Pošto su se nemačko-kvislinške jedinice povlačile iz rejona Celja ka Dravogradu, brzim prebacivanjem jedinica 51. divizije vozom do Dravograda i spajanjem jedinica 4. operativne zone i motorizovanog odreda 4. armije i delova 3. armije, stvoren je strategijski obruc oko neprijatelja.

Do 9. maja oslobođena je Mežiška dolina, Zelezn Kapla i počelo je razoružavanje nemačkih vojnika.


Posle te borbe, po naredenju fon Lera, prestao je oružani otpor nemačkih jedinica.

Na prostoru Poljane i Pliberka od 14. do 15. maja završen je konačni obračun i s ustaško-četničkim snagama. Posle njihove kapitulacije, zaborljeno je oko 30.000 ustaša i domobrana i 5.000 četnika. U isto vreme jedinice 4. armije, razoružavale su u Stajerskoj jedinice grupe armije »E«.

Korpus narodne odbrale i OZNA u završnim operacijama izvršavali su raznovrsne zadatke. Čistili su oslobođena područja od neprijateljevih grupa, diverzanata i špijuna, i vodili borbu protiv operativnih snaga neprijatelja.

Ratna mornarica JA uspešno je izvršila zadatak sadejstva sa jedinicama 4. armije. Sa preko 400 transportnih brodova i čamaca prevezeno je preko 27.000 boraca. U završnim operacijama Ratno vazduhoplovstvo uspešno je podržavalo operacije naših snaga. Jedanaesta lovačka i 42. juršna vazduhoplovna divizija bile su naoružane avionima tipa yak i il-2, a prva i druga eskadrila avionima tipa spitfajer-V i hariken MK-IV.

U operacijama za konačno oslobođenje zemlje Jugoslovenska armija nanela je neprijatelju velike gubitke: 100.000 poginulih i oko 341.000 zaborljenih, među kojima je bilo više generala na čelu sa Lerom, nemačkim vrhovnim komandantom za Yugostok. Zaplenjena je ogromna količina ratnog materijala.

**SUMMARY**

At the beginning of January 1945 the I, II, and III Armies were formed and two months later, at the beginning of March the IV Army was formed as well. The People’s Liberation Army was renamed the Yugoslav Army, and the Supreme HQ came to be called the General Staff of the Yugoslav Army.

By the middle of March, before the final offensive was undertaken, the Yugoslav Army was, at a separate front, confronted with German Group of Armies »E«; otherwise it had to fight against 7 German Army corps of total strenght over 450,000 soldiers and against over 243,000 quislings — numbering a total over 684,000 enemy soldiers.

The task of the Yugoslav Army, set by Marshal Tito, was to destroy or capture the enemy forces on Yugoslav soil and to liberate all the parts of Yugoslavia, including the territories which ethnically belong to Yu-
gosslavia as well as to prevent the German Balkan Group to strengthen its forces against the Red Army in Hungary and the Allied forces in Italy.

The final offensive was carried out by the four Yugoslav armies from the front, six corps and the Fourth operative zone from the background. From March 20, 1945 May 15, 1945, the Yugoslav Army undertook the following operations: operations of the IV Army — at the first stage Lika and the Croatian littoral were liberated /the «Ličko-primorska» operation/; at the second stage the army moved towards the former Yugoslav—Italian border and then liberated Istria, Trieste and the Slovenian littoral /the »Riječko-trščanska« operation/; the »Sarajevo« operation; the »Sremsko-slavonska« operation of the I and II Armies; Operation of the II Army in the eastern and central Bosnia; Operation of the I, II and III Armies from the line Una — Ilova — Bilogora — Drava and liberation of Karlovac and Zagreb; Operation of the I, II and III Armies and parts of the IV Army in Slovenia, and the final destruction of the enemy.

The German and the quisling forces made the resistance until May 15, 1945. One after another the German divisions were destroyed or captured. Fourteen divisions and a great number of independant brigades, regiments, battalions and other units of the operative force and police were disarmed.

During the final operations for the liberation of the country, the Yugoslav Army inflicted severe losses upon the enemy: 100 000 of dead and about 341 000 of captured, among which a number of generals together with Lehr, German Supreme commander for the South-east. A large quantities of war material were captured as well.

13. LOVAČKA PUŠKA KREMENJACA, inv. br. 12796

Gardone vall Trompia, kraj 17. i početak 18. veka

Oktogonalo facetirana, glatka cev. U visini barutne komore floralni ukras u tehniči cizelacije i inkrustacije požačenim srebrojem.

Na cevi aplicirana dva žiga: jedan sa potpisom majstora (TENAS) i, drugi, sa stilizovanim motivom ptice. Tri prstena koja vezuju cev s usadnikom i potkov kundaka, izrađeni su od srebra u maniru baroka. Mehanizam na kremen tipa »Alla romana«, sa spoljnim sistemom opruga.

Na tabanskoj daščici žig majstora: u štitu delimično nečitka slova (M. Dandri?). Španski (»madridski«) tip kundaka sa specifičnim zadnjim delom koji se u odnosu na vrat simetrično širi ka glavi.

Kalibar . . . . 16 mm Dužina oružja . 1540 mm
Dužina cevi . 1060 mm Težina oružja . 3750 g

Elia Tenas, majstor specijalizovan za izradu cevi, radio je u poznatom oružarskom centru Gardone V. Trompia na prelazu 17. u 18. vek.

SUMMARY

Only a small number of guns and rifles from the seventeenth century in collection of the Military Museum's in Belgrade has been preserved. If an excuse for the lack of the wheellocks can be found in the indifference of the Turks for this expensive and complicated system as well as in its absence in the armament of the majority of the European infantry, it is hard to explain why the arquebus and matchlock muskets are preserved in almost insignificant number. This kind of weapon was well known and almost equally used in all the armies of the sixteenth, seventeenth and even of a part of the eighteenth century.

The appearance of the firearms on the Balkans was first mentioned in 1351. During the sixteenth and the seventeenth century Austria played the most significant role in spreading the modern weapons over the territory of the Yugoslav lands.

All the pieces of arms from that epoch in the collections of the Military Museum are of the middle-European origin, and they were probably brought to our territories over Austria.

Early enough, the Turks realised the importance of the firearms and adopted it quickly, but the development of the Ottoman war
equipment was greatly influenced by the Balkan lands, especially by Serbia. The »Janissary rifle« remained, without considerable changes in design, in use by the Turkish army until the late nineteenth century. These rifles were improved by direct transformation of the matchlock mechanism into the flintlock mechanism (the miquelet type), but the cheap and simple matchlocks were being replaced slowly.

The musket was the most practical and at the same time it was the rifle most widely used by the European armies until the beginning of the eighteenth century. This weapon was equipped mainly with cheap and constructively and functionally simple matchlock mechanism.

Apart from the muskets, the big hackbutts and arquebuses had, according to the technical progress, both the matchlock and the wheellock mechanism. That made this weapon exclusive and expensive, and therefore less used by the infantry of that time.

At our north-western borders the muskets appeared in larger number in the first half of the seventeenth century. On the territory of the Military March, majority of the infantry was not armed with the expensive wheellocks which at the same time was typical for the Insurrection of the internal — Austrian lands. It is not quite certain whether this type of weapon was widely used by the light cavalry of that time.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the infantry firearms were equipped with various types of butts. In the middle Europe of that time the most common was the so-called »German butt«, developed from the heavy and simple holder of the Landsknechts’ hand borrels. From the mid sixteenth century, the two special types of the butt designed for hunting, sporting and luxury rifles were developed from the German type of the butt. The first one was fitted at some specimens of the »Bürschrohren« or »Pirschbüchen«. The head of this type was encrusted with bone and had a characteristic ending in the shape of the asymmetrical volutes.

The second type of the hunting butt appeared by the end of the sixteenth century at the famous »Techner buchse«, »Tschinke«, small caliber rifles designed for shooting birds. This type of arms had a slim and light butt with an extremely short head and, because of its specific shape similar to a hoof, it was called »pied-de-biche« as well. The thin form of the stock of these rifles did not allow (incorporation) fitting of the »German type« of wheellock with the internal system of springs.

Simultaneously with the appearance of the German butts, the butts of the Roman origin appeared in the west Europe of the early sixteenth century. Those were, in the first place, the butts curved at an almost right angle (Petrinal) and the butts of an arched shape («culata castelana») which were widely in use in France, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and western parts of Germany.

All of the mentioned types of Germany and Roman butts were, in fact, impractical because they required holding the weapon against the chick or chest.

The appearance of the musket had a decisive role in the further development of the butt. About 1560, probably in Italy, appeared the butt of the musket with neck either extended, slightly curved or with
extremely pronounced curve for the thumb of the right hand. The length of the neck and the head of the musket butt allowed the shooter to lean the weapon on the shoulder which increased the precision of the aiming and the compensation of the compulsion power. During the seventeenth century this shape developed into the famous French type of the butt which, with some slight changes, remained on the military weapons until the present days.

The appearance of the wheellock had the decisive influence on the development of the guns during the sixteenth and the seventeenth century. The butts of the first wheellock guns had the handle which was almost parallel to the axis of the barrel or made a slight angle with it.

By the end of the sixteenth century the butt of the gun became more and more adjusted to the protected (shielded) hand of the cuirassier, visibly acquiring a more acute angle between the handle and axis of the barrel (50—60°) and more robust and marked ending in the shape of a ball. In the German speaking territories this type of the gun was called Puffer of Fäustlinge (an expression that was seldom used on the territory of Austria).

The type of the handle characteristic for the puffers of the sixties of the sixteenth century, appeared in Italy as well, but with the less acute angle between the handle and the axis of the barrel and sometimes with an egg-shaped or flat form of the pammel.

Parallely with the use of the German and Italian gun butts with spheric or egg-shaped pammel, the butt in the form of a «fish tail» was used in the littoral lands of Europe (Italy, France, Scotland, England, etc.). During the thirty years war, a typicaly military form of the butt of the Dutch—Germany province, the so-called «Lützentip», derived from this form of the handle (shaft). The wheellocks equipped in this way were introduced in the armament of the Austrian cavalry.
SUMMARY

The Russian regular weapons appeared in the territories of the present Yugoslavia in a number of ways and for several times. Here we are interested in the supplies of the cold steel which the Principality of Serbia ordered from Russia during the 19th century. Until the First World War, the armament of the Serbian army was mainly imported. Until the middle of the 19th century, the sabres were mostly supplied from Russia.

The first deliveries of the Russian regular cold steel to Serbs date from the period of the First Serbian Uprising. The first delivery of weapons came to Serbia on 18th October 1808. Among the other things, it contained 1000 sabres. According to the contemporary sources, the quality of that weapons was so poor that it had to be repaired before use. Neither the next contingent of the Russian weapons (1809) was of a better quality. Some facts about the type of sabres that the Russians gave to the insurgents can be found in the Austrian reports. On that
gave to the insurgents can be found in the Austrian reports. Among the
»sabres of various types and lengths« there were »small« od »short« sa-
bres, which probably indicated the infantry weapons. The infantry sa-
bre was essentially different from the previous cavalry weapons, both
in design and the size.

A Russian grenadier’s sabre was made on the model of the Prussian
infantry weapon M. 1715, and was slightly different from the Swedish
model from 1748. The delivered cavalry sabres probably originated from
the armament of the Russian hussars, Uhlns and Cossacks. During the
18th century, the sabres of the light cavalry of the Russian army did
not have a strictly regulated form. But, since a new, uniform sabre was
introduced in the Russian cavalry in 1809, the insurgents were supplied
only with the old fashioned type of weapons.

Until 1809, the wooden grip of the light cavalry sabre was wound
with cord and covered with leather. The back rib ended in a shallow,
flat cut cap. At the centre of the cross-guard there were cross-guard
catches that fixed the sabre in the scabbard. The blade grooved on
both sides was about 800 mm long, and 36 mm wide. The wooden, lea-
ter-covered scabbard had perforated mounts which cover most of its
surface. The mounts were made of iron and brass and, only if designed
for the officers, gilded. This type of weapon was developed from the
classic hussar sabre of the Polish-Hungarian type from the 17th cen-
tury.

The next supply of the cold steel from Russia followed in 1836. In
1825 prince Miloš Obrenović actually started with the organization
of the regular army. At the beginning the problem of the uniforming
and armament of the regular troops was solved either by import from
Austria or by manufacture in the domestic workshops. Contacts with
the Russian manufacturers of the military equipment followed after the
detailed analysis of the actual needs of the Serbian regular army.

In the order from Tula made in 1836, among the other things they
required 100 officer’s half-sabres, 2000 guards cutlasses and 300 light
cavalry sabres. It seems that this delivery was not completely finished
until 1842. For the Serbian officers only the »half-sabres«, or actually,
the officer’s sabres M. 1826. were ordered. The sabre M. 26 was, in a
way, an innovation because it had an additional arm which provided a
much better protection for the owner’s hand.

The Russian half-sabre and the officer’s sabre of the Austrian type
were equally used by the infantry and the artillery noncommissio-
ned officers of the Serbian army. But, already in 1857 a new type of
sabre, designed on the model of the Russian cavalry sabre M. 1809,
was prepared for the infantry officers. The fundamental changes in
the armament of the Serbian army followed only after the adoption
of the Law on the Formation of the Army on 24th May, 1860. After
that, the infantry had only the necessary rifles with bayonets in its
equipment, while the artillery kept the Russian cutlass. From that time
until the First World War, the cutlasses were exclusively the character-
istic of the artillery and technical troops. In 1897 the old Russian sa-
bre was finally put out of use and replaced with the first domestic
constructed cold steel — the artillery dagger M. 1897 which, according
to its conception and purpose, represented a typical cutlass. The 2000
cutlasses ordered from Tula in 1836 were, actually, Russian sabres M.
1817. This weapon was a rather true copy of the French infantry sabre: M. AN. IX, called »sabre briquet«.

In 1860, soon after the »Law on the Formation of the Army« was brought in, the problem of the sabres supply was present again. Then the Principality of Serbia started supplying the cold steel from Germany and Austria, and even the more skilful domestic blacksmiths were engaged. This method of supply contributed to the general variety in the armament of the Serbian army. To unify at least the appearance of the regular cavalry »the Uniform regulation« from July 1870 stated that the complete regular cavalry and artillery should be armed with the »white hilt« sabres. In this way, any connection with the Russian sabres was finally broken, and the advantage was given to the Austrian weapon M. 1845/50 and M. 1869.

It should be stated that the change in the tactical purpose of the cavalry was in accordance with the turning to the Austrian cold steel which was much more practical. The Russian sabre M. 1809. had a conservative type of the hussar blade suitable only for a cutting stroke. The blade was 35 mm wide and 850 mm long.

Except for the lessened dimensions of the basket and some other minor changes, the sabre M. 1826. was of the identical construction. All the metal parts of the hand-guard mounted on the weapon M. 1826. were cast of brass. This made the difference between the soldier's sabre M. 1826. and the weapon of the lower ranks M. 1809. which had an iron hilt. Both models of the sabre had a massive iron made scabbard with two studs and hanging rings. The weapon M. 1826. was one of the first products of the Institute of Zlatoust established in 1811/14.

The fair prospects of a permanent solution to the crisis made by the lack of weapons for the people's army did not appear until March 1862. At that time Russia promised to give away certain amounts of warmaterial to Serbia.

After the bombardment of Belgrade, Serbia appealed to Petersburg to hasten the realization of this promise. At this occasion 3000 sabres »of various kinds« were obtained and they were used for arming the people's cavalry. Among these cavalry and dragoon's sabres there were the »šaške« (sa'sho) as well.

After 1862/63, the Principality of Serbia ceased to supply significant amounts of the Russian light arms. At that time the Serbian army turned more and more towards the Middle European manufacturers of the war material. Such attitude was caused by several reasons. Russia was lead by its own interests when supplying Serbia with weapons. In general, the quality of the weapons supplied from Petersbourg was at a very low level. During the First Serbian Uprising, the insurgents were supplied either with plundered weapons, or the obsolete weapons put out of use in the Russian army. The situation was no better in 1862/63. The condition of the Serbian army was improved only by the quantity of the received Russian weapons.

The young Serbian state of great national ambitions could not and should not build the power of its army on the obsolete arms. The developed war industry of the Middle Europe offered cheap and modern weapons of a high quality. One of the reasons for turning to Austrian and German weapons was the general foreign policy of the Obrenović dynasty.
SUMMARY

THE WATCHTOWER AT GLAVIČINE IN SPLITSKO POLJE

With the arrival of the Turks to the Split district at the beginning of the 16th century, the exposed and raised position of Glavičina, in the north part of Splitsko Polje, gained an important role as a watchtower for the control of the movements of the Turks. The existing church of St Nicholas was additionally built and turned into a tower around 1538, and it became a permanent watch post. In that way the church of St Nicholas gained the fortifying purpose same as a number of other churches in Dalmatia.

During the war the tower was pulled down, and by making a border line towards the Turks away from Split it lost its importance and was not renewed. Its remains existed all until 1922, when because of the opening of a stone pit, they were destroyed. After the once existing watchtower, the position of Glavičina is more often called the Turkish tower. The watchtower is shown on a number of old cards and pictures, but the drawings of G. Santini from 1666 as well as sketches in the cadastre of the Split capitol from the 18th century are of a special importance.

---
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