

FORGING THE WALLACHIAN MILITARY BORDER, 1769–1772

Jelena Ilić Mandić*

Keywords: Habsburg Monarchy, Wallachian Military Border, Temeswarer Banat, militarization, emigration

Cuvinte cheie: monarhia Habsburgică, granița militară românească, Banatul Timișoarei, militarizare, emigrare

Introduction

In his report on travels around Banat, Slavonia and a part of Hungary in April–May 1768, Emperor Joseph II noted that the entire line from the Adriatic Sea to Moldova was inhabited by frontiersmen, with the exception of a part of the border towards the Principality of Wallachia, where there were no frontiersmen but only the so-called *Playaschen*.¹ Back in 1766 it was decided that the stretch from Orșova to Transylvania in the east of the Habsburg province of Temeswarer Banat be regulated as an area of the “border militia” (*Grenzmiliz*). This was an area with settlements located in the valleys of the rivers of Cerna (and its tributary Bela Reka) and (the upper flow of) Timiș, and the surrounding hills. However, it was only in March 1769 that Empress Maria Theresa ordered that the militia should be finally “regulated” (*zu Stand gebracht worden solle*). The Empress literally ordered that 33 villages between Jupalnic and Marga be surveyed, and that new “military settlers” could be brought to these villages after each of them was, one by one, made subordinate to the military authorities.² Thirty three villages in the districts of Orșova and Caransebeș were to be taken over from the competence of the Court Chamber (*Hofkammer*) and its

* Institute of History Belgrade, Knez Mihailova Street 36/II, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, e-mail: jelena.ilic@iib.ac.rs

¹ Antal Hegediš, “Josif II o svom putovanju u Banat 1768,” *Istraživanja* 11 (1986): 249: *Die gantze Strecke von dem Adriatischen Meer bis an die letzten Gränitzen der Moldau, ist wirklich durch die Karlstätter, Bannalisten, Sclavonier, Bannatische Gränitzer Invaliden, und druch Siebenbürgischen Gränitzer besetzt, einen kleinen Theil ausgenommen, an der Wallachischen Gränitze, den keine Militares, sondern so genante Playaschen besetzen.*

² Österreichische Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv Wien(KA), HKR, Akten 1769, Kt. 699, 1769 – 45–11.

branch-administration in Timișoara (*Landesadministration*). In military terms, major Baron Pavle Dimić von Papilla (*Obristlieutenant Baron von Papilla*) was entrusted with the regulation of this part of the border. It should be noted that the military-administrative area created at the time in the east of Temeswarer Banat under the name of the Wallachian Military Border (*Wallachische Militär Grenze*) existed only temporarily, and in military-formation terms it was organised at the level of battalion (*Wallachische Grenzbataillon*).³ In 1775, it was reorganised and expanded into a larger border area called the Wallachian-Illyrian Border Regiment (*Wallachische-Illyrische Militärgrenz Regiment*).⁴

In response to the Empress's order, the first census of 33 villages on the line Jupalnic–Mehadia–Caransebeș–Marga was carried out, with 2,551 households recorded in June 1769.⁵ The second census was carried out in September 1769 as a more comprehensive one, with a commission going to each village. In addition to the present population, it covered the land such as fields, meadows, vineyards and gardens, and the amount of hitherto cameral levies. It shows a somewhat larger number of households – 2,668.⁶ Not long thereafter, the border of Temeswarer Banat was visited by its commander-in-chief, General Count *Mitroffsky*, traveling from Arad on the Mureș river, through Mehadia on the Cerna river, to Nova Palanka and Pančevo on the Danube.⁷ It was only when militarisation in eastern Banat gained momentum that it became clear that the population was not ready to abandon the civilian status and assume military obligations of a frontiersmen (*Grenzer*). This fact was officially confirmed during the first questioning of the village representatives about their status in May 1770 as the majority decided “not to accept the military status and assume the cameral administration”.⁸ Co-ruler Joseph II was practically immediately informed about the resistance of Romanian villages to militarisation as he vis-

³ The name *Wallachians* (for members of the *Wallachische Nation*) was officially used until the mid-19th century when it was replaced with the term Romanians. It was only then that the name of the regiment in eastern Banat was changed from *Wallachian* into the *Romanian Banat Regiment* (Irina Marin, “The Formation and Allegiance of the Romanian Military Elite Originating from the Banat Military Border,” Ph.D. Thesis, University College London – School of Slavonic and East European Studies 2009, 95, 105).

⁴ Less detailed information about events and various aspects of militarisation of the Wallachian Military Border in the 1769–1775 is also contained in the monograph: Јелена Илић Мандић, *Банатска војна крајина (1764–1800)* (Београд: Историјски институт Београд, 2020), 321–361.

⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1769, Kt. 699, 1769 – 45–10.

⁶ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 745, 1770 – 39–21.

⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–62. Maximilian Joseph Graf von Mitrovsky (1709–1782), commanding general in Temeswarer Banat 1769–1775.

⁸ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–77; 1770 – 39–97.

ited Timișoara on 10–13 May.⁹ The census of villages of June 1770 recorded a smaller number of households than before – 2,425.¹⁰

However, the militarisation of this area did not stop before the first obstacle. Regardless of disaffection among the population, plans were made for further establishment of the military administration. In mid-1770, the villages of the Wallachian Military Border were grouped into four companies named, according to their headquarters, as the companies of Mehadia (or Topleț), Globurău, Ilova and Ohaba Bistra. Four companies in the area of the Wallachian Military Border were to be divided according to their “strength”, i.e. the number of households (and proportionately the number of frontiersmen) in them. It was necessary to take over the former cameral facilities and apartments of district officers (*Kayserliche Königliche Gebäude*) and rearrange them for military needs and accommodation for officers (*Offiziers Quartier*). At that moment, unresolved territorial disputes existed only in relation to the village of Teregoва and its neighbouring cameral villages of Domașnea and Cănicea. It was subsequently decided that the territory of Domașnea and Cănicea (and Little Teregoва) villages be given to the military authorities, instead of the previously envisaged (Old) Teregoва. After the incorporation of these villages, the Wallachian Military Border included 35 places in total.¹¹ However, the resistance to militarisation which lasted until mid-1772 partly postponed the tax collection. The military-border area between the settlements of Jupalnic and Marga was later called the *Old* Wallachian Military Border, whereby a difference was made compared to the areas added to this border area in 1773 – Almaș, Craina and Clisura.¹²

In addition to the resistance to militarisation, the Russo-Ottoman War (1768–1774) and bandits’ incursions from Wallachia aggravated and slowed the establishment of an efficient military administration on the eastern border of Banat. Due to all these factors, the final declaration of subjects on their status – in favour of militarisation (and thus staying in their places), was carried out only during the autumn of 1771 and the spring of 1772. After the majority of subjects

⁹ Costin Feneșan, “Die zweite Reise Kaisers Josephs II. ins Temeswarer Banat (1770),” *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 45 (1997): 238–239. In his travel report, Joseph II expressed satisfaction with progress in the regulation of the German-Banat Regiment, noted somewhat weaker results in the regulation of the Illyrian Border Regiment, and expressed dissatisfaction with the situation in the Wallachian Battalion.

¹⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–149.

¹¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–149. The number 35 was also reached through a separate census of Old Jupalnic and New Jupalnic.

¹² KA, HKR, Akten 1774, Kt. 1016, 1774 – 39–69/2, folio 4–5. In case of the subsequently militarised 31 settlements in the areas of Almaș, Craina and (Lower) Clisura, fiscal and military obligations were valid from 1 November 1773.

accepted the frontiersmen status, in August 1772 a comprehensive census of the population and their property was carried out, according to which the number of households was higher than in previous censuses – 3,136.¹³

Declaration on status and population census

Given the strategic position of villages between Jupalnic and Marga, it was not possible to negotiate the possibility of their remaining under civilian rule. The question was, however, at what speed an efficient military administration would be established. The dynamics of construction of the military infrastructure depended, among other things, on the readiness of the population to assume the military jurisdiction and obligations. The first step in the process of militarisation included questioning the communities about whether they accepted the new frontiersmen status or retained the old status of civilian subjects. If they decided to keep the status of civilians, i.e. cameral subjects (*Cameral Unterthanen*), they were obliged to move to another place under civilian administration. The military authorities had to make the decision on how to carry out this questioning – whether to start with commissions visiting villages, or it would be better to invite village representatives to Caransebeş so that they state their decisions there. Defined as village representatives were “knezes with several older villagers” (*Kneesen nebst etwelche Älteste des Dorfs*), whose number was proportionate to the size of villages – 4, 8, 12 or 15. The military authorities opted for the second possibility and the decisions of village representatives were recorded in Caransebeş. According to the results of the first survey carried out by the commission headed by major von Papilla during May 1770, the majority of villages of the former districts of Caransebeş and Orşova decided to remain in the status of civilians and move to another place under the cameral rule.¹⁴

What did the first declaration of representatives of village communities about their future status in Caransebeş look like? In the villages exempted from the Caransebeş district, the survey was carried out between 30 April and 4 May 1770, when only few of them opted for the military status. An affirmative response – *will bey seinem Hauß und Wirtschaft bleiben, und den Militar Stand annehmen* – was given only by representatives of the villages of Ohaba

¹³ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 909, 1772 – 39–182.

¹⁴ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–77; 1770 – 39–97. The role of *knezes* in the representation of Wallachian and Serbian villages in the Habsburg province of Temeswarer Banat was elaborated in Costin Feneşan, *Cnezi si obercnezi in Banatul Imperial (1716–1778)* (Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1996); Benjamin Landais, “La réforme cadastrale dans les villages du Banat au XVIII^e siècle,” *Historie et sociétés rurales* N° 37 – 1^{er} semestre 2012 (2014): 43–116.

Bistra, Vârciorova, Bolvaşniţa and Dalci, while mixed answers were recorded for the villages of Marga, Borlova, Sadova (Veche) and Rusca. The villages of Valeamare (Valea Bistrei), Măru, Mal, Cicleni, Zerveşti, Var, Turnul (Turnu Ruieni), Ilova, Armeniş, Feneş, Ruen, Teregoa and Crâjma (Măgura) opted to remain under the cameral jurisdiction and to resettle – *wollen in das Camerale überziehen*.¹⁵ On 21 May, Papilla's commission completed the examination of the second part of the new border, in the Orşova district. Until then, only the communities of New and Old Jupalnic expressed readiness to accept the military status (*haben den Militair Stand angenommen*), while all other places were willing to retain the civilian status, even at the cost of resettlement – *Wollen in das Camerali überziehen, und den Militair Stand nicht annehmen*. The representatives of the villages of Tufari, Topleţ, Mehadia, Bârza, Pecinişca, Coramnic, (Valea) Bolvaşniţa, Plugova, Globurău, Bogâltin and Cornereva were against militarisation. In such circumstances, Papilla asked for an instruction from Vienna about what to do next. It was possible to immediately start with the militarisation of only those places that were ready to embrace the military status, and they were not a majority.¹⁶

Due to resistance to the status change, but also a number of other circumstances, the survey on the status and census of the population for the purpose of defining the quotas of military conscripts (number of recruited men, those in reserve and exempted) were not completed even in the following year. In fact, these activities were completed only in June 1772. As many as two years elapsed before the opposite decision prevailed among the population – to accept the military status and stay in places where they lived. The last phase in completing the militarisation process for 35 villages of the Wallachian Military Border lasted from September 1771 until June 1772. Through their representatives, villages, one by one, opted to stay in the Border (*wollen bey ihrer Hauß und Grundt Stücken bleiben, und den Militari Stand annehmen*). They assumed the frontiersmen status by “swearing an oath of loyalty to the read military laws without any misgivings”.¹⁷

Papilla's report signed in Caransebeş on 31 October 1772 outlines the chronology of these events. This document shows that in September 1771 the

¹⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–77. Names of villages stated in document, given in German transcription by following order: *Ohaba Bistra, Marga, Wallia Mare, Mercul, Mall, Csiglen, Wercserova, Bolwaschniza, Serbestie, Dalcs, Warr, Turnul, Borlova, Illova, Sadova, Armenisch, Fenisch, Russka, Ruen, Terregova, Keressma*.

¹⁶ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–97. In German transcription by following order: *Neu Schupanek, Alt Schupanek, Doffier, Topliz, Mehadia, Börsa, Pecsinehska, Korabnik, Balwahsniza, Plugova, Globureu, Bogoldin, Cornia-Reva*.

¹⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–66.

military status was accepted and a census carried out in Bolvaşniţa, Domaşnea, Cănicea, Rusca, Feneş, Armeniş, Sadova, Ilova, Vârciorova, Borlova; and in December 1771 in Marga, Valeamare, Crâjma, Măru, Mal and Ohaba Bistra. The militarisation and census were carried out in March 1772 in Ruieni, Turnul, Zerveşti, Cicleni and Dalci; in April in New and Old Jupalnic, Coramnic, Tufari, Bârza, Topleţ, Pecinişca and (Valea) Bolvaşniţa; and in June in places which were the last to mount resistance: Mehadia, Globurău, Plugova, Bogăltin, Cornereva and Var.¹⁸ In the first comprehensive census of 35 villages of the Wallachian Military Border, carried out soon afterwards, in August 1772, total 3,136 households with 13,927 inhabitants were recorded. Among them, there were 6,685 men (*mennliche Personal*), of whom 2,523 were fit for military service (*dienst taugliche effektive*).¹⁹ The new military administration was, in fact, most interested in data on the population fit for military service. To ensure a sufficient number of frontiersmen, however, it was also necessary to gain insight into the number of their household members, who were all recorded by their gender, age, religious and professional affiliation and property status.

Plans about the settlement of foreign population

It is hard to say whether mistrust towards the local population generated plans about the settlement of Germans and other foreign peoples in the Wallachian Military Border, or these plans existed before. Nonetheless, the census carried out in September 1769 partly aimed to determine to what extent there was room for potential incomers – the German border militia (*in die zu einer neuen Ansiedlung der deutschen Granitz Militz bestimmte 33. Dörfer*). It was necessary to compile an accurate report on circumstances in these villages and define – based on the determined number of houses, households and estates – how many settlers to inhabit and how to provide them with dwelling in a successful and fastest possible way.²⁰ It is doubtless that the plans on settlement of this part of border relied on experience in settling colonists-veterans in the area near of Pančevo after 1765 – in the so-called Settlers Regiment (*Ansiedlungs Regiment*), which became the core of the future German-Banat Regiment (*Deutsch-bannatische Grenz Regiment*).²¹

¹⁸ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 909, 1772 – 39–182.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 745, 1770 – 39–21.

²¹ The third wave of the colonisation of Germans to Temeswarer Banat was in full swing starting from 1762 (the so-called Teresian colonisation) and covered mainly the civilian territory (Ernst Schimscha, *Tehnik und Methoden der Theresianischen Besiedlung des Banats* (Wien, 1939)). A part of this wave, however, included the colonisation of veterans in the status of frontiersmen in the environs of Pančevo after 1765, in: Јелена Илић Мандић, “Планско насељавање у

Unlike the colonists-veterans who were settled near Pančevo from veteran homes (*Invaliden Hausen*) in Vienna, Pest or Petau, the colonists in the Wallachian Military Border were to be recruited in the Austrian provinces of Tyrol and Voralberg. The plan for the settlement of the “new border militia of Tyroleans” was also contained in the name of the census of the former cameral villages between Marga and Jupalnic of June 1769, which read: *Den Cameraldorffen, welche in dem Theil von Marga und Caransebes über Mehadia bis Suppaneck zur Ansiedlung einer daselbs neu-zu erichtenden Militar Gräniz Miliz von Tyerollenen angetragen worden.*²² The invitation for settlement was sent to interested persons of different social status, particularly to the poor. Moreover, the invitation indicated the state’s intention to resolve the question of sustenance of the poor population – unmarried urban craftsmen, people without professions and farmers without houses, who contributed to the overpopulation of some areas, both villages and towns. In October 1769, a declaration was issued in Innsbruck, inviting everyone, “particularly young bachelors without houses” to settle in places *an der Granizen des Temeswarer Banat gegen die Wallachen*. They were told they could find there accommodation, necessary means and tools to establish estates, cattle for farming and tugging, seeds for sowing, means for transport and material for the construction of houses.²³

In addition to colonisation from Tyrol, during 1769 there were also plans to settle “other foreigners, particularly Bulgarians, Albanians and the so-called Clementiers” (*andere fremde, und vorzuglich Bulgarn, Albaneser, und so genannten Clementier*). This was, however, explicitly opposed by the Court War Council (*Hofkriegsrat*). It noted the anachronistic nature of such plans (topical before 1753) and the deficiencies revealed during the colonisation of peoples who came from the Ottoman territory (*Transmigranten aus Bulgarien und Albanien*) and were settled in the Petrovaradin Regiment in the Slavonian Military Border after 1739. It was hard to expect that success would be achieved in the Wallachian Military Border, “where fields and meadows are much smaller and not so fertile as in the Petrovaradin Regiment, and where their sustenance would therefore be difficult and their lives poor”. Instead, during that year, the Court War Council advocated the settlement of German colonists, whose “diligence should be used in production”. The Empress was also told that, if settlers were mainly “Bulgarians and Albanians”, she would be forced to relieve

Војној крајини: колонисти–ветерани у Немачко-банатској регименти (1764–1788),” in P. Krešić, ed., *Држава и политике управљања (18–20. век)* (Београд, 2017), 37–56; Erik Roth, *Die planmäßigangelegten Siedlungen im Deutsch-Banater Militärbezirk 1765–1821* (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1988).

²² KA, HKR, Akten 1769, Kt. 699, 1769 – 45–10

²³ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 745, 1770 – 39–21.

them of contributions, land tax and tithe, which would not be the case if settlers were mainly people “from German mountainous areas not belonging to the Hereditary Lands”.²⁴

It is doubtless that the resistance to militarisation expressed in Caransebeş in May 1770 by the representatives of the majority of villages was something not trusted by the authorities, which therefore increasingly believed that the settlement of foreigners in this area was a good solution. It was thus stated in Papilla’s report that there was the intention to resettle those wallachian families that were in two minds about the status, together with *knezes*, to a place distant from the border, “such as, for instance, Tisa or Mureş”, as they were “inclined to mounting riots and emigrating to Turkey”. Different population had to be settled instead of them, read the report. Namely, at that moment it was expected that 160 German families from the environs of Pančevo would be settled to the rebellious village of Domaşnea. German families purportedly immediately expressed the wish to be armed and equipped for the sake of their safety and so as “to be able to counter tribulations and the Wallachians they would be surrounded with”.²⁵ These plans did not materialise either.

The plans about the settlement of foreigners in this part of the Military Border were a short-lived episode in the population policy of the authorities, topical only in 1769 and 1770. They failed in face of the indisputable fact that the economic conditions in that area were too limited. The resistance to the idea of colonisation of this part of Banat was also stated in several official elaborates, starting from the one from 1768, whose author was economic inspector Anton Koczian.²⁶ The plans of colonisation of the new population in Wallachian Military Border were gradually abandoned, and the local population timely embraced their frontiersmen obligations. Nonetheless, the existence of such plans coincided to the doubts that military administration had, if the autochthonous Romanian population would be willing to assume the military status loyally and in sufficient numbers.²⁷

Russo-Ottoman War and bandits from Wallachia

At the time of militarisation in the east of Temeswarer Banat, the Russo-Ottoman War was ongoing (1768–1774), and the Habsburg Monarchy was a

²⁴ KA, HKR, Akten 1769, Kt. 699, 1769 – 45–10.

²⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–164.

²⁶ Marin, “The Formation and Allegiance,” 100.

²⁷ During his stay in Timișoara in May 1770, co-ruler Joseph II noted that the new frontiersmen were not satisfied, about which he seems to have talked to them personally: *Wallachen, die neuen, nicht völlig zufrieden. Mit ihnen geredet* (Feneșan, “Die zweite Reise Kaisers Josephs II.,” 239, 243).

neutral party. On several occasions, the Monarchy rejected the invitations of the warring parties to join the alliance. In early 1770, the Russian army already kept the territory of the Ottoman vassal provinces, the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldova.²⁸ At the time, the first news emerged on the borders of Temeswarer Banat about the progress of the Russian army and presence of Wallachian volunteers in the Russian army. The report of the Court War Council also testifies to the cause-and-effect link between the events in Wallachia and the accelerated process of militarisation in eastern Banat. Empress Maria Theresa gave her approval – *Ich benemigen*, to the report which in short reads: “It is known that Russian troops are still in Wallachia and that they have already arrived at the borders of Temeswarer Banat, and we may witness to what was happening last year in Hungary and Transylvania, and has partly already been happening [in Temeswarer Banat] – a foreigner would occasionally move to our side and the border thus gets exposed to various wrongdoings...”²⁹

Documents suggest that in early 1770 not much was known about the circumstances in Wallachia and the exact position of Russian troops, and the incoming news was interpreted as rumours to be checked. Border captains (at that moment from the regular army), *playaschen* and the remaining cameral officers reported on circumstances in the field. Confusion was caused by the fact that Wallachian volunteers supported Russian occupation in the territory of Little Wallachia (Oltenia), in much higher numbers than the regular Russian army. It happened, however, that Wallachian volunteer units (justifiably or not) were sometimes mistaken for bandit gangs, while the Russian army, by all odds, did not depart too much from Bucharest and Craiova. Banditry coming from Wallachia, however, should be differed from that which in the same period was rampant across Temeswarer Banat.³⁰

In late March 1770, a border incident happened which clearly illustrates the degree of confusion prevailing at that moment. On 25 March, the administrator of the Mehadia district *Ignaz Kirchmayer* reported to the *Landesadministration* in Timișoara that “28 armed men from the bandit gang on the other side of the border near *Paja Aramo*” (Baia de Aramă) came to the *Metterisch/Meteriz*

²⁸ The Russian incursion to the Ottoman vassal Principalities of Moldova and Wallachia took place in autumn 1769. Iași was captured on 7 October and Bucharest on 17 November 1769. This wing of the Russian army was under the command of General Pyotr Alexandrovich Rumyantsev, and the main conflicts took place in 1770 on the Lower Danube (Karl A. Roider, Jr., *Austria's Eastern Question 1700–1790* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982), 109–130, 113).

²⁹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–45.

³⁰ Xénia Havadi-Nagy, *Die Slawonische und Banater Militärgrenze. Kriegserfahrungen und räumliche Mobilität* (Cluj-Napoca (Klausenburg): Romänische Akademie – Zentrum für Siebenbürgische Studien, 2010), 223; Илић Мандић, *Банатска војна крајина*, 351.

guardhouse, and requested to get into contact with playaschen captain *Petro Vanza*. It was found out that additional 300 of their people were one hour away from the border, in the village of *Pojen* (Poieni). Frightened Kirchmayer concluded that bandits could “ransack [Banat villages] and commit wrongdoings”, and asked what measures to undertake in advance.³¹ Some statements from the report, however, were elaborated in the report that the general command in Timișoara received from the commander in Mehadia, *Hauptmann von Steinberg* and playaschen captain *Petro Vanza*. The latter learned on the spot that these 300 persons were not bandits but Russian soldiers (i.e. Wallachian volunteers) – from the unit of *captain Duntscha*, who acted upon the authorisation of Russian General *Alexander* from Bucharest.³² Vanza found out that Duntscha’s men did not have any intention to cause incidents or resort to violence, but only to deliver two letters to the playaschen. Information was obtained from them that “not many bandits remained” in Wallachia, and that Russian General Alexander allegedly ordered captain Duntscha and four more captains “not to commit any violence against Christians and on our [Banat] border”, but to “eradicate banditry only in Wallachia” and prevent the Turks’ incursions.³³

Nonetheless, banditry in Wallachia was not eradicated. Bandit gangs oppressed Banat villages during that and the following year. For the struggle against the bandits, major Baron von Papilla requested on 4 July 1770 that the playaschen on the border be provided with additional munition. According to him, bandit gangs from Wallachia numbered even 50 and 60 people each, and did not hesitate to attack the playaschen guardhouses. It thus happened that a group of 60 bandits attacked, on 30 June, the *Hotar Reo* guardhouse above the Măru village. Five playaschen in that station were seriously injured as bandits fully disarmed and disrobed three playaschen, tied and brought with them one, while the other two managed to flee. As assessed by Papilla, the situation was generally bad as bandits took away horses, cows and sheep from peasants, who were therefore afraid to keep cattle in meadows in the hills. To make matters worse, the road to Mehadia was partly closed as the bandits captured the narrow

³¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–60. The same document mentions that the purported cause was the fact that a trader from Poieni was held in quarantine as four persons said that he promised, in the status of an officer, to take them to Wallachia, provide them with horses, equipment and weapons, including even a monthly salary of eight forints.

³² Here reference is probably made to the general-in-chief Pyotr Alexandrovich Rumyantsev (Пётр Александрович Румянцев-Задунайский, 1725–1796).

³³ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–60. The same report suggests that captain Duntscha originally came from Banat to join the Russian army as he delivered to the playaschen two letters – one for Petar Vanza, entrusting him to care about his wife, and the second for his wife, advising her to be patient. This put some more light on the origin of some part of Wallachian volunteers in Russian army.

passage between Slatina and Teregova. Papilla believed that the infantry should be brought to the positions in the hills between these two places as otherwise “the road leading therefrom to the Timiș river and left towards Mehadia” would soon be closed. He pleaded that 100 pieces of firearms and some munition be sent so that the locals could reinforce the garrison in playaschen guardhouses from Rusca to Marga. He pessimistically concluded that it seemed there was no way “for the evil of bandits from Wallachia to suppressed” because, most likely, “the majority of *Wallachen* in Wallachia turned into bandits since the Turks took away everything from them, of what was left after the Russians, including women and children”³⁴.

The tumultuous events on the border between Temeswarer Banat and Wallachia during 1771 are attested by several reports which successively and by the chain of command were going from Mehadia through Caransebeș and Timișoara, and arriving in Vienna.³⁵ The presence of Russian troops was even greater that year compared to the previous one. On 22 May 1771, *Hauptmann Kolli* reported from Mehadia to his superiors about what had been found about the presence of Russian troops in Wallachia from Greek trader Stamaty from Craiova, who appeared in the quarantine station (*Contumaz*) with the passport of Russian colonel *Mickolin*. Russian General *Gligorie Alexandrovich* was allegedly eight hours away from Craiova by Orahov with 20,000 grenadiers, carabinieri and jaegers.³⁶ There were also 12,000 hussars and Cossacks near Craiova, by the *Strahaja* monastery, under major *Prsebinsky*, while captain *Marolachio* was in *Csernez* (Czernz) with a mixed unit of 400 cavalymen. There is no doubt that the build-up of Russian troops in Wallachia caused the appearance of Ottoman troops on the Danube, and Kolli reported that 21 ships packed with troops passed that same day early in the morning by Orșova. Moreover, Austrian deserters hurried to meet the Russian army and Kolli also reported that several days before, on 17 May, two soldiers from the company of *Hauptmann von Bacola* (from the *Adam Bathyani Regiment*) deserted from the guardhouses of *Krazkerberg* and *Mosna* in Old Orșova, but they “promptly returned to the quarantine station in Jupalnic because the Turks wanted to sell them”. On the same day, six frontiersmen from the company of *Hauptmann von*

³⁴ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–127. – ... dann das Übel von denen Raubern aus der Wallachey wird sobald kein Ende nehmen, massen allem vernehmen nach die mehrersten Wallachen in der Wallachey Rauber geworden, weilen dasjenige, was ihnen von denen Russen übrig geblieben, die Türcken nebst Weib und Kindern noch dazu hinweggeführt.

³⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–102.

³⁶ Russian General Grigory Aleksandrovich (Григорий Александрович Потёмкин-Таврический, 1739–1791) was, no more or less, the future famous Russian prince Potemkin, an associate and lover of Empress Catherine II, who was at the time at the beginning of his career.

Metzer (from the *Johan Palfy Regiment*) fled from the guardhouses of *Tihsovicza* and *Labodignia*, but it was not known where.³⁷

The report of major Papilla of 27 May 1771 addressed to commanding general in Timișoara Count Mitrofsky testifies to the impact of those events on the behaviour of the population. In the report, Papilla expressed, among other things, his concern that the emigrants who were leaving particularly the places of Ilova, Rusca, Feneș, and Armeniș, as well as others – once they arrived at the other side of the border – could join bandits from Wallachia. Papilla warned that emigrants without food and means of livelihood on the other side of the border could join bandits and return to plunder and loot their own villages. As they knew well the tracks and roads, it could be expected that “they would invade on this side and inflict damage on those who remained on the border, drive away their cattle, plunder or kill them”. Bearing all this in mind, Papilla proposed that in addition to the already present two companies of the *Johan Palfy Regiment*, the arrival of a cavalry squadron should be ensured as soon as possible in order to prevent in advance that emigration and banditry spread to other places as well.³⁸ Papilla’s warnings soon came true. In mid-1771, bandit gangs came from Wallachia to the environs of the villages of Ilova, Feneș and Rusca, and according to some claims, they expected the reinforcement of 500 men (!). As they threatened the local inhabitants to enter their villages and kill them (*Insassen mit Töden und Morden begegnen zu können*), the locals ran away. Although Papilla considered the bandits’ threats unfeasible, they did have an effect because the inhabitants from Ilova and Armeniș left their houses due to the danger and withdrew to the hills (*ihre Haßser verlaßen, und sich in das Gebürge gezogen*).³⁹

Due to the overall uncertainty caused by bandits’ incursions and mass fleeing of the population and desertion, units of the Habsburg army were deployed in the villages of the Wallachian Military Border. In mid-1771, Papilla reported that soldiers were deployed from two companies of the *Johann Palfyschen Regiment*, one company of the Garnisons Regiment and two cavalry squadrons of the *Podstakyschen Cuirahsier Regiment*, in the border villages of Domașnea, Rusca, Feneș, Armeniș, Sadova, Ilova, Vârciorova, Bolvașnița, Borlova, Turnul and Măru, and in cameral villages of Teregova, Slatina and Marga.⁴⁰ Until then, the presence of regular troops in the entire Danube cordon (from Pančevo to Orșova) was greater than in early 1770.⁴¹ In mid-1771, the inspector general

³⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–94.

³⁸ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–94.

³⁹ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–111.

⁴⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–111.

⁴¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–204. In January 1770, deployed on the Danube

of the Military Border General *Schischkovich* supported Papilla's proposal that troops on the border be reinforced by the units of the Timișoara garrison. Additional units were to be deployed on the critical sectors, with five companies designated for places lying along the Lower Danube cordon and opposite Wallachia, so as to "succour cordon stations from the vicinity and seize the border villages".⁴²

The deployment of additional military units on the Habsburg borders towards Moldova and Wallachia, primarily in Transylvania, was also affected by the foreign policy factor – the Monarchy clearly opposed Russian hegemony in the two neighbouring principalities.⁴³ However, by late 1771, the danger disappeared and it became clear that the Russian positioning in the two principalities was nothing more than a bluff.⁴⁴

Deserters and emigrants

One of the greatest challenges during militarisation in the east of Temeswarer Banat was the wave of mass emigration in 1771 and 1772. Emigrants were, however, only one of the groups violating peace and order, and disturbing cross-border military controls. The then laws differentiated among perpetrators of the misdemeanour of unpermitted movement according to the motive – the emigration of the civilian population (most often entire families), desertion (of military persons and frontiersmen), wandering of individuals without residence (the so-called *Vagabonds*) and joint robbery (bandits). It is evident that the authorities aimed to precisely identify the nature of misdemeanours and

cordon were 3,799 infantrymen from the garrison army (14 companies of the First Garrison Regiment, Third Battalion of the Leopold Palffy Regiment and Third Battalion of the Forgarasch Regiment) and 3,487 members of border units in Banat (German-Banat and Illyrian Border Regiments, and 70 *playaschen*). There were also 744 cavalrymen of the Seventh Squadron of cuirassiers and 235 hussars of the Illyrian Border Regiment. The sector of the border towards Wallachia was the most poorly secured.

⁴² KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–44, folio 375–378. In addition, one company was deployed in the Bozovici village in Almaș, one company in Bela Crkva and Nova Palanka, and other three companies with one squadron in Pančevo.

⁴³ The problem centred on the fact that the exact nature of Russian objectives was not known in Vienna, and there were indications that they were broadly defined. This dissatisfaction brought about a precedent in the history of Habsburg-Ottoman relations, i.e. a short-lived alliance of the two states against Russia, which was concluded on 6 July 1771. Under this secret agreement, the Monarchy secured the Porte's promise that it would be given Little Wallachia, a monetary compensation and status of a privileged trade partner (Roider, *Austria's Eastern Question*, 117, 120, 124).

⁴⁴ In December 1771, Russia made a secret agreement with Vienna to return Moldova and Wallachia to the Porte, and Vienna decided to join Russia and Prussia in the division of Poland (Ibid., 126).

carefully differentiated among the enumerated groups of offenders. In chronological terms, deserters appeared in spring 1770, at the same time when the Russian army appeared in Wallachia. The emigration of entire families was recorded from spring 1771, and it stepped up in autumn of that year and spring 1772.

Individuals from various sides tried to get into Russian military troops. Among them were also frontiersmen from other areas of the Military Border in the Monarchy, who thus committed the offence of desertion, but not always successfully. Some of them came from the *Illyrische Grenz Regiment* (in Banat), and some from the Slavonian Military Border. In spring 1770, reports from Mehadia stated the arrest of two *Illyrian* deserters called *Adam Roshovan* and *Pervo Kalinesko*, and four *Illyrian* frontiersmen and six Slavonian ones who together tried to enter Wallachia. The number of deserters was certainly much higher. This is indirectly testified by the report of *Obristwahtmeister Miokoviz* from Bela Crkva of 20 April 1770, where he states that during that month alone, 60 people fled from three companies of the *Illyrian Border Regiment*.⁴⁵ In the same period, an investigation was conducted in relation to the attempt of six Slavonian frontiersmen to reach Wallachia from Zemun with the intention “to join Russians”. They were caught by soldiers of the *Bathyani Regiment* in Jupalnic and escorted to Mehadia.⁴⁶ One document mentions Coramnic, Tufari, Topleţ and Bârza as the places from which desertions through the valley of the Cerna river to Wallachia were the most commonplace.⁴⁷ Desertion gathered momentum, even from the regular military units which, in the middle of the following, 1771 year, were in charge of securing the border in Banat. In early June 1771, Count Mitrofsky, commanding general in Timișoara, reported about 15 deserted soldiers – ten from the *Palfy Battalion*, three from guard in (Valea) Bolvașnița, and two from Mehadia.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–74. In early June, 12 of these deserters were captured near Rebenburg (Kaluderovo); they were interrogated and sent back, and their statements were submitted to the competent authorities (KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 822, 1771 – 39–44, folio 49). Co-ruler Joseph II probably had in mind this group of deserters from the *Illyrian Border Regiment* under the command of major Seczujacs, when in May 1770 he noted in Timișoara: *Ursach deren 41 Mann Desertuers. ... Dreyzehn revertiert* (Feneșan, “Die zweite Reise Kaisers Josephs II.,” 238, 243).

⁴⁶ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–102. Correspondence was maintained about that case between the Slavonian and Banat General Command and the question was asked about the grounds on which they should be punished. It was decided that they should not be considered bandits or vagabonds and armed emigrants (and that they should therefore not be punished for such offences), because they were deserters (KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–138).

⁴⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 822, 1771 – 39–41.

⁴⁸ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–102.

In spring 1771, the first reports on emigrants from “the new Wallachian Military Border” to neighbouring Wallachia appeared. In May 1771, major Papilla reported that the population of the villages of Rusca, Ilova, Feneş and Armeniş wanted to emigrate to Wallachia, with the inhabitants of Armeniş and Ilova being somewhat more seditious.⁴⁹ The fear of mass emigration proved to be justified. In early June 1771, the instruction was requested from the Court War Council (*Hofkriegsrat*) about what to undertake in relation to 66 families from the villages of Ilova, Sadova and Armeniş, who during the night of 27 May left to Wallachia with all their property (i.e. cattle), while on 29 May another 13 families fled from the village of Armeniş.⁵⁰ In spring 1772, the circumstances only deteriorated, as indicated by the numbers of emigrated families. On 28 April, major Papilla reported from Caransebeş that he was successively receiving the information about emigrants in Wallachia – on 23 April, four families emigrated from the village of Pecinişca, on 24–25 April 20 families from the village of Coramnic, and on 27, 16 families and three young men from Mehadia. The scope of emigration at that moment is also witnessed by his warning that “soon all our villages will emigrate to Wallachia”.⁵¹ Only a few days later, on 3 May, Papilla had to report unpleasant news that another 34 families fled on 29 April from the village of Pecinişca to Wallachia.⁵² Emigration continued over the following months, as suggested by Papilla’s report of 21 June – 41 families emigrated to Wallachia: 36 from the Cornereva village and five families from Cănicea.⁵³

It is fortunate that there is a preserved summary report on emigrants from the villages of the Wallachian Military Border, signed by major Papilla and officer *Traian* in Caransebeş. Recorded are the dates of emigration of individual families from 24 settlements in four companies, and monetary dues that the emigrated families owed both for the past and future period. It was calculated that the emigrated families caused a loss for the state budget of 2,874 Gulden and 8 1/8 Kreuzer. In total, in the period between May 1771 and July 1772, 601 families emigrated. In the second half of 1771, 257 families emigrated (mainly from the Ilova Company), and in the first half of 1772 – 344 families (mainly from the Globurău and Mehadia companies).⁵⁴ The majority of emigrants fled during May–June and September–November, but individual cases of emigration were noted in almost all months in the given period. Although emigration

⁴⁹ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–94.

⁵⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 823, 1771 – 39–98; 1771 – 39–102.

⁵¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–84.

⁵² KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–90.

⁵³ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 908, 1772 – 39–121.

⁵⁴ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 909, 1772 – 39–182, folio 22–26, folio 28–33.

was noted in as many as 24 settlements, it can be localised according to places with the highest number of recorded cases. Some villages of the Ilova Company took the lead – in 1771, 66 families emigrated from Ilova, 37 from Borlova, 37 from Vârciorova, 29 from Sadova, and 29 from Armeniş. In 1772, there were a greater number of emigrants from the villages of the Globurău Company – 64 families from the Cornereva village, 59 from Globurău and 23 from (Valea) Bolvaşniţa. That year, emigration also took place in the Mehadia Company, particularly in the village of Mehadia – 84 emigrant families, Pecinişca – 38 and Coramnic – 20.

Until mid-1772, the military authorities began with a more vigorous struggle both with rebels and emigrants. In the report of 21 June 1772, major Papilla informed about the plans for the destruction of property owned by one of the last larger groups of emigrants – 41 families from Cornereva and Cănicea. The property left behind these families was to be destroyed, i.e. farms and huts (*Sallasche; Hüttern*) burnt and orchards (*Obst Baumen*) cut down. In addition to precluding the possibility that the abandoned facilities serve as a shelter for bandits, this measure was also a message for the emigrated families that they were no longer welcome.⁵⁵ The mass emigration from the Wallachian Military Border was stopped by the end of summer of 1772. One of the last large groups of emigrants (30 families from Mehadia, 20 from Pecinişca and 30 from Cornereva) was stopped and escorted, through the playaschen station of *Rakila*, to the quarantine station in Jupalnic in September that year. The authorities had to decide on how to act further with refugees, whether to punish them and return them to the places from which they fled, or to resettle them farther in the province “as they could no longer be entrusted with the security of the Military Border”.⁵⁶

The expectations cherished by entire families which decided to emigrate with their entire movable property are nowhere stated. However, the destiny of emigrated families can be glimpsed from documents. In late October 1772, Russian General Count *Romanzoff* stated that Russian military commanders were prepared to dispatch 80 families that “crossed borders from Jupalnic” back to Banat.⁵⁷ Until late that year, the number of families staying in the quarantine station in Jupalnic rose to 235. It was planned that these families, after they withstood the quarantine, be sent to the “upper districts of the province

⁵⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 908, 1772 – 39–121.

⁵⁶ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 908, 1772 – 39–146.

⁵⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 909, 1772 – 39–177. The helpfulness of the Russian side stemmed from a secret agreement between Vienna and St Petersburg of December 1771, according to which the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldova were to be returned to the Ottomans (Roider, *Austria's Eastern Question*, 126).

[Temeswarer Banat]”, as they were obviously no longer trusted.⁵⁸ In fact, their wish to retain the status of subjects of the Court Chamber was thus met.

Resistance to militarisation – a set of different motives

What were the reasons for resistance of the local population to militarisation, which eventually caused mass emigration? It would be interesting to see more closely whether sources testify to what the local population expected and what they feared at the time of establishment of military rule. The first report of Papilla’s commission concerning the preference of inhabitants of the new Wallachian Military Border of May 1770 reads, among other things, that although the Wallachians wanted to remain in their places, they were at the same time against militarisation, because they feared they “would be killed and lose their faith” during marching to the battlefield.⁵⁹ It may be concluded that they feared to be engaged on far-flung fronts during the wars, and that they would be imposed different religious (i.e. customs-related and linguistic) patterns. Justified or not, those fears were caused by possible changes both in the sphere of temporary military obligations and the sphere of everyday life. The initial resistance doubtless relied on fears of novelty, general unknowns and changes that were still only speculated about, and in such circumstances inertia played a significant role. The manifestation of inertia can be read in statements of village *knezes* of May 1770, either in the formulation that they “wished to stay on their estates and their houses, and that they accepted the military status” (*wollen bey seiner Wirtschaft und Haus bleiben, und den Militari Stand übernehmen*) or the formulation that they “wished to move to the cameral territory” and thus retain the status of civilian subjects (*wollen in das Camerali übersiedlen*).

Inhabitants of militarised villages were doubtless torn by ambivalent feelings. On the one hand, they were not willing to change their status and embrace new obligations due to militarisation, while on the other hand, they were not willing to leave their property and a known environment and change their places of residence. It is therefore no wonder – as stated in Papilla’s report compiled after the first round of vote of village representatives in Caransebeş in May 1770 – that they mainly chose two incompatible possibilities: to remain as villagers in their hitherto places of abode (*die übrige aber lieber Bauern seye wollen, und glauben dennoch ihre dermahlige Wohn-Plätz zubehalten*). However, in the same report, Papilla mentions additional facts that he learned about and that could be useful to new administration. The commission was allegedly advised to wait because “as soon as they return to their places, they will decide to stay” and it

⁵⁸ KA, HKR, Akten 1773, Kt. 964, 1773 – 39–7, folio 4–8.

⁵⁹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–97.

was only necessary “to be patient for two or three months”. Namely, harvesting activities were yet to come and villagers would be tied to their land, which would give them time to change their opinion and decide to stay. State treasury (*Ärar*) was also not supposed to be against this as the military authorities did not hinder the payment of outstanding and current taxes.⁶⁰

Some more light on the disposition of inhabitants of the new border and circumstances in which they were found is shed by the description from the report on the subsequently militarised villages of Domaşnea and Cănicea. The census of these villages in June 1770 failed because the commission found only a third of inhabitants as the rest were absent purportedly due to seasonal activities such as haymaking. It was only later, in August that year, that *knezes* of these two villages, accompanied with 15 older household heads, came before the commission and expressed their readiness to be surveyed. However, as even this time there were not many men in the village, they asked that the census be postponed. Numerous men were allegedly engaged in transport and work, trying to earn some money. *Knezes* committed to inform the authorities of when “all people are at home” so that they be surveyed. It seems that such explanation did not satisfy the authorities as they continued to believe that “it seems the inhabitants are still deliberating”. It was therefore proposed that a place for their resettlement be found as soon as possible and “as farther as possible, for instance on the Tisa or Mureş rivers”.⁶¹ The commission seems to have correctly assessed the depth of resistance of inhabitants of Domaşnea and Cănicea as they instigated the rebellion the following year.⁶²

Until spring 1771, the obligations imposed by the military administration became much clearer to inhabitants of Wallachian villages. Explaining the rebellious mood of villagers of Armeniş, Rusca, Ilova and Feneş, purportedly instigated by inhabitants of Domaşnea and Cănicea, in his report major Papilla stated that they did not want to pay to the army any contributions or build the officers’ apartments.⁶³ The latter obligation of the border population – to construct buildings for the accommodation of officers (*Offiziers Quartier*) and perform for them various jobs (*Rabot*), was particularly disliked in all parts of the Military Border. Work of any kind caused more resistance than monetary dues, though they were not observed with approval either. It may be assumed that the problem was also the fact that the military authorities were far more

⁶⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 746, 1770 – 39–97.

⁶¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1770, Kt. 747, 1770 – 39–164.

⁶² In his notes of May 1770, in Timișoara co-ruler Joseph II also mentioned the case of two villages to be exchanged for the village of Teregoa (Feneşan, “Die zweite Reise Kaisers Josephs II.,” 239, 243).

⁶³ KA, HKR, Akten 1771, Kt. 1771 – 39–94.

successful in collecting monetary dues or in requisitioning commodity reserves (*Naturalien*) than it was the case during the district administration.⁶⁴ It was already stated that until mid-1771, a larger number of regular troops were placed on the Danube cordon and the Wallachian Military Border, and the local population also bore the brunt of their sustenance.

By opting for the civilian status and evading the obligation to be surveyed, the population demonstrated the unwillingness to accept the military rule and participate in military obligations. It is necessary to observe in this light the mass emigration of 1771 and 1772. The peak of emigration coincided with the time when the population declared their final decisions on status and when the census was carried out. As indicated by Papilla's report on emigration of 34 families from Pecinișca to Wallachia on 29 April 1772, those were the inhabitants of the village which had recently assumed the military status (*in die Pflicht gekommenen Militar Ort Pecsinescka*).⁶⁵ The second question is whether the mass emigration would have taken place had the military-political situation in neighbouring Wallachia not changed at the same time. By all odds, the emigration from Wallachian Military Border cannot be separated from the presence of the Russian army in Wallachia. The reports brought in direct connection the emigration from villages near Mehadia in spring 1772 with the appearance of Russian troops (more precisely Wallachian volunteer troops) in Wallachia. In April that year, Papilla stated he was obliged to more closely examine the rumours that "soon all our villages will emigrate to Wallachia, because Russians with the so-called Wallachian volunteers are taking the border from Tufari to Transylvania".⁶⁶ Claims from one document also support the conclusion that dissatisfaction with militarisation turned inhabitants towards Wallachia and the Russian occupation there. Namely, in late 1772, 235 families that were returned from Wallachia were staying in the quarantine station in Jupalnic, and it is explicitly stated that those were families "that did not want to participate in completing the Wallachian border troops".⁶⁷

The resistance to status change was not rare in the wider environment. The emigration of numerous families from new Wallachian Military Border to Wallachia, where they faced the foreign occupation authorities, may have partly reflected opportunism typical of peasantry. In a similar way, as it was noted,

⁶⁴ Such conclusion relies on the fact that the district administration consisted of a small number of clerks (district administrator and deputy administrator), who by cooperating with *knezes* communicated with municipalities and collected taxes (Landais, "La réforme cadastrale," 53–54).

⁶⁵ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–90.

⁶⁶ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–84.

⁶⁷ KA, HKR, Akten 1773, Kt. 964, 1773 – 39–7, folio 4–8.

former Ottoman subjects once resisted the establishment of the Habsburg rule in Banat and Little Wallachia not because they were loyal to the former power holders, but because they wished to remain unsubjugated.⁶⁸ In the case of former cameral district subjects, the resistance to militarisation can also be interpreted as a reflection of the desire to stay subjugated to the least possible extent. A particular interesting question in this regard is the treatment of the elite, i.e. *knezes* and village representatives as their role became superfluous with the introduction of military administration.⁶⁹ In bottom line, the tradition of preserving the local autonomy was much rooted in the mountainous regions, as it was the case of eastern Temeswarer Banat.

Epilogue

The last resistance to the census and acceptance of the military status was mounted in spring 1772 in the territory of the former Orşova district in five villages – Bogâltin, Cornereva, Globurău, Plugova and Mehadia, while in the former Caransebeş district the village of Var was the only one which put up resistance. On this occasion, military officers encountered the same attitudes of locals as several years before – they were willing to remain faithful subjects (to the *Hofkammer*), in the villages which they already inhabited. As we have seen, their wish could not be fulfilled and resistance was quelled, with the instigators being adequately punished by arrests and detention in the prison in Caransebeş.⁷⁰ All rebellious villages were finally recorded in June 1772 and their inhabitants swore an oath of allegiance to Empress Maria Theresa on the Military Laws.

What did the militarisation of the last rebellious villages in the Wallachian Military Border look like? A problem occurred in April 1772, only after Jupalnic and six surrounding places (Tufari, Coramnic, Topleţ, Bârza and Pecinişca) were recorded without any problems. As the inhabitants offered no resistance (*ohne geringste Widerstand*), militarisation was carried out “in good faith” (*freymütig und gutwillig*), and military laws were read “in peace”. Therefrom the commission went to Mehadia, where inhabitants allowed to be surveyed, but still put up resistance (*Widerwille*). The instigators of the rebellion were taken to Caransebeş in iron chains. The commission then went to (Valea) Bolvaşniţa,

⁶⁸ Marin, “The Formation and Allegiance,” 13.

⁶⁹ *Knezes* lost the privileged status in *old* parts of the Military Border back in the mid-18th century. Their role of representatives, tax collectors and intermediaries in communication with the authorities became superfluous with the appearance of military lower and higher officers (Војин С. Дабић, “Кнезови у војној крајини у Хрватској и Славонији до половине XVIII века,” *Зборник о Србима у Хрватској* 6, 2007: 7–123).

⁷⁰ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–83.

where the census was carried out and the declaration for frontiersmen read without any hostility. There was resistance in the place of Plugova, which is why the census was not completed, and four rebels were arrested. The inhabitants of Globurău put up resistance, “but not too great”, claiming they were faithful subjects (of the *Hofkammer*) and wanting to stay there, while three main rebels were arrested. The inhabitants of Cornereva “looked up to Globurău” and the census and subjugation to the military rule failed. The Bogăltin people were particularly opposed to the census and the report cited that they “do not wish and will not swear” (*wir wollen nicht und werden nicht schwöhren*). Thirteen arrestees from five rebellious places served as an example and were detained in prison until militarisation was completed.⁷¹ As already stated, these villages gave their final consent to the military status and census in June.

Place called Var was the last one to be subjugated to the military administration in the former Caransebeș district. After the places of Ruieni, Turnul, Zervești, Dalci and Cicleni were successfully surveyed and their inhabitants swore an oath of loyalty in March 1772, the commission came to the village of Var. When trying to carry out a census in that village, the commission encountered the inhabitants’ opposition to the military-border order. Its inhabitants did not mount resistance, but there were few of them to be surveyed – they purportedly went to care about the cattle in the hills or were procuring essentials. However, the present inhabitants used the opportunity to express their unchanged attitude – they were faithful subjects of the Court Chamber and would rather retain cameral status. Major Papilla ordered that the census of that village be postponed and that some measures should be undertaken, “but such that would not encourage hostility”. He proposed that a unit with one officer and 25 infantrymen be deployed in Var which had 135 houses, so that they prevent disorder and emigration, timely arrest the instigators of rebellion and, when needed, influence the inhabitants to swear the frontiersmen oath.⁷² This measure probably contributed to the success in the final militarisation of this village several months later, in June 1772, whereby the entire process of militarisation of the Wallachian Military Border was completed.

The fact that the Wallachian Military Border was not prepared in the military-administrative terms can be the reason why co-ruler Joseph II did not get close to it during his second stay in the province of Temeswarer Banat in May 1770. He travelled from Slavonia through Novi Bečej and Čakovo to Timișoara, and then to Arad and the towns of Hungary.⁷³ However, in spring 1770, the foreign policy situation was drastically different than in spring-summer 1773,

⁷¹ KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–83.

⁷² KA, HKR, Akten 1772, Kt. 907, 1772 – 39–66.

⁷³ Feneșan, “Die zweite Reise Kaisers Josephs II.,” 233–247.

when the co-ruler travelled across Little Wallachia, Transylvania and Galicia. Apart from the fact that the new Wallachian Military Border was formed in the meantime, with manpower ensured for the *Wallachische Grenzbataillon*, the Monarchy began to cooperate with the victorious party in the Russo-Ottoman War. After he got more closely familiar with problems of the Monarchy's eastern borders, Joseph II stated they should be actively resolved. He underlined that in order to secure new estates in Galicia, Bukovina had to be taken as soon as possible (which took place already in 1775), as well as the *varoş* of Orşova with the eponymous island in the Danube, so that the Cerna valley be fully secured in respect to the Ottoman side.⁷⁴

Summary

Contrary to plans, the militarisation of the border in the east of the Habsburg province of Temeswarer Banat lasted for around three years, resulting with the formation of the Wallachian Military Border and the Wallachian Battalion. It began in spring 1769 and was completed in mid-1772, and covered 35 settlements on the line Jupalnic–Mehadia–Caransebeş–Marga, in the valleys of the rivers Cerna (and its tributary Bela Reka) and (upper flow of) Timiş, and their environs. The establishment of military administration in this area aimed to complete the “uninterrupted stretch” of Military Border, which warden the Monarchy from the Adriatic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains. Militarisation implied several customary steps. First, the inhabitants of villages in the former Orşova district and a part of the Caransebeş district were questioned about whether they wished to become frontiersmen (and remain in their abodes) or remain civilians (and move to cameral territory). In May 1770, a vast majority of them opted for the second possibility and thus demonstrated their discontent with the military administration. It was only in autumn 1771 and spring 1772 that they decided to accept the border status, which is when the population census began.

The inhabitants' declaration on the status and the population census were prolonged also due to other factors. At the time of militarisation of the Wallachian Military Border, the Russo-Ottoman War (1768–1774) was ongoing, and the Habsburg Monarchy had a neutral status. Its borders in Banat and Transylvania were endangered because they were often illicitly crossed by bandit troops from Wallachia, while heading to the opposite direction, in face of the Russian army

⁷⁴ Roider, *Austria's Eastern Question*, 140, 146. The question of the town and island of Orşova, occupied by the Ottomans back in 1739, was partly resolved only in 1791, when the settlement was given to the Habsburgs, but the island remained in Ottoman hands. The island of New Orşova (Ada Cale) was considered “the key of the Danube” back from Marsigli's days (1690), when the Habsburg army reached for the first time this Danube section.

(and Wallachian volunteer units), were the families of emigrants and deserters from regular and border troops. Bandit units of 50–60 people were making forays into Banat border villages, causing the population to flee. However, there is no doubt that the main reason for the mass emigration from Banat border villages in 1771 and 1772 was the resistance to militarisation. Between June 1771 and July 1772, 601 families emigrated from the Wallachian Military Border to Wallachia. Although emigration was recorded in as many as 24 settlements, it can be localised according to places with the greatest number of recorded cases. Some villages of the Ilova Company took the lead in 1771, but in 1772, there were a greater number of emigrants from the villages of the Globurău and Mehadia companies.

The motives for resistance to militarisation can be glimpsed from some documents. Few reports note concrete reasons for resistance, such as those that the inhabitants of the new border villages feared to be killed on the front and lose their faith, and that they did not wish to pay military dues and build the officers' apartments. Repeated in several places is their wish to remain the subjects of the Court Chamber and stay in their places of abode, although these requests could not be simultaneously met. In some reports, emigration to Wallachia is brought in direct connection with the presence of Russian troops there, but the expectations of emigrated families after they moved to Wallachia are nowhere explained. From late 1771, the Russian army began to cooperate with the Habsburg military administration, and it enabled that dozens of emigrant families be dispatched back to Banat.

FĂURIREA GRANIȚEI MILITARE ROMÂNE, 1769–1772

Rezumat

Granița militară română a fost stabilită în 1769 pe linia de graniță dintre provincia habsburgică a Banatului timișan și Țara Românească, principatul vasal al Imperiului Otoman. Arealul acesta includea 35 de așezări pe râurile Cerna și Timiș și afluenții acestora. Dar organizarea recensământului militar al acestor localități și acceptarea obligațiilor militare de către locuitorii lor au fost amânate pentru un timp. Motivele au fost multiple. În primul rând, s-a observat atunci o puternică rezistență a populației în fața unei schimbări a statutului său legal (de la *Cameral Unterthanen* [supus cameral] to *Grenzer* [grănicer]). În al doilea rând, emigrarea în masă și dezertarea s-au răspândit în zonă ca o reacție la factorii “externi”, cum au fost războiul ruso-turc și, deopotrivă, actele de violență dinspre Țara Românească. Militarizarea s-a dovedit un proces dificil atât timp cât administrația și instituțiile militare nu au fost eficient organizate înainte de mijlocul anului 1772.