

Dániel Ballabás: The reform of the House of Magnates and the distribution of land among peers of Hungary

In my dissertation I studied the reform of the House of Magnates (1885) from a special social historical aspect. According to this aspect the newly introduced 3000 forints census divided the peerages two different financial positioned parts. Károly Vörös in his significant treatise from 1987, concluded that many families lost their fortune, because they lost their right to be a member of the House of Magnates.

Is it really so simple? Is it enough to subtract a number from another and we already get acquainted with distribution of land among peers of Hungary? It is hardly believed. My purpose in my dissertation is deconstruct the concept of Károly Vörös and study the peerage's ownership of the estates how to correlate to the membership of the House of Magnates. More specifically I study those peers who could have perpetual right to be a member of the House of Magnets, namely the two group is not the same, so it is necessary to define of the basic terms in my thesis. That raises the question of how we can use the list of the members of the House of

Magnates? Who could be on the list? Was everyone on the list who could be on there? These questions are very important, because they could determine the conclusions what we get due to using these sources.

The examination of the members of the House of Magnates is extensible from the year of the reform, to a whole period, from 1885 to 1918, so we can study the fluctuation of the members who have perpetual right to be a member. But can we deduce from this process to the alteration of distribution of land? What kind of factors affected the inconstancy of the membership? These questions approach the topic from the angle of the House of Magnates, but it would be conceivable from the angle of the estates as well. In that case, due to the attributes of the sources, the emphases are transfer from the processes to the more intensive study of a very specific time. In that case the focus is on the family, the relatives and their role of acquire, keep and transmit fortune and estate. The currently living peers' demographic settings and family relationships are revealing. Using these results, I study the distribution of land, and then the attendance in the House of Magnates. I seek the answers for the following questions: did those peers who weren't the members of the House of Magnates really lose their high position? And did those

peers who were the members of the House of Magnates have a really large fortune? How big estate was needed to achieve the census? How divided parts, by financial aspect, the group of those peers who has the right to be a member of the House of Magnates? Furthermore, time by time it is needed to take notice of the mistakes and limits of our essential source, the Register of landowners.