

Athens Institute for Education and Research  
2019

# NEW STUDIES IN HISTORY AND LAW

Edited by

David A. Frenkel, LL.D.

Emeritus Professor, Guilford Glazer Faculty of Business and Management  
Department of Business Administration  
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva  
Israel

Norbert Varga, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences  
Department of Hungarian Legal History  
University of Szeged, Szeged  
Hungary

## Table of Contents

<b>List of Contributors</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction</b> <i>David A. Frenkel &amp; Norbert Varga</i>	<b>7</b>
<b>Manifestations of Populism in Late 5<sup>th</sup> Century Athens</b> <i>Vasileios Adamidis</i>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Jurisdiction in the Hungarian Cartel Law: Historical Background</b> <i>Norbert Varga</i>	<b>29</b>
<b>Development of the Hungarian 'Work Made for Hire' Provisions</b> <i>Dénes Legeza</i>	<b>47</b>
<b>The Establishment of the Districts in Hungary after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise</b> <i>Máté Pétervári</i>	<b>65</b>
<b>The <i>Eventualmaxime</i> in the Hungarian Civil Procedure - A Historical Perspective</b> <i>Kristóf Szivós</i>	<b>79</b>
<b>Social Rights in the First Yugoslavia (1918-1941): Tradition, Model and Deviations</b> <i>Ivan Kosnica</i>	<b>91</b>
<b>Legal History of the Development of the Process of Forced Execution of Claims in Croatian Law</b> <i>Jelena Kasap &amp; Višnja Lachner</i>	<b>103</b>
<b>Ancient Cypriot Kingdoms: Political and Legal Aspects of Their Regimes (1200 BC to 30 BC)</b> <i>Charalampos (Harry) Stamelos</i>	<b>121</b>

## The Establishment of the Districts in Hungary after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise<sup>1</sup>

Máté Pétervári

### Abstract

*After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, Hungary regained independence and consequently bourgeois reform of the state started on the basis of the April Acts of 1848. The legislator wanted to create an administrative system which would be able to carry out the acts and decrees on the local levels. The majority in the National Assembly (Hungarian Parliament) achieved this goal by implementing the Act 42 of 1870 and Act 18 of 1871. The need for modernising the administrative system resulted in reshaping of feudal territorial division, thus redrawing of the districts' territories was also put on the agenda during the implementation of the Act. The districts were the lowest levels of the counties' organizations. The paper is based on the examination of the archive material of the Hungarian Royal Ministry of the Interior (Hungarian National Archives, Documents of Ministry of the Interior K150 117, 118 bundles) which implied the drafts of the Hungarian counties about the public administration organization and the controlling of the Hungarian Royal Ministry of the Interior. The attribute of the new Hungarian district system on the basis of the Act 42 of 1870 is presented in this paper.*

**Keywords:** Kingdom of Hungary; District Administrator; Austro-Hungarian Monarchy; Public Administration; Dualism.

### Introduction

The institution history of district level accompanied the development of Hungarian constitutional history, since the Noble Judges (*szolgabíró*) appeared simultaneously in the 13<sup>th</sup> century with the formation of Noble County (*nemesi vármegye*).<sup>2</sup> The office remained until the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century, but it adjusted the social needs.<sup>3</sup> Its territory of competence was the "district" (*járás*) from the 16<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>4</sup> which was an administrative level below the counties until 1 January

<sup>1</sup>This research was supported by the project nr. EFOP-3.6.2-16-2017-00007, titled Aspects on the development of intelligent, sustainable and inclusive society: social, technological, innovation networks in employment and digital economy. The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund and the budget of Hungary.

<sup>2</sup>Béli (2008) at 47-49; Béli (2017) at 120-121; Zsoldos (2003) at. 791; 797-798.; Zsoldos (1994) at 488-489; Novák (2003) at 30; Mezey (2018) at 134.

<sup>3</sup>Marjanucz (2013) at 443-453.

<sup>4</sup>Tringli (2009) at 515; C. Tóth (2008) at 26 ;C. Tóth (2010) at 413.

1984. In 1971, the political decision-making removed the district councils, thus this local level were deprived of the representative organ.<sup>1</sup> The district level lost the authority of public administration in 1983, as the offices of district (*járási hivatal*) were abolished.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, Hungary remained without local level under counties from 1984.

After the democratic transformation, the Hungarian government strove for establishment of small regions (*kistérség*) as needed for joining the European Union, but this attempt achieved only some partial results<sup>3</sup>. Finally, the legislator leaned on the historical traditions in compliance with the Fundamental Law of Hungary, and the districts became again the part of the Hungarian public administration system from 1 January 2013, on the basis of Act XCIII of 2012 and Government Decree No. 218/2012 of 13 August 2012.<sup>4</sup> The government moved the big part of public administration competence from the self-governments to the district level, which has given a special topicality of the historical research of districts.<sup>5</sup> The districts served its purpose of LAU 1 in Classification of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) in the European Union nomenclature. The aim of this paper is working up of a contemporary legal historical subject. According to István Stipta, the contemporary legal historical subject means a prevailing legal institution, which had age-olds traditions.<sup>6</sup>

The main subject of my paper is the provisions of the Act XLII of 1870, which realised bourgeois reorganisation, modernisation of the feudal (before 1848) district system thorough working up of narrower interval. This legal regulation completed the modernisation of this administrative unit; therefore its examination is reasonable. The new information complemented some research achievements which were concerned with the Municipality Act perfectly, since numerous scholarly works dealt with the making of Act XLII of 1870,<sup>7</sup> the functioning of the counties (*vármegyei törvényhatóságok*)<sup>8</sup> and the cities with municipal rank (*törvényhatósági jogú városok*).<sup>9</sup>

The district system had to be reorganised in the same way like the counties after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, because the Act IV of 1869 ordered the separation of jurisdiction and public administration,<sup>10</sup> and it was necessary to the execution organization into the public law construction of the Compromise.<sup>11</sup> Two provisions concerning the districts (§61 and §91) could be found only in the Act XLII of 1870 on the municipality, but these did not provide detailed

<sup>1</sup>Takács (1963) at 53.; Antal (2003) at 85.

<sup>2</sup>Dominkovits & Horváth (2011) at 49.

<sup>3</sup>Kovács (2009) at 40-42.

<sup>4</sup>Hoffman (2014) at 193-194.

<sup>5</sup>Barta (2012) at 28.

<sup>6</sup>Stipta (2016) at 39.

<sup>7</sup>Mezey (2004) at 18-23; Varga (2007a.); Varga (2009) at 227-250.

<sup>8</sup>Zsuppán (1980) at 260-280; Stipta (1998a) at 77-93.

<sup>9</sup>Ruszoly (2004) at 11-17; Antal (2011) at 154-215.; Kajtár (1992) at 68-77; Varga (2002) at 59-63; Varga (2006) at 606-623; Varga (2007b) at 466-475; Varga (2013) at 715-726.

<sup>10</sup>Homoki-Nagy (2014) at 6-7; Homoki-Nagy (2017) at 50-51; Papp (2017) at 69-70; Máthé (1982) at 36.

<sup>11</sup>Sarlós (1976) at 13-15.

regulation.<sup>1</sup> I analysed the execution and the practical implementation of these provisions. The execution of the act was the authority of the counties. The counties were middle-level public administration units with rights of self-government. These organs had to create their public administration organization, and they were obliged to send the drafts to the Ministry of Interior with the purpose of confirmation. The councillors of Ministry of Interior controlled the conformities of the drafts with the legal regulation. In cases they criticised some provisions, they sent them back to the general assembly of the county for modification.<sup>2</sup>

Having examined these documents in the National Archives of Hungary I worked up the drafts of 26 municipalities which were submitted by the counties to the Ministry of Interior.<sup>3</sup> I examined counties from different part of the country, and dealt with municipalities with diverse population, including the counties of Transylvania, privileged regions (*kiváltságos kerületek*) and Székely seats. The municipalities of Transylvania constitute the basis of research due to reannexation by Hungary in 1868.<sup>4</sup> I do not examine the district organization in the Croatian territory, because the Hungarian-Croatian Compromise of 1868 formed independent administration of internal affairs in Croatia, since the internal affairs, the judicial matters, the education and the religion, were left to the Croatian autonomous government.<sup>5</sup> Nor I deal with the Military Border.<sup>6</sup> In my opinion it is possible to reach an appropriate conclusion in this way on the district organization which was formed by the Act XLII of 1870 in Hungary.

### The Creation of the Municipality Act

The National Assembly passed the April Acts on 11 April 1848, thanks to the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. These acts established the principle of

<sup>1</sup>61. § *The district administrator is the first officer of district.*

*The district administrator supervises the communities under his authority, and he exercises the rights and executes his duty which were delegated by the act or municipal statutes.*

*His directives – unless otherwise required by law – were given by the deputy-lieutenant (alispán) and he received by deputy-lieutenant, and the district administrator was in contact with deputy-lieutenant.*

*He possessed private seal with the municipality coat of arms and a legend which included the name of the district.*

*He employed an administrative clerk who was paid by the municipality with the aim of accurate discharging of the duties. The parties were able to appeal to the deputy-lieutenant and after that to the Ministry of Interior against the adverse decisions which were made by the district administrator independently in the authority which was determined by the act and the municipal statutes.*

<sup>2</sup>Pétervári (2018a) at 122-123.

<sup>3</sup>The examined municipalities: Alsó-Fehér County; Arad County; Aranyosszék; Bars County; Békés County; Bereg County; Csanád County; Csongrád County; Doboka County; Fejér County; Felső-Fehér County; Fogaras Region; Gömör és Kis-Hont County; Hajdú Circle; Hont County; Krassó County; Kővár Region; Nagy-Kikinda Circle; Pozsony County; Sáros County; Szabolcs County; Szepes County; Temes County; Trencsén County; Veszprém County; Zala County.

<sup>4</sup>Kisteleki (2018) at 282-284.

<sup>5</sup>Ogris (2015) at 26-27; Cepulo (2006) at 64-69; Cepulo (2015) at 50; Csorba (1998) at 378.; Heka (2004) at 150-152.

<sup>6</sup>Erekly (1910) at 51.

equality before the law and the foundations of the modern state. But Hungary lost the War of Independence against the Habsburg emperor and the Russian troops. As a result, Hungary lost its autonomy, and the monarch of Habsburg treated the Hungarian state as a province on the basis of "Verwirkungstheorie".<sup>1</sup> The Emperor practised his powers in an absolutistic manner, therefore this period of Hungarian history was named neo-absolutism. Franz Joseph I of Austria created unified public administration organization in the entire empire due to the modernization of the Habsburg Empire.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, the Hungarian independent administrative system became the part of the imperial government in 1853.<sup>3</sup> However, the era of neo-absolutism ended in 1860 when the Habsburg emperor issued the October Diploma, which restored the Hungarian public administration to the status prior to 1848.<sup>4</sup>

In 1867, Franz Joseph I and the Hungarian political elite under direction of Ferenc Deák reached the Austro-Hungarian Compromise. The Kingdom of Hungary became the part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, which was a "real union".<sup>5</sup> The monarch was common in the member states, and Hungary handled the external affairs, the military affairs and the financial matters of both fields in common with the other member state.<sup>6</sup>

The National Assembly became again independent. As a result, Hungary was able to create a modern Hungarian public administration from the feudal system. The re-establishment of the public administration was one of the most important goals of the Hungarian central government,<sup>7</sup> but it was established only with the Act XLII of 1870 (Municipality Act).<sup>8</sup> This act codified the Hungarian public administration for the first time.

The Act XLII of 1870 created the municipalities as unified public administration units. Municipalities (*törvényhatóság*), which were the big cities and the counties, represented the middle level of public administration in Hungary.<sup>9</sup> Such municipality exercised the right of self-government and conveyed the state government. In addition, they had the right to discuss questions of public interest.<sup>10</sup> The right of self-government included free decision making in own affairs. The municipality elected its own officials, determined its budget and levied taxes in order to cover the expenses.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, the municipality executed the acts and the government decrees by its own official functionary. In addition, the municipality had a petition right, which constituted a legal basis to raise before the ministry its opposition against a decree the municipality regards as unlawful or impractical before it

<sup>1</sup>Papp (2014) at 157.

<sup>2</sup>Sashegyi (1965) at 58-59.

<sup>3</sup>Erekly (1939) at 31.

<sup>4</sup>Stipta (1998b) at. 117.; Varga, (2010) at 856.

<sup>5</sup>Rigó (2017) at 197.

<sup>6</sup>Máthé (2018) at 46-47.

<sup>7</sup>Csorba (2000) at 193.

<sup>8</sup>Stipta (1985) at 910-911.

<sup>9</sup>Kmety (1911) at 84; Magyary (1942) at 336.

<sup>10</sup>Stipta (1992) at 481.

<sup>11</sup>Csizmadia (1976) at 123.

comes into force. The rights of the municipality are vested in the municipal board (*törvényhatósági bizottság*). Half of the members of the municipal board consisted of those who paid the highest taxes while the other half consists of the elected representatives.<sup>1</sup> The head of the municipality was the Lord Lieutenant (*főispán*), who was appointed by the king upon the advice of the Minister of the Interior. The minister controlled the self-government of the municipality and defended the interests of the state administration.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, he controlled the work of the municipality's officers at least annually, but these officers were elected by the municipal board.<sup>3</sup> However, the deputy-lieutenant (*alispán*) led the public administration in the county, and carried out the decrees of government; consequently. He served a mission of state administration. In addition to these tasks, he was empowered to instruct the officers of the municipality.<sup>4</sup> Along with other officers of the municipality, he was elected by the municipal board.

### The District Level on the Basis of Act XLII of 1870

The Act XLII of 1870 established the local executive organs in Hungary, on the basis of feudal tradition, so the counties (*megyék*) and the districts (*járások*) remained part of public administration. The districts were public administration units between the counties and the communities. The top officer of the district was the district administrator (*szolgabíró*).<sup>5</sup> The English terminology of this position is questionable, because it was formed in the 13th century and was transformed radically by the Municipality Act. The Latin name was *iudex nobelium* ("Stuhlrichter" in German). The English version of this term before 1848 was "the Noble Judge",<sup>6</sup> but it had no meaning after 1872, as these officers lost their jurisdiction competences. In my opinion the equivalent term is the "district administrator" because that expresses exercising public administration authority after 1870.

The territory of the county divided into districts, which were headed by the district administrators, who supervised the communities of his district. His superior was the deputy-lieutenant, who had to power to instruct him. Moreover, the district administrator was the delegate of the district. The district administrator was elected by the municipal board and was independent of the central power.

The aim of the central government was the creation of legal terminology, which was absent in some branches of law in Hungary.<sup>7</sup> The other aim of this act was the unification of the Hungarian public administration system; therefore the Ministry of the Interior corrected the divergences from the terms of legal norm.

<sup>1</sup>Varga (2011) at 44.

<sup>2</sup>Boncz (1876) at 128.

<sup>3</sup>Stipta (1995a) at 299-300.

<sup>4</sup>Fésüs (1880) at 61.

<sup>5</sup>Máthé (2017) at 432.

<sup>6</sup>Iusztin (2013) at 253.

<sup>7</sup>Mezey (2011) at 101-102.

This administration level was denominated permanent as “district”.<sup>1</sup> Arad County and Fejér County referred to the administration units as “circle” (*kerület*).<sup>2</sup> Bereg County named the territories of the district administrator “parts” (*szakasz*).<sup>3</sup> These wrong denominations were corrected by the councillors of the Royal Ministry of the Interior, but the different denominations were corrected just as “not so important issue”. The unified terminology was also an aim of councillors of Ministry of Interior in connection of the offices of the district administrators, but they intervened more efficient in this issue on the occasion of confirmation. Bars, Sáros, Gömör and Kis-Hont, Veszprém Counties planned, that the heads of the districts would be the “chief district administrators”.<sup>4</sup> This solution was the old custom in these counties. This was important because these counties established the chief district administrator in addition to the deputy district administrator. The counties wanted to give the two of them different powers. For example, Sáros county wished entrust recruitments of the soldiers only with the chief district administrator.<sup>5</sup> The Ministry of the Interior rejected these drafts.

Moreover, the councillors of Ministry of the Interior focused their attention on the establishment of the unified organizational structure. They transformed successfully the district system into one level organization. The Ministry of the Interior refused to divide the districts into additional subunits.<sup>6</sup>

We can observe the same aim to the unification in connection of formation of offices of district administrators, but the councillors required of the counties to unify in this issue on the occasion of confirmation more accurate. The majority of the municipalities employed the district administrator clerk (*szolgabírói írnok*), who was appointed by the district administrator, and assisted to the work of the district administrator pursuant to the Act XLII of 1870. However, a part of the municipality considered this solution unsatisfactory; therefore they established a new position, the district administrator assistant (*szolgabírósegéd*) with the consent of the Ministry of the Interior.<sup>7</sup> Such position was more acceptable and favourable than the district administrator clerk. However, the counties wanted to empower the municipal board to elect the district administrator assistant, but the Ministry of the Interior dismissed this proposal, because, according to their

<sup>1</sup>National Archives of Hungary (hereinafter MNL) Documents of the Ministry of the Interior (BM) K150 117. bundle K150 117. 21161/1871.-Békés County, 17803/1871.-Csanád County; 21068/1871.; 27282/1871.-Csongrád County; 21272/1871.-Doboka County, 17808/1871.-Fejér County; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér County, 21800/1871.-Region of Fogaras; 21798/1871.-Zala County; 118. 31726/1871.-Alsó-Fehér County; 23816/1871.-Gömör és Kis-Hont County; 22499/1871.-Region of Kővár; 22336/1871.-Veszprém County.

<sup>2</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 17731/1871.; 17731Sz/1871.; 32702/1871.-Arad County; MNL BM K150 117. 17808/1871.-Fejér County.

<sup>3</sup>MNL BM K150 118. 22592/1871.

<sup>4</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 21799/1871.; 20826/1871.; MNL BM K150 118. 23816/1871.; 22336/1871.

<sup>5</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 20826/1871.

<sup>6</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 117. 21799/1871.; 28287/1871.-Bars County; 20826/1871.-Sáros County; 118. 22592/1871.; 27001/1871.-Bereg County; 28726/1871.; 31986/1871.-Hont County

<sup>7</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 32702/1871.-Arad County; 28287/1871.-Bars County; 28525/1871.-Trencsén County; 118. 32051/1871.-Gömör and Kis-Hont County; 26616/1871.-Pozsony County; 33141/1871.-Hont County; 30172/1871.-Veszprém County; 22499/1871.-Region of Kővár.

opinion, the Lord Lieutenant had the power to appoint this official.<sup>1</sup> The Ministry reduced the number of the elected officials in this way, because the general assembly elected the deputy-noble judges (*alszolgabíró*) in the feudal era.<sup>2</sup>

The legislator regulated the establishment of the districts in the Municipal Act. The territories of the districts were formed by the general assemblies of the counties with the consent of the Ministry of the Interior, in the Kingdom of Hungary. The Municipality Act provided that the general assemblies must establish the districts considering the election districts of the country. The election districts were organised by the general assemblies according to Act V of 1848 (Voting Act), too. The legislator established a legal ground to the counties with the intention to determine the districts' territory divisions since the size of the election of districts were fixed in 30 000 inhabitants, after a short parliamentary debate.<sup>3</sup> The interpretation of this provision of Act XLII of 1870 were different in Transylvania, because the elections there were regulated by Act VII of 1848 on Union of Hungary and Transylvania was included in this area, and the election districts did not adjust to the population of the Transylvania's municipality.<sup>4</sup>

The archive materials, which I have examined, proved the fact that in this case, the majority of the counties acted contrary to the provisions of the Act.<sup>5</sup> The municipalities refused to pay attention to the election districts because they believed that the organization, which is suitable for the voting, was impractical to discharge the duties of administration. The counties argument was that the election districts resorted just one time in three years, while the public administration required a regular and daily connection between the population and the district officers.<sup>6</sup> The municipalities divided the territory typically on the basis of natural endowments and district courts.<sup>7</sup> It happened so due to the irregular district organization. In the counties, which I explored, the biggest district was the Békés District with 52 159 inhabitants,<sup>8</sup> but the smallest district was the Peselnek District with 5450 inhabitants.<sup>9</sup>

The Act XLII of 1870 did not define the seats of the districts in Hungary. It only provided that the external officers had to reside in the area of the district. For this reason, the majority of the district did not even establish their centre during the implementation of the Act. As an exception, the counties of Csongrád, Pozsony, Hont and Békés, the region of Fogaras and the Nagy-Kikinda Circle did set up the

<sup>1</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 17731Sz/1871.-Arad County; 118. 28726/1871.; 31986/1871.-Hont County.

<sup>2</sup>Puky (1828) at 62-64; Récs (1861) at 482.

<sup>3</sup>Ruszoly (1986) at 219; Ruszoly (1996) at.291-293.

<sup>4</sup>Pap (2014) at 242-244.

<sup>5</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 17731/1871.; 17731Sz/1871.; 32702/1871.-Arad County; 20171/1871.-Aranyosszék; 21068/1871.-Csongrád County; 21272/1871.-Doboka County; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér County; 21800/1871.-Region of Fogaras; 20826/1871.-Sáros County; 22226/1871.-Krassó County; 28525/1871.-Trencsén County; 21799/1871.-Bars County; 21161/1871.-Békés County; 21798/1871.-Zala County; 118. 22592/1871.-Bereg County; 23816/1871.-Gömör and Kis-Hont County; 26616/1871.-Pozsony County; 28391/1871.-Szabolcs County.

<sup>6</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 28525/1871.-Trencsén County; 22226/1871.-Krassó County; 21799/1871.-Bars County.

<sup>7</sup>Pétevári (2018b) at 239-240.

<sup>8</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 28287/1871.

<sup>9</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 22026/1871.

centres of their districts.<sup>1</sup>

The Act IV of 1869 of the Kingdom of Hungary separated the jurisdiction and the public administration on all levels. The district level of administration was established as independent from the judicial organization. The heads of the districts carried out judicial duties during six centuries,<sup>2</sup> which was a big change. The district administrator became just a worker of the public administration. He supervised the communities, and executed the acts, the decrees and the statutes of the municipality. But the general assemblies of the counties got the power and authority to specify the authority of their district administrator. The most important authority of the district administrator was the recruitment of the soldiers, quartering of the soldiers and the administration in connection of the army.<sup>3</sup> He coordinated the public work, which was imposed on the inhabitants.<sup>4</sup> They repaired the ways and the bridges in the framework of public work. The district administrator administrated and recovered the public work. He took part in the collection of the back taxes.<sup>5</sup> Another important duty was the maintenance of the public security and public order.<sup>6</sup>

The unification of salaries and working conditions of district administrators was not the main intention of the Ministry, hence the councillors did not strive to form a class of civil servants in the counties like in the neoabsolutism. His mandate changed from three years to six years. The salaries of district administrators were left by the counties on the former level due to the straitened financial sources, thus it created a wage differential contrary to the judges, who were paid by the central government. The district administrator was a recognised office among the officials of the counties. Their salaries showed deviation between wide frames, and the public administration officials were not well-paid positions. The salaries of judges were competitive with the similar positions in this period. The Ministry of the Interior did not attempt to unify the daily allowances, the travelling fees or the duration of holiday of the officials. It corrected them sporadic which resulted with unreasonable financial demands.

<sup>1</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 21161/1871.-Békés County; 21068/1871.-Csongrád County; 21800/1871.-Region of Fogaras; 118. 31986/1871.-Hont County; 24696/1871.-Nagy-Kikinda Circle; 26616/1871.-Pozsony County.

<sup>2</sup>Bató (2010) at 23.

<sup>3</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 21272/1871.-Doboka vármegye; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér vármegye; 21800/1871.-Fogaras vidék; 20826/1871.-Sáros vármegye; 118. 22592/1871.-Bereg vármegye; 32032/1871.-Gömör és Kis-Hont vármegye; 22187/1871.-Közép-Szolnok vármegye; 22336/1871.-Veszprém vármegye; 233. 28463/1873.-Moson vármegye.

<sup>4</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 21272/1871.-Doboka vármegye; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér vármegye; 21800/1871.-Fogaras vidék; 20826/1871.-Sáros vármegye; 118. 22592/1871.-Bereg vármegye; 32032/1871.-Gömör és Kis-Hont vármegye; 23891/1871.-Hunyad vármegye; 22187/1871.-Közép-Szolnok vármegye; 22336/1871.-Veszprém vármegye; 233. 28463/1873.-Moson vármegye.

<sup>5</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 21272/1871.-Doboka vármegye; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér vármegye; 21800/1871.-Fogaras vidék; 118. 22592/1871.-Bereg vármegye; 32032/1871.-Gömör és Kis-Hont vármegye; 22187/1871.-Közép-Szolnok vármegye; 22336/1871.-Veszprém vármegye; 233. 28463/1873.-Moson vármegye.

<sup>6</sup>MNL BM K150 118. 22592/1871.-Bereg vármegye; 22187/1871.-Közép-Szolnok vármegye; 30937/1871.-Moson vármegye; 22336/1871.-Veszprém vármegye; 117. 21272/1871.-Doboka vármegye; 22026/1871.-Felső-Fehér vármegye; 20826/1871.-Sáros vármegye.

The salary of the district administrator was decided upon and financed by the counties according to the Municipal Act. This issue caused problems, because the counties had divergent area, population and tax-payer ability. For this reason, the government was unable to carry out this provision of the Act, which regulated that the counties finance the expenses of the public administration.<sup>1</sup> In the future the state would have to pay also the salaries of the public servants of counties.

## Summary

The Royal Interior of Ministry realised the unification of the district administration level in Hungary. The division of labour in the Ministry made this work easier because the drafts of the counties in the same subject were examined by same councillors on every occasion. All drafts in connection of districts were confirmed by *László Torkos*,<sup>2</sup> thus he was the public servant who formed the unified concepts for the examined administration level.

I would like to present in my paper that a short provision of the act can have some questions in store, which we can recognise from the archive material. The realization of this part of Municipal Act was successful because the cooperation of the Royal Ministry of Interior with the counties enabled the establishment of a unified district level under the middle level in the whole territory of the country, instead of the particular, feudal public administration. This was an important condition of the modern administration at this period.

## References

- Antal, T. (2009). *A tanácsrendszer és jogintézményei Szegeden (1950-1990)*. Szeged: Csongrád Megyei Levéltár.
- Antal, T. (2011). *Város és népképviselő. Az 1848:XXIII. tc. és intézményei Debrecenben (1848-1872)*. Szeged: Pólay Elemér Alapítvány.
- Barta, A. (2012). 'A magyar államigazgatás alsó-középszintjének átalakítása 2012-ben. A járások feladataira és szervezetére vonatkozó főbb megállapítások' in *Kodifikáció és közigazgatás* 1(2):28-38.
- Bató, Sz. (2010). "'A járásbeli tisztség által megítélt bűnügyek". A szolgabírói szék büntető jellegű bírászkodása a Békési járásban (1843-1847)', in M. Homoki-Nagy (ed.) *Mezővárosaink jogélete a 18-19. Századba* (pp. 19-47). Szeged: Pólay Elemér Alapítvány.
- Béli, G. (2008). *A nemesek négy bírója: a szolgabírók működésének első korszaka, 1268-1351*. Budapest-Pécs: Dialóg Campus - PTE ÁJK.

<sup>1</sup>Stipta, I. (1995/b). 159.

<sup>2</sup>MNL BM K150 117. 17731Sz/1871.; 17803/1871.; 18194/1871.; 18839/1871.; 20171/1871.; 21068/1871.; 21161/1871.; 21272/1871.; 21798/1871.; 21799/1871.; 21800/1871.; 22026/1871.; 27079/1871.; 27282/1871.; 27291/1871.; 28287/1871.; 29328/1871.; 29721/1871.; 31267/1871.; 31913/1871.; 32702/1871.; 32776/1871.; 34430/1871.; 118. 22336/1871.; 22499/1871.; 22592/1871.; 23346/1871.; 23816/1871.; 27001/1871.; 28726/1871.; 30172/1871.; 30266/1871.; 31726/1871.; 31986/1871.; 32051/1871.; 33141/1871.

- Béli, G. (2017). 'Organe der Machtausübung' in G. Máthé (ed.) *Die Entwicklung der Verfassung und des Rechts in Ungarn* (pp. 93-132) Budapest: Dialóg Campus.
- Boncz, F. (1876). *A magyar közigazgatási törvénytudomány kézikönyve a törvényhozás legújabb állása szerint*. Vol. I. Budapest: Athenaeum.
- Cepulo, D. (2006). 'Building of the modern legal system in Croatia 1848-1918 in the centre-periphery perspective' in T. Giaro (ed.) *Modernisierung durch Transfer im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert* (pp. 47-91). Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Cepulo, D. (2015). 'Entwicklung der Regierungsinstitutionen des Königreiches Kroatien und Slawonien von 1868-1918', in G. Máthé & B. Mezey (eds.) *Kroatisch-ungarische öffentlich-rechtliche Verhältnisse zur Zeit der Doppelmonarchie* (pp. 31-103). Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
- C. Tóth, N. (2008). *Szabolcs megye működése a Zsigmond-korban*. Nyíregyháza: Szabolcs Községért Kulturális Közhasznú Közalapítvány.
- C. Tóth, N. (2010). 'A nemesi megye a középkori Magyarországon. Öt megye példája' in *Szabolcs-Szatmár-Beregi szemle* 44(4):405-413.
- Csizmadia, A. (1976). *A magyar közigazgatás fejlődése a XVIII. századtól a tanácsrendszer létrejöttéig*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Csorba, L. (1998). 'A dualizmus rendszerének kiépülése és a konszolidált időszak (1867-1890)' in A. Gergely (ed.) *19. századi magyar történelem, 1790-1918* (pp. 375-403). Budapest: Korona Kiadó.
- Csorba, L. (2000). *A tizenkilencedik század története*. Budapest: Pannonica Kiadó.
- Dominkovits, P. & G.K. Horváth (2011). 'A szolgabíráktól a járási hivatalokig - a járások története Magyarországon a 13. századtól 1983-ig' in A. Csité & M. Oláh (eds.) *"Kormányozni lehet ugyan távolról, de igazgatni csak közelről lehet jól..."*. *Tanulmány a területi igazgatás magyar történelmi hagyományairól, az átalakításra vonatkozó jelenkori kutatások eredményeinek áttekintése, valamint az európai tapasztalatok bemutatása* (pp. 16-74). Budapest: Hétfő Elemző Központ. Available at [http://hetfa.hu/wp-content/uploads/I\\_modul.pdf](http://hetfa.hu/wp-content/uploads/I_modul.pdf)
- Erekly, I. (1910). *A magyar helyhatósági önkormányzat. Vármegyék és községek*. Vol. I. Budapest: Grill Könyvkiadóvállalat.
- Erekly, I. (1939). *Az önkormányzat modern rendszerének kialakulása Magyarországon*. Budapest: Budapest Székesfőváros Házinyomdája.
- Fésüs, Gy. (1880). *A magyar közigazgatási jog kézikönyve: a jogtanulók s egyéb vizsgálati jelöltek igényeihez alkalmazva*. Budapest: Eggenberger.
- Heka, L. (2004). *Horvát alkotmány- és jogtörténet*. Vol. II. Szeged: JATEPress.
- Hoffman, I. (2014). 'A területi államigazgatási szervek' in Fazekas Marianna (ed.), *Közigazgatási jog. Általános rész I* (pp. 181-218). Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó.
- Homoki-Nagy, M. (2014). *A Szegedi Törvénytörvények története*. Vol. I. Szeged: Szegedi Törvénytörvények.
- Homoki-Nagy, M. (2017). 'A bírói felelősség az 1869:IV. tc. alapján' in *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis, Forum. Acta Juridica et Politica* 7(1):45-68.
- Iusztin, Z. (2013). 'The Noble Judges in Timis County (14th-15th Centuries)' in *Transylvanian Review* 22(4):253-264.
- Kajtár, I. (1992). *Magyar városi önkormányzatok (1848-1918)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kisteleki, K. (2018). 'Erdély és Magyarország második egyesülése: az 1868-as uniós törvény' in E. Veress (ed.) *Erdély jogtörténete* (pp. 282-286). Kolozsvár: Forum Iuris.
- Kmety, K. (1911). *A magyar közigazgatási és pénzügyi jog kézikönyve*. Vol. I. Budapest: Grill Kiadó.

- Kovács, Sz. (2009). 'A járások és a mai kistérségi felosztás összehasonlítása I.' in *Comitatus* 19(5):31-43.
- Magyary, Z. (1942). *Magyar közigazgatás*. Budapest: Királyi Magyar Egyetemi Nyomda.
- Marjanucz, L. (2013). 'A járás a magyar történelemben' in M. Homoki-Nagy (ed.), *Ünnepi kötet Dr. Blazovich László egyetemi tanár 70. Születésnapjára* (pp. 441-454). Szeged: SZTE-ÁJTK.
- Máthé, G. (1982). *A magyar burzsoá igazságszolgáltatási szervezet kialakulása, 1867-1875*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Máthé, G. (2015). 'Der ungarische Rechtsstaat in der Zeit der Doppelmonarchie' in G. Máthé & B. Mezey (eds.) *Kroatisch-ungarische öffentlich-rechtliche Verhältnisse zur Zeit der Doppelmonarchie* (pp. 105-185). Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
- Máthé, G. (2017). 'Das institutionelle System des ungarischen Rechtsstaates und die Doppelmonarchie' in G. Máthé (ed.) *Die Entwicklung der Verfassung und des Rechts in Ungarn* (pp. 403-450). Budapest: Dialóg Campus.
- Máthé, G. (2018). 'Deák Ferenc közjogi dogmatikai remeke' in G. Máthé, A. Menyhárd & B. Mezey (eds.) *A kettős monarchia. Die Doppelmonarchie* (pp. 39-63). Budapest: ELTE Állam- és Jogtudományi Kar.
- Mezey, B. (2004). 'Államosítás és autonómia. Centralizáció és önkormányzatiság a XIX. század második felében' in J. Gergely (ed.), *Autonómiák Magyarországon 1848-1998* (pp. 13-24). Budapest: ELTE BTK Új- és Jelenkori Magyar Történeti Tanszék.
- Mezey, B. (2011). 'A bírói szervezet átalakítása és a büntetés-végrehajtási intézetek a 19. században' in M. Homoki-Nagy (ed.) *Konferencia a bírói hatalomról és az állampolgárságról* (pp. 101-110). Szeged: Szegedi Egyetemi Kiadó - Juhász Gyula Felsőoktatási Kiadó.
- Mezey, B. (2018). 'Helyi igazgatási modellek Erdélyben' in E. Veress (ed.) *Erdély jogtörténete* (pp. 131-149). Kolozsvár: Forum Iuris.
- Novák, V. (2003). 'Nyitra, Bars és Abaúj vármegyék tisztségviselői és oklevélkiadásuk 1526-ig' in Á. Henszel (ed.) *Szabolcs-szatmár-beregi levéltári évkönyv* (Vol. XVI, 29-55). Nyíregyháza: Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg Megyei Önkormányzat Levéltára.
- Ogris, W. (2015). 'Die Doppelmonarchie Österreich-Ungarn und ihre Länder – Eine Einführung' in G. Máthé & B. Mezey (eds.) *Kroatisch-ungarische öffentlich-rechtliche Verhältnisse zur Zeit der Doppelmonarchie*, (pp. 11-30). Budapest: Eötvös University Press.
- Pap, J. (2014). *Tanulmányok a dualizmus kori magyar parlamentarizmus történetéből*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó & EKF Líceum Kiadó.
- Papp, L. (2014). 'A rendes bírósági szervezet Magyarországon 1849-1861 között' *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Forum. Acta Juridica et Politica* 4(1):157-167.
- Papp, L. (2017). 'Különbírók szerepe és rendeltetése a modern igazságszolgáltatási rendszerekben' in *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis, Forum. Acta Juridica et Politica* 7(1):69-81.
- Pétevári, M. (2018a). 'Die rechtsstaatliche Umgestaltung der Verwaltung im Jahr 1870, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bezirke' in M. Homoki-Nagy & N. Varga (eds.) *Codification Achievements and Failures in the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Century* (pp. 117-124).
- Pétevári, M. (2018b). 'A járások polgári kialakítását befolyásoló tényezők az 1870:XLII. tc. végrehajtása során' in P. Szabó Béla, Zaccaria Márton Leó & Árva Zsuzsanna (eds.) *Profectus in litteris IX.* (pp. 233-240). Debrecen: Lícium-Art.
- Puky, K. (1828). *Politikai igazgatás, avagy A' magyar országi tekintetes nemes vármegyék' politikai szerkezetéseinek és igazgatások módjainak, úgy nem különben azon nemes megyék, melly politikai igazgató székek által, és miképpen való kormányoztatásoknak rövid leírása*. Pest: Petrózai Trattner J. M.-Károlyi István.

- Récsi, E. (1861). *Magyarország közzjoga a mint 1848-ig s 1848-ban fenállott*. Buda-Pest: Pfeiffer Ferdinánd.
- Rigó, B. (2017). 'Alkotmányos változások az 1860-as évek második felében' in *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis. Forum. Publicationes Doctorandorum Juridicorum* 7(1):193-222.
- Ruszoly, J. (1986). 'A hazai választási statisztika kezdetei (1848-1869)' in K. Tóth (ed.) *Studia in honorem Roberti Horváth septuagenarii* (pp. 217-237). Szeged: JATE.
- Ruszoly, J. (1996). 'Az országgyűlési népképviselő bevezetése Magyarországon (Az 1848: V. tc. létrejötte)' in Cs. Fazekas (ed.), *Társadalomtörténeti tanulmányok* (pp. 277-299). Miskolc: Bíbor Kiadó. (Studia Miskolcensis 2)
- Ruszoly, J. (2004). *Szeged szabad királyi város törvényhatósága, 1872-1944*. Szeged: Csongrád Megyei Levéltár.
- Sarlós, B. (1976). *Közigazgatás és hatalompolitika a dualizmus rendszerében*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Sashegyi, O. (1965). *Az abszolutizmus kori levéltár*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Stipta, I. (1985). 'Vármegyei reformkonceptiók az 1870. XLII. tc. képviselőházi vitájában' in *Állam és igazgatás* 35(10):910-917.
- Stipta, I. (1992). 'Intézménytörténeti adalékok az 1870:XLII. tc. végrehajtásához' in K. Tóth (ed.) *Emlékkönyv Dr. Cséka Ervin egyetemi tanár születésének 70. és oktatói munkásságának 25. Évfordulójára* (pp. 481-494). Szeged: JATE.
- Stipta, I. (1995a). 'A főispáni hatáskör törvényi szabályozása (1870, 1886)' in G. Máthé & J. Zlinszky (eds.) *Degré Alajos emlékkönyv* (pp. 299-312). Budapest: UNIÓ Lap- és Könyvkiadó.
- Stipta, I. (1995b). *Törekvések a vármegyék polgári átalakítására*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Stipta, I. (1998a). 'Parlamentari viták a területi önkormányzatról (1870-1886)' in B. Mezey (ed.) *Hatalommegosztás és jogállamiság* (pp. 77-93). Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Stipta, I. (1998b). *A magyar bírósági rendszer története*. Debrecen: Multiplex Media - Debrecen U. P.
- Stipta, I. (2016). 'A jelenkori jogtörténet-tudomány (értelmezési kísérlet)' in *Jogtörténeti szemle* 18(3):36-40.
- Takács, I. (1963). *A járási tanácsok feladatai*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.
- Tringli, I. (2009). 'Megyék a középkori Magyarországon' in T. Neumann & Gy. Rácz (eds.) *Honoris causa. Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére* (pp. 487-518). Budapest: MTA Történettudományi Intézete.
- Varga, N. (2002). 'A köztörvényhatóság létrehozásának előzményei az 1870:XLII. tc. alapján Debrecen szabad királyi városban' in *Collega* 6(2):59-63.
- Varga, N. (2006). 'A főispáni tisztség bevezetése Debrecen és Szeged szabad királyi városokban a köztörvényhatósági törvény alapján' in B. Mezey & T. M. Révész (eds.) *Ünnepi tanulmányok Máthé Gábor 65. születésnapja tiszteletére* (pp. 606-623). Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- Varga, N. (2007a). 'A köztörvényhatósági törvény (1870:XLII. tc.) létrejötte' in *Debreceni Jogi Műhely* 4(4). Available at [http://www.debrecenijogimuhely.hu/archivum/4\\_2007/a\\_koztorvenyhatosagi\\_torveny\\_ltrejotte/](http://www.debrecenijogimuhely.hu/archivum/4_2007/a_koztorvenyhatosagi_torveny_ltrejotte/)
- Varga, N. (2007b). 'A közigazgatási reform és a helyi politika viszonya Debrecenben és Szegeden (1870-1872)' in *Debreceni Szemle* 15(4):466-475.
- Varga, N. (2009). 'A polgári közigazgatás kiépítése felé tett lépések a dualizmus időszakában' in K. Radics (ed.) *A Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Levéltár évkönyve*, Vol. XXXI (pp. 227-250). Debrecen: Hajdú-Bihar Megyei Levéltár.

- Varga N. (2010). 'The emergence of bourgeois public administration in hungarian cities (1843-1867)' in I. Magos & M. Stoian (eds.) *European Legal Studies and Research*, Vol. II. (pp. 849-857). Timisoara: Wolters Kluwer.
- Varga, N. (2011). 'A virilizmus bevezetése és a cégek virilis jogának megítélése Szegeden' in *Jogtörténeti Szemle* 13(1):43-47.
- Varga, N. (2013). 'A törvényhatósági bizottság alakuló ülése Debrecenben és Szegeden' in E. Balogh & M. Homoki-Nagy (eds.) *Ünnepi kötet Dr. Blazovich László egyetemi tanár 70. születésnapjára* (pp. 715-726). Szeged: SZTE-ÁJTK.
- Zsoldos, A. (1994). 'A megye intézménye a 14. sz. második felében' in Gy. Kristó (ed.) *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9-14. század)* (pp. 488-489). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Zsoldos, A. (2003). 'Az özvegy és a szolgabírák' in *Századok* 137(4):783-808.
- Zsuppán, F.T. (1980). 'A helyi önkormányzat újjászervezése 1871/72-ben' in *Századok* 114(2):260-280.