

wholly accidental, is the omission in the bibliography of an old but surely not outdated work by Henry F. Schwarz, *The Imperial Privy Council in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943). Second, and much more serious, the one-and-one-half-page index, a brief list of seemingly random entries, serves no discernible purpose. Buyers of such an expensive book deserve more from the publisher than this.

Hughes's study makes significant points even if the Mecklenburg and East Frisian disputes themselves may not have had lasting importance. In the former case, the privileges of the nobles were upheld in 1755, not by a decision of the aulic council but by Prussia's Frederick the Great, acting as arbiter. The resulting state constitution survived until 1918 as the most nearly "feudal" in Germany. As for East Frisia, Prussia had the last word there as well, by annexing the county outright after the death of its prince without heirs in 1744 and by treating it subsequently as a favored province. Undeniably important, however, is the documented evidence of efforts to enhance Vienna's influence in ways more commonly identified with subsequent actions first of Maria Theresia and then of Joseph II.

Franklin L. Ford
Harvard University

Kristó, Gyula. *A vármegyék kialakulása Magyarországon* [The Development of the County in Hungary]. Budapest: Magvető, 1988. Pp. 465.

King St. Stephen (d. 1038) had designated forts, *civitates*, as centers of the royal domain spread over the realm

and placed a head officer, *comes castri*, in charge of the inhabitants in every fort district, *pagus*. There were ancient forts, such as Komárom, Esztergom, Győr, and Sopron; and new ones were built and named after the first head official assigned to them. Pereslavasburch, for instance, became Pressburg, or Pozsony. Secular and ecclesiastical administrators acted in harmony, and the former supported the church administration. Various fields of law handled by the state, such as marriage or witchcraft, were fused into the legal jurisdiction of the church. Ordeals were held before church officials, though it remained the duty of secular authority to present a case in a court of law. Consequently, the organization of ecclesiastical and temporal matters developed along parallel lines.

The monarch developed his administrative county system fully in the territory of the ecclesiastical province of Esztergom and in the Kalocsa diocese, later a church province itself. Esztergom, Fehérvár, Sopron, and Moson became administrative centers with some 40 established forts. The royal economic domain in the fort district, the fort stewardship or *comitatus civitatis*, was, like the Bavarian and Frankish counties, not a closed territorial unit. In his founding charter for the Veszprém bishopric, the king depicted the country surrounding the fort as *pagus civitatis*, a description changed to *mega civitatis* in the late eleventh century. The county actually comprised private agricultural holdings scattered around in an area under the economic, administrative, judicial, and military jurisdiction of a royal head official, the reeve, *comes*, distinct from the already developed church administrative unit in a given area. The county materialized as a geographical concept only in the latter thirteenth century.

The elite strata of people, the *civis* or *miles*, of the agricultural fort district

later formed the class of *lobagiones castrī*, whose members were free to cultivate land they had received in perpetuity from the king in return for military service. In time of war they had to serve under the reeve in the ranks of the county detachment. The king also established border regions, *comitus confinium*, under the supervision of the "marchio." The laws of Coloman the Learned (d. 1116) mention *marchia*, the defensive frontier zones. The border regions in Transylvania remained under the protection of the "Princeps, Ultrasylvanus."

In his work, Kristó researches the origins of the county, its definition, and the relationship between the secular and ecclesiastical administrations. He relies on narrative sources, such as Anonymus' *Gesta Hunarorum*, in his analysis of the castle (*castrum*) and earthen fort (*castellum terreum*) as centers of county administration. It is Kristó's view that Anonymus suggested a twofold origin for the county: either as an institution dating back to the Hungarian conquest of the mid-Danube region in the 890s or as the result of Slavic influence. This hypothesis will have to be modified now that many scholars regard the estates of the ruling family as developed economic centers that existed as early as the tenth century. A sentence by the compiler of Gerard of Csanád's *Vita maior* says that King Stephen made Csanád the steward, *princeps*, over the domain of the king's archenemy Ajtony and of the whole area ("comes illius provinciae"), as well, after Csanád defeated Ajtony.

Kristó sees in the use of the term *mega*, which he defines as a given area (not as a county), the origins of the word *mege* or *megye*, Magyar for county, even though the term *mega regis* meant, rather, a closed unit of the royal domain, as is evident from aa. 12, 36, and 37 of Coloman the Learned's Laws. In

his study of diplomatic sources, Kristó comes to the conclusion that the social structure had in its development a territorial base that had already existed in the tribal "state" of the Arpads, and he looks upon King St. Stephen as founder of the royal county system since, for example, the royal charter for the Pannonhalma abbey dated 1001 described the *comitatus* of Somogy.

The fort played an important role in the formation of the county, as is evident from its coordinated cooperation with the bishopric in territorial administration. Like diocese and village, the county, too, had boundaries, as evidenced by the 1009 founding charter for the Veszprém bishopric that spoke about "terminiis et finibus." Kristó is convinced that the tribal political structure affected the formation of the county. In defining "county," Kristó accepts the views of Péter Váczy, stated in 1935 and in 1958, that the "county" was a real institution of power covering everybody and everything in its administration. Bálint Hóman defined the county based on its territorial and legal aspects. Kristó, too, distinguishes between the activities of the county's and the fort's administrative structures. As he sees it, the county did not possess a separate apparatus for its administration before the late thirteenth century, when the royal officials of the fort could only attend to immediate fort-related matters. Kristó, following in Váczy's footsteps, notes, for instance, that in the mid-twelfth century the steward of Nógrád county reported on royal estates in Zala county, which could not have been under the reeve's jurisdiction. Kristó concludes that the reeve was still a member of the king's entourage (*comitatus*). Originally, the office or commission of the reeve had been a military one restricted to the fort district and its inhabitants, to whom he represented the monarch. In other words, the county was a well-defined

area of a fort district, in which the bishopric was included along with the king's domain. Eventually, the reeve of the fort had wider authority and held jurisdiction over the affairs of the county which included the fort area. By the late thirteenth century, because of the shrinking size of the royal domain, the reeve's authority declined, and the royal *comitas* fell apart. In the emerging new administration it was, the service nobility, fearful of the influence of the higher noblemen, who established themselves in power.

Kristó further depicts in depth the relationship between the temporal and spiritual administrations (pp. 208–35). In a separate and detailed section of 251 pages he deals with the formation of some of the counties. Endnotes (pp. 521–602) and a detailed bibliography (pp. 605–42) add to the value of this book. Its author has done a thorough job, indeed.

Z. J. Kosztolnyik
Texas A&M University

Zimányi, Vera, ed. *Studien zur deutschen und ungarischen Wirtschaftsentwicklung (16–20. Jahrhundert)*. Proceedings of the fifth conference of East German and Hungarian economic historians in Debrecen, September 23–26, 1980. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985. Pp. 187.

As with most conference proceedings, the topics in this collection of 18 articles range widely. However, despite the diversity, the volume does have some areas of emphasis. Perhaps because the conference took place in Debrecen, two-thirds of the articles are by Hungarians and about topics in Hungarian economic history. In addition, roughly

two-thirds of the book is devoted to agrarian conditions in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The other third deals with economic development in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Unfortunately, the quality of these articles is not uniformly high. All are short, with several only four pages long, and one is left with the impression that some authors were hard-pressed to say anything significant in so limited a space. The first article in the book, for example, a survey of the economic geography of Hungary during the late feudal period by László Makkai, is almost exclusively descriptive and quite superficial description at that. Peter Beyer's contribution dealing with the impact of the First World War on industrial workers is also less than provocative: "In the state-monopoly war economy which differed significantly from the pre-war era, among other things the whole of industry was reoriented to armaments production as much as possible" (p. 167).

Zsigmond Pál Pach's discussion of the imposition in Hungary of "der zweite Leibeigenschaft," on the other hand, is quite informative and despite its brevity offers some interesting theses regarding that fascinating phenomenon. Pach maintains, for example, that price increases owing to the conflict between the Habsburgs and the Porte, rather than the opening of an international market as was the case in more northerly regions of Eastern Europe, contributed to the rise of the second serfdom in Hungary. The war-driven inflation of the sixteenth century led Hungarian estate-owners to institute serfdom not because they could no longer afford to pay for wage labor; in fact, they were in a better position to pay wages than ever before, because the price of agricultural products had reached new heights. Instead, it was the devaluation of money rents