doi: 10.19090/i.2024.35.69-81
UDC: 94(497.11)“04/14“:67/68-055.2

ISTRAŽIVANJA
JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES
35 (2024)

ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER
Received: 14 September 2023
Accepted: 5 February 2024

ALEKSANDRA FOSTIKOV
The Institute of History Belgrade
0000-0002-9089-0339
aleksandra.fostikov@iib.ac.rs

CRAFTSWOMEN IN MEDIEVAL SERBIA: A COMPARATIVE VIEW

Abstract: As a research topic, women in medieval Serbian lands who were engaged professionally in skilled crafts is practically unexplored territory. In addition to a chronic lack of sources—which is clearly evident in the case of women’s work in producing commodities—exploration of the role of women’s work, even in medieval society, did not begin until the emergence of historiography of sex and gender, in particular at the end of the twentieth century. In addition to women from the ruling and aristocratic classes, who were noticeably preserved in the surviving sources in accordance with their status, the documents, primarily from the interior, mostly record widows due to their specific position in society, with the exception of a few legal provisions regulating women’s earnings. Narrative sources predominantly created within the Church view women through a Christian perspective and omit women’s work. However, information preserved in coastal cities such as Kotor or Dubrovnik, cities in the interior in neighboring states of what was previously Serbia and throughout medieval Europe, allow for parallels to be drawn and for issues related to the work of skilled craftswomen to be better understood. Through the comparative method based on currently established methodology, this paper will present women’s activities as professional craftswomen, their work as assistants in workshops, and their activities related to the infrastructure of a particular craft so that what is already known can be interpreted using source material and literature of both local and foreign origin in order to determine at least an approximate framework and role for women within the skilled crafts in medieval Serbia.

Keywords: women, crafts, craftsmanship, craftswomen, Middle Ages, Serbia, Europe.

In the literature, women’s work has long been connected with home and family and, in comparison to men’s work, is often treated as domestic, secondary, or not professional. This is consistent not only with the time period investigated here but also with the early modern period, during which women had no defined place, role, or employment status, and were not considered participants of any importance for the economy. This has resulted in the neglect of women’s professional work in earlier periods. Apart from a few exceptions, until the

emergence of gender studies, there had been almost no mention of the role and place of women in the skilled crafts, and the issue of women's professional work was not raised until the second half of the twentieth century.[1] Taking so long to pose this question led not only to a delay in researching women's work and the development of specific methodologies, but also to source material only being considered from a male angle. This has also led to misinterpretations of sources, and even when there was mention of a particular occupation or trade, without a name attached to the person in question, it was interpreted as confirmation that the subject was a craftsman, even though there could have been a woman hidden behind it, especially considering that certain names were not gendered, as Ingvild Øye has recently pointed out.[2]

Among the many scholars who deal with women's roles in the economy in medieval skilled crafts and in foreign literature, the work of Janice Marie Archer, who clearly demonstrated the scope and issues relevant to the time period and paved the way for further research, is of particular significance. She has also suggested that detailed comparisons within medieval Europe are necessary in order to arrive at a valid answer to the question of whether there were differences among women's professional activities resulting from geographical or historical circumstances.[3] In addition to works focused on women's commercial activities in general, some only deal with certain crafts or issues related to production. One of these is women's participation in professional organizations, which must be established for the role of women's work to be properly considered. A study by Maryanne Kowaleski and Judith Bennett is particularly significant because they employed a comparative approach to women's organizations and because it contains an extensive bibliography to date at the time.[4]

As opposed to its breadth in foreign literature, regional historiography dealing with the medieval period has mostly overlooked this topic. With the exception of one chapter of a monograph focused on women in Dubrovnik and Kotor by Dušanka Dinić and Lenka Blehova Čelebić dealing with commerce, which also includes some information about

---

1 Bock 2002; Fostikov 2004: 323–324, Stolić 2013; Rokai 2015; Mrgić, Fostikov 2017: 382 n. 1, 2. In addition to these, Marian K. Dale's early work on silkwomen in London must be pointed out as an early example of interest in women in the economy and craft production. Dale 1933.

2 Examples of this issue are numerous. For example, Øye pointed out one of the possible examples that is documented in the case of the using the noun weaver. Øye 2016: 47. Additionally, in some cases when there were almost no explicit mentions of craftswomen in the sources, as was the case in Brno (except for one—a regulation from 1328 about collecting taxes, which mentions both sexes in regard to cutting fabric), it is enough to see not only that women were craftspeople, but also that they were not mentioned in parallel in the same article, so there is no way to know if the article refers only to men or to both sexes. For this regulation about those "who cut cloth," see: Malanikova 2016: 192. In addition, Malanikova mentioned a document from Jihlava from the 1380s that includes "a full range of occupations in grammatically correct feminine forms." Malanikova 2016: 193. Since this is the only document of this sort that is known, it is important that it be published in the future. Another document similar to this one is from Crete: a decree issued on March 13, 1351, and it provides feminine forms for only three occupations: tailors/seamstresses who specialized in making cloaks and overcloaks, or *iupae* (*iupparius*, *iupparia*), tailors/seamstresses (*sartor*, *sartoressa*) and weavers (*textor*, *texrix*). It is also known that there were apprentice contracts for shoemakers and tanners. In addition, a decree from 1526 also mentions "master artisans—men and women" (*maistri et homini et femine*). Panopoulou 2019: 208–209, 221.

3 Archer 1995, passim. Therefore, although the place and role of women in society and the economy can be studied through collective experience, it is still necessary to approach such research carefully due to potential differences between certain practices. Rokai 2015: 199.

4 Kowaleski, Bennett 1989. Additional works and sources will be cited in the appropriate context later on, see below.

craftswomen,[5] almost no one has specifically addressed in detail either women's commercial activity or women's work as artisans. Among the studies that address women's commercial activity, those by Marija Karbić and Darja Mihelič are particularly significant. They provide an overview of the commercial activities, including skilled crafts, of women in medieval Croatia between the Drava and Sava rivers in what is now modern-day Slovenia, which clearly point to the presence of craftswomen.[6]

Based on what is currently known, although quite diverse in terms of type, area, surroundings, and chronology, women throughout medieval Europe were clearly engaged in all the skilled crafts that men performed, albeit in smaller numbers, and they were also involved in guilds, either directly as members or indirectly through the workshop in which they were employed. Although women were primarily admitted into guilds as wives, daughters, or widows of masters (with widows having more rights within the organization), there are nevertheless examples of women belonging to guilds without a family connection to the craft, which can clearly be seen in cases of guilds that were predominantly female.[7] However, they were generally not able to participate in decision-making, often worked under supervision, and their participation in certain professions was limited. Over time, as attitudes toward women shifted, they were increasingly pushed out of these professional organizations, and their membership rights were limited.[8] According to their gender, women in Florence could join less important organizations for artisans, such as *Linaiuoli*, but not more significant ones, such as *Arte di Calimala*. In Paris, women silk spinners were also permitted to supervise a limited number of apprentices, and widows of glaziers and jewelers could continue their husbands' work but could not take on apprentices because these skills were considered too important to be taught by women. Although women weavers operated in mixed guilds, there were predominantly female guilds, although much fewer, such as those in Paris, Rouen, Cologne, and other important centers for weaving, but in these cases they were usually related to luxury materials such as silk, technical work such as embroidery or goldwork embroidery, or even specialized according to an article of clothing. As for Byzantium, it is unknown if or in what manner women were members of professional organizations, but the fact that they were forbidden from joining goldsmiths' organizations would suggest that in other cases they were most likely permitted to become members, and, judging by the restrictive attitude, women were members of these organizations in an earlier period.[9]

According to surviving records, women in medieval Europe were also chandlers, ironmongers, net-makers, shoemakers, glovers, girdlers, haberdashers, purse-makers, cap-

---

5 Dinić-Knežević 1974: 1–60; Blehova Čelebić 2002: 219–227.

6 Mihelič 2002; Karbić 2004.

7 Kowaleski, Bennett 1989: 476–484; King 1991: 64–65; Øye 2016: 45. In the case of the Parisian guild of embroiderers (which consisted of eighty-one women and twelve men) twenty-five women did not have husbands in the same trade, and twelve were not daughters of embroiderers, while in the case of the purse makers, only seven out of 124 women had a family relationship with a given craft. Kowaleski, Bennett 1989: 482.

8 Kowaleski, Bennett 1989: 482–483; Rokai 2015: 192; Øye 2016: 45. According to a Bristol law from 1461, except for women working alongside their husbands, women, including wives, daughters and servants of weavers, could no longer be employed as weavers in order to prevent the unemployment of men. King 1991: 66, 68–69. Also, see below.

9 King 1991: 65, 67, 71; Dagron 2002: 409. See note 8 above. For women in weavers' guilds, and for the feminine forms for different occupations including crafts in Jihlava, see: Malanikova 2016: 193–194.

makers, skinners, bookbinders, gilders, painters, silk weavers and embroiderers, smiths, blacksmiths, goldsmiths, dyers, yarn spinners, gold spinners, weavers of silks and other textiles, seamstresses, veil makers, silk embroiderers, glove knitters, bag makers, nappers, bag and glove embroiderers, wagoners, tailors, rope makers, coopers, glass-cutters and gem-workers. In thirteenth-century Paris, women were professionally engaged in almost all occupations that men were, although there were much fewer of them. In Frankfurt women were recorded as practicing 201 different professions, sixty-five of which they even held a monopoly, they were predominant in seventeen, and in thirty-eight they were in equal numbers as men. Women weavers were also mentioned in birch bark manuscripts,[10] as were women fullers (*bjelilniks*).[11]

In addition to these skilled professions, scarce information of foreign provenance suggests women also worked in construction not only as less-skilled workers who prepared and delivered materials such as mortar and stone, but also worked on roofing, within the building profession, and in workshops, as well as performing work that required them to be present at construction sites. They were also recorded as masons, carpenters, doormakers, tilers, and plasterers. In Strasbourg, two women in the fifteenth century were recorded as having joined a masons' guild through which they acquired citizenship, although it appears that it was rare to join traveling groups of masons.[12] Furthermore, women also worked in family workshops as wives, daughters, or widows who not only provided assistance but also acquired their own skills through practice just as they would have through an apprenticeship. A representation of Eve from the ninth or tenth century that originated from Byzantium should be viewed in this context: In accordance with her traditional role of assisting her husband, she is depicted as holding a pair of bellows.[13]

Further evidence that even in the Middle Ages women could acquire the status of a professional craftswomen comes from a medieval Russian source from the twelfth or thirteenth century, the expanded *Russkaya Pravda*, which explicitly differentiates between craftsmen (ремственник) and craftswomen (ремственница), and the death penalty for both was the same. This source therefore indicates that, at this time, even among the dependent population, not only was there was distinct class of craftswomen, but also that many women were professional craftswomen who were valued equally with their male counterparts, and that for masters, at least initially, distinctions were based on skill rather than sex.[14] A specific

---

[10] In addition to summarizing information about craftswomen's professions, Margaret L. King also provides an overview of the situation in different city centers across Europe associated with women's crafts and trades. King 1991: 64–69. For Paris, see also: Archer 1995: passim. For Crete and rope makers: Panopoulou 2019: 231. Moreover, this document from Jihlava indicates that the presence of craftswomen was commonplace in medieval Moravia in the fourteenth century. Malanikova 2016: 193. See also note 2 above, for details of this document.

[11] Čerepnin 1960: 264–267. For the meaning of term *bjelilnik*, see Fostikov 2019: 183–184.

[12] For more detail, see: Roff 2010. According to a regulation from Graz (1460), women bringing stone and mortar were paid one-eighth less than men were. Mihelič 2002: 318.

[13] Epstein 1991: 104–107; Fostikov 2019: 38 n. 85. Also, see above.

[14] *Pravda Ruskaja* II, 317–318, 604, Article 15. For gender equality in Russian sources, including Article 15, see: Čvorović 2022. In addition, Serkina also makes some interesting points about women among the early Slavs: Serkina 2004: 85–92. Although Article 15 is well known in older Russian studies, there are still no studies specifically focused on the role of the women in craft production in the Russian historiography, as far as is currently known. In addition, it should be noted that European historiography that is focused on gender in the Middle Ages in Europe does not include Soviet or modern Russian gender studies in its comparative

title for a female master (*maistra*/*mastorissa*) was also recorded in Crete as a counterpart to the male title.[15] The well known author Kristina Pizanska also pointed out the significance of women's roles in production and technology in her work on the defense of women, known as the City of Women, which she completed in 1405.[16]

Furthermore, when it comes to textile production, it must be pointed out that, in addition to the earlier opinion that women as professional weavers were eclipsed by their male counterparts due to the advent of the horizontal loom, the emergence of the weaving and textile industries essentially led to an increase in the percentage of men involved in the urban space in textile production in accordance with demand. In the case of weaving, regardless of the type of loom (vertical or horizontal), existing records and accompanying artistic representations undeniably indicate that both men and women worked on them, sometimes together in parallel on the same loom. Despite aggressive favoritism of male weavers, first through certain directives, the work of male weavers increasingly gained prominence starting in the early sixteenth century as the field of women's work narrowed.[17] Further evidence that spinning was considered a way for single women in the Middle Ages and even later to survive and support themselves with their own work, also comes from the widespread use of a name for a woman who spins—such as spinster—in several languages, as a term for a widow or an unmarried woman, meaning a "poor woman" who alone supports herself. An additional counterpart that appears in Dušan's Code is the term *sirota kudeljnica*.[18]

When considering women, one should keep in mind that they undoubtedly belonged to the class of skilled artisans, and in addition to decorative embroidery and metalwork, they also produced illuminated manuscripts, even within scriptoria. Records of women working in scriptoria, as both transcribers and illuminators, has come to light only through new historical research that points to women illuminators in Austria and Germany in the Middle Ages. In Germany alone between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, there were forty-eight active scriptoria in convents, and around four hundred women produced over four thousand manuscripts. Evidence of women's involvement in producing pigments or in the illumination of manuscripts has come from an analysis of a female skeleton from the eleventh or twelfth century, and a dark blue residue obtained from lapis lazuli was found on a tooth from the necropolis of the Dalheim monastery complex in Germany.[19]

Last, when considering research into women's economic role, including skilled crafts in medieval Serbia, it should be noted that a particular issue is that, due to a lack of sources and insufficiently studied processes, medieval Serbia has long been viewed within

---

methodology. This is a result of issues around accepting the Medieval Rus' as a part of medieval Europe, along with other research questions, as has been clearly pointed out in recent times by Christian Raffensperger. Raffensperger 2012: 1–2, and thereafter passim. However, there have recently been some changes to this.

15 Panopoulou 2019: 222. For more on the term and title *maistor*, see: Fostikov 2019: 12–18.

16 In the *City of Ladies*, Pisan defends women by gathering together numerous examples of well known heroines from history and legend. It is of relevance here that de Pisan also included craftswomen who were, according to legend, the inventors of some crafts, including Minerva, the queen Ceres, the maiden Arachne, Pamphile, and the queen Artemisia. Christine de Pizan 1405: 73, 76, 80, 81, 83, 124.

17 Øye 2016: 44–48; Rokai: 2015: 192. See also Notes 8 and 9 above.

18 King 1991: 67; Katić 2009: 217–218, 225; Fostikov 2004: 330 n. 224. For the meaning of noun *sirota* (poor) in the term *sirota kudeljnica* in the Dušan's Code, see: Filipović 1953: 40–47.

19 This article is also important for distribution of lapis lazuli in medieval Europe. Radini *et al*. 2019: 1–8.

the broader historiography as having been isolated from the rest of the world, despite its economic development at the time and being socially involved in medieval European trends. Even Dinić Knežević held at one time that, unlike Dubrovnik, there was "a different social order" in medieval Serbia, which resulted in women being unable to "freely conduct business" as women in Dubrovnik did, with the exception of those in the cities or members of the merchant class, and she did not take into consideration not only the economy in the rural outskirts of urban areas or the economy as a whole, but also the role of women within society as a whole and in accordance with the attitudes and understandings of the time.[20]

Indeed, in medieval Serbia women in both urban and rural areas must have been involved in skilled production, either professionally or as assistants in workshops attached to homes, or through the infrastructure of a particular craft within which they formed the workforce for processing raw materials, or to provide assistance that required minimal skills, as indicated by existing records and parallels which can be drawn not only from facts known from primary sources of foreign provenance, both written and artistic, but also from examples from local neighboring cities and regions, and from rare local mentions.[21] Additionally, the fact that Slavic women were found to have taken part in a military campaign in the early medieval period strongly suggests that they must have been engaged in various professional activities, including skilled crafts.[22]

Records from Kotor, Dubrovnik, and neighboring countries and cities indicate that craftswomen were present within various professions, just as they were throughout the rest of medieval Europe. In addition to being involved in textile production, somewhat further afield in Slovenia there are records of a female tawer (Ptuj, 1513) and a female furrier (Goriza, 1472). Also, membership in guilds was required for the wives of masters, and the masters had to be married in order to achieve their status as masters. As in the rest of medieval Europe, they were referred to as brothers and sisters, and they were also mentioned in the tailors' fraternity in Maribor.[23] In the region between the Sava and the Drava rivers that is now Slavonia, there are also mentions of craftswomen, and their status as widows enabled them to inherit a workshop. The statutes of the Križevci Guild of Locksmiths and Spurriers (1510) and the Gradec Spurriers, Locksmiths, Blacksmiths, and Swordsmiths (1521) stipulated that the guilds must designate a journeyman for the widow of a member for as long as she is in need of assistance in running her workshop. Furthermore, the same statutes indicate that these journeymen often married the widows, in which case they paid only half of the guild's fee. In addition to women weavers and chandlers, there is a record in Gradec from 1588 of a woman cobbler, and a mention of a seamstress in Varaždin in the fifteenth century, as well as mention of a woman sword maker and cleaner whose husband was a locksmith, and who were members of the same guild. Widows of blacksmiths also appear in court records.[24]

---

20 Dinić-Knežević 1974: 60.

21 See above, also n. 13. For infrastructures for the different professions of craft production, see: Fostikov 2019, passim.

22 The presence of Slavic women in the military has been noted in sources, see: Fontes Byzantini I, 242. See also note 14 above.

23 Mihelič 2002: 316–318.

24 Karbić 2004: 60–64, 69.

In Dubrovnik, most of the records Dinić-Knežević collected refer to women taking part in the production of textiles and embroidery, and Diversis also provides evidence of women taking part in the production of broadcloth.[25] Although there are currently no known records from Dubrovnik itself regarding women apprenticing, there is evidence from a contract from 1361 that women from Dubrovnik and the hinterland could be accepted for training if they so wished. This contract was drawn up on behalf of a Vlach woman named Velna to learn the craft of tailoring from a man from Dubrovnik named Milan the tailor. Once she completed her ten-year apprenticeship, Milan was expected to provide her with tools for making clothing.[26] In Kotor, along with silk spinning, professions practiced by women that were specifically mentioned included tallow chandlers, *opanak* makers, and even armorers. It seems there was also a woman capmaker, and there is no reason to doubt that women also practiced certain crafts in the interior, just as they did other professions.[27]

Although the only skilled craft practiced by women that appears in sources of local provenance is related to spinning, which is connected the term *sirota kudeljnica* in Dušan's Code (Article 64), according to parallels in other areas, the range of crafts they practiced must have been far greater. The only issue with identifying them rests solely in the lack of available sources. Furthermore, the same article, as in the article concerning a *sirota kudeljnica*'s inability to bring suit, (Article 73), underscores the right and status of a widow to independently earn money and represent herself.[28] Accordingly the mention of the poor spinster could be interpreted as a universal rule related to a widow's business opportunities.

As widows, women in medieval Serbia were most likely able to continue working in a family workshop or to employ a master, just as women in other countries and economic centers were able to. Evidence that they also invested money and could enter into formal business contracts comes from a 1463 agreement between Vladica (Vladislava), widow of Budisav of Srebrenica, and Andrija, a goldbeater and son of Jakob of Genoa. Although there is no mention of Budisav's profession in the document, nor is it known what Vladica's was, it does mention that she entered into a partnership agreement with Andrija, for which she gave him 120 ducats for a year so he could practice "his craft" and teach it to her son Anton. The profits would then be divided between them, with two-thirds going to Andrija and one-third to Vladica.[29] Setting aside the question of which city the late Budisav and his widow Vladica were citizens, especially since many local inhabitants sought to acquire citizenship in Dubrovnik due to privileges,[30] Budisav is indeed mentioned as being a resident of Srebrenica, and judging by Vladica's investment and decisions, the family most likely would have been among the affluent inhabitants originating from that town. It is unknown if

---

25 Filip de Diversis 1440: 110; Dinić-Knežević 1974: 9. In addition, Dinić-Knežević wrote a book about the fabric trade in Dubrovnik that provides an extensive overview of women's work in textile production in medieval Serbia, from which fabric was exported to Ragusa, see: Dinić-Knežević 1982, passim.

26 State Archive in Dubrovnik, Debita Notariae (Debts and debit notes registered at the Public Notary) Vol. 4 f. 4v (abbreviated: DAD, Deb. Not. 4 f. 4v); Petrović 1985: 19. I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague Esad Kurtović for providing me with the two documents from DAD that are quoted in this paper.

27 Blehova Čelebić 2002: 222–224.

28 Radojčić 1960: 55 No. 64, 57 No. 73. Also, see Note 18 above.

29 Kovačević-Kojić 2010: 60.

30 State Archive in Dubrovnik, Debita Notariae (Debts and debit notes registered at the Public Notary) Vol. 36 f. 18v (abbreviated: DAD, Deb. Not. 36 f. 18v); Kovačević-Kojić 2010: 97–104; Fostikov 2019:72. See n. 26.

Vladica's family had any connection to the goldsmith trade, and if they did, what kind it was.

Except as a widow, student, or even craftswoman, a woman's particular role in the skilled trades, as with other matters, lay in the bonds of marriage, whether she was a young woman, a widow, or a daughter, just as it did throughout medieval Europe. Trading houses were connected with each other, and even with other trades, which according to local sources was an already established practice in the early fifteenth century, as is evidenced by the marriage of Nikola the hat-maker to the daughter of a protomaster. Additionally, it was certainly possible through marriage to enter a trade house with an artisan's privilege in accordance with the practice of hereditary crafts known from the Masters' Act as well as parallel comparative examples.[31]

In terms of individual crafts, it is generally known that that women were directly involved in the production and sale of textiles. Textile production demanded not only the work of both sexes, but also an extremely diversified infrastructure, regardless of the genesis of the threads. Thus, in parallel with the term for *kudeljnica*, there is also *kudeljin*, and a term for a male embroiderer (*vezilj*) also appears.[32] Women were involved in processing plant and animal fibers within manorial estates and commercial production houses, and in addition to spinning and weaving for the needs of the home or a master, this work was done as an additional commercial activity. Among the primary products of women's work with fibers, a form of cloth known as *rassia* (раша) can also be considered, which was later sold and also exported, and based on trade and furnishing raw fiber to be worked by women in the hinterland, it can be seen that women from the Slavic hinterland of Dubrovnik also worked professionally within the textile industry.[33] Furthermore, the transformation of fibers, especially linen, into garments was known in Byzantium, and this role of women is glorified by Christianity in which the Virgin Mary is depicted with a spindle, a distaff, or knitting needles in her hands, indicating that she spins and knits. Distaffs were also given to brides in Dubrovnik a symbol of women.[34] With the emergence of the silk industry, women were involved in processing and producing silk, and the entire process from cultivating silkworms to spinning thread and weaving passed through their hands. Although, judging by comparisons, this work was not well-paid, their role in production cannot be dismissed,[35] especially when taking into account that silkweaving requires particular specialization and knowledge of techniques. Judging at least by records from Crete, women taught this skill to female students.[36] Parallels and daily requirements also provide evidence that they were engaged in decorative embroidery.[37]

At the same time, women from the upper classes also turned to artistic professions, and in particular artistic embroidery, as is seen in local sources. Even if we set aside some

---

31 Fostikov 2021: 96, 106. Also, see above.

32 Filip de Diversis 1440: 110; Fostikov 2019: 165, 182, 191. See also note 21 above.

33 Dinić-Knežević 1982, passim; Fostikov 2004: 329–330.

34 Lambert 2002: 6 Fig. 1; Matschke 2002: 777; A. Fostikov 2004: 330 n. 24.

35 Ottoman sources and examples from the Ottoman period provide more information women's involvement in in silk-making. According to these, of the 300 silk-spinning machines in Bursa, 150 were owned by women. Katić 2009: 225. It is not known what the situation was in Prizren before it fell under Ottoman rule. However, given that Prizren was considered a center of silk production, women must have been involved in it. Fostikov 2019: 181–182.

36 Panopoulou 2019: 211.

37 Men also worked as embroiderers, see n. 31.

rather suspect information that Queen Helen taught the girls in her court handicrafts "befitting of the female sex," the nun Jefimija, the despot Uglješa's wife Kantakuzina (Katarina), and Ulrich II Celje's widow Mara were certainly well known for their embroidery skills.[38] With such embroidery, and especially embroidery that was so artistic, used expensive materials and required large amounts of time, they must have had some assistance, perhaps from their own court workshops. Additionally, handicrafts, and especially artistic crafts must have been nurtured in convents, as part of the economy to preserve certain crafts, at least for the needs of the sisterhood and royal and noble convents, and it is to be expected that there were women involved with manuscripts in their scriptoria.[39]

Last, when considering the work of women in terms of assisting men, apocryphal hagiographies suggest that women in medieval Serbia were involved in a number of tasks not only in workshops but most likely also at construction sites, which included various peripheral tasks such as carrying stones or mixing mud and pitch.[40]

Limiting women's rights and their work most certainly influenced changes in their activities within the public sphere.[41] Although there are no records of women present within professional organizations, their status in these most likely corresponded at least partially to those in the rest of medieval Europe. Furthermore, as these examples show, widows could invest in workshops and employ masters, and young women could be accepted into workshops to learn a trade. Finally, taking all of this into account, it must be inferred that women in medieval Serbia practiced various trades, and their role cannot be reduced to simply the traditional participation of women in producing fabrics. Further research into existing written sources and the potential discovery of new ones, along with studies of material findings and skeletal analyses, which has not been widely conducted, could contribute to new and more detailed considerations of women's work within professional craftsmanship.[42] In this regard, it is also important to conduct deeper interdisciplinary cooperation so that all possible sources are taken into account in future research.

---

38 Fostikov 2004: 329–330. It has recently been suggested that the information in The Life of Queen Helen by Archbishop Daniel II about the first school for girls, which also taught women's crafts at the court of Queen Helen is an interpolation from the life of the Russian empress Catherine II (Czarina Catherine II), who lived and ruled in the eighteenth century. Todić 2019.

39 For more about the court and monastery workshops, see: Fostikov 2021a.

40 *Apokrifi starozavetni*, 118, 127.

41 Women, including those in Dubrovnik, originally had more rights, even when it came to the division of inheritance. Women's positions changed in the thirteenth century. Vadunec 2009: 52. See also note 8 above.

42 Iin future analyses of burials all possible skeletal analyses should also be included. There is currently still no good explanation in the sources for the burials of women with tools or weapons in the Przeworsk culture, but the fact that these even included swords, would seem to indicate this was not just part of a ritual. For more on these burials and armament, see: Bochnak 2020.

REFERENCES:
Unpublished sources:
State Archive in Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik (abbreviated: DAD):
Debita Notariae (Debts and debit notes registered at the Public Notary) (abbreviated: Deb. Not.) Vol. 4 f. 4v
Debita Notariae (Debts and debit notes registered at the Public Notary) (abbreviated: Deb. Not.) Vol. 36 f. 18v

Published sources:
Apokrifi starozavetni. Prema srpskim prepisima, prir. i preveo T. Jovanović, Beograd: SKZ, 2005. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Filip de Diversis, *Opis slavnoga grada Dubrovnika*, 1440. Predgovor, transkripcija i prijevod s latinskoga Z. Janeković-Römer, Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2004.
Fontes Byzantini Historiam Populorum Jugoslaviae Spectantes. Tomus I, Serbocroatice interpretati et commentariis ornati ab F. Barisic, M. Rajkovic, B. Krekic, L. Tomic. Academia Scientiarum Serbica. Institutum Byzantinum. Lib. III. Beograd, 1955.
Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, 1405. Trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards, New York: Persea, 1982.
Pravda Ruskaja I–II, pod red. akad. B. D. Grekova, T. I, Teksti; T. II. Komentarii, Moskva-Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1940, 1947. (Russian Cyrillic)
Radojčić, N. *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana 1349 i 1354*, Beograd: Naučno delo, 1960. (Serbian Cyrillic)

References:
Archer, J. M. *Working women in thirteenth-century Paris*, The University of Arizona, 1995. (PhD Dissertation-Reproduction electronic). Available at: https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/187182 (13. 08. 2023).
Blehova Čelebić, L. *Žene srednjovjekovnog Kotora*, Podgorica: CID, 2002.
Bochnak, T. 'The Phenomenon of Burying Women with Weapons in Iron Age Poland: Tactical, social and funerary considerations.', *Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology*, 20, 2020, 1–13.
Bock, G. *Women in European History*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
Čerepnin, L. V. *Novgorodskie berestjanye gramoty kak istoričeskij istočnik*, Moskva: Nauka, 1969. (Russian Cyrillic)
Čvorović, Z. 'Krivičnopravna zaštita žene u ruskom srednjovekovnom pravu', *Crkvene studije*, 19, 2022, 405–433.
Dagron, G.'The Urban Economy, Seventh-Twelfth Centuries', in: A. E. Laiou (ed.), *The economic history of Byzantium: from the seventh through the fifteenth century*, II, Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002, 385–493.
Dale, M. K. 'The London Silkwomen of the Fifteenth Century', *Economic History Review*, Series 1, Part 4. 1932–4, 324–335.
Dinić-Knežević, D. *Položaj žena u Dubrovniku u XIII i XIV veku*, Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, 1974. (Serbian Cyrillic)
_____. *Tkanine u privredi srednjovjekovnog Dubrovnika*, Beograd: 1982. (Serbian Cyrilic)
Kovačević-Kojić, D. *Srednjovjekovna Srebrenica XIV-XV vijek*, Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 2010. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Epstein, S. A. *Wage Labor and Guilds in Medieval Europe*, Chapel Hill and London: The University

of North Carolina Press, 1991.
Filipović, M. 'Sirota kudeljnica: prilog objašnjenu čl. 64 Dušanova zakonika', *Zbornik Matice srpske za društvene nauke*, 5, 1953, 40–47. (Serbian Cyrilic)
Fostikov, A. 'Žena - između vrline i greha', in: S. Marjanović-Dušanić, D. Popović (eds.), *Privatni život u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka*, Beograd: Clio, 2004, 323–366. (Serbian Cyrillic)
_____. *Zanatstvo u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji*, Beograd: Istorijski insitut Beograd, Narodni muzej Požarevac, 2019.
_____. 'Organizacija zanatstva u urbanim centrima srednjovekovne Srbije', *Istorijski časopis*, 70, 2021, 91–115. (Serbian Cyrillic)
_____. 'Dvorski i manastirski kompleksi kao centri zanatstva u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji', *Etnoantropološki problem*, n. s. god. 16, sv. 4, 2021a, 1189–1206. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Karbić, M. '«Nije, naime, njezina duša drugačija nego kod muškarca» - položaj žene u gradskim naseljima međurječja Save i Drave u razvijenom i kasnom srednjem vijeku', in: A. Feldman (ed.), *Žene u Hrvatskoj. Ženska i kulturna povijest*, Zagreb: Institut Vlado Gotovac - Ženska infoteka, 2004, 57–76.
King, M. L. *Women of the Renaissance*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
Katić, T. '„Sirote kudeljnice" i baštinice: dva tipa hrišćanskih udovičkih domaćinstava u Osmanskom carstvu – na primeru Prizrenskog sandžaka u 16. veku', *Istorijski časopis*, 58, 2009, 209–229. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Kowaleski, M. Bennett, J. M. 'Crafts, Gilds, and Women in the Middle Ages: Fifty Years after Marian K. Dale', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 14, no. 2, 1989, 474–488.
Lambert, G. A. *The Taxonomy of Sweater Structures and Their Origins*, Raleigh 2002 (MS thesis, available at: http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/resolver/1840.16/174).
Majorossy, J. 'From the Judge's House to the Town's House Town Halls in Medieval Hungary', in: S. C. Pils, M. Scheutz, C. Sonnlechner, S. Spevak (eds.) *Rathäuser als multifunktionale Räume der Repräsentation, der Parteiungen und des Geheimnisses*, StudienVerlag Innsbruck: Wien: Bozen 2012, 2012, 155–210.
Malanikova, M. A. 'Female engagement in medieval urban economy: late-medieval Moravia in a comparative perspective', in: G. Jaritz, K. Szende (eds.), *Medieval East Central Europe in a Comparative Perspective: From Frontier Zones to Lands in Focus*, London and New York: Routledge, 2016, 185–201.
Matschke, K-P. 'Commerce, Trade, Markets, and Money, Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries', in: A. E. Laiou (ed.), *The economic history of Byzantium: from the seventh through the fifteenth century*, II, Washington, D. C: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002, 771–806.
Mihelič, D. 'Crafts and trades practised by women in urban settlements in the territory of Slovenia during the Middle and Early Modern Ages', *Annales. Series historia et sociologia*, letnik 12. številka 2, 2002, 307–320.
Mrgić, J. Fostikov, A. 'Ženski glasovi Bosanskog kraljevstva na primeru dve Jelene – Jelene (Grube) i Jelene Nelipčić', in: S. Mišić (ed.), *Srpska kraljevstva u Srednjem veku*, Beograd: Centar za istorijsku geografiju i istorijsku demografiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta; Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, Odsek za istoriju; Niš : Centar za vizantijsko-slovenske studije; Kraljevo: Grad Kraljevo, 2017 (Kraljevo : Pergament), 381–399. (Serbian Cyrilic)
Øye, I. 'When did weaving become a male profession?', *Danish Journal of Archaeology*, 5, 2016, 34–51.
Panopoulou, A. 'Working indoors and outdoors: female labour, artisanal activity and retail trade in Crete (14th–16th centuries), in: E. Kountoura Galaki, E. Mitsiou (eds.), *Women and Monasticism in the Medieval Eastern Mediterranean: Decoding a Cultural Map*, Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation: Institute of Historical Research: Section of Byzantine Research (International Symposium 23), 2019, 207–231.

Petrović, Đ. 'Dubrovačke arhivske vesti o društvenom položaju žena', *Istorijski časopis*, 32, 1985, 5–25.
Radini, A. Tromp, M. Beach, A. Tong, E. Speller, C. McCormick, M. Dudgeon, J. V. Collins, M. J. Rühli, F. Kröger, R. Warinner, C. 'Medieval women's early involvement in manuscript production suggested by lapis lazuli identification in dental calculus', *Science Advances*, Volume 5, Issue 1, Jan 2019, 1–8.
Raffensperger, C. *Reimagining Europe. Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
Roff, S. E. '"Appropriate to Her Sex"? Women's Participation on the Construction Site in Medieval and Early Modern Europe', in: T. Earenfight, (ed.), *Women and Wealth in Late Medieval Europe. The New Middle Ages*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2010, 109–134.
Rokai, M. 'Existence of collective women's experience viewed in the light of historiography referring to women in early modern Western and Eastern Europe', *Istraživanja*, 26, 2015, 190–201.
Serkina, V. N. 'O roli žencin u slavjan v period jazičestva', *Antropologičeskije isledovanija v Moldove 2004. Priloženije k žurnalu Stratum plus. Archaeology and Cultural Anthropology*, Vissaja antropologičeskaja škola 2005, 85–92. (Russian Cyrillic)
Stolić, A. 'Od politike ka novim naučnim disciplinama: ženska i rodna istorija. Koncepti o ženskoj emancipaciji krajem 19. i početkom 20. veka u srpskoj istoriografiji', in: B. Dimitrijević (ed.), *Humanizacija univerziteta: tematski zbornik. Tom 1*, Niš: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu, 2013, 376–387. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Todić, B. 'O školi za devojke na dvoru srpske kraljice Jelene', *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 85, 2019, 3–14. (Serbian Cyrillic)
Vadunec, I. 'Položaj žene u srednjem vijeku na hrvatskim prostorima', *Pro tempore*, 6-7, 2009, 48–73.

АЛЕКСАНДРА ФОСТИКОВ
Историјски институт Београд

ЗАНАТЛИЈКЕ У СРЕДЊОВЕКОВНОЈ СРБИЈИ. КОМПАРАТИВНИ ПРЕГЛЕД

Резиме

Активност жена у привреди, а на територији средњовековног европског простора, па и средњовековне Србије, дуго није била у жижи истраживања. Ипак са успоном развоја родне историје, и ова тема је отворена средином 20. века, да би крајем истог столећа већ забележен озбиљан помак у њеном проучавању. Мада се првобитно сматрало да жена сходно ранијим начелима нема улогу од значаја ван дома, те се њена улога своди на улогу домаћице, након постављања нових истраживачких питања, подаци из изворне грађе указали су заправо на сасвим супротне чињенице. Сходно познатим изворима тако се може закључити не само да су права и статус жене били далеко шири у раном средњем веку, већ и да су и у касном средњем веку жене и даље активно суделовале у привредним активностима, те да су се попут мушкараца бавиле и великим бројем занимања, међу којима и оним занатским. Тако се заправо жене на тлу средњовековног европског простора баве свим оним занатима којим и мушкарци, те је исправно рећи да занатлијке као и занатлије представљају важан чинилац у развоју заната. Такође, осим као занатлијке, радиле су и као помоћнице својих супруга у кућним радионицама, а чине и део инфраструктуре појединих заната, који захтевају прераду и обраду сирових материјала. Ипак, већински услед недостатка, али и не проучености извора њихов свакодневни рад остаје и даље делом сакривен од очију истраживача. Осим што се јављају у бројним занатским активностима као активни учесници и произвођачи, занатлијке су биле посредно или непосредно укључене у јавноправне организације. Коначно, жене представљају и значајан чинилац занатства не само као самосталне занатлијке, већ и у статуту су удовице, који им је омогућавао и већа права, а имале су улогу и преносу права на занат и радионицу путем брака. Судећи бар према оним ретким поменима, ситуација није била другачија ни на територији средњовековне Србије, где су жене сходно паралелама морале да чине део мајсторија, било као самосталне занатлијке, или као испомоћ у кућној радионици. Иако се у изворима у унутрашњости јавља директно само помен сироте кудељнице, у смислу исправно наведеног рода у женском полу, заправо је удео жена и у другим занатима морао да буде и већи, као и у самом занатству. У ком обиму су оне и заиста учествовале у производњи или пак грађевинским активностима, показаће даља истраживања како изворне грађе, тако и материјалних налаза.

Кључне речи: жене, занати, занатство, занатлијке, средњи век, Србија, Европа.

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 35, 69-81