

GÁBOR KÁRMÁN
PAX AND PACIFICATIO

AN ATTEMPT TO CLARIFY TERMINOLOGY FOR A BETTER UNDERSTANDING
OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE KINGDOM OF HUNGARY AND THE PRINCIPALITY
OF TRANSYLVANIA

The study is a reassessment of Sándor Gebei's thesis concerning the separation of the concepts *pax* and *pacificatio* in early modern political theory: according to his argumentation, *pax* would have been used only to refer to international peace treaties, whereas *pacificatio* would have meant a settlement between a ruler and his subjects, a reinstatement of social peace. Thus, according to Gebei, it is only justified to use the latter term for the peace settlements between the kings of Hungary and the princes of Transylvania (which early modern documents also did), because the princes were the kings' subjects and the legitimacy of the princes' rule derived partly from the kings' confirmation. On the basis of many examples from European, as well as from specifically Hungarian usage, this study argues that there is no prestige-based distinction between the two terms when they are used in the meaning "peace treaty". Also, the formulations of the treaties' preambles do not suggest that the parties would have regarded the princes as the kings' subjects; and contrary to the widespread opinion in the scholarship, the Hungarian diets codified not the entire text of the peace treaties, only those parts which were relevant for the current territories of the kingdom – which also suggests that by the mid-17th century they no longer regarded the Principality of Transylvania as an inherent part of the Kingdom of Hungary.