

UDC 94(4-11)“14/15”

DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.15.204963

Yaroslav ANDRUSYAK

PhD (History), Associate Professor, Department of Ancient, Medieval and History of Ukraine Premodern period, State Higher Educational Establishment “Uzhhorod National University”, Narodna 3 Square, Uzhhorod, Ukraine, postal code 88000 (yaroslav.andrusyak@uzhnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7021-3402>

ResearcherID: G-3693-2019 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/G-3693-2019>

Ярослав АНДРУСЯК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри Античності, Середньовіччя та історії України домодерної доби, Вищий державний навчальний заклад “Ужгородський національний університет”, площа Народна 3, м. Ужгород, Україна, індекс 88000 (yaroslav.andrusyak@uzhnu.edu.ua)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Andrusyak, Ya. (2020). The opposition of the Ottoman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire in Central and Eastern Europe and the position of the Czech szlachta (the end of the XVth – the 30-ies of the XVIth century). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 15, 23–34. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.15.204963

**THE OPPOSITION OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE
AND THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE
AND THE POSITION OF THE CZECH SZLACHTA
(THE END OF THE XVth – THE 30-IES OF THE XVIth CENTURY)**

Abstract. *The aim of the research is to highlight the problem of the opposition of the Ottoman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire in the Central and Eastern regions of Europe and to reveal the position of the Czech szlachta. The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, systematic, scientific, author's objectivity, based on historical sources and the chronological and problem principle, as well as on the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) and special-historical (integrated method of analysis of sources, historical-comparative, historical-descriptive, historical-systemic, terminological analysis) methods. The scientific novelty is that for the first time in Ukrainian historical science an analysis of the role and position of the Czech szlachta concerning the problem of the Turkish threat, through the prism of rule in the Czech kingdom of the Jagiellonian dynasty, has been carried out. The Conclusions.* At the end of the XVth century to the beginning of the XVIth century the international situation in the Central and Eastern regions of Europe was tense. The hostility continued between the leading monarchs of Europe. There was a direct Turkish threat to the Czech kingdom. The Papal state, the Polish kingdom and Moscow principality tried to resist the Turkish aggression. The created anti-Turkish alliance (France, Poland and the Pope of Rome) was little effective. Thus, the Hungarian kingdom, headed by King Louis II of Jagiellon, was forced to resist the Turkish Empire on its own actually. Under such circumstances, Louis II, being a Czech king, sought for support among the Czech classes. Taking into consideration the controversy between the Czech and Hungarian upper classes, it can be argued that the Czech szlachta chose a neutral, expectant position, and the Czech city estate at this stage was ignored and did not provide adequate military support to the king. During that period the cities in the Czech kingdom resisted the Czech szlachta and fought for their rights and privileges. Among the Hungarian estates there were disputes

between magnates and szlachta, which greatly complicated the situation. The unsuccessful policy of the representatives of the Czech and Hungarian Jagiellon dynasty led to the loss of the support among the Czech lords, Hungarian magnates and the representatives of burghers. The culmination of the opposition was the Battle of Mohács (August 29, 1526). The Czech estates (upper classes) didn't try to give the military assistance to the King and concerned only about their own interests, which the Czech szlachta together with the Czech city upper class put above the state interest.

Key words: szlachta, estates, lords, Turkish, Jagiellonian dynasty, Vladislaus II Jagiellon, Louis II Jagiellon, the Czech Kingdom, the Turkish Empire.

ПРОТИСТОЯННЯ МІЖ ОСМАНСЬКОЮ ІМПЕРІЄЮ ТА СВЯЩЕННОЮ РИМСЬКОЮ ІМПЕРІЄЮ В ЦЕНТРАЛЬНО-СХІДНІЙ ЄВРОПІ ТА ПОЗИЦІЯ ЧЕСЬКОЇ ШЛЯХТИ (КІНЕЦЬ XV – 30-ті рр. XVI ст.)

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* – висвітлити проблему протистояння між Османською імперією та Священною Римською імперією в Центрально-Східному регіоні Європи та розкрити позицію чеської шляхти за часів правління Владислава II та Людовіка II Ягеллонів. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, авторської об'єктивності, оперті на історичні джерела та хронологічно-проблемний принцип, а також на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) та спеціально-історичних (комплексний метод аналізу джерел, історико-порівняльний, історико-описовий, історико-системний, термінологічний аналіз) методів. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в українській історичній науці здійснено аналіз позиції чеської шляхти щодо проблеми турецької загрози крізь призму правління в Чеському королівстві династії Ягеллонів. **Висновки.** На кінець XV – поч. XVI ст. міжнародна ситуація у Центрально-Східному регіоні Європи була напруженою. Тривала ворожнеча між провідними монархами Європи. Виникла пряма турецька загроза для Чеського королівства. Протистояти турецькій агресії намагалася Папська держава, Польське королівство та Московське князівство. Створений антиосманський союз (Франція, Польща, Папа Римський) був малоефективним. Таким чином, Угорське королівство на чолі з королем Людовіком II Ягеллоном було змушене фактично самотійно чинити опір Османській імперії. За таких обставин Людовік II, будучи і чеським королем, шукав підтримку серед чеських станів. Зважаючи на суперечки між чеськими і угорськими станами, можна стверджувати, що чеська шляхта обрала нейтральну, вичікувальну позицію, а чеський міський стан на цьому етапі був проігнорований і не надав належної військової підтримки королю. Саме в цей період у Чеському королівстві міста чинили опір чеській шляхті й боролися за свої права та привілеї. Серед угорських станів відбувалися суперечки між магнатами та шляхтою, що значно ускладнювало ситуацію. Вони так і не змогли дійти згоди і об'єднатися в період небезпеки. Невдала внутрішня політика представників чесько-угорської лінії династії Ягеллонів призвела до втрати підтримки серед чеських панів, угорських магнатів та представників містян. Кульмінацією протистояння з Османською імперією стала битва при Могачі (29 серпня 1526 р.). Чеські стани не надали належної військової допомоги королю і керувалися насамперед власними інтересами, які ставили вище від державних.

Ключові слова: шляхта, стани, пани, турки, династія Ягеллонів, Владислав II Ягеллон, Людовік II Ягеллон, Чеське королівство, Турецька імперія.

The Problem Statement. With the expansion of the Ottomans into the Balkans and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, there was a direct threat of the Turkish invasion to Central and Eastern Europe. First of all, the Ottoman Empire was a danger to the Hungarian, Czech and Polish kingdoms. This danger was facilitated by the escalation of disputes among the heads of European states, the Emperor Charles V and King Francis I, which caused the rapprochement and signing of allied relations between the Kingdom of France and the High Porte (in Turkish – *Babiali*).

The period of reign of the Jagiellonian dynasty in the Czech kingdom (1471 – 1526) was chosen as the chronological boundaries of the study. The representatives of the

Czech-Hungarian dynastic line of Jagiellonians were Vladislaus II Jagiellończyk (Jagiellonian) (1471 – 1516) and Louis II of Hungary (1516 – 1526) (Čornej & Bartlová, 2008, pp. 407, 474, 531). During their reign in the Czech Kingdom, a class-representative model of a public administration was formed, which significantly weakened the king's position and strengthened the position of the Czech upper classes.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. The term “Turkish threat” or “Turkish fear” is widely used in historiography. In a historical science, the problem of struggle against the Turkish aggression is considered in the context of elucidating of the international relations of the leading European states.

In the Czech historical science, some aspects of the outlined issues are found in the works of: F. Palacký (Palacký, 1930; Palacký, 1976), F. Dvorník (Dvorník, 2005), A. Denis (Denis, 1932), J. Macek (Macek, 2001), V. Čechura (Čechura, 2012) and the others.

The four-volume work by J. Macek “Jagiellonian Age in the Czech Lands” should be singled out (Macek, 2001). The third volume is devoted to the problems of the Czech szlachta and cities. The socio-political struggle of the city class with the Czech szlachta is covered.

The researchers paid much attention to the expansion of the Ottomans in the Czech Republic and Hungary. In addition to general works, the problem of the Turkish aggression was reflected in the specific works. The most complete studies of this kind are the monographs and articles by J. Szabó (Szabó, 2006), Z. Vybíral (Vybíral, 2008), A. Mezeiová (Mezeiová, 2005), I. Zombori (Zombori, 2004) and the others. In some parts of the above-mentioned studies the preconditions, course and consequences of the Battle of Mohács in 1526 are described.

Much material about the activities of Vladislaus II Jagiellonian and Louis II Jagiellonian and their struggle against the Turkish sultanate, can be found in the works on the history of Hungary (Picheta, 1947; Tóth, 2001; Zombori, 2006).

In the Slavic studies, some facts of the Czech szlachta activities and its role in the struggle against the Turkish threat are contained in the works of the Russian and Soviet researchers: “History of the Czech Republic” edited by V. Picheta (Picheta, 1947), “History of Czechoslovakia” (Sanchuk, G.E. & Tretyakova, 1956), the monograph by L. Lapteva (Lapteva, 1993) and the others.

It is worth mentioning the works of the Ottoman historians. The fundamental study of the Austrian historian Josef von Hammer-Purgstall “History of the Ottoman Empire” should be mentioned as well (Hammer, 1947). Volume IX is of great interest, in which through the prism of the foreign policy of the Ottoman Empire, the problem of the Turkish aggression in the region of Central and Eastern Europe is revealed. The work of the Turkish historian G. İnaldjik “The Ottoman Empire: Classical Age 1300 – 1600” (İnaldžyk, 1998) is in-depth, which due to its original concept has not lost its scientific topicality. Analyzing the work, we note that the author covered almost all aspects of the study of the Ottoman state. The reign of Suleiman I was not an exception. The author reveals the reasons for the battle of Mohács, the problems of confrontation between Charles V and Francis I, the rapprochement of the French with the High Porte, which significantly contributed to the penetration of the Ottoman army into Hungary and Austria. Important information about the above-mentioned events is contained in the work of the Scottish historian-orientalist John Patrick Douglas Balfour, Baron Kinross “The Rise and Fall of the Ottoman Empire” (Kynross, 1999).

In the Ukrainian historical science, it is worth mentioning the research of the team of authors “Essays on the History of the Czech Republic” (Zinko, Kalytko, Kravchuk & Pop,

2017). The authors pay little attention to the reign of the Jagiellonians and their struggle against the Turkish aggression. Some aspects of this issue are elucidated in the works of the Ukrainian historians: L. Zashkilnyak (Zashkilniak, 2001), Ya. Tovtyn (Tovtyn, 2011), O. Zviagina (Zviagina, 2015).

However, in the above-mentioned works, little attention is paid to the role of the Czech estates in the struggle against the Turkish threat. Thus, there are no complex studies on the outlined problem in the Ukrainian historiography.

The source basis for writing our scientific study was the documents published in the collections of works "Sources on the History of Slovakia and the Slovaks" (Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovakov) and "Mohács" (Szabó, 2006; Dvořák, 2005). The collection of documents "The Czech Archive" contains no less important material (Archiv Český) (Palacký, 1872; Dvorský, 1889; Rezek, 1890; Kalousek, 1895). Supporting material is contained in the collections of documents "From Ancient Czech Chronicles" (Ze starých letopisů českých) (Porák & Kašpar, 1980), "Czechoslovak History in Archival Documents" (Československé dějiny v archivních dokumentech) (Kut, 1961) and "History in Documents" (Historie v dokumentech) (Kvirenc, & Kunstová, 2006).

In 1829, F. Palacký published the collection of sources "Ancient Czech Chronicles from 1378 to 1527 or a Continuation of the Chronicle of Przybik Pulkava and Beneš from Horzovice from Ancient Manuscripts". In this collection of sources in a chronological order there are the letters of princes, lords and knights, which contain important political information of an ultraquistic nature. It should be noted that in 1980 the collection was republished and translated from Old Czech into modern Czech by J. Porák and J. Kaspar under the title "From the Ancient Czech Chronicles" (Ze starých letopisů českých) (Porák & Kašpar, 1980).

Important information is contained in Chapters VI, IX, X, and XIV of the Czech Archives, published by F. Palatsky, F. Dvorsky, A. Rezek, and J. Kalousek. In Volume VI, published in 1872, we have analyzed the chapter "Acts and Decisions of Congresses in the Czech Kingdom", which contains the information on the introduction of congresses acts and decisions, laws and decrees that shed light on the political activities of the Czech szlachta (Palacký, 1872). In Volume IX, published in 1889, the chapter "The Letters of Zdenek Lev from Rozhmítal in 1526" is important. (Dopisy Zdeňka Lvy z Rozmítalu in 1526) (Dvorský, 1889). The chapter contains the letters from Mr. Zdenek Lev from Rozhmítal, which cover a political life and the inter-state disputes. The documents contained in Volumes X and XIV, published in 1890 and 1895, (Rezek, 1890; Kalousek, 1895), reveal the political activities of the Czech szlachta and their disputes with the city authorities.

In 1961 the collection of documents "Czechoslovak History in Archival Documents" was published. The collection comprises the document "The Letter of Derdja Doge with an Order to Conduct the Combat against Szlachta in 1514" (Kut, 1961). Analyzing this letter, we learn about the delay of the Czech szlachta in providing a military help to the king.

In 2005 the collection of documents "Sources on the History of Slovakia and the Slovaks" was published under the editorship of P. Dvořák. Volume VII, the chapter "The Turks in Hungary" contains a significant material, in which we find the information about the Battle of Mohács and its consequences (Dvořák, 2005). An important source on the topic of the research is the collection "Mohács", compiled by J. Szabó in 2006. First of all, we were interested in the reports on the Battle of Mohács in 1526 (Szabó, 2006).

In 2006, J. Kvirents and E. Kunstová compiled a collection of materials based on the documents from the early Middle Ages to 1914. In Chapter V we find the documents and

illustrations, which date back to the Jagiellonian period and provide information about the Battle of Mohács (Kvirenc, & Kunstová, 2006).

The purpose of the study is to elucidate the problem of confrontation between the Ottoman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire in the Central and Eastern regions of Europe and to reveal the position of the Czech szlachta.

The Statement of the Basic Material. It is advisable to refer to the term “szlachta”. In the sources of this period it is difficult to find the term “szlachta”. We will not find this term in the legal acts, provincial documents, “The Tovachov Book” or “The Provincial Statute of Vladislaus II”. Instead, we come across the terms: “lord”, “panosh”, “zeman”, “knight” and, etc. The very term “szlachta” comes from Germany and it began to be used in the Czech lands later. Until the XVth century the wealthiest lords and knights were called “szlachta” (Macek, 2001, p. 338; Denis, 1932, pp. 164–176; Starý, 2005, p. 252). In the Ukrainian historical science, in addition to the term “the Czech szlachta”, we also find the use of the terms “the Czech nobility”, “the Czech petty gentry”. However, in the Czech historiography, all the upper classes of the Czech medieval society are called “szlachta”. That is why, the author of this research will use the term “the Czech szlachta”.

At the beginning of the XVIth century there was a direct Turkish threat to the Czech kingdom. Before elucidating this issue, it is necessary to learn about the international situation at the end of the XVth – the beginning of the XVIth century. It should be noted that there was some enmity among the leading monarchs of Europe. The Papal Curia, the Polish Kingdom during the reign of Sigismund I the Old (1507 – 1548), and Moscovia, under the rule of Grand Duke Basil III (1505 – 1533), tried to oppose the Turkish sultanate. However, the latter two were at some enmity with each other and did not want to aggravate relations with the Ottoman Empire (Krymskiy, 1996, pp. 153–157).

Despite a rather peaceful nature of Sultan Bayezid II (1481 – 1512), during 1491 – 1492 the Turks carried out several military actions in the Balkans and laid siege to Belgrade (retreated on July 29, 1491). (Pushkash & Shusharina, 1971, p. 236; Porák & Kašpar, 1980, p. 267). Under such circumstances, in 1500, Vladislaus II joined the alliance with the kings of France, Poland and Pope Alexander IV (1492 – 1503) in the struggle against the High Porte. Despite the anti-Turkish alliance, the Turks remained being dangerous for the Hungarian and Czech kingdoms, as well as for the whole territory of Europe. That is why, in 1514 a crusade against the Turkish Empire was declared in Hungary, but, as we know, it all ended in the uprising under the command of Derdja Doge (1470 – 1514). It should be noted that it was during the uprising that the Czech szlachta expressed their position for the first time. The Czech szlachta reacted to the problems of their king in Hungary very slowly and they were in no hurry to provide some help (Pushkash & Shusharina, 1971, p. 237). This slowness was caused not only by indifference to the problems of the king, but also to the Hungarian estates (upper classes).

An interesting fact is that during the uprising (Kut, 1961, p. 28), Vladislaus II rejected the offer of a military assistance of the Czech cities: “The Hungarian upper class does not want this... such an embassy can harm us” (Macek, 2001, pp. 251–252). This mistake will have serious consequences in the future, as the Czech cities could actually provide military force in the struggle against the Turkish sultanate. Taking into consideration the disputes between the Czech and Hungarian upper classes, it can be stated that the Czech szlachta chose a neutral, wait-and-see attitude, and the Czech urban representatives were ignored at this stage.

A new danger arose in 1521 with the coming to power of the new Sultan Suleiman I the Magnificent or Kanuni (Legislator) (1520 – 1566). Under these circumstances, King Louis II

asked European rulers for help at the congress in Worms (Krymskyi, 1996, p. 160; Cambel, 1986, p. 424; Petrosyan, 2013, p. 67; Zviahina, 2015, p. 74). The idea that the Hungarians could not defeat the Turks dominated among the Czech szlachta. It should be noted that the leading representatives of the Czech szlachta were reluctant to help the King. It can be affirmed that the main reason for the delay in helping the King was his support policy of the city representatives. The King understood the importance of it, but the opportunity to receive a military assistance was already lost. It was during this period that in the Czech Kingdom the cities resisted the Czech szlachta and fought for their rights and privileges (Čechura, 2012, pp. 194–199; Mrva, 2005, p. 7; Zombori, 2004, p. 148).

The circumstances of the Turkish aggression made the Kings Sigismund I, Louis II and Duke Ferdinand I meet in October 1523 in Wiener Neustadt (Zombori, 2004, pp. 149–150; Zombori, 2006, pp. 274–284). One of the questions concerned the Turkish danger. A large crusade against the Ottomans was planned. It is known that the Czech upper classes reacted for the first time, sending the delegation to the Congress on October 21, 1523: Prince Karl of Minsterberg, Chancellor Adam from Hradec, Wojciech from Pernstein, Jan Glaws, a representative of the city, and the others. It should be noted that the records of this meeting on agreements with the Czech upper classes remained a mystery (Palacký, 1930, p. 532).

The Turkish issue became acute after Suleiman I captured quite important fortresses during the summer of 1524, namely: Pětikostelí, Orschowa and Caras-Severin. This success was facilitated by the escalation of disputes between the Emperor Charles V of Habsburg (1519 – 1558) and the King Francis I (1515 – 1547). After Francis I lost the battle for the imperial crown and was taken a prisoner, his relations with the Emperor and the Roman Curia deteriorated considerably. The Turkish sultanate decided to take advantage of this, signing a secret treaty with Francis I and intending to weaken the unity of European monarchs (Иналджик, 1998, pp. 45–46; Новичев, 1963, pp. 86–87; Кинросс, 1999, pp. 190–195).

The inaction of the King and his entourage caused indignation among the Hungarian estates (upper classes). This situation led to the development of disputes between the magnates and szlachta, which greatly complicated the situation. It should be noted that the Hungarian estates (upper classes) were unable to reach an agreement and unite during the period of danger (Palacký, 1930, p. 563).

Under such circumstances, Louis II tried to gather more troops to defend the lands. In particular, his letters to the Czech upper class representatives, the representatives of religious movements and the Pope are known. The ambassador was sent to the Czech lands with a request to provide a military assistance. Lev of Rožmítal (1470 – 1535), the supreme burgrave, immediately announced that this issue must be resolved at the Sejm in Prague (Palacký, 1930, p. 564).

To provide a military assistance to the King the consent of the General Sejm (the main body) was required. The procedure was as follows: the King had the right to summon the General Sejm, and in of his absence (death, departure, etc.) – the governor of the kingdom – the supreme burgrave (*supremus burgravius*). Usually the main issues discussed were the following: the election of a new king, religious issues, military readiness in case of danger, etc. (Vaněček, 1970, pp. 108, 113–114; Vaněček, 1947, p. 143). To do this, it was necessary to summon regional and zemstvo congresses, which gave a permission for a military campaign and elected representatives to take part in the General Sejm. The decision of the Sejm did not require a royal assent. After the decision was made, it was included into zemstvo boards (in Czech – *zemské desky*) and came into force (Markov, 1930, p. 92). As we can see, in the

case of a rapid response to the danger, giving a military assistance was a complex and time-consuming process in terms of organization.

Mr. Lev's letter of June 22, 1526, to his comrade testifies to the mood, which prevailed among the Czech estates (upper classes): "I am sending you the answer given by Prague lords to Mr. Tsetris. We hope that there will be no need to go to the battle against the Turks". (Dvorský, 1889, p. 48). Also on June 28, 1526, he wrote to Mr. Wojciech of Pernstein that the money had been sent from Buda for 4,000 mercenaries, adding: "Why do we need the infantry against the Turks? Let them serve for us. We must defend our lands, so we must be ready". On July 7, 1526, Mr. Lev wrote: "Those, who were present at the Congress in Prague decided to help the King" (Dvorský, 1889, p. 48). Based on the analysis of the letters, it can be stated that the Czech estates (upper classes) were in no hurry to provide a military assistance to the King and were guided primarily by their own interests, which the Czech szlachta together with the Czech city upper class put above the state interest.

As of the first quarter of the XVIth century the richest Czech lords were: Indřich from Hradec, the Rožmberka lords, Jan from Šelmberk, Mykola Tyrčka from Lichtenburg, the lord Kostka from Postupice, Willem from Pernštejna, Indřich from Plavn, the Schwigowski lords, Albrecht Lipsteinsky from Kolovrat, Vladyslav and Jan from Sternberg, the Weitmilnarzhi lords, Zdeněk Lev from Rozhmital (Palacký, 1872, pp. 316–321). Depending on a lord's wealth, it was determined how many soldiers the lord had to make ready for the needs during the war (Macek, 2001, p. 364). The most influential lords (Willem from Pernštejna, Wok from Rožmberk, Peter and Zdeněk of Sternberg) no longer provided a military assistance to the King. This came under the control of vassals: magnates, zemanes, mercenaries (Rezek, 1890, p. 56). Among the duties of vassals was primarily a military service. At the lord's call, the vassal had to appear in the lord's estate with his horse, weapons, supplies. The vassal had to accompany the lord during military activities or hunting. The vassal had to repair fortresses, clean the yards, etc. The vassals were greatly influenced by the lords from Rožmberk, Shvamberg, Indrzhikhov Hradec families. By the way, a military service could be redeemed. Thus, in 1472 zeman Peter of Voikov paid a ransom of 400 zlotykh to Jan from Rožmberk (Kalousek, 1895, p. 209).

As we see, with the establishment of the estate monarchy in the lands of the Czech crown, the upper Czech szlachta no longer provided a military assistance to the King, and the petty szlachta could pay off this obligation. Of course, the King was able to hire troops for large sums of money. In 1526 they managed to hire 1,300 Czech soldiers (zholdners), (from French *solde* – a mercenary), who will take a direct part in the battle of Mohács.

The culmination of the confrontation with the Ottoman Empire was the battle of Mohács (in Hungarian – *Mohács*). The King Louis II had much hope for the Hungarian and Czech troops. He accounted for the Czech and Moravian armies of up to 16 000. However, the military help was less than it was expected. It is known that with the funds sent by the Pope (25 000 ducats), they managed to hire 4 000 of the Czech and German and 1 500 Polish soldiers. The exact number of the Czech troops is not known, it was about 1 300 Moravian soldiers. As for earl Janos Zapolyai, he and his army (about 8 – 10 000 of people) were late for the battle. According to the main version, he is believed to have betrayed the King, but there are speculations concerning the geographical features of the Balkans. It should be noted that there were no exact data on the movement of the Ottoman army. What direction they chose became known only when the Ottoman army crossed the Balkans (the main target was Buda). Thus, Janos Zapolyai defended the way through

Transylvania, not knowing the movement direction of the Ottoman army (Mohach – 1526, 2014, p. 13; Szabó, 2006, pp. 93–94).

The sources give rather poor information about the number of the royal troops. Thus, according to various statistics data, the royal army numbered 25–28 000 (of whom 8 000 were foreigners: the Czechs, the Poles, the Croats, the Serbs, the Germans, the Italians, the Spaniards) soldiers and 53–80 guns. The number of the Turkish troops was 55–65 000 soldiers and 160 guns (Vybiral, 2008, pp. 24–25; Čechura, 2012, p. 206; Mohach – 1526, 2014, pp. 13–14; Szabó, 2006, pp. 93–94; Fučík & Havel, 2003, p. 11). With such a distribution of forces, the Ottomans had a clear advantage.

The battle took place in the afternoon of August 29, 1526 and ended in two hours with the complete defeat of the royal troops, and King Louis II, escaping from the battle field, died (got drowned, crossing the Danube Gulf of Csele-patak (Čechura, 2012, p. 206; Letz, 1995, pp. 30–31; Vybiral, 2008, pp. 73–75; Lapteva, 1993, p. 105; Kvirenc & Kunstová, 2006, p. 93; Кинросс, 1999, pp. 202–203). All the prisoners (about 1 500 people) were executed by the order of Suleiman I. Archbishop of Salkan, Tomori (7 prelates in total), György Zapolyai, Jan Dragfi, Ambrose Sharshen (28 lords and 500 sylachta representatives in total) were killed (Dvořák, 2005, pp. 22–24; Szabó, 2006, pp. 155–156; Dvořák, 2005, pp. 25–26; Szabó, 2006, p. 143; Fialová, 1964, p. 95; Segeš, 1998, p. 193; Mohach – 1526, 2014, p. 27). In two weeks, on September 10, 1526, the Turks captured Buda. It should be noted that the Ottoman troops were stopped only near Vienna (1529) (Krymskyi, 1996, p. 161; Petrosyan, 2013, pp. 69–70).

The defeat at the Battle of Mohács had serious geopolitical consequences. Thus, the majority of the Hungarian petty and middle szlachta supported Janos I Zapolyai (1526 – 1540), and the representatives of the higher szlachta supported Ferdinand I Habsburg (Tóth, 2001, p. 234; Skladaný, 1970, p. 44; Palacký, 1930, pp. 570–572; Tovtyn, 2011, pp. 35–36). The Transylvanian principality (dependent on Turkey) emerged, and the so-called Royal Hungary emerged in the other part of Hungary. Concerning the Czech estates, according to the matrimonial pact of 1515, a representative of the Habsburg dynasty, Ferdinand I of Habsburg (1526 – 1564), was elected to the Czech throne (Baďurik & Konya, 2000, p. 15; Čechura, 2012, pp. 64–80; Galandauer & Honzík, 1987, p. 274). The Czech estates (upper classes) elected a monarch, who was initially forced to secure their rights and privileges and to take care of the security of the lands of the Czech crown.

The Conclusions. Thus, the unsuccessful domestic policy of the Czech-Hungarian line of the Jagiellonian dynasty caused a loss of support among the Czech lords, the Hungarian magnates and townspeople. It was a failure to involve the leading monarchs of Europe into the struggle against the Turkish aggression. The Czech estates (upper classes) underestimated the level of danger and cared more about their own political and economic interests. The evidence of this are the letters of the Czech lords, knights, townspeople. The Czech lords, knights, townspeople had the duty to provide a military assistance to the King only in case of an imminent danger to the Czech kingdom. Louis II, as the King of the two kingdoms, was betrayed by the representatives of his own Czech estates. The Czech szlachta no longer took part in the military campaigns personally, and the petty szlachta could redeem themselves from this duty. However, as the history will show, the consequences of the “Catastrophe at Mohács” was felt later by the Czech kingdom. In the beginning, no significant changes occurred. The Turks were stopped near Vienna and did not invade the Czech lands. The Habsburg dynasty became a hidden threat. Already from the 30-ies of the XVIth century

there were tendencies to the centralization of power. After 1547 there were tendencies to a certain absolutism of power. All this will lead to the confrontation of the Czech estates with the monarch and, as the consequence, the uprising broke out, which led to the defeat, the loss of the Czech statehood and the establishment of absolutism.

Acknowledgments. The author expresses gratitude to the staff of the Moravian Library (Brno city, Czech Republic) for the materials provided by the funds used in the study.

Funding. The author received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bad'urik, J. & Konya, P. (ed.). (2000). *Slovensko v habsburskej monarchii 1526 – 1918* [Slovakia in the Habsburg Monarchy 1526 – 1918]. Bratislava: Lana, 122 p. [in Slovak]

Cambel, S. (ed.). (1986). *Dějiny Slovenska I. Do roku 1526* [History of Slovakia I. Until 1526]. Bratislava: Veda, 534 p. [in Slovak]

Čechura, J. (2012). *České země v letech 1437 – 1526, Jagellonci na českém trůně 1471 – 1526 (Díl II)* [Czech lands in 1437 – 1526, Jagellons on the Czech throne 1471 – 1526]. Praha: "Libri", 423 p. [in Czech]

Čornej, P. & Bartlová, M. (2007). *Velké dějiny země Koruny České (1437 – 1526) (Svazek VI)* [Great History of the Czech Crown lands (1437 – 1526)]. Praha-Litomyšl: Paseka, 839 p. [in Czech]

Denis, A. (1932). *Konec samostatnosti České (Díl I)* [End of Czech Independence]. Praha: Šolc a Šimáček, 301 p. [in Czech]

Dupuy, E. & Dupuy, T. (ed.). (1996). *Vojenské dejiny. Od 3500 př. Kr. Do r. 1700 (Díl I)* [Military history. From 3500 BC. Until 1700]. Praha: Forma, 667 p. [in Czech]

Dvořák, P. (ed.). (2005). *Opis nešťastnej bitky pri Moháči Mikuláša Ištivániho, Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovakov VII, Turci v Uhorsku I, Život v Uhorskom kraľovstve počas tureckých vojen od tragickej bitky pri Moháči až do Bratislavského snemu* [Description of the unfortunate battle of Mohács Mikuláš Ištiváni, Sources to the history of Slovakia and Slovaks VII, Turks in Hungary I, Life in the Kingdom of Hungary during the Turkish Wars from the tragic Battle of Mohács to the Bratislava Assembly] (pp. 22–24). Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum. [in Slovak]

Dvořák, P. (ed.). (2005). *Verný opis tureckej masakry po bitke pri Moháči, Pramene k dejinám Slovenska a Slovakov VII, Turci v Uhorsku I, Život v Uhorskom kraľovstve počas tureckých vojen od tragickej bitky pri Moháči až do Bratislavského snemu* [A real description of the Turkish massacre after the Battle of Mohács, Sources to the History of Slovakia and Slovaks VII, Turks in Hungary I, Life in the Kingdom of Hungary during the Turkish Wars from the tragic Battle of Mohács to the Bratislava Assembly] (pp. 25–26). Bratislava: Literárne informačné centrum, 2005. [in Slovak]

Dvornik, F. (2005). *Sloviany v yevropeiskii istorii ta tsyvilizatsii* [Slavs in European history and civilization]. Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 494 p. [in Ukrainian]

Dvorský, F. (1889). *Vojtěchovi z Pernšteina o hájení spravedlivosti, prav, svobod zemských i vší vlasti. Na hradě Pražském 1526, 22. 3, Dopisy pana Zdeňka Lva z Rožmitála z roku 1526* [Adalbert of Pernstein about defending the rights and freedoms of the lands and all the country. At Prague Castle 1526, March 22, Letters by Zdeněk Leo of Rožmitál from 1526], *Archiv Český 9 (AČ)*. Praha, 48. [in Czech]

Fialová, V. (1964). *Znojmo a královna Marie, vdova po Ludovíku Jagellonském* [Znojmo and the Queen Mary, a widow of Louis Jagiellonian]. *Vlastivědný věsík moravský*, 26, 89–96. [in Czech]

Fučík, J. & Havel, P. (ed.). (2003). *Pod císařským praporem. Historie habsburské armády 1526 – 1918* [Under the Imperial banner. The History of the Habsburg Army 1526 – 1918]. Praha: Elka Press, 555 p. [in Czech]

Galandauer, J. & Honzík, M. (1987). *Osud trónu Habsburského* [The fate of the throne of Habsburg]. Bratislava: Obzor, 392 p. [in Slovak]

Hammer, von J. (1947). *Osmanlı Devleti Tarihi (1066 – 1086 / 1656 – 1676) (Cilt XI)* [Ottoman State History (1066 – 1086 / 1656 – 1676)]. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 303 p. [in Turkish]

Heřman, F. (ed.). (2007). *Duchem i mečem, čtení o slávě, velikosti a utrpení našeho lidu [With the spirit and the sword, reading about the glory, greatness and suffering of our people]*. Praha: “Naše vojsko”, 778 p. [in Czech]

Inaldzhyk, Gh. (1998). *Osmanská imperija: klasychna doba 1300 – 1600: per. z anglh [Ottoman Empire: Classic Age 1300 – 1600]*. Kyiv: Krytyka, 286 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kalousek, J. (ed.) (1895). *Petr z Vojkova purkrabí Zvíkovskému; o půjčce panu z Rosenberka, Dodavek ke sbírce dopisův rodu Rosenberského do roku 1526 [Peter of Vojkov, a burgrave Zvíkovský; about the loan of the lord of Rosenberg, Addition to the collection of the Rosenberg family until 1526]*, AČ 14. Praha, 209 p. [in Czech]

Kolankowski, L. (1911). *Polityka ostatnich Jagiellonów [Policy of the recent Jagiellonians]*, *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 25 (1), 55–63, 201–232. [in Polish]

Krymskyi, A. (1996). *Istoriia Turechchyny [History of Turkey]*. Kyiv-Lviv: Olir, 288 p. [in Ukrainian]

Kut, B. (1961). *List Jiřího Doži s příkazem k boji proti šlechtě (1514), Československé dějiny v archivních dokumentech, Výbor exponátu z celostátní výstavy archivních dokumentů v Praze roku 1958 [Letter from Jiří Doža with the Order to the battle against the Nobility (1514), Czechoslovak History in Archival Documents, Choice of the Exhibit from the National Exhibition of Archival Documents in Prague 1958]*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 28 p. [in Czech]

Kvířenc, J. & Kunstová, E. (2006). *České dějiny do roku 1914. Historie v dokumentech [Czech history until 1914. History in documents]*. Liberec: Dialog, 208 p. [in Czech]

Kynross, Lord (1999). *Rascvet y upadok Osmanskoj ymperyy [The Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire]*. Moskva: Kron-press, 696 p. [in Russian]

Lapteva, L. P. (1993). *Istoriya Chehii perioda feodalizma (X – seredina XVII st.) [History of Czechia during the period of Feudalism (X – mid. XVII century.)]*. Moskva: Izd-vo MGU, 1993, 159 p. [in Russian]

Letz, R. (1995). *Náčrt dějin Uhorska a Mad'arska, S osobitným zreteľom na mad'arsko-slovenské vzťahy [Outline of the history of Hungary and Hungarians, With special regard to Hungarian-Slovak relations]*. Bratislava: Polygrafia vedeckej literatúry a časopisov SAV, 139 p. [in Slovak]

Macek, J. (2001). *Jagellonský věk v českých zemích (1471 – 1526) (Díl 1-2) [The Jagiellonian Age in the Czech Lands (1471 – 1526)]*. Praha: Academia, 561 p. [in Czech]

Mannova, E. (ed.). (2003). *Kratke dejiny Slovenska [Brief history of Slovakia]*. Bratislava: AEP, 368 p. [in Slovak]

Markov, J. (1930). *Přípravné řízení procesní v českém právu zemském XII – XVII stol. [Preparatory Procedural Statutes in Czech Land Law XII – XVII cent.]*. Bratislava, 203 p. [in Slovak]

Mohach – 1526. (2014). *100 bitv kotoryie izmenili mir [100 battles that have changed the world]*. Moskva: De Agostini, 181 p. [in Russian]

Mrva, I. (2005). *Jagelovec s puncnom predčasnosti [Jagelovec with the hallmark of premature]*, *Historická revue* 10, Roč. V, 6–7. [in Czech]

Novychev, A. (1963). *Ystoriya Turcyi. pokha feodalizma (XI – XVIII veka) (Tom 1) [History of Turkey. The Era of Feudalism (XI – XVIII centuries)]*. Leningrad: Yzd-vo LGhU, 310 p. [in Russian]

Palacký, F. (1930). *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a na Moravě (Díl V) [History of the Czech nation in Bohemia and Moravia]*. Praha: L. Mazáč, 578 p. [in Czech]

Palacký, F. (1976). *Stručný přehled dějin českých doby starší (až po rok 1526) [Brief overview of the history of the Bohemian Era (up to 1526)]*. Praha: Odeon, 134 p. [in Czech]

Palacký, F. (ed.). (1872). *Popis lidí branných a vozův, kteří k válce proti Šlikům z celého království vypraviti se měli. Jul. 1505, Akta wrejina i snémowni w Čechach 1505 [Description of people conscripts and carts sent to the wars against the Sliks from all Kingdom. Jul. 1505, Acts of Congresses in Bohemia 1505]*, AČ 6. Praha, 316–321. [in Czech]

Panek, J. & Tůma, O. (2008). *Dějiny Česých zemích [History of the Czech Lands]*. Praha: Karolinum, 492 p. [in Czech]

Petrosyan, Yu. (2013). *Osmanskaya imperiya [Ottoman Empire]*. Moskva: Algoritm, 2013, 304 p. [in Russian]

- Picheta, V. I.** (Ed.). (1947). *Istoriya Chehii [History of Czechia]*. Moskva: Gospolitizdat, 260 p. [in Russian]
- Porák, J. & Kašpar, J.** (ed.). (1980). *Ze starých letopisů českých [From old Czech Chronicles]*. Praha: Svoboda, 576 p. [in Czech]
- Pushkash, A. I. & Shusharina, V. P.** (ed.). (1971). *Istoriya Vengrii [History of Hungary] (in 3 vol., Vol. I)*. Moskva: Nauka, 643 p. [in Russian]
- Rezek, A.** (ed.) (1890). *Petr ze Šternberka Vokovi z Rosenberka oznamuje návštěvu svou na Krumlov ve příčině zbroje, i s manželkou Kateřinou (rozenou z Rosenberka) a synem Janem. Na Leštně 1490, 14. Sept., Dopisy rodů Hradeckého a Rosenberského od roku 1478 – 1506 [Peter of Šternberk announces to Vok of Rosenberk his visit to Krumlov in the cause of armour, together with his wife Kateřina (from Rosenberk) and his son Jan. Na Leštně 1490, 14. Sept., Letters of the Hradec Králové and Rosenberg families from 1478 – 1506], AČ 10*. Praha, 56. [in Czech]
- Sanchuk, G.E. & Tretyakova, P.N.** (1956). *Istoriya Chechoslovakii [History of Czechoslovakia] (in 3 vol., Vol. 1)*. Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 416 p. [in Russian]
- Segeš, V.** (ed.). (1998). *Kniha kraľov. Panovníci v dejinách Slovenska a Slovakov [The Book of Kings. The ruler in the history of Slovakia and Slovaks]*. Bratislava: Kleio, 300 p. [in Czech]
- Skladany, M.** (1970). Slovensko ako suplent "Uhorského kraľovstva" [*Slovakia as a part of the "Kingdom of Hungary"*], *Príroda a spoločnosť*, 19 (3), 40–45. [in Czech]
- Starý, M.** (2005). Prijímaní Moravských a Slezských šlechticův do panského stavu království Českého v 16 a na počátku 17 století, *Korunní země v dějinách českého státu II: společné a rozdílné, Česká koruna v životě jejich obyvatel ve 14-16 století, Sborník příspěvků přednesených na kolokviu pořádaném ve dnech 12. a 13. května 2004 v Clam-Gallasově paláci v Praze [Acceptance of Moravian and Silesian nobles to the ruling state of the Bohemian Kingdom in the 16th and early 17th centuries, The Crown Land in the History of the Czech State II: Common and Different, The Czech Crown 12 and 13 May 2004 at the Clam-Gallas Palace in Prague]*. Praha: Albis international, 2005, 251–288. [in Czech]
- Szabó, J.** (2006). Mohács [*Mohács*]. Budapest: Osiris, 2006, 638 p. [in Hungarian]
- Szabó, J.** (ed.). (2006). *Antonio Giovanni da Burgio pápai követ levele Jacobo Saboletto pápai titkárnak, Pozsony, 1526 szeptember 5, Mohács [Antonio Giovanni da Burgio Pipe's letter to Jacobo Saboletto Pipe assistant, Pozsony, 1526 September 5, Mohács]*. Budapest: Osiris kiadó, 93–94. [in Hungarian]
- Szabó, J.** (ed.). (2006). *Igaz történet a magyarok és Szulejmán török császár ütközetéről, 1527, Mohács [A true story about the battle between the Hungarians and the Turkish emperor Suleiman, 1527, Mohács]*. Budapest: Osiris kiadó, 134–155. [in Hungarian]
- Szabó, J.** (ed.). (2006). *Sperfogel Konrád lőcsei városi tanácsos naplója (részlet), Mohács [The diary of the city councilor of Levoča, Konrád Sperfogel (part), Mohács]*. Budapest: Osiris kiadó, 155–156. [in Hungarian]
- Tóth, I.-G.** (ed.). (2001). *Millenniumi magyar történet. Magyarország története a honfoglalástól napjainkig [Millennium Hungarian story. The history of Hungary from the conquest to the present day]*. Budapest: Osiris kiadó, 733 p. [in Hungarian]
- Tovtyn, Ya.** (2011). *Suspilno-politychne stanovyshche slovatskykh zemel u skladi monarkhii Habsburhiv (1526 – 1610 rr.) [Socio-political position of the Slovak lands as part of the Habsburg monarchy (1526 – 1610)]*. Uzhhorod: Polihraftsentr "Lira", 160 p. [in Ukrainian]
- Vaněček, V.** (1947). *Malé dějiny státu a práva v Československu [Small History of the State and Law in Czechoslovakia]*. Praha: Nákl. vl., 210 p. [in Czech]
- Vaněček, V.** (1970). České sněmy za stavovské monarchie (od poloviny 15. Století do počátku třicetileté války) [*Czech congress during the Estates Monarchy (from the middle 15th century to the beginning of the Thirty Years War)*], *Česka národní rada, sněm českého lidu*. Praha, 103–116. [in Czech]
- Veselý, Z.** (1999). *Přehled dějin českého státu [Review of the history of the Czech state]*. Praha: Přehled dějin českého státu, 484 p. [in Czech]
- Vybíral, Z.** (2008). *Bitva u Moháče. Krvavá porážka uherského a českého krále Ludvíka Jagellonského v boji s Osmany 29. srpna 1526 [Battle of Mohachi. Bloody defeat of the Hungarian and*

Czech King Louis Jagellon in the battle with the Ottomans in August 29, 1526. Praha: Havran, 225 p. [in Czech]

Zashkilniak, L. (Ed.). (2001). *Istoriia Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy [History of Central and Eastern Europe], Posibnyk dlia studentiv istorychnykh i humanitarnykh fakultetiv universytetiv*. Lviv: Lvivskiy natsionalnyi universytet imeni Ivana Franka, 660 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zinko, Yu. A., Kalytko, S. L., Kravchuk, O. M. & Pop, I. I. (Comps.). (2017). *Narysy istorii Chekhii [Essays on the History of Czechia], Navchalnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladiv*. Vinnytsia: TOV "Nilan-LTD", 464 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zombori, I. (2004). *Jagello-Habsburg kísérlet a török elleni háborúra 1523-ban, Közép – Európa harca a török ellen a 16. század első felében [Jagello-Habsburg's attempt at the war against the Turks in 1523, Central-European battle against the Turks in the first half of the 16th century]*. Budapest, 2004, 147–153. [in Hungarian]

Zombori, I. (2006). *Jagelló habsburg rendezési kísérlet 1523-ban Krzysztof Szydłowiecki naplója alapján [Attempt to settle Jagiellonian habsburg in 1523 based on the diary of Krzysztof Szydłowiecki]*. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, 2006, 335 p. [in Hungarian]

Zviahina, O. (2015). *Formuvannia novykh osoblyvostei politychnoho rozvytku Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy. Borotba za uhorsku ta chesku korony u 1526 r. [The formation of new features of the political development of Central and Eastern Europe. Fighting for the Hungarian and Czechian Crown in 1526]*. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopil'skoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Seriya: Istoriia*, 2 (2), 73–81. [in Ukrainian]

Mezeiová, A. (2005). *Stopy bitiek v Moháči [Traces of the Battle of Mohacs]*. *Historická revue* 10, Roč. V, 8. [in Czech]

*The article was received on August 18, 2019.
Article recommended for publishing 20/05/2020.*