

Gogić, M.. (2023): *An overview of livestock breeding in the medieval Zeta through the legal norms of the statutes of Kotor, Budva and Skadar. Agriculture and Forestry, 69 (2): 203-215. doi:10.17707/AgricultForest.69.2.16*

DOI: 10.17707/AgricultForest.69.2.16

Miljan Gogić¹,

AN OVERVIEW OF LIVESTOCK BREEDING IN THE MIEVEAL ZETA THROUGH THE LEGAL NORMS OF THE STATUTES OF KOTOR, BUDVA AND SKADAR

SUMMARY

The statutes of the medieval Zeta communes (Kotor, Budva, Skadar) also contain norms that, in whole or in part, also refer to animal husbandry. In the area of city districts, livestock could be kept on private properties, but also on municipal properties. One of the measures adopted to ensure the best possible conditions for cattle breeding was the ban on the surrounding population grazing their cattle in the area of the district. In the same way, the communal authorities adopted measures concerning the regulation of the use of certain lands as pasture areas in the area of the district. Apart from own management, the livestock could be raised by giving it to graze to other persons who took care of the livestock. Cattle were raised primarily for the household's needs, food, the sale of surplus agricultural products and their use for cultivating the land and transporting goods. Apart from this benefit from raising cattle, its owners could have certain incomes and benefits, as can be seen from the statutory provisions, from renting out draft and cargo cattle. In addition to rent, livestock was also used as a means of pledge, as stated in the statutes in Budva and Kotor. Livestock raised in Zeta communes caused damage to agricultural crops, and the communal authorities prescribed norms that provided for sanctions for the damage caused. Analyzing those sanctions from the norms of the Kotor legal system, it can be noted that cargo and draft animals, that is, their owners, were sometimes more leniently, or differently, sanctioned for the same damage than other livestock, while their killing was not allowed.

Keywords: statutes, animal husbandry, the Middle Ages

INTRODUCTION

The economy of the people in the medieval Zeta communes was determined above all by social conditions, but also by the natural environment that existed in them. Social conditions were generally more dominant than natural conditions for economic development. This resulted in the dynamic development

¹Miljan Gogić, scientific associate, Historical Institute, University of Montenegro, MONTENEGRO
Notes: The author declares that has no conflicts of interest. Authorship Form signed online.

Received: 24/03/2023

Accepted: 19/06/2023

of trade, crafts, fishing, and shipping as important economic branches in those communes. Due to the physio-geographic characteristics of the area, the natural conditions for cattle breeding were not very favorable (Djurović P. and Djurović M. 2015; Marković *et al.* 2017; Barović *et al.* 2020). And yet, a significant part of the population in the communes was engaged in agricultural activities, animal husbandry, or farming.

Medieval communes consisted of a town, which usually had a suburb and a district. The district was a wider area governed by a legal regime enacted by the authorities of the commune that governed it. Today, to a certain extent, it is possible to reconstruct the approximate area occupied by the districts of Zeta communes in the Middle Ages (Antonović, 2003). From these data, it can be seen that part of those city territories was an area suitable for agriculture, that is, animal husbandry. Over time, the need arose in the communes to settle issues related to animal husbandry, in addition to other issues. In addition to the norms that directly concerned that activity, it is indirectly discussed in some other legal norms, primarily those concerning the cultivation of land and the damage caused to agricultural crops by cattle. Those norms, direct and indirect, give answers to some questions that talk about the livestock farming of the population of Zeta communes, as well as the importance of this activity in the economy of Zeta communes. This paper aims to present and analyze the legal norms from the preserved statutes of Zeta communes that relate to animal husbandry and to consider its importance in the economy of Zeta communes, which until now has not been the subject of detailed analysis and study in science. Animal husbandry in Montenegro today represents the most important branch of animal breeding and agriculture in general (Adžić *et al.* 2004; Marković *et al.* 2021).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The material for writing this paper can be divided into several categories. The core material used to write this paper are the medieval statutes of Kotor, Budva and Shkodra, whose texts have been preserved and published (Statuta Civitatis Cathari, 1616; Statuta *et* leges civitatis Buduae, 1988; Statuta di Scutari 2016).

In addition to written norms, in the Zeta communes, when it comes to animal husbandry, customary law was also applied, which would represent the next, although much less common source (material) used for writing this work (On customary law, see: Marinović, 1974; Statute of the City of Kotor II, 2009).

A very significant comparative material for the study of this topic is represented by the statutes of medieval Dalmatian communes, first of all, due to their geographical proximity and similar socio-economic structure, the statute of Korčula (Statuta *et* leges civitatis *et* insulae Curzullae, 1877), but also of other smaller Dalmatian communes, that were close in social structure to Zeta communes, especially Budva and Skadar.

In the statutes of Zeta communes, as the material on which the work was written, one cannot notice the efforts of the organizers to regulate issues related to

animal husbandry in detail, and in one place. This seemed to be the most common legal norming of matters centered on another issue. We could divide the legal norms of the Zeta communes that speak about animal husbandry into several categories. The first would be those few provisions that directly relate to that activity. This category of norms includes those that regulate the use of areas for livestock grazing by the population of the district, that is, they sanction unauthorized use by persons outside the city district, who did not have the right to do so. Norms related to the ways of raising livestock and their use can also be counted there. In them, we come across mentions of persons who had the obligation to look after livestock. The second group consists of those provisions which, indirectly, also testify to livestock farming in the communes. These are mainly regulations that regulate the issue of damage caused by cattle on agricultural properties. The last group of regulations testifying to animal husbandry consists of those in which, through the regulation of some other concerns, some issues that can be linked to animal husbandry are mentioned and thus testify to that activity. Although there are not many legal norms about animal husbandry in the statutes of Zeta cities, they can give a certain picture of animal husbandry in them and its importance for the economy of those communes.

It can be safely assumed that part of the legal norms related to animal husbandry in Zeta communes originates from customary law. Thus, the legal institutes that were in force, and which are said to be regulated according to customary law, are mentioned in the Kotor official and notary documents. The absence of a large number of legal norms on animal husbandry in the statutes of Zeta communes can be interpreted precisely by the application of customary law. It can be assumed that the legal norms found in the statutes reflect the legal awareness and needs of a period, which does not mean that they were not subject to change. In some cases, these changes can be traced to the fact that at some point legal norms related to animal husbandry were replaced or supplemented by others.

When it comes to the methods used to write this paper, analytical and comparative methods are dominant. The material was approached in such a way that, to the extent possible, as far as the statutes of the Zeta communes allowed, individual topics, i.e. issues concerning animal husbandry, were analyzed, with a simultaneous comparison of those solutions, both in the Zeta statutes and those in the statutes of the Dalmatian communes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We could start the story by showing the area where livestock could be raised in Zeta communes, that is, grazed, and under what conditions. The basis for raising cattle was private land holdings within the district owned by the inhabitants of Zeta communes. We learn about their existence through the norms of all three statutes, which talk about the ownership of private immovable property, which also included pasture land, as well as preserved Kotor archival material. Those properties, in private ownership, were the subject of some norms

in the statutes (Bujuklić 1988; Bogojević Gluščević 1992; Statuta di Scutari 2016). In addition to private estates, areas owned by the communes were of particular importance for livestock farming in the communes. As we will see, the municipal authorities in some cases prescribed the conditions for their use for grazing.

The use of private properties for livestock grazing is directly evidenced by the Kotor Statute norm passed in 1421 by the Venetian authorities. It was stated that the population of Kotor could not graze their cattle to cattle breeders outside the district, i.e. to those from the hinterland, nor to lease their land holdings for grazing, which also applied to foreigners (Statuta Civitatis Cathari, 1616). (In this way, the Venetian authorities in Kotor, in addition to severing ties with the hinterland after Kotor accepted their supreme authority, wanted to preserve pasture areas only for the needs of the population of their commune (Sindik, 1950). This provision says that the population that reared cattle during the summer gave the cattle to shepherds from the surrounding areas for grazing, which in turn speaks of the insufficiency of pasture land in the area of the Kotor district. In question was the well-known custom of Katun cattle herding, widespread in the Middle Ages, but also the modern period (On Katun cattle herding in the Middle Ages see: Symposium 1963; Božić 1968; Luković 2015; Isailović 2017; Marković *et al.* 2018). The lack of pasture land in the area of the Kotor district is also reflected in the charter of Queen Jelena of Anjou for the village of Zator, which is located near Kotor. Under the threat of a large fine, the inhabitants of Kotor were forbidden, among other things, to graze their livestock in the area of that village, the boundaries of which are detailed in the charter (Gogić, 2021). Some similar measures, to secure pasture areas only for their population, were adopted in the 14th century by the Budva authorities. The statutory provision of that commune stipulated that foreigners may not graze on Budva's borders and territories, with the threat of a fine. That ban did not apply to the population from Suzana, probably today's Šušanj (Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae, 1988; Bujuklić 1988). The concern of the Budva authorities about the cattle and their nutrition is reflected in the norm by which the city judges, under the threat of punishment, are obliged to buy all the grass from the places where the *vlašts* were not settled (Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae, 1988). The statute of the city of Shkodra makes a provision that talks about the existence of pastures and a special regime for their use. This provision does not tell us enough about the ownership of those pasture areas, but it would rather be said that they are common, i.e. municipal areas than private properties of the Skadar population. According to this norm, the guardians of the pastures were obliged to conscientiously guard the pastures (*herbi*). If the guard caught someone (slave, Albanian or Skadran) grazing sheep, cows or pigs during the night, he had the right to take one sheep, cow or pig from that person. In addition, he had to inform the court about it, with the testimony of two or three other guards (Statuta di Scutari, 2016). The existence of pasture guards in Skadar speaks of the efforts of the communal authorities to provide pasture areas for the needs of their

population, who had the right to do so. Some Dalmatian communes also adopted norms on the regime of use of municipal pastures, bringing sometimes interesting solutions. Thus, the Korčula statute prescribes the grazing regime in Kneže, the area that was at the disposal of that commune. It was prescribed that during the day anyone could graze livestock in that area (except for kids and lambs), while at night grazing was prohibited in that area. This norm was later changed so that neither goats nor sheep were allowed to graze in that area, neither day nor night (*Statuta et leges civitatis et insulae Curzullae*, 1877). The Skadar statute does not contain a provision prohibiting the use of pasture areas by the population that did not belong to the district, which does not mean that such measures were not regulated by customary law, bearing in mind the importance of those areas for the economy of the commune's population. Similar measures aimed at banning the use of pasture lands belonging to the commune by the surrounding population, as was done by the authorities of Kotor and Budva, are also stated in the statute of the commune of Brač (Cvitanić, 1968).

All three communes adopted measures aimed at banning or limiting livestock grazing in certain areas within the district, primarily vineyards and areas sown with grain. The Kotor Statute talks about it in detail. When in 1307 the commune of Kotor received the parish of Grbalj from the Serbian king Milutin, and thus expanded its district, its authorities began to organize the legal regime in it. One of the segments of that arrangement referred to the more precise conditions of use of that fertile area. Thus, in the statutory provision created after 1316, it is prescribed that no one may use someone else's sown field for grazing, nor the grass that someone left behind as grassland. Furthermore, in the same provision, it was stated that when the owner of that land with grass starts to use that grass for grazing, then his neighbors can use it for grazing riding horses and oxen for plowing (*Statuta civitatis Cathari* 1616). An undated provision stipulated that no one should dare to graze horses, mules, donkeys, oxen, cows, pigs and sheep at any time in vineyards, orchards, gardens and sown fields, with detailed sanctions for violators of this provision, which will be discussed later in the work (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616; Katić, 1978). However, at one point the Kotor authorities deviated from this norm. It was about the fact that the statutory provision from 1406 allowed the grazing of oxen in the vineyards during their plowing, during the day. In the evening, the oxen had to be chased away from the vineyard (*Statuta civitatis Cathari* 1616; Gogić 2016). The municipality of Skadar prescribed a ban on grazing cows, horses or donkeys within areas planted with wheat before the end of the harvest. Cases were exempted from this decision when the cow was tied and thus could not cause harm (*Statuta di Scutari*, 2016). In the same commune, by statutory provision, it was forbidden for anyone to graze cows in one part of the district, the area between the church of St. Peter and the church of St. Angel, in the period from spring to the feast of St. Andrea (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). Similar measures, banning cattle grazing in a certain area, were adopted by the Korčula authorities. By the norms they brought, it was forbidden to graze cattle in front of the city, excluding horses and donkeys, as

well as cattle for slaughter (*Statuta et leges civitatis et insulae Curzullae* 1877). Similar to the one in Skadar, this issue was also regulated in the Budva statute. It stated that no one could graze oxen, horses or donkeys between the grain until it was harvested, except if the animals were tied and could not cause harm (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988). As can be seen, unlike the Kotor commune, which almost explicitly forbade it, the Budva and Skadar communes allowed cattle grazing on arable land in some situations, and only in those cases when the cattle were tethered. The safety of arable land was their priority. All of the above could, on the one hand, be interpreted as the great concern of the Kotor commune for viticulture, which represented an extremely important branch of agricultural space. This could be considered indirect proof of the importance of animal husbandry in the economy of the population of those communes and the aspirations of their authorities to help their animal husbandry population in this way.

The statutes of Zeta communes give norms about the areas where livestock could be housed, or more precisely, where it was not allowed. Medieval communes were communities where, for the most part, there were no clear boundaries between urban and rural lifestyles. This was also manifested by the fact that the population within the cities themselves, ie. the city walls kept livestock, which the communal authorities tried to prevent. This was also the case in medieval Kotor. From the 13th-14th centuries, there are no legal norms related to the regulation of this issue. From the beginning of the 15th century (1406), there is a provision that prohibited the keeping of cattle in the city. Whoever wanted to keep livestock could still build a stable outside the city of Kotor, specifying two locations near the city, as well as several others a little further from the city, where this could be done (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616; Sindik 1950; Katić 1978). So, while the Korčula authorities tried to prevent livestock from grazing in front of the city, the Kotor commune adopted a norm prohibiting the keeping of livestock in the city. There is no doubt that this problem existed in the Kotor commune before. The adoption of this norm at that moment was possibly conditioned by the consequences of political events in the Kotor area. Those were the years when, under the pressure of armed conflicts, the population from the area of the district, as well as the surrounding areas, sought refuge within the city walls, probably trying to place some of their movable property there. Such a problem is not regulated in the Budva statute, while in Skadar it is mentioned indirectly. It states that pigs cannot be kept in the city, within the norm related to the damage that pigs could do to cultivated areas (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). Certainly, such measures were adopted in Kotor and Skadar mainly for hygiene and health reasons. Keeping livestock in the limited space of the city walls could worsen the living conditions of the population inside them and thus potentially be the cause of some infectious diseases.

The next question related to animal husbandry in Zeta communes is the question of how the animals were raised. The first was that the population only raised livestock within their household. It was mainly applied by the population

of the rural areas of the communes, within their households. Another way, also represented, was giving cattle to graze to other people. When it comes to the Kotor statute, there are no provisions in it that regulate this type of livestock farming. Preserved archival materials from Kotor testify that Kotor nobles and citizens gave cattle to the peasants for grazing. Those peasants, therefore, in addition to their own livestock, also took other people's for safekeeping. Keeping other people's livestock was regulated by contracts, which stated that they were concluded according to customary law (*secundum consuetudines terrae*) (Mayer 1950; Sindik 1950). In contrast to Kotor, the Budva statute contains provisions related to the provision of livestock for grazing and the existence of shepherds who were responsible for this. The first provision (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988; Katić, 1978; Bujuklić, 1988) prescribes the method of giving cows or sheep for grazing. Two-thirds of the offspring belonged to the owner of the cattle, and a third to the shepherd. In case of any damage to the animals, which would be interpreted as an omission by the shepherd, he was obliged to compensate it. He was exempted from this only if the theft of the livestock entrusted to him for safekeeping occurred during the night, provided that he informed the owner of the livestock about the theft in time. Another provision regulates the keeping of pigs. The herdsman had the obligation to look after the pigs for at least three years, with the obligation to compensate for any damage caused by his responsibility. Half of the offspring belonged to him, which was more favorable than in the case of keeping cows or sheep (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988; Katić, 1978; Bujuklić, 1988). The Statute of Skadar talks in more detail about the care of livestock that has been entrusted for safekeeping. First of all, it is stated that shepherds who lead cattle to graze on holidays and Sundays must do this work in such a way that they do not lose their cattle, either their own or someone else's. The livestock owner could hire a maximum of two people during the livestock grazing. One was in charge of guarding the cattle, the other was obliged to bring food. If he hired more than two assistants, he had to pay a fine. The shepherd was obliged to compensate for any damage to the livestock (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). Attention is also drawn to the following provision of the Skadar statute, which stipulated that if a shepherd, instead of returning his cattle and those of other villagers, leaves them in the evening and goes to celebrate in the city, he will be responsible for any damage (*Statuta di Scutari*, 2016). This is about raising livestock, i.e. looking after livestock in such a way that the owners of the livestock hired shepherds who took care of theirs, theirs, but also the livestock of other people who entrusted it to them. The part of the provision where it is said that it applies only to certain days (holidays and Sundays) is particularly significant. This would suggest that a different livestock-keeping regime was in effect on the other days. In the same statute, there is also a provision regulating the loss of a cow during the night in an unknown place. The owner had to be informed about her disappearance before dawn. If the shepherd did not inform him about it, he had to bear the damage himself. The shepherd had to pay for the loss of the cow during the day himself. This provision prescribes

another case of the loss of a cow. If she got lost due to a fly attack, the shepherd had until evening to look for her and inform the owner about it. If he did not find it, he had to compensate the owner of the livestock for the damage (Statuta di Scutari 2016). All the mentioned norms of the Skadar statute on the shepherd's obligations regarding keeping livestock and the measures taken if he does not perform his work conscientiously speak of the efforts of the communal authorities to protect their population from the damage they would suffer due to the loss of livestock. This detailed legal arrangement of this issue concerning the Kotor and Budva communes also speaks of a more pronounced degree of rural life in the Skadar community compared to the other two, which can be seen from the legal norms enacted by its statute. From the above, it can be seen that in Zeta communes there were shepherds who, according to certain norms, took care of livestock, both their own and those of others. It seems that the issue of keeping livestock, shepherds and their obligations is regulated in more detail in the statutes of some Dalmatian communes, e.g. Korcula (Statuta et leges civitatis et insulae Curzullae, 1877) and especially Hvar (Statuta communitatis Lesinae (Phare) 1882-3).

We come to the next question when it comes to the topic of work, which is the use of livestock in Zeta communes. From the available material, it can be seen that cattle (cows, oxen, bison), sheep, goats, horses, donkeys and mules were raised in the mentioned communes. In addition to ordinary cattle, buffaloes were also kept, which were used as draft animals. Cattle were primarily raised for household needs. First of all, it met a significant part of the food needs. Draft and pack animals were used to cultivate the land and transport goods. There was also some benefit from the sale of surplus livestock and their products. It is possible that part of these commodity activities took place through barter for some other agricultural products or other goods necessary for the household. The effort to ensure the supply of livestock products to the population of the commune was of great importance to the commune authorities. When it comes to the commune of Kotor, it is possible that livestock products from the territory of the commune, at least at some point, according to the assessment of its authorities, were not sufficient to meet the needs of that commune, so their export is prohibited. The norm adopted in July 1346 prohibited the purchase of livestock and cheese in the territory of the Kotor commune and their sale outside that city (Statuta Civitatis Cathari, 1616). It is not known whether this measure was conditioned by some other motives (the impossibility of importing these products from some other markets for certain reasons), but it is certainly an example of the communal authorities' concern for the nutrition of their population. Part of the livestock products imported from the Zeta hinterland and the interior were certainly used to meet the needs of the population of the communes, primarily the urban area. Trade in livestock products, as well as other goods, took place in shops and on town squares. (See: Privatni život, 2004).

Certain incomes or services were obtained from renting out a draft and pack animals. Every household at some point did not have the animals necessary

to cultivate the land. The same was true for the transport of goods. Business people who were engaged in trade and transportation of goods were especially interested in this last activity. For these reasons, it was necessary to hire animals for the mentioned activities. We find some information about this special type of obligation relationship in the statutes of Zeta communes. The Kotor Statute contains a norm that more closely regulates the issue of renting cargo animals. Two cases were foreseen when it came to renting these animals. In the first case, when someone would give a pack animal for rent or service, and the owner of the livestock would go with them if the animal died or was stolen, the damage was borne by its owner. If the owner or someone of his does not go, the resulting damage would be borne by the person who hired the animals (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616). The provision on the cows that went to Brskovo and other inland regions also speaks of the rental of pack animals in Kotor (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616; Katić, 1978). Of course, not all the beasts of burden that were used for this activity were the property of people from the district area, but they were mostly the property of Vlach-herdsmen from the hinterland (About this, see: Sindik 1950,). The Budva statute provides somewhat more detailed solutions to the issue of compensation for damage to cargo animals (horses or donkeys) that someone would hire. The main obligation of the person who hired these animals was not to burden them excessively, i.e. more than what was agreed. If a horse or donkey died, the person who hired it was obliged to pay for it. If someone steals those pack animals from him, the damage would be borne by their owner. If he took it at his own risk, he was obliged to pay. If a horse or donkey was stolen in the presence of the owner or his boy, the owner had to pay for the damage, if they were not present, and the person who hired the animals was responsible for the damage. (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988; Bujuklić, 1988). The Skadar statute also contains a norm related to the lease of livestock. She talks about hiring oxen to work the land. It was prescribed that if someone hires an ox to cultivate the land of the owner of that animal and his own, permanently or for a certain period, he was obliged to cultivate the land of the owner of the bull fairly as if it were his own. If a fraud of the person from whom the bull was hired or abuse of the animal is determined, if something happens to the bull and because of this the work is not done, if his guilt is proven he is obliged to pay a fine (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). How important the bull was for cultivating the land in the same commune is also shown by the provision prohibiting any citizen or foreigner from selling a bull to the slaughterhouse. He could only be sold for fieldwork. The only exception was if it could no longer be used to cultivate the land and only in that case could it be sold (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). The hiring of oxen for plowing as well as the plowman's care of them even after the sowing is finished is also recorded in the Korčula statute (*Statuta et leges civitatis et insulae Curzullae* 1877), while the documents of the Dubrovnik archive offer plenty of data on the leasing of oxen (Blagojević, 2004).

In rural areas such as the Zeta communes, livestock could also be used as a pledge. That type of obligation relations, where the property is specified as a

means of securing the performance of contractual obligations, is regulated in detail in the Kotor Statute (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616). We can assume that under the clause *super me et omnia bona mea*, by which the debtor committed himself to the creditor to guarantee the fulfillment of contractual obligations in the notarial document, his livestock could also be understood as part of the property (On the pledge in Kotor, see: Bogojević-Glušćević 1999). Unlike the Kotor statute, the Budva statute contains norms that mention livestock as the subject of a pledge. First of all, within the provision on the pledge of movable property, it is briefly stated that an animal cannot be held as a pledge without proof (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988; Bujuklić 1988). In the second provision, this issue is regulated in such a way that it is prescribed that no animal may be accepted as a pledge without the surety of a witness, otherwise, the person who would accept as a pledge without a surety had to return the animal to the owner and pay a fine (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988; Bujuklić 1988). Therefore, the pledge, in this case, was possible only with the presence of witnesses. As a possible means of pledge, animals are also mentioned in the Skadar statute in the provision related to the payment of the court fee (*Statuta di Scutari*, 2016). Therefore, in the communes of Zeta, livestock was used as a means of pledge, which was also the case in some Dalmatian communes, e.g. of Hvar (*Statuta communitatis Lesinae (Pharae)*, 1991).

A special type of source that also testifies to livestock farming in the communes is those norms that provide regulations on damage caused by livestock. Those norms are significant in that, in some cases, they can reveal the different attitudes of communal authorities towards sanctioning the same damages, depending on which livestock caused them, which directly speaks of the importance of those animals for the agriculture of the commune. When it comes to the municipality of Kotor, legal norms from the end of the 12th century, related to animal husbandry, have been preserved. The provisions in question were related to the punishment of owners of livestock that caused damage to crops. The first of them is from April 1197 and is located in the Pontifical of Kotor. With this decision, it was stipulated that if someone finds a cow, horse or donkey in his vineyard, he has the right to be compensated for the damage, that is, the effort he invested in cultivating the vineyard. From the owner of that animal, he had the right to take one *perper* per cow, horse or donkey. As for sheep and other small livestock, it was stipulated that the owner of the vineyard has the right to appropriate them, that is, take them or kill them. The remaining part of the text of this decision was scraped off, but we can assume that it also referred to punishment for damage caused by cattle (Gyug 2016; Gogić 2016). *Perper*, by the way, was a unit of account that was worth twelve units of local silver money (Ćirković, Mihaljčić 1999). Interestingly, the entire text of this provision (each line) has been crossed out as if it was intended to show that this decision was no longer in force. The following decision on this issue, also recorded in the Pontifical, shows that this was indeed the case. It was passed in April 1203. In its introduction, it is stated that the earlier decision regarding punishment for damage

caused by cattle created numerous problems, which led to numerous court cases. For this reason, the Kotor authorities decided to adopt new measures regarding the sanctioning of damage caused by livestock. The new decision stipulated that if someone found a donkey, horse, cow or another animal on his property, he had the right to appropriate the livestock, and its owner had the obligation to compensate for the damage (Gyug 2016; Gogić 2016).

The statute of Kotor deals with the issue of punishment for damage caused by cattle on arable land. In an undated provision, probably from the 14th century, penalties were prescribed for livestock (horses, mules, donkeys, oxen, cows, sheep, pigs) that caused damage to some arable land (vineyards, orchards, gardens, areas under grain). If a draft animal (horse, mule, donkey, cow) caused damage, its owner was obliged to pay a fine of two perpers to the commune, along with the obligation to compensate for the damage. If another livestock was damaged, the owner who suffered the damage could do whatever he wanted with it, beat or kill it (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616; Gogić 2016). This type of norming changed the norm from 1203, which allowed the appropriation of all livestock that caused damage. Now the owner of the property to which the damage was caused could not freely dispose of the draft stock that caused the damage. Such a measure was probably adopted due to the importance of draft animals in the economy of the population from the area of the commune. From these norms, it can be concluded that draft animals had a slightly different treatment when punished for the damage done.

The aforementioned nondated norm was amended by the aforementioned provision from 1406. The earlier provision that the owner of an ox that caused the damage was to pay a fine of two perpers was changed in such a way that he now pays it to the owner of the property, while for damage caused by mules, horses and donkeys he would still pay the same fine to the municipality. It was also prescribed that the owner of the property (vineyards, gardens, fields) where the damage was caused belongs to two-thirds of the found livestock, one third belonged to the official who found them in damage (*Statuta Civitatis Cathari*, 1616; Gogić 2016). In this way, the communal authorities actually returned to the norm from 1203. Unlike the one in Kotor, the Budva statute does not decisively specify the types of livestock when prescribing norms for the damage they have caused in the vineyard and the field, making no distinction in punishment for individual types of livestock (*Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae*, 1988). A similar provision was made in the Skadar statute. It lists cows and horses as livestock for which punishment is prescribed for the damage they have done in the vineyard, but without distinction in their punishment (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). In the already mentioned provision of the Scutari statute, which allowed the grazing of horses, cows or donkeys within the sown areas if the cows were tied, a sanction was also provided for in case of damage caused by the cow (*Statuta di Scutari* 2016). Also, in the statute of Dubrovnik, there is no indication of certain categories of livestock when prescribing the norm for the damage they caused to agricultural crops (*Liber statutorum civitatis Ragusii* 2002).

When it comes to animal husbandry, not only in the Zeta regions, it should be noted that salt was of great importance for its development and the number of livestock. It was used, first of all, for the preparation and storage of livestock products, but also as a supplement to livestock nutrition. It is known that in the Middle Ages, salt was sold in Kotor and Sv. Srđ, a small square at the mouth of Bojana (Istorija Crne Gore II/1 1970). The proximity of these places where they could get that much-needed item made it easier for the herding population of the Zeta region to engage in animal husbandry.

CONCLUSIONS

In the Middle Ages, animal husbandry represented a significant economic branch that was engaged in by a significant part of the population of Zeta communes. The norms of the statutes of Zeta communes (Kotor, Budva, Skadar) provide data from which a certain picture can be created about animal husbandry in the area of their districts. From the smaller number of statutory norms, one can see the effort of communal authorities to regulate certain issues related to animal husbandry. Significant data on animal husbandry in medieval communes can be obtained from the statutory provisions, the center of which is the regulation of some other issues. The basis for animal husbandry in the communes was the private estates located in its district. In addition to them, pasture lands owned by the communes themselves were used for animal husbandry. From the content of the statutory provisions, it can be seen that the cattle were raised by being kept on their property, within their own household, but also in the way that they were given to grazing by other persons who took care of them. Cattle were raised primarily for the household's needs, food, the sale of surplus agricultural products and their use for cultivating the land and transporting goods. Apart from this, cattle could be used by renting them out and as a means of the pledge.

REFERENCES

- Adžić, N.; Marković, B.; Adžić, B. (2004). Stočarstvo i stočarska proizvodnja Crne Gore, *Agriculture and Forestry*, 1-2: 171-184.
- Antonović, M. (2003). Grad i župa u Zetskom primorju i severnoj Albaniji u XIV i XV veku.
- Barović, G.; Vujačić, D.; Radusinović, S. (2020). Physical-Geographical Characteristics of the Coast of Montenegro, *The Montenegrin Adriatic Coast*: 15-28.
- Blagojević, M. (2004). *Zemljoradnja u srednjovekovnoj Srbiji*.
- Bogojević-Gluščević N. (1999). Obligaciono pravna problematika, *Iz pravne prošlosti Kotora*.
- Bogojević-Gluščević, N. (1992). Svojinski odnosi u Kotoru u XIV vijeku.
- Božić, I. (1968). Katuni Crne Gore. *Žbornik Filozofskog fakulteta X/1*: 245-249.
- Bujuklić Ž. (1988). *Pravno uređenje srednjovekovne Budvanske komune*.
- Čirković, S.; Mihaljčić, R. (1999). *Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka*.
- Cvitanić, A. (1968). *Srednjovekovni statut bračke komune iz godine 1305*.
- Djurović, P. & Djurović, M. (2016). Physical Geographic Characteristics and Sustainable Development of the Mountain Area in Montenegro, in: *Sustainable Development in Mountain Regions Southeastern Europe*: 93-111.

- Gogić, M. (2018). Prilog proučavanju stočarstva u srednjovjekovnom Kotoru. Održivi razvoj planinskih područja — iskustva, izazovi i perspektive, Zbornici radova sa naučnih skupova, Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti, Podgorica, 2018. ISBN 978-86-7215-445-0, Vol. 145, pp. 191-198
- Gogić, M. (2021). O povelji kraljice Jelene Anžuske za selo Zator (1376-1306). Istorijski zapisi, 1-2: 53-72.
- Gyug, R. F. (2016). Liturgy and Law in a Dalmatian City.
- Isailović, N. (2017). Legislation concerning the Vlachs of the Balkans before and after Ottoman conquest: an overview, in: State and society in the Balkans before and after the establishment of Ottoman Rule: 25-42.
- Istorija Crne Gore II/1. (1970).
- Katić, R. (1978). Stočarstvo srednjovekovne Srbije.
- Liber statutorum civitatis Ragusii. Statut grada Dubrovnika. (2002).
- Luković, M. (2015). Zakon vlahom (Ius Valachicum) in the charters issued to Serbian medieval monasteries and kanuns regarding Vlachs in the early ottoman tax registers (defters). Balcanica posnaniensia Acta et studia XXII/1: 29-47.
- Luković, M. (2016). Self-Government Institutions of Nomadic and Semi-Nomadic Livestock Breeders in the Balkans and in the Carpathian Regions in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods. Res Historica, 41: 51-94.
- Marijanović-Dušanić, S., Popović, D., (2004). Privatni život u srpskim zemljama srednjeg veka
- Marinović, A. (1974). Običajno pravo i samouprave u Dubrovačkoj Republici i njihovo izučavanje
- Marković, M.; Erjavec, E.; Marković, B.; Juvančić, L.; Radonjić, D. (2018): Traditional livestock production at the Montenegrin katuns, Održivi razvoj planinskih područja - iskustva, izazovi i perspektive : [radovi sa naučnog skupa održanog na Žabljaku, 14-16. septembra 2016.god.]:49-61.
- Marković, M.; Marković, B.; Dubljević, R.; Radonjić, D.; Đokić, M.; Mirecki, S.; Jovović, Z. (2017). Poljoprivreda planinskih područja: priručnik za proizvođače
- Marković, M.; Radonjić, D.; Đokić, M.; Kandić, A.; Marković, B. (2021). Allelic polymorphism of k-casein gene (csn3) in three Montenegrin cattle breeds. Agriculture and Forestry, 67 (3): 61-70
- Mayer, A. (1950). Monumenta Catharensia.
- Simpozijum o srednjovjekovnom katunu održan 24. i 25. novembra 1961. (1963).
- Sindik, I. (1950). Komunalno uređenje Kotora od druge polovine XII do početka XV stoleća
- Statut grada Kotora II. (2009).
- Statuta Civitatis Cathari, Venetiis. (1616).
- Statuta communitatis Lesinae (Pharae). (1991).
- Statuta di Scutari. (2016).
- Statuta et leges civitatis Buduae. (1988).
- Statuta et leges civitatis et insulae Curzullae 1214-1558. (1877)