

## SACRED SPACE, VIOLENCE AND PUBLIC LAW IN THE CLOISTERS OF THE FRANCISCAN AND DOMINICAN HOUSES OF DUBROVNIK

*Gordan Ravančić*

Relations among different social groups and structures in any community are complex since they rely on a paradigm of institutional relationships as well as on personal links. By the same token, one also has to bear in mind the political will of the institutions involved in this relationship.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, one has to recall that the relationship between public and private in the Middle Ages was rather different than we think today.<sup>2</sup> Namely, during medieval times public space was much wider, and civil authorities repeatedly invaded private space for the sake of public interest.<sup>3</sup> In this regard, the authorities of medieval Dubrovnik were no exception. Quite the contrary, because of a political interest in preserving their "nobility," Dubrovnik authorities and officials often peeked into the bedrooms of common and noble citizens, not permitting vicious rumors to distract public officials from their work.<sup>4</sup> An example of such interference is the case of a Dubrovnik nobleman, Stephan de Zamagna, which happened in 1438. During this civil process, the Dubrovnik authorities tried to force this patrician into a marriage with a noble girl from the Caboga family, and they persisted until it was publicly proclaimed before the court that the marriage had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding this, see, together with the cited literature, e. g., Tomislav Popić, "Oblikovanje srednjovjekovne stvarnosti – sociologija znanja i povijest," [Shaping of the medieval reality – sociology of knowledge and history] *Povijesni prilozi* 33 (2007): 239-248; Mladen Ančić, "Kako 'popraviti' prošlost. Konstrukcija memorije na nadgrobniim spomenicima 15. stoljeća," [How to rectify the past. Construction of a memory on the tombstones from the 15<sup>th</sup> century] *Povijesni prilozi* 34 (2007.): 83-102; Zdenka Janeković Römer, *Okvir slobode – Dubrovačka vlastela između srednjovjekovlja i humanizma* [Framework of freedom – Nobility of Dubrovnik on the crossroads of medieval and early modern times] (Zagreb-Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku, 1999), 251-324.

<sup>2</sup> Regarding this see, together with the cited literature, e. g., David Herlihy, "Società e spazio nella città Italiana del Medioevo," in *Cities and Society in Medieval Italy* (London: Variorum, 1980.), 174-190; Gordan Ravančić, "Javni prostor i okolica kasnosrednjovjekovnog i renesansnog Dubrovnika," [Public space and leisure in the late medieval and renaissance Dubrovnik] *Anal. Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 38 (2000): 53-64.

<sup>3</sup> Zdenka Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona: Gradska vlast i privatni život u kasnosrednjovjekovnom i ranonovovjekovnom Dubrovniku," [Violence of law: city authorities and private life in late medieval and early modern Dubrovnik] *Anal. Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 41 (2003): 9-44; Ravančić, "Javni prostor," *passim*.

<sup>4</sup> Regarding interference of the civil law in marriage relationships, probably the best examined example is the case of Maruša Bratosaljić from the end of the fifteenth century. See: Zdenka Janeković Römer, *Maruša ili suđenje ljubavi: bračno-ljubavna priča iz srednjovjekovnog Dubrovnika* [Maruša or prosecution of love: marriage and love story from the medieval Dubrovnik] (Zagreb: Algoritam, 2007).

consummated *per copulam carnalem prout est publica vox et fama*.<sup>5</sup>

I assume that one should review the relationship between Dubrovnik authorities, ecclesiastical institutions, and the clergy in exactly the same way.<sup>6</sup> Namely, regarding this relationship in the first place there was a problem of jurisdiction in the process of entering into a marriage.<sup>7</sup> To be precise – even though all the questions regarding marriage were generally subject to canon law and ecclesiastical institutions, in real life Dubrovnik authorities frequently intervened and imposed their interests.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, it is fact that Dubrovnik authorities interfered in various ecclesiastical issues, probably considering them as a part of state policy.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it is quite clear that during the late Middle Ages the civil authorities of Dubrovnik adjusted all the Church ceremonies according to their needs and “public interest.”<sup>10</sup>

However, one has to keep in mind that Dubrovnik’s community, and therefore civil authorities, too, were deeply steeped in Christianity and the Christian faith. By the same token, Dubrovnik authorities frequently vigorously supported and defended the papacy’s policy in the region during the dangerous times of the Ottoman threat. Thus, by the end of the fifteenth century one notes that some extant sources refer to Dubrovnik as to *respublica christiana*.<sup>11</sup> So, bearing in mind such an intense impregnation with the Christian spirit, one cannot avoid noticing

<sup>5</sup> *Acta consilii rogatorum*, 3, vol. 22, fol. 158’-160 (Dubrovnik, State Archives). I would like to thank Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, who showed me this case. See also Gordan Ravančić, “Izvanbračna ljubav i ženska posluga u vlasteoskim obiteljima kasnosrednjovjekovnog Dubrovnika,” [Extramarital love and female servants in noble families of Dubrovnik in the late middle ages] in *Hereditas rerum croaticarum*, ed. Alexander Buczynski, Milan Kruhek and Stjepan Matković (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2003), 63-68.

<sup>6</sup> Surprisingly, in the historiography about Dubrovnik there are not many studies about the relationship between civil authorities and Church. The only comprehensive studies about this topic are: Kosta Vojnović, “Crkva i država u dubrovačkoj republici,” [Church and state in the Republic of Dubrovnik] in *Rad JAZU*, vol. 119 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1894), 32-142; idem, “Crkva i država u dubrovačkoj republici – drugi dio,” [Church and state the Republic of Dubrovnik – part two] in *Rad JAZU*, vol. 121 (Zagreb: JAZU, 1895), 1-91; which is presently quite obsolete but still usable; Ivica Prlender, “Crkva i država u srednjovjekovnom Dubrovniku,” [Church and the state in the medieval Dubrovnik] (PhD dissertation, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, 1998), which is still unpublished.

<sup>7</sup> A good example is the afore mentioned case of Maruša Bratosaljić from the end of the fifteenth century; see: Janeković Römer, *Maruša*, passim. About the interference of the juridical jurisdiction see especially the chapter: “Nadležno pravo, sud i sudski službenici,” [Competent law, court and judicial officials] 29-34.

<sup>8</sup> Janeković Römer, “Nasilje zakona,” 10-11. The situation was not much different in other parts of Europe, since the restoration of central royal power enforced the jurisdiction of civil law and the courts in all segments of life. See, e.g.: Denys Hay, *A general history of Europe: Europe in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: Longman, 1980), 161-162.

<sup>9</sup> The fact that during the late Middle Ages many of Dubrovnik’s elected archbishops actually never came to the city indirectly witnesses that civil law and public authorities overwhelmed the Church’s authority in Dubrovnik.

<sup>10</sup> Janeković Römer, *Okvir slobode*, 291-324; See also: Nella Lonza, *Kazalište vlasti. Ceremonijal i državni blagdani Dubrovačke Republike u 17. i 18. stoljeću*, [The theatre of power: State ceremony and feasts of the Dubrovnik Republic in the seventeenth and eighteenth century] (Zagreb – Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku, 2009), passim.

<sup>11</sup> Eadem, “Nasilje zakona,” 35; *Liber Croceus*, ed., Branislav Nedeljković, *Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda* III, 24 (Beograd: SANU, 1997), 4.

that in Dubrovnik a kind of rigidity of civil institutions existed simultaneously towards the Church and clergy.<sup>12</sup> It seems that in medieval Dubrovnik the principle of the state, at least on the surface, had overwhelmed all the other principles; as is written above the gates of the council chamber "*Obliti privatorum publica curate.*"

Besides this, one has to admit that medieval legal structures were not strictly defined and separated, so the jurisdictions of the various courts coincided, interlaced, and sometimes even interfered.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, generally speaking, ecclesiastical courts had jurisdiction over the clergy and ecclesiastical institutions. However, during the late Middle Ages, because of a strengthening of the state and civil/royal power, civil courts gradually usurped the right to judge clergy.

Such a development can be witnessed in a case from Amiens from 1408. Namely, during this year royal court processed many allegations against royal soldiers and officials who put clergymen into royal prisons. Consequently, this situation led to almost open conflict between the archbishop and the royal authorities, behind which was an ongoing process of struggle for domination; all of which can be "read" in the correspondence between the archbishop and the royal court. In his letters to the royal court, the archbishop repeatedly complains that civil authorities did not want to hand over imprisoned clerics to the arbitration of ecclesiastical institutions and canon law. Moreover, the archbishop states that the civil authorities tortured these clerics and he strictly disapproves of such actions. On the other hand, the royal officials tried to avoid these handovers in numerous ways, since they stated that ecclesiastical courts were too mild and forgiving towards the accused. Furthermore, they maintained that absence of corporal punishment and even the death penalty could aggravate a situation in the city, which was "swallowed" by crime, predominantly perpetrated by clergymen.<sup>14</sup>

Such a relationship of mutual conflict and the real supremacy of the civil authorities can be also traced in medieval Dubrovnik, and several cases from the beginning and the first half of the fifteenth century illustrate it nicely. A more thorough investigation of the extant archival materials could reveal even more cases, but I believe that following will serve well enough.<sup>15</sup> Some of these cases illustrate a kind of feeble interference into the private space of ecclesiastical institutions, while others clearly reveal the "omnipotence" of Dubrovnik's patricians, who had all the power in the city in their hands. By the same token, I believe that it is quite significant to emphasize that all these examples come from the records of Dubrovnik's Minor Council, which indirectly indicates the importance of these cases, since they were not handed

---

<sup>12</sup> This question is open in Croatian historiography, but viewed from a different perspective in Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona," 9-44, especially: 35-39.

<sup>13</sup> Robert N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe c. 1215 - c. 1515* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 39-40; Trevor Dean, *Crime in medieval Europe* (London: Longman, 2001), 108-14.

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem, 110-1.

<sup>15</sup> Some examples of violence against ecclesiastical institutions can be found in Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona," 35-9.

over to lower ranks of the juridical hierarchy.

The first case witnesses how Dubrovnik authorities saw the difference between the public and sacred (i.e., private) space of the Dominicans and their monastery in Dubrovnik. Namely, during the paving of this part of the city the civil authorities concluded that the ground-plan of the Dominican monastery, which abutted the east wall of the city's fortifications, did not correspond with the planned plot of the streets. Therefore, on 26 February 1415, the Minor Council did not hesitate to order the Dominicans to remove their lavatory and to wall up some of the windows and doors of the monastery because of the new layout of the street.<sup>16</sup> In the same year something similar happened at the monastery of St. Mark.<sup>17</sup> It is interesting to note that all the expenses of these renovations were supposed to be financed by the Dubrovnik commune. Therefore, one can assume that the Dubrovnik authorities saw this monastery as a public area of the city, not as an ecclesiastical private space. Moreover, the formulation of this decree clearly states that these orders did not take into account just the Dominican monastery, but the entire quarter of the city where the monastery was situated, which corroborates the above assumption. Other cases of similar conflicts between civil structures and ecclesiastical institutions also reveal that Dubrovnik's patricians, probably because of their pragmatic approach, considered that these ecclesiastical institutions belonged to the city and not to the Church.<sup>18</sup>

Moreover, it seems that the Dubrovnik authorities not only considered the Church's property as public space, but they also uncompromisingly usurped the right to judge clergy if it was in the political interest of the republic. This should not surprise us much, since Dubrovnik authorities tried to monitor and control almost all segments of public (and often also private) life and space.<sup>19</sup> Such an attitude can also be perceived in regulations and prohibitions from the beginning of the fifteenth century, according to which male Franciscans were forbidden to enter the convent of St. Clara and conduct holy mass.<sup>20</sup> The situation became even worse in 1434, when besides these restrictions, a love affair took place between young Clarissa Pervula de Tudisio and the Franciscan Antun Vukčić. Dubrovnik authorities reacted quickly and strictly, not hesitating to intrude on the privacy of the lovers, nor to interfere in the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical institutions. Namely,

<sup>16</sup> *Acta Consili Minoris*, s. 5, vol. 1, fol. 13 (Dubrovnik, State Archives).

<sup>17</sup> *Acta Consili Minoris*, s. 5, vol. 1, fol. 73 (Dubrovnik, State Archives).

<sup>18</sup> Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona," 38. The same could be concluded from some decrees of Dubrovnik's Minor Council from the 1380s, since in these regulations the council decided without any consent of ecclesiastical institutions about the usage and distribution of some gardens between the monasteries of St. Bartholomew and St. Clara. See.: *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike, knjiga I*, [Decrees of the councils of the Republic of Dubrovnik, vol. 1] ed. Mihajlo J. Dinić, *Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, III odeljenje*, knj. 15 (Beograd: SANU i Naučna knjiga, 1951.), 39-40.

<sup>19</sup> Ravančić, "Javno i privatno ...", 54.

<sup>20</sup> Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona ...", 37.

Clarissa was secretly taken to a convent in another Dalmatian city and the male "perpetrator" was put in jail. Moreover, all their abettors were also punished by expulsion from the city. Even a vigorous attempt by the archbishop was not enough to prevent a rigid punishment that was "acceptable to God and compatible with the crime so that this would be dignified before God and praised before the people."<sup>21</sup>

Although this reaction of the Dubrovnik authorities was rigid, one could interpret it as an attempt to protect the moral life and virginity of the sisters in the convent of St. Clara. However, another case reveals that behind such reactions was just the simple need of the civil authorities to control all the segments of life within the city.<sup>22</sup> Namely, sometime around the end of February or the beginning of March 1415 a brawl occurred in the cloister of the Franciscan monastery, which would not have been anything special if it had not provoked the legal action of Dubrovnik civil authorities, followed – as in the previous case – by the archbishop's reaction. It seems that during the Middle Ages this cloister was a kind of half-public half-private space, where frequently one could find lay persons having a rest or just loitering.<sup>23</sup> Such mingling did not usually bother the peace of the monks, but sometimes it could disturb the Franciscans' quiet life, as happened when Vlaho Stankov, called Kotica, started a fight with some of the brothers.<sup>24</sup> The reaction of the authorities was quick: Vlaho was forbidden to enter monastery and its cloister until the end of that year.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, the civil authorities indiscreetly interfered in the Franciscans' attempt to solve this case within the ecclesiastical institutions – they simply asked the Franciscan inquisitor, Nicolas from Split, to stop his activity and hand over the case to the civil authorities.<sup>26</sup> As in the previous case, the archbishop's intervention had no result. Quite the contrary, the Minor Council only requested advice from the Senate, after which the procedure led to separate legal processes against each of the unfortunates involved.<sup>27</sup> After a long discussion, about which unfortunately there is no extant record, all the Franciscans involved were banned from the city. Most of them could not return until November 1416, while two were banned

<sup>21</sup> More about this case see in: Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona ...", 37-39.

<sup>22</sup> Regarding this I would like to point out additional examples in: Ravančić, "Javni prostor ...", passim; Z. Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona ...", passim; Gordan Ravančić, "Prostitucija u kasnosrednjovjekovnom i renesansnom Dubrovniku" [Prostitution in the late medieval and renaissance Dubrovnik] in *Gradske marginalne skupine u Hrvatskoj kroz srednji vijek i ranomoderno doba : zbornik radova sa znanstvenog kolokvija održanog 10. prosinca 2003. u Zagrebu*, [Urban marginal groups in Croatia in the medieval and early modern period] ed. Tomislav Popić (Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji, 2004.), passim.

<sup>23</sup> Anđelko Badurina, *Uloga franjevačkih samostana u urbanizaciji dubrovačkog prostora* [Role of the Franciscan monasteries in the urbanization of Dubrovnik] (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 1990), 15-16; Ravančić, "Javni prostor ...", 55-56.

<sup>24</sup> It is important to note that in the sources Kotica was addressed as *dompnus*, which could indicate that he was also a clergyman. However, even if it were so, this would additionally prove Dubrovnik authorities' usurpation of ecclesiastical jurisdictional rights.

<sup>25</sup> *Acta Consili Minoris*, s. 5, vol. 1, fol. 15' (State Archives Dubrovnik).

<sup>26</sup> *Acta Consili Minoris*, s. 5, vol. 1, fol. 15 (State Archives Dubrovnik).

<sup>27</sup> *Acta Consili Minoris*, s. 5, vol. 1, fol. 15'-16 (State Archives Dubrovnik).

from the city only until the end of 1415. The sentence of the Franciscan Laurentius did not allow him to return to the city and its district for three years.

From the extant sources, unfortunately, it is not possible to determine the cause of this brawl and who started it. However, there is no doubt that this sentence of the Minor Council could not have been more strict and rigid, especially because this was not a crime that caused death, but only a brawl without any serious consequences. Still, something can be assumed/concluded from the extant records. Thus, the Franciscan Laurentius was probably considered the chief culprit since he "earned" the longest expulsion from the city. Similarly, Vlaho Stankov (i.e., his actions) was probably the cause of the brawl that provoked "rage" of the Dubrovnik authorities. Other involved Franciscans probably just joined the fight that started between Laurentius and Vlaho; perhaps they were trying to defend their brother.

In contrast, cases of clerics' conviction in contemporary Europe usually did not involve such rigid sentences, except in the case of murder or another grave crime.<sup>28</sup> Still, Dubrovnik patricians decided to punish these misbehaving friars gravely, so one can ask him/herself what the grounds were for such a decision. Maybe the reason was deeper than can be seen at first glance and one should look into other circumstances in this period. Since there is no written explanation of these sentences in the extant records, one can only guess. The fact that Dubrovnik's Franciscans were part of the Dalmatian Province, which was under the strong influence of Venice, may have played a certain role in this sentence, since the Dubrovnik authorities did not like Venetian interference in their jurisdiction.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, one should not forget that all this was happening at the beginning of the fifteenth century - in the period when Dubrovnik was going through one of its economic and cultural peaks. This quick development led to some changes in the standards of living and behaving, so it is possible that Dubrovnik authorities started to fear that such changes might cause other, graver, changes. The fact that it is stated in the records that this sentence was given as an "example" and "against scandal" may perhaps be a guide in revealing why the punishment was so strict. The Franciscan mendicant order was rather popular among the commoners and Franciscans served as models of moral living. Thus, if a scandal such as a brawl were tolerated, who knew where it could lead? Therefore, it is possible that the Dubrovnik civil authorities acted strictly to try to prevent and avoid any other possible "deviations" of commoner behavior. The "poor" friars ended up banned from the city in order to "rectify" themselves and avoid "scandalizing" citizens.

---

<sup>28</sup> See e.g.: Dean, *Crime*, 108-112.

<sup>29</sup> Janeković Römer, "Nasilje zakona ...", 38.

## APPENDIX

### *Acta Consili Minoris, s. 5, vol. 1 (State Archives Dubrovnik)* *Acts of the Minor Council*

#### **№ 1**

26th February 1415

Order of the Minor Council that Dominican friars had to make some constructional modifications on the monastery because of the new street regulations.

fol. 13

[die XXVI februarii 1415]

[pro monasterio fratrum predicatorum]

Captum fuit quod omnes porte que funt circa monasterium fratrum predicatorum quocumque modo murentur exceptis solummodo tribus videlicet duabus ecclesie et tertia claustri versus ponentem. Et quod dictum monastrium pro diligenti custodia ciuitatis et conseruatione honestatis fratrum dicti monasterii reducatur in scoleum siue insulam sic quod remaneat expedita via comunis eundi circa muros ciuitatis. Et quod latrine siue conductum que sunt iuxta muros destruantur et fiant a redificentur aut in dicto monasterio in domo eius existente a parte ponentis aut in via versus ponentem subtus teram in illo loco et in ea parte dictorum locorum prout et sicut placuerint ipsis fratribus simile cum procuratoribus dictorum fratrum pro commoditate ipsorum fratrum. Et quod due siue tres fenestrie que sunt in vna cella ex parte (cass: murorum) murorum civitatis murentur uel inferrentur si et in quantum per exportationem terreni existentis retro ipsam cellam non videatur domino restori et minori consilio quod remaneant adeo alte quod nulla suspicio haberi rationabiliter debeat. Que omnia debeant expensis comunis.

#### **№ 2**

9th March 1415

Decision and other records of the Minor Council about the case of brawl in the cloister of the Franciscan monastery.

fol. 15

die VIII <martii 1415>

Captum fuit de mittendo in forcia fratrum Marinum de Antibaro capellanum monacarum et fratrem Nicolaum de Cataro ad dominum viceuicarium (cass: qui) et quod ipse faciat de eis iusticiam et de offerendo sibi brachium et carceris et omnia que erunt ad hoc oportuam.

Captum fuit de offerendo domino vicetario brachium scalare (?) pro querendo fratrum Laurentium et (cass: esse) omnes alios et etiam carceres et alia opportuam in premissis.

[pro fratribus minoribus]

Captum fuit de procedendo contra fratres minores propter excessum comissum inter eos de vulneribus et percussionibus inter se ipsos perpetratis (?) vigore habite primo licentie a venerabili fratre Nicola de Spaletto inquisitore ac viceuicario in prouincia Dalmatina.

[pro eisdem]

Captum fuit de induciando super processu predictorum fratrum vsque ad diem Iiuis de mane proxime futuri que erit etiam (?) presentis.

fol. 15'

[contra dompinum Blasium Stanchi]

Captum fuit de precipiando (?) dompino Blasio Stanchi dicto Cotiza quod nullo modo audeat nichil persumat intrare monasterium fratrum minorum de Ragusio vsque per totum menssem decembris proximo sub pena voluntatis rectori Ragusiis.

[pro Albanense]

Captum fuit de dando in illis rebus que videbuntur domino rectori et minori consilio illo Albanensi qui venit huc pro faciendo fieri vestes pro suo domino (?) valorem yperperos quinqa de denariis (?) nostri comunis.

[pro fratribus minoribus]

Captum fuit de non portando ad consilium rogatorum processum fiendum contra fratres minores propter delictum et excessum eorum.

[pro eisdem]

Captum fuit de procedendo contra dictos fratres minores singulatum (?) ad vnum ad vnum quem ad modum videbitur presenti consilio.

fol. 16

dei XIII<sup>o</sup> marcii 1415

Captum fuit in suprascripto minori consilio in quo interfuerunt consiliarii decem de excludendo per summam (?) infrascriptes fratres ordis minorum (?) prptpter uulneta rixas questinas et procussinas habitas inter dictos fratres, vt (cass: de) monasterium decetero remaneat in quiete et nullum scandalum in hac civitate per eos oriri possit viro ut ceteris etiam transeat in exemplum quo vercantur (?) similia decetero perpetiare (?) a civitate Ragusii et eius



districtu in quam civitatem et districtum venire non presumant infra tempora infrascripta et si uenerint totiens excludantur per illa eadem tempora quotiens per ipsos uel aliquem ipsorum fuerit contrafactum si legitime probari poterit. Frater Laurentius fuit exclusus a ciuitate et districtu in parte suprascripta continetur per annos tres proxime futuros.

Frater Marinus de Antibaro capellanus incarcerationum usque ad diem XV<sup>am</sup> nouembris 1416.

Frater Nixa de Cathero fuit exclusus ut supra usque ad dictam diem XV<sup>am</sup> nouembris 1416.

Frater Petrus de Scardona fuit exclusus ut supra usque ad dictam diem XV<sup>am</sup> nouembris 1416.

Frater Ziuchus de Ragusio lector fuit exclusus ut supra usque ad dictam diem XV<sup>am</sup> nouembris 1416.

Frater Jacobus de Spaleto fuit exclusus ut supra usque ad dictam diem XV<sup>am</sup> nouembris 1416.

Frater Antonius de Caffia et frater Michael de Durachio lector Cathari usque per totum mensem decembris 1415.

Captum fuit in suprascripto minori consilio quod illi fratres ex suprascriptis qui ad presens non sunt in carceribus habeant terminum recedendi in Ragusio per totam diem dominicam proxime futuram.

### **Nº 3**

10th March 1416

Order of the Minor Council regarding the problem of the windows on the monastery of Saint Mark.

fol. 73'

[die X martii 1416]

[pro fenestra Sancti Marci]

Captum fuit de murando fenestram Sancti Marci que aspicit versus plateam et de faciendo vnam aliam fenestram in facie que est ex opposito domus thesaurariorum que sit fortis et bene ferrata.