

labour, whom the Florentines bought from the Ragusans to sell them further on the Italian market.

A biography of Držić by Rosanna Morabito follows (pp. 51-56), which, besides giving a factual overview of his life, also includes a short outline of the basic interpretations of his work and worldview. It is followed by a selection of representative texts of “Držićology” (pp. 57-87), short fragments of important works, mostly by the leading Croatian scholars (e.g. V. Foretić, F. Čale, S. Stojan, D. Fališevac), covering the key issues such as Držić’s language, poetics, political and esthetical attitudes. The volume ends with an up to date bibliography (pp.89-96) which lists the most important works on Držić.

All in all, despite its relatively small size, this book—together with the recently published Italian translation of *Skup*—will undeniably serve as a valuable introduction of Držić to the Italian public. Especially commendable is the fact that all the authors used the most recent results of the Croatian scholarship, which, unfortunately, is not always the case with volumes regarding Croatian history in foreign languages. The only serious remark that could be directed to this volume is in fact half a compliment: it is a pity that it is not longer.

Lovro Kunčević

*Bogišić i kultura sjećanja. Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem održanog u prigodi stote godišnjice smrti Balda Bogišića*, ed. Josip Kregar, Vlaho Bogišić, Dalibor Čepulo, Petar Miladin, Slaven Ravlić and Filip Hameršak. Zagreb: Pravni fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu - Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2011. Pages 410.

The centenary of the death of Baltazar Bogišić, one of the rare Croatian lawyers who has rightly earned his place on the international scholarly scene, was marked by several conferences in 2008. The volume *Bogišić i kultura sjećanja (Bogišić and the Cultural Memory)*, published recently, contains papers resulting mainly from the lectures delivered at the conference organised by the Faculty of Law in Zagreb and the Miroslav Krleža Lexicographical Institute. The core of the organisers reflected also on the topics addressed, as well as on the authors’ circle, consisting mostly of lawyers and lexicographers, joined by several experts from other disciplines of major importance to Bogišić’s opus.

Two contributions by Dalibor Čepulo may well be recommended to the scholarly public: »Baltazar Bogišić u hrvatskom i europskom pravno-kulturnom kontekstu« (»Baltazar Bogišić in the context of Croatian and European legal culture«, pp. 18-29) and »Baltazar Bogišić i Pravni fakultet u Zagrebu: kontroverzije i suradnja« (»Baltazar Bogišić and the Faculty of Law in Zagreb: Controversies and cooperation«, pp. 30-52). These papers are in fact complementary with the author’s earlier texts, in which he focused on the European context of Bogišić’s work and his contacts with foreign scholars. Here, however, Čepulo tackles an equally demanding task to elucidate Bogišić from the standpoint of the processes that marked the Croatian politics, higher education and research of the time: early encouraging contacts with Matija Mesić and Franjo Rački, plans for professorship in Zagreb, publications in JAZU editions, collaboration on the Academy’s editorial projects, and lastly, regular survey of Bogišić’s activities and accomplishments in the *Mjesečnik Pravnčkoga društva*, a

journal with broad reception among the Croatian lawyers. Bogišić tended to maintain his contacts in Croatia, keeping the doors of Zagreb ajar just in case, considering it in fact merely a peripheral solution to his existence and scientific ambitions. Besides his ties with Cavtat and Konavle, his place of birth, Bogišić placed his personal identity within a broader Slavic frame, avoiding closer ethnic mapping, in which Čepulo recognises “the complexity of the ongoing shaping of the national identity process, and perhaps even more than that, the complexity of Bogišić’s personality” (18).

In a contribution entitled »Pravna kultura i pravna promjena: za novi pristup Bogišiću« (»Legal culture and legal change: towards a new approach to Bogišić«, pp. 53-65) Slaven Ravlić addresses the problem from the viewpoint of the sociology of law and its analytical apparatus. Friedman’s concept of *legal culture* and its role in the process of legal change has proved a most resourceful launching pad for the analysis of Bogišić’s approach to the framing of the General Property Code of Montenegro in 1888. This legislative task was part of the transformation project of the Montenegrin society by means of “modernisation from the above” or “conservative modernisation”, initiated by Count Nikola with an aim to crush the powerful tribal structures and ensure the stability of his sovereign position, which again included the institution of a civil society with a liberal institutional and political organisation (“patriarchal monarchy”). As he himself emphasised, Bogišić did not approach the existent custom law “mechanically”, but tried to harmonise the national traditions, that is, legal cultures with the modern development needs. In his attempt to detect the most suitable requirements of Montenegrin legal culture, Bogišić boldly trod beyond the strict frames of the historical school of law, bringing innovative elements for which he felt were essential on the path of social modernisation (e.g. provisions of the international private law).

Several articles discuss Bogišić’s contribution to modern law. Petar Miladin in »Običaji, kondicije, ortaštvo i ugovorna kazna prema Bogišićevu Općem imovinskom zakoniku za

Crnu Goru i hrvatskom Zakonu o obveznim odnosima« (»Customs, conditions, partnership, and contractual penalty in Bogišić’s General property code for Montenegro and Croatian Law on obligations«, pp. 66-97) brings to attention certain elements of modern Croatian Law on Obligations into which Bogišić’s legal solutions have been incorporated, through the Draft of Obligations and Contracts by Mihailo Konstantinović from 1969. Written with a lot of zeal and profound admiration for Bogišić’s work, this contribution actually aims to stamp Bogišić on the *cultural memory* of Croatian civil law discipline. In his paper »Imovinskoppravne *regulae iuris* u Bogišićevu zakoniku i njihovo aktualno značenje« (»Property-rights *regulae iuris* in Bogišić’s Code and their current interpretation«, pp. 98-118) Marko Petrak highlights certain legal provisions from Bogišić’s General Property Code and traces their Roman legal tradition, pointing to the corresponding solutions in the actual Croatian legislation as well as in the Croatian and European legal practice. Davor Babić in his contribution »Međunarodno privatno pravo u Bogišićevu zakoniku« (»International private law in Bogišić’s Codex«, pp. 119-144) shows how Bogišić combined the two approaches that dominated in the mentioned legal discipline in the nineteenth century, borrowing already formulated principles, but also introducing important new elements.

Drago Roksandić published the letters of Jean-Baptiste Feuvrier, French physician who worked in Cetinje for a number of years, addressed to Baltazar Bogišić between 1873 and 1908 (»Jean-Baptiste Feuvrier (1842-1926): Baltazar Bogišić’s correspondent from Cetinje«, pp. 254-299). Faithfully transcribed and accompanied by exemplary critical apparatus, this correspondence will certainly shed new light on some episodes from Bogišić’s life (e.g. his assistance with Feuvrier’s translation of Parčić’s grammar into French) and enable a clearer view of his social network.

The work of Filip Hameršak »Baltazar Bogišić u hrvatskom javnom prostoru (s posebnim obzirom na zagrebačku ulicu)« (»Baltazar Bogišić

in Croatian public domain (with special attention to Bogišić street in Zagreb)«, pp. 309-324), in which the author traces the memory of Bogišić in the school curricula, on the postal stamps and envelopes, street names, erection of the monument and grave best fits into Assmann's concept of *cultural memory*, the key word of the edition under review.

Josip Kregar (pp. 9-17) comes forward with his considerations on the freshness of some of Bogišić's ideas for legal theory and sociology. Radoje Korać (pp. 145-166), Zoran P. Rašović (pp. 167-185) and Šime Ivanjko (pp. 186-193) analyse certain elements of Bogišić's General Property Code, in that the last two draw parallels with modern law. The papers of Maja Bošković Stulli (pp. 194-201) and Ljiljana Marks (pp. 225-236) deal with Bogišić's contribution to recording oral tradition and point to its potential in the field of ethnology and cultural anthropology, while Marko Karamatić (pp. 209-224) casts light on the ethnological heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina preserved in Bogišić's collection of legal customs. Marko Samardžija (pp. 202-208) focuses on lexical analysis and some interesting terminological solutions found in Bogišić's General Property Code. Ivana Crljenko (pp. 237-248) affords an outline of her study of Bogišić's travels to Caucasus in 1872, during which he collected demographical and ethnographical data on the Abkhazians and their legal customs. Based on Russian sources, Nikolaj Zubov (pp. 249-253) highlights the events surrounding Bogišić's conflict with his students in Odessa, drawing attention to the key role of the Russian radical Alexander Zhelyabov. The bibliography compiled by Paulina Radonić Vranjković (pp. 357-388) is arranged chronologically, which does have certain practical flaws, yet helps trace the development of Bogišić's scientific interests and the reception of his works, contributing thus to the topic of the edition. The volume is concluded by Vlaho Bogišić's discussion on the importance of Baltazar Bogišić for the encyclopaedic endeavours in Croatia (pp. 389-399), and the conference chronology (pp. 401-410).

Apart from those who specialized in Bogišić and who have published research based on the material from his rich Cavtat collection—Maja Bošković Stulli, Dalibor Čepulo, Ljiljana

Marks and Drago Roksanđić in particular—the anniversary has attracted a succession of authors somewhat less familiar with Bogišić's work. For this reason some contributions have not managed to attain the level of scientific discourse, a feature commonly witnessed with volumes collecting conference papers, while the paper by Anđelka Milić (pp. 300-308), should, unfortunately, be assessed as an unconvincing improvisation which fails to satisfy even the lowest scholarly standards. It is a great pity that the editors (a crew of six in all) made no attempt to find a more appropriate solution for the two papers that deserve to be published in a literary or historical journal, but are not thematically related to the volume's main theme: the contribution of Alla Tatarenko on cultural memory in contemporary Croatian prose (pp. 325-337) and of Pejo Čošković on the question of feudal fidelity in medieval Bosnia (pp. 338-356).

The editorial team should be commended for having motivated a series of scholars to devote themselves to Bogišić and make an effort to revalorise his work and thus contribute to our scholarship with a number of truly excellent and interesting works. The editorial idea to mould the volume around the concept of *cultural memory* proved to be ingenious, not only giving to diverse texts an all-embracing editorial frame, but also contributing greatly to the enrichment of the cultural memory itself.

Nella Lonza