

**Jelena Ilić Mandić\***  
Institute of History  
Belgrade  
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7172-6915

## **FIRST RESULTS OF SPATIAL PLANNING IN THE HABSBURG MILITARY FRONTIER: FRONTIER REGIMENTS, NUCLEATED SETTLEMENTS AND CADASTRAL SURVEY (C. 1745–1785)**

**Abstract:** There are numerous examples of spatial planning on the periphery of the Habsburg Monarchy, which was organised within the regiments of the Military Frontier in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Our focus was on the territory of the Slavonian-Syrmian Military Frontier, the Šajkaš Battalion, and the Banat Military Frontier, where flat landscapes enabled various forms of state spatial intervention, approximately at the same time – around 1770. This paper presents some aspects important for understanding this complex topic, such as the influence of militarisation and centralisation, colonisation and spatial planning of settlements (following the nucleated settlement model), as well as the tight structuring of rural areas and parcelisation of arable land, and their final results in the form of land and tax reforms (cadastral surveying).

**Keywords:** Military Frontier, Habsburg Monarchy, spatial planning, 18<sup>th</sup> century.

### **Introduction**

During the 18<sup>th</sup> century, several factors converged that influenced spatial development towards its planning and usage on the broader periphery of the Habsburg Monarchy. Undeniably, the most significant driving force behind this was state intervention, and the results and scope can be analysed based on various types of sources, such as contemporary accounts, official reports, censuses, maps, etc.<sup>1</sup> We will focus on the processes that affected the territory of the Military Frontier, which

---

\* jelena.ilic@iib.ac.rs

<sup>1</sup> In the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Habsburg Monarchy implemented measures under the comprehensive political programmes of mercantilism or cameralism, as dominant socio-economic doctrines of the Enlightenment (G. Otruba, *Die Wirtschaftspolitik Maria Theresias*, Wien 1963, 123).

served as a defensive belt towards the Ottoman Empire, stretching from the Adriatic Sea to the Carpathian Mountains. The beginnings and initial results of spatial planning are visible primarily in regions whose geographical characteristics allowed for it, such as predominantly flat land areas of Slavonia, Syrmia, Bačka, and Banat. By organising regulated frontier regiments in Slavonia and Syrmia regions in the 1740s and in Banat and Šajkaš in the 1760s, new chapters in the history of these areas were opened.<sup>2</sup> Although on the state periphery, these regions were under the administration of central authorities, and a series of reform measures were implemented in them during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, leading to long-term consequences regarding spatial organisation.<sup>3</sup>

With militarisation, military administration was introduced to the previously civilian areas, and military control was established over a relatively wide territory (in the form of *regiments* under *generalates*). Simultaneously, the building of new settlements or quarters for colonists, and application of urban regulations (often due to relocation) to indigenous villages created a network of typical settlements following the nucleated settlement pattern.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, a broad range of measures was taken in order to familiarise the authorities with the terrain and intensify the use of arable land by the local population. Measures such as surveying the terrain and mapping, defining compact agricultural areas, parcelisation and allocation of arable land to individual households, keeping records of landowners and tax assessment for each household were implemented.<sup>5</sup> The state's intention was to learn the extent of

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to differentiate between the civilian (county) and Military Frontier territories of the historical-geographical regions of Slavonia, Srem, Bačka, and Banat. For the purposes of our paper, we will focus only on the last phase of the Military Frontier organisation, after 1745, when the "regulated" regiments were established as the primary territorial-administrative units in the Military Frontier system. This model was initially introduced in the Slavonian-Syrmian Military Frontier and later used in the organisation of the Šajkaš Battalion (within the territory of the Bacs County) in 1763, and the first regiments of the Banat Military Frontier in southern Temeswarer Banat in 1764. For more on the new regimental organisational model, refer to: K. Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnici* I, Zagreb 1997, 239–246.

<sup>3</sup> Some aspects on this subject, in: X. Havadi-Nagy, *Die Slawonische und Banater Militärgrenze. Kriegserfahrungen und räumliche Mobilität*, Cluj-Napoca (Klausenburg) 2010.

<sup>4</sup> The contemporary definition of *nucleated settlement* corresponds to the circumstances of the formation of this type of settlement in the Military Frontier, as cited: "A settlement clustered around a central point, such as a village green or church. ... Nucleation is fostered by defense considerations, localized water supply, the incidence of flooding, or rich soils so that farmers can easily get to their smaller, productive fields while continuing to live in the village." In: Nucleated settlement - Oxford Reference, *A Dictionary of Geography*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Oxford University Press 2009.

<sup>5</sup> The same scope of activities was applied in the civilian territory under the state's control – in the Temeswarer Banat – as a result of colonisation policies from 1762 to 1772, with visible results until 1773 (B. Landais, "La réforme cadastrale dans les villages du Banat au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Historie et sociétés rurales*, No 37 – 1<sup>er</sup> semestre 2012 (2014) 66–79.

usable terrain while increasing the possibilities for its taxation. As a result, a tax on arable land for each household was introduced (*terestral*), which was the first time that the basic tax in the Military Frontier was land-based.<sup>6</sup>

The extent of the measures taken and their far-reaching consequences can be understood by considering the conditions prevailing in the regions of Slavonia, Syrmia, Bačka, and Banat before these reforms. In short, at that time, land in the agricultural areas was at rural communities' disposal as private right.<sup>7</sup> Their settlements were of scattered type, and the population was predominantly oriented towards livestock farming. Agriculture was limited to subsistence production since the annual survey of cereal yields and handing over *tithes* to officials did not incentivise significant investments in cereal farming, given its perishability and transportation difficulties. The easiest way to obtain money was by selling livestock, especially fattened cattle and pigs, which were in high demand in the large cities of Central Europe.<sup>8</sup> Livestock farming was extensive and occupied the best and largest areas throughout southern Hungary, often leading to complaints from locals as the best land was left to individuals for grazing their herds at the cost of pushing crop farming to poorer-quality terrain. These conditions were prevalent both in civilian and military-frontier territories, indicating that the frontier society was far from the social equality commonly attributed to it.<sup>9</sup> Official statistics also confirm that the highest income in the southern Hungary provinces came from selling livestock and animal products (wool, fur, lard, wax, etc.), with cereal exports playing a much smaller role.<sup>10</sup> Finally,

---

<sup>6</sup> Fr. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, Wien 1875, 231 (for the Banat Military Frontier); K. Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik* II, Zagreb 1997, 82–85.

<sup>7</sup> Johann Jacob Erler, a knowledgeable observer and imperial official in the province of Temeswarer Banat, vividly described the high degree of autonomy of local communities, stating that “the village leader has not seen anyone of higher rank than himself for about half a year” (J. J. Erler, *Banat*, [Temeswar 1774], translated by M. Mitrović, Pančevo 2003, 54). The small number of officials meant weak supervision over local affairs, leading to the strengthening of the autonomy of village communities and the social position of their leaders (B. Landais, “Village Politics and the Use of ‘Nation’ in the Banat in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century”, in: *Forschungswerkstatt: Die Habsburgmonarchie im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Barth-Scalmani, etc., Bochum 2012, 200–201).

<sup>8</sup> J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, Beograd 2020, 301–302.

<sup>9</sup> We will refer to the description of the problem regarding the use of arable land in the territories of the Banat *Landmiliz* (a predecessor of the Illyrian Banat Regiments), where in 1755, accusations were made against officers “for keeping too much livestock on arable land [...] and for not following the rules regarding ploughing and mowing, although the fields and meadows were limited by hummocks”. A particular problem were the arable lands that could not be fenced as meadows due to seasonal movements of livestock and were “ploughed in one place, and then in another”. The authorities recommended that in both cases officers should work together with the community (L. Hofmann, “Kikindski distrikt 1755”, *Glasnik Istoriskog društva u Novom Sadu* X (1937) 325).

<sup>10</sup> In 1770, in Temeswarer Banat, the export of livestock and animal products amounted to about one and a half million forints. At the same time, the export of grains was worth 142,000 forints, and the mining products only 34,200 forints (J. J. Erler, *Banat*, 49–50).

it should be noted that these regions were sparsely populated compared to other provinces, such as Austrian, Czech, and German lands. This fact was of crucial importance as a starting point for affirming the state policy of intervention aimed at maximising land use for cultivation in order to create conditions for establishing new settlements and expanding existing ones.<sup>11</sup>

There is evidence that measures implemented in the last quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century resulted in the introduction of cadastre in areas under direct state administration, such as the regions of the Military Frontier and the *Temeswarer Banat* province. Describing the conditions in the latter, during the eighth decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the official Franz Grisellini pointed out that the current land policy involved the creation of a *tax cadastre* (*Steuerkatastrum*) to “calculate the annual revenues of the imperial and royal treasury more securely, according to the allocated land”. The land allocated to the individual households would be separate from the land that could be “offered for lease to the highest bidder”, constituting a “new type of state revenue”.<sup>12</sup> Thus, the state’s interest was formulated in a straightforward manner, with the goal of land reform being translated into taxation reform. The purpose of these measures was directed towards achieving the principle of autarky, and in that sense, with the cantonal arrangement introduced in the territory of the Military Frontier in 1786, Emperor Joseph renounced any outflow of funds from it to the state treasury.<sup>13</sup>

### **Militarisation and centralisation in Frontier regiments**

The concept of territorialisation of generalates emerged after 1745 and was based on the establishment of “enclosed” regiments (*Regimenten*) as the primary territorial-administrative units in the Military Frontier. Before this period, there was no efficient distribution of responsibilities between the Court Chamber (*Hofkammer*) and the Court War Council (*Hofkriegsrath*) since they were conducted based on personal,

---

<sup>11</sup> Regarding state intervention in the economy and demographic development of the province of Temeswarer Banat during the period from 1718 to 1778, which largely served as a testing ground for implementing reform measures considered to be modernising, more can be found in: S. Jordan, *Die kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat im 18. Jahrhundert*, München 1967; E. Schimscha, *Tehnik und Methoden der Theresianischen Besiedlung des Banats*, Wien 1939.

<sup>12</sup> F. Grisellini, *Versuch einer politischen und natürlichen Geschichte des Temeswarer Bannats in Briefen an Standespersonen und Gelehrte*, Erster Theil, Wien 1780, 185. Furthermore, Grisellini noted that the first task of Count Klari, who was appointed President of the *Land Administration* in Timișoara in 1768, was to implement a plan for the allocation of land to local farming families (basic 32 acres). This was done with the goal of introducing a tax-cadastre, ensuring that the revenues of the imperial and royal treasury could be determined with certainty and in proportion to the allocated land (F. Grisellini, *Pokušaj proučavanja političke i istorije prirode Temišvarskog Banata*, Pančevo 2008, 158).

<sup>13</sup> Fr. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* III, Wien 1875, 17.

instead a territorial principle.<sup>14</sup> The territorial development of regiments took place gradually as settlements were grouped and removed from the jurisdiction of civilian institutions (either the *Hofkammer* or feudal estates in the *comitats*) and placed under military administration. The regimental model imposed the concept of territorialisation, where exclusive jurisdiction over all matters within the regiments belonged to the central military institution – *Hofkriegsrath* in Vienna. Its jurisdiction was delegated to the headquarters of the general command of the Slavonic-Banat region (located in fortifications in Osijek and Timișoara), and then to lower authorities in the form of the headquarters of individual regiments in Petrovaradin, Brod, Nova Gradiška, Titel and Pančevo.

The presence of military authority had a direct impact on the spatial development of the mentioned cities, leading to their intensive urbanisation, albeit under controlled conditions. However, most settlements within the regiments were still of rural type, and during the reorganisation, they developed following the nucleated settlement pattern. It should be noted, however, that in addition to settlements, the regiments included uninhabited areas, such as pastures, marshlands, swamps, etc. The military jurisdiction extended over the entire territory, not just the populated areas. A good example of territorial development is the German-Banat Regiment (*Deutsch-bannatische Grenzregiment*), situated between the Tamiš river and the Danube. It was founded in 1764 when the frontier obligations were taken over by the inhabitants of some of the villages around Pančevo. However, by 1770, it was proclaimed as necessary to take over the entire territory that formed the “outer ring of the frontier, even if it contained only barren, flooded, impassable, or unusable areas”.<sup>15</sup> The example of the Banat Regiment testifies to the existence of a total approach in territorial development of regiments with the aim of creating, as called in sources, an “uninterrupted belt” (*ohnunterbrochenen Granizkette*) in the Military Frontier system. Striving for their own “enclosure”, almost all regimental borders were established along natural (physical) barriers, most commonly rivers.<sup>16</sup>

Another aspect of building regiments concerned the political centralisation that was carried out in them. It was not only the territorial principle that was inviolable;

---

<sup>14</sup> K. Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik I*, 227–233.

<sup>15</sup> The distribution of wasteland is best illustrated by the data indicating that in the territory of the German-Banat Regiment in 1784, there were 122,306 acres recorded as wasteland and *überland* (J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 213–215, 217).

<sup>16</sup> Similarly, the Banat Military Frontier is a good example of the gradual expansion of military administration over a broader territory. Although the formal establishment of the *Illyrian* and *Ansiedlungs* (later German) Regiments was proclaimed in 1764, and the Wallachian Battalion in 1769, they were individually territorially developed until 1775, when they were unified within the framework of the Banat Military Frontier and its two regiments, the German-Banat and Wallachian-Illyrian regiment (J. Ilić Mandić, “Making the Border and Frontiersmen. Militarization in Temeswarer Banat, 1764–1775”, in: *From Medieval Frontiers to Early Modern Borders in Central and South-Eastern Europe*, ed. F. N. Aderlan, L. Cimpeanu, G. Fodor, L. Magina, Peter Lang Publishing 2022, 211, passim).

regiments were supposed to represent areas where no other political authorities existed except military ones. Until 1745, the situation in Syrmian villages by the Sava and Danube was chaotic since both military subjects and civilians lived there. The restoration of counties and demarcation with the Military Frontier in Slavonia and Syrmia lasted from 1745 to 1749 and caused many conflicts. It turned out that the division of the population by preference for civilian or frontiersman status did not follow the original plan, since dissatisfaction among communities and individuals with the allocated land was far from easily and quickly resolvable.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the experience gained at this time undoubtedly improved the efficiency of the process in the future, which was evident during the militarisation of the areas in southern Banat and Bačka. For example, the constitution of the Banat-Illyrian Regiment, starting from 1 May 1764, was preceded by an agreement between the Court War Council as the new beneficiary and the Aulic Bank Deputation (*Ministerialbankdeputation*) as the previous beneficiary of revenue from land militia. The organisation in that regiment was prescribed following the model of the “Slavonian system”, and the new administration manifesto was implemented by reading the Transfer of Jurisdiction Act (*Übergab Aktus*) from village to village, between 28 March and 17 April of that year.<sup>18</sup> By abolishing the jurisdiction of the Aulic Sanitary Deputation (*Sanitätshofdeputation*) in 1776, until then in charge on sanitary stations (*Contumazen* at border crossings), the last step towards the centralisation of all affairs and activities in the Military Frontier was put under the control of the Court War Council.<sup>19</sup>

There is no doubt that the physical presence of the military contributed to the establishment of a new order that caused significant turbulence among the resident population, both in the Military Frontier and civilian territories.<sup>20</sup> The consolidation of the military administration territorial scope certainly facilitated the implementation of measures that were considered, in the manner of the Enlightenment, a priori modernising. This is evidenced by the words of Friedrich Wilhelm von Taube, an imperial official well-versed in the conditions in Slavonia and Syrmia, who described the organisation of their frontier area as follows: “It cannot be denied that everything is arranged in a more orderly and better manner in the military districts than in the counties. The ruler’s decrees and all the new measures and regulations aimed at the

---

<sup>17</sup> S. Gavrilović, “Obnova županija i njihovo razgraničenje sa Vojnom granicom (1745–1749)”, *Zbornik za društvene nauke* 25 (1960) 65–66, passim.

<sup>18</sup> Fr. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, 183; J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 47.

<sup>19</sup> Fr. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, 249. The only exception were some civil domains in Karlovac- and Banalgrenze, resolved by Joseph II on behalf of military authorities by 1784 (ibidem, 258–269).

<sup>20</sup> In the case of civilian Slavonia, according to Taube’s assessment written in the 1770s, “public peace and security have been restored about fifteen years ago”, thanks, among other things, to the consent of the nobility of the three counties to build barracks for accommodation of 20 to 30 cavalymen from German regiments on their estates (F. V. Taube, *Istorijski i geografski opis Kraljevine Slavonije i Vojvodstva Srema*, Novi Sad 1998, 121).

progress and betterment of the country, and therefore the well-being of its subjects, are not only carried out willingly and diligently, without slowness and hesitation as in the counties, but are actively and persistently enforced once they are introduced". Taube explains his opinion by stating that the reason for this is "military obedience, discipline, and pressure", as well as the fact that there were "many more low- and high-ranking officers than royal officials in the provinces".<sup>21</sup> He concludes that in the Frontier, "supervision is stricter, and the introduction of new and useful measures is far easier than in the counties, where there is a considerable shortage of supervisory staff". The problem of the bureaucratic network on which the implementation of the measures directly depended existed not only in the provinces' administration, where officials were in the royal service, but also on chamber estates, where officials were in the service of financial institutions, as was the case with the district officials of the Land Administration in the Temeswarer Banat.<sup>22</sup>

The inhabitants of the Military Frontier had to accept the status of frontiersmen, which entailed certain rights and obligations, and in return, they acquired the privilege of exclusive landownership.<sup>23</sup> Decisions were made by higher military authorities in Vienna, the general command, and regimental staff, while Military Frontier officers executed these decisions, since they were present in each *company* (at the lowest ranks of warrant officers, lieutenants and second lieutenants, and captains). The commanders of the companies – which generally included two to three villages each – were in charge of maintaining the land system. In the 1771 Urbarium for Kovin, a colonised settlement on the Danube in the German-Banat Regiment, one of the final articles states that "the Commander of the Company should not only apply the prescribed good [land] system, but also nurture and multiply it, and should not only perform the prescribed tasks from year to year but also personally visit his district in spring and autumn to observe how the frontiersmen differ from each other in their diligence, and thus have the opportunity to admonish and guide the less diligent to follow the example of those more diligent, for their own good. Furthermore, he should mark and restore every border marker and detect whether someone has ploughed over the border lines or committed any other offense that he could

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, 130.

<sup>22</sup> Erler considered that frequent official visitations in villages were a prerequisite for effective administration. Furthermore, he justified his advocacy for the introduction of taxes on cultivable land of rural households by the fact that the existing number of district officials was insufficient to organise annual censuses of male household members who paid taxes, as well as other types of censuses on a yearly basis, such as the census of movable property, which primarily consisted of livestock (J. J. Erler, *Banat*, 57).

<sup>23</sup> Only subjects who had the frontiersmen status were eligible to own land in the Military Frontier, as stated in the second provision of the Basic Frontier Law (*Grundgesetz*) from 1807: "According to this rule, only those individuals can acquire and retain properties in the Frontier who have either already settled there and subjected themselves to frontier duties, or who intend to settle there with their families and take on specified duties". (S. Gavrilović, "Osnovni graničarski zakon iz 1807 (1808) godine", *Zbornik za istoriju* 38 (1988) 145).

immediately correct; if an offense was committed from the other side [referring to the Ottoman territory], he has an obligation to immediately inform higher authorities about it."<sup>24</sup> In the civilian territory under state administration, such as the Temeswarer Banat province, a similar order was in force.<sup>25</sup>

The immediate influence of military officials on the spatial scheme was evident in numerous instances, especially when it involved collectively organising frontiersmen in a joint work endeavour. The compiler of the church description of the Šajkaš Battalion in 1785 noted, among other things, that the instruction to relocate village public cemeteries at a minimum distance of 400 klafters from the settlements and enclose them was not fulfilled in almost any of the 12 villages, and "they [the locals] will not do it until officers force them to".<sup>26</sup> There is no doubt that, in addition to the initiative coming from the military authorities, the implementation of specific ideas and achievement of effective results in spatial planning required the application of direct pressure, provided by lower-ranking officers in each of the frontier villages.

### Nucleated and urban settlements

In the Military Frontier, as well as in other areas conquered during the Ottoman-Habsburg wars (1683–99; 1716–18; 1737–1739) in the region of southern Hungary – which had been under centuries-long Ottoman rule – the villages were of a scattered type, while urban settlements almost did not exist.<sup>27</sup> The first settlements following the urban planning pattern called nucleated settlement appeared through systematic action of military and chamber authorities – in Slavonia starting from the 1740s, and in Banat from the 1760s. The beginnings of urbanisation coincided with the renewal of the Slavonian and Syrmian counties in the hinterland of the Military Frontier and

---

<sup>24</sup> J. Ilić, "Urbar naselja Kovin (1771. godina)", *Mešovita građa – Miscellanea XXXIII* (2012) 213–214.

<sup>25</sup> The Commissioner for Settlement Affairs (in *Ansiedlungskommission*), Wolfgang von Kempelen, noted in his elaboration from February 1768 that in each district, supervision should be established – one governor, one deputy governor, as well as one parish priest, one Hungarian official, and one judge – who would visit and serve two or three villages each, "so that the official apparatus would not be excessively enlarged". In addition to collecting complaints from the locals, they were responsible for ensuring that "all fields are ploughed by autumn, so they can be cultivated in the spring" (A. Reininger, "Wolfgang von Kempelen und die Bevölkerungspolitik unter Maria Theresia und Joseph II im Banat (1Teil)", *Analele Banatului XV* (2007) 209).

<sup>26</sup> Similar remarks were recorded in the description of most of the settlements of the Šajkaš Battalion in 1785 (S. Pecinjački, "Podaci iz 1785. o naseljima i školama Srema i Šajkaške", *Zbornik za društvene nauke* 49 (1968) 140–143).

<sup>27</sup> Serbian villages in the southwestern Banat in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century still consisted of irregularly clustered houses and homesteads. The cultivated plots were of varying shapes and sizes, irregularly distributed. There were no planned roads, and some houses or structures stood isolated (E. Roth, *Die planmäßig angelegten Siedlungen im Deutsch-Banater Militärgrenzbezirk 1765–1821*, München 1988, 31, passim).



the redefinition of the boundaries of the local feudal estates after 1745. In the eighth decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Taube recorded a tradition where the construction of a network of nucleated villages was part of the fight against widespread brigandage and robbery in Slavonia and Sylvania during the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48). Namely, after Trenck and his *pandurs* had gone to the battlefield in Germany, it was considered that “one of the most useful means to start making villages is to have the houses that were scattered in huge forests or hills demolished and then raised together in one place”.<sup>28</sup> At this stage, completely planned construction of a new headquarters of the Gradiška Regiment began, following the building of Nova Gradiška (1748). In addition to promoting public security, the building of nucleated settlements was also encouraged by the state’s intention to adapt the rural land to the needs of controlled agricultural activities, land reform, and colonisation. The fact that the regulation of settlements in Slavonia was carried out by the eighth decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is confirmed by Franz Stefan Engel, another active official in that area, writing ten years after Taube (1786). Engel described each of the hundred or so settlements of the Slavonian regiments with an identical, concise formulation – “immaculately built”.<sup>29</sup> In the same way, he described the frontier settlements of the Šajkaš Battalion, which were built a few years after 1780.<sup>30</sup>

The application of the nucleated settlement pattern in the frontier of Banat was initiated by the German veterans’ colonisation, starting from 1764.<sup>31</sup> Paradoxically, the first planned and regulated settlements in southern Banat – Bavanište, Dolovo, and Novo Selo – were built in 1766 by the Court Chamber to house the Serbian population that had withdrawn from settlements on the Danube to avoid militarisation.<sup>32</sup> However, their civilian status as subjects of the Chamber (*Camerallisten*) did not last, as there was a rapid expansion of the frontier area towards the hinterland of the Danube line. Initially, militarisation was equated with the colonisation of German veterans, but after 1772, it was extended to indigenous settlements to encompass a larger geographical area and be “territorially enclosed” (bounded by the Danube and Tamiš rivers, including the Deliblato Sands).<sup>33</sup> The process of planned settlement

---

<sup>28</sup> F. V. Taube, *Istorijski i geografski opis*, 121.

<sup>29</sup> F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, Novi Sad 2003, 165–217.

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem, 217–225. In the Šajkaš Battalion, apart from the recently built headquarters of the battalion in Titel, he also described the settlement of Gornji Kovilj with as many as “188 houses built in immaculate order” (Ibidem, 221).

<sup>31</sup> The colonisation of German veterans as frontiersmen in the so-called *Ansiedlungsregiment* since 1764 was a process separate from the simultaneous colonisation of Germans in the civilian territory of the Temeswarer Banat. Despite this, the characteristics of the development of colonised settlements were almost the same (E. Schimscha, *Tehnik und Methode*, Anhang: Impopulations-Haupt-Instruktion, 184–198).

<sup>32</sup> V. S. Dabić, “Srpsko selo (XVI–XVIII vek): Oblikovanje životnog i privrednog prostora”, u: *Prostorno planiranje u Jugoistočnoj Evropi (do Drugog svetskog rata)*, Beograd 2011, 35–36.

<sup>33</sup> The German-Banat Regiment encompassed only 16 settlements until 1775, 32 until 1781, and as many as 43 by 1793 (J. Ilić Mandić, “Making the Border and Frontiersmen”, 214–215).

regulation proceeded in the same dynamic, which, after the construction of new quarters in the 12 colonised settlements,<sup>34</sup> was soon spread onto indigenous villages by imposing regulatory tasks on them too. By the 1780s, the process of planned regulation, i.e. nucleation of settlements, had been completed in almost all settlements of the German-Banat Regiment.<sup>35</sup>

As a *terminus ante quem* when the new nucleated type of settlements prevailed in the broader area of the Habsburg frontier regions, we will use the information that testifies to an attempt to transplant this model to the newly conquered area of Serbia during the short Austrian rule in Belgrade and its surroundings, during the last Austro-Turkish War (1788–91). By the construction of houses for settlers in the newly conquered Belgrade and its surroundings (*Ansiedlernhauser*), it was recommended, “not to scatter them and build them somewhere on the side, but on the roads so that they can be under supervision, just as the construction for settlers was carried out in the German-Banat and Wallachian-Illyrian frontier regiments”. According to the recommended model, in addition to building houses along the roads for supervision, “each house had to be provided with a plot for a yard and a garden, as well as a stable for livestock, and when allocating arable land, care should be taken that it is not too far from the house”.<sup>36</sup>

The end result was that the settlements acquired a standardised appearance following the pattern of a nucleated settlement. What they all had in common was the presence of urban core with a square and public buildings (for civilian purposes such as churches, parish house, school, and inn, but also for military purposes like officer’s quarters and drill grounds), while the square was surrounded by a regular grid of streets and blocks of residential units with yards. The construction regulations stipulated the typical appearance of houses, rules on street width and fire protection, the existence of public wells, sanitation rules, and so on. The initial plans for “solid” construction of all buildings (using baked bricks) were later replaced with cheaper solutions, and most houses were built using rammed earth. However, solid construction remained a desirable prerequisite for building corners, floors, and chimneys in residential buildings, and brick was still the mandatory construction material for public buildings.<sup>37</sup> By using statistical data from state services when

---

<sup>34</sup> The German colonists-veterans population mostly settled in newly built places or quarters: Gornje (Serbian) and Donje (German) Pančevo, Sefkerin, Jabuka, Starčevo, Omoljica, Brestovac, Kovin, Pločica, Opovo, Glogonj, and Crepaja. Among these settlements, only two were exclusively populated by colonists (Jabuka and Glogonj), while in the remaining ten settlements, the colonists settled their communities alongside existing Serbian communities, forming the new quarters (J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 113, 120).

<sup>35</sup> E. Roth, *Die planmässig angelegten Siedlungen*, 155, *passim*. Some of the Serbian and Romanian villages were first relocated and then systematically rebuilt, as was the case with Idvor, Uzdin (Padina), Gaj, and others.

<sup>36</sup> D. Pavlović, *Srbija za vreme poslednjeg Austro-turskog rata (1788–1791)*, Beograd 1910, 293.

<sup>37</sup> E. Roth, *Die planmässig angelegten Siedlungen*, 319, 320–335, *passim*; J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 218–232.

compiling his descriptions, Engel precisely determined the extent of predominant use of rammed earth and wattle and daub (a mixture of earth and straw between beams) in construction. According to his data, it can be calculated that by 1786 within the territory of three regiments of the Slavonian Frontier and the Šajkaš Battalion, there were around 20,000 buildings, with approximately 19,500 frontier houses constructed in the mentioned manner and around 500 solidly built buildings for public purposes.<sup>38</sup> Despite the fact that traditional construction methods were predominantly used, it is important to emphasise that all of the houses were built according to new construction principles that, despite the materials used, provided improved sanitary and safety conditions for living.<sup>39</sup>

Although most residential houses in the Military Frontier settlements were of “common” construction,<sup>40</sup> building using solid materials, such as stone or brick, was mandatory for military, economic and administrative buildings.<sup>41</sup> Most settlement’s central parts were organised in the form of squares with buildings for housing officers, churches, schools, inns, and other public needs.<sup>42</sup> Places with a larger number of such buildings took on the appearance of real “urban” centres and acquired multiple administrative functions.<sup>43</sup> Although this is often overlooked, and the Military Frontier

---

<sup>38</sup> In the Petrovaradin Regiment area, there were 7,723 “frontiersmen houses made of wattle and daub” in 66 settlements. In the Brod Regiment, there were 5,456 “houses built of rammed earth and wattle and daub” in 96 settlements, while in the Gradiška Regiment, there were 4,728 “frontiersmen houses made of wood” in 125 settlements. In the territory of 12 settlements of the Šajkaš Battalion, there were 1,680 inhabited “frontiersmen houses made of rammed earth” (F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 235–137).

<sup>39</sup> Foundations were raised several feet above the ground, and brick chimneys, as well as mandatory installation of windows and doors, were some of the examples that testified to the sanitary and safety improvements in construction. Regardless of the general regulation of settlements, the construction of residential buildings remained predominantly traditional, which involved walls made of rammed earth and roofs made of thatch, as stated in the description of the German-Banat Regiment from 1859 (E. Roth, *Die planmässig angelegten Siedlungen*, 280, passim).

<sup>40</sup> Such construction of houses also applied to the military communities of Stara Gradiška, Nova Gradiška, Brod, Mitrovica, and Vinkovci (F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 243–248).

<sup>41</sup> According to the church census from 1785 of the Šajkaš Battalion 12 settlements, all churches were built of bricks and adobe (S. Pecinjački, “Podaci iz 1785. o naseljima”, 140–143).

<sup>42</sup> One such example, according to Engel’s description, was Vinkovci, where 168 frontiersmen houses and 136 civilian houses were entirely constructed of wattle and covered partly with straw and partly with shingles. Additionally, the town had a square and new well-built buildings on it, such as the “magnificent” parish church, quarters for brigadier and colonel, “new and modernly built two-story guardhouses”, and even a “two-story new mathematical school” (F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 283–284).

<sup>43</sup> If we look at the example of Titel, we can see what public buildings were required for the functioning of a headquarters town since Engel recorded a whole list of existing buildings, noting that they were “partly made of good material, and partly of Egyptian bricks or rammed earth”. In Titel, there were recently erected Catholic church and Orthodox church, quarters for the battalion and canton command, a number of apartments (quarters) for officials such as

territory is seen as exclusively “rural”, there were also settlements with the status of privileged military communities (*privilegierte Militärcomunitäten*) that were the counterparts of the Hungarian free cities (*Königliche Freiestädte*).<sup>44</sup> Around 1785, some of these *Militärcomunitäten* resembled towns due to the presence of buildings made of “good or solid material”, brick and stone. Engel records that in Zemun, the largest town in the Military Frontier, there were as many as 943 buildings, including the quarantine, post office, inspectorate, barracks, commander’s house, salt office, the parish and magistrate houses, and several town houses, “which are mostly built of good materials and can be called beautiful”.<sup>45</sup> (Sremski) Karlovci was slightly smaller, with 789 houses, but of notably more respectable architecture, since even “about three hundred houses were made of stone, and about a hundred were two-story houses”. Moreover, Engel noticed that the best houses were built in the neighbourhood of the metropolitan’s residence, which itself was “the first and most elegant of these buildings”, and that “several of them would be considered beautiful even in big cities”. The final steps toward urbanisation in Karlovci were taken “recently”, Engel writes, in 1785, when the old houses bought from the owners were demolished to expand the town square.<sup>46</sup>

Far more impressive examples of planned construction were cities with fortifications (and headquarters of general command) such as Osijek, Petrovaradin and Timișoara. Simultaneously with the construction of fortresses, which lasted for decades, the settlements around them were also developed, and the inhabitants were subject to certain construction requirements and restrictions in regard to the position of the fortresses. For example, in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, the construction of a new Orthodox church in the Timișoara suburb of Fabrika had to wait until it was determined whether the fortress esplanade would be 1000 or 600 klafters wide. On the other hand, the construction of the seminary and school was allowed “at a designated location according to the existing fortress plan”.<sup>47</sup> At the same time, in

---

captains, auditors, lieutenants, surgeons, pursers, adjutants, as well as for accounting offices. Additionally, there were the main guardhouse, state inn, blacksmith’s shop, parish house, people’s school, butcher’s shop, armoury, wharf, gunpowder magazine, storage for pontoons and boats (tschaikas), and six state wells (Ibid, 218).

<sup>44</sup> This status was granted first to Zemun, Karlovci, Bukovac, and Petrovaradin in 1753, and later of the same year to Brod, Stara Gradiška and Nova Gradiška, and temporarily to Mitrovica and Vinkovci. Bela Crkva got this status in 1774, and Pančevo in 1794. Their evolution into urban-type settlements represents one of the urbanisation achievements of the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Fr. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, 295–298).

<sup>45</sup> F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 249–251. The urban structure of Zemun is best shown by the detailed plan of its area and the urban core from 1780 (Austrian State Archives (=ÖStA), War Archives (=KA), Map Collection (=KS), B IX 906).

<sup>46</sup> F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 254–255.

<sup>47</sup> Archive of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (=ASANUK), fund MP A, Box 24 (1755), doc. 393 and 442.

Petrovaradin, the request for the construction of the (Orthodox) metropolitan's residence and church, as well as residential buildings, had to be rejected based on the fact that "there was no space left in the existing and available fortress plan for such buildings, and that there was a lack of space for necessary barracks and other fortification structures already".<sup>48</sup> Data on the advanced urbanisation in the mentioned places and areas are numerous, as well as on the completion of the process by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>49</sup>

### Land plots ownership and cadastral surveying

Any kind of land-use planning could not be realised without the nucleation of settlements. By grouping buildings closely together around a central feature, conditions were created for the purposeful allocation of fields in line with the planned activities – for agriculture or livestock farming. The frontiersmen were owners of arable land plots that they cultivated themselves.<sup>50</sup> Even the residents of *Militärcommunitäten* with the status of citizens and those with wardship status (*Burger* and *Schutzleute*), otherwise exempt from frontiersmen duties, were owners of arable land and its cultivators. This is best shown by the structure of the land in *Militärcommunitäten* around 1780, even in the largest ones like Zemun, whose inhabitants, despite the growth of the urban core and urban occupations, were simultaneously owners of arable fields, meadows, vineyards, and pastures.<sup>51</sup> In the planning of the village land structure, the position of the fields was determined, where possible, following the ideal model – pastures near the populated core, and arable

---

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*, doc. 414.

<sup>49</sup> In 1794, Count Teleki travelled through these regions and described the appearance of four Hungarian fortresses (Osijek, Petrovaradin, Arad, and Timișoara), judging that the Petrovaradin fortress was the largest and "in the most beautiful position" in Hungary, while the Timișoara fortress was "large, with an arsenal well-stocked with all kinds of weapons, and with barracks and casemates for 3,000 people, and a city fortified following all the rules of the art of fortification" (D. Teleki, *Reisen durch Ungern und einige angränzende Länder* [1796], aus dem Ungarisch übersetzt durch Ladislaus v Nemeth, Pesth 1805, 143, 162).

<sup>50</sup> Although it is often stated in literature that the frontiersmen were merely users of land as fief, with the supreme owner being the Emperor, their ownership rights were not challenged in practice. Therefore, in the first provision of the Basic Law (*Grundgesetze*) from 1807, it was unequivocally stated: "It follows that these military estates (fiefs) are not merely granted goods, temporarily handed over and subject to the will of superiors, as it has been understood in some places until now, but they are permanent properties for continuous use" (S. Gavrilović, "Osnovni graničarski zakon", 145).

<sup>51</sup> ÖStA, KA, KS, B IX 906. The ownership of land plots of different sizes and types (fields, meadows, vineyards) was common even in cities on the civilian territory, as evidenced by the cadastral book of the city of Rijeka (Fiume) from 1785/87 (I. Erceg, *Jozefinski katastar grada Rijeke i njegove uže okolice (1785/87)*, Zagreb 1998).

land and meadows towards the edges of the village area (*Hotars* or *Districts*).<sup>52</sup> In addition to protecting the arable land from livestock movement, the goal was to limit the areas for livestock farming and redirect this activity to *überland* (unallocated land, usually marshes) and wastelands, where keeping livestock was taxed.<sup>53</sup> The dominance of arable land over pastures and unusable land was achieved precisely through the rural land (re)structuring and allocation of arable land to the frontiersmen. For example, in the land tax-inventory of the German-Banat Regiment from 1781, 85% consisted of cultivated land (arable land, meadows, orchards, and vineyards), and the remaining 15% were pastures.<sup>54</sup>

The parcelisation of arable land was a fundamental element in the process of creating cadastral records, i.e. the registration of household heads in landowner books (*Grundbücher*) and imposing proportional tax obligations on them. Defining the land tax (*Grundtax*) as the primary tax for households, was seen as a solution to the multi-decade issue of simplifying population tax-obligations and stabilising revenues.<sup>55</sup> The introduction of the land tax in the territory of the Military Frontier in 1774 (first in the German-Banat Regiment) was proclaimed by the regulation of Major Žišković and was the result of a comprehensive and systematic action of central authorities.<sup>56</sup> The success achieved in Banat was due to the fact that the province was the first to start with the project of measuring the entire land and mapping it within the Josephine survey or cadastre (*Josephinische Aufnahme*), during the period 1769–73.<sup>57</sup> In addition to mapping, there was also a reorganisation of agricultural land and its distribution to the frontiersmen based on a decree issued in 1768, stating that

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibidem. Regarding the rural land in colonised settlements of civilian Banat, the same was recommended by Kempelen in his elaboration from February 1768, where it is suggested that “common pastures should be near villages” (A. Reininger, “Wolfgang von Kempelen und die Bevölkerungspolitik”, 209).

<sup>53</sup> J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 286.

<sup>54</sup> Ibidem, 256.

<sup>55</sup> In 1774, Erler noted that instead of the head tax (apparently referring to civilian Banat), which took too much of the officials’ time due to annual census, it is advisable to introduce a “tax per session, after the land distribution is completed”, and that “there are very good methods and techniques for collecting land taxes, accepted in other civilised countries.” (J. J. Erler, *Banat*, 57).

<sup>56</sup> Žišković’s regulation of socio-economic conditions in this part of the Military Frontier was based on the idea that the tax burden should be on the land holdings of the households and their “non-serving” members, allowing recruited members to fulfil their frontiersmen duties without harming the household (F. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, 230–231; K. Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik* II, 82–85).

<sup>57</sup> The Josephine land survey was a comprehensive state project conducted in Temeswarer Banat in 1769–73 and 1773–78, and in the entire Military Frontier in 1780–84. Mapping had a lasting effect since the sections created at that time became the basis for taxation until 1819, when the so-called Second or Francis (after Emperor Francis I) Cadastre was created (J. Paldus, *Die militärischen Aufnahmen im Bereich der Habsburgischen Länder aus der Zeit Kaisers Josephs II*, Vienna 1919, 104–108).

each frontiersman should be given a landholding of 30 acres (*Joch*), consisting of 18 acres of arable land, 6 acres of meadows, and 6 acres of pastures (or 24 acres without pastures).<sup>58</sup> During the land distribution, this model could not be consistently applied since it depended on the nature and quality of the land in different areas, while pastures were soon excluded from the distribution. Additionally, in rural areas where colonists were settled alongside the local population, the redistribution was carried out with less available land. According to the *Urbarium* for seven colonised settlements of the German-Banat Regiment in the vicinity of Pančevo in 1769, individual land holdings amounted to only 20 acres (10 acres of arable land and 10 acres of meadows).<sup>59</sup>

Land books (*Grundbuch; Urbarium*), which have been preserved for only a few settlements, are direct evidence of the implementation of land reform in militarised agricultural areas at the time. In the Banat Military Frontier, the 1769 map of Idvor (*Plan von Idvor*) and the 1771 land book of Kovin (*Urbarium von Kubin*) are preserved in the form of a cadastre.<sup>60</sup> The appearance and content of these sources are similar. They consist of a cartographic representation of the settlement and a list of names of owners of various types of plots in its area. Land plots are described by their location, type (arable land or meadows), and size (*Joch, Klafter*).<sup>61</sup> The most important aspect is that the plots were registered under the name of the owner who, in addition to ownership rights, had certain tax obligations on their property. At that time, Idvor was a Serbian frontier settlement of the Illyrian Regiment (with its headquarters in Velika Kikinda), and its regulation was initiated by relocating the settlement from a marshy area around the Tamiš river, while the regulation of Kovin was carried out as a consequence of the colonisation of German veterans and the distribution of land to

---

<sup>58</sup> J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 180, 271. The decision from 1768 applied to the frontier Banat but it coincided with decisions made in the civilian territory prompted by colonisation (e.g. Kempelen's model from 1769). For the sake of comparison, the frontiersmen holdings were determined to be approximately the same size as the peasant session of 36 acres (*Ganz Session*), which was prescribed as a land unit in the *urbaria* for civilian territories – for Slavonia in 1756, Hungary in 1767, and Banat in 1780. However, the difference lay in the fact that peasant families often had 1/8, 1/4, or 1/2 sessions, while frontier households had "a session per frontiersman" (S. Gavrilović, "Banatski urbar", *Zbornik za društvene nauke* 34 (1963) 77; B. Landais, "La réforme cadastrale dans les villages du Banat au XVIIIe siècle", 68–71).

<sup>59</sup> J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 274.

<sup>60</sup> The cadastral map shows the boundaries and ownership of land parcels in Banat settlement Idvor in 1769: ÖStA, KA, KS, G I h 242. The List of Idvorian landowners shown in this map was published in: S. Pecinjački, "Individualna raspodela zemlje idvorskim graničarima 1769. godine", *Zbornik za istoriju* 7 (1973) 124–128. The cadastral book of Kovin contains the list of landowners and describes the parcels by their ownership, in: J. Ilić, "Urbar naselja Kovin (1771. godina)", 199–229.

<sup>61</sup> A Viennese acre equalled 1,600 square klafters, and it amounted to 0.57 hectares.

their families, including the necessary redistribution to local Serbian households.<sup>62</sup> Colonisation brought another lasting effect – the three-part division of arable plots and the so-called three-field system of land cultivation.<sup>63</sup> In the Kovin area, arable plots were “divided into three separate parts, where the owners could use one part for winter crops, another for summer crops, and leave the third one fallow” (*Urbarium*, §18). In addition to being applied to the land holdings of new colonist households, the three-field system was also applied to indigenous households (*Urbarium*, §19: ... *auf nehmliche Art bey denen Militaren geschehen*). Local officers were supposed to supervise the implementation of the three-field crop rotation in land cultivation (*Urbarium*, §48).<sup>64</sup>

Outside of Banat, land and tax reforms were implemented during the early 1780s. After the successful implementation of the land reform based on the *Urbarium* model in the German-Banat Regiment, its commander, Colonel Geneyne, was promoted to frontier inspector in 1782, with the task of applying the same model in other parts of the Military Frontier. The effective continuation of Geneyne’s work is evidenced by the results he achieved in the Šajkaš Battalion, where, according to Engel, “in 1784, the entire land of this battalion was measured for each house according to its needs and requests and handed over to the frontiersmen as ownership for use, and the arable land was divided into two fields for winter and one field for spring sowing, and into meadow, then into pasture, which were specifically allotted to each village community, with surplus land set aside either as uninhabited land (wasteland) for grazing, or as village communal, unallocated land (*überland*)”.<sup>65</sup> The detailed maps of frontier regiments created during the period 1780-84 represent a kind of manifesto of the land reform campaign and its results in the Military Frontier.<sup>66</sup>

With the exception of the German-Banat Regiment, the Šajkaš Battalion, and partly the regiments in the Slavonian Frontier, significant obstacles were encountered in implementing land reforms and introducing land taxation as their final result in all

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. Although implemented on the same principles, the model of land reform in these two settlements differed in the size of individually allocated plots. In Idvor, households were granted a land holding of 24 acres (arable land and pasture) per frontiersman, meaning that households with two, three, or more recruited members received arable land holdings sized two, three, or more times the prescribed basic holding. Kovinian colonists were allocated 25 acres of land, which included 15 acres of arable land (three plots of 5 acres each) and 10 acres of meadows (two plots of 5 acres each). Since the colonised families were by rule nucleated families, only basic holdings were distributed.

<sup>63</sup> J. Ilić Mandić, *Banatska vojna krajina*, 283–286. The three-field model was more economical than the four-field model used by the indigenous households, in which the land allowed to lie fallow amounted to as much as half of the total arable land.

<sup>64</sup> J. Ilić, “Urbar naselja Kovin (1771. godina)”, 208, 213–214.

<sup>65</sup> F. Š. Engel, *Opis Kraljevine Slavonije*, 224.

<sup>66</sup> J. Paldus, *Die militärische Aufnahmen*, passim.



other regions of the Military Frontier.<sup>67</sup> However, the success of this tax model is evidenced by the fact that the *Grundtax* remained the primary taxation model in the Military Frontier until 1850. The largest part of the Frontier Treasury revenue (approximately three-quarters) was collected from the *Grundtax*, while smaller revenues were generated from various fees and leases (e.g. individual right of use).<sup>68</sup> State intervention did not address all challenges entirely and immediately. Indeed, demands for a new redistribution of arable land in the frontier areas were also heard during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and the process was occasionally repeated.<sup>69</sup> Although it is difficult to measure the full extent of the land reform success, the fact is that planned land use and the cadastre survived as its foundations throughout that century. Evidence that the reform left long-term consequences in the frontier landscape can be found, among others, in the 1834 travel journal of General Marmont, who, while travelling along the eastern border of Banat, passing through Caransebeş towards Orşova, noticed that the cadastre had been successfully introduced in the Banat regiments' territories "half a century ago".<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> General Commander of Slavonian Military Frontier, Count Serbelloni, wrote in 1785 an apprehensive account, in which he stated that the application of land and tax reform according to the Banat and Šajkaška model – was not to be recommended in parts of Slavonian and especially the Karlovac and Banal frontier (F. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* III, 7–8).

<sup>68</sup> The land tax was defined in monetary equivalent based on the size (per acre) and quality (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> class) of arable land registered in the form of parcels (ploughland, meadows, vineyards, and orchards) alongside the owner's name in the land book. In the Military Frontier, specifically, this duty could be reduced by the amount of a special subsidy granted as a tax relief to each recruited frontiersman (F. Vaniček, *Specialgeschichte der Militärgrenze* II, 231; K. Kaser, *Slobodan seljak i vojnik* II, 82–85, 88–95).

<sup>69</sup> Despite that, the effects of the land reform in the Military Frontier territory were not annulled as it happened in the civilian (county) territory after the death of Emperor Joseph II, when the cadastral books were systematically burnt (I. Erceg, *Jozefinski katastar grada Rijeke*, XI).

<sup>70</sup> I. Kirža, "Francuz na proputovanju kroz Banat. Graničarska regimenta u Karansebešu u putopisu maršala Marmona (1834)," in: *Vojna granica u Banatu i banatski militari u 18. i 19. veku*, ed. M. Samardžić, Novi Sad 2014, 66.

**Елена Илич Мандич**

**ПЕРВЫЕ РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННОГО ПЛАНИРОВАНИЯ НА ВОЕННОЙ ГРАНИЦЕ ГАБСБУРГСКОЙ МОНАРХИИ: ГРАНИЧНЫЕ ПОЛКИ, УШОРЕННЫЕ СЕЛА И КАДАСТРОВЫЙ УЧЕТ (1745–1785)**

**Резюме**

Есть много примеров административно-территориального устройства пограничных областей Габсбургской монархии, на которых во второй половине XVIII столетия были организованы граничарские полки. В центре нашего внимания территории Славонско-сремской военной границы, Шайкашского батальона и Банатской военной границы. Особенности физико-географического положения этих территориальных единиц, а именно расположение на равнинной местности, способствовали тому, что они становились объектом для разного рода вмешательств со стороны государства. В работе будут представлены некоторые, важные для рассмотрения этой сложной темы, аспекты, а именно: влияния милитаризации и централизации, основание и планировка поселений (по модели ушоренного села), а также межевание земельных владений и разделение пахотных земель, реализованные в виде земельной и налоговой реформ на основе кадастра.

**Јелена Илић Мандић**

**ПРВИ РЕЗУЛТАТИ ПРОСТОРНОГ ПЛАНИРАЊА У ХАБЗБУРШКОЈ ВОЈНОЈ ГРАНИЦИ: ГРАНИЧАРСКЕ РЕГИМЕНТЕ, УШОРЕНА СЕЛА И КАТАСТАРСКИ ПОПИС (1745–1785)**

**Резиме**

Бројни су примери планског уређења простора на периферији Хабзбуршке монархије, која је у другој половини 18. века била уређена у оквирима регименти Војне границе. У фокусу нам је била територија Славонско-сремске војне границе, Шајкашког батаљона и Банатске војне границе, чији је равничарски простор омогућио различите облике државне интервенције у простору. У раду ће бити представљени неки од аспеката важни за сагледавање ове комплексне теме попут утицаја милитаризације и централизације, колонизације и планске регулације насеља (по моделу *ушореног села*), као и потесног структурирања атара и парцелизације обрадивог земљишта, те њихових крајњих резултата у виду земљишне и пореске реформе у форми катастра.