

7-1-2017

Žumberak: A Sixteenth-Century Refugee Settlement Zone

Nicholas J. Miller
Boise State University

Žumberak: A Sixteenth-Century Refugee Settlement Zone

Nicholas J. Miller
Boise State University

Abstract

This article examines the movement of Orthodox Christian refugees from Bosnia to the Habsburg Monarchy in the 1530s and their settlement in a district called Žumberak. The movement of these Uskoks has never been examined in the context of refugee studies. This study of a refugee movement and settlement over a five century period offers the possibility of reaching a better understanding of the long-term outcome of refugee movements. Ultimately, this article suggests that the refugees affected the land they settled as much as the settlement zone affected them, that, in this case, the refugees were able to define their own outcome.

Keywords: refugees, migration, Croatia, Habsburg Monarchy, Žumberak

From the south, Žumberak rises abruptly, a range of mountains in northwestern Croatia bordering southeastern Slovenia, extending from the southwest to the northeast between the Kupa and the Krka rivers. Otherwise, it has never stood out much, never really been noteworthy, and produced only a few people who made names for themselves. For them, leaving Žumberak was half the battle. It is an undeveloped, poor, aging, and lightly populated place today. Yet it was significant at one point in its history. Between 1530 and 1550, Žumberak became a refugee settlement zone, long before the famous Great Migration of Serbs of the late seventeenth century, as several thousand Orthodox Christian Uskoks fled north, ahead of the army of the Ottoman Empire as it moved through the Balkan peninsula. Whether as cause or consequence of this refugee influx, the Habsburgs made Žumberak the first link in a chain of militarized border districts that would eventually become the Military Frontier (*Militärgrenze* in German; *Vojna krajina* in Croatian and Serbian), which provided a line of defense for Habsburg forces when the Ottomans attacked. For a brief moment, Žumberak had meaning; almost as quickly, it faded back into obscurity. That moment, though, provides us with a rare window into refugee origins, movement, and settlement in the early modern period – an opportunity to go resist the norm in refugee studies, which is to consider refugees a modern phenomenon. In examining that moment and its aftermath, one discovers that the refugees and the place exerted a powerful hold on each other; in fact, one cannot understand the fate of the people or the place without considering them both, in tandem.

Refugee Movements: Not Just a Modern Phenomenon

Relatively little has been written about refugees before the late nineteenth century, which is logical enough: refugee movements emerged in force with the advent of the nation-state and its exclusive definitions of citizenship and belonging. While refugee movements existed before the nation-state era, they were fewer and smaller and thus less destabilizing than modern refugee crises. Thus it is no surprise that the contemporary framework for examining and understanding refugee movements has emerged from the experience of and the study of modern situations. The post Second World War era has brought an international structure to address refugee issues (via the United Nations High Commission for Refugees), the emergence of international human rights law, a definition of ‘refugee’ that was made formal in 1951 in the *United Nations Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees*,¹ and a set of practices emerging from them and the real history of refugees since the war. The hope of this article is that looking at an older, unexamined refugee crisis and its settlement will provide some worthwhile insight regarding modern refugee movements. While there is no formal rubric for evaluating refugee movements, one can infer one from the past seventy years of international practice. What should one look for in the older, that will help us understand the newer? The article will answer that question as it proceeds, treating the Uskoks of Žumberak as one might treat a modern refugee flow; systematically, from origins to settlement, with particular attention paid to the geographic and historical setting, the nature of the refugees themselves, and the vagaries of settlement.

The Setting

Like virtually all modern refugee movements and the crises they engender, the Uskok movement into Žumberak was the result of war. Wars, civil and otherwise, are the most common catalyst of refugee movements, bringing with them regime changes, sudden alterations in legal status for significant populations, shifting borders, or simply the creation of winners and losers. In most cases all are involved, as they were in the 1530s in Bosnia, Croatia, and Carniola. War compels people under threat to find a balance, to tally up the benefits and disadvantages of remaining or moving on. This is true of modern refugee populations, where the distinction between ‘internally displaced’ status and ‘refugee’ status attests to this balancing act, and it was true of the Uskoks, who would teeter between staying and going until the 1550s. As this analysis proceeds, one should imagine the Uskoks as internally displaced peoples, which will situate them as refugees much more easily, as opposed to, say, mercenaries or colonists.² They were, in fact, part of a multitude of people who had moved north and west as the Ottomans advanced, and they did have to calculate the benefits of moving on as opposed to staying in Ottoman territory.

In 1526, after a century and a half of advance north through the Balkan peninsula, the Ottoman Empire defeated Hungarian forces at the Battle of Mohacs. As a result, the Hungarian throne passed in 1527 to Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, who ruled the German Habsburg lands. During this unsettled period along a now-murky Ottoman-Habsburg border, a new institution emerged: the Military Frontier. The Military Frontier grew from disorganized beginnings in the 1530s to become a well-defined part of the Habsburg military and administrative structure fifty years later. It lasted until it was no longer needed in the late nineteenth century.³ The Military Frontier has held a steady place in Habsburg and Croatian historiography for the past century, with the only real controversy concerning its ethnic composition.⁴ What remains uncontested is that people from territories conquered by the Ottomans (medieval Bosnia and Serbia) moved northward to settle the region that would become the Military Frontier. One of the earliest of these migrations is the subject of this study.

Those fifteenth- and sixteenth-century battles between the Ottomans and their opponents – Habsburg, Croatian, Bosnian, Hungarian, and others – left large swaths of land from the northern Adriatic coast eastward to the Hungarian plain deserted, or virtually so. The landscape varied from the rocky, arid Dalmatian coast through the rolling hills of southern Carniola and northern Croatia; there were easily travelled plains to the east in Slavonia and Hungary, seemingly created for the passage of armies. The western areas were less welcoming. Most of it was nevertheless easily conquered. ‘The Turks’ wartime advances,’ according to one historian, ‘were always preceded by the thorough devastation of the territory which they intended to occupy.’⁵ Ottoman soldiers killed, captured, or enslaved many of the people who had lived in Croatia, Slavonia, and southern Carniola, and most of the rest cleared out. Slavonia was the most severely depopulated, while western Croatia and Žumberak (always a border area, at this time a part of Carniola) were mountainous and remote enough that some people probably remained.⁶ These regions ended up as the limit of Ottoman expansion, except for a couple of frenetic periods, and thus a borderland for close to four centuries. Emptied of prior inhabitants, it was available for resettlement.

With abandoned land available and a pressing need for security, the Habsburgs looked to the south for reinforcements. There they found people who were ready to cross from the Ottoman side. As Ottoman armies moved north and west through southeastern Europe, some of the population they encountered fled ahead of them, displaced by war. These refugees – Orthodox Christians primarily, and described as such, or as Rascians, or as Serbs – included noble families and their retainers, but were mostly livestock traders known as Vlachs. Some were no doubt peasants, but those were less likely to have fled north, as the Ottomans did not see any value in killing or converting them. As the border area separating the Ottomans and the Habsburgs slowly took shape in the early sixteenth century, these migrants collected along the Ottoman side, where they served as a sort of frontier guard. They were not organized, and they were in all likelihood not paid – rather, they subsisted on plunder. As such, they served more to destabilize the border than to stabilize it, rendering it more a border zone than a border line. The Ottomans tolerated this behaviour because these people were known to be excellent fighters.

The Refugees

Typically today, a refugee movement is subjected to analysis by the United Nations, by NGOs that focus their attention on refugees, and by the governments of states that are likely to receive refugees. One of the first questions asked is ‘are these people refugees,’ which is a reflection of the power of the aforementioned 1951 definition. States use the definition, which proclaims who is a refugee, but also therefore who is not, to limit their involvement, to provide legal

cover for a decidedly moral decision. Before 1951, though, there was no definition; rather, refugees were simply people who fled their countries in fear for their lives. Today, the existence of the definition means that an awful lot of research is done on the origins, characteristics, and needs of refugee groups. The following section of this article will subject the Uskoks – a people on the move in the 1520s and 1530s – to that sort of analysis, because, as with modern refugee groups, knowing these things helps us understand why and how they were treated by their (potential) host country.

Historians have described multiple Ottoman incursions into Croatia and Carniola in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries: in 1408, 1431, 1469, 1472, 1519, 1524, and three times in 1528. In 1524 and 1528, the Ottomans attacked along the length of the Croatian-Carniolan border, destroying Žumberak castle and putting Pribiće, Marindol, Metlika, Črnomelj, Vinica, and other towns along the border under siege.⁷ By 1530, the pressure drove Inner Austrian and Habsburg authorities to copy from the Turks' playbook by militarizing their border. Archduke Ferdinand (later Ferdinand I) had spies who told him that Ottoman oppression grew after the Battle of Mohacs (1526) – the child levy (*devşirme*) was applied, dues were collected, a tax on cattle was imposed, the building of churches forbidden.⁸ All of this suggested to the Habsburgs that Christians in the Ottoman empire could be expected or convinced to trek north and to settle on unpopulated lands in the Habsburg Monarchy. And so some did: in the summer of 1530, a large contingent of people moved north from the towns of Glamoč, Unac, and Srb. These towns all lay along today's Bosnian/Croatian border to the east of Knin, but they were not quite neighbours – separate migrant groups probably converged on the way north. Bihać itself was the closest Croatian town, and a logical place for northbound refugees to congregate, a staging area. These refugees were Orthodox Christians, armed fighters accompanied by their extended families.

Habsburg emissaries probably recruited these men to move north with their families. By September the refugees had passed through Bihać, where they were warned that the Turks knew they were crossing over. In fact, their group was attacked by Turkish pursuers, but the attack failed. The Croatian Ban Ivan Karlović informed the commander of Habsburg forces in Croatia, Hans Katzianer (Ivan Kacijaner), that at least 50 Vlach families were coming across, and that they were good soldiers. This group included

...leaders among Vlach warriors, who did great damage to this kingdom and to Carinthia while they were in Turkey. Now they've returned to the Christian faith, and no matter how much evil they did to Christians, that will be redeemed by the shedding of Turkish blood...Thus we will make this borderland safe over time, because nobody has so wreaked havoc on this kingdom and other kingdoms as these very Vlachs.⁹

These refugees, known in the documents and ever since as Uskoks (for *uskočiti*, 'to jump in,' or attack), arrived on September 14, 1530.¹⁰ They were met by Ivan Kobasić, a Žumberak captain,¹¹ who had agreed to work with the Habsburgs to settle them on his own lands.¹²

...fearing that they might go back again to their old homeland from these lands, seeing that everyone scorned and abandoned them, I have to the best of my ability served the king in supporting them...thus, I send them to Žumberak.¹³

Upon their arrival, though, they would spread out over an area spanning parts of Žumberak, but also much more, including miles of territory along and north of the Kupa River, from Metlika to Črnomelj and Kostel. The concern now was where they would be permanently settled.

It may have been a lark at first to Habsburg authorities, this idea of welcoming in some legendary Uskoks from south of the border, but it was in no way a lark to the people who still laid claim to that land, or to those who worked it. Refugees had arrived, but under what conditions? Like modern refugees, their fate would be determined by the complex interaction of peoples, lands, calculations of state security, and the possibility of long-term settlement. These events occurred on the most visible surface of an intricate social and political system, with various actors that one might call interest groups in the 1530s in Carniola and Croatia, and the interests of those groups played a profound role in the movement, settlement, and later aftermath of the Uskok migration described here.

The group most central to this story were the Uskoks themselves. ‘Uskok’ is a name that is generally reserved for two groups of people: the more famous are the pirates known as the Uskoks of Senj, while the less well-known are the land-bound migrants of Žumberak.¹⁴ While the two groups of Uskoks lived and thrived in the same era, they were different. The sixteenth-century pirates of the northern Adriatic, working from Senj to Klis and occasionally inland from there, are famous, a part of Croatian national mythology at this point. They have been the subjects of much romantic literature in Croatia. During the nineteenth century, thanks to August Šenoa’s novel *Čuvaj se senjske ruke* (Beware the Hand of Senj, 1876),¹⁵ the legend of the heroic Uskok arose. Šenoa dealt solely with the Uskoks of Senj, fearsome, brutal, and allegedly honorable. The myth continues to be fed to this day (one discovers when visiting the museum in Senj that the Uskoks wore red and black, the tantalizingly evocative ‘colors of blood and death,’ according to the signage). They have also been the subjects of scholarly attention. Catherine Wendy Bracewell’s *The Uskoks of Senj: Piracy, Banditry, and Holy War in the Sixteenth Century Adriatic* is a fabulous, thorough account of these Uskoks and the wars they fought.¹⁶ They were defeated in war in 1618 and then dispersed inland to various parts of the Military Frontier.

These, however, are not the Uskoks at the centre of this story. *These* Uskoks were actually the originals, from whom the Uskoks of Senj emerged. In this case, the term was reserved for those migrants who moved north from the Bosnian/Dalmatian border area east of Knin and those from the Cetina River basin. They also enjoyed a bloodthirsty reputation. Both groups were known to be excellent fighters; both, in their way, were pirates. The group that moved to Žumberak lived in the Ottoman Empire as border defenders but also raiders who subsisted on plunder. They had an instrumental relationship with organized religion – the group that moved north in 1530 may have been Muslim at some point (probably converts from Orthodox Christianity to Islam, and then back).¹⁷ They were not farmers; instead, they raised livestock. Their lifestyle would contrast severely with that of any Croatian and Carniolan peasants whom they displaced in Žumberak. One historian has noted that they wore rags and furs and had habits that were disgusting to their Carniolan hosts.¹⁸ Bracewell has described in great detail the ways in which the lifestyle, culture, and economy of these people made them outsiders. They played fast and loose with their loyalty to the Habsburgs once they moved north, and for some time they mulled a return to Ottoman territory, likely due to the perception that they could do better there. Uskoks were Orthodox Christians, opportunists, outsiders to their new neighbours in Žumberak, insular, warlike, not politicians. Their basic interest? Land that would sustain their livestock and their extended families, and land that would serve as an effective point of departure for raids across the border.¹⁹

The other actors in this story had more exalted interests. These included the Habsburg family, which wished to repopulate the veritable desert that the Turkish incursions left behind, including Žumberak. They were interested in keeping their nobility in a weakened state, as all dynasts do.²⁰ And there is no question that the Habsburgs wished to fortify their border with the Ottoman Empire. The Carniolan nobility had similar interests, as loyal Habsburg subjects of long standing. Carniola was one of the three Inner Austrian territories (Styria and Carinthia were the others) whose estates convened in Graz. Carniola formally joined the Habsburg lands in 1379; its own capital city was Ljubljana. The Carniolan nobility controlled the territory north of the Kupa, till it passed through Metlika and to the south of Žumberak; then the border left the river and curled to the north. Žumberak had been part of Carniola from thirteenth or fourteenth century.²¹ When the Uskoks crossed the Kupa, they crossed into Carniolan territory; their first temporary abodes were along that river, southwest of Metlika. Initially, the Habsburg authorities considered settling them in that area, but resistance from the local Carniolan noble families turned their attention to the east and Žumberak, which coincided with Uskok desires. This shifted the focus from the Carniolan nobility to the Croatian, as Žumberak was held by a Croatian family in the 1520s.

This Croatian nobility had possessed the lands south and east of Carniola until the Ottoman advance. The Croatian estates had only recently entered the Habsburg Empire, in 1527, upon their election of Ferdinand as their king following the Battle of Mohacs. The most important Croatian noble families after the devastation of the Ottoman wars were the Zrinskis and Frankopans; most of the others had been reduced in status or had fled. There were other once-proud Croatian families with interests throughout the region – their title to the lands ravaged by Ottoman wars remained, even if they were not in physical control of them. As with all royal/noble relationships, there was tension between the Croatian nobility and their new Habsburg king. Ivan Kobasić and his heirs, who possessed Žumberak, were representatives of this nobility, but of a poorer, needier sort than the Zrinskis. It seems likely that Ivan Kobasić came north from Bihać in the mid 1520s, a dispossessed Catholic nobleman, and was granted the title to Žumberak.²² He thus shared the fact of flight with the Uskoks, but not much else – as an impoverished but ambitious noble from a shrunken state, he could still count on a privileged position, while the Uskoks were beggars. The Croatian nobility wished to hold on to their position on their lands, even in absentia. Far from being willing to cede land and/or their

rights over the people who worked that land to Orthodox Christian hooligans like the Uskoks, they wished to populate their lands with labour-fulfilling, dues- and tithe- paying peasants, preferably Catholic. And, as Orthodox Christian cattle breeders, the Uskoks did little to supplement the agricultural economy of the local estates.

Yet another group with interests at stake in Žumberak was the ‘old settlers,’ a term that encompassed those people who lived on these lands before the Turkish advance and Uskok settlement; this could include members of the impoverished Croatian nobility, but usually refers to peasants. These were speakers of a different dialect than the migrants, and they were Catholic. (Interestingly, linguists can still detect the descendants of old settlers in Žumberak, through their speech). It is difficult to determine how many old settlers were actually present in any of the lands under discussion here. Like the Croatian nobility, they had been harassed off the land during the preceding century’s warfare. But, over time, the lands were slowly but purposely resettled, and the region under discussion was at the extent of the Turkish advance, and thus not utterly deserted. There were probably more old settlers on other Carniolan lands than in Žumberak. But some were present, working the land in the name of the Kobasić family. As entailed Catholic peasants, their interests most directly clashed with those of the Uskoks and their patrons. The peasantry did not want to share the land with these invasive newcomers, and in fact, they were occasionally coerced to leave: those on Kobasić lands in 1534 were forced to move, to make way for the Uskoks. Furthermore, according to Štefanec, as the new regime of the privileges set in, those old settlers who stayed on in the new Military Frontier could be relieved of the labour duty but not of dues or of the tithe to church – a worse deal than the Orthodox migrants received.²³

Given the interests at work, it is no surprise that finding permanent abodes for the Uskok refugees was complicated. Settlement was viewed with favour by some, as a burden to others. Those who saw it as a necessary good viewed it through the eyes of the Habsburg dynasty – an opportunity to make the monarchy more secure and to bring in people to repopulate a destroyed land. Old-settler peasants resented the comparative privileges the refugees gained, while the Croatian aristocracy disliked the influx of people so culturally different from themselves and the role they played in enhancing Habsburg power at the expense of local nobility. Legally, most of the land that the Uskoks first entered, just across the Kupa River in Carniola, was the possession of the Habsburgs. The region was to the west of that most affected by Ottoman warfare. Here, one could not count on totally abandoned lands – there were still peasants working some of it, and the Habsburgs had begun to dole out parcels to loyal Carniolan and Croatian nobles. Such was the case with much of that territory that the Uskoks first crossed into, just north of the Kupa, from Kastel in the west, through Črnomelj, Mehovo, and Metlika farther east, and Žumberak to the northeast. The Uskoks were temporarily settled across the whole region. ‘They were mixed in with peasants from the Ottoman lands (*spahiski kmetovi*), and they lived on the deserted uncultivated land with their wives and children and livestock and things brought from Turkish territory.’²⁴ Uskok leaders focused their attentions on Žumberak, which was the poorest of those districts, the most remote, but also the least populated. It is likely that Žumberak also served the Habsburgs well, as in addition to being largely abandoned, it was also royal land. In any case, Ferdinand appointed a commissariat of four of his captains (local military leaders) to arrange the settlement, which, thanks to passive resistance by the Kobasićs, took four years to accomplish.

The Settlement

Like many modern refugee populations, the Uskoks were subjected to discrimination; they were disliked. They were disliked even before their arrival, but certainly moreso after it. This prejudice had its origins in fear, and is an attribute that the Uskoks share with modern refugees. One could borrow a sentence from analyses of virtually any current refugee group – they dress differently; their families are organized differently; they earn their livings in ways foreign to us; they come from a war zone, thus they are warlike, they act as spies for the people they claim to be fleeing – the same was said of the Uskoks. The Uskoks of Žumberak faced prejudice even before they crossed over, wearing their skins, herding their cattle, followed by their extended families, and preceded by the knowledge that they were bloodthirsty land-pirates. The fear and disgust felt by the occupants of the land the Uskoks were poised to settle never dissipated, and might have meant the Uskoks would not be allowed in, but they were, for reasons that help explain the other reason that the Uskoks were disliked: jealousy.

Between arrival and formal settlement, the Uskoks proved to be needy, demanding, unruly and even dangerous. Ivan Kobasić had been instrumental in bringing the Uskoks north – but he died in the interim, and his commitment to them had perhaps been shaky. Now headed by his widow Margareta and his eldest son Petar, the family resisted handing over its control of the land in question, and attempted to get the most beneficial settlement out of the royal authorities. Negotiations dragged on over the years, and in the meantime, the migrants suffered: ‘... we’ve been here three years already,’ they reported, and ‘we have no regular place to stay, we go from place to place, have nothing to live on, we

can't even get straw and hay for our livestock.²⁵ They came with a reputation for violence, and did nothing to change it. Even supporters of Uskok settlement had difficulty keeping them on the leash for such an extended period. Before his death, Ivan Kobasić allowed them temporary abode near Sošice and perhaps to the north around Stojdraga and Mrzlo polje.²⁶ Even in the early months following their arrival, the local mood was hostile – one local noble, Juraj Gušić, from Metlika, wrote in October 1530 that his people would ‘rise up and smother the Uskoks along with their wives and children.’²⁷ On the gates of the Pleterje monastery in Kostanjevica, north of Žumberak castle at the base of the mountains, were the words ‘Neither Thieves, Nor Robbers, Nor Vlachs Shall Enter the Kingdom of Heaven.’²⁸ Such sentiments indicate that their reputation preceded them – but rumours and reports of looting and plundering were common, including an April 1533 report of two pitched battles with local peasants (said to have been started by those peasants, not the Uskoks). Along with their reputation and the mayhem that they admittedly fomented, the Uskoks regularly threatened to go back to the Ottoman Empire.²⁹ Given their rocky reputations, their chaotic behaviour, and the resistance of so many to their resettlement in Žumberak, one wonders how badly they must have been wanted by the Habsburgs and the Carniolan nobility.

As it happens, they were wanted badly enough for the Habsburgs to acquiesce to a short list of substantial and costly demands. While initial reports state that 50 families were moving north, a few years later, sources indicate that there were 350 families, understood as ‘extended families’ today; a family included up to 5 brothers, with all of their dependents.³⁰ Two hundred of the adult men were cavalry; 300 were foot soldiers. The commissars suggested to the king that 150 cavalry and 200 foot soldiers be accommodated.³¹ The increase in numbers likely reflects subsequent migrations.³² In March 1534, royal authorities finally reached an agreement for compensation to the Kobasić family for its possessions in Žumberak, and settlement of the Uskok families proceeded.³³ On their way out, the Kobasićs plundered the castle and then demolished it, as a final sign of their resentment at being displaced by the newcomers. There were enough Uskok individuals – potentially as many as four thousand – that some had to be settled outside Žumberak; they went to Metlika, Kostanjevica, or Pleterje. It is unclear whether Žumberak was now fully repopulated, or if the overflow went elsewhere for other reasons. The leaders of the Uskoks (the *vojvode*) received relatively lucrative lands to settle: Vuk Popović got 9 parcels near Sošice; Resan Šišmanović received 3 parcels near Gaberje; others received fewer.³⁴

The agreement to settle the Uskoks on Kobasić land in Žumberak was confirmed in a grant of *povlastice* (‘benefits,’ but usually translated as ‘privileges’) announced by Archduke Ferdinand on June 6, 1535. This agreement was the first of many, which collectively would provide the basis for populating the Military Frontier. This initial agreement was to last 20 years. In return for military service against the Turks, the Uskoks of Žumberak were freed of all dues and work obligations. ‘Ordinary’ Uskoks received less land than the *vojvode* and *knezovi* (military and village leaders, respectively), but otherwise their situations were similar. The *povlastice* included conditions for inheritance and renewal after 20 years, but the limits were ignored and the arrangement simply assumed on into the future, as the Turkish threat did not recede. ‘A virtual class of free peasants was created, free peasants who owed military service. Their fief (*len*) turned into ownership over time.’³⁵ Žumberak, the site of the first such agreement, was thus the first district to enter the Military Frontier that was now under construction.

Today, refugee status is a privileged status – people seek it, because it has the potential to bring with it security. This privilege runs like a red thread through testimonies of refugees and their hosts, who often openly resent it when refugees are treated better than the locals that they live among. One example, among thousands that could be offered, this testimony from a Hungarian camp for Bosnian refugees in the 1990s, reminds us that resentment is to be expected:

Many Hungarians are unemployed, underemployed, or trying to make ends meet on very small retirement or disability pensions. They are angered by refugees making profits on goods they are given and ‘having it better than the townspeople do.’

The Uskoks who settled Žumberak were frankly and openly privileged – land was cleared of inhabitants for them; *povlastice* were negotiated to entice them to settle and to entice others to follow them north; and when many of them wished to return to Ottoman territory, the Habsburgs fought to keep them. The Uskoks were desired because they would (in theory) revitalize fallow land and protect Habsburg borders. The privileges created a special class of subject in the Habsburg monarchy – the soldier/farmer who owed no taxes, paid no duties, was able to practice his strange religion, but had to provide military service. For the Catholic peasants who lived and worked among them, the Uskoks were unjustly favored, and resentment flourished.

The Final Resolution

It would take another decade for the situation of the refugees in Žumberak to calm down. The scattered nature of immigration into the district has been detailed – between the first group in 1530 and the issuance of the *povlastice* in 1535, several hundred more families crossed over from Ottoman territory. Thereafter, it became Habsburg practice to use the Uskoks who had already arrived as talent scouts, sending them back south to recruit more of their friends and relatives. Vuk Popović, one of the three leaders of the 1530 Uskok contingent, was one such scout, and his story is instructive. In 1538, he was responsible for recruiting and chaperoning two separate groups of Uskoks from the Cetina River area across the border. The leaders of those groups appointed him their representative to the king, and he ultimately negotiated the conditions of their settlement, which were quite similar to the conditions spelled out in the 1535 agreement. This one promised them land near Kostel, which was many miles down the Kupa River from Žumberak; it promised 20 years freedom from taxes, and gave the Uskoks the right to all of their plunder save castles, forts, and villages; it also allowed them to keep any Turkish captives that the king did not want.³⁶

As with the earlier migrants, so this contingent demanded to be settled in Žumberak rather than its appointed place downriver. And there were other difficulties. Popović and his two partners, Jovan Radivojević and Rešan Šišmanović, requested land grants in Žumberak in return for their services. Popović hoped for five parcels of land near Višči vrh; Radivojević wanted land in Cernik (near Sošice), and Šišmanović hoped to see his existing lands expanded. Their requests were denied by the king, upon the advice of Ivan Pichler, who now possessed all of the Žumberak parcels that had not been given to the earlier Uskok group. (Pichler noted that the supplicants had enough land, and giving the men the parcels they desired would render his own holding economically unviable.) With that denial, local and royal authorities had a difficult situation to deal with. The migrant Uskoks were currently roaming (and ravaging) lands around Metlika, Mehovo, and Kostanjevica (west and north of Žumberak), and the frustrated Popović and Radivojević fled south to serve the Ottomans once again.³⁷ The result was what one historian referred to as an all-out rebellion of Uskoks between 1542 and 1550.³⁸

There is no known record indicating where the 1538 migrants finally settled, although Vinica (to the west), Slavonia (east), and Ogulin (south) were all suggested and rejected by the Uskoks themselves or the respective nobilities.³⁹ One good possibility is that they found a home in and around Marindol, in Bela Krajina, a region immediately southwest of Žumberak, which is known to have been settled by Orthodox Christians in 1549. The fate of Popović and his cronies, however, is known. When the three aforementioned Uskok leaders fled south, Habsburg authorities responded immediately, as their flight signaled the potential failure of their plan to create a militarized zone along their southern border. The Popović cabal's intent was to draw their family and friends in Žumberak back south, with the promise of more and better plunder and a better deal than the agreement of 1538 with Ferdinand. The authorities responded on two fronts: they immediately sided with the Uskoks in their ongoing battles with old-settler peasants and their leaders, so as to stave off any more defections to the Turks; and, they paid a bounty for the capture of Popović, Radivojević, and Jovan Vlach, a third member of Popović's group of returnees to Ottoman territory. Popović and Vlach were executed in 1543. The rebellion continued until 1550, when historians credit the appointment of a 'captain' for the Uskoks – one Ivan Lenković, who was able to finally bring some order to the lives of the Uskoks and make loyal Habsburg subjects of them. With the appointment of Lenković, the story of the Žumberak Uskoks moves from chaos and unpredictability to relative stability.⁴⁰

Uskok Idiosyncracies

Thus far, our point has been that the Uskok experience tracks modern refugee experiences fairly well. But there are some obvious exceptions. Above all, the response to the Uskoks was not primarily rooted in humanitarianism – it was negotiated. The very privileges that could be viewed as part of refugee status in general were inordinately lucrative for the Uskoks. It is unusual for refugees to cut such a beneficial deal, and the privileges render the Uskoks particularly interesting among refugees in history. Such instrumental welcomes had precedents in the Early Modern period. The standard Early Modern example, found in virtually every historical discussion of refugees, is that of the Huguenots, who fled France after the Edict of Fontainebleau in 1685. Like the Uskoks, the Huguenots were desirable to their English hosts and others.⁴¹ The Huguenots were persecuted in France due to their Protestantism, and welcomed in England thanks to that same Protestantism. Their particular skills as artisans and shopkeepers also satisfied a need in England in the late seventeenth century. And, so the story goes, the Huguenots were welcomed and quickly integrated into English life. Like the Uskoks, they brought something of value with them to their new homes, and as a result were

made welcome. There are other more modern historical analogues. The most directly comparable were German refugees after the Second World War, many of whom were allowed to immigrate to the United States thanks to their engineering and scientific expertise. And in the convention era, host-country selectivity is taken for granted. The United States took Eastern Bloc refugees during the Cold War while refusing them from other conflict areas. Many of the refugees the United States did accept were able to fill valuable niches in industry. Later, it was just as selective (the selectivity rooted in guilt and indebtedness) when it accepted refugees from Vietnam and Cambodia after the Vietnam War. That the Habsburg authorities welcomed these Uskok refugees had much to do with their political position and other instrumental qualities they possessed, particularly their value as fighters.⁴²

The Uskoks then make for a rather confounding group, in that they do not line up perfectly with the modern concept of the refugee. The term itself is unfixed historically. Historians have called the Uskoks refugees, mercenaries, colonists, and simple migrants. Arguments can be made for each label, and seem to reflect the commitments of the given scholar. To the Ottoman historian, ‘mercenaries’ fits best; to the Serbian or Croatian historian, as well as to other European or US historians, ‘refugees’ works well. Fancying oneself uncommitted, one might argue that one can learn much about them and the categories applied to them by keeping an open mind. And indeed, as uncomfortable as it may be, one might want to consider the possibility that the modern refugees one hears so much about may occasionally be better understood as mercenaries or just migrants. The point is this: one must take what one knows about modern refugees (which is, after all, most of what one does know) and ever so slightly tilt the prism, allow oneself to play with the disconcerting differences. The Uskoks conform to one’s expectations in some ways, diverge radically in others.

Dual Marginalization and the Žumberak Ghetto

In the modern era, with the creation of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees in 1951 and the growth of a structured international response to refugees, it has become normal to speak of ‘durable solutions’ to refugee situations. These durable solutions, as defined by the UNHCR, include repatriation, resettlement, and integration. While there was no such thing as a structured international response to Early Modern refugee crises, whether one speaks of the Uskoks, the Huguenots, the Jews, or others, it is useful to consider them all in light of these modern categories. The Uskok settlement is now in its sixth century, and one can still see its original traces. If the first twenty years of Uskok settlement in Žumberak buzzed with energy and activity, and ended with a pretty unique solution in the form of the negotiated privileges, the next five centuries were characterized by energy’s opposite – stasis perhaps, or possibly stagnation. Žumberak’s marginalization, its segregation from Carniola and Croatia and even the rest of the Military Frontier, turned it into a ghetto. Where the people dominated the first, short, dynamic phase of settlement, the history of the long centuries that followed is equally well-understood through the prism of the land.

From the point of Uskok settlement, Žumberak became cohesive and separate – insular, protected, parochial, local. While it was purposely set aside as the first link in a chain of districts in a new Military Frontier, it was somewhat miscast, for the actual border between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans settled 24 miles to the south at its closest point. It would not be until 1578 at a meeting in Bruck am Mur that the Military Frontier was formally created, and by that point, the bulk of the frontier was already set to the south. While more Uskoks (and more Orthodox Christians under other names) did come to Žumberak after 1550, they were reduced to a trickle until the early seventeenth century, when even the trickle ceased. There was little movement within Žumberak, so villages that were settled or established in the first half of the sixteenth century remained in the hands of those families that arrived at that time. The rest of the Military Frontier continued to take in Orthodox migrants, but Žumberak’s isolation betrayed its promise as the first district in the frontier. Instead of becoming the core of a vital military region, it was secluded and therefore geographically marginalized from the start, as were the refugees who had settled it.

Right away, then, one is confronted with a fact that bears on one’s understanding of the durable solution to the Uskok refugee crisis: these migrants were tied to the land they settled by the privileges, and that land and these people were then further segregated by their separation from others like them in the new Military Frontier. One (and only one!) important event broke the monotonous history of the Uskoks of Žumberak between 1550 and 1881, when the Military Frontier was abolished. In the seventeenth century, virtually all of the Orthodox Christians of Žumberak (which is to say, descendants of the original Uskoks) converted to the Uniate faith. The Uniate church was a halfway house – in the Habsburg context, it was a tool of the authorities to pry believers away from Orthodoxy by enabling them to retain their practices while recognizing the Pope as their spiritual leader. The assumption (borne out by the long history of the region) was that Uniates would eventually continue on the path to Roman Catholicism. Leaders of the Uniate

church found the Žumberak Orthodox to be pliant; Orthodoxy was weakly observed, and leadership in the hands of impoverished and poorly educated parish priests.⁴³ Uskok conversion to the Uniate church was then enabled by their marginalization, and enhanced it as well, as it brought them spiritually a bit closer to their Catholic neighbours, but undoubtedly divided them culturally from their fellow Orthodox Christians in the rest of the Military Frontier. In other words, they bumped themselves into a position midway between the Catholicism of their hosts and the Orthodoxy of their peers elsewhere in the Military Frontier. As they had been spatially segregated within the frontier, now they were spiritually isolated as well, suffering from a dual marginalization that would persist until they left, again.⁴⁴

By the nineteenth century, the region had come to be known as the *Uskokengebirge* (Uskok Mountains); life revolved around the extended family and military service. There were land disputes, conflicts surrounding marriage and inheritance, but woefully little economic development. Legend holds that Empress Maria Theresa imagined creating an iron-works in western Žumberak, which gave rise to the practice of referring to those from the (western) Radatovići/Sošice area as *fužinari* (steel workers), while those from the (eastern) Samobor portion were known as *maslari* ('butter-makers').⁴⁵ There is no evidence that the plans were real, but the epithets can still occasionally be heard. In 1841, Stanko Vraz, a writer who saw himself as both Slovene and Croat (yet was born into a German speaking family as 'Jacob Frass') traveled from Zagreb to Ljubljana, by way of Metlika. The route took him up a small road from Metlika to Novo Mesto, a road that skirted the western edge of Žumberak, and still does. Vraz's travel essay on the trip captured the separateness and isolation that was Žumberak. His description of a stopover in a small village called Drage recalled images and impressions that seem to connect directly with the sixteenth-century; was it the place, or Vraz's understanding of the place, that evoked such inertia? He described the Uskoks in ethnographic terms typical for the period (tall, honest, hard working). He recognized 'Uskok blood' in the people he met.⁴⁶ There was no line on the map dividing Žumberak from Bela Krajina to the west, but he could sense a border. Arriving in Hrast, a village halfway between Metlika and Novo Mesto along that border, Vraz noted that 'on the left side reside the very first Carniolan settlers, and on the right side the so-called Uskoks, the most extreme western outpost of these settlers from the south.'⁴⁷ Detailing the Uskoks' sixteenth-century heroics ('Sworn adversaries of the Turk, they never once spared the life of the enemy, never spared his home or possessions'),⁴⁸ Vraz noticed that by 1841, they were poor, with nothing to occupy them. 'Banditry was forbidden, and there was no trade. What would an Uskok trade?'⁴⁹ Vraz mixed historic legend with ethnographic observation, combining the ancient image of the warlike Uskok with the modern reality of the poverty-stricken small farmer. The Military Frontier that still encompassed Žumberak (at least administratively) had another forty years to live, but Žumberak had been dying for some time.

The demilitarization and reincorporation of the Military Frontier after 1881 prompted a sadly poetic ending to the Uskok settlement of Žumberak, as a new emigration commenced. From a consistent high of about 11,000 residents between 1880 and 1931, Žumberak's population plummeted from about 10,000 in 1941 to around 2,000 in 2001.⁵⁰ The figure would have been much higher between 1880 and 1920, but for the flow of emigrants to North America. Those who remained were much older – from an average of 28 years old in 1953 to 46 in 1991.⁵¹ Today Žumberak has come full circle, depopulated again. The Turks did not drive out the people, though. This time the economy was the culprit, in a process that began after the Military Frontier was demilitarized and joined to Croatia proper. To end the Military Frontier was to remove the sole source of employment from a region that had no agricultural economy, no infrastructure, no industry. Croatian politicians and nationalists rejoiced at the removal of this scar across Croatian territory, but for the population of Žumberak, it meant the beginning of a precipitous economic decline. Žumberčani began to pour out of the region, heading to the United States, Canada, and other points known and unknown. For a time, natural population growth exceeded the pace of out-migration, but after the Second World War, with the typical communist regime push to industrialize and urbanize, people simply fled this hill country for the cities.

In the mid 1990s, planners, geographers, linguists, anthropologists, and others found Žumberak to be a fascinating living laboratory, and a development challenge for newly independent Croatia. As a laboratory, Žumberak held secrets that were handed down from the distant past. For instance, one study traced the deep origins of a single village by the particular variety of the language spoken there;⁵² another marveled that Žumberak was 'a true linguistic treasure trove,' where every dialect and variant of the language once known as Serbo-Croatian was spoken and indicated some connection to migrations centuries past.⁵³ Planners marveled at the isolated and inward nature of a place only a half-hour's drive from Zagreb. 'The majority of Žumberčani marry amongst themselves,' an anthropologist concluded.⁵⁴ She agreed with Vraz, who a century and a half before had noted the same thing, writing that the Uskoks of Žumberak 'do not allow their blood to mix with the blood of their neighbours, and all attempts will be in vain...to get them to take as wives rich Carniolans, or to get an Uskok girl to go off with a rich Carniolan man.'⁵⁵ By the early 2000s, a bit more than half the population was Uniate, the rest Catholic. Where there had been a significant number of people in

Žumberak who professed to be Serbs before the Second World War, by the twenty first century, virtually the entire population declared themselves as Croats. However, that population was reduced, as many Žumberčani had emigrated to the US, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere, where they continue to view themselves as complicated in-betweeners. Lacking any constructive way to integrate Žumberak into Croatia's economy, the government established it as a nature park in May 1999. Today it remains virtually abandoned, although Žumberčani in Uskok costume can be found regularly on important holidays.

Sociologist Grga Frangeš has noted that today's Žumberčani protect their idiosyncracies, conscious of their history. He referred to these idiosyncracies as the products of a 'unique and endemic local culture...'⁵⁶ Consider that word, 'endemic': it means 'native,' or 'indigenous,' or 'characteristic of a place': it leads us to interesting potential conclusions. Those qualities that Frangeš described as endemic in 2008 had come with the Uskoks in the 1530s; they were the product of events that had occurred nearly five hundred years before. The people and the place defined each other – what had been new, and then became spatial and spiritual isolation, came to be so closely identified with the land and its unique population that by 2008 it could all be characterized as *endemic*.

This endemic quality is relevant to the way one understands refugee settlement, in Žumberak and elsewhere. What type of solution might the UNHCR see in this endemic outcome? It could certainly be called durable, as it lasted over 400 years. But durable is an umbrella term, and the more specific UNHCR forms of 'durable' just seem wrong. The Uskoks had not been repatriated; they remained where they arrived, so they were not resettled. That leaves local integration, which is an uncomfortable fit at best. Today the remaining Žumberčani call themselves Croats, but there are so few left living there that generalizing from their experience would be foolhardy, since most Žumberčani moved on to other lands, where many hold on to their separateness. No, rather than force modern categories to work, it may be best to let what is known about the Uskoks of Žumberak to expand our lexicon. These people, who came and stayed and left an imprint that was so strong that it could be called 'endemic' left again, moved on, in the end. Maybe the lesson to be learned is that these were the rare winners among refugees – they did not resettle, they were not integrated, and they were not returned. Instead, they came, they settled on land that they made their own, and they eventually moved on, as a group that maintained its identity, its idiosyncracies, its cohesion.

Most attention in refugee movements, crises, and settlements is rightly paid to the effects of refugee status on people. But tilt the prism a bit and one can see that the story of the Uskoks of Žumberak was not just of people who were affected; rather, they had agency. Where refugees are generally the subjects and the lands wind up somewhere in the predicate, for Žumberak, understanding the strangeness of the place demands that their places in the sentence be switched. Is Žumberak's museum-like quality a product of its inaccessibility, its deep gorges, steep mountainsides, and infertile soil? No doubt. But it is hard to avoid the conclusion that its isolation is also the result of the people who settled it. Were this article about Žumberak, the place and its isolation rather than the people, the difficulties of integrating it into the Croatian economy (not to mention consciousness), we would be talking about how its endemic qualities were a result of its settlement by some oddballs, some uncategorizable refugees in the sixteenth century. The lesson for refugee studies may well be that in the long term (an analytical luxury that we do not have with modern refugee movements) refugees are not limited to being victims of forces outside their control. They may in fact have agency, actually do things. In the case of the Uskoks and Žumberak, the people and the place each contributed equally to their dual marginalization and their shared fate. In other cases, the long-term interaction of the people and the place may not result in marginalization at all – but the Uskok case tells us that whatever the result, both matter.

References

- Bracewell, Catherine Wendy. *The Uskoks of Senj: Piracy, Banditry, and Holy War in the Sixteenth Century Adriatic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).
- Celinić, Anita and Ankica Čilaš Šimpraga, 'Govor Jurkovog sela u Žumberku,' in *Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 34/1 (2008) 64.
- Crkvenčić, Ivan. 'Žumberačka gora: Transformation from a Refuge to an Exodus Zone,' *Migracijske i etničke teme* (2002)
- Frangeš, Grga. 'Etnološko istraživanje kao izvor podataka za planiranje strategije održivog razvoja ruralnih područja; Ogladni slučaj: Žumberak,' in *Etnološka istraživanja* 12/13 (2008) 114
- Gruenfelder, Anna Maria. 'Vojna krajina: Reformski procesi u ranom novom vijeku,' in *Senjski zbornik* (2009) 96-97.

- Hintermeier, John M. 'The First Modern Refugees? Charity, Entitlement, and Persuasion in the Huguenot Immigration of the 1680s,' in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Autumn, 2000), pp. 429-449.
- Ilmaz, Gülay. 'The Devshirme System and the Levied Children of Bursa in 1603-4 A.D.' in *Bellefen* 74, 2015 (Ankara).
- Ivić, Aleksa. 'Iz prolost Srba žumberčana,' in *Spomenik srpske kraljevske akademije* LVIII/49 (Subotica) 1923
- Ivić, Aleksa. 'O prvoj srpskoj seobi u Žumberak (1530. - 1535.),' in *Vjesnik kr. hrvatsko-slavonsko-dalmatinskoga zemaljskog arkiva* v. 20, no. 1/2 (Zagreb) 1918
- Josipović, Damir. 'Žumberk: Meja, etničnost, veroizpoved, rodnost in migracije prebivalstva: Demogeografska analiza,' in *Dve domovini* 25 (Ljubljana: 2007) 39-68
- Kaser, Karl. *Slobodan seljak i vojnik* (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1997)
- Klemenčić, Mladen. 'Starenje stanovništva: Pokazatelj prozorne izoliranosti Žumberka,' in *Radovi* 24/24, 1989 (Zagreb).
- Knežević-Hočevar, Duška. 'Ali se Žumberčani većinom poročajo med seboj? Primer župnije v radatovičih,' in *Dve domovini* (2007) 131.
- Kudelić, Zlatko. *Marčanska biskupija: Habsburgovci, pravoslavlje i crkvena unija u Hrvatsko-slavonskoj vojnoj krajini (1611.-1755.)* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2007)
- Lopašić, Radoslav. 'Žumberak,' in *Vienac: Zabavi i pouci* v. 12, no. 39-47, 1880 (Zagreb)
- Rothenberg, Gunther. *The Austrian Military Border in Croatia, 1522-1747* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960)
- Rothenberg, Gunther. *The Military Border in Croatia, 1740-1881: A Study of an Imperial Institution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).
- Šenoa, August. *Čuvaj se senjske ruke* (Zagreb, 1876)
- Shaw, Stanford J. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976)
- Signjar, R., ed., *1875-1915: Statistički atlas kraljevine Hrvatske i Slavonije* (Zagreb: Tisak i litografije kraljevske i zemaljske tiskare, 1915).
- Šimrak, Janko. 'Povijest marčansko-svidničke eparhije i crkvene unije u Jugoslavenskim zemljama,' in *Bogoslovska smotra* 12/1 (Zagreb, 1924)
- Štefanec, Nataša. 'Osmanski zapovjednici i struktura osmanske i habsburške vojske na hrvatskom dijelu krajišta (prema špijunskim izvještajima iz 1570-ih),' in Marija Karbić, et al., eds. *Ascendere historiam: Zbornik u častu Milana Kruheka* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2014)
- Štefanec, Nataša. 'Tolerance and Intolerance in the Croatian-Slavonian Kingdom at the Turn of the 17th Century Contest for Gomirje,' in Egidio Ivetić and Drago Roksančić, eds., *Tolerance and Intolerance in the Triplex Confinium: Approaching the Other on the Borderlands Eastern Adriatic and Beyond 1500-1800* (Padova: CLEUP, 2007)
- Štrumbl, Žarko. 'Uskoki na Slovenskem in v. Žumberku,' in *Arhivi: Glasilo arhivskega društva in arhivov Slovenije* 14/1-2 (Ljubljana) 1991
- Šugar, Hrvoje. 'The Frontiersmen (Graničari) in the Austrian Military Border in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' in Arnold Suppan and Maximilian Graf, eds., *From the Austrian Empire to Communist East Central Europe* (Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2010)
- Valentić, Mirko. *Vojna krajina i pitanje njezina sjedinjenja s Hrvatskom, 1849-1881* (Zagreb: Institut za hrvatsku povijest, 1981).
- Vraz, Stanko. 'Put u gornje strane,' in Stanko Vraz, *Stihovi i proza* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1951)
- Wakounig, Marija. 'Žandarji ali roparji: Integracija Uskokov kot regionalni problem,' *Zgodovinski časopis*, 57, 3/4 (2003)
- Zajc, Marko. *Gdje slovensko prestaje, i hrvatska počinje: Slovensko-hrvatska granica u XIX. I početkom XX. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Srednja europa, 2008)
- Županić, Niko. *Žumberčani i Marindolci: Prilog antropologiji i etnografiji Srba u kranjskoj* (Beograd: Državna štamparija Kraljevine Srbije, 1912).

Notes

The author would like to thank Lisa Brady, Emily Wakild, and Marko Zajc for their critiques and encouragement as he wrote this article.

¹ Its key portion argues that refugees are people who have left their country of origin ‘...as a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion...’

² Shaw referred to them as ‘hired mercenaries as well as permanent colonists’ in Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, 94. As we have seen, Rothenberg, the historian of the Austrian side of the frontier, refers to the Uskoks as refugees, in Rothenberg, *The Austrian Military Border*, 4. One of the easy conclusions to draw would be that there is enlightenment to be found in the murky history of the people and the categories applied to them.

³ The standard work at this point on the Military Frontier is Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik*, which was originally published in German in 1986 and is a social history. On the general history of the Military Frontier in English, see Rothenberg, *The Austrian Military Border* and Rothenberg, *The Military Border in Croatia*. Šugar, ‘The Frontiersmen (Graničari) in the Austrian Military Border’ is a short recent treatment. On the reincorporation of the Military Frontier into Croatia, see Valentić, *Vojna krajina i pitanje njezina sjedinjenja s Hrvatskom*.

⁴ The region was settled by migrants from the south who went by various names but who, by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, generally saw themselves as Serbs. But were these people always Serbs? Vlachs? Something else? Rothenberg, in *The Military Border in Croatia*, called the debate ‘arid’ (p. 11, n. 14); at this point, nearly fifty years later, it has become fetid. It need not detain us now.

⁵ Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik*, v. 1, 31.

⁶ Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik*, v. 1, 36 on western Croatia.

⁷ Lopašić, ‘Žumberak,’ 686-87; Županić, *Žumberčani i Marindolci*, 16-22.

⁸ Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 74. The *devşirme* was an irregular child levy, by which Ottoman authorities would select young Orthodox Christian boys who would then be converted to Islam and incorporated in Ottoman service; see Ilmaz, ‘The Devşirme System and the Levied Children of Bursa.’

⁹ Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 76, n. 12.

¹⁰ According to Karlović; see Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 75-76.

¹¹ A ‘captain’ in this context is a local military leader, within the Habsburg military hierarchy. See Gruenfelder, ‘Vojna krajina’ 96-97.

¹² According to Šimrak, Kobasić was given Žumberak (castle and lands) after the Battle of Mohacs (‘Povijest,’ 76, n. 14 [written ‘34’ in document]). Anthropologist Niko Županić wrote that Kobasić was himself a migrant from the Ottoman south, having moved north from Bihać in the 1520s. The family was Catholic, which would explain the receipt of a Habsburg grant; Županić, *Žumberčani i Marindolci*, 23-24. A third historian, Žarko Štrumbli, says that Kobasić married into the title to Žumberak; see ‘Uskoki na Slovenskem in v. Žumberku,’ 44.

¹³ Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 77-78, n. 15.

¹⁴ Kudelić, *Marčanska biskupija*, 127.

¹⁵ Šenoa, *Čuvaj se senjske ruke*.

¹⁶ Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj*.

¹⁷ Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj*, discusses the ease of conversion from Islam to Christianity, and the reverse; 73-76.

¹⁸ Wakounig, ‘Žandarji ali roparji,’ 257.

¹⁹ Štefanec, ‘Osmanski zapovjednici,’ has fascinating information on the composition of Ottoman forces across the border in the mid 1570s. The local commanders had Serbian surnames, and ‘Vlachs’ constituted a large percentage of their forces. This is not really news – but it is a nice reminder that the border was a place where identities shifted, and one suspects that religious identity followed existential (and military) need.

²⁰ Štefanec, ‘Tolerance and Intolerance,’ 132-33.

²¹ See Zajc, quoting Kos and Kosi; there is not complete agreement on the date that Žumberak became Carniolan. Zajc, *Gdje slovensko prestatje*, 340-41.

²² Note that Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 76 n. 14, describes the situation thus: the Kobasićs were the noble owners of properties north of Bihać; thanks to services to Ferdinand, they were given Žumberak in 1527. Previously, the Semić clan had owned it. Thos čakavian speakers who came to Žumberak, did so with Kobasić, according to Šimrak (to Kalje, Oštrc, and Podžumberak). Štrumbli, ‘Uskoki na Slovenskem in v. Žumberku,’ 44

²³ Štefanec, ‘Tolerance and Intolerance,’ 138.

²⁴ Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 246-47.

²⁵ Quoted in Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 252.

²⁶ Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 77.

²⁷ Gušić headed one of the families that moved north from Bihać at same time as Kobasić; see Županić, *Žumberčani i Marindolci*, 23.

²⁸ Šimrak, ‘Povijest,’ 78. The meaning of ‘Vlach’ is contentious, but for our purposes, the Vlachs were a larger group that included Uskoks.

²⁹ Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 252.

³⁰ The radically larger number for 1534 probably includes a second large group that came in 1531, along with other smaller movements during those years.

³¹ Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 251, 256.

³² There were probably additional population movements in 1531, 1533, 1538, and 1541 (plus smaller ones along the way, and some others later in the century).

³³ Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 255-56

³⁴ Ivić, ‘O prvoj srpskoj seobi,’ 256.

³⁵ Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik*, v. 1, 64.

³⁶ Ivić, ‘Iz prolost Srba žumberčana,’ 2.

³⁷ Ivić, ‘Iz prošlosti,’ 7 ff.

³⁸ Ivić, ‘Iz prošlosti,’ 7.

³⁹ Ivić, 'Iz prošlosti,' 5.

⁴⁰ Šimrak, 'Povijest,' 296.

⁴¹ Hintermeier, 'The First Modern Refugees?' 429-449.

⁴² In the late seventeenth century, the Habsburgs would allow a particularly large group of Orthodox Christian Serbs to move north into the Military Frontier after they supported the Habsburg army in a war against the Ottomans; while this 'Great Migration' is outside the purview of this article, it is nonetheless a good example of the 'Vietnam' refugee syndrome in this earlier context

⁴³ Kudelić, *Marčanska biskupija*, 145-57, goes into some depth on the backwardness and weakness of the Orthodox church in Žumberak, as does Šimrak, 'Povijest,' 437-38.

⁴⁴ Sources indicate that there were no more Orthodox Christians in Žumberak at the turn of the twentieth century, and today the region is split between Uniates and Catholics; many of the Catholics are those who continued the journey from Orthodoxy to the Uniate church to the Catholic church; others are those in the eastern (Samobor) section of Žumberak that was predominantly Catholic (with few Uskoks) all along. On Orthodox Christians at the turn of the twentieth century, see the map in Signjar, ed., *1875-1915: Statistički atlas kraljevine Hrvatske i Slavonije*. See Josipović, 'Žumberk,' for modern demographics.

⁴⁵ Šimrak, 'Povijest,' 80, n. 16; Županić, *Žumberčani i Marindolci*, 13, suggests that *fužinari* reflects the population's origins as miners in Bosnia.

⁴⁶ Vraz, 'Put u gornje strane,' 47.

⁴⁷ Vraz, 'Put u gornje strane,' 46.

⁴⁸ Vraz, 'Put u gornje strane,' 49.

⁴⁹ Vraz, 'Put u gornje strane,' 51.

⁵⁰ Crkvenčić, 'Žumberačka gora,' 42

⁵¹ Klemenčić, 'Starenje stanovništva,' 302.

⁵² Celinić and Šimpraga, 'Govor Jurkovog sela u Žumberku,' 64.

⁵³ Josipović, 'Žumberk,' 51.

⁵⁴ Knežević-Hočevar, 'Ali se Žumberčani većinom poroćaju med seboj?' 131.

⁵⁵ Vraz, 'Put u gornje strane,' 51.

⁵⁶ Frangeš, 'Etnološko istraživanje kao izvor,' 114