



Imaging frontiers, contesting identities / edited by Steven G. Ellis and Lud'a Klusáková  
(Frontiers and identities : thematic work group 5 ; 2)

305.8 (21.)

1. Identità 2. Multiculturalismo I. Ellis, Steven G. II. Klusáková, Lud'a

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa



This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-00164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

*Cover:* Fernand Leger (1881-1955), *Contrast of Forms*, painting, Rosengart Collection, Luzern, detail ©1990.

Photo Scala Archives, Florence

© Copyright 2007 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

info-plus@edizioniplus.it

www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

Member of



Association of American  
University Presses

ISBN 978-88-8492-466-7

*Manager*

Claudia Napolitano

*Editing*

Francesca Petrucci, Eleonora Lollini

*Informatic assistance*

Massimo Arcidiacono, Michele Gasparello

# Venice-Babylon: Foreigners and Citizens in the Renaissance Period (14th-16th Centuries)

LUDIVINE-JULIE OLARD  
University Toulouse II - Le Mirail

## ABSTRACT

The concept of “*ville mangeuse d’hommes*” is no longer credible, and there is a wealth of scholarship on the complex forces surrounding urban migration in Renaissance Europe which affirms the primacy of human agency in the development of the city. The present chapter builds on this tradition, reconstructing the legal, economic and social conditions which informed the status of foreigners in Renaissance Venice, or ‘Venice-Babylon’. While the city’s dynamism, diversity, and apparent tolerance attracted many foreigners to settle there, the influence of Italian jurists was being felt among the local native elite. In reorganizing themselves socially and politically, the Venetian oligarchy’s attitudes towards foreigners became less sanguine: some communities were considered more useful than others, while, especially during times of crisis, foreign citizens and patricians came under increased scrutiny by the natives.

*Une fois écarté le concept désuet de “ville mangeuse d’hommes”, nous pouvons mesurer la place réelle de la main humaine dans le développement extraordinaire des cités italiennes de la fin du Moyen Age, et notamment de Venise. Les travaux de nombreux historiens (Ph. Braunstein, R.C. Mueller) sont venus étayer notre analyse concernant le rôle crucial joué par les migrations pendulaires entre campagne et cité, terreferme et lagune, outre-mer et métropole. Venise-Babylone frappe les voyageurs par sa diversité, son dynamisme et la tolérance apparente qui alimente un flot continu de nouveaux arrivants: pèlerins, marchands, voyageurs de passage, etc. Evaluer la place des étrangers dans la cité des Doges revient à décrire plusieurs réalités superposées: leur statut juridique, leur rôle économique et social voire religieux et spirituel dans la république. Telle est la démarche engagée par les plus grands juristes italiens dès le XIVe siècle à propos de la citoyenneté: déterminer qui appartient à la communauté civique afin de se libérer de la tutelle impériale. Le droit est l’instrument par lequel les cités italiennes acquièrent leur autonomie. Elles organisent au fil du temps, une nouvelle hiérarchisation interne de la vie urbaine. Ainsi, à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle, la potestas prend le pas sur la civilitas.*

*Les historiens de “l’espace” (D. Calabi, E. Crouzet-Pavan) ont mis en avant la présence physique de ces étrangers dans la cité de Venise: toponymie, édifices religieux, etc. Bien que*

*le modèle de la polis grecque soit présent chez tous les érudits, celle-ci n'est pas la città médiévale; la civilitas ne confère pas automatiquement la participation à la gestion de la chose publique (la res publica). Le caractère commun des cités du Moyen Âge réside plutôt dans la pratique du commerce et tous les citoyens ne sont pas égaux en droits (ils ne peuvent notamment rivaliser avec les patriciens qui eux, détiennent la véritable capacité d'agir dans la polis). Bien qu'ils soient accueillis favorablement comme des partenaires économiques potentiels (main-d'œuvre, savoir-faire, intermédiaires vers de nouveaux marchés...), les étrangers sont toujours soumis à l'autorité politique et administrative de la cité: une méfiance organisée consent ponctuellement des avantages fiscaux plus attractifs afin de subvenir à la dépopulation.*

*En outre, ils jouent de fait un rôle éminemment social: les Allemands vendent, cuisent le pain et font souvent crédit aux plus démunis; les Juifs pratiquent l'usure à des taux très inférieurs à ceux habituellement pratiqués par les chrétiens. Chaque communauté d'étranger prend en charge ses pauvres dans le cadre de confréries, etc. Les contemporains reconnaissent l'utilité de ces "autres" et lorsque les prédicateurs élaborent le projet de ghetto, le célèbre chroniqueur vénitien M. Sanudo défend les Juifs de Venise, devenus indispensables à la prospérité vénitienne et au maintien de la paix civile.*

*La crise identitaire qui frappe la civilisation vénitienne à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle a inspiré l'analyse comparative de Venise et Londres: leur commun intérêt pour le commerce et la recherche d'une identité fédératrice (vertu, pureté) dépassant toutes les influences et permettant de braver toutes les difficultés. Les citoyens ne sont pas les seuls à faire les frais de cette tendance: en 1506, les patriciens vénitiens sont eux aussi soumis à la nova probatio.*

In the article *Venise et les villes de la République: communautés nationales et artisans*, Paola Lanaro describes the mobility which characterized pre-industrial societies<sup>1</sup>. She insists that the concept of the "*ville mangeuse d'hommes*" (literally, the man-eating city), is no longer tenable, as there were other impulses which prompted migration to urban areas. The present chapter is concerned with foreigners in the city of Venice in the late medieval period. Immigration was a fundamental feature of life in the city; at the close of the 15th century, Philippe de Commines, the French ambassador, was moved to observe that "most of [the Venetian] people are foreigners"<sup>2</sup>. Before embarking on such an exploration, of course, we must define what 'foreigner' meant in Renaissance Venice. The English language<sup>3</sup> has two distinct words for the notion of strangeness. 'Stranger' refers to someone coming from another place, and often unfamiliar with the prevailing conditions in the new environment; 'foreigner' refers to someone from another 'nation', defined, for example, by the use of a different language<sup>4</sup>. In the Venetian language, the word *forastier* refers to the stranger, one who comes from *fōra* (Latin *fōras*), in other words, from outside. In Venetian legal terms, he who did not have Venetian citizenship was accounted a *forastier*. During the period under review here<sup>5</sup>, the definition of the legal status of foreigners in the Italian city-states, and their ability to integrate as citizens, were questions of great importance; and the distinctions between citizens and non-citi-

zens, and between the members of the civic community and the disenfranchised, had to be clear and firmly established<sup>6</sup>.

Ernst Kantorowicz has asserted that: “for Greeks or Romans, the word *πατρις* or *patria* stood mostly, if not only for the city. Only barbarians, like the citizens of modern nations, were named according to their fatherland and only they were *patriotai*, while the Greeks were proud to be *politai*, citizens”<sup>7</sup>. The city-states in medieval Italy borrowed this ‘political’ concept of urban organization from the Greek *polis* concept. However, unlike in Antiquity, the acquisition of the idea of *civitas*<sup>8</sup> in the 14th century did not necessarily allow one to take part in the *res publica*. There was no equality between the “*civis originarius* and the new *civis*”<sup>9</sup>. In Venice, only the patriciate (members of the Great Council, the assembly that voted for laws and elected officials) governed. But that is not to say that foreigners were completely ostracized from society.

Migrants were important to a city like Venice, which despite its wealth was still prone to problems associated with disease, famine and war. During the Great Plague of 1347-1348, Venice lost three out of five inhabitants. For the 15th century, Freddy Thiriet estimates the number of inhabitants at 150,000<sup>10</sup>, and 190,000 around 1550. In the second half of the 16th century, with victims falling to another plague, Venice barely reached the number of inhabitants of cities such as Rome or Palermo, with approximately 90-100,000 inhabitants around 1590<sup>11</sup>. It was a city devoid of any mining and agricultural resources (except fish and salt), constantly importing from other regions (the *Terra Ferma* – the Venetian hinterland and its dominion), and always threatened by depopulation and a lack of manpower. Immigration quotas were thus devised to meet the needs of the city. Those who wished to settle for a long period of time, or apply for citizenship, had to meet very strict standards. To qualify for Venetian citizenship, the applicant had to give proof of his willingness to assimilate (including his intention to settle and practice his profession in the city for life, and acquire real estate, etc.). And, of course, it should be noted that citizenship was granted exclusively to men.

## USEFUL MIGRANTS, BUT UNDER SURVEILLANCE<sup>12</sup>

### Manpower and skills; middlemen for new markets

Some foreigners were more sought after than others, especially for their professional qualities. These included physicians (often Jews) and jurists (educated in the universities of France or Bologna). Foreigners were also welcome as a means of increasing revenue from taxation and to stimulate business. In order to draw them to Venice, they were offered certain legal advantages. The city authorities attempted to avoid a large settlement of poor peasants in the city<sup>13</sup>, which would have brought about a general decrease in wages. The city’s inhabitants were of various ethnicities. Since the 9th century A.D., Venice had been known as place of permanent settlement for pilgrims and travelers who came to worship the relics of Saint Mark before moving onto those of Saints Paul and Peter in Rome. They also did business in the city, and would perhaps sail east aboard the infamous Venetian merchant-ships, to visit Alexandria and the Holy Land.

In Venice, as in Babylon<sup>14</sup>, it was said proverbially that all the world's languages could be heard there. Even though, according to Ernesto Sestan, “the Italian ethnic-linguistic background still played the greatest part in all cities”<sup>15</sup>, foreign elements were ever present in economic, political and cultural life. In the maritime republic of Venice, “true” Venetians and foreigners lived together. Natives and newcomers alike were represented in the ranks of both the *popolo* (composed of the citizens and non-citizens) and the patricians who took part in the *res publica*, as Venetian citizenship could be obtained in various ways.

In the 14th century, the *bourgeoisie* dissociated itself from the common ‘manual’ workers, by claiming for themselves the title of ‘*cittadini*’ [citizens]. In this new social hierarchy, the highest rank was that of the *cittadini originari* [original citizens], distinct from any financial criterion. The civil servants at the Ducal Chancery<sup>16</sup>, commissioners and numerous functionaries of the tribunals of the city<sup>17</sup> regarded themselves as such. Others did business in international trade or ran local workshops, for example, in glass-making. The *cittadini originari* benefited from privileges including the right to bear arms and customs exemptions. They participated in *Scuole Grandi*, religious and philanthropic brotherhoods; they were second class nobles. At a lower rank were the *cittadini de intus et extra* [complete citizens]. In order for a foreigner to qualify for this status, a constant residence in the city, of at least 25 years, had to be proven. Finally, the *cittadini de intus* had to prove a ten-year residence in town, to have married a Venetian woman and not to have exercised any *ars mechanica*.

Traditionally, throughout the middle ages, the knowledge of craftsmen, merchants and other professionals coming from other countries was welcome in Venice. A perpetual movement from the countryside to the city was essential to compensate for the high level of death in town. The members of the *popolo minuto* [the group of people excluding citizens and patricians, who did not have the rank of citizen], could still benefit from corporate privileges regarding their profession and their status within the trade hierarchy. Many Greek, Dalmatian and Albanian sailors came to Venice and joined the crews of Venetian trading galleys<sup>18</sup>. In Venice, many other communities co-existed, including Armenians, Turks<sup>19</sup> and Slavs. But the city also attracted other Italians<sup>20</sup>: people from Lucca (known for their silk art), Lombards, Milanese and Tuscans. Other important ethnic groups in the city were Germans and Jews. From the 16th century, craftsmen from Bergamo were in demand. The urban nomenclature of Venice attests to their long-lasting presence: *calle dei Armeni* [Armenians’ street], *chiesa dei Greci* [Greeks’ church], *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, etc.

In order to understand better the experience of Venice and its foreigners in the Renaissance, it may be helpful to look briefly at the experience of another important cosmopolitan European city – London. During the English Renaissance London may have been considered a fourth ‘Babel’ of cosmopolitanism, after the original Babel, Rome and Venice<sup>21</sup>. Like the other cities, it was looked upon as an ‘*Orbis forum*’, or market of the world, and not as an ‘*Urbis forum*’, a market of the city. Maritime imperial exchange flourished during this era. J. Bottin and D. Calabi wrote in 1999 that Venice and Lon-

don are comparable cases with which to analyse the relationships between foreigners and an urban space<sup>22</sup>. Recently, the British historian M.T. Jones-Davies argued that Renaissance London, while open to others was still conscious of the desirability of retaining her own identity<sup>23</sup>. It may be questioned whether this specific city identity and “xenophobia”, as Jones-Davies puts it, was a reaction to the stiff competition from other European maritime economies – despite the fact that “others” were undoubtedly helpful in developing commerce and enriching the kingdom. Though Jones-Davies remarks applied to early modern England, it may be helpful to transfer her ideas to the case of Venice – even if the two societies were quite different in some respects. We will see, however, that Venice continued to uphold the traditional practice of assimilating foreigners into local society, though, as time went, on, some ethnic groups were less tolerated than others, for example, the orthodox Greeks.

### Diverse communities and political and religious tensions

In Venice, an atmosphere of mistrust existed between the government, the Catholic clergy, and the large Greek Orthodox population. In theory, the Christianity shared by the orthodox Greeks and Catholic Venetians reinforced the ties of interdependence between the *Serenissima* and the ‘Byzantines.’ It was possible for them to claim convincingly to be good Catholics following the Greek rite, and not heretics or schismatics, on account of the reconciliation between the Catholic and Eastern Churches arrived at in 1439 by the Council of Florence. The patriarch of Constantinople exercised his office everywhere in the Empire except in Latin colonies or in those that were dominated by the maritime Republics (Genoa, Amalfi and Venice). Thus, the Venetians of the Greek islands were under the jurisdiction of Rome. Accordingly, neither the patriarch of Venice nor the pope had any juridical power over the Greeks of Venice<sup>24</sup>. The two religious communities ignored each other though pretending not to do so because they both needed each other.

The majority of Greeks in Venice lived in the *sestier* of Castello. The parish of San Pietro, where there was the *Scuola* of San Nicolò, seemed like “another Byzantium” to those who arrived there from across the Adriatic Sea<sup>25</sup>. From the fall of Constantinople in 1456, the Venetian Greeks started to ask for their own church within the city of Venice. The Senate initially refused, but in 1498 the Ten authorised them to establish a church in San Biagio, a port parish close to the Arsenal. H. Porfyriou adds that this recognition was a first step towards the affirmation of a national identity for the Greeks<sup>26</sup>. D. Calabi has argued that the so-called *Magna multitudo Graecorum* from the Venetian *Stado da Mar* during the *Quattrocento* (in 1509 around 4,000 people arrived in the city), would probably have been well received in the lagoon<sup>27</sup>. The Republic needed these *stradioti* coming from the Aegean islands because of their competence as printers. Until 1494-95 (when Aldus Manutius opened his printing house), only a dozen of books in the Greek language had been published in Italy<sup>28</sup>. However, the repatriated people represented a problem for the authorities: for decades, for instance, they neglected to register their young men to the *Balla d'oro*, the main rite of the Venetian patriciate<sup>29</sup>.

In 1511, the Greek community of Venice once again asked for a church to be built in the city to serve the many soldiers and their families who had arrived in the city with their families after serving the State. Finally, on 30 April 1514, the Ten allowed for land in the *contrada* (parish) of Sant'Antonin to be allotted to the "Greek nation" of Venice, which provided a haven of peace for the community until the fall of the Republic in 1797.

The orthodox Greeks were not the only subjects of mistrust for the Venetian authorities. In the second half of the 16th century, the spread of Lutheranism among the German population of Venice, close to the heart of the city's central business district, was a perpetual source of concern to the papal representatives. Actually, the German community had its own business building (the so-called *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*), placed under the strict surveillance of local power. Despite the religious, ideological and political conflicts following the Reformation, the Venetian government was too jealous of its traditional commercial interests to contemplate closing the *Fondaco*<sup>30</sup>. Other ethnic groups represented in "Venice-Babylon" were "Turkish" merchants and non-Jewish subjects of the Sultan from the Balkans and Asia Minor (who had been present in Venice at least from the early 16th century). However, the ruling class did authorise them to have their own market place. At the end of the 16th century, their critics began to urge that they and their merchandise should be concentrated in a central place, like the German exchange house and the *Ghetto*<sup>31</sup>. An area for these migrants duly became known as the *Fondaco dei Turchi*.

#### A HIERARCHY OF THE DISTINCTION INSIDE OF THE VENETIAN CITY: ALL FOREIGNERS WERE NOT "EQUAL" IN FRONT OF THE LAW

Before entering into the juridical debate, I think it useful to explain a few principles about Venetian citizenship. A. Bellavitis describes three categories of inhabitants before the 14th century: the *cives* (who participated in political life), the *habitatores* (who lived and worked in the city) and the *forinseci* (who came from outside of the territory)<sup>32</sup>. In Venice, the famous institution of the *Serrata del Mazor Consejo* (1297) made patrician status strictly hereditary: a *numerus clausus* was created. Before this year, the whole group of its members were considered simply as citizens, but after this event, an elite emerged, an aristocracy of members who defined themselves as "nobles". Only the sons of members could now enter the Great Council. All the men not included in the *numerus clausus* were designated in the next century as *cives originarii* (native citizens). From this time, it appears that the number of patrician *Casate* (Houses) was fixed. In fact, other laws organised the admission of new members (in 1381 for instance). From this period, only members of the Great Council could participate in the *res publica*. Very few people could obtain ennoblement by being registered as a member of the Great Council by *grazia*<sup>33</sup>, the status of a Venetian noble by legal dispensation, though it was possible for foreigners to obtain this. From 1297, patricians and citizens were given different roles in Venetian society. The first governed the state, while the second

helped to administrate it and execute the decisions adopted in the councils. It was easier for a foreigner to become a Venetian, by applying for a grant of citizenship than by waiting for an ennoblement.

Access to citizenship in Venice could take many forms. For instance, after ten years, a jurist could automatically become a citizen, and could apply for public office<sup>34</sup>. *Trecento* legal literature insisted on communes granting liberty by *civilitas* to foreigners, according to their own *ius proprium*<sup>35</sup>. In fact, it seems that local suspicion prevented a higher number of cases of naturalization. Thus, in spite of the population crisis after the Black Death (1348-1351), Italian jurists such as Paolo di Castro (1360-1441) maintained that: “a citizen *ex privilegio* could not be equivalent to a native citizen”<sup>36</sup>. Bartolus (Bartolo da Sassoferrato 1314-1357), author of the *De regimine civitatis*, denied that the son of a *comitatensis*<sup>37</sup> born in the city should be eligible to receive full citizenship *ipso facto* in any city. He argued that the criterion of birth was not in the state’s interest, because it would have required the acceptance as native citizens even those foreigners born within its territory. He proposed strict control of the extension of citizenship to foreigners and *contadini*<sup>38</sup>. This refusal of Bartolus to accept the principle of *ius soli* regarding citizenship is based on the *ius commune*, which places the decision upon the political authority of the cities. Bartolus – considered the main advocate of urban authorities’ legal liberty as opposed to imperial power – asserted that the cities and republics (*civitates*) of his time were similar to those of imperial Rome. According to the Bartolian concept of citizenship, communal jurisdiction was considered as *ius proprium* and the heir of Roman law<sup>39</sup>. Thus, the son of a foreigner turned citizen could never claim citizenship in the city where he was born. Unilaterally and individually, the city could decide who would be a member of the civic community. The feeling of mistrust was always latent towards the “other”.

In 1380, the jurist Baldo degli Ubaldi (Baldus; Baldo da Perugia) published a *consilium* (an opinion) about a foreign ‘*notaio*’, ser Orlando di Piemonte, who became a Florentine citizen in November of 1379, but was declared a foreigner once more the following month. This reversal of opinion would come to be blamed on the failure of the candidate to fulfil all the criteria necessary for citizenship: apparently ser Orlando had not bought a new house, but an old one. Baldus defended di Piemonte: stating that he remained a true citizen of Florence and as such, he had the right to be considered for all the privileges of a *verus civis* (a real citizen). Invoking the *iusta ignorantia* (the good faith) of the *notaio*, he went on to criticize the existence of a distinction between native citizens and citizens *ex privilegio* (adopted). Therefore, Baldus turned upside down the hyper-restrictive policy which the ruling class of Florence tried to impose on the integration of foreigners who had become new citizens<sup>40</sup>. By reducing the citizens to a *quid factibile*, he cancelled the distinctions between the native citizen and the citizen *de gratia*<sup>41</sup>. According to J. Kirshner, this interpretation would “simplify the idea of the foreigner by rejecting *nativism*, which was ingrained in the heart of the medieval cities”<sup>42</sup>.

The jurist Bartolus de Sassoferrato went further: according to him, “birth does not make a citizen. It is the city that confers citizenship. It does not rely on birthright: one



becomes a citizen not *naturaliter* but *civiliter*". These arguments gave grist to the mill to the supporters of the *respublica* who wished to perpetuate the *Bene comune*. Other legal theorists went even further in defining the citizen: Baldus (a pupil of Bartolus), argued for more rights to be given to the *civilitas acquisita*. On the subject of a foreign resident in Venice, he claimed that "*consuetudo vincit naturam*", in other words, that a plaintiff who is a long-term resident of Venice and has become assimilated, is "like a plant transplanted from one field to another"<sup>43</sup>. Thus, a long-stay in Venice could make him a Venetian.

These ideas were developed in the 15th century, when the definition of foreigner was simplified<sup>44</sup> to mean, in essence, that anyone who was not a member of the urban community was not a citizen. The first Italian jurist to introduce this idea was Alessandro d'Imola (1424-1477), in a *consilium* on the statute of the *districtuales*, which dealt with the inhabitants of a district<sup>45</sup> of a city who wanted to buy land in the *contado*<sup>46</sup>, and thus be closer to the heart of the *civitas*<sup>47</sup>. Traditionally, Venetian statutes forbade the selling of real estate to foreigners. Should the *districtuales* be considered as such? Alessandro answered that another interpretation would have been untrue to the spirit of the statute. On this point, he agreed with most of the jurists<sup>48</sup> of his time (even if a civic identity was not shared between inhabitants of an inferior city and that of the capital). Paolo di Castro had specified that Venetian statutes defined those privileges only for the Venetians (except the people of Padua, even though the city had been faced with the Venetian domination from 1406 after the extermination of the Carrara). The *districtuales* of *Veneto* could buy lands in the *contado* of Venice, but were not seen as true Venetian citizens.

The culture surrounding naturalization was one of distrust and hostility, and citizenship was organized along hierarchical lines, in order to preserve communal liberties and local interests<sup>49</sup>. One hundred years before, Bartolus contested the pre-eminence of *ius soli*. On the other hand, Paolo di Castro seemed to insist on the primacy of the Venetians of Venice. Dante Alighieri himself, in the *Divina Commedia* (lament of his ancestor Cacciaguida, *Paradiso*, canto 16) hardly criticised the new citizens of Florence. During the 14th and 15th centuries, we can notice a theoretical decline of the access to citizenship. Leonardo Bruni (1374-1444) justified this mistrust by arguing that it was better for civic justice. R.C. Mueller<sup>50</sup> studied this phenomenon in Venice: from 1350 to 1420, the annual number of privileges bestowed was very high (rising from 180 to 380) but in the years after (1430-1490), it diminished and remained at under ninety privileges per annum. In Venice, a decision of the Council of the *Pregadi* adopted in 1448, refused the granting of Venetian citizenship to the *contadini*. This Council justified its ruling on the basis of apparent fiscal difficulties which the state would incur if it granted the privileges<sup>51</sup>. In 1450, the Veronese Bartolomeo Cipolla (1420-1475) declared the impossibility of extending citizenship to those *exercentes opera ruralia*<sup>52</sup>. Thus, jurists agreed with the ruling elites, and tried to stop the process of the acquisition of citizenship by peasants<sup>53</sup>.

On the other hand, regarding naturalized foreigners, the prevailing legal orthodoxy seems to have been in defiance of the *communis opinio*, and sometimes even with the

policies of the communal executive. Facing demographical problems, urban governments reacted. In Viterbo, the damages of the Plague of 1480 imposed “*population-niste*” policies, according to the expression of P. Gilli<sup>54</sup> – policies which allowed fiscal advantages for the newcomers, while over 120 citizenship licences were granted between 1400 and 1450, with licences for approximately 500 persons.

Under the political constraints of regional states, and the intervention of other princes, legal specialists gave a new dimension to citizenship by changing the definition of the foreigner: the lord could abolish the civic alterity of those he wanted to reward. Therefore, the status of citizenship lost much of its political power. This can perhaps be attributed to the increasing urban population in Europe, which was linked during the 15th century to a kind of “depreciation of citizen status”. It is not the only element for political qualification. All demographical studies about the city of Venice during the years 1305-1500<sup>55</sup>, agree that there was a generous policy in conceding Venetian citizenship in operation.

In the procedure of granting citizenship within the Venetian *Stato di Terra Ferma*<sup>56</sup>, only long-term citizens were asked to participate in the administration of the *polis*<sup>57</sup>. In Verona, too, during this period there occurred a phenomenon that J. Law calls “the reduction of *cittadinanza* rights, preventing the attainment of political functions”<sup>58</sup>. But at the end of the middle ages there occurred a “levelling of citizen status and a simplification of the *distinguo* between citizen and foreigner: henceforth, both of them were considered as subjects” in law, under the authority of the prince. *Potestas* took the *civilitas*’ place. And this fact gave ideas to foreign princes such as the emperor Maximilian, who was looking to stir up a conspiracy against Venice in order to fuel tensions there among the aristocracy<sup>59</sup>.

In Venice, as has been said, nobility – following the *Serrata* of 1297 – was strictly hereditary. The stakes were high because membership of the patrician assembly gave access to public responsibilities and the right to vote for all laws of the Republic. Mistrust regarding foreigners was still present: some foreign nobles had been admitted into the Great Council<sup>60</sup> between the 14th and 16th centuries, but they were not allowed to vote or elect other nobles to office. They benefited from ennoblement *per grazia* due to their service to the Republic. For instance, nobles of Cordoba had this title in 1523. At the end of the middle ages, however, the integration of foreigners into the highest political level of Venice became rarer. From 1524 on, the Ten forbade to “*far compagnia*” with foreigners<sup>61</sup>. During this period, foreign influences in Italian society were frowned upon.

## THE IDENTITY CRISIS IN RENAISSANCE VENICE

Baldassar Castiglione, in his *Libro del Cortegiano*, published in Venice in 1528, refers to the positive influence of French feudal customs on the courts of Italian cities<sup>62</sup>. He deplored the identity crisis then present in his country – a crisis exemplified in the controversies raging over the primacy of the Tuscan, Venetian and Neapolitan languages in the peninsula. Cas-

tiglione believed it was important to value a new type of man without abandoning the rich artistic, literary and philosophical heritage. It was necessary to restore *virtus* (purity) in the heart of all Italians, and to liberate themselves from French fashion (especially in the matter of clothes), and take inspiration from the ‘imposed seriousness’ of the Spanish. We must remember that Castiglione wrote this piece after having been granted Spanish nationality in 1525 by Charles V. In some way, the work acknowledges his master.

G. E. Brennan<sup>63</sup> has observed that in Renaissance England ambivalent attitudes to foreign influences prevailed. For instance, foreign travel was extolled by Shakespeare, while he also warned that excessive exposure to continental culture could lead to corruption of “English purity”. Therefore, both Venice and England faced a similar problem – that of foreign cultural influences. Both Shakespeare and Castiglione refer to the malign potential of foreign influences such as fashion on their native lands. In the Venetian case the most pressing and serious threat which concerned the authorities lay in the loss of the Venetians’ superiority in international economics and politics. During the wars of 1494-1559, and particularly after the defeat at Agnadello of 1509, the Venetian state faced grave problems.

As Brennan observes, in times of economic difficulty, the outsider becomes the scapegoat<sup>64</sup>. Faced with such a threat, the common reaction is one of protectionism. There were differences, however, in the English and Venetian experiences of foreigners. In England, according to Brennan, only a minority were personally acquainted with foreigners<sup>65</sup>. In Venice, every inhabitant could have contact with foreigners: for instance, Germans were ubiquitous bakers. Braunstein insists on their crucial role in Venetian society during the 15th century<sup>66</sup>, for instance, by granting credit to the poor, and their philanthropic endeavours. According to him, then, the attachment to the parish structure came more from foreigners partly integrated into the mainstream society, than from great citizens or the patrician families<sup>67</sup>.

In Medieval Venice, the same phenomenon of mistrust was seen with regard to the poor and destitute, who were suspected of feigning their hardship. At the end of the 15th century, the loss of the *Stato da Mar* – the overseas Venetian empire which had been carefully constructed since the Fourth Crusade and the taking of Constantinople by the Franks – and the influx of the repatriated Venetians, contributed to increasing anxiety *vis-à-vis* the foreigner. It became more important than ever to establish the criteria of Venetian identity. A law of 1506 marked a turning point: for the first time in its history, the Republic required the registration of all noble births: the so-called *nova probatio* [new proof]. From that date, no one could claim patrician status if he had not previously been included in the lists of the *Avogaria di Comun*, though, in practice, this measure was not respected, particularly by the notaries in charge of registration, at least until 1526. Thus, the population of Venetian nobles and citizens was quantified and validated by the written records.

To observe more closely the impact of foreigners in Venice, it may be profitable to take the example of the Jews – frequently involved in banking, yet subject to constraining state policies.

## A SPECIAL STATUTE: THE JEWS IN VENICE

### Before 1516

Three Jewish ‘nations’ were present in late medieval Venice. The so-called Germanic Ashkenazi Jews – ‘*Ebrei Tedeschi*’ (though many were really of Italian origin) – gathered in large numbers in Venice after the invasion of the Veneto in 1509. They were chiefly associated with money-lending and with the trade of second-hand goods. The second “nation” was composed by the Sephardic Jews coming from Spain, Portugal and the Levant. They were chiefly traders. The third ‘nation’ was recognised by the Venetian government as Levantine Jews who were subjects of the Ottoman Sultan. In 1541, the city authorities expanded the Jewish *Ghetto* to accommodate them. New Christians came from those same countries, were still suspected of crypto-Judaism. They were stigmatised by the abusive term ‘*Marrano*’ and officially banned from Venice as heretics in 1497, and again in 1550<sup>68</sup>. The presence of Jews in Venice was officially tolerated not only because of their usefulness to the large poor population, but also because many eventually conformed to Christianity.

Until the beginning of the 16th century, the Venetian Jews<sup>69</sup> were traditionally compelled to live in Mestre. In 1503, after the war against Ferrara and the impoverishment of many nobles, the Republic drew up an agreement with the Jews of Mestre, granting them conditional freedoms for ten years<sup>70</sup>. First, they, their families and their banking employees were given the right to live inside the city. Second, they could store their pledges within Venice. Third, they were granted complete freedom of movement and could carry arms to protect themselves and their property. In cases of danger, they were permitted, for the first time in their history, to remove the distinctive yellow beret. Finally, if their lives were threatened, they were permitted to transfer their possessions into the city. It was a significant advance.

Unfortunately, in 1508, the Republic lost control of all the towns of the *Terra Ferma* following the taking of Padua. A large number of refugees flocked into Venice, while people privately spoke of divine anger at those who were guilty of moral corruption and simony. In this context of spiritual and moral crisis – we must remember that the Protestant Reformation in Northern Europe was imminent – the influence of Dominican preachers was crucial in Italian urban religious life. They stigmatised the presence of harmful elements in the city, and especially targeted Jewish doctors who could move around freely at night to visit the sick of all faiths. In the years 1513-14, the town saw episodes of violence and disease. However, the agreement between the Council of the Ten and the Jewish community in Venice was renewed in 1513. The Jews’ status as bankers was official: in the absence of *Monti di pietà* (pawnbrokers), they lent to the neediest at very low rates of interest. Thus, their usefulness in society seemed unchallengeable. But the *Serenissima* also tolerated their presence for more political reasons: in the case of civil unrest, they served as shield and scapegoat. Unfortunately for them, the agreement was short-lived: in March 1515, the Senate heard a proposal from Emo Zorzi, strongly recommending the confinement of all Jews on the island of Giudecca.

On 20 March 1516, another patrician, Zaccaria Dolfin accused all the Jews of illegally building synagogues and corrupting the state. He demanded their containment in an abandoned foundry situated in the *Ghetto Nuovo* quarter. It was an unhealthy area on the edge of town, in the northern parish of San Girolamo, and from the outside resembled a fortress. Thus the first system of enclosure of the Jews would take place in Venice, despite its acceptance and tolerance of foreigners.

### After 1516

However, in the spring of 1516, the French occupation of Milan dealt a massive blow to the international standing of the Republic. On 29 March, the Venetian Senate published an historic decree: all Jews were forbidden to move around the city at night. Two new walls were built around the *Ghetto* to enclose it completely, while four sentries were to guard the two entrances – only to be opened between sunrise and midnight. The Jews had to pay all construction and maintenance costs themselves. By order of the magistrates *al Cattaver*<sup>71</sup>, all means of escape, doors and windows over-looking the canals, were sealed and placed under constant surveillance. It is ironic that an old dream was now fulfilled<sup>72</sup>, as the Venetian Jews, in the 13th century, dreamed of having their own quarter in the city. But this *Ghetto*, an unsanitary zone in the *sestier* of Cannaregio, was a long way from the centres of power and commerce in San Marco and the Rialto. The decree of 29 March 1516 confirmed the agreement of 1513: the Jews had to pay an annual tax of 6,500 ducats. The government had to use all possible means (for example, the sale of public offices) to refill the coffers, because the city was still subject to violence, plague, over-population and a continuing influx of refugees from the countryside. Further, there was worrying news from the Eastern front – a new Turkish invasion was feared. Pessimism about the future of Venice was at its height.

In December 1516, the Republic signed the treaty of Noyon: the authorities immediately relieved the pressure on the Jews, reduced the number of the sentries and left the gates open longer. But this respite was short-lived. In 1518-1519, the question of *Monti di pietà* arose again with a vengeance in Venice, and reached a climax the following summer. The very expulsion of the inhabitants of the *Ghetto* was considered. The chronicler Sanudo joined the debate. He reported in his diary that none of the Council of the Ten would say what he really thought for fear of being suspected of corruption by the Jews. In reality, he was denouncing the fact that certain patricians wanted to take the place of Jewish bankers, and raise interest rates from 20 to 50 percent. Sanudo reminded his fellow citizens about the usefulness of the Jews, “as necessary to a country as bakers”. The state, he averred, could not “conduct itself in a more stupid manner and expel them when there is not even a pawnbroker”. The presence of Jewish finance was not used for political conspiracy, but enabled the struggle against abject poverty, and could help restore the Arsenal to working order. In 1523, the supporters for the installation of pawnbrokers in the city repeated their proposal, but this time, the Council of Ten forbade Senate members on pain of death from agreeing to it, in order to preserve the interests of the state. The Venetian Republic did not amend this decision until 1734.

## CONCLUSION

The real benefit of the foreigners in Venetian society was recognised and valued throughout the city's history, notably for repopulating the city and its territories following difficult periods. Lack of manpower and skill was a constant problem. To maintain economic activity, public finance, and promote civil peace, the state had to attract people from elsewhere – whether Italians or strangers coming from further afield. We must note that all foreigners did not become citizens. A long-term stay in the city as a consistent tax contributor had to be proven. However, one does find a certain tolerance of diverse social and religious practices, though strict surveillance of some groups suspected of prosletism shows that there was still mistrust. The jurists enlightened the ruling classes on how best to 'optimize' the presence of outsiders within Italian cities, but could not ignore the identity crisis of urban Italian societies at the end of the middle ages. The fortunes of the Jews of Venice show the dynamic range of reactions of late medieval Venetian society towards 'the other'.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> P. Lanaro, *Introduction to III. Venise et les villes de la République: communautés nationales et artisans*, J. Bottin, D. Calabi (ed.), *Les étrangers dans la ville. Minorités et espace urbain du bas Moyen Age à l'époque moderne*, Paris 1999, pp. 155-158.
- <sup>2</sup> P. de Commynes, *The Memoirs*, ed. S. Kinser, trans. I. Cazeaux, 2 vols, New York 1969-1973, vol. II, p. 493.
- <sup>3</sup> I would like to thank Rosemary, William, Meghan and Gerald for their patience and help in translating this article, and also to Cristina and Rhys for their advice.
- <sup>4</sup> M.T. Jones-Davies, *Londres et les étrangers: quand Londres devient "le marché du monde"*, in "L'Etranger: identité et altérité au temps de la Renaissance", SIRIR, Paris 1996, pp. 15-28.
- <sup>5</sup> P. Gilli, *Comment cesser d'être étranger: citoyens et non-citoyens dans la pensée juridique italienne de la fin du Moyen Age*, in *Les Espaces sociaux de l'Italie urbaine (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*. Recueil d'articles, Paris 2005, vol. I, pp. 341-364 (published in *L'étranger au Moyen Age*. Actes du XXXe Congrès de la Société des Historiens médiévistes de l'Enseignement supérieur public, Göttingen 1999, Paris 2000, pp. 59-77).
- <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 341: "les femmes, les enfants et les miséreux ne font pas partie de la communauté civique": women, children and the poor form no part of the civic community.
- <sup>7</sup> E. Kantorowicz, *Pro Patria Mori in medieval political thought*, in "American Historical Review", 1951, 56, 3 (April), pp. 472-492 published in French under the title *Mourir pour la patrie* (Pro Patria Mori), "Mourir pour la patrie et autres textes", Paris 2004, p. 133 (pp. 127-166): "To the Stoics, it is true, and to the other philosophical schools as well, the notion of *patria* may have meant the universe, the *kosmos* of which they were citizens. But then this was a philosophical or religious, and not a political, conception. For the Roman Empire or the *orbis Romanus* would not have been referred to as *patria*, and if a soldier, when killed in the defence of Gaul or Spain or Syria, died nevertheless a hero's death *pro patria*, it was a death for the *res publica Romana*, for Rome and all Rome stood for – her gods, perhaps the *Dea Romana*, the imperial *pater patriae*, or Roman education and life in general – but not for the territory he happened to defend. *Patria*, most certainly, did not mean the same thing as all times, but usually meant the city".
- <sup>8</sup> *Civilitas*: in Latin, literally the quality of the citizen, the civility which is his "ability to live together under the shared founding principles" of urban society ("bien social et vie juste garantissant la paix civile". B. Doumerc, *Les Communes en Italie. XIIe-XIVe siècles*, Toulouse 2004).

- <sup>9</sup> Gilli, *Comment cesser d'être étranger* cit.
- <sup>10</sup> F. Thiriet, *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, Venice 1981. For the year 1509, K.J. Beloch reported the number of 105,000 inhabitants and the one of 158,069 for 1552 (in Id., *Storia della popolazione d'Italia*, trad. it., Florence 1994, p. 497 – orig. ed. *Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens*, Berlin - Leipzig 1937-1961).
- <sup>11</sup> E. Sestan, *La città italiana nei secoli XIV, XV et XVI*, in M. Berengo, *Italia comunale e signorile, Scritti Vari* – II, Florence 1989, p. 186. The exact population of Venice during this period is still debated by historians.
- <sup>12</sup> D. Calabi, *Gli stranieri e la città*, in A. Tenenti, U. Tucci (eds.), *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, Rome 1996, vol. V. *Il Rinascimento. Società ed economia*, pp. 913-946.
- <sup>13</sup> G. Piccinni, *I "villani incittadinati" nella Siena del XIV secolo*, in "Bulettno senese di storia patria", 1975-1976, 82-83, pp. 158-159: a statistical account of the relationship between immigration and acquired citizenship on the one hand, social and geographical origin of "accédants" (immigrants) and on the other hand. Pult, Quaglia, *Citizenship in Medieval and Early Modern Italian Cities*, in S.G. Ellis, G. Halfdanarson, A.K. Isaacs (eds.), *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, Pisa 2006, pp. 107-114.
- <sup>14</sup> Sir Edward Lewkenor (1542-1605), politician and patron of English puritans, had translated a text of Girolamo Contarini regarding the city of Venice. In it the city of London was compared to the Tower of Babel.
- <sup>15</sup> Sestan, *La città italiana* cit., p. 187.
- <sup>16</sup> G. Trebbi, *La cancelleria veneta nei secoli XVI e XVII*, in "Annali della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi", 1980, 14, pp. 65-125; Id., *Il segretario veneziano* in S. Bertelli (ed.), *La mediazione* (Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, I, III, § V), Florence 1992, pp. 32-58 ("Quaderni del castello di Gargonza. Laboratorio di storia", 5); Id., *La società veneziana*, in G. Cozzi, P. Prodi (eds.), *Storia di Venezia. Dal Rinascimento al Barocco*, VI, Rome 1994, pp. 129-213. A. Zannini, *Burocrazia e burocrati a Venezia in età moderna: i cittadini originari (sec. XVI-XVIII)*, Venezia 1993 ("Memorie classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti", XLVII); Id., *L'impiego pubblico* in A. Tenenti, U. Tucci (eds.), *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, IV, *Il Rinascimento politica e cultura*, Rome 1996, pp. 415-463. A. Bellavitis, *Identité, mariage, mobilité sociale: citoyens à Venise au XVIe siècle*, Rome 2001. M. Casini, *Realtà e simboli del cancellier grande veneziano in età moderna (secc. XVI-XVII)*, in "Studi Veneziani", N.S., 1991, 22, pp. 195-251; Id., *I gesti del Principe La festa politica a Firenze e Venezia in età rinascimentale*, Venice 1996.
- <sup>17</sup> A series of laws provided for their progressive integration into Venetian administration. In 1410 and 1438, the most senior positions in the *Scuole Grandi* were reserved for them. In 1419, only the *Scuole Grandi* provided chancellors and notaries for diplomatic service. In 1444 and 1455, the Republic entitled them to the middle-level positions in the city administration. Then, in 1478, they had access to the Ducal Chancery (Grand Chancellor, secretaries of the Senate, the *Collegio* and the Council of Ten, as well as all the administration's notaries). By the end of the century all offices of the lower Chancery and the notaries' chambers were exclusively reserved for them. Finally, in 1517, all "lower" positions – 200 or 300 offices – could only be taken by natural born citizens.
- <sup>18</sup> B. Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice*, Oxford 1971, shows the link between the corporations and the level of recruitment of Venetian ships' crews.
- <sup>19</sup> Sestan, *La città italiana* cit., p. 188.
- <sup>20</sup> For a more global view about internal migrations into modern and contemporary Italy, see: A. Arru, F. Ramella (eds.), *L'Italia delle migrazioni interne. Donne, uomini, mobilità in età moderna e contemporanea*, Rome 2003.
- <sup>21</sup> The Elizabethan poet Edmund Spenser wrote about this subject in his fourth sonnet.
- <sup>22</sup> Bottin, Calabi (eds.), *Introduction, Les étrangers dans la ville* cit., p. 5.
- <sup>23</sup> Jones-Davies, *Londres et les étrangers* cit., p. 18.

- <sup>24</sup> G. Fedalto, *Le minoranze greche a Venezia: i Greci*, in coll., *Contributi alla Storia della Chiesa veneziana*, vol. 3. *La Chiesa di Venezia tra Medioevo ed Età moderna*, Venice 1989, p. 205 (pp. 205-216).
- <sup>25</sup> Calabi, *Gli stranieri e la città* cit., p. 919.
- <sup>26</sup> H. Porfyriou, *La présence grecque en Italie entre XVIe et XVIIe siècle: Rome et Venise*, Bottin, Calabi (eds.), *Les Etrangers* cit., pp. 121-136.
- <sup>27</sup> Calabi, *Gli stranieri e la città* cit., p. 921. Porfyriou, *La présence grecque* cit., p. 132, mentions the “ship-owners, captains, sailors, soldiers, merchants, intellectuals and artists, printers and publishers”.
- <sup>28</sup> D. Geanakoplos, “La colonia greca di Venezia e il suo significato per il Rinascimento”, *Venezia e l’Oriente fra tardo Medio Evo e Rinascimento*, in A. Pertusi (ed.), Florence 1966, p. 186 (pp. 183-203).
- <sup>29</sup> B. Doumerc, “*De lignée antique et consanguine*”. *L’idéologie nobiliaire à Venise (fin XVe-début XVIe siècles)*, “Le sang au Moyen Age”, Actes du IVe Colloque international de Montpellier, Université Paul-Valéry (27-29 novembre 1997), *Les Cahiers du C.R.I.S.I.M.A.*, 1999, 4, p. 107 (pp. 87-108) “un certain Alvisé Corner d’Antonio de San Bartolomeo se plaint de “ne pas avoir l’usage de son état de noblesse” alors qu’il en possède les critères et la *virtù*. À partir de 1514 ce résidant vénitien de Padoue cherche à intégrer le patriciat de la Sérénissime “puisque tous les descendants du doge Marco Corner, étant des seigneurs, ne s’occupaient pas de l’état de noblesse car ils étaient éloignés (résidant dans le Péloponnèse) et, ne respectant pas les usages de la loi, comme celui qui oblige à l’inscription de la naissance d’un noble dans le registre officiel, ils perdirent leur noblesse car ils ne figuraient pas dans ledit livre [...]. Cette famille de retour à Venise dans les années 1480, avait fait une tentative pour récupérer son statut de noblesse en vain. [...] Il semble bien que l’oubli ait joué un mauvais tour”.
- <sup>30</sup> D. Chambers, B. Pullan (eds.), *Venice, a documentary history (1450-1630)*, Renaissance Society of America 2001, p. 326 (orig. ed. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA 1992).
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 327.
- <sup>32</sup> A. Bellavitis, *Mythe et réalité des Cittadini vénitiens au Moyen Age et à l’époque Moderne*, A. Fontana, G. Saro (eds.), *Venise (1297-1797): la république des castors*, Fontenay-aux Roses 1997, pp. 81-92.
- <sup>33</sup> P. Braunstein, *Remarques sur la population allemande de Venise au Moyen Age*, in H.-G. Beck, M. Manoussacas, A. Pertusi (eds.), *Venezia, centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV-XVI). Aspetti e problemi*, I, Florence 1977, p. 240.
- <sup>34</sup> D. Calabi, P. Lanaro, *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri*, Rome 1998: most of those studies about the containing and regrouping of foreigners have been republished in J. Bottin, D. Calabi (eds.), *Les étrangers dans la ville. Minorités et espace urbain du bas Moyen Age à l’époque moderne*, Paris 1999.
- <sup>35</sup> J. Kirshner, *Civitas sibi faciat civem: Bartolus of Sassoferrato’s Doctrine on the Making of a Citizen*, “*Speculum*”, 1973, 48, p. 696, addresses the ambiguity of the statutes concerning new citizens, some contradicting the others.
- <sup>36</sup> L. Morpurgo, *Sulla condizione giuridica dei forestieri in Italia nei secoli di mezzo*, “*Archivio giuridico*”, 1872, 9, p. 269. Paolo di Castro is one of the writers of the statutes of Florence, in 1414-15.
- <sup>37</sup> *Comitatensis*: in Latin derived from *comitatus* (“company”, “party”, “suite”; in this military context it has the novel meaning of “the field army”), itself rooted in *comes* (“companion”, but with specific historical military and civilian meanings).
- <sup>38</sup> *Contadino* (-i): inhabitant of the *contado* cf. *infra*.
- <sup>39</sup> M. Bellomo, *Istituzioni e società dal medioevo agli inizi dell’età moderna*, Rome 1997, pp. 466-478.
- <sup>40</sup> M. Becker, *Florence in Transition*, Baltimore 1968, 2, pp. 93-149; A. Mohlo, *Politics and the Ruling Class in early Renaissance Florence*, in “*Nuova rivista storica*”, 1968, 70, p. 401.
- <sup>41</sup> E. Cortese, *Cittadinanza*, in *Enciclopedia del diritto*, VII, Milano 1960, pp. 132-140.
- <sup>42</sup> J. Kirshner, *Between Culture and Nature: an Opinion of Baldus of Perugia on Venetian Citizenship as second nature*, in “*Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*”, 1979, 9, pp. 179-208.



- <sup>43</sup> *Consilium* republished by Kirshner, cit., p. 205: “*Nam iste est sicut planta translata que in alieno agro coaluit, et sicut de une qualitate translatus ad aliam*”.
- <sup>44</sup> Gilli, *Comment cesser d'être étranger* cit., p. 356.
- <sup>45</sup> District: territory over which the city has judicial and administrative control (feudal law) delegated to a regent.
- <sup>46</sup> *Contado*: rural territory directly dependent on an urban community.
- <sup>47</sup> *Civitas*: in Latin this is the group of citizens who make up a town, a state or even a city itself in the sense of state.
- <sup>48</sup> The *districtuales* and the *comitatenses* were long considered as second class citizens. A fiscal system that relies on hierarchical status of citizens (citizens of Florence, its *contado* and its district) was perpetuated by the ruling classes in Ch. Klapisch-Zuber, *Les Toscans et leurs familles. Une étude du catasto florentin de 1427*, Paris 1978, p. 33, 119-134.
- <sup>49</sup> Gilli, *Comment cesser d'être étranger* cit., p. 357.
- <sup>50</sup> R.C. Mueller, *Veneti facti privilegio: les étrangers naturalisés à Venise entre XIVe et XVIe siècle*, in Bottin, Calabi (eds.), *Les étrangers* cit., pp. 171-181.
- <sup>51</sup> A. Ventura, *Il dominio di Venezia nel Quattrocento*, in S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, C.H. Smith (eds.), *Florence and Venice: comparisons and relations*, Florence 1979, vol. I, p. 183.
- <sup>52</sup> G.M. Varanini, *Il distretto veronese del'400. Vicariati del comune di Verona e vicariati privati*, Verona 1980, p. 105.
- <sup>53</sup> A. Bellavitis, *Identité, mobilité sociale, honorabilité. Citoyennes et citoyens à Venise au XVIe siècle*, PhD. (EHESS), 1996, p. 40: the more frequent satire against the peasants is based on *villano incittadinato*.
- <sup>54</sup> Gilli, *Comment cesser d'être étranger* cit., p. 358. Regarding the fears of Venetian society during the Middle Ages: Preto, *Le "paure" della società veneziana: le calamità, le sconfitte, i nemici esterni ed interni*, in *Storia di Venezia* cit., vol. VI, pp. 215-238.
- <sup>55</sup> Fedalto, *Le minoranze straniere a Venezia tra politica e legislazione*, pp. 143-162 and Braunstein, *Remarques sur la population allemande de Venise à la fin du Moyen Age*, in *Venezia, centro* cit., pp. 233-243. Cf. R. C. Mueller, *Stranieri e culture straniere a Venezia. Aspetti economici e sociali*, in “Ateneo Veneto”, 1981, pp. 75-77.
- <sup>56</sup> A. Viggiano, *Governanti e governati. Legittimità del potere ed esercizio dell'autorità sovrana nello stato veneto della prima età moderna*, Treviso 1993, pp. 103-105: *cittadinanza de intus tantum* had been conferred on all citizens of the main submitted cities; henceforth they could trade with Venice without any local middleman: it was a “custom citizenship” (G. Cozzi, M. Knapton, *Storia della repubblica di Venezia. Dalla guerra di Chioggia al 1517*, Torino 1986).
- <sup>57</sup> Cf. G.M. Varanini, *L'organizzazione del distretto cittadino nell'Italia padana dei secoli XIII-XV (Marca trevigiana, Lombardia, Emilia)*, in G. Chittolini, D. Willoweit (eds.), *L'organizzazione del territorio in Italia e Germania: secoli XIII-XIV*, in “Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico. Quaderno”, 1994, 37, pp. 133-234.
- <sup>58</sup> J. Law, *Venice and the 'Closing' of the Veronese Constitution of 1405*, in “Studi veneziani”, 1997, 1, pp. 69-103.
- <sup>59</sup> M. Sanudo, *Vite dei dogi*, ed. G. Monticolo, Venice 1900, f. 237 verso.
- <sup>60</sup> Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASV), Maggior Consiglio, busta 186, *Esteri creati nobili*.
- <sup>61</sup> ASV, Consiglio dei Dieci, Parti comuni, regg. 29 and 64.
- <sup>62</sup> J. Dubu, *L'ambassadeur d'après Il Libro del Cortegiano de Baldassar Castiglione*, in Jones-Davies (ed.), *L'Etranger* cit., pp. 181-215.
- <sup>63</sup> G. E. Brennan, *The cheese and the Welsh: foreigners in Elizabethan literature*, in “Renaissance Studies”, March 1994, 8, 1, pp. 40-64.

- <sup>64</sup> Brennan, *The cheese* cit., p. 62.
- <sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- <sup>66</sup> P. Braunstein, *Cannaregio, zone de transit?*, Bottin, Calabi (eds.), *Les étrangers* cit., pp. 159-169.
- <sup>67</sup> He cites two important theses edited by the Ecole française de Rome: E. Crouzet-Pavan (*Espace, pouvoir et société à Venise à la fin du Moyen Age*, Rome 1992, coll. 156, 2 vol.) and A. Bellavitis (*Identité, mariage, mobilité sociale. Citoyennes et citoyens à Venise au XVIe siècle*, Rome 1996).
- <sup>68</sup> In practice many were able to live and trade in Venice if, discarding their Christian past, they went promptly to the *Ghetto* and declared themselves to be Jews. For more information see Chambers, Pullan (eds.), *Venice* cit., pp. 326-327.
- <sup>69</sup> D. Calabi, U. Camerino, E. Concina, *La città degli Ebrei. Il ghetto di Venezia: architettura e urbanistica*, Venice 1991 (10th ed., 2000). G. Cozzi (ed.), *Gli Ebrei e Venezia*, Milan 1987. R. Calimani, *Histoire du Ghetto de Venise*, Paris 1988 (2nd ed. 1997) (orig. ed., *Storia del ghetto di Venezia*, Milan 1985). R. Finlay, *The Foundation of the Ghetto: Venice, the Jews and the War of the League of Cambrai*, in "Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society", 1982. U. Fortis (ed.), *Venezia ebraica*, Rome 1982.
- <sup>70</sup> In 1512, as soon as the deadline came, the Senate required the payment of an annual tax: around 10,000 ducats. If the payment was not made, the Jews would have been forced to close their banks inside of the city. The spokesmen of the Jewish community refused. The Ten lowered the tax to 5,000 ducats, and authorised the opening of nine shops in the Rialto.
- <sup>71</sup> *Ufficiali al Cattaver* or *Cattaveri*: a magistrate of varied function, responsible for the recovery of public property, including buried or hidden treasure, and the goods of those who died intestate. They also oversaw Jerusalem pilgrims and pilots. These officials were placed in administrative charge of the *Geto* (afterwards *Ghetto Nuovo* in 1516).
- <sup>72</sup> Calimani, *Histoire du Ghetto de Venise* cit., p. 56.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arru A., Ramella F. (eds.), *L'Italia delle migrazioni interne. Donne, uomini, mobilità in età moderna e contemporanea*, Rome 2003.
- Becker M., *Florence in Transition*, Baltimore 1968.
- Bellavitis A., *Identité, mariage, mobilité sociale: citoyens à Venise au XVIe siècle*, Rome 2001.
- Id., *Mythe et réalité des citadins vénitiens entre Moyen Age et époque moderne* in Fontana A., Saro G. (eds.), *Venise 1297-1797. La République des Castors*, Fontenay-aux-Roses (ENS St-Cloud) 1998, pp. 81-92.
- Id., *Identité, mariage, mobilité sociale. Citoyennes et citoyens à Venise au XVIe siècle*, Rome 1996.
- Bellomo M., *Istituzioni e società dal medioevo agli inizi dell'età moderna*, Rome 1997.
- Beloch G., *La popolazione di Venezia nei secoli XVI e XVII*, in "N.A.V.", 1902, 3, pp. 46-49. Beloch K.J., *Storia della popolazione d'Italia*, trad. it., Florence 1994 (orig. ed. *Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens*, Berlin-Leipzig 1937-1961).
- Beltrami B., *Storia della popolazione di Venezia dalla fine del secolo XVI alla caduta della Repubblica*, Padua 1954.
- Bizzarri D., *Ricerche sul diritto di cittadinanza nella costituzione comunale*, in "Studi senesi", 1916, 32, pp. 16-136.
- Bottin J., Calabi D. (ed.), *Les étrangers dans la ville. Minorités et espace urbain du bas Moyen Age à l'époque moderne*, Maison des Sciences de l'Homme (MSH), Paris 1999.
- Brennan G.E., *The cheese and the Welsh: foreigners in Elizabethan literature*, in "Renaissance Studies", March 1994, 8, n.1, pp. 40-64.
- Braunstein Ph., *Cannaregio, zone de transit?* in Bottin J., Calabi D. (eds.), *Les étrangers*, cit., pp. 159-169.

- Id., *Remarques sur la population allemande de Venise à la fin du Moyen Age* in H.-G. Beck, M. Manoussacas, A. Pertusi (eds.), *Venezia, centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV-XVI). Aspetti e problemi*, I, Florence 1977, pp. 233-243.
- Calabi D., Lanaro P., *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri*, Rome 1998.
- Id., *Gli stranieri e la città*, in Tenenti A., Tucci U. (eds), *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, Rome 1996, vol. V. *Il Rinascimento. Società ed economia*, pp. 913-946.
- Id., Camerino U., Concina E., *La città degli Ebrei. Il ghetto di Venezia: architettura e urbanistica*, Venice 1991 (10th ed., 2000).
- Calimani R., *Histoire du Ghetto de Venise*, Paris 1997 (1st ed. 1988) (orig. ed. *Storia del ghetto di Venezia*, Milano 1985).
- Casini M., *Realtà e simboli del cancellier grande veneziano in età moderna (secc. XVI-XVII)*, in "Studi Veneziani", N.S., 1991, 22, pp. 195-251.
- Id., *I gesti del Principe La festa politica a Firenze e Venezia in età rinascimentale*, Venice 1996.
- Chambers D., Pullan B. (eds.), *Venice, a documentary history (1450-1630)*, Renaissance Society of America 2001, p. 326 (orig. ed. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA 1992).
- Commynes Ph., Kinser S. (eds.), *The Memoirs*, S. Kinser (ed), 2 vols, New York, 1969-1973, II.
- Contento A., *Il censimento della popolazione sotto la Repubblica veneta*, in "Nuovo Archivio Veneto" (N.A.V.), 1900, 19, pp. 5-42 et pp. 179-240.
- Cortese E., "Cittadinanza", in *Enciclopedia del diritto*, VII, Milano 1960, pp. 132-140.
- Cozzi G. (dir.), *Gli Ebrei e Venezia*, Milano, 1987.
- Id., Knapton M., *Storia della repubblica di Venezia. Dalla guerra di Chioggia al 1517*, Torino 1986.
- Crouzet-Pavan E., *Espace, pouvoir et société à Venise à la fin du Moyen Age*, Rome 1992, coll. 156, 2 vol.
- Doumerc B., *Quand la rue s'impose à la cité. L'exemple de Venise au Moyen Age* in J. Brody (ed.), *La Rue*, Actes du Colloque de Toulouse, UTM 2005, pp. 35-61.
- Id., *Les Communes en Italie. XIIe-XIVe siècles*, Toulouse 2004.
- Id., "De lignée antique et consanguine". *L'idéologie nobiliaire à Venise (fin XVe-début XVIe siècles)*, "Le sang au Moyen Age", Actes du IVe Colloque international de Montpellier, Université Paul-Valéry (27-29 novembre 1997), *Les Cahiers du C.R.I.S.I.M.A.*, 1999, 4, pp. 87-108.
- Dubu J., *L'ambassadeur d'après "Il Libro del Cortegiano" de Baldassar Castiglione*, in Jones-Davies M.T. (ed.), *L'Étranger: identité et altérité au temps de la Renaissance*, SIRIR, Paris 1996, pp. 181-215.
- Fedalto G., *Le minoranze greche a Venezia: i Greci*, in coll., *Contributi alla Storia della Chiesa veneziana*, vol. 3. *La Chiesa di Venezia tra Medioevo ed Età moderna*, Venice 1989, pp. 205-216.
- Id., *Le minoranze straniere a Venezia tra politica e legislazione*, in *Venezia, centro... cit.*, pp. 143-162.
- Finlay R., *The Foundation of the Ghetto: Venice, the Jews and the War of the League of Cambrai*, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1982.
- Fontana A., Saro G. (dir.), *Venise (1297-1797): la république des castors*, Fontenay-aux Roses 1997, pp. 81-92.
- Fortis U. (dir.), *Venezia ebraica*, Rome 1982.
- Geanokoplos D., *La colonia greca di Venezia e il suo significato per il Rinascimento*, in Pertusi A. (ed.), *Venezia e l'Oriente fra tardo Medio Evo e Rinascimento*, Florence 1966, pp. 183-203.
- Gilli P., *Comment cesser d'être étranger: citoyens et non-citoyens dans la pensée juridique italienne de la fin du Moyen Age*, in "Les Espaces sociaux de l'Italie urbaine (XIIe-XVe siècles). Recueil d'articles", Paris 2005, vol. I, pp. 341-364 (published in *L'étranger au Moyen Age*. Actes du XXXe Congrès de la S.H.M.E.S., Göttingen 1999), Paris, Publ. de la Sorbonne 2000, pp. 59-77).
- Ginatempo M., Sandri L., *L'Italia delle città. Il popolamento urbano tra Medioevo e Rinascimento (secoli XIII-XVI)*, Florence 1990.

- Jones-Davies M.T., *Londres et les étrangers: quand Londres devient "le marché du monde"*, in "L'Etranger: identité et altérité au temps de la Renaissance" cit., pp. 15-28.
- Kantorowicz E., *Pro Patria Mori in medieval political thought*, in "American Historical Review", 1951, 56, No. 3 (April), pp. 472-492 published in French under the title *Mourir pour la patrie (Pro Patria Mori)*, in "Mourir pour la patrie et autres textes", Paris 2004, pp. 127-166.
- Kirshner J., *Between Culture and Nature: an Opinion of Baldus of Perugia on Venetian Citizenship as second nature*, in "Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies", 1979, 9, pp. 179-208.
- Id., *Civitas sibi faciat civem: Bartolus of Sassoferrato's Doctrine on the Making of a Citizen*, in "Speculum", 1973, 48.
- Klapisch-Zuber Ch., *Les Toscans et leurs familles. Une étude du catasto florentin de 1427*, Paris 1978.
- Lane F.C., *Venise, une république maritime*, Paris 1985, (ed. 1988) [orig. ed. *Venice: A Maritime Republic*, Johns Hopkins Univ. Press 1973].
- Law J., *Venice and the 'Closing' of the Veronese Constitution of 1405*, in "Studi veneziani", 1997, 1, pp. 69-103.
- Maire-Vigueur J.-Cl., *Cavaliers et citoyens. Guerre, conflits et société dans l'Italie communale (XIIe-XIIIe siècles)*, Paris 2003.
- Molho A., *Politics and the Ruling Class in early Renaissance Florence*, in "Nuova rivista storica", 1968, 70, pp. 401 ff.
- Morpurgo L., *Sulla condizione giuridica dei forestieri in Italia nei secoli di mezzo*, in "Archivio giuridico", 1872, 9.
- Mueller R. C., *Veneti facti privilegio: les étrangers naturalisés à Venise entre XIVe et XVIe siècle* in Bottin J., Calabi D. (eds.), *Les étrangers* cit., pp. 171-181.
- Id., *Stranieri e culture straniere a Venezia. Aspetti economici e sociali*, in "Ateneo Veneto", 1981, pp. 75-77.
- Piccinni G., *I "villani incittadinati" nella Siena del XIV secolo*, in "Bollettino senese di storia patria", 1975-1976, 82-83, pp. 158-159.
- Porfyriou H., *La présence grecque en Italie entre XVIe et XVIIe siècle: Rome et Venise*, in Bottin J., Calabi D. (eds.), *Les étrangers* cit., pp. 121-136.
- Preto P., *Le "pauvre" della società veneziana: le calamità, le sconfitte, i nemici esterni ed interni*, in *Storia di Venezia* cit., vol. VI, pp. 215-238.
- Pullan B., *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice*, Oxford 1971.
- Pult Quaglia A.M., *Citizenship in Medieval and Early Modern Italian Cities*, in Ellis S., Hålfdanarson G., Isaacs A.K. (eds.), *Citizenship in Historical Perspective*, Pisa 2006, pp. 107-114.
- Sestan E., *La città italiana nei secoli XIV, XV et XVI*, "Italia comunale e signorile", Scritti Vari – II, Florence 1989.
- Skinner Q., *Les fondements de la pensée politique moderne*, Paris 2001.
- Thiriet F., *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, Venice 1981.
- Id., *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIe-XVe siècles)*, Paris 1975 (1st ed. 1955).
- Trebbi G., *La cancelleria veneta nei secoli XVI e XVII*, in "Annali della Fondazione Luigi Einaudi", 1980, 14, pp. 65-125.
- Id., *Il segretario veneziano*, in S. Bertelli (ed.), *La mediazione* (Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, I, III, § V), Florence 1992, pp. 32-58 ("Quaderni del castello di Gargonza. Laboratorio di storia", 5).
- Id., *La società veneziana*, in Cozzi G., Prodi P. (eds.), *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Repubblica* cit., 1994, tome VI. *Dal Rinascimento al Barocco*, pp. 129-213.
- Varanini G.M., *L'organizzazione del distretto cittadino nell'Italia padana dei secoli XIII-XV (Marca trevigiana, Lombardia, Emilia)*, in Chittolini G., Willoweit D. (eds.), *L'organizzazione del territorio in Italia e Germania: secoli XIII-XIV*, in "Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico. Quaderno", 1994, 37, pp. 133-234.

Id., *Il distretto veronese del '400. Vicariati del comune di Verona e vicariati privati*, Verona 1980.

Ventura A., *Il dominio di Venezia nel Quattrocento*, in S. Bertelli, N. Rubinstein, C.H. Smith (eds.), *Florence and Venice: comparisons and relations*, Florence 1979, I.

Viggiano A., *Governanti e governati. Leggittimità del potere ed esercizio dell'autorità sovrana nello stato veneto della prima età moderna*, Treviso 1993.

Zannini A., *Burocrazia e burocrati a Venezia in età moderna: i cittadini originari (sec. XVI-XVIII)*, Venezia 1993 ("Memorie classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti", XLVII).

Id., *L'impiego pubblico*, in Tenenti A., Tucci U. (eds.), *Storia di Venezia*, cit., tome IV, *Il Rinascimento. Politica e cultura*, pp. 415-463.