

THE TERRITORIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES OF THE LUDBREG ESTATE (1741–1939)

TERITORIJALNE I GOSPODARSKE PROMJENE LUDBREŠKOG IMANJA (1741. – 1939.)

Zoltán KAPOSI

University of Pécs, Hungary

kaposi.zoltan@tkk.pte.hu

Received/Primljeno: 11. 10. 2024.

Accepted/Prihvaćeno: 19. 11. 2024.

Original scientific paper/Izvorni znanstveni rad

UDK / UDC: 929.735(497.523Ludbreg)"1741/1939"

332.2(497.523Ludbreg)"7/19"(091)

SUMMARY

In this study I examine the economic and territorial changes of the Ludbreg Estate (beyond the Drava River), belonging to the Batthyány Entail. This large estate was located in an area which had a part usually flooded several times in a year due to three rivers. Therefore, till the Dual Monarchy husbandry (livestock, fishery) had a highly important role both in the manorial and serfs' husbandry. In the 1860s and 1870s the railway system began to expand and it significantly improved transportation possibilities. In the last third of the century, wheat production became more important. High prices of grain urged the transformation of the area. Deforestation started, and grain fields were created. More and more lands were recaptured from the rivers. The three manors (21.27 km²) which were leased out generated high profit to Prince Batthyány until World War I. The economic boom came to an end in 1918. After World War I, the Ludbreg Estate became the territory of the newly born South Slavic state. A part of it was parcelled while Prince László Batthyány managed to sell the remaining.

Keywords: Ludbreg, manor, estate, economy, agrarian history

Ključne riječi: Ludbreg, vlastelinstvo, posjed, gospodarstvo, agrarna povijest

INTRODUCTION

In my study I analyse the almost 200 years long process of economic and social changes of the former Ludbreg Estate which territory is currently located in Croatia. The Habsburg troops drove out the Osman forces from this area in the last decades of the 17th century, thus, significant extent of the lands beyond the Drava River became under the Habsburg crown's administration.¹ Vienna gifted the regained lands cheaply to its generals, military transporters; furthermore, to emerging aristocrats, thus it was possible to get huge estates in Slavonian territories.² The Ludbreg Estate was acquired by the Erdódy family, from whom in the early 1730s the widow of Ádám Batthyány II., Countess Eleonóra Strattmann has bought. Their children shared in 1741 the Batthyány-Strattmann inheritance,³ and as a result of the divisio the Ludbreg dominium passed to the first-born son, Count Lajos. Maria Theresa confirmed in 1742 Lajos Batthyány's possession of the estates and the villages of Ludbreg, furthermore

¹ Sokcsevits, D. (2011): 224.

² Kaposi, Z. (2007): 49.

³ See Zsámbéky, M. (2006): 713–722; Bakács, I. (1965); Zimányi, V. (1962)

Karlovecz, Szelnik, Hrasztovsko, Szigetecz, Apotovina, Szlokovecz, Obrankovecz, Prilecz, Luka, Kamanicza, Polyanczi, Szentgyörgy, Kuchan, Struga, Szeszveté, Hersenicza, Csernoglavec, Reka, Ivanecz, Perkesz, Csukovecz and Globosecz.⁴ (The writing form of the names of the villages changed multiple times over time) The area of the Ludbreg Estate was approximately more than 13.000 hold.⁵

Count Lajos Batthyány (1696–1765) was probably the most known man in the middle third of the 18th century. The most important result of his career were the titles of chancellor and Palatine of Hungary, which he wore more than one and a half decade long.⁶ Count Lajos acquired besides the inheritance (Körmend, Inta, Ludbreg) numerous other estates. The treasury bought in 1743 the Kanizsa estate, thereafter the neighboring Homokkomárom estate.⁷ He founded on June 26, 1746 with the permission of the Queen an entail from the estates of Kanizsa in Zala County, from the Inta and Körmend estates in Vas County, furthermore from the Ludbreg and the neighboring Karlovác estates in Körös County, as well as from the Batthyány palaces in Vienna and Buda.⁸ The Ludbreg dominium included with this an about 80 000 hold estate complex, which fate was linked to the Batthyány family for almost 200 years.

HISTORIOGRAPHICAL OVERVIEW, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODS

One of the most popular trends of the Central European economic and social history writing is estate history. It has more reasons. On the one hand, agriculture played a decisive role from the perspective of output and employment. On the other hand, large estate was important part of the economy, which changed quiet a lot over time, but remained until the land redistribution of 1945 the most important form of agricultural production. Third, in social thinking ownership of land was a strong factor in judgement of persons or groups. It was not a coincidence, then, that from the beginning of the 19th century numerous analyses were made in Hungary about the large estates. In the beginning mostly estates from the 16–18th centuries were studied, later economic processes of the 19th century were involved in the analyses. These analyses were linked mostly to estates within the borders of Trianon in 1920, which were motivated mainly by the availability of archival sources. However, there were barely written studies about the estates which were located in the territories of other countries since 1920.

The study is primarily based on archival sources, of which the vast majority was delivered to the National Archives of Hungary. We were able to use the archival documents regarding entails of the National Archives of Hungary Archive of Vas County, as well as documents of the Batthyány-collection in the Burgenland State Archives. Besides, we were aware of statistical, press and historiographical sources.⁹ The historiographical overviews regarding the Slavonian side of the Drava River and the castle- and estate surveys were also useful.¹⁰

Mainly those works could be utilized from the historical literature regarding this period, which were written about the large estates of Southern Transdanubia.¹¹ Many works were prepared about the estates of the Northern Drava region, for example about the Széchényi, Zichy and Batthyány estates. These works provide a very good point of comparison to interpret the changes of Ludbreg. It was successful to explore and publish the history of the also Batthyány owned Kanizsa estate,¹² therefore the question was raised, what kind of changes can be observed regarding an estate along the Drava River which operated under different economic and natural circumstances, but was owned by the same person? In which points does the operation of that estate match with other Batthyány estates? Moreover, as last,

⁴ HU-MNL-OL. A 57. Libri regii. 39. 238–244.; HU-MNL-OL A 35. 1742. Nr. 58.; HU-MNL-OL.

⁵ All territorial units are given in cadastral hold. (1 cat. hold = 0.56 hectare)

⁶ Kaposi, Z. (2009): 48.

⁷ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 36. Lad. 13. Nr. 18.; HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 36. Lad. 13. Nr. 23.

⁸ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. No. 692–693.; Kaposi, Z. (2012): 189–220. See further: Polster, G. (1998)

⁹ See for example: Szabó, M. (2023).

¹⁰ See for example: Scitaroci, M. O. – Scitaroci, B. O. (1998)

¹¹ See: Bakács, I. (1958); Tilkovszky, L. (1990); Kaposi, Z. (2009); Kaposi, Z. (2000). etc.

¹² Kaposi, Z. (2009)

which kind of difficulties had the heads of the estate to face during World War I, and during the following territorial detachments?

To answer the research questions, appropriate methods should be applied according to the huge variety of sources. It was assumed to evaluate legal documents to clarify questions related to property. I had to prepare economic, branchial, regional and workforce-structural analyses in order to have an overview on economic processes. Furthermore, it was possible to find answers linked to problems that were political related by exploring bibliography, press and private correspondence.

THE NATURAL AND ECONOMIC ENDOWMENTS OF THE LUBBREG ESTATE

The Lubreg manor was located on the Croatian side of the Drava River. In the 18–19th centuries enormous sized estates existed in this territory, which were mainly in the hands of the Hungarian and German landowners. We could mention from the larger ones Varazsd of the Erdődy family, Raszinya of the Inkey family, Verőce estate of Prince Schaumburg-Lippe, the Therezovacz-Suhopolje and Cabuna centred estates of the Jankovics family, and the Dolnj-Mihojlac estate of the Majláth family, which was owned previously by the Prandau family. Many landowners lived on the Northern (Hungarian) side of the Drava River, who were proprietors in Croatia as well (Somssich, Jankovich, Erdődy etc.).¹³ The natural border of the Lubreg Estate was in the South the Kalnik-mountain, while the Western borders were formed by the Varazsd and Csáktornya estates. Kaproncza and the estates of the Inkey family were located in the East. On the Northern Side of the Drava River situated the lands of the Kanizsa estate of the Batthyány entail, furthermore the lands of the Csurgó estate of the Festetics family. The Lubreg Estate embraced in the 18th century 24 smaller or larger settlements.

The estate operated in the 18–19th centuries under difficult natural circumstances, the reason for this should be found in the unregulated rivers. The Drava River was flowing from the Alps with a large amount of water and slowed down in this region, created numerous backwaters, and flooded the plain coastal area in a range of 5–10 km annually once or twice.¹⁴ Until the flow regulation at the turn of the 19–20th century, the Drava River limited for a long time the region's carrying capacity, even according to a survey which was prepared around the end of the 19th century, 8–10% of land was not suitable to be cultivated in this area.¹⁵ The people of the estate villages suffered a lot from the floods. The other problem was posed by the River Bednja, which flowed through Lubreg and could cause huge destruction as well.¹⁶ However, the rivers did not just take away, but also meant income. The estate imposed duty for crossing, many mills could be built on the waters, and it is important that after the floods in the drying meadows everything grew faster that could be mowed, which was the basis of husbandry, not to mention the possibility of fishing in the waters, which left behind. The highroad between Kaproncza and Varasd went through Lubreg, whilst regarding the North-South traffic the crossing of the river was possible at crossing points (Perlak, Kotori, Légrád etc.), furthermore over a bridge in Varasd some further away.¹⁷

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATE OF THE ESTATE AROUND THE MID-18 CENTURY

Lubreg was the center of the estate, where the landlord had a castle (in the sources it was called for a long time often a fortress). According to a survey in 1731 in the little manor 41 cattle, 56 pigs and 145 poultry was kept. The manor had a garden with a barn and a granary. The extension of the autumn grain sowing was about 50 hold. Two gardens were connected to the castle, one for vegetables and another for fruits. The landlord had on the market of the city a small shop used by a Greek merchant, further-

¹³ See Kaposi, Z. (2020/a): 2.

¹⁴ See: Petrić, H. – Obadić, I. (2007): 136-147.; Petrić, H. (1997)

¹⁵ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 136. Nr. 14.

¹⁶ Hunfalvy, J. (1865): 240–241.

¹⁷ Bencze, G. (1983): 27–28.

more a slaughterhouse, both were leased out. The landlord owned the customs house in the city and a tavern, and two mills on the Bednja respectively, whilst another mill was in Hrasztovszko, in the second largest settlement of the estate, it was built on the Bedja as well.¹⁸

After the consolidation of ownership, a renovation began after 1745, during which the formerly renaissance castle has been transformed to baroque style. Some works lasted until the beginning of the 19th century, thus the building got some classicist elements later. The house, which exists nowadays, was a square formed four-story building.¹⁹ A park was installed in the area from the castle to the River Bednja, as well as on the other side of the castle.²⁰ In one of the apartments of the castle was operating the office of the bailiff, the manorial court hearings were held in this place.²¹ The bailiff belonged to the Körmend estate manager that controlled the entail's demesne. Ludbreg got in 1792 the right to hold market, the fairs were held in the marketplace of the market town,²² but the markets of surrounding larger settlements were also available to sale products. Besides Varasd and Kaproncza, Légrád should be emphasized, because traffickers of Ludbreg often popped up on its market.²³

The population significantly declined on the Hungarian and Croatian side of the Drava River during the Ottoman occupation. Small villages emerged in the territory of the Ludbreg Estate. Overall, 5244 people lived in 23 settlements of the estate according to the census of 1784,²⁴ thus 228 persons lived in a village on average, which is a low number in Hungary in that period. In 1784, overall 679 peasants were in the census, which is consistent with a list of serf landholders prepared at the same time that contained the data of 617 peasants.²⁵ Besides landholder serfs, 341 cottars lived in the estate according to the census. Ludbreg was the demesne's largest settlement with 677 inhabitants.²⁶ Civic population lived essentially just in Ludbreg (12 men), the social structure of the estate was typically agrarian.

In the second half of the 18th century the manorial farming was expanded, they tried to take advantage of the rising grain, meat and wine prices in the whole empire.²⁷ From cereals, wheat, rye, oats and barley were produced. Besides that, the villagers produced buckwheat, millet, bean, pea, lens, maize, as well as hemp and flax.²⁸ Cattle husbandry provided functions linked to cultivation of arable land and meat sales, but the carrier of sheep farming started as well. People were involved in pig farming to a significant degree, since the region's biggest pig market was located in the nearby city of Kanizsa. Poultry farming met probably just household needs.

Grape and wine production became more important, since wine as a product could be sold very easily. Except the wine that was taken as tithe and as mountain duty from the growing population, a small sized manorial vineyard could be found in the estate. In 1765 in Ludbreg 933 akó wine (1 akó = 58 liters) was listed from mountain duty, and 524 akó wine from manorial wine production.²⁹ More craftsman were active in the manorial farms, who were employed mainly at construction sites which number increased. There were in Ludbreg coopers, brickmakers, and masons and carpenters were occasionally employed. The manorial mills in larger settlements were leased out.

¹⁸ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 102. Nr. 66–76.; HU-MNL-OL E 156. – a – Fasc. 068, Nr. 008.

¹⁹ Scitaroci, M. O. – Scitaroci, B. O. (1998); Petrić, H. (2022): 84–95.

²⁰ See HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. VII-d bb. Ludbreg, 1880.

²¹ Kállay, I. (1985): 31.

²² HU-MNL-OL A 39. Libri regii. Vol. 56. 406–408.

²³ Bencze, G. (1983): 160.

²⁴ Danyi, D. – Dávid, Z. (1960) 78–79.

²⁵ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 102. Nr. 163–172.

²⁶ In 1784, 5500 people lived in Kanizsa, while in Körmend 2500.

²⁷ Kaposi, Z. (2002): 80–81.

²⁸ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 41. Körmendi uradalom. 1765. Fundus instructus.

²⁹ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc.37. Nr. 514–520.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DURING THE PERIOD OF PRINCE FÜLÖP BATTHYÁNY (1806–1870)

Prince Fülöp Batthyány governed the estates of the entail. This epoch was the period of manorial production ramp-up, which was made initially possible by the Napoleonic, later on the reform era, and finally by the world economic boom in the 1850–60s. At the time of Prince Fülöp began bigger deforestations, furthermore irrigation and drainage works, which were started earlier, continued. Hugh amount of money was invested in improvement of the condition of the Ludbreg Estate as well. Between 1769 and 1863 16 439 forint for immobile goods (parcels, plots, houses etc.), 31 624 forint for regulatory costs, 16 662 forint for forest clearing and ditching, while 110 forint for flow regulation of smaller rivers was spent, totally 64 837 forint.³⁰ The goal was to improve the estate financial efficiency according to the sources.

It was necessary to enlarge arable land, among others pastures to increase manorial income. In case of the estates located North from the Drava River, sheep farming became a success branch.³¹ In 1841 in the Ludbreg Estate totally 3695 Viennese pound wool was sheared (1 Viennese pound = 0,56 kg), which assumes that according to the conversion key of the period it was a 2550 piecemeal sheep farming. The managers of the estates took care of starting the development of sheep farming in each estate, thus for example in 1836 noble rams were bought from Silesia.³² Some wholesalers in the entail's estates got contracts to take over wool; therefore, there was no problem with the distribution.³³ Beside of sheep farming, cattle breeding was an important branch of manorial farming; mostly breeds from Switzerland had a bigger role, which represented huge value in that period.³⁴ Important part of the landlord's income derived from the amount of the leases of regalian. The estates of the entail followed a unified practice: every tavern, mill etc. was given in lease by bidding. These price reductions were advertised in bigger newspapers.³⁵

The population of the estate was growing: in 1828, more than 1100 persons lived in the territory of the demesne than in 1784.³⁶ 575 serf and 59 cottar family lived in the estate's territory in 1844.³⁷ The most serfs (97) lived in Ludbreg, but their number was considerably high in Hersenicza (74), in Struga (49), in Szeszveté (48) and in Hrastovsko (47). (The names of some settlements changed over time and do not correspond to today's names) In contrast, there were villages that had very low manorial population, for instance Kormanicza (15 people), Obrankovicz (12 people) and Kuckáni (11 people).³⁸ The average size of land per serf reached almost a size of a half plot (approximately 12 hold), which is a higher rate than the Hungarian average. Among 575 serfs with plots, 28 had a whole or larger plot. The living standard of the population was probably very low. The comments of a British doctor Richard Bright, who passed through this region in 1814 and spent two days in Ludbreg, refer to this, according to him people were characterized by such a poverty that they baked bread from the mixture of grinded corn stalk and millet.³⁹

Due to the low population density, the landlord had a need for the free work. Those who lived in the territory of the manor obliged to fulfill 33 579 day in the form of free work. Additionally tax could be collected in cash; its amount was 1594 forint.⁴⁰ The landlord lost free work and tax by the promulgation of the Serf Emancipation Act of 1848, but the loss was compensated by the land burden relief contribution (Grundentlastung), which sum became asset of the entail. Prince Batthyány received a bond with a

³⁰ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 42. Az 1769–1863. közötti hitbizományi költségek kimutatása.

³¹ See for example: T. Mérey, K. (1962); Kaposi, Z. (2000)

³² HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 163. Nr. 573.

³³ HU-MNL-OL P 1333. Fasc. 4. Nr. 281.

³⁴ See Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, 1 August 1810.

³⁵ Pressburger Zeitung, 5 May 1831.

³⁶ See Nagy, L. (1828–29). Vol. 2. 10–21.

³⁷ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 109. Nr. 101–111.

³⁸ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 109. Nr. 101–111.

³⁹ Bright, R. (1818): 495.

⁴⁰ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 109. Nr. 101–111.

face value of 133 009 forint for the Ludbreg Estate, which was 22,4% of the amount due the four entail estates.⁴¹

It is well known that large number of Jews lived in the market towns of the Batthyány family,⁴² for example in Kanizsa the migration began from the 1770s.⁴³ In Ludbreg just 25 Jews were listed in 1828,⁴⁴ but around the mid-19th century more people arrived. There were some who moved to Ludbreg from other Batthyány market towns, but many people came from the neighboring Croatian and Hungarian cities and villages, furthermore significant number of people came from the regions of Western Hungary.⁴⁵ The Jews who settled here were engaged in activities like trade, leasing (brewing), and other services. Their number grew fast, according to the census in 1857 more than 100 Jewish family lived in the territory of the Ludbreg Estate.⁴⁶

The operation of the Batthyány estates changed significantly in the 1850s. According to the laws of 1848, the former manorial lands were excluded from the large estate. As a result of the separation of forests and pastures, which were in common use until then, the landlord's fields decreased. In 1870, about 29 435 hold of the entail land remained in the hands of the landlord, of which 23% derived from the Ludbreg manor, whose area reduced to 6628 hold. Almost half of the estate (3131 hold) was woodland, its size decreased as well: in the deforested area 81 hold plough-land, 10 hold meadow and 425 hold pasture was created.⁴⁷ However, there were still 570 hold floodplain. It was a huge problem that at the beginning of the 1870s only 26% (1714 hold) of the large estate could be used for agricultural production, which means that the owner legitimately wanted to increase arable land.

It was also necessary to improve transport conditions. It is worth to mention from this point of view that the estate concluded a contract with the market town of Perlak to improve crossing of the Drava River. According to the contract of 1865 the manor and the market town, which “*are suffering due to the lack of proper crossing possibilities of the Drava River*”, bear the costs in half and build a river crossing at Perlak. Wood was delivered from the forests of Ludbreg at a predetermined price. The operation of the river crossing was leased out; the revenue was shared 50–50%.⁴⁸ The region's railway system was developing and it was an important step forward. On the Buda-Párgerhof railway line, which was handed over in 1861 by the then Rothschild owned Déli Vasút Társaság and which passed through Kanizsa, the largest Transdanubian trade center, the products of the Ludbreg estate could be distributed to Austria and to the sea (Trieszt).⁴⁹ On the other hand, the Buda-Fiume line,⁵⁰ which was embraced by the Hungarian state and was put into operation in 1873, also passed near Ludbreg towards the sea.

THE ESTATE DURING THE AGE OF DUALISM (1867–1918)

Since Prince Fülöp Batthyány had no children, after his death the prince title reverted to the Tivadar branch of the sons of Palatine Lajos, who founded the entail.⁵¹ Between 1871 and 1883 Gusztáv, then his son Ödön owned the entail. Gusztáv Batthyány had not lived in Hungary since 1833, because of this reason he leased his entail estates (without the forests) in 1871 to Béla and István Karczag, and to István and Kálmán Nádosy for 25 years.⁵² The operating model of the estate had been transformed due to the

⁴¹ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 260–291.

⁴² Prickler, H. (1994): 30.

⁴³ Kaposi, Z. (2009): 273.

⁴⁴ Nagy, L. (1828–29). Vol. 2. 238.

⁴⁵ Dretar, M. (2010/a)

⁴⁶ Ibidem. See more Dretar, M. (2010/b)

⁴⁷ HU-MNL-OL P 1333. Fasc. 4. Nr. 319.

⁴⁸ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 44. Nr. 142–144.

⁴⁹ See Barbarits, L. (1929): 197.; Kaposi, Z. (2014): 221–222.

⁵⁰ Fest, A. (1897): 239.

⁵¹ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 863.

⁵² HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 138. 1871. Contractus.

Tab. 1 Leased lands of the Ludbreg Estate in 1896 (hold)

Economic district	Arable land	Inlot	Garten	Pasture	Meadow	Except of land tax	Wine	Totally
Ludbreg	1198	4	6	19	67	23	12	1328
Hrastovsko	367	3	1	7	37	4	-	419
Hersenicza	848	2	3	21	5	30	-	909
Totally	2413	9	10	47	109	57	12	2656

Source: HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 43: 2. April 1895.

large land lease as well: only the forests remained in the management of the landlord, thus the former manorial staff was no longer needed. Henceforth, the heads of forest offices managed the affairs of the estate; the head of the forest office in Kanizsa was also in charge of the forestry in Ludbreg. The manorial forest offices were responsible to the directorate of Körmend, where the so-called entail caretaker handled the issues increasingly.

In addition to the forests, many smaller sources of profit remained in the hands of the landlord. At the beginning of the dualist era, the landlords generally tried to get rid of the so-called smaller royal profits, which were especially difficult to control in addition to the lease management. In 1880, there were 30 such usufructuary rights in the Ludbreg Estate, which were meant to be sold. The majority of these were measurement of drinks, but they also included crossing rights, operation of restaurants, bridges tariffs etc. The rights to be sold amounted 108 038 forint.⁵³

Ludbreg became a significant settlement around the turn of the century, and simultaneously functioned as a district center. In 1890, 1400 persons lived in Ludbreg, while in 1910 its population was around 1700.⁵⁴ The town had at the turn of the century a post office, a telegraph office, a postal savings bank, and it was at the same time the seat of the district court servant.⁵⁵ The settlement developed rapidly, where small industrial factories were already established. At the beginning of the 20th century, Ludbreg bought fair right from Prince Ödön Batthyány: it costed 40 000 crowns, which could be repaid in installments over 10 years.⁵⁶

The previous manorial management system was changed after the 25 years long Karczag-Nádósy lease expired. In the future, the non-forested areas of the four estates of the entail were leased out separately instead of joint leasing, which – although it required more administration to a significant degree – made more profit for the landlord.⁵⁷ In 1896, the Ludbreg Estate was given to two entrepreneurs: Lajos Gayer 85%, while Ferenc Hild rented 15% of the area.

Along with the 2656 hold of leased land in 1896, the tenants received in the Ludbreg and Herse-Nicza districts totally 1003 hold woodland, which had to be deforested according to the contract. Almost in all Southern Transdanubian estates very similar deforestations can we witness in this era.⁵⁸ In 1885, the forests' estimated value was 66 041 forint, while the value of other areas was 262 555 forint.⁵⁹ The forests consisted of two main parts territorially. One of them was the so-called "mountain forest", which was located on the border of the villages of Ludbreg and Duka-Réka (1291 hold). These were the most valuable forests, consisting mainly of hornbeam and beech; these were divided into 40–60 years cycles according to the plant plan. The other, 786 hold sized forested area was the so-called "Drava willows" along the river, mainly around Herse-Nicza. The forest's stock was in this case willow,

⁵³ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 42. Year 1880.

⁵⁴ Népszámlálás (1890); Népszámlálás (1910) adatai alapján.

⁵⁵ Pallas (1895): 709.; Révai (1915): 31.

⁵⁶ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 19.

⁵⁷ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 535–549.

⁵⁸ Kaposi, Z. (2020/b): 80–82.

⁵⁹ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 278.

Tab. 2 The estimated value of the lands and size of the territory in the estates of the entail in 1885

Name of the estate	Size (hold)	Estimated value of land (forint)	Estimated value per hold (forint)
Kanizsa	9910	640 710	64,7
Körmend	9389	407 352	43,4
Ludbreg	6758	328 596	48,6
Inta	2280	147 840	64,8
Totally	28.337	1.524.498	Average: 53,8

Source: HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 260-291.

alder and poplar, for which the plant plan kept the previous 20 years long cycle.⁶⁰ The amount of wood that was paid to the employees as a convention also derived from the estate's forests: in 1871, the bailiff received 30, the accountant 24, the lawyer 15, the ispán 12, and the doctor 10 fathoms of wood (1 Viennese fathom = 6.8 m³).⁶¹

The economic performance of the Ludbreg Estate fell short of the larger, better soil-quality estate of Nagy-Kanizsa. In 1869, the value of live and dead inventory amounted to 39 847 forint, which was only 15% of all the equipment of the estates of the entail.⁶² Larger investments generally avoided the area beyond the Drava River. It is hard to find among the loans taken out in the period between 1888–1917, which could be related to the Ludbreg Estate, only the repair of one or two bridges and the restoration following storm damage are on the list.⁶³ It is characteristic that when the entail caretaker visited the estates in the fall of 1888, he noticed many deficiencies in the Ludbreg Estate (neglected buildings, condition of the apartments, bad condition of the house of the vine-dresser, missing Bednja-bridge next to the castle for years, in the farm of Hrastovskó the couple roof of the ox barn threatened to break etc.).⁶⁴

As the table shows the estates of the entail of Prince Ödön Batthyány which amounted 28 337 hold in the 1880s were worth more than 1,5 million silver forints. This is only the value of land, that is, it does not include the farm buildings of the estates, the equipment and as last but not least the houses in the town.⁶⁵

Towards the end of the 19th century, the results of modernization were clearly visible in the Ludbreg Estate. In 1895, the approximately 3700 hold sized farm was primarily devoted to arable crop production and animal husbandry. 51 servants were employed in the estate. The large-scale farm had a significant stock of machinery and equipment: it had a steam engine, 2 threshing cabinets, 5 seeders, 32 ploughs, 43 harrows, 6 rollers and 31 yoked carts. Sheep farming remained the most important branch of animal husbandry: in 1895, we find a herd of 1300 animals, in addition 424 pigs, 70 cattle and 51 horses belonged to the farm.⁶⁶

The changes of the dualist era had also such processes that had to be reckoned with in the long term, since they could have sometimes serious impact on the operation of the farm. The population of the estate became Croatian a long time ago. According to the 1910 census, only 39 out of 1724 residents were native Hungarian speakers in Ludbreg. The situation was very similar in the more populous manorial settlements: in Hrastovsko 8 out of 760 and in Hersenicza 2 out of 991 people were only Hungarians who belonged to the manorial management.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 19. 28 February 1903.

⁶¹ HU-MNL-OL P 1333. Fasc. 4. Nr. 320–321.

⁶² HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 374.

⁶³ HU-MNL-OL P 1320. Fasc. 8. Nr. 715–727.

⁶⁴ HU-MNL-OL P 1322. Fasc. 109. Nr. 244–249.

⁶⁵ HU-MNL-OL P 1313. Fasc. 139. Nr. 276.

⁶⁶ *Gazdacímtár* (1897): 618–619.

⁶⁷ *Népszámlálás* (1910): 705–706.

THE CONSEQUENCE OF WORLD WAR I AND TRIANON: LOSING LUDBREG

From 1914, László Batthyány-Strattmann (1870–1931), the famous ophthalmologist, took over the estate and bore the prince title.⁶⁸ The economic environment, which was functioning previously predictable, was replaced by an uncertain and constantly changing situation. Several factors affected the operation of domestic large estates during the First World War. The problems arose partly from the decrease of real income due to the inflation, since forestry revenues and house rents were slowly collected, and significant arrears accumulated; in addition, a part of the workforce was called up for military service.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the estate was an attractive income-generating opportunity; there were always applicants for the lease, in 1915, even the Bank for Settling and Parceling (Telepítő és Parcellázó Bank) wanted to rent it.⁷⁰

In 1916, the Ludbreg Estate was leased to Jenő Riedl, who was an entrepreneur in Kanizsa. The leasing contract was prepared based on the model of the previous ones: the tenant had similar rights and obligations. The previous rent was successfully doubled, thus a lease amount of 80 000 crown had been negotiated.⁷¹ This amount was net income of the prince, since according to the contract all taxes and other contributions had to be bore by the tenant. They tried to emphasize continuity in the contract by saying that the previous operation of the estate met the farming ideas. The tenant took obligation to continue reasonable management. In addition, he was obliged to keep at least 500 cattle. It was also stipulated that the servants must be provided with the so-called conventional arable land, as well as with pasture and fodder for animal husbandry. The rooms on the second floor of the castle that were serving the purposes of the landlord, as well as the ground floor rooms serving as office space, were not subject of the lease.⁷²

The Ludbreg Estate, similarly to the Hungarian owned estates in Slavonia (Novi Marof, Cabuna, Bellye, Alsó-Mihojlac, Csáktornya etc.) became part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes after World War I.⁷³ The Yugoslav laws did not recognize the Hungarian laws on entails, thus the estate could only operate as a civil property in the future. After the report of the district huntsman István Licsár on July 8, 1919, they wrote to the prince, “*the Ludbreg Estate has been taken over by the Croatian state and its fate is uncertain*”.⁷⁴ On February 25, 1919, the law on land reform was issued. Its aim was to force foreign large landowners to the background and to give plots to the landless and smallholders. During the first wave of the land reform, 69 000 hectares were redistributed in the Croatian-Slavonian territories. The peasants paid compensation for the land, but its exact regulation was delayed until the summer of 1925.⁷⁵ At first, the lands were allocated as lease, and later as property.⁷⁶ In the new country, 2,48 million hectares of the almost 22 million hectares of agricultural and forestry land were redistributed, however, entire large estates were generally not parceled out.⁷⁷

Prince Batthyány’s aim was to keep the estates, and then to sell them.⁷⁸ The prince defended his interest and estate with a lawyer in Zágráb, which, however, did not go well. It was only after 1925 possible to sell his remaining lands. Such situation was created on the estates, which were already under sequestrum, that the owner was forced to sell his lands.⁷⁹ Finally, at the end of the 1920s, the Ludbreg Estate was successfully sold to the Croatian baron Amon Rukavina, who was not only a large landown-

⁶⁸ Kaposi, Z. (2012): 206.

⁶⁹ BLA HAK. Nagykanizsa. Fasc. 2. Erdőhivatali levelek. 23 November 1917.

⁷⁰ BLA HAK. Nagykanizsa. Fasc. 2. Erdőhivatali levelek. Fasc. 2. 1915.

⁷¹ HU-MNL-VaML BLHI. Fasc. 26. 15 Mai 1916. Pachtvertrag.

⁷² Ibidem.

⁷³ Kaposi, Z. 2020/a): 10–13.

⁷⁴ BLA HAK. Nagykanizsa. Fasc. 2. Erdőhivatali levelek. 8 July 1919.

⁷⁵ Berend, T. I. – Ránki, Gy. (1976): 275.

⁷⁶ Kovács, A. (2004): 9.

⁷⁷ Berend, T. I. – Ránki, Gy. (1976): 274.; Csuka, J. (1941): 42-61.; Milotay, I. (1941): 1.

⁷⁸ Kardos, K. (Ed.) (1987): 151.

⁷⁹ See Novi Knezevac-i Újság, 22. April 2010., 17., Németh, J.

er, but also had many industrial interests.⁸⁰ According to the data of the inheritance negotiations, the price of the purchase may have been 123 000 dollars, which was invested in shares. However, the farm did not operate well in the hands of the new owner during the global economic crisis, so he passed it on to the Berger Brothers Trading House in Zagreb, which company parceled out the fields and meadows of the former estate to urban peasants. The castle and the park became property of the city of Ludbreg in 1939.⁸¹

SUMMARY

The image of the estates of the Hungarian entails generally emphasizes their negative features. Among them, unsaleability, poor management, and exclusion of family members are the most common which appear. In contrast, it turns out according to the Ludbreg (and other) investigations that an entail estate founded in the middle of the 18th century has changed a lot over time. Without any doubt, it was more important in the beginning to preserve the family property, ensure stability and expand manorial management. In the era of the emergence of market economy, the owner had new tasks in adapting to the changing economic environment, such as the launch of development programs, income generation, and the transformation of manorial farming, through which he was able to preserve the family fortune. At the same time, there were such external effects against which the owner was defenseless. Among these, let us mention the loss of manorial lands due to the laws of 1848, the loss of land due to the separation of pastures and forests in the 1850s and 1860s, the shocks of World War, and then the annexation to the South-Slavic state. The rental management model had probably served as an escape route for a while, where at least the management difficulties were burdened by the tenants, but a stable income could still be obtained. The aforementioned external processes could not be influenced at the manorial level, therefore the Ludbreg economy also fell into an increasingly hopeless situation, at the end of which the large estate ceased to exist.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

BLA HAK = Burgenländisches Landesarchiv. Herrschaftsarchiv Kittsee, Nagykanizsa. Fasc. 2. Erdőhivatali levelek.

HU-MNL-OL = National Archives of Hungary National Archive

A 39. Libri regii. Vol. 56.

A 35. Conceptus Expeditionum. 1742.

A 57 Libri regii. Vol. 39.

E 156 – a. Fasc. 068.

P 1313. Fasc. 36., 37., 44., 138., 139., 136., 102.

P 1320. Fasc. 8.

P 1322. Fasc. 102., 109., 163.,

P 1333. Fasc. 4.

HU-MNL-VaML = National Archives of Hungary Archive of Vas County

VII-/d bb. Gróf Batthyány Lajos hitbizományi iratai (1760) 1872–1948 (BLHI). 19., 26., 41., 42., 43. doboz.

REFERENCES

1. 1000. év törvényei: <http://www.1000ev.hu/>
2. Bakács, I. (1965). A magyar nagybirtokos családok hitelügyletei a XVII–XVIII. században. Budapest
3. Bakács, I. (1958). Népszéki és mezőgazdasági adatok a Széchenyi család Somogy és Zala megyei birtokairól a 18–19. század fordulóján. Történelmi Statisztikai Közlemények, Vol. 2. (1958) Nr. 3–4. pp 3–27.
4. Barbarits, L. (1929). Nagykanizsa. Budapest

⁸⁰ Kaposi, Z. (2012); Magyar Kereskedők Lapja, 1922. 19 April 1922. 3.

⁸¹ See Scitaroci, M. O. – Scitaroci, B. O. (1998): 142–147.

5. Bencze, G. (1983). Zala megye leírása a reformkorban. Zalai gyűjtemény 23. Zalaegerszeg
6. Berend, T. I. – Ránki, Gy. (1976). Közép-Kelet-Európa gazdasági fejlődése a 19–20. században. Budapest
7. Bright, R. (1818). Travels from Vienna through Lower Hungary; with some remarks on the state of Vienna during the Congress, in the Year of 1814. Edinburgh
8. Csuka, J. (1941). Kisebbségi sorban 1. A délvidéki magyarság húsz éve. Szabadka
9. Dretar, M. (2010/a). Doseljavanje Židova u ludbreški kraj. In: <http://povijest.net/v5/hrvatska/regionalno/2010/doseljavanje-zidova-u-ludbreski-kraj/>
10. Date of access: 22.01.2013
11. Dretar, M. (2010/b). Židovi u Ludbregu. Ludbreg. Dragutin Novak
12. Fest, A. (1897). Fiume kereskedelme. In Sziklay J. – Borovszky, S. (Eds.): Fiume és a magyar-horvát tengerpart. Magyarország vármegyéi és városai 7. Budapest
13. Hunfalvy, J. (1865). A Magyar Birodalom természeti viszonyainak leírása. Pest
14. Kállay, I. (1985). Úriszéki bíráskodás a XVIII–XIX. században. Budapest
15. Kaposi, Z. (2000). Uradalmi gazdaság és társadalom a 18–19. században. Budapest-Pécs
16. Kaposi, Z. (2007). Die Funktionsänderungen der adeligen Gesellschaft in Südtransdanubien im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. In Pferschy, G. – Weisflecker, P. (Eds.): Internationales Kulturhistorisches Symposium Mogersdorf 35. Graz. pp 48–60.
17. Kaposi, Z. (2009). Kanizsa gazdasági struktúrájának változásai 1743–1848. Nagykanizsa
18. Kaposi, Z. (2012). A hitbizományi működés nehézségei a piacosodás korában. In Szirácsik, É. (Ed.): Birtokosok és birtokok. Salgótarján. pp 189–220.
19. Kaposi, Z. (2014). Nagykanizsa gazdasági fejlődése (1850–1945). In Kaposi Z. (Ed.): Nagykanizsa. Városi Monográfia III. (1850–1945). Nagykanizsa. 99–250.
20. Kaposi, Z. (2020/a). A Dráva menti uradalmak gazdasági változásai a Trianon körüli években. *Agrártörténeti Szemle*, Vol. LXI. (2020) Nr. 1–4. pp 1–24.
21. Kaposi, Z. (2020/b). Forstbewirtschaftung in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Nagykanizsa und Umgebung. In Malli, R. – Moll, M. – Ruhri, A. (Eds.): Der Wald als Lebens- und Wirtschaftswachstum im pannonischen Raum – Forests as living space and economic sphere in the pannonian region. Mogersdorf 47. Graz. pp 80–94.
22. Kardos, K. (Ed.) (1897). A szegények orvosa: Batthyány-Strattmann László. Eisenstadt, Prugg Verlag
23. Kovács, A. (2004). Földreform és kolonizáció a Lendva-vidéken a két világháború között. *Korall, Társadalomtudományi folyóirat*. Nr. 18. (2004). pp 5–29.
24. Milotay, I. (1941). A szerb telepes-invázió. *Új Magyarország*, Vol. 8. (1941) Nr. 134.
25. Mórocz, P. (2005). Batthyány Lajos (1696–1765). Körmend
26. Németh, J. (1929). A balkáni államok birtoklási és mezőgazdasági termelési viszonyai. *Közgazdasági Szemle* Vol. LIII. Nr. 74. pp 224–249.
27. Pallas (1895). A Pallas Nagy Lexikona. Vol. XI. Budapest
28. Palugyay, I. (1863). A kapcsolt részek (Slavonia–Croatia) történelmi- s jog-viszonya Magyar-Országhoz. Pozsony
29. Petrić, H. (1997). Društveni i gospodarski razvoj od srednjeg vijeka do prvog svjetskog rata, in: Umjetnička topografija Hrvatske, knjiga 3, Ludbreg - Ludbreška Podravina, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Ministarstvo kulture - Uprava za zaštitu kulturne i prirodne baštine, Ministarstvo razvitka i obnove, Zagreb 1997, pp. 43-64.
30. Petrić, H. – Obadić, I. (2007). Drava River Flooding in Varaždin and Koprivnica Parts of Podravina (Drava River Region - between Croatia and Hungary) in the Period 17th - 19th Century. Vol. 6. (2007) No. 12. pp 136-147.
31. Petrić, H. (2022): O Ludbregu i obitelji Batthyány s posebnim osvrtom na odnos prema relikviji Presvete Krvi Kristove (cca 1696. – 1817.). About Ludbreg and the Batthyány Family with Special Reference to the Attitude towards the Relic of the Holy Blood of Christ (Cca 1696-1817). *Podravina* Vol. 21. (2022) No. 41. pp 84-95.
32. Polster, G. (1998). Von Soldaten, Pralaten und Magnaten. Wien http://www.umiznet.com/de/datenbanken/ddb/diplomarbeiten/Von_Soldaten_Praelaten_und_Magnaten.pdf
33. Prickler, H. (1994). A nyugat-magyarországi (burgenlandi) zsidó települések. In Deáky, Z. – Csoma, Zs. – Vörös, É. (Eds.): "...és hol van a vidék zsidósága?" Történeti és néprajzi tanulmányok a falusi és a mezővárosi zsidók és nem-zsidók együttéléséről. Budapest
34. Révai (1915). Révai Nagy Lexikona. Vol. XIII. Budapest

35. Scitaroci, M. O. – Scitaroci, B. O. (1998). Kastélyok és történelmi kertek a horvátországi Zagorjében Zágrábtól Újlakig. Zágráb. <http://jupiter.elte.hu/aacikkek/356zagoje.htm>
36. Sokcsevits, D. (2011). Horvátország története a 7. századtól napjainkig. Budapest
37. Vízzabályozás (1973). A magyar vízzabályozás története (Ed. Ihrig, D.). Budapest
38. Szabó, M. (2023). The Development of Professional Game Management and Hunting Tourism along the River of Drava. *Podravina*, Vol. 22 (2023) Nr. 43. pp 76–86.
39. Tilkovszky, L. (1990): Széchenyi István csokonyai uradalma. In Kanyar, J. (Ed.): Somogy megye múltjából 1990. Levéltári Évkönyv 21. Kaposvár. pp 111–154.
40. T. Mérey, K. (1962). Somogy megye mezőgazdasága (1790–1848). Kaposvár
41. Zimányi (1962). A hg. Batthyány-család levéltára. Budapest
42. Zsámbéky, M. (2006). A Batthyány hercegek ősanija, Strattmann Eleonóra. *Vasi Szemle*, Vol. 60. (2006) Nr. 6. pp 713–722.

STATISTICAL SOURCES

1. Danyi, D. – Dávid, Z. (1960). Az első magyarországi népszámlálás. Budapest
2. Gazdacímtár (1897). A magyar korona országainak mezőgazdasági statisztikája. Vol. 2. Budapest
3. Nagy, L. (1828–1829). Notitiae politico-geographico-statisticae Inclyti Regni Hungariae, Partiumque eidem adnexarum. Vol. 2. Buda
4. Népszámlálás (1890). A Magyar Korona országáiban az 1890. év elején végrehajtott népszámlálás eredményei. Vol. 1. Budapest
5. Népszámlálás (1910). A magyar szent korona országainak 1910. évi népszámlálása. Vol. 1. Budapest

PRESS SOURCES

1. Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, 1810.
2. Pressburger Zeitung 1831.
3. Novi Knezevac-i Újság, 2010.
4. Zala, 1895.
5. Köztelek, 1896.
6. Magyar Kereskedők Lapja 1922.

SAŽETAK

U ovoj studiji istražujemo gospodarske i teritorijalne promjene Ludbreškog imanja, koje je pripadalo Entailu Batthyány. Ovo veliko imanje nalazilo se na području čiji je dio bio plavljen nekoliko puta godišnje zbog tri rijeke. Stoga je do Dvojne Monarhije stočarstvo imalo vrlo važnu ulogu kako u vlastelinskom tako i u feudalnim gospodarstvu. U 1860-im i 1870-im godinama počeo se širiti željeznički sustav te je značajno poboljšana mogućnosti prijevoza. U posljednjoj trećini 19. stoljeća proizvodnja pšenice postala je sve važnija. Visoke cijene žitarica potaknule su transformaciju područja. Počelo je krčenje šuma i stvorena su žitna polja. Sve više više zemlje uzimano je rijekama. Dio vlastelinstva (21,27 km²) koji je dan u zakup donosila su visoku zaradu knezu Batthyányju sve do Prvog svjetskog rata. Gospodarski procvat prestao je 1918. godine. Nakon Prvog svjetskog rata ludbreško imanje ulazi u novonastalu južnoslavensku državu, a dio je isparceliran, dok je knez Ladislav (László) Batthyány uspio prodati ostatak.