



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century

Pesalj, J.

Citation

Pesalj, J. (2019, March 27). *Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/70437>

Author: Pešalj, J.

Title: Monitoring migrations: the Habsburg-Ottoman border in the eighteenth century

Issue Date: 2019-03-27

CHAPTER 6: THE QUARANTINE STATION OF PANČEVO: THE IMPACT OF BORDER CONTROLS ON MOBILITY AND MIGRATIONS

Extra time and expenses had to be included in migrants' calculations as one of the elements considered before deciding to travel. It is not possible to measure the exact effect because we do not know what the numbers would be had no quarantine been in place. An estimation, however, could be given indirectly in two ways. It is possible to follow migrations during specific periods, comparing year-by-year numbers. In addition, we could also measure the impact of border controls by comparing different quarantine lengths. The full quarantine of forty-two days during pestilent regimes was exactly twice as long and twice as expensive as the quarantine of twenty-one days during healthy regimes. If long border procedures had a significant negative impact on migrations, migration numbers during pestilent regimes would be depressed.


Border controls also may have influenced the structure of migration. Did the "hard border" facilitate certain kinds of migrations, while curbing others? I take a closer look at the social profile of migrants crossing the Ottoman-Habsburg border. The relative impact on local cross-border mobility would be more severe than the influence on travel and migrations between the interiors of the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy. While the controls could increase travel time and costs for local border inhabitants tenfold or more, the cost of travel for travelers coming from Ottoman Macedonia or from the Ottoman capital would increase twofold or less. It could affect the incomes of seasonal workers more seriously than the earnings of well-off merchants. In addition, the impact of Habsburg residence and naturalization

regulations would be visible in migrant records from border stations as well. If the non-tolerance of non-Christians in the Habsburg Monarchy had serious impact on migrations, it would be reflected in numbers of non-Christians arriving at border crossings.

The Station's Capacity, Seasonality, Nature of Migrations

The capacity of the Pančevo station during the 1750s appears to have been relatively modest. In the two longest uninterrupted series (25 May 1752-31 January 1755, 1 October 1755-31 July 1756) the station accommodated up to fifty-six migrants at most, while usually housing about seventeen people.⁵⁹⁶ About 264 people entered the station yearly, or about three migrants every four days (See figure 6.1 and appendix 6.1.).

Figure 6.1. Average Number of Migrants Entering Pančevo per Month, 1752-1756



⁵⁹⁶ Median number; the average was nineteen, the mode thirteen.

The average monthly number of migrants' entries at Pančevo in 1752-1756⁵⁹⁷ varied between thirteen for April and thirty-six for October. On average, the preferred months for travel were June and July and from September through December, when there would be on average twice as many migrants entering the station than from January through May and in August. Longer or shorter quarantine regimes did not significantly influence the averages.⁵⁹⁸ They were similar for all categories of migrant, with non-business travelers favoring July, while business travelers preferred the last part of the year.⁵⁹⁹ The averages only very roughly reflect the seasonal migration of artisans and workers from Macedonia mentioned elsewhere,⁶⁰⁰ starting each year around St. George's Day (4 May in the 1750s according to the Julian calendar, followed by Orthodox Church), with the returns from St. Demetrius's Day (6 November in the 1750s) to Christmas (5 January). It does not explain the low May

⁵⁹⁷ Of 984 known entry dates, entries in February and May 1752 were not used to calculate the averages, because the sample is too small (only four of twenty-nine days in February, and only six of thirty-one days in May are covered by quarantine tables). The number for March 1752 is estimated based on known data that covers twenty-five days (estimate = 22 entries/25*31).

⁵⁹⁸ The numbers for individual months varied from year to year considerably. This cannot be attributed only to quarantine regimes. It is possible that the highest quarantine regime of forty-two days depressed the numbers in the period January-April 1753. The number remained depressed in May 1753 despite the fact that the shortest regime was in force (twenty-one days). The numbers for January, February and April 1754 were also low, during a moderate quarantine regime (twenty-eight days).

⁵⁹⁹ The seasonality of migrants who travelled for business reasons did not differ significantly from the general trend, with the same peaks and troughs (the following group combinations were analyzed: artisans, merchants, people with horses and/or servants, merchants; artisans, merchants, people with horses and/or servants, and servants; artisans, merchants, people with horses and/or servants, servants, and clergy; artisans, merchants, people with horses and/or servants, and clergy). Regarding non-business groups (with arrestees, slaves and deserters excluded because they did not make independent travel decisions; unspecified also excluded, because no distinction could be made there between business and non-business travelers), they follow trends similar to those of business travelers, with stronger activity in July. There was no peak in March with immigrants. If all non-business immigrants were analyzed without immigrants, then there was drop in April-June and September and a stronger peak in July. This does not change the general picture much. See the Appendix 6.2 for the distribution of entries through weekdays.

⁶⁰⁰ Popović, *O Cincarima*, 82-89.

numbers and the exceptional drop in August, persisting in all years. Moreover, this would not reflect the expected averages for the seasonal labor from the Ottoman Empire to the Habsburg Monarchy. Most seasonal workers came in late spring, early summer, and the numbers should be the highest then. They are, however, highest in the last four months of the year, when these laborers should have been returning to their homes, and would not be registered in the Pančevo quarantine, since the tables did not record the traffic in that direction. If seasonal labor migrations existed, in Pačevo in the 1750s, they occurred in both directions, with more people possibly traveling to the Ottoman Empire for seasonal work, than in the opposite direction.⁶⁰¹ Low migration numbers from January to May could be also explained by local circumstances. Flowing ice on the Danube River during winter and early spring could make the border crossing very difficult or stop traffic completely.⁶⁰²

Migrations in Pančevo could be classified as voluntary. It is difficult to make a clear distinction between free and forced migrations.⁶⁰³ However, even the migrants who were unfree when they arrived to the Pančevo station, such as the deserters trying to sneak across the border and return to Germany, or arrestees, caught crossing the border illegally to avoid quarantine, originally started out their journey under their own free will. For slaves, crossing the border was an opportunity to gain their freedom or to continue their free life in a Christian country, if they were released by their Ottoman masters. While immigration from the Ottoman Empire could be classified as permanent, many through-work-defined migrations were probably yearly

⁶⁰¹ As, for example, *Wolleintretern*, Habsburg subjects who traveled seasonally to the Ottoman Empire to wash wool, were recorded in Mehadia. Monthly averages in Mehadia were similar to those in Pančevo, with weaker numbers in spring and the end of the year. Sutterlüti, “Die Kontumaz in Mehadia,” 49.

⁶⁰² Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 2: 24-28.

⁶⁰³ Lucassen and Lucassen, “Migration, Migration History,” 11-17.

or multiyear.⁶⁰⁴ Merchants' trips could last from a few months to a couple of years, as in the case of the merchant Matho Dellith, who entered the Pančevo quarantine in November 1752, June 1753 and February 1756.⁶⁰⁵ While such individual cases would suggest that many business migrations were circular, it is difficult to make generalizations. There is a contemporaneous survey of Ottoman merchants residing in parts of civil Hungary, which Hungarian authorities made in 1754.⁶⁰⁶ It would be reasonable to expect to find there many names from the Pančevo quarantine registers of 1752-1756, since some of the merchants certainly traveled to the Ottoman Empire and back through Pančevo. That, however, proved to be difficult, because the surnames did not seem to be stable and their writing is not sufficiently standardized to convincingly connect the names in the survey with the Pančevo registers. While, for example, Apostol Rosan from the 1754 survey was probably the same person as Apostol Ruschan from the Pančevo tables, it is difficult to claim a match for people carrying more common names and surnames, for instance the several Demetrius Popoviths (alternatively spelled as Demetrius/Dima/Demitro Popovics). The Magyarisation of the names in the Hungarian survey (Pál, János or György for Paule, Jovan/Jani for George from the Pančevo tables) makes the connection more tentative, while alternative use of nicknames (as the nicknames designating origin: Görög, Graek, Bugar, Bosznyák) and unstable family names makes positive identifications practically impossible.⁶⁰⁷ The circular nature of these migrations could be deduced indirectly. While some merchants mentioned in the tables, like the Ottoman consul

⁶⁰⁴ Lucassen and Lucassen, "Mobilität," 627-28.

⁶⁰⁵ The trips of Balkan merchants to other countries had similar dynamics, for example, four journeys of the Ottoman merchant Petar Andrejević (or Andrejić) from Peć (1746-1747, 1747-1748, 1749-1751, 1755). Dimitrijević, "Jedan naš trgovački dnevnik:" 364, 366-67.

⁶⁰⁶ Bur, "Handelsgesellschaften," 291-307.

⁶⁰⁷ Hacsí Duca from the Hungarian survey could be Hadgy Duca from the Pančevo tables, but he also could be somebody else.

Dimo Schokantar, brought their families from the Ottoman Empire, the overwhelming majority of other migrants defined through work was composed of adolescent and adult males. This would agree with the often sex-selective nature of circular migrations.⁶⁰⁸ Circular migrants would travel to the Habsburg Monarchy and would periodically return to their families in the Ottoman Empire with their earnings.

Impact of the Duration of Quarantine on Migrations

The border controls were introduced to facilitate migrations and in principle every healthy person was allowed to cross from the Ottoman Empire to the Habsburg Monarchy. However, in addition to quarantine time that needed to be counted in their travel, quarantined migrants, were sitting inactive in the quarantine station, spending their funds to buy food, firewood, and fodder for their horses. The question remains how big a hindrance compulsory quarantine was, and how it affected migration numbers. While it is not possible to know what the numbers would be without quarantine, it is possible to compare the impact of different quarantine durations on migrations.

The migrants arriving in Pančevo in the years 1752-1756 were subjected to different quarantine regimes (forty-two days during pestilent regime, twenty-eight during suspicious regime, and twenty-one days during healthy regime). The changes in quarantine regimes can be traced in Pančevo from 4 February 1752 to 27 July 1756.⁶⁰⁹ There were ten changes during this time. (See the Appendix 6.3.) Of 1,635 days, the healthy regime was in force more than half of the time (825 days), the

⁶⁰⁸ Tilly, "Migration in Modern European History," 51-57.

⁶⁰⁹ Sanitary diaries from Pančevo and the records of the Sanitary Court Commission/Deputation in Vienna complement the data from quarantine tables for the periods that quarantine tables did not cover (4 to 25 February 1752, 26 March – 25 May 1752, 1 February – 30 September 1755).

suspicious regime for about the sixth of a time (260 days), while a third of all days belonged to the pestilent regime (550 days).⁶¹⁰ Actual quarantine times were usually forty to forty-one days, twenty-seven days and twenty days instead of forty-two, twenty-eight and twenty-one days, perhaps because both the date of arrival and the date of departure were counted in.⁶¹¹

During the pestilent regime, the migrants had to pass exactly twice as long in the quarantine compared to healthy times (forty-two versus twenty-one days), doubling both the costs and the time lost. If the quarantine length played a major role in decisions whether or not to cross the border, it can be expected that a statistically

⁶¹⁰ SHK, Decree to the quarantine directors in Pančevo and Transylvania, Vienna, 4 February 1752, 1752 Februarius 2, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Bücher 1; SHD to TLA, 10 February 1753, 1753 Februarius 3; SHD to TLA, 10 April 1753, 1753 Aprilis 5; SHD to the Transylvanian SK; to TLA; to the General Scherzer, Vienna, 20 August 1753, 1753 Augustus 11; SHD to TLA, 8 September 1753, 1753 September 1; SHD to TLA, Vienna, 17 December 1753, 1753 December 5; SHD to Slav. SK, Vienna, 10 July 1754, 1754 Julius 3; SHD to TLA, 30 July 1754, 1754 Julius 10; SHD to TLA; to Slav. SK, to the Court and State Chancellery, Meuhof in Bohemia, 17 August 1754, 1754 Augustus 5; SHD to Slav. SK, Vienna, 13 November 1754, 1754 November 35; SHD to TLA, Vienna, 17 May 1755, 1755 Majus 2; SHD to TLA; also to Slav. SK, Vienna, 15 December 1755, 1755 December 9; SHD to TLA, Vienna, 3 April 1756, 1756 Aprilis 3; SHD to TLA, Vienna, 8 May 1756, 1756 Majus 2; SHD to TLA, Vienna, 22 June 1756, 1756 Junius 12; SHD to Slav. SK; to TLA, Vienna, 14 July 1756, 1756 Julius 12, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Bücher 2; Johann Paitsch to TLA, 10 December 1754, Sanitäts-Diarium von der Contumaz-Station Panzova pro Dezembris 1754; Johann Paitsch to TLA, 13 January 1755, Sanitäts-Diarium pro Januar 1755; Johann Paitsch to TLA, Pančevo, 10 November 1755, Sanitäts-Diarium pro November 1755; Johan Paitsch to TLA, 16 February 1756, Sanitäts-Diarium pro Februar 1756; Johann Paitsch to TLA, Pančevo, 17 November 1755, 25 November 1755, Sanitäts-Diarium pro November 1755; Johan Paitsch to TLA, 16 February 1756, Sanitäts-Diarium pro Februar 1756; Johann Paitsch to TLA, Pančevo, 28 June 1756, Sanitäts-Diarium pro Junii 1756; Johann Paitsch to TLA, Pančevo, 27 July 1756, Sanitäts-Diarium pro July 1756, FHKA NHK Banat A 123.

⁶¹¹ Some people spent a day, or very rarely, two days longer or less in the quarantine. When a shorter regime would be introduced, the people already in the quarantine would profit, since their quarantine would be immediately reduced too (on 26 June 1752, 23 April and 23 December 1753, 8 December 1754 and 26 December 1755). When quarantine would be extended, people who had started their quarantine before the extension were exempted from longer quarantine time. A decrease would apply to everybody, to persons already in the quarantine and to new arrivals, while increases only to new arrivals.

significant negative correlation between the length of quarantine and number of entrances could be detected. The longer the regime, more migrants would be expected to abandon or postpone their travel plans. I compared average daily entries⁶¹² for thirty-five months⁶¹³ with the regime that was in force that month (pestilent, suspicious and healthy regimes), calculated in weeks (three, four and six weeks). The sample size is made of 797 migrant entries.⁶¹⁴

Linear correlation analysis (Pearson) reveals that there is indeed a negative linear correlation between the number of daily entries of migrants and the quarantine length. The correlation is, however, a weak one, and statistically insignificant.⁶¹⁵ A separate analysis of professional groups: merchants with people with horses/servants,⁶¹⁶ decisions for merchants together with the people with servants/horses, clergy;⁶¹⁷ all

⁶¹² The migrants where only exits are known were not counted.

⁶¹³ I excluded from the calculation the months for which there are no data (April 1752, February-October 1755); where data are incomplete (February, March, May 1752); and the months with mixed regimes, when the change in the regime happened during the month (June 1752, April and August 1753, May and December 1754, November and December 1755). There are two exceptions to the last exclusion: the increase from three to six weeks at the end of December 1752 or at the beginning of January 1753 is assumed to have happened on the 1 January 1753 for the sake of this analysis. There were no entrances between 1 and 6 January 1753. The second similar change, the quarantine increase from three to six weeks happened on 28 June 1756, without new entries until the end of the month. I calculated the whole June 1753 as a three-weeks'-quarantine month.

⁶¹⁴ I excluded from analysis arrestees and deserters, because they did not make voluntary decisions to enter the quarantine. Authorities brought them there. I also excluded slaves. Some of them escaped from their Ottoman masters and could not delay or abandon their travel to avoid long quarantines. Without these three groups, 797 migrants were registered in Pančevo during the 35 analyzed months. After analyzing all 797 crossings, I analyzed specific professional and non-professional categories and the combination of categories.

⁶¹⁵ $R = -0.32$; $R = -0.332$ for decisions; $p\text{-value} = 0.06$; 0.051 for decisions. "Decisions" denote a comparison between the number of groups and the length of quarantine regimes, each group counted as only one entry and the length of quarantine regimes. This is based on an assumption that the decision whether to cross the border, to abandon or delay the trip was made on the group level.

⁶¹⁶ $R = -0.306$; $p\text{-value} = 0.073$; $R = -0.29$; $p\text{-value} = 0.09$ for decision makers.

⁶¹⁷ $R = -0.29$, $p\text{-value} = 0.09$.

business migrants with servants;⁶¹⁸ all business migrants with servants and clergy⁶¹⁹ reveals similar results, weak negative linear correlation, statistically insignificant.⁶²⁰ The only combination where the results are statistically significant is the combination of merchants, people with servants/horses and clergy – professional groups without artisans and servants.⁶²¹ Longer quarantines might have impacted the number of entrances of business travelers, but it was a minor factor of questionable significance.⁶²²

The results for non-business travelers suggests that quarantine length had little influence on their travel decisions.⁶²³ The results are particularly persuasive for immigrants, where there is no linear correlation between the average number of border crossings and the length of quarantine.⁶²⁴ This is not surprising. When immigrants decided to cross the border, their decision was permanent. Three additional weeks did not play an important role, particularly with Habsburg state aid covering their sustenance until the first harvest, including quarantine costs.

Compulsory quarantine must have been, nevertheless, an enormous burden on short-distance non-definitive trips. The available documents suggest that inhabitants on both sides of the border maintained close social and economic relations. People

⁶¹⁸ R = -0.28; p-value = 0.099.

⁶¹⁹ R = -0.31; p-value = 0.07; decisions R = -0.30; p-value = 0.08.

⁶²⁰ P-value between 0.05 and 0.1. Statistical insignificance of the results further increases with merchants (including decisions makers), people with horses/servants (including decision makers); the combination of merchants, artisans, people with horses/servants (with decision makers); all business migrants and servants (only for decision makers) and clergy (with decision makers), with p-values above 0.1 and weaker negative linear correlation (varying between R=-0.20 and R=-0.28).

⁶²¹ R = -0.43; p-value = 0.045.

⁶²² For some migrants this could be an information problem. Particularly at the beginning of new quarantine regimes, the migrants might not be informed in advance that quarantine was shortened or extended. Business migrants were, on the other hand, in general well informed and could guess, based on news and rumors about epidemic diseases, the length of the regime on the Habsburg border.

⁶²³ R=-0.14; -0.12 for decisions; p-value = 0.39; 0.51 for decisions.

⁶²⁴ R = -0.008; R=0.03 for decisions; p-values: 0.96; 0.85.

across the border usually shared language and ethnicity.⁶²⁵ They married each other. Some families had members who were Ottoman subjects and members who were Habsburg subjects. Business people had their partners across the boundary. These were all incentives to travel. Before the journey started, the border controls had to be factored in. Short trips lasting for hours or days from an Ottoman border province to the Habsburg territory just across the river would turn into expensive multi-weeks' journeys, discouraging all non-essential travels.⁶²⁶ While merchants' profits from commerce made their border crossings economically feasible, increased travel time and costs might have raised the threshold too high for other types of travel. Short-distance circular migrations, for example, visits to relatives and friends, and pilgrimages, would suffer. Seasonal labor, where substantial time and money investments in the quarantine could not be economically justified by earned wages, would also take a hit. The mere existence of quarantine could have led to a greater social and economic separation between Ottoman and Habsburg provinces.⁶²⁷ We do not know, however, how big the impact was. Ethnic (regional) labels, with their limited reliability, could provide an indirect indicator, while keeping in mind that they were not stable and could denote different things.

⁶²⁵ Klaus Roth, "Rivers as Bridges – Rivers as Boundaries: Some Reflections on Intercultural Exchange on the Danube," *Ethnologia Balkanica* 1 (1997): 20-23.

⁶²⁶ There was a weak and statistically insignificant correlation ($R = -0.21$, p -value 0,22) between daily entries of migrants from Serbia, Banat and Zemun (short-distance migrations) and the length of quarantine regimes. The results for long distance travelers (Greeks, Aromanians, Albanians) is similar ($R = -0.22$, p -value 0,19).

⁶²⁷ It seems that short-distance circular migrations were less affected in Mehadia, where home-community local migrations continued to prevail. Romanians and Serbs made up about 68% of migrants with ethnic markers in Mehadia. Sutterlüti, "Die Kontumaz in Mehadia," 52-54.

Ethnicities and Distances

Early modern ethnicities were less pronounced and more flexible, sometimes difficult to pinpoint, particularly in illiterate rural communities. In that regard, the southern provinces of the Habsburg Monarchy did not differ much from other parts of Europe. Ethnicities should be approached with care for two reasons. First, ethnic markers were unstable. In eleven cases in the Pančevo tables, one identity was recorded at the entrance (Serb/Raitz; Bulgarian), and another at the exit (Bulgarian; Greek).⁶²⁸ Even if we interpret “Greek” as a religious designation, a short form for Greek Orthodox Christian, the change from Serbs to Bulgarians still remains difficult to explain. Both were broad ethnic designations, not synonyms with religion or occupation. We should keep in mind that, even though the cases with multiple ethnic markers make up only 1.5% of all migrants with ethnic or regional labels,⁶²⁹ ethnic markers were changeable. There were some limits and rules that applied to shifting ethnic markers. The shifts of ethnic labels occurred inside the religious denomination of Orthodox Christians. Shifts between different religions, or different Christian denominations were rare and much more difficult. None were recorded in Pančevo.

Second, apparent ethnic names were sometimes used to denote religion, membership in a particular congregation, province of origin, residence or occupation. The seemingly ethnic label “Turks” (Türckhen, Türken) is a good example,

⁶²⁸ Stan Dreftovith, Stan George, and Stamo Stojanovith, were designed as Serbs (Raitzen) at their entrance on 3 December 1755, as Bulgarians at their exit, on 26 December 1755; George Jovan was Serb (Raitz) when he entered on 7 April 1756, and a Bulgarian (Bulgar), when he exited on 27 April 1756; George Banko was marked as Serb when he entered on 12 February 1756, and as Greek (Griech), when he exited on 4 March 1756; the same change from Serb to Greek occurred in the cases of Matha Bergith, Illie Jankovith, Netelko Stojanovith, and George Stamato, who entered Pančevo on 15 June 1756, and left it on 5 July 1756; Mihal Adanassj, and Stama Mafratj entered as Bulgarians on 23 February 1756 and exited as Greeks on 14 March 1756.

⁶²⁹ Making eleven of the 717 migrants with ethnicity or regional identity indicated.

designating a religious identity, not an ethnic identity. Muslims were equated with Turks. The name “Turks” could cover the ethnic identities of Muslim Turks, Slavs, Greeks or Albanians. A similar use of ethnic names to denote religious identities existed in the Russian Empire, where accepting Christianity meant “becoming Russian,” while accepting Islam meant “becoming Tatar.”⁶³⁰ “Turks” in the Pančevo quarantine tables of 1752-1756 could be thus ethnic Turks originally from Istanbul or Anatolia, but also Slavic-speaking Muslims from the towns just across the boundary. Some of them may have been even originally from Banat, refugees or the descendants of refugees from the province that was under Ottoman rule until 1718.⁶³¹ Many of them were merchants. Some could be at the same time state servants. Janissaries, using their tax exemptions, were actively engaged in cross-border travel. Although some Muslims were engaged in commerce with Vienna, and resided there,⁶³² Muslim

⁶³⁰ Khodarkovsky, *Russia's Steppe Frontier*, 185-86; Pedani, *Dalla frontiera al confine*, 93-94.

⁶³¹ They left for two reasons. First, Muslims were not tolerated in the Habsburg Monarchy. After the conquest of Lika in the 1680s, for example, the Muslim population was left with the choice of converting to Catholic Christianity or leaving. This requirement of conversion remained a prerequisite in peacetime too, throughout the eighteenth century. Conversion was to be followed by the pledge of allegiance (*Huldigungseid*) to the Habsburg ruler. Most Muslims left Lika in the 1680s. Most of those who stayed and converted left ultimately too, because Christian immigrants continued to harass them. Second, the emigration was in line with Islamic recommendations that pious Muslims should not live permanently under non-Islamic rulers, but should move to Islamic territory. The arrival of numerous refugees in Ottoman territory and the emigration of Orthodox and Catholic Christians to Venetian and Habsburg territories increased the number of Muslims and their relative significance in the remaining Ottoman European provinces, including Bosnia. After the Habsburg conquest of Ottoman Croatia, Slavonia, Hungary and Banat, Muslim refugees went to Ottoman territory, mostly to Bosnia (130,000 refugees). Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 59-60; vol. 2: 27-28; vol. 3: 59-60; Kaser, Grandits and Gruber, *Popis Like i Krbave 1712*, 10-11, 18-20; Faroqi, “The Ottoman Empire Confronting the Christian World,” 95; Sundhaussen, “Südosteuropa,” 292, 296-300; Pelidija, “O migracionim kretanjima,” 119-31. Pelidija’s estimate, that this increased the Muslim population to 70% and that subsequent religious-selective demographic explosion of Orthodox Christians “changed the ethnic picture” of the province, seems both anachronistic and implausible.

⁶³² HHStA StAbt Türkei V 27, Konv. 7, Konskription der Türken und türkischen Untertanen in Wien, 1766.

participation overall, compared to Christian merchants, was modest.⁶³³ The label “Turk” gives little indication about migrants’ possible region of origin.

The labels “Jew” and “Armenian” also give little clue about migrants’ origin. Fifteen entries in Pančevo were registered as Jews, suggesting that Jewish merchants either avoided Pančevo, or they had an even more modest role in commerce than Muslims in the 1750s, a result of a long decline. Most Ottoman Jews were former Sephardic refugees who had fled Spain after 1492. They built a big merchant network that continued to develop until around 1660. The Ottoman retreat from Hungary in 1683-1718 and parts of the northern Balkans made a lasting impact, wiping out Jewish merchant communities. Around 1680 about a thousand Jews lived in Zemun, but by around 1750 only fifty remained. The Habsburg Monarchy offered much less freedom than the Ottomans to domestic Jews. On the border, Jews were tolerated in Zemun, where they had a synagogue, and they were present in Pančevo, but they were rare elsewhere. Five Jews in the Pančevo quarantine tables were merchants. For eight no occupation was specified or implied.⁶³⁴ It is also difficult to determine a region or origin for six Armenians who entered Pančevo during forty-three months in 1752-1756. They could be Persian subjects, or Ottoman subjects from Asia Minor, or from Balkan towns, where they resided as merchants and artisans.⁶³⁵

⁶³³ See the Appendix 6.4. for a breakdown of Muslim migrants in Pančevo.

⁶³⁴ From the reign of Joseph II, Jewish economic activity and the number of Jews increased, but not significantly on the Military Border. Many Jews worked as petty traders in the first half of the nineteenth century. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 59-60, vol. 2: 27-28; vol. 3: 59-60; Engel, “Beschreibung des Königreichs Slawonien,” vol. 1: 72-73; vol. 2: 574-81, 759-60, 762, 764-66; Hietzinger, *Statistik der Militärgränze*, vol. 1: 204; Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemälde*, 55-56, 59-62; Tkalac, *Jugenderinnerungen*, 303-304; Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:” 245-47, 298-300; Gavrilović, *Jevreji u Sremu*, particularly 47-99; Zelepos, “Griechische Händler und Fanarioten,” 615-16; Roitman, “Sephardische Juden,” 976. See Appendix 6.4.

⁶³⁵ Armenians were present in Zemun, but were rare elsewhere on the Military Border, where they occasionally were peddlers. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 2: 27-28; vol. 3:

Other ethnic or regional markers were less strictly aligned with religion or particular Christian denominations. They could be used as proxies for a region or regions of origin, making it possible to differentiate between long-distance, medium-distance and short-distance migrations. The self-identification⁶³⁶ of Pančevo migrants played a role, as is visible in the identities with which quarantine officials were less familiar. Thus, a merchant Matho Dellith, who entered Pančevo in March 1752, June 1753 and February 1756, identified himself as an “Albaneuser/Albanesser,” and this identity was written down. Sometimes ethnicity mattered for migrants. In business networks, family and ethnic ties were often formative.⁶³⁷ Ethnicity could speed up or slow down integration in some urban communities, increasing in importance as the eighteenth century went on. In Zemun, Vienna, Pest and Trieste, Greek merchants insisted on preserving their separate church service and schools in Greek, refusing integration with their Serb co-religionists.⁶³⁸

59-60; Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemählde*, 55-56, 59-62; Ivanova, “The Empire’s ‘own’ Foreigners:” 682-702; Rossitsa Gradeva, “The Ottoman Balkans: a Zone of Fracture or a Zone of Contacts?” in *Zones of Fracture in Modern Europe: the Baltic Countries, the Balkans, and Northern Italy*, 72; Sundhaussen, “Südosteuropa,” 298-300; Zelepos, “Griechische Händler und Fanarioten,” 615-16; Subrahmanyam, *Three Ways to Be Alien*, 17-18.

⁶³⁶ See Lucassen, “Towards a Comparative History of Migration:” 29, for the importance of self-identification and the identification by the host population.

⁶³⁷ Mantouvalos, “Greek Immigrants in Central Europe,” 32-33. The companies of Orthodox Christian merchants in the Habsburg Monarchy and the Ottoman Empire were often composed of family members and countrymen. Bur, “Handelsgesellschaften;” Popović, *O Cincarima*, 83-84.

⁶³⁸ In the 1720s, Ottoman Orthodox subjects in Vienna came into jurisdictional conflict with the Serbian Metropolitan of Karlovci, the highest Orthodox Church authority in the Habsburg Monarchy. They insisted on remaining under the authority of the Greek Patriarch in Constantinople. Ransmayr, “Greek Presence in Habsburg Vienna,” 136; Mantouvalos, “Greek Immigrants in Central Europe,” 40-43. In the late eighteenth century the Greek Orthodox community in Trieste, insisting on language and church service differences separated from the joint Serbian-Greek Orthodox community. Bur, “Handelsgesellschaften;” Popović, *O Cincarima*, 159-93, 199-243; Katsiardi-Hering, “Migrationen:” 128-30, 135-36, 141-45.

The Habsburg administration cared about ethnicities, too. Quarantine officials made a distinction between different ethnic and regional identities. While early modern states did not define ethnicity as we understand it today,⁶³⁹ it was not irrelevant. The societies in the Habsburg Monarchy were divided along ethnic lines.⁶⁴⁰ In dynastic states immigrants had to stay loyal to the ruler, but they did not need to integrate into the domestic culture or the language.⁶⁴¹ In the perception of the Habsburg authorities, there was a hierarchy of domestic ethnicities, each possessing different qualities. Catholic Germans were considered to be, for example, hard working and loyal subjects. They were ideal inhabitants of Hungarian fortresses in Banat, while Serbs lived in Serbian suburbs (Raitzenstädte). Serbs and Romanians were perceived to have higher fertility, thanks to early marriages, leading to faster population growth.⁶⁴² Habsburg authorities encouraged village segregation, mono-ethnic settlements as better for communal peace. In Banat, Serbs and Romanians, called “Nationalisten,” to denote that they lived in the province before the Habsburg conquest, were resettled to create separate German settlements.⁶⁴³

⁶³⁹ An a priori focus on ethnicities, particularly an essentialist understanding of ethnic designations, seeing them as stable centuries-old groups, is for this reason problematic. The ethnicity was not as decisive for integration and assimilation as religion. Lucassen and Lucassen, “Migration, Migration History,” 23; Lucassen, “Towards a Comparative History of Migration,” 27-28.

⁶⁴⁰ Bosma, Kessler and Lucassen, “Migration and Membership Regimes,” 11-12.

⁶⁴¹ Lucassen and Lucassen, “Mobilität,” 632-33.

⁶⁴² Hietzinger, *Statistik der Militärgränze*, vol. 1: 178-79.

⁶⁴³ Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 21-28, 79-81; Seewann, “Migration in Südosteuropa,” 89-90, 99-101, 103-106; Wolf, “Ethnische Konflikte,” 337-46, 348-53, 359-66; Steiner, *Rückkehr unerwünscht*, 122-24, 130-34. Ethnic closeness, a shared language and dialect could also trump religious differences, for example the settlement of Catholic and Orthodox South Slavs in Croatia and Slavonia that originally proceeded spontaneously. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 3, Foreword to the volume 3; Engel, “Beschreibung des Königreichs Slawonien,” vol. 1: 13-16, 21, 45, 83; Hietzinger, *Statistik der Militärgränze*, vol. 1: 198-200, 207; Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemählde*, 55-56, 59-62; Kaser, Grandits and Gruber, *Popis Like i Krbave 1712*, 11-13, 18-23. The state became more involved as the eighteenth century went on. Gavrilović, *Prilog istoriji trgovine i migracije*, 116-20.

Early modern ethnicities, the shared language, dialect, material culture, oral traditions and customs, therefore mattered to some degree to both Habsburg bureaucrats and to migrants. The Pančevo records made some distinction between different ethnic and regional identities. The distinction between the most numerous group with ethnic label, “Greeks,” and other groups is the most difficult to pinpoint. The name “Greek” was ambiguous. It could designate ethnic identity, a person whose native language was Greek. It was also a synonym for Orthodox Christians, short for Greek Orthodox Christians.⁶⁴⁴ It could more narrowly refer to the believers under the jurisdiction of the Greek-led Patriarchate of Constantinople (and not to the Serb-led Habsburg Orthodox Metropolitanate of Karlovci). It could also refer to a social-professional group, being a synonym for Orthodox merchants or for merchants in general. In some parts of Hungary “Greek” was a synonym for merchants, so much so that a Jewish merchant could be called “Jewish Greek.” These meanings could overlap. Orthodox merchants from Macedonia, Epirus and Thessaly were principally engaged in land trade with Hungary and Central Europe. Greek merchants were present in Transylvania in the seventeenth century. After the Habsburgs gained control of Transylvania and Ottoman Hungary in 1699, “Greek” merchants, who acquired commercial privileges in 1718, became very active in international trade, visiting fairs in Lemberg, Nežin (Nizhyn), Wrocław (Breslau), Leipzig, Pest and Debrecen. After around 1750, “Greeks” became more important as merchants than Serbs in Hungary. The Greek language was at this time the *lingua franca* of trade and was used not only by Greeks. Some “Greeks” were ethnic Greeks, while others might

⁶⁴⁴ In Russian Empire in 1701-1710, the name “Greek” was used to designate Orthodox Christians from southeastern Europe: “Moldavian Greek,” “Wallachian Greek,” “Bulgarian Greek,” “Greek-Bulgarian,” “Greek-Serb.” Bulgarian, Wallachian and Greek members of the community in Nezhin, a city on the left bank of the River Dnieper, used “Greek” as a common name. Carras, “Connecting Migration and Identities,” 71-72, 76, 80, 82, 84, 86-92.

be Aromanians, Albanians or Slavs. The majority of “Greeks” in Zemun in 1770 were, for example, Aromanians.⁶⁴⁵

The name “Greek” in the Pančevo tables was probably used to mean a social-professional and confessional group, called by Stoianovich “Balkan Orthodox merchants.”⁶⁴⁶ It designated, however, just a part of that group. It probably did not include local ethnicities (Serbs, Romanians), which Pančevo officials were familiar with and could recognize easily. The designation could be more specific, since the quarantine records mention other ethnic groups from the central Balkans separately. One of these groups is the ethnic group of Aromanians, called *Zinsars* in the quarantine tables.⁶⁴⁷ This is a Romance-speaking group that still exists in what is now Albania, Macedonia and northern Greece. The majority was Slavicized or Grecized in the past. Its language is the closest to Romanian. Their main profession was livestock breeding, but they engaged also early in caravan transports and then in commerce, with many being artisans, builders, carpenters, silversmiths, and woodcarvers in search for seasonal work. While Aromanian merchants gradually assimilated into Greek or Serbian Orthodox majorities, Aromanian artisans and peddlers kept their Aromanian language and identity for a longer time.⁶⁴⁸ *Zinzars* in Pančevo were

⁶⁴⁵ Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:” 245-47, 277-79, 290-91, 304; Bur, “Handelsgesellschaften,” 269-90; Katsiardi-Hering, “Migrationen:” 133; Faroqi, “The Ottoman Empire Confronting the Christian World,” 95, 106; Zelepos, “Griechische Händler und Fanarioten,” 615-16; Sundhaussen, “Südosteuropa,” 292, 298-300; Katsiardi-Hering, “Grenz-, Staats- und Gemeindegrenskriptionen,” 236, 238-44; Mantouvalos, “Greek Immigrants in Central Europe,” 35. See also the Appendix 6.4.

⁶⁴⁶ Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant.”

⁶⁴⁷ The exonym Zinzar is considered derisory today.

⁶⁴⁸ Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, Vol. 2: 22-24; Max Demeter Peyfuss, *Die Aromunische Frage. Ihre Entwicklung von den Ursprüngen bis zum Frieden von Bukarest (1913) und die Haltung Österreich-Ungarns* (Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1974), 11-20; Sundhaussen, “Südosteuropa,” 298-300; Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:” 252-53, 260-62, 276-79, 290-91; Popović, *O Cincarima*, 9, 17-22, 24-39, 42-46, 54-56, 71, 82-89, 91-98, 102-105, 110-11, 149-58, 169-70, 282; Zelepos, “Griechische Händler und Fanarioten,” 615-16; Katsiardi-

perhaps these peddlers and artisans. Using their ethnic names as proxies, I designated both Greeks and Aromanians as relatively long-distance migrants, coming from the southern and central Balkans. I have also classified three “Albanian” (Albaneuser/ Albanesse)⁶⁴⁹ and one “Arnaut”⁶⁵⁰ (an alternative name for Albanians⁶⁵¹) entries as long-distance migrants.

During the period covered by quarantine tables, forty persons identified as Bulgarians crossed the border at Pančevo. Twelve of them were members of traveling families. Eleven Bulgarians were artisans, servants or people with horses and servants. Bulgarian involvement in commerce increased at about this time, around 1750, when Bulgarians from Rhodope and the Balkan Mountains (Stara Planina) became more active.⁶⁵² Their regions of origins were closer than those of Greek or Aromanians. They did not live, however, in adjacent Ottoman and Habsburg provinces. For this

Hering, “Grenz-, Staats- und Gemeindegrenzkonskriptionen,” 238-44, 248-50; Olga Katsiardi-Hering and Maria Stassinopoulou, “The Long 18th Century of Greek Commerce in the Habsburg Empire: Social Careers,” in *Social Change in the Habsburg Monarchy*, ed. Harald Heppner, Peter Urbanitsch and Renate Zedlinger (Bochum: Verlag Dr. Dieter Winkler, 2011), 198-202. For a breakdown of Aromanian migrants in Pančevo, see Appendix 6.4.

⁶⁴⁹ There is a possibility that the “Albanian” was from Venetian Albania, in which case it is a regional, not an ethnic designation. The migrant would nevertheless travel approximately the same distance as ethnic Albanians.

⁶⁵⁰ Risto Andrea.

⁶⁵¹ Orthodox Albanians were present among “Greek” merchants who crossed the border. They used Greek as a business language. Albanians could also be Catholics. In the eighteenth century a group of Catholic Albanians crossed into the Habsburg Monarchy and settled in Srem, where they preserved their distinctiveness throughout the century and were known as “Clementiner,” “Arnauten” and Albanians (Albanier). In 1835 their number was estimated at 2,000. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 3, 59; Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemählde*, 55-56, 59-62; Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:” 277-79, 290-91; Bur, “Handelsgesellschaften,” 269-90; Sima Ćirković, “Albanci u ogledalu južnoslovenskih izvora,” in *Iliri i Albanci*, ed. Milutin Garašanin (Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1988), 323-39; Katsiardi-Hering, “Migrationen:” 128-30, 135-36, 141-45; Zelepos, “Griechische Händler und Fanarioten,” 615-16.

⁶⁵² Stoianovich, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:” 279-82; Wolf, “Ethnische Konflikte,” 337-46.

reason, I classify them as medium-range migrants. Some Bulgarians could have been Habsburg subjects. Catholic Bulgarians settled in Banat at the end of the 1730s. At this time, Bulgarian settlements were still exclusively in the far northern Banat,⁶⁵³ making their classification as medium-range migrants plausible as well. I also classified entries of three Bosnians as medium-range migrants.⁶⁵⁴

The migrants designated as *Wallachen* in the Pančevo quarantine tables were Romanians.⁶⁵⁵ Romanians formed, together with the Serbs, the indigenous population of the Banat at the time of Habsburg conquest.⁶⁵⁶ Half of the Romanian migrants in Pančevo (twenty persons) were males and traveled alone. They might be seasonal laborers. One Romanian was designated as artisan, another as an escaped slave. The remaining eleven migrants were labeled as traveling families, four migrants as returning Habsburg subjects, while five were designated as immigrants. Modest number of Romanians in Pančevo could be explained by the fact that most Banat Romanian settlements were far away from Pančevo, in the eastern Banat, approximately east of the line Arad-Temesvár-Bela Crkva. Ottoman Romanians could come from what is now eastern Serbia, or the Ottoman vassal Principality of Wallachia, both gravitating to the other Banat border crossing, Mehadia. Roman

⁶⁵³ Two Bulgarian Banat settlements were Vinga and Beshenov (today Dudeștii Vechi). Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 21-28, 83-98; Lyubomir Klimentov Georgiev, "In Search of the Promised Land: Bulgarian Settlers in the Banat (18th-19th Centuries)," in *Across the Danube*, 196-199, 202-209.

⁶⁵⁴ The name *Bosniak*, used presently to denote the Muslim constituent nation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, appeared in the Pančevo tables to denote three persons, Costa Kassanzi, George Maxim/Janos, Peter Thomeskovich. While it is difficult to deduce much from the names, it can be safely concluded that all three were Christians, Orthodox or Catholic. The name *Bosniak* would therefore be a regional name, with similar meaning to modern Bosnian. One "Bosniak" was recorded in Mehadia too. Sutterlützi, "Die Kontumaz in Mehadia," 56.

⁶⁵⁵ The same name was used in Croatia and Slavonia to designate Serbs. See also Marin, *Contested Frontiers*, 48-49.

⁶⁵⁶ Together with Gypsies and few remaining Jews. Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*. Wolf, "Ethische Konflikte," 337-46, 348-53, 359-66.

settlements were closer than Bulgarian, placing them somewhere between short-distance and medium-distance migrations. Since the migrants from there would need to travel eighty kilometers or in most cases much more to reach Pančevo, I grouped them with other medium-distance migrations.

The second most frequent ethnic label in the Pančevo tables was “Raitz,” “Raitzen,” (also Raiz) from the Hungarian exonym for Serbs, Rác.⁶⁵⁷ This was one of the four names the Habsburg administration used in contemporary sources to designate the Serb population in Pančevo and on the Military Border. The others were the endonym, Serbs (Serben)⁶⁵⁸, an exonym Vlachs/Wallachians (Wallachen)⁶⁵⁹ and

⁶⁵⁷ The term Raitzen was used interchangeably with the terms “Serbs,” and “Illyrians.” In Novi Sad (Neusatz) lived “die Rascier oder Rätzen,” or “die Serbier von der griechischen Religion.”⁶⁵⁷ Orthodox Illyrier are called Raizen or Raazen, Rascier. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 3-4. *Raizen* or *Raazen* were “bey den Illyriern nur die jenigen von ihnen, welche Glaubensverwandte der morgenländischen Kirche sind.” Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 2: 49-51; almost identical formulation by Engel, “Beschreibung des Königreichs Slawonien,” vol. 1: 16: “Raitzen, welcher Name derzeit bei den Illyriern nur diejenige von ihnen, welche Glaubens verwandte der morgenländischen Kirchen sind, auszeichnet.”

⁶⁵⁸ Domestic population, Orthodox prelates and the eighteen-century Serbian authors used the name “Serbs” as the preferable ethnic name (see for example the memoirs of Simeon Pishchevic, *Izvestie o pokhozhdenii Simeona Stepanovicha Pishchevicha, 1731-1785* (Moscow: Moscow University, 1884); Veselinović, “Srbi u Hrvatskoj u XVI i XVII veku:” 471-87. The name was used by Habsburg bureaucrats in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Veselinović, “Srbi u Hrvatskoj u XVI i XVII veku:” 433, 448) and in the eighteenth-century description of the Military Border in German, but much less frequently than other names. For example “Der größer Theil der Einwohner [Slavoniens] bestehet aus Serben,” Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 3: 96; Engel, “Beschreibung des Königreichs Slawonien,” vol. 1: 16, 21; Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 17.

⁶⁵⁹ Some sources used the name “Wallach” to refer to Orthodox Serbs in Pančevo, such as an eighteenth-century map of Pančevo, where the Orthodox Preobraženska Church, used by Orthodox Serbs in the town is labeled “Wallach Kirche”. Lit. P. Situations Plan der Pancsovaer Contumaz-Sambtdessen vorContumaz, Hungarian State Archives (Magyar Országos Levéltár), Budapest, S 12 - Div. XII. - No. 28:2). I am grateful to Benjamin Landais for allowing me to inspect the map. In the Pančevo quarantine tables, however, the term “Valachs/Wallachians” was used to denote Romanians. See Appendix 6.4. for more details.

the archaized name Illyrians (Illyrier).⁶⁶⁰ In Pančevo, the term *Raitzen/Raizen* was used as an ethnic name and regional term, to refer to Serbs as an ethnic group.⁶⁶¹ Most settlements around Pančevo, on both sides of the border, were settled by Serbs, who settled most of the Banat even before the Ottomans conquered it in 1541.⁶⁶² The Serbian population in Banat increased with the settlement of soldiers from the Tisza-Maros Military Border, dissolved in 1751-1752,⁶⁶³ and with immigration from the Ottoman Empire. Serb migrants in general crossed shorter distances than other migrants, mostly traveling between contiguous Ottoman and Habsburg Banat. For that reason I classified them as short-distance migrants.

The following ethnic labels were excluded from the classification into long-distance, medium-distance and short-distance migrations. One Gypsy boy (Zigeuner Bub) Stann Nicola passed through Pančevo in August 1753.⁶⁶⁴ As with Jews and Muslims, it is difficult to determine approximately from where he was coming. All three Germans in the Pančevo tables were military deserters, not German settlers who were present in the province since 1720s.⁶⁶⁵ A single Hungarian, Thomas Midiz,

⁶⁶⁰ See Appendix 6.4. for the discussion of the term.

⁶⁶¹ Pest-Ordnung, Graz, 14 October 1710, FHKA SUS Patente 43.15; Stoianovich, "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:" 234-38; Seewann, "Migration in Südosteuropa," 89-101, 103-106; Faroqi, "The Ottoman Empire Confronting the Christian World," 106; Ibolya Gerelyes, "Garrisons and the Local Population in Ottoman Hungary: The Testimony of the Archeological Finds," in *The Frontiers of the Ottoman World*, 385-401. See also the Appendix 6.4.

⁶⁶² Dávid, "The Eyalet of Temesvár:" 124-27. Serbs made up a significant part of the population of Ottoman Hungary in the seventeenth century. The medieval counties of Požega, Baranya and Srem were alternatively called Rácország, Rascia (Serbia). Varga, "Croatia and Slavonia:" 264.

⁶⁶³ Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 83-98.

⁶⁶⁴ Vagabond Gypsies (herumschweifenden Zigeuner) were present, despite being formally forbidden in border provinces. "New peasants" (Neubauern), Gypsies who accepted sedentary life and settled permanently in villages, were, however, allowed. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 59-60; Hietzinger, *Statistik der Militärgränze*, 1: 204; Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemählde*, 55-56, 59-62.

⁶⁶⁵ Germans were newcomers to the Banat, settling there from the 1720s. In the 1750s they were present mainly in northern Banat. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 59-60;

passed through the Pančevo quarantine station during forty-three months. The number of Hungarians in Banat was modest at this time. They were perceived as newcomers, since they had disappeared from the province before 1699.⁶⁶⁶ Since I couldn't determine to which of the three distance categories Midiz could belong based on his province of origin, I excluded him from the classification.

Table 6.1. The Classification of Migrants into Short-, Medium- and Long-Distance groups, Based on Recorded Ethnic Labels in Pančevo (1752-1756)

	number	%
Short distance	163	25%
<i>Serbs</i>	163	
Medium distance	76	12%
<i>Romanians</i>	33	
<i>Bulgarians</i>	40	
<i>Bosnians</i>	3	
Long distance	410	63%
<i>Greeks</i>	327	
<i>Aromanians</i>	79	
<i>Albanians</i>	4	
Sum	649	100%

According to the classification, among the migrants with ethnic labels, the short-distance and medium distance migrants comprised somewhat more than a third of migrants in Pančevo. Among the migrants with ethnic identities, the migrants who made longer trips (400 km or more) accounted for almost two thirds of all entries in

Jowitsch, *Ethnographisches Gemählde*, 55-56, 59-62; Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 21-28, 79-81, 83-98; Seewann, "Migration in Südosteuropa," 89-90, 92-101, 103-106; Wolf, "Ethnische Konflikte," 337-46, 348-53, 359-66.

⁶⁶⁶ Their number decreased significantly even before the Ottoman conquest of Banat in 1541. A Hungarian community survived only in Temesvár, but disappeared before 1699. When the Habsburgs conquered the province in 1718, no Hungarian communities remained in the province. By 1734, only two Hungarian villages had been established. Taube, *Historische und geographische Beschreibung*, vol. 1: 59-60; Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat*, 17, 21-28; Dávid, "The Eyalet of Temesvár," 122-28; Seewann, "Migration in Südosteuropa," 92-98; Wolf, "Ethnische Konflikte," 337-46.

Pančevo in 1752-1756.⁶⁶⁷ This would suggest that the “hard border” or compulsory quarantine had the biggest impact on short- and medium-distance migrations, depressing potential numbers. This is based on the assumption that without border controls, most migrants would come from Banat or the Ottoman and Habsburg provinces adjacent to Pančevo, followed by the migrants traveling medium and longer distances. The existence of border controls, however, only marginally affected long-distance migration. Migrants needed stronger motives and more funds to begin long-distance travels. Compulsory quarantine had less influence on their decision to migrate. Compulsory border controls, despite their inclusive nature, appeared to have a negative effect on cross-border mobility and migrations. It made the strongest impact on the shortest travels, with its influence gradually decreasing with distance.

Migrations in Pančevo in the 1750s and 1760s and the Overall Number of Migrants on the Habsburg-Ottoman Land Border in 1768

In the early 1770s, the Sanitary Court Deputation undertook a general review of border quarantine facilities preparing to transfer the sanitary border administration to the jurisdiction of the War Council. The records from this review allow us a brief look at migration trends in Pančevo in the 1750s-1760s. They also help us to reconstruct the picture of overall migration on the Habsburg-Ottoman border in 1768. For the early 1770s review of border quarantine facilities, the Pančevo quarantine director Wisinger sent an extract from its records, listing entries between 1 January 1768 and 17 July 1769. This record shows that during 1768, 917 migrants entered the Habsburg

⁶⁶⁷ See the Appendix 6.4. for a breakdown of ethnic groups along status and occupation categories.

Monarchy through Pančevo⁶⁶⁸ Compared to average numbers of migrants per year in 1752-1756, the number of migrants entering Pančevo tripled by 1768. The migration grew 8.3% on average in the period 1754-1768.⁶⁶⁹ A similar upward trend is visible also in nine Transylvanian quarantine stations, where migration numbers grew about 16% on average for the years 1763-1767.⁶⁷⁰ This increase happened before a major revision of sanitary procedures in January 1770, which limited quarantine time to forty-two days during the times of plague. During the 1750s and the 1760s, quarantine stations occasionally introduced longer quarantines as an additional precaution. Migration numbers grew despite compulsory quarantines and their occasional extension over the prescribed forty-two days. This is an additional indication that quarantine lengths had very limited influence on overall migration numbers.

Thanks to available data, it is possible to estimate the number of migrants crossing the Habsburg-Ottoman land border during 1768, showing the relative importance of Pančevo and of other quarantine stations along the border. Summary records with exact numbers were preserved for ten out of eighteen quarantine stations. For the remaining eight stations, it is possible to make approximate estimations using indirect information. Upon request from Vienna, the Transylvanian Sanitary Commission sent a table of persons, animals and goods that entered the Habsburg Monarchy between the 1 January 1763 and 1770 through nine Transylvanian

⁶⁶⁸ Extract des seit Anno. 1768 bis 17 July 1769 ex Turcico in die Panczovaer Contumaz eingelangten Personalis, Fr. Wisinger, Contumaz director, Pančevo, 17 July 1769, 1770 13, Sanität Contumatz Plane no. 13, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Akten 3.

⁶⁶⁹ I used Microsoft Excel XIRR function to calculate average yearly growth rates in the years 1754-1768 in Pančevo. An average yearly growth would be 8.29%. The comparison with the records from Transylvanian stations from the 1760s would suggest that growth was possibly slower in the 1750s and stronger in the 1760s.

⁶⁷⁰ Tabella deren in nachbenannten Contumaz Stationen des Großfürstentums Siebenbürgen vom Ersten Januar 1763 bis Ende December 1770 angekommenen- und nach institutmäßiger Behandlung entlaßen wordenen Personen, Waaren und Vieh. 1773 Aprilis 16, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Akten 2.

stations.⁶⁷¹ Together with the records from Pančevo, that provides exact migration numbers for ten stations. I estimated the numbers for the Mehadia station to be 2,804 persons for the year 1768. I based the estimation on the ratio between Pančevo and Mehadia in 1752-1756, as well as on the assumption that Mehadia grew at double the rate of Pančevo. Unlike Pančevo, it had a pre-quarantine facility, enabling it to remain open during pestilent times and to accept a wider range of goods.⁶⁷² The migration for Zemun is estimated at 4,954 entries, based on the number of passport forms for the year 1768 and the fact that the station was the major land border-crossing point between the Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Monarchy, both for the traffic of persons and the traffic of goods.⁶⁷³ I used the expenditures for passports, and the information about the relative significance of the other Slavonian and Banal stations to estimate the numbers for Mitrovica, Brod, Gradiška and Kostajnica, as well as for the remaining two stations in the Karlovac Generalate, Slunj and Rudanovac.⁶⁷⁴

The comparison of the migrants' numbers for 1768 with other years suggests that the year was not untypical. In Transylvania, the numbers were slightly depressed compared to the year before, but generally in line with trends of the 1760s. The year 1768 was the first year of the Russian-Ottoman war of 1768-1774 that took place in the provinces that bordered Transylvania. The war did not appear to have affected migration numbers yet, since the migration continued to follow the trends from the previous five years. A spike in migrations that could be attributed to war and the

⁶⁷¹ Tabella deren in nachbenannten Contumaz Stationen des Großfürstentums Siebenbürgen vom Ersten Januar 1763 bis Ende December 1770 angekommenen- und nach institutmäßiger Behandlung entlaßen wordenen Personen, Waaren und Vieh. 1773 Aprilis 16, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Akten 2. See Appendix 6.5. for details.

⁶⁷² See Appendix 6.5. for a detailed estimation.

⁶⁷³ See Appendix 6.5. for the explanation of the estimation.

⁶⁷⁴ See Appendix 6.5. for the estimation.

arrival of refugees was registered only in the year 1769 (51% increase compared to 1768), when the military confrontation started in earnest.⁶⁷⁵

Table 6.2. The number of migrants entering the Habsburg Monarchy in 1768 from the Ottoman Empire by land

Quarantine station	The number of migrants who went through quarantine stations	With the immigrants entering outside quarantine stations (estimation)⁶⁷⁶
Rudanovac (estimation)	85	106
Slunj (estimation)	85	106
Kostajnica (estimation)	610	758
Gradiška (estimation)	610	758
Brod (estimation)	1,220	1,516
Mitrovica (estimation)	610	758
Zemun (estimation)	4,954	6,154
Pančevo	917	1,139
Mehadia (estimation)	2,804	3,483
Vulcan	1,037	1,288
Turnu Roșu	447	555
Bran	915	1,137
Timiș	403	501
Buzau	218	271
Oituz	955	1,186
Ghimes-Faget	644	800
Peritzke	214	266
Borgo & Șant (Rodna)	401	498
Total:	17,129	21,278

⁶⁷⁵ Fiscal pressures by Janissaries on clergy and disorder caused by soldiers passing on their way to the campaign against Russia were registered already in 1768 in Serbia. Gavrilović, "Ka srpskoj revoluciji." This might have encouraged emigration to the Habsburg Monarchy, but it did not apparently have a major impact on migration numbers. To see if the disorder led to significant increase or drop in the number of cross-border migrants in 1768, making the year atypical, I compared the numbers from 1768 with the averages for the previous five years (1763-1767). There were about 13% more migrants in 1768 compared to the average for previous five years (10% in the stations that faced the more exposed Ottoman Vassal Principality of Moldavia, and about 15% in the stations bordering Wallachia). This was generally in line with average yearly growths in the number of migrants, 16% on average for the years 1763-1767. Tabella deren in nachbenannten Contumaz Stationen des Großfürstentums Siebenbürgen vom Ersten Januar 1763 bis Ende December 1770 angekommenen- und nach institutmäßiger Behandlung entlassen wordenen Personen, Waaren und Vieh. 1773 Aprilis 16, KA ZSt MilKom Sanitätshofkommission Akten 2

⁶⁷⁶ Based on the ratio from the 1754 Pančevo immigrant list.

According to the estimation, somewhat more than 17,100 migrants in total entered the Habsburg Monarchy by land through quarantine stations. In the last column I adjusted the number of immigrants. As discussed in this and in previous chapter, about 64% of immigrants, the settlers from the Ottoman Empire, entered the Habsburg Monarchy in the section for which the Pančevo quarantine station was responsible but not through the official Pančevo border crossing, to decrease the chances of Ottoman border authorities detecting and preventing emigration.⁶⁷⁷ If the ratio from 1754 Pančevo list reflected the average ratios elsewhere, the number of migrants entering the Habsburg Monarchy from the Ottoman Empire by land needs to be revised upwards by about 24.22%. This would increase the total estimation to about 21,300, with the immigrants making about 6,500 or 30.71% of total entries.

Table 6.3. The Number of Migrants Entering Individual Habsburg Border

Provinces in 1768.

Military Border	Migrants per province	Percentage
Croatia (Karlovac and Banal Borders)	969	4.6%
Slavonia and Srem (Slavonian Border)	9,185	43.2%
<i>Zemun</i>	<i>6,154</i>	<i>28.9%</i>
<i>Other stations</i>	<i>3,031</i>	<i>14.2%</i>
Banat (Banat Border)	4,622	21.7%
Transylvania (Transylvanian Border)	6,502	30.6%
Total	21,278	100.0%

The border traffic can be broken down from two geographical perspectives. From the Habsburg perspective, about a half of migrants (51%) entered the Monarchy through

⁶⁷⁷ Eager to avoid reprisals by Ottoman border authorities if caught, many Ottoman emigrants chose to cross the boundary on the sections that were less supervised by the Ottoman border authorities. Was pro 1754 vor Emigrirte Familien ex Turcico in Hießiger Contumaz, die quarantie gehalten, und in welcher zeit, selbe entlassen worden, alß Pancsova, den 31 Dezember 1754, Johann Paitsch, Cont. Director, FHKA NHK Banat A 123.

two Banat stations and through Zemun.⁶⁷⁸ About 30% of traffic went through Transylvanian stations and about 19% through Slavonia (without Zemun) and Croatia. The Ottoman perspective offers a similar breakdown.⁶⁷⁹ The majority of migrants, 44%, were coming from or through Serbia, following the major route Istanbul-Belgrade or arriving from the central Balkans, from Macedonia, Epirus, and Thessaly. The traffic through two Danubian vassal principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia would rank second, with about 39%. Finally, about 17% of traffic would go through Bosnia.⁶⁸⁰ Such a breakdown of traffic would reflect the relative importance of individual transit routes between the Balkans and Central Europe.

Table 6.4. The Number of Migrants Entering from Individual Ottoman Provinces in 1768.

Ottoman territories	Migrants per province	Percentage
Bosnia	3,621	17.0%
Serbia	9,414	44.2%
Wallachia & Moldavia	8,243	38.7%
<i>Wallachia</i>	5,493	25.8%
<i>Moldavia</i>	2,750	12.9%
Total	21,278	100.0%

⁶⁷⁸ The major trade route through Zemun passed through Slavonia and Srem on its eastern margin, entering at Zemun and exiting at Petrovaradin. It makes more sense, therefore, to regard the travel through Zemun, together with Pančevo and Mehadia, as a part of central routes, leading to central Hungary, Vienna and Germany.

⁶⁷⁹ The station of Mitrovica was close both to Ottoman Bosnia and to Ottoman Serbia, while Mehadia was a point of entry for both migrants coming from Ottoman Serbia and from the Ottoman vassal principality of Wallachia. I assigned half of the migrants in these two stations to Serbia, and the other half to Bosnia and Wallachia respectively. Serbia is understood here as the present geographical territory, south of the Sava and Danube rivers, and between the river Drina on the west and the River Timok on the east.

⁶⁸⁰ Macedonian merchants, for example, used three major roads to Hungary: through Sofia and Vidin to Orșova, through Niš and Belgrade to Zemun, and through Bosnia to Slavonia. Mantouvalos, "Greek Immigrants in Central Europe," 36.

Habsburg-Ottoman migrations were not uni-directional. A great majority of migrants traveled in both directions, thus also from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Ottoman Empire. Unfortunately, no similar border control infrastructure existed on the Ottoman side of the border. The question of the number of migrants going to Ottoman territory is still open. It is possible only to speculate the structure and major trends of migration in that direction. It is reasonable to guess that the numbers were similar to the migration from the Ottoman Empire. With the exception of immigration/emigration, which were one-way and definite, all other migrations were circular. About 14,750 non-immigrants would pass the border in each direction in 1768. It is more difficult to estimate the (permanent) emigration to the Ottoman Empire. Both the Habsburgs and the Ottomans looked unfavorably on emigration. Preventing emigration was an important role of the Habsburg sanitary cordon. Permanent border guards were more effective than Ottoman policies, even though they could not completely prevent emigration. If the Habsburgs lost one leaving emigrant for every three immigrants arriving (or 2,178 out of 6,534) about 17,000 persons would travel in 1768 from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Ottoman Empire. If the sanitary cordon was more effective, reducing the loss through emigration to one emigrant for every ten immigrants (or 653 out of 6,534), about 15,400 migrants crossed the land border in the direction of the Ottoman Empire, with emigrants making up only about 3% of this number.⁶⁸¹ According to these estimations, between 36,700 and 38,200 migrants would cross the land border between two empires in 1768.

⁶⁸¹ If the loss for the Habsburg Monarchy through emigration was just 10% of the gain through immigration, the traffic from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Ottoman Empire would be around 90% of the traffic in the other direction, or about 72% if the immigrants entering the Habsburg Monarchy not through quarantine stations were counted.

Table 6.5. Migrations on the Habsburg-Ottoman Border 1768 (both directions).

Migrants crossing the Habsburg-Ottoman border in 1768	Ratio of emigration to and the immigration from the Ottoman Empire 1:3	Ratio of emigration to and the immigration from the Ottoman Empire 1:10
From the Ottoman Empire to the Habsburg Monarchy ⁶⁸²	21,278	21,278
<i>Non-immigrants</i>	<i>14,744</i>	<i>14,744</i>
<i>Immigrants</i>	<i>6,534</i>	<i>6,534</i>
From the Habsburg Monarchy to the Ottoman Empire	16,922	15,397
<i>Non-immigrants</i>	<i>14,744</i>	<i>14,744</i>
<i>Immigrants</i>	<i>2,178</i>	<i>653</i>
Total	38,200	36,675

The preserved forty-three monthly quarantine tables from Pančevo of 1752-1756 allow us to take a closer look at the trends and structure of migrations from the Ottoman Empire to the Habsburg Monarchy. Migrants' records from Pančevo represented major migration groups well, attracting local, regional and long-distance migrations. The Pančevo quarantine station was placed centrally on the Habsburg-Ottoman border, on the southwestern edge of the Province of Banat, drawing various groups of migrants. Close to Belgrade and to the major trade route connecting Vienna and Istanbul, it attracted merchants and other business travelers from distant Ottoman commercial centers. As Banat was a province of settlement, with vast unpopulated areas, it also attracted peasant settlers from the Ottoman Empire. Finally, it received local migrants from nearby Ottoman border provinces.

⁶⁸² With immigrants entering outside quarantine stations included.

During the forty-three months (1752-1756) covered by the quarantine tables, 1,127 migrants passed through the quarantine station in Pančevo.⁶⁸³ The migrants traveling for their work (merchants, clergymen, artisans, servants) were the biggest group, making up about half of recorded migrations. Almost all of them were male. Although the analysis of yearly seasonality remains inconclusive, the sex-exclusive nature of business migrations suggests that they were circular, with the migrants returning periodically to their families to the Ottoman Empire. Non-business migrants made up the second biggest group, with a strong presence of immigrant and non-immigrant traveling families. Gender distribution among this group was more even. For almost two thirds of migrants in the Pančevo quarantine tables, ethnic labels were indicated, with non-regional ethnical names, like Greeks, prevailing among business migrants, while local ethnicities, Serbs and Romanians, accounted for most of non-business migrants. A great majority of migrants in both groups were Christians (96%), most of them Orthodox Christians. The presence of Muslims (3%) and Jews (1%) was very modest.

The migrations recorded in Pančevo offer a snapshot of the late development of a much larger regional migration system⁶⁸⁴ that had existed between the areas south of the rivers Sava and Danube and the Hungarian plain since the late Middle Ages. It began slowly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with the migrations from the south to the southern provinces of the Kingdom of Hungary,⁶⁸⁵ stimulated by

⁶⁸³ I estimate that with immigrants allowed to enter elsewhere, to escape Ottoman anti-emigration measures, the number would rise to 1,400 persons passing the border section for which the Pančevo station was responsible, or about thirty-three migrants a month.

⁶⁸⁴ Defined as “empirically verifiable migration by many individuals from a particular geographic and economic region over a sizable period of time toward a common region of destination connected by the information flows.” Hoerder, Lucassen and Lucassen, “Terminologies and Concepts of Migration Research,” xxxiii.

⁶⁸⁵ Ivić, *Migracije Srba u Hrvatsku*; Veselinović, “Srbi u Hrvatskoj u XVI i XVII veku;” “Srbi u Velikom ratu 1683-1699.”

demographic losses during the plague pandemic of 1347-1351. The Ottoman conquest of the Balkans and Hungarian plain produced a stream of refugees to the west and to the north, many settling in the Kingdom of Hungary in the areas depopulated by earlier Ottoman raids. By 1437, Srem became predominantly Serbian (raizisch). By the middle of the sixteenth century, the same happened with the most of Banat, and by 1600 to most of Slavonia and the border regions of Transylvania. During Ottoman rule in Hungary, migrations from the south continued, partly spontaneously, partly directed by the Ottomans, focusing on Ottoman possessions in central Hungary, around Buda, and on Transdanubia (the area on the right bank of Danube, today southwestern Hungary).⁶⁸⁶ After the Habsburg re-conquest of Hungary (1683-1699), Muslim and Jewish inhabitants left the region, leaving Serbs as about a half of the total population of former Ottoman Hungary. Serbian migrations underwent a major setback during the Rákóczi' Rebellion, with Serbian settlements beginning to disappear from western and central Hungary (replaced by German, Hungarian and Slovak colonists). The inflow of new settlers from the Balkans nevertheless continued.⁶⁸⁷

The south-north migration system continued to exist in the eighteenth century, despite the major political changes and the emergence of comprehensive border controls. The migrations recorded in Pančevo in 1752-1756 give an insight into the later history of the south-north migration system. Muslims and Jews, not tolerated as settlers in the Habsburg Monarchy, played much more modest roles than in previous

⁶⁸⁶ Many border Ottoman fortresses had a "Serbian town" (Raitzenviertel, rácváros), assisting garrisons. The migrations of Serbs reached a peak at the end of the seventeenth century, with the arrival of refugees led by the Patriarch Arsenije III Čarnojević in 1690, and a parallel migration from Bosnia.

⁶⁸⁷ Stoianovich, "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant:" 234-38; Seewann, "Migration in Südosteuropa," 89-101, 103-106; Faroqhi, "The Ottoman Empire Confronting the Christian World," 106; Gerelyes, "Garrisons and the Local Population in Ottoman Hungary," Kaser, "Siedler an der habsburgischen Militärgrenze," 985-87; Sundhassen, "Südosteuropa," 294-98; Hoerder, Lucassen and Lucassen, "Terminologies and Concepts of Migration Research," xxxiii.

centuries, despite enjoying the same commercial privileges and free travel provisions as all other Ottoman subjects. The structure of Christian migrants coming from the Balkans to the Hungarian plain also changed. Serbian, Romanian, Bulgarian settlers continued to arrive, remaining mainly in border provinces. Emigration toward the plains continued to be important. The decline of Pax Ottomanica played a role too,⁶⁸⁸ as did the economic interests of peasants in decreasing their overall tax burden by moving to areas with lower taxes.⁶⁸⁹ Settlement areas, however, changed. Serbian migrations to central Hungary ceased, partly because the colonists from other Habsburg dominions and from the Holy Empire were settling these areas, and partly because settlement in border provinces became more attractive. Migrants concentrated more on the border provinces, Slavonia, Srem, Bačka, Banat, and the Military Border in particular. Thanks to the pacification in the post-1699 Habsburg-Ottoman border regime, it was safe to live on the border. The expansion of the Military Border with its lower tax burden, as well as fiscal incentives for settlers shifted the focus of settlement to the border provinces. After the 1718 Passarowitz commercial treaty, granting rights and tax exemptions to Habsburg and Ottoman merchants, business migrations became increasingly important. Serbian merchants continued to play a prominent role, without Muslim and Jewish competition, but were gradually being replaced by their co-religionists from the central and southern Balkans, mainly by Greeks and Aromanians. The development of a Habsburg textile industry and cotton trade encouraged closer connection between the southern and central Balkans and Vienna.⁶⁹⁰

⁶⁸⁸ Sundhaussen, "Südosteuropa," 300-301.

⁶⁸⁹ Gavrilović, *Prilog istoriji trgovine i migracije*, 111-14.

⁶⁹⁰ Ransmayr, "Greek Presence in Habsburg Vienna," 136-39; Seirinidou, "Greek Migration in Vienna," 114-21.

If ethnic labels were used as proxies for migrants' origin, the data from Pančevo table would suggest that almost two thirds of migrants, labelled as Greeks and Aromanians, were coming from the central and southern Balkans, while little more than a third was arriving from Ottoman provinces closer to Pančevo. The "hard border," with comprehensive border controls and compulsory quarantine, had the greatest impact on short-distance, non-business, home-community temporary migrations, increasing travel time and costs. This is how a relative decrease of Serb participation in overall numbers can be explained. A number of temporary migrations that might gradually turn into a permanent settlement were not started because of the border regime.

Migration control on the border changed the structure of migrations, but it had a more limited effect on the general picture than would have been expected. The number of migrants grew steadily and strongly during the 1750s and the 1760s. Business migrations, and merchant migrations in particular, did not seem to be impacted much, with changes in quarantine regimes having no significant influence. Also, the immigration numbers did not seem to be affected at all by the existence of a hard border. What apparently had a far more decisive influence was the Habsburg membership regime, with its religious-selective toleration of non-Catholics and non-toleration of non-Christians. There had been a tolerance for Orthodox Christians already since 1690, many decades before the Toleration Edict and the suppression of the Jesuits. Orthodox Christians in the Habsburg monarchy were allowed to create local religious communities, to practice freely their religion, to settle and to naturalize. Orthodox merchant networks were based on local communities that existed in many Habsburg provinces. Merchant companies were made up of both Habsburg and Ottoman subjects, with connections in the Ottoman Empire and Central Europe. Jews and Muslims, despite enjoying formally the same commercial and travel rights as

other Ottoman subjects, did not have a place in the Habsburg membership regime. They could be only temporary residents, and hence could not gain the benefits of long-term residence and religious toleration. This might explain their comparatively modest role in the Habsburg-Ottoman trade in Pančevo.

Crossing a “hard border,” an important moment in migrations, did not seem to have much influence on general migration trends. Only this conclusion can explain why the paradoxical tripling of migration numbers in Pančevo in 1754-1768 happened when quarantine times were further raised. In the late 1750s and during the 1760s migrants were subjected to a more severe border regime, with more frequent closures and the increase of quarantine time to eighty-four days for people and to 168 days for some of their goods in the stations that remained open. Quarantine times and quarantine procedures did not seem to matter enough to have a serious depressing effect on migration numbers.