

This, in my opinion, is the conclusion that follows from Chary's detailed analysis. But without the most recent documents at his disposal, the author does not arrive at that conclusion. His investigations, however, provide a wide view of the difficult war years and the dramatic struggle waged for the salvation of Bulgarian Jews. The excellent appendixes further enhance the value of the book. Beyond any doubt it is one of the most important research contributions to the fate of Bulgarian Jews during the drama-packed years of World War II.

VESELIN TRAIKOV

*Institute of Balkan Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences*

DUBROVNIK (RAGUSA): A CLASSIC CITY-STATE. By *Francis W. Carter*. London and New York: Seminar Press, 1972. xxxi, 710 pp. £9.50.

The purpose of Carter's voluminous book on Dubrovnik is to present the "first complete examination" in English of that city in such a way that it would be "unique both in its approach and subject matter." The book contains twelve chapters, a conclusion, four appendixes, a bibliography, and two indexes. It covers all aspects of Dubrovnik's history from the early Middle Ages to the most recent times. Obviously, to write a work of such breadth and scope there are certain prerequisites, the least of which are a detailed knowledge of sources and a solid knowledge of the languages with which the author has to deal. Dubrovnik's Historical Archives consist of about seven thousand volumes of documents and about one hundred thousand *separata* (eleventh to nineteenth centuries), written mostly in Latin, Italian, and Serbo-Croatian. The modern works on Dubrovnik are published primarily in Serbo-Croatian.

Unfortunately, Carter has not worked on original archival documents, nor does he possess sufficient knowledge of Latin, Italian, or Serbo-Croatian to launch into such a vast enterprise. Although he contends that Dubrovnik's archives "serve as a base for this work" (p. 599), it is obvious to anyone who knows those archives that Carter has never seen the original documents. Suffice it to say that he consistently mentions nonexistent "folders" instead of "folia," for the letter "f" in archival call numbers. Furthermore, his efforts to impress us with his use and knowledge of the archives fail on a quick check of a few of his quotations, which proves their total unreliability and reveals incredible blunders.

The ignorance of Latin, Italian, and Serbo-Croatian is visible throughout the book. Let me just say here that one can hardly find one footnote containing Latin text without errors in it; that there are countless mistakes in Italian in the superfluous reproduction of the outdated archival catalogue (pp. 601-61); and that the complete unfamiliarity with Serbo-Croatian is best exemplified in the absurd citation of Dušan's Code (p. 666). Although the author wants to impress us with a huge and partly deficient bibliography, full of mistakes, at the end of his book, he has used mostly late nineteenth and early twentieth-century works in his actual writing, as can be seen in the notes to his chapters. More serious is the fact that entire paragraphs of the book are simply translations from other works (for example, pp. 446-47, text on Dubrovnik's architecture and sculpture translated from Serbo-Croatian—obviously not by Carter—from vol. 3, p. 154, of the *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*).

The consequences of such methods are disastrous not only for Carter's history of Dubrovnik but also for his discussions of Croatian, Bosnian, and Serbian history.

This is not to say that there is nothing good in this book. In a 700-page volume, in which some reliable old works were used (such as Jireček, Gelcich), there is bound to be something sound, but it is difficult to locate, buried as it is in an avalanche of mistakes. Carter has used maps and diagrams which, although useful, are frequently pretentious and unreliable. Unnecessarily he has reproduced pages from published works and has included illustrations and facsimiles of documents, some of which do not correspond to his interpretation of them (e.g., p. 228, fig. 34).

On the whole, the best one can say for this book is that one wishes it had never been written. This is not to question Carter's good intentions and his enthusiasm. Unfortunately, they were matched only by his ignorance of the subject. Thus this volume, presented as a "definitive study" of Dubrovnik, is in fact a great disservice both to Dubrovnik and to its author.

BARIŠA KREKIĆ

*University of California, Los Angeles*

BALKANSKI I AT GRAD XV-XIX VEK: SOTSIALNO-IKONOMICHESKO I DEMOGRAFSKO RAZVITIE. By *Nikolai Todorov*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1972. 504 pp. 4.72 lv.

PROUCHVANIIA NA GRADSKOTO STOPANSTVO PREZ XV-XVI VEK. By *Bistra Tsvetkova*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1972. 255 pp. 2.66 lv.

The two books reviewed here have been written by distinguished Bulgarian historians. Of the two, Todorov's is the more ambitious, encompassing a greater span of time and endeavoring to provide a comparative study of social, economic, and demographic developments affecting Balkan cities from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth. Todorov, in preparing his study, consulted secondary works in several languages as well as archival materials, including Ottoman official statistics, *esnaf* registers, *defters* of various kinds, judicial records (*sicils*), *fermâns*, *berâts*, and *buyuruldus*, most of which are located in the Oriental Section of the National Library of Cyril and Methodius in Sofia and in the Bulgarian Central State Historical Archives. He discusses the Ottoman town in the feudal and transitional periods, its types and sizes, the urban economy, the settlement of Turks in the Balkans, and the Islamization of part of the native population. On the basis of inheritance records and other materials, Todorov analyzes the social structure of both Muslim and non-Muslim urban populations. The major point he stresses is that the decline of the *timar-sipâhî* system beginning at the end of the sixteenth century was not accompanied by a breakdown of the feudal method of production. The principal aim of the Ottoman feudatories, he writes, was to garner as much wealth as possible in the easiest and surest way. This they did by acquiring high military and administrative positions, which gave them ever closer ties with the state apparatus and resulted in the bureaucratization of the federal class.

According to Todorov, expanded trade in the eighteenth century stimulated the development of productive forces and the emergence of the middle class among the subject peoples (Bulgarians, Greeks, and Serbs), who began to play a greater part in the urban economy and local administration than they had earlier. The growing participation of the subject peoples in the emerging capitalist economy and the indifference of the government to the development of capitalism were, in the words of the author, phenomena peculiar to the Ottoman Empire. When the