

Divide et impera: Race, Ethnicity and Administration in Early 18th-Century Habsburg Hungary

William O'Reilly
National University of Ireland, Galway



Processes of imperial expansion within the European continent, as well as in parts beyond, impacted on the formation of racial hierarchies and the gradation of subject peoples. In this paper, Habsburg administrative attitudes to the residents of territories conquered from the Ottoman Empire in the period 1699-1740 are examined; how multi-ethnic territories were viewed by Viennese administrators on first contact and how racial reordering, and policies of discrimination, became an integral part of governmental practice.

Specifically, that part of the Kingdom of Hungary known as the Banat of Temesvár will be focused upon, for it was this territory which Vienna saw as an experimental region where new models of government might be best tried and put to use. By highlighting the impact of the historical memory of the Spanish reconquista, this paper suggests that Habsburg policies in Central Europe vis-à-vis Muslims and 'Nationalists' owed as much to racialised practices in Spain and the Spanish American colonies as it did to the peculiarities of multi-ethnic society in the expanding Austrian Habsburg dominions in Central and South-central Europe.



William O'Reilly was educated at University College Galway, Universität Hamburg and the University of Oxford; he is Lecturer in History at the National University of Ireland, Galway. He is especially interested in early modern European history and Atlantic history and has published articles on colonial American and early modern European colonization and migration. He is currently an IRCHSS Government of Ireland Fellow and a Visiting Fellow of the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities, and the Centre for History and Economics, University of Cambridge, where he is preparing a volume on migration and colonization in the 18th century in North America and east-central Europe.



INTRODUCTION

The Habsburg Monarchy was faced with a quandary of government characteristic of many early modern European states. Unlike its regal neighbours to the west and south, the Austrian Habsburgs did not possess colonies in the Atlantic, Indian or Pacific Oceans, nor was it likely they ever would. Yet the Habsburg Lands possessed a lengthy border with an Ottoman Empire which in the early 18th century was entering a period of steady decline, glorying in a false sense of security, and witnessing a short lived blossoming in culture in the late 17th century. The Habsburg Empire, so long the champion of Christian Europe, remained constantly threatened by the actual and possible threat of Muslim advance. For

other states, the Ottomans remained a maritime nuisance and at worst an economic rival, but from the end of the 16th century always of waning influence. Not so for Austria, however: the southern Habsburg lands remained the last line of defence against the Turk. And Habsburg expansion, denied her in the west and the north by alliances and intrigues between fellow European powers, was prevented in the south and the east by the stubborn attacks and counter-attacks of the Turks.

Conscious that land regained from the Turks would need to be absorbed into the Habsburg administrative system as speedily and efficiently as possible, civil and military administrators alike recognised the need to colonise these new territories. Hungary, and particularly the Banat of Temesvár, was to be an experiment in colonial government of a type the Habsburg administration had not tried before. German settlers would be invited to settle the territory and no possibility for recourse to the law was allowed to resident non-Germans, however long they might have been *in situ* or however legitimate their claims to land ownership were. Practices in Hungary were to resemble those in reconquest Spain, with all Muslims expelled from the territory, Jews severely limited and technically not at all tolerated in the region, and the 'nationalities', that is, all non-German peoples, largely ignored and only occasionally referred to. The Emperor Charles VI (1711-1740), previously self-styled King of Spain and most familiar with racial government in Spain and the Spanish Americas, carried with him to Central Europe, it is fair to say, knowledge of governing indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities gleaned in Spain and the Spanish dominions. The processes of European 'expansion' and of globalization were not limited to extra-European activities, but operated within the continent, too ¹. The Banat of Temesvár was to be an entrepôt for merchants and ministers, soldiers and settlers, a new site for development and design.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BANAT OF TEMESVÁR

The Banat of Temesvár has always been an entrepôt of ethnicity; an area of approximately 28,500 km², it is bordered in the north by the river Maros, in the south by the Danube and in the west by the Tisza ². Further to the north lies the county of Arad, to the south Serbia, to the west the county of Bács and to the east Transylvania and Wallachia ³. Only with the reconquest of the area from the Ottoman empire in 1717 did it come to be called the 'Banat of Temesvár' or the 'Temeser Banat'. Prior to Turkish rule, the region was governed as a union of individual counties, including Temesvár, Csanad and Severin. The 'supremus Comes' of this important Hungarian bulwark against the Ottoman world held the title *Ban*, or Margrave ⁴. With the loss of the city of Severin, Temesvár, as the next most important of the constituent parts, acquired the role as chief look-out post, and with it *per translationem* its ruler the title *Ban* ⁵, the title 'Ban' coming to be associated with the entire region ⁶.

The region, which is now divided between Hungary, Romania and Serbia (Vojvodina and Serbia), was known by the Romans as *Dacia Ripensis* ⁷. The Roman Empire had realised the importance of the Transilvanian region as the key to controlling the Central European plains ⁸; from the late 9th century the region became an integral part of the Hungarian Crown territory. Under King Béla III in the late 12th century, the region had opened up to

non-Magyar settlers. The Banat became exceedingly important after Charles Robert of Anjou came to the Hungarian throne, as Anjou occasionally took residence there (1315-23), settling permanently in 1331 to escape the plague⁹. The Banat had about fifty towns of differing racial composition in the late medieval period, with Temesvár becoming the temporary capital of imperial Hungary in 1365¹⁰. All the while, Ottoman incursions into the Banat were having a disastrous effect on border-zone settlements and were forcing settlers loyal to the Hungarian crown to push further northwards. After the Battle of Kosovo on 28 June 1389, the Turkish near-annihilation of the Serbian army gave them unlimited access across the Danube into the Banat¹¹. Many Serbian families fled before the advancing Turks, moving into the Banat and settling in the west of the region, where a number of Serbs already lived¹². Some topographical studies of 15th-century place names in the Banat propose that 356 (53%) of the 676 village names were of Slavic origin¹³. By 1514, when Pope Leo X called for a crusade against the Turk, the Banat frontier was as fluid as at any previous stage in its history¹⁴.

The Turkish army entered the Banat across the frozen Danube in 1522, one year after taking the fortress city of Belgrade¹⁵. Military operations came to a head in 1526 with the Battle of Mohács, and the defeat of Hungarian forces. Then began a series of diplomatic and political alliances, more transnational than local, which lasted until 1552¹⁶. In that year an Ottoman force of 50,000 men under the command of the Serb Mohamed Sokolli (Mehemet Sokolovich) crossed the river Tisza and entered the Banat. The entire land of the three rivers was now in Ottoman hands, having been created a *Ejalet*, and subdivided into several *Sandschaks*¹⁷. Thus began a period of Turkish interest, and part settlement, in the area.

With his appointment as Prince of Transylvania in 1658, Achatius Barcsay surrendered his control of property in the land of the three rivers, in return for Ottoman recognition of his title¹⁸. This allowed the Ottomans to incorporate the surrendered region into the vilayet of Temesvár, thereby laying the foundations for the future geographic entity of the Banat of Temesvár. Two wars were waged by the Emperor Leopold I in the 17th century, in an attempt to free the region from Turkish control¹⁹. Ofen, held by the Ottomans, was regained by the Imperial forces in 1686 and one year later forces under the command of Duke Charles of Lorraine engaged and defeated the Turkish army near Peterwardein, at the battles of Mohács and Essek²⁰. Many inhabitants fled and moved into the Banat, seeking protection. After the reconquest of Ofen it was clear to the Austrian forces that the territory would only be held if loyal subjects were settled, and in 1689 an Imperial Commission for the Government of Hungary (*Kaiserliche Kommission zur Einrichtung Ungarns*) was created, with the aim of attracting German settlers. In a phrase which finds real resonance with purity of the blood debates in Spain and the Spanish Americas, the Viennese administration noted, it was to be hoped 'that the Kingdom, or at least a greater part of it, might become increasingly Germanicised, that the Hungarian blood, which is naturally inclined to revolution and disquiet, might be tempered with the German, and thereby brought to a constant trust and love of their natural, hereditary monarchy and nobility'²¹. German settlers were conceived as the best bastion against the enemy, all other ethnic groups, in this so-called *terra deserta*²². Indeed, they were envisaged as a bulwark of Christianity (*eine Vormauer der Christenheit*) and German colonisation was planned with this in mind²³.

In the summer of 1689, one of the most famous characters of the Turkish wars, the Margrave Ludwig of Baden, 'Türken Louis', moved into Serbia. He and his troops were soon forced on the defensive and retreated, giving protection to the Archbishop Arsenije Carnojevic and some 30,000 Serbian families. This 'Great Migration' retreated to the safety of the Habsburg-held region north of the Danube. Many of these families were resettled in Hungary²⁴. The attacking forces, under the command of the Grand Vezir Köprülü, moved on Belgrade and Ofen and the region once again came under Turkish domination. War with France in 1689 meant Habsburg troops were diverted from the eastern to the western front and the momentum of the previous twelve months was in danger of being lost.

But war in the Banat was far from over. Victory in Temesvár was becoming the obvious climax to a war now being fought in an ever decreasing theatre of engagement. In the late summer of 1696, Elector Prince Friedrich August of Saxony began the siege of Temesvár, just as Count Starhemberg heard of the defeat of the Imperial fleet and the approach of the Sultan and his forces²⁵. In a battle which cost over 10,000 lives, the Sultan was defeated by Starhemberg at the Pusta Hetin, near Tomasevac, and he retreated after sending 16,000 men to reinforce Temesvár. Sultan Mustafa II mustered his forces for a final battle and on 11 September 1697 faced the united Imperial forces under the command of Prince Eugene of Savoy at the Battle of Zenta²⁶. The Turkish infantry was totally destroyed, while the Sultan's cavalry was forced to retreat to Temesvár, leaving a large booty for the victorious army²⁷. Just as Louis XIV had done earlier, the Turks made a major miscalculation²⁸.

With the end of this phase in the Austro-Turkish wars in 1699, the Treaty of Carlowitz (Karlowitz, Sremski Karlovci) confirmed Habsburg victory and at least temporary control of the region. Austria won control of Turkish Hungary, Transylvania, Slavonia, a part of Srem, and Lika and Krbava in Croatia²⁹. The Batschka was also ceded to the Habsburgs and was administered as part of Hungary, through the employment of thirteen garrisons along the River Tisza to Titel and across the slopes of the Fruška Gora to the banks of the Sava river³⁰. A Military Frontier (*Militärgrenze*), in existence since the 1530s, created a bulwark of retired and discharged soldiers and their families in small permanent outposts, numerically supported by colonists drawn from the Empire and the conquered territories³¹. The Banat of Temesvár, however, remained under Ottoman rule. More importantly, the Carlowitz Treaty represented a significant change in Austro-Turkish relations; while the possibility of an Ottoman attack and invasion had once caused European powers to cower, now it was the Turks' turn to dread Habsburg advances³². And the Austrians quickly came to realise that the powerful momentum which had brought them victories thus far might bring further results. Ottoman military and civil government was in decline, albeit temporarily, and this was nowhere expressed more arrogantly than in the comments of a Habsburg envoy in Constantinople, who, just sixteen years after the signing of the Treaty intimated that an Austrian army might easily march all the way to the Ottoman capital, expelling the Turk from Europe along the way³³.

Even before the Banat of Temesvár was regained by the Habsburgs, Prince Eugene of Savoy had clear aims for the region and its role in the Empire. One view of his aims and hopes is summed up in Hugo von Hofmannsthal's words: 'He conquered, and where he conquered, he secured and won provinces back by the sword and truly won them. Unexpectedly the flower of peace blossomed in his creative hands. Behind his army followed the colonists'

plough and in the forests their axe' ³⁴. By settling the area with loyal, German, crown subjects, four key aspects of the Habsburg plan would be fulfilled. The planting of a loyal population would, it was hoped by example, help in making the native Magyar population loyal, for they were suspected to be untrustworthy; Hungary would be buffered and sealed off from the rest of the Balkans; the rich and fertile lands of the Banat would become the grain basket of the monarchy; and German culture would be carried farther east ³⁵.

The Banat had long been seen as the pivotal territory upon which the control of all contiguous areas depended. Savoy had seen the conquest of Belgrade and Temesvár as keystones in the future defence of the Habsburg lands, and the ultimate defeat of the Ottoman Empire ³⁶. Were it not for Emperor Leopold's need to bring the war with the Turks to a speedy conclusion, Eugene might very well have retaken Temesvár before the end of the century ³⁷. Securing the *status quo* was the highest aim for the Emperor at the turn of the 18th century; indeed, it is obvious from initial moves made in the last decade of the 17th century that security, through the planting of loyal colonists, and not agriculture, was the primary strategic motive behind colonisation drives ³⁸. With the attempted re-incorporation of the Batschka, a new Military Frontier was created between 1702 and 1715 along the river Mures, incorporating thirteen settlements from Subotica to Arad and Csanad ³⁹. While the Ottoman forces may have looked upon the Treaty of Carlowitz as an armistice ⁴⁰, the Habsburgs, and Savoy in particular, saw the conquering of the Danube line as the end of Turkish military power in the Mediterranean and the acquisition of an 'entrance door to the Banat' ⁴¹. Attention in Central Europe was turned, after the Peace of Carlowitz, to the position of the Banat in the hope that it could be retaken as quickly as possible.

Within two decades the situation in the Balkans had changed, and the war of 1716-1718 culminated in Habsburg gains at the Peace of Passarowitz (Pozarevac): the Banat was once again in Habsburg hands. Temesvár had been secured by the Austrian forces in October 1716 ⁴². The satisfaction which this gave the long-besieging forces is evident from communications between the administrative centres. On the 16th October, the Imperial War Office (*Kaiserliche Hofkriegsrat*) notified the Austrian and Bohemian Court Chanceries (*Hofkanzlei*) in German, and the Hungarian and Spanish Office in Latin, of the proud conquest, with the help of the Almighty, of the city and fortification of Temesvár four days earlier ⁴³. In fact, a day of celebrations, the 18 October, was set aside for thanksgiving in the Imperial capital, Vienna ⁴⁴. The capture of Temesvár did not mark the end of war with the Ottomans, as Emperor Charles VI was tied in alliance with the Venetian Republic. However there can be no doubt that the conquest of the principal town in the Banat was Charles' primary aim ⁴⁵.

It is quite certain that the first German settlers in the Banat during and after reconquest were soldiers and traders; the aptly named Lagerdorf ('Camptown') dates its foundation to 1716-1717 and was on the site of a cavalry barracks ⁴⁶. Settlers, as has been mentioned above, were already living in Temesvár, the largest town of the Banat and its capital; a German Magistrate, Tobias Balthasar Hold from Frankenhausen in Bavaria, was appointed to the city on New Year's Day 1718 ⁴⁷. Approximately three hundred German tradesmen also arrived in the Banat early in the same year, with representatives of five guilds in the walled 'Little Vienna' by early 1719: masons, carpenters, brickmakers, butchers and shoemakers ⁴⁸. The necessity to get residents into the region immediately is evident from the appeals in the

Hereditary Lands (*Erblände*) in February 1719 for colonists, mainly tradesmen and farmers⁴⁹. This is comparable to the establishment of Jamestown on the New England coast in the early 17th century. In Temesvár, just as Jamestown, the exploitative mission took precedence over the civilising mission in the first years of settlement⁵⁰. In the first three years after the Treaty of Passarowitz settlement was either chain-linked, the direct result of soldiers returning to the Banat to settle land they had helped conquer, or was small scale agricultural settlement. This settlement was often from the Austrian lands: the foundation of Weisskirchen in the autumn of 1717, of Deutsch Sankt Peter in 1718, and of the vinegrowing settlement of Kudritz in 1719 are all representative of settlements in this period.

MINORITIES AND ADMINISTRATION IN HABSBURG HUNGARY

The period after the Peace of Westphalia changed the face of Europe and by the end of 1683 the Turks were on the defensive. Successive Habsburg Emperors regained control of international armies, ushering in a period of revived hope for the Viennese court. The possibility of acquiring the whole of Hungary, wafted tantalisingly before the Habsburgs in the early 16th century but quickly stolen away by the Ottoman armies, now reappeared. Hungarian nobles' hopes of regaining their ancestral lands were misguided, as the Habsburg court had decided even before the kingdom was retaken that the lands were to become *neo acquisita*, the booty property of the victorious Emperor. Hungarian counterclaims were more publically ignored after the failed *Kuruc* revolts and it became clear to Vienna that these lands, now a frontier which might be pushed ever further south and east, would need to be inhabited with more loyal subjects of the crown from the German lands. For these they looked to those who might be induced to risk their lives on the frontier in exchange for the possibility of gaining farms and fertile land. For the first time, the Habsburg administration found itself in the role of coloniser: not in the *terra incognita* of the Americas, nor in the *res nullius* of the Pacific, but in the 'lost lands' of Europe⁵¹.

The Habsburgs thus became colonial enterprisers in a way which superficially resembled their British, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Swedish and Danish royal peers, but in the relatively unique position of colonisers within the European continent. The experiment of colonial government which led Sweden to colonise New Sweden in North America took place in the Nordic north in the lands of the Sami; Britain had its colonial experiment in Ireland before venturing to New England in North America. The Habsburg Empire had its experiment in the Banat of Temesvár (the Banat) in Hungary, before pushing later in the 18th century into Galicia in the north and thereafter consolidating her government of the northern Balkans in the 19th century. The Banat became the Habsburg beehive: a model of colonial government desired and advocated. For the Empire to produce the rich honey of success, industrious worker bees would need to tend the land, feed from the fruit of the earth, and serve their Queen⁵². The by-product of this ordered society was sweet success and contentment for all. The under-populated, in part depopulated, Banat cried out for industrious workers, and colonists were promised great success in this land of milk and honey. But the model was doubly apt for the Banat, where it was also used: the beehive was both a blueprint for industry and commerce, and at the same time a paradigm for the construction of an ordered and disciplined society. Just as the hive provided a powerful model for the emergence of British colonies on the shifting and conflicted North America fron-

tier, its inherent order allowed Habsburg state-builders to impose discipline and stability along the turbulent borderlands where Christianity and Islam collided. The 18th century ushered in choice for potential colonists, and competition was inevitable. Colonists, the worker bees who built 18th-century Empires, were presented with the one great directional choice: to go east or go west, to the Banat or to America.

The role and treatment of the Banat, and the ensuing policy there from the reign of Emperor Charles VI onward, would in many ways form the basis for imperial thinking and planning until the early 20th century⁵³. Prince Eugene of Savoy, the valiant warrior-prince who served three emperors, had fought for the capture of this land, not that it might be returned to the Hungarian Crown, but rather that it might be used as an experiment in government, which might in turn provide models for the rest of the Empire⁵⁴. This was to be a land recreated for, and to be turned to the advantage of, Germans and German-loyalists, at the expense of the resident Magyars, Slavs and other groups.

When Eugene first arrived in the Banat he was faced with a mixed ethnic population of principally Magyars⁵⁵, with Romanians, Serbs and Bulgarians, and even fewer Germans, totalling approximately 80-85,000 in all, in a total of 663 ill-maintained villages⁵⁶. As reflected agricultural trends, most Serbs lived on the plains, with Romanians in the foothills and Magyars along the River Maros⁵⁷. The majority of Serb families were engaged in pastoral husbandry; the later enclosure of land carried out by German colonist families would lead to great problems with the Serb population. Two obvious alternatives presented themselves to the Viennese administration. First, the reconquered land could continue to be used for extensive pasture farming, requiring no great new colonisation drive. Second, the fertile plains of the Banat might be cultivated, requiring an increased population for both the amelioration and settlement of the land. The Banat was not to be returned to the Hungarian Chamber for government, but was to be established as a Cameral Province: Count Claudius Florimund Mercy called the area 'a Land without Lords and rulers, in which everything is *pures camerale*'⁵⁸. Although Mercy requested that the old Magyar county system, in existence since before the Turkish occupation, be restored, the eight Turkish *sandzhaks* which had been the administrative departments under Ottoman rule were replaced by thirteen military districts, each ruled by an Administrator (*Verwalter*), similar to those introduced for the Batschka in 1699⁵⁹. This reorganisation of government in the area resulted initially in the *provisorische Cameral-Einrichtungs-kommission*, later replaced by the Banat of Temesvár Council of Government (*Landes-Administration des Temesvarer Banats*), a reform accepted by the Viennese Court Chamber on 30 December 1717⁶⁰.

The most important individual in the early stages of the settlement of the Banat was Count Claudius Florimund Mercy, a native of Lorraine in the service of Austria, later to be called the 'Father of the Banat'⁶¹. Named on 1 November 1716 as Military and Civil Governor of the region by Prince Eugene, Mercy was entrusted with the reconstruction of the territory, ravaged after decades of war. On one point both Mercy and Eugene agreed: Temesvár was to be populated by Germans alone, with Serbs, and especially Jews, being denied the right of residence. Only in later years would Jews be permitted to live within the city walls, undertaking financial and administrative tasks deemed unfit for Christian residents⁶². All the while, the Magyars waited for permission to reclaim lands 'occupied' for over one hundred and fifty years by the Ottomans⁶³.

Mercy was given free hand to plan and organise the colonisation of the Banat. Thought highly of by both the Emperor Charles VI and Prince Eugene, he was an obvious choice as first Governor General of the newly conquered Banat, being entrusted with the economic, social and structural rehabilitation and development of the new territory, as well as its repopulation. It has been suggested that Mercy's principal aims during his repopulation drives in the Banat were to delimit the role of Hungarian landowners and, where possible, to replace them entirely by new German settlers; that Mercy effectively sanctioned the forcible removal of Magyars from their homes⁶⁴. Others propose that Mercy practised a deliberate policy of *divide et impera*, an integral part of an 18th-century Habsburg policy of reducing Hungary to a subservient position and thereby hindering any possibility of the growth of Hungarian nationalism in the same century⁶⁵. This seems highly unlikely, in the light of Mercy's own comments and vocabulary concerning the region; commenting on the Magyars he noted that the Banat 'could really not have been in better hands'⁶⁶.

As well as the Magyars a number of other ethnic and national groups were found living in the Banat by Mercy: Serbs (Ratzen)⁶⁷; Romanians; Greeks; Jews and Gypsies, the latter three groups being tolerated to a varying extent. Because of their nomadic lifestyle, migratory Gypsies could not be registered or conscripted, although the Banat Administration did hope to document all members of this 'category'⁶⁸. In the early stages of agricultural development Gypsies provided newly-settled farmers with essential nails, scythes and knives⁶⁹.

Jewish residents of the Banat were similarly tolerated. Just as Gypsies filled the early 18th-century skills-vacuum created by the lack of tradesmen, Jews were offered greater tolerance in the second and third decades of the century, acting as merchants and traders and generally engaged in financial matters. Many were engaged in highly important positions, such as army suppliers, essential for the speedy reintegration of the region into the Empire⁷⁰. Numbers of Jews and Jewish families are even more difficult to calculate than in the case of the Gypsies, as their numbers are entirely left out of the documentation⁷¹. Jews from the Ottoman Empire were totally forbidden to enter the Banat, unless they could produce a certificate proving they had paid the *Harrasch*, a tax placed on Gypsies and Jews⁷². The situation continued to deteriorate for Jews until 1736, when General Johann Hamilton ordered all 'superfluous' Jews to depart from the region, claiming they were robbing Christian merchants of business⁷³. It is impossible to approach a figure of how many Jews lived in the Banat, but it is possible that the figure of 960 was not exceeded from 1734 onwards, when this was set as the maximum number tolerable in the entire Banat⁷⁴.

Greeks resident in the region in the early 18th century were neither counted nor treated as part of the official resident population: These 'Greeks', the name given to Ottoman resident traders and including Bulgars, Armenians, Greeks and other Balkan residents, and merchants resident in the Banat at the time of reconquest, had special privileges bestowed upon them⁷⁵.

The final group belonging to the so-called 'Nationalities'⁷⁶, the Vlachs, lived predominantly in the highlands of the south and east and together with the Serbs constituted the largest ethnic 'nation' in the Banat⁷⁷. Contemporary travellers commented on the extremely poor living standards of these two groups: the Administration did attempt to improve their standard of living, paying particular attention to the miserable housing arrangements many families tolerated, which were little more than huts put together prin-

cipally from earth⁷⁸. Others commented on the similarities of the Raitzes and Vlachs with the Gypsies⁷⁹. The Vlachs and Raitzes were predominantly Orthodox in belief and under Imperial privilege they benefitted from the *Exercitium liberum religionis*, granting them freedom of religious practice in their own churches and with their own ministers⁸⁰. Suggestions were made to limit their privileges and freedom of movement, with a proposal to settle them in the districts of Orawitz and Maydanbek and to employ them, under heavy guard, in the newly established mining industry⁸¹. A small number of Catholic Raitzes were also found in the Banat.

Since 1699 and the first victories against the Turks, private landowners had invited settlers to come and settle their new lands. Mercy's imperial actions were, therefore, an imitation of private initiative. The Esterhazy, Karolyi and Zichy families all maintained claims of ownership to lands occupied by the Turks down to the Treaty of Passarowitz⁸². Private settlements, the seed of all future state and entrepreneurial colonisation attempts, took place from 1689, and continued to be of great importance in the repopulation of the Batschka, in the Tolnau (for example, in Högyész), in the *Schwäbische Türkei*, on the Esterhazy lands in the Saar and Boglar, and in other parts of Hungary⁸³. And leading members of church and state became involved in the re-settlement of Hungary with German colonists at this early stage. Cardinal Leopold Count Kollonich's 'Imperial and Royal Impopulation Patent' of 1689 was the first document to invite residents of the Empire to come and settle areas of Hungary won back during the Turkish wars⁸⁴. Under the patent's terms, all residents of the Habsburg inherited lands (*Inländer*), were to be granted three, other migrants five, years' residence tax free. One early example of a settlement resulting from the patent of 1689 was that at Keszöhidegkút (Tolnau), which in 1702 had newly settled residents originally from Hesse, Bavaria, Fulda, Würzburg, the Palatinate and Alsace⁸⁵. Settlers came to the new Hungarian regions mostly by chance and on hearsay, however, as no organised system of recruitment or transplantation existed to enable easy transition from the area of departure to the site of relocation.

The incentives of greatest interest to potential settlers must have been the promised freedom from serfdom (*Leibeigenschaft*) and the promise of free land. Renewed Turkish attacks on German settlements, and a heightening of *Kuruc* activity in the period to 1711, meant that many of the recent settlers were killed, returned home or moved to safer areas. Private landowners needed to become more actively engaged in the recruitment of potential settlers. As a direct consequence of the fall-off in self motivated 'chain migration' private landowners thought of engaging individuals to travel throughout the Empire in search of potential colonists. It is because these agents needed Imperial passports, granting them freedom of movement throughout areas of the Empire, that their record survives; indeed, many of them were actively supported by the Emperor, as loyal settlers consolidated the strength of the Habsburgs along their frontier with the Ottoman empire.

FIRST ATTEMPTS AT PLANTING THE BANAT

There can be no doubt that the early success experienced in the recruitment of colonists for Hungary, and in the plantation of German villages in the Banat, was positively linked to the actions of individual plantation undertakers⁸⁶. The interests of local Hungarian

landowners led to the briefing of recruitment agents who would make best use of local knowledge. This process began in the first and second decades of the 18th century in Hungary, but was familiar in other colonial drives from centuries earlier. Agents would take responsibility for promoting the new territory to potential colonists; they would act as an interface between commercial interests and bureaucracy; between the 'Planter' class of landowners and both colonists and governmental bureaucracy; as sources of local knowledge for the government and as ambassadors of knowledge to the sources of labour in the Empire⁸⁷. Ladislaus Döry de Jóbaháza, owner of land in and around the vicinity of Tevel in the Tolnau, may have been the first such agent to be granted Imperial sanction to recruit settlers within the Empire for his new land, being given the title 'Crown Agent' in 1712⁸⁸. Acting as a 'Chief Agent' (*Imperial War Office-Agent*) of sorts, Döry on 25 July 1712 wrote 'I have, for my property Tevel in the County of Tolnau, need of more than one thousand subjects, which I promise to have delivered within three years, through my own and royal funding'⁸⁹.

Döry placed a recruiting agent, Franz Felbinger, in Württemberg, where he travelled from city to city. Reaching Biberach, in Upper Swabia, Felbinger commenced work as a Chancery Clerk (*Kanzlist*). Knowing Württemberg quite well, he zealously recruited for the settlement of Tevel, receiving an unknown amount (*Kopfgeld*) for each settler he registered. In the autumn of 1713 between six and seven hundred individuals, close to one hundred families, passed along the Danube through Vienna, where they were given passports, on their way to Döry's estates in Tevel. An observer wrote on 10 January 1714 'Döry has had a number of Swabians delivered on two ships to his Tevel estate', and these were followed by a further 27 families in autumn of that same year⁹⁰. Through examining the place of origin of these migrants, as listed on the Viennese passports, it becomes obvious that the attributed name 'Swabians' (*Schwaben*) was erroneous. Most of these families came from Baden, specifically from Mahlberg, and from Biberach in Württemberg. It was Felbinger who received permission from Emperor Charles VI to recruit freely throughout Swabia. In 1718 in Riedlingen, Württemberg, Felbinger also had the first advertising pamphlet for the Banat printed, which appeared in a number of different newspapers and broadsheets, and which offered many promises and advantages to individuals willing to move to Hungary⁹¹. It was distributed widely in the province⁹².

MODE, METHOD AND MEANS: THE MECHANICS OF IMMIGRATION

This settlement offer of 1718 may very well have become the prototype for future settlement advertising, including, as it does, the issues of village government, of passports and of the religious life of the new villages. Although many settlers did accept this new invitation and were transported to the Tolnau, they did not travel in the numbers hoped for or expected. This may be because Felbinger was also working towards the colonisation of other privately-owned regions, such as Kovácsi and Kisdorog, which were also in the possession of the Döry family⁹³. The number of private landowners competing for German colonists also began to increase⁹⁴.

Before the assembled group might continue to their new homes in Hungary, they required an Imperial passport granting them freedom to travel. A group passport was more usually

granted, which allowed immigrants the freedom to proceed along the Danube and to pass through the many customs posts relatively unhindered and under Imperial protection. Most group passports outlined the criteria under which the group was permitted to travel; the document typically contained a clause which forbade any member of the group from disembarking their vessel, particularly when travelling through the Imperial *Residenzstadt* Vienna⁹⁵. This proviso had an element of foresight, as many colonists attempted to stay in Vienna, or to disembark along the route, having accepted the temptingly competitive offers of rival landowners.

Indeed, a major problem for Imperial-sanctioned colonisation in the Banat occurred when colonists, initially recruited in the Empire by Imperial agents, were 'stolen' *en route* by agents working for private landowners. This allowed private landowners to cheaply recruit colonists, saving themselves the bother of sending recruiters into the Empire. The problem must have continued, as an ever increasing number of agents promised to escort those settlers they had gathered all the way to their new land, indicating that the problem had grown to a stage where it was threatening their livelihood. Much money could be lost by an investor or landowner who paid for the initial advertising and recruitment by an agent and then had his settlers enticed away from him by rival agents, typically at Dunaföldvár, Paks or Tolna. Döry must have experienced some financial loss, perhaps more than once, in his attempts to transport settlers from the Empire to his estates at Tevel, as his agent Felbinger put great emphasis on his promise of personally escorting all colonists under his charge, that they might not 'go missing'.

The luring away of colonists *en route* had negative consequences not just for those financially involved in the venture, but also, more drastically, for the longterm colonial enterprise. The negative publicity which accompanied such events damaged the standing of both landowners and agents, but especially the latter group. The poor reputation of many agents discouraged many potential colonists from emigrating. Many colonists were misled by rival agents in the early years of the century and a large number found life on their new properties to be more difficult than they had hoped. Many were forced to supplement their primary occupation, generally tillage, with an additional source of income. The broken promises of landowners too caused many to regret their decision to move⁹⁶.

As a result, towns, cities and city states were appreciating for the first time a concern which was not to diminish during the century: the issue of *Rückmigranten* or returning migrants. In 1712, the free and imperial city of Ulm, so important for travel on the River Danube and a centre for the collection of colonists for Hungary from all over the Empire, was presented with news of migrants, previously processed through Ulm, now in an impoverished state on the return trip to the city. In June of the same year news reached Ulm from Vienna that many people were begging in the city and that those healthy enough were travelling by foot, those unable, by boat, to Ulm. Fearing a possible epidemic of the 'Hungarian sickness', Ulm magistrates attempted to have these boats stopped before they reached the city, or if this was not successful to have them travel on to Offingen. When on 22 September two boats laden with sick colonists reached Leipheim, a distance of twelve miles from Ulm, they were held and medically tended to at the cost of the city of Ulm. Potential migrants were frequently warned by their city or

indeed by their religious leaders of the dangers involved in moving to Hungary, but not always for philanthropic reasons. The Imperial Prince Abbot of Fulda, Constantin von Buttlar, used the testimony of one returned 'failed' colonist to highlight the foolishness of believing all promises made by landowners and agents⁹⁷. Konrad Röder had been to Hungary and returned complaining that 'a German would not like to live there.' The Abbot went on to warn against the 'Movement to Hungary', and stipulated that only those returning with a minimum of 200 florins might be allowed re-entry to the territory, as a preventive measure against the region becoming the theatre for 'the movement back and forth of beggars'⁹⁸.

It is in the light of these private settlements that Mercy's settlement drive in the Banat must be seen. By virtue of being Governor of the Banat of Temesvár, Mercy was responsible for official colonisation, but he was also owner of private lands which he wished to settle. With a purchase contract dated 24 April 1722, signed at Preßburg (Pozsony/Bratislava), Mercy acquired the middle-Tolnau lands of Count Friedrich Christian Zinzendorf in the Schwäbische Türkei, comprising the estate of Högyész (Völgyész) with all villages and towns within that estate⁹⁹. Having secured the right of *Indigenat* in 1723, which entitled him to ownership rights in the area, his purchase was acknowledged in a deed signed by the Emperor in his capacity as king of Hungary, 'King Charles III', dated Prague, 27 August 1723¹⁰⁰. Colonists for these, his private, lands were diverted from those originally gathered and organised for the state-sponsored settlement of the *neo-acquisita* Banat of Temesvár. This act of the Hungarian Diet of 1723 on 'the Resettlement of the Kingdom of Hungary', has been seen as 'the fundamental law of Danube-Swabian colonization' and offers us an early example of the often conflicting roles of the state and state officials acting in their own private interests¹⁰¹.

***UBI POPULUS, IBI OBULUS.* RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND THE SETTLEMENT OF PRIVATE ESTATES**

Claudius Mercy most likely made full use of one complication arising from open-ended advertising for the Banat. Substantial numbers of Lutherans and Calvinists offered themselves as potential colonists in the first years of colonization, but were rejected colonist status in the Banat because of their religion. While the personal views of Emperor Charles VI are none too clear on the subject of Protestant settlement in the Banat, as the period continued the blatant disregard of colonists' religious affiliation indicated the state preferment for the Banat to become a bulwark of Christianity, made up of any Christians, not just Roman Catholics. This was most likely the situation with the first settlers of Högyész, who were originally intent on settling in the Banat but were diverted from their course. Captain Vátzy, an agent under pay and instruction of Mercy, was sent to Vienna, where he was instructed to dissuade colonists from their planned course of travel and escort them to his Tolnau estate. This juxtaposition of private and state settlement led, on the one hand, to an apparent disregard for all but the letter of the law, and on the other a competition of Mercy's own making in the market for colonists. Mercy devised a segregated policy for the settlement of all colonists, along ethnic and religious affiliation lines; religion and ethnicity were both to act as forms of social cement in the new colony. Villages were to be settled not merely by newly-arrived

Germans, but by Germans of the same religious affiliation¹⁰². Another important figure in the colonisation of the Tolnau was Count Styrum-Lymburg, who brought colonists from Hesse-Kassel and Hanau to Simontornya, Nagyszékely and Udvari in 1720¹⁰³. It is even possible to speculate on the strategic choice of village location in the Banat: there appears to have been a deliberate plan to favour and protect those villages established by Mercy in his private estates¹⁰⁴.

One change did occur under the Mercy regime after 1718. All subsequent settlement attempts during the reign of Charles VI were state-sponsored and state-controlled. Private settlement continued on privately owned land in the Batschka and in other regions of Hungary, but settlement in the Banat was to be different. This resulted from Prince Eugene's conviction that only through direct Imperial rule could the region be held and peace maintained¹⁰⁵. Eugene had expressed this view even before Temesvár came into Habsburg possession: 'In this I am and shall remain of the opinion, that neither the present nor any future considerations of peace can [...] recommend incorporation with the relevant Kingdom [i.e. Hungary] nor as a special province of Transylvania'¹⁰⁶. Temesvár was to be representative of the entire Banat, being inhabited by loyal German subjects alone; 'Let no further foreigners in', as General Marshall Franz Paul Wallis wrote to Prince Eugene¹⁰⁷. By the 1 January 1718, there was already a noticeable increase in the number of German colonist families granted *Bürgerrecht* in Temesvár¹⁰⁸. But crucially, an established economic system facilitated the introduction and settlement of German settlers in the years surrounding and following reconquest.

The example set by private landowners, colonising their estates with German families recruited from the Empire, became the model for all future private and government-sponsored colonisation in the Banat. From Mercy's own experience of planting his private estates in the region with German colonists, grew a plan for the settlement of the entire Banat. Conscious of the tax-paying ability of a large population – *ubi populus, ibi obulus* – Mercy's plan was to attract as many loyal, German subjects as possible¹⁰⁹. While we know Mercy was not the first to settle new territories in Hungary with colonists, he was the first to do so on such a large, organised scale. It was hoped that security and agricultural success would result from this transplantation¹¹⁰.

Following Mercy's return from campaigns in Sicily in the summer of 1721, the organisation of full settlement could be undertaken. It was planned in this initial plantation to settle the areas of Jarmata, Neu-Arad, Werschetz, Orawitza and Alt-Moldova with subjects of the Empire¹¹¹. For Mercy at least it was undoubtedly logical to engage an agent who was fully *au fait* with the territory in question and who would successfully use his local knowledge to attract the maximum number of colonists. The individual judged most qualified for this was Franz Albert Craußen (Crauss/Krauß), originally from the Rhineland, a tax collector who had been sent by Mercy immediately after reconquest to undertake a study of the Banat¹¹². On 15 December 1721 a resolution signed by Mercy and Samuel Franz von Rebentisch recognised the proposals forwarded by Craußen for the colonisation of the Banat and secured for him permission to travel throughout the Empire. In 1722 Craußen travelled to Vienna, where he was given a Passport (*Passbrief*) permitting him to travel in the Empire and organise the transportation of 600 families to the Banat¹¹³. Craußen organised an advertising office (*Kolonistenwerbe Büro*) and an office to arrange the transportation of

colonists (*Speditionen Büro*) in Worms. A similar 'forwarding' office for colonists was opened in the important city of Regensburg on the Danube. Craußen promised to bring many families from the Rhineland, but was to experience at first hand the difficulties in keeping control of all 'his' settlers, preventing them from being tempted away by private landowners who offered more competitive treatment on their estates. In a report dated Vienna 1722, Craußen reported to the Court Chamber on the fate of 600 German families he had recruited to escort to the Banat.

Only a small number ever succeeded in making it to the region, the greater number being tempted away by Magyar agents working for private Hungarian landowners¹¹⁴. Travelling with his passport and a printed copy of the terms on offer to settlers in the Banat, Craußen reached Regensburg at the beginning of April and was one month later found in Worms, actively engaged in advertising and recruiting. On 8 April he secured a contract with the River Master (*Floßmeister*) at Lechbrück, Thomas Ott, wherein it was agreed that all colonists sent by Craußen to either Marxheim or Neuburg in Bavarian Swabia would be shipped up the Danube to the Banat¹¹⁵.

Colonists were required to reach one of the Danubian ports at their own expense—often a journey of between one hundred and one hundred and fifty kilometres. From the ports onwards – typically Regensburg, Neuburg, Donauwörth, or Marxheim – they travelled along the Danube, through Bavaria, in the direction of Vienna, at the expense of the Temesvár Council of Government. In Vienna, all colonists over the age of fifteen years received their travel money, one Thaler, from the agent Bruckentheiss. Leaving Vienna, and at the end of an average six weeks on the Danube, the colonists travelled through Belgrade to Neu Palanka (Új Palanka) or Pantschowa in the Banat, where they disembarked and were sent in the direction of their new homes¹¹⁶. Having lost so many colonists, the Court (Finance) Chamber was forced into action and Craußen's report was treated with the utmost seriousness. The Chamber issued four decrees, all dated 11 January 1723, which attempted to correct the situation and deter families already attracted by agents' offers from being tempted away. The fourth decree contains the first mention of the financial difficulties incurred by many families willing to be resettled, but unable to meet the immediate financial commitment necessary to uproot and move to the Banat. Potential colonists in the vicinity of Mainz, Trier and some Palatine districts were to be financially assisted to enable them to cover the often substantial costs in travelling to Ulm or Regensburg and from there onwards to Vienna and the Banat. This decision is supported by the issuing of another decree of the same date (11 January 1723) which laid out the sum of one Thaler, or one Gulden and thirty Kreuzer (1,30 fl.) for every adult, irrespective of gender, as 'Help Money'¹¹⁷. That the Court Chamber acted out of self interest in initiating these reforms is understandable; Craußen, too, was financially driven. 'Craußen was a very gifted official, but unfortunately also very greedy; he knew the entire Banat well, having being active there for many years'¹¹⁸.

Craußen, of course, relied very much on the support of the regional ruler in the districts in which he advertised. In a number of areas, he received much more; in Koblenz, for example, Count Johann Hugo Franz von Metternich-Winneburg, great-grandfather of the Austrian Chancellor Clemens von Metternich, organised his own advertising station in his house, *Metternicher Hof*, and gathered colonists from the surrounding Moselland for the

Banat¹¹⁹. Metternich-Winneburg further employed under-agents in the regions, so-called *Wahlmänner* because they ‘chose’ the particular colonists they wanted, usually Roman Catholics. The syphoning off of Protestant colonists *en route* to the Banat by private landowners for their own estates has been discussed above, in the context of the official settlement of Catholics alone, but a decree underlining the prohibition of Protestants settling in the Banat was issued on 21 July 1724¹²⁰. Despite Charles VI’s concern that colonists settle the region, supposedly irrespective of religion, it is clear that if colonists were to fall prey to private landowners, then the Administration preferred Protestant colonists to be this prey. *Wahlmänner* were clearly selected for their specific regional knowledge¹²¹. Most were also, as von Hamm points out¹²², chosen specifically because they were established farmers, some having already been in the Banat, and were not officials *per se*, but became so after their employment. It seems that it was an established, accepted part of colonising technique by this early stage that the best advertisers for the Banat were not officers of the state Chancery, but farmers, trademen and priests – representatives of ordinary, quotidian society. These were individuals who had experienced the ‘middle passage’ to the new region, they spoke the distinct regional dialect in which they recruited new colonists, and they preyed on regional socio-economic problems, promising success in Hungary. All these were aspects of the organisation of colonisation which governmental agents sent directly from Vienna or Buda might never hope to address. As well as the usual offers of 40 Morgen of land, of wood and other material for the building of a house, of four horses, a cow and farming machinery¹²³, many regions offered further incentives for their Catholic subjects to settle in the Banat, seeing them as Crusaders of old. Some migrants were offered the opportunity to return, should they so wish, without any repercussions, something which was rarely granted¹²⁴.

CONCLUSION

During the Caroline reign we may speak of two major periods of state-sponsored colonisation. The first from 1722 to 1726, was a government-sponsored plan organised by Mercy and relied heavily on the experience and expertise of agents and recruiters previously, or sometimes simultaneously, engaged by private landowners for the settlement of their own territories. During these five years approximately 20,000 Germans moved to and colonised the Banat¹²⁵. Serbs and Wallachians, as well as Spaniards, Italians, and a small number of Armenians and Bulgarians, also settled in the region¹²⁶. The second major period of colonisation, from 1734 to 1737, saw a 50% increase on the previous population, with the number of Serbs and Wallachians moving to the region being counted as similar to that of the new German families arriving¹²⁷. Many agree that the Turkish War of the late 1730s offered the Nationalists, and particularly the Romanians, the opportunity to avenge themselves on ‘the hated German colonist population’¹²⁸.

But irrespective of population depletion amongst the new German community in the Banat, the demographic structure of this Habsburg territory had been irrevocably changed. The seeds of Habsburg colonial interest in the region had been planted and knowledge of opportunities in the Banat would continue to disseminate throughout Europe, as a result of the settlements of the 1720s and 1730s. And while the Turkish wars of the 1730s halted migration

Zu wissen sey hiermit jedermänniglich besonders denen so daran gelegen / welcher Gestalten diejenige Teutsche Familien / welche nach denen Kaysrl. Hungarischen Erb- Landen / insonderheit den bawischen Teuchwarter Bannat abzugehen und sich daselbst Häußlich niederzulassen entschlossen seynd nachbeschriebener Kaysrl. Prærogativ- und Freyheiten ohnfehlbarlich zu genießen haben sollen.

Erstlich sollen besagten Familien einige Nahmhaffte sehr gute und wohlgelegene Städte Dörff- Flecken und Dörffer in erwehnten Bannat mit allen Appertinentien / als Haus- und Hof- Plätzen / Gärten / Obst- Bäumen / Aecker / Wiesen / Wem- Gärten und Vieh- Weid- eisen und erblisch und zwar umb sonst / als wann all solches vor baarem Geld wäre erkaufft worden / aus sonderbarem allerhöchsten Kaysrl. Hulden und Gnaden eingeräumt und so gleich bey deren dortigen Hinabkaufft nach Begheeren und Vermögen off- besagter Familien zugewiesen / auch selbde hierbey käufflich geschüezet werden:

Zweytens: Seynd dieselbe Krafft eines Kaysrl. Freyen Reichs- Patents / welches Endes bemeldter Kaysrl. Administrations- Fiscal Herr Johann Franz Hales Originaliter in Händen hat / allenthalben auff der Key- mit ihren eigenen Mobilien und Haus- Vorhürfften Holt- und Rauch- frey.

Drittens: Soll ihren Familien das erforderliche Bau- und Brenn- Holz / welches sie über dem allenthalben nahe bey Händen haben / auch umsonst verahfolget werden:

Viertens: Hiß ihm der freye Handel und Wandel gegen Entrichtung der gewöhnlichen Wauch- und Zehnkub- Erhebung erlaubet;

Fünftens: Seynd sic Familien dahin privilegiert / daß in ihren besitzenden Seid- / Marc- Flecken und Dörffern ohne ihren Willen kein Jud eingelassen werden solle.

Sechstens: Soll erwehnten Familien die zu ihrer Verbauung benötigte Stein und Kalk ohne einigen Steuern des Kaysrl. Erarii außgeschlozet werden;

Siebentens: Werden obgedachte Familien auff Ihre Kaysrl. und Königl. Cathol. Majestät alleinig Schiff- oder Floss- Transport- Kosten von Wartheim oder Regensburg an Ort und Ziel / wo selbige sich in mehr- besagten Bannat anßig zu machen gedencken / frey hinab gefuhret / wie dann auch

Achtens: Nach Begheeren ihnen Familien die zum Anbauen und eigener Subsistenz nöthige Früchten ohn entgeltlich vergelichen werden sollen / umb solchde demnach bey erfolgender guter Ernd- Einbringung in Natura hundertertum zu ersehen;

Neuntens: Wann auch etwaig 40. / 50. oder mehr Familien wegen guter Ein- Verständnuß sich zusammen schlozen sollen / umb allein unter sich zu wohnen / und einen gang neuen Ort außzurichten / wird und soll ihnen auch vor sich und ihrer anwachsende Kinder ein zulänglichcs Terratin an Waldung / Aecker / Wein- Gärten / Wiesen und Vieh- Weid alles vor eigen und ohne Befehlung des mindesten Pellers angewiesen und gewährt werden: Wir dann auch

Zehntens: Offters besagten Familien hiermit erlaubt seyn solle / so gleich einen Pfarrere oder Seelforger mit sich hinunter zu nehmen / umb solchen präsentieren und vorstellen zu können / welchem jedann

Elfens: Ein gewisses zulänglichcs Quantum oder Deputat von demen alldort eingehenden Frucht- und Wein- Zehnden / und das Uebrig nach proportion an baarem Geld auß der Kaysrl. Cammeral- Cassa zugewilt / für einen jeden auch ein bequamlisches Unterkommen oder Pfarr- Hof samneibus Arazii erbauet werden sollt:

Zwölffens: Sollt sic Familien auß aller- höchsten Kaysrl. Hulden und Gnaden zu Dero mehrerer Erbklecken- und Entpfer- Verlegung die erstere drey Jahr von aller Contribution- Anlag und Eingewortierung frey un- entzogen seyn / das darauff folgende vierdte Jahr soll ein jeder nur das Drittel der gangen Anlag / das fünfte Jahr zwey Drittel / und das sechste Jahr allereerst die ganze an sich gering- schüzigte Quotam zu entrichten haben; Damit aber

Dreyßigstens: ein jerr auch wilffe / wie viel die nöllige Anlag außtrant / als wird ihnen hiermit auch zugewilt hant anwacht / bey die Unterthanen in mehr- besagtem Bannat in drey Classen als ganzer- halbe und vor- ul- Bauer oder Bauern eingetheilt seyn / ein ganzer Bauer ist / welcher allein einen Pflug führet / ein halber Bauer wo ihrer zwey zusammen spannen / und ein Dritt- Bauer / wo ihrer drey oder vier einen gemein- schafflichen Pflug führen / und hat so gleich nach vollzogenen Fere- Jahren ein ganzer Bauer das ganze Jahr hant un- er hebt und in vorum großt Thaler / ein halber Bauer sechs / und der Viertels- Bauer drey Thaler abzutragen.

17 **Bedienstendens:** Seynd die Familien in mehrbesagten Käyserl. Erb-Landen ganz und gar Einer Schicklichkeit / Grob- Diensten / Siben aber Nachen außzugeben / wie sie dann nicht weniger auch
18 **Sibenendens:** Immediate rüthig und allein Käyserlich / Feindt wegd aber eines Fürsten und Keyser aber sonder Privat- Brand- Heren Unterthanen seyn und bleiben sollen. Welche Familien dennoch als
 -Der. Köm. Reichs Landen entschlossen seynd / sich vorbestehender Käyserl. Prærogativ- und Reichs-Regalien zu bedienen / und unter dem Schutze S. M. Köyserl. und Königl. Cathol. Majest. in dieser ansehnlichen Eintrags-Banner zu nehmen / können sich bey dem als besonders zu sechsen Geschäfte abgetretene
 Notmach- Erager dem Käyserl. Administration- Fiscal- Herr Johann Franz Falck zu Worms in
 sein Behausung / sohan zu Franckfurt in dessen Verordnungs- bey dessen Burger und Kaufmann Hertzog
 hann Georg Müller bestehend anmelden / tollern Bericht einlegen / sich ordentlich protocolliren lassen
 und Auherrischer Paß- Porten zu bezeln sicher und ohne hinderren Fortkommen geröthig seyn. Der
 Transport wird in nachfolgendem 1723. Jahr von Marzheim auß abgeben / den 17. August / von Kienburg
 den 19. August / sohan der Forste und Vögte von Waichheim den 17. Septemb. / von Ruyt / den
 19. September unter jedermahliger Begleitung darselbst Auherrlichen Käyserl. Transport- Officianten.

(L.S.) **Johann Franz Falck / Käyserl.**
Administration- Fiscal.

Fig. 1
 The first Advertisement by the Imperial Administration's appointed 'Fiskal', Johann Franz Falck, at Worms, early 1723, Landesarchiv Speyer, C 14/342.

into the region, it was a temporary cessation of the settlement drive which had been set in motion and which had acquired a momentum of its own. The colonial ventures undertaken by Döry, Eugene of Savoy and Mercy, and others, employing agents to populate their private estates, set in train a larger colonial enterprise which was to reach full momentum under a new Habsburg administration after 1740. The self-motivated objectives of these private estate owners should not be seen as wholly without benefit to the Habsburg government of the Banat of Temesvár. The seeds of the colonial repopulation of the Banat were sown in the period to 1740: the fruit of these labours was harvested in the succeeding decades.

Thus, by the end of the reign of Charles VI in 1740, the process of colonizing the Banat of Temesvár was in progress, with tentative networks of communication established between new settlements and the places of origin of the German colonists. The government in Vienna was willing to commit some money to the organisation of a recruitment campaign, while remaining cognisant of the lack of any financial return from this venture, at least in the first years. If money was to be spent, then preference was given to the payrolling of recruiter-agents, seen as the best value for money, who might solicit German colonists to come to the region. As we have seen, the Banat was devoid neither of population nor of ambitious plans, with soldiers, bureaucrats and settlers all vying for the opportunity to enscribe their hopes and ambitions on the land. The Banat was far from devoid of ethnic minorities; Magyars, Serbs, Greeks, Vlachs, Bulgars and Wallachians all inhabited the area, but were not registered on the increasingly racialised Habsburg governmental screen. Equally evident is the tension, from this first period in the Habsburg government of the region, between private landowners and those agents working for the state. While more than 20,000 colonists arrived from the German Empire (and a small minority from Italy and Spain came to southern Hungary between circa 1718 and circa 1740) not all settlers came at the invitation of the Viennese administration.

This is important caveat, reminding us that recruiting agents worked for private and state enterprises, meeting different and at times contradictory labour demands, but at all

times privileging German colonists over local, native, groups. Racial discrimination became a defining element of central European government with the Viennese administration privileging 'established' groups, namely Germans and those from the Austrian inherited lands, over southern and south-eastern Europeans, including Magyars, Slavs, Wallachians and Gypsies. Colonization, with its particular and pronounced German accent, could not have taken place without the actions of such individuals as Craußen, Falck, or Wagner. And the personal interests of a monarch who had real memories of ethnic rule in peninsular Spain, could never be under-estimated: it was under a Habsburg who did not wear the imperial crown, Maria Theresia, that the greatest bulwark of colonization would later be built.



NOTES

- ¹ R. Robinson, *Non-European Foundations of European Imperialism: Sketch for a Theory of Collaboration*, R. Owen, R. Sutcliffe, *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism*, London 1972, pp. 117-142; R. Drayton, *Nature's Government. Science, Imperial Britain, and the 'Improvement' of the World*, New Haven - London 2000, esp. Preface, pp. xi-xviii. That colonization and expansion in Europe were intrinsic parts of contemporary developments in the Atlantic world has been commented upon: in a review of N. Canny, *Europeans on the Move. Studies on European Migration, 1500-1800*, Oxford 1994, J. Black commented "...more could have been made of comparisons and contrasts with long-distance migration within Europe, especially emigration to Hungary..."; "English Historical Review", 1997, CXII, no. 445, p. 201.
- ² F. Reschke, *Genese und Wandlung der Kulturlandschaft des südöstlichen jugoslawischen Banats im Wechsel des historischen Geschehens*, Ph.D. Diss., Köln 1968, pp. 3-4; I. Kucsko, *Die Organisation der Verwaltung im Banat vom Jahre 1717-1738*, Ph.D. Diss., Vienna 1934.
- ³ County is used for the contemporary 'comitat' or 'Komitat' throughout.
- ⁴ Z. Gombacz, J. Melich, *Magyar Etymologiai Szótár, Lexicon Critico-Etymologicum Linguae Hungaricae*, II. Füzet, Budapest 1914, pp. 267-270.
- ⁵ E. Szentklaray, *Temesvar und seine Umgebung, Die öst.-ung. Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, IX, Ungarn II, Vienna 1891, p. 512.
- ⁶ For more on the Nagy family in eighteenth-century Habsburg service, see: C. von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon*, Vienna 1869, vol. XX, pp. 64-65.
- ⁷ A. Valentin, *Die Banater Schwaben*, München 1959, p. 10.
- ⁸ Attila, leader of the Huns, is said to have been born in this ancient land; Burger, *Modosch*, cit., p. 16; C. Petersen, O. Scheel (eds.), *Handwörterbuch des Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschum*, vol. I, Breslawa 1933, p. 219.
- ⁹ H. Keller, *Banat. Bergland. Siebenbürgen. Die Deutsche Volksgruppe in Rumänien*, Vienna 1942, p. 15.
- ¹⁰ Scherer, *Felix Milleker* cit., p. 105.
- ¹¹ Heimatortsgemeinschaft Jahrmarkt (ed.), *Jahrmarkt im Banat*, Donauwörth n.d., p. 10; Scherer, *Felix Milleker* cit., p. 105.
- ¹² E. Roth, *Die planmäßig angelegten Siedlungen im Deutsch-Banater Militärgrenzbezirk 1765-1821*, Munich 1988, p. 24. Refugees from Serbia streamed into southern Hungary, with resultant claims of over half of the total population being Serb; D.J. Popovic, *Srbi u Banatu do kraja osamnaestog veka: istorija naselja i stanovništva*, Belgrade 1955, pp. 28-29. A further 50,000 Slav settlers are said to have entered the territory immediately following the 1481 decree, founding eighty villages; *ibid.*, pp. 33-36.
- ¹³ J. Erdeljanovic, *Tragovi najstarijeg slovenskog sloja u Banatu*, Prague 1925.
- ¹⁴ Cf. PRO C76/184 m.1, 27 May 1502, 'Letter of empowerment for Geoffrey Blythe, the Dean of York, to negotiate an alliance against the Turks with Wladislaus [sic] II'.

- ¹⁵ PRO, SC7/64/26, 30 April 1523, 'Adrian VI to all Christian princes with a view to a crusade against the Turks following the loss of Belgrade'.
- ¹⁶ When King Zápolya died in 1538, the Banat passed to his widow and became a united Turkish sandschak with Transylvania after the capture of Ofen, being passed to Ferdinand by Cardinal Martinuzzi, regent of John Sigismund, in 1551.
- ¹⁷ Many Magyars and the few German settlers fled the region, with some Serbs moving in, establishing further south, in 1557, their own orthodox centre at Péc (Ipek, alban. Pejë). Hungarian Catholics and Orthodox Serbs do appear to have co-existed in mixed communities in the region Fenlak nahija. R. Veselinovic, *Development of Craftsman-Merchant Layer of Serbian Society under Foreign Domination in the 17th and 18th Centuries*, in V. Han (ed.), *The Balkan Urban Culture (15th-19th Century)*, Belgrade 1984, p. 138.
- ¹⁸ For more on the Barcsay (Barcsai) family, see: Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon* cit., 1856, vol. I, p. 157.
- ¹⁹ Sir G. Larpent, *Turkey; its History and Progress, from the Journals and Correspondence of Sir James Porter*, London 1854, p. 189.
- ²⁰ Horváth, *The Banat* cit., pp. 15-16.
- ²¹ A. Tafferner, *Quellenbuch zur Donauschwäbischen Geschichte*, München 1974, Bd. I, Nr. 32, 'Das erste habsburgische Impopulationspatent (11.8.1689)', p. 53.
- ²² H. Rothfels (ed.), *Das Auslandsdeutschtum des Ostens, Auslandsstudien*, 7 vols., Königsberg i. Pr. 1932, p. 122.
- ²³ Tafferner, *Quellenbuch* cit., vol. II, Nr. 47, p. 75.
- ²⁴ I. Vojvodic, S. Vodvodic, *Kolonizatsija Ruskog Sela 1919-1941*, in I. Vojvodic, et al., (eds.), *Prilozi za Poznavanje Naselja i Naseljavanja Vojvodine, Novi Sad - Matica Srpska* 1974, pp. 5-44. Decendants of Carnojevic also held estates in Futog in the 1740s; cf. N.L. Gacesa, *Agrarna Reforma i Kolonizatsija u Backoj 1918-1941*, Novi Sad - Matica Srpska 1968.
- ²⁵ O. Vogenberger, *Pantschowa. Zentrum des Deutschtums im Südbanat*, Freilassing 1991, p. 24.
- ²⁶ The Ottoman forces lost the day, suffering more than 30,000 casualties, as opposed to the 600 deaths and 1,500 wounded suffered by the imperial forces; Burger, *Modosch* cit., p. 22.
- ²⁷ D. McKay, *Prince Eugene of Savoy*, Thames and Hudson, London 1977, pp. 46-47.
- ²⁸ R.J.W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550-1700*, Oxford 1979, viii.
- ²⁹ Veselinovic, *Development of Craftsman-Merchant* cit., p. 137.
- ³⁰ Thomas, *Banat of Temesvar* cit., p. 7.
- ³¹ J.H. Schwicker, *Geschichte der österreichischen Militärgrenze*, Vienna - Teschen 1883; K. Wessely, *The Development of the Hungarian Military Frontier until the Middle of the 18th Century*, *The Austrian History Yearbook*, vol. IX-X (1973-74), pp. 55-120.
- ³² K.A. Roider, *Austria's Eastern Question 1700-1790*, Princeton 1982, p. 4.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- ³⁴ F. Lotz, *Die ersten deutschen Kolonisten der Batschka, "SODA"*, 1960, III, pp. 169-176, here: p. 169.
- ³⁵ N. Henderson, *Prince Eugene of Savoy*, London 1965, p. 227.
- ³⁶ M. Braubach, *Prinz Eugene von Savoy*, 5 vols., Vienna 1963-1965, here: vol. 2, pp. 258-261 and p. 266.
- ³⁷ J.H. Blumenthal, *Prinz Eugene als Präsident des Imperial War Officees (1703-1713)*, in "Der Donauraum", 9. Jahrgang, 1964, pp. 29-41.
- ³⁸ Agricultural statistics further show that production remained very low, despite the availability of land. Gacesa, *Agrarna Reforma* cit., p. 8.
- ³⁹ Popovic, *Srbi u Banatu* cit., pp. 51-55.
- ⁴⁰ N. Iorga, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches nach den Quellen dargestellt*, vols. I-IV, 1908-1913, here: IV, p. 275.
- ⁴¹ N. Iorga, *Chestiunea Dunării. Istoria Europei rasaritene in legatura cu aceasta chestie, "Studii si documente"*, XXVI, Valeni 1913, p. 218.

- ⁴² See F. [Bódog] Milleker, *Geschichte der Deutschen im Banat von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1716. Kritische Untersuchungen*, Bela Crkva (Weißkirchen) 1927, *passim*.
- ⁴³ Communication of the Hofkriegsrat in German to the Bohemian and Austrian Hofkanzlei, KA, HKA 1716 R, October 184; in Latin to the Hungarian and Spanish Hofkanzlei, KA, HKA, 1716 R, October 183.
- ⁴⁴ KA, HKA 1716 R, Oktober 184.
- ⁴⁵ Mraz, *Die Einrichtung der Kaiserlichen Verwaltung* cit., p. 13; Braubach, *Prinz Eugene* cit., vol. 3, p. 310.
- ⁴⁶ Kucsko, *Die Organisation* cit., pp. 27-28.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- ⁴⁸ Imperial War Office (HKR) Vienna, E. no. 56, from 1717.
- ⁴⁹ Weifert, *Beiträge* cit., p. 135. For best discussion of the changing definitions of 'Austria', 'Hereditary Lands', etc., see: Evans, *Making of the Habsburg Monarchy* cit., pp. 158-62.
- ⁵⁰ Jamestown saw no farmers arrive on the first fleet to that colonial establishment, but many soldiers, footmen, noblemen and traders made up the vanguard of colonial settlement in the British Americas.
- ⁵¹ A. Pagden, *Lords of All the World. Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800*, New Haven-London 1995, p. 76.
- ⁵² K. Ordahl Kuppermann, *The Beehive as a Model for Colonial Design*, in *eadem* (ed.), *America in European Consciousness 1493-1750*, Chapel Hill - London 1995, pp. 272-292, here p. 273.
- ⁵³ Thomas, *Banat of Temesvar* cit., p. 8; *Handwörterbuch des Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschum*, vol. 1, Breslau 1933, p. 207, ff.
- ⁵⁴ J. Kallbrunner, *Das kaiserliche Banat*, vol I., Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, Munich 1958, p. 13 ff.
- ⁵⁵ Although the number of Magyars is sometimes too 'enthusiastically' underestimated; Cf. K. von Möller, H. Grothe (eds.), *Das Banat. Ein Bild deutschen Volkstums und deutschen Schaffens im Südosten Europas*, IX Jahrgang, XIV (Sonderheft), Heft 1/4, esp. p. 9.
- ⁵⁶ Or a population of 3 people per square kilometre. Keller, *Banat. Bergland. Siebenbürgen* cit., p. 16.
- ⁵⁷ Scherer, *Felix Milleker* cit., p. 108.
- ⁵⁸ J. Kallbrunner, *Zur Geschichte der Wirtschaft im Temescher Banat bis zum Ausgang des siebenjährigen Krieges*, in "SODF" 1936, I, 1, pp. 46-60, here: p. 47, n. 1.
- ⁵⁹ Horváth, *The Banat* cit., pp. 16-17.
- ⁶⁰ S. Schmidt, H. Lauer, F. Dürrbeck, *Kleiner Banater Lesebogen im Wort, Bild und Zahl*, Munich 1982, p. 39.
- ⁶¹ J.H. Schwicker, *Geschichte des Temesvarer Banates*, Gross - Becskerek 1861, p. 284.
- ⁶² For the role of Jews in Habsburg tax collection, see: A. Peri, *The Activity of Jewish Army-Suppliers in the Kingdom of Hungary in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century*, in "Zion, A Quarterly for Research in Jewish History", 1992, vol. LVII, 2, pp. 135-174, here: pp. XII-XIII.
- ⁶³ J. (E.) Horváth, *The Banat. A Forgotten Chapter of European History*, Budapest 1931, pp. 17-18.
- ⁶⁴ E. Szentklaray, *Mercy kormányzata a Temesi Bánságban*, Budapest 1909, p. 165, ff.
- ⁶⁵ E. Gyözö, *Die Absolute Monarchie der Habsburger als Hindernis der Ungarischen Nationalen Entwicklung*, in: *Études des Délégués Hongrois au Xe Congrès International des Sciences Historiques*, Rome, 4-11 September 1955, in: *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Tomus IV, Fasciculi 1-3, Budapest 1955, pp. 73-100, here: p. 82.
- ⁶⁶ M. Horváth, *Az ipar és kereskedé története Magyarországon a három utolsó század alatt*, Budán 1840, p. 118.
- ⁶⁷ Also 'Raizen', Serbs of Orthodox faith living in Serbia, Slavonia, Lower Hungary and Roumania. A. Schenk, I. Weber-Kellermann, *Interethnik und sozialer Wandel in einem mehrsprachigen Dorf des rumänischen Banates*, Marburg 1973, pp. 13-41.
- ⁶⁸ HKA, B.A., 13290, 30. December 1721, f. 46.
- ⁶⁹ Kucsko, *Die Organisation* cit., p. 40. No exact figure of the number of Gypsy families or individuals is available, but a figure which errs on the side of cautious approximation and which varies greatly from year to year can be gleaned

- from the records of the *Harrasch*, a tax which all male Gypsies over the age of fifteen years was required to pay. HKA, Ung. Hoffinanz, 7, IX, 1720; *ibid.*, 16. May 1719, f. 21.
- ⁷⁰ Peri, *The Activity of Jewish Army-Suppliers* cit., pp. XII-XIII.
- ⁷¹ HKA, Ung. Hoffinanz, Hamiltons Bericht, 1734; after: Kucsko, *Die Organisation*, p. 41, n. 2; HKA, Ung. Hoffinanz, 7 November 1720.
- ⁷² A. Baroti, *Délmagyarország XVIII. Századi Története*, 2 vols., Temesvár 1893-1896, here: I, p. 151-153. F.J.J. O'Reilly, *Skizzirte Biographien der berühmtesten Feldherren Oesterreichs von Maximilian I. bis auf Franz II.*, Vienna 1813, p. 310 and Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon* cit., 1861, vol. VII, pp. 265-266.
- ⁷³ Baroti, *Délmagyarország* cit., I, p. 4; p. 143; II, p. 14; p. 342.
- ⁷⁴ *Chorographia Bannatus Temessiensis sub auspiciis novi Gubernatoris Edita* (ddo. Temeswar 12. Dez. 1734). Series allegatorum, zu der Landesbeschreibung des Temeswarer Banats gehörig. HKA, Sammlung der Handschriften, Signatur 424 (previous Signatur: H 51/I).
- ⁷⁵ Kucsko, *Die Organisation* cit., p. 42.
- ⁷⁶ Cf. P.J. Adler, *Serbs, Magyars, and Staatsinteresse in Eighteenth Century Austria: A Study in the History of Habsburg Administration*, in *The Austrian History Yearbook*, XII-XIII (1), 1976-77, pp. 116-152, for a consideration of the 'Nationalities'.
- ⁷⁷ A. Tinta, *Colonizarile Habsburgice in Banat 1716-1740*, Editura Facla, Timisoara 1972, p. 204; my translation.
- ⁷⁸ F. Grisellini, *Aus dem Versuch einer politischen und natürlichen Geschichte des temeswarer Banats in Briefen 1716-1778*, Erschienen bei Johann Paul Krauß, Vienna 1780, p. 213, ff.
- ⁷⁹ Kucsko, *Die Organisation* cit., p. 44.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁸¹ HKA, Ung. Hoffinanz, Hamilton's Report from 1734, section on 'Raitzen und Walachen'.
- ⁸² Herman von Hamm, unpublished typescript, Landeshauptarchiv Koblenz, Bestand 700, 77, nr. 1, ch VII, *Die Auswanderung nach Ungarn (Banat und Batschka)*, p. 60.
- ⁸³ K. Vargha, *Zur Ansiedlung der Deutschen im Schelitz/Zselic*, in *A Magyarországi Németek Néprajzához/Beiträge zur Volkskunde der Ungarndeutschen*, 2, Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest 1979, pp. 145-158.
- ⁸⁴ Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexikon* cit., 1864, vol. XII, pp. 361-362.
- ⁸⁵ Hoben, *Högyész* cit., p. 206.
- ⁸⁶ I am here making deliberate use of the nomenclature of the earlier and contemporary English colonial enterprises.
- ⁸⁷ Similarities with agents in the British Colonial system are obvious. Cf. L.M. Penson, *The Colonial Agents of the British West Indies. A Study in Colonial Administration, Mainly in the Eighteenth Century*, London 1971, esp. chs. I and IX.
- ⁸⁸ I. Wellmann, *Die Ansiedlung der Ungarndeutschen*, in *300 Jahre Zusammenleben - Aus der Geschichte der Ungarndeutschen/300 éves együttélés - A magyarországi németek történetéből*, Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest 1988, pp. 33-43, here p. 34.
- ⁸⁹ Magyar Országos Levéltár, p. 396 19/a Acta Publica (Károlyi), Acta colonorum Germanorum, esp. fol. 6-11.
- ⁹⁰ J. Cziráky, *Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der Tolnauer Dunaföldvár*, 1910, p. 90; G. Holder, *Schicksal schwäbischer Ungarnfahrer im Jahre 1712*, "Deutsch-Ungarische Heimatblätter", 1930, pp. 136 ff.
- ⁹¹ Reprinted in J. Weidlein, *A tolnamegyei német telepítések* [The Settlement of Germans in the County of Tolnau], Fünfkirchen 1937, p. 20.
- ⁹² J. Weidlein, *Die volklichen Verhältnisse in der Schwäbischen Türkei im 18. Jahrhundert*, "SODF", I, 1936.
- ⁹³ *Ibid.*
- ⁹⁴ I. Steinsch, *Die Ansiedlung der privaten Grundherrschaften der Schwäbischen Türkei in Ungarn im 18. Jahrhundert*, Budapest 1942, pp. 21, ff.
- ⁹⁵ Taffermer, *Quellenbuch* cit., vol. 1, nr. 39.
- ⁹⁶ Taffermer, *Quellenbuch* cit., vol. 1, nr. 103/4.

- ⁹⁷ Tafferner, *Quellenbuch*, vol. 2, nr. 295.
- ⁹⁸ J. Weidlein, *Über die deutschen Kolonisten der ersten Auswanderungsperiode (1722-1726) in Ungarn*, in "Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung" 1937, 1, Heft 2, pp. 487-492.
- ⁹⁹ R. Hartmann, *Das Deutschtum der Schwäbischen Türkei im 18. Jahrhundert*, Fünfkirchen (Pécs) 1935.
- ¹⁰⁰ Tafferner, *Quellenbuch* cit., vol. 2, nr. 299/300.
- ¹⁰¹ G. Schödl, *Die Deutschen in Ungarn*, in K.J. Bade (ed.), *Deutsche im Ausland, Fremde in Deutschland: Migration in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., Munich 1992, pp. 70-85, here: p. 75. M. Fata, *Einwanderung und Siedlung der Deutschen (1686-1790)*, in G. Schödl (ed.), *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas: Land an der Donau*, Berlin 1995, pp. 89-181.
- ¹⁰² These villages and the ethnic and religious make-up of their inhabitants are given in: E. Schäfer, *Lautehre der deutschen Mundart in Kalaznó*, Budapest 1908, p. 3.
- ¹⁰³ Bleyer, *Das Deutschtum* cit., p. 63.
- ¹⁰⁴ I. Steinisch, *Die Ansiedlung der privaten Grundherrschaften der Schwäbischen Türkei in Ungarn im 18. Jahrhundert*, Ofenpest [Budapest] 1942, pp. 86, ff..
- ¹⁰⁵ von Arneth, *Prinz Eugene von Savoyen* cit., vol. II, p. 529.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Feldzüge des Prinzen Eugene von Savoyen*, II. Serie, VIII. vols. supplement, p.70, letter from 1. June 1717.
- ¹⁰⁷ Lotz, *Die frühtheresianische Kolonisation*, p. 148.
- ¹⁰⁸ F. Lotz, *Aus der deutschen Vergangenheit der Stadt Temeswar. Die Zeit Mercys*, in *Die deutschen Ansiedler der Städte des Südostens*, Neusatz 1939.
- ¹⁰⁹ E. Nowotny, *Die Transmigration ober- und innerösterreichischen Protestanten nach Siebenbürgen im 18. Jahrhundert*, Jena 1931, p. 3.
- ¹¹⁰ 'Durch Untermischung teutscher Kolonien die Revolten des Pöbels leichter zu verhindern'. Kallbrunner, *Die deutsche Auswanderung* cit., p. 177; Kaindl, *Geschichte der Deutschen in Ungarn* cit., p. 41.
- ¹¹¹ F. Milleker, *Geschichte der Stadt Werschetz*, vol. I, Budapest 1886.
- ¹¹² Kucsko, *Die Organisation* cit., p. 50.
- ¹¹³ B. Lajos, *A bánsági legrégebbi német település története*, Temesvár 1892.
- ¹¹⁴ Tafferner, *Quellenbuch* cit., II, pp. 183-5.
- ¹¹⁵ The question of the voyage to the Banat and of transportation costs is not here discussed in detail.
- ¹¹⁶ A. Takáts, *Spanyolok telepítése Pancsován*, "Gazdaság-történelmi Szemle", 1900, p. 44.
- ¹¹⁷ HKA, *Ungarische Gedenkbücher*, vol. 450, folio 15-16.
- ¹¹⁸ L. Hoffmann, *Kurze Geschichte der Banater Deutschen 1717-1848*, Temeschburg 1925, p. 10.
- ¹¹⁹ H. Bellinghausen, *Koblenz als Auswanderungszentrale für Ungarn und die Balkanländer*, in "Moselland. Kulturpolitische Monatshefte (Luxemburg)", May 1942.
- ¹²⁰ Tafferner, *Quellenbuch* cit., II, pp. 195-196; F. Lotz, *Johann Karl Reichard (1700-1753). Der erste Banater evangelische Pfarrer nach der Türkenzeit*, in "Südostforschungen (SOF)", 1963, vol. XXII, pp. 280-300.
- ¹²¹ The named *Wahlmänner* came from numerous villages, including one (Walterich) left completely vacant as a result of immigration to the Banat. One local Priest, Sebastian Plenker, also organised many colonists for the Banat.
- ¹²² von Hamm, unpublished typescript cit., p. 62.
- ¹²³ *Ibid.*
- ¹²⁴ See, for example: von Hamm, unpublished typescript cit., p. 63, n. 20.
- ¹²⁵ Although this may be an over-estimation J. Kallbrunner, *Zur Geschichte der Wirtschaft im Temescher Banat bis zum Ausgang des siebenjährigen Krieges*, Südostdeutsche Forschungen, Munich, 1936, p. 556.
- ¹²⁶ For Serbs in the Banat, see, *inter alia*, D.J. Popovic, *Srbi u Banatu do kraja osamnaestog veka: istorija naselja i stanovnist-*

va, Naucna knjiga - Belgrade 1955; for Wallachians (Romanians), see, *inter alia*, F. Lackner, *Römanische und deutsche Siedlungsbewegungen im Banat, ihre Beziehungen und gegenseitige Bedingtheit*, "Südostdeutsches Archiv", 1974-75, vol. 17/18, pp. 74-84; for Spaniards, see, *inter alia*, L. Réti, *Magyarországi spanyol telepek*, "Ethnographia", 1890, pp. 300-303; for Italians, see, *inter alia*, A. Tinta, *Colonizari fortate de refugiatii spanioli si italieni in Banat (1716-1740)*, in *Studii de Istorie a Banatului*, vol. II, Universitatea din Timisoara, Timisoara 1970, pp. 111-140; for Bulgarians, see, *inter alia*, K. Telbis, *200 Gudini u Banata 1738-1938*, Zivota i obicaja na banatscite balgarel, Izdava, 'Banatsci Balgarsci Glasnic', Timisoara 1938.

¹²⁷J. Kallbrunner, *Das kaiserliche Banat*, I, Veröff. d. Südeutschen Kulturwerkes, Reihe Banat, Band 11, Munich 1958, p. 36.

¹²⁸K. Schünemann, *Österreichs Bevölkerungspolitik unter Maria Theresia*, vol. I, Veröffentl. d. Inst. z. Erforsch. d. dtsh. Volkst. im S. und SO., 6, Berlin 1935, p. 5.



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evans R.J.W., *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy 1550-1700*, Oxford 1979.

Frazer A., *The Gypsies*, Oxford 1992.

Griselini F., *Aus dem Versuch einer politischen und natürlichen Geschichte des temeswarer Banats in Briefen 1716-1778*, Erschienen bei Johann Paul Krauß, Vienna 1780.

Han V. (ed.), *The Balkan Urban Culture (15th-19th Century)*, Belgrade 1984.

Horváth M., *Az ipar és kereskedé története Magyarorszáiban a három utolsó század alatt*, Budán 1840.

Kallbrunner J., *Das kaiserliche Banat*, vol I, Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerkes, Munich 1958.

Iorga N., *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches. Nach den Quellen dargestellt*, vols. I-IV, Gotha 1908-1913.

Milleker F., *Geschichte der Deutschen im Banat von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1716. Kritische Untersuchungen*, Bela Crkva (Weißkirchen) 1927.

Owen R., Sutcliffe R., *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism*, London 1972.

Pagden A., *Lords of All the World. Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800*, New Haven - London 1995.

Petersen C, Scheel O. (eds.), *Handwörterbuch des Grenz- und Auslandsdeutschum*, vol. I, Breslau 1933.

Popovic D.J., *Srbi u Banatu do kraja osamnaestog veka: istorija naselja i stanovnistva*, Belgrade 1955.

Roth E., *Die planmäßig angelegten Siedlungen im Deutsch-Banater Militärgrenzbezirk 1765-1821*, Munich 1988.

Schwicker J.H., *Geschichte der österreichischen Militärgrenze*, Vienna - Teschen 1883.

Szentklaray E., *Temesvar und seine Umgebung, Die öst.-ung. Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, IX, Ungarn II, Vienna 1891.

Szentklaray E., *Mercy kormányzata a Temesi Bánságban*, Budapest 1909.

Tafferner A., *Quellenbuch zur Donauschwäbischen Geschichte*, Munich 1974.

Tinta A., *Colonizările Habsburgice in Banat 1716-1740*, Editura Facla, Timisoara 1972.

Valentin A., *Die Banater Schwaben*, Munich 1959.

Vojvodić I. et al. (eds.), *Prilozi za Poznavanje Naselja i Naseljavanja Vojvodine*, Novi Sad - Matica Srpska 1974.



SOURCE

1. De impopulatione regni.

Ut liberae quaevis personae, per sexennium a quavis contributione libertandae, in regnum vocari ac ejusmodi libertas per totum regnum publicari possit, benigne admittet Sua Majestas Sacratissima.

§ 1. Ut autem patentes in Sacro Romano Imperio et aliis etiam vicinis Suae Majestatis Sacratissimae regnis et provinciis eatenus publicari possint, id cum Statibus praelibati Sacri Imperii et vicinorum regnorum et provinciarum deliberari debet: ...

Concerning the Repopulation of the Kingdom. In order that all sorts of free persons can be attracted to the kingdom and in this way freedom can be made public throughout the whole kingdom, His Most Sacred Majesty has kindly allowed the freeing from any sort of payment for six years.

§ 1. Moreover, in order that these evident things can be so far made public in the Holy Roman Empire as well as in the other neighboring kingdoms and provinces of His Most Sacred Majesty, it ought to be deliberated with the States of the aforementioned Holy Empire and of the neighboring kingdoms and provinces.

2. Quia vero regnum hocce ... vastum et amplissimum sufficienti populo, quem terrenum ipsius recipere posset, quive ad excollendum idem necessarius esset, destitutum haberetur, ob quem populi defectum nonnisi amplissima posset cernere deserta, quae ut per instituendam impopulationem tam regni, quam Majestati Vestrae Sacratissimae commodo proficua esse possint, Status et Ordines Majestatis V.S. humillime supplicant: Quatenus M.V.S. ad alias etiam hereditarias exteras provincias suas et Imperium quoque Romano-Germanicum benignas suas Patentales dare dignaretur, et si qui ex personis liberis in regnum hoc se translocare velint, secure venire queant, qui ut rem suam familiarem debito modo ordinare possint respectu onerum publicorum ad minus per 6 annos immuntandi censerentur ...

Since indeed this vast kingdom is also very large it seems forsaken by sufficient population, which population can occupy its land or who were necessary for working the same, on account of which underpopulation nothing except a vast wasteland can be seen, and since fostering this repopulation could be advantageous to the prosperity both of the kingdom and of Your Most Sacred Majesty, the State and the Orders of Your Most Sacred Majesty most humbly beseech: In so far as Your Most Sacred Majesty has also seen fit to give to his other external hereditary provinces as well as the Romano-Germanic Empire his bountiful Patents and if any of the free men in this kingdom want to relocate, desire to come safely, they, in order that they be able to establish their households with a limit to debt, would be immune from assessment for at least six years with respect to the burden of public [taxation].

In the above excerpts from the Hungarian Articles of Law 103/1723 CJH from 7 May 1723, the Hungarian Reichstag requests that the King, as Emperor, allow colonists from the empire be recruited for the Kingdom of Hungary, and that they be encouraged to do so by granting them six years exemption from the payment of tax. Printed in full in: Konrad Schünemann, *Zur Bevölkerungspolitik der Ungarischen Stände, Deutsch Ungarische Heimatblätter*, vol. II (1930), pp. 115-120 and Anton Tafferner, *Ungarnwanderer in den Donauwörther Matrikeln, Donauschwäbische familienkundliche Forschungsblätter* (Darmstadt), no. 7 (1978), pp. 2-13.



