

*Boris Dundović **

The History of Topolovac Estate: An Analytical Perspective on Spatial Dynamics and Socioeconomic Transitions

This research paper explores the historical trajectory of the Topolovac estate, located southeast of Sisak, from its earliest mentions in medieval sources to its modern-day status. It presents a comprehensive synthesis of scattered historical data, offering new insights into noble land ownership, economic structures, and spatial transformations. The estate's origins are linked to the Hungarian noble family Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja, whose control over the land in the 14th and 15th centuries marked the beginning of its documented history. Subsequently, land ownership transitions, from the Branković despots and Berislavić family to the Keglević counts, shaped the estate's legal and administrative frameworks, influencing its function within the feudal system. The military significance of Topolovac, particularly during Ottoman incursions in the 16th century, is examined through historical records referencing fortifications and strategic positioning. In the early modern period, the estate became a key agricultural and economic centre, integrating new infrastructural developments while maintaining traditional feudal structures. The study also addresses the estate's transformation in the 19th and 20th centuries, highlighting its transition from noble property to state administration and, later, privatization. Furthermore, this research consults cartographic and archival documentation, drawing from historical maps and land surveys to reconstruct the estate's spatial development. By integrating archival research, historical topography, and conservation perspectives, this paper aims to contribute to the understanding and contextualization of Topolovac, its physical landscape and built heritage within the ongoing preservation and conservation initiatives.

Keywords: Blinja and Totuševina, feudal and seignorial estate, Counts Keglević Bužimski (Keglevich de Buzin), Sisak, Croatia, Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja

* Boris Dundović, Institute of Art History, Ulica grada Vukovara 68, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, E-mail: bdundovi@ipu.hr. The paper was proofread by David Edel.

Introduction

Situated southeast of Sisak, Croatia, the village of Topolovac (**Fig. 1**) emerged from a feudal and later a seignorial estate, whose territorial expanse once extended across the present-day cadastral municipality of Budaševo-Topolovac. This rural south-eastern edge of Sisak, today a part of Sisak's suburban area, is marked out by the alluvial deposits of the Sava River before it continues its course through the Lonjsko Polje wetland. The village of Topolovac is located between two Sava River channels – one old natural and one newer, constructed to regulate river flow – with a road passing between them, where the historical part of the settlement can be found predominantly north of the road. The characteristic shape of this area is defined by the recognizable, almost regular circular meander of the older of the two Sava River channels, around whose outer edge a row of houses is situated. This circular channel delineates the space of Lug, which contains the central part of Topolovac on its southern part, while the settlement of Budaševo is located on the northern part of its edge. Agricultural areas are situated in the central part of the floodplain ring, where a forest grove once stood, having likely consisted of planted poplar trees from which Topolovac derived its name.¹

Topolovac is one of the oldest settlements on the left bank of the Sava River. From its medieval origins as part of the possessions of the Hungarian noble family Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja to its more recent integration into state and private ownership, the area reflects centuries of shifting spatial dynamics and socioeconomical transitions. These changes not only shaped the spatial ensemble and land-use patterns but also highlighted the strategic importance of Topolovac, particularly during periods of Ottoman incursions and fortification efforts of the sixteenth century that aimed to combat them.

In the centre of the settlement stands a manorial complex, consisting of seven major and mid-sized buildings (two manor houses, a stable building, two ground-floor houses, a granary and a distillery), five minor infrastructural and technical outbuildings and other objects, a central garden, and remnants of former garden-styled areas. Today, it is known as the Keglevich Manor, as it historically served as the residential, administrative, and economic centre of the estate

¹ The toponym Topolovac derives etymologically from the Croatian term for poplar tree, *topola*. At the confluence of the Kupa and Sava rivers, on the low marshy areas of the fields below the Sisak Fortress and on the opposite side in Galdovo, there is a homogeneous forested area composed of willow trees and planted poplars. Moreover, the forest on the peninsula of the same name between the Kupa and Sava rivers, part of the fortification landscape, is called Topolik. See: Goran Andlar, Ines Hrdalo, Tanja Udovč, *Studija i strategija razvoja zelene infrastrukture Grada Siska* (Zagreb: 3E Projekti; Agronomski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2018), 74, 111.

of Counts Keglević Bužimski.² It stands as an authentic example of secular architectural heritage; hence it has been individually protected as immovable cultural property by the Ministry of Culture and Media of the Republic of Croatia (Z-4410). However, the predominant characteristic of Topolovac is a dispersion of residential dwellings lining its streets and roads, a spatial configuration that reflects the organic evolution of the settlement.



Fig. 1. The village of Topolovac in the lowland area along the Sava River, bird's-eye view from the west, 2019

The Keglevich Manor is only a focal point of wider historical residential, economic, and industrial layers of Topolovac that, preserved in physical environment and its built heritage, not only testify to representative living of nobility but also to the former high level of continuous economic production of the feudal estate of which the beginnings can be traced back to as early as the fourteenth century.

This study aims to provide a historical analysis of Topolovac, focusing on its spatial and socioeconomic evolution from the fourteenth century to the present. Unlike prior research, which has often treated such estates in a fragmented or

² As is customary in historical contexts, the surname exhibits linguistic variations: *Keglević Bužimski* in Croatian, *Keglevich von Buzin* in German, and *buzini Keglevics* in Hungarian. Also, it is pertinent to note that permutations from the listed variations may occur across languages.

localized manner, this paper examines the diachronic trajectory of ownership, governance, and use of the estate, emphasizing the interactions between its spatial configuration and broader historical processes. By integrating historical and archival sources, along with contemporary conservation research,³ the aim is to interpret the collected previously scattered information on the historical development of Topolovac. This research was structured around key themes: the establishment of the estate under the Töttös family, its development during the medieval and early modern periods, the economic and administrative shifts through history and its eventual transformation during the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, with a comment on recent periods. Particular attention is paid to the spatial organization that evolved in response to changing sociopolitical conditions.

In addition to on-site analyses and exploratory restoration research, this research is also based on extensive historical and archival examination, review and analysis of relevant literature, graphic materials, as well as description and analysis of built and cultivated structures within the village and the former estate. By synthesizing these aspects, this paper not only offers new insights into the history of Topolovac but also seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the genesis of the estate and the village's evolution from its feudal origins to its contemporary status as a cultural and historical landmark.

Totuševina: Historical Origins and Feudal Dynasties

Topolovac was already a populated settlement by the end of the fourteenth century, as evidenced by the charter of Queen Mary dated 15 August 1384 in Latin, granting it the right to hold a weekly market.⁴ At that time, the settlement was known as Totuševina or Tetuševina (Lat. *Tewthewschyna*), taking its name after its lords, the originally Hungarian noble family Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja.⁵

³ The rich historical and spatial layers of Topolovac have not yet been thoroughly researched, neither as a settlement nor a feudal complex. For this reason, in conjunction with the initiation of comprehensive conservation and preservation research on the Keglevich Manor at the Institute of Art History in Zagreb in 2019, a broader investigation into the history and development of the entire historical estate was undertaken. See the unpublished conservation study on the Keglevich Manor by the Institute of Art History in Zagreb: Boris Dundović, Katarina Horvat-Levaj, Tamara Bjažić Klarin, *Topolovac, Kompleks obitelji Keglević: Konzervatorska studija sa smjernicama za obnovu* (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2019).

⁴ The transcript of this document was published in: Tadija Smičiklas and Marko Kostrenčić, eds., *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, vol. 16: *Listine godina 1379–1385* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1976), 481–482.

⁵ In written sources, they are also referred to as Thöttös de Báthmonostor, as well as “domini de Theteos” or, in Croatian, Titušević or Teteušev (László Töttös is mentioned in 1360 as Ladislav Teteušev, and from 1415 as Vladislav Tituseuich). See: Vjekoslav Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 9 (1907), no. 1: 190; Ana Novak, “Gorski arhidakonat Zagrebačke biskupije

The settlement of Blinja, where members of the Töttös family had their ancestral home in the form of a fortress⁶ since 1344 (when they received the epithet “Tuteus” from King Louis I) – which they held even before their Hungarian family seat in Bátmonostor⁷ – is located south of the present-day area of Topolovac and Sisak.⁸ Permission to build a stone or wooden fortress in Bátmonostor was granted by King Sigismund of Luxembourg only over half a century later, in 1401. The first written mention of the fortress in Blinja and its castellan occurred in 1430.⁹ The construction of the fortress is confirmed by the statement of King Matthias Corvinus in 1464, in which the great Renaissance ruler of Hungary instructs the Töttös family to further fortify it with stone walls, towers, and a moat.¹⁰

During that period, the Blinja estate of the Töttös family suffered numerous attacks in 1423 and 1424 from Ladislav Toth of Susedgrad, whose castellans from Kostajnica devastated Pasonje and Otok (likely today’s Ostrvo on the western part of the abovementioned circular meander of Topolovac). In 1427, the same area was attacked by Benedikt Veliki, along with the castellans from Kostajnica.¹¹ The fre-

u razdoblju od 1334. do 1501. godine (Povijesni razvoj crkvenoadministrativnoga područja)” (PhD diss., University of Zagreb, 2011), 62.

⁶ Based on research by Mladen Ančić, Ana Novak concluded that László Töttös and his lineage rose to prominence largely due to strategic acquisitions and royal favour. László’s father, son of Emerik (Imre) from Bečej, secured the royal estate of Moysa in Baranja County through an exchange in 1333. By 1344, he held prominent positions as *magister clavium regis* (master of the king’s keys), prefect of Borša, and castellan of Levice (Hun. Léva) and Óbuda. His close relationship with the king resulted in him being granted three estates in the Blinja area which were, from 1352 on exempted from the judicial authority of the Ban of Slavonia. His son László II is mentioned in 1355 as the *comes* (prefect) of Blinja. Mladen Ančić, “Cistercitska opatija u Topuskom do pretvaranja u komendu”, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 27 (1994): 37; also mentioned in: Novak, *Gorski arhiđakonat Zagrebačke biskupije*, 62.

⁷ Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, 191.

⁸ In 1360, Bishop Ladislav de Kobol from the Diocese of Hrastovica, together with his castellans and the episcopal and chapter serfs was accused of attacking the estates of László Töttös, destroying the manor house and seizing property. Researcher Ana Novak notes that this retribution was the result of half a century of abuse of power and influence by the Töttös family, as well as the occupation, expropriation, and poor management of the peripheral estates of the diocese. At the same time, historical events highlight the strong protective role of the Hungarian ecclesiastical authorities, the king, and the ban towards László Töttös and his heirs. Ančić, “Cistercitska opatija u Topuskom”, 37; Novak, *Gorski arhiđakonat Zagrebačke biskupije*, 62, 85, 162; Ana Novak, “Sisački kaptolski posjedi u 14. stoljeću”, in: *Antiquam fidem: Radovi sa znanstvenoga skupa*, ed. Darko Tepert and Spomenka Jurić (Zagreb: Glas Koncila, 2011), 189–190.

⁹ Novak, *Gorski arhiđakonat Zagrebačke biskupije*, 164. For more information on the fortress, consult: Krešimir Regan and Vlatka Dugački, eds., *Leksikon utvrda Hrvatske: Srednji i rani novi vijek* (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2024), 41–42.

¹⁰ Piroška Biczó, “Régészeti kutatások a középkori bátmonostor területén”, *Műemlékvédelem* 25 (1981), no. 2: 106.

¹¹ Suzana Miljan, “*Familiaritas* i klijentelski sustav unutar plemićkog društva Zagrebačke županije za vrijeme vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškog (1387.–1437.)”, *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 33 (2015): 107–108.

quency of such devastations and individual raids demonstrates that the Topolovac estate was a competitive centre for agriculture and trade at the beginning of the fifteenth century. It is also important to note that, besides the castellans, historical sources mention the function of officials within the Töttös family, indicating that they were among the more powerful magnates of the Croato-Hungarian Kingdom with estates spanning a larger geographical area.¹² Since they did not reside on each of their estates throughout the year, they needed to “have an extensive structure of officials to manage their estates”.¹³

Despite numerous disputes with the Counts of Zrin (Cro. Zrinski, Hun. Zrínyi) over land ownership, with whom they arrived in the area of Zagreb County around 1345,¹⁴ initial good relations between the Töttös family and the Zrinski family are evidenced by Duke¹⁵ Petar I Zrinski's (Hun. Péter I Zrínyi) personal involvement in the defence of the Töttös estate against aforementioned attacks, as well as his protection of the widow and children of the late László (Ladislav) II Töttös in the 1420s.¹⁶ László II Töttös was a royal treasurer who spent the period from 1415 to 1417 in captivity in Bosnia fighting against the Ottomans alongside Sigismund of Luxembourg.¹⁷ It was King Sigismund who, fifteen years earlier, in a document dated 2 September 1403, mentioned a village of Topolovac in con-

¹² The term “estate” in this context refers to the wider concept of a traditional territorial unit within the medieval socioeconomic system. It represents land over which the feudal owner exercises administrative and judicial authority, with governance carried out by an established administrative structure. Prior to the Töttös family's possessions in the region, the area forming part of the Sisak estate, divided into separate parts, was leased by the Zagreb Chapter. By regulating land use rights and maintaining control over leased estates, the Chapter ensured steady revenue collection. The geographic distribution of these estates suggests a deliberate and well-planned strategy for economic development. Marko Jerković, “Uprava Zagrebačkog kaptola nad sisačkim vlastelinstvom od 1215. godine do sredine 14. stoljeća”, in: *Antiquam fidem: Radovi sa znanstvenoga skupa*, ed. Darko Tepert and Spomenka Jurić (Zagreb: Glas Koncila, 2011), 150, 166–167. For more detailed information on the structure, population, and socio-economic processes of the Sisak estate, consult: Branimir Brgles, “Stanovništvo i struktura sisačkoga vlastelinstva na prijelazu iz 15. u 16. stoljeće”, in: *Sisačka bitka 1593.–2018.: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog kolokvija povodom 425-te obljetnice Sisačke bitke održanoga u Sisku 20. lipnja 2018. godine*, ed. Hrvoje Kekez, Stipica Grgić and Valentina Janković (Sisak: Sisačka biskupija, Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište; Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2019), 75–96.

¹³ Miljan, “*Familiaritas* i klijentelski sustav”, 111.

¹⁴ Suzana Miljan, “Plemstvo Zagrebačke županije prema kraljevskoj i banskoj vlasti u doba kralja Žigmunda (1387.–1437.)”, in: *A horvát-magyar együttélés fordulópontjai: Intézmények, társadalom, gazdaság, kultúra = Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata i Mađara: Ustanove, društvo, gospodarstvo i kultura*, ed. Pál Fodor and Dinko Šokčević (Budapest; Zagreb: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Történettudományi Intézet; Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2015), 202.

¹⁵ The Croatian term *knez* denotes a noble rank closer to that of a ruler or sovereign lord than to the more administrative title of count, therefore it translates more accurately to *duke* in English.

¹⁶ The widow was Orsolya (Ursula) Töttös. For more information, consult: Miljan, “*Familiaritas* i klijentelski sustav”, 114.

¹⁷ Miljan, “Plemstvo Zagrebačke županije”, 198; Péter E. Kovács, “Magyarország ‘törökképe’ a XV. század elején”, *Hadtörténeti Közlemények* 122 (2009), no. 1: 119.

nection with nobles from the Garić region who had opposed the king. The document refers to “László, son of Miklós (Nikola) from the vicinity of Topolovac” (*Thapolchamelleky*).¹⁸ However, it is not clear whether these were members of the Töttös family who then participated in wars against the Ottomans to prove their loyalty to the king. Furthermore, given that the Garić region extended north and east of Moslavačka Gora, encompassing areas between the Čazma and Ilova rivers, and considering the prevalence of the toponym *Topolovac*, this reference may not pertain to the estate later known as Totuševina. The position and social status of the Töttös family were further solidified with László III, son of László II Töttös, whose first wife was Anna Csáki (or Csáky),¹⁹ from the old Hungarian noble family dating back to the Árpád dynasty, and whose second wife was Fruzsina Dombai. His son Petar, in turn, established marital ties with the noble Héderváry family,²⁰ making the family a firm part of the high noble classes in medieval Slavonia in just one century through kinship connections. Moreover, in 1458, the Töttös family was classified among the baronial families, confirming both the king’s recognition of their contribution to defence against Ottoman conquests and their large landholding status and significant noble power during the fifteenth century.

Although he was mentioned in a charter from 1459 due to his loyalty to Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary and Croatia,²¹ the decline of the noble feudal family began with Péter Töttös. Probably because Péter Töttös had no heir, around 1478 Totuševina was listed as belonging to the Serbian despot Vuk Branković.²² The Töttös family continued to reside in their family fortress in Bátmonostor for some time, but their downfall came in 1514 during the uprising of Hungarian peasants led by the nobleman György Dózsa. At that time, the Bátmonostor fortress – mentioned in the noble charter of the Töttös family as *curia nobilitaris* – was plundered and set on fire. The extent of the damage was such that the fortress was never used again, and for future generations of certain distant family relations, the fortress was just one among many items in their inheritance agreements. Considering the constant threat of Ottoman conquests, the family archive was relocated to Kisvárdá in 1524, and over the next 150 years, due to the

¹⁸ Marko Bedić, “Naselja Moslavine: Od najstarijih pisanih naziva do danas”, *Kaj* 31 (1998), no. 1: 41.

¹⁹ Miklós Lendvai, *Temes vármegye nemes családjai*, vol. 1 (Budapest: Budapesti Hírlap Nyomdája, 1896), 37.

²⁰ Borbála Kelényi, “Három Várdai-feleség végrendelete a késő középkorból”, in: *Micae Mediaevales: II. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországról és Európáról*, ed. Bence Péterfi et al. (Budapest: ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, 2012), 162.

²¹ Hungary (henceforth: HU) – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Budapest (henceforth: MNL) – fund Diplomatikai Levéltár – Bécsi levéltárakból kiszolgáltatott iratokból – Bécsi levéltárakból kiszolgáltatott iratok, inv. no. 39297.

²² Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, 189.

pronounced depopulation of the impoverished population, Bátmonostor slowly but completely vanished.²³

Vuk Grgurević Branković, also known as Zmaj Ognjeni Vuk²⁴ (likely because he was a knight and bearer of the Hungarian Order of the Dragon), came to the Totuševina area after King Matthias Corvinus, renewing the Serbian Despotate in Syrmia, appointed him as despot in 1471.²⁵ Before becoming despot, a title similar to that of a baron in practice, Vuk Branković had been in service of Croato-Hungarian kings since 1465, as a warrior in many battlefields of Central and South-eastern Europe. From 1469, he owned the fortress of Bijela Stijena (Hun. *Fejérkő*),²⁶ and upon becoming despot, he gained possession of “about a hundred villages in the Posavina region between Sisak and Gradiška and in lower Pounje.”²⁷ Totuševina belonged to Despot Branković as early as 1478 when, on 1 July, he issued a document in Buda allowing the bishop of Zagreb to collect tithes from the fortress of Bijela Stijena and from the Totuševina estate.²⁸

On 3 May 1482, following their marriage, Despot Branković granted his wife Barbara Frankopan (daughter of Žigmund Frankopan) life tenancy of many estates, including Totuševina, Blinja, and Bijela Stijena. In this document, Totuševina is affirmed as a property that was previously under the ownership of the “domini de Theteos”, the lords of Töttös.²⁹ Additionally, the names of at least thirty-six villages that were transferred to Barbara Frankopan under the jurisdiction of the Krk and Zagreb bishoprics are clearly listed in the document. At the bottom of the document, in Cyrillic script, it is written: “Volovana... na Belu Stenu i Ti-

²³ Biczó, “Régészeti kutatások”, 106.

²⁴ The Croatian or Serbian “zmaj ognjeni” can be rendered into English as “fiery dragon”.

²⁵ Hrvoje Petrić, *Pogranična društva i okoliš: Varaždinski generalat i Križevačka županija u 17. stoljeću* (Samobor; Zagreb: Meridijani; Društvo za hrvatsku ekonomsku povijest i ekohistoriju, 2012), 132.

²⁶ Arijana Koprčina, “Barbara Frankapan i zlatarske narudžbe oko 1500. godine”, *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 37 (2013): 65. Bijela Stijena was also known by the Hungarian versions of the toponym: Fehérkő, Fejérkő, or, in older versions, Feyerkew. For further information on the fortress of Bijela Stijena, see: Regan, Dugački, *Leksikon utvrda Hrvatske*, 31–32; Szabolcs László Kozák-Kígyóssy, “Fejérkő várának felszerelése a mohácsi vész előtti évekből”, in: *Várfundalók örököse: Tanulmányok Domokos György tiszteletére*, ed. Mihály Krámlí and Ferenc Pollmann (Budapest: self-published by the editors, 2024), 167–189.

²⁷ Drago Roksandić, *Srbi u Hrvatskoj od 15. stoljeća do naših dana* (Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1991), 7; Hrvoje Petrić, *Pogranična društva i okoliš*, 132.

²⁸ Original text in Latin: “ratione decimarum de pertinenciis castri Nostri Feyerkew et Thethewsewyna ac aliis bonis et possessionibus Nostris illius dyocesis, que (plerumque) dicari debito tempore et etiam aliquando dicte exigi non sunt permissae, pro eo presertim, quia casellani Nostri et alii officiales quasdam marcas denariorum sub Feywkew et sedecim denarios in possessione Nostra Thethewsewyna a decimatoribus dicti domini episcopi aliqua... pretensa exposcere solebant”. See: M[atija] Mesić, “Gradja mojih razprava u “Radu”, *Starine* 5 (1873), 120; Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, 189.

²⁹ Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, 189; Marija Karbić, “Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija: Primjer obitelji Berislavića Grabarskih iz Slavonije”, *Povijesni prilozi* 25 (2006), no. 31: 74.

tuševinu”.³⁰ Just three years later, on 16 April 1485, Vuk Branković passed away,³¹ leaving all his estates to his widow, Despotess Barbara, as she was called during her husband’s lifetime. She relinquished Berkasovo and Kostajnica to the king³² while receiving life tenancy of Komogovina³³ in return. The following year, she also received Graduša as a gift. It should be noted that Barbara Frankopan also “managed the dowry she received from her parents, as well as various gifts she received from her husband”,³⁴ which made her one of the largest landowners in Croatian territory of her time.

After a decade of widowhood, during which she lived in the lavishly arranged court of Bijela Stijena,³⁵ Barbara Frankopan married Franjo Berislavić, the Ban of Jajce, who had a son named Ivan from his first marriage to Katarina Berislavić. Barbara Frankopan is first mentioned as the wife of Berislavić in the document of Duke and Ban John Corvinus “on the 25th day after St. James’ Day in 1495.”³⁶ The Berislavić family from Grabarje is a Slavonian family that played an important role in the war against the Ottomans, and the beginning of their rise is also associated with the reign of King Matthias Corvinus, “who relied precisely on individuals belonging to the class to which he himself belonged, that is, the middle-rank nobility. Matthias entrusted the members of this class with the most important duties, endowing them with significant estates and titles.”³⁷

A year after their wedding, Franjo Berislavić and Barbara Frankopan fell into disfavour with King Vladislaus II of Hungary due to negotiations and trade with the Ottomans, and he subsequently confiscated Bijela Stijena, Komogovina, and some other estates that had previously belonged to Despot Branković, and gave them to Tamás Bakócz, archbishop of Esztergom. The exact events that preceded the confiscation of the estates are not known, but on 28 May 1498, Franjo Berislavić managed to “justify himself before the king” and the king “received him back into his grace, emphasizing that he does so because of his merits, as well as

³⁰ Mesić, “Gradja mojih razprava”, 122–123. This can be roughly translated to English as: “Committed... to Bela Stijena and Totuševina”, which means the land has been given to her.

³¹ Ede Margalits, *Szerb történelmi repertorium*, vol. 1 (Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1918), 675.

³² That’s likely a settlement owing to the fact that Barbara and Vuk Branković did not produce any heirs. In this way, King Matthias Corvinus could gift Berkasovo and Kostajnica to Vuk’s cousins, despots Đorđe and Jovan Branković. More details can be found in: M[atija] Mesić, “Pleme Berislavića”, *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 8 (1869), 62.

³³ Regan, Dugački, *Leksikon utvrda Hrvatske*, 274–275.

³⁴ Karbić, “Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija”, 74.

³⁵ Marija Šercer, “Žene Frankopanke”, *Modruški zbornik* 4–5 (2011): 41.

³⁶ Mesić, “Pleme Berislavića”, 63; Karbić, “Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija”, 73.

³⁷ Karbić, “Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija”, 72.

the merits of his and Barbara's ancestors."³⁸ Already on 6 December of the same year, the king granted land to Franjo Berislavić and his cousins Nikola and Ivan with a new deed, and the following year appointed Franjo as the Ban of Jajce, granting him more land in the then Vukovska County.³⁹ On 14 February 1500, Barbara Frankopan sought to reclaim her estates and, in addition to the existing deed from King Matthias Corvinus, she procured a new deed from King Vladislaus II as confirmation of her rights, thus reinstating possession of her estates.⁴⁰ The fact that at that time Barbara Frankopan (and thus Franjo Berislavić) still enjoyed the possession of Totuševina is evidenced by a document from 1501 that mentions a dispute between Boldizsár I Batthyány (who succeeded Franjo Berislavić as the Ban of Jajce that same year) against "Barbaram alias relictam quondam Wk dezpothi, nunc vero consortem egregii Francisci Berizlo de Grabarya, – racione occupacionis certorum jobagionum in pertinenciis Thythesewyna ajacencium."⁴¹ When Barbara's health deteriorated, Ban John Corvinus, during his stay in Zagreb on 24 February 1504, transferred to her the legal right to all the estates previously enjoyed by Vuk Branković, including Bijela Stijena and Totuševina.⁴² Just three days later, the same legal right was transferred to Franjo Berislavić and his son Ivan,⁴³ which the king confirmed on 29 May.⁴⁴ He did this because, by a provision of King Vladislaus II from 1490, he was the heir to Barbara's estates.⁴⁵ Barbara died later that year, leaving behind not only vast estates but also a large fortune she had entrusted to her cousin Beatrice Frankopan (married to John Corvinus) for safekeeping in Medvedgrad.⁴⁶ After Barbara's death, since she had no direct descendants, archbishop Tamás Bakócz attempted to take over her estates, and would have succeeded had Franjo Berislavić not complained.⁴⁷

³⁸ Karbić, "Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija", 74; Mesić, "Pleme Berislavića", 65.

³⁹ Mesić, "Pleme Berislavića", 65.

⁴⁰ Mesić, "Pleme Berislavića", 71.

⁴¹ Mesić, "Gradja mojih razprava", 136; Klaić, "Topografske sitnice", 189. This can be roughly translated as: "Barbara, also known as the widow of the late Despot Vuk, now indeed the consort of the distinguished Franjo Berislavić of Grabarje, – because of the occupation of certain serfs in the domain adjacent to Tituševina."

⁴² Šercer, "Žene Frankopanke", 41. After: Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, *Beatrica Frankopan i njezin rod* (Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1885), 34.

⁴³ Mesić, "Gradja mojih razprava", 142; Klaić, "Topografske sitnice", 189.

⁴⁴ Mesić, "Pleme Berislavića", 71.

⁴⁵ Vjekoslav Klaić, *Povjest Hrvata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća*, vol. 2, part 3: *Treće doba: vladanje kraljeva iz raznih porodica (1301–1526)* (Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmana (Stj. Kugli), 1904), 167–168.

⁴⁶ Koprčina, "Barbara Frankopan", 65–66.

⁴⁷ Tamás Bakócz (Toma Bakač) sought for him and his brothers the ownership of "dominium castri Feyerkew in Crisiensi, ac districtus Thethwssawyna, nec non castellorum Komogoyna in Zagrabiensi, et Dolaczky vocatorum in de Oborgaz Comitatus existencium." See: Mesić, "Pleme Berislavića", 81.

In June 1518, Bishop and Ban Petar Berislavić issued a document in which, among other things, he stated that after Barbara's death, Franjo Berislavić married Margit Székely de Kövend. As Franjo Berislavić had died the year prior, his wife inherited a portion of his estates. From the document, we learn that she gained possession of the fortified towns of Bijela Stijena and Lobor, as well as of Totuševina, which was an unfortified (*non castella Thythwssewyna*) estate.⁴⁸ In 1521, Palatine Stephen III Báthori (István III Báthori de Ecsed) confirmed to Count Ivan Banić (János IV Bánffy) of Donja Lendava, whom Margit Székely had recently married, possession of numerous towns and estates, among which "districtus Thwthossewyna" is mentioned.⁴⁹

During those years, the Keglević Bužimski (Keglevich de Buzin) family, nobility from the Prkalj lineage originating from the Knin area, settled in the area of the former Lower Posavina estates of the Töttös family. After purchasing the estates of Krapina and Kostel a year earlier to compensate for those lost in the Zrmanja Valley in Ottoman conquests, Petar II Keglević bought the estates of Lobor, Blinja, and Totuševina from Count Bánffy (Banić) and his wife Margit in 1524.⁵⁰ In 1532, a document written in Cyrillic script stated that Petar Keglević was in dispute with Nikola Zrinski (Miklós Zrínyi) over the Selce Estate, where he was twice mentioned as the lord of Totuševina and Blinja.⁵¹ Having previously served as the Ban of Jajce, the king appointed Petar Keglević as his viceroy, that is the Ban of Croatia and Slavonia in 1533, granting him full judicial, administrative, and military authority.⁵² A document from Holy Roman Emperor, King Ferdinand I of Habsburg, dated November 1537 also mentions the Keglevićs as lords of the fortress of Bijela Stijena, indicating that they had taken over a significant portion of the estates that formerly belonged to the Berislavić family.⁵³

In 1540, castellan Stjepan Bošnjak informed the Bishop of Zagreb, Šimun Bakač Erdődy (Simon Bakócz de Erdőd), that a Turk in Pakrac reported that Kostajnica and Totuševina had been abandoned due to Ottoman wars. In 1543, the Ottomans conquered Bijela Stijena,⁵⁴ and it seems that after the years 1547 or 1553, the majority of Totuševina fell under Ottoman rule, while the Keglevićs managed to

⁴⁸ Mesić, "Gradja mojih razprava", 174.

⁴⁹ Mesić, "Gradja mojih razprava", 186; Klaić, "Topografske sitnice", 190.

⁵⁰ Vjekoslav Klaić, *Acta Keglevichiana annorum 1322.-1527.: Najstarije isprave porodice Keglevića do boja na Muhačkom polju* (Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmana (Stj. Kugli), 1917), 78.

⁵¹ Klaić, "Topografske sitnice", 190.

⁵² Rudolf Horvat, *Povijest Hrvatske*, knjiga I.: *Od najstarijeg doba do g. 1657.* (Zagreb: Tiskara "Merkur", 1924), 226.

⁵³ Vilmos Fraknói, *Monumenta Comititalia regni Hungariae: Magyar országgyűlési emlékek 1537-1545*, vol. 3 (Budapest: Ráth Mór, 1875), 234; Milan Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde i obrana hrvatskog kraljevstva tijekom 16. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Institut za suvremenu povijest, 1995), 98.

⁵⁴ Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde*, 106.

retain only a small portion directly adjacent to Sisak.⁵⁵ In later documents, Totuševina is often divided into Upper and Lower, which may indicate the division of the estate under Ottoman and Croatian authority. In 1584, it was “recorded that the construction of the Totuševina fortress had been completed,”⁵⁶ so we can assume with a certain likelihood that the estate contained a smaller fortified part.

The militant Hasan-pasha became the sultan’s vizier in Bosnia at the beginning of 1591 and began assembling an army in Banja Luka in the spring, attacking Sisak with an army of 16,000 Ottomans in early August. At one point, he occupied and burned Topolovac,⁵⁷ as noted by historian Rudolf Horvat, who mentioned “Keglević’s fortress Totuševina” in his description of the attack.⁵⁸ Although the war was initially showing no results, with the construction of Sisak Fortress (between 1544 and 1550)⁵⁹ and even more so after the expulsion of Ottoman forces from Petrinja, the border between the Ottomans and the Habsburg Monarchy eventually stabilized along a broad stretch of the valley between the Kupa River and the hills of Zrinska Gora.⁶⁰ It was there, southeast of the Sisak Fortress on the

⁵⁵ Klaić, “Topografske sitnice”, 190–191.

⁵⁶ Ivan Majnarić, Maja Katušić, “Keglević, plemićka obitelj (XIV–XIX. st.)”, in: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, vol. 7, edited by Trpimir Macan (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2009), 228.

⁵⁷ It was likely a smaller wooden castle, typical of this area in the second half of the 16th century, as such structures, according to Milan Kruhek, “could be built more quickly and economically, allowing for a greater number of border fortifications to accommodate smaller defensive garrisons.” Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde*, 31.

⁵⁸ Horvat, *Povijest Hrvatske*, 279.

⁵⁹ The decision to build the fortress of Sisak was made by the Zagreb Chapter and Ban Nikola Zrinski on 4 August 1544, obligating members of the Croatian nobility to contribute to the construction in money and in labour. As the Ottoman advance posed a danger to all of Europe, nearby major cities (such as Zagreb and Ljubljana) sent assistance in that first year of construction. Additionally, Emperor Ferdinand issued a special privilege stipulating that all funds collected through taxes and contributions from the subjects of Sisak be used for the construction and equipping of the new fortress. On 9 August 1546, likely upon the commissioning of the Old Town of Sisak, a document was issued containing a list of equipment, weapons, servants, and provisions in the new fortress. The construction of the fortress was completed in 1556. Croatia (henceforth: HR) – Nadbiskupijski arhiv, Zagreb (henceforth: NAZ) – fund Acta Capituli antiqua (henceforth: ACA), folder 31, no. 85/2, 85/3 and folder 52, no. 1. Also consult: Josip Kolanović, ed., *Sisak u obrani od Turaka: Izbor građe 1543–1597*, prepared by Jozo Ivanović et al. (Zagreb: Povijesni arhiv Sisak; Matica hrvatska Sisak; Arhiv Hrvatske, 1993), 31–33, 66–68. On construction and equipment of the fortress of Sisak, also consult: Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde*, 128–140; Mira Kolar-Dimitrijević, “Ostaci protuturskih utvrda u Hrvatskoj”, in: *Ascendere historiam: Zbornik u čast Milana Kruheka*, ed. Marija Karbić et al. (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2014), 538–539; Hrvoje Kekez, “Sisačka utvrda i njezine predstraže u obrambenim strategijama sredinom 16. stoljeća”, in: *Sisačka bitka 1593.–2018.: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog kolokvija povodom 425-te obljetnice Sisačke bitke održanoga u Sisku 20. lipnja 2018. godine*, ed. Hrvoje Kekez, Stipica Grgić and Valentina Janković (Sisak: Sisačka biskupija; Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište; Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2019), 8–9; Regan, Dugački, *Leksikon utvrda Hrvatske*, 558–559.

⁶⁰ Filip Škiljan, *Kulturno-historijski spomenici Banije* (Zagreb: Srpsko narodno vijeće, 2008), 9. See the map in: Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde*, 262.

left bank of the Sava, that a part of the Keglević estates that best resisted the Ottoman attacks was situated.⁶¹ With the intention of better securing Croatia against future Ottoman incursions, the Chapter of Zagreb decided on 3 January 1592 to persuade Count Keglević to defend Totuševina (**Fig. 2**).⁶² The Croatian Assembly (Cro. *Sabor*) was somewhat stricter, deciding on 29 May 1589 that the Totuševina stronghold be restored. Since this request was not complied with in the following eight years, on 20 May 1597, the Assembly once again decreed that “the Keglević brothers are to restore their fortress Totuševina near Sisak.”⁶³



Fig. 2. Totuševina estate in the 16th century, depicted on present-day topographic map, 2024

⁶¹ In the 1579 list of fortresses, two fortresses in Blinja belonging to the Keglevićs are mentioned. Kruhek, *Krajiške utvrde*, 324–325.

⁶² “Totussevinam quoque nunc in regno opera domini Keglevich et intercessione eiusdem pro laboratoribus restaurandam omnino sollicitent, alioquin neque lignacio oppidanis neque nobis libera foret, piscacio vero nulla qua miseri cives et taxam solum et seipso sublevant.” HR-NAZ-ACA, folder 27, no. 11/42. Transcript according to: Kolanović, *Sisak u obrani od Turaka*, 342–343.

⁶³ Ferdo Šišić, ed., *Hrvatski saborski spisi, knjiga četvrta: Od godine 1578. do godine 1608, Dodatak od 1573.–1605.* (Zagreb: Akademijaska knjižara Lav. Hartmana, 1917), 247; Horvat, *Povijest Hrvatske*, 293.

From Totuševina to Topolovac: Economic Realities and Change in a Noble Estate

The first renewed mention of Totuševina after 1403 appears under the present name of Topolovac (*Topolowecz*), as the settlement is mentioned on 29 March 1593, in a commander report to the Zagreb Chapter, stating that all the local people had fled from the Ottomans, and that it was necessary to send more money, workers, defenders, and wine.⁶⁴ The next mention of the estate under the name Topolovac is in Čakovec on 24 September 1657 when at the behest of Emperor Leopold, Ban Nikola Zrinski demands compensation from the Keglević Bužimski family for the estates of Topolovac and Lobar, which belonged to the Eleskő (*Eleskeö*) estate, and which he believed was his rightful inheritance.⁶⁵ Thus, in addition to the uncertainty due to the constant Ottoman threat, the seventeenth century in the Sisak region was also marked by unsettled property relations. It was a period during which the Keglevićs gradually lost real control over Blinja and Totuševina. Only at the end of the century, as a result of the lawsuit he pursued with the Zagreb Chapter and the people of Sisak from 1690 to 1699, did Petar Keglević, Croatian Ban's deputy and Supreme Count,⁶⁶ acquire the estates of Blinja, Upper and Lower Totuševina.⁶⁷ Due to his prominent role in the defence of Vienna against the Ottomans, King Leopold I of Habsburg granted him the title of Count at the Diet of Pozsony in 1687. Thus, the estates of Blinja and Totuševina (**Fig. 3**)⁶⁸ once again came under the complete control of the Keglevićs. In 1694, Petar Keglević was also appointed supreme commander of part of the Banovina region in Pounje.⁶⁹ After reclaiming the estates, the Keglevićs main-

⁶⁴ HR-NAZ-ACA, folder 27, no. 11/83. Also see: Kolanović, *Sisak u obrani od Turaka*, 378–379.

⁶⁵ Lujo Šavor, "Regesti isprava iz arhiva porodice Keglević g. 1700–1853.", *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 1 (1954): 371–372.

⁶⁶ Great County Prefect (Lat. *comes supremus*, Cro. *veliki župan*, Hun. *főispán*) was a judicial title of the highest-ranking royal official in a county (*comitatus*) within the Kingdom of Croatia-Hungary. Appointed by the king, the county prefect acted as the sovereign's representative, overseeing governance, justice, and military obligations within their jurisdiction. Božena Vranješ-Šoljan, "Veliki župani – upravno-činovnička elita u hrvatskom društvu na prijelazu iz 19. u 20. stoljeće", *Historijski zbornik* 71 (2018), no. 2: 269–282.

⁶⁷ The agreement on the estates of Blinja and Totuševina between the Keglević brothers and the Zagreb Chapter was signed on 5 October 1700. Šavor, "Regesti isprava", 255, 257.

⁶⁸ The depiction on Coronelli's 1693 map shows inconsistencies with the settlement's known location relative to the 16th-century course of Sava River. However, early cartographic representations often exhibited inaccuracies due to limitations in surveying techniques and reliance on secondary sources. As such, the identification of "Dabolat" and "Dablawetz" with Topolovac is tentative, and the possibility of an error in its placement on the map cannot be excluded.

⁶⁹ Maja Katušić, "Keglević, Petar (Keglevich, Keglewich; Petrus), banski namjesnik i veliki župan", in: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, vol. 7, edited by Trpimir Macan (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2009), 234.

tained there a country estate named Topolovac, as evidenced by a letter from Đuro Rogan written in Vienna in 1701, reminding Petar Keglević of his promise to give his brother the role of the castellan of Topolovac.⁷⁰ Petar Keglević's presence at the Topolovac estate is further evidenced by his letter of 10 September 1711, sent from Topolovac.⁷¹ It is known that until 1714, the estate's steward was Toma Brlečić.⁷²



Fig. 3. Detail: The domain of Totuševina and its vicinity on the map of the Franciscan geographer Vincenzo Coronelli, with the depiction of the settlement noted as “Dabolar” and “Dablawetz” (Topolovac?) southeast of Sisak, 1693

In 1724, before he passed away, Petar Keglević sold the estate of Totuševina, also known as Topolovac, to his son Ladislav II Keglević and his male descendants for 10,000 florins. The document clearly states that Topolovac is located in the area previously known as Totuševina (*Topolovecz sive Totussevina*), indicating the geographical overlap of the two areas. The following decade, in 1735, Ladislav entered into an agreement with his brother Aleksandar, pledging the estate of Topolovac as collateral for 20,000 florins, with the condition that Ladislav could not dispose of it, and the lender could not redeem it for the next thirty years.⁷³ It appears that at that time, the fortified part of the estate still existed because on 28th March 1738, the widow of Ladislav II. Keglević, Countess Franciska Tha-

⁷⁰ Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 259.

⁷¹ Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 313.

⁷² Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 334.

⁷³ Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 344–345.

vonat,⁷⁴ signed a declaration of life tenancy “in castello Topolovecz”,⁷⁵ over the land in the Topolovac estate. In 1741, Countess Thavonat eventually reached an agreement to remain in possession of the Topolovac estate until she received a one-time payment of 3,047 florins and 47 kreuzers as compensation and dowry.⁷⁶

For the cultural history of Topolovac, it might serve as an interesting side note that during Countess Thavonat’s time on the estate, Mihalj (Mijo) Brezovački, father of Croatian playwright Tituš Brezovački, worked at the estate. Even though Tituš Brezovački was born in Zagreb in 1757, it is worth considering that in the first half of the eighteenth century, Topolovac was still commonly referred to as Totuševina or Tituševina.⁷⁷

The obligations of the peasants and inhabitants of the Topolovac estate towards the Keglević family during the 18th century are known to us from a number of historical and archival sources, and they were further confirmed in 1749 when new taxes were introduced to ensure funds for the development of the Military Frontier (Cro. *Vojna krajina* or *Vojna granica*, Ger. *Militärgrenze*). At that time, the entire population across the Kupa River, from Kamensko to Topolovac, unless belonging to the noble class, were required to pay 1 forint for each house they owned, and the free population also received a new tax of 30 kreuzers. Furthermore, subjects and estate properties, who until then had already paid 300 forints in taxes, were obliged to pay the same amount again.⁷⁸

Count Petar VIII Keglević (1722–1749), the son of Ladislav II Keglević and Franciska Thavonat, inherited the estate around 1740 upon reaching adulthood. By her marriage with Petar, Marija Ana Walpurga Keglević, born Drašković, inherited the Topolovac estate after his death.⁷⁹ In 1754, during preparations for the arrival of Empress Maria Theresa in Croatia, new financial burdens were introduced: “It was then determined that for her reception, the widow of Petar Keglević should provide 167 soldiers from the Topolovac estate on both sides of the Sava River, who would form the fourth battalion. Along with the soldiers, one

⁷⁴ In archival documents, she is known as Franziska Tavonath or Thavonath (Freiin/Freifrau Thavonat von Thavon, by rank a Freifrau, belonging to the lower German nobility similar to a baroness), born on 5 December 1704, in Vienna. She married Ladislav II Keglević on 15 July 1722, also in Vienna. A[dolf] M[athias] Hildebrandt, *Der Kärntner Adel* (Nürnberg: Bauer und Raspe, 1879), 209–213; József Szinnyei, *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, vol. 5 (Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor Könyvkiadóhivatala, 1897), 1342.

⁷⁵ Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 356.

⁷⁶ Majnarić, Katušić, “Keglević”, 229.

⁷⁷ Milan Ratković, “Tituš Brezovački”, in: Tituš Brezovački, *Djela* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951), 223.

⁷⁸ Miroslav Matovina, *Živojin Milosavljević, Prijatelji Posavine i Resave* (Sisak: Mjesne zajednice Preloščica, Roanda i Topolovac, 1988), 177.

⁷⁹ Majnarić, Katušić, “Keglević”, 229.

captain, first lieutenant, second lieutenant, ensign, musician, and three drummers were required. Subjects of the Topolovac estate were also designated for road repairs, but 17 measures and 2 and a half quarters were exempt from this burden, as these subjects were preparing oak timber for the construction of the Karlovac Bridge.”⁸⁰

Widow Marija Ana Keglević remarried in 1755 to the widower Petar Trojlo Sermage, but she continued to personally manage Topolovac, because Petar left the estate under her life tenancy, as stated in documents about the estate preserved today in the Croatian State Archives.⁸¹ Alongside her, the owner of Topolovac was her daughter Josipa Keglević, who also married into the Sermage family. The second daughter of Petar VIII Keglević and Marija Ana Drašković, Katarina (Kata), married Count Franjo Patačić on 13 April 1763 in Topolovac, but she moved to Varaždin after the wedding and lived there as a renowned poetess.⁸² It is known that during approximately the same decades, Péter Berzay served as the provisor of Topolovac, while Countess Franciska Thavonat is mentioned again as the “domina terrestris” of the Topolovac estate on 26 April 1765.⁸³

An excerpt from the land register (*urbarium*) from 1775 confirms that in that year, wine tributes from dependent peasants of the Samobor estate were regulated for Topolovac, indicating significant vinicultural activity in the area.⁸⁴ In 1776, a large map of eight provincial villages of the Topolovac estate was published, showing Count Josip Keglević as the owner of this vast estate (**Fig. 4**). This meant that the estate had passed back into the line of Ladislav’s brother Aleksandar, Josip’s father. A detailed depiction of the construction of individual settlements on that map, although not exclusively focusing on the Topolovac settlement, provides a clear insight into the spatial-morphological features of the villages, all situated along the Sava River, or the road that follows it, with many canals and streams of the estate dedicated to regulating irrigation of this floodplain area, intertwined with numerous large forested areas. Taking this into account, as well as the map of the First Military Survey (**Fig. 5**) which was conducted at the time, we can conclude that only a small portion of land remained for agricultural use.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 177.

⁸¹ HR – Hrvatski državni arhiv (henceforth: HDA) – fund 22 – Ugarska dvorska komora: Urbarski spisi i popisi posjeda, folder 28, no. 388.

⁸² Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 229.

⁸³ Šavor, “Regesti isprava”, 374.

⁸⁴ Hrvoje Petrić, “Samobor i okolica u ranome novom vijeku”, in: *Samobor: Zemljopisno-povijesna monografija*, ed. Dragutin Feletar (Samobor: Meridijani, 2011), 306.

⁸⁵ Austria (henceforth: AT) – Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv (henceforth: OeStA/FHKA) – Sonderbestände, Sammlungen und Selekte, 1170–1987/Sammlungen und Selekte, 0963–2006 (henceforth: SUS) – Karten- und Plansammlung, 1540–1938 (henceforth: KS), L 066 Acht Provinzialdörfer der Herrschaft Topolovecz des Grafen Josef Keglevich am Saustrom (Komitat Warasdin), 1776.

In 1793, a regulation was issued that determined the relationship between the peasants and lord Josip Keglević on the Topolovac estate. The document was issued by the Zagreb County, and it equalized the forest rights of the *hercegs* – a term that then encompassed all nobles, prominent citizens, landowners, and freemen who were not members of the Topolovac nobility – with the tithe-payers and peasants. Interestingly, the regulations prohibited the peasant from selling a house built from forest wood, as well as any house sale, granting the lord the right to confiscate the money earned from any such sale. “It was also determined which trees the peasants could use for fuel, when they could cut down trees, gather brushwood, and generally enter the forests, all this only with permission of their lord. The ordinance stipulated that if the residents of Topolovac ever learned and started making thatched roofs on their houses, their lord was not obligated to provide them with roof boards. Thirteen paragraphs specified a range of other tasks that the Topolovac peasants were obligated to perform or were prohibited from doing. Failure to comply with the paragraphs of this regulation resulted in ‘culprits’ being punished with 12 to 15 strokes of the cane.”⁸⁶ At that time, the Topolovac estate of Josip Keglević was significantly smaller in size, following the division of the entire estate between him and his brother Count Julije Keglević a decade prior, on 14 September 1786.⁸⁷

Austrian geographer and statistician Joseph Marx Freyherrn von Liechtenstern described Topolovac in 1818 as an area consisting of a single village and the administrative centre of the Keglević family estate, located among the settlements between the Sava River and the ponds below Sisak.⁸⁸ An earlier regulatory map from 1813,⁸⁹ for the road built by Captain Wilhelm Notterhirn from Sisak to the village of Brebovec (now Stručec), clearly shows that Topolovac at that time was a settlement located exclusively along the northern part of the road that stretches along the floodplain of the left bank of the Sava, while the space between the river and the road was undeveloped. The regulation of the Sava was considered as early as 1793 by nobleman Ignjat Pongrac, a ship surveyor of the Directorate of the Imperial Chamber who, as part of the consideration of the river regulation, proposed “cutting off numerous meanders, including the meander of the Sava in front of Topolovac, which was carried out by digging a canal between the village of Crnac and the Bacan field from 1890 to 1900.”⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 177.

⁸⁷ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 182.

⁸⁸ Joseph Marx Freiherr von Lichtenstern, *Handbuch der neuesten Geographie des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, vol. 3 (Vienna: B. Ph. Bauer, 1818), 1460.

⁸⁹ HU-MNL – Térképtár – fund Kormányhatósági fondokból kiemelt térképek – Helytartótanácsi térképek, 1738–1875 (S 12), div. XIII, no. 408, Mappa repraesentans viam Notterhirianam, 1813.

⁹⁰ Valentina Šerbec, Novela Rimay Ferenčak, Margita Malnar, “Stambenogospodarski sklop kurije Keglević u Topolovcu: Postojeće stanje, današnja namjena i prijedlog mogućega načina korištenja”,

The death of Count Josip Keglević was followed by a radical transformation and intensive construction on the estate. The entire property was inherited in 1813 by Josip's son, Count Toma Keglević (1769–1850),⁹¹ who was responsible for initiating the building activities on the estate which by the end of the nineteenth century would shape it into what we know today, deeply embedding it in the cultural memory of the Sisak-Topolovac region. Even though Count Toma Keglević was first recorded as the lord of Topolovac in documents in 1815, it was not until 1828 that he was appointed a steward of the Topolovac estate in the person of Tadija Ferrich.⁹² Over the next two decades, a large stable (1824) and a manor house (1831) were built on the estate, and in the subsequent period, residential and farm buildings were constructed along the main road of the settlement.

Count Toma Keglević handed over the management – but not the ownership – of the Topolovac estate “due to old age and infirmity” to his son Count Samuel Keglević on 8 December 1838. In addition to the Topolovac estate, he also entrusted him with the management of other properties. Despite the significant architectural development of the estate during Count Toma Keglević's time, the family sold Topolovac in June 1840 to Ivan Juraj Dömötörfy for 360,000 forints, who took over the estate at the beginning of 1841.⁹³

Already on 8 June 1844, it was announced to the public through a newspaper advertisement that the Topolovac estate, along with the “meadow without pasture”,⁹⁴ was once again up for sale. In November 1846, the list of donors to the Zagreb Diocese mentions Mirko Kuković, a Zagreb nobleman, lawyer and official from Zagreb, as the new owner of the Topolovac estate.⁹⁵ The Kuković family had already owned certain properties in the Topolovac area, as evidenced by their involvement in the founding of the Croatian-Slavonian Economic Society in Zagreb on 3 February 1841, where a certain Ivan Kuković, mentioned as one of its founders, was described as a “landowner in Topolovac.”⁹⁶ In the following decades, the Kuković family became known in the cultural history of Zagreb as patrons who in the 1870s built the Kuković House, the first large and significant residential tenement block in the Lower Town Zagreb.

in: *Dvorci i ljetnikovci: Kulturno naslijeđe kao pokretač gospodarskog razvoja*, conference proceedings, ed. Mladen Obad Šćitaroci (Zagreb: Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2006), 392.

⁹¹ Iván Nagy, *Magyarország családai czímerekkel és nemzékrendi táblákkal*, vol. 6 (Pest: Ráth Mór, 1860), 152.

⁹² Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 185.

⁹³ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 179, 185.

⁹⁴ “Gras-Verkauf”, *Kais. Kön. Priv. Agramer politische Zeitung* 19 (1844), no. 47: 217.

⁹⁵ “Erster öffentlicher Ausweis”, *Kais. kön. privilegirte Agramer polit. Zeitung* 21 (1846), no. 88: 397.

⁹⁶ For further information, consult: HR-HDA – fund 1333 – Hrvatsko-slavonsko gospodarsko društvo kao središnja zadruha u Zagrebu (henceforth: HDGD), box 1, f. 1.1., Osnivanje i registracija.

After Kuković, Topolovac was owned subsequently by noblemen Jeger and Mautner. In 1870, it was purchased by Hinko Escher, a Swiss national originally from Zürich, who in 1874 established the elementary school in Topolovac for the education of the children of his workers (rather than in the distant Preloščica, where they attended school until then). Due to the outstanding debts of the Escher estate, the Topolovac estate was acquired by the Swiss Bank in 1886. The bank sold it in 1887 to Count Miklós (Nikola) Zay, a member of the old noble family from Upper Hungary (present-day Slovakia). Count Zay sold it to Archduke Friedrich of Austria in 1908 for 2.5 million crowns, and – along with the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy – on 10 September 1919, all of the Archduke's estates, including Topolovac, became part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Thus, after centuries of private ownership, the Topolovac estate passed into state and national ownership.⁹⁷



Fig. 6. Keglevich Manor, Topolovac, at the beginning of the 20th century

The Aftermath: From State Property Back to Private Ownership

The State Property of Topolovac was established by the Law on the Organization and Management of the State Property of Belje, enacted on 31 December 1921. Although it was part of Belje, the Topolovac estate “operated independently

⁹⁷ Nagy, *Magyarország családai*, 329; Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 191, 199.

and had independent agricultural and forestry management” until 1 April 1932, when the administrative merger of the two estates into one was carried out. As of 1 April 1940, the estate was called the Banovina Estate of Topolovac, but activity on it declined.⁹⁸

After several years of hiatus, during which Mirko Matovina took over as the administrator in the first days following the liberation in 1945, and Đuro Ogulinac was manager of the estate, the manorial complex was reestablished and revitalized. The estate was organized, becoming one of the largest agricultural enterprises in the People’s Republic of Croatia, renamed the State Agricultural Estate Topolovac in 1946. After operating independently in the 1950s, and then as part of the Agricultural Estate Posavina from 1959, in the 1960s it became part of the Gavrilović Meat Industry from Petrinja, and in 1968 it became part of the Institute for Plant Breeding and Production of the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Zagreb. In that period, the manorial complex was recognized as an exceptionally valuable spatial unit by the Regional Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments in Zagreb, and in 1969 it was designated as a cultural monument. From 1984 until the end of the decade, the manor operated as part of a series of work organizations (e. g. Koopexport, Agriculture, Posavka).⁹⁹

After 1990, the buildings of the manorial complex partially served as waste dumps, while those along the main road of the settlement were mainly used for housing. Today, residential use applies only to one house in the eastern part of the complex, while other buildings are abandoned and are in ruins. After Ivan Meštrović, MD purchased the Keglevich Manor in November 2016, the central part of the Topolovac manorial complex found itself back in private ownership, and the first active steps were taken towards its expert-based reconstruction and revitalization.

Conclusion

The cultural and spatial development of Topolovac and its estate represents a synthesis of socio-economic and political developments spanning from the fourteenth century to the present day. Originating within the domain of the Hungarian noble family Töötös de Bátmonostor et Blinja, the estate underwent multiple transitions in ownership, evolving from a feudal landholding into an important administrative and economic centre. Its eventual incorporation into state administration, followed by nationalization in the twentieth century and the recent

⁹⁸ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 199; HR – Državni arhiv u Osijeku, Osijek – fund 495 – Zbirka planova i nacrti (henceforth: ZPN), inv. no. 51.1.1.–51.1.20. For more information on the State Property of Belje, see: Stjepan Sršan, *Tri stoljeća Belja: 1698.–1998.* (Osijek: Belje, 1998).

⁹⁹ Matovina, Milosavljević, *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*, 240–241.

privatization, sums up a number of historical models of adaptation and alteration of physical and built landscape.¹⁰⁰

This research has laid out a concise insight into the estate's evolution, offering interpretations of historical sources and previously overlooked archival material. By tracing the estate's noble ownership transitions from the Töttös and Branković families to the Berislavić and Keglević families, the study illuminates the complexity of legal and administrative mechanisms governing land tenure in medieval and early modern Croatia. Furthermore, it reconstructs the estate's economic foundations, detailing its agricultural functions, taxation systems, and the role of dependent peasants in maintaining its productivity.

One of the focal points of this study is the analysis of Topolovac's military and strategic role, particularly its fortification efforts and involvement in Ottoman conflicts. Additionally, the research has synthesized fragmented cartographic and archival evidence to reconstruct the estate's spatial development. While these aspects were previously discussed in isolated studies, this research offers their first comprehensive consideration.

Despite these advancements, significant gaps remain in understanding the architectural and spatial development of the manorial complex itself, which remains underexplored, especially its historical resonance within the constellation of Croatian cultural heritage. While this research has identified the contextual aspects of its emergence and its crucial moments of historical transformation, such as the nineteenth-century adaptations under Count Toma Keglević, further investigations are being conducted to assess the evolution of its built environment. That is also the point of the continuation of the research, particularly in connection with recent conservation and preservation efforts. Although Topolovac has experienced periods of neglect, its architectural ensemble comprising the manor house, ancillary structures, and remnants of its agricultural infrastructure remains a significant example of the Croatian cultural landscape. The identification of vinicultural activities, infrastructural innovations, and changing land use patterns further highlight the estate's agricultural and economic role.

In conclusion, by integrating archival research with historical topography and conservation studies, this study provides a unified historical understanding of Topolovac as both a settlement and an estate. This approach establishes a comprehensive foundation for preservation efforts and serves as a prolegomenon for future strategies that affirm the inherited physical landscape within contemporary imperatives.

¹⁰⁰ This is evident in the broader regional context, particularly in the constellation of fortresses and manor complexes, as well as in the historical changes in the course of the Sava River, which have influenced settlement patterns and land use over time. For more information on historical models of adaptation and alteration of manorial estates, see: Boris Dundović, Mladen Obad Šćitaroci, József Sisa, "Revitalisation Models for Central European Country Houses", in: *Cultural Urban Heritage: Development, Learning and Landscape Strategies*, ed. Mladen Obad Šćitaroci, Bojana Bojanić Obad Šćitaroci and Ana Mrda (Cham: Springer, 2019), 446–448.

Illustration Sources

Fig. 1. – Photograph by: Paolo Mofardin (Institute of Art History, Zagreb, The Photographic Collection, inv. no. IPU-F-34400), 2019.

Fig. 2. – Map drawn by the author. Boundary of the estate reconstructed from: Dundović, Horvat-Levaj, Bjažić Klarin, *Topolovac, Komplex obitelji Keglević*, 37. Fortifications system also from: Hrvoje Kekez, Martina Markešić, “Izvještaj Ivana Lenkovića iz 1563. godine i pravci kretanja na prostoru od Velike Kapele do rijeke Save”, *Modruški zbornik* 9–10 (2017).

Fig. 3. – Detail: Vincenzo Coronelli, *Corso del Danubio da Vienna Sin' à Nicopoli, e paesi adiacenti Descritti e Dedicati Dal P. M. Coronelli Cosmografo della Serenissima Republica di Venetia All' Eccellenza del Sig. Federico Marcello, Procuratore di S. Marco, Sauio Grande, etc. Con Privilegio dell' Ecc:mo Senato*, David Rumsey Map Collection, David Rumsey Map Center, Stanford Libraries, list no. 12186.150, series no. 150.

Fig. 4. – Posinger, *Acht Provinzialdörfer der Herrschaft Topolovecz des Grafen Josef Keglevich am Saustrom (Komitat Warasdin)*, July 1776, AT-OeStA/FHKA-SUS-KS, L 066, *Bestand Kamerale Ungarn*, map 16, no. 46, f. 436, 35 by 51 cm, paper.

Fig. 5. – Detail: Provinz Kroatien (1783–1784) and Banal Grenze (1773–1775), First Military Survey, as published on Arcanum Maps (Arcanum Database Ltd, Budapest).

Fig. 6. – Photograph in the collections of the Institute of Art History, Zagreb, The Photographic Collection, inv. no. IPU-F-34406.

Unpublished Sources

Austria – Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Finanz- und Hofkammerarchiv – Sonderbestände, Sammlungen und Selekte, 1170–1987/Sammlungen und Selekte, 0963–2006 – Karten- und Plansammlung, 1540–1938 (AT-OeStA/FHKA-SUS-KS).

Croatia (HR) – Državni arhiv u Osijeku, Osijek – fund 495 – Zbirka planova i nacrti (HR-DAOS-495-ZPN).

Croatia – Hrvatski državni arhiv, Zagreb (HR-HDA) – fund 22 – Ugarska dvorska komora: Urbarski spisi i popisi posjeda.

Croatia – Hrvatski državni arhiv, Zagreb (HR-HDA) – fund 1333 – Hrvatsko-slavonsko gospodarsko društvo kao središnja zadruga u Zagrebu.

Croatia – Nadbiskupijski arhiv, Zagreb – fund Acta Capituli antiqua (HR-NAZ-ACA).

Hungary – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Budapest (HU-MNL) – collection Diplomatikai Levéltár – fund Bécsi levéltárakból kiszolgáltatott iratokból – Bécsi levéltárakból kiszolgáltatott iratok.

Hungary – Magyar Nemzeti Levéltár, Budapest (HU-MNL) – collection Térképtár – fund Kormányhatósági fondokból kiemelt térképek, 17.–20. sz. – Helytartótanácsi térképek, 1738–1875.

United States of America – Stanford Libraries, Stanford CA – David Rumsey Map Center – David Rumsey Map Collection.

Published Sources and Literature

Ančić, Mladen. “Cistercitska opatija u Topuskom do pretvaranja u komendu”. *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 27 (1994): 29–42.

Andlar, Goran; Hrdalo, Ines; Udovč, Tanja. *Studija i strategija razvoja zelene infrastrukture Grada Siska*. Zagreb: 3E Projekti; Agronomski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2018.

Bedić, Marko. “Naselja Moslavine: Od najstarijih pisanih naziva do danas”. *Kaj* 31 (1998), no. 1: 37–52.

Biczó, Piroska. “Régészeti kutatások a középkori bátmonostor területén”. *Műemlékvédelem* 25 (1981), no. 2: 104–108.

Brgles, Branimir. “Stanovništvo i struktura sisačkoga vlastelinstva na prijelazu iz 15. u 16. stoljeće”. In: *Sisačka bitka 1593.–2018.: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog kolokvija povodom 425-te obljetnice Sisačke bitke održanoga u Sisku 20. lipnja 2018. godine*, edited by Hrvoje Kekez, Stipica Grgić, and Valentina Janković, 75–96. Sisak: Sisačka biskupija, Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište; Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2019.

Dundović, Boris; **Horvat-Levaj**, Katarina; **Bjažić Klarin**, Tamara. *Topolovac, Kompleks obitelji Keglević: Konzervatorska studija sa smjernicama za obnovu*. Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2019.

Dundović, Boris; **Obad Šćitaroci**, Mladen; **Sisa**, József. “Revitalisation Models for Central European Country Houses”. In: *Cultural Urban Heritage: Development, Learning and Landscape Strategies*, edited by Mladen Obad Šćitaroci, Bojana Bojanić Obad Šćitaroci and Ana Mrđa, 443–455. Cham: Springer, 2019.

“Erster öffentlicher Ausweis”. *Kais. kön. privilegirte Agramer polit. Zeitung* 21 (1846), no. 88: 397–398.

Fraknói, Vilmos. *Monumenta Comititalia regni Hungariae: Magyar országgyűlési emlékek 1537–1545*, volume 3. Budapest: Ráth Mór, 1875.

“Gras-Verkauf”. *Kais. Kön. Priv. Agramer politische Zeitung* 19 (1844), no. 47: 217.

Hildebrandt, A[dolf] M[athias]. *Der Kärtner Adel*. Nürnberg: Bauer und Raspe, 1879.

Horvat, Rudolf. *Povijest Hrvatske*, knjiga I.: *Od najstarijeg doba do g. 1657*. Zagreb: Tiskara “Merkur”, 1924.

Jerković, Marko. “Uprava Zagrebačkog kaptola nad sisačkim vlastelinstvom od 1215.godine do sredine 14. stoljeća”. In: *Antiquam fidem: Radovi sa znanstvenoga skupa*, edited by Darko Tepert and Spomenka Jurić, 149–176. Zagreb: Glas Koncila, 2011.

Karbić, Marija. “Hrvatsko plemstvo u borbi protiv Osmanlija: Primjer obitelji Berislavića Grabarskih iz Slavonije”. *Povijesni prilozi* 25 (2006), no. 31: 71–85.

Katušić, Maja. “Keglević, Petar (Keglevich, Keglewich; Petrus), banski namjesnik i veliki župan”. In: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, volume 7, edited by Trpimir Macan, 234. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2009.

Kekez, Hrvoje; **Markešić**, Martina. “Izvještaj Ivana Lenkovića iz 1563. godine i pravcikretanja na prostoru od Velike Kapele do rijeke Save”. *Modruški zbornik* 9–10 (2017): 41–62.

Kekez, Hrvoje. “Sisačka utvrda i njezine predstraže u obrambenim strategijama sredinom 16.stoljeća”. In: *Sisačka bitka 1593.–2018.: Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog kolokvija povodom 425-te obljetnice Sisačke bitke održanoga u Sisku 20. lipnja 2018. godine*, edited by Hrvoje Kekez, Stipica Grgić and Valentina Janković, 5–23. Sisak: Sisačka biskupija; Hrvatsko katoličko sveučilište; Hrvatski studiji Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2019.

Kelényi, Borbála. “Három Várdai-feleség végrendelete a késő középkorból”. In: *Micae Mediaevales: II. Fiatal történészek dolgozatai a középkori Magyarországáról és Európáról*, edited by Bence Péterfi, András Vadas, Gábor Mikó and Péter Jakab, 159–175. Budapest: ELTE BTK Történelemtudományok Doktori Iskola, 2012.

Klaić, Vjekoslav. *Povjest Hrvata od najstarijih vremena do svršetka XIX. stoljeća*, volume 2, part 3: *Treće doba: vladanje kraljeva iz raznih porodica (1301–1526)*. Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmana (Stj. Kugli), 1904.

Klaić, Vjekoslav. “Topografske sitnice”. *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 9 (1907), no. 1: 185–193.

Klaić, Vjekoslav. *Acta Keglevichiana annorum 1322.–1527.: Najstarije isprave porodice Keglevića do boja na Muhačkom polju*. Zagreb: Knjižara L. Hartmana (Stj. Kugli), 1917.

Kolanović, Josip, ed. *Sisak u obrani od Turaka: Izbor građe 1543–1597.*, prepared by Jozo Ivanović, Josip Kolanović, Andrija Lukinović, Fedor Moaćanin and Ivan

Pomper. Zagreb: Povijesni arhiv Sisak; Matica hrvatska Sisak; Arhiv Hrvatske, 1993.

Kolar-Dimitrijević, Mira. "Ostaci protuturskih utvrda u Hrvatskoj". In: *Ascendere historiam: Zbornik u čast Milana Kruheka*, edited by Marija Karbić, Hrvoje Kekez, Ana Novak, and Zorislav Horvat, 519–550. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2014.

Koprčina, Arijana. "Barbara Frankapan i zlatarske narudžbe oko 1500. godine". *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 37 (2013): 61-72.

Kovács, Péter E. "Magyarország 'törökképe' a XV. század elején". *Hadtörténeti Közlemények* 122 (2009), no. 1: 111–126.

Kozák-Kígyóssy, Szabolcs László. "Fejérkö várának felszerelése a mohácsi vész előtti évekből". In: *Várfundalók örököse: Tanulmányok Domokos György tiszteletére*, edited by Mihály Krámlí and Ferenc Pollmann, 167–189. Budapest: self-published by the editors, 2024.

Kruhek, Milan. *Krajiške utvrde i obrana hrvatskog kraljevstva tijekom 16. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Institut za suvremenu povijest, 1995.

Kukuljević Sakcinski, Ivan. *Beatrica Frankopan i njezin rod*. Zagreb: Dionička tiskara, 1885.

Lendvai, Miklós. *Temes vármegye nemes családjai*, volume 1. Budapest: Budapesti Hirlap Nyomdája, 1896.

Lichtenstern, Joseph Marx Freiherr von. *Handbuch der neuesten Geographie des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, volume 3. Vienna: B. Ph. Bauer, 1818.

Majnarić, Ivan; **Katušić**, Maja. "Keglević, plemićka obitelj (XIV–XIX. st.)". In: *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, volume 7, edited by Trpimir Macan, 223–231. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2009.

Margalits, Ede. *Szerb történelmi repertorium*, volume 1. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1918.

Matovina, Miroslav; **Milosavljević**, Živojin. *Prijatelji Posavine i Resave*. Sisak: Mjesne zajednice Preloščica, Roanda i Topolovac, 1988.

Mesić, M[atija]. "Pleme Berislavića". *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 8 (1869): 30-104.

Mesić, M[atija]. "Gradja mojih razprava u 'Radu'". *Starine* 5 (1873): 109–280.

Miljan, Suzana. "Familiaritas i klijentelski sustav unutar plemićkog društva Zagrebačke županije za vrijeme vladavine Žigmunda Luksemburškog (1387.–1437.)". *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 33 (2015): 103–132.

Miljan, Suzana. "Plemstvo Zagrebačke županije prema kraljevskoj i banskoj vlasti u doba kralja Žigmunda (1387.–1437.)". In: *A horvát-magyar együttélés fordulópontjai: Intézmények, társadalom, gazdaság, kultúra = Prekretnice u suživotu Hrvata i Mađara: Ustanove, društvo, gospodarstvo i kultura*, edited by Pál Fodor and Dinko Šokčević, 195–202. Budapest; Zagreb: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Történettudományi Intézet; Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2015.

Nagy, Iván. *Magyarország családai czímerekkel és nemzékrendi táblákkal*, volume 6. Pest: Ráth Mór, 1860.

Novak, Ana. "Gorski arhidakonat Zagrebačke biskupije u razdoblju od 1334. do 1501. godine (Povijesni razvoj crkvenoadministrativnoga područja)". PhD diss., University of Zagreb, 2011.

Novak, Ana. "Sisački kaptolski posjedi u 14. stoljeću". In: *Antiquam fidem: Radovi sa znanstvenoga skupa*, edited by Darko Tepert and Spomenka Jurić, 177–192. Zagreb: Glas Koncila, 2011.

Petrić, Hrvoje. "Samobor i okolica u ranome novom vijeku". In: *Samobor: Zemljopisno-povijesna monografija*, edited by Dragutin Feletar, 237–321. Samobor: Meridijani, 2011.

Petrić, Hrvoje. *Pogranična društva i okoliš: Varaždinski generalat i Križevačka županija u 17. stoljeću*. Samobor; Zagreb: Meridijani; Društvo za hrvatsku ekonomsku povijest i ekohistoriju, 2012.

Ratković, Milan. "Tituš Brezovački". In: Tituš Brezovački, *Djela*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951.

Regan, Krešimir; **Dugački**, Vlatka, eds. *Leksikon utvrda Hrvatske: Srednji i rani novi vijek*. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2024.

Roksandić, Drago. *Srbi u Hrvatskoj od 15. stoljeća do naših dana*. Zagreb: Vjesnik, 1991.

Smičiklas, Tadija; **Kostrenčić**, Marko, eds. *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, volume 16: *Listine godina 1379–1385*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1976.

Sršan, Stjepan. *Tri stoljeća Belja: 1698.–1998*. Osijek: Belje, 1998.

Szinnyei, József. *Magyar írók élete és munkái*, volume 5. Budapest: Hornyánszky Viktor Könyvkiadóhivatala, 1897.

Šavor, Lujó. "Regesti isprava iz arhiva porodice Keglević g. 1700–1853.". *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 1 (1954): 251–406.

Šerbec, Valentina; **Rimay Ferencak**, Novela; **Malnar**, Margita. "Stambenogospodarski sklop kurije Keglević u Topolovcu: Postojeće stanje, današnja namjena i

prijedlog mogućega načina korištenja”. In: *Dvorci i ljetnikovci: Kulturno naslijeđe kao pokretač gospodarskog razvoja*, conference proceedings, edited by Mladen Obad Šćitaroci, 391–400. Zagreb: Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2006.

Šercer, Marija. “Žene Frankopanke”. *Modruški zbornik* 4–5 (2011): 21–81.

Šišić, Ferdo, ed. *Hrvatski saborski spisi*, knjiga četvrta: *Od godine 1578. do godine 1608, Dodatak od 1573.–1605.* Zagreb: Akademijaska knjižara Lav. Hartmana, 1917.

Škiljan, Filip. *Kulturno-historijski spomenici Banije*. Zagreb: Srpsko narodno vijeće, 2008.

Vranješ-Šoljan, Božena. “Veliki župani – upravno-činovnička elita u hrvatskom društvu na prijelazu iz 19. u 20. stoljeće”. *Historijski zbornik* 71 (2018), no. 2: 269–282.

*Boris Dundović**

Povijest vlastelinstva Topolovac: analitički prikaz prostornih i društveno-gospodarskih mijena

Sažetak

Ovaj rad rezultat je istraživanja povijesnoga konteksta, vlasničkih odnosa i prostorno-ga razvoja vlastelinstva i naselja Topolovac, smještenog jugoistočno od Siska. Prvi put spomenut u pisanim izvorima 1384. godine pod nazivom Totuševina, ovaj posjed vezan je uz ugarsku plemićku obitelj Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja. U idućim stoljećima vlastelinstvo je svjedočilo brojnim društvenim i gospodarskim promjenama, uključujući napade i sporove, te na kraju došlo pod upravu plemićkih obitelji poput despota Brankovića i, poslije, grofova Keglevića. S obzirom na njegovu obrambenu funkciju u okviru širega utvrdnog sustava Posavine, ovim istraživanjem posebno je istaknuta strateška važnost Topolovca u obrani od osmanskih upada, što je kulminiralo naporima vlastelina i stanovništva da krajem 16. stoljeća ojačaju obrambeni sustav novom fortifikacijom. U prvoj polovini 19. stoljeća grof Toma Keglević započeo je važnu arhitektonsku preobrazbu i nadogradnju vlastelinstva, ponajprije središnjega kurijalnog sklopa, što je konačno oblikovalo naselje Topolovac kakvim ga danas poznajemo. Kraj 19. stoljeća pa sve do raspada Austro-Ugarske Monarhije obilježilo je više promjena vlasnika, dok vlastelinstvo iz stoljetnoga privatnog vlasništva 1919. nije prešlo u upravu Kraljevine Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca, a danas je kurija Keglević ponovno u privatnom vlasništvu. Topolovac stoga odražava sedam stoljeća povijesnih mijena. Ovo istraživanje potaknuto je recentnim konzervatorskim istraživanjima te naporima u revitalizaciji sklopa kurije Keglević, pa time i samoga naselja Topolovac. Kao prolegomenu budućim nastojanjima revitalizacije kulturnoga krajolika naselja i njegova kurijalnoga sklopa, ova studija nudi sintezu arhivskih izvora i kartografskih podataka, pružajući novi uvid u još uvijek nedovoljno istraženu povijest Topolovca. Rezultati rada mogu poslužiti kao temelj za buduće razvojne strategije usmjerene na očuvanje, interpretaciju i revitalizaciju bogatoga arhitektonskog naslijeđa.

Ključne riječi: Blinja i Totuševina; feudalno vlastelinstvo; grofovi Keglevići Bužimski (Keglevich de Buzin); Sisak, Hrvatska; Töttös de Bátmonostor et Blinja

* Boris Dundović, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Ulica grada Vukovara 68, 10000 Zagreb, Republika Hrvatska, E-mail adresa: bdundovi@ipu.hr. Članak je lektorirao David Edel.