

Lorenzo Vitelleschi, Povijesne i statističke bilješke o Dubrovačkom okrugu 1828. / Notizie storiche e statistiche del Circolo di Ragusa 1828.

Ćosić, Stjepan

Source / Izvornik: **Dubrovnik annals, 2004, 189 - 191**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:111:823300>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-04-20**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of University of Zagreb, Centre for Croatian Studies](#)



Reviews

Liber Statutorum Ragusii compositus anno MCCLXXII / Statut grada Dubrovnika sastavljen godine 1272. (The Statute of the City of Dubrovnik composed in 1272). Edited and translated into Croatian by **Ante Šoljić, Zdravko Šundrica** and **Ivo Veselić**; introductory study by **Nella Lonza**. Dubrovnik: Državni arhiv u Dubrovniku, 2002. Pages 680.

Dubrovnik's intense development in the thirteenth century necessitated the promulgation of an authoritative and comprehensive collection of laws as a foundation of its legal system. Thus in 1272, the Statute of Dubrovnik was enacted, the basic legal document of the Ragusan commune, later Republic. Political communities throughout Europe made similar efforts at codification, marking an era in which statutes were at the core of the legal system, particularly in communes. Written legal codes spread from the urban communities of Italy and the western Mediterranean to the eastern coast of the Adriatic. Unfortunately, some of the earliest versions of the statutes of Dalmatian towns, such as those of Zadar or Trogir, have not been preserved, the oldest extant (Dalmatian) statute being that of Korčula from 1265. The Dubrovnik Statute was promulgated shortly afterwards, and is one of the oldest preserved statutes of Southern Europe (in Italy, only the statutes of Volterra, Treviso, Padua, Verona and Venice are older). True, Dubrovnik had legal ordinances prior to the Statute, but they were very fragmentary and unsystematic. With the Statute of 1272, solid foundations for the organisation and future development of Dubrovnik were established. The Statute, together with additions and other legal collections (*Liber viridis* and *Liber croceus*), remained in force until the fall of the Republic in 1808.

The Statute consists of eight books (487 chapters) which define miscellaneous legal matters. The first book (34 chapters) defines the privileges and responsibilities of the communal institutions, councils, the Count and magistrates, the Church

and its officials, the archbishop, the clergy and members of religious orders. Book II (33 chapters) comprises the formulas of the solemn inauguration oaths taken by the Count, judges, council members and other public officials. The third book (61 chapters) regulates the civil procedure and jurisdiction of the courts. Book IV (80 chapters) details family law and provisions governing inheritance, with most consideration being given to marital issues and dowries. Book V (45 chapters) deals with ownership rights pertaining to real estate in and outside the city. The provisions pay considerable attention to urban development and construction, as well as the use of public areas. Also included are the regulations governing the relationship between tenants and landowners. Book VI (45 chapters) deals with Ragusan criminal law. Book VII (67 chapters) details maritime affairs. Book VIII (99 chapters) comprises additions to the previous volumes. In the Republic period, the Statute circulated in manuscript form, many copies of which were used in the government offices, the court of law and in legal circles. It is certain that at the very moment of the Republic's independence in 1358 there were at least 13 copies of the Statute in circulation. Over the years the number increased considerably, for many a copy found a place in private collections. The first official copy of 1272 has been lost, and the oldest extant transcript of the Statute dates from the 1340s. It is written on parchment and is housed at the State Archives in Dubrovnik.

The first documentary publication of the Latin text was edited and published by Baltazar Bogišić and Konstantin Jireček in 1904 under the title *Liber Statutorum civitatis Ragusii compositus anno 1272*. Based on an exhaustive comparative study of several manuscript versions, this edition remains indispensable for any kind of analysis or translation of the Ragusan Statute. Following a series of fragmentary translations, the first comprehensive edition of the Statute in Croatian was published in 1990, in the translation of Mate Križman and Josip Kolanović. It comprises the reprint of the Bogišić-Jireček edition of the Latin text, and a valuable

commentary by Antun Cvitanić. The commentary examines the contents of the Ragusan Statute and some of its legal institutions by comparing it to the statutory collections of other Dalmatian communes.

Since the 1990 edition was sold out long ago, the State Archives in Dubrovnik decided to re-edit the Statute. The most recent edition is a new translation, the first version of which was completed in the early 1980s by a renowned authority among Dubrovnik's archivists and palaeographers, Zdravko Šundrica (1915-1995). His work was further adapted, improved and updated by the experienced archivists of the State Archives, Ante Šoljić and Ivo Veselić, and thus the three of them put their names to the translation of this edition which, in terms of interpretation, tends to offer different solutions. In the foreword, Šoljić and Veselić provide details on the method used, and the obstacles and ambiguities they faced while working on this edition. Unlike the previous edition, in this comprehensive publication the rectos place the Croatian translation alongside the Latin original found in the famous Bogišić-Jireček version. The appendix includes an index of personal names and institutions, an index of place names, a subject index, a note on money, weights and measures, and a glossary of less familiar terms.

The introductory study "The Statute of Dubrovnik, the basis of the legal system and hallmark of political identity" is by Nella Lonza. She has chosen a somewhat different approach from that of Cvitanić. Based on comprehensive knowledge of archival sources and Ragusan legal practice, the author analyses the Statute's legal and social role from the inside. She explains how the Statute coexisted with the community which created it, how it was constructed and decomposed and how its contents covered various branches of law and state territory. She highlights the (mis)use of the Statute in legal practice, how the ordinances mirrored political tensions and conflicts, and how, as a result of traditionalism, the Statute became part of the myth of the Ragusan state. Lonza points to the terminological pitfalls and the correlation between

the Statute and other elements of the Ragusan legal system, particularly with earlier pre-statutory laws. The elements of the Ragusan Statute stem from diverse legal traditions. Besides ancient customs, there were also legal solutions resulting from the relationship with the neighbouring Croatian lands and Slavic states in the hinterland (e.g. the institutions of *stanak* and *porota*). Byzantine elements may be observed in certain institutions and terms as a result of the direct influence exercised by the Eastern Roman Empire or the indirect influence from southern Italy (e.g. *epitropoi* in the law regulating inheritance and *entega* in maritime law). The opening chapters of the criminal law and the provisions relating to the government organisation reflect the Venetian political pattern. Lastly, the Ragusan Statute adopted a number of elements from European legal heritage based on Roman and canon law (e.g. provisions concerning the act of disinheritance and the law of evidence).

The Ragusan Statute was to undergo a number of adaptations, revisions, and rearrangements by the beginning of the fifteenth century. Yet, certain areas of the legal system failed to be incorporated into the body of the written law. These lacunae lead us to believe that a great many cases were resolved by the customary law or through the agreements of the parties.

Lonza analyses different versions and transcripts of the Statute which were in legal use over the centuries. The oldest transcript (commonly referred to as Version B) contains the Statute drawn up around 1349. With the end of Venetian suzerainty and the beginning of Dubrovnik's autonomous development in 1358, the Statute was cleansed of all provisions pertaining to Venice, giving way to a new version, generally known as Version C. During the fourteenth century a growing number of laws were inscribed in a separate volume, called *Liber omnium reformationum* (followed by *Liber viridis* and *Liber croceus*). The final draft of the Statute was hammered out between 1408 and 1410, and since new collections were later brought out, no additional attempts were ever made to revise it. Lonza raises the question of legality, that is, the

problems pertaining to the implementation of the statutory provisions in the Ragusan class community. She concludes that one should not envisage the Ragusan state as predominantly ruled by law. Judicial discretion was often politically based, and the political will was class determined. In this light, it becomes clear that the significance of the Statute has to be sought elsewhere than in the "codification" of law: it represented one of the prominent political symbols of the Ragusan state and its ruling patriciate. Each patrician attending the Major Council's session in December took a solemn oath by placing his hand upon the Statute, as did the Count and each official prior to taking office. This ritual may be interpreted as a secular reflection of the liturgical role of the Scriptures in the spiritual and religious sphere. Well aware that legal tradition was the basis of political identity, the Ragusans were loath to reform the Statute. They were prepared to abide by a code which no longer fitted the times, rather than relinquish the old text imbued with symbolism. Ragusan political identity was constructed around the ideas of independence and tradition, the Statute encompassing them both. Along with St Blaise, the city fortifications, the coat of arms, and Orlando's Column, the Statute was a symbol of Dubrovnik's sovereignty.

Stjepan Ćosić

Gli accordi con Curzola 1352-1421, ed. **Ermanno Orlando**. [Pacta Veneta, 9]. Roma: Viella, 2002. Pages 106.

It has been over a decade since Gherardo Ortalli, together with his collaborators gathered around the Department of Historical Studies in Venice, launched the *Pacta Veneta* series. The original editorial aim was to publish systematically the agreements Serenissima made with different parties, great powers and minor centres, with neighbouring states and remote nations, pertaining to military, political, and economic issues. The original documents are filed at the State Archives in Venice, in the series *Libri Pactorum* which date from the end of the twelfth century, but they are also preserved in more recent transcripts. In addition to the documentary publication of the agreements, each volume contains an introduction reconstructing the historical and political context behind the document, a bibliography, and indexes.

The first eight volumes deal with the Venetian agreements with Brescia, Aleppo, Fano, Byzantine Empire (2 volumes), Imola, Genoa, and the Kingdom of Cilicia, signed between the tenth and the fifteenth centuries. The ninth, most recent, publication comprises the Venetian pacts with Korčula (1352-1421), edited by Ermanno Orlando, a historian experienced in similar projects.

In a short preface (pp. 10-11), the author outlines the importance of the Dalmatian area, Korčula in particular, for the safe and secure voyage across the Adriatic. Following the general introduction, Orlando presents the protocols between Venice and Korčula from 1352 and 1420, along with a number of other closely related documents. Each of the two 'clusters' of material (pp. 35-51 and 76-89) is preceded by a study which introduces the reader to the historical context of the period covered, pinpointing the setting in which the document was made, its contents and political significance (pp. 14-34 and 54-75). The fact that the studies offer no ground-breaking evidence should not be seen as a shortcoming, since editions such as this do not necessarily do so. The broader context of the Venetian crisis in the mid-fourteenth century

will certainly appeal to the Croatian scholarly public, in line with the study on the growth of coastal centres in the southernmost Adriatic and in today's Greece at the turn of the fourteenth century, preceding the Venetian 'return' to Dalmatia in 1409/20. Moreover, the political situation governing the agreement between Venice and Korčula has been elucidated from several perspectives, drawing a genuinely three-dimensional and objective historical picture. While retaining all the features of scientific discourse, the text is at times imbued with subtle irony, for example, when the author quotes the Venetian arguments as to why its annexation of Dalmatia in the early fifteenth century was of equal interest to the King of Hungary (pp. 59-60).

The documents in Orlando's edition are not published here for the first time, since all of them were also included in Ljubić's *Listine*. Yet this latest edition is far from unnecessary. The texts have been thoroughly transcribed, enabling us to discern that in Ljubić's edition, for example, several lines happen to have been omitted from a document from 1420 (cf. p. 77 and *Listine* VIII, p. 47). The edition follows the guidelines of modern documentary publication, manifested in a restrained style of punctuation, less extensive notes which contain only significant variants, and so on.

The list of references (pp. 91-99) is exhaustive and reliable. Croatian editions may also be found in the pertaining notes and in the bibliography, from Vinko Foretić's monograph *Otok Korčula u srednjem vijeku do g. 1420*, to articles by A. Cvitanić, L. Margetić and others, from Lučić's classical *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae*, to the more recent surveys of Croatian history by Nada Klaić and Tomislav Raukar. The citations of Croatian literature display an oversight or two (misspellings, omission of diacritical marks, etc.), though in comparison with other foreign publications to much a lesser extent. The editor has decided on the author-date system of documentation, the notes being amplified in the list of references at the end of the book, which often proves less satisfactory: for example, the

date (1986) of Cvitanić's edition of the Statute of Korčula cited in the text does not correspond to the entry in the list of references, where the second edition from 1995 is listed (p. 91). Further inconsistency in dates may be noted: with Sestan, the year of the original publication is followed by the date of reprint in brackets, the reader thus being best served by scholarly publications arranged chronologically, whereas the date of Krekić's article "Venetian Merchants..." is entered in reverse order (it was first published in 1978, and not in 1980, p. 95). Minor quibbles aside, Orlando has produced an excellent work. The book contains four facsimiles of high quality (between pp. 51 and 53). The indexes are flawless (pp. 101-106), and modern geographic terms have been appended to the historical place-names in both Italian and the vernacular of the state comprising the territory today (Croatian, Albanian, Greek, etc.).

Orlando's book offers a new and accurate publication of the sources essential for the history of Korčula. In sum, a careful balance between the sources and the commentary, along with the author's exemplary approach to his editorial task, provide a useful and instructive example for similar projects to be undertaken in Croatia.

Nella Lonza

David Rheubottom, *Age, Marriage, and Politics in Fifteenth-Century Ragusa*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pages xiii + 220.

David Rheubottom, Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester, has already published several works related to Dubrovnik in the Middle Ages. One could say that Rheubottom, an anthropologist by training, made his first steps in historical research almost experimentally. Twenty years ago he joined a group of historians and anthropologists who were interested in exploring some of the connections between the two disciplines, when he realized that "he would not understand the historian's mind and manner of working" until he did some historical research of his own. For this purpose he took a small project on dowries in fifteenth-century Ragusa and their impact on marriage patterns and social relations. According to the author, the Republic of Dubrovnik is a unique object of anthropological study because of its relatively small population and its historical records which are extraordinarily well preserved. This allowed him to explore the interplay between the patrician families, marriage strategy, and politics. The work on the first project led him to some other topics: marriage strategies of the Ragusan patrician families, kinship structure, age and the political career of the members of Ragusa's ruling class, and the hierarchy of the administration of the Republic. Various aspects of this research, carried out in the late 1980s and early 1990s, have been presented at seminars and published, amended, and included in this book.

The book consists of the following chapters: Introduction; Ragusa: Trade and Territory; Ragusan Government and the Quest for Offices; The *Casata*; *Casata* Unity: Size and Political Muscle; Betrothal Order, Dowry, and the "Sister First" Principle; The *Casata*: Genealogical Skewing and Political Support; Changes in the Great Council and Political Competition; Bureaucracy and Office; Conclusion. In Appendix A the author presents a list of the *casata* names. He has decided to use the Latin form of the surnames, but also cites alternative forms (not all are included) as encountered in the archival sources. In Appendix

B the author explains the sources, the data, and the evolution of the database he employed in the computer analysis and simulations upon which the research was based. Appendix C contains a list of 813 men presumed to have been politically active between 1440 and 1490, including the father's name and that of the grandfather, the Hackenberg Number, the year when the person entered the Great Council, and the year of death. The book is also supplemented with a map of the Ragusan Republic c. 1450 and a city map. It further contains a number of tables and figures, bibliography, and Index.

Rheubottom's study of the features of the late medieval Dubrovnik as a city-state, its trade, the territorial boundaries of the Republic, and the life of the Ragusan elite and commoners is primarily based upon the works of F. Carter, S. Mosher Stuard, I. Mahnken, J. Tadić, M. Petrović, B. Krekić, and some others. Apart from being unacceptably poor, the bibliography has failed to incorporate the accounts by more recent authors (with the exception of B. Krekić), even those who have explicitly contributed to the topic of his book (S. Krivošić, N. Vekarić, Z. Janeković Römer, and others). This curious absence of recent scholarship comes as a yet greater surprise knowing that Rheubottom has leaned considerably not only on the sources pertaining to fifteenth-century Venice and Florence, but on the anthropological material dealing with the societies of West Africa, Papua New Guinea, Australian Aborigines, Chinese and Japanese clans. Admittedly, such broad-frame parallels are a legitimate and generally accepted departure point of anthropological methodology, but can also lead to misinterpretations, particularly because they tend to ignore the different social context in which distinguishing organisation forms of family and kinship relations prevail. The answers to the author's questions should primarily be drawn from the accounts concerning the Republic of Dubrovnik, and then from those which offer material for comparison.

From the anthropological point of view, Rheubottom's contribution is valuable, fresh, and challenging at times, especially due to his

computer analysis of the data sets, an approach relatively rare in Ragusan historiography. By linking individual data into series which he eventually subjected to computer analysis, the author has made some important new discoveries which prompted his enquiry of the patrician class. Information on the politically active noblemen during the fifteenth century is extremely helpful, supported by the data provided by the *Specchio del Gran Consiglio* and the Hackenberg Number which organises genealogical data into a generally accepted system in use since 1967. Namely, this series of two-digit numbers encodes an individual's family affiliation and genealogical location in Mahnken's genealogies. A number of tables provide detailed information on an individual's office dynamics, along with the statistical record of over 7,000 elections to office in the fifteenth century, the latter not only highlighting the political career of certain nobles but the election procedure as well. The author has established that 60 per cent of the patricians eligible to hold office actually took part in the administration. Equally useful are the marriage data with details on the betrothal and marital arrangements, dowry, marriage strategies, age at marriage, marriage order within the sibling group and the role of tutors derived from the following sources: *Pacta matrimonialia*, *Libri dotium*, *Testamenta*, and *Acta Consilii Minoris*. One should admire Rheubottom's meticulous effort to establish accurately the forms of structural organisation of the Ragusan patrician families, the result of which is a precise terminological identification of these forms.

Rheubottom argues that the vernacular Slavic played an important role in the Ragusan kinship relations, for that was the only language spoken by all in daily life. Yet, for the Ragusan patrician families he has adopted one of the Italian terms commonly appearing in the sources—*casata* or house. Following Goody's interpretation of Venetian and Florentine practices, the author understands the term *casata* as a kinship group linked together on the property and status basis and organised as a cognatic, that is, bilateral group. According to the author, the Ragusan

casata was a combined form: similar to traditional lineages, the *casata* had a strong structure which did not admit outsiders and functioned patrilineally. On the other hand, *casata*, apart from the name and status symbols, had no common property and was not politically institutionalised. Quantitative analysis of the data concerning betrothal arrangements and agnatically linked tutors of the fatherless brides indicates that the Ragusan *casata* was not organised as a patrilineal lineage of the classic type: no agnatic authority, no corporate interests in marriage arrangements, no consent of a *casata* authority was sought for marriage or dowry arrangements, whether the father was living or dead. The Slavic system of kinship terminology also speaks in favour of the Ragusan lineage being of the bilateral and not patrilineal type. This is further supported by the naming patterns, marriage strategies, analysis of kinship links between tutors and tutored girls as well as the significant role played by women in different family situations. Arguments are undoubtedly strong, but evidence which points to certain advantages of the male descent line and the awareness of the family unity cannot be ignored. For instance, the statement that there is no evidence to support the fact that Ragusan patriciate of the fifteenth century operated on patrilineal basis simply does not hold. According to the author, patrician genealogies published by I. Mahnken are misleading in this sense, for one might conclude that the Ragusan families are patrilineages in appearance because they begin with an apical ancestor in the topmost generation and trace down only male descendants. Rheubottom supports this with Florentine genealogies which extend from "Ego", a founding ancestor, down to 3 or 4 generations. Yet he makes no reference to the traditional patrician genealogies that emerged in the fifteenth century and those that were introduced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Unfortunately, only two genealogies have survived, those of the Gozze and the Gondola, but they too testify of the patrilineal consciousness of the Ragusan patrician families. Namely, the aforementioned lineages consist of "top-down" knowledge, as they begin with a common ancestor and trace

down generation after generation of male members only. Furthermore, although family property ownership was not part of the Ragusan practice, different devices of patrimony protection such as *fideicomissum familiae relictum* and collective patronage of the churches clearly bear witness to the patrilineal consciousness, along with the exceptional meaning of the family name, arms, and other insignia. In sum, the debate on the features of the Ragusan patrician families or houses is merely at its beginning. In this sense Rheubottom's assertion that the Ragusan *casate* had classic lineage features at first, but were subsequently to shift certain duties and functions to the government bodies, is an intriguing one. Such understanding falls within the current historiographic knowledge on the family-class relationship among the Ragusan patriciate.

The author has devoted much space to marriage strategies of the Ragusan patrician families, the dowry system and class solidarity, age of bride and groom at marriage, marriage order within the sibling group, and age difference between spouses. The result of this research demonstrates that marriages of the Ragusan patriciate in the fifteenth century generally followed the Mediterranean marriage pattern, distinguished by a considerable age difference between spouses and a relatively large number of men who never married. An examination of the dowry distribution in the period 1455-1460 indicates that the marriage of Ragusan patricians was isogamous, given no evidence for the redistribution of wealth. In other words, the rich married the rich and the poor married the poor, contrary to S. Mosher Stuard's view that there was a tendency among Ragusan noble women to marry down, which enabled redistribution of wealth to poorer patricians. By examining dowry amounts, the author has established that sisters were betrothed with equal dowries, failing to mention numerous girls who were sent to a convent with a modest "nun's dowry" because their families could not provide one. In an earlier article entitled »Sisters First: Betrothal Order and Age at Marriage in Fifteenth-Century Ragusa« (*Journal of Family History* 13/4 (1988):

pp. 359-406), the author has addressed the issue of marriage order within the sibling group. The detailed analysis of 33 sibling sets has been additionally supported by a computer simulation which was to provide answers to some issues which have remained without an explanation so far. For each run of the simulation, the author created a population of 1,000 individuals, the simulation being repeated 64 times. In doing so, Rheubottom argues that the problem was determined by two cultural rules: sisters were betrothed first in order of age and their brothers followed, again in age order. Additional analysis of 412 patrician marriages occurring between 1440 and 1490 has confirmed these results and showed that the "brother for sister" marriage practice was an exception in Dubrovnik because of differences in marriage age. The author also concludes that only sons often remained bachelors, their political career often being less successful than of those who had brothers. He explains this with the "sisters first" marriage order principle and the brother's engagement in running the family business. Rheubottom therefore argues that the concern for the sister's marriage was more important than the continuity of the family, implying a dominant matrilineal pattern. As has been noted, the question of the role and significance of the female line in the Ragusan society remains unanswered, for the assumption provided seems insufficient for such an overall conclusion, more so because it is based on I. Mahnken's genealogical tables which, as far as the fifteenth century is concerned, are incomplete. Rheubottom argues that the small size of the endogamous community itself played a considerable part in the marriage strategy. In relatively closed marriage systems like that of the Ragusan patriciate, only small numbers of women and men were available for marriage at any single point in time. The size of the marriage pool was further restricted by the Church's prohibitions on marriage between various categories of kin and affines, as well as a necessity of finding a spouse of comparable wealth and status. An enquiry into the age of father, groom and bride at betrothal demonstrates that only a

few fathers actually lived to see their daughters' betrothal, and even fewer witnessed their sons' marriage. In the fifteenth century the betrothal of about 40 per cent of patrician women and 80 per cent of their male counterparts was not witnessed by a living father. These results cast a new light on the structure of patrician family, providing solid basis for the rethinking of the problem, including my own *Rod i grad*, (1994). By all means, Rheubottom's analysis of the relationship between marriage strategies and political relations among certain patrician houses has confirmed the already established historiographic view that the Ragusan political power was distributed among the entire patrician class, and not only among certain families.

The research on the genealogical generations and the influence of age differences among them on the kinship and political support deserves our full attention. Rheubottom points to a considerable age discrepancy between spouses which affected not only the internal structure of the families, but also the larger society. According to the age gap between bride and groom of the Tuscan marriage pattern (D. Herlihy), the father and his sibling tended to be 15 years older than the mother and her sibling, the father's sister's husband and his sibling were also 15 years older than the father and his siblings. Interpreted in this way, genealogical generations do not correspond in age, causing skewing within several generations. For example, Ego's father's sister's sons are about 15 years older than Ego; the mother's brother's sons are about 15 years younger, while Ego would be about the same age as his parallel cousins. In other words, paternal kin were significantly older than the corresponding maternal kin. The Ragusan model has fully confirmed the existence of this sort of genealogical skewing which had considerable societal implications. Since the differing ages were associated with different opportunities and obligations, various categories of Ego's kin were likely to be differentially important to Ego in different phases of Ego's life cycle. Computer analysis of the political careers of Ragusan patricians at five-yearly intervals between 1455 and 1490 made

it possible to establish that the electoral success was inversely related to the number of agnates and positively associated with the number of other kin on the Major Council. The "skewing" of genealogical generations caused difficulties in co-ordinating the political activities of agnates because successive generations of agnates were not members of the Major Council in the same period. In addition to the electoral regulations, which excluded kinsmen from voting, it is clear that certain families could not be over-represented on the council. Here Rheubottom partly departs from his thesis earlier presented in the article »Genealogical Skewing and Political Support: Patrician Politics in Fifteenth-Century Ragusa« (*Continuity and Change* 9/3 (1994): pp. 369-390), in which he considers the association between house size and the concentration of power. There he sought the answer only in the power of the houses and not in the class. Apparently, in this book he has reached the conclusion generally accepted by historians, that is, that numerically superior houses were relatively under-represented on the Council as compared to the smaller houses.

Some other assumptions of Rheubottom's research also deserve notice. His views on the relationship between office, individual and society represent a spin-off from the traditional anthropological approaches based on Weber's discussion of bureaucracy. According to Weber, bureaucracy involves an impersonal organization based on labour division which includes specialization of differentiated functions, where each participant acts by virtue of the authority vested in the office and not his personal reputation and influence. Such an understanding of modern bureaucracy presumes the clear separation of competences within the bureaucratic framework. This is related to "the principles of office hierarchy" with a clearly established system of super- and sub-ordination in which there is supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones. Rheubottom argues that competences were not clearly defined within the Ragusan government, nor was the system of super- and sub-ordination. However, it does not imply that

there was no hierarchy articulated essentially by difference in age. Even more provocative than the conclusion of the author's article »Hierarchy of Office in Fifteenth-Century Ragusa« (*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 72/3 (1990): pp. 155-167) is the thesis according to which the Ragusan administration is characterised by an interaction between office and its holder. The orthodox view of office, which has dominated classical anthropological accounts, treats offices as an array of positions, which serve particular governmental functions. An alternative view tends to interpret offices as a movement of office-holders through a series of posts. In order to prove his thesis, Rheubottom has examined pairs of offices mathematically: the greater the difference in years, the more determinant the appearance of hierarchy. This led him to conclude that the Ragusan bureaucracy model does not fit into the Weberian paradigm of offices as static positions within an organised and clearly structured system, that is, as perpetual values independent from their holders.

The chapter on the changes in the Major Council and political competition as an outcome brings some interesting demographic data concerning age at marriage, two baby-boom periods in the fifteenth century, and a rise in the number of marriages which were to follow. For the historian, examination of the "shape" or oscillation of age structure of the Major Council at intervals of five years between 1455 and 1490 is of little benefit. The fact that at a certain point in time there were more seniors than juniors on the Council or vice versa had no implications whatsoever for the deliberations and the Council's political activity on the whole. Rheubottom believes that by sampling the Major Council at intervals of five years, he has introduced the passage of time into his analysis, revealing thus the changes which took place in the course of the fifteenth century: oscillations of the number of the available office candidates, age cohorts of the Major Council, the role played by particular offices within the hierarchy, "crests" and "dips" of the number of men in certain generations, and changes in the competition for

office at differing points in time and in various segments of the Major Council. This, however, does not concern basic changes but only minor ones resulting from the current demographic situation and the number of offices and holders available. Rheubottom has failed to capture time. Conversely, he has plucked the Major Council and its elections away from the historical context, transforming it into numerical values, estranged from the decisions of the Council itself and life, most of all from the time passing outside the Council hall. Similar is his interpretation of the increase of administrative offices and their holders during the fifteenth century. There is no doubt that the growth of the patriciate affected the amount of competition for office, but the growth of administration cannot be examined from this perspective only, isolated from all other occurrences. It appears, for instance, that the establishment of the *Collegium appellationum* in 1490 was an alleviating solution for many patricians without office. But, the rise in the number of office holders in the fifteenth century is primarily the result of the territorial expansion and population growth, the reinforcement of the sovereignty of the Republic, as well as its international contacts.

Research based on historical record, contrary to that of anthropologists, is accompanied by obstacles concerned initially with the collection and analysis of the sources of the data. Rheubottom is well aware that historical data can hardly be subjected to a uniform computer analysis like the information obtained by aimed and programmed anthropological enquiry. These deductions have drawn the author's attention to the necessity of the growing rapprochement between history and anthropology in terms of methodology and subject matter. Therefore he frequently criticises anthropology for not incorporating historical changes through time, in an attempt to connect anthropological methods with the time metric. He asserts that the fundamental anthropological methodology has become the instrument "for the obliteration of time", and rejects de Saussure's radical distinction between diachrony and synchrony which leads to a timeless

space of the “ethnographic present”. He sees his analysis through a temporal dimension, a “before and after” sequence. This idea is not recent in anthropology. Unlike the ahistorical traditional structural anthropology, new trends, particularly those emerging within symbolic anthropology, reintroduce chronology as the basic methodological assumption of the historical and anthropological study. Many anthropologists have encountered the difficulties of anthropological techniques of fieldwork, the greatest of them lying in the self-confirming nature of these techniques because they themselves generate the materials they later investigate. That is why some scholars, including Rheubottom, decided to lean on historical methodology and the advantages offered by archival sources which are public and can be consulted independently by many different investigators, their interpretation being open for debate. In practice, the author’s theoretical departure from anthropology to history bears the mark of a partly successful attempt as far as his anthropological analysis is concerned. For example, Rheubottom’s references on the historical fifteenth-century setting and the earlier periods are scanty and inaccurate, even erroneous at times. In his enquiry of the patriciate, the focus of the study, Rheubottom is far from interpreting its development throughout the Middle Ages, but tends to concentrate on the evidence and sources related to the issues of egalitarianism, the number of patricians, house relations, marriage strategies, patrician stability, and the administrative apparatus of the Republic. He takes fifteenth-century administrative structure for granted, showing little interest in the evolution of such an administrative body or the historical context. As I see it, the reasons behind this are purely methodological. Despite an attempt to incorporate “time” and “process” into his analysis, the historical context, obscure and vague, is no more than a scene setting. Rheubottom has failed to consider the development and significance of communal institutions as well as the differences in view of the aristocratic rule of the later period.

I would, however, agree with the author that the relationship between history and

anthropology bears implications for both disciplines, but I do not share his view according to which anthropology is credited for its theoretical influence, while history is being reduced to an old treasure trove, an orthodoxy deeply-seated from the antiquity to the present day. Speaking about his own enquiry, Rheubottom sees the contribution of history primarily through the genealogical research of I. Mahnken and some other sources upon which he has based his study, that is, which served as proof of his conclusions. Anthropological analysis can contribute to a historical approach to the problem, particularly by means of a characteristic comparative analysis as well as different methodological research patterns of the past. No doubt, history brings much more into this relationship than bulks of sheer data: a broad perspective, a sense of wholeness, and most of all, a sense of continuity and change. Rheubottom’s need to transcend the “ethnographic present” should be interpreted as a first step, if insufficient, in his quest of time. His limited use of the time metric in the historical analysis, together with an understanding of the “historical” framework of his own research methodology differ fundamentally from the historical interpretation of time. That is why his definition of historical anthropology is much too narrow for the historian for whom it implies a spin-off from the study of “progress” of the Western society and elite culture, a shift towards popular culture, fiction and symbolism, mentalities, rituals, and a closer approach to the methods and techniques of ethnology and anthropology. In understanding man, history has found its place in the socio-cultural frame, in a comprehensive study of the history of man’s physical and intellectual being and his environment. In doing so, it has partly adopted the methods of quantitative analysis as well as various anthropological patterns and microanalysis. For the historian, however, analytical patterns are no more than that: a direct possibility of acquiring data for a qualitative interpretation. The historian cannot accept the reduction of reality to models and numerical summaries of data, beyond the social context as a whole and beyond the process in time. The historian views “time” as an underlying social

context with all the transformations it implies, and not a mere variable in a table.

D. Rheubottom's analysis both confirms and rejects certain historiographic views and at the same time opens a debate on them. It has filled a gap in Ragusan historiography not only with new serial data, but also with an original thesis, constructed from a different perspective. Although the historian is hardly able to conform to the translation of the complex reality into several simplified metric categories, the result is very useful for historiography as well. Rheubottom investigates questions that the Ragusan historiography has interpreted on the basis of assumption or comparison, by means of a most thorough statistical analysis which in some cases produces more accurate answers and offers solid ground for reinterpretation. The book is invaluable for future research of the Ragusan patrician class, particularly for the advanced demographic study. The author should be welcome by historians since he expresses the desire in joining their research efforts in exploring various points at issue.

Zdenka Janeković-Römer

Piotr Źurek, *Ragużani i Sarmati. Iz povijesti dubrovačko-poljskih odnosa u drugoj polovici 18. stoljeća / Raguzańczycy i Sarmaci. Z dziejów stosunków polsko-dubrownickich w drugiej połowie XVIII wieku*. Zagreb: Veleposlanstvo Republike Poljske u Zagrebu, 2001. Pages 186.

The Embassy of the Republic of Poland in Croatia publishes a series aimed at promoting Croato-Polish themes, in which the fourth, most recent, edition by Piotr Źurek examines the contacts between Dubrovnik and Poland. This bilingual book is arranged in six chapters which cover chronologically the main themes, events, and protagonists of Polish-Dubrovnik relations during the eighteenth century. In an attempt to highlight and analyse particular episodes in Polish-Dubrovnik relations, the author leans on extensive historiographic literature and archival sources, markedly those of Dubrovnik, Poland, and Russia. Źurek's well-grounded work is an interesting interpretation of the political connections between the Republic of Dubrovnik and Poland in the eighteenth century. The author affords an array of details, casting light upon the, until recently, obscure political background of Poland's attitude towards Dubrovnik.

In the introduction, Źurek surveys the literature published on Croato-(Yugoslav)-Polish relations. He further narrows the scope of his research to the political and cultural contacts of the Poles with the Republic of Dubrovnik in the latter half of the eighteenth century when relations were at their most intense.

The chapter *Dvije Republike - dvije "zjenice slobode"* (*Two Republics - the two 'eyes of freedom'*) sketches the political and cultural history of the Republic of Dubrovnik on the one hand, and Poland on the other. In Źurek's opinion, the two distinct historical experiences share a common attitude towards aristocratic republicanism, symbolically represented as the 'eye of freedom' (*pupilla libertatis*). The author discusses the political, cultural, and economic achievements of Dubrovnik, emphasising its institutional and ideological uniqueness within the Croatian and Slavic context. In his survey

of the basic historical processes in eighteenth-century Poland, Žurek's analysis of *sarmatianism*, the political and ideological framework of the Polish gentry, will undoubtedly draw the attention of Croatian historians as Dubrovnik played an important role in the 1770s in the international policy and plans of the Polish Sarmatians, who had initially been organised in Italy.

The third chapter, *Rudžer Josip Bošković i "kraljevska tajna" Luja XV (Ruder Josip Bošković and the 'royal secret' of Louis XV)*, discusses the connections between the famous Ragusan scientist Ruder Bošković and the Poles, particularly his fellow Jesuits. Special attention has been given to Bošković's diplomatic mission to Poland in 1762, when he was in the service of King Louis XV of France, son-in-law of the former Polish king, Stanisław Leszczyński. During his mission to Poland, Bošković met Leszczyński who had not given up on restoring the throne. Bošković's impressions of Poland and its people, in line with the scientist's lucid observations on the Polish political situation, are based on Bošković's Diary as well as his correspondence with his brother Baro in Dubrovnik.

The fourth chapter, *Boravak Barskih konfederata u Dubrovniku 1774 g. (The Confederates of Bar visiting Dubrovnik in 1774)*, represents a valuable and original contribution to the history of Dubrovnik. The author brings to light the political background of the visit of Polish nobles to Dubrovnik in 1774, not tackled so far in Croatian historiography. Preceding this stirring visit, a league of Polish aristocracy, leading partisans of sarmatianism and the opponents of King Stanisław II August Poniatowski and his political reforms, was organised at the little fortress of Bar in Podolia. In 1774 the confederates visited Dubrovnik, this particular city being chosen for the establishment of a Polish legion which, reinforced by the Turks, was to fight against the Russians. The fact is that the Poles tried to take advantage of the raging Russo-Turkish war. As part of a carefully plotted scheme, Count Stanisław Radziwiłł arrived in Dubrovnik in the company of an impostor Russian princess, Tarakanova, pretender to the imperial

throne. Broader diplomatic reverberations marked this unusual visit, and the most fantastic rumours circulated in the city, some of which have survived in the oral tradition of Dubrovnik. Their visit led to a serious deterioration in relations between Dubrovnik and Russia, already destabilised because of the Ragusan naval support to the Turks. Yet the Polish plans spurred the Russian commander Orlov to threaten to attack Dubrovnik with a strong fleet. After a web of plots and conspiracies, crowned by the apprehension of Tarakanova, the entire plan proved doomed to failure.

The fifth chapter, *Dubrovnik i jadranska obala u strateškim planovima generala Jana Henryka Dabrowskog (Dubrovnik and the Adriatic coast in the strategic plans of General Jan Henryk Dabrowski)* examines the political situation in Poland at the turn of the eighteenth century, focusing on Polish affairs in Dubrovnik and along the eastern Adriatic after the Third Partition of Poland in 1795, when a group of Polish gentry gathered in Venice. In 1797, after the fall of Venice, under the leadership of General Dabrowski and aided by the French, the Polish nobles established a legion in Italy. Dabrowski's military strategy was to ship the legion to Dubrovnik, where it was to join the French troops against the Russians. His plan was greatly influenced by a Ragusan, Frano Dolci (1741?-1805), a Franciscan writer and diplomat. Dabrowski also supported the French in their intent to occupy the Bay of Kotor and Montenegro, but under the influence of Austria and Russia, the Montenegrin prince-bishop Petar I had him arrested and executed.

In the closing chapter, Žurek underlines the importance and influence of the relations between Dubrovnik and Poland in the second half of the eighteenth century on Poland and Croatia in the first half of the nineteenth century, particularly articulated in the policy of *Hôtel Lambert* during the Illyrian movement.

Also appended are six valuable sources on Croato-Polish relations translated into Croatian (a letter of King John III Sobieski to Petar Kanavelić from 1687, two letters written by Bošković to King Stanisław II August Poniatowski from 1764 and 1771, together with the King's

reply from 1774, a letter of Adam Czartoryski to Ruder Bošković from 1764, and a fragment describing the visit of the Polish confederates to Dubrovnik, taken from an early nineteenth-century account of the Ragusan historian Mato Bašić), as well as biographical references on the main figures cited in the text.

Stjepan Ćosić

Lorenzo Vitelleschi, *Povijesne i statističke bilješke o Dubrovačkom okrugu 1828. / Notizie storiche e statistiche del Circolo di Ragusa 1828.* (ed. **Vinicije B. Lupis**, translated by Ivona Fabris, Kornelija Bašica and Ivana Burdelez). Dubrovnik: Matica hrvatska Dubrovnik and Državni arhiv u Dubrovniku, 2002. Pages 211.

The book under review is a bilingual (Croatian-Italian) edition of a well-known collection of manuscripts, watercolour illustrations and architectural drawings by Lorenzo Vitelleschi who, as a state civil engineer, worked in Dubrovnik between 1811 and 1831. His *Notizie storiche e statistiche del Circolo di Ragusa* developed over the years, and the writing was completed in 1828.

The book consists of two parts, the first of which includes Vitelleschi's commentary in Italian with a Croatian translation, while the second part contains reproductions of his watercolours, 70 in all. As editor, Vinicije B. Lupis writes a lengthy introduction entitled "Lorenzo Vitelleschi and His Day", including bibliographical documentation and other references indispensable for the understanding of Vitelleschi's work. Also appended is an abridged Italian translation of the introduction and an author index. The most thorough editorial preparation, high quality print and somewhat larger format contribute to the excellent reproduction of Vitelleschi's drawings, printed in the scale 1:1. Although too literal in parts, the Croatian translation generally renders the original text.

Vitelleschi's manuscript is kept at the State Archives in Dubrovnik and specialists have been showing interest in it for quite some time. His work has often been cited by social and art historians, and some of his drawings have been reproduced recurrently. But a comprehensive approach to Vitelleschi's work has been missing, as researchers tended to concentrate on single monuments or constructions from his text. Until recently, neither the author nor his work as a civil engineer has been evaluated in the context of classicism in the eastern Adriatic. Moreover, the valuable data provided by Vitelleschi's notes have generally been neglected. This edition, however, has made Vitelleschi's commentary

accessible to both a scholarly and general readership interested in the cultural history of Dubrovnik.

In addition to a survey on the state of civil engineering in Dalmatia at the turn of the eighteenth century, the introduction casts welcome light on Vitelleschi's life and work. Lorenzo Vitelleschi (Vitalesschi in the original transcription) was born in the town of Hvar in 1773, to a family with Venetian roots. Apart from the scant details on his service in Istria (at the salt works in Sečovlje) during the first years of the French rule, very little is known of Vitelleschi's life and work prior to his settlement in Dubrovnik. The results of Lupis's research show that Vitelleschi studied civil engineering, mathematics and drawing, probably at the polytechnic school in Padua or Milan. He spoke Italian and French as well as Croatian and Latin, though less fluently. He arrived in Dubrovnik in 1811, having been assigned to the greatest civil engineering project undertaken by the French government - the construction of Napoleon's route. During the French administration he was appointed district engineer, a post he retained until 1831, after Dubrovnik's annexation to the Hapsburg Empire. No mention of Vitelleschi or his family has been found in Dubrovnik after the year 1831. Given that no evidence can be traced on his later work elsewhere in the province, one may assume that he was transferred out of Dalmatia.

Alongside Frano Zavoreo from Zadar and Vicko Andrić from Split, Vitelleschi belongs to the first generation of civil engineers who operated within the modernised Austrian administration, that is, the Committee for Public Construction in the Austrian Province of Dalmatia. Highly trained and conscientious, Vitelleschi was equally skilled in road construction, hydraulic engineering, painting techniques, and the art of silver and gold plating. Apart from the notes which are now edited, Vitelleschi is the author of a number of manuscripts also written in Dubrovnik and filed in the Dubrovnik Archives. They are studies on the preparation and application of pastels and the technology of silver and gold plating: *Trattato della pittura a pastello...* (1821), *L'arte del*

pittore da edifizii, dell' indoratore, e d' applicare le vernici (1822), *L'arte dell' indoratore* (1824), *L'arte di fare le vernici* (1824). Special attention should be given to Vitelleschi's work *Le servitù prediali dimonstrate geometricamente, ed applicate al vigente codice Universale austriaco* (1825) which, in fact, is a collection of Austrian estate laws, along with a commentary and 177 water-colours illustrating legal cases.

The archival materials of the District Planning Office in Dubrovnik testify to Vitelleschi's engineering accomplishments in the city, on the territory of the former Republic, in Kotor and on the Island of Korčula. The scope and diversity of his work were governed by the practical demands of reconstruction following the war damage of 1806 and 1813/4 and also the earthquakes of 1823/4 and 1827. Reproduced in the introduction are some of his most significant reconstruction projects: the division and adaptation of buildings and monastic complexes for military and administrative purposes (St Catherine's and St Sebastian's in Dubrovnik), the renovation and remodelling of churches and ecclesiastical residences (in Mlini, Ston and Lumbarda), and a number of unexecuted proposals (the buildings of the city port authority, the Orthodox cemetery, the churches of St Stephen in Zaton and Our Lady in Orašac, etc.).

The twenty years of Lorenzo Vitelleschi's work have established him as a pioneer of conservational work in Dubrovnik. Thus Vitelleschi, as his notes reveal, pinpointed the architectural heritage of Dubrovnik, and in practice always opted for remodelling rather than demolition. His proposals and accomplished projects, adaptations and conservational efforts mark the beginning of the modern construction and planned urban development of Dubrovnik, stylistically recognised as neoclassicism.

Notizie storiche e statistiche is certainly the most interesting and, in terms of cultural history, the most valuable manuscript in Vitelleschi's legacy. The notes on the Dubrovnik district (153 pages) are arranged in 47 textual chapters, with 62 illustrations, 7 maps and a distance chart. The opening chapters describe the geographical,

political and climatic landscape of the Dubrovnik region. They are followed by a survey of the most notable private, public and ecclesiastical buildings and the population of all the six *preture* of the Dubrovnik district, along with a full description of the most important buildings and monuments. Naturally, most space is given to the buildings of Dubrovnik, from the Rector's Palace and Sponza, to friaries, convents, churches and prisons, hospitals, hospices, and the city's fountains. Vitelleschi summarises the information drawn from literature and offers his own scientifically based description of the monuments. Vitelleschi showed particular interest in the problem of water supply and its management. He gives details on the state of the ports and river flows both on the islands and on the mainland, indicating the advantages of modern hydraulic engineering in water supply, cultivation and industry, particularly in the production of salt. Similarly, he reconsiders the state of public institutions (the administration, schools and the health service), infrastructure (roads, the aqueduct and the salt pans), agriculture, manufacturing, and commerce. In his observations on the weather and climatic conditions, Vitelleschi tried to explain the popular phenomenon of the so-called "Mljet detonations" - the underground roar which took place on the Island of Mljet between 1822 and 1827 and later, sometimes followed by earthquake. Vitelleschi shared the opinion of his friend Luko Stulli on a possible underwater eruption, the detonations being caused by a succession of explosive reactions in a chain of underground or underwater caves.

The most original part of the book comprises Vitelleschi's plans in hydraulic engineering which, as he put it, "remain dormant for the time being". They consist of a most extensive scheme on the regulation of water supply and the management of Konavosko Polje, plans to remodel and expand the salt pans of Ston, unaccomplished projects on the construction of a maritime lazaretto in Lapad and an Orthodox church, and the urban design of Pile, Ploče, and Gruž. Noting the specific features of the local folk costumes, Vitelleschi concludes the first

part of the *Notizie* by drawing a parallel between Ragusan and Austrian weights and measures.

Watercolour *vedute*, maps and architectural drawings in the second part of the book illustrate the preceding textual matter. Viewed artistically, Vitelleschi's drawings are of uneven quality. Lack of proportion and perspective are partly compensated for by the author's passion for detail, which qualify these illustrations as a valuable part of the culturo-historical heritage. They include architectural drawings, a series of ground plans, cross sections and schemes of all the major public buildings, monuments, churches and monastic buildings in the Dubrovnik region. Also valuable are Vitelleschi's drawings of certain buildings which stood in the 1820s (e.g. the Romanesque baptistery next to the Cathedral) but no longer exist, as well as the views of some temporary constructions (e.g. the triumphal arch erected in honour of Emperor Francis I in 1818). Among the designs are his unexecuted projects (a lazaretto in Lapad, an Orthodox church in the classicistic manner and the salt works). The illustrated part of the book ends with a table of the road network and the distances within the district (from Klek to Sutorina), together with drawings of local inhabitants in national costume.

Stjepan Ćosić

Jacques Pervititch Sigorta Haritalarında İstanbul / Istanbul in the Insurance Maps of Jacques Pervititch. İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı - AXA OYAK, 2000. Pages 338.

Fires were a feature of everyday life in İstanbul for centuries. It was the arrival of the insurance companies in the second half of the nineteenth century, first the three British companies (Sun, Northern, and North British), followed by the French and other European agents, that brought changes in this respect. Until then, the Ottoman Empire had not had any regulations defining the operation of such companies, being a state where the obscure idea of insurance was deemed a sin. In quest of profit and reputation, foreign insurance companies branched out throughout the Empire. Lack of local competition and laws regulating this activity opened the way for misuse and for an increase in foreigners who took advantage of the privileges in the Ottoman state. This called for the establishment of the first Ottoman insurance company in 1893. The foreign insurance companies, however, soon reacted by forming a union in 1900. The union contributed greatly to the development of the insurance sector and to the organisation of fire fighting brigades, also ensuring that the ferries of the İstanbul Car Ferry Company were always ready to transport the firemen to the location of the fire.

Terms of insurance were influenced by diverse factors of risk, including an assessment of the fire danger. For this purpose, cadastral-based maps of İstanbul were drawn up. The first half of the twentieth century saw the commissioning of map sections or revisions to these maps. The most systematic and detailed maps were the work of an 'Austrian topographer of Croatian origin' Jacques Pervititch, who was engaged on the project from 1920 to 1945. Though no longer serving their original purpose, the maps are a most valuable source for the historical research of İstanbul.

Thus it is not surprising that Pervititch continues to attract the attention of Turkish scholars wishing to bring to light the life and

work of this extraordinary figure. The most recent findings of a young Turkish researcher Müsemma Sabancıoğlu make a significant contribution, presented in the book *Istanbul in the Insurance Maps of Jacques Pervititch*, supported by the History Foundation of Turkey and published in 2000 by the AXA OYAK Insurance Group. This impressive Turkish-English edition consists of two parts.

The first part (pp. 5-24) contains an introduction and three essays. "Maps as an instrument for people to know, to control and to interpret their environment" by İlhan Tekeli offers a general introduction to the development and significance of cartography, with a short survey of Pervititch's maps. Murat Güvenç discusses the practical aspects of Pervititch's maps from a modern perspective in "An unfinished research project for İstanbul". Lastly, in her essay "Jacques Pervititch and his maps" Müsemma Sabancıoğlu provides a brief insight into the development of the insurance network and fire protection, with details on the life and work of Jacques Pervititch.

The second part of the book (pp. 25-336) contains a facsimile collection of Pervititch's maps divided into nine sections, covering the İstanbul districts of Beşiktaş, Beyazıt, Beyoğlu, Taksim, Eminönü, Fatih, Kadıköy, Şişli, and Üsküdar respectively. A brief historical description accompanies each of the districts.

Vesna Miović