

Armed Memory

Agency and Peasant Revolts in Central
and Southern Europe (1450–1700)



Academic Studies

27

Gabriella Erdélyi, *Armed Memory*

V&R Academic

Refo500 Academic Studies

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In Co-operation with
Günter Frank (Bretten), Bruce Gordon, (New Haven),
Ute Lotz-Heumann (Tucson), Mathijs Lamberigts (Leuven),
Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer (Bern), Tarald Rasmussen (Oslo),
Johannes Schilling (Kiel), Günther Wassilowsky (Linz),
Siegfried Westphal (Osnabrück), David M. Whitford (Waco).

Volume 27

Gabriella Erdélyi (ed.)

Armed Memory

**Agency and Peasant Revolts in Central and
Southern Europe (1450–1700)**

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 18 figures

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

ISSN 2197-0165

ISBN 978-3-647-55097-8

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website: www.v-r.de

© 2016, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, 37073 Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.
www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means,
electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and
retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting by Konrad Triltsch GmbH, Ochsenfurt

Contents

Acknowledgements	9
List of Contributors	11
List of Illustrations	15
Gabriella Erdélyi Introduction	19

Part I Revolt Territories: European and Transnational Contexts

Peter Blickle Revolten in Europa 1200–1800	41
Katalin Péter The Other Way. Negotiating Freedom in a <i>Gutsherrschaft</i> Country, the Kingdom of Hungary, in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries	59
Marco Gentile In Search of the Italian “Common Man.” Rethinking the 1462 Peasant Uprising in the Territory of Piacenza	83

Part II Utopia and Vision: Religious Radicalism

Martin Rothkegel Institutionalisierte Rebellion. Aufsässige Praktiken der Hutterischen Täufer in Mähren	121
---	-----

Pál Ács	
Falsorum fratrum rebellio. Jenő Szűcs's Essays on the Peasant Revolt of György Dózsa 40 Years Later	137
Zoltán Csepregi	
Bund, Bundschuh, Verbundenheit. Radikales Gemeinschaftsprinzip in der frühen Reformation Ungarns	147
Part III Unfinished Pasts: Early Modern Narratives of Revolts	
Farkas Gábor Kiss	
Ambiguity and Paradox in the Humanistic Literature of the Jagiellonian Age	171
László Szörényi	
Das Epos „ <i>Matthiados carmina heroica</i> “ von Ioannes Bocatius (Kaschau, 1614)	191
Gabriella Erdélyi	
The Memory War of the Dózsa Revolt in Hungary	201
Gergely Tóth	
Caught in the Web of Interpretations. The 1514 Peasant War in Early Modern Hungarian Historiography	223
Part IV Modern Images: Revolt Representations in the 19th and 20th Centuries	
Nataša Štefanec	
Why Did Gubec Have to Die Dózsa's Death? Historical Representations of the Croatian Peasant Rebellion of 1573 and of Its Leader's Public Execution	251
Márton Szilágyi	
Der Bauernkrieg von 1514 als Exemplum. Die literarischen Dózsa-Interpretationen im 19. Jahrhundert	281
Giorgio Politi	
Spontane Generation einer Fälschung. Michael Gaismair und „seine“ sogenannte Landesordnung	289

Erzsébet Tatai

Dózsa '72. The Visual Representation of György Dózsa in the Middle of
the Kádár Era 301

Márta Fata

War György Dózsa der ungarische Thomas Müntzer? Erinnerungskultur
und Geschichtspolitik in der Volksrepublik Ungarn und in der DDR im
Vergleich 323

Index 353

Acknowledgements

The studies in this volume were originally conceived as papers for the conference *Revolt, Violence and Memory: Peasant Uprisings in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, that was held in Budapest in May 2014. The conference, funded by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS), was a REFO500 event and part of the research agenda of the HAS Research Centre for the Humanities (RCH), entitled *500 Years of Hungarian Reformation in European Context. Histories, Traditions, and Scholarship (2012–2017)*. The publication of the conference proceedings was financially supported by the Hungarian National Research Fund (research project OTKA-81435). We are grateful to the editorial board of the REFO500 Academic Series and the anonymous peer reviewers for their invaluable suggestions. We thank the scrupulous work of our copy-editors Sean Lambert and Andreas Schmidt-Schweizer and the project's assistants Réka Krizmanics and András Péterfi at HAS RCH, who offered a dedicated assistance throughout the editorial process. We are also greatly indebted to Elke Liebig and Christoph Spill at Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht publishers for their enthusiasm and support in seeing this volume through the press.

List of Contributors

Pál Ács is senior research fellow at the Research Centre for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He is honorary professor of Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest) and editor of the journal *Magyar Könyvszemle* [Hungarian Book Review]. He is the author of *Átszitált idő. Tinóditól Tandoriig* [Sifted Time. From Tinódi to Tandori], Budapest, 2015; “Az idő ósága” – *Történetiség és történetsszemlélet a régi magyar irodalomban* [“The Antiquity of Time”–Historicity and Historical Vision in Early Modern Hungarian Literature], Budapest, 2002.

Peter Blickle is professor emeritus of modern history at the University of Berne. He has published on legal history: *Landschaften im Alten Reich* (München, 1973); *Kommunalismus* (2 vols, München, 2000); on Reformation history: *Die Revolution von 1525* (4th edn, München, 2004), and *Gemeindereformation* (München, 1985). He is the editor of one of the seven volumes of *The Origins of the Modern State in Europe*, Resistance, Representation and Community (Oxford, 1997), and of the *Handbuch der Geschichte Europas* (9 vols, Stuttgart 2001–12).

Zoltán Csepregi is professor and Head of the Institute for Church History at the Lutheran University (Budapest). He is DSc of literary science (2011, Budapest). He has specialized in early modern Protestant movements and is involved in the publication of early modern texts in Latin and German (editor of “Martin Luther’s Selected Works”: *Luther Válogatott Művei*). His books include *Magyar pietizmus, 1700–1756* [Hungarian Pietism, 1700–1756] (Budapest, 2000), and *A reformáció nyelve. Tanulmányok a magyarországi reformáció első negyedszázadának vizsgálatára alapján* [The Language of the Reformation. Studies on the Early Reformation in Hungary]. Budapest, 2013.

Gabriella Erdélyi is senior research fellow in the Institute of History (Research Centre for the Humanities) of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest. She is editor of *The Hungarian Historical Review* (2013–). She has recently

published *A Cloister on Trial. Religious Culture and Everyday Life in Late Medieval Hungary* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).

Márta Fata is fellow at the Institut für donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde and lecturer at the Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. Her research interests comprise the history of migration, the history of memory, confessionalization, German-Hungarian relations in the Early Modern and the Modern Period. Her most recent book is *Migration im kameralistischen Staat Josephs II. Theorie und Praxis der Ansiedlungspolitik in Ungarn, Siebenbürgen, Galizien und der Bukowina von 1768 bis 1790* (Münster, 2014).

Marco Gentile is senior lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Parma and member of the editorial board of the journal *Società e Storia*. He was awarded a PhD in Historical Studies from the University of Trent (2003), and was Dombrowski Fellow in history at Villa I Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies (2005–2006). His research focus is late medieval Italian society and forms of political conflict. He is the author of *Fazioni al governo. Politica e società a Parma nel Quattrocento* (Rome: Viella, 2009), editor of *Guelfi e ghibellini nell'Italia del Rinascimento* (Rome: Viella, 2005), and co-editor of *Noblesse et états princiers en Italie et en France au XV^e siècle* (Rome: école Française de Rome, 2009).

Farkas Gábor Kiss is a specialist on Latin and Hungarian literature in the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance. He has taught at the Eötvös University of Budapest and in the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies at the University of Innsbruck. His interests include Central European humanism, the history of reading, the relationship between the vernaculars and Latin, and late medieval art of memory. Currently he is the head of the *Humanism in East Central Europe* “Lendület” research group, a five-year research project funded by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. His main projects at present are the publication of an anthology of late medieval texts on the art of memory from East Central Europe (with Lucie Dolezalova and Rafal Wójcik) and an in-depth study of texts and transmissions of authors from Hungary in the period 1420–1620, resulting in a *Verfasserlexikon* for this region.

Katalin Péter is professor emeritus of the Institute of History (Research Centre for the Humanities) of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and also professor emeritus of the Central European University. She has published widely on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century history. Her tropics range from the Protestant Reformation to the history of the family. She is the editor of *Beloved Children. The History of Aristocratic Childhood in Hungary in the Early Modern Age* (Budapest and New

York: CEU Press, 2000) and her most recent book is *Magánélet a régi Magyarországon* [Private Life in Early Modern Hungary], Budapest, 2012.

Giorgio Politi is professor at Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy. He is the author of *La società cremonese nella prima età spagnola* (Milano: Unicopli, 2002), which reconsiders the role of the Spanish Habsburgs in Italy. He specializes in the history of European peasant revolts, which is marked by such monographs as *Gli statuti impossibili. La rivoluzione tedesca del 1525 e il "programma" di Michael Gaismair* (Torino: Einaudi, 1975) and *La storia lingua morta. Manifesto. Il telaio incantato, Il caso Thomas Müntzer* (Milano: Unicopli 2011).

Martin Rothkegel studied Protestant Theology (ThD, Charles University Prague, 2001) and Classical Philology (PhD, University of Hamburg, 2005). He is Professor of Church History at the Theologische Hochschule Elstal near Berlin, Germany. His research interests are focused on the Radical Reformation and Humanism in East Central Europe. He is the editor of the series *Bibliotheca Dissidentium. Répertoire des non-conformistes religieux des seizième et dix-septième siècles* (Baden-Baden: Éditions Valentin Koerner).

Nataša Štefanec is associate professor at the History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences and vice-director of the Postgraduate Doctoral Studies in Early Modern History at the University of Zagreb. She was awarded PhD in history by the Central European University (Budapest) in 2004. She has published two monographs, co-edited several volumes and published numerous articles. Her research interest comprises early modern Croatian history in a wider regional and imperial framework, the history of the military border systems in Central and Southeastern Europe as well as administrative, institutional and legal organization and development of the Habsburg-Ottoman military frontier. More recently, she has focused on migrations and socio-cultural practices on the Habsburg-Ottoman borderland.

Márton Szilágyi (DSc) is professor and Head of Department at Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest). He specializes in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Hungarian literature. He was guest professor at the University of Vienna (2002–2004). He wrote a monograph on the Hungarian-language journal *Uránia*, published at the end of the eighteenth century (*Kármán József és Pajor Gáspár Urániája*. Debrecen, 1998). He is also prolific as the editor of contemporary literary texts (works by Ferenc Kölcsey, Ferenc Kazinczy). His most recent book is *A költő társadalmi helye. Csokonai Vitéz Mihály pályafutásának mikrotörténeti dimenziói* [The Social Position of the Poet. The Microhistorical Dimensions of the Career of Mihály Csokonai Vitéz], Budapest, 2014.

László Szörényi is professor emeritus of the Institute for Literary Studies (Research Centre for the Humanities) of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and also professor emeritus of the University of Szeged. He was Director of the Institute for Literary Studies (1997–2012). He is a prolific scholar of humanism, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century neo-Latin poetry in Hungary and Europe as well as modern literature. He recently published *Harmóniára teremtve. Tanulmányok Mátyás királyról* [Created for Harmony. Studies on King Matthias], (Budapest, 2012) and *Petrarca Budapesten. Esszék, tanulmányok* [Petarch in Budapest. Essays and Studies], Budapest, 2011; 2nd edition: 2015.

Erzsébet Tatai is senior research fellow at the Institute for Art History of the Research Center for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. As the chief curator of the Műcsarnok [Kunsthalle] in Budapest (2001–2002) and director of the Bartók 32 Gallery (Budapest, 1993–199) she was curator of about seventy exhibitions. She has published one monograph (*Neo-Conceptual Art in Hungary in the Nineties*, Budapest, 2005, in Hungarian) and co-edited *Conceptual Art at the Turn of the Millenium. Konceptuálne umenie na zlome tisícročí. Konceptuális művészet az ezredfordulón* (With Jana Geržová, Budapest–Bratislava, 2002). She has published numerous essays and studies on contemporary art, iconography and feminist visual culture.

Gergely Tóth is research fellow in the Institute of History (Research Centre for the Humanities) of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He was awarded his PhD in History at the Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest) in 2008. He is a specialist on early modern historiography in Hungary and neo-Latin philology. His major project is the publication of the works of the historian Mátyás Bél (1684–1749), of which he has published three volumes (Matthias Bel, *Notitia Hungariae novae historico-geographica. Comitatum ineditorum* Tomus I–III, Budapest, 2011–15).

List of Illustrations

Gabriella Erdélyi

- Fig 1. The execution of Dózsa on the front page of Stephanus Taurinus, *Staurromachia* (Vindobonae, 1519). With the permission of the National Széchényi Library (Budapest), Régi Nyomtatványok Tára (Collection of Old Prints) Apponyi Hungarica, no. 137.
- Fig 2. The execution of Dózsa in Paul Ricaut, *Die Neu eröffnete Ottomanische Pforte* (Augsburg, 1694) vol. 2, p. 106. Library and Information Center of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Oriental Collection.

Giorgio Politi

- Fig. 1. „Gaismairs“ sogenannte Landesordnung: Wasserzeichen aus der Wiener Abschrift (Ochsenköpfe mit einer Schlange mit doppelter Kontur). Haus-, Hof- u. Staatsarchiv Wien, Reichskanzlei, Oesterreichischen Akten, Abteilung Tirol, Generalia Faszikel 2, Fol. 3; G. Piccard, *Die Wasserzeichenkartei Piccard im Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart*, Findbuch II/I, Abteilung XVI, Typ 331, Stuttgart 1966.
- Fig. 2. „Gaismairs“ sogenannte Landesordnung: Wasserzeichen aus der Brixner Abschrift (Doppeladler) Archivio diocesano Bressanone/Brixen, Archivio aulico/Hofarchiv, N. 16575; C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes. Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier dès leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, Gêneve 1907, *Aigle, Aigle à deux têtes*, Tafel Nr. 285; Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, *Die Wasserzeichensammlung Piccard* (J 340), s. www.piccard-online.de.

- Fig. 3. „Gaismairs“ sogenannte Landesordnung, Wiener Abschrift (Detail): Haus-, Hof- u. Staatsarchiv Wien, Reichskanzlei, Oesterreichischen Akten, Abteilung Tirol, Generalia Faszikel 2, 5a.
- Fig. 4. „Gaismairs“ sogenannte Landesordnung, Wiener Abschrift (Detail): Haus-, Hof- u. Staatsarchiv Wien, Reichskanzlei, Oesterreichischen Akten, Abteilung Tirol, Generalia Faszikel 2, 4b.

Erzsébet Tatai

- Fig. 1. András Váci: *In Memory of Dózsa I.* 1972, etching, 489x296 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.237. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 2. Imre Kovács: *In Remembrance of Peasants Revolts I. Execution of György Dózsa, Zincography*, 140x196 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.232. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 3. Mihály Gács: *Lords' Vengeance*, linocut, 331x505 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.230. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 4. Vladimír Szabó: *In Memory of Dózsa*, pencil, 600x750 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. F. 73.157. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 5. Árpád Bognár: *Dózsa III.* 1972, etching, 297x396 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.236. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 6. Gábor Pásztor: *1514.* 1972, fiber pen, 430x307 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. F 73.149. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 7. Tibor Zala: *His Spirit Fire Could not Burn (Dózsa).* 1972, colored lithograph, 610x430 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.249. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 8. Endre Sziráki: *Humans, Wolves IV.* 1972, lithograph, 316x430 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G.73.234. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 9. Gábor Rádóczy Gyarmathy: *Hunger.* 1970, color etching, 591x480 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. G. 73.250. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 10. Ferenc Banga: *Suspense 1514.* 1971, China ink, 420x600 mm. Museum of Fine Arts, Hungarian National Gallery Inv. F 73.153. Photo: Zsuzsa Berényi.
- Fig. 11. István Bodóczy: *Dózsa.* 1972, oil, canvas, 150x110 cm. Private property. Photo: courtesy of the artist.

Fig. 12. Dóra Maurer: *Looking for Dózsa!* 1972, fiberboard, paper, collage, pencil, 62x100 cm. Pécs, Janus Pannonius Múzeum Inv. 74.71. Photo: István Füzi.

Gabriella Erdélyi

Introduction

The Faces of Peasants

There remains a vivid picture in academic circles, the larger public and in school books of the peasantry living east of the Elbe as being “exploited” and “overburden” with forced labor. Furthermore, peasants endured this passively as they sank into the state of “second serfdom” at the time when free peasant ownership and personal status emerged in the West due to the active resistance of the peasants there. This notion of a dual Western and Eastern model of European peasantry—the systems of *Grundherrschaft* versus *Gutsherrschaft*—reached its most extensive version, both in terms of its geographical scope as well as its theses, during the time when Europe was divided by the Iron Curtain.¹ In response to this long-established paradigm based on the concept of two enormous regions, over more recent decades the earlier observation—going back to Otto Brunner himself—seems to have become prevalent again: that the immense diversity of peasant conditions in Europe renders any grand-scale comparison meaningless.² As a result, local studies and national frameworks dominate the field of the history of late medieval and early modern European rural society.³

1 On the historiography of the model see András Vári, “Kelet- és Nyugat-Európa agrártársadalmi dualizmusa – tavalyi hó?,” *Korall. Társadalomtörténeti Folyóirat* 15–16 (2004): 117–44; Idem, “Wirrwarr der Herrschaftstypen? Herrschaftselemente und regionale Typologien von Herrschaft über Bauern,” in *Historie und Eigen-Sinn: Festschrift für Jan Peters zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Axel Lubinski, Thomas Rudert, and Martina Schattkowsky (Weimar: Böhlau, 1997), 115–27.

2 See the results of the project called *Potsdamer Studien zur Geschichte der ländlichen Gesellschaft* (Böhlau: Cologne–Weimar–Vienna, 2001–2003), 4 vols. For more thoughts on this issue see Katalin Péter’s chapter in this book.

3 As the editors of this collective volume note, the effort at a new comparison of European servile status was induced by the lack of such modern scholarly output. Contributions in the book stress the fundamental local variations of the conditions of serfdom. Paul Freedman and Monique Bourin, eds., *Forms of Servitude in Northern and Central Europe: Decline, Resistance, and Expansion* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005). This impression is also reinforced by the survey by

Is there a viable alternative to the oversimplified model shaped by political ideologies and the empiricist narratives of a protean social reality? By its focus on peasant revolts, the present edited volume attempts to narrate, on the one hand, the entangled history of peasants and, on the other hand, to reflect upon the entangled memories of revolts and of their leaders.⁴ Such an approach is based on the assumption that rebellions—I use the term *revolt*, *rebellion*, *uprising* and *unrest* as synonyms—render themselves more apt for comparison since they place peasants, otherwise portrayed as passive and exploited in their everyday lives, on the stage amid independent action. In terms of methodology, this volume wishes to promote the move from local, national and sometimes comparative history, which have dominated scholarly literature on European peasantry and peasant revolts, to the history of interactions, transfers and entanglements.⁵

With regard to the book's geographical scope, it wishes to put under the spotlight that part of Europe which is always missing from the comparative analyses of European peasant revolts.⁶ Under the term Central Europe we focus on the region that historians came to call "Habsburg central Europe" of the early modern period: the Kingdom of Hungary and Croatia, territories of the Bohemian Crown, the Austrian Hereditary Provinces, as well as the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. The inclusion of northern Italy into our investigation had an a priori justification: the Ottoman expansion threatening Europe on both land and sea, the military and political challenge of which placed additional burdens on and increased the potency of social tensions among social strata in both Central Europe and the Mediterranean.⁷ It turned out, however,

Peter Blickle in this book of the scholarly literature of rural revolts in the last fifty years. See further literature there.

4 For the concept of entangled history or *histoire croisée* see Shalini Randeria, "Entangled Histories of Uneven Modernities: Civil Society, Caste Solidarities and Legal pluralism in Post-Colonial India," in *Unraveling Ties. From Social Cohesion to New Practices of Connectedness*, ed. Yehuda Elkana et al. (Frankfurt: Campus, 2002), 284–311; Bénédicte Zimmermann and Michael Werner, "Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity," *History and Theory* 45 (2006): 30–50.

5 On the concept cultural transfer in history writing and the advantages of this approach compared to comparative history see Michael Espagne, "Au delà du comparatisme," in idem, *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999), 35–49.

6 Hugues Neveux most typically writes about England, France and the German territories under Europe: Hugues Neveux, *Révoltes Paysannes En Europe (XIV^e-XVII^e Siècle)* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1997). The terms Central Europe designates the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation in Peter Blickle, ed., *Resistance, Representation and Community* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). Peter Blickle's chapter in this book is an exception in this regard: he includes the Mediterranean (Italy and Spain) and also the post-communist countries of what he calls Eastern Europe (Hungary, Czech Republic) into his summary of European revolts.

7 See for example the role of the extraordinary tax called Turkish Aid (*Türkenhilfe*) as a factor that made the peasants feel that the social status quo had been damaged before 1525 and also in

that we have an argument more relevant to our social historical perspective. Marco Gentile's case study of the 1462 peasant uprising in the territory of Piacenza provides an exceptional insight into what has been deemed to be structurally impossible by experts of Italian rural protests: the alliance between peasants and urban commoners.⁸ The *Gemeiner Mann* of the Mediterranean sounds, therefore, like an apt title for a future European research project.

This volume is an endeavor to unravel the ways in which ideas, rituals, people, texts and images related to revolts migrated and met in Europe and how their interaction mutually shaped them. The identification of the transfers and adaptations between the ideas and practices of rebellious peasants in Europe is facilitated by the chosen perspective. The authors who have contributed to this volume sought to narrate the histories of peasant resistance from the perspective of the actors—the peasants themselves.⁹ In historical narratives peasants most often appear as the passive victims of great historical processes, such as the rivalry between territorial states and landlords for control of the serfs, who from that angle appeared to be the “Leibeigene” of their overlords.¹⁰ Historians who are perhaps more interested in *longue durée* processes than the world of peasants investigated the ways in which peasants contributed to the making of the modern state, which has become the mainstream approach of peasant revolts in the last two or three decades.¹¹ According to these investigations, the rebellion of peasants against the state effectively served to advance the process of centralization.¹² Although the approach interprets itself as a model of state-building from below,

Moravia in 1530 (on the latter see Martin Rothkegel's essay in this volume). The role of the anti-Ottoman crusade in the outbreak of the rural rebellion is most obvious in the Kingdom of Hungary in 1514.

- 8 See the argument of Samuel Cohn, who established a divide between Europe north (France and Flanders) and south of the Alps (Italy) along the existence versus lack of city–country cooperation. Samuel K. Cohn, *Lust for Liberty. The Politics of Social Revolt in Medieval Europe, 1200–1425* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2006), 157–76.
- 9 On the centrality of the concept of experience in the variant attempts of the transcultural reorientation of historical scholarship see for example Michel Espagne, “Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle,” *Genèses* 17 (1994): 112–21.
- 10 As an example for this perspective see R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991, first edn. 1979), 88–91.
- 11 See the volume on peasant resistance within the project entitled *The Origins of the Modern State in Europe*. Peter Blickle, ed., *Resistance, Representation and Community* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); Wim Blockmans, André Holenstein, and Jon Mathieu, eds., *Empowering Interactions: Political Cultures and the Emergence of the State in Europe, 1300–1900* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); Peter Rauscher and Martin Scheutz, eds., *Die Stimme der ewigen Verlierer? Aufstände, Revolten und Revolutionen in den österreichischen Ländern (ca.1450–1815)* (Vienna–Munich: Oldenbourg–Böhlau, 2013).
- 12 Blickle, ed., *Resistance*, passim, for example 337; Blockmans, Holenstein and Mathieu, eds., *Empowering Interactions*, 218.

it hardly goes beyond the Tillyan thesis of “wars made states,”¹³ extending its explanatory value to peasant wars, and thus remains a top-down narrative of the peasant world. And although its narrative, based on an evolutionary conception of history, may seem persuasive to modern readers, the rebels would have been surprised by the statement that they were, in fact, building the state from below when they demanded freedom via armed uprising. The application of this state-oriented perspective is anachronistic in an age when, for the peasants, authority was essentially represented by the landlord and thus peasants never rebelled against the king, but against his wicked advisors as well as the nobility and the Church as a feudal institution.¹⁴

Contemporary peasants would be surprised not only by this image of the *homo politicus*, but also by that of the *homo oeconomicus*, which they had been considered in the 1930s. According to the latter concept, the peasants organized their household and economy based exclusively on rational and economic considerations, thus being driven solely by the aim of maximizing the profit derived from the difference between the gross yield of their economic activity and the taxes levied on it. The landlord, from this perspective, enters the life of the peasant only in the role of the “economic exploiter.”¹⁵

Evidently, the high price to be paid for comparativism is oversimplification. The present volume aims to avoid such perils through its focus on the lived experiences of contemporary agents. As a first step in this endeavor, we return the given names to the protagonists of our narratives, even if we are overly accustomed to books on the peasantry that do not use any personal names. Dispensing with this anonymity, we wish to portray peasants as people with faces and personalities; and more than that, as actors possessing independent spheres of action, personal relationships with their landlords, private thoughts and even emotions. The (loose) personal subjection and the (negligible quantity of) labor services, or *robot*, was onerous for Hungarian peasants primarily in an emotional sense, which made them invest an immense amount of money and know-how into purchasing freedoms for themselves, as Katalin Péter argues in this volume. Péter’s thesis represents a radical rejection of that which has become accepted knowledge of the so-called second serfdom in East Elbia and in fact reminds the reader of the embarrassment of the wealthy Dutch during the same time period as portrayed vividly by Simon Shama.

13 Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990–1992*, revised edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

14 Rauscher and Scheutz formulate this problem of perspective, though nevertheless regard it to be legitimate due to other aspects that remain unspecified. Rauscher and Scheutz, eds., *Die Stimme der ewigen Verlierer?*, 23–24.

15 Cf. Wilhelm Abel, *Agrarkrisen und Agrarkonjunktur in Mitteleuropa vom 13. zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg–Berlin: Parey, 1935).

This volume contends that the “political” moments of armed collective resistance and the everyday lives of peasants seemingly dominated by their “economic” activities can be better grasped in the process of *Herrschaft*, in which—if considered as a social practice—the relations between peasants and their overlords are shaped within the dynamic of their everyday communication and interactions.¹⁶ From this angle, their everyday lives and exceptional moments of armed rebellion appear as part of the social practice of “negotiating freedom.”¹⁷ This is highlighted with exceptional clarity in the chapter by Marco Gentile in this volume regarding the Rebellion of Piacenza in 1462, in which the author pinpoints the pivotal role that rituals of negotiation played in the armed conflict and speaks of a limited or regulated use of force. Gentile argues, moreover, that the well-known fact that in Southern Europe and in particular Italy there were relatively few rural revolts in the fifteenth century can be seen as evidence of the effective use on the part of peasants of existing legal channels for negotiating freedom.

The concept of freedom refers not to a human right,¹⁸ as it evolved in later discourses of freedom, but to a practical matter, most typically an exemption from a duty tied to the peasant plot. According to S. A. Eddie’s investigation of rural life in Prussia, during the period under discussion such exemptions entailed ad hoc deals in which peasants altered their economic and personal status.¹⁹ For the individual, freedom in its fullness meant the possession of a plot free from any taxes and services, in other words, reaching noble status.²⁰ The status of nobility could be purchased with money or earned through education or the provision of services, just as it could through armed uprising. A different interpretation of the demand of peasants for freedom also appears in this volume,²¹ which shows that more work should be done in this field in the future.

16 Cf. Alf Lüdtke, “Einleitung: Herrschaft als soziale Praxis,” in idem, *Herrschaft als soziale Praxis. Historische und sozialanthropologische Studien*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 91 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 9–63. See also detailed case studies of other members of the Göttingen school (David Warren Sabean, Hans Medick, and Jürgen Schlumbohm), which are strongly influenced by social anthropology.

17 Thus I propose to extend the concept used by Katalin Péter in this volume referring only to their everyday negotiations aimed at elevating their social status.

18 See the contrary argumentation of Samuel Cohn with regard to the aims of late medieval revolts in Italy, France and Flanders in his book *Lust for Liberty*.

19 S. A. Eddie, *Freedom’s Price: Serfdom, Subjection and Reform in Prussia, 1648–1848* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1.

20 As interpreted by Katalin Péter in this book.

21 See the chapter in the present volume by Peter Blickle, who argues that the slogan of freedom represented the effort to abolish “Leibeigenschaft” and also to extend communal political rights. Commoners in North Italy aimed to redress justice (overturned by new taxes) without changing the social order, as shown by Marco Gentile in this volume.

When did rebellion break out? From our anthropological perspective, at moments when the mutually expected reciprocity of human relations was undermined.²² If this premise is accepted, it logically follows that this happened in both the West and in the East, in both the *Grundherrschaft* and *Gutsherrschaft* zones of Europe. The most recent investigator of rural life in Prussia, generally considered as the archetype of Eastern exploitation, asserts that *Herrschaft* in the *Gutsherrschaft* zone did not represent unilateral exploitation, but a mutually beneficial relationship, “a more balanced system of mutual rights and responsibilities than the received wisdom has allowed ... where peasants were well capable of defending their rights.”²³ In this volume, Katalin Péter also describes Hungary in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as a *Gutsherrschaft* zone. She uses the category of *Gutsherrschaft* in its limited, original sense introduced by traditional German history writing, thus denoting the relation in which peasants became subjected to the manor through their possession of a plot (*Gutsuntertänigkeit*).²⁴ Péter therefore preserves the concept which originates from contemporary usage and discards its extended interpretation, which constructed a homogenous social system from it whose central criteria are commonly held to be the workings of the seigneurial *Gutswirtschaft*, the labor of the serfs for the lord and the fragility of their personal rights and of their possessions. On the contrary, in this volume one can read of the hereditary nature of the peasant tenant plot, the far-reaching personal freedom of Hungarian peasants and of their purposeful actions.

Shared Ideas and Experiences

Revolts were sparked off when these mutual relations between peasants and lords were damaged and the lords did not fulfill their obligations from the perspective of the peasants. The language of negotiation, which escalated into conflict amid the disappointment resulting from its failure, was very often that of religion in the first half of the sixteenth century, when the majority of armed conflicts discussed in this book took place. If we want to take seriously the actions and thoughts of peasants, this deserves special attention. Therefore, the second section of this volume (Part II) is dedicated to issues related to the role of religion in revolts. With regard to this subject, the edited volume entitled *Religion and Rural Revolt* signifies an important milestone, which, extraordinarily, discussed the role of

22 See also Blockmans, Hostenstein, and Mathieu, eds., *Empowering Interactions*, 170.

23 Eddie, *Freedom's Price*, 88.

24 Georg Friedrich Knapp, *Die Bauern-Befreiung und der Ursprung der Landarbeiter in den älteren Theilen Preußens*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: n.p. 1887), 22–23.

religion in peasant rebellions in a global context already in 1982.²⁵ The research of the Hungarian medievalist, Jenő Szűcs (1928–88), who enjoyed international fame at the time appears to have influenced the choice of themes in the edited volume.²⁶ At the beginning of the 1970s, Szűcs expressed radically new viewpoints concerning the revolt of 1514 in Hungary. The results of his research were fully published in Hungarian and partially in German in 1972.²⁷ Szűcs was the first historian to divert attention from the economic and social contexts to the religious rhetoric of texts possibly produced by the rebels themselves—thus placing him a little before research concerning the German Peasants’ War of 1525, which gathered new impetus with the anniversary of 1975.²⁸ His central concern was the question of who had translated the orthodox Christian ideology of the crusade against the Ottomans into a religio-political language (which he called “popular crusade ideology”) that mobilized the masses and how they had done so. Szűcs identified the young, “apostate” Observant Franciscan friars in the role of military leaders and as forgers of the central idea of the revolt, which claimed that the consecrated army of crusaders, being commissioned not only by the pope, but by God himself, must fight not against the Ottoman-Turks, but against the “infidel” nobility that failed to perform their duty. Szűcs reached this insight through nuanced philological readings: on the one hand, he identified the rhetoric of religious mysticism and apocalyptic ideas in the texts produced by the Observant Franciscans in the Kingdom of Hungary; while on the other hand, he noticed that the centers of the revolt—as well as the regions which reacted most intensely to evangelical ideas a decade later—coincided with the location of major cloisters of the Observant Franciscans. Szűcs spoke of the ambivalence inherent in the spirituality of the latter order: the social criticism preached from the pulpit on the basis of the sermons of the leaders of the Observant Franciscans, Oswaldus de Lasko and Pelbartus de Temeswar, combined with the spiritual traditions of the order easily developed into a rebellion against all kinds of authority. This, according to Szűcs, accounts for the fact that while the Observant Franciscans were officially entrusted to preach the crusade in the name of the pope and the king, the spiritual and military leaders of the revolt against the

25 János M. Bak and Gerhard Benecke, eds., *Religion and Rural Revolt* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984).

26 On the oeuvre of Szűcs and its reception in more detail on the twentieth anniversary of his death see Gábor Gyáni, “Szűcs Jenő, a magányos történetíró,” *Forrás* 40, no. 6 (2008): 13–17.

27 On his works concerning the 1514 revolt see the study of Pál Ács here. In German: Jenő Szűcs, “Die Ideologie des Bauernkrieges,” in *Aus der Geschichte der Ostmitteleuropäischen Bauernbewegungen im 16.–17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Gusztáv Heckenast (Budapest: Akadémiai, 1977), 157–88.

28 Szűcs’s writings on the 1514 revolt were occasioned by official commemorations in 1972 of the 500-year anniversary of the “invented” birth year of Dózsa. See more on these commemorations in the chapter by Pál Ács in this volume.