The way in which the sixteenth and seventeenth century relations of the Habsburg Monarchy and the Kingdom of Hungary were viewed changed significantly after the first half of the nineteenth century. Modern Hungarian historiography came into existence in the eighteenth century. Its first practitioners were influenced by the contemporary Habsburg state in which they lived. The appearance of the nation-states and of the concept of national independence brought major changes. The historical concept of independence became the major trend in Hungarian historiography during the last third of the nineteenth century. Its role is still important today and was particularly important during certain earlier periods. It was accepted equally by Catholic and Protestant historians, by positivists just as much as by the historians of ideas, by Marxists and by the partisans of the national romanticism of our day.¹

A solid basis was laid down, during the second half of the nineteenth century, by the romantic nationalist historians.² They uncovered enormous archival material but assessed it from the perspective of the political situation and independist ideology of the times. The principal representatives of this approach were the Protestant Kálmán Thaly (1839–1909) and the leader of the Viennese research group, Sándor
Takáts (1860–1932), a Piarist priest. The former published a number of volumes of source material on the activities of Imre Thököly and Ferenc II Rákóczi but, as a leading member of the Independence Party, the concepts of national independence dominated his historiography. Thus, he even published historical poems which he forged himself. Takáts was one of the greatest experts on the contents of the Vienna archives. He was firmly anti-Habsburg and thus in his essays, written in an enjoyable style, he generally endeavored to show the anti-Hungary sentiments of the Vienna court. In the absence of more recent investigations, their writings were used frequently during the decades after World War II and are of importance even today. The perspectives of Thaly and Takáts were based on their firm resolve to engage in extended polemics with their Austrian historian colleagues who represented a dynastic-imperial perspective.

In writing the history of the multinational Kingdom of Hungary in the early modern era not every historian subscribed to the concepts of national independence, even when romantic nationalism was at its peak. Ignác Acsády (1853–1906), who summarized the history of the sixteenth century for the 1896 millennium of the Hungarian conquest, or Árpád Károlyi (1853–1940), who was another great expert on the Vienna archives were more careful in their presentations. An even stronger position was taken in his *Magyar történet* by the most noted Hungarian historian of the first half of the twentieth century, Gyula Szekfű (1883–1955), even though in his historiographical works, stress on the nation-state perspective could be noticed. After several years of research in the Viennese archives and on the basis of the sources concerning the Kingdom of Hungary, he concluded that the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century activities of the Habsburgs vis-à-vis Hungary could not be summarily condemned. According to Szekfű, the Habsburgs, in cooperation with the Hungarian landowner nobility, played an important role in the protection of the Kingdom of Hungary against the Ottomans. Because of this view Szekfű was severely criticized by his romantic nationalist colleagues and by the major representatives of the post-1950 historians. It was thus that Szekfű was classified with the “bourgeois, pro-Habsburg falsifiers of history.” In these debates the primary considerations were not the appropriateness of the sources but the virulent prejudices of the period and the nationalist illusions.
The above epithet came from Aladár Mód (1908–1973), one of the most unusual figures of the national independence concept and the “father” of Hungarian “scientific socialism.” In his celebrated, romantic nationalist monograph, 400 év küzdélem az önálló Magyarországért, he offered an interpretation of history that reflected the political ideology of his times. The work presents the joint history of the Hungarian state and the Habsburgs, from 1526 to 1918, as a fight for Hungarian independence against the “German oppressors,” the “Austrian colonizers” and the “imperialist” Habsburgs. The leaders of this struggle on the Hungarian side were the princes of Transylvania. The work, first published in 1943, was written in opposition to German fascism. In a number of significantly enlarged and modified editions, after the 1950s, it became, in support of communist propaganda, an attack against German imperialism and against the Habsburgs. In this era, the work was very effective. It focused on a few of the critical periods in the history of the Habsburgs and the Hungarians, such as the Bocskai uprising (1604–1606), the Rákóczi War of Independence (1703–1711), and the 1848–49 Revolution and War of Independence and superimposed the problems of these limited time periods to the entire four centuries of the Habsburg-Hungarian relations. He assessed the history of Hungary in the early modern era in the spirit of the prevailing political ideology of his times, without having done any basic research and ignoring the fundamental principles of his craft. Even though the work is now rarely read by students, its effects on historical perspectives are still very much alive.

The influence of the politics and ideology of the 1950s and 1960s on Hungarian historiography was so profound that even the most significant researcher of the history of Hungarian administration, Győző Ember (1909–1993), accepted the view that the Habsburgs impeded the evolution of the Hungarian nation in the early modern era. This perspective resulted, between the 1950s and 1970s, in a very selective use of the sources and consequently led to an idiosyncratic selection of topics and a tendentious assessment of the source material. The debates in the 1960s on the issues of nationalism, firmly attached to the name of Erik Molnár, testify to the contradictions inseparable from this perspective. Yet, these discussions resulted in a number of internationally important professional results such as the surveys, spanning this entire period, published by Jenő Szűcs (1928–1988).
Consequently, the majority of the historical surveys, written during the twenty-five years after World War II, could say little new about the activities of the Kingdom of Hungary, ruled by the Habsburgs, when compared to the important summaries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For this reason, such works largely discussed the confrontation of the Habsburgs with the Transylvanian princes who conducted their own foreign policy. According to these works, these princes, particularly István Bocskai, Gábor Bethlen, and Imre Thököly fought for an “independent Hungary,” albeit with the help of several thousand Ottoman and Tatar troops. Official policies consistently supported this dubious concept. This was demonstrated vividly to the public when during the first half of the 1950s when the statues of the Habsburg rulers (Ferdinand I, Charles III, Maria Theresa, Leopold II, and Francis Joseph) in the Hungarian royal pantheon on Heroes’ Square in Budapest were replaced by the statues of István Bocskai, Gábor Bethlen, Imre Thököly, Ferenc II Rákóczi, and Lajos Kossuth.

Another method for the schematic assessment of the Habsburgs’ Hungarian policies was to show their opposition to the freedom fight and state of Ferenc II Rákóczi, who conducted an armed struggle for independence. The survey by Ágnes R. Várkonyi (b. 1928), Két pogány közt: A Rákóczi-szabadságharc története, revealed this method vividly in four successive editions. This volume was one of the most popular works during the 1970s and 1980s for the students interested in the history of the early modern era, including the author of the present volume. It was decisive in establishing the view of history for the present younger generation. It was thus that the Habsburgs, who wore the royal crown of Hungary just as legitimately as did the Italian Angevines or the Polish Jagielllos, were transformed into conquerors just like the Ottomans who had in fact conquered one third of the country with armed forces.

During the 1960s to 1980s the studies first of Kálmán Benda (1913–1994) and László Makkai (1914–1989) and later of László Benczédi (1929–1986), Katalin Péter (b. 1937), Ferenc Szakály (1942–1999), and Imre Szántó (1920–1993) significantly modified the earlier perspective. Yet, even then, the Hungarian policies of the Habsburgs and the activities of the kingdom were rarely studied on the basis of the resources in the Vienna and Budapest archives. New investigations
focused primarily on the resistance of the Hungarian estates against the centralist or absolutist activities of the rulers and on the various anti-Habsburg movements. In this context, the students of political and administrative history spent most of their time analyzing the rule of János (John) Szapolyai, the evolution of the Transylvanian principality and, first and foremost, the anti-Habsburg campaigns of the Transylvanian princes. The selection of topics relative to the Habsburgs and the Kingdom of Hungary was still frequently one-sided in spite of the lessening of the ideological pressures. In both spirit and professionalism the three volume history of Transylvania can be considered to be a major achievement.

After the 1980s, the anachronistic historical theme of national independence was gradually replaced by the theory of the national unification attempts which originated in Transylvania. This approach is clear in the most significant undertaking of postwar Hungarian historiography, the ten-volume history of Hungary. The two volumes dealing with the period between 1526 and 1686 no longer speak of an independent Hungary, not even in a discussion on Transylvania. The princes are involved only in “anti-Habsburg struggles” and “national unification endeavors” and no longer in fights for freedom or national independence movements. This view was rejected sharply by Ferenc Szakály, one of the greatest experts on the internal matters of the kingdom. In spite of this the above concepts continue to be very much alive.

Yet, even after World War II not every Hungarian historian interpreted the history of the Kingdom of Hungary in the early modern era from the perspective of the anti-Habsburg movements or national independence. In addition to the economic historians to be discussed below, we must particularly recognize H. Éva Balázs (1915–2006), Domokos Kosáry (1913–2007), Ferenc Szakály, and Jenő Szűcs as well as the Hungarian Osmanists who always thought in terms of international relations. While H. Balázs and Kosáry assessed the eighteenth century Habsburg-Hungarian relationships and cultural matters from a new perspective, Szakály studied the role of the Hungarian large estate owners and the Hungarian history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Jenő Szűcs, in his overarching historical essay in 1983, made daring statements like, “The dreams begin by saying that the Habsburgs might have been forestalled….They continue by stating that there
was an idea of some kind of ‘national absolutism’ at work in depths of anti-Habsburg movements. They end by concluding that these movements would have achieved some freedom for the serfs.”21 Even the most ardent representatives of the independence perspective of the 1950s–1970s significantly modified their earlier views.22

The works prepared in a European framework after the 1980s contributed substantially to the beginnings of a gradual reassessment of the Habsburg and Hungarian relations. The independence concept, based on solid nineteenth century traditions resulted in the fact that the post-1526 Habsburg rule of Hungary is given, even today, a biased interpretation. This view becomes less frequent in the professional monographs and is seen primarily in works on the seventeenth century and on the Rákóczi War of Independence.23 The long range effects of the national independence perspective of the 1950s–1970s Hungarian historiography can be seen clearly in the Hungarian historical summaries of Paul Lendvai (b. 1929), the Austrian journalist of Hungarian descent. The chapter introducing the reader to Transylvania is entitled, anachronistically in 2003, “Stronghold of Hungarian Sovereignty.”24 The same is shown in the most recent history of Hungary, written in English, discussing the history of the 150 years after the middle of the sixteenth century under the title of, The Struggle for Independence (1547–1711).25 The proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Hungary in 1989 made it easy to recruit new adherents to the anti-Habsburg nationalist romanticism. Consequently there appeared a series of new summaries which emphasize the early modern era struggle for independence theme. These were not written by professional historians and their arguments were based on the myths and prejudices, which had become part of the public consciousness, and not on valid sources.26

*Turning Points in the History of the Kingdom of Hungary and of the Habsburg Monarchy*

Even though the Rákóczi War of Independence (1703–1711) was evidently a major landmark in the history of the Kingdom of Hungary and of the Habsburg Monarchy, it was not the only turning point in Hungarian-Habsburg relations during the six-
teenth to eighteenth centuries. Turning points need not be endeavors for independence. In the several centuries there were a number of decisive periods which determined the relationship between the kingdom and the monarchy governed by a common ruler. In my view there are three such periods between the Battle of Mohács in 1526 and the time Maria Theresa assumed the throne in 1740. During these periods either the situation and role of the Kingdom of Hungary underwent a significant change, or the Habsburg Monarchy and the ruling court underwent substantive change or the two processes occurred at the same time.

1. One of the decisive periods which had long-lasting effects occurred during the decades immediately after the Battle of Mohács. The central European position of the Kingdom of Hungary underwent significant change and at the same time, and largely due to Hungary, the earlier domains of the Habsburg dynasty also underwent changes which lasted for centuries. Due to these events, the first half of the sixteenth century became one of the most significant periods in Hungarian history.

2. The second, somewhat less significant period was the quarter century after the 1606 Peace Treaty of Vienna. This era was rife with contradictions. During this time, and again largely under foreign influences, the Hungarian estates and the lay elite gained significant strength and then the Thirty Years War (1618–1648) led to major changes and crises in the Habsburg Monarchy. What followed were significant metamorphoses in the Vienna court and in the ruling elite of the Monarchy.

3. Lastly, the third decisive period was the half century between the 1670s and the 1710s. The Hungarian crisis of the 1670s, the so-called Wesselényi Conspiracy, was followed by the almost complete liberation of Hungary from Ottoman rule (1699) and then by the Rákóczi War of Independence. The Treaty of Szatmár, which brought this war to an end in 1711, brought peace and renewal after almost two hundred years of war. The Kingdom of Hungary became one of the most significant, largest, and most appealing components of the Danubian Monarchy. This then offered an opportunity for an internal rearrangement between the kingdom and the monarchy and between the Hungarian political elite and the Habsburg court.
The Fateful but Little Known Sixteenth Century

Of the three turning points it is the Rákóczi War of Independence that we are most familiar with. There are a number of shorter and longer summaries of this event in a variety of languages. Yet, the post-1711 Hungary, with all the changes of the previous fifty years has not yet been the subject of a thorough investigation in an international framework. An understanding of the role of the Hungarian aristocracy and of the higher clergy, loyal to the Habsburgs during the War of Independence, is also fragmentary. This is particularly regrettable because their loyalty made the war a civil war.

During the past two decades there has been a start toward investigations in this area. The majority of these no longer assessed the changes occurring after the 1670s from the perspective of the independence theme of the earlier historiography. The conditions in the eighteenth century have been documented for international historiography by the works of Henrik Marczali, Béla K. Király, and H. Éva Balázs and by the numerous essays by Robert J. W. Evans.

The twenty five years after 1606 have received considerably less attention. The important studies of Kálmán Benda and László Makkai, during the 1960s and 1970s, focused primarily on the years between 1604 and 1608. Since that time only a Russian historian, K.T. Medvedeva, and the authors of several biographies and studies of Bocskai investigated this period in some detail but even they generally limited their studies to the same four years. Thus, the Hungarian and international public, interested in this period, have to rely on the chapter dealing with Hungary in R. J. W. Evans’s monograph, The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700, and on the more recent publications of Jean Bérenger and Tatiana Gusarova on the Hungarian diet as well as on the studies on military history by László Nagy. In addition to these, the recent studies of Péter Tusor on the prelates of the Hungarian Catholic Church are a welcome exception.

In the 1990s the situation was even more unsatisfactory so far as the half century after the Battle of Mohács was concerned. The pre-Mohács Habsburg-Hungarian relations and the battle itself have a considerable literature in a variety of languages. The critically important changes after 1526 were elucidated primarily by the Hungarian eco-
conomic historians. Their work was in keeping with the general flourishing of economic history in Europe and was linked tightly to international investigations. The principal resources for the political conditions of the Kingdom of Hungary in this period are Jozef Karpat’s monograph on the legislative powers and Győző Ember’s exceedingly important administrative history. During the past ten years about a dozen studies, based on basic research, have been published in a variety of languages.

The understanding of the functioning of the Kingdom of Hungary after 1526 and its place in the Habsburg Monarchy has not been helped by the recently published Hungarian and Croatian works on constitutional and administrative history. These works, with the exception of Győző Ember’s monograph, have not been based on archival research but were simply summaries of the scholarly literature. Thus, they do not go beyond the work that had been done before the middle of the twentieth century. The same is true for the two more comprehensive studies of the Habsburg-Hungarian relations. The 1937 survey of Clemens Graf zu Brandis, Die Habsburger und die Stephanskrone, has been largely forgotten by international and Hungarian historiography. While the work is more sympathetic toward Hungary, it has a strong dynastic perspective and is critical of the Hungarian estates. The amateur historian and jurist, János Sára (b. 1923), has little to say about the century after 1526 in his extensive survey published Hungarian, A Habsburgok és Magyarország 950–1918. The volume, written from a Hungarian point of view, is a popular survey of political history and of the events. Little help is provided by a new work written for a wider reading public, which provides a chronological survey of the history of the Habsburgs and of the Croats.

The English-speaking readers were able to obtain during the recent decades surveys of Hungarian history published in English. Because there is more interest in the contemporary era, the history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, however, takes a prominent place and the history of the sixteenth century is given no more than a few pages. Even in these chapters the emphasis is on events, social, religious, and cultural history. They do not discuss the administration and governing structures of the Kingdom of Hungary or its position in the Habsburg Monarchy, or discuss it only in the context of the eighteenth century.
Even less information is provided by the more extensive histories of the Habsburg Empire and Monarchy. Their authors, with the exception of R.J.W. Evans and Emil Niederhauser, make little use of the Hungarian literature. They spend little time of the sixteenth century and focus their attention on the history of the seventeenth to the nineteenth century. Thus Hungary is mentioned only when the Turkish wars, the reformation, or the economic links are discussed.

Among these works, other than the work of Evans, only the monograph by Thomas Winkelbauer represents an exception. This overview studies the period between 1522 and 1699 in two volumes and nearly twelve hundred pages. The author does not use Hungarian primary sources to a great extent but uses the findings of the above-mentioned foreign language publications to the full. Furthermore, when Winkelbauer discusses the state governments of the Habsburg Monarchy, he always includes the structure and major issues of the Kingdom of Hungary.

The Fallacy of the Projection of the Nation-State Concept onto the Early Modern Era

Evans and Winkelbauer study the complex, multi-ethnic and multicultural Habsburg Monarchy in the context of the sixteenth and seventeenth century state formations, i.e. the Austrian hereditary provinces, the lands of the Bohemian, and Hungarian crowns, and the Holy Roman Empire. This perspective is by no means used widely. In the case of the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, particularly Slovakia which became independent in 1993 and Slovenia, and Croatia, which separated from Yugoslavia in 1991, focus on the nation-state perspective and studies in the framework of modern state boundaries are very much alive. Today, they are related particularly to the actual political situation and to the recently attained independent statehood. The lack of historical perspective, relative to the early modern era, is shown clearly in two recent volumes of studies published in the capital of Slovakia. One of them endeavors to analyze the relationship between Slovakia and the Habsburg Monarchy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while the
other one discusses the position of Slovakia within the Monarchy between 1526 and 1918 [sic].46

It must be emphasized that during the early modern era Slovakia did not exist, either as a territorial concept or as a state and thus it could not have been a part of the Habsburg Monarchy. To speak of Slovakia in a sixteenth century context is just as much an anachronism as talking of the thirteenth century history of the United States of America. Assessment of the documents in the above two works is made difficult by the fact that the authors appear to be unfamiliar with the substantial Hungarian professional literature dealing with that period. The result is as if somebody wanted to write the history of the United Kingdom or of the United States of America, being unfamiliar with any language except Spanish.

It is clearly a dubious practice to study the relationship of twentieth century Slovakia to the Habsburgs. In the early modern era Slovakia did not constitute any territorial, political, or administrative unit and was not even an ethnic area. The same is true for the Austrian province of the Burgenland which was created in 1921. As will be shown later, it is incorrect to speak of a united Croatian-Slavonian-Dalmatian kingdom until the second half of the sixteenth century, even though Croatian historiography does this frequently, ever since the nineteenth century, by projecting later conditions and borders back to the entire medieval period.47

It is ahistorical to speak of the Slovakian-Turkish border in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or of the presence of Turks or Fuggers in Slovakia, or of the development of customs in Slovakia, or of Slovakian copper, or of copper mining in Slovakia. It is equally anachronistic to speak of Burgenland in the Turkish era, even though a number of works have been published with such titles during the past decades.48 A somewhat more appropriate solution was chosen by the Slovenian historian Ignacij Voje. Because there was no Slovenia in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries when the area was known as Carniola and partly Styria, he wrote the military history of the former Carniola, inhabited by Austrians and Slovenians, under the title of *Sloveni pod pritiskom turškega nasilja*.49 A similar technique was adopted by Vjekoslav Klaić at the beginning of the twentieth century, who summarized the history of Croatia of his time under the title of *Povijest Hrvata*...50
The works prepared from the perspective of the national state do little to make us understand the system of relations between the central European Habsburg Monarchy and the Kingdom of Hungary in the sixteenth century. The Slovakian, Slovenian and Croatian historians examine the historical processes of a given century by projecting onto the period modern national state borders that were established much later. This is just as inappropriate as the examination of an earlier period from the perspective of a much later national independence movement, as has been done until recently by a number of Hungarian historians. Therefore, the present work endeavors to show the early modern era in the perspective represented by R. J. W. Evans, Thomas Winkelbauer, and Charles W. Ingrao. This is what the title of this monograph attempts to suggest. It therefore speaks of the Kingdom of Hungary and not of Hungary. When I use the term “Hungary,” I am not speaking of the present Republic of Hungary or its territory, but of historic Hungary, namely of the multinational Kingdom of Hungary.

In contrast to my predecessors I do not use the terms Royal Hungary or Habsburg Hungary. The term Royal Hungary suggest, incorrectly, that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were several kingdoms of Hungary, such as the Habsburg kingdom, the Transylvanian kingdom or even a Slavonian kingdom. Furthermore, and more importantly, I do not share the idea that under the name of Royal Hungary, a new entity emerged after 1541 and existed until 1686, or that Royal Hungary emerged from the medieval Kingdom of Hungary as a new state. These views have been held by a number of Hungarian historians. During the era under investigation such concepts were not used and we cannot speak of a Hungary of the Transylvanian princes or of a Hungary of the sultans. The most we can say is Ottoman Hungary. In the latter case the adjective refers to the power elite of the Ottoman Empire, its military and subjects and not to the dynasty. It is much more accurate therefore if we use the names applied to the states at the time, and speak of the Kingdom of Hungary attached to the Habsburg Monarchy and of the Transylvanian principality under the Porte, or of the Ottoman Empire.

Following the lead of my colleagues abroad I do not use the term Habsburg Empire when writing about the central European state of the Habsburgs under Ferdinand I, but refer to it under the more appropri-
ate term of Habsburg Monarchy, which indicates its composite state and multinational nature.\textsuperscript{53} I limit the term Habsburg Empire to the great dynastic conglomerate of Charles V. The term empire (\textit{Reich}), by itself is used only for Holy Roman Empire (\textit{Heiliges Römisches Reich Deutscher Nation} or \textit{Altes Reich}). Turkish power is always referred to as the Ottoman Empire and its ruling class is referred to as Ottomans and Ottoman elite. For primarily stylistic reasons, and in keeping with the traditions of earlier historiography, I refer to the leaders and to the military both as Turks and as Ottomans.

\textit{On Sources and New Researches}

This monograph investigates the system of relationships between the Kingdom of Hungary and the Habsburg Monarchy between 1526 and 1608. I endeavor to analyze it in an international framework, but from a Hungarian perspective. Such analysis has been largely ignored. I emphasize international conditions, administration, the imperial and royal court, military and financial matters, and economics. I also discuss domestic policies, the estates and the political elite and, in general, the functional mechanisms of the Kingdom of Hungary. Relative to these, I have included a discussion of state sovereignty and of the important ceremonies and symbols of power.

My approach is similar to the one used during the past decade by Jaroslav Pánek, Winfried Eberhard, Josef Valka, Joachim Bahlcke, Václav Bůžek, Petr Vorel, and Petr Mat’a in describing the history of the Bohemian crown lands in the sixteenth century and their position within the Habsburg Monarchy and by Thomas Winkelbauer and Karin J. MacHardy in their work on the Austrian provinces.\textsuperscript{54} Religious, cultural and scientific relationships are not discussed because they are independent of borders and because the readers can learn about them from the works of a number of my domestic and foreign colleagues, in a variety of languages.\textsuperscript{55}

My monograph is primarily a summary of my archival research in Austria, Hungary, Slovakia, Croatia, Germany, and Czech Republic. In Vienna, Budapest, Sankt Pölten, Graz, Nuremberg, Prague, and Brno I worked primarily on the government institutions and on the estates. In
Budapest, Bratislava and Zagreb I did my work primarily on the former Hungarian and Croatian aristocratic families, the Batthyány, Draskovics, Erdődy, Nádasdy, Pálffy, Révay, Thurzó, Zay, etc. The best sources were provided by the three major collections of the Österre-ichisches Staatsarchiv in Vienna, the Haus,- Hof,- und Staatsarchiv, the Hofkammerarchiv and the Kriegsarchiv and by the Hungarian National Archives (Magyar Országos Levéltár). In the Haus,- Hof,- und Staats-
archiv, for instance, I reviewed every item in the court records (Hof-
staatsverzeichisse) and I have also used many items from the archives’ almost inexhaustible Hungarian collection, the Ungarische Akten. I also profited greatly from the documents in the Hofkammerarchiv which pertained to Hungary (Hoffinanz Ungarn). In the same archive I reviewed, volume by volume, the Hofzahlenstabücher collection and almost every one of the documents pertaining to Hungarian family matters (Familienakten). I acted in a similar fashion with the most important collections of the Kriegsarchiv, including the Akten des Wiener Hofkriegsrates, the Bestallungen, the Hofkriegsrätschliches Kanzleiarchiv, and the Alte Feldakten, which contain much material pertinent to the sixteenth century history of Hungary. In Budapest, in addition to the family archives, I studied the documents in the Magyar Kamara
Archívuma (Hungarian Chamber Archives).

The preparation of my summaries was greatly assisted by the valuable work performed in these same archives, after the 1980s, by Hungarian, Austrian, German, Czech, and other colleagues. Ferenc Szakály, Lajos Gecsényi, and more recently H. István Németh produced internationally significant works on economic affairs, Zoltán Fallenbichl, István Kenyeres, and Peter Rauscher did the same on financial connections. József Kelenik, György Domokos, and Péter Zoltán Bagi made significant contributions in military matters. The work of Jaroslava Hausenblasová, Jeroen Duindam, Mark Hengerer, Katrin Keller, and Václav Bůžek made significant discoveries in the matter of the Vienna and Prague Court and were most helpful to me with their monographs and essays.56

More recently József Bessenyei, Gabriella Erdélyi, István Fazekas, András Kolttai, and Natasa Štefanec uncovered new source material about the Hungarian aristocracy and higher clergy. The same was done for the higher Bohemian and Moravian nobility by Petr Mat’a, Petr
Vorel, Tomáš Knoz, Václav Bůžek and his pupils, Josef Hrdlička, Pavel Král, Zdeněk Vybiral, etc. Since the writings of Gábor Barta in the 1980s on this subject, Teréz Oborní, Cristina Feneșan, Sándor Papp, Tamás Kruppa, and Meinolf Arens have published more recently on János Szapolyai, king of Hungary, and on the relationship of the Transylvanian Principality with the Habsburgs. The Ottomans’ goals in Hungary and their rule in that country were made available to international historiography through the archival revelations of Gábor Ágoston, Géza Dávid, Pál Fodor, Klára Hegyi, Mária Ivanics, Gyula Káldy-Nagy, Antal Molnár, Sándor Papp, and Ferenc Szakály.\(^{57}\)

Thus, this volume, using the eighteenth century survey of Éva H. Balázs as a model, endeavors to show the sixteenth century Habsburg-Hungarian relations, the functional mechanisms of an old realm, the Kingdom of Hungary, and its place during the early modern era in a new monarchy, the composite state of the Austrian Habsburgs in central Europe. This is done on the basis of new archival researches and with a broader and more objective perspective.