As for Polish history, it is argued that it does not make sense to speak about the *sejm* without speaking about the *sejmiki*.\(^1\) It is just the same with Hungary. They counties were the organs of the self-government of the local nobility, but also represented the state, as – beyond the flimsy and specialized apparatus of the Hungarian Chamber – the ruler had no agents in Hungary on the local and regional levels. As the army could only be relied on exceptionally, the court and the central administrative offices were dependent on the counties’ mostly elected official apparatus in implementing their orders. The counties are, therefore, the clue to the political development of Hungary in the 18th and 19th centuries. The fact that they collected taxes made them into a mighty bulwark of the estates’ power. As Hungary was left out of the great administrative reforms of the Habsburg Monarchy in the mid-18th century, it was continued to be run by the *bene possessionatus* gentry and not by royal bureaucrats, unlike the other provinces of the Monarchy, as observed by P. G. M. Dickson.\(^2\) It is the system

---


of counties that hides behind the fact that the path of Hungary’s development gradually deviated from that of the western provinces of the Habsburg state, conserving an increasingly outdated dualism of king and estates, which the estates redefined in modern terms by the 1790s, as they came to call their rights and privileges the „constitution” of Hungary.\(^3\)

Not surprisingly, State Chancellor Wenzel Anton Count of Kaunitz-Rietberg in 1761 and Palatine Archduke Alexander Leopold in 1795 agreed that the system of the counties was the greatest obstacle to reforming Hungary. The latter wrote in a memorandum for his brother, Emperor Francis II (as king of Hungary, Francis I) that the state was powerless in Hungary, it could not enter the counties, and did not even have adequate information on the situation there, so it was unable protect the taxpaying population. According to Kaunitz, the counties of Hungary could „hardly to be directed to the proper path”, and the state should penetrate them.\(^4\) Joseph II even abolished the counties and replaced them by districts directed by appointed royal officials (1785-1790), but after less then five years he had to acknowledge his defeat and restore the counties.

More than in other countries and provinces of the Habsburg Monarchy, in Hungary landlords preserved much of their power above their serfs well into the 19th century, and the noble self-government of the counties exerted almost all of the power of the state through their elected noble office-holders wielding public authority on the regional and local levels. Thus, behind the strong position of the Hungarian diet vis-à-vis the king, the counties can be found. In the eighteenth century, their deputies were in an increasingly strong position at the diet, where crucial political decisions were taken and legislation happened in cooperation with the ruler. Here, by the end of the century, county deputies pushed all the other participants into the background: aristocrats, bishops and the deputies both of the free royal cities and of the clergy.\(^5\)

### Counties and officials

It is, thus, relevant to explore the bureaucracy that ran the counties in the 18th-century. This study will make an attempt at an investigation of the bureaucracies

---

3 E. g. Hungarian malcontents asked Prime Minister William Pitt to recognize Leopold II’s rule legitimate in Hungary on the condition that he rules in the spirit of the “constitution”, that is, Hungary is acknowledged being a monarchia mixta and the estates’ consent should be required to decide questions of war and peace. (SZAKÁLY. Egy vállalkozó főnemes: Vay Miklós báró (1756–1824). Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó, 2003, p. 124-125.)


in six counties: two in Transdanubia in the west: Baranya and Zala, two in the northern and eastern regions of the Great Hungarian Plain (Heves and Ung), while two more to the south: Békés and Csanád. Their choice is determined by the fact that they have published archontological data about their 18th-century history. We cannot, therefore, claim that they represent the whole of Kingdom of Hungary, as especially the absence of northern territories is a sore spot in this sample. Still, we have here both counties with overwhelmingly Catholic nobility and a county from the Transtibiscan area where Protestantism stood the strongest; we have on the one hand a county like Zala situated in the former belt of military defences against the Ottomans, characterized by continuous warfare in the 16th and 17th centuries, therefore having a high proportion of noble population, and on the other hand counties like Csanád and Békés, lying in the territories formerly occupied by Ottomans, having hardly any noble inhabitants — so we have a colourful mix of different conditions. Thus, we can claim that the lessons of our investigation might have a wider relevance.

As it makes sense to concentrate our investigation on those county office-holders who held real power, the bottom line of the primary group under investigation was drawn by the judicial powers wielded by the *supremus judex*

---

6 In this article, this shorter designation will be used. The full form is Heves and Külső-Szolnok county.


8 According to the categorization employed by Lajos Hajdu, Zala, Somogy and Baranya counties possessed well-developed county administrations, having more and better paid officials, while Ung, Békés and Csanád lacked behind by half a century with their more primitive county administration. Heves was somewhere in between, but closer to the first group. (HAJDU. II. József igazgatási reformjai Magyarországon. Budapest: Akadémiai, 1982, p. 22., 486-493.)

9 The different archontologies used here give a varied chronological coverage. In this analysis, all the data from the period between 1700 and 1800 were included, but they are not available for Baranya before 1711, for Békés before 1715, and for Csanád after 1777. Needless to say, the lists are not uniform: some offices are not covered in some archontological lists, and several offices were not even filled in some counties in certain periods. About the data in more detail see: SZIJÁRTÓ. *A diéta II: A 18. századi politikai elit társadalom- és kultúrtörténeti megközelítésben*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, 2021, p. 80-84.
nobilium (or judlium for short). He was the official who represented the full powers of the state in one of the districts of the county. In these times, there may have been two districts or even half a dozen of them in a certain county. On the other end of the scale, we can find the ordinarius vicecomes, the number one elected official of the county, practically running the county, especially in the – usual but not general – absence of the supremus comes appointed by the ruler. Furthermore, in the group of powerful leading county officials we can find the generalis perceptor, responsible for collecting taxes and for county finances in general, the ordinarius notarius, chief notary, in charge of the county bureaucracy, slowly but steadily on the increase in these decades, and finally maybe also the magistratualis fiscus or ficalis, representing the county in court cases. Most but not all of the office-holders in this primary group of investigation were elected by the county assembly.

Then, I have added to their ranks some more county officials to have a better understanding of the patterns of promotion. This second, wider circle includes mostly the deputies of the formerly mentioned office-holders: the substitutus judex nobilium, the substitutus vicecomes, the substitutus notarius (deputy notary) and the substitutus magistratualis fiscalis. Finally, we can also include into this investigation the lower echelons of the district administration, too: the jurassor (originally: juratus assessor) and the commissarius bellicus, aides to the
ordinarius and substitutus judex nobilium, engaged in the various tasks of local government or, as far as the commissarius bellicosus, war commissionary, was concerned, in solving the problems raised by the army units billeted in or passing through the district. The hierarchy of these offices are best demonstrated by the lists of salaries they were paid. (See Table 1.) Some offices, especially but not exclusively lower ones, provided a living for the officials, while others, mainly the most prestigious offices entailing significant power, were held as nobile officium by members of the rich gentry with big landholdings.

From the archontological publications, a data base comprising their office-holding was built, offering us a chance to conduct a quantitative investigation. Our questions will concern the inner dynamic of the county administration as well as the career possibilities offered within the county and beyond – but in a close correspondence with the social structures of the county gentry, and especially of its elit, the well-to-do gentry, that is, the bene possessionati.

Gates of entry, glass ceiling, and those too highborn
First of all, we can observe the fact that some offices functioned as points of entry into the county administration while others were typically filled by already experienced officials. (See Table 2.) Unsurprisingly, the lower echelon of offices was a typical gate of entry into the county administration: those of the substitutus notarius, the substitutus magistratalis fiscalis, and the substitutus judilium. It is, however, somewhat surprising that the office of the ordinarius magistratalis fiscalis was similarly a typical first office, filled by barristers who represented the county in law cases while also pursuing their private legal practice parallelly. In all these offices, the newcomers’ number was higher than that of those officials that had been holding other county offices earlier. (This also means that serving

---

15 See the 1559 records as part of the database http://szijarto.web.elte.hu/diaeta-index.html.
as a *jurassor* or a war commissionary was not a necessary step to start a career on the district level.) In a second group of offices (that of the chief notary, the *generalis perceptor* and the several *supremi judices nobilium*) we find newcomers and seasoned county officials in more or less equal numbers. In a difference to the other two offices in this group, that made special knowledge necessary and entailed very bureaucratic official activities, the *supremi judices nobilium* were representing the state in their person in their districts and even had limited judicial powers there. Their office was therefore coveted, and it is an important fact that half of the applicants were elected into this office without prior experience in office-holding. Finally, on the other end of the scale, we can find the *vicecomites*. They were typically seasoned office-holders when elected. But also here, we can register an interesting fact: the *ordinarius vicecomes* was significantly more often a newcomer than his deputy, the *substitutus vicecomes*. We can conclude that there were certain social layers of the local gentry, among the members of which it was an expectation to be elected a *supremus judex nobilium* or even an *ordinarius vicecomes*, as a natural corollary of their status, without any prior proof of their capabilities, without any previously earned experience.

If we look at a wider range of data than that provided by the archontological lists of our six counties, we can find proof of how social standing and county office-holding interacted. This is made possible by an investigation all the 18th-century elections in Somogy county (in Southern Transdanubia, close to Zala and Baranya counties), and the collection of data not exclusively on elections but also on nominations as well as on participation at the county assemblies at which elections took place. What we can learn from this second quantitative analysis is, first, that there seems to have been a kind of a glass ceiling effective for most of those office-holders coming from a modest noble background.

---

Members of the Stephaits family, for example, were holding the office of the *substitutus judlium* four different occasions, but they hardly got nominations for the next step of the ladder, the office of the *ordinarius judex nobilium* – and they were never elected to serve as one. György Bárány was three times elected to *substitutus judex nobilium*, but both of his two candidacies to *ordinarius judex nobilium* were unsuccessful. László Hunkár was twice candidate to this office, but he was elected by the county assembly of Somogy only after 27 years of serving as *substitutus judlium* – elected he was, but not to be the boss in his district, an *ordinarius judex nobilium*, but only to be a county tax collector (*exactor*). Miklós Fonyó must have been an able administrator as he was twice confirmed as *substitutus judex nobilium* – but both his candidacies to become an *ordinarius judlium* were unsuccessful.

Only exceptional cases can be found of talent breaking through this “glass ceiling.”

István Vörös came from a relatively humble background, he served as *substitutus judlium* from 1767 on, his aspirations to be elected to the office of the *ordinarius judlium* were twice thwarted, but when in 1795 he appeared at the general county elections as already holding this office as the result of a provisional commission, he was finally elected.

His career can be contrasted to the behaviour of those distinguished members of well-to-do gentry families for whom county office-holding seemed unattractive, at least below a certain level – even if this attitude practically excluded them from participating in the management of the affairs of their county. Members of the Póka family feature in these sources exclusively as candidates to the office of the *ordinarius judex nobilium* – albeit unsuccessfully each single time: Miklós Póka in 1724, 1727, 1732 and 1736, Ádám Póka in 1746 and 1753. They both were granted the title of *assessor*, judge of the county court of justice (*sedes judiciaria*, or *sedria* for short). This award demonstrates the fact that Miklós and Ádám Póka might have been very much right about the prestige of their family. They seem to have been on the level where nobles started office-holding when being elected *ordinarii judices nobilium*. Candidacies of the Rosty and Szegedy families seem to provide corroborative evidence for this.

And we can make one more step higher: members of the elite gentry families seem to have been reticent to serve at all – save as *ordinarii vicecomites*. We can see the candidacy of Károly Bezerédi (twice, both unsuccessful, but he did not aspire to any other office, and he was decorated with the title of an *assessor*), of

---

19 Talent is mentioned here, but without detailed sources we shall never know if promotion was not rather due to the well-timed intervention of a patron, as in this society the relationship of patrons and clients was still of decisive importance. See e. g. SZEMETHY, Katonabárók és hivatalnok grófok: Új arisztokraták a 18. századi Magyarországon. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, 2022, p. 184-200.
the member of the Lengyel family in 1746, 1748, 1753 (Gáspár Lengyel), 1760 (Lajos Lengyel) and 1800 (Imre Lengyel) – all unsuccessful, but they did not try to serve in any other county office. János Inkey was ordinarius vicecomes in the neighbouring Zala county and substitutus vicecomes in Somogy county. Then, he was a candidate to be ordinarius vicecomes in Somogy in 1727, and members of his family in 1760 and 1767 (Boldizsár Inkey) and 1800 (Károly Inkey). Of these attempts, only the very last one proved to be successful.

Other sources let us identify the crème de la crème of the gentry society in Somogy county. The Zichy, Festetics, Niczky, verebi Végh, szentgyörgyi Horváth and pribéri Jankovich families had no aristocratic titles, but they were great landowners just like the great aristocratic families. Among their members, we can often find members of the national elite, holding offices of nationwide authority by royal appointment. While some members of the first three families mentioned, especially their minor branches, can pop up from time to time in Somogy county offices, the last three families seem to be just too rich and too distinguished to be interested in county office holding, including the office of the ordinarius vicecomes: as if it was below their dignity.

Royal appointments and the signs of professionalization

We happen to find a surprisingly high percentage of Somogy county office-holders being promoted to a central royal office, including both administrative positions at the Council of Lieutenancy or the Hungarian Chamber (first in Pressburg [Bratislava, Pozsony], later in Buda) as well as the Hungarian Chancellery in Vienna, and judicial positions at the Court of Appeals (Tabula Septemviralis) or the Royal Court of Justice (both in Pest) or the four district courts in Kőszeg, Trnava (Nagyszombat), Presov (Eperjes) and the last one first in Oradea (Nagvyvárad), later in Debrecen. Three ordinarii vicecomites and one ordinarius notarius who had served in Somogy county were subsequently promoted to offices with a nationwide authority. For the group of the ten ordinarii vicecomites in eighteenth-century Somogy, this gives a surprisingly high promotion rate of 30%. As we have just seen the colourful patterns of relations between social status and county office holding, the question can be asked if the ordinarii vicecomites who were appointed to royal administrative or judicial positions on the national level were those who had worked their way up the ladder of the county offices to this top position or were those of their colleagues who had been elected to ordinarii vicecomites on the basis of their belonging to the elite of the

21 SZIJÁRTÓ, A diéta II, p. 76-78.
Somogy county *bene possessionatus* gentry, without prior experience in county office holding.

Instead of giving a reply to this question on the basis of the scarcely three cases in Somogy county, we can widen the scope of the investigation, make use of the published archontological lists again and draw up a matrix of promotions for all our seven counties with all known offices included. (See Table 3) Here, we can track various promotions (defined on the basis of salaries paid out) for all the offices held in Somogy, Zala, Baranya, Heves, Ung, Békés and Csanád counties in the 18th century. What we first learn from this is that not many county office-holders were given royal appointments in nationwide administrative or judicial authorities in the complete 18th century: only four from both Somogy and Heves, three from Zala, and none from Baranya, Ung, Békés and Csanád.

Of the *ordinarii vicecomites*, István Orczy from Heves was promoted to the Royal Court of Justice, later also into aristocracy; Mihály Sághy, also from Heves, was serving first at the same court of justice, later at the Court of Appeals; József Sigray from Zala went first to Pest to the Royal Court of Justice, than to Vienna to the Hungarian Royal Court Chancellery, finally to the Council of Lieutenancy in Pressburg – he was later promoted to barony and returned to his home county as *supremus comes*; György Niczky, also from Zala, was appointed to the Royal Court of Justice – being an *ordinarius vicecomes* in Zala, he had earlier served as ordinarius notarius in Somogy;22 Kristóf Festetics from Somogy was promoted to the Council of Lieutenancy, from which he moved on to the Court of Appeals, his son got the title of a count later, his great-grandson that of a prince; Antal Somssich also from Somogy was appointed to the Chancellery; and finally János Tallián, similarly from Somogy, got a position at the Royal Court of Justice. As far as the *substituti vicecomites*, István Gosztonyi from Heves was appointed to the Council of Lieutenancy; and Ádám Vay, also from Heves, to the Royal Court of Justice. His two sons were promoted into aristocracy, becoming barons in Transylvania. György Nagy, *ordinarius notarius* of Zala county, was promoted to the Royal Court of Justice and Antal Tallián, *ordinarius notarius* of Somogy, was appointed to the district court of Kőszeg.23

That is, seven of the most successful members of the county administrations of our seven counties served as *ordinarii*, two as *substituti vicecomites* and two more as *ordinarii notarii*. Although the first is the largest sub-group, the success rate is fairly low: the sobering fact is that from 73 *ordinarii vicecomites* only

---

22 The reason for this is the closeness of Zala and Somogy counties: their administrations were united in times of the long Ottoman occupation of Central Hungary. They were only separated by the Act 86 of 1715.

seven were promoted to a national office, which is less than 10%, a far cry from the significant proportions found in the case of Somogy county.

The hypothesis that those were given royal appointments who came from the most prestigious gentry families (that aspired to the office of the vicecomes but not to anything below that) may hold for István Orczy and Ádám Vay, who bore no county office before being elected ordinarius and substitutus vicecomes of Heves respectively, and for Kristóf Festetics, ordinarius vicecomes of Somogy county, but not for the rest: they all held lower county offices earlier, eight out of eleven representing an overwhelming majority. On the one hand, this proves the importance of personal performance, that of being an efficient office-holder, instead of being just born into a prestigious family, while on the other hand, it brings us to the last point.

The Somogy county data suggest a strong correlation between serving as the deputy of an office holder and being elected (appointed) to this official itself later. Four out of the 11 ordinarii notarii were substituti notarii earlier, ten out of the 24 ordinarii judlium were substituti judlium earlier, four out of nine ordinarii magistratuales fiscales were previously substituti magistratuales fiscales. In these cases, the proportion of this type of a promotion is around 40%, which is really impressive. May we for this reason claim that the special knowledge and the necessary skills learned as deputy office holders contributed to a significant extend to their promotion, even if these were not necessarily enough in themselves to guarantee that? May we perhaps catch a first glimpse of professionalization here? Professionalization was a process that was definitely going on in the higher echelons of the administration in the Habsburg Monarchy, but it has not yet been detected on the level of the counties of the Kingdom of Hungary in the 18th century.

Fortunately, we can use our matrix of promotions in seven counties to investigate this special type of promotion, namely when a deputy is elected (or promoted) to occupying his former boss’s position. Unfortunately, these data, covering a much wider range than those of Somogy county only, seem to refute the alluring hypothesis on the beginnings of professionalization in Hungarian county administration. True, in Zala, a similar rate the one detected in Somogy can be found for the ordinarii judices nobilium, 34% of which were prior substituti judlium, and among the ordinarii magistratuales fiscales, as five out

of six had served earlier as substituti magistratuales fiscales. In Heves county, it is among the ordinarii vicecomites that a high percentage of this type of a promotion can be observed (in opposition to Somogy or Zala): ten out of 13 of them were substituti vicecomites earlier. But apart of these three, in no other case did the relevant rates come close to 40%.

The aggregate data of the seven counties are decisive. (See Table 3.) Only 22% of the ordinarii notarii were substituti notarii earlier, 24% of the 24 ordinarii judlium served prior as substituti judlium, and a mere 18% of the ordinarii magistratuales fiscales were previously substituti magistratuales fiscales. Somogy is atypical both as for high chances of the leading county officials to be appointed to royal office later and as far as the tendencies are concerned that seemed to point in the direction of professionalization. The general picture is closer to the one painted by Lajos Hajdu:

“It may not be valid for all cases, but we can say that those leading the county administration around 1780 are first of all lords […]” who did not wish “to become Beamter observing regulations, working punctually and conscientiously instead of being very powerful lords.”

As we see, Hajdu allows for exceptions to this rule, and I claim that these are not at all merely sporadic in the 18th century. The tendency of professionalization is at least making itself felt – although not everywhere and presumably not with the same pace.

R. J. W. Evans argues that the history of Hungary in the first half of the 19th-century can be explained by reference to the opposition of two rival administrations: the loyal royal bureaucracy on the one hand, and the county officials on the other, inclined towards opposition, and sending their deputies to the diet, too. In the 18th century, the county was the power-base of the Hungarian gentry, and this power was mostly exerted through a group of mainly elected noble county officials. In this quantitative analysis, we could see how the different strata of the gentry were active in the county administration, and we could also observe its connections to the royal bureaucrats filling in national offices. There were no walls separating these two elites. And in the new, increasingly bureaucratic order of things, office-holding and wielding power were not two distinct options, but the former was rather a precondition of the latter.

---

25 Hajdu, II. József, p. 16.
### Table 1.
Annual salary of certain county office-holders (forint)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>(ordinarius)</th>
<th>substitutus vicecomes</th>
<th>(ordinarius)</th>
<th>substitutus</th>
<th>(ordinarius)</th>
<th>substitutus</th>
<th>(ordinarius)</th>
<th>substitutus</th>
<th>(ordinarius)</th>
<th>substitutus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csanád 1744(^{10})</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala 1750(^{11})</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala 1758(^{12})</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csanád 1759(^{13})</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csanád 1767(^{14})</td>
<td>400(^{15})</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ung 1769(^{16})</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150–300</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogy 1770–1771(^{17})</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala 1774(^{18})</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150–250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala 1780(^{19})</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200–300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Békés 1794(^{20})</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^2\) According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *ordinarii vicecomes* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 500 and 800 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 24.)

\(^3\) According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *substituti vicecomes* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 250 and 400 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 24.)

\(^4\) According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *ordinarii notarii* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 400 and 600 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 25.)

\(^5\) According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *generales perceptores* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 400 and 600 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 25.)

\(^6\) According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *ordinarii judices nobilium* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 100 and 400 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 31.)
According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *substituti notarii* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 150 and 250 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 25.)

According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *ordinarii magistratualis fiscales* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 200 and 400 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 26.)

According to Lajos Hajdu, the salaries of the *substituti magistratualis fiscales* in the various counties of the Kingdom of Hungary at the beginning of Joseph II’s reign were between 100 and 200 forints. (Hajdu, II. József, p. 26.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ordinarius vicecomes</th>
<th>substitutus vicecomes</th>
<th>ordinarius notarius</th>
<th>generalis perceptor</th>
<th>ordinarius judex nobilium</th>
<th>substitutus notarius</th>
<th>ordinarius magistratalis fiscalis</th>
<th>substitutus magistratalis fiscalis</th>
<th>substitutus judex nobilium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without earlier office-holding</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotion from another office</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
Promotion of certain county office holders (Somogy, Zala, Heves, Békés, Ung, Baranya and Csanád counties, aggregate data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From love to national office¹</th>
<th>ordinarius vicecomes</th>
<th>substitutus or surrogatus vicecomes²</th>
<th>ordinarius notarius</th>
<th>generalis perceptor</th>
<th>ordinarius judex nobilium</th>
<th>substitutus notarius</th>
<th>ordinarius magistratualis fiscalis</th>
<th>substitutus magistratualis fiscalis</th>
<th>substitutus judex nobilium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ordinarius vicecomes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitutus or surrogatus vicecomes²</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinarius notarius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalis perceptor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinarius judex nobilium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitutus notarius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinarius magistratualis fiscalis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitutus magistratualis fiscalis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitutus judex nobilium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without any or without know prior office</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Both administrative office held at the Council of Lieutenancy, the Chancellery, the Hungarian Chamber or judicial office held at the Court of Appeals (Tabula Septemviralis), the Royal Court of Justice or one of the four district courts.
² In Heves county, János Csőke was both perceptor and magistratualis fiscalis, András Dèvay both perceptor and judex. In these cases I have put 0,5–0,5 into the relevant category.
³ Sometimes deputies were sent out to replace the ordinarius vicecomes temporarily. These surrogati vicecomites are included into this category.
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