

WILLIAM J. CONNELL

*«I fautori delle parti». Citizen interest and the treatment of a subject town, c.1500*

A passage in Francesco Guicciardini's *Storie fiorentine*, in which the historian discusses his city's response to the factional war that devastated Pistoia in the period 1499-1502, provides an unusually revealing description of relations between leading Florentines and the patricians of an important subject town in the later fifteenth century<sup>1</sup>. In accordance with the well-established Florentine policy of ruling Pistoia through her factions, the Panciatichi and the Cancellieri parties of Pistoia were encouraged to continue their rivalry throughout the fifteenth century, although the Florentines «contrived that the quarrels were carried out by means of favors, rather than with arms and slaughter»<sup>2</sup>. Exchanges of favors between Florentines and Pistoiese, and the fact that the Pistoiese continually turned to Florence for the mediation of their disputes, resulted in eminent citizens of Florence becoming known as the «supporters (*fautori*)» of one Pistoiese party or the other. Once established, these factional allegiances of the Florentines were passed down to their descendants<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine dal 1378 al 1509*, a cura di R. PALMAROCCHI, Bari, Laterza, 1931, pp. 202-206. The passage was first noticed by L. MARTINES, *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968, pp. 234-237. I am grateful to him for discussing this study with me.

<sup>2</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 203: «che e'si ingegnavano che queste quistioni procedessino più tosto con favori, che con arme ed uccisione». On Florentine-Pistoiese relations in the fifteenth century see W.J. CONNELL, *Clientelismo e stato territoriale. Il potere fiorentino a Pistoia nel XV secolo*, in «Società e storia», XIV (1991), pp. 523-543.

<sup>3</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., pp. 202-203: «Ed avendo nelle loro quistione a ricorrere a Firenze, avevano operato in modo che tutti gli uomini della città che maneggiavano lo stato, erano, continuandosi ancora ne'descendenti, battezzati fautori chi di una parte, chi di una altra (...).».

In his narration of the Pistoiese crisis, Guicciardini carefully identifies the Florentine statesmen who were aligned with each of the two Pistoiese factions. A thorough examination of the Florentines Guicciardini named is revealing, for it suggests what it meant for a Florentine citizen to be a *fautore* of the Cancellieri or Panciatichi party in the later fifteenth century. A detailed profile of the particular Pistoiese interests of the Florentine statesmen mentioned by Guicciardini can be obtained from a survey of surviving letters, *ricordanze* and chronicles, and of archival records concerning officeholding, ecclesiastical benefices and land ownership.

Guicciardini discusses the Florentine supporters of the Cancellieri party in the following terms:

«The Cancellieri had very many supporters: some of whom were naturally their allies; some of whom had been enemies of the Medici, and who hated the Panciatichi because Lorenzo and the Medici house had always favored them; and some of whom had been enemies of the Vitelli, because a sister of Paolo and Vitellozzo had married a son of Niccolao Bracciolini – one of the Panciatichi leaders – and on this account the Vitelli had always favored that party. The leaders of this group were messer Guidantonio Vespucci, Bernardo Rucellai, messer Francesco Gualterotti, Giovan Batista Ridolfi, Guglielmo de'Pazzi, the Nerli, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de'Medici, Luca d'Antonio degli Albizzi, and Iacopo Pandolfini. Of these, Giovan Batista Ridolfi always comported himself correctly, while messer Guidantonio and Bernardo Rucellai revealed themselves in such a light that they were heavily criticized, and the *popolo* blamed them in large measure for this disorder»<sup>4</sup>.

The passage distinguishes between two sorts of Florentine citizens who supported the Cancellieri during the Pistoiese civil war. While certain Florentines supported the Cancellieri *naturalmente*, that is, on the basis of pre-existent ties, resulting from such factors as shared property interests or traditions of office-

<sup>4</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 205: «Avevano e'Cancellieri moltissimi fautori: una parte naturalmente; una parte di quegli erano stati inimici de'Medici, e quali odiavano e'Panciatichi perché Lorenzo e la casa de'Medici gli aveva sempre favoriti; una parte di quegli erano stati inimici de'Vitelli, perché una sorella di Paolo e di Vitellozzo era maritata a uno figliuolo di Niccolao Bracciolini, uno de'capi panciatichi, e per questo rispetto e'Vitelli avevano sempre dato favore a quella parte. Eranne capi messer Guidantonio Vespucci, Bernardo Rucellai, messer Francesco Gualterotti, Giovan Batista Ridolfi, Guglielmo de'Pazzi, e'Nerli, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco [de'Medici], Luca d'Antonio degli Albizzi, Iacopo Pandolfini; de'quali, Giovan Batista Ridolfi se ne portò sempre costumatissimamente, messer Guidantonio e Bernardo Rucellai se ne scopersono in modo che n'ebbono grandissimo carico, e fu dal popolo imputato a loro in gran parte questo disordine».

holding at Pistoia, other Florentines supported them because the Panciatichi party was friendly toward their enemies, the Medici and the Vitelli.

The Florentines who supported the Cancellieri out of hatred toward the Medici can be identified from another list in the *Storie fiorentine* that records the «capital enemies» of Piero de' Medici<sup>5</sup>. These included, among others, the Pazzi, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici (sent into exile by Piero di Lorenzo), and the Nerli family (which had played an important part in the exile of the Medici in 1494)<sup>6</sup>. Guglielmo de' Pazzi and Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco appear not to have been active in Pistoia in the period before 1499, and it is therefore a likely hypothesis that the two men supported of the Cancellieri faction simply out of fear and dislike of the descendants of Cosimo di Giovanni de' Medici<sup>7</sup>. The Nerli, however, appear to have forged substantial ties with the Cancellieri party at an earlier date.

Conspicuous Nerli involvement in Pistoiese affairs becomes evident at least from the early 1480s. Fiscal declarations of several members of the Nerli family from both 1480 and 1495 reveal their ownership of «più pezzi di terra lavorativi» located at Vignole, in the comune of Tizzana in the Pistoiese contado. In 1487 the Vignole properties were given by Tanai de' Nerli to his son, Francesco. In addition, the Nerli had extensive property holdings at Montemurlo, located along the northern road between Pistoia and Prato, just outside the Pistoiese contado<sup>8</sup>. Nerli activity at Pistoia extended also to officeholding. The politically powerful *capofamiglia* of the Nerli, Tanai di Francesco, served as Captain of Pistoia in 1481-1482<sup>9</sup>. And in 1494, while Francesco di Tanai was

<sup>5</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 133: «inimici sua capitali».

<sup>6</sup> On the Nerli in 1494 see G. GUIDI, *Ciò che accadde al tempo della Signoria di novembre dicembre in Firenze l'anno 1494*, Firenze, Arnaud, 1988, pp. 26, 27, 35.

<sup>7</sup> Neither man's family line contributed territorial governors for Pistoia in the fifteenth century, although messer Piero di messer Andrea di Guglielmo de' Pazzi was elected *Podestà* of Pistoia in 1464, before being removed «cum deveto» AS FI, *Tratte*, 985, c. 29r. Nor is there evidence known to me of property-holding in the Pistoiese by the two men or their relatives.

<sup>8</sup> AS FI, *Decima repubblicana* (hereafter DR), 4, cc. 361v-366v (1480 declaration of Tanai de' Nerli); and note the later addition to this declaration on c. 364v: «E più ho alienato, hò ch'ò donato, più pezzi di terra lavorativi a Vingnuole, comune di Tizana, chontado di Pistoia, chonservando li chonfini. Donai a Franc[esc]o mio figl[uol]o, chome appare carta per mano di ser Stefano [di Niccolò da Portico], sotto [9 April 1487]». See as well: AS FI, DR, 1, cc. 409 e sgg. (1495 declaration of Francesco di Tanai); and DR, 3, c. 212v (1495 declaration of Benedetto di Tanai). It would appear likely that *contadini* from these rural properties were among the 1000 *fanti* reportedly lodged in the Nerli palaces in April-May 1501; G. CAMBI, *Istoria di Firenze dal 70 a.C. al 1534*, a cura di ILDEFONSO DI SAN LUIGI, in «Delizie degli eruditi toscani», XX-XXIII, (1785-1788), XXI, p. 162.

<sup>9</sup> AS FI, *Tratte*, 986, c. 4r.

serving as Commissioner of Pistoia in the aftermath of the expulsion of the Medici from Florence, he gave clear evidence of partisanship for the Cancellieri by attempting to exclude the Panciatichi from the administration of a local hospital, the Ceppo, which had long been controlled by the Panciatichi party<sup>10</sup>.

Guicciardini also indicates that enmity for the Vitelli family of Città di Castello became a reason for supporting the Cancellieri, as a result of the marriage between the son of a Panciatichi leader and the sister of Paolo and Vitellozzo Vitelli<sup>11</sup>. There is solid evidence to the effect that the Vitelli-Bracciolini *parentado* remained an important factor in the rivalry of the Pistoiese factions in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. At least one Panciatichi follower found employment as a soldier under the Vitelli *condottieri*<sup>12</sup>, and Città di Castello became the destination of several Panciatichi exiles during the crisis of 1499-1502<sup>13</sup>. In January 1501 Vitellozzo Vitelli reportedly sent a number of Panciatichi exiles to Pisa, to help the Pisans in their struggle against the Florentines<sup>14</sup>; in March of that year he was said to have sent troops to help the Panciatichi against the Cancellieri<sup>15</sup>; and a surviving letter of Vitellozzo's, dated 23 April 1501, recommends an important Panciatichi leader, messer Goro Gheri, to Vitelli's son-in-law, messer Oliverotto Euffreducci da Fermo<sup>16</sup>.

No doubt it was true that, after the arrest, torture and execution of Paolo

<sup>10</sup> On this attempt see: L. BARGIACCHI, *Storia degli istituti di beneficenza, d'istruzione ed educazione in Pistoia e suo circondario dalle rispettive origini a tutto l'anno 1880*, Firenze, 1883-1884, I, p. 192; and L. GAI, *Centro e periferia: Pistoia nell'orbita fiorentina durante il '500*, in *Pistoia: una città nello stato mediceo*, Pistoia, Edizioni del Comune, 1980, p. 89 note 62.

<sup>11</sup> A notice concerning the Bracciolini-Vitelli marriage is found in G. GIUSTI, *Cronica o Memorie*, ms. in BNCF, *Nazionale*, II.II.127, c. 140r: «[19 January 1482/3], venne ad Anghiari la figliuola di messer Niccolò Vitelli da [Città di] Castello, che andava a marito a Pistoia. Stette la sera in casa di Mazzone d'Anghiari, e stettero ad albergo in casa mia Giovanni e Paulo Vitelli, figliuoli di detto messer Niccolò». Cfr. F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 185: «[Paolo Vitelli] tenne sempre pratiche ed amicizie in Pistoia (...).».

<sup>12</sup> For Giuliano di Ubertino Ser Atto, detto Maccione, «homo d'arme di Vitellozzo» in 1501, see I. MELOCCHI, *Libro di possessioni*, ms. in AS FI, *Acquisti e doni* (hereafter AD), 8, c. 24r.

<sup>13</sup> For instance, messer Iacopo Panciatichi went to Città di Castello in 1500; M. SALVI, *Historie di Pistoia e fazioni d'Italia*, Roma-Pistoia-Venezia, 1656-1662, voll. 3, (rist. anast., Bologna, Forni, 1978), III, p. 12.

<sup>14</sup> AS FI, *Dieci di balia, Carteggi, Responsive*, 60, cc. 67r-68r, letter from Tommaso Tosinghi to the Ten of Liberty and Peace, 8 January 1501.

<sup>15</sup> B. CERRETANI, *Ricordi*, ms. in BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 13651, c. 6v., now published in B. CERRETANI, *Ricordi*, a cura di G. BERTI, Firenze, Olschki, 1993, p.15. (Note that this edition mistakes the *segnatura* of the autograph as *Vat. lat. 13661 [sic]*).

<sup>16</sup> Published here in appendix as Letter VI. On Gheri's ties to the Vitelli see also C. DIONISOTTI, *Machiavellerie*, Torino, Einaudi, 1980, pp. 105-106 note 3.

Vitelli by the Florentine Republic in the fall of 1499, the remaining members of the Vitelli family counted a number of prominent Florentines among their enemies<sup>17</sup>. However one of the Florentines singled out by Guicciardini as a friend of the Cancellieri seems to have been on especially unfriendly terms with the Vitelli even prior to the arrest of Paolo. According to a chancery notice of June 1499, Luca di Antonio degli Albizzi refused to serve as Commissioner General with Paolo Vitelli in the campaign against Pisa, because he considered himself the «enemy (*inimico*)» of Paolo<sup>18</sup>. Since Luca di Antonio and the other members of his line of the Albizzi, seem not to have owned property in the Pistoiese, nor to have held important offices there in the second half of the fifteenth century, and since no other evidence of Luca's involvement in Pistoiese affairs has emerged in the course of research concerning the period before 1499, it appears most likely that it was this particular enmity toward the Vitelli, the source of which remains to be discovered, that determined his support for the Cancellieri during the Pistoiese crisis<sup>19</sup>.

Another Florentine supporter of the Cancellieri was Giovan Batista di Luigi Ridolfi, whom Guicciardini praised for the propriety of his conduct throughout the turmoil at Pistoia. Ridolfi belonged to a family that had already held a number of Pistoiese governorships during the *Quattrocento*<sup>20</sup>. In 1463, at the death of Giovan Batista's father, Luigi di messer Lorenzo Ridolfi, Pistoia's Council of the People voted to honor the «generosa domus et familia de Ridolfis» for their service on behalf of the commune<sup>21</sup>. Perhaps Ridolfi's most significant Pistoiese ties dated from his twenty-month term as *Podestà* and

<sup>17</sup> On the episode, see F. CHIAPPELLI, *Guicciardini, Machiavelli e il caso di Paolo*, in «Annali d'italianistica», II, (1984), pp. 53-62.

<sup>18</sup> Luca di Antonio degli Albizzi was elected Commissioner General by the Council of Eighty on 18 June 1499; AS FI, *Signoria, Carteggio, Legazioni e commissarie, Elezioni e istruzioni agli oratori*, (hereafter SCLCEIO), 26, c. 8; cfr. N. MACHIAVELLI, *Sommario*, in Id., *Legazioni e commissarie. Scritti di governo*, a cura di F. CHIAPPELLI, Bari, Laterza, 1971, I, p. 571, «non andò per esser inimico ad Pagolo [Vitelli]».

<sup>19</sup> Cfr. AS FI, *Catasto*, 1021, c. 385 (1480 declaration of Luca di Antonio di Luca degli Albizzi).

<sup>20</sup> Giovan Batista's uncle, Bernardo di messer Lorenzo Ridolfi, was *Podestà* and Reformer of the city's offices in 1437 (AS FI, *Statuti delle comunità autonome e soggette* [hereafter SCAS], 595, cc. 539r-551v); and another uncle, Antonio di messer Lorenzo, was Captain of Pistoia in 1456-57 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 985, c. 6r), and *Podestà* of Pistoia in 1465 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 29r). Giovanni di messer Lorenzo di Antonio Ridolfi was *Podestà* in 1467 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 29r); Tommaso di Luigi di messer Lorenzo was one of 4 Commissioners *super litibus et differentiis civitatis et comitatus et districtus Pistorii* in 1477 (BIBLIOTECA FORTEGUERRIANA, Pistoia (hereafter BFPT), ms. B 169, *Reforma*, c. 1v).

<sup>21</sup> ASPT, *Comune* (hereafter Com.), *Provvisioni e riforme* (hereafter «Provv. e rif.»), 42, cc. 19v-20r, 20 April 1463.

Commissioner of Pistoia in 1490-1491<sup>22</sup>. Well after the completion of this term in office, Ridolfi remained a vital point of reference in Florence for the Pistoiese, as is revealed in a letter from Ridolfi to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia dated 18 March 1498<sup>23</sup>. Responding to a questioning letter from the Priors, Ridolfi explains that at the end of his term in 1491 he commissioned a personal copy of his *Atti e sentenze*. Meanwhile, the official register of his *Atti e sentenze* was properly consigned to the Florentine chancery upon his return from Pistoia<sup>24</sup>. Ridolfi assures the Priors that he is not in the practice of giving out copies of his *Atti*; however, from time to time, he explains, persons from Pistoia come to consult his private copy of the register, rather than the official version in the Palace of the Signoria<sup>25</sup>. One further indication of Ridolfi's continuing influence with the Pistoiese can be found in the instructions that were written ten days later to a Pistoiese ambassador, who was told to seek out Ridolfi privately to request his influence with the Ten of Liberty and Peace<sup>26</sup>.

When compared with Ridolfi, whose family's influence at Pistoia seems to have been founded especially on officeholding and on mediation with various Florentine magistracies, the extensive influence that the Pandolfini family grew to wield was established in a manner more diffuse<sup>27</sup>. As with the Ridolfi, and with several other Florentine families influential at Pistoia, the holding of territorial offices was of importance in establishing Pandolfini clout<sup>28</sup>. Yet the aspects of Pandolfini activity at Pistoia that stood out in the second half of the fifteenth century were their participation in the commercial life of the territory

<sup>22</sup> AS FI, *Tratte*, 986, c. 27v. The terms of the office are outlined in AS FI, *Provvisioni, Registri*, 181, cc. 31v-32r, 27 July 1490.

<sup>23</sup> Letter from Giovan Battista Ridolfi, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 18 March 1498, in AS PT, *Opera di S. Jacopo* (hereafter OSJ), 761, c. 97r, published below in appendix as Letter IV.

<sup>24</sup> Ridolfi's personal copy of the *Atti e sentenze* is now preserved in AS PT, *Capitano di custodia, poi Commissario*, serie III, 34, fasc. 1. The official register deposited in Florence is preserved in AS FI, *Pratica segreta di Pistoia e Pontremoli*, 138.

<sup>25</sup> AS PT, OSJ, 761, c. 97r: «perché qualche volta ne servo' di quelli vostri huomini, non che se ne dia copia, ma ad informatione loro.»

<sup>26</sup> AS PT, OSJ, 761, c. 14v, 28 March 1498, instructions to messer Bartolomeo Baldinotti.

<sup>27</sup> For an appraisal of the rise of the Pandolfini family to political prominence under the Medicean regime, see F.W. KENT, *Bartolomeo Cederni and His Friends. Letters to an Obscure Florentine*, Firenze, Olschki, 1991, pp. 32-33.

<sup>28</sup> Pandolfini family members who served as officers at Pistoia in the fifteenth century included Agnolo di Filippo, one of the Six Reformers of 1403 (M. SALVI *Historie ... cit*, II, p. 216), and Podestà in 1430 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 984, c. 36r); messer Giannozzo di Agnolo, Captain in 1454-1455 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 7v); and messer Carlo di Agnolo, Podestà in 1463 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 29r).

and their control of major ecclesiastical positions. Contemporary business documents indicate Pandolfini involvement in the two principal industries at Pistoia, iron-smelting and silk production<sup>29</sup>. And it was perhaps of some significance to the Pandolfini, as they became more important at Pistoia, that their chief family estate was located at Signa, in the Florentine contado, near the point at which the chief river in the Pistoiese countryside, the Ombrone, flows into the Arno<sup>30</sup>.

One member of the family, Pierfilippo Pandolfini, was especially responsible for constructing a familial sphere of influence within the Pistoiese church. Pierfilippo was an active promoter of the ecclesiastical career of his brother, Niccolò, whose election as bishop of Pistoia in 1474 he helped secure<sup>31</sup>. In subsequent years, Pierfilippo continued to support Niccolò in his vigorous accumulation of attractive benefices, as can be seen in a letter he received from

<sup>29</sup> On the Pandolfini and the iron trade, it is interesting to note that when, on 25 February 1477, Pierfilippo Pandolfini signed on behalf of Lorenzo and Giuliano de' Medici an agreement to purchase the entire output of iron ore from the island of Elba for five years from Jacopo IV Appiani, probably he knew that much of the ore would be smelted in iron works in the Pistoiese and Lucchese Montagna in which the Pandolfini had investments. See G. CAMERANI MARRI, *I documenti commerciali del fondo Diplomatico mediceo nell'Archivio di stato di Firenze (1230-1492)*, Regesti, Firenze, Olschki, 1951, p. 133 (no. 411); and R. DE ROOVER, *The Rise and Decline of the Medici Bank*, New York, Norton 1966, p. 165, who is uncertain whether to date the document to 1477 or 1478; however, since the document was drawn up at Piombino (where the *stile pisano* was used) it should be dated to 1477. Compare P. GINORI CONTI, *La magona della vena di ferro di Pisa e di Pietrasanta sotto la gestione di Piero de' Medici e Comp. (1489-1492)*, Firenze, Olschki, 1939. For Pandolfini involvement in the Pistoiese silk trade, see Battista di Pandolfo di messer Giannozzo Pandolfini's *Libro bianco «A»*, in AS FI, *Galletti*, 8, cc. 77 and 88 – a reference I owe to the late Hidetoshi Hoshino.

<sup>30</sup> The Pandolfini property at Signa is mentioned by F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 102; and L. LANDUCCI, *Diario fiorentino dal 1450 al 1516*, a cura di I. DEL BADIA, Firenze, Sansoni, 1883, p. 224. However the Pandolfini appear not to have owned land in the Pistoiese contado; cfr. AS FI, *Catasto*, 1022, parte II, cc. 427r-428r (the 1480 declaration of Pierfilippo di messer Giannozzo); *Catasto*, 1021, c. 313 (the 1480 declaration of Jacopo di messer Giannozzo).

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, the letter from Niccolò Pandolfini, in Rome, to Priore Pandolfini, in Florence, 11 June 1473, copy in BRITISH LIBRARY, London, *Additional Manuscripts*, 28, 272, c. 22r, which reads in part: «(...) il cardinale mio [Giuliano della Rovere] mostra volermi fare bene, et stimo sarà con effecto, e sia che si vuole veschovado pratichare con Lorenzo noi è vedere, dove è che, senza lui, in simil cosa con difficultà saria honore; (...) e se sopra Pistoia [Lorenzo] non havessi qualche interesso (*sic!*), piacendo a llui, l'avessi io». (I should like to thank F. W. Kent for this reference, and Mary Bonn and Dora Thornton for their help in obtaining a photograph of the letter). Further details concerning the election to Pistoia are given in R. BIZZOCCHI, *Chiesa e potere nella Toscana del Quattrocento*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1987, pp. 230-231. For a story concerning the gift that Niccolò's «consanguinei» made to Giuliano della Rovere after the election, see AS FI, *Notarile antecosimiano* (hereafter NA), 8604, c. 46v.

messer Guidantonio Vespucci in 1483<sup>32</sup>. And the ecclesiastical patronage of the Pandolfini in Pistoia extended beyond Niccolò's bishopric to other family members. In 1476 Pierfilippo acquired for the Pandolfini the patronage rights of the archidiaconate, the third-ranking dignity within the college of cathedral canons at Pistoia<sup>33</sup>. Francesco di Pandolfo, another Pandolfini prelate, was awarded the important pieve of S. Andrea in Pistoia in 1485<sup>34</sup>. And in 1492 messer Jacopo Pandolfini re-endowed the fourth-ranking dignity in the college of cathedral canons, the diaconate, reserving for his family the patronage rights<sup>35</sup>.

Throughout much of the fifteenth century the Pandolfini were close to the Rucellai family of Florence, and in Pistoiese affairs the two families seem at times to have acted in concert<sup>36</sup>. The Rucellai had substantial Pistoiese interests of their own. Their villa at Quaracchi, built during the fifteenth century on land already belonging to the family in the fourteenth century, was situated along the most commonly traveled road between Florence and Pistoia<sup>37</sup>. According to a letter of Bernardo Rucellai's from 1474, the family's property along this road gave them many «friendships (*amicizie*)» in the Pistoiese contado<sup>38</sup>. And a tax declaration of Bernardo's in 1495 reveals him in possession of a new property located just outside the walls of Pistoia, although he had not yet received the papers to confirm the transaction, and he had not visited the estate<sup>39</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> Letter from messer Guidantonio Vespucci, in Rome, to Pierfilippo Pandolfini, in Florence, 30 September 1483, in LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, Washington, *Rare Book Collection, Thacher Autographs*, 1395, no. 2, published below in Appendix as Letter III.

<sup>33</sup> M. SALVI, *Historie ... cit.*, II, p. 421; J.M. FIORAVANTI, *Memorie storiche della città di Pistoja*, Lucca, Benedini, 1758 (rist. anast., Bologna, Forni, 1986), p. 49.

<sup>34</sup> BNCF, *Magliabechi* (hereafter *Magl.*), II.ii.441, c. 1v.

<sup>35</sup> G. BEANI, *La chiesa pistoiese dalla sua origine ai tempi nostri. Appunti storici*<sup>2</sup>, Pistoia, Pagnini 1912, p. 64; cfr. J.M. FIORAVANTI, *Memorie storiche ... cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>36</sup> On Pandolfini-Rucellai ties, see F.W. KENT, *The Making of a Renaissance Patron of the Arts*, in *Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo Zibaldone*, London, Warburg Institute, 1960-1981, 2 voll., II, pp. 14-18.

<sup>37</sup> On this road, see A. CHIAPPELLI, *Come si viaggiava da Pistoia a Firenze nei secoli decimoterzo, decimoquarto e decimoquinto?* in «L'illustratore fiorentino», 1909, pp. 23-28; D. HERLIHY, *Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia: The social history of an Italian town, 1200-1430* New Haven, Yale University Press, p. 51; T. SZABO, *Comuni e politica stradale in Toscana e in Italia nel Medioevo* Bologna, CLUEB, 1992, pp. 212-214.

<sup>38</sup> Letter from Bernardo Rucellai to Giuliano di Piero de'Medici, 6 May 1474, in AS FI, *Archivio mediceo avanti il principato* (hereafter MAP), 5, n. 807; cited by F.W. KENT, *Household and Lineage in Renaissance Florence*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 236-237 note 29.

<sup>39</sup> AS FI, DR, 22, cc. 195r-198r (Bernardo Rucellai's declaration for the 1495 *catasto*). See, in

Although different branches of the large Rucellai house appear to have followed divergent paths in other areas of endeavor, when it came to Pistoiese affairs the *consorteria* maintained a common front<sup>40</sup>. As has already been noted with respect to several other Florentine families, numerous terms as Captain or *Podestà* of Pistoia during the fifteenth century served to reinforce Rucellai influence in the town<sup>41</sup>. An active convergence between territorial officeholding and the furtherance of the family's interests as patrons at Pistoia can be seen in two recently discovered letters written by Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai in 1449<sup>42</sup>. The first of the letters is addressed to two Pistoiese friends, to whom Giovanni expresses his willingness to provide help in a civil suit concerning a garden plot. In the suit they are defending a third friend of Giovanni's, one Ludovico Ferrauti. Since the suit will soon be heard before Giovanni's cousin, Piero di Cardinale Rucellai, now serving as *Podestà* of Pistoia, Giovanni addresses the second of the letters to Piero, urging him, «on account of my love [to] favor the said Ludovico with whatever is just and honest, (...) because I had the greatest friendship with him in Venice». Although Piero di Cardinale belonged to the pro-Medicean lineage of Paolo di Bingeri Rucellai, while the Medici perceived Giovanni Rucellai as an unfriendly figure, such differences seem not to have hindered the collaboration of family members in the exercise of social patronage.

particular, c. 197r: «Una possesione lavoratìa et prativa posta insulle mura di Pistoia, della quale non vi posso dare la vera notitia per non potere andare in sulla possessione né havere le scripture, di che ve ne ho la maggiore parte a livello, et facti perpetui, che Iddio ci dia gratia, che presto possiamo usare decte possessioni, acciò ve la possa dare. f.-».

<sup>40</sup> See F.W. KENT, *Household and Lineage ...* cit., pp. 182-183.

<sup>41</sup> Paolo di Vanni di Lapo Rucellai was Captain in 1414 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 983, c. 8r). Cardinale di Piero Rucellai was *Podestà* and Reformer in 1417 (ivi, c. 35r; and AS FI, *SCAS*, 595, cc. 122r-145r), and Captain of the Montagna in 1418-19 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 10r). Francesco di Ugolino was *Podestà* of Pistoia in 1427 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 36r). Filippo di Vanni di Lapo was *Podestà* of Montale in the Pistoiese contado in 1431 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 113r). Piero di Cardinale was *Podestà* of Pistoia in 1431-33 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 36r), and again in 1448-1449 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 36v). Filippo di Pancrazio was Captain in 1451 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 7v; cfr. *SCAS*, 597). Giovanni di Piero di Pancrazio was *Podestà* of Tizzana in the Pistoiese contado in 1474 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 82v). Bernardo di Piero di Cardinale (not Bernardo di Giovanni) was Captain of Pistoia in 1485 (*Tratte*, 986, c. 4r). Mariotto di Piero di Pancrazio was *Podestà* in 1489-1490 (*Tratte*, 986, c. 27v). Girolamo di Filippo di Vanni imposed the *estimo* on the contado and Montagna of Pistoia in 1495-1496 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 14, cc. 17r-18v, 23v, 26v-34v). A Rucellai coat-of-arms dated 1472 that was displayed on the facade of the Palazzo Pretorio cannot be associated securely with any of the above offices; cfr. G. TIGRI, *Intorno al Palazzo Pretorio o del Podestà di Pistoia. Memoria storica*, Pistoia, Bracali, 1848, p. 32.

<sup>42</sup> See Letters I and II in the Appendix. Cfr. F.W. KENT, *The Letters genuine and spurious of Giovanni Rucellai*, in «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», XXXVII (1974), pp. 342-349.

A similar recognition of shared patronage interests seems to have been again at work in an episode of August 1498. When Bernardo Rucellai, the son of Giovanni di Paolo, was called away from his post as Commissioner of Pistoia to serve as ambassador to Venice, the Signoria replaced Bernardo with a distant cousin from a different branch of the family, Girolamo di Filippo di Vanni Rucellai<sup>43</sup>.

A pro-Cancellieri «strategy» of the Rucellai in the later fifteenth century was brought into focus by a matrimonial alliance they forged with the Melocchi, a powerful and wealthy Pistoiese house<sup>44</sup>. During the 1480s, a decade in which the Cancellieri family was in sharp decline, the Melocchi displaced the Cancellieri as the leading family within the Cancellieri party<sup>45</sup>. The Rucellai-Melocchi *parentado* was all the more notable, since such marriages between the children of Florentine patricians and non-Florentines seem to have been relatively rare in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Unlike the marriages that were arranged between Florentine and Pistoiese patrician families in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, in which both bride and groom belonged to the principal branches of their families, the match between Giovanni di Tolomeo Melocchi and Ginevra di Agnolo Rucellai joined a bride from a somewhat lesser branch of the Florentine family with the only son of the wealthy leader of an important Pistoiese family<sup>46</sup>. A century earlier, when an assumption of social parity among leading Florentine and Pistoiese houses

<sup>43</sup> For Bernardo Rucellai's election as Commissioner of Pistoia, together with Giovanni Manetti, on 11 July 1498, see AS FI, *Tratte*, 14, cc. 70v-71r. The commissioners were sent in order to impose peace on the feuding Bracciolini and Melocchi families, and it is likely that Bernardo was sent on account of his influence with the Melocchi (see below).

For Bernardo's embassy to Venice, and his replacement by Girolamo di Filippo di Vanni Rucellai, see *ibid.* cc. 72v-73v, 74v, 77v-78r, 79r; and AS PT, OSJ, 769, cc. 76v, 78r. A letter of 18 August 1498 from Girolamo Rucellai and Giovanni Manetti to the Florentine Signoria is preserved in AS FI, *Signoria, Carteggi, Responsive originali*, 10, c. 220.

<sup>44</sup> For the marriage between Giovanni di Tolomeo Melocchi and Ginevra di Agnolo Rucellai, see AS PT, *Famigliario Franchi*, 15 (M, parte II), c. 8. Ginevra is not recorded in L. PASSERINI, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Rucellai*, Firenze, Cellini, 1861. Her father, Agnolo di Donato Rucellai, who was Bernardo's first cousin, is mentioned in F.W. KENT, *Making of a Renaissance Patron* ... cit., p. 76, who notes that Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai became responsible for Agnolo and his brothers after the death of Donato in 1460. The fact that the two family lines were quite close makes it probable that Bernardo Rucellai played a role in arranging the marriage.

<sup>45</sup> See, for instance, a letter from the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Florence, 16 January 1498, AS PT, OSJ, 761, c. 11v, in which it is stated that the *briga* between the Melocchi (Cancellieri) and the Bracciolini (Panciatichi) is «the most important and the one that sustains all the rest».

<sup>46</sup> See W.J. CONNELL, *Clientelismo e stato territoriale* ... cit., pp. 533-534.

seems to have been operant, it might have been thought that this *parentado* was imbalanced. But frequent mentions in contemporary Pistoiese sources make clear that the marriage was seen as marking a special commitment of the Rucellai to the Cancellieri party.

Rucellai sympathies at Pistoia had not always been established in so precise a manner. During the 1430s, '40s, and '50s, Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai and his immediate family were perceived as anti-Medicean, as a consequence of Giovanni's marriage to Iacopa di messer Palla Strozzi in 1431, and his continuing loyalty to Palla Strozzi after the latter's exile in 1434<sup>47</sup>. When it came to Pistoiese matters, the Strozzi were traditionally allied with the Panciatichi faction<sup>48</sup>, whereas the Medici in this earlier period were still allies of the Cancellieri<sup>49</sup>. Thus in 1440, when Giovanni Rucellai's brother, Donato, married Margherita di Antonio Panciatichi, it may have been the case that, with respect to Pistoiese affairs, the marriage was seen as consistent with these interests<sup>50</sup>. However it is also true that the Pistoiese *amico* whom Giovanni recommended to Piero di Cardinale in 1449 belonged to a family, the Ferrauti, with Cancellieri loyalties<sup>51</sup>. Although the evidence is still limited, it appears possible that a firmer commitment of the Rucellai to the Cancellieri party was at least partially a response to the warning of relations between the Medici and the Panciatichi after 1478, and to Bernardo Rucellai's own increasing difficulties with the Medicean regime in the 1480s and early 1490s<sup>52</sup>.

After the fall of the Medicean regime in 1494, Bernardo Rucellai's chief political ally in the prosecution of a pro-Cancellieri policy was messer Guidantonio Vespucci. There had been a number of Vespucci rectors at Pistoia

<sup>47</sup> On the difficult relations between the Rucellai and the Medici in the fifteenth century, see F.W. KENT, *Making of a Renaissance Patron* ... cit., pp. 22-39.

<sup>48</sup> According to L. DOMINICI, *Cronaca seconda*, a cura di G.C. GIGLIOTTI, Pistoia, Pacinotti, 1937, p. 11. Cfr. L. PASSERINI, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi*, Firenze, Cellini, 1858, Tavola XII, for the 1371 marriage of Bandino di Giovanni Panciatichi to Camilla di Bernardo Strozzi; and Tavola VI, for the 1431 marriage of Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi to Margherita di Benedetto Strozzi.

<sup>49</sup> L. DOMINICI, *Cronaca seconda* ... cit., pp. 11-12; and, on the traditional ties of the Medici to the Cancellieri, see W.J. CONNELL, *Clientelismo e stato territoriale*... cit., p. 538.

<sup>50</sup> For the marriage of Donato di Paolo Rucellai to Margherita di Antonio Panciatichi in 1440 or 1441, see L. PASSERINI, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi* ... cit., Tavola V; and ID., *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Rucellai* ... cit., Tavola XVI.

<sup>51</sup> For the Ferrauti as Cancellieri partisans see L. DOMINICI, *Cronaca seconda* ... cit., pp. 45-46, in the year 1401; and M. SALVI, *Historie di Pistoia* ... cit., II, p. 349, in the year 1451.

<sup>52</sup> For Medici favoritism of the Panciatichi family after the reconciliation of 1478, see W.J. CONNELL, *Clientelismo e stato territoriale* ... cit., pp. 538-539.

in the fifteenth century<sup>53</sup>, and messer Guidantonio had himself served briefly as Captain of the Pistoiese Montagna in the winter of 1481-1482<sup>54</sup>. One Cancellieri partisan later saw fit to praise messer Guidantonio as an «exceptional man»<sup>55</sup>. But more direct evidence of private ties between Vespucci and the Cancellieri faction has yet come to light. Instead, it seems more probable that Vespucci's close personal and political ties to Bernardo Rucellai caused him to follow the other man's lead. Vespucci had been associated with Bernardo for years, according to Guicciardini, who named the two men as the most important leaders of the anti-Savonarolan faction in Florence<sup>56</sup>. Furthermore, they seem to have worked closely in the period immediately after Savonarola's arrest<sup>57</sup>. In August 1498 they were sent as an ambassadorial team to Venice<sup>58</sup>. According to Piero Parenti, in November 1498, when Bernardo fell ill shortly before he was to begin a term as Standard-Bearer of Justice, he resigned the post only after he was assured that Vespucci would serve in his place<sup>59</sup>.

When Guicciardini states, in his discussion of the Pistoiese crisis, that «messer Guidantonio and Bernardo Rucellai revealed themselves in such a light that they were heavily criticized», he is almost certainly referring to the activity of Rucellai and Vespucci on behalf of the Cancellieri party's candidate for the post of director (*spedalingo*) of the foundling hospital of S. Gregorio in the fall and winter of 1498-1499. In the search for evidence of meddling in Pistoiese matters, a letter of Bernardo's, dated 31 October 1498, is a smoking gun<sup>60</sup>. The letter requests that the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia

<sup>53</sup> Messer Guidantonio's father, Giovanni di Simone Vespucci, was *Podestà* in 1449-1450 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 984, c. 36v). Other Vespucci rectors in the fifteenth century were Giuliano di Lapo, *Podestà* in 1459-1460 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 29r), and again in 1466 (ivi); and Piero di Bernardo di Piero, Captain and Commissioner in 1494 (*Tratte*, 987, c. 3r).

<sup>54</sup> AS FI, *Tratte*, 986, c. 10r. The term began on 1 December 1481, however he was removed in January 1482.

<sup>55</sup> I. MELOCCHI, *Libro ... cit.*, in AS FI, *AD*, 8, c. 9r: «homo singulare».

<sup>56</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine ... cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155.

<sup>58</sup> N. MACHIAVELLI, *Sommario ... cit.*, in Id., *Legazioni. Commissarie. Scritti di governo*, I, p. 565.

<sup>59</sup> P. PARENTI, *Historia fiorentina*, cited in I. NARDI, *Istorie della città di Firenze*, a cura di A. GELLI, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1858, , 2 voll.I, p. 153, note 2: «Ultimamente non sendo per recuperare a tempo la sanità, intesosi etiam M. Guid'Antonio Vespucci di più favore li succedeva, Bernardo allegò lo impedimento, e M. Guido in suo luogo successe». For Rucellai's «allegatio impedimenti» of 2 November 1498, see AS FI, *Tratte*, 14, c. 80r; the substitution by Vespucci on 3 November 1498 is recorded on c. 81r.

<sup>60</sup> AS PT, *OSJ*, 761, c. 104r, published below in appendix as Letter IV.

reconfirm their election of one Bernardo Nutini to the directorship of S. Gregorio. Nutini, described as «my great friend», happened also to be the brother-in-law of Tolomeo Melocchi<sup>61</sup>; and, since Tolomeo's only son was married to Rucellai's grand-niece, there is every reason to believe that the leader of the Rucellai family considered Nutini a valued relation. The background to Rucellai's letter is still more interesting, for additional evidence reveals that it was written in an attempt to paper over an irregularity in the hospital election.

The electoral procedure that applied to the office of *spedalingo* of S. Gregorio had been established by a papal bull of 1393, which provided that the hospital director be selected by the bishop of Pistoia from among three finalists, who were to be proposed by the city's Council of the People. The candidates were to be over forty years of age and natives of the city of Pistoia<sup>62</sup>. Records of the communal deliberations show that Rucellai's client, Bernardo Nutini, was not among the three finalists whose names were approved by the Council<sup>63</sup>. The preferred candidates were all Panciatichi partisans, while Nutini, the most promising Cancellieri candidate, took fourth place in the election<sup>64</sup>. At first it appeared that Bishop Pandolfini would have little choice but to name ser Piero del Terchio, a wealthy Panciatichi follower, since the two other candidates indicated no desire for the offices<sup>65</sup>. However the Cancellieri party soon realized that one of the three finalists, a certain Giovanni di Matteo Brunozzi,

<sup>61</sup> I. MELOCCHI, *Libro ... cit.*, in AS FI, AD, 8, c. 60r, for Tolomeo's wife, Cosa Nutini; and cfr. B. BUONI, *De'casi di Pistoia*, ms. in BNCF, *Rossi-Cassigoli* (hereafter RC), 371, c. 2v: «(...) Tholomeo Melocchi, che era cugnato di Bernardo Nutini».

<sup>62</sup> P. TURI, *Lotte per la carica di Spedalingo del Ceppo e di San Gregorio tra il '400 ed il '500*, in «Bullettino storico pistoiese», LXXIX (1977), p. 56. The Council of the People consisted of the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice, an advisory College of 12 persons, and eighty citizens elected by sortition.

<sup>63</sup> AS PT, *Com., Provv. e rif.*, 50, c. 205r, 28 October 1498, records the election of the three finalists.

<sup>64</sup> For Bernardo Nutini's fourth-place finish, see B. BUONI, *De'casi ... cit.*, in BNCF, RC, 371, cc. 2r-4r.

<sup>65</sup> See the letter from Andrea Panciatichi, in Pistoia, to Niccolò Pandolfini, in Florence, 27 [but really 28] October 1498, in ARCHIVIO DELLA CURIA VESCOVILE DI PISTOIA, III-B-18, inserto 50: «(...) ha intexa la Vostra Signoria la nuova electione de'tre spidalieri di Sancto Gregorio; et se Vostra Signoria noterà bene el partito del Consiglio, loro ànno dato a chompagnia a ser Piero del Terchio, Giovanni di Matheo et Piero di Paparo. Perché s'intende che nessuno di questi 2 non vorrebbono essere, et el Consiglio pigla ser Piero, perché lui è il meglo di questo ciptà a tale exercitio (...). With respect to the Panciatichi candidate, ser Piero del Terchio, there is a humanist miscellany in BNCF, *Magl.*, VII.1095, that contains on c. 25 some «versus cuiusdam Florentini ad Petrum Terchium». (Cfr. P.O. KRISTELLER, *Iter Italicum*, London, The Warburg Institute, 1963, I, p. 131, which gives the uncertain name «Petrum Terebium?»).

had been granted Pistoiese citizenship by the Council in 1474, and that he was not, therefore, a native citizen<sup>66</sup>.

Acting through «friends and relations» in Florence, the Cancellieri persuaded Bishop Pandolfini to eliminate Brunozzi from the pool of candidates, and to consider Nutini, the fourth-place finisher, as belonging to the final group<sup>67</sup>. This way of proceeding was quite irregular, since the Council of the People had never presented Nutini's name to the Bishop; but it gave the pro-Cancellieri Pandolfini the pretext he needed to formally elect Nutini as *spedalingo*. Thus Bernardo Rucellai's request that the Pistoiese Priors «reconfirm» Nutini can only be seen as an attempt to legitimize an electoral abuse.

In the event, the Pistoiese Priors were not forthcoming. Instead, the Panciatichi party seized control of the hospital of S. Gregorio; the pro-Panciatichi Standard-Bearer of Justice in Pistoia installed a guard to keep out Nutini and the Cancellieri party; and the matter was appealed to the Florentine Signoria. The Signoria decided to delegate the matter to a panel of three Florentine jurisconsults: one to be chosen by each of the Pistoiese parties, with the third and deciding vote given to the Florentine Standard-Bearer of Justice, who was none other than Bernardo Rucellai's close political ally, messer Guidantonio Vespucci. On 20 January 1499 Vespucci and his fellow lawyers made known their decision in favor of Nutini and Cancellieri, precipitating the factional violence that would engulf Pistoia for the next four years<sup>68</sup>. Small wonder that the Florentine *popolo* blamed Rucellai and Vespucci for the disorder.

<sup>66</sup> M. SALVI, *Historie ... cit.*, II, pp. 168-169, 419; and see also AS FI, MAP, 21, n. 110, letter from Gualterotto dei Bardi da Vernio to Lorenzo di Piero de' Medici, 16 October 1468, recommending «Giovanni di Matheo di Gabriello da Lizano» and two other men who «sempre sono stati di casa nostra»; and BFPT, ms. B 169, *Reforma officiorum*, 1477, c. 25r: «quod Iohannes, Ghabriel et Possente, fratres et filii Mattei Ghabriellis ad presens habitantes Pistorii (...) im perpetuum sint et esse intelligentur habiles et tanquam habiles admicantur in extractionibus de eis faciendis in civitate Pistorii et pro officiis eiusdem, tanquam soluissent honera ordinaria per tempus viginti annorum proxime preteritorum in civitate Pistorii (...).»

<sup>67</sup> B. BUONI, *De' Casi ... cit.*, in BNCF, RC, 371, c. 1v: «(...) gli detti cittadini Canciglieri feceno capo a molti amici et parenti del Vescovo, facendolo pregare, che dessi detta electione a Bernardo Nutini, in modo che fu subbornato, tale che feceno fare la confirmatione a Bernardo Nutini»; and cfr. F. VASSELLINI, *De calamitatibus suae patriae*, ms. in BIBLIOTECA MARUCELLIANA, Firenze (hereafter BMF), C.64, c. 4r: «Caeteri nonnulli pernitosi cives, factio facta, insidiis dolis, contra iura ac reipublicae decreta insurgentes, Bernardum Nutinum (...), in sufragiis publicis inferiorem, adversus rem publicam, antistiti Nicholao Pistoriensi obtulerunt, qui (ut fama est) pecunia muneribus corruptus eum hospitalarium confirmavit».

<sup>68</sup> F. RICCIARDI, *Ricordi storici di Francesco Ricciardi, detto «Ceccodea»*, a cura di A. CHITI, Pistoia, Pacinotti, 1934, p. 70.

In discussing the Pistoiese crisis, Francesco Guicciardini also mentions a number of Florentine supporters of the Panciatichi party<sup>69</sup>.

It was well known that the Panciatichi party possessed many friends in Florence<sup>70</sup>. These ties were buttressed by the fact that an important branch of the Panciatichi family had assumed Florentine citizenship in the fourteenth century<sup>71</sup>. According to Guicciardini, «the friends of the Panciatichi were fewer in number [than those of the Cancellieri], and they also proceeded slowly, and the men who in practice were their leaders were Piero Soderini, Piero Guicciardini, Alamanno and Jacopo Salviati. They did not make their allegiance much known, and they proceeded with caution (...)»<sup>72</sup>. Information concerning these individuals and their ties to Pistoia is also available in contemporary sources.

The Soderini were probably the Florentine family with the most clearly defined pro-Panciatichi interests at the end of the fifteenth century. To begin with, the Soderini demonstrate a pattern of officeholding that was typical of families influential in Pistoia. Before his exile in 1466, Niccolò di Lorenzo di messer Tommaso Soderini served as one of four Commissioners to Pistoia in 1457<sup>73</sup> and as Captain of the Pistoiese Montagna in 1465<sup>74</sup>. Messer Tommaso Soderini served on a commission to resolve a Pistoiese dispute while he was Florentine Standard-

<sup>69</sup> Among the Cancellieri supporters named by Guicciardini, only the Pistoiese interests of messer Francesco Gualterotti remain obscure for the period prior to 1500. Gualterotti seems to have owned no Pistoiese property (cfr. his declaration for the *catasto* of 1495 in AS FI, DR, 1, c. 426r); and neither he nor other members of his family held offices in Pistoia prior to 1501. However, on 8 February 1501, the Signoria elected him one of its four Commissioners for Pistoia (AS FI, SCLCEIO, 26, c. 53r). And Guicciardini does seem to have been correct in including Gualterotti among the Florentines supporting the Cancellieri, since in 1509 a Cancellieri partisan described the unusual assistance he received from Gualterotti (called an «homo excellentissimo») during the latter's term as Captain and Commissioner of Pistoia in a dispute over an ecclesiastical benefice; see I. MELOCCHI, *Libro* ... cit., in AS FI, AD, 8, c. 46v. See also note 107 below.

<sup>70</sup> I. MELOCCHI, *Libro* ... cit., in AS FI, AD, 8, c. 9r: «Et per dicti Panciatichi appellorno alla Signoria di Firenze, (...) confidandosi più tosto nel favore dell'i amici che havevano in Firenze che in ragion che havessono».

<sup>71</sup> For indications concerning the Panciatichi of Florence, see L. MARTINES, *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists, 1390-1460*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963, pp. 63-65; and E. CONTI, *L'imposta diretta a Firenze nel Quattrocento (1427-1494)*, Roma, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984, pp. 345-348.

<sup>72</sup> F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine* ... cit., p. 204: «Gli amici de'Panciatichi erono in minore numero ed anche andavano lentamente, e ne erano quasi capi Piero Soderini, Piero Guicciardini, Alamanno ed Iacopo Salviati, e' quali non si scoprivano molto e procedevano con rispetto (...).».

<sup>73</sup> AS FI, SCAS, 597bis, cc. 166r-170v.

<sup>74</sup> AS FI, Tratte, 985, c. 11r.

Bearer of Justice in 1460<sup>75</sup>; and in 1483 messer Tommaso acted as mediator between Lorenzo the Magnificent and the Panciatichi party in order to achieve the election of Andrea de' Rossi as director of the Panciatichi-run hospital, the Ceppo<sup>76</sup>. Two years later, in 1485, messer Tommaso's son, Piero, was chosen in an extraordinary election to serve as *Podestà* of Pistoia<sup>77</sup>. It was while Piero was *Podestà* that messer Tommaso died, and the directors of the town's «community chest», the Opera di S. Jacopo, dipped into its funds to commemorate Tommaso's service to the community. In the same year, when Francesco di messer Tommaso, bishop of Volterra, came to Pistoia to call on his brother, the Opera disbursed further sums to celebrate the visit<sup>78</sup>.

Francesco Soderini, who was pursuing a successful ecclesiastical career, is mentioned in a Pistoiese *libro di ricordi*, in an entry of 1488, as «patrone» of the convent of the Umiliati at Pistoia<sup>79</sup>. In 1495 Francesco was invited, together with Bishop Pandolfini, to preside over the laying of the cornerstone of the great monumental church, of S. Maria dell'Umiltà. Since, at least at a later date, Pandolfini was well known as an «inimicus» of Francesco and Piero Soderini<sup>80</sup>, it would appear that the pro-Panciatichi Francesco provided a counterweight to Pandolfini's Cancellieri partisanship during this important celebration of civic concord<sup>81</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> Mentioned in P. CLARKE, *The Soderini and the Medici: Power and Patronage in Fifteenth-Century Florence*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991, p. 68.

<sup>76</sup> L. BARGIACCHI, *Storia degli istituti di beneficenza* ... cit., I, p. 190.

<sup>77</sup> AS FI, *Tratte*, 986, c. 27r. Piero replaced a *Podestà* who died shortly after his term began.

<sup>78</sup> AS PT, *Com., Provv. e rif.*, 48, c. 184, 19 June 1488: «E' pare che dell'anno 1485, al tempo dell'i spettibili Operai di San Iacopo Bartholomeo Astesi e Compagni, succedendo la morte della felice memoria di messer Thommaso Soderini, benefactore et padre di questa prestantissima repubblica, fu per più cittadini de' principali della vostra città consultato essere bene a honorare decto messer Thomaso, atteso e' beneficii ricevuti dalla sua magnificenza, et similmente di dì in di potere ricevere da' suoi generosi figliuoli, fecesi per detti operai, a conforto de' detti cittadini, tale honoranza, la quale fu molto accepta; et similmente, per parte di simili cittadini, capitandoci la Signoria del veschovo di Volterra, figluolo di decto messer Thomaso, l'honororeno. Et perché ciascuna delle dette honoranze fureno repentine et subite, non vi fu tempo di farle ordinariamente pe' consigli. Nacque dipoi che e' ragionieri che hebbeno a rivedere la ragione di decti operai gli condannorenno di tale honoranza facte (...).» (The proposal to absolve the *operai* failed in the Council of the People on 19 June 1488, however a similar proposal passed on 22 June 1488; *ibid.*, c. 185r). Francesco Soderini's visit to Pistoia in 1485 is also mentioned by P. ARFERUOLI, *Historie delle cose più notabili seguite in Toscana et altri luoghi et in particolare in Pistoia*, ms. in ARCHIVIO CAPITOLARE, Pistoia, II, c. 106.

<sup>79</sup> A. ROSPIGLIOXI, *Libro «A» di richordi (1459-1498)*, a cura di L. ANDREANI, Pisa, Mariotti, 1909, p. 9.

<sup>80</sup> For Pandolfini as «inimicus» of the Soderini, see AS FI, NA, 8601, unpaginated trial testimony of 18 April 1507.

<sup>81</sup> F. RICCIARDI, *Ricordi storici* ... cit., p. 50. On the ceremony see V. CAPPONI, *SS. Maria dell'Umiltà. Storia della sacra immagine di Maria e del prodigo da lei operato l'anno 1490*, Pistoia, 1890.

Pier Soderini's ties to Pistoia and to the Panciatichi are even more clearly recognizable. According to his tax declaration of 1495, Piero Soderini had recently sold two *poderi* located in the communes of Montemagno and Agliana in the Pistoiese contado<sup>82</sup>. One Cancellieri leader, in his *ricordanze*, described Piero as the party's «nimico»<sup>83</sup>. And Piero is known to have maintained a close rapport with the Florentine branch of the Panciatichi family: He exchanged friendly correspondence with Bartolomeo Panciatichi, a Florentine banker resident in Lyons<sup>84</sup>; and the Panciatichi of Florence were apparently commercial *soci* of the Soderini in 1512<sup>85</sup>. In 1507, while he was serving as Florence's Perpetual Standard-Bearer of Justice, Piero tried to secure from the Pistoiese government the renewal of a Panciatichi partisan, Girolamo Bracciolini, in his position as Captain of the *famiglia* of the Priors of Pistoia<sup>86</sup>. In the somewhat apologetic letter he wrote to the Priors after the request was denied, Soderini seems at pains to banish memories of his past partisanship for the Panciatichi that seem to have been conjured by the recent recommendation of Bracciolini: «(...) it would always be our intent, while benefiting private persons, to preserve the public interest (...). We very much love all of the city, equally, and without reserve with respect to any of its parts, as is becoming one who finds himself where we do at present [that is, in the office of Perpetual Standard-Bearer], by the grace of the all-powerful God».

The evidence concerning Salviati family interests in Pistoia is scarcer and these seem to have been largely defined by officeholding. A number of family members served as governors of Pistoia in the fifteenth century<sup>87</sup>; and, most

<sup>82</sup> AS FI, DR, 9, 1096r-1099r, (declaration of Piero di messer Tommaso Soderini for 1495).

<sup>83</sup> I. MELOCCHI, *Libro* ... cit., in AS FI, AD, 8, c. 18r; noted also by H.C. BUTTERS, *Pier Soderini and the Golden Age*, in «Italian Studies», XXXIII (1978), p. 70.

<sup>84</sup> For one among several such letters, see AS FI, *Signoria, Carteggi, Minutari*, 19, c. 16r; cfr. also *Signoria, Dieci di balia, Otto di Pratica, Carteggi, Missive originali*, 6, c. 167r.

<sup>85</sup> A. ANZILOTTI, *La crisi costituzionale della Repubblica fiorentina*, Firenze, Seeber, 1912 (rist. anast.), Roma, Multigrafica, 1969), p. 12.

<sup>86</sup> See in appendix Letters VII and VIII.

<sup>87</sup> Messer Forese Salviati was *Podestà* of Pistoia in 1400-1401 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 982, c. 15r); messer Jacopo di Alamanno was Captain of Pistoia in 1406-7 (*Tratte*, 983, c. 8r); Alamanno di messer Jacopo was Captain in 1435-1436 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 7v); Giovanni di messer Forese was Captain of the Montagna in 1447 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 10v); Francesco di Alamanno was *Podestà* and Reformer in 1451-1452 (*Tratte*, 984, c. 36v; SCAS, 595, cc. 235r-253v); Marco di Giovanni di messer Forese was Captain in 1461 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 6r); and *Podestà* of Larciano, Serravalle and Lamporecchio in 1469-70 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 84r); and Giuliano di Francesco was Captain of Pistoia in 1496-1497 (*Tratte*, 987, c. 3r). Investigation of the Salviati archive in Pisa has revealed no further information on the family's Pistoiese ties.

importantly, Giuliano di Francesco Salviati appears to have maintained an influential role in Pistoia beyond his term as Captain in 1496-1497. Thus, in 1498, the Pistoiese Priors and Standard-Bearer instructed their ambassador to seek out Giuliano, then serving on the Ten of Liberty and Peace, in order to discuss alone with him the community's needs, and to ask his help and favor<sup>88</sup>.

Like several other Florentine families that wielded particular clout at Pistoia, the Guicciardini had held important Pistoiese offices<sup>89</sup>. Although the Guicciardini are reported to have been very friendly with the Cancellieri at the beginning of the *Quattrocento*, by the end of the century they appear firmly allied with the Panciatichi, and we can probably assume that the Guicciardini, as loyal Medici partisans, participated in the realignment of interests that characterized Medici policy toward Pistoia in the fifteenth century<sup>90</sup>. The Panciatichi leanings of Piero Guicciardini may have been taken into consideration by the Signoria, when it elected him Commissioner to Pistoia on 3 September 1498, since his co-Commissioner, already on the spot, was the pro-Cancellieri Girolamo Rucellai. Piero Guicciardini remained in Pistoia until the end of October, and so would have witnessed first hand the maneuvers of the two parties as they vied for control of S. Gregorio. He was almost certainly a prime source for the account in his son's *Storie fiorentine*<sup>91</sup>.

One especially important confirmation of the party ties of the Guicciardini in Pistoia is to be found in the 1508 marriage of Francesca di Niccolò Guicciardini to Gualtieri di Antonio Panciatichi, which in one notable way

<sup>88</sup> AS PT, OSJ, 761, c. 14v, ambassadorial instructions to messer Bartolomeo Baldinotti, 21 March 1498: «(...) et perché Giuliano Salviati è dello offitio, farete prima d'essere con sua Magnificentia, alla quale comunicherete il desiderio et bisogno di questa comunità. Et ricercheretelo per nostra parte di adiuto et favore, ché siamo certissimi per lo amore porta a questa comunità operrà quanto in lui è; et il simile farete a Giovambaptista Ridolfi, al quale harete lettere. (...).» On Ridolfi see above. Note that the ambassador was instructed to approach a *fautore* of each faction.

<sup>89</sup> Giovanni di Luigi Guicciardini was Captain of Pistoia in 1424 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 984, c. 7r); Luigi di Piero di messer Luigi was Captain of the Montagna in 1460 (*Tratte*, 985, c. 11r), and Commissioner to Pistoia in 1476-77 (BFPT, B 169, c. 1v); Iacopo di Piero Guicciardini was 1 of 2 commissioners to revise the 1474 Pistoiese scrutiny (AS FI, *Tratte*, 1494, cc. 144r-156r), and 1 of 5 commissioners to impose the *estimo* on the Pistoiese contado in 1475 (AS FI, *Carte di corredo*, 34, c. 133r); and Oddo di Niccolò di messer Luigi was Captain of the Montagna in 1484 (AS FI, *Tratte*, 986, c. 10r).

<sup>90</sup> L. DOMINICI, *Cronaca seconda ...* cit., pp. 11-12. The Medici, who had been *fautori* of the Cancellieri, became *fautori* of the Panciatichi in the course of the fifteenth century. See W.J. CONNELL, *Clientelismo e stato territoriale ...* cit., pp. 538-539.

<sup>91</sup> AS FI, *Tratte*, 14, cc. 75r-76r, 77v-78r, 79r.

mirrored the earlier Melocchi-Rucellai *parentado*. Although the Pistoiese groom was the undisputed leader of his party, the bride belonged to a lesser branch of the Guicciardini. The Panciatichi, like the Melocchi, were unable to claim parity with a leading Florentine house in the marriage market of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries<sup>92</sup>.

Investigation of the Pistoiese interests of these Florentines and their families could be developed in an even more extensive fashion. However, we have already uncovered sufficient evidence to demonstrate the sorts of ties that bound individual members of the Florentine ruling elite to the factions of Pistoia at the end of the fifteenth century. Marriage alliances, officeholding, land tenure, ecclesiastical benefices and shared friendships and enmities constituted the important supporting elements in the creation and furtherance of allegiances with the factions of Pistoia. The extent to which such party ties Florentine affected policy-making is an issue that remains to be explored.

In the historical literature of recent decades concerning the republican government of Renaissance Florence, one of the most interesting questions to have been raised has had to do with the way in which conflict within the Florentine ruling group was expressed during discussions of public affairs. The survival of registers containing the minutes of special meetings, or *pratiche*, in which the Signoria of Florence sought the advice of other magistracies and of other members of the republic's ruling elite, has offered historians an unusual opportunity for studying exchanges among Florentine citizens concerning matters of public policy<sup>93</sup>. The evidence provided by these minutes has been the subject of a great deal of discussion, above all because it has been suggested that the atmosphere of the *pratica* might tend to create a false impression of consensus within a regime that was characterized by fierce competitiveness.

It was Lauro Martines who first suggested that the records of the *pratiche* concerning the Pistoiese crisis of 1499-1502 might prove particularly illuminating,

<sup>92</sup> L. PASSERINI, *Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi* ... cit., pp. 183-190, 267-278.

<sup>93</sup> See especially F. GILBERT, *Florentine Political Assumptions in the Period of Savonarola and Soderini*, in «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», XX (1957), pp. 187-214; and ID., *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: Politics and History in Sixteenth-Century Florence*, revised edition, New York, Norton, 1984; G. BRUCKER, *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1977; Le «consulte» e «pratiche» della Repubblica Fiorentina nel Quattrocento, a cura di un seminario curato da E. CONTI, Pisa, Giardini, 1981, pp. V-LXXIII; J. NAJEMY, *Linguaggi storiografici sulla Firenze rinascimentale*, in «Rivista storica italiana», XCVII (1985), pp. 102-159.

since Guicciardini offered clear indications of the party interests of many of the participants. But in the absence of a reliable day-to-day account of the events in Pistoia, Martines was unable to correlate the views expressed in the *pratiche* with the presumed allegiances of the speakers. He could only suggest that the Florentine politicians might have been acting privately in ways that were not consonant with their public remarks<sup>94</sup>. A new look at the minutes of the debates over Pistoia reveals that leading Florentines did indeed find significant ways of voicing support for their Pistoiese allies<sup>95</sup>.

The surviving minutes of forty-seven *pratiche* discuss the Pistoiese crisis. In chronological terms the historical record they preserve is certainly a partial one. The initial dispute over the hospital of S. Gregorio in 1498-1499 appears not to have been discussed in Florentine *pratiche*. Not until August 1500 – after bloody street battles and a series of palace-burnings – did *pratiche* concerning Pistoia begin at Florence. Moreover, we know that Pier Soderini's term as Standard-Bearer of Justice in January-February 1501 was conspicuous for Soderini's failure to call *pratiche* to discuss the Pistoiese situation<sup>96</sup>. Additionally, in the spring of 1501, most statesmen of oligarchical leanings who were also supporters of the Cancellieri party, men such as Bernardo Rucellai and Guidantonio Vespucci, stopped taking part in *pratiche*, and indeed in most official activities<sup>97</sup>. The most interesting discussions concerning Pistoia were those that took place in August 1500, since they involved leading Florentine supporters of both Pistoiese parties.

<sup>94</sup> L. MARTINES, *Lawyers and Statecraft* ... cit., pp. 234-237. A narrative of these events can now be found in W. J. CONNELL, *Republican Territorial Government: Florence and Pistoia, Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries*, Ph. D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1989, pp. 200-356.

<sup>95</sup> All citations will be to the relevant manuscript sources. The debates concerning Pistoia have recently been published in *Consulte e pratiche della Repubblica fiorentina, 1498-1505*, a cura di D. FACHARD, Genève, Droz, I, 1993, a volume that appeared too late to be used for this study.

<sup>96</sup> P. PARENTI, *Historia fiorentina*, ms. in BNCF, *Magl.*, II.IV.170, c. 165r: «Alla Signoria, pure increscendoli di tante calamità, parse dovere pigliare qualche partito sopra tante importanti chose, et benché dovesse fare consulta in che modo procedessi, non dimeno, o stimando che nel conferire per la diversità de'fautori fiorentini le chose peggiorerebbero, o per quale altra cagione si fussi, diliberò fare qualche impresa circa le appartenenze a Pistoia senza altrimenti conferirne. Di tale partito fu dato charicho a Piero Soderini, ghonfaloniere, dalli altri cittadini cupidi di intendere e facti della città, o per suspicione loro, o per il cattivo exemplo si metteva di non conferire le imprese appartenenti a tutta la città, accioché, se male ne advenissi, lo universale a patire non havessi delli errori de'particulari».

<sup>97</sup> R. PESMAN COOPER, *L'elezione di Pier Soderini a gonfaloniere a vita*, in «Archivio storico italiano», CXXV (1967), pp. 149-150; S. BERTELLI, «Uno magistrato per a tempo lungho o uno doge», in *Studi di storia medioevale e moderna per Ernesto Sestan*, Firenze, Olschki, 1970, II, pp. 472, 490-491.

The «pragmatic» character of the Florentine *pratiche* has often been remarked, and the discussions of Pistoia were no exception. There were few statements of principle; the causes of the Pistoiese conflict were sometimes alluded to, but they were not the subject of debate. Instead, the speeches in the *pratiche* addressed the more specific problem of how to restore order to the violence-torn town. Even within such closely-marked parameters, however, it is possible to discern Florentine statesmen arguing for policies that favored the parties to which they were allied.

Under the Florentine Signoria for July and August 1500, a particularly powerful role was played by Piero Panciatichi, one of the Florentine Panciatichi, who was related by marriage to three other members of the Signoria, including the Standard-Bearer of Justice<sup>98</sup>. During the month of August, when a first wave of homicides struck Pistoia, it appears likely that Piero Panciatichi, with the support of his fellow priors, aided his Pistoiese *consorti* by resisting the sending of troops. The Panciatichi faction commanded more men than the Cancellieri; and, as the violence mounted, it became increasingly clear that, without intervention from outside, the Panciatichi would be able to defeat their opponents decisively. Consequently, in the *pratiche* of these days, it was the Cancellieri supporters in Florence who were particularly vocal in urging forceful measures to put a stop to the strife. On 3 August 1500, messer Guidantonio Vespucci stated: «With respect to the problems in Pistoia, the easy medicine, if it is to be adopted, is to impose justice and to punish the offenders; and, if we don't have the force to do this, then we should send them troops sufficient to do so at their own expense»<sup>99</sup>. Similarly, on 14 August, with the Panciatichi on the verge of victory after days of streetfighting, while, thousands of armed Panciatichi *contadini* milled about the walls of the town, it was again messer Guidantonio who spoke most vigorously for the use of force, urging that a very high price be put on the heads of those who had committed the most recent offense – meaning the Panciatichi leaders<sup>100</sup>.

<sup>98</sup> P. PARENTI, *Historia ... cit.*, in BNCF, *Magl.* 170, c. 138. For criticisms of this particular Signoria, cfr. F. GUICCIARDINI, *Storie fiorentine ... cit.*, p. 204; and N. RINUCCINI in *Ricordi storici di Filippo di Cino Rinuccini*, a cura di G. AIAZZI, Firenze, Piatti, 1840, p. CLXV.

<sup>99</sup> AS FI, *Consulte e pratiche*, 66, c. 87r, 3 August 1500: «Quanto a' casi di Pistoia, che pare medicina agevole, quando si voglia usare, et questo è fare Iustitia, et punire chi erra, et se non vi è forza da poterlo fare, vi si mandi a spesa loro tante gente che si possa fare».

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 92v, 14 August 1500: «Quanto a Pistoia, che quella terra si voti di forestieri; et che fra loro si faccia iustitia, et punire chi erra; et mettere taglia drieto a quelli che hanno facto ultimamente lo insulto, in modo che in luogho alcuno non si tenessino sicuri; et farla pagare a' Pistolesi medesimi».

But friends of the Panciatichi saw matters in a somewhat different light. In a speech of 14 August, Piero Soderini seems not to have acknowledged Vespucci's proposal for putting a price on the heads of the Panciatichi leaders. Although he endorsed sending «as many troops as possible» to Pistoia, Soderini tried to turn the discussion to the need for an institutional approach to the Pistoiese problem: «The true method» for settling the matter, he said, would be to give the Signoria, Colleges and Council of Eighty extraordinary authority to appoint a Captain and a *Podestà* to Pistoia for a term of one year, rather than continue to select these officials by lot for terms of six months<sup>101</sup>.

A force of 200 soldiers did arrive from Florence, on the afternoon of 14 August 1500, hoping to restore calm. That very night, however, the situation at Pistoia changed dramatically. At an assembly of the Panciatichi party, messer Goro Gheri convinced his fellows to take advantage of their recent gains by launching an all-out attack against the Cancellieri<sup>102</sup>. Meanwhile, under cover of darkness, the Cancellieri faction brought hundreds of troops from Bologna into the town. During the fighting of the next two days the Panciatichi suffered terrible reverses. The Cancellieri, thanks to the help from Bologna, and the perhaps novel tactic of firing light cannons from afar at the Panciatichi palaces, were able to seize most of the city. Approximately 150 persons died. The Panciatichi were forced to retreat into the few palaces that remained to them.

With the situation in Pistoia so remarkably altered, the speakers in the Florentine *pratiche* quickly changed their positions. Messer Guidantonio Vespucci, who had been so adamant on the need to use armed force, became much more cautious. The minutes record his new position as follows: «If it could be done, troops should be sent. But such a thing might be done with one end in mind and yet result in something quite different. And, since the government has no money, he does not know how the matter can be remedied (...).» Messer Guidantonio endorsed sending an ambassador to Bologna to

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 93r-v, 14 August 1500: «Quanto alle cose di Pistoia, che si mandi più forze si può (...). Ma il vero modo ad posare quella città sarebbe che la Signoria, Collegi et li Octanta pigliassino auctorità dal Consiglio Maggiore di potere mandare per uno anno là Capitano et Podestà, et levare via tanti commissarii et altri, perché ha provato et visto in facto che tanti nuocono; et dixe più ragioni, monstrando che questo sarebbe il meglio si potessi fare etc.».

<sup>102</sup> A later and almost certainly fictive summary of Gheri's speech of 14 August 1500 is given by F. VASSELLINI, *De calamitatibus ... cit.*, in BMF, C. 64, cc. 12v-13v. Although the *Decalamitatibus* was composed at a much later date, *circa* 1518, it is probable that Gheri made a speech of some kind, since Vassellini (who would have wished to flatter the powerful Gheri), is unlikely to have invented his role in an episode that had such disastrous consequences for the Panciatichi faction.

prevent more troops arriving in Pistoia to support the Cancellieri, but he doubted that the troops that were already there could be called back<sup>103</sup>.

The friends of the Panciatichi were instead insistent on the need for prompt measures to limit the Cancellieri gains. Piero Soderini lamented «that today and yesterday much has been said and nothing has been done», and he called for less talk and swifter action<sup>104</sup>. Piero Guicciardini urged that Giovanni Bentivoglio be asked to recall the Bolognese troops from Pistoia, and both he and Jacopo Salviati spoke against the release of Cancellieri prisoners who were then being held in Florence<sup>105</sup>. A passionate speech was delivered in the meeting of 18 August by messer Francesco Pepi, who, after denouncing Bishop Pandolfini and the Florentine Commissioners, declared «that Pistoia means more than Pistoia, she means Volterra, Arezzo and Cortona»<sup>106</sup>. But a response was immediately forthcoming from a Cancellieri supporter, messer Francesco Gualterotti, who «advised that the affairs of Pistoia were to be managed with gentle plasters»<sup>107</sup>. Bernardo Rucellai agreed with another speaker in doubting that fresh forces for Pistoia would «bring results»<sup>108</sup>.

By the time of the discussion of 23 August, the situation in Pistoia had changed yet again. The Panciatichi family and most of their partisans had abandoned the city, and the Cancellieri party was now in control. The main question for Florentine supporters of the Cancellieri now became one of maintaining influence over their Pistoiese clients. Messer Guidantonio Vespucci recommended that the Florentines carefully negotiate with the Cancellieri,

<sup>103</sup> AS FI, *Consulte e pratiche*, 66, c. 97v, 18 August 1500: «Messer Guidantonio: che potendo vi si mandino forze; et che questo potrebbe essere facto a uno fine et potrebbe riuscirne uno altro; et non havendo danaio, non sa come a questo si possi rimediare. (...) Item, manderebbe volando uno cancelliere a messer Giovanni et appresso uno di auctorità a pregarlo faccia opera che del suo non vi vada gente; ma non vede già quello vi sono si revochino, et è da temere non vi entri qualche uccello che dispiaccia etc.».

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 98v, 18 August 1500: «Che il consiglio più breve sarà migliore, che hoggi et hieri si è consultato assai et facto nulla.»

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 100r, 18 August 1500: «Piero Guicciardini. Che sarebbe bene mandare subito uno a messer Giovanni con ordine che la gente vi sono tornino et non ve ne vada più (...). Iacopo Salviati. (...) Item non manderebbe e pistolesi si domandano».

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 101v, 18 August 1500: «che Pistoia vuole dire altro che Pistoia, che vuole dire Volterra, Arezzo et Cortona etc.».

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 102r, 18 August 1500: «Et le cose di Pistoia confortò ad governarle con impiastri dolci, et ricordò fare opera che messer Criacho entra nella fortezza di Pistoia».

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 98r, 18 August 1500: «Messer Domenico Bonsi (...). Quanto al mandare a Pistoia, che colui non pare chi andasse posse fare fructo (...); cfr. Bernardo Rucellai, *ivi*, c. 102v, 18 August 1500.

«line by line», making sure to delegate the business to «citizens who are trusted by the Cancellieri». He also enjoined his colleagues to stipulate that, «for their own good, the Panciatichi be made to pay some fine» – this after they had been forced to abandon their homes and leave the city<sup>109</sup>!

In the discussion of 30 August, Bernardo Rucellai responded to a renewed call by Pier Soderini to «send troops»<sup>110</sup>, saying that he thought «the gentle path should be followed», that it would please him «if it were possible to reassure the Cancellieri»<sup>111</sup>. Another Cancellieri supporter, Giovan Batista Ridolfi, urged the Signoria to reassure the Cancellieri by disarming the Panciatichi. He proposed that the latter should be deprived of their rural bastions, La Tenuta and La Magia, which were to be garrisoned with Florentine troops<sup>112</sup>. However, as Piero Soderini saw matters, it was instead Pistoia's own fortress that needed to be guarded against the Cancellieri<sup>113</sup>.

As we trace the comments of the important leaders of the republican regime in the discussions of events at Pistoia, it is clear that throughout these meetings Florentine leaders made conscientious efforts to protect their Pistoiese clients. In the debates that were called to find effective ways of imposing peace on the subject town, it is clear that participating citizens had competing ideas as to the sort of settlement that would be most consonant with their private and party interests. The contemporary fear, noted by Guicciardini and others, that the feuding at Pistoia would spread to Florence seems to have been quite real. Moreover, these disagreements had the effect of blocking decisive action to restore order at Pistoia. We are perhaps now in a better position to understand the bonds of affection to which Machiavelli alluded, when, in his famous discussion in *The Prince* of the question «an melius sit amari quam timeri», he wrote that «to avoid a reputation of cruelty, the Florentines allowed Pistoia to be destroyed»<sup>114</sup>.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 108v, 23 August 1500: «I Signori sì potendo fare, si deputi cittadini ne' quali questa parte cancelliera habbino fede, et deputar questa cosa a capitolo a capitolo, et fare che questa parte panciaticha sopporti per beneficio loro qualche cosa (...).»

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 118v, 30 August 1500: «si spaccino fanti a causa si possino mettere nelle fortezze, et maxime in quella di Pistoia, et che chi ha maneggiato questa praticha veggia di tirarla a fine.»

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 119v, 30 August 1500: «Replichò che li pare dovere entrare per la via dolcie, et quando si possi assicurare la parte cancelliera, li piacerebbe».

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 118r, 30 August 1500, c. 118r: «Che si faccia dolciemente quello sì può, da altra parte si preparino forze per usarle quando bisognassi. Item farebbe di havere questi capi Panciatichi, et astrignerebbeli a dare la Tenuta et Magia alla Signoria, et manderebbe alla guardia sino in 100 fanti.»

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 66, c. 119r, 30 August 1500.

<sup>114</sup> N. MACHIAVELLI, *Il principe*, XVII, in ID., *Tutte le opere*, a cura di M. MARTELLI, Firenze, Sansoni, 1971, p. 282.

## APPENDIX

*Eight unpublished letters of Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai, Pierfilippo Pandolfini, Giovan Batista Ridolfi, Bernardo Rucellai, Vitellozzo Vitelli and Pier Soderini<sup>1</sup>.*

## I

Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai, in Florence, to Marco di maestro Antonio Carafantoni and Niccolao di Lanfranco Ferrauti, in Pistoia, 3 February 1449. Original in AS PT, *Documenti vari*, 22, c. 120.

[r]

+ Al nome di Dio, a'dì 3 di febraio 1448 [1449].

Honorandi amici karissimi. Ieri ebbi vostra lettera de'dì 28 del passato, per la quale inteso della noia ch'è data a Lodovicho<sup>2</sup> su quello orticello e di quanto disiderresti ch'io m'aoperassi chol podestà. E perché gli porto quello amore chome sendomi fratello, per detta chagione ò scritto<sup>3</sup> al podestà<sup>4</sup> 1<sup>a</sup> lettera aperta<sup>5</sup>, che fia in questa. Leggietela, e stando a vostro modo la suggielate e datela, e bisongnandovi altro che per me si possa, m'offerò presto a ongni chosa. Che Christo vi guardi.

Giovanni Rucellai, in Firenze.

[v]

Spetabili et 'gregi huomini,  
maestro Marcho di maestro Antonio<sup>6</sup>  
e Nicholaio di Lanfranco, in  
Pistoia.

## II

Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai, in Florence, to Piero di Cardinale Rucellai, in Pistoia, 3 February 1449. Original in AS PT, *Documenti vari*, 22, c. 296.

<sup>1</sup> I should especially like to thank F. W. Kent and Gino Corti for their careful readings of Letters I and II.

<sup>2</sup> Lodovico Ferrauti of Pistoia. Paula Clarke has kindly informed me of a testament preserved in the Archivio di Stato di Venezia, drawn up on 10 October 1437 in Venice, that names Lodovico di Lodovico Ferrauti of Pistoia as a possible beneficiary and Niccolao di Lanfranco Ferrauti of Pistoia as *commissarius*.

<sup>3</sup> Canceled: «a Lodovicho».

<sup>4</sup> Piero di Cardinale Rucellai.

<sup>5</sup> This is Letter II below.

<sup>6</sup> Maestro Marco di maestro Antonio Carafantoni. On his career as a physician, see A. CHIAPPELLI, *Medici e chirurghi pistoiesi nel Medio Evo*, Pistoia, 1909 (rist. anast., Bologna, Forni, 1989), *passim*. The Carafantoni correspondence is now the subject of an important *tesi di laurea* by Francesco Neri.

[r]

+ Al nome di Dio, a'dì 3 di febraio 1448 [1449].

Honorando maggiore mio etc. La chagione di questa si è per racomandarvi le ragioni di Lodovicho Ferraut[i] d'uno cierto orticello apicchato cholla chasa sua, che comprendo che ingiustamente gli vogl[i]a essere tolto. Maestro Marcho di maestro Antonio e Nicholaio di Lanfranco, che difendono le ragioni di detto Lodovicho, ve ne parleranno. Prieghovi strettamente che per mio amore favoreggiate il detto Lodovicho nelle chose giuste e oneste, perché ò avuto co'llui a Vinegia grandissima amicizia, e riputerò quello farete per lui lo facciate a la persona mia.

Io ve ne priegho, gravo e stringho fuori del gienerale. Né altro per ora. Dio vi conservi in sua grazia.

Vostro Giovanni di Paolo Ruciellai,  
in Firenze.

[v]

Spetabile et 'gregio viro,  
Piero di Cardinale Rucellai,  
honorando podestà, in Pistoia.

### III

Messer Guidantonio Vespucci, in Rome, to Pierfilippo Pandolfini, in Florence, 30 September 1483. Original in LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, Washington, D.C., *Rare Book Collection, Thacher Autographs*, 1395, no. 2.

[r]

Spectabilis compater etc. E' mi duole assai la morte che ho intexa di Gianozo vostro figliolo: pure alquanto et a voi et a me debba mitigare il dolore lo intendere con quanta buona gratia de Dio et degli huomini è passato di questa vita. Adeo quod verisimiliter de l'anima sua non si può sperare se non che sia ita in luogo di salvatione, confortovi ad patientia et ringratiare Dio che ve l'à prestato infino ad qui et pregarlo che vi conservi el resto.

Fu'col reverendissimo Santo Pietro in Vincula<sup>7</sup>, il quale fermò meco l'accordo del vostro reverendo vescovo<sup>8</sup>. Et perché il vescovo mostra havere una gran voglia del beneficio di Santo Appostolo<sup>9</sup>, ordinai che Sua Signoria Reverendissima scrivessi al vescovo di Ventimiglia<sup>10</sup>, pregandolo volessi renuntiare decto benefitio a sua contemplatione al vescovo vostro. Attenderemo la risposta, la qual ci doverrebbe essere presto, perché il decto di Ventimiglia è ad Anania<sup>11</sup> preso da le gotte. Et doverrebbe essere ad votum, essendo servidore di Santo Pietro in Vincula come è, et offerendoli di

<sup>7</sup> Giuliano della Rovere, Cardinal Priest of S. Pietro in Vincula, and later Pope Julius II.

<sup>8</sup> Niccolò Pandolfini, bishop of Pistoia.

<sup>9</sup> Probably a benefice in the Church of Ss. Apostoli in Rome, restored by Sixtus IV.

<sup>10</sup> Giovan Battista de Giudici, bishop of Ventimiglia, and a friend of Giuliano della Rovere.

<sup>11</sup> Anagni.

pensione quello trarrebbe di Santo Appostolo. Solo vorrei che mi advisassi chi è in possessione di decto Santo Appostolo, perché non vorrei comperassimo una briga per uscire d'un'altra, et se faccendose tal renuntia di Santo Appostolo, credete havere la possessione, perché non intendo ancora che Ventimilia ne habbi possessione alcuna. La rivalidatione dela reservatione del vescovo non è ancor facta, per non havere Nostra Santità a questi di dato audience ad persona per quel pocho dell' ascesa che ha. Nec alia, se non che vi raccomando il caso di Simone mio fratello. Romae, xxx septembris 1483.

Guidantonius

Vespucius, orator.

[v]

Spectabili viro, Petro Philippo de Pandolfinis, compatri honorando, Florentiae.

#### IV

Giovan Batista Ridolfi, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 18 March 1498. Copy in AS PT, *Opera di S. Jacopo*, 761, c. 97r.

[margin]

Scripture commissariorum.

[text]

Magnifici priores etc. Per la vostra lettera rice[v]uta questa mattina sono avisato nel modo et per che cagione il caso di ser Agnolo da Pescia; et è il vero ne ho hauto qualche dispiacere, perché lui da sé non può satisfare alle scripture vorresti per non essere apresso di lui; et se bene ha dato alcuna copia di quelle, furono facte quando mi trovai di costì commissario insieme con la buona memoria di Piero Vettori<sup>12</sup>. Dice le trasse di alcuni quinterni di che fu rogato ser Vanni<sup>13</sup>, allora nostro cancellieri et hora cavalieri del capitano che è costì, che pare li smarisce: et doverono restare fra le scripture erano in me, le quali vennono poi in mano di ser Agnolo. Et nondimeno non commendo che ne habbi dato copia ad altri per non impedire in alcuna parte lo offitio d'alcuno ministro vostro costì. Così biasimo ser Agnolo se non rispuose alle vostre lettere, né mostrò portarli quella reverentia che si conviene, tandem, per la experientia ho vista di lui, è più tosto d'atribuirla per essere collerico che non alcuna sua malignità; ma quando le

<sup>12</sup> Ser Agnolo Testa da Pescia. Piero Vettori (Captain and Commissioner) and Giovan Batista Ridolfi (*Podestà* and Commissioner) served together as governors of Pistoia in 1490-1491. In 1495-1496 Piero Vettori returned to Pistoia as Captain, dying during his term, on 22 January 1496. He was succeeded by his son, Francesco. See AS FI, *Provvisioni, Registri*, 186, c. 196, 9 February 1496 (enabling Francesco di Piero to serve as Captain of Pistoia) F. VETTORI, *Vita di Piero Vettori*, in ID., *Scritti storici e politici*, a cura di E. NICCOLINI, Bari, Laterza, 1972, pp. 253-255; and P. BENIVIENI, *Vita di Piero Vettori l'antico, gentil'huomo fiorentino*, Firenze, Giunti, 1583, pp. 46-49.

<sup>13</sup> Ser Vannis de Turris, chancellor of the two commissioners. Some of his private letters from Pistoia in 1490 are preserved in BIBLIOTECA MEDICEA LAURENZIANA, Firenze, Ashburnham, 1841, for instance at cc. 37-38. Other letters between Ridolfi and the Pistoiese Priors about these *Atti* appear in AS PT, OSJ, 761.

Vostre Magnificentie a principio ne havessino facto intendere el desiderio vostro, ne saresti stati satisfacti sanza alteratione di persona. Nondimeno li errori seguiti facilmente si possono corregiere; et per questo vi mando per il presente latoare vostro servidore le copie di tutte le scripture che furon facte a tempo di Piero Vectori et mio, rogare per diversi cancellieri et auctenticate, dalle quali sono contento ne facciate extrahere copia, et poi me le rimandate, perché qualche volta ne servo' di quelli vostri huomini, non che se ne dia copia, ma ad informatione loro. Et sono proprie decte scripture nel modo che sono incamerate nella cancelleria qui de' nostri Excelsi Signori<sup>14</sup>. Havrò caro sia usata buona diligentia in conservarle et rimandarle illese prima che si può<sup>15</sup>. Ringratio le Vostre Magnificentie dello havere facto capsare lo obbligo havea dato nella corte del capitano ser Agnolo. Et io, a più satisfactione vostra, farò di havere da decto ser Agnolo li quinterni delle scripture che furono smarrite, a ffine che più non ne possa dare copia ad altri. Se a questo modo fia la satisfactione delle Vostre Magnificentie, che è quello posso fare da me, lo havrò molto caro. Quando altrimenti le achaggia l'opera mia, mi offero satsifarneli per tutto quello che a mesarà possibile. Né altro per questo. Rachomandomi alle Vostre Magnificentie, que bene valeant. Florentie, die xviii martii 1497 [1498].

Magnificus vir, Iohannis Baptista de Ridolphis.

Magnificis prioribus populi et vexillifero iustitie civitatis Pistorii, maioribus honorandis.

## V

Bernardo Rucellai, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 31 October 1498. Copy in AS PT, *Opera di S. Jacopo*, 761, c. 104r.

[margin]

Pro Bernardo de Nutinis.

[text]

Magnifici domini Signori. La stanza, benché pichola, che a' giorni passati feci apresso le Signorie Vostre<sup>16</sup>, mi necessita a ritenere buona amicitia con quelle, et richiederle di qualunque mia importante occurrentia. Et per questo, havendo quelle nuovamente electo per spedalieri di Sancto Gregorio, infra li altri, Bernardo Nutini<sup>17</sup>, huomo da bene, costumato, et molto mio amico, il quale etiam ha confermato la Signoria del vescovo vostro<sup>18</sup>, non posso fare che per tutti questi respecti, et non manco per la utilità

<sup>14</sup> The register deposited in Florence is preserved in AS FI, *Pratica segreta di Pistoia e Pontremoli*, 138.

<sup>15</sup> Apparently they were never returned to him, since his personal copy is now preserved in AS PT, *Capitano di custodia, poi Commissario*, serie III, 34, fasc. 1.

<sup>16</sup> Bernardo Rucellai was elected commissioner to Pistoia on 11 July 1498; AS FI, *Tratte*, 14, cc. 70v-71r. Girolamo Rucellai was elected to replace Bernardo on 11 August 1498, because Bernardo «deputatus fuit in oratorem apud Venetos»; *Tratte*, 14, cc. 72v-73v.

<sup>17</sup> Bernardo Nutini's sister, Cosa, was married to the Cancellieri leader, Tolomeo Melocchi. Melocchi's only son, Giovanni, was married to Ginevra di Agnolo Rucellai, Bernardo Rucellai's grand-niece.

<sup>18</sup> Bishop Niccolò Pandolfini.

del luogho che per il beneficio el quale indubitatamente spero dalle Signorie Vostre ricevere, che caldamente non lo rachomandi a quelle, le quali pregho voglino ancora loro riconfermare, restandone sempre obligatissimo alle Signorie Vostre, alle quali mi rachomando et offero. Bene valete. Ex Florentia, die ultima mensis ottobris 1498.  
Bernardus Oricellarius.

## VI

Vitellozzo Vitelli, outside Faenza, to messer Oliverotto Euffreducci da Fermo, 23 April 1501. Original in AS FI, *Signoria, Carteggi, Responsive originali*, 20, c. 242.  
[r]

Messer Liverotto. Io scrivo a messer Goro<sup>19</sup> che in tucte le ocurrentie et bisogni loro el vi rechieda et fatighi che li mancherite a niente per quanto poterite in favore et adiuto. Et per questa ad voi vi dico el midesimo facciate, cum effecto in quello cognosarite sia el proposito loro et nostro. Et ad voi me offero. Ex castris ad Faventiam, die 23 aprilis MDi.

Vitellozzo Vitelli.

[v]

Al mio magnifico affine<sup>20</sup>, messer Liverotto da Fermo etc.

## VII

Pier Soderini, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 12 June 1507. Copy in AS PT, *Opera di S. Jacopo*, 761, c. 150r.

[margin]

Lectera del gonfaloniere a beneficio di Girolamo Bracciolini<sup>21</sup>.

[text]

Magnifici viri amici nostri carissimi etc. E'pare che sia presso al tempo della fine dell'officio di Girolamo di Bartolomeo Bracciolini, et di nuovo s'abbi per Vostre Magnificentie a farne electione. Desiderremmo vi piacesse, per amore nostro, sendosi lui portato bene, rieleggere decto Girolamo per questo anno futuro, la qual cosa ci sarà gratissima. Bene valete. Ex palatio Florentino, die xii iunii MDvii.

Petrus de Soderinis,

vexillifer iusticie perpetuus populi Florentini.

Magnificis viris prioribus populi et vexillifero iusticie civitatis Pistorii, amicis carissimis etc.

<sup>19</sup> Messer Goro Gheri of Pistoia.

<sup>20</sup> Messer Oliverotto was Vitellozzo's son-in-law.

<sup>21</sup> On Bracciolini and Soderini two years earlier, see AS PT, *OSJ*, 761, c. 141r, a letter from Pier Soderini's wife, Argentina Malaspina Soderini, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 17 July 1505: «Ringratiamo Vostre Magnificentie della gratia facta per amore nostro al vostro Girolamo Bracciolini, ch'è di quelli non lo reputiamo altrimenti che se l'avessino conferita in uno del sangue nostro».

## VIII

Pier Soderini, in Florence, to the Priors and Standard-Bearer of Justice of Pistoia, 17 June 1507. Copy in AS PT, *Opera di S. Jacopo*, 761, c. 150v.

[margin]

Lectera del gonfaloniere pel conto di Girolamo Bracciolini.

[text]

Magnifici priores amici nostri dilectissimi salutem. Habbiamo ricevuto vostra de'xvi del presente colla copia del capitulo etc. Rispondiamo brevemente che la intentione nostra sarebbe sempre di benifichare e privati ma colla conservatione del pubblico, et havendo inteso quanto lo universale costì desidera che il capitano de'fanti si facci secondo le vostre riforme, non ci piacerebbe in alcuno modo che restasse con tale displicentia, et però ne seguirete quanto ne vogliono gli ordini. Et se ci fusse stato facto intendere prima tale cosa, haremmo seguitato quello che è la natura nostra. Seguirete adunque liberamente li ordini vostri, et vivete in quiete et in tranquillità, ché noi siamo per prestarne ogni favore, perché amiamo tucta la ciptà singularmente et parimente, senza exceptione di alcuna parte, come è conveniente a chi si trova dove siamo noi al presente per la gratia dello omnipotente Iddio. Et di questo animo et volontà saremo trovati sempre. Bene valete. Ex palatio Florentino, die xvii iunii MDvii.

Petrus de Soderinis, vexillifer

iustitie perpetuus populi Florentini.

Magnificis prioribus populi et vexillifer iustitie civitatis Pistorii, amicis nostris dilectissimis.