



Gentry or Bourgeois? The Social Statuses and Roles of Gyula Justh¹

Ákos SZENDREI

Institute of History
University of Debrecen
szendrei.akos@arts.unideb.hu

Abstract. One of the many manifestations of Hungarian embourgeoisement in the second half of the 19th century was the amalgamation of the social roles of both the traditional landed gentry and the emerging bourgeoisie. As a consequence, a new social group was born with plural identity and a set of roles. Along with many others, Gyula Justh, an influential politician of the opposition, was also a member of this new social group and therefore will be used here as an example to present this social phenomenon. Although Justh's social descent was determined by the 8,000 acres of land and the half a dozen mansions owned by his family, the influence of embourgeoisement becomes apparent as we outline his career. The flat he rented, the upper-middle class Jewish (Szitányi/Ullmann) origin of his wife, the profit-oriented management of his estate, his share subscriptions, the support of foundations and the demand of universal suffrage determined Justh's social status just as much as the phenomena of the landowners' traditional lifestyle.

Keywords: Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, embourgeoisement, social modernization, plural identity

Introduction

In Hungary the process of embourgeoisement began in the first half of the 19th century and it really got under way after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867 and the formation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, when it covered various classes of society. As far as the process of this transformation is concerned, in Hungary, in accordance with the characteristics of Middle-Eastern Europe, the number of citizens and intellectuals was not really significant, which made it possible for the liberal nobility (landholders of noble origins and the so-called genteel middle class)

¹ This research was supported by the European Union and the State of Hungary, co-financed by the European Social Fund in the framework of TÁMOP-4.2.4.A/ 2-11/1-2012-0001 'National Excellence Program.

to take an active part in the spread of embourgeoisement in a political, economic and social respect as well. Consequently, at least part of the nobility adopted more and more modern roles and as a result, due to the active involvement of the traditional social classes, the process of embourgeoisement cannot be described exclusively either by the development of the bourgeois classes, such as the upper-middle, middle, lower-middle and the working classes, or by the immobility and narrowness of the traditional social groups, namely the aristocracy, the medium landowners and smallholders, the (Hungarian) gentry and the peasantry (Halmos 1991).² When exclusively great social theories are considered, the process of change, which took place in the course of bourgeois modernization, can indeed be characterized by the temporary coexistence of the bourgeois and traditional social classes. However, if we focus on groups and individuals, we do not experience interruptions and rapid changes but the amalgamation of different structures and also the coexistence and continuity of the roles related to these structures (Merton 1980, 27; Veliky 2008; Sennett 1998, 39–57, 165–212, 212–237). Embourgeoisement in 19th century Hungary was a general phenomenon which affected every layer and class of the contemporary society. Therefore it would be a mistake to demonstrate its extent and spread based solely on the increase of the number and proportion of burgesses. The process itself can be viewed as a fundamental phenomenon and a leading motif of social modernization, which therefore influenced the aristocracy, the landholders of noble birth, the intellectuals of peasant origin (called *honoraciór* in Hungary), and certain members of the wealthy peasantry as well. The direct consequence of modernization cannot be described primarily by the sudden increase in the number of burgesses, but by the parallelism of bourgeois and traditional social structures and roles on the level of individuals and groups. Consequently, it can also be characterized by the appearance and spread of multiple or plural identities brought about by this parallelism (Hanák 1977; Benda 2006, 343, 345; Bódy 2007, 12).

The so-called noble “holders of a thousand acres” or, as they were previously called, the ‘*bene possessionati*’ were the social, political and cultural determinants in the Dualist Era between 1867 and 1918. Without rank or title they did not gain entry to the still fairly exclusive world of the aristocracy. However, there were several links which tied this group to the process of embourgeoisement. On the one hand, since their estates made them interested in the market, they introduced a somewhat capitalist type of estate management. On the other hand, due to their expertise, they became state bureaucrats and entered regional and national public life and politics. In terms of status this group appears to be quite multi-coloured and this phenomenon also presumes the application of a multi-

2 In 19th century Hungary the word ‘embourgeoisement’ did not primarily apply to the bourgeoisie, but it was used to describe the progress of civilization and it was more closely related to the concept of citizenship and to the process of becoming a citizen of the state.

layered and complex set of roles (Merton 1980, 88–89; Veliky 1999, 46; Estók 1999, 167–170, 172).

Therefore history might show some interest in some leaders of the contemporary political life, not only because of their leading role, but also because of their multiple social statuses, lifestyles, identities and cultural relations. Such notable prime ministers as Kálmán Széll (1899–1903) or István Tisza (1903–1905 and 1913–1917) who later in his life became an aristocrat, and for instance Gyula Justh, a significant politician of the opposition, are only some of the most remarkable politicians of the era who belonged to this group. Of course, the present study will not focus on the political activity of Justh, but on his “not yet fully bourgeois, but no longer exclusively noble” identity and social roles. Justh’s correspondence and the papers he left behind served as the basic sources of this investigation. The first half of the study focuses on the mixed (partly traditional and partly bourgeois) social roles of the politician, whereas the second half provides an insight into Justh’s duels, which can be interpreted as a characteristic symbol of the traditional social role.

The social background and roles of Gyula Justh

Although there are relatively few documents or reminiscences related to the lifestyle and social habits of Gyula Justh, we can state that, for example, the maintenance of two residences (one in Torna and another one in Budapest) in line with his social roles (as a landed gentry and as a bourgeois) reflect his multiple identity. Justh could easily reconcile his rural mansion, his estate of several thousand acres, his “patriarchal” attitude toward the peasantry and the acknowledgement of the institution of duelling related to the traditions and customs of the noble class with the upper middle class Jewish origin of his wife, the apartment he rented in the capital near Kiskörút boulevard, the coffee-house culture, his share subscriptions, a profit-oriented management of his estates, the support of foundations and, last but not least, the pursuit of universal suffrage as a political objective.

The Justh family was first mentioned in a charter issued by King Sigismund at the end of his reign in 1437. According to this charter, an ancestor of the family – and presumably their first ancestor in Hungary – called Jwsth of Fankwsoo was granted the castle of Cserép (Cherep) and several royal villages in Borsod county for his services (Borsa ed. 1991, 118). In 1507 they started to use the name ‘of Neczpál’ referring to the centre of their estates in Turóc county, but their lands stretched sporadically across several counties. As far as social status is concerned, the family belonged to the wealthy nobility throughout its half-millennium long history. Certain members of the family regularly held various positions in their county (district administrator, deputy-lieutenant, lord-lieutenant of Turóc county, etc.) and also political and other types of positions

at a national level (member of parliament for Turóc county, royal councillor, assessor of the royal court, etc.). Over the centuries, the family built and maintained several mansions in Turóc county, for instance in Piribóc, Kostány, Necpál, etc. In the 19th century, one branch of the family moved from Turóc county to the south-eastern corner of the Great Hungarian Plain and settled down in Békés and Csanád counties. Gyula Justh's father, István Justh played the most crucial role in enlarging the family estates in the Great Hungarian Plain. During the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848–1849, István Justh was the chief constable of Turóc; then he moved to Szentetornya (Békés county) with his family.³ At the end of the 19th century, the Justh estates on the Great Hungarian Plain spread across Arad, Csanád and Békés counties covering approximately 2,500 acres and had two major centres, one in Szentetornya (Békés county) and another one in Torna (Csanád county). The manor house in Szentetornya, called Justh-manor, was built in several phases and was finally completed in 1889/1890 with the construction of the upper-storey. Zsigmond Justh set up his famous 'peasant theatre' in this latter centre. The mansion in Torna, the home of Gyula Justh and his immediate family, was built in 1807.

In his youth, the lifestyle and living conditions of Gyula Justh did not differ much from that of contemporary young wealthy landholders. He attended the secondary school of the Piarist monks in Szeged as a private student. Then, from the middle of the 1860s, he continued his secondary school studies in Pest at the local school of the Piarists. Finally, in 1868, he graduated in the capital from a Calvinist secondary school in district 9 (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, AI/1. 14540). Then he enrolled at the Faculty of Law at the University of Pest where he received his degree in 1872 (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, AI/5, 14540). In the middle of the 1870s he entered the service of Békés county first as a deputy clerk, then he served as the chief constable in the town of Gyula, but because of his political sentiments – he was a supporter of political independence – he left his office after a few years. At the turn of the 1870s and 1880s, he travelled abroad on several occasions with the intention of gathering experience. He visited the Austrian (Hereditary) Lands and Germany several times, but travelled to France, Switzerland and Great Britain as well. During his travels he became acquainted with the political system and structure of several European states with developed political, social and economic cultures. From the middle of the 1880s, after his return to Hungary, he became a prominent member of regional and later national politics as well. Between 1884 and his death in 1917, he was elected member of parliament on eight occasions, and between 1905 and 1909 he was the speaker of the House of Representatives (Szendrei 2008). Justh was even nominated for

3 István Justh's first son, Gyula was born in 1850 in Necpál, whereas Gedeon, who died an early death, was born in Szentetornya in 1859. Zsigmond Justh, a celebrated writer at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, was also born in Szentetornya in 1863.

the position of Minister of the Interior and for the position of prime minister as a possible means to solve the crisis of the coalition in 1909 (Szendrei 2006).

According to the data of the 1893 Directory of Landholders, the estates of the Justh family on the Great Hungarian Plain were held by four individuals: István Justh had 484 acres in Oláhlécska (Arad county), 155 acres in Pusztaszenttornya (Békés county), 154 acres in Szentandrás-Csabacsüd (Békés county), 126 acres in Dombegyháza (Csanád county), and 320 acres in Tornya (Csanád county). Mrs István Justh possessed 374 acres in Pusztaszenttornya (Békés county). Gyula Justh owned 476 acres in Nagyvarygas (Arad county) and Matild Justh had 393 acres in Kurtics (Arad county) (Belussi Baross and Németh eds. 1893, 137, 138, 187, 188, 29, 19). Altogether, the estates added up to 2,482 acres. According to an article which was published in *Pénzvilág* [Financial World] in 1913, after the death of his parents, Gyula Justh inherited the majority of the estates amounting to 2,103 acres, and the Hungarian National Central Savings Bank burdened these with 6,631 crowns (Szamuely 1913). Based on the *Makói Újság* [Makó Newspaper] we can state that the annual tax levied on the family's estates exceeded 6,000 crowns, which more or less equals to the amount of debt accumulated on their lands (Makói Hírlap, 1906.03.23.). István Justh, in virtue of his estates registered under his name, figured 29th in the 1901 list of the highest tax-payers and wealthiest people of Csanád county, and was the 28th wealthiest in 1902 (Makói Hírlap, 1901.09.15.).

The estates of the other branch of the family in Upper-Hungary were confined to Turóc county, but on the whole, these estates covered twice as much land as the previously described ones on the Great Hungarian Plain. The estates in Turóc were in the possession of György Justh and Kálmán Justh, and altogether amounted to 5,406 acres. According to the Directory of Landholders, the only notable estate of the county specializing in animal breeding was in the possession of György Justh in Necpál, where he bred Simmental cattle (Baross Belussi and Németh eds. 1893, 769, 7688, 766).

The other branch of the Justh family with approximately 2,500 acres on the Great Hungarian Plain was, of course, lagging far behind those noble families which possessed the most significant estates. Considering the structure and quality of their lands, however, their estates were of very good quality and they usually yielded crops well above average. The family did not have any stock-farm or agricultural firm, but by selling their products, such as grain, corn, tobacco, various vegetables, etc. they did have connections with the market-based capitalist economic system. Although we do not know the exact ratio of these agricultural products within the whole production of their estates, we can tell that the majority of their lands yielded wheat, barley and corn, and besides these cereals their tobacco and grape production was also outstanding. What we know for certain is that Gyula Justh, together with the most significant landholders of Csanád county (for instance Forster, Eckhardt, Prugly, Návay and others), was

among those who were awarded at the national exhibition organized for the Millennium, and Justh even received a certificate for his achievements in tobacco production. Later, as a member of the board of directors, together with many great landholders of the county, he took part in the work of the cooperative society of Makó, which was set up in 1900 to support local onion producers.

A letter received by Gyula Justh in 1909 proves that he had a thorough knowledge of modern market economy, since according to this letter he was enquiring about the introduction of vegetable production and truck farming on his estates (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/76, 14542). Unfortunately, we do not have certain proof that the introduction of these special farming methods did take effect. The sources do not say much about the technical equipment and mechanisation of the estates, but some letters bear testimony that he occasionally considered the use of tractors or steam ploughs to cultivate his plough-lands. These letters point to the fact that Justh, who had influential government connections, tried to make certain stages of agricultural production more efficient by borrowing machines and by relying on the instrumentality of the Agricultural Under-secretary of State (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/99, 14542). Moreover, in 1916 he asked for the assistance of the same Under-secretary of State to purchase a steam-engine produced by Stock (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/126, 14542).

The distribution of the peasantry, as far as nationality is concerned, was in many ways different on the Justh estates than in the surrounding region. On the estates around Szentetornya and Magyarpécska and in the settlements, which served as the centre of these estates, the proportion of Hungarians within the whole population was higher than the average in the surrounding county or district. This is especially true in case of the lands in Arad county. However, on the estate of Tornya, which is located at the Eastern end of Csanád county, the proportion of nationalities within the whole population was higher than the average of the county or the district. Hungarians were in a clear majority on the Justh estates, but the number of Romanians and Serbians was also significantly high in Tornya.

Apart from the information regarding the estates of Gyula Justh and his family, a few details are also known about some of their investments and their funds in cash. The above mentioned article published in 1913 also reveals that the dowry of Vilma Szitányi, the wife of Gyula Justh, amounted to 200 thousand crowns, and even years after their marriage it was still kept intact in a bank in Makó, most probably in the Savings Bank of Makó. According to contemporary news, the family also had a deposit in the First Domestic Savings Bank of Pest amounting to 1 million crowns (Szamuely 1913). Compared to Justh's salary, which was regarded as quite significant even in European standards, this was considered to be a fairly solid financial background, because as a member of parliament he received 6,400 crowns and he was paid 24,000 crowns when he became a Speaker of the House (Gerő 1988, 161).

In April 1904, after his brother's death, Gyula Justh gave over the publishing rights of the deceased Zsigmond Justh's literary works to the Franklin Association for 1,000 crowns. In view of the above discussed financial situation of the family, it is obvious that he did not do this because he was short in cash, but to prepare the publication of these works (OSZK Manuscript Archive, 2/742). The volumes of Zsigmond Justh were therefore published by the Franklin Association in the following order: *A pénz legendája* [The Legend of Money] (1905), *Gányó Julcsa* (1905), *Fuimus* (1906).

To get a more complex picture about the financial situation and social position of the Justh family, it is important to remark that, similarly to other wealthy landholders of the era, they also maintained bourgeois apartments in Budapest besides their rural mansion(s). Being permanently settled in Budapest was not pertained to Gyula Justh's occupation as a member of parliament, since his parents, István Justh and Matild Pákozdy also had a fixed residence in the capital, just like Zsigmond Justh, who spent a considerable time in Budapest as well (Dede 2004). In the middle of the 1880s, Gyula Justh, as a newly elected member of parliament, and Zsigmond Justh, the literary man, rented a luxury flat in the capital together with their parents at 13 Esterházy Street, district 8 (nowadays Puskin Street in district 7). Due to the lifestyle of the younger brother, they set up a parlour in this flat which was highly valued in fashionable circles (Janszky ed. 1885–1886, 520; Kozocsa ed. 1977, 732). At the beginning of the 1890s, Gyula Justh rented an apartment at 13 Lónyay Street (district 9), from where he moved into 4 József Boulevard (district 8) and finally, at the beginning of the new century, he rented a luxury flat at 4 Wenckheim Palace built in Reviczky Street in district 8, where he stayed for around one and a half decades. When the Wenckheim Palace was under reconstruction in the middle of the 1910s, he usually rented an apartment in Hotel Hungaria on the corner of Mária Valéria Street (nowadays Apáczai Csere János Street) and Türr István Street. After being elected a member of parliament in 1906, his son, János Justh lived at 3 Bálvány Street, district 5 (nowadays Október 6 Street) (Janszky 1891–1892, 566; 1896–1897, 700; 1902–1903, 1162, 1908, 1362).

The Justh family probably rented these luxury flats for a long period of time; no evidence suggests that the apartments were owned by the family, and in the case of the Wenckheim Palace it would be impossible to talk about ownership. The buildings regularly visited by Gyula Justh were not far from his apartments in district 8 (also called Joseph Town). These buildings include the following: the former house of representatives in Sándor Street (nowadays Bródy Sándor Street), Café Balaton with its eclectic interior on the corner of Rákóczi Street and Szentkirályi Street, which served as a regular haunt for Justh and many other politicians, such as Dezső Szilágyi. After the opening of the Parliament House on the bank of the Danube, Justh continued to live in district 8 and usually travelled to his “workplace” by hansom cabs.

When discussing the assets and investments of Justh, we need to touch upon the dealings in shares, which was a modern method of money and capital management exercised by the wealthy landholders and members of the aristocracy, although for Justh this was rather a necessity. All data that can be found unexceptionally refer to the shares of a significant oppositional daily paper entitled *Magyarország* [Hungary]. These shares are related to the last years of Gyula Justh and also to his inheritance. The first letters written in the autumn of 1913 testify that Gyula Justh, similarly to other members of his party, became a shareholder of the newspaper in return for his previous loans, although he regarded the transaction overseen by Count Tivadar Batthyány with mistrust (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, BeXI/31, 14542).⁴ The correspondence related to the issue was continued by János Justh and Tivadar Batthyány five years later, and revealed that at his death Gyula Justh held at least 25 shares issued by *Magyarország*, and the total face value of these shares at the time amounted to 25,000 crowns (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, BeXI/31, BdX/50; 14542). This block of shares was sold in July 1918 and was bought by Count Mihály Károlyi. Hence Justh did not subscribe these shares as a form of investment since they came into his possession by political/financial necessity. All similar phenomena can be considered almost typical to the assumption of financial risk and certain transactions of contemporary political elite.

Gyula Justh married Vilma Szitányi at the end of the 1870s. The Szitányi family was a Christianized branch of the originally Jewish Ullmann family from Bavaria. Their first ancestor in Hungary was ennobled in 1825 and was the founding vice-president of the Hungarian Commercial Bank of Pest established in 1841. The Szitányi family did not play a significant role in the economic life of the Dualist Era, but the other branch of the Ullmann family was the founding owner of the General Hungarian Credit Bank, which was the fundamental monetary and investment institution of the era (Varga 1993). Oddly enough, there are not even slight references to the financial or capital connections between the Justh and the Szitányi and Ullmann families. What is more, as we have seen, the Jusths did not keep their cash in the bank of the distant relatives or take out loans from their bank.

Matild was the first-born child of Gyula Justh and Vilma Szitányi, and was followed by János, Elza, Lajos, who died an early death, and finally Margit.

4 Because of the poor financial situation of *Magyarország* [Hungary], it was inevitable for the newspaper to found a joint-stock company. At first Justh did not intend to subscribe shares with interest rate of 3 percent, but wanted to get back his credit which amounted to more than 20,000 crowns. Since this transaction would have ruined the daily paper and its general editor, Lajos Holló, Justh finally accepted the offer. Batthyány tried to convince Justh to bring him around by saying: "*If you do not join this standpoint but demand the reimbursement of your twenty odd thousand crowns from Holló in cash, you will probably make Holló and Magyarország bankrupt and by doing so you and all of us will lose the whole amount of money we invested in Magyarország for good.*"

János Justh graduated as a lawyer from the University of Budapest, and then became a deputy clerk at the royal court of justice in Pest county. In 1906 and in 1910, he stood for elections in the constituency of Hajdúszoboszló as a member of the Independent and Forty-Eighter Party, and after winning the election he represented his constituents in Parliament. Between 1917 and 1918, he was lord-lieutenant of Csanád county, and after 1920 he became a prominent figure of the Hungarian Party in Arad. Only one of Gyula Justh's son-in-laws needs to be mentioned: the first husband of Matild Justh, János Purgly was a landholder in Arad county and the brother of Margit Prugly, the wife of Miklós Horthy.

Duel as a feature of traditional social role

Since the nobility played an important role in the spread of embourgeoisement, the tradition of duelling in Hungary at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries was not only characteristic of the traditional social classes, but as a typical element of gentlemanly lifestyle it also became widespread in bourgeois and intellectual circles. However, duelling can definitely be considered as a traditional social role and, of course, this rule applies to Gyula Justh as well. Several sources related to Gyula Justh tell us about his points of honour, many of which, complying with the traditions of contemporary landed gentry, ended in a duel. Both his political position and plural social identity (being a bourgeois and a nobleman at the same time) inspired him not only to accept the institution of duelling, but to comply with its rules as well (Kocka 1995, 51–53).⁵ Based on the surviving sources, his first case could be traced back to 1892 when the passionate parliamentary quarrel of Justh and Dániel Thold, a liberal member of parliament (Ságvári ed. 2002, 319), ended in a sword duel, in the course of which Justh suffered a serious mouth injury (Ságvári ed. 2002, 319). The next case is also dated from 1892, when Endre Zsilinszky, the editor of *Békési Közlöny* [Békés Bulletin], insulted the Independent and Forty-Eighter Party and its local Members of Parliament. Gyula Justh, accompanied by the other insulted Member of Parliament, Elek Papp objected to this insult and, as a result, Zsilinszky published a correction in his paper and made the following statement in the minute-book: “*it could not have been and it was not his intention to use the word arrant to comment on either*

5 Although it had been forbidden by law since 1874, duelling continued to be a spectacularly distinctive feature of noble ethos and a sign of belonging to the middle-class. Members of the middle-class with bourgeois origin tried to emphasize their middle-class status by collectively adopting certain properties previously held exclusively by the noble landholders, such as possessing estates and rural mansions, hunting and duelling. By doing so, these properties became part of the identity of the upper-middle and middle classes, which was already characterized by mixed roles. The social function of the duel played a similar role in German social history as well.

the political performance or the personal character of Gyula Justh and Elek Papp MPs in a derogatory way” (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, BbI/24, 14540). Therefore the parties agreed to dispense with the duel by mutual consent. Justh’s next point of honour in May 1893 also ended in a duel. This time he was provoked by János Cseresnyés, who was at that time the head of the police department in Makó and later in 1905/06 became lord-lieutenant of the county. Justh was presenting a report at the general meeting of Makó when Cseresnyés unequivocally queried the trustworthiness of his report by saying: “*He is lying!*” After this incident the two men faced each other in the Náray Mansion in Földeák (Ságvári ed. 2002, 319). Based on a short account of a contemporary, we can conclude that Justh was considered to be a skilled fencer and seriously wounded his opponent on three occasions. Nevertheless, his arm and face also got seriously injured. As a consequence of his injuries, he was in a critical condition for several days, stayed in bed for weeks, and the wound on his face served as a reminder of this duel for many years (Ságvári ed. 2002, 319). Gyula Justh was still recovering when he was elected president of the Independent and Forthty-Eighter Party in May 1893, and with regard to his condition his absence from the election was “validly” excused. One of Zsigmond Justh’s letters mentions his brother’s injury as well (Kozocsa ed. 1977, Letter 213). The point of honour of Nándor Horánszky, a member of the oppositional National Party and prime-minister Dezső Bánffy was an overtone of the parliamentary quarrels in 1899. This was such a complex and entangled affair that altogether fifteen politicians and two generals got involved in it. The most significant participants were the prime minister, the minister of defence Géza Fejérváry and István Tisza, son of the former prime minister. Gyula Justh was involved in the affair as a second of Nándor Horánszky. This indicates that Justh must have been regarded as an acknowledged and experienced duellist, since, as a “confidential gentleman”, he could take part in this accepted concomitant of political quarrelling, in which members of the highest circles faced each other with swords or guns in their hands (Ságvári ed. 2002, 354–356).

In the series of duels at the turn of 1898 and 1899 Justh was in the company of such contemporary experts or perhaps even heroes as Gusztáv Elek and Ferenc Bolgár MPs, who were victors of tragically ended previous duels, which, in a quite grotesque way, contributed to the establishment of their future career. The subsequent affair happened in 1907 when Justh was already the Speaker of the House; “*the assignees of Mr Gyula Justh demanded explanation, or perhaps satisfaction from Mr György Szmrecsányi for the expressions he used today on the corridor of the House in reference to Mr Justh*” (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, DbIII/60, 14542). Eventually, the affair did not end in a duel because the statements rested on mutual misunderstanding, and the minute-book also helped to clarify the issue. Two years later, a similar event took place when, yet again, the assignees of Justh demanded explanation from the assignees of

Gyula Andrásy, Minister of the Interior regarding the meaning and intent of the minister's statements, which were said in a private conversation on the corridor of the House. The misunderstanding was officially clarified by the following explanation: "[Andrásy] *thought that Justh doubted the seriousness of his very often declared intention to leave his ministerial position*" (MOL Bequest of Gyula Justh, BbIV/104, 14540). Once the minister's assumption was proved groundless, and neither party insulted the other, the affair was closed in the minute-book.

Conclusion

When examining the social roles of Gyula Justh, the amalgamation of certain elements and roles of both traditional noble landowner and modern bourgeoisie lifestyles are apparent. However, it also needs to be emphasized that, as the years went by, modern bourgeois elements became more stressed both in his social status and in his political approach. This obviously correlates with the transformation of the general phenomena of the social and political environment as well.

It would not be wise to present the situation of Justh and other people with mixed/multiple social identities and statuses as an identity crisis or a disorder. An argument against such a measure is that this phenomenon was characteristic of an easily-distinguishable, fairly large and significant class, which could also be categorized as a determining element of the political elite (Pap 2007, 51–31). On the other hand, the picture of the lifestyle, status and role of the bourgeois middle and upper-middle classes is also mixed, because these social groups also used certain elements of both modern bourgeois and traditional noble landholder lifestyles simultaneously.

References

- Baross Belussi, Károly and Németh, József (eds.). 1893. *Magyarország földbirtokosai* [The Landholders of Hungary]. Budapest: Singer és Wolfner.
- Benda, Gyula. 2006. A polgárosodás fogalmának történeti értelmezhetősége [The Historical Interpretability of the Concept of Embourgeoisement]. In Gyula Benda (ed.) *Studies in Social History*. Budapest: Osiris.
- Bódy, Zsombor. 2007. „Polgárság” és „polgárosodás” fogalma [The Concept of “Bourgeoisie” and “Embourgeoisement”]. *Kommentár* 3: 12.
- Borsa, Iván (ed.). 1991. *A Justh család levéltára 1274–1526* [Justh Family Archives 1274–1526]. Budapest, 118. Rescript 51.
- Csorba, Csaba. 2002. *Regényes váraink* [Our Romantic Castles]. Budapest: Magyar Könyvklub.

- Dede, Franciska. 2004. A szalonember: Justh Zsigmond [The Man of Fashion: Zsigmond Justh]. *Budapesti Negyed* [Budapest Quarter], Vol. 4.
- Estók, János. 1999. *Magyarország története 1867–1914* [History of Hungary, 1867–1914]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Gerő, András. 1988. *Elsőprő kisebbség* [Overwhelming Minority]. Budapest: Gondolat.
- Halmos, Károly. 1991. Polgár–polgárosodás–civilizáció–kultúra [Burgess – Embourgeoisement – Civilization – Culture]. *Századvég* 2–3: 131–166.
- Hanák, Péter. 1977. Társadalmi struktúrák a 19. századi Közép-Európában [Social Structures in 19th Century Central Europe]. *Történelmi Szemle* 2: 159–179.
- Kocka, Jürgen. 1995. Das europäische Muster und deutsche Fall [The European Muster and the German Case]. In Jürgen Kocka (ed.) *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert. Deutschland im europäischen Vergleich: eine Auswahl. Band I.* [Bourgeoisie in the 19th Century. Germany in European Contrast: A Selection. Vol. I.] Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupert.
- Kövér, György. 2005. Bankárok és bürokraták. A Magyar Általános Hitelbank igazgatósági tanácsa és igazgatósága (1876–1905) [Bankers and Bureaucrats. The Board of Directors and the Directorate of the Hungarian General Credit Bank (1876–1905)]. *AETAS* 1–2: 93–115.
- Merton, Robert K. 1980. *Társadalomelmélet és társadalmi struktúra* [Social Theory and Social Structure]. Budapest: Gondolat.
- Pap, József. 2007. „Két választás Magyarországon”. Az országgyűlési képviselők társadalmi összetétele a 20. század első éveiben [“Two Elections in Hungary”. The Social Composition of Members of Parliament in the Early 20th Century]. *AETAS* 1: 5–31.
- Ságvári, György (ed.) 2002. *A Magyar párbaj* [The Hungarian Duel]. Budapest: Osiris.
- Sennett, Richard. 1998. *A közéleti ember bukása* [The Fall of Public Man]. Budapest: Helikon.
- Szamuely, Tibor. 1913. Justh Gyula vagyona [The Wealth of Gyula Justh]. *Pénzvilág* [Financial World], December 13.
- Szendrei, Ákos. 2006. Három audiencia: Ferenc József és Justh Gyula találkozásai [Three Audiences: Meetings between Emperor Francis Joseph and Gyula Justh]. In Erzsébet Bodnár and Gábor Demeter (eds.) *Állam és Nemzet a XIX–XX. században* [State and Nation in the 19–20th Centuries]. 289–300. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Nyomda.
- Szendrei, Ákos. 2008. Tíz választás, egy politikus. Justh Gyula képviselőválasztásai [Ten Elections, One Politician. The Returns of Gyula Justh]. In Erzsébet Bodnár and Gábor Demeter (eds.) *Tradíció és modernizáció a XVIII–XX. században* [Tradition and Modernization in the 18–20th Centuries]. 190–202. Budapest: Hungarovox.

- Varga, László. 1993. A hazai nagyburzsoázia történetéből [About the History of the Hungarian Upper-Middle Class]. In Pál Léderer (ed.) *Az úri Magyarország [Gentry Hungary]*. 106–118. Budapest: ELTE.
- Veliky, János. 1999. A felbomló és átalakuló rendiség gazdasági-szociális rendszerei [Socio-Economic Systems in the Age of the Disintegration and Transformation of Feudalism]. In János Veliky (ed.) *Polgárosodás és szabadság (Magyarországon a XIX. században)*. [Embourgeoisement and Liberty (Hungary in the 19th Century)]. 33–60. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- Veliky, János. 2008. Reformkor - a változások kora [The Reform Era: The Age of Changes]. *Magyar Tudomány*. Vol. 10, 1238–1255.

Archives

- Adolf Janszky (ed.) date unknown. *Budapesti cím- és lakjegyzék 1885–1886* [Budapest Directory 1885–1886] Budapest.
- Adolf Janszky (ed.) date unknown. *Budapesti cím- és lakjegyzék 1891–1892* [Budapest Directory 1891–1892] Budapest.
- Adolf Janszky (ed.) date unknown. *Budapesti cím- és lakjegyzék 1896–1897* [Budapest Directory 1896–1897] Budapest.
- Adolf Janszky (ed.) date unknown. *Budapesti cím- és lakjegyzék 1902–1903* [Budapest Directory 1902–1903] Budapest.
- Adolf Janszky (ed.) date unknown. *Budapesti cím- és lakjegyzék 1908* [Budapest Directory 1908] Budapest.
- Kozocsa, Sándor (ed.) 1977. *Justh Zsigmond naplója és levelei* [Diary and Correspondence of Zsigmond Justh] Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó.
- Letter dated April 1, 1909 from the Agricultural Under-secretary of State to Gyula Justh, MOL (Magyar Országos Levéltár [National Archives of Hungary]), Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/76, 14542.
- Letter dated April 8, 1904 from the *Franklin Association* to Gyula Justh, OSZK, Manuscript Archive, 2/742.
- Letter dated December 5, 1913 from Tivadar Batthyány to Gyula Justh, MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, BeXI/31, 14542.
- Letter dated February 9, 1916 from Árpád Bartóky to Gyula Justh, MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/126, 14542.
- Letter dated July 20, 1918 from Tivadar Batthyány to János Justh. MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, BeXI/39, 14542.
- Letter dated June 30, 1918 from Tivadar Batthyány to János Justh. MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, BdX/50, 14542.
- Letter dated May 9, 1915 from Árpád Bartóky to Gyula Justh, MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, FbIII/99, 14542.

Makói Hírlap [Makó Newspaer], March 23, 1906. Mennyi Justh Gyula adója? [How Much Tax Does Gyula Justh Pay?], 3.

Makói Hírlap [Makó Newspaper], September 15, 1901. A megye virilistái [The Virilists of the County], 5.

Minute-book, December 17, 1909, MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, BbIV/104, 14540.

Minute-book, May 9, 1892. MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, BbI/24. 14540.

Minute-book, November 20, 1907. MOL, bequest of Gyula Justh, DbIII/60, 14542.

School-leaving certificate of Gyula Justh, Pest, July 22, 1868. MOL (Magyar Országos Levéltár [National Archives of Hungary]), X5095, Bequest of Gyula Justh, AI/1, 14540.

University degree of Gyula Justh, Pest, July 14, 1872. MOL, Bequest of Gyula Justh, AI/5, 14540.