century.<sup>45</sup> This activity naturally concentrated on Magyar, the main language of the nobility, and German, the main

<sup>43</sup> P. Pázmány, *Istváni Igazságra vezető út Kalauz* (Pozsony 1663), esp. pt. 2, bks. 6-7. Id., 'A Szent Hainal-Csillag után bujdosó Lutheristák Vezetője', in *Összes munkái*, v. 477-819, confuting Frederick Balduinus of Wittenberg. In the same year (1627) Pázmány still found time to compose instructions to estate bailiffs in his own hand: *Levellei*, nos. 394-7.

<sup>44</sup> *RMK* i, for these works. A. Illyés, *Megecédítettet [sic] Ige az-az: Predikatiois könyve, 1-iii* (Tyrnau-V. 1691-2), is a serviceable introduction to the genre. S. Révay, *Káldi György életrajza, Biblia-fordítása és Oktató Intéze* (Pécs 1900); this translation was apparently begun by Szántó (above, p. 50). It is easy to forget, in the Central European context, that vernacular Bibles were actually prohibited (without special permission) by the Index (Reusch, op. cit. i, 333-6).

<sup>45</sup> Franciscans: Gy. P. Szabó, op. cit. Piarists: Horányi, op. cit., esp. i, 805-8; ii, 72-5, 103-5, 347-50; Gy. Balanyi et al., *A magyar piarista rendtartomány története* (Bp. 1943). Their first Hungarian house was opened at Privigye (Slovak: Prievidza; Ger: Priwitz) in the *Felvidék*. Earlier (1642) they had been brought to Podolin, one of the towns in the Zips region which were mortgaged to Poland.

language of the towns. But it did not discriminate: there is evidence of literature in Slovak, beginning with a translation of hymns in 1655, and the South Slav languages, for which Carafa acquired 'Illiricae litterae' as early as 1622.<sup>46</sup> We know that the rules of the Observant Franciscans provided for alternative election of Magyars and Slovaks, and much of Tyrnau society was thoroughly diglot. Pázmány's *Rituale Strigoniense* of 1625 appeared in four languages: Latin, Hungarian, German, and Slovak; while visitation reports reveal the extent of polyglot coexistence in western Hungary.<sup>47</sup>

The creation of a distinctive atmosphere and loyalties for the Hungarian Church under the aegis of universal Catholicism was much forwarded by the cult of saints and intermediaries. As in Austria and Bohemia, Marian worship is the most prominent feature of Counter-Reformation devotions. Pilgrimage places sprang up around miracle-working shrines: at Máriavölgy, near Pozsony, run by the Paulines; at Máriapócs, whose famous votive painting was later transferred to St. Stephen's in Vienna; at Boldogasszony (Frauenkirchen), founded by Pál Esterházy, with its fine Baroque church.<sup>48</sup> But again we have a Virgin conceived in the national image, for her cult was directly associated with the country's role as a bulwark against the Turks. Mary was seen as a kind of untouchable goddess, a divine protector against the infidel. In the towns Marian societies multiplied, especially where they were organized by the Jesuits, and although their influence on the

<sup>46</sup> *RMK* ii, 830, 1343, 1409, 1696, 2010; Carafa, *Commentaria*, 124; Kazy, op. cit. i, 203 f. Literature in Croatian is registered by I. Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Bibliografija hrvatska: itikane knjige* (Zagreb 1860). By 1700 even Ruthene types were in operation at Tyrnau (Iványi-Gárdonyi, op. cit. 49).

<sup>47</sup> Gy. P. Szabó, op. cit. 81; E. Angyal, 'Česko-mad'arské a slovensko-mad'arské styky v době baroka', *Dějiny a národy* (Pr. 1965), 55-70, at 58-61; B. Varsik, *Národnostný problém trnavskej univerzity* (Bratislava 1938), esp. 22 ff.; I. Käfer in *Filológiai Közlöny*, xi (1965), 380-7. Cf. Pázmány, *Levellei*, no. 711; there was a Slovak translation of the *Kalauz* (see I. Käfer in *Helikon*, v (1959), 178-80). Above, n. 3 (Ványó and Házi).

<sup>48</sup> L. Németh, *A Regnum Marianum államzeme a magyar katolikus megújítódás korában* (Bp. 1941), 58 ff.; Höman-Székfi, op. cit. iv, 121-4; K. Garas, *Magyarországi írástörténet a XVII században* (Bp. 1953), 25 ff. On Máriavölgy: Kisbán, i, 188-92; Galla, *Pálosrend*, 105 f.; L. Pásztor, 'A máriavölgyi kegyhely a XVII-XVIII században', *Regnum*, v (1943), 563-600. On Máriapócs: L. Juhász, *Bécs Magyar emlékei* (V. 1972), 44 f. For Esterházy see above, n. 26. Joseph was also revered (Illyés, op. cit. i, 1-30); and at a later stage calvaries came much into vogue (Lehmarm, art. cit. 136-42, 148, 150-6, lists some 250 substantial examples).

course of military events during the 1680s may well have been less than hagiographers would wish, none the less they tended to promote charity and encourage feelings of Catholic solidarity.<sup>49</sup>

The idea of a *Regnum Marianum* went with renewed veneration for Hungary's early saintly kings, who had made their land a haven of Latin Christianity under constant siege from the Orthodox and the pagans. The crucial figure was St. Stephen, warrior for *patria* and Catholicism. The mantle of Stephen suited the Habsburgs well: insistence on his apostolic rights over the Hungarian Church, supposedly granted by Pope Silverius II in the year 1000, could have consequences startlingly unwelcome to prelates and aristocracy alike, but in the seventeenth century no one pushed the doctrine to its limits; in fact it was ultramontanes like the Jesuit Inchofer and Bársony who expounded it. The popular *cultus* of Stephen, propagated in countless sermons, books, altarpieces, wall-paintings, and statuary, was much more straightforward, and his son Imre, who died young, partook of it: a Hungarian Wenceslas, though no martyr (like Zrinyi, he was slain by a boar).<sup>50</sup> The crown of martyrdom was borne rather by Stephen's confidant and Imre's mentor, Bishop Gellért, who was bound to a handcart and dispatched into the Danube from a great height in 1046. Stephen's relative and successor, Ladislas or László, also earned reverence as the paragon of a saintly national ruler: his cult flourished at Nagyvárad and Győr, and his feast-day was celebrated from the 1620s at Vienna University with Baroque pageantry and a ceremonial oration.<sup>51</sup> The gallery of lesser Christian heroes stretched from the early missionary Adalbert (*alás* Vojtěch, and shared with Bohemia), via the admirable St. Elizabeth, a princess from the house of Árpád, and her niece, the Blessed Margaret, who took the vows of a nun on the Danubian island named after her, to the

<sup>49</sup> Németh, *op. cit.*; cf. above, p. 126 n. 27.

<sup>50</sup> On the apostolic kingship cf. above, p. 134, and below, p. 273 and n. 88. M. Inchofer, *Annales ecclesiarum Regni Hungariae*, I, pss. 1-4 (Pozsony 1795-7), first published at Rome in 1644; *RMK*, I, 1110 (Bársony). Illyés, *op. cit.*, II, 416-38, 560-79; III, 21-60; *Acta SS.* Sept., I, 456-575 (Stephen—whose Hungarian feast-day, however, is 20 Aug.); *ibid.* Nov., II, I, 477-91 (Imre).

<sup>51</sup> Gellért (Gerard): *ibid.* Sept., VI, 713-27. László: Illyés, *op. cit.*, II, 249-70; III, 60-80; S. Barta, *Ungarn und die Wiener Universität des Jesuitenzeitalters* (Bp. 1937; separatim from *BE* VII), 20 ff.; *Acta SS.* June, V, 315-27.

valiant crusading friar, St. John Capistrano, and the Jesuits slaughtered at Kassa in 1619.<sup>52</sup>

What began as a stress on the continuity of Catholic virtue broadened into a whole interpretation of Hungarian history, incorporating notions of hierarchy, order, and discipline freely adapted from the neo-stoics. This was a facet of the embattled culture of the Counter-Reformation which once more owed most to Pázmány. His refutation of the preacher Magyari in 1603 is the starting-point: the devilish message of Lutheranism has dissolved centuries of accumulated grace and precipitated Turkish conquest.<sup>53</sup> Again and again he returns to the particular situation of the early seventeenth century and scores points off the less adaptable Calvinist view of providence. Renewed concern for the medieval heritage came, naturally enough, from the older orders, but also from the Jesuits. It is striking how often Marian shrines were claimed—however spuriously—to date from the Middle Ages and to have miraculously survived Protestant iconoclasm. Yet the same urge brought also a first serious interest in source materials and led to the eighteenth-century Jesuit school of Hevenes, Péterfy, Kaprainai, and Pray. It overlaps with the celebration of profane history stimulated by such men as Ferenc Nádasdy and Pál Esterházy, whose courts provided a real focus for native culture.<sup>54</sup>

\*

I have outlined the makings of a 'system', an alliance—part-conscious, part-implicit—between the dynasty and the holders of secular and ecclesiastical power in Hungary. We must now turn to

<sup>52</sup> These and others are recorded in the *Ungaricae Sanctitatis Indicia* (Tyrnau 1692), translated as *Régi Magyar Szentiség* (*ibid.* 1695), a work apparently by Gábor Hevenes; and in the *Acta Sanctorum Ungariae* (*ibid.* 1743), drawn from the Bollandists, with an appendix on some homelier unofficial saints. Cf. Illyés, *op. cit.* III, 1-21 (Adalbert); II, 599-620; III, 80-99 (Elizabeth); *Acta SS.* Jan., II, 897-909 (Margaret, sainted in 1943); Pázmány, *Levélai*, nos. 502, 601, 624, 629-30, 700-1, 709. On Capistrano: above, p. 128.

<sup>53</sup> P. Pázmány, 'Felelet az Magyarai István sárvári praedicatorinak... irt könyvére', *Összes munkái*, I, 13-192. On neo-stoics cf. above, pp. 113 ff.

<sup>54</sup> On the first major Hungarian Jesuit historian, Gábor Hevenes (1656-1715), friend of Kollonich and rector of the Viennese college, who left a large collection of MSS., see B. Hóman, 'Kishevesi Hevenes Gábor', *Történeti és forráskritika* (Bp. 1938), 337-51. *Mausoleum... Regni Apostolici... regum... Ungariae* (Nuremberg 1664), directed by Nádasdy; cf. Rózsa, *op. cit.* 13-80, 107-20, and below, n. 66. The *Trophaeum... Domus Estoracianae* was closely supervised, and probably partly written, by Esterházy.

the limitations of this system. Substantial pressure-groups rejected it from the outset. Protestantism lived on, and not only in the special circumstances of Transylvania and the comparative isolation of the north-east. Lutherans huddled together in most of the free towns, while Calvinists throughout the country had their parishes, districts, seniors, and superintendents, registered with a mixture of love and bitterness by the chroniclers of their tribulations.<sup>55</sup> With Protestantism survived the influence of Hungary's numerous gentry on provincial life: a 'country party' pursuing its grudges with grim determination through county administration and dietal representatives. Moreover, no proper stability existed beneath the surface: the large body of petty nobles shaded into free peasants, especially hajducks, privileged or unprivileged, then into migrant populations, shifted by war and economic distress, and bandit groups on the margin. Organized peasant resistance in the 1690s and 1700s contributed powerfully to the disorder of those years.

This remained an essentially fragmented opposition. It possessed one major piece of common ground: resentment at Germans (*németek*), a nebulous term embracing mainly the Habsburg armies, and administrators from the rest of the Monarchy and the *Reich*. They overbore the nobles, dismissed the local soldiery (especially after the peace of Vasvár in 1664), screwed taxes from the peasants and laid waste their livelihood. The antagonism was much more an elemental xenophobia nourished by material and psychological insecurity than a friction between nationalities. It did not normally extend to indigenous Germans; indeed, the latter were ironically thrown into the rebel camp by Habsburg religious intolerance.<sup>56</sup>

All this represented a substantial irritant to the grander strategy of the dynasty, but not a serious threat. More significant for our purposes are grave discords *within* the system. Magnates had an equal dislike of 'Germans', although the objects of their enmity stood rather higher up the social scale: warlords, presumptuous court officials. There was one important difference between them

<sup>55</sup> Lampe, *op. cit.*, pt. 3; Bod, *op. cit.* iii, *passim*.

<sup>56</sup> *Venetianische Depeschen, passim*; *Relationen Venetianischer Botschaften*, ed. Fiedler, esp. 13: 'E veramente trà la Nazione Onghera, e l'Alemana passa un Antipathia cosi grande, che il solo timore de' Turchi fa tollerare al Regno il Giogo Theasco.' Further evidence of this mood in Hóman-Szekfi, *op. cit.* iv, 148 ff.; Bérenger, '*Gravamina*', 67 f. R. F. Kaindl, *Geschichte der Deutschen in den Karpathenländern*, ii (Gotha 1908), 60 ff., on domestic German attitudes.

and their Austrian or Bohemian counterparts: throughout the seventeenth century, and even beyond, no Hungarian felt entirely at home in Vienna's corridors of power. And the Habsburgs and their immediate servants returned the mistrust. Scarcely any Hungarian was offered a major central post in our period, and such titles as privy councillor usually brought little more than prestige. The strange dress and unpronounceable names of the native aristocrats set them apart, and even the most ambitious among them continued, despite the hothouse atmosphere at court, to cultivate their own garden. They communicated with each other exclusively in Magyar—most knew little more of the German language than did their peasantry—and retained a full sense of the national past and its obligations, that past which they so glamorized in their fanciful genealogies.<sup>57</sup>

Pál Esterházy came nearest to assimilation; but he stood firm, like his father, on the role of the estates, even through the fraught years of the 1690s.<sup>58</sup> Let us consider two less obvious examples: during the reign of Ferdinand III Ádám Batthyány was a chief protagonist in the defence and the Counter-Reformation of the modern Burgenland, no more than sixty miles from Vienna. He regularly corresponded with the central government, especially with the War Council, in German and Latin (though admitting he needed a secretary to manage even the latter). But Batthyány's diary reveals only infrequent visits to the capital—perhaps once a year—and, while there, he might be kept waiting for three weeks without an audience.<sup>59</sup> Ádám Forgách too was a good servant of the

<sup>57</sup> Leopold made some strongly antipathetic comments in private about Hungarians, and not just after 1670: e.g. the remarks about 'quelle bestie dell' 'Ungari' in Kallista (ed.), *Korespondence* nos. 35, 38, 41 (all 1662). But such things are, of course, easily said (he does add that they are 'bestie al modo d'asini'). Cf. Vanyó, *Nemzetünk*, pp. 14, 17, 55. The point about language is an obvious one, yet it has often been misunderstood. Latin too, though used for many official purposes, was hardly a living tongue to most of the nobility. For one typical example of ignorance: B. Grünwald, *A régi Magyarországon* (Bp. 1888), 93 f. See also J. Bérenger, 'Latin et langues vernaculaires dans la Hongrie du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle', *Revue Historique*, cxxli (1969), 5-28; and id., '*Gravamina*', 23-8. Hungarian magnate costume, with *dobrány* and *mente*, long resisted the encroachments of international *haute couture*, and would make an interesting social study.

<sup>58</sup> Hóman-Szekfi, *op. cit.* iv, 237-9; cf. Csapodi, *op. cit.* 67 ff.

<sup>59</sup> OL, Batthyány cs. lt., P. 1315, cs. 1-3 (the foliation is very *ad hoc*). See cs. 2 for the (incomplete) travel-diary, 1644-54; cs. 1, fol. 25, for the ignorance of Latin; cs. 1, fols. 255-61, for the snub in Vienna. On Batthyány's Counter-Reformation see (continued)

Habsburgs, despite temporary disgrace in 1663 when he allowed the fortress of Neuhausel to fall to the Turks. He profited materially from his loyalty, and he enjoyed the friendship of Leopold's major-domo, Lamberg, even of Ampringen. But Forgách was appalled—at least privately—by the ill-considered policies of the 1670s. Both he and Batthyány show considerable recrimination over Vienna's neglect and incompetence; both appear to strive for distinctly cordial relations with the Rákóczi of Transylvania. Neither can have been entirely critical of the overtures made by magnates to Venice during the 1650s and later to France.<sup>60</sup>

The clergy's loyalty came under similar strain: a direct line of dissent stretches right back to the time of Rudolf II's unconstitutional actions after 1600. Pázmány, always true to the Habsburg alliance, never feared to voice disagreement, as with the forward policy adopted by Esterházy and Ferdinand II against Transylvania. Lippay was no less independent, while even Szelepcsényi and Tamás Pálffy, deputy-palatine and chancellor during the 1670s, resisted the naked exercise of court absolutism, and Sinelli did what he could for the counsels of moderation. The German background of Kollonich was nowhere more fiercely belaboured than among his fellow bishops: the primate, Szelepcsényi, for example, detested him.<sup>61</sup> When necessary, prelates could fall back on the Pope. We

above, p. 72, n. 74, and OL, Batthyány cs. lt. misszisek, nos. 36158-67, 54896-8, mostly published by B. Iványi in *Körmendi füzetek*, iii (1943).

<sup>60</sup> Forgách's papers are in OL, Forgách család levéltára, P. 287, ser. II, cs. 40 (foliated in reverse order of dates); and *ibid.* P. 1883. Tributes to his loyalty: *ibid.* (P. 287), fols. 491, 481, 271. Neuhausel affair: *ibid.* fols. 392-21 and (P. 1883) 103 ff. Letters from Lamberg: *ibid.* (P. 287), fols. 259, 233, 220, 189, 177 f.; from Ampringen, fols. 242-35, 218-12. Rákóczi: *ibid.* fols. 438 f. (an interesting letter). Habsburg criticism: esp. *ibid.* (P. 1883), fols. 108 f., '155-8' (*reclé* 255-8), memorandum to Sinelli; cf. Bod, op. cit. ii, 66. For Venetian activity in 1659: *Venetianische Depeschen*, esp. nos. 119-34, 142 seqq.; *Relationen Venetianischer Botschaften*, ed. Fiedler, esp. 107 ff.

<sup>61</sup> Benda, 'Absolutismus', 114 f.; Pázmány, *Levelek*, nos. 429, 631, 644, 656, 838, 846, 860-1, 898-900, 911, 918-20, 924, 1065; cf. Csapodi, op. cit. 72 ff. Zsilinszky, 'Lippay'; and cf. below n. 65. Pauler, op. cit. ii, 57-9, 156 ff., 248 f., 248 f., on Szelepcsényi's views in the 1660s; Meszlényi, *Szelepcsényi*, 7 f.; *Life of Leopold*, 77 f., 90; cf. Krones, 'Zur Geschichte Ungarns (1671-83)', 359 f. OL, Esterházy cs. lt., P. 125 (cs. 658), nos. 2490-2508 (Iare 1683 and 1684), with Sinelli's hopes for the restoration of the kingdom of Hungary 'splendori pristino'; cf. Antal-Páter (eds.), op. cit. i, 270 f. On Kollonich: OL, Esterházy cs. lt. P. 125 (cs. 658), nos. 3934-80 (letters from Szelepcsényi), esp. no. 3936; *ibid.* nos. 3899-3923 (letters from Széchenyi), esp. nos. 3921-3; *ibid.* nos. 2827-64 (letters from Kollonich), esp. nos. 2828, 2831-2; Vanyó, *Nunciatuk*, no. 89.

have seen some chronic bones of contention between Vienna and Rome; and it is not surprising that the Hungarian Church should have been the most Curially-inclined in the Monarchy, just as Bohemia—with figures like Harrach and Magni—was potentially the most anti-Curial area. The Papacy had its own diplomatic course to pursue in Hungary: it might approve the centralizing drive of the 1670s (even congratulate Ampringen on resuming the Teutonic order's traditional mission against pagans!), but by the end of the decade it espoused mediation, then reverted to a strong Counter-Reformation line for the diet of 1681. The following year Szelepcsényi issued a formal condemnation of the new Gallican articles, which added to the storm of controversy in France. Of course, his attack suited the Austrian call to defence against Louis XIV; but historians seem to have overlooked the fact that its ultramontanist was also pointedly equivocal *vis-à-vis* the Habsburgs themselves.<sup>62</sup>

\*

Out of this dual opposition from aristocrats and prelates, overlapping but not identical, deeply-felt but hesitant, grew Hungary's revolts against Habsburg authority after 1664. In that year, despite a Christian victory at Szentgotthárd over the Turks, the peace of Vasvár confirmed the Porte in its possession of more extensive Danubian territories than ever before, among them the historic city of Nagyvárád, whose famous equestrian statue of St. László, a miracle of the medieval kingdom once covered by Rudolf II, was unceremoniously sunk in the river Tisza.<sup>63</sup> Leaders of the nation, with rare unanimity, railed at Vienna for its shameful diplomacy and insouciance. There followed, as an immediate consequence, the so-called Wesselényi conspiracy, a very bizarre episode and an odd misnomer, a kind of *Fronde nobiliaire* with large dashes of slapstick.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Above, pp. 59-62, 133-7. *Nuntiaturberichte*, II, nos. 203, 232, 250; Bojani, op. cit. III, 426-79; Vanyó, *Nunciatuk*, nos. 117 seqq., esp. 118. Szelepcsényi's statement is printed in Péterfy, op. cit. II, 438-41; its impact is discussed by B. Zolnai, *A Gallikanizmus magyarországi visszhangja* (Bp. 1935; separatatum from *Minerva*, xiii (1934)). Galla, 'Felhatalmazások', has interesting evidence of Papal policy towards Hungary in *spiritualibus*.

<sup>63</sup> On the battle at Szentgotthárd (called Mogensdorf by Austrian historians): G. Wagner, *Das Türkenjahr 1664, eine europäische Bewährung* (Eisenstadt 1964). A. Kampis, *A history of art in Hungary* (Bp.-London 1966), 73 f.

<sup>64</sup> Basic documents in F. Rackj (ed.), *Acta consuetationem bani Perri a Zrinio et comitis Fr. Frangepani illustrantia* (Zagreb 1873); and Bogišić (ed.), op. cit. The most (continued)

It was launched by the Croatian ban, Miklós Zrínyi, his patience with the Habsburgs finally exhausted, and by Archbishop Lippay, publicly outspoken in his abuse of the emperor and maddened at the loss of his estates around Neuhausel. But both these men soon died, as did Wesselényi, the páiatine, whose role in the movement never became more than peripheral. The plot was then taken over by Péter Zrínyi, his brother-in-law Fran Frangepan, and the chief justice, Nádasdy, with Machiavellian encouragement from the French ambassador, Gremonville, and from Protestant lesser nobles whose spokesman was a lawyer, István Vitnyédy.<sup>65</sup>

Beside the hot-blooded Vitnyédy there is no doubt that Ferenc Nádasdy master-minded the malcontents. Contemporaries agree in stressing both his ambition and his great talents: a cultured and lively intelligence, he edited several volumes on the rights of the estates, one of them at his own press, then turned to eloquent appeals for a cleansing of Hungary from foreign influence.<sup>66</sup> Not even Nádasdy could breathe life into the 'conspiracy', whose amateurish plotting became an open secret both at home and in Vienna. Eventually, having heard the details of it from almost all the ringleaders in their periodic moods of contrition, Leopold had them arrested by stages in 1670. Fears of a genuine Protestant insurrection and Turkish involvement persuaded him—against his natural inclination—to order the execution of Nádasdy, Zrínyi, and

thorough treatment is Pauler, op. cit. Cf. Kazy, op. cit. iii, 37 ff.; Redlich, *Weltmacht*, 196-214; and some additional material in J. Béranger, 'Franci-magyar kapesolatok a Wesselényi-összeesküvés idején', *TSz* x (1967), 275-91. E. Lilek, *Kritische Darstellung der ungarisch-kroatischen Verschwörung und Rebellion, 1663-71*, i-iv (Celje 1928-30), is a harmless curiosity, which casts more light on academic frictions in inter-war Yugoslavia; by contrast G. Wagner, 'Der Wiener Hof, Ludwig XIV und die Anfänge der Magnatenverschwörung, 1664-5', *MÖStA* xvi (1963), 87-150, is disfigured by scurrilous anti-Hungarian polemic.

<sup>65</sup> On Lippay's attitude, blended of material and intellectual outrage (for he was a cultured patriot; cf. below, pp. 317 f.); Bogsić (ed.), op. cit. 7, 17 ff., 55; Pauler, op. cit. i, 21-3 and 82 n. He also sought a cardinal's hat (*Nuntiaturberichte*, i, nos. 149, 155). For Vitnyédy see J. Fölk in *Sz.* xli (1907), 289-320, 400-14, 502-17.

<sup>66</sup> Péter Révay, *De Sacrae Romanae ... Ortu [et] ... Fortuna* (V. 1652); id., *De Monarchia et Sacra Corona Regni Hungariae* (Frankfurt 1659); both reissued by Nádasdy. H. Verdyssen (ed.), *Articuli Universorum Statuum et Ordinum Inchyti Regni Hungariae, 1606-59* (Pottendorf 1668). F. Nádasdy, *Oratio az ország négy rendjéhez*, ed. E. Veress (Bp. 1896, separatim from *TT*). Cf. J. Vértessy, 'Nádasdy Ferencz mint iró', *Sz.* xxxviii (1904), 47-57. Opinions of him in *Privatbriefe*, ii, no. 258 ('G'was ist es, dass er origo omnis mali'); Bogsić (ed.), op. cit. 80 ff.; Pauler, op. cit. i, 29 ff.

Frangepan, and to move against their allies, actual or potential, among the gentry and burghers.

The Wesselényi conspiracy may appear a wild exception to the general argument of this book. Here we find the paladins of a magnate-Catholic élite engaged in *lése-majesté*—and there is little doubt about their *formal* guilt, which they themselves more or less admitted! Yet on investigation it proves to conform to type, at least given the extra fragility of relations between the dynasty and Hungary. The existence of a privileged caste both made the plotting possible and also ensured its failure. Pampered but not courted, that caste was able to nurse rebellion while possessing neither the heart for a serious breakaway nor any understanding of political realities. Precisely because of the covert bond of high Counter-Reformation culture, Nádasdy could expect clemency from Leopold (whom he had regularly and regally entertained at his castles); precisely for the want of any overt political bond between Vienna and Hungary it could not be granted: indeed, all manner of improbable rumours were circulated about the dissidents' plans (like poisoning the emperor or burning down the Hofburg) and readily believed in Austria and abroad. Thus the same evidence was bound to be interpreted in two different ways, and the death sentences proved just as surprising to the magnates as they were obvious to most of the rest of Europe.<sup>67</sup>

The events of 1670-1 were made the pretext for the absolutist experiment in the next decade—Leopold frankly admits as much in his private correspondence.<sup>68</sup> Hence they brought ever more tumultuous resistance, led now by the Lutheran Thököly, who

<sup>67</sup> On the rumours cf. below, p. 381; some probably originated with loose-talking plotters. Most foreign writers condemned the conspiracy: e.g. C. Freschot, *Rivretto dell'Historia d'Ungheria* (Naples 1687), 155-95; *Life of Leopold*, 69; Rinck, op. cit. 554 ff., esp. 582-7; and, of course, translators of the official report of the proceedings, whose English version is *The Hungarian Rebellion, or an Historical Relation of the late wicked Practices of the three Courts*... (London 1672). But—as Rozsa rightly observes (op. cit. 123-8)—there is evidence of a deliberate Habsburg propaganda campaign to justify the sentences, moved by considerable fears of a wave of sympathy. The court composer, Alessandro de Poglietti, even wrote a *Toccatina sopra la ribellione de Ungheria*. The propaganda (though not perhaps the *Toccatina*) had its effect, and the conspirators have been consigned to historical limbo, irredeemably 'Magyar' to Habsburg sympathizers, yet not 'nationalist' enough for patriotic Hungarian historians. Cf. their pathetic pleas in (e.g.) OL, Eszterházy cs. lt. P. 125 (cs. 638), no. 3266; *ibid.* Forgách cs. lt. P. 287, ser. II, cs. 41, fols. 28-30.

<sup>68</sup> *Privatbriefe*, ii, no. 249 (Heiligenkreuz, 22 May 1670).

mobilized his co-religionists in the *Fetvidék*: the *kurucok* come of age. But Thököly too was a magnate; his great-grandfather, once a rough cattle-dealer, had made the family fortunes in that mobile half-century before 1600. And Catholics were part of his milieu: his uncle became a convert; his wife was Ilona Zrinyi, daughter of Péter. In 1682-3, when Thököly's troops flooded Habsburg Hungary, most of the Catholic nobility threw in their lot with them.<sup>69</sup> By the same token, any lasting success was impossible without those Catholic supporters, as was soon shown when they reverted to Habsburg allegiance for the contest against the discountenanced Turks.

Exactly the same phenomenon presents itself, on a larger scale, with the last and most grandiose of the revolts: the Rákóczi rebellion of 1703-11.<sup>70</sup> To understand how Ferenc II Rákóczi came to dominate the culminating act in the drama of early-modern Hungary, we must look briefly at one more genealogy. The Rákóczis—Ragoczy or Ragozci, as foreigners corrupted the name—were an established family of Transylvania, rising (yet again) on the eve of 1600 to stand among the senior nobility of the principality. Zsigmond (1544-1608) was temporarily elected prince in his old age; his son, György I gained the same position in 1630 and held it till his death in 1648. Parallel with their political advance went economic consolidation. Zsigmond gained large estates along the Polish border; György I added further latifundia in Upper Hungary, as well as the perquisites of personal government in Transylvania; his son was married to the last of the Báthorys, Zsófia, hence inheritor of another huge fortune. Even though György II's foreign political designs brought Rákóczi rule over Transylvania to an abrupt end, the family remained—beside the Esterházy—the most exalted and wealthy in Hungary. From the forests of Makovica down to the swamps of Ecsed and beyond they

<sup>69</sup> D. Angyal, *Kázmárki Thököly Imre*, i-ii (Bp. 1888-9). Thököly took over the leadership of opposition from another magnate, Pál Wesselényi, cousin once removed to the palatine (on whom see Gy. Décsényi in *Sz. xix* (1885), 520-32, 614-20). For the term *kuruc* (or *kurutz*) see above, p. 97. At the time 'Thököly' was often spelt 'Tekeli', *vel sim*.

<sup>70</sup> The enormous secondary literature does not belong here; cf. Kosáry, *op. cit.*, i, 435-72. The standard life is S. Márki, *II Rákóczi Ferenc*, i-iii (Bp. 1907-10); cf. Redlich, *Werden einer Grossmacht*, 108-55. Recent work has concentrated on international aspects of the story, especially B. Kopecki, *A Rákóczi szabadságharc és Franciaország* (Bp. 1966, French version 1971).

could travel a hundred miles or more without quitting their private patrimony.<sup>71</sup>

The Rákóczis occupied a kind of middle-ground between the principality and the kingdom: resident and esteemed in both, they constituted the natural focus for anti-Habsburg patriotism in each realm. The short-lived Ferenc I (1645-76) took up where his father, György II had left off, becoming involved in the treasonable manœuvres of the 1660s and marrying Péter Zrinyi's daughter Ilona (as her first husband); their son, Ferenc II (1676-1735) enjoyed a right of apostolic succession to the leadership of the *kuruc* army. Nevertheless the Rákóczis were also evidently magnates. Catholicism had been in the family since the 1620s with György I's convert brother Pál, chief justice of the kingdom. Zsófia Báthory, scion of a fervently Romanist house, was *persona gratissima* among the Hungarian prelates and second to none as a Counter-Reformer after her husband's death, beginning with the conversion of her own son, whose release from prison (and from possible execution) she managed to secure by intervention at Vienna in 1670. Ferenc II, after the defeat of his stepfather Thököly, actually received his education at a Jesuit college in Bohemia and lived out his young manhood amid the high culture of Vienna's international Baroque.

Thus Rákóczi carries the same stamp of the intelligent renegade courtier as does Nádasdy. At first he conspired equally idly against Leopold; then, committed to an Austrian dungeon (the same as had harboured his grandfather, Zrinyi), he escaped to raise the standard of national revolt. And who were his lieutenants? Catholics, almost to a man: Miklós Bercsényi, a refined, rich, and high-living noble, previously Habsburg commander in Upper Hungary; Sándor Károlyi, a leading landowner from the east; Antal Esterházy, a nephew of Pál; Simon Forgách, the younger son of Ádám; István and Mihály Csáky, two of the twenty-five children of chief justice István. In fact, initial Catholic sympathy for the rebellion was quite widespread, even among Jesuits and the Benedictines of Pannonhalma. The archbishop of Kalocsa, Pál Széchenyi, tried to mediate in 1704; although unsuccessful, he could at least see both sides of the argument.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>71</sup> On these estates: L. Makkai, *I Rákóczi György birtokainak gazdasági iratai, 1631-48* (Bp. 1954); Marsina-Kušik (eds.), *op. cit.* ii, 58-124.

<sup>72</sup> Again I cannot list bibliography for the other leaders of the revolt; but cf. K. (continued)



In the end most Catholics returned to the Habsburg fold, and peace was negotiated by two magnates: Károlyi and János Pálffy. Of course, the prime motor of the uprising had lain elsewhere, in popular discontent and Protestant hatred. The peasants first encouraged Rákóczi to take the field; the Calvinist gentry elected him prince of Transylvania and sought to crown him king. But they alone could not deliver any decisive blow against the dynasty. Indeed, their growing predominance among the insurgents persuaded many members of the upper class and the Catholic intelligentsia to exchange, as in the 1620s and the 1680s, a half-hearted opposition for renewed lukewarm conformity. Rákóczi went into exile, wrapped himself up in a heavily French-inspired Jansenism quite remote from Hungarian traditions, and sought solace first at a Camaldulensian monastery in Paris. The declining years of melancholy reflection beside the Bosphorus are immortalized in the imaginative letters of his noble Catholic companion, Kelemen Mikes.<sup>73</sup>

\*

That brings us to a consideration of Transylvania, Mikes's homeland and Rákóczi's strongest base. It must be short: the principality was an integral part of the Monarchy only from the 1690s; but it can be instructive, for it throws into relief the weaknesses and strengths of the entire Habsburg order in Hungary.<sup>74</sup> Transylvania stood in a curious position: almost completely autonomous (and more threatened from Istanbul than from Vienna during most of the period) it was yet bound by numerous ties to the crown of St. Stephen. No clear frontier existed, and much of eastern Hungary came under dual influence, especially on the estates of the Rákóczi—who held court mainly at Sárospatak—and in local towns

Thaly, *A székesi gr. Berestényi-család, 1460-1835*, i-iii (Bp. 1885-92), ii-iii; and much documentation of the Károlyi family in *A nagykárolyi gr. Károlyi-család emlékváltára*, i-v (Bp. 1882-97), esp. v. On the religious issue: A. Meszlényi, *II Rákóczi Ferenc felkelésének valláspolitikája és a jezsuiták* (Bp. n. d., separatatum from *Regnum*); Erdélyi-Szörös (eds.), op. cit. iv, 123 ff.; v, 57-60; cf., for a Protestant view, Bod, op. cit. ii, 322-40. For Széchenyi see Gy. Lánczy in *Sz. xvi* (1882), 273-99.

<sup>73</sup> Gy. Szekfű, *A származott Rákóczi* (Bp. 1913), is a shrewd, irreverent view. K. Mikes, *Összes művei*, ed. L. Hopp, i (Bp. 1966), a critical edition of the 'letters' from Turkey. The Rákóczi died out in exile with Ferenc II's two sons.

<sup>74</sup> There are very few general accounts, especially on the non-political side. J. Benkő, *Transilvania*, i-ii (V. 1778), is a very useful compendium; Makkai, *Transilvanie*, is the best narrative.

such as Debrecen, almost cut off from the rest of the country. Movement took place to-and-fro; some of the great families migrated or, like Csáky and Wesselényi, preserved two branches. Regular Magyar correspondence across the border shows common interests, while close contacts were maintained too among German communities: the leading Saxon politician of the early eighteenth century, Sachs von Harteneck, was the son of a burgher from the *Févidék*. Transylvania had a county structure which, archaic and intricate, was arranged on the same principles as in Hungary; until 1659 the principality still sent observers to the royal diet.<sup>75</sup>

Thus Transylvania naturally represented, for those dissatisfied with life under the Habsburgs, the conscience of Hungary as a whole: the legacy of John Hunyadi and his son, Matthias Corvinus, who originated there; a truly native, elective régime. The tradition of resistance to Habsburg claims, periodically spilling over into belligerence, was advertised from Bocskai onwards as a struggle for political and religious liberties, the central strand in *kuruc* ideology. Major formulations are the apology for Bocskai, issued in 1605, and Alvinczi's *Querela Hungariae* of 1619. We should not (*pace* many Hungarian historians) take all the slogans too seriously, but they clearly offered an alternative set of values. They meant the survival, not only of Protestantism, but of confessional pluralism. Calvinism was the dominant faith, its sense of mission becoming a key factor in policy; but Lutherans survived as a minority group, now practically identical with the Saxon community, along with some Unitarians, even Sabbatarians, a sprinkling of Roman-Catholics, and a considerable population of Orthodox Romanians.<sup>76</sup> Links with Protestant Europe, snapped everywhere else by war and official pressure, were sustained in Transylvania. Indeed, the international role of Bethlen and the Rákóczi helped to bring her nearer to her foreign allies and sympathizers and to channel strong Dutch and English influences. They went with the continuance of

<sup>75</sup> On Sachs von Harteneck see the summary in F. Teutsch, *Die Siebenbürger Sachsen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Sibiu 1924), 126-30. For the constitutional position: Timon, *Verfassungsgeschichte*, 725 ff.; Berenger, *Groamitica*, 48.

<sup>76</sup> The vindication of Bocskai appeared in English: *A Declaration of the Lordes and States of the Realme of Hungary* (London 1605, tr. from the French). The *Querela Hungariae* was printed in Hungarian, Latin, and German. The positive nature of toleration in Transylvania has been enthusiastically argued by some, e.g. by D. Angyal in *Sz. lxiü-lxix* (1929-30), 591-600; cf. above, p. 15 and n. 28.

an urban culture: not at all a metropolitan ethos, but the life of the little boroughs of Transylvania and the humble *mezővárosok* of the Great Plain. Here Reformation pedagogy retained its hold, creating a stratum of Western-orientated lay intellectuals, taught by such exiles as Alsted and Comenius. Here, more even than in most of Germany, let alone the Habsburg lands, radical ideas could still flourish: most notably a Puritan critique of the established ecclesiastical and social order, but also certain aspects of Cartesian thinking, and the new theories of Bacon, Grotius, and Coccejus.<sup>77</sup>

Yet in many ways Transylvania ran a similar course to the rest of the Monarchy. In one key respect it outstripped the Habsburgs on their own ground: by the mid-seventeenth century it approached much closer to political absolutism. The development is a remarkable one, given the electiveness of the ruler and the religious compromises already entered into. It was helped by the *de facto* authority of the prince, who held most of the military, financial, and juridical strings of power; he and his court at Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia) could define their own sphere of influence and draw on the same sort of submissive neo-stoic literature which rallied to the Habsburgs. An estates' organization existed, based on the three 'nations' of Magyars, Szeklers, and Saxons, and the diet met very regularly; but (in the absence of any long tradition of precedent and authority) it depended heavily on the prince who summoned it. The very uncertainty of the situation, both at home and abroad, tended to predispose electoral assemblies in favour of a strong ruler.<sup>78</sup> This process advanced quickly from 1613, after Transylvania had passed through its own 'time of troubles', and Bethlen Gábor, by no means the semi-savage of traditional Western historiography, balanced his

<sup>77</sup> I intend to write more fully elsewhere about Transylvanian culture in the 17th century and its Western European connections. See most recently, on contacts, L. Demény and P. Cernovodeanu, *Relațiile politice ale Angliei cu Moldova, Țara Românească și Transilvania în secolul XVI-XVIII* (Bucharest 1974). For the Puritans: J. Zoványi, *Puritanus mozgalomak a magyar református egyházban* (Bp. 1911), theological; Makkai, *Puritanusok*, social and economic.

<sup>78</sup> V. Biró, *Az erdélyi fejedelmi hatalom fejlődése* (Kolozsvár 1917), a perceptive essay. On the administration: Ember, op. cit. 380-516; cf. Benkő, op. cit. II, 1-77. For the neo-stoics, cf. above, pp. 113 f. On the diet: Zs. Trócsányi, *Az erdélyi fejedelemség korának országgyűlései* (Bp. 1976). Transylvania is one of few parts of Europe with full published records of its 17th-century dietal proceedings: *Erdélyi országgyűlései emlékek* (*Monumenta Comitatus Regni Transylvaniae*), ed. S. Szilágyi, I-XXI (Bp. 1876-98).

natural deviousness with shrewd, tough, and quite enlightened policies, which included a kind of paternal mercantilism. Then the dynastic Rakóczi built upon his government and upon their own unrivalled private resources.<sup>79</sup>

The outcome could not, of course, be total absolutism. Sovereignty was shared with a high nobility which likewise won out from the 1600s onwards: a little later than further west, and less completely, but following the same trend, and helped by the hitching to Transylvania of the rich latifundia of the *Partium*. Many ennoblements took place during the wars, but the value of petty nobility declined steadily: one good example is the differentiation among the Szeklers, previously the most egalitarian society in Central Europe, and the enhanced prominence of such clans as Mikes, Kálnoky, Lázár, Mikó, and Apór.<sup>80</sup> When the Turks crushed Transylvanian independence in the years 1658 to 1662 and installed the fainéant Mihály I Apafi as prince, they left an oligarchy of established Magyar and Szekler families, more or less ancient in their provenance. Besides the ones just mentioned, these included Bethlen (the Keresd line, rather than the Iktár branch which produced Bethlen Gábor) and Bánffy of Losonez; Kemény and Rhédey; Kornis and Gyulaffy; Telekis from the *Partium*, the nearest to arrivistes; and Hallers, unique examples of a transition from patricians of Nuremberg, through Saxon entrepreneurs, to landed aristocrats.<sup>81</sup> Chaos in the 1680s and 1690s, even more than

<sup>79</sup> Gy. Szekfü, *Bethlen Gábor* (Bp. 1929), esp. 152 ff.; Makkai, *Transylvánia*, 221 ff. E. Makkai, *Bethlen Gábor országalkotó politikája* (Bp. 1929), does not do justice to its title. For the Rakóczi as sovereigns: S. Szilágyi, *A Rákócziak kora Erdélyben* (Pest 1868).

<sup>80</sup> The Szeklers were originally a tribe used as frontiersmen by the early Hungarian state. By the 17th century they were largely assimilated to the Magyars, especially in language, but still preserved relics of their original military order and political privileges. It is not easy to find information on their social evolution. I have used, besides Nagy, op. cit., J. Benkő, *Imago indytae ... Nationis Studicae* (Nagyseben-Kolozsvár 1791); L. Szádeczky Kardoss, *A székelly nemzet története és alkotmányja* (Bp. 1927), esp. 107 ff.; 214-59; and, most recent, S. Benkő, L. Demény, and K. Vekov (eds.), *Rákóczi századok évt. 1595-6: antecedenst, desfejtarare și urmări* (Bucharest 1978), esp. 266-316.

<sup>81</sup> Much useful biographical information about ruling families is gathered together in the lists of *comites* of Transylvanian counties by M. Lázár in *Sz. XXI* (1887), 400-26, 518-28, 610-25, 700-15; *XXII* (1888), 33-41, 242-51, 334-48, 426-34, 505-22, 622-37, 730-9, 911-31; *XXIII* (1889), 30-41, 131-47, 229-37. See also Nagy, op. cit. The fascinating story of the Hallers of Hallerthó, alias Hallerstein, emerges from the article *ibid.*, s.v.; cf. A. Kubinyi, 'Die Nürnberger Haller in Ofen', *Mitteilungen des* (*unpublished*)

in the 1590s and 1600s, grew out of personality clashes within a very limited élite which would dominate the life of the principality, and sometimes of Hungary as a whole, for centuries to come.

The prince and the magnates sought greater social control, and in Transylvania too the key to this lay in the ecclesiastical situation. The seventeenth-century religious picture was no longer really liberal: Calvinism had become a state Church, its court preachers little better than house chaplains; Lutheranism was acceptable, but isolated and stagnant; the Unitarians were firmly restrained and their college at Kolozsvár showed few signs of animation. Once the spirit of Humanist accommodation faded away, only the letter of the constitution remained, and that proscribed all innovation. Not only Sabbatarians were persecuted, but heterodox Calvinists as well. Thus Puritanism suffered decisive rejection: Transylvania's authorities proved as antipathetic towards it during the 1650s as were the Habsburgs *vis-à-vis* their own radicals earlier. Having lost most of the battle over organization, it survived only in the interstices of a hidebound establishment, running into the sand of sterile theological disputes.<sup>82</sup> Mainstream Calvinism, with its episcopal structure, bore the stamp of deference, hierarchy, and conservatism.

Of particular concern in the present context is the state of Catholicism, which existed on sufferance throughout the golden age of Transylvanian independence. The Catholic community fell into a parlous decline by the early seventeenth century: in 1607 it numbered no more than forty priests (excluding Jesuits), most of them married, and saw no prospect of an appointment to the vacant see of Gyulafehérvár, where the episcopal palace had been occupied by the princely household. In this strange accephalous condition (somewhat akin to the state of Catholicism in the United Provinces), the Church could display no proper vitality. But it showed itself curiously tenacious, and even won a sort of official approval—evidently having less to fear than the Protestants from the

*Verens für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg*, 1963-4, 80-128. Practically every one of the families mentioned was raised by the Habsburgs to the rank of count (not known earlier in Transylvania) between 1685 (Teleki) and 1714. Cf., on the oligarchy, Trócsányi, op. cit. 42 f. and *passim*.

<sup>82</sup> For the persecution of Sabbatarians: Kohn, op. cit. 295 ff. On the fate of Puritanism: Zoványi, *Puritanus mozgalom*, 355 ff. This said, it should be added that some elements of Puritan morality remained influential, and that scarcely any of its advocates suffered extreme penalties for his opinions.

constitutional clause forbidding innovation. Bethlen Gábor permitted some Jesuit missionaries and schools, and maintained good relations with individual Catholics, while his nomination of an administrator (*vicarius*) on his own terms—forestalling any Habsburg candidate—may not have been entirely unacceptable to Rome. The Rákóczi extended the self-government of the 'Status Catholicus' in Transylvania and employed a few of its members in high positions.<sup>83</sup> After 1660 the Church broadened its spiritual base, aided especially by the Franciscans of Csik with their printing-press in the Szekler heartland, and a Catholic political group began to form around certain aristocrats (some of them converts): István Apor and Mihály Mikes, the Hallers and Kornises. Behind its recovery lay the larger cultural impact of the Habsburg world: neoscholasticism and Jesuit education, Baroque learning and sentiment, which I shall touch on again in a later chapter.<sup>84</sup>

Thus by the 1680s the Transylvanian élite which was the inheritor of *kuruc* political traditions had grown increasingly ambivalent about them, and sought rather to safeguard its position in a country so near the edge of European civilization, but so proud of belonging within it. As will be remembered, no complete break with the rest of Hungary had ever occurred (for a few improbable years Zsigmond Báthory was actually brother-in-law to the future Emperor Ferdinand II); and so the Habsburg embrace could be attractive enough, given the right terms. The stages of accommodation are symbolized by two generations of the Teleki family: Mihály (1634-90), Apafi's chief minister, who, having campaigned for a French orientation, made a *volte-face* in the mid-1680s; and his son Mihály, who in 1689 translated an impeccably loyalist work

<sup>83</sup> V. Biró, *Bethlen Gábor és az erdélyi katholicizmus* (Cluj 1929); Kazay, op. cit. i, 104 f., 211 f., 265, 269-72, 299 f.; ii, 29-36; Révai, op. cit. 19, on Bethlen's subsidy for Káldi's Bible-translation; Székfü, *Bethlen Gábor*, 192-5; F. Galla, 'A csiksomlyói ferencendi kolostor viszonyosságai Bethlen Gábor idején', *B.É.* iv (1934), 283-302; cf. *Narrativ-berichte*, I, no. 91. Bethlen's widow, Katharina of Brandenburg, became a convert for a time; cf. below, p. 284. It may be recalled (p. 51 n. 23) that Transylvania had a resident Catholic bishop very briefly in the late 1590s.

<sup>84</sup> *RMK* i, 1188, 1253, 1273, 1328-9; cf. *MIT* ii, 319, on Káloni. The best work on the Catholic revival, though a disorganized one, is V. Biró, *Apor István és kora* (Cluj 1935), on the powerful Transylvanian treasurer of the 1690s. Mihály Mikes (died in 1721), nephew of a Catholic chancellor of the principality under György II Rákóczi, was a supporter of the Rákóczi rebellion. Cf. below, ch. 9, esp. pp. 325-7, for the cultural background.

by an Austrian canon regular for the younger Prince Apafi.<sup>85</sup> The flood of titles now issued by the Habsburgs for the Telekis and their compeers were a mere appendage to the power of the aristocrats, rather as, decades before, the ruling Rákóczi had been accorded the style of princes of the Holy Roman Empire. And Catholics now began to make the political pace in Transylvania, outrunning Vienna's generous concessions to them in a way which fifty years earlier, in the heyday of the Calvinist principality, would have appeared wildly unlikely.

\*

Let us, finally, take our stance in the years around 1700 and try to draw conclusions. The Habsburgs have found just enough support to seize the whole historic territory of the crown of St. Stephen, as the Turks are rolled back to Belgrade, while the body and spirit of Transylvanian separatism (young Prince Mihály II Apafi and his chancellor, Miklós Bethlen) are held under close surveillance in Vienna. But they have not found strength enough to impose any kind of centralization in Hungary—not even the semi-native variant proposed by that stormy petrel, Kollonich—while Leopold's Diploma of 1699 for Transylvania retains, alongside the native governor, a separate chancellor and treasurer for the principality and too large a toleration to please local Catholics. The peace of Szatmár will confirm the bargain, laying a foundation for the country's more orderly eighteenth-century evolution. On the one hand, the aristocracy is groomed for its magnificent gesture of loyalty in 1741, and the Protestants are confined within narrow and humiliating limits. On the other hand, a series of awkward compromises are reached in the political and economic sphere: diet, chancery, *Constitutum Locumtenentiale*, courts and counties all continue with minimal modification, newly-recovered lands gradually fall under domestic management, and a cryptic document known as the Pragmatic Sanction comes to regulate relations between ruler and ruled in a way calculated to generate far more heat than light.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>85</sup> The elder Teleki had earlier been responsible for the elimination of a strong pro-Habsburg magnate group around Dénes Bánffy and Pál Beldi. Mihály Teleki, *Fejedelmi Lelek aranygy A'jo Fejedelemehek Szükséges Ajándékai . . .* (Kolozsvár 1689), from a Latin work by Adam Johann Weber of Neusuff. This younger Teleki adhered to the Rákóczi revolt, but his own son became a Catholic convert, further evidence of the intricate loyalties at this time in Hungary.

<sup>86</sup> The modifications in Hungary's political institutions during the earlier 18th

Thus the arrangements I have examined in this chapter were considerably more fragile than those elsewhere in the Monarchy. Hungary after 1700 entered a period of full-scale Catholic Baroque florescence: the same religious and social intolerance, the same intellectual and educational preoccupations, the same buildings and paintings, as in the rest of Central Europe, all just a little belated. It is a meaning detail of delayed response that Stobäus's letter of 1598 to Archduke Ferdinand about how to destroy Protestantism in Styria was distributed at Tyrnau in 1714 for the instruction of new Hungarian doctors of divinity.<sup>87</sup> Yet the Habsburgs had little control over the movement, and it was threatened in two different ways. The continuing disruptive stance of Calvinist gentry and intellectuals would eventually lead to the liberal programmes of the Reform era and a fringe of more radical critics of the establishment. Much sooner than that, deep rifts were already appearing *within* the establishment. When Maria Theresa's librarian, Adam Franz Kollár—himself a native of Trencsén—wrote two learned Latin treatises in the 1760s to re-examine the nature of the crown's apostolic rights over the Hungarian Church, he flung the diet into a turmoil and barely escaped with an abject recantation.<sup>88</sup> There was, needless to say, some *arrière-pensée* about Kollár's, and the

century are conveniently summarized in H. Marczali, *Hungary in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge 1910), 329 ff. The Pragmatic Sanction was not, of course, merely (or even primarily) designed to resolve the constitutional problems of Habsburg Hungary, though that came to be its most important function—hence the absence of any properly objective treatment of it. Cf., in general, G. Turba, *Die Grundlagen der Pragmatischen Sanktion, i: Ungarn* (V. 1911).

<sup>87</sup> G. Stobaeus de Palmaburgo, *Historica Religiosis Reformatio penam theologica*, ed. L. Tapolcsani (Tyrnau 1714), prints for the first time the guidance to Ferdinand (pp. 1–14), and the report of 1604 on the progress of Counter-Reformation (25–80). There are good summaries of high-Baroque culture in Hungary in Hóman-Szekfü, op. cit. iv, 366–416, and S. Domanovszky (ed), *Magyar művelődéstörténet*, I–V (Bp. n.d.), iv, 421–52 and *passim*.

<sup>88</sup> Kollár, *Historia Diplomatica*, and *De Originibus . . .* His defence of Habsburg powers of presentation, taxation, and so forth, in *foro eclesiastico* is largely derived in a scholarly way, though undoubtedly fuelled by resentment at clerical and noble privilege. On the circumstances surrounding the Kollár-affair (not adequately recognized by historians) see F. Krönes, *Ungarn unter Maria Theresia und Joseph II* (Graz 1871), pt. 1. The latest discussion of his ideas is a learned and curious article by D. Dummerth in *Fiollogiai Közlemények*, xii (1966), 391–413. Orlter enlightened figures, like Bishop Bathányi of Transylvania (Bathányi, op. cit. i, 137 ff., 363 ff.), took Kollár's view of the authenticity of Silvester's donation to King Stephen, but eschewed his polemical tone.

empress's, investigation of sovereign claims; but the case serves to show how insecure was the foundation on which even existing co-operation between the Habsburgs and their Hungarian subjects rested. And when that base was called in question, the co-operation could only become progressively more difficult to sustain.

## CHAPTER 8

### The German Empire: limited hegemony

Throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries the Habsburgs were continually occupied, often preoccupied, with German questions: the manifold problems of the *Reich* which spread away beyond the familiar confines of Austria and Bohemia as far as the Meuse, the North Sea, and the Baltic. Then 1648 brought a famous watershed, the failure of a direct military-political campaign to assert imperial authority. The princes of Germany now buttressed their liberties further at the diet of 1653-4, which settled the new constitutional mechanisms of a divided Empire, and during the protracted and unifying dealings which preceded the election of Leopold in 1657.<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile the dynasty found compensation at home—underpinning the separate Austrian development allowed for by the *Privilegium Maius*; turning Bohemia's effective immunity from the *Reich* (and thus from the religious guarantees of Westphalia) against the very 'patriots' who had always appealed to it in the past; looking to a genuinely Danubian and Balkan foreign policy.

These points have often been made, and they were an essential precondition for any free-standing Habsburg commonwealth in Central Europe. Yet it is equally obvious that the Habsburgs still sought a German role. Integral Hungary was recovered largely by the accident of Ottoman miscalculation and decline. We have seen how little institutional evolution accompanied the changing position of the house of Austria. The dynasty itself was, in some irreducible sense, Germanic, and apt to become more so rather than less with the passage of time. Until the mid-nineteenth century it preserved

<sup>1</sup> J. S. Pütter, *An historical Development of the present Political Constitution of the Germanic Empire*, tr. J. Dornford, i-iii (London 1790), ii, 56-271. On the election, precipitated by the sudden death of Leopold's elder brother Ferdinand, who had already been confirmed as king of the Romans, i.e. heir apparent: A. F. Pribram, 'Zur Wahl Leopold I, 1654-8', *AOG* lxxiii (1888), 81-222.