

## ABSTRACTS

**Gergely Bődök**

■ ***A Comparison of Béla Kun's and Miklós Horthy's Career, Personal and Political profile***

Keywords: *Béla Kun, Miklós Horthy, 20<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian history*

Kun, the Foreign Affairs Commissioner of the Revolutionary Governing Council, and Miklós Horthy, the Minister of Defense of the Counter-Revolutionary Government in Szeged, the Commander of the National Army, and later the Governor of the country for a quarter of a century, are controversial and divisive figures of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian history. This study compares the personal and political profile of these two leaders on the basis of the historical achievements of the past hundred years. Beyond their starting position and their origins, there are far more important differences in their ideological positions and identity. Their careers, however, also present some similarities (e.g. the circumstances of their accession to power and the international aspects of their failure).

**Gábor Hausner**

■ ***Was Miklós Zrínyi, the Poet, a Rebel?***

Keywords: *Miklós Zrínyi, 17<sup>th</sup> century, rebellio versus reformatio, peace versus war*

In the documents we have access to today – i.e. Zrínyi's own works, his letters, and the contemporary documents – do not present any traces of rebellious political attitudes or Zrínyi's support for any rebellious political movement. Instead of 'rebellio', he always uses the word 'reformatio': the renewal of the military and society, unity instead of dissension, serving the interests of the bonum publicum instead of the privatum, and heroic virtue and self-sacrifice instead of otium. His wide interests in the domain of political theory have crystallized around ideologies such as Machiavellianism and French abso-

lutism. Military reasons have also made him a devotee of order, discipline, social stability, and legality. Nevertheless, an interesting characteristic of his devotion for order is that its goal is not peace, but war.

**Géza Hegyi – András W. Kovács**

■ ***On the History of the Peasant Revolt of Bobâlna***

Keywords: *peasant revolt, 1437-1438, Transylvania*

The peasant revolt of 1437-1438 is one of the most researched moments of medieval Transylvania. The present study modifies the current literature on the topic on three accounts. 1) The Nădaș parts, the segment of the Land of Călata which stretches along the river Nădaș, cannot be regarded as one of the centres of the revolt. The uprising barely extended to Alba and Turda counties and did not reach Târnava county at all. 2) The second battle between the peasants' troops and the voivode's army took place probably near Apatiu but surely not in the valley of the Someșul Mic river as stated by earlier literature. The mistaken data was based on a diploma assumed to have been issued by Transylvanian vice-voivode Lóránd Lépes Váraskeszi on September 30, 1437, which however has turned out to be one of the forgeries of count József Kemény (1795-1855). 3) The scene of the fraternatio established on September 16, 1437, the market-town Căpâlna, has been mistakenly identified as the settlement Căpâlna, nearby Dej, in Solnocul interior county. Based on further research into the settlement history of Transylvania, it can be stated that the Union was formed in what is today known as Căpâlna de Sus, in Târnava county.

**Róbert Hermann**

■ ***Lajos Kossuth, the Eternal Rebel?***

Keywords: *Lajos Kossuth, bourgeois transformation, national autonomy*

Among the historical figures of 19<sup>th</sup> Hungarian history, Kossuth is counted

among the persons prepared to fight for the cause of the bourgeois transformation and national autonomy even with illegal means. This study seeks an answer to the question whether he was really a rebel. According to its arguments, this categorisation can only be applied to some of the stages of his political career and with important stipulations. In the Hungarian Reform Era, Kossuth took not of the existing political framework and has fought for their change with legal means. The spring of 1848, however, created a completely new situation for him, but he nevertheless insisted on the observance of legality. After April 1849, he considered that Hungary has no future within the Habsburg empire, and his struggle was directed at escaping its confines.

**Melinda Kalmár**

■ ***Paradoxes of Political Resistance and Cooperation***

Keywords: *Imre Nagy, János Kádár, Hungarian history after 1945, “unwillingly rebellious”, “retaliatory-pacifier”*

Historical consciousness leaning towards symbolic thinking attaches just as great importance to epoch-representing personalities as to culturally established caesuras or spectacular political gestures. Very often these serve as orientation points to measure actors, events and also origins and consequences of the processes. The political personae of Imre Nagy and János Kádár with their complex and enigmatic attitudes stand out from the cultic, symbolic political figures of Hungarian history after 1945. The simplest, quasi-complementary topoi associated with them are the image of the “unwillingly rebellious” and the “retaliatory-pacifier”. The continual rethinking of these highly compressed notions can help us get closer to understanding the dynamics of historical rebellion and the need for political status quo. When comparing the activities of the two politicians,

one must not ignore the fact that these crossed each other in the interplay of mutually diverging Soviet strategies. Therefore, the question is not only what their inherent political origins were, but also what directions they were forced to take by the circumstances.

**Ágnes Kovács**

■ ***Two Rebels of the Early 18<sup>th</sup> Century: Rákóczi and Károlyi***

Keywords: *Ferenc Rákóczi, Sándor Károlyi, war of independence, Habsburg absolutism*

After the 1687/88 Diet, an ample resistance against Habsburg absolutism has built up in Hungary. However, the opinions about the solutions were divided. Some hoped for a political solution of the conflict, while others have put their trust into an armed uprising and fought for eight years against the Habsburgs. This study calls attention to the fact that the rebels themselves have not always been united in all respects. At the same time, the decisions of the prince cannot be adequately interpreted without taking into account his special social and family situation.

**Ignác Romsics**

■ ***The Wesselényi-Conspiracy***

Keywords: *Ferenc Wesselényi (Palatine), György Lippay (Archbishop of Esztergom), Ferenc Nádasdy (Lord Chief Justice), Péter Zrínyi (Ban of Croatia), emperor Leopold I of Habsburg*

Although the Ottoman forces heading towards Vienna suffered a crushing defeat from the Christian troops on 1 August 1664 near Szentgotthárd, the imperial War Council decided to sign a peace that recognized all of the previous Turkish conquests and forbade the pursuit of the fleeing enemy. From the Viennese court's standpoint, this was a logical decision, because the ruler, Leopold I was preoccupied with the impending extinction of the Spanish Habsburg dynasty and the inevitable war of succession that would break out. The troops were

being kept in reserve for this. The Hungarian nobles, however, who hoped that the victory would signal the start of an anti-Turkish campaign, which would result in the whole of Hungary being liberated, became deeply dismayed. The most illustrious dignitaries of the country – Ferenc Wesselényi (Palatine), György Lippay (Archbishop of Esztergom), Ferenc Nádasdy (Lord Chief Justice) and Péter Zrínyi (Ban of Croatia) – all swore to oppose the emperor in order to create a Hungary independent from the Habsburgs with foreign help. After long preparations this conspiracy led to the armed uprising in 1670, that came, however, to naught and the Viennese court made an example of the plotters to serve as warning. It sentenced the chief conspirators to death by beheading and to loss of lands; the rest saw part or all of their property confiscated. It was following this that Leopold proclaimed the so-called legal forfeiture doctrine as the pretext for introducing open monarchical absolutism. Due to the resistance of the Hungarian nobility, however, his attempt failed.

**György Szabados**

■ ***The Rivalry of Two Kinsmen – on the Conflict of two Árpáds, Koppány and Stephen***

Keywords: *King Stephen I the Saint, Koppány, warlord of Somogy, Árpád-dynasty, conflict*

In 997, a fateful battle came to pass between two kinsmen of the Hungarian ruling dynasty. The later King Stephen I the Saint defeated the powerful warlord of Somogy, called Koppány, who was the son of Szerind the Bald. According to the chronicle, Koppány wanted to marry Stephen's mother, to kill Stephen himself and to

get the supreme power over the Hungarians. In this battle Koppány, was killed, his dead body was quartered and was sent to Esztergom, Veszprém, Győr and Erdély. Only few solid aspects can help us to reconstruct their conflict. Koppány was surely the member of the Árpád-dynasty (he was originated from an elder line), otherwise he would have had no right to claim the throne and the marriage with Sarolt, widow of Great Prince Géza (the ancient custom of the levirate came from the steppe). As Géza and his son Stephen descended from the youngest son of Árpád, the battle with Koppány brought the clash of the old and the new order represented by the heathen and the Christian lines of the same ruling house of Hungary.

**Attila Zsoldos**

■ ***The Rebellious King and the Traditionalist Prince***

Keywords: *Andrew II of Hungary, Béla IV of Hungary, reforms versus absolute power, conflict*

This study reviews the history and the nature of the conflict between Andrew II of Hungary (1205-1235) and his oldest son, prince Béla, the later king Béla IV of Hungary (1235-1270). This conflict was not centred upon the throne, but on the reforms of Andrew, radically altering the way in which power was exercised. Béla was firmly confident that the restoration of the absolute power of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> century is only a matter of will and determination. Although their views were radically opposed, they did not lead to any bloody confrontation. Andrew did not have to fear his son's claims to the throne, and Béla could be certain that he will eventually come to exercise his power according to his preferences.

## SZÁMUNK SZERZŐI

A lapszámot szerkesztette:  
**Kovács Kiss Gyöngy**

**Beretvás Gábor** (1978) – filmesztéta, filmtörténész, Kolozsvár

**Bödök Gergely** (1983) – történész-doktorandus, Eszterházy Károly Egyetem, Eger, Clio Intézet, ügyvezető  
**Csorba László** (1952) – történész, az MTA doktora, egyetemi tanár, ELTE, Budapest

**Erdei Virág** (1998) – egyetemi hallgató, BBTE, Kolozsvár

**Estók János** (1958) – történész, CSc, főigazgató, Magyar Mezőgazdasági Múzeum és Könyvtár, Budapest

**Hausner Gábor** (1960) – alezredes, PhD, Nemzeti Közszolgálati Egyetem – Hadtudományi és Honvédtisztképző Kar, Budapest

**Hegyi Géza** (1981) – tudományos munkatárs, PhD, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, Kolozsvár

**Hermann Róbert** (1963) – történész, az MTA doktora, tudományos tanácsadó, HM Hadtörténelmi Intézet és Múzeum, egyetemi tanár, Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem, Budapest

**Kalmár Melinda** (1959) – történész, PhD, tudományos főmunkatárs, Szegedi Tudományegyetem

**Kerekes Pál** (1951) – címzetes egyetemi docens, ELTE BTK Könyvtár- és Információtudományi Intézet, Budapest

**Kész Orsolya** (1994) – mesterképzős hallgató, BBTE, Kolozsvár

**Kovács Ágnes** (1946) – történész, ny. egyetemi docens, Debreceni Egyetem

**W. Kovács András** (1975) – tudományos munkatárs, PhD, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, Kolozsvár

**Kőbányai János** (1951) – író, szociográfus, főszerkesztő, Múlt és Jövő, Budapest

**Kürti Andrea** (1987) – illusztrátor, Kolozsvár

**Romsics Ignác** (1951) – történész, az MTA rendes tagja, egyetemi tanár, Eszterházy Károly Egyetem, Eger

**Szabados György** (1971) – történész, PhD, Szent István Király Múzeum, Székesfehérvár

**Zsoldos Attila** (1962) – történész, az MTA rendes tagja, tudományos tanácsadó, témacsoport-vezető, MTA BTK TTI, Budapest

TÁMOGATÓK



**nka**  
Nemzeti Kulturális Alap



CONSILIUL JUDEȚEAN  
CLUJ



MINISTERUL CULTURII ȘI  
IDENTITĂȚII NAȚIONALE

„Zrínyi Pétertől eltérően Wesselényi nem sokat várt a francia udvartól, attól pedig, hogy a magyar trónra egy francia herceg üljön, kifejezetten idegenkedett. A felső-magyarországi protestáns nemsek többségével együtt ehelyett inkább a Porta felé tekingetett. Az a korábban általa is vallott koncepció, hogy a török kiűzése Habsburg segítséggel elképzelhető, sőt csak úgy képzelhető el, idejét múltá – vélte. A történelem miatt nincs más alternatíva, mint amit János király egy évszázaddal korábban, Bethlen Gábor pedig a 17. század első harmadában képviselt: a török–magyar szövetségé. A nádor úgy képzelte, hogy a magyar nemzet a szultán védnöksége alá helyezi magát, s belső ügyeinek szabad intézése, továbbá a szabad királyválasztás fejében évi 50–100 ezer talléros »tiszteletdíjat«  
fizet a Portának. Vagyis az egész országnak az erdélyi fejedelemségéhez hasonló státust képzelt el. »Wesselényi a lépése – állapította meg a katolikus és Habsburg-barát szemléletéről ismert Székfi Gyula is – a sok fantasztikus és felelőtlen terv közt – egyetlen logikus következménye volt Montecuccoli és az udvar vétkes török politikájának.«”

(Romsics Ignác)

ISSN 1222 8338



5 LEI  
500 FT

ADEPTII AI ORDINII ȘI REBELI ÎN ISTORIA MAGHIARĂ  
COMPROMISERS AND REBELS IN HUNGARIAN  
HISTORY