

Series *Hrvatska povjesnica* – Special Editions – Conference Proceedings

Publisher

Hrvatski institut za povijest / Croatian Institute of History
10000 Zagreb, Opatička 10
Croatia
<http://www.isp.hr>

For the Publisher

Jasna Turkalj

Editors

Irena Benyovsky Latin
Zrinka Pešorda Vardić

Peer reviewers

Stanko Andrić
Damir Karbić

Translation

Marina Miladinov

Graphic design of the cover page

Sandra Begonja

Printed by

Intergrafika TTŽ d.o.o., Bistranska 19, Zagreb

Print run

300 copies

A CIP code for this book 894712 is available from the National and University Library in Zagreb.

ISBN 978-953-7840-30-3 (hardback)

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Illustration:

Detail from a perspective view of Dubrovnik before the earthquake of 1667 (19th c. copy).
Reproduced by courtesy of the Franciscan Monastery in Dubrovnik and Dubrovnik State Archive.

Co-financed by the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education, and Sports.

**TOWNS AND CITIES OF THE CROATIAN
MIDDLE AGES
Authority and Property**

Edited by

Irena Benyovsky Latin and Zrinka Pešorda Vardić

Hrvatski institut za povijest / Croatian Institute of History
Zagreb, 2014

elites, social topography, and medieval economy. He is currently writing his PhD dissertation on medieval and early modern urban elites in Gradec.

Trpimir Vedriš is an Assistant Professor at the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb. His research and teaching focus on the history of Christianity, hagiography, and the cult of the saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, most notably in South-Eastern Europe.

Ratko Vučetić is a senior research associate at the Institute of Art History, Zagreb. Currently participates in a project on the art topography of Croatia and its architectural heritage from the 16th-19th centuries at the same Institute. His research focuses on the historical and spatial development of Croatian architectural heritage in medieval Slavonian towns during the Middle Ages and the early modern period.

Table of Contents

<i>Irena Benyovsky Latin</i>	Introduction: Towns and Cities of the Croatian Middle Ages: Authority and Property	13
<i>Maurizio Levak</i>	Public and Private Space in Early Medieval Towns: Istrian Cases	35
<i>Dušan Mlacović</i>	The Relationship between Public and Private on the Island of Rab during the Second Half of the 14 th Century.....	55
<i>Franjo Smiljanić</i>	What is the Meaning of "Large" and "Small" in the Names of Municipal Estates in Zadar's Mainland Communal Territory?.....	67
<i>Darja Mihelič</i>	Space and Property in Medieval Towns in the Venetian Part of Istria: The Case of Piran.....	95
<i>Miha Kosi</i>	The Beginnings of Medieval Towns in the Slovenian Lands and Their Founders: Controversies and New Interpretations.....	115
<i>Hrvoje Kekez</i>	Fortified Towns of the Babonić Counts in Central and Lower Pounje as Non-Agrarian Settlements (13 th -14 th Centuries)	157
<i>Gordan Ravančić</i>	Urban Settlements (<i>oppida</i>) of Vinodol under the Rule of the Counts of Krk: Topographical Situation and Local Organization within the Feudal Manor	189
<i>Ivan Majnarić</i>	Nobility of the Croatian Kingdom between Zadar and Its Hinterland during the Late 14 th and Early 15 th Centuries.....	209

<i>Károly Goda</i>	Divided Spaces of Authority: Civic Power and Urban Property in Pre-Modern Western Pannonia.....237
<i>Ratko Vučetić</i>	The Role of Nobility in the Transformation of Towns in 15 th -Century Continental Croatia..... 261
<i>Zrinka Nikolić Jakus</i>	Privately Owned Towers in Dalmatian Towns during the High and Central Middle Ages 273
<i>Irena Benyovsky Latin</i>	Dubrovnik's Burgus of St Blasius in the 13 th Century295
<i>Zrinka Pešorda Vardić</i>	Property and Ownership in Dubrovnik's Confraternity of St Anthony in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Ages327
<i>Ana Plosnić Škarić</i>	Real Property of Wealthy Commoners: The Formation and Rise of Commoner Lineages in Trogir after 1420349
<i>Tonija Andrić</i>	Commoners' Ownership in Medieval Cities: Real-Estate Trading of Split's Craftsmen in the Mid-Fifteenth Century.....377
<i>Bruno Škreblin</i>	Urban Elites and Real Estate in Medieval Town: Owners of Palaces in Medieval Gradec (Zagreb)..... 399
<i>Marija Karbić</i>	Women and Property in Medieval Slavonian Towns439
<i>Ante Birin</i>	The Foreigner and Ownership Rights in Eastern Adriatic Medieval Communes..... 455
<i>Tomislav Popić</i>	Mechanisms of Immovable Property Transfer in a Medieval Town: The Case of Zadar469
<i>Nella Lonza</i>	Property under the Protection of the Authorities: Punishment of Thieves in Medieval Dubrovnik487
<i>Trpimir Vedriš</i>	<i>Memoria S. Chrysogoni</i> Between the Legend on the Transfer of Relics and Ownership over Monastic Land ...509

Introduction: Towns and Cities of the Croatian Middle Ages: Authority and Property

Irena Benyovsky Latin

The question of land property has always been an intriguing one for the European historians, especially medievalists, as practices concerning property are complex.¹ Medieval concepts such as (land) property, ownership, and lease do not correspond to our understanding or to the Roman period.² In the changed social and economic circumstances of Late Antiquity, ownership gradually lost its absolute meaning.³ The notion of land possession also changed radically throughout the Middle Ages.⁴ As Europe came to be inhabited by new populations, legal concepts

¹ See for example: *Les Formes dissociées de propriété immobilière dans les villes de France et d'Italie (XIIe-XIXe siècle): actes de la table ronde de Lyon (14-15 mai 1993)*, ed. Olivier Faron and Étienne Hubert (Roma: École française de Rome, 1995). *D'une ville à l'autre : structures matérielles et organisation de l'espace dans les villes européennes (XIIIe-XVIe siècle): Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française de Rome avec le concours de l'Université de Rome*, ed. Jean-Claude Maire Vigueur (Roma: École française de Rome, 1986).

² In Roman law, there was an absolute and indivisible right of use and disposal, a maximum and exclusive set of rights in the property that belonged to the owner. Vertical division of ownership was excluded. Cf. Paolo Grossi, *A History of European Law* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 15; cf. Emanuele Conte, "Droit médiéval. Un débat historiographique italien," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57/6 (2002), 1593-1613; Thomas Rübner, "The Roman Concept of Ownership and the Medieval Doctrine of *Dominium Utile*," in: *The Creation of the *Ius Commune*. From *Casus* to *Regula**, eds. John W. Cairns and Paul J. du Plessis (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 127-142, 129; Lujo Margetić, *Srednjovjekovno hrvatsko pravo. Stvarna prava* [Medieval Croatian law: Law of real property] (Zagreb, Rijeka, and Čakovec: Pravni fakultet Zagreb / Pravni fakultet u Rijeci, 1983), 74-75 and 163165; idem, *Antika i srednji vijek. Studije* [Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Studies] (Rijeka: HAZU, 1995), 5, 9-10, 151, 169, 177, and 195; Antun Cvitanić, "Splitsko srednjovjekovno pravo" [Split's medieval law], in *Statut Grada Splita*, ed. Antun Cvitanić (Split: Književni krug, 1998).

³ Derek Keene, "The Property Market in English Towns, A.D. 1100-1600," in *D'une ville à l'autre: structures matérielles et organisation de l'espace dans les villes européennes*, ed. J.-C. Maire Vigueur (Roma: École française de Rome, 1989), 201-226, especially 210; James A. Brundage, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession: Canonists, Civilians, and Courts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 50.

⁴ In the legislative compilation of Justinian, the position of the possessor of a land plot was already vague (concerning the rights after long-term usage of land); cf. Manlio Bellomo, *The Common Legal Past of Europe, 1000-1800* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1995), 151; and the Church was also active in the legal processes protecting property rights, cf. Paul Fouracre, "Space, Culture and Kingdoms in Early Medieval Europe," in *The Medieval World*, ed. Peter Linehan and Janet L. Nelson (London: Routledge, 2001), 366-380.

Privately Owned Towers in Dalmatian Towns during the High and Central Middle Ages

Zrinka Nikolić Jakus

During the high and central Middle Ages, in most although not all Mediterranean towns one of the most prominent expressions of power for urban nobility was to own a fortified residence or refuge where their families could find shelter in times of danger. Mighty private towers, which dominated the townscapes of northern and central Italy and, as it seems, also of southern France and central/southern Germany, were the visual means of self-assertion for the prominent families within their urban societies and spaces, while in historical studies their role has been particularly popularized by the work of Jacques Heers on urban noble family kindreds. These private towers often protected large building complexes that belonged to individual noble kindreds, which also gave them their names (e.g. the still extant *Torri dei Salvucci* in San Gimignano, a small Tuscan town particularly famous for its tall private towers). Examples of contracts related to the construction of private towers found in Heers indicate their joint ownership: individual family units possessed specific parts of the towers, inherited along the male line.¹ Private towers could also be erected and owned by the so-called *società delle torri*, associations that were based on common interest rather than kinship, as observed by the critics of Heers' work. Judging from the Florentine contracts related to the establishment of such associations, this partaking in tower ownership was inherited along the male line and towers could not be owned by women; moreover, particular attention was paid to prevent the towers from falling into the hands of an enemy by means of marriage ties.² In Croatian historiography, the first scholar who has analyzed private towers more extensively,

¹ Jacques Heers, *Family Clans in the Middle Ages: A Study of Political and Social Structures in Urban Areas*, trans. Barry Herbert (Amsterdam, New York, and Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977), on towers: 174-205 (original title: *Le clan familial au Moyen Age* [Paris: P.U.F., 1974]; David Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1985), 89. See also articles in: *Paesaggi urbani dell' Italia padana nei secoli VIII-XIV*, ed. Gigliola Soldi Rondinini (Bologna: Cappelli editore, 1988), which contain critiques of Heers' work.

² Carol Lansing, *The Florentine Magnates. Lineage and Faction in a Medieval Commune* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), 84-97, esp. 89-91.

referring to Heers' book, was Mladen Ančić in his article (1997) on nobleman Ciprijan Zaninov from *de Ciprianis* kindred, where he mentioned the "kindred's tower" within the building complex that the kindred possessed in the south-eastern corner of Diocletian's Palace.³ Back in 1952, Cvito Fisković had already related the Dalmatian towers within various complexes of residential architecture to the emergence of Mediterranean, particularly Italian private towers.⁴ More recently, this topic has been treated by scholars dealing with the social topography of Trogir, specifically by Irena Benyovsky (Latin) and Ana Plosnić (Škarić).⁵ Thus, private towers are mentioned in medieval Dalmatia, especially in sources related to Split and Trogir in the 13th and 14th centuries. In this study, my aim is to explore whether their function corresponded to that of Italian private towers from the same period.

The earliest stories on the use of towers for private purposes date from the early Middle Ages and are found in the most prominent medieval chronicler in the Croatian lands: Thomas the Archdeacon (1200/1201-1268).⁶ He explains that the refugees of Salona, having decided to colonize the former imperial palace, "came to an agreement that the wealthier would erect houses for themselves at their own expense, while the others whose means were not sufficient to build houses would use the surrounding towers (*turres circumpositas*) as their dwellings; as for the rest of the common people, they would live in the vaults and underground passages."⁷ This would mean that the towers were inhabited by the "middle class" and yet, apparently it was not so, since

³ Mladen Ančić, "Ser Ciprijan Zaninov. Rod i karijera jednog splitskog patricija druge polovice XIV. st." [Ser Ciprijan Zaninov: The kindred and career of a patrician from Split in the second half of the 14th century], *Radovi Zavoda povijesnih znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 39 (1997), 37-80, esp. 43-48.

⁴ Cvito Fisković, "Romaničke kuće u Splitu i Trogiru" [Romanesque houses in Split and Trogir], *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/2 (1952), 154-155.

⁵ Mladen Andreis, Irena Benyovsky, and Ana Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" [Social topography of Trogir in the 13th century], *Povijesni prilozi* 25 (2003), 37-92, esp. 44 and 54-57; Mladen Andreis, Irena Benyovsky Latin, and Ana Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" [Social topography of Trogir in the 14th century], *Povijesni prilozi* 33 (2007), 103-192, esp. 115-116, 122, and 124-126; Irena Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir. Prostor i društvo* [Medieval Trogir: Space and society] (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2007); Ana Plosnić Škarić, "Blok Andreis u Trogiru. Prilog poznavanju romaničke stambene arhitekture" [The Andreis block in Trogir: New Insights on Romanesque residential architecture], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 31 (2007), 9-28; Ana Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura grada Trogira" [Gothic residential architecture of Trogir], PhD dissertation (University of Zagreb, 2010).

⁶ *Thomas archidiaconi Spalatensis Historia Salonitanorum atque Spalatinorum Pontificum / Archdeacon Thomas of Split: History of the Bishops of Salona and Split*; Latin text by Olga Perić; edited, translated and annotated by Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol, and James Ross Sweeney (Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2006), 50-51 (hereafter: Thomas the Archdeacon). References are to both Latin and English pages.

⁷ Thomas the Archdeacon, 54-55.

according to Thomas even Severus the Great, leader of the refugees, who may be considered with some certainty as a member of the elite, chose for himself a house with a corner tower and a palace, which he then gave to the first archbishop of Split, John of Ravenna. The tower was situated in the south-eastern corner of the palace.⁸ It may be speculated whether the control of individual towers within the city walls contributed to one's social standing, but the only source for this early period, namely Thomas the Archdeacon, says nothing about that. Otherwise, this early colonization and the control of ancient ruins suitable for fortification by the urban elite was not unusual and can be found in some other Mediterranean settings, such as southern France, some Italian cities (such as Rome or Florence), and other places. Besides the defence function, one should not underestimate the prestige that such localities bestowed upon their owner, which may have been significant and even crucial in some areas, since the small distance between the towers actually made it impossible for their owners to fight each other efficiently.⁹ The fact that even much later some noblemen of Split still treated the city walls as their private property is visible from the fact that the Venetian authorities had great problems with the local nobility in the late 15th century.¹⁰

Other mentions of private towers in Split likewise relate them to the walls of Diocletian's Palace, even at the time when the city had already started spreading gradually beyond its ancient boundaries.¹¹ On the occasion of its foundation in 1068, the nunnery of St Benedict obtained the lower (ground?) level with the wine cellar of St Peter's Tower, in the north-western part of Diocletian's Palace. The tower got its name after the church dedicated to the same saint, which was apparently also located within the tower or next to it, since the heirs of the church's founder had to give their consent.¹² In 1119, a nun from St Benedict's bought one third of the tower

⁸ *Tum prenomiatus Seuerus domicilium suum, quod in Spalato sortitus fuerat, quando de insulis redierunt, donavit ecclesie cum turri angulari et palatio episcopium ibi fieri statuens....* Ibidem.

⁹ Aldo A. Settia, "Lo sviluppo di un modello: origine e funzioni delle torri private urbane nell'Italia centrosettentrionale," in *Paesaggi urbani dell'Italia padana nei secoli VIII-XIV* (as in n.1), 155-171; Heers, *Family Clans* (as in n. 1), 174-178.

¹⁰ In 1482, *ser* Antonije de Albertis took stones off the wall on the southern side of the palace adjacent to his house and sold them to his neighbour, *ser* Toma de Chranco (Hranković). That same year, *ser* Nikola de Maricich (Cindro) and widow Katarina Nuzarelli were accused of meddling with the city walls. Cf. Frane Bulić and Ljubo Karaman, *Palača cara Dioklecijana* [Diocletian's imperial palace] (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1927), 258-263. For a similar example in Dubrovnik, see below.

¹¹ See Grga Novak, *Povijest Splita* [History of Split], vol. 1: *Od prethistorijskih vremena do definitivnog gubitka pune autonomije 1420. god.* [From the prehistoric times to the final loss of full autonomy in 1420] (Split: Matica hrvatska, 1957), 498.

¹² *...inferiorem pavementum cum canaua turris sancti Petri omnibus eiusdem ecclesie hereditariis consentientibus concessimus.* Cf. *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae* /

that used to belong to a man called Grimaldo “from the foundations to the gable.” The sellers were brothers Prvonja and Črneha, Treskalo’s grandsons or nephews (*nepotes*). It is stated that this act was meant to prevent anyone from opening the window above the monastery and peep in, which shows that the tower was located at the northern wall of the Palace, same as the nunnery of St Benedict, later known under the patrocinium of St Arnir (Rainerius).¹³ Among the parchment documents of the nunnery, there is one dated to 1040 that mentions parts of the tower being purchased by Nicifor, prior of Split, otherwise unknown from any other documents.¹⁴ Having analyzed this source, Mirjana Matijević Sokol concluded that it was a forgery produced at the monastery of St Benedict, probably by Dobre, son of Ditus, deacon of Split, who was active at the turn of the 12th century. The aim of the forgery was to reassert the monastery’s ownership over the previously acquired goods.¹⁵ It is possible that all the three documents (the forgery dated to 1040, the foundation charter from 1068, and the purchase contract from 1119) refer to the same tower, parts of which the monastery acquired gradually, but it is also possible that they speak of two different towers – one located at the corner and another in the space between the north-western corner tower and the “Golden Gate”.

The cartulary of the Split chapter from the first half of the 13th century mentions a tower owned in the late 12th century by Talmacije and Proda – they were married and each owned a half – who eventually donated it to the chapter. The tower was linked to the New Gate and situated at the eastern section of the walls of Diocletian’s Palace.¹⁶

Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije (hereafter: CD), vol. 1, eds. Jakov Stipišić and Miljen Šamšalović (Zagreb: JAZU, 1967), doc. 80, p. 111.

¹³ ... *emi terciam partem de turre, que aliquando fuit Grimaldi, a nepotibus Trescale, scilicet Piruana et a fratre Cirnecha, pro viginti octo solidos romanatos et IIIlor modia frumenti (pro) benedictione a fundamento usque ad culmen*. CD 2, ed. Tadija Smičiklas (Zagreb: JAZU, 1904), doc. 28, pp. 30-31. At the same time, they purchased one fifth of the courtyard (*curtis*) next to the tower, while the rest they had purchased before. It seems that this was the tower referred to in 1268 as the monastery tower in a lawsuit involving the monastery itself and Prva, widow of Leonardo Cavalsolo, where it was stated that the nuns had to close and wall up the vault and the “bugna” (cellar?) of the monastery tower: *murari et claudi fecerat uoltam turre ipsius monasterii et etiam bugne ibidem*. CD 5, ed. Tadija Smičiklas (Zagreb: JAZU, 1907), doc. 936, pp. 470-471. See also: Ančić, “Ser Ciprijan Zaninov” (as in n. 3), 46.

¹⁴ CD 1, doc. 55, pp. 73-74.

¹⁵ Mirjana Matijević Sokol, “Neka pitanja o splitskom đakonu Dobri (kraj XI.-početak XII. stoljeća)” [Questions regarding Dobre, deacon of Split (late 11th - early 12th century)], in: *Spomenica Ljube Bobana: 1933-1994* (Zagreb: Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 1996), 61-71, esp. 69-71.

¹⁶ *Talmacius cum uxore sua Prodda dedit ecclesiam Sancti Leonardi que sita est ad Portam Novam simul cum istis terris: In primis domum, que est iuxta ipsam ecclesiam, medietatem turre que est super eam... Ex*

The couple belonged to the Split elite at the time, as Talmacije is mentioned as a lawyer or župan of the famous monastery of St Peter of Gumay near Split.¹⁷

The role of towers as refuges and strongholds in case of internal strives among the urban elites is indicated by the description of a blood feud from the 1230s, which was personally witnessed by Thomas the Archdeacon and mentioned in his chronicle.¹⁸ This particular conflict involved two groups related by kinship – according to Thomas, one consisted of the sons of Dujam son of Draža (*Duimus Drasce*) and the other of the sons of Vital and Galon. The relationship between the latter is not quite clear, but they were most probably blood relatives. These family groups are difficult to identify in the sources as family names were not used at the time, but what one can discover about them and their kindreds is that they were important persons holding public offices and participating in the city’s affairs. Vital may be identical to Vito, son of Mrđa,¹⁹ while Dujam’s family may be linked to the kindred of “Bulpicella”, since Vital’s descendants were likewise involved in a blood feud against it.²⁰ A man called Ivan Cigaida also appears as a relative and ally of Dujam’s sons, and later as a promi-

parte vero uxoris sue est predicta media turris. Ivan Ostojić, *Metropolitanski kaptol u Splitu* [Metropolitan chapter in Split] (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1975), 41-42. On the position of the New Gate, where a tower was mentioned later on, see Novak, *Povijest Splita* (as in n. 11), 498 and 506-507.

¹⁷ CD 2, doc. 141, pp. 143-144; doc. 204, p. 217.

¹⁸ Toma, 184-189 and 194-195. In the context of the role of towers in medieval Split, this conflict is also mentioned by Mladen Ančić, “Ser Ciprijan Zaninov” (as in n. 3), 45-46.

¹⁹ *Vido figliolo di Murga or Vita Murgia*: 1193, CD 2, doc. 248, 249, pp. 263-64. That is also the opinion of Mario-Nepo Kuzmanić, who named this family “Vitalis” in his genealogical study on the noble families of Split (for reasons of easier identification) and attributed the place name Vitaljina in the field of Solin to them: Kuzmanić, *Splitski plemići, prezime i etnos* [The noblemen of Split, their family names and ethnos] (Split: Književni krug, 1998), 98. Vital’s son Ivan, who survived the conflict, was later appointed a judge on several occasions: 1245, 1248, 1254, 1255, 1266, CD 4, ed. Tadija Smičiklas (Zagreb: JAZU, 1906), doc. 236, p. 271; doc. 331, pp. 373-374; doc. 348, pp. 394-395; doc. 498, p. 571; doc. 506, pp. 587-588; doc. 507, p. 588; 1265, 1266, CD 5, doc. 833, p. 343; doc. 875, p. 399. Vito had a brother called Mager, who appears in the sources from 1187 (CD 2, doc. 204, p. 217) until 1207 (CD 3, ed. Tadija Smičiklas [Zagreb: JAZU, 1905], doc. 60, pp. 67-68). His son Stojko is mentioned in 1245 as deceased and apparently died childless (CD *Supplementa* 1, eds. Josip Barbarić, Jasna Marković, et al. [Zagreb: HAZU i Hrvatski državni arhiv, 1998], doc. 88, pp. 126-127), which may explain why neither he nor his descendants are mentioned as participants of the blood feud. Galona was elected a judge by Santius Gumay along with Ivan son of Marko and Drago son of Pinsa in his conflict with the archbishops around the salt plants of Solin in 1203: CD 3, doc. 30, p. 34, transcript in a document from 1247. Dessa, son of Galona was probably his ancestor: 1145-1153, CD 2, doc. 59, p. 60. The whole kindred seems to have been related with the Gumays, descendants of Petar Crni from the 11th century, since they are mentioned several times as associated to them and their foundation of St Peter of Gumay.

²⁰ Chapter Archive in Split, *Ostavština Ivana Lučića Lucija* [Legacy of Ivan Lučić Lucius], vol. 539, fol. 217-217’ / transcript in the Archive of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts (hereafter: HAZU), vol. 12, pp. 28-32.

ment citizen and politician of Split.²¹

During the conflict, the party of Vital's sons, "acting on the counsel of their friends and relatives," occupied the tower above the northern entrance to the city. That would be the tower at the "Golden Gate", the northern entrance to Diocletian's Palace which had from the early Middle Ages housed a small church of St Martin. The opposing party, that of Dujam's sons and their allies, took shelter in Kalenda's Tower, which must have been located at the south-western side of the fortifications (perhaps even not the ancient walls of Diocletian's Palace, but rather the protective walls of the suburbium, which was a drystone wall at the time), since they were able to see the provoking gestures of their enemies, who had left the tower and settled down near the monastery of St Stephen (Sustipan) to the southwest of the city.²² It may be presumed that Kalenda's Tower belonged to a man called Gaudije Kalenda, who is mentioned as deceased in 1224, or to one of his descendants. Kalenda's descendants are mentioned as late as the 14th century among the elites of Split.²³ It cannot be ascertained whether Dujam's sons were related to Kalenda or the Kalendas in the 13th century, but it may be presumed on the basis of their use of the tower. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Thomas' report does not allow us to argue with certainty that both parties had necessarily owned towers before the conflict.

It seems that in the 14th century, in the vicinity of Kalenda's Tower in the south-western part of the city, in the direction of the monastery of St Stephen, in the area called *Columna* (Stupi, Stupovlje), there was also a tower owned by the Petracha (Petraka, Petrača) family and a tower belonging to a man called Ciprijan, son of Božana.²⁴ As for Petraka's tower, Grga Novak is of the opinion that it was located

²¹ His nickname appears in various forms, such as *Johannes Cegaida*, *Johannes Čigaida*, *Johannes Cichaide*, *Johannis Cicheyde*, and *Johannes Cicayda*. He was a judge in 1250, 1252, and 1255: CD 4, doc. 372, pp. 428-429; doc. 444, p. 510; CD *Supplementa* 1, doc. 155, pp. 199-200; 1257: CD 5, doc. 579, pp. 56-57.

²² Thomas the Archdeacon, 184-187.

²³ CD 3, doc. 209, pp. 234-235. His descendant of the same name, probably a grandson, is mentioned in 1282: CD 6, ed. Tadija Smičiklas (Zagreb: JAZU, 1908), doc. 349, p. 411. *Matheus Kalende* and his sons Nikola and Dujam lived in Split in the 14th century: 1342, *Splitski spomenici, dio prvi, Splitski bilježnički spisi* [Monuments of Split, part 1: Notarial documents of Split], vol. 1, *Spisi splitskog bilježnika Ivana pok. Čove iz Ankone od 1341. do 1344.* [Documents of the Split notary Ivan, son of the late Čove from Ancona, 1341-1344], eds. Jakov Stipišić and Ante Nazor, *Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium* (hereafter: MSHSM), vol. 53 (Zagreb: HAZU, 2002) (hereafter: SS 1), doc. 182, pp. 103-104; doc. 284, p. 164; 1344, SS 1, doc. 531, p. 319. Mario-Nepo Kuzmanić has identified them with the Bubanić family: *Splitski plemići* (as in n. 19), 102-103.

²⁴ ... in *Colompna prope turrim heredum Petri Petrache prope domum Camurtii Iohannis prope palacium monasterii sancti Stephani*: 1342, SS 1, doc. 215, p. 123; in *Colomna in contrata pellipaliorum... Item*

between the south-western tower of Diocletian's Palace and the western entrance to the palace (the "Iron Gate"), that is, at the beginning of the line of new walls, which at the turn of the 14th century also included the suburbium (*murus burghi*).²⁵ The index of Split's notaries indicates for the locality of Colom(pnia) that it may have referred to Stupi in Lažani. However, as a district of tanners is mentioned in the same place, it must have been located within the city or at its edge, where tanners usually settled because of the nature of their profession.²⁶

The tower of rich nobleman and entrepreneur Ciprijan de Ciprianis, dated to the second half of the 14th century, was located to the north of the archiepiscopal complex – formerly the palace of Severus the Great. That tower was later handed over to King Ladislav of Naples and restructured into the so-called Hrvoje's Fort (named after the Bosnian nobleman Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, deputy of King Ladislav and the count of Split), and Grga Novak has concluded that it was located between the south-eastern corner tower of Diocletian's Palace and the eastern entrance to the palace (the "Silver Gate").²⁷ Mladen Ančić is of the opinion that this construction, which apparently he does not consider as a part of the palace's wall, can be recognized in a miniature found in fol. 47 of Count Hrvoje's *Mass Book* from the early 15th century, which according to Tomislav Marasović depicts a part of the eastern wall of Diocletian's Palace, between the rectangular and octagonal towers of the eastern "Silver Gate". However, even Marasović could not identify any other building (beside the cathedral belfry) in the three miniatures supposedly representing various vistas of Split, but stated that the rest of them are represented symbolically, as sights within the townscape.²⁸ Besides, the only high building in that miniature showing the city walls,

vnam paratineam prope domum Camurtii Iohannis et prope turrim Cipriani Bosane: 1342, SS 1, doc. 226, p. 130. The tower owned by the heirs of Petar, son of Petrača, is also mentioned in 1344: *in turri heredum Petri Petrache*, SS 1, doc. 488, p. 193. It is interesting to note that this document also mentions a son of Ivan Črnac, whose widow likewise owned a tower: SS 1, doc. 204, pp. 116-117. This may indicate that these two towers stood close nearby.

²⁵ *Povijest Splita* (as in n. 11), 488 and 504.

²⁶ *in Colomna in contrata pellipaliorum... Item vnam paratineam prope domum Camurtii Iohannis et prope turrim Cipriani Bosane*: SS 1, doc. 226, p. 130.

²⁷ ... *curia ipsius archiepiscopatus ... ubique habens pro metis ex parte orientis et austri murum ipsius palatii archiepiscopalis, qui est etiam pro muro ipsi civitati, incipiendo ex parte aquilonari a turre siue domo Cipriani Zanini*: 1397, CD 18, ed. Duje Rendić-Miočević et al. (Zagreb: JAZU, 1990), doc. 170, pp. 252-253; Ivan Lučić Lucius, *Povijesna svjedočanstva o Trogiru* [Historical testimonies on Trogir] (hereafter: *Povijesna svjedočanstva*), vol. 2 (Split: Čakavski sabor, 1979), 832-834; Novak, *Povijest Splita* (as in n. 11), 491 and 498; Ančić, "Ser Ciprijan Zaninov" (as in n. 3): 43 and 47-48.

²⁸ Ančić, "Ser Ciprijan Zaninov" (as in n. 3), 43 and 47-48; Tomislav Marasović, "Najstarije vedute srednjovjekovnog Splita" [The oldest vistas of medieval Split], *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, ser. III, 16

apart from the belfry of St Duimus, can hardly be said to depict a tower. In any case, it is not comparable to the depictions of city towers in the images and maps of Italian cities from the same period.

It may therefore be observed that all the abovementioned towers of Split were either connected to the city walls or at least mentioned in the same areas in which those were located. Even some other towers can presumably be related to the city walls, although they were situated next to certain buildings outside of the walls.²⁹ Others, again, cannot be located with certainty, such as the tower owned by Lady Dobra, daughter of the late Lukar (the Lukarić kindred), the tower of Dešica, widow of Ivan Črnac, or that of Ivan Dobralj.³⁰ For the latter two towers, Grga Novak has noted that they were also towers of Diocletian's Palace,³¹ although their description does not clearly define their location. The only Romanesque "tower house" (*casa turrita*) – a sort of tower with a residential building – that is still visible today is located next to the "Iron Gate", the western exit of Diocletian's Palace, but it was not part of the fortifications. Cvito Fisković has dated it to the 13th century, observing that it shows no fortification elements, since the city had already spread towards the west by that time and there were houses further outside than the tower.³² In other words, it was no longer at the edge of the city and it may thus be concluded that its purpose was representative rather than defensive.³³

In case of the private towers of Trogir, historian Ivan Lučić Lucius argued that, after the city was devastated in the 12th century, the municipal authorities had to allow wealthy citizens who financed the restoration of towers to keep them as their proper-

(1987), 187-194, esp. 190 and Plate II.

²⁹ ... *domum suam positam extra ciuitatem prope turrim Guche*: 1343, SS 1, doc. 423, p. 254; *positam in Spaletto iuxta domum monialium sancte Marie et iuxta turrim condam Stephani*: 1289, *Spisi zadarskih bilježnika Henrika i Creste Tarallo 1279.-1308*. [Documents of Zadar's notaries Henrik and Cresta Tarallo, 1279-1308], vol. 1, ed. Mirko Zjačić (Zadar: Državni arhiv u Zadru, 1959), doc. 75, p. 135.

³⁰ *Domina Dobra, filia condam domini Luchari... Actum Spalleti (!) in turri habitationis ipsius domine Dobre...*: 1341, SS 1, doc. 44, p. 27; *Dessiça, relicta et uxor condam Iohannis Černec ... in turri ipsius venditricis*: 1342, SS 1, doc. 204, pp. 116-117; ... *tradidit atque dedit Johanni Doblali de Spaletto locum suum positum in ciuitate Spaleti iuxta turrim dicti emptoris*: 1272, *Monumenta traguriensia, pars prima, notae seu abbreviaturae cancellariae comunis Tragurii / Trogirski spomenici, dio I. Zapisci pisarne općine trogirске*, vol. 1: from October 21, 1263 until May 22, 1273, ed. Miho Barada, MSHSM, vol. 44 (hereafter: MT 1/1), 5, doc. 133, p. 343. Cvito Fisković mentions it as the *turris* of Ivan Doblal: "Romaničke kuće u Splitu i Trogiru" (as in n. 4), 154.

³¹ Novak, *Povijest Splita* (as in n. 11), 498.

³² Cvito Fisković, "Izgled splitskog Narodnog trga u prošlosti" [Appearance of the People's Square in Split in the past], *Peristil* 1 (1954), 98; idem, "Romaničke kuće u Splitu i Trogiru" (as in n. 4), 155.

³³ *Case-torri*, which the Italian sources differentiate clearly from towers, are also mentioned in Heers, *Family clans* (as in n. 1), 200.

ty.³⁴ One certainly cannot exclude the possibility that Trogir's elite, same as their Split counterparts, had been using the city walls for private purposes before that. It may serve to explain the private ownership of the church of St Duimus near the southern city gate, which was donated in the 11th century by a group of citizens for the foundation of a Benedictine monastery. It is next to that church, situated west of the city gate, that the remnants of a medieval wall have been uncovered.³⁵ The 13th century was very intense regarding the building activity in Trogir, particularly in the area between the ancient (and early medieval) and the later medieval "circular parameter," that is, the fortifications from the late 12th and early 13th century,³⁶ in which building activity the urban elites participated most actively. From the second half of the 13th century onwards, the historical sources make it possible to identify the private towers of Trogir's nobility more easily, which have been analyzed by Irena Benyovsky Latin and Ana Plosnić Škarić with the help of genealogist Mladen Andreis. Their analyses have shown that the property of some of the oldest and most powerful families can be found along the city walls.³⁷ Thus, towers belonging to the few oldest noble kindreds of Trogir, who had belonged to the city's elite as early as in the times of building the medieval wall in the late 12th century, were located along the southern city walls.

³⁴ *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 1, 115-116 and 356; *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 2, 983-991. The line of the early medieval wall can be followed in small part only, but it seems that it was largely identical with that of the late antique walls: Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 13. Next to the northern city gate, there was a church of St Leo, built by a citizen of Trogir and perhaps a prior, Vital: *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 2, 1039-1041; CD 2, doc. 20, p. 23; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 216.

³⁵ CD 1, doc. 70, pp. 98-99; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 16.

³⁶ Tomislav Marasović, "Stambena kuća u Trogiru Radovanova doba" [A residential house in Trogir during Radovan's times], in: *Per Radouanum. Majstor Radovan i njegovo doba* (Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira, 1994), 197. In the second half of the 14th century, new fortifications were built, more to the south than those from the late 12th and early 13th centuries: Plosnić Škarić, "Blok Andreis u Trogiru" (as in n. 5), 10; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 71-74; Irena Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija u Trogiru od 13. do 15. stoljeća" [Construction of city fortifications in Trogir from the 13th to the 15th century], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 28 (2010), 17-48.

³⁷ Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 44 and 55-56; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 115-116 and 124-126; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 132-168, esp. 148-150, 150-155, 161, and 165; Plosnić Škarić, "Gotočka stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 168-172; Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija" (as in n. 36); they use the results of the genealogical analysis of Trogir's noble kindreds performed by Mladen Andreis: *Trogirsko plemstvo do kraja prve austrijske uprave u Dalmaciji (1805.)* [Trogir's nobility from the end of the first Austrian administration in Dalmatia (1805)] (Trogir: Muzej grada Trogira, 2006). Andreis has also given nicknames, marked by quotation marks, to those kindreds and families who died before adopting family names, and these names are also used in the present study.

Next to the monastery of St Nicholas, there was a house with a courtyard and a tower, owned by the Lucio (Lučić) kindred, nowadays known as the Vitturi tower and situated within the eastern wing of the monastery.³⁸ Along the southern city walls, there was another house with the tower belonging to the Vitturi kindred, which is today preserved only partially, as a part of the rear wall, but can be tracked in the written sources from the second half of the 13th century onwards as it was changing owners over several generations. In the late 15th century, it was in the hands of the Lucio kindred and is therefore known today as the Lučić Tower (just like the former tower of that family is named after its later owners, the Vitturi kindred).³⁹ In the second half of the 14th century, another tower is mentioned within the residential complex of Stjepan Cega (d. 1384), bishop of Hvar and Brač, likewise near the southern city walls (on the outside). However, the tower is far older and belonged to the Cegas, one of the oldest and most numerous kindreds in Trogir, who owned many houses near the southern city walls. In the rear, it leaned against the early medieval wall and

³⁸ ... in domum cum curte et in turre... que domus et turris hiis finibus circumdantur: videlicet primo fine domo Dese Duymi; II fine muro ciuitatis, III fine domibus monialium monasterii sancti Nicolai, IIII vero fine domo Bonne de N...Dese matris Marinci de Picha et viam publicam, 1279, Monumenta traguriensia, pars prima, notae seu abbreviaturae cancellariae comunis Tragurii / Trogirski spomenici, dio I. Zapisci pisarne općine trogirske [Documents of the notary of the Commune of Trogir], vol. 2 (from January 31, 1274 until April 1, 1294), ed. Miho Barada, MSHSM, vol. 45 (hereafter: MT 1/2), 4, doc. 76, p. 207; una turris cum coquina et cum suis pertinentiis posita iuxta portam ciuitatis Traguriensis et iuxta palatium domini Domaldi Zadulini. Ostavština Ivana Lučića Lucija, vol. 539, fol. 347 / vol. 13, p. 7; Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 44 and 54; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 137-139; Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 68-69; Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija" (as in n. 36), 23.

³⁹ It is mentioned about this tower that it belonged to the founder of the Držimir kindred from Vrsar and was then inherited by his son Salingvera: ... a primo domus dicte emptricis [Margareta Vodovar], a secundo murus comunis Traguriensis, a III turris et domus condam domini Drigimeri Ursari: 1271, MT 1/1, 4, doc. 117, p. 192; also: MT 1/1, 4, doc. 118, p. 193; doc. 122, p. 194; actum in turri Salinverre, presentibus ... Matheo Salinverra (!): 1279, MT 1/2, 4, doc. 12, p. 183. The tower was later owned by Salingvera's son Grgur, who apparently came into conflict around it with the widow of his uncle Totila (from Držimir's first marriage): Ivan Lučić Lucius, *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 1, 353-356; *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 2, 987-988 and 1077; and afterwards by his children Salingvera and Desača, the latter mentioning it in her testament: ... unius sue turris posite in Tragurio iuxta Matheum Querchi et murum communis: 1371, Marija Karbić and Zoran Ladić, "Oporuke stanovnika grada Trogira u Arhivu HAZU" [Testaments of the residents of Trogir in the Archive of HAZU], *Radovi Zavoda HAZU u Zadru* 43 (2001) (hereafter: "Oporuke"), 177, no. 9; Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 44, 55-56, and 202-203; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 125 and 181-182; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 150-153; Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija" (as in n. 36), 24. Ana Plosnić Škarić has written in great detail about the transfer of ownership rights over the tower, quoting excerpts from 15th-century archival sources. On the basis of data drawn from Ivan Lučić Lucius, she has also suggested that there may have been two towers: "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 118-119, n. 400, p. 171, doc. 43, pp. 280-281.

was then incorporated into the new walls during the 14th century. In the early 1300s, it was owned by Nikola, son of Stjepan Cega, a relative of the bishop, and when his widow remarried, it came into the possession of Dragolin from the noble kindred of Domišić. Eventually, in the mid-15th century it became property of the commune and since then it has been known as St Nicholas' Tower.⁴⁰ Along the eastern city wall, there was a tower belonging to the "Ursus" family, later to become property of the "Hvalimir" family.⁴¹ In the late 15th century, it is described as derelict, and Plosnić Škarić has presumed that Malipiera Tower was built in its place.⁴² An analysis performed by the same author has shown that there was a residence of the Andreis kindred in the south-western part of the older medieval wall (from the late 12th and early 13th century), which also contained a tower, similar to the situation of the Vitturi and Lucio towers. The link between the Andreis tower and the fortifications was later lost, as the new city walls were built in the second half of the 14th century, by which the city again extended to the south.⁴³ It is probably this tower that is referred to in a decree from 1320, where it is stated that the sons of (Count) Marin, son of Amblasius, Šimun, and Gavžinja, must cede their towers to the city forever "for the sake of peace in the city".⁴⁴ Sixteen years later, a tower of Šimun's descendants is attested near the

⁴⁰ Lucius, *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 2, 983-984; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 110, 122, 126, 127, and 171-173; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 148-150; Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija" (as in n. 36), 30 and 37-38. An extensive overview of archival data referring to the tower of Cega in the first half of the 15th century, as well as an architectural analysis that shows that it was built in an earlier period, can be found in Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 74-76 and 78.

⁴¹ una turris posita Tragurii iuxta murum civitatis in qua ipsa cum suis heredibus habitat: 1329, *Trogirski spomenici, Zapisci kurije grada Trogira od 1310. do 1331.* [Monuments of Trogir: Documents of Trogir's court from 1310-1331], ed. Miho Barada (hereafter: TS), doc. 99, p. 284. The "Ursus" kindred owned houses in that part of the city, near those of the monastery of St John the Baptist, as late as the 13th and 14th centuries: Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 59; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 121, 126, and 142-143; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 132-133; Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 172; Benyovsky Latin, "Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija" (as in n. 36), 22-23.

⁴² Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 172.

⁴³ Plosnić Škarić, "Blok Andreis u Trogiru" (as in n. 5), 9-16; Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 138-139 and 142. This tower was not mentioned by Ivan Lučić Lucius in his book on Trogir, probably because it was no longer recognizable at that time as it had lost its defensive function.

⁴⁴ *Povijesna svjedočanstva* 1, 391; Plosnić Škarić, "Blok Andreis u Trogiru" (as in n. 5), 16. For the context of these events in Trogir, see: Irena Benyovsky, "Politički sukobi u srednjovjekovnom Trogiru i njihov utjecaj na posjedovne odnose u gradu" [Political conflicts in medieval Trogir and their impact on the property relations in the city], in *Hereditas rerum croaticarum*, eds. Alexander Buczynski, Milan Kruhek, and Stjepan Matković (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2003), 44-51.

coast, which also corresponds to the situation of this tower.⁴⁵ A “residential tower” has also been identified in an old photograph of Trogir, at the northern wall, which was later demolished.⁴⁶ The link between the private residencies of the nobility and the city fortifications is also evident from the decree issued by Trogir’s authorities in 1267, when an attack on the city was expected, to place communal canons in the houses of eight noblemen, namely those of the “Domišić”, “Hvalot”, Cippico (Ćipiko), “Stria”, Vodovar, “Ursus”, and Lucius (Lučić) kindreds.⁴⁷

The towers of Trogir are among the best preserved and researched, and it is known that they were buildings of a “square ground plan, with a single room on each level.”⁴⁸ On the basis of that, as well as the height of four levels in total, Plosnić Škarić has identified another tower, which would have guarded the entrance to the “Andreis block.”⁴⁹ The situation of that tower at the entrance of a residential complex belonging to the Andreis kindred, and the context in which both towers are mentioned, indeed reminds of the function that the towers performed in medieval Italy – as strongholds of powerful kindreds that could serve in mutual conflicts such as attested at that time in Trogir as well. This may be the reason why the sons of Count Marin were specifically named in the abovementioned decree as the leaders of the opposition. Besides the tower at the entrance of the “Andreis bloc,” Ana Plosnić Škarić has identified two more towers within the city, which were not linked to the city walls, but defended the entrance to “pre-communal complexes.” Both of these cases are four-storey buildings that rose high above their surroundings: one a part of the complex of the so-called “Paitun’s House,” and another mentioned as a *domus alta* owned by Biva Cega in the mid-15th century, located west of the cathedral.⁵⁰ Thus, in their function – defence

⁴⁵ The archival document (SAZ, Archive of Trogir, box 66, fasc. 2, fol. 42r) is given in Plosnić Škarić, “Blok Andreis u Trogiru” (as in n. 5), 16; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, “Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću” (as in n. 5), 115-116, n. 127, 124, and 149; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 161; Benyovsky Latin, “Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija” (as in n. 36), 27-28.

⁴⁶ Mentioned by Marasović, “Stambena kuća u Trogiru Radovanova doba” (as in n. 36), 197.

⁴⁷ In 1267: *Trogirski spomenici, dio II. Zapisnici sudbenog stola dvora općine trogirske* [Monuments of Trogir, Part II: Documents from the court sessions of the commune of Trogir], vol. 1, from August 8, 1266 until December 6, 1299, ed. Miho Barada, MSHSM, vol. 46 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1951), 1, doc. 48, p. 34; Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, “Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću” (as in n. 5), 56; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 67; Benyovsky Latin, “Izgradnja gradskih fortifikacija” (as in n. 36), 22.

⁴⁸ Plosnić Škarić, “Blok Andreis u Trogiru” (as in n. 5), 13; Marasović, “Stambena kuća u Trogiru Radovanova doba” (as in n. 36), 197.

⁴⁹ Plosnić Škarić, “Blok Andreis u Trogiru” (as in n. 5), 16.

⁵⁰ Plosnić Škarić, “Gotska stambena arhitektura” (as in n. 5), 72, 105, and 169, doc. 57, p. 283,

within the city – these towers would correspond to similar private towers mentioned in various Italian towns during the 12th and 13th centuries as listed by Heers. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the rest of the towers in Trogir that can be identified with certainty in archival documents, as well as those in Split, were mostly linked to the city walls and are not mentioned, for example, as associated with the noble residences at the central city square.

Private towers are also mentioned in Dubrovnik in the late 13th century, such as Budislava’s Tower,⁵¹ the tower of Marin Celipa,⁵² or the tower of Ivan *de Zereva* (de Crieva, Črijević), later owned by his son Martol.⁵³ It is believed that they were attached to the oldest belt of Dubrovnik’s city walls, to the north.⁵⁴ In case of de Crieva family, there is direct evidence that, same as in Trogir, members of the elite had the responsibility of fortifying the city. Martol de Crieva was accused of reconstructing or repairing (*sunt laborate*) his two towers attached to the communal wall, but he justified himself by saying that he had done everything publicly and openly (at that time, the new city walls had not yet been built). He emphasized that he had reconstructed the towers at his own expense, for the sake of protecting the city, and that they had been owned by his father and his grandfather. After a detailed investigation and a testimony of “old and good” citizens (*antiqui et boni homines*), charges against Martol were dismissed and he was allowed to own the towers *in perpetuum*, as had been the

illustration on p. 443.

⁵¹ ... *sub turris Budisclauae*, 1280, *Spisi dubrovačke kancelarije, Zapisni notara Tomazina da Savere 1278-1282* [Documents of the Dubrovnik chancellery: Records of notary Tomazino da Savera, 1278-1282], ed. Gregor Čremošnik, *Monumenta historica Ragusina*, vol. 1 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1951) (hereafter: MHR 1), doc. 408, p. 117; *in territorio Bogdani de Pisino sub turri Budisclauae*, 1281, MHR 1, doc. 451, p. 130; *in territorio Bogdani Pisine sub turri Budisclauae*, 1282, MHR 1, doc. 824, p. 254. In scholarly literature, this tower is occasionally mentioned as “Budislav’s”, but the sources clearly say “Budislava’s”.

⁵² ... *in territorio Marini Celippe ex parte orientis apud turrim dicti Marini*, 1281, MHR 1, doc. 427, p. 124.

⁵³ ... *in territorio Benedicti de Gondula subtus turri Johannis de Zereua*, 1282, MHR 1, doc. 767, p. 240; *quod due turres Martoli de Zereua, que sunt apud domum Nichole de Ceria, sunt laborate super muros commuis (!). Spisi dubrovačke kancelarije, Zapisni notara Tomazina da Savere 1282-1284. Diversa Cancellariae I (1282-1284). Testamenta I (1282-1284)*, ed. Josip Lučić, *Monumenta historica Ragusina*, vol. 2 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1984) (hereafter: MHR 2), doc. 1305, p. 345.

⁵⁴ Lukša Beritić, *Utvrdjenja grada Dubrovnika* [Fortifications of Dubrovnik] (Zagreb: JAZU, 1955), 15; Marija Planić-Lončarić, “Zajednički prostori stambenih zona srednjovjekovnog Dubrovnika” [Common spaces of the residential zones in medieval Dubrovnik], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti 12-13* (1988-1989), 65-75, esp. 70 and 74, n. 15; Željko Peković, *Dubrovnik: nastanak i razvoj srednjovjekovnoga grada* [Dubrovnik: The emergence and evolution of a medieval city] (Split: Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, 1998). I will not enter here the question of differences between individual authors concerning the exact location of the city walls.

case with his ancestors.⁵⁵ Another tower is mentioned as the tower of Valio de Sersio.⁵⁶ In the city district of Pustijerna, several towers are mentioned in the 14th century that bear the names of their owners, such as the family of Gondola (Gundulić), Ilija de Binzola (Binčulić), Pavao Marseleza, and Juraj Kotoran, which indicates that, similarly to Trogir and Split, the defence of the city was initially “privatized” and in the hands of powerful individuals and families.⁵⁷ Brothers Šimun and Vukas (*Volcius*), sons of Matija de Resti (Rastić), divided the inheritance after their father’s death, whereby the tower in the district of Pustijerna was allotted to Šimun.⁵⁸

Private towers, remnants of which are still visible, can also be found in Rab, in the so-called *contrata macella* – a street called after the butchery, which led from the harbour to the cathedral through the midst of the city district of Kaldanac, which was one of the localities in which the most prominent citizens of Rab lived. The tower belonging to one of the oldest noble kindreds of Rab, the Galzignas, was located in Katurb, within the old city walls, on the Old Square, at the corner of Upper Street and the Old Square with the New Square and the harbour. In 1213, they obtain the permission from the

⁵⁵ *Aduocati communis Ragusii dixerunt quod cum dicte turres sunt laborate super muro communis Ragusii, et commune secundum usum ciuitatis per prescriptionem siue transcursum tempus non perdat ius suum, pecierunt iudicari per sentenciam, quod dictus Martolus aut debeat se concordare cum communi Ragusii aut debeat deiactare dictas turres que sunt facte super dicto muro communis. Ad que dictus Martolus per suum advocatum Vitalem Binčole respondit dicens quod dicte turres fuerunt laborate ita in publico et in aperte. Et etiam tunc temporis pro defensione ciuitatis, cum murus nouus ciuitatis illo tempore factus non esset, quod non est credendum quod dicte turres fuerint facte sine consciencia et uoluntate communis Ragusii...Et quod commune dederit de suo ad faciendum ipsas turres pro munimento et tuitiione ciuitatis. Et etiam avus et pater dicti Martoli possederunt dictas turres antiquo tempore sine questione...quod dictus Martolus in perpetuum habeat et possideat dictum murum et dictas turres in perpetuum sicut ipse et antecessores sui possederunt, nec commune Ragusii possit ipsi Martolo facere perpetuo super dictis muro et turribus aliquam questionem.* MHR 2, doc. 1305, p. 345.

⁵⁶ ... cum turri Valii de Sersio, 1301, *Spisi dubrovačke kancelarije, Zapisi notara Andrije Beneše 1295-1301* [Documents of the Dubrovnik chancellory: Records of notary Andrija Beneš, 1295-1301], *Praecepta rectoris II (1299-1301), Testamenta II (1295-1301)*, ed. Josip Lučić, *Monumenta historica Ragusina*, vol. 4 (Zagreb: HAZU and Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta Zagrebu, 1993) (hereafter: MHR 4), doc. 544, p. 142.

⁵⁷ ... super turrim illius de Gondola..., super turrim Helie de Binzola..., super turrim Pauli de Masarlesso..., super turrim Giorgi Cotorani, *Monumenta Ragusina, Libri reformationum tomus I. ann. 1306-1347*, eds. Josip Gelcich and Ivan Tkalčić, MSHSM, vol. 10 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1879) (hereafter: MR), 225; Nada Grujić, “Dubrovnik – Pustijerna. Istraživanje jednog dijela povijesnog tkiva grada” [Dubrovnik – Pustijerna: Research on a part of the historical city], *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 10 (1986), 14-16.

⁵⁸ *Nos quidem Simon et Volcius filii quondam Mathie de Rasti nostra bona et spontanea voluntate confitemur, quod facimus divisionem inter nos de patrimonio nostro... Item ego Simon predictus accepi pro parte mea in perpetuum turrem que est ad Puistolam (potius Posterulam), et tres cubitos de alia domo in qua erat coquina cum omnibus suis pertinentiis*, MHR 4, doc. 36, p. 27.

bishop to erect a chapel of St Stephen as an endowment on top of their tower. During the Romanesque period, towers were among the rare buildings in the city built of stone. In the 15th century, there are a few mentions of towers in the written sources, at least one of which was also a part of the city’s fortifications.⁵⁹ It may be presumed that, in case of Rab in the high and central Middle Ages, private towers were linked to the fortifications, and Galzigna Tower is a rare example of joint use of the tower by a kindred.

It is interesting to observe that only one private tower is mentioned in the sources related to late medieval Zadar. It belonged to the house of Dominik Morosini (*Mau-roccenus*), count of Zadar during the Venetian rule over the city,⁶⁰ which was sold by his son, Count Rogerije, in 1193, at the time when Zadar was ruled by the Hungarian-Croatian king Béla III, to Matija, son of Zorobabel.⁶¹ It is stated that the house was located in front of the church of Our Lady the Great, which was very near to the city walls, and thus it is possible that the tower was also attached to them. It is significant that, in the 12th century, during which Zadar was mostly ruled by the Venetians, the only house known to have had a tower belonged to the Venetian count. It is possible that the construction of noblemen’s towers was suppressed or abolished by the Venetian authorities, who rightfully feared that they might be used as strongholds of rebellion and resistance against them. Thus, the only known tower that was part of a private residence could in fact have served to shelter the Venetian count from the rebelling citizens of Zadar.

⁵⁹ Dušan Mlacović, *Građani plemići. Pad i uspon rapskoga plemstva* [Citizens and noblemen: The fall and rise of Rab’s nobility] (Zagreb: Leykam international, 2008), 121-122, 159, and 232-233; Neven Budak, “Urban development of Rab – a Hypothesis,” *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 12 (2006), 128 and 130-134; ... *vir nobilis dominus Albertus quondam Matthahei Gauzigna tamquam senior stirpis cum omnibus propinquis dictae domus de Gauzigna sexus masculini civibus Arbensibus se sistit in episcopali palatio coram episcopo Prodano... sopra turrim ad eos spectantem et existentem supra Catribum aedificandi unam ecclesiam ad honorem praedicti sancti. Item ut ipse et progenies sexus masculini habeant in eadem ecclesiam aedificandam iuspatronatum, cum libertate eligendi capellanum*: CD 3, doc. 91, p. 113; *in ciuitate Arbi, super via apud turrim ser Henrici de Baduario*: 1453, State Archive in Zadar, *Arhiv stare rapske općine, Spisi rapskih bilježnika* [Archive of the old commune of Rab: Records of the notaries of Rab], Marcus de Olivone, box 4, fasc. 4.1, 29-35; *et turris vocata Gagliarda cum omnibus eorum pertinentiis*: Biblioteca Marciana, Praga (*Le carte di storia et erudizione dalmatica di Giuseppe Praga*), *Excerpta per servire alla storia di Arba*, box 3 (from 1409 until 1797), It. VI, 539 (=12333), Praga XXXV, 162-165. Quoted from: Budak, “Urban development of Rab – a Hypothesis,” 135, n. 57.

⁶⁰ He is mentioned as the count of Zadar from 1166-1180 (CD 2, doc. 101, p. 107 – CD 2, doc. 164, p. 166).

⁶¹ CD 2, doc. 246, pp. 261-262. Matej, who was from Apulia by origin, but a citizen of Zadar from his childhood, is mentioned together with his brother Aristodije by Thomas the Archdeacon as a skilful painter goldsmith, as well as a preacher of heresy: Thomas the Archdeacon, 122-123. He is also mentioned in 1198 as a member of the Zadar elite: CD 2, doc. 296, p. 297.

To be sure, the possibility of having private towers within the city (unattached to the city walls) that served the members of the elite for defence against the “internal” enemies before the 13th century cannot be excluded. The fact that they are not mentioned in the written sources can be explained through the scarcity of preserved documents before the strengthening of notarial institutions. However, one must remain cautious when associating them with the later kindreds mentioned in connection with the same localities (such as Andreis or Cega) despite the possibility of genealogical links. Research on nobility indicates that it was during the high and central Middle Ages (from the 11th to 14th centuries) that the large kindreds, organized in an agnate-patrilinial manner, were gradually formed. Many among them had not even adopted a common family name by the time and therefore it may be erroneous to speak about the kindred as a unit before the late 13th or even 14th century. As for the earlier period, these were families organized on the basis of cognate relations, where both connections and inheritance along the female line played a significant role, which makes it difficult to trace the later development of individual genealogical lines. The same system is reflected in the inheritance of patronate rights along both lines of kinship, which in Dalmatia persisted almost until the modern times.⁶² Therefore, one should be cautious when drawing conclusions about the collective ownership of a kindred over the towers in the earlier times, or about the later transfer of property from the kindred to an individual,⁶³ since the equal right of inheritance claimed by both male and female descendants is attested also for the earlier period.⁶⁴

The available data do not indicate collective ownership over the towers, since the contemporary sources mostly mention the towers as the individual property of specific family members, regardless of the fact that they could be parts of complex-

⁶² Cf. Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (as in n. 1), 44-48 and 82-92; for Dalmatia: Zrinka Nikolić, *Rodaci i bližnji. Dalmatinsko gradsko plemstvo u ranom srednjem vijeku* [Kin and kith: Dalmatian urban nobility in the early Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2003), esp. 75-83; Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, “Obitelj dalmatinskog plemstva od 12. do 14. stoljeća” [Noble families in Dalmatia from the 12th through the 14th centuries], *Acta Histriae* 16/1-2 (2008), 37-58. In 13th-century Trogir, kindreds such as Lucio, Kazarica, and “Pecci” were still aware of their common descent from the kindred (organized on the principle of cognate inheritance along both lines of kinship) of “Bogobojsje”, which emerged in the 11th century: CD *Supplementa* 1, doc. 102, pp. 139-140; CD 1, doc. 70, p. 99; doc. 108, p. 138; *Rodaci i bližnji*, 80.

⁶³ Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 13; Plosnić Škarić, “Gotička stambena arhitektura” (as in n. 5), 169.

⁶⁴ See, for example, the “Madii” family: Zrinka Nikolić, “Madijevci: primjer obitelji dalmatinske gradske elite u desetom i jedanaestom stoljeću” [The Madii: Example of a Dalmatian urban elite family in the 10th and 11th centuries], *Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 23 (2005), 1-24, esp. 5-10.

es in which brothers and relatives lived as neighbours. An exception would be the common action taken by the male members of the Gauzigna kindred in Rab, led by their head (*senior stirpis*) Albert, on the occasion of constructing the chapel of St Stephen.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, it is possible that what mattered in this case was the chapel itself as a common place of family memory. One should also note the mention of the tower “of those de Gondola” in Dubrovnik,⁶⁶ even though this case does not allow for an unambiguous conclusion whether the kindred is here referred to as a whole. The mention of dividing the father’s inheritance among brothers de Resti in Dubrovnik, when Šimun obtained the tower and his brother the neighbouring property,⁶⁷ again indicates individual ownership over the towers. It has also been established for Trogir that the members of the Andreis kindred, especially brothers Desa and Count Marin (d. 1278), as well as Marin’s descendants, seem to have possessed houses next to each other along the south-western wall of the city, in which Plosnić Škarić has identified buildings of the residential complex (block) of Andreis,⁶⁸ but the mere fact that the towers were treated as property of individual members of the Andreis kindred – Šimun and Gavžinja, as well as Šimun’s descendants – means that one can no longer speak of collective ownership of the Andreis kindred over these buildings.

Some documents indicate that towers could be possessed by various branches of a kindred. Thus, a tower of the heirs of Petar of Petrača is mentioned in Split in the 1240s, probably referring to Petar and Jakša (Jakov) rather than the Petrača (Petrača) kindred. Several other relatives of the late Petar de Petrača lived in the same period – such as Josip and Dujam, sons of the late Marin of Petrača and probably nephews of the late Petar of Petrača – and yet, they obviously did not own the tower together with their cousins. *Ser Ivan Petrača*, probably brother of the late Petar of Petrača, owned a house next to the tower of his nephews, which he sold to Dujam, son of Madije, for 400 pounds.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ CD 3, doc. 91, pp. 112-113.

⁶⁶ *super turrim illius de Gondola...*, MR, 225.

⁶⁷ MHR 4, doc. 36, p. 27.

⁶⁸ Plosnić Škarić, “Blok Andreis u Trogiru” (as in n. 5), 19; Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, “Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću” (as in n. 5), 57; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 161.

⁶⁹ In 1342, *ser Ivan* of Petrača sold *domum ipisius positam in Colompna prope turrim heredum Petri Petrache*: SS 1, doc. 215, pp. 122-123; see also: *in turri heredum Petri Petrache*: 1344, SS 1, doc. 488, p. 293; cf. the genealogy of Petrača/Petraka (although it does not show the relation between the sons of Petrača) in: Kuzmanić, *Splitski plemići* (as in n. 19), 67. Documents showing the family relations among the Petrača include: SS 1, doc. 249-253, pp. 144-146, and doc. 443, p. 265.

Individual ownership over the towers is most clearly manifested in the fact that parts of the towers could be owned by women, at least in the period when they still had the right to equal shares in inheritance along with their brothers. This is clearly evident in a number of examples in Trogir, where equal inheritance between sisters was preserved for quite a long time. When Dobra, daughter of the late Valentin de Lucio, married in Split, she renounced a part of the house and the family tower for the sake of her three brothers.⁷⁰ It may be presumed that they wanted to forestall the possibility that parts of the city fortifications should fall into the hands of foreigners when noblewomen were married outside of Trogir, especially if their husbands were from Split, as Trogir was often in tense relations with that city. The available data show that there was otherwise nothing controversial about women owning the towers, and occasionally it occurred that towers came into possession of other kindreds through marriage. During the conflict that arose between members of the Vitturi family, it was mentioned that Jakovica Vitturi and her husband Dujam, son of Domika (Domišić), held the Vitturi tower and then later renounced at it. It is probable that Jakovica, in fact, renounced at her part of the tower, which means that originally she had had a right to it.⁷¹ The tower of the "Ursus" family came into possession of the "Hvalimir" kindred when Agapi "Ursus" married Juraj, son of Hvalimir. Many years later, after Agapi's death, her brother Silvestar demanded from her daughter-in-law Mira, likewise widowed, several pieces of property including the tower, claiming that a half of the property that he had shared undivided with his sister belonged to him despite her marriage. Mira and her descendants were living in the tower at the time.⁷² Desaća, daughter of Grgur Vitturi, married to Ivan son of Matko from the "Ploča" family, had the right to a half of the tower (the other half had probably been inherited by her brother Salinguerra), for which she defined in her testament that it should be sold and the money used to make a wooden cross for the cathedral of St Lawrence.⁷³ In Dubrovnik, a tower was called after a woman called

⁷⁰ *Dabra, filia quondam domini Valentini Petri, de consensu et voluntate Francisci viri sui ibidem astantis nec non et presente et consenciente domina Peruosclaua matre ipsius, dedit, tradidit, quietavit et cesit Petro fratri suo recipienti tam pro parte sua quam pro parte Francisci et Luce fratrum suorum omne jus et actionem quod et quam habebat*: 1279, MT 1/2, 4, doc. 76, p. 207. In my opinion, not all the brothers renounced at their parts for the sake of Petar, as claimed by Andreis-Benyovsky-Plosnić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 13. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 54; Benyovsky Latin, *Srednjovjekovni Trogir* (as in n. 5), 139; but only Dobra for the sake of all her brothers together, represented by Petar.

⁷¹ *Ostavština Ivana Lučića Lucija*, 1298, vol. 539, fol. 347-48 / vol. 13, pp. 7-8.

⁷² TS, doc. 99, pp. 284-292; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 115, 142-143.

⁷³ *Item voluit dicta testatrix quod de residuo predicto extrahatur medietas unius sue turris posite in Tragurio iuxta Matheum Querchi et murum communis et alia latera et venditur per commissarios*

Budislava, probably preserved from the past and reminiscent of its former owner.⁷⁴ In Split, Dobra, daughter of the late Lukar (the Lukarić kindred) made a contract in her *turris habitationis*. At that time, she had at least one living brother.⁷⁵ Regarding the fact that she is not described as widowed or married, it seems that she lived in the house or tower inherited from her father. In all these features of ownership – individual property, ownership by a branch of the kindred – the towers of Split and Trogir show similarity with the Venetian towers of the same period. In that respect, the Dalmatian practice corresponded to the Venetian one, which likewise included individual ownership and the free use of towers, including examples where sisters could own or inherit the towers or a widow could obtain one in reimbursement of her dowry (*repromissa*). On the other hand, such examples are not found in other Italian settings, such as Florence or Verona, where patrilinear inheritance, exclusively along the male line, and kindred ownership were present far more strongly.⁷⁶ These other examples, however, are analogous with the Gauzigna tower, although it must be taken into account that it was a case of founding a chapel as a common kindred endowment.

Dobra of Lukar from Split was not too young, as it seems, as the dowry contract of her niece states that the girl would inherit 50 pounds after her aunt's death.⁷⁷ This allows for the conclusion that family towers, having lost their defence function, could also serve as a suitable place for women who had not married or had become nuns, since in such places they could live a secluded and pious life. To be sure, one should also consider the possibility of other members of a family who wanted to withdraw

infrascriptos et de pecunia habita de illa medietate dicti infrascripti commissarii faciant fieri unam crucem lineam in similitudine crucis sancti Iohannis Baptiste et illa crus (!) ponatur in ecclesia sancti Laurentii. ...unius sue turris posite in Tragurio iuxta Matheum Querchi et murum communis: 1371, "Oporuke", 177, no. 9; Andreis-Benyovsky Latin-Plosnić Škarić, "Socijalna topografija Trogira u 14. stoljeću" (as in n. 5), 126 and 181-182. I have already mentioned the example of the Cega tower (which is, however, from the 15th century), which came into the hands of Dragolin Domišić when the widow of Nikola Cega remarried. Plosnić Škarić, "Gotička stambena arhitektura" (as in n. 5), 75-76.

⁷⁴ MHR 1, doc. 408, p. 117; doc. 451, p. 130; doc. 824, p. 254.

⁷⁵ SS 1, doc. 44, p. 27.

⁷⁶ Juergen Schulz has criticized the conclusions of Heers and Herlihy, pointing to the various results of research on ownership and the residential complexes based on the Venetian source material: "The Houses of the Dandolo: A Family Compound in Medieval Venice," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 52/4 (December 1993), 405-414; Wladimiro Dorigo, *Venezia romanica: La formazione della città medioevale fino all'età gotica* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Cierre Edizioni, Regione del Veneto, 2003), 315; Lansing, *Florentine Magnates* (as in n. 2), 91; Andrea Castagnetti, *La società veronese nel medioevo*, vol. 2, *Ceti e famiglie dominanti nella prima età comunale* (Verona: Istituto di storia, Università degli studi di Verona, 1987), 21-22, 76, and 127-29.

⁷⁷ SS 1, doc. 408, p. 245.

from social life, for which purpose such towers were very suitable.⁷⁸

Eventually, in Dalmatian towns one does not come across examples of organizing a "tower society" (*società delle torri*) as known from the Italian sources, in which members would partake without necessarily being relatives.⁷⁹ In Split we do find examples in which several owners are mentioned for a single tower although no blood relation is explicitly mentioned, but that is present only in the earlier period and the owners do not act as members of a society founded for defence purposes. Among these owners, one finds women and priests as well.⁸⁰ It is possible that they were distant relatives and in any case, they could sell their parts of the tower at their will, regardless of the rights of other owners.

In conclusion, one might say that the available sources confirm Lučić's assumption that noble families (that is, families of the urban elite) had the privilege and the duty of defending the city walls. Almost all towers which could be located with certainty are somehow linked to the city fortifications – this is the case with sources from Trogir, Split, and Dubrovnik. In a sense, one could speak of a public-private partnership, in which both parties – the urban community and the urban elite – could reap benefits: families of the urban elite invested their own money to fortify the city and thus helped defend the entire urban community, which could not afford maintaining them at its own cost, and in turn they enjoyed a prestigious status in their urban settings.⁸¹ As for Zadar, it may be presumed that the Venetian authorities,

⁷⁸ Cf. the example of a pious widow from a noble family who had retreated into a tower, refusing to remarry: Lansing, *Florentine magnates* (as in n. 2), 98-99 and 114. On the "home nuns" in 11th-century Dalmatian towns, see: Nikolić, *Rodaci i bližnji* (as in n. 62), 57-58.

⁷⁹ Carol Lansing has opposed the opinion of Jacques Heers that these societies imitated the structure of kindreds: *Florentine Magnates* (as in n. 2), 88-97, esp. 89-90.

⁸⁰ In a document from 1040, which is probably a forgery from the early 12th century, it is mentioned that prior Nicifor had bought parts of a tower from nine different persons, of whom two were clerics and four women (one of them wife of a priest): CD 1, doc. 55, pp. 73-74. A similar case of owning parts of a tower can be found in relation to the monastery of St Benedict as its later owner: CD 1, doc. 80, p. 111.

⁸¹ In 14th- and 15th-century Gradec (Zagreb), more towers were privately owned (such as the tower at the Stone Gate, for example, which was part of the largest residential complex in the city). They were situated on the inside of the city walls, although usually had protrusions which made it possible to control the outer walls. This may indicate that at least some of them were built by individual citizens at their own cost: Vladimir Bedenko, *Zagrebački Gradec: kuća i grad u srednjem vijeku* [Zagreb's Gradec: The house and the city in the Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1989), 44-45 and 82-87; idem, "Gradec – osnivanje i gradnja jednog europskog grada" [Gradec: Foundation and construction of a European city], in: *Zlatna Bula 1242-1992* [The Golden Bull, 1242-1992], exhibition catalogue (Zagreb: Muzej grada Zagreba, 1992), 36; Neven Budak, Karolina Kanižaj, and Svjetlana Vorel, "Kolonije stranaca na Gradecu u 14. stoljeću" [Colonies of foreigners in 14th-century Gradec], *Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva* 14 (1996), 80.

which ruled over Zadar during most of the period considered here, prevented or suppressed a similar development, rightfully fearing that the nobility of Zadar could use the fortifications against them. In Venice itself, private towers were rare and had a predominantly residential character.⁸²

The sources show that, in Dalmatia, towers had a double function: a defensive one, which could also be used to settle accounts in an internal strife against a competing family, as shown very illustratively by the "civil war" of Split described by Thomas the Archdeacon, and the residential one, prevailing in the 14th century, by which time the communal institution had already come into control.⁸³ However, their earlier residential role should not be neglected. The preserved examples of towers in Split show that they had windows even on the lower levels, which is contrary to the noblemen's towers in Tuscany, Genoa, and other Italian localities.⁸⁴ They are in this respect closer to the Venetian examples, which show features of representative rather than defensive architecture.⁸⁵ In his synthesis, Heers speculated that the tradition of centralized state power (imperial or royal) could prevent the fortification of family groups in Venice and South Italy, even though he warns of the scarcity of data.⁸⁶ In any case, further research has indicated that more attention should be paid to the comparison with Venice, whose influence on the Dalmatian cities in this period was certainly more important than that of Tuscany or Liguria.

⁸² Schulz, "The Houses of the Dandolo" (as in n. 76), 407-414. A list of Venetian towers can be found in: Elisabeth Crouzet-Pavan, "Sopra le acque salse": *Espaces, pouvoir et société à Venise à la fin du Moyen âge* (Roma: École française de Rome, 1992), vol. 1, 149-150.

⁸³ Thus, Ančić presumes that the towers of Split changed their functions with time ("Ser Ciprijan Zaninov" [as in n. 3]: 47), which would correspond to Heers (*Family clans* [as in n. 1], 199-201).

⁸⁴ Fisković, "Izgled splitskog Narodnog trga" (as in n. 32), 98.

⁸⁵ Dorigo, *Venezia romanica* (as in n. 76), 315; Schulz, "The Houses of the Dandolo" (as in n. 76), 407-14.

⁸⁶ Heers, *Family Clans* (as in n. 1), 180-181, 203, n. 42a.