

and legally free (patricians and commoners), those who were legally free (peasants and servants), and those who were deprived of all rights (slaves). She describes the activities of women belonging to each of these categories and concludes that they played a significant role in certain areas of Dubrovnik's economy.

In Dubrovnik, marriage was a religious ceremony, but it was heavily regulated by city laws, especially in respect to the economic aspects of the union. Although marriages between patricians and commoners were not prohibited, the laws made such matches unattractive. Marriages, of course, were not based on free choice by the partners, but on decisions made by their parents or tutors. Dowries were widespread among all social groups and obligatory among patricians. Although divorce did not exist, there were cases of legal separation, which included alimony payments by the husband to the wife. The woman was legally subordinated to her husband, but all women were treated equally by city laws, regardless of their social status. Their participation in civic life, however, was minimal.

In her chapter on moral problems, Dinić-Knežević discusses thefts, fist fights, cheating, adultery, rape, illegitimate children, prostitution, brothels, and so forth. It is interesting to note that Ragusan law seems to have tolerated the existence of concubinage in Dubrovnik and among Ragusans in the Balkan hinterland. This situation existed in spite of the population's adherence to the Roman Catholic religion and the church's influence in Dubrovnik. The author also surveys household furnishings and equipment and, in her last chapter, deals with dress and jewelry. Some residents enjoyed considerable luxury and the Italian influence on dress was very strong. Finally, Dinić-Knežević briefly touches upon the difficult problem of women's education.

Throughout the book, the author compares the position of women in Dubrovnik with that of women in Serbia. Although this is interesting, it would have been more useful had she taken a broader approach by introducing more comparisons with the situation in the West, especially in Italian cities. In all fairness, however, one should point out that at the time that Dinić-Knežević was writing her book (in the mid-1960s), women in history were just being discovered in the West as well.

This volume is a pioneering work. It has its flaws (one of which is excessive inclusion of archival data), but it provides a wealth of extremely valuable information. It certainly constitutes a major contribution and opens new paths of research on an important subject hitherto almost completely neglected.

BARIŠA KREKIĆ

University of California, Los Angeles

STUDIJE IZ HRVATSKE POVIJESTI XIX STOLJEĆA. By *Jaroslav Šidak*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Institut za Hrvatske Povijest, 1973. 404 pp.

STUDIJE O "CRKVI BOSANSKOJ" I BOGUMILSTVU. By *Jaroslav Šidak*. Zagreb: Liber, 1975. 400 pp. Plates.

Probably no other living Yugoslav historian has done as much for the understanding of the history of the Church of Bosnia, or the Bogomils (Bogumils or *krstjani*), as Jaroslav Šidak, the doyen of Croatian historians. Versatile and highly talented, Šidak's historical research ranges from early medieval times to the twentieth century. Prior to the Second World War he had already published two books on the Bogomils and since then has produced a large number of shorter studies which examine specific aspects of Bogomilism and Bogomil history.

The 1973 work reviewed here is a collection of fifteen articles published by Šidak since 1950 in various historical journals, collected works, and Festschriften. The individual articles, usually on controversial topics, are important not only for their interpretations and insights but also for their valuable bibliographical references. Only

one article was rewritten especially for the book, and it includes some material that the author had previously published. In addition, the work includes an extensive bibliography of literature on the Bogomils.

The collected articles treat the history and historiography of the Bogomils, the author's views on various controversies, and studies of Bogomil manuscripts, miniatures, and symbols. A number of articles treat the origin of the Bogomil heresy, the authenticity and reliability of some sources (that is, the charter issued by Ban Tvrtko to Stjepan Rajković), the Bogomil influence on fifteenth-century Bosnian society, and one article reviews the literature published up to 1953. One aspect of Bogomilism to which Šidak has not given much attention is the question of the teachings of the Church of Bosnia.

The Church of Bosnia (*ecclesiae Bosnensis, ecclesiae Sclavoniae*) still remains shrouded in mystery. Many fundamental questions remain unanswered. The basic problem is the lack of sources. Bogomil sources, condemned as subversive by the Catholic and Orthodox churches, have largely been destroyed. Scholars are forced to rely on materials which stem largely from sources unfriendly to the Bogomils. Nonetheless, few topics have received as much attention from Yugoslav historians as the Bogomils. Bogomilism has been investigated from every possible angle, including its teachings, origins, symbols, burials, organization, social practices, relations with the Orthodox and Catholic churches, and its possible transformation from the twelfth to the fifteenth century.

The first to write about the Bogomils was Charles Schmidt, but the most systematic early study is by Franjo Rački, a prominent Croat historian, who wrote in the second half of the nineteenth century. The latter's conclusion was that the Bogomil movement was a dualistic heresy resembling the beliefs of Manicheans, Patarenes, and Cathari, and that it came to the Balkans from the East (*Bogomili i Patareni* [Zagreb, 1869–70]). More recently, Dominik Mandić (*Bogomilska crkva bosanskih krstijana* [Chicago, 1962]), and several others have taken up Rački's view. Other historians (B. Petranović, V. Glušac) insist that Bogomilism, that is, the Church of Bosnia (*krstijani*) was much like the Serbian Orthodox church. Still others (A. Hoffer, Ć. Truhelka, L. Petrović, K. Draganović, A. Vaillant) contend that Bogomilism was akin to the Roman Catholic church. Some historians argue that Bogomilism spread to Bosnia from the East and others that it reached Bosnia from the West.

Originally, in 1937, Professor Šidak contended that the Bosnian church had nothing in common with the dualist heresies, and that except in matters of organization, it did not differ from other Christian churches. Since then much new material on the Bogomils has been published. Between 1947 and 1949, in separate articles, Aleksander Solovjev and Dragutin Kniewald questioned Šidak's thesis about the true faith of the *ecclesiae Bosnensis*. Their work corroborated Rački's thesis. Moreover, Solovjev contributed a great deal in familiarizing Yugoslav scholars with Western historiography on Neo-Manichean movements (for example, A. Dondaine and A. Borst).

After the Second World War, there was renewed interest in heretical movements in many places (take, for example, the works by D. Obolensky, D. Angelov, H. Puech, A. Schmaus). In Yugoslavia itself, Vaso Glušac with his book *Istina o bogomilima* (1941) and articles, and Alojzije Benac with his studies of the medieval tombstones (*stećci*) contributed new ideas and fresh data on Bogomilism. Much has also been written on the disappearance of the Bogomils, how and when they disappeared, and on the question of the possible en masse Islamization of the Bogomils. Some allege that, squeezed between Catholic and Orthodox churches, and subjected to repeated Catholic crusading wars, the Bogomils voluntarily accepted Islam.

The new interpretations of and sources on the Church of Bosnia and the heretical movements led Šidak to alter his earlier positions and, in 1954–55, to accept, with some

important reservations, Rački's basic thesis "as an indispensable framework" for the further investigation of the Bogomil question. Šidak explained the change in his assessment of the Bogomils in papers he read in 1954 at the First Congress of Yugoslav Historians in Belgrade and in 1955 at the Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences in Rome. Both these statements are paraphrased in this book. Šidak does not accept Rački's thesis in its entirety and cautions that Rački has left many unanswered questions. Nor does he share Rački's belief that the dualistic heresy spread to Bosnia from the East. Bogomilism, in Šidak's view, is of Western origin. His essays throw significant light on many crucial questions concerning Bogomil history. The present collection of previously scattered short studies is most welcome.

The second of the two books reviewed here is likewise a collection of the author's earlier essays. No contemporary Croat historian has been as courageous in tackling so many controversial historiographic questions as Šidak. His *Studije iz hrvatske povijesti XIX stoljeća* (*Studies in Nineteenth-Century Croatian History*) contains eighteen articles published in various journals on as many major historical questions. All except three articles were published after 1960; one was first published in 1940. Together these articles examine nearly all crucial political problems in the development of the Croatian nation from the end of the eighteenth century to the outbreak of the First World War.

In this book, the author assesses such issues as the Croatian question in the Habsburg Monarchy, the idea of Yugoslavism, the background and development of the Croatian revival movement, the party conflict in the 1840s, the impact of the French Revolution on Croatia, Croatian politics in the 1860s, the Rakovica uprising, and Stjepan Radić and his ideas. The book also contains a series of studies on individuals (J. Drašković, Lj. Gaj, I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski, I. Mažuranić, E. Kvaternik) and their place in Croatian historiography. What is particularly valuable about these studies is that they are well documented, reflect the author's intimate knowledge of Croatian historical research, contain the latest interpretations of significant questions, demonstrate vividly the current trends and tendencies in Croatian historiography, give Šidak's own position in the continuing historiographic controversies, and supply valuable references to documentary, monographic, and other writings on Croatian history.

WAYNE S. VUCINICH
Stanford University

HRVATSKI NARODNI PREPOROD U ISTRI, 2 vols. By *Božo Milanović*. Pazin: Istarsko književno društvo sv. Ćirila i Metoda. Vol. 1: 1797–1882. 1967. 336 pp. Paper. Vol. 2: 1883–1947. 1973. 673 pp.

Sovereignty over the Istrian peninsula in the upper Adriatic and its adjacent islands was vehemently disputed by Italians and Yugoslavs after the First and Second World wars. Hence, it is not surprising that many books have been written about the subject. Even so, Milanović's two-volume work merits special attention for many reasons: It is an objective, well-documented and all-encompassing account of the Croatian national awakening in Istria, based on secular and ecclesiastical archives, memoir literature, and newspaper accounts. Because Milanović himself participated in politics for many years after World War I, he is able to enliven his narrative of this period with details from his own experience. But the work is also significant because it was published in a socialist country and written by a Catholic priest who frankly describes the important role the Croatian clergy played in the national awakening of Istrian Croats.

Milanović's career properly prepared him to write this work. After seminary training in Gorica he went to Vienna where he obtained his doctorate. Thereafter