

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Faculty of Humanities  
Doctoral School of History  
Doctoral Program for the History of Ideology  
Dr. Ida Fröhlich DSc.

**TÍMEA SZTANCSNÉ KARDOS**  
**FAMILIAR OF IMRE THÖKÖLY AND HIS COURT**  
THESES OF DOCTORAL (PHD) DISSERTATION

Supervisor: Dr. J. Újváry Zsuzsanna PhD.

2020

I am grateful and respectful to the consultant of the topic, Zsuzsanna J. Újváry. I would like to thank the critics of the topic, János J. Varga, István Czigány and Nóra Etényi, for their professional advice and help.

## **I. The Theme and Objectives of the Dissertation**

In the period from 1664 to 1670, a special society began to take shape: the Wesselényi conspiracy extracted the hiding layer of society. When the military elements from the thirteen counties, and especially from its eastern half, moved to Transylvania, they already had group consciousness. Their pay was no longer expected from lords but from prey and prey during the hiding years. This self-awareness and group consciousness formed the characteristic of the hideouts, who, as a community, took a stand, gave instructions, and wrote to the counties, lords, and princes, so there was always the germ of an independent Kuruc state in their activities.

Such a community was led by the young Imre Thököly in 1678. His loyalty was due to the fact that, bypassing the policy of the Transylvanian prince, he took the army of the hideouts to effective prey and victory, and invested considerable sums in their management. In the Principality of Upper Hungary, the hiding society changed.

For more than a decade now, social elements outside the states, mostly bribing in the territory of the Partium, have simultaneously found themselves within the state and formed the military organization of the Kuruc state.

The starting point for my dissertation was the work of Jolán Székely and Győző Bruckner, who previously dealt with the court of Imre Thököly. However, the peculiarity of their publications is that both authors worked mainly from the conventional registers and diaries of Thököly's court.

Thus, the changes in Thököly's court were not perceived by their works. Győző Bruckner chose a torn state, his stay in Keszthely in 1683, as the subject of his investigation. Jolán Székely, although in his work he sought to present the Thököly court in general, actually worked from the diary of 1693–1694, trying to shape the era of emigration into a general one, although after the principality we can speak of a completely different kind of court. Although Dávid Angyal, the author of Imre Thököly's monograph, did little to deal with the yard, she nevertheless carried out careful care, which can be considered a basic work in defining the familiar. Áron

Petneki undertook the art-historical and cultural-historical approach of the Thököly court, focusing primarily on the splendor, seeking the light and splendor of the Thököly court. In his work, Petneki stated that the personal part of the Thököly courtyard requires a separate social history study.

In my dissertation I sought the answer to the question of how the events of the 1670s affected the hiding society and how the familial layer of the Thököly court was formed, how all this peculiarity appeared in the princely court.

Summaries about the institution of familial and aristocratic and princely courts were considered a basic dissertation for my work: Gyula Szekfű Military service of Servants and Families and János J. Varga Servitors in the 16th – 17th centuries on the large estates of Transdanubia. Gyula Szekfű examined medieval familiarity, János J. Varga dealt with early modern Transdanubian servants.

After the Mohács disaster, R. J. W. Evans from Oxford University recently wrote about the Habsburg court, which was also decisive and exemplary for the Hungarian aristocratic courts, and Géza Pálffy describes the relationship between the Viennese court and the Hungarian lords in several studies.

In connection with the person and uprising of Imre Thököly, new research results have been presented at several international conferences in recent decades, and a familiar one has appeared in the volumes. Most recently, Kálmán Mészáros dealt with Bálint Nemessányi and Péter Kónya with György Ottlyk.

My choice of topic was justified by the lack of a modern summary of Thököly's court. I placed emphasis on the presentation of the formation of familials from the hiding places, on the expansion processes of the Thököly court. I considered the presentation of Thököly's court as the peculiarities and differences of the Upper Hungarian court important because I found that this field did not play or played only a small role in the research so far. My dissertation extends the knowledge of the 17th century court and familiarity to the territory of Upper Hungary.

## **II. The Method of the Research and the Composition of the Dissertation**

The peculiarity of the period and Thököly's familiarity led me to examine their antecedents and backgrounds in order to explore the system of hideout refugees and soldiers. In addition to the diary of Imre Thököly published by Károly Torma and the correspondence of Mihály Teleki, the G1, G2 sections of the Thököly War of Independence of the National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives and the materials of the Spiš Chamber Archives provided documents. Throughout the movement of a decade and a half, the political and ideological background of these individuals and finally their role in Thököly's court was an extremely exciting question in depicting this era, from the Wesselényi conspiracy to the fall of Thököly's principality. In reviewing the literature, I have tried to highlight the latest research.

In order to study the period, I conducted extensive research in the archives of Slovakia and Budapest. For the familiarity of the principality and the princely court, it was necessary to work mostly from the smallest fibrous material, to systematically explore and collect the relevant resources. The foreign archives, the archival sources of Levoča, Prešov and Košice, as well as the material of the Thököly War of Independence kept in the National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives, the large units of Section G, the G4, G5, G8, G12, the Turkish – Hungarian State Library provided great help. and the relevant volumes of the Transylvanian Parliamentary Memories series, as well as the diaries, correspondence books and other memorable writings of Imre Kékmárki Thököly.

In the course of my research, I established that the examination of the familiarity of Imre Thököly should begin with the examination of the paternal heritage and the special status of the refugees who came to Transylvania. The Historical Archive, the Archives of the Bujdosók and the correspondence of Imre Thököly and the correspondence of Mihály Teleki, which published István Thököly's letter book, provided the largest base for these years, in addition to the sporadic data that can be extracted from various family archives.

I also tried to extract information relevant to the topic from the documents of the Wesselényi conspiracy and the confiscation lists of the Spiš Chamber. To examine the Transylvanian years, I also utilized the resources excavated from family archives.

The richest source material for the princely years was the G2 and G8 documents from the Thököly War of Independence of the National Archives of the Hungarian National Archives. In addition to the Košice Archives, I utilized the Turkish State Library and the monography of Dávid Angyal from the published sources.

During my research in Budapest, I also used some of Radvánszky's documents preserved in the Lutheran National Archives in my dissertation. Carrying out the understanding and examination of the court society and the society of Upper Hungary, I also took into account the aspects of social life and economic history in addition to the political historical events.

In addition to textual interpretation, I used several tables to process the data. In order to explain the topic, it was essential to jointly interpret and explore the literature and sources.

### **III. The Main Results of the Essay**

Thököly's familials differed from the historically known familiarity and the 16-17th century from the Transdanubian institution, because it was based on the Turkish orientation and the hiding places.

The peculiarities of Thököly's court were due to the difference in the political situation. Some of the family members were seconded commissioners, defenders, policemen of family estates, others were on permanent assignments, performing postal, diplomatic and military duties. Very few belonged to the permanent courtyard, which was constantly on the road with Thököly. Therefore, terms of this nature, such as continuous or house lords, are seldom found in Thököly sources. A 13-17th century the nobles in the service of Imre Thököly, who can also be said to be the last representatives of the servie-familial-servitor layer serving, organically connected to the previous period, but I extended the study geographically from Western Transdanubia to Upper Hungary. I found that Thököly familiarity differs significantly from 16-17th century, mainly in Transdanubia, because they are not serving nobles built into the system of protection against the Ottomans, but on the contrary, Social stratum.

At the beginning of my dissertation I presented the rise of the Thököly family: Sebestyén, I. and II. István's advantageous marriages, their policy of acquiring property, their system of social relations in Upper Hungary and Transylvania, as well as the formation of the circle of service nobles after the fall of the noble organization named after the palatine Ferenc Wesselényi. All participants are guided by the political goal of reclaiming their confiscated property and ensuring religious freedom, as well as, at least in part, the service of Imre Thököly. In my dissertation I presented the career of Count Imre Thököly, who fled to Transylvania, from his studies in Transylvania to his election as head of the hideouts and his appointment as prince in 1682 by the will of Istanbul. At that time, it was already surrounded by a significant number of middle- and small-noble familial strata serving military, political-diplomatic, economic and

personal-court services, sometimes intertwined, complemented by the noble service of his wife, Ilona Zrínyi.

By the beginning of the 1680s, an internal group of familiar people, close to the prince, entrusted with the above-mentioned tasks, as well as an external group of soldiers, recruited mainly from the nobles of the county, were formed. Accordingly, a distinction can be made between groups of continents and crawlers, and those serving for annual pay and snow money. All this corresponds to the customary system of the familial-servicist layer of any aristocratic service of the age. Thököly counties, the so-called His “regional nobles” were sharply distinguished from the personally attached families by the compulsion and interest that moved them: the fear of confiscating their estates from Thököly’s chamber in the event of their absence, or the hope of recovering their lost property after the Wesselényi organization.

Most of Thököly's family members did not want to be a noble servant, he rejected the princely centralization, he wanted noble freedom without any dependence at all. Familiarity was accepted only by those who served the person of Thököly. This can be explained, among other factors, by the fact that after the failure of Grand Vizier Kara Mustafa in Vienna, the swaying and fall of the Kuruc state brought with him the anti-Thököly conspiracy of a group of acquaintances (Munkács, Uzhhorod) and the infidelity of most of them.

In Thököly's court, the process of changing the social system of the recapture war can be traced the most. While in the decades of the weakening of royal power the importance of service to the nobles became more important, with the strengthening of royal power, the familial system entered a ruptured and declining, disintegrating phase. What the prince perceived as infidelity and becoming a labanc was, in fact, a drastic transformation of social structure; Thököly had to experience this in his own court and in his own paid member. Dávid Petneházy, for whose loyalty he himself fought for years and honored with a donation of real estate, also received possession and honors from the king in the new system.

1. Personal loyalty: In Thököly's familiarity, personal loyalty was central. At the beginning of Thököly's military action, this personal allegiance



distinguishes his own family members from other hideout-kuruc elements, and at the time of his principality the politically accepting or supportive nobility makes allegiance to the prince.

2. *Nostrae familiares*: According to the list of conventions of 1683, it can be observed that in the court of Thököly the persons are classified as *nostrae familiares* who belong primarily to Thököly by their loyalty, but the manner of their service cannot be determined on the basis of the list. Twenty-five such persons were included in the convention, including István Csáky, Ferenc Nyáry and István Andrassy, but the term is also used for János Badinyi, educator of Ferenc Rákóczi, János Záborszky, chief butler of Thököly, and Captain Gáspár Zmeskai, whose father In the time of István Thököly - so the family's relationship with Thököly is of old origin.
3. In the Thököly Convention, the term *nostrae familiaris* is given to those whose loyalty is primarily important and whose service is indefinable, so the familial term is not meant for the whole court and not for all the servant nobles in Thököly who belong to the court. In the Thököly court, this kind of expression should have been avoided as much as possible, since those over whom Thököly gained power were fighting for noble liberties, and this demand, quoting László Benczédi's words, was.
4. The formulation *nostrae familiaris* was therefore applied to a nobleman who was more accepting of the familial relationship and further away from the Kuruc world of ideas - Csáky, Andrassy, Nyáry, Pethó, etc. - who understood this system more easily and better, accepted it, belonged to Thököly with his loyalty and appeared primarily as a man of Thököly during the principality. The active political members of the Bujdosó-Kuruc system of ideas - Gábor Kende, Pál Szepesi - were reluctant to get under the centralizing Thököly out of resentment of familial dependence, and therefore persevered to the end. The use of the familial term in the Thököly yard was avoided in the Thököly yard for the military elements

that sooner connected to Thököly from the Bujdosó-kuruc society, and instead marked their connection to the Thököly court with the nature of the service. In Thököly familiarity, the familiar word was used cautiously in terms of wording; more important was the person's political, religious, personal loyalty, or manner of service. The term “*Nostrae familiaris*” was given to either paternally inherited persons, such as Daniel Absolon, clarifying the relationship primarily in foreign wording, or regionally to those who lived and became faithful under the rule of Thököly.

5. Kuruc as familiar: Thököly kept in touch with the bujdosos since the beginning of his political activity and due to his career. In the courtyard of Imre Thököly, a special example of familiarity can be traced. Their connection to Thököly stems from an identity of interest. Like Thököly, they are refugees who want to reclaim their former estates. So their goal is common. Thököly's acquaintance will soon be those who hid in Thököly permanently, more often and regularly during the Transylvanian years, especially the nobles who politicized the Transylvanian court, who had previously been in contact with the Petrőczy-Thököly family. They have a personal relationship with him, but not yet in a military setting. Such a person was András Radics, Pál Szalay. Their numbers were small, but they later became dominant. Or military leaders were captains and thousands of captains. During the rivalry period, some of the people won from Pál Wesselényi were military, such as György Harsányi or Gergely Hatházy; they are the most valuable warlords. Their value is well illustrated by the fact that Thököly immediately accepted Hatházy as his family, causing no small disagreement with Pál Wesselényi. There will also be thousands of captains during the principality. Thököly typically retained good commanders in the military, elevated the talented, and thus became colonel captains, such as Sámuel Tunyogi, Dávid Petneházy and General István Pertőczy.

6. Personal, family members of trust: In the period of the principality, people of trust who had been serving Thököly for a long time and who were also personally attached to them took important positions. In diplomacy, almost without exception, in all directions, Thököly's personal men moved there. The ambassadors not only needed good language skills and good performance, but they also needed to be reliable, which is why the paternal ministers were included: Dániel Absolon, Bálint Nemessányi and István Szenczy, who enjoyed the trust of the prince. The other part of them became court servants from hiding places, led by Pál Ubrizy, who will be Thököly's court master. In Thököly's court, it can be observed that the persons performing his personal service are separated from the lieutenants and captains serving in the military. Overlaps are only observed at the top positions. However, only the oldest people who had come into contact in some way since Thököly's childhood or adolescence could be included in the most confidential circles: István Petrőczy, a cousin, secret counselor and captain, and András Jelenik, a chamberlain and counselor. The most important tasks of those dealing with the military were in military administration, but Thököly also provided the personnel with confidential tasks, in addition to carrying messages and letters, up to personal purchases.
7. Families taken over from others: In the system of Thököly's familiarity, the development and settlement of the hidden society in Transylvania in the Transylvanian years played a decisive role. Many of the refugees inside and outside came from under the former leaders and began to connect with the wealthy Thököly court. The former writers of István Witnyédi were Péter Faigel, András Radics, who can be connected to Witnyédi, and Bálint Nemessányi, who had previously served István Thököly. A group of his family members were family members inherited from others. Thököly won several family members from the Wesselényi family; Pál Wesselényi won Gergely Hatházy and his writer István

Daróczy, and by the death of László Wesselényi he won the Géczy brothers, István and Zsigmond. The latter played a prominent role in the bodyguard and served him countless services.

8. Invited family members: During the rise of Thököly in 1680–1681, more and more people appeared in Thököly's court, who joined Thököly on an invitation basis, such as András Szirmay, a former schoolmate and engineer.
9. Voluntary family members: For example, members of the Spiš Chamber; According to his confession, Vilmos Draheim was expecting the growth of his goods as a reward for his service, or András Kazinczy, who knocked on the court of Thököly in Lőcse in 1683. Many of the Wesselényi conspiracy remained in Hungary by agreement, but in a political sense, those who sympathized with the hideouts crashed into the new prince and took up his service as prince secretary Dániel Gutth or prefect Sebestyén Sárossy.
10. The nobility and chief lords of the princely territory: Regionally they undertook to keep their estates or to reclaim their confiscated estates, but with the defeat of the Turks, the organizers gathered in Uzshorod and prepared to overthrow the principality of Thököly with Polish help. For only a few months, these familiarity can actually be called, their belonging to the court lived only under the influence of political-military coercion and pressure.
11. Familiarization, career: In Thököly's familiarity, it was possible to run very large tracks, often not really by military means. Two examples prove that one of the writers could also become a castle captain: Péter Faigel was the scribe of István Witnyédi, under the principality of Thököly he became the permanent captain of Košice, Márton Izdenczy, the scribe of Thököly, captain of Tokaj in December 1682. Personal loyalty was as valuable a character among the service providers as talent, so János Kellemessy became a glassmaker and later a castle captain in Sárospatak.

András Jelenik appears, butler, court chamberlain, administrator, and finally became fiscal prefect.

The main strata of Thököly's familiarity: Thököly gained power over two very unstable societies: on the one hand, he brought with him the hiding society, and on the other, he tried to rule over the social groups of the mixed-receiving counties in his territory. The main characteristic of the Thököly familials is that the small nobles were familiar from the dissatisfied highlands, Upper Hungary, mainly Eastern Hungary, and Transylvanian and partisan areas, most of whom did perform military tasks, desire for independence. This carries with it the dream of independence independent of Habsburg and Transylvanian politics, and driven by it, even taking on Turkish vassals. Their affiliation with Thököly was only partly military, other partly and mainly political party affiliation. They did not expect military protection from Thököly, like the Transdanubian servants, but political representation. Thököly was elected prince, but in return he was expected to realize the idea of kuruc, both religiously and politically. And Imre Thököly was very much aware of these expectations, and he needed his family members (including his advisers) just as much as he needed them. With the fall of the idea - the capture of Oradea - he did not lose his previously stable people for no reason, and the personal servants who were loyal to Thököly's person come to the fore.

With his appointment as prince, Thököly rules a three-pronged system: 1. the county commonplace - in the princely territory - 2. the private-law familial nobility - belonging to a person or property - and 3. the military nobility - among whom there are both familial and non-familial. In terms of familiarity, the picture is not uniform even within the group of military, economic and personnel servicemen.

Thököly familials can be divided into three groups: their first group is the family ministers, who are not politically-militarily or less involved, they mainly provide per-person services and deal with property administration. The second group - this is the largest - are family members with political and military interests who came from the hiding crowd. The third group is the group of temporary, regional familiar people who behave in a submissive manner due to momentary political changes, but

do not belong to the Thököly family, especially from a political – military – ideological point of view, to Bujdosó-kuruc society, but were placed under Thököly in a given space-time continuity (see: Period of the Principality of Central Hungary, Principality of Transylvania).

Thököly's princely court is also a simplified copy of the large permanent aristocratic court. Thököly kept a moving, changing court. Its permanent members were mainly Thököly's personal servants and court people. Thököly also financed most of his political career and the construction of his court from family wealth. During his reign he also traded various fiscal goods, but paid salaries to the most confidential and important people, returned money and crops, but did not donate property - the hideouts got back their former estates, many of which received conventions and salaries, Thököly always had problem.

In Thököly's court, the positions were filled, for the most part, on a trust basis. The main criteria of Thököly's familiarity are personality, aptitude and political stability. His servants thus decisively held their place in the office entrusted to them.

The easiest thing to do, of course, was with the people tied to the person, who kept their loyalty to Thököly. Political stability lasted as long as Thököly had political potential. This was the strongest point of support for Thököly at the stage of the principality. The ability of aptitude was the most important to the prince, and if one was destined to hold an office because of these abilities, he was either well paid or coerced to accept it.

In Thököly's court, service circles formed quite firmly, and individuals who had proved themselves militarily from 1670 onwards remained in the war. Personal servants were hired by the lord several times as needed to fill some kind of economic or other job, even military-military service, or simply trusted in their person so much that he placed him in a kind and esteemed position. János Kellemessy appointed chief glassman as captain of Sárospatak when he had already arranged his court in Sárospatak. Thököly forced the nobles living in the principality - most of them - to be loyal, but he built mainly on the small and medium-sized nobles and citizens who had

previously been involved in the Wesselényi movement, so the political common denominator is already rooted in the past.

Loyal military-political servants did not switch over until the capture of the castles in 1685 with the abandonment of the castles. Those who remain with Thököly were primarily servants tied to his person or had a strong kinship with him. Such were the ones he sent to the important castle, Munkács, to stand there, and they formed an escort. With the abandonment of the castle in Munkács in 1688, most of them would accept the amnesty and remain in place. A new era began in Thököly's familiarity between 1685 and 1688, and after that. However, the scope of this description is beyond the scope of the present work.

#### IV. Publications Relating to the Theme

##### Studies:

*Thököly Imre politikai megjelenése és felemelkedése a kuruc érdekképviseletben./The political appearance and rise of Imre Thököly in the representation of kuruc interests/ In: Rod Thököly, Késmárk, (2018) 127-134.*

*Zrínyi Ilona és a Rákóczi-kincsek – Egyházi és világi érdekek Báthory Zsófia halála után./ Ilona Zrínyi and the Rákóczi Treasures - Church and secular interests after the death of Zsófia Báthory/ In: The gold treasure of Košice, Kassa, (2018) 140-159.*

*A vallásszabadság és kiválasztottság kérdése – A Thököly-felkelés vallási eszmerendzere./ The issue of religious freedom and choice - The religious ideology of the Thököly uprising/ In: Vallástudományi Szemle (2016), 4. sz.*

*„egy igyünk, egy igyekezetünk” – Thököly Imre és II. Rákóczi Ferenc a Habsburg-ellenes mozgalmak élén /”One case, one endeavor” - Imre Thököly and II. Ferenc Rákóczi at the head of anti-Habsburg movements/ In: Rákóczi és Kassa. Sárospatak, (2016) 8-15.*

*Familiaritás és udvari társadalom a 17. század második felében – Források és fogalmi rendszerek Thököly Imre udvarához. / Familiarity and court society in the second half of the 17th century - Sources and conceptual systems for the court of Imre Thököly/ In: Studia Varia Tanulmánykötet, Budapest, (2016) 372-383.*

*Adalékok a Partium fogalmához – A Partium szó fogalombővülése az 1683-as kassai gyűlésen. / Additions to the Concept of Partium - Expansion of the Word Partium at the Parliament of Košice in 1683/ In: Valóság (2016), 7. sz. 19-20.*

*Thököly Imre fejedelmi udvara Lőcsén. / The princely court of Imre Thököly in Levoča/ In: Honismeret (2016), 3. sz. 66-69.*

*Társadalom-és életmódtörténeti elemek Thököly Imre 1693–1694. évi naplójegyzéseiben. /Society – and elements of lifestyle history Imre Thököly 1693–1694. in his diary/ In: PPKE BTK Conference of the Doctoral School of History, Department of Social and Lifestyle History. Szerk: J. Újváry Zsuzsanna Piliscsaba, 2014, 259-267.*

*A Habsburg-ellenes mozgalmak és kuruc hadvezérek kódolási technikái. / Coding techniques of anti-Habsburg movements and kuruc warlords/ In: Valóság (2014), 42. évf. 3. sz. 33-35.*



*A seregválasztó nagyveszekedés – Thököly Imre és Teleki Mihály vitája. /The army-choosing big quarrel - the debate between Imre Thököly and Mihály Teleki/ In: Valóság (2014), 42. évf. 1. sz. 89-93.*

*Thököly Imre és Zrínyi Ilona levelezése 1686-ban. /Correspondence between Imre Thököly and Ilona Zrínyi in 1686/ In: Honismeret (2013), 41. évf. 4. sz. 35-37.*

*Thököly Imre és a homofonikus behelyettesítő sifre: kódolás a kuruc fejedelem idején. /Imre Thököly and the homophonic surrogate sifre: coding in the time of the Kuruc prince /In: Valóság (2012), 55.évf. 5. sz. 27-38.*

*A monoki kiskastély a Thököly-család birtokában. /The small castle in Monok is owned by the Thököly family/ In: Honismeret (2012), 40. évf. 3. sz. 55-57.*

*Ónod Thököly fejedelemsége idején. / Ónod under the principality of Thököly/ In: Honismeret (2011), 39. évf. 4. sz. 32-36.*

### **Conference lecture in the theme of the essay:**

*Az ifjú Rákóczi Ferenc udvara. / The courtyard of the young Ferenc Rákóczi/ Rákóczi Memorial Year “Saint of our country, leader of freedom” international scientific conference, (2019) Beregszász*

*Thököly Imre politikai megjelenése és felemelkedése a kuruc érdekképviseletben /The political appearance and rise of Imre Thököly in the representation of kuruc interests /– International scientific conference organized on the occasion of the 360th anniversary of Thököly's birth, (2017) Késmárk*

*„egy igyünk, egy igyekezetünk” – Thököly Imre és Rákóczi Ferenc a Habsburg-ellenes mozgalmak élén/” One case, one endeavor” - Imre Thököly and II. Ferenc Rákóczi at the head of anti-Habsburg movements - Rákóczi 110 years in Kassa - II. Anniversary of the reburial of Ferenc Rákóczi and his comrades-in-arms conference, (2016) Kassa*

*Familiaritás és udvari társadalom a 17. század második felében – Források és fogalmi rendszerek Thököly Imre udvarához /Familiarity and court society in the second half of the 17th century - Sources and conceptual systems for the court of Imre Thököly/ – Spring Conference – PPKE (2016) Budapest*

*Zrínyi Ilona és a Rákóczi-kincsek – Egyházi és világi érdekek Báthory Zsófia halála után. /Ilona Zrínyi and the Rákóczi Treasures - Church and secular interests after the death of Zsófia Báthory / Košice Gold Treasure Conference, (2015) Kassa*

*Thököly Imre és az 1683-as kassai országgyűlés./ Imre Thököly and the Parliament of Košice in 1683/ Early New Age Conference, ELTE (2015) Budapest*

*The Hungarian and Slovakian national interpretations of history textbooks, canons of difference – The Thököly phenomenon contexts.* Modernization processes in the multi-ethnic nation-states Mentality, social and cultural history approaches Conference (2015) Kosice, Pavol Josef Safarik University

*Thököly udvara Lőcsén. /The princely court of Imre Thököly in Levoča/* Space, time, community conference (2015) Tornaľja

*Thököly Imre vallásossága a források alapján. / The religiosity of Imre Thököly based on the sources./* Religion and denomination conference (2014) Miskolc

*Társadalom–és életmódtörténeti elemek Thököly Imre 1693–1694. évi naplőbejegyzéseiben / Society – and elements of lifestyle history Imre Thököly 1693–1694. in his diary/* (2013) PPKE BTK Conference of the Doctoral School of History, Department of Social and Lifestyle History

*A seregválasztó nagyveszekedés – Thököly Imre és Teleki Mihály vitája/* The army-choosing big quarrel - the debate between Imre Thököly and Mihály Teleki/ (2013) DE BTK Night of researchers

*Thököly Imre a visszafoglaló háború idején. / Imre Thököly during the recapture war/* (2013) XXXI. OTDK

*Munkács és Várad közt – Thököly Imre 1686-1688./* Between Munkács and Várad - Imre Thököly 1686-1688/ (2012) MNL HBML Regional Research Conference

*Ónod és Regéc Thököly fejedelemsége idején/ Ónod and Regéc under the principality of Thököly/* (2011) XXX. OTDK

*A monoki Monaky-kastély/* The small castle in Monok is owned by the Thököly family/ (2010) Homeland Youth Conference