
PROBLEMS

An Attempted «Reconversion» of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca: the Lands of Michele di Giovanni Guinigi

Sante Polica
University of Rome

The problem of the so-called "return to the land" has not probably received the attention which it deserves from economic and social historians of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Italian Periods. The subject has been discussed, of course, and variously confirmed, denied, and qualified,¹ but it seems to me that the debate has not always been sufficiently clear. It is easy to deny the existence of such a problem, if by "return to the land" we mean an unprecedented interest on the part of the urban mercantile classes of Northern and Central Italy in land investment in the late XIVth century in contrast to a supposed lack of interest on the part of the same class in the preceding centuries. It has been well established for some time now that even in the most intensely urbanised parts of the peninsula, where commercial, financial, and manufacturing activities were most fully developed, there

¹ Virtually every authority on later medieval economic and social history in Italy, from Volpe to Luzzatto, Sereni to Saponi, Cipolla to Romano and Jones to mention only those who come first to mind, has touched on the problem, although from very different viewpoints which we shall attempt to summarise below. As it would be impossible to provide a bibliography with any claim to comprehensiveness I would draw attention to three articles which appear to me to relate the problem of the 'return to the land' to the evolution of the economy in general in Italy: C. M. CIPOLLA, 'The trends in Italian economic history in the late Middle Ages' *Economic History Review*, XXII, 1949, pp. 101-104; R. ROMANO, 'L'Italia nella crisi del secolo XIV' and 'Agricoltura e contadini nell'Italia del XV e del XVI secolo', now in R. ROMANO, *Tra due crisi: l'Italia del Rinascimento*, Torino 1971, pp. 13-34 & 51-58; E. SERENI, 'Agricoltura e mondo rurale', in *Storia d'Italia*, Vol. 1, Turin 1972, pp. 183-213.

had never been any decline in interest in the ownership of land throughout the medieval period. This is not what is at issue, but rather whether or not, in the period in question, the interest in the ownership of land began to have in both quantitative and qualitative terms certain new dimensions.

The issue at stake is whether some kind of connection existed between these new dimensions and disruption resulting from the "XIVth century crisis". In other words, what was the significance of the expansion in investment in land — if there was an expansion and where it was — by the ruling urban classes, which in the case of Northern and Central Italy we know as the mercantile classes? Did such expansion provide an alternative (albeit still a speculative one) investment once they had withdrawn from the type of economic activity in which they had traditionally been engaged (credit, trade, manufacture etc.)?

There have been a number of attempts to answer these questions. Some have argued that the increase in landed investment by the commercial *élite* was an attempt to seek refuge when their traditional activities began to run into difficulties because of the changing economic situation and the related changes in the social structure which affected them. In this situation they sought to defend their economic power and their means of subsistence by falling back on less ambitious but more accessible forms of activity. In a society which, as can not be too often repeated, was still highly rural, this was surely a perfectly understandable choice. Others have detected a conscious policy of immobilising capital caused predominantly by non-economic factors, and in particular by the persistence of the feudal aristocratic mentality which conferred on the ownership of land a form of prestige which was unobtainable by other means (and this leads to a reopening of the whole issue of "rifeudalizzazione"). It has also been claimed, finally, that the increase in investment in land was the result of entirely speculative motives resulting from the attempt to compensate for losses sustained in the traditional sectors of mercantile activity through investment in a sector which could yield large profit margins, particularly because it was easier than elsewhere to pass on these ever-growing difficulties to the subordinate classes in this sector.

All these different arguments have found supporters; in the present state of research, it seems to me, that all three can be argued persuasively if we are to rely simply on the study of particular isolated cases to reach our generalisations, or if we wish to depend solely on those sources which have been published and which are perhaps too "significant" to be really representative when trying to trace the overall situation. But there can be no doubt that we need to establish an overall picture, because this alone can help us to interpret and give its due historical meaning to a key period, a turning point, in Italian economic history — this alone can tell us how to interpret the centuries lying between the Middle Ages and the start of the Modern Period, which witnessed the transformation of the peninsula from an area in the forefront of European economy to a backward agrarian economy.

In order to achieve such a picture I feel that we must draw more widely and fully on archival material which we can find in the numerous archives of Central and Northern Italy, for it is only the intensive study of such sources which will enable us to reconstruct the overall picture of these centuries. And although we may well become aware of the differences existing between one region and another, and between one example and another, we shall still achieve the goal of defining the more prevalent tendencies. In terms of the problem in question, it will be no small achievement to be able to distinguish between the exceptions and the rule.

The paper which follows is intended as a contribution towards the formation of this overall picture. Its subject is the problems and development of landed property owned by mercantile groups in the Lucca region of Tuscany, which unlike other regions of Tuscany has received little attention within the ambit of late Mediaeval studies.² Rather than attempt a "horizontal" sample, which the vast mass of surviving documentation would inevitably cause to be superficial, we have chosen to concentrate on a more detailed³ analysis of the Guinigi,⁴

² The present essay is intended solely as an initial contribution towards such a study. The author is engaged in a systematic analysis of the vast documentation in the *Archivio dei Notari* (in the Archivio di Stato di Lucca) for the whole period 1370-1470 in order to attempt a diachronic study of the development of wealth and the economy in Luccan society.

³ In addition to the other sources which will be referred to below we have also used all the 'commercial' account books of Michele di Giovanni Guinigi which have survived: these amount to 6 ledgers from the Guinigi Archive (hereafter A.G.) now lodged in the Archivio di Stato di Lucca (hereafter A.S.L.) where they were deposited by Count Pier Angelo Guinigi, one of the last survivors of the now extinct family. These ledgers cover all the various operations in which Michele was engaged. More precise references will be given as the documents are cited.

⁴ The first reliable information on the Guinigi comes from the 10th century, when their economic fortunes seemed to be expanding rapidly. They moved to Lucca from the countryside in the 11th century, and by the early 12th century the family was among the most eminent in the city. In 1308 they were exiled as Ghibellines and *Magnati*, but returned to Lucca in 1310, thereafter becoming engaged in commerce and credit activities (especially with the Church). Although there is a reference to a merchant named Guinigi in Lucca as early as 1282, and although Michele di Giovanni (who took great interest in his family's history) noted that 'in the year 1294 the Guinigi had a large company', direct references to their commercial and credit operations only date from 1317. There is still some difficulty in identifying the moment at which the Guinigi effected this change in their economic interests, because in the 13th century they were known primarily as landowners and lessors of land and buildings. They probably put their money rents into commercial operations, as these are frequently referred to in the sources.

In the XIVth century the family's fortunes become easier to follow. The two major figures were Michele di Lazzaro (the grand-father of our Michele) and his brother Francesco. The former played a major part in running the commercial enterprises,

one of the most important families in Lucca, and to follow through the activities of one important member of the family, Michele di Giovanni, the development of their economic fortunes and of their patrimony. Michele di Giovanni was alive and active at a time which was decisive in the family's history, that is immediately after the deposition of Paolo Guinigi⁵ who had for some thirty years been *signore* of the city.

* * *

Michele was born in 1405,⁶ probably in Lucca, to Margherita di Bonagiunta Schezza and Giovanni di Michele Guinigi.⁷ We know nothing of his youth, and the first information we have dates from 1430 when he appears to have

which were spread over six banking factors, in London, Seville and Avignon, acted as Urban VI's tithe collector in England and receiver of ecclesiastical rents in the Kingdom of Naples. With his brother he built a fine house in the country at S. Simo & Giuda, which became the residence of the lord of Lucca and then of Michele. He was also a man of culture and corresponded with Franco Sacchetti. Francesco was not averse to commerce but was best known as a politician and his career culminated when Lucca won its freedom from Pisa, which earned him the title of *Pater patriae*. He also built up a vast patronage network which his son, while posing as a moderator in the city's politics, used to drive home his feuds with rival families, succeeding in involving Lucca in the anti-Florentine and pro-Visconti alliances. This was also to form the basis for the continuation of the *signoria* under another of Francesco's sons, Paolo.

⁵ There is no critical study of the *signoria* of Paolo Guinigi. He came to power in 1400 and was expelled in 1430, dying in 1432 in Pavia as a prisoner of the Duke of Milan. He came to power more as a result of his family's position than of his own ability, and although he was a shrewd administrator he played an entirely subordinate role to the other Italian powers in 'foreign' policy matters. The city he inherited was firmly tied to the Visconti cause, and while this allowed Lucca some degree of independence it also demanded considerable political skills on the part of the ruler to make the alliance with a distant friend work against a hostile neighbour (Florence). Paolo did not have such skills, and it is no surprise that he fell under converging blows from Florence and from Filippo Maria Visconti who in the end proved disloyal.

On the Guinigi *signoria* see: A. MANGINI, *Storia di Lucca*, Florence 1950, pp. 177-197. This paper was in proof-revise when *Lucca 1369-1400*, Oxford, 1978, by Chr. Meck was published.

⁶ ASL, "Biblioteca Manoscritti", n. 21: B. BARONI, 'Alberi di famiglie', vol. 11, foll. 125, 129.

⁷ ASL, AG n. 151, fol. 61v. Following the death of his wife Giovanni Guinigi (b. 1375) married Caterina di Giovanni Bernardini, and by this marriage had 5 children. Giovanni was an *Anziano* between March and April 1398 and then became a councillor to Paolo Guinigi and took part in various political events of the time. He was registered as a member of the Merchants' Court in 1407 as 'compagno della ragione di Bologna' of Baldassare, Francesco, Nicolao and Lorenzo Guinigi; and again as 'mercadante da Luca senza factore compagno o garzone' (ASL Corte de' Mercanti n. 85, fol. 6v-7r). He must have followed in the family business although with a rather

been one of the Guinigi most heavily upset by the fall of the *signore*. He was imprisoned at once and only released a year later at the plea of Niccolò Piccinino and on payment of a surety of 300 florins and subject to remaining under surveillance.⁸ The newly formed Republic was particularly wary and suspicious of him, and a letter from the *Anziani* to the Duke of Milan, dated 17th December 1433, announced that he was accused of plotting with others of the Guinigi against the government of the city and had been exiled to Alessandria.⁹ However, the exile did not last long, and by 1434 Michele was able to return to Lucca, once again as a result of Piccinino's¹⁰ good offices with the *Anziani*, but his membership of the *signore's* family and, most important, his involvement in the *fronde* which had followed the deposition damaged his chances of a "political career". In fact, the name of one Guinigi did reappear amongst the *Consiglio degli Anziani* in 1438,¹¹ but Michele had to wait until 1460: during this year he was a member of the *Consiglio* for 2 months (March and April). His career then was, for the central part at least, rather lean in public events, and was marked only by more personal land-marks: his marriage (in 1443) to Camilla di Antonio Tegrimi which provided him with a dowry of 500 *ducats*¹² the birth of five children (to whom should be added a daughter born before

reduced range of affairs. The highly important Merchants' Court (which for a long time acted as a sort of shadow government in Lucca) included as members all those who were engaged in large scale trade in wool and silk, as well as those who manufactured the products, and those engaged in banking and credit activities.

⁸ ASL, *Regesti*, IV, *Carteggio degli Anziani 1430-1472*, ed. L. Fumi, Lucca 1907, p. 8.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

¹⁰ ASL, AG 'Libro di notizie', unnumbered fol. The Guinigi kept in close and friendly contact with Piccinino even after the fall of Paolo, and the relations between the Duke of Milan's mercenary captain and the Republic of Lucca were good — this suggests that probably after the fall of the *signoria* Lucca continued to be hostile to Florence and an ally of the Visconti. The following note by Michele provides evidence of the good relations with Piccinino: "Ricordo che a di 30 luglio 1439 ebbi lettera patente da Nicolò Piccinino, capitano generale del duca di Milano, marchese e conte, etc., di familiarità e di potere andare per tutti li luoghi dove avesse giurisdictione, con tucte miei some et arnesi, con compagni sei così a chavallo come a piedi, senza alcuna spesa o impedimento": ASL AG n. 151 fol. 42v.

¹¹ This was Piero Guinigi, a minor figure from a collateral branch of the family, who was an *Anziano* between March & April 1438, July & August 1443, March & April 1452, March & April 1455, September & October 1458, July & August 1461, and then again in 1462 and 1467: in 1460 he was also elected *Gonfaloniere* (see ASL BM n. 83 unnumbered fol.). The other Guinigi who held public office, in addition to Michele, in this period was Girolamo (probably Michele's brother) — he was an *Anziano* in Sept. & Oct. 1455, Nov. & Dec. 1458, Jan. & Feb. 1461, and then again in 1462, 1464, 1469, and 1472: in 1470 he was *Gonfaloniere*.

¹² ASL, AG n. 151, f. 43v.

his marriage¹³); a few short journeys, such as the one which he made in 1453 to visit a nephew who was studying in Siena;¹⁴ and finally his death, probably unexpected, on 5th July 1461.¹⁵

Unlike his grand-father and father, Michele was not a typical merchant. He was never part of the Guinigi "*ragione*" nor did he ever have a company of his own,¹⁶ although his brothers ran one in partnership, with Francesco operating from Bruges and London and Gerolamo from Lucca.¹⁷ Michele, however, had not completely abandoned all commercial interest, and an examination of his account books provides considerable information. The share held by commerce, if we take Michele's activities as a whole, was very small, and very different from that of his brothers and family, consisting in the renting of looms, workshops and store-rooms in Lucca.¹⁸ All direct involvement in the manufacture or the marketing of cloth had gone, and not only was he not concerned with the markets of London, Bruges, Lyon or Avignon, but even the regional horizon of his operations rarely went beyond the countryside immediately surrounding the city itself. Michele dealt mainly in equipment and tools; it was only rarely that he sold a piece of cloth, a Russian or Tartar slave-girl, or books;¹⁹ slightly more frequently — although within strict limits as we shall see below — he sold agricultural produce.²⁰ In fact, a petty trader

¹³ There were three daughters — Margherita, Pippa and Lucia — and two boys — Giovanni and Francesco; the natural daughter, Maddalena, was married to a carpenter in Lucca ASL, AG n. 151, f. 61v.

¹⁴ ASL, AG n. 154.

¹⁵ ASL, AG n. 151, f. 241v: "Nota come io, Tomaxo di Nic(olao) Guinigi ho letto in libro di ricordi di Girolamo di Gio(vanni) Guinigi, fratello di padre et non di madre di Michele di Gio(vanni) Guinigi, che ha fatto le soprascripte note fino a qui, come detto Michele morì l'anno 1461 a dì 5 luglio et non fece testamento". The fact that he left no will (together with the information that during the late Spring he had been busy trying to reach some compromise in a litigation in which he was involved) leads on to conclude that his death was unexpected.

¹⁶ Unfortunately the registers of the Merchants' Court during that period when Michele was active have all been lost. But in addition to the evidence of his account books which never refer to commercial operations of this sort, the case that Michele played little part in 'traditional' commercial activities is born out by a ledger headed *Notulario di contratti dall'anno 1401 all'anno 1499* (ASL, AG n. 313) which records all the activities in which the Guinigi were involved in the 15th century (and amongst these it is with Michele that landed property first begins to have an important role).

¹⁷ ASL, AG n. 313, f. 63v.

¹⁸ ASL, AG n. 154 *passim*.

¹⁹ A much longer discussion of the book trade is called for and I am in the process of preparing a separate monograph on the subject. As a matter of fact Michele is not a "*marchand écrivain*": he is interested in various cultural matters which led him to become involved in lending and exchanging texts, to come into contact with the well known book-seller Vespasiano da Bisticci, and to build up a conspicuous library.

²⁰ See below, pp. 290-291.

engaging in a defensive play which was virtually left to its own momentum. The change seems to have been quite radical, the more so in view of the fact that, while one might have supposed that he would have less capital available after the family's political disaster, there is considerable evidence in the documents that he always had very large financial resources,²¹ and also the fact that his brothers, as we have mentioned, continued their traditional commercial operations. But, while Michele's commercial activities contracted and declined in importance, his account books show that operations based on his landed property were taking on a predominant role. The way in which Michele managed these operations is what provides us with a key to understanding the nature of the change which was occurring, and it is therefore his estates which we must examine as closely as possible.²²

We must start by establishing three things: the total area of the estate, the way in which it was organised for farming, and the topography of the different parcels of which it was composed. The two latter present only very minor problems (some names are difficult to identify and in a couple of cases it is difficult to discover what crops were grown on particular parts of the estate). As far as the first is concerned, however, the figures taken from sources have only a rather approximate value for three reasons: first, as a result of possible

²¹ ASL, AG n. 313, *passim*. Apart from the other 10,000 florins which he inherited in 1427 before Paolo's fall and which he had to share with Nicolo and Lorenzo di Lazzaro Guinigi, Michele received 1564 florins in 1439; earlier various credits with the Burlamacchi had fallen due, while in 1445 he received the inheritance from his mother and soon after his wife's dowry (which we shall come back to). If we change perspective we find that Michele also spent a lot — 300 florins to the Republic in 1437 — in settlement of some complex litigation; in 1438 he redeemed the moveable assets in his father's legacy which were assigned to his brothers; in 1439 he paid 465 florins as a dowry for one of his daughters; he was also involved in lengthy suits and heavy expenditure to obtain full possession of the country house at S. Sino & Giuda of which he had only inherited a half share (although once he had established full ownership rights it was promptly confiscated by the Republic, following the fall of Paolo, and bought in part by Giovanni Arnolfini).

²² The account book from which the data for this study was drawn is to be found in ASL, AG n. 151. It is a large paper volume *in folio* with 241 hand-written sheets, the first 41 of which are in the hand of Michele's grand-father. The heading is *Memorie e note 1394-1447*, but the dates are inaccurate as the entries continue until Michele's death in 1461. On sheet 42r Michele noted: "... In questo libro... tucte le compre che seguirò di fare d'ogni mio bene immobile, e molte altre cose appartenenti a' dicti beni, e così più altre ch'i' aresse di miei facti, seguendo a uno libro A di questa grandezza, non sì alto, principiato per me l'anno 1426 e finito il 1446...". The Volume A mentioned has unfortunately disappeared.

LAND OWNED BY MICHELE DI GIOVANNI GUINIGI (1)

	Area in coltre quarre and pertiche			Arable		Arable with frees	
	N.	C.	Q. P.	N.	Area	N.	Area
<i>Sai Miglia</i>							
S. Donato	2	5	- -			2	5 - -
S. Concordio	1	1	- 114			1	1 - 114
S. Prospero	7	3	3 103	6	3 2 -	1	- 1 103
Pulia	1	2	- 18			1	2 - 18
S. Angelo in Campo	2	1	2 22	1	- 3 15	1	- 3 7
S. Lor. a Picciorana	4	9	2 73	3	7 1 50	1	2 1 23
Tassignano	8	26	1 -	2	1 1 -	1	- 3 -
Capannori	1	-	3 58				
Marlia	2	2	- 19	1	1 2 19		
Lammari	2	1	2 110	1	- 2 97	1	1 - 13
Saltocchio	66	29	1 10	3	- 1 90	23	14 1 37
Torre	15	6	2 17			4	2 2 93
Guercia	18	9	- 2				
Carraia	1	2	1 -			1	2 - -
Rughi	1	1	- 52			1	1 - 52
Salissina	2	1	- 48			2	1 - 48
S. Maria in Piazza	1	-	- 101				
S. Lor. a Corte	9	8	3 15			1	1 - 53
S. Mich. a Matraia	132	110	3 80	9	8 - -	13	2 2 25
S. Bart. a Ciciano	9	5	- 2	3	2 2 40		
Palsia	2	-	4 50			1	- 1 50
<i>Vicarie</i>							
Aquilea	1	-	2 51				
Diecimo	1						
Massa ciuccoli	16	17	- 83	2	- 1 107	1	3 1 9
Oneta	6	10	2 -			3	5 1 -
Corsagna	1	98	- 7				
Anchiano	30	9	3 51	7	1 2 77		
Motrone (Coreglia)	2						
Cune	34	140	- 45	1	4 2 -	3	5 2 45
Brancoli	3	1	2 82				
Boveglio	1	1	1 -			1	1 1 -
Castelvecchio	1						
Mommio	8	3	- 30	5	1 3 64	1	- 1 76
Conca	6	2	3 107	3	1 2 42		
Quiesa	6	4	2 78	1	- - 60		
Bozzano	1	-	- 88	1	- - 88		
Corsanico	5	1	3 111			1	- 3 61
Camaiore	3	2	- 100	1	- 1 58		
Pedona	5	3	- 25	5	3 - 25		
Pietrasanta	27	39	3 3	15	16 1 88	3	7 3 61
Montetignoso	2	2	1 -	2	2 1 -		
S. Maria a Colle	15	4	3 88			2	- 1 13
S. Andrea a Compito	1	1	- 7				
S. Macario	1	2	- -				
S. Gemignano	5	-	2 70			5	2 2 70
S. Lorenzo	4	2	3 114			1	2 2 96
Petrognano	24	8	2 81	1	- - 43		
S. Gennaro	4	3	2 55				
S. Stefano	2	16	- -				
S. Pancrazio	4	1	- 79				
Mastiano	4	9	- 20				
S. Quirico	1	19	- -				
S. Fred. a Valgiano	1	2	- -				
S. Pancrazio (Segr.)	1	0	1 -				

(1) The numerical totals in the first column do not always correspond with the other figures because we have not included in this table the farms (*podere*) which are discussed separately, and land of unspecified area. There were 28 such holdings, as follows: woods n. 17; arable n. 9; pasture n. 1;

Specialized Crops		Type Meadow		Chestnut		Pasture, Shrub, Woodland		Buildings, Sheds, gardens, orchards
N.	Area	N.	Area	N.	Area	N.	Area	
								1 hut
		1	- 3 58			5	34 1 -	
17	9 1 56	1	- 1 48	12	3 1 -	1	- 2 -	8 house with orchard
5	1 1 48			2	2 3 -	9	1 2 9	1 house (mins)
						6	2 1 101	1 house
						16	6 1 2	
				1	- - 101			
3	5 1 47	1	- 2 -	2	1 - -	2	- 3 30	2 houses, 2 houses
25	7 3 98			13	13 3 57	70	46 2 15	4 houses
						5	2 1 77	1 house, orchard
1	- 2 51							
3	1 - 40					6	9 1 71	1 house, orchard
				1	2 1 -	1	3 - -	2 clove-cots, 1 orchard: 2,3.86
11	1 2 52	1	1 1 -	3	3 2 -	1	98 - -	2 houses, huts
				3	1 2 82	9	127 - -	1 hut
2	- 3 5							
3	1 1 65							
3	2 2 91	1	- 1 71			1	- 1 86	1 small shed
3	- 1 43					1	- 3 7	
		1	- 2 15			1	1 1 27	
		3	8 3 11	3	1 - 2	2	- 2 -	1 house, 4 sheds
1	1 - 7					3	4 - 75	
		1	- 2 -					1 small shed
2	- 1 18							1 ruined house
21	5 3 43			1	2 - 33	1	- 2 77	1 house, orchard
1	2 3 61			1	16 - -	3	- 2 109	1 small shed
				3	9 - 20	4	1 - 79	
						1	2 - -	1 house with 19
						1	- 1 -	coltre of land

shrub n. 1.

The area of the two mountains, Catureglio and Bargiglio, is not known either and these were mainly wooded with shrub culture.

inaccuracies on Michele's part; ²³ secondly, due to the unavoidable uncertainties in any attempt to translate medieval measures exactly in to modern ones; ²⁴ thirdly, and lastly, because we lack information on the size of a number of portions of the estate.²⁵ The information is reproduced, however, in Table 1. In view of the need to examine the lay-out of the estate in some detail, and given also that it is essential that any effective research into agrarian history should be based on a specific and defined area ²⁶ (see also the map showing the places in which Michele owned property). It will be seen that these included the countryside immediately surrounding the city (the *contrade*), suburbs which were only just outside the city wall, as well as the most distant and isolated *vicarie*. In fact, Guinigi's property was scattered over all three of "the agrarian regions" ²⁷ which made up the Luccan territory in this period.²⁸

²³ Expression such as 'pigla a ochio' 'è per mizura a ochio' which appear (although happily rarely) in the sources certainly do not encourage complacency on this.

²⁴ However the degree of uncertainty is greatly reduced in this case given that there are a number of authorities in general agreement over the equivalents of the measures in use in Lucca in the later Middle Ages: See A. MARTINI, *Manuale di metrologia*, Torino 1883, pp. 308-9, and under the relevant headings *Inventario dell'Archivio di Stato di Lucca*, ed. S. Bonghi, Vol. II, Lucca 1876, pp. 65-77.

The measures used by Michele were as follows: for area, *a*) the *coltra*, divided into 4 *quarre* (or quarters) equal to about 40 *ari*, *b*) the *quarra*, divided into 115 square *pertiche* (perches), equal to about 10 *ari*, *c*) the square *pertica* (or perch), divided into 25 square *braccia*, and equal to about 8.7 m², *d*) the square *braccia*, equal to 0.34 m². For length, *a*) *pertica*, divided into 5 *braccia* (sometimes into 6, in which case of 3.54 m) equal to 2.9 m, *b*) the *braccia* equal to 0.59 m. Very rarely the *staio* appears as a unit of area (for the lands at Pietrasanta), and this can be taken as being about the same as the *quarra*.

²⁵ For those lands for which this latter information is available it would be possible to make a very approximative estimate. However the calculation would be so uncertain as to make it not worthwhile.

²⁶ See: E. CONTI, *La formazione della struttura agraria moderna nel contado fiorentino*, Roma 1965, Vol. 1, p. viii.

²⁷ See G. MERLINI, *Le regioni agrarie in Italia*, Bologna 1948, pp. 87-120. Some of the localities where Michele owned land were on the Luccan plain, (although this was proportionately smaller than the hill and mountain areas: in the present province of Lucca the mountains cover 65% of the total area, the hills 22% and the plain only 14%) which was formed from marine and fluvial deposits in the last Quaternary age with the result that the soil is sandy and thin, and were it not for the fact that it is deep and the aquiferous stratum is extensive it would not be particularly suitable for farming. In terms of geo-pedological features (and therefore for similar types of crops) the coastal area around modern Viareggio is similar to the plain (although at that time it was partly covered with marshes), and was favoured with a very mild climate being protected by the Apennines and the Apuan Alps (and olive growing was widespread there). The majority of Michele's holdings, however, were sited in the upper, middle and mainly lower Serchio valley. The valley is formed from the jagged chain of the

TABLE I

TOTALS

Type of land	N.	Area in C.Q.P.		Area in ha.	Percentages
Arable	57	57	1 43	22,8	8,8%
Arable with trees	68	69	- 69	27,6	10,6%
Specialised crops	101	43	2 35	17,3	6,6%
Meadow	8	14	2 78	5,8	2,2%
Chestnuts	46	61	2 63	24,6	9,5%
Woods etc.	149	343	1 75	137,2	53,0%
Farms and others	8	58	1 44	23,2	8,8%
<i>Total</i>	437	648	- 62	258,5	99,5%

Apuan Alps and from the less rugged Appennine and pre-Appennine ranges which cut deeply into Luccan territory from North to South. The area is mainly hilly with largely autochthonous terrain (sand and marl, clay and conglomerates etc.) which is not of good quality, although its chemical poverty is at least partly compensated by the gentle hill morphology and climate which assist drainage, making possible cultivation of olives and vines and mixed farming. The hills facing Monte Pisano are much less fertile due to the impacted limestone mesozoics, and its square mass rears up on the South-East of the city almost in isolation from the surrounding plain. There was also poor mountain terrain in the upper valley of the Serchio where Michele held land on both sides of the river. The soil was mainly limestone on the right of the river and sandy eocene on the left, and the tendency for the land to dry out quickly due to the slope also made in poorly suited to cultivation. On these lands grain and wheat were in fact grown at Guinigi's time, although with difficulty due to the height, or else they were left to grass, or on the spots which were richer in silica and had a lower limestone content chestnut trees were also grown (these were to the left of the Serchio).

For geological and pedological data see: P. PRINCIPI, 'I terreni agrari in Toscana', in *L'Italia Agricola*, May 1948, pp. 253-65, and especially F. ROGAI, 'I terreni della provincia di Lucca', in *Annali della Facoltà di Agraria dell'Università di Pisa*, 1941, pp. 82-153. For the places shown on the Istituto Geografico Militare map see the entries in E. REPETTI, *Dizionario geografico fisico storico della Toscana*, Firenze, 1883-46, *sub voce*.

²⁸ In the 15th century the Luccan countryside was divided into two zones: the first, known as the *Sei Miglia*, included the area around the city and was directly controlled by the city magistrates; the second was divided into 4 parishes (*vicarie*) and covered the more peripheral area and was controlled by an 'official' appointed by the *Anziani* (known as the Vicar, or more rarely the *Podestà*). The administrative distinction, which has been retained in Table 1, acknowledged and indeed explained the important real differences dividing the two areas. The influence of Lucca was very strongly felt in the *Sei Miglia* for this constituted the city's irreplaceable granary, and the city was careful to dictate what was grown there. In the parishes, on the other hand, where communication were more difficult and less frequent, a more intensely 'rural' type of existence was to be found. So it happened that peasants in the *Sei Miglia* could come

A first glance at the Table suggests that the properties were extremely dispersed²⁹ and fragmented. Although we know that both characteristics were typical of the Luccan countryside in this period³⁰ (as of many other rural areas in later medieval Italy), the degree reached by both on Michele's estates would seem to suggest that they form a rather extreme example, so that it is perhaps worth checking again on our initial impression. If we first consider the problem of dispersion, we see that 3 of a total of 51 localities in which Michele owned property (that is 5.8% of the total number) contained over half of all the land which Michele owned (52.3%); 7 localities together (13.7% of the total number) covered 26.2% of the total property; 9 (17.6%) covered 11.6%; 24 (that is 47%) only 8.2%; and the last 7 localities (13.7%) covered less than 0.5% of Michele's land. So, the bulk of the plats, over 80% in fact, were distributed over only 10 localities, and over 90% of the holdings were concentrated around some 19 localities. The impression of very extreme dispersion needs to be modified, and we may well ask whether also the impression of fragmentation will not, on closer inspection prove to be similarly more apparent than real. In order to do this we need to know more about the size

into the city every day to sell their goods, buy what they needed, draw up legal documents etc., and the townsmen preferred to invest in land in the *Sei Miglia* not just because it was better land but also because a property close to the city conferred greater prestige. In the parishes, on the other hand, peasant property survived longer and the city was less able to extend its property there.

²⁹ To put the references to the distance of certain places from Lucca into perspective we need to have some idea of the road net-work. By the XVth century a network of roads radiating from the city had already been developed. They were not very good and only permitted passage for men on foot or horse and perhaps at most or a few farm carts, but they did put Lucca in direct contact with virtually every part of the countryside. The parishes of Pietrasanta and Camaiore were reached by the via Aurelia, which probably went further inland than its present day course, at which point one had to continue on one of the three roads linking Lucca to Pisa. The more distant places in the upper Serchio valley were equally well connected by the road which climbed up into the Garfagnana. On the right of the river a road passed through Monte S. Quirico and Guercia (where there was an ancient hospice), another ran more to the right, linking Mastiano, Aquilea, Diecimo, Borgo a Mozzano, Oneta. On the left of the river there were numerous footpaths running along the flanks of the Apennines as far as S. Bartolomeo di Pizzorna, from which Lucca could be reached by two roads. The places on the slopes of Monte Pisano and those on the plain to the East of the city were linked by three roads joining Lucca with Buggiano (very close to modern Montecatini), then Pistoia and Florence. The first and oldest ran along the slopes of the Pizzorne, the second cut across the plain, and the third was more to the South and joined the road to Valdarno, then went on to Capannori and Lucca.

³⁰ Cf. for a slightly later period M. BERENGO, *Nobili e mercanti nella Lucca del Cinquecento*, Torino 1965, pp. 303-304 (hereafter *Berengo*).

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF PLOTS BY SIZE

Locality	Under 1 quarra		From 1 quarra to 1 coltra		From 1 to 5 coltre		Over 5 coltre	
	Num.	%	Num.	%	Num.	%	Num.	%
S. Donato					2	100		
S. Lor. a Picciorana			2	50,0	1	25,0	1	25,0
Tassignano			6	75,0	1	12,5	1	12,5
Torre	7	46,6	7	46,6	1	6,6		
Guercia	7	36,8	10	52,6	2	10,5		
S. Mich. a Matraia	69	53,0	42	32,2	15	11,5	4	3,0
S. Bart. a Cicana	4	50,0	2	25,0	2	25,0		
S. Quirico in Mont.							1	100,0
S. Stefano							1	100,0
Saltocchio	37	56,6	23	35,1	4	6,1	1	1,5
Mastiano					2	66,6	1	33,3
S. Lorenzo a Corte	1	11,1	6	66,6	2	22,2		
Petrognano	15	62,4	8	33,2	1	4,1		
Massaciuccoli	3	21,3	7	49,9	3	21,3	1	7,1
Pietrasanta	1	3,7	12	44,4	11	40,7	3	11,1
Oneta					5	100,0		
Cune			5	33,3	5	33,3	5	33,3
Anchiano	21	72,2	7	24,0	1	3,4		
Corsagna							1	100,0

(1) The table refers to the 19 localities in which the majority of Michele's property was sited.

of individual parts of the estates and their distribution amongst the different localities, and this information is given in Table 2.³¹

The first group contains genuine fragments of land, the largest of which were less than 1,000 m². And, over 50% of the total holdings were of this size in 5 out of the 19 localities where the bulk of Michele's possessions were. In another 3 localities the percentage was still high, ranging from 46.6% to 21.3%, but in the other 11 "major" localities there were no small fragments of this type. Were these more concentrated than the others? If we move on to the next group, by size, bearing in mind that we are still talking of areas which

³¹ In calculating the various areas I have left out those pieces of land for which there was no information on size (in fact these were few in number) and in order to simplify I used only 19 on the plades, in which the bulk of Michele's property was concentrated. The various categories of size have been constructed somewhat artificially as the sources do not contain genuine benchmarks which might be taken as objective divisions between one category and another.

are still less than half a hectare, we find that these constituted high percentages in Pietrasanta, Tassignano, S. Lorenzo a Corte and S. Lorenzo a Picciorana. These too should be considered as zones in which the property was highly fragmented, although to a lesser extent than in the previous localities. Corsagna, S. Stefano, S. Quirico, Oneta, Mastiano, S. Donato and some of Cune remain to be discussed. There is some difficulty when it comes to Cune because there is no information on the size of about half the holdings which Michele possessed there is no information on the size of about half of the holdings which Michele possessed there, and so we shall leave it for the time being. Of the others, the holdings in Corsagna, S. Stefano and Mastiano consisted of woodland, and therefore had a particular economic significance, while Michele's property in Oneta and S. Donato was minute in comparison with other localities. In conclusion then, although the degree of fragmentation was rather less in these localities than in others, it was only in S. Quirico that one can really talk of substantial contiguous holdings.

Our detailed examination then reinforces the original impression of considerable fragmentation. Although holdings of 20 or 30 perches were exceptional (although not negligible in the case of olive groves and "shrub-land") the majority of the plots were very small in size, ranging from 1,000 to 4,000 m². The largest holdings were woodland, but even then one still finds tiny *morceaux* of only a few hundred square meters. Nor were certain efforts made by Michele to "rationalise" his properties³² (we shall come back to this shortly) sufficient to alter the overall situation. It does, however, help demonstrate the beginnings of the process of creating large concentrated and contiguous estates which was to be completed, in the Luccan area, only in the XVIth century.³³ The costs of such fragmentation for an urban land-owner were enormous, creating difficulties for introducing new crops or changing old ones, making it impossible

³² The most obvious attempt at 'rationalization' carried out by Michele was at Matraia. We have an extremely important statement by Michele regarding this locality: in an auction he bought for 14 florins and 6 *bolognini* "uno petio di terra con alchuni pochi piedi di viti... che già non vale più di f. 5; ma la bontà di Andrea di Guglielmo dal Portico, a instantia di Francesco Mag(****) lo fece saltare a dicto pregio, e io vi corsi a ciò che non mi fusse guasto uno mio disegno che intendo fare a Matraia (ASL, AG n. 151, f. 60r). What this plan might have been we do not know, but in view of the fact that there were a number of fairly concentrated holdings at Matraia which Michele referred to as 'farms' (*podere*) (cf. note 35), or even 'large farms', one is strongly tempted to believe that his 'plan' was to build up these contiguous holdings in the area.

We should not forget, however, that at the time of Michele's death there were over 132 pieces of property in this locality with a total area of some 100 *coltre*, which indicates the highly marginal character of any attempted 'rationalization'.

³³ Cf. C. SARDI, *Le contrattazioni agrarie del Medioevo studiate sui documenti lucchesi*, Lucca 1914, p. 171.

to guard the tiny holdings effectively or keep a constant eye on the tenant farmers, and preventing any rapid or straightforward collection of rents. The comparative backwardness of the Lucca region,³⁴ in contrast with the agrarian structure of Florentine Tuscany, which by the start of the 15th century had a close network of share-cropping farms (*mezzadrie*),³⁵ which constituted its "basic structure",³⁶ is well known. But our analysis will shortly indicate that the fragmentation of holdings which characterised the Guinigi estates cannot be explained solely in terms of "structural" causes.

To complete the picture, there are certain remarks to be made about the way in which the lands were farmed. One of the most striking things is the huge extension of woodland. Only in the suburban area was this missing, but even at Tassignano³⁷ at the heart of the fertile Luccan plain it was of considerable importance, while nearly all Michele's possessions in the Serchio valley contained woods, and these only began to thin out on the hillsides of Camaioere. Woodland in fact made up over 50% of the entire property, and woods were of considerable importance in the economy of the Luccan countryside and uplands in particular, being used as pasture for smaller live-stock.³⁸ None the less it is still quite astonishing to find such a high proportion of woodland in the property of an urban landowner: the fact that Michele continued to purchase

³⁴ BERENGO, p. 306.

³⁵ Apart from the case at S. Michele a Matraia, the only pieces of Michele's property which were referred to as 'farms' (*podere*) were a single piece at Pietrasanta ('a farm, being fields with trees, vines and figs') and two strips at S. Bartolomeo a Ciciano. The holding at Pietrasanta was less than 3 *coltre* (just over a hectaire), while of the two at S. Bartolomeo a Ciciano one was 1 *coltra*, and although we do not know the size of the other it was purchased for just over 10 florins so cannot have been very big. Apart from the fact there was a farm house (although other holdings also had houses) there seems to be little to distinguish these three so-called 'farms' from other holdings of similar size (some being even bigger) which were not graced with such a title.

³⁶ Cf. E. CONTI, *La formazione...*, p. 1.

³⁷ Cf. the 30 *coltre* of woodland with 'ontani, olmi e alcune quercie'. ASL, AG n. 151.

³⁸ The importance of woodland in the Luccan agrarian economy is evident from the severity with which the Republic prohibited indiscriminate clearing of woodland, and also from the continuing litigation between rural communes for possession of a few *coltre* of woods and from the numerous suits for damage to woodland caused by animals breaking saplings. See BERENGO, pp. 314-316.

Our sources also refer to damage by animals to woodland. There is reference to a suit which Michele initiated due to damage caused by sheep and pigs to his land at Cune in the parish of Coreglia. An agreement was reached and Michele was paid 12 bolognini for the damage caused by a herd of pigs and another 3 *staia* of wheat for damage caused by a flock of sheep, the two types of animal most commonly found on the Luccan mountains. ASL, AG n. 151.

woodland should bring us to think in terms of land speculation, for which, however, there is no evidence in the documents. Although they played an important part in the agrarian economy of Lucca at the time, the area of chestnut plantations was not very large and amounted to less than 10% of the total property. Although Lucca cannot be thought of as a member of Ladurie's "International of poverty"³⁹, (that is, those poor mountain regions with hostile climates in which chestnuts formed the basic diet of the population) chestnuts were still of considerable importance⁴⁰ and often featured amongst the rents in kind collected by Michele.

In economic terms, however, the real heart of the estate (given the almost total absence of meadowland⁴¹) was either clear or tree-covered arable land,⁴² which made up about one third of the properties, and — due to the high unit value, because the areas involved were not large — what are known as "specialised crops".⁴³ In the *contrade* in the suburban localities and parishes, arable land tended to predominate, while in the territory of the *Sei Miglia* it was confined by olive groves and vineyards, but even here Michele seemed to prefer arable to the specialised crops.⁴⁴ This was a process, however, which can only be

³⁹ E. LE ROY LADURIE, *I contadini di Linguadoca* (It. edn.), Bari 1970, p. 88.

⁴⁰ BERENGO, pp. 316-320; see also ASL, *Officio sopra l'Abbondanza*, N. 1: like wheat and cereals, chestnuts were always included in the Republic's protective legislation.

⁴¹ Meadows made up 2.2% of Michele's land. But this is not surprising, and agrarian historians have for some time shown that a central feature and an insurmountable limitation of agriculture before the agronomic revolution was the problem of the equal balance between arable and pasture land (between crops and livestock). For this whole question see B. H. SLICHER VAN BATH, *Storia agraria dell'Europa occidentale*, Turin 1972; for detailed reference to Italy P. JONES, 'Per la storia agraria italiana nel Medio Evo; lineamenti e problemi', in *Rivista Storica Italiana*, LXXVI (1964), pp. 320-323.

The consequence of this was, of course, a shortage of larger livestock, with all that this implied for working and manuring the fields. Among the dozens of different types of contracts used by Michele there were only two involving any form of partnership (see below p. 697 ff.). Also Michele showed no interest in the number of beasts of burden on his lands. This silence in the documents must I think be seen as the reflection of a real scarcity, for which there is direct evidence in the Luccan countryside for a slightly later period — see BERENGO, pp. 312-313.

⁴² The term 'arable with shrub culture (*arativo arborato*) appears in the sources and although the term is rather general it refers to seed land with vines, olives or fruit trees planted on it, or, as was more frequently the case on Michele's property, in a mixture.

⁴³ By 'specialised crops' I mean olives, vines, fruit trees etc. The most important of these was probably the fine orchard at Massaciuccoli which Michele valued to the sum of 61 florins and 8 *soldi*, and covered 3 *coltre* with 233 orange trees and 87 olive bushes.

⁴⁴ See Table on p. 671. Note that with certain unimportant exceptions (Anchiano and Corsagna — and the vineyard which was ploughed up at Anchiano was described as 'ruined') all the land that was put under the plough was within the *Sei Miglia*.

faintly detected at first in our sources but then in the following decades becomes more and more pronounced and seems to have been connected not so much with the economic situation⁴⁵ as with the Republic's ever growing concern to safeguard its food supplies, besieged as it was, and felt itself to be, by the threatening regional Medici state.⁴⁶

To summarise then: an extreme degree of fragmentation to be found everywhere, although in varying degrees; holdings scattered over considerable distances, albeit not as great as appeared at first sight; a very high percentage of woodland; less arboriculture than plain ploughland; very few meadows; a rickety farm structure. Even for their times, many features of Michele's estates were quite simply backward. Even the attempts at improvements (Michele's efforts to turn ploughland into shrub crops are typical of this) (table III) fall

TABLE III
LAND FALLEN INTO POOR CONDITION

Locality	% of the total number of holding's in the locality	% of the quantitative total of holding's in the locality
Guercia	47.3	27.2
Torre	11.6	13.2
S. Mich. a Matr.	9.0	7.4
Anchiano	8.7	12.1

HOLDINGS TURNED INTO ARABLE

Locality	Number	Area in coltre, quarre y pertiche
Guercia	9	3 - 90
Torre	2	- 1 93
S. Prospero	1	- 2 -
S. Bart. a Ciciana	14	?
Tassignano	1	?
S. Mich. a Matraia	14	9 - 22
Anchiano	1	- - 60
Camaioere	1	- 1 58

The example of Tassignano is particularly interesting, as woodland was turned into arable here. It is worth mentioning that in the description of the property the presence of a large area of woodland in this part of the plain was remarked upon as being unusual.

⁴⁵ It now seems to be established that cereal prices tended to fall in the late Middle Ages; see P. J. JONES, 'Per la storia agraria italiana...', p. 324 where he states that the Middle Ages Italian agriculture was never speculative, not even in the area close to ports.

⁴⁶ See BERENGO, pp. 147-234.

into an agrarian pattern aimed at creating a relationship between fruit and cereal production which indicated a strong drive for self-sufficiency at the level of each farm (although this was not in fact achieved). But this was an agrarian pattern which in many areas of central and Northern Italy had already been superseded. So, bearing these points in mind, let us turn to Michele's 'purchasing policy'.⁴⁷

* * *

In Michele's day the commercialisation of the land was widespread and unchallenged in those regions where the civilization of the city-states had stamped itself and where the commercial classes had generally destroyed the earlier social structures of feudal origin. Generally this type of circulation of land followed if not obligatory, at least favoured routes, moving from one great family in decline to another great family in ascendance or, from impoverished and indebted peasants to newly rich city men. But the basic features of the situation did not change — land passed from hand to hand quickly and continuously.

There was literally not a single year in which Michele did not complete one operation or another. Most of the cases were purchases involving very small sums — in 1447 9 florins, in 1451 8, in 1452 4, and so on (see the Table IV). In all he invested in land between 1447-1460 some 800 florins "*di moneta*".⁴⁸ Although this was a large sum it was certainly not conspicuous when compared, say, with the amounts spent by Francesco Datini (the great merchant was virtually Michele's contemporary) or even more significantly with those spent by Simo d'Ubertino — a 'middling' merchant who lived about half a century earlier.⁴⁹ The vendors came from a variety of backgrounds

⁴⁷ This is still based on register n. 151. For the purposes of our study of Michele's 'purchasing policy' it will help if we identify the goods which he received by way of inheritance; only by identifying these and hoping that the rest resulted from purchases can we gain an accurate idea of the formation of Michele's landed properties. But as the purchases can only be followed for the years 1447-60, we have no way of tracing them back to his initial inheritance, and we must therefore rely on the indications given by Guinigi himself when he noted against the description of a tract of land whether it had come as an inheritance. Where there is such a note, we have of course not included that piece of land in our present study.

⁴⁸ When mentioning florins Michele always specified whether they were 'gold' florins or 'cash' (*moneta*) florins, and he himself explains why this was so (ASL, AG 151 f. 44v): the disparity coefficient between the two forms of money was 1.34 between the gold and the cash florin. Except where gold florins are mentioned we have taken the references in the text to be to 'cash' florins. Among the multiples of the florin were *soldi*, *denari* and *bolognini*, especially the latter which at Michele's time stood at about 40 to the florin.

⁴⁹ Cf. I. IMBERCIADORI, 'Proprietà terriera di Francesco Datini a parziaria mezzadrile nel '400' in *Economia e Storia*, V, 1958, pp. 256-57, 265; and G. CHERUBINI, 'La

MICHELE'S LAND PURCHASES

TABLE IV

Vendor	Type of land*	Locality	Date	Sum sent
Franc. Malizardi	16 terr.	Guercia	3. 4.1447	f. 3
Mich. Nicolai	4 selve	?	19. 5.1447	f. 1
Galvano del Portico	1 bosco	Tassignano	26. 5.1447	f. 1 oro
Andrea Lucherini	1 selva	Matraia	12. 6.1447	f. 1
Franc. Malizardi	1 bosco	Parassana	10.11.1447	f. 3
Bart. Bartolomei	7 torr.	?	23. 9.1448	f. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nic. di Dino Guinigi	terr.	Salt. e Branc.	6. 9.1449	f. 600 oro
Guaspari Gaddini	2 boschi	Matraia	4.11.1449	f. 1 oro
Andrea di Mignano	4 boschi	Matraia	14. 2.1450	bol. 12
Iacopo Baldinetti	terr.	Matraia	14. 2.1450	f. 154 oro
Taddea Inardini	1 bosco	Matraia	7.11.1450	f. 1 bol. 12
Simone Opisi	1 selva	?	28.12.1450	duc. 2 oro
Mich. Mordecastelli	23 terr.	Matraia	4. 5.1451	f. 8
Iacopo di Borto	5 terr.	Matraia	5. 2.1552	f. 2
Antonio Vannucori	3 terr.	Matraia	17. 2.1452	f. 2
Paolo di Bartolomeo	1 bosco	Matraia	17. 1.1453	bol. 24
Marco di Marco	2 terr.	?	1. 6.1454	f. 1 oro
Salvestro di Batt.	2 terr.	Ciciana	13. 6.1454	f. 1 oro
Bart. Luporini	3 terr.	Matraia	17.10.1454	f. 3
Giovanni Dinelli	3 terr.	Matraia	26. 1.1455	?
Nicol. di Antonio	1 terr.	Matraia	15. 1.1456	bol. 18
Baldass. di Pellegr.	3 terr.	Matraia	11. 2.1456	bol. 18
Conv. S. Piero Cigoli	1 terr.	Marlia	3. 4.1456	f. 5
Giov. Andree	1 oliv.	Catureglio	11. 5.1456	f. 5
Francesco Antoni	1 vigna	Torre	21. 5.1456	f. 5
Giov. Bartolomei	5 selve	Cune	25. 6.1456	f. 13 bol. 12
Mich. di Meglio	2 terr.	Carraia	17.11.1456	f. 1 bol. 16
Bart. Bartolomei	1 selva	Torre	17. 5.1457	f. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$
Michele di Antonio	1 oliv.	Catureglio	9. 4.1457	f. 3 bol. 5
Bart. Dominichi	1 oliv.	Catureglio	7. 5.1457	f. 10
Marco Nicolai	1 terr.	S. Stefano	7. 5.1457	f. 3
Bart. Bartolomei	1 vigna	Guercia	16. 5.1457	f. 3
Matteo Iacopi	1 oliv.	Aquilea	19. 5.1457	f. 2 bol. 27
Antonio di Meo	1 selva	Cune	11. 6.1457	f. 2
Antonio Iohanni	2 terr.	Anchiano	11. 6.1457	duc. 8
Conv. S. Cerbone	1 terr.	Matraia	11. 6.1457	f. 14 bol. 6
Giovanni di Andrea	1 oliv.	Catureglio	8. 9.1457	f. 3 bol. 12
Bart. Domanchi (?)	1 terr.	Cune	8. 9.1457	f. 7
Bart. Nicolai	1 terr.	Marlia	1.12.1457	f. 3
Giov. Collecti	1 oliv.	Cune	24. 3.1458	f. 12
Bart. Dominichi	1 selva	Coreglia	8. 4.1458	f. 2
Antonio Barsugli	1 bosco	Oneta	15. 4.1458	f. 6
Giov. Andree	4 selve	Cune	12. 6.1458	?
Maddalena di Mich.	18 terr.	S. Maria a Colle	18. 1.1459	f. 12
Luca di Andrea	3 terr.	Cune	31.10.1459	f. 3
Pellegrino di Iac.	1 terr.	Oneta	9.11.1459	f. 5
Antonio di Giov.	1 bosco	Oneta	29. 1.1460	f. 4 bol. 33
Bart. Dominichi	1 terr.	Cune	20. 9.1460	f. 5

* For English equivalents see table at end of Appendix 3.

and included two "testori di drappi" (weavers) from Lucca, a certain Bartolomeo di Francesco Luporini "che già pare fusse heremita", a notary, as the 'ser' before his name indicates, called Nicolao Bartholomei, a number of widows like Taddea Innardini and monks such as those of the monastery of S. Pietro Gigoli. For the most part the vendors came from the surrounding countryside.

What kinds of land did Guinigi buy? As we have already seen, mainly woodland chestnut plantations, and shrub land, less often arable land and only very rarely more specialised crop land. He also bought a good deal of deteriorated land, and in fact this occurred so often that one is led to believe that Michele tended to buy land of this type which was not being fully used and therefore of low cost in order to make it productive again, although there is nothing in the documents which would confirm such an argument. Some of Guinigi's purchases were genuine 'bargains', as when he bought 5 pieces of land in S. Michele a Matraia in 1452 which were valued at 9 florins for only 2.⁵⁰ It would be interesting to be able to study some of these cases more closely, because without attributing them necessarily with usurious nature it was clearly the case that Michele was able to exploit the economic difficulties of the vendors.⁵¹ More generally, however, the purchase price (in those cases where it is possible to check) was only slightly below the valuation.⁵²

In making these purchases Michele always kept within the radius known as the *Sei Miglia*, avoiding the dispersion of land among distant localities and concentrating particularly on S. Michele in Matraia. It was here that the largest number of purchases were concentrated between 1447 and 1455, numbering 11 in a whole of 19 in all. Tenaciously and patiently Guinigi gradually scratched away at the small peasant properties which covered these hill sides only a short distance from Lucca itself and at the mouth of the Serchio valley. To build up his property in this area Michele also resorted to bartering, and of the

proprietà fondiaria di un mercante toscano del Trecento (Simo d'Ubertino d'Arezzo), in *Rivista di Storia dell'Agricoltura*, V, 1965, pp. 76.

⁵⁰ ASL, AG 151, f. 187v.

⁵¹ Evidence of this is found in the litigations which invariably followed purchases and the way in which Michele hastened to find justification for the way in which he had acted. Regarding the operation mentioned, for example, we read: "... Trovo... che Iacopo di Berto [the vendor] comperò questi beni da Orso Giannuchori, lo quale m'era obbligato in propio...; sì che se mai mi fusseno molestati li s(upra) s(cripti) beni li posso difendere etian dio per questo propio" (ASL, AG n. 151, f. 187v). It is interesting to note in this case that the purchase was a real business deal for Michele, and the vendor was a weaver, Iacopo di Berto de' Borghi (from Lucca). For the difficulties to which weavers often fell victim in order to raise capital to hire or buy equipment, see BERENGO, pp. 66-68.

⁵² To give some examples: in 1448 he bought land valued at 9 florins for 8 (ASL, AG 151); 2 pieces of land bought in 1454 for 1 gold florin were valued at 1 florin 6 *bolognini* (ASL, AG 151). It should be remembered, however, that valuations were often very approximative.

four examples which crop up in the documents⁵³ three were concerned with creating an as yet non-existent continuity amongst the lands which he held in S. Michele a Matraia. In order to achieve this Michele was prepared to exchange more distant holdings of higher value for lands adjacent to his own. Even so, he was still able to find a bargain at times, as when he exchanged a piece of land measuring ('about' Michele noted) a *coltra* at Antraccole for 4 pieces of land producing the same type of crops (vineyards and one woodland), but which covered over 3 *coltre*, in S. Michele a Matraia, which were Michele noted to be useless to the monks (the words are obviously Michele's) "per la inhabitatione dello luogo donde sono...; e de' quali fino a qui àno tracto pocho fructo, e ànone avute molte questioni e rixe, e dubitano di peggio per lo avvenire".⁵⁵

There was a sharp rise in the sums being spent on land in 1449 and 1450. In 1449 (apart from some woodland which he purchased for a gold florin in S. Michele a Matraia) Michele, in partnership with his brothers Gerolamo and Francesco, purchased from Nicolao Guinigi his "consorte" some huge properties at Saltocchio and Brancoli. The total sum was considerable, amounting to 600 gold florins⁵⁶ of which Michele's share was exactly a third, 268 florins and 4 *bolognini* "di moneta". In 1450, on the other hand, Michele acted on his own and in addition to the endless but very modest purchases of woodland for a couple of florins in S. Michele a Matraia, he also purchased from Iacopo Baldinetti in his favoured locality 'vineyards, olive groves, woods, houses and huts'.⁵⁷ The sum paid for this was 154 gold florins. It is not possible to discover

⁵³ One occurred in 1453 with the monks 'de' Servi di S. Maria di Lucca', who exchanged half a house for a piece of Michele's land of 290 *pertiche* in Mozzano. Michele noted: 'E vale più quello ò e dato loro circa due tante che quello àno dato a me. Ma sia per l'anima mia'. However Michele did not have any other property in the area. Another exchange occurred in 1455, another in 1456 and the last in 1457. See ASL, AG n. 151, ff. 52v, 56r, 57v, 63r.

⁵⁴ This was the 1456 exchange: 'E poichè lo mio pesso è più e di migliore conditione dicemmo e dichiarammo che mi rifacesse il soprapiù...' ASL, AG n. 151, f. 57v.

⁵⁵ ASL, AG 151, f. 56r.

⁵⁶ If I have understood this rather complicated transaction, these goods did not appear as Michele's properties because they were already divided in 1452 when Michele made a valuation of his recent purchases (which amounted to 720 gold florins) quite a bargain. In exchange for his portion Michele took land at Quiesa, Bozzano and in the parish of Camaiole (ASL, AG 151, f. 44v).

⁵⁷ ASL, AG 151, f. 45v. These were lands which had previously belonged to Michele di Baldassare Guinigi. It should be remembered, however, that what appear to be transfers of rather large pieces of land were in fact taking place within one family. In other words, the capital for investment in land on a large scale was not to be found except in the hands of a few urban families, who, together with the monasteries, were the only large landowners. More particularly, the circulation of landed property within a single family nucleus seems to call into question the notion of the

with any accuracy the number and size of the properties which came to Michele through this transaction, but it seems to have been the culmination of the process of investment in S. Michele a Matraia which we have described and which had lasted for a number of years. In this locality, then, the land which Michele owned resulted entirely from his own choice, and it is important to be able to establish this without any doubt. But, one asks, was this sudden increase in expenditure which led Guinigi to spend in the course of only two successive years over 60% of the entire sum which he had been investing over a period of some 15 years, totalling some 500 florins, purely fortuitous? The answer, very probably, is no, bearing in mind that the sum promised to Michele as his wife's dowry was 500 ducati⁵⁸ and that this was paid in 1448. But the way in which Michele used his wife, Camilla's, dowry needs to be underlined — in Luccan commercial circles from which he came it was normal for dowry payments simply to be placed with company funds, rather than invested separately in land.⁵⁹

There was a sudden change in Michele's 'purchasing policy' in 1456, the reasons for which cannot be established from the documents. From 1447 to 1455 all his transactions were purchases with a few exchanges, but from 1456 to the year he died the number of deeds become much greater and show a clear prevalence, 11 in a whole of 19, of usurious transactions involving purchases with conditional redemption — Guinigi would lend a certain sum of money to a peasant, and in return the peasant would 'sell' land of approximately the same value to him (although it was normally Michele who decided on the value) while preserving the right to 'repurchase' the land if he repaid the debt within the appointed term (and this was always short — 2,4,⁶⁰ or more often 3 years). Throughout this period Michele receives a 'rent' at a rate previously agreed which in practice constituted the interest on his credit.

It would seem that Guinigi's transactions were very similar to those studied in what has now become a classic article by Saponi on loans made by Florentine merchants in the 14th century.⁶¹ If we examine the underlying economic principles, however, it becomes clear that the analogy with under stated legal conditions hides certain major differences. What the Florentine merchants

merchant family as a *gens*, as an organisation which was shut in on itself. See BERENGO, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-34.

⁵⁸ ASL, AG 151, f. 43v.

⁵⁹ BERENGO, pp. 40-43.

⁶⁰ It was only when buildings were 'assigned' that the period for redemption was longer in one case 8 years, and in another 10. The credit granted in such 'assignment' operations was quite high, and in money terms reached about 20 florins each (the amount was set by Michele) even though they were loans in kind. We shall come back to the problem.

⁶¹ A. SAPORI, 'I mutui dei mercanti fiorentini del Trecento e l'incremento della proprietà fondiaria', in *Studi di Storia economica*, Vol. 1, Firenze 1955, pp. 191-221.

were primarily concerned with was providing credit and thereby employing their capital. The provision of land by the debtor, in the other case, was only the provision of a real surety. This is one of the reasons for the modest interest rates, for the time, which Sapori discovered (varying between 7 and 15%, while covering risk, providing a profit, and making it possible for the capital to be restored). It also explains the 'humanitarian' nature of many of the clauses contained in these contracts and the rarity of cases when the lenders appropriated a pawned surety because the credit had not been repaid. In Michele's operations, of the other hand, the primary interest was that of acquiring land. He was not concerned with getting his capital back once it had provided him with a reasonable profit, but rather with getting the lands of his debtor, and to this end capital was simply a means. Clearly, then, Guinigi went to every length to ensure that his debtor did not redeem the land: the rents were high⁶² and often increased over the term of the loan;⁶³ he was quite inflexible in insisting on repayment within the agreed term, the right of 'repurchase' being forfeit through a single failure to pay on time and even in the case of straightforward delay.⁶⁴

Let us take one case amongst the many. For 4 florins and 23 *bolognini* "di moneta" Antonio Barsugli of Oneta gave Michele a fine vineyard and a piece of woodland measuring over a *coltra*. This took place on January 29th 1460, and Antonio was then obliged to pay immediately at the end of the period which was the most difficult for him, the winter and the spring, the very high rent of two *staia* of corn, because the time within which he had the right of 'repurchase' was short — only two years. It is hardly surprising to read in the margin of the account book "È caduto dalla ricompera per non aver pagato l'affitto". This was a common ending for operations of the type. Out of 15 cases, it was only twice that a debtor succeeded in regaining his land.⁶⁶

⁶² For the level of the rents see below pp. 694-696.

⁶³ There was a particularly good example: Giovanni formerly Andrea and Michele di Antonio known as 'Malcorpo', both of Cune, saw their rent increased from half a gold *libbra* in the first year to a whole *libbra* in the second and third years which they were allowed for the 'repurchase' of an olive grove which they had 'assigned' to Michele.

⁶⁴ An example: Giovanni Bartolomeo of Catureglio on the 11th April 1467 undertook to pay 4 *staia* of wheat a year as interest on his debt 'per tucto il mese di agosto, tracto [the wheat] a Lucha a sua vectura. E chomincia la prima rendita a agosto proximo'. If he either did not pay or did not pay in time 'ipso facto si intenda finita ogni allogagione e finito ogni tempo concedutoli alla ricompra' (ASL, AG n. 151 f. 59r).

⁶⁵ ASL, AG 151, f. 65r.

⁶⁶ In one of these two cases the restitution of the debtor's goods must have stuck in Michele's throat. He had in fact obtained a fine vineyard of about a *coltra* in area at Guercia against a small loan of only 3 florins, and he had noted down: 'E quello

The kind of transaction undertaken by Michele leads one to think not so much of the activities of the Florentine merchants studied by Saporì as of the more aggressive although less easily definable operations of the so-called rural money-lender. These astonishing and well-hated figures who were the pioneers of 'primitive capital accumulation' in the countryside, seemed able to make a profit out of anything, and were deeply embedded in a peasant world which, at the close of the Middle Ages, was forced increasingly to make use of credit as money began to circulate more widely in the countryside. In Michele's case, for example, the sales with conditional repurchase agreements were often the final step to a series of earlier credit operations, the final seal on a highly complex and far-reaching set of activities. The granting of one final credit meant that the indebted peasant was forced to enter into a contract which would cause him to lose his piece of land. Lurking behind the sales with redemption agreements (in fact disguised loans) numerous entries in the sources show that there was a whole series of undisguised loans, although these were generally for the purpose of consumption rather than for investment — to allow a peasant to meet the expense of a marriage, to pay gradually rising taxes, or to cope with the consequences of a poor harvest: the loan of a "giovencho" (bull-calf) or an "instrumento" (instrument, perhaps a plough?), equipment, cash, or, as happened in most of the cases, mixed loans consisting of small sums of money together with corn, wine, oil, millet, barley or lupins.

Through such credit operations, and thanks to certain legal forms which had been developed and acted in his favour,⁶⁷ Michele was able to impose on the peasant debtors a wide range of obligations.⁶⁸ They had to pay rent for land, hand over shares in their crops, and even give labour services. In this manner a finely woven net of chain-mail was stretched over the peasant economy, and a genuine control was established which differed from what had gone before but was no less onerous. In fact, it was when men like Michele, who came from mighty urban families and were determined to employ their capital in the countryside around the city, entered the rural world and made it the base for their economic operations that they necessarily became agents which destroyed previous equilibria. And in practice (even if not at law) new relations of dependence were established in the countryside in this period, which might even include direct personal dependence. In reality the imbalance of power between the rural and the urban world was much too great

più valesse mi donò [sic]. E siami nota che questa vigna fae più di carro uno di vino; buono fondo da ritenerla in perpetuo. (ASL, AG b. 151, f. 61r).

⁶⁷ Cf. G. DUBY, *L'economia rurale nell'Europa medievale* (Ital. edn.) Bari 1970, Vol. II, pp. 393-394.

⁶⁸ Cf. below pp. 693-97. It should also be remembered that the obligation placed on a peasant to bring the goods to Michele's house in Lucca — one frequently found in the sources — was also strictly speaking a labour service.

for the contractual terms which formally⁶⁹ (and this has an importance of its own) regulated every contact between Michele and the peasants to have any real or effective influence. Their central feature was a very real innovation on previous centuries and placed the two parties on an equal footing, but it was precisely this that was nullified in practice. If this was in fact the case, then it is clear that in purely legal terms landownership had a quite different meaning and much lesser importance for men like Michele than it was to have for the "rentiers" of the XVth century.⁷⁰ It gives rise to a further consideration as well. The 800 florins which Michele spent on purchasing land (we can include the sales with redemption agreements under the heading of 'direct' purchases) was not the only or even the most important aspect of his involvement in the rural economy. Beside this we must set mass of capital tied up in usurious activities of one kind or another (cash, equipment, produce), which although difficult to quantify certainly constituted another and powerful means of penetrating the rural economy.

To sum up then, after his family had lost its political power and the probable economic difficulties which followed this, Michele devoted himself mainly to credit operations in the neighbouring countryside and to the management of his estate, giving up his former commercial interests, although his brothers continued in them, albeit probably on a reduced scale. However, it is almost certainly the case that as their wealth and power had originally derived from their agrarian possessions the Giunigis had always kept very close ties with the land and landownership.⁷¹ But Michele's predecessors had been deeply involved in international commercial speculation, had been prepared to take daring and rewarding risks, and had not considered land to be in any sense at the centre of their financial activities.⁷² In a society which was no less subject than in earlier centuries to the problem of subsistence, land was there to provide for the needs of the family, and could alternatively, or additionally, also be used as security for commercial or credit operations.⁷² Men like Michele di Lazzaro, leaders of international trade and banking, invested thousands of

⁶⁹ G. GIORGETTI, "Contratti agrari e rapporti sociali nelle campagne", in *Storia d'Italia*, V, 1, Torino 1973, pp. 704-705 (hereafter GIORGETTI).

⁷⁰ If it was the case that there were many individuals like Michele, then a cadastral map of their property would reveal only a part of the real picture. Conti certainly had this in mind when he placed alongside his statistical tables on the distribution of property in the Florentine countryside in the XVth century a further series of calculations designed to reconstruct the real social and economic status of the peasants (Cf. CONTI, *La struttura...*, Vol. III, Pt II, pp. 11-12). In fact, was there any difference in economic terms between a tenant and a peasant who was still formally the owner of a small property, but who for years was obliged to hand over part of his crop to Michele in settlement of some small debt which he had contracted?

⁷¹ See note 4 above.

⁷² SAPORI, "I mutui...", p. 211.

fiorins at a time in land, but their purchases were not numerous, although large and made up of extensive, centralised estates devoted to the production of specialised crops.⁷³ But when, as in the case of Michele di Giovanni, those activities which were based on land and the peasant economy became of fundamental importance, then the whole picture changed. Instead of purchases to bring prestige, undertaken as a form of alternative investment, Michele's acquisitions were slow but continual, and gradually pieced together tiny peasant properties. This allows us to provide a better explanation for the exaggerated fragmentation of his estates, for this was clearly not only the result of the structure of landownership in the Luccan countryside. It also explains why his operations were mainly made up of very small purchases. The type of penetration which Michele practised clearly called for a considerable understanding of the peasant economy, careful watching of the ways in which even the smallest patrimonial conditions developed, and a determined and speedy ability to intervene at right moment. And these were things which it would have been impossible to develop had the countryside not been the almost exclusive focus of his interest.

It seems clear that on leaving the sphere of major commercial and credit activities Michele's income must have fallen, and that it would have been difficult to offset this as he merely continued to treat land as a simple alternative form of investment. Guinigi might, of course, have simply transformed himself into an agrarian capitalist *avant la lettre*, and have tried to increase his income by increasing production per unit area, by increasing productivity and the commercialisation of agricultural production. But this would have been a 'revolutionary' choice,⁷⁴ and we must ask whether it would have been possible in XVth century Lucca. When one considers the kind of obstacles, the answer would seem to be no. To some extent these were objective, deriving from the structural and economic situation of the period,⁷⁵ from the organization of landed property in the Luccan countryside,⁷⁶ from the political difficulties imposed

⁷³ On Michele di Lazzaro's property see the appendix. However, a purchase made by Michele di Lazzaro at Cune is particularly interesting. For 1700 florins he purchased in 1388 the mountain called the 'Bargiglio' with a castle, "biscoccato", a church, meadows, fields, together with a large field "con più colli" and the mountain "dicto vulgarmente Chatureglio, fructifero e bello, con terre vignate, olivate, campie, prative, silvate, sterpitate et boschive e con più fructi domestici, et con fonti solchi e rivi, dalli quali procede l'acqua che vae verso lo molino posto in del comune di Borgo [a Mozzano]": (ASL, AG n. 151, f. 210r). The zone of Catureglio and mount Bargiglio, 'the eye of Lucca', was of vital strategic importance and had for a long time been allodial property of the Castracani-Antelminelli family. The castle was pulled down by the Republic for security reasons in 1392 or 1393.

⁷⁴ Again see P. JONES, "Per la storia...", p. 323.

⁷⁵ See above n. 45.

⁷⁶ See above pp. 653-65.

by the Republic whose concern for its food supplies is well known and which attempted to prevent any genuinely profitable commercialization of agricultural products from occurring.⁷⁷ There were also subjective obstacles, especially in terms of the attitudes of the time. In fact Michele operated in a very traditional way, following the 'backward' features of his properties which we have pointed out. As a matter of fact he was always trying to increase his income through increasing the cultivable area in his possession (hence the continual purchases of pieces of land without any balancing sales)⁷⁸ and through obtaining more work from his peasants than in the past. In order to do this -- as we have seen -- he resorted to a massive network of usurious operations; but Guinigi was also able to use another mean for increasing the exploitation of peasant labour, the classical mean that landowners have always used, the agricultural lease and its terms. Did he use it? We need to explore this more carefully.

In studying the contracts⁷⁹ in existence on Guinigi's properties we have left out any attempt at providing any purely legal description of the different categories, because this creates major problems and is likely to cause confusion.

⁷⁷ See above n. 46.

⁷⁸ If we exclude the two properties which Michele had to restore to their former owners who managed to settle their debts on time (see note 91), there were only two examples that we know of when Michele sold land: one was a piece of woodland, his only property at Parezzana in the parish of S. Paolo, and the other a quarter share of a house at Anchiano. There is no information for the first on the date or price, but the second was sold for 8 florins & 23 *bolognini* on the 4th Feb. 1458, it being his own share of the house which he had bought in the same year for 8 florins (on 20th Jan.). An indication of Michele's reluctance to sell property is given by the fact that he admitted that he had only sold his share of the house due to pressure from the purchaser who owned the other half, and that he had retained the right to repurchase (ASL, AG 151 f. 63v).

⁷⁹ Information on agrarian contracts is to be found scattered throughout the ledgers and registers we have examined. Generally they are very schematic giving only the name of the lease-holder and referring to the registers entitled '*dei renditori*' (i.e. rent-books) for further details, which means that they are of little use. Only one of these rent-books has survived (ASL, AG 156). This is a bound paper ledger of some 140 pages in quarto, and on the first (unnumbered) page Michele noted: '... In questo libro s'è descritto tucte le alloggioni e li renditori di me Michele..., d'ogni mio bene così di Lucha come del contado, come d'ogni altro luogho... E chiamasi, questo, lo libro D, principiato questo dì tre di giannaio 1457'. The register covers the years 1457-1460, and although the period covered is rather short it is useful because it covers the final period of Michele's activities and means that we do not have to guess as to subsequent developments in the contracts he used. Although the register only starts in 1457 it also contains references to earlier contracts, sometimes as much as several decades earlier. The register abstracts from the full notarial deed essential informa-

It would, for example, probably be quite misleading, and not very helpful, to place in any single legal category the single "livello" contract or the few "ficti perpetui" contracts which appear in the documents, because little but the name survives of the original meaning of such contracts and because they form part of a quite different type of contractual history. Our examination is based on more specifically economic features of the contracts, and the contracts, and the degree of diffusion or otherwise of one or another form of contract has been tied to two fundamental points: the obligatory connection which was almost always created between certain property structures and certain forms of lease, and the extent to which the type of leases used by Michele tend to confirm the picture which we have already drawn of his activities in the countryside.

Throughout Michele's property the dominant form was the short-term lease, but before examining these in detail it is necessary to give a brief survey of the other forms of leases and contracts which were to be found, although to a lesser extent, on Michele's estates, and also to mention those which are noticeable in their absence.

If we leave aside direct, personal involvement in farming,⁸⁰ which is very difficult to identify in the sources and may well not have existed,⁸¹ the first

tion — the names of the peasants, length of the contract, the type and amount of the rent, and any additional conditions.

⁸⁰ The reason is obvious — direct farming left no trace in the sources because it did not create rent income. The work was mainly carried out not by paid labourers taken on for the purpose (although there are some references to them in the sources) but by house servants, for whom cultivation of the land was amongst the many jobs required of them. On the problems involved in studying the activities and economic importance of house servants, see C. M. CIPOLLA, *Storia economica dell'Europa pre-industriale*, Bologna 1974, pp. 121-122.

⁸¹ In the records of Michele di Lazzaro there is the following statement: 'Li ditti pessi [three vineyards at Palaia] si tegnono a nostra mano e lavorali Simone, dito frate Asino, nostro famiglo, e tuto quello che se ne trae è nostro propio' (ASL, AG 151, f. 132v). In our Michele's records there are no similarly explicit references, although the following properties were probably farmed directly: a field at Pedona, a vineyard at S. Gennaro which the previous owner 'held directly' and for which no rent is recorded, and three strips near the city, for which again no tenants are mentioned although it is highly unlikely that they would have been left unlet.

Whatever the case, however, it is clear that this type of management held only a very marginal place on Michele's property. For it to have been more widespread it would have been necessary to increase the number of house servants, and would still have necessitated employing more paid labourers. This was certainly not common practice in late Medieval Tuscany, as witnesses the prevalence of the classical *mezzadria*. On Michele's property there would have been two difficulties to overcome as well: the fragmentation and dispersion of his property would have made the use of paid labour very uneconomic, and would also have run counter to his reluctance to invest directly in farming (which we shall discuss further). Perhaps this explains the absence

thing to be noted is that none of Michele's properties were farmed by share-cropping (*mezzadria*).⁸² The absence of this type of lease, which in contemporary Tuscany formed the principal criterion of agricultural 'modernity', in the Luccan (as in the Pisan) countryside has been remarked on before.⁸³ In the case of Michele's property this was almost certainly the result of the extreme frag-

of direct farming using wage labour on Michele's property, rather than the more general problem of the long-term tendency of rising wages (or wages fixed at high levels) and stagnating prices for agricultural products, because the latter calls into question economic issues which were probably not felt in the Luccan countryside in this period.

⁸² In speaking of *mezzadria* I meant the form of share-cropping contract which has been described, perhaps too ornately, as the 'classical farm'. The *mezzadria* which became established historically as the predominant form of agrarian lease throughout much of Central-Northern Italy until only a few years ago, was the product of a variety of institutions, many of very ancient origin (even in the Roman period there are cases of peasants living on the holding and sharing half of the crops), which converged together to form a single institution — the *mezzadria*. This was the reflection of a more rational organization of the land, involving a functional partnership between capital and labour, which was introduced in to the countryside by economic forces which for simplicity can be described as 'bourgeois', and which was made possible because the peasantry had reached a fairly advanced stage of proletarianization. The fundamental features of the new contract were established very clearly: 'the peasant/tenant lived on the land in a house joining the farm, although this did not form a link between the peasant and the land because he could leave it or be evicted at any time, providing that certain norms relating to the fulfillment of the annual productive cycle had been completed, and the renewal of the contract was tacitly understood unless it was stated otherwise before expiry; the produce was divided in half shares; the supply of capital was generally shared half and half by the owner and the tenant in the case of capital, although buildings were normally supplied wholly by the owner; there were also additional clauses' (M. LUZZATTO, 'Contributo alla storia della mezzadria nel Medio Evo', *Nuova Rivista Storica*, XXXII, (1948), p. 70).

This was the most important thing for those concerned with the real economic meaning of the lease (the advantage of which, for the proprietor, lay in the chance of setting the share due to the tenant at a level which no more than satisfied his needs of subsistence) rather than in the legal disputes over whether the tenant was a partner (*societas*) or a leasor (*locatio*). Although this may have interested and even divided lawyers of the period (and some echoes of this can still be found in some modern studies), it certainly was not of much concern to the peasants directly involved in the *mezzadria*, who greeted the new contract with verses like the following: "Noi ci stian tutto l'anno a lavorare / e lor si stanno al fresco a merigiare; / perché s'ha da lor mezza ricolta / se n'abbiam la fatica tutta noi?" (see CHERUBINI, 'La proprietà...', p. 151). That the new contract was quite different from the various forms that had preceded it and were often brought together in it is evident from the fact that although various elements of the *mezzadria* contract appeared early in the Middle Ages, the *mezzadria* proper remained relatively scarce (see the following note).

⁸³ See L. A. KOTELNIKOVA, "L'evoluzione dei canoni fondiari dall'XI al XIV secolo in territorio lucchese", *Studi medievali*, III serie, IX (1968), pp. 622-623. and G.

mentation of the holdings, as this clearly made it impossible to use a form of lease which was based on the working of an integrated farm unit by a peasant family living on the holding. But in the case of those few pieces of land which were more extensive and concentrated on the Guinigi estates, the absence of share-cropping leases can only be explained by Michele's unwillingness to invest directly in farming by providing the working capital — livestock, equipment, advances to the peasant — normally required in share-cropping leases.⁸⁴ It is possible that M. Guinigi thought more rewarding to use capital in usurious activities. The parts of Michele's property which were more compact and constituted 'farms' in themselves (or at least some of them) were normally leased in some form of participatory contract (*colonia parziaria*) which did not require any capital investment in operating costs. In fact, the 'salani' ⁸⁵ paid for the farm fittings and equipment, and sometimes even a rental on the farm buildings and for pasture on the meadows.⁸⁶ As a result, the share of the produce handed over to the landlord was generally less than half of the harvest,⁸⁷ although in line with the tendency which was fairly widespread amongst landlords operating participatory leases, Michele's share of the produce was made up of the items which were most valuable (and hence most easily sold) such as oil and wine.⁸⁸

CHERUBINI, 'Qualche considerazione sulle campagne italiane fra XII e XV secolo', *Riv. Stor. It.*, LXXIX(1967), pp. 135. For the later period, M. BERENGO, p. 307.

⁸⁴ Although in varying proportions: cf. GIORGETTI, 'Contratti agrari e rapporti sociali nelle campagne', in *Storia d'Italia*, V, 1, Torino 1973, pp. 706-707. (hereafter GIORGETTI).

⁸⁵ In the Luccan dialect of the period the term meant 'tenant farmer' or 'toiler on the land'. Cf. entries in I. NIERI, *Vocabulario lucchese*, Lucca 1914, *sub voce*.

⁸⁶ ASL, AG 151. There are no references to seed, manure, stakes for the vines etc. in the documents, although these must have been at the owner's expense (Cf. G. GIORGETTI, p. 707). Nor is there information on beasts working on the land, but again where they were to be found these would be at the owner's expense. We have already mentioned the chronic shortage of animals in the Luccan countryside and the consequences of this for agriculture. The contracts further confirm this, and show that no livestock was being reared on Michele's land. There were two partnership contracts involving livestock, but neither of any moment: he shared with Matteo Jacopi of Aquilea a two year old heifer which was to be kept for five years "e di poi a partire fructo e capitale" (ASL, AG 156) and Francesco di Benvenuto who leased a 'farm' at S. Bartolomeo at Ciciana was rearing a few animals, mainly pigs, in partnership (ASL, AG n. 156).

⁸⁷ Only Iacopino and Cristofano, 'salani' on part of the farm at Matraia, shared their crops 50/50 with Michele. Salvestro di Michele gave him half his wine and olives, but 'what we have agreed' of his wheat. The peasants at Catureglio gave him half the wine and oil, but the 'chestnuts and fruit at their discretion' while the 'grain and fodder are theirs'. Iacopo son of father Pieri and Giovanni di Andreuccio gave only 1/3 of their oil.

⁸⁸ G. GIORGETTI, p. 773.

On Michele's estates there were three forms of longer-term contracts: two cases of *ficti perpetui*⁸⁹ and one "livello". The latter was for 20 years, and the annual rent paid by the lease-holders, Giovanni di Andrea Massoni and his son Marco, was reasonably low in relation to the size of the property — 24 *staia* for 19 *coltre* — but far from nominal, while many other clauses of the lease were quite onerous for the lease-holders.⁹⁰ Again in the case of the two '*ficti perpetui*', both of which were sited in the area around Cune, a village high in the hills and at some distance from Lucca, the rents were much higher than the more nominal charges which had formerly been made by feudal and ecclesiastical landowners. But it is still interesting to note that even in the mid-XVth century such forms of long-term lease continued to exist even in those areas where urban civilization had firmly established itself.⁹¹ And the fact is even more remarkable if we consider that one of the two "*ficti perpetui*" contracted by Michele was granted *ex novo*.⁹² It is, however, undeniable (as we can see from the data we have examined) that "*ficti perpetui*" tended to disappear as a feature of agrarian leasing.⁹³ In the wake of the growing conception of landownership as something absolute and untrammelled, conception which in the early Middle Ages

⁸⁹ Leases '*ad terminum vitae*', '*ad totam vitam*', or even '*in perpetuum*', of which the oldest form were the *ficti perpetui*, had originally been granted by the Church or the feudal aristocracy, and became the means by which peasant property encumbered only by rent for the land had come into being. The '*dominium eminens*' over land was in fact reduced in practice to the simple receipt of a fixed rent, while *dominium utile* was transformed, although not fully, into a form of ownership. Cf. B. H. SLICHER VAN BATH, *Storia agraria...*, p. 208; G. CHERUBINI, 'La proprietà... etc.', pp. 71-72.

⁹⁰ The contract lapsed if the rent was not paid for two years running, in which case Michele could fix a new rent as he chose and seize the chattels of the tenant (ASL, AG n. 156, f. 114v), or alternatively, evict the tenant and keep whatever improvements had been carried out; costs of the contract were borne by the tenant.

⁹¹ For the 'permanent lease' of a piece of woodland, Vicarello Peglini and his wife owed Guinigi a 'perpetual rent' of 4 *staia* of wheat; for 'strip of land with olives' Giovanni di Andrea owed 'for ever' 1 *staio* of wheat (ASL, AG 156, ff. 43v, 69v).

⁹² Looking through the papers of Michele di Lazzaro we find that permanent leases were more common. What is even more interesting is the discovery that they were to be found not only on peripheral territories like Cune but also close to the city and well within the confines of the Sei Miglia (S. Michele a Matraia, Tassignano, Palaia). There is also evidence of rents which were only paid in part (ASL, AG 151, *passim*), and statements such as the following: "... e così ogni'anno [I have] allogato il pascho come cosa mia; e questo ci pervenne per affitto perpetuo a che c'era tenuto il comune e homini di Palaia, il quale è più di XXXX anni che non s'è facto": (ASL, AG 151, f. 131r). When Michele, for example, bought two pieces of woodland at Matraia which were subject to '*ficto perpetuo*' he made certain from the vendor that 'the land was reserved to them', in other words that he would acquire them as full property.

⁹³ If we assume on the other hand that when the length of the contract was not specified it was for a single year (Cf.: G. GIORGETTI, p. 705), then the percentage fall

had faded out as a consequence of multiple rights appertaining to a single piece of land, contracts of this type were being eroded on two fronts: by the tenants who were keen to seize the first opportunity to do away with any trace of *dominium eminens* and by the landowners who were eager to recover their property and change fixed rents into charges which could be increased.

As for short-term leases, the predominant contracts, as we have said, on Michele's estates, they are best considered in terms of: length of the lease, type and amount of rents.

The position with regard to the length of the leases can be summarised as follows (the contracts for which we know the length of the leases amount to 104):

Length of lease	Number of contracts
1 year	6 (5.7%)
2 years	10 (9.6%)
3 years	31 (29.7%)
4 years	16 (15.3%)
5 years	8 (7.6%)
6 years	12 (11.5%)
8 years	3 (2.8%)
9 years	17 (16.3%)
12 years	1 (0.9%)

Over 60% of the leases were for less than 5 years. Among the longer leases, the largest group (those for 9 years)⁹⁴ were mainly on the land in Pietrasanta, and so it was possibly the case that distance from Lucca was instrumental in the granting of longer leases, together with Pietrasanta's uncertain political situation.⁹⁵ Both factors could have made it inconvenient for these to be frequent changes of tenant. The single 12 year lease was a quite exceptional contract, and was for a '*retaiò*', that is the use of a bird net in a wood belonging to Michele.⁹⁶ No clear pattern emerges of the connection between length of lease and type of farming, although if one allows for numerous exceptions one can detect a certain tendency for leases to lengthen for woodland and olive groves. Even obliga-

considerably and emphasise even more strongly the short duration: 40.6%, 5.8%, 17.9%, 9.2%, 4.6%, 6.9%, 1.7%, 9.8%, 0.5%.

⁹⁴ Their is a clear preponderance of contracts lasting either three years or multiples of three years. Although by no means proof of it, this may well indicate the use of triennial rotation in the region (or at least that part of it in which Michele owned land).

⁹⁵ There are brief but interesting references in BERENGO, p. 17.

⁹⁶ Three bird-nets were leased by Michele, but this is the only one for which the length of the lease was mentioned. The rents were in wheat and were often large, and for the case mentioned in the text the rent was 1½ *staia* of wheat a year.

tions on the tenant to improve the land — which we shall come back to in a moment — were not necessarily connected to longer leases.

In all then, Michele's desire to keep the length of his leases as short as possible is quite apparent. The reasons for this are also clear — it allowed him to keep the ownership of the various parts of his estates firmly in his own hands, guaranteed efficient farming of the land because poor tenants could be replaced, and left the door open for continuous increases in rents. That at least is the theory, but one must ask whether in fact there was a fairly rapid changeover of tenants and whether rents were regularly increased, or whether it was not more normal for the contractual clause allowing for renewal, providing that the owner had no wish to cancel, to come into play. However, on Michele's land 'reallocations' were fairly frequent. In the short period 1457-60 some 28 tenants were replaced, for example. Other periods provide examples which are probably extreme — between 1452 and 1460 one piece of land at S. Pancrazio was leased to a new tenant every year, while a large holding in Cune changed tenant at least six times in 10 years.⁹⁷ Even if this was not always the case, in most of the 28 'relettings' we mentioned, the new tenant had to accept a higher rent, and it was also often the case that a tenant was subject to rent increases when renewing expired leases.⁹⁸ There are also cases when peasants volunteered higher rents than those being paid in order to acquire a lease on a certain strip of land.⁹⁹ Clearly Guinigi was in a position of considerable power, and there was not a single clause in any of the contracts which he made which favoured the tenant or encouraged him to stay — but despite this, and despite the frequent changes in tenants, none of his land ever seems to have been unlet.

It is clear that Michele did not lack tenants to work his land, and one of the reasons for this is to be found in the demographic situation in the Luccan countryside in the mid-XVth century, as the population density must have been very high.¹⁰⁰ In fact although the demographic decline of the mid-XIVth century

⁹⁷ It would be interesting to be able to compare the average length of leases in Michele di Giovanni's time with that in his grand-father's day, but unfortunately the documents on the latter's do not provide information on the length of the leases.

⁹⁸ For examples, on taking out a new lease Cristoforo Pagnone had to pay a rent of 1½ *libbra* of oil in place of the former 1 *libbra*, Lorenzo Bertolini's rent went up from 22 *staia* to 24 and then 27; Agostino & Michele del Pucto from 18 to 22 etc. ASL AG 156, respectively ff. 41v, 79v, 81v). In two cases, however, the rent went down, but in both cases this involved a new tenant taking over a lease.

⁹⁹ ASL, AG n. 156.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. BERENGO, p. 306 & G. BELOCH, "La popolazione d'Italia nei secoli sedicesimo, diciassettesimo e diciottesimo", in *Storia dell'economia italiana*, 1, Torino 1959, p. 474, who gives the following figures for the present provinces of Tuscany: Arezzo 38 inhabitants per km²; Florence 52; Livorno & Pisa 19; Grosseto 8.7; Siena 26; Lucca 92. Beloch's figures come from early XVth century sources and while they provide

had made great inroads even in the Luccan countryside, the position had been entirely restored a century later, and in part this must have resulted from a major wave of immigration which the Guinigi papers also reveal.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, the ease with which Michele was able to find tenants suggests that the Luccan countryside was not so much full of people as of landless peasants,¹⁰² or at least of peasants whose parcels of land were too small to support them, peasants who could survive only by renting other mens' lands. The policies of the ruling oligarchy in Lucca had also contributed to this situation and, even in the periods of major commercial, manufacturing, and banking expansion these had always been designed to maintain a firm control over the countryside and establish strong levers of power there, using the economic power derived from commercial capital in order to exercise a form of monopoly over the land.¹⁰³

All Michele's rents seem to have been taken in kind,¹⁰⁴ and particularly in grain¹⁰⁵ — even in the cases of non-arable holdings.¹⁰⁶ Everything would seem to confirm the absolute predominance of rents in kind in the Luccan countryside which has already been noted as a characteristic in both the preceding period and in that which followed Guinigi's death. But the situation was more complicated in practice, and Michele's accounts show that some rents were

a general indication of the situation in the previous century, the inelastic nature of the demographic structure of the time means that there could not have been a population density of this sort in the Lucca region in 1500 had the situation been very different 50 years earlier.

¹⁰¹ ASL, AG, 151, 156 *passim*.

¹⁰² BERENGO, p. 306.

¹⁰³ L. A. KOTELNIKOVA, "L'evoluzione...", pp. 634, 643.

¹⁰⁴ Excluding the two gold florins paid (one each) by Jacopo and Cardone for some grassland (payment in cash for pasture was fairly frequent and generalised even in areas where rents were normally paid in kind — cf. GIORGETTI), and a similar sum owed for woodland. There are two other cases which are less clear. The first concerns Jacopo di Andrea who paid Michele 2 florins and 8 bolognini, but it is not certain that this was for rent (ASL, AG 156 f. 24v); the other concerns Giovanni di Piero of Pietrasanta who leased land from Michele and paid 8 florins 'rent' and also had to enlarge a farmhouse — there is some doubt, then, as to whether the cash rent was for the use of the house or for the rent of the land (ASL, AG 156, f. 74v).

¹⁰⁵ This raises the question of permanent small peasant properties.

¹⁰⁶ To give some idea of the clear predominance of rents in wheat, these are the amounts of different types of produce which Michele received as rents in a single year 1458: 1350 *staia* of wheat; 5 *carra* of straw; 3 *carra* of wood; 3 *carra* of barley; 25 *staia* of chestnuts; 1 *staio* of nuts; 59 *some* of wine; 225 *libbre* of oil. There was also a special rent of 32 thrushes 'a tempo di Carnasciale' for the lease of a wood.

Out of 167 leases for which the rent is indicated, 119 (30.2%) were in wheat, 8 (4.7%) were mixed and included wheat, 6 (3.4%) were in wine, 10 (5.9%) were in oil, 4 (2.3%) were mixed oil-wine, (5.3%) were in chestnuts, 11 (6.4%) were varied (wood, nuts etc.).

paid at least partly in cash. Further evidence is to be found in the fact that the produce in Michele's barns¹⁰⁷ was always less than the amount owed to him, even if one discounts losses resulting from unpaid rents, as this must have occurred and perhaps quite frequently. It would seem to be established that when payment of rent was fixed in kind this was not fictional — when a rent of 2 *staia* of grain was mentioned, for example, this meant 2 *staia* of grain and not the cash equivalent. But in some cases there were certain factors which encouraged the use of cash payments. One of these was certainly the high level of the rent with consequent arrears in payment which were then settled in installments with interest¹⁰⁸ — and some of these installments were payable in cash.¹⁰⁹ In particular, cash payments seem to have been in Michele's interest. A *staia* of grain which was not paid at the appointed time was then normally paid in cash calculated at the maximum price of grain reached between the end of the harvest and the date on which the rent in arrears were in fact paid, either in whole or in part. In view of the major seasonal fluctuations and of the general tendency for grain prices to rise between the autumn and the harvest of the following year, this meant that the true rent was in fact considerably increased, without causing Michele any discomfort as he still always held large quantities of grain in any case.¹¹⁰

At this point it would be helpful to know more exactly the size of the rent and the percentage of the peasant income which accrued to Michele. Unfortunately it is very difficult to reach any accurate estimates because there was considerable variation between rents in relation to both the size of holdings and the type of crops on them,¹¹¹ so that it is impossible to reconstruct any fixed relationship between rent and area of land or type of farming. Even the obligation to carry out improvements, which as we have seen was not connected with the length of lease, seems to have had no influence on lowering the level of rent.¹¹²

¹⁰⁷ See below, pp. 694-696.

¹⁰⁸ See below, p. 691.

¹⁰⁹ Clearly this raises the whole question of the circulation of money in the countryside, and in particular its availability to the peasants. As far as the sources are concerned (and not only those which are being considered for the present study) one must say immediately that they contain no information whatsoever on this. This is because they all provide a picture of the rural world viewed through the eyes of the landowners, and the peasant world is left in the shadows. As a result we can only put forward suggestions: that is, the peasants could either obtain money through the sale of surplus produce (although this is rather improbable in view of what we have said and will add to) or it might result, from payment for work done as a paid hand, or else it might come from some additional occupation such as domestic manufacture (weaving, spinning, etc.) in which many of the women were engaged.

¹¹⁰ See below, p. 698.

¹¹¹ KOTELNIKOVA, "L'evoluzione..." (pp. 621-622) (also remarks on the great variation in rents.

¹¹² The variations in the rents obviously resulted at least partly from factors which

To give some examples, the highest rent (21 *staia* of grain, about 10 *staia* per *coltra* in view of the size of the holding) was paid for a meadow at S. Bartolomeo in Selci, a place near the city, and the high figure can be explained in terms of the relative scarcity of meadowland in the Luccan countryside, especially as this contract also imposed obligations to carry out improvements¹¹³. A similar rent, however, (about 10 *staia*) was paid for two pieces of arable land at Pietrasanta, although in this case the rent probably also included the farm house.¹¹⁴ At the other extreme was a rent of 1 *staio* per *coltra* for an arable strip.¹¹⁵ But within these extremes the variations were considerable, running from about 3 *staia* per *coltra* up to 7 or more.¹¹⁶ Average rents (although only in the sense that these were the more common) can be placed at around 5 *staia* per *coltra*.¹¹⁷

Bearing in mind that this is very deceptive ground, we can I think put forward some general remarks, although these relate solely to rents in grain for arable holdings, which were however the most frequent and important of the leases on the estates. For this type of land Michele generally received about 3 hl per hectare as an 'average' rent¹¹⁸ sometimes a little less (although not much, except in exceptional cases), sometimes more (and then generally a great deal more). But we should not be misled by the figures, and in particular they cannot be compared with post-agricultural revolution rents. In Michele's time in the Luccan countryside, and bearing in mind the nature of agricultural yields in the later Middle Ages,¹¹⁹ an 'average' rent of this kind meant taking

are now very difficult to identify from the sources (e.g. the fertility of the land, ease of cultivation, state of cultivation, circumstances of the tenant etc.), and there was probably also a certain 'customary' factor influencing rents for certain pieces of land and also the way in which they came to be part of the estate.

¹¹³ This may indicate the value given meadowland in the Luccan region at this time. Its scarcity and the problems surrounding it have been mentioned. It is interesting that of the few rents in cash, one was for a meadow, and this is a tendency which has been remarked on: see GIORGETTI, p. 723.

¹¹⁴ ASL, AG 156, f. 81v.

¹¹⁵ ASL, AG 156, f. 14v. It should be noted that this was far and away the lowest rent for an arable holding, and there may be some error as the measurements supplied by Michele are not very plausible. In the other leases which fall below the 'average' (5 in all) Michele noted 'sono male allogati', or for a piece on which he received 2 *staia* of wheat 'meriterebbe *staia* sei d'affitto'. ASL, AG 156.

¹¹⁶ ASL, AG 156, *passim*.

¹¹⁷ Allowing for the difference in regions and measures, a similar level of rents have been calculated by several authors of later Middle Ages Italian history.

¹¹⁸ After making the necessary calculations with 1 *staio* = 24.42 litres and 1 *coltra* = 0.409 ha.: Cf. A. MARTINI, *Manuale...*, pp. 308-309.

¹¹⁹ On the problem of late Medieval yields, one of the thorniest problems in the agrarian history of this period, see P. JONES, "Per la storia...", p. 319; SLICHER VAN BATH, *Storia ecc.*; G. CHERUBINI, *Agricoltura e società rurale nel medio evo*, Firenze 1972, pp. 10-11. We have used a ration of 1:5 for seed: yield, as is suggested for later medieval farming,

something between a minimum of a third and a maximum of a half or more of the peasant's crop. But from the share which was left to him the tenant had also to take his seed — which given the low yields of the time amounted to 1/5 or even as much as a 1/4 of the entire harvest¹²⁰ — so that even at the very best of times he would be left with half of his crop, and in the worst with as little as a 1/4. The rigid structure of the rents and the fact that allowances were made only in the most disastrous years and even then in terms which were extremely difficult to interpret, meant that the peasant always ran the risk of being left with nothing after he had paid the rent. Clear evidence of this, if the complaints of the tenants carry sufficient credibility to act as proof, is to be found in the difficulties which faced Michele in collecting his rents. It was very rare for a rent to be paid in full throughout the full period of a lease, even more rare for it always to be paid on time without the tenant asking for an extension, or to be allowed to pay over a period, or else offering labour service to work off the debt.¹²¹ But all of these opened up the door to a variety of usurious operations, because the common denominator of such situations was that the peasant was in debt. I do not mean by this the kind of indebtedness that we

and this falls in the middle of the ratios given in the works cited above. In view of the geo-pedological situation of the Luccan region, this may be too high. However, for the purposes of the present exercise it is important to avoid the alternative error of making too low a calculation.

¹²⁰ GIORGETTI, p. 706. These conclusions already show that a very heavy burden fell on the Luccan peasantry. For this reason the figures of rents given by BERENGO, p. 307, seem improbable. He claims that in the slightly later period which he has studied, rents in wheat for arable land were as follow: average rent - 10 *staia* per *coltra*; upper level - 15 *staia* per *coltra*; lower level - 6 *staia* per *coltra* (which he claims was very rare). These estimates imply a rent for the landlord, which, in the case of the 'upper level', would be on a par with those from land after the agricultural revolution. Berengo himself is somewhat perplexed by the figures, and asks what could have been left for the peasant after such shares had been taken from the harvest. I would guess that there are two possible answers: either the sources which Berengo has used (mainly XVth century treatise on agriculture, and therefore 'theoretical' sources) are unreliable on this account; or else the peasants used the strips from which these figures were taken in order to produce crops for the rent, keeping the crops on other strips which they also rented for their own and where they would probably grow inferior cereals.

¹²¹ Reading the sources, it is surprising to find that the peasants did not seem to be aware of their plight. Michele was a very careful observer of his tenants, but only on a couple of occasions is there any hint in his notes of any discontent: Andrea da Corneglia 'lombardo che stae a Ciciana' contested the rent he owed every time it was due, and we find that Michele finally noted with a certain hint of anger: 'costui non stae più a Ciciana e non intende darmi alcuna cosa'. In 1459 Antonio da Vicovaro, from the country around Pistoia, fled without notice after becoming heavily indebted to Michele.

have already seen which followed a delay or failure to pay the rent, but rather the kind of loans which the peasants could not do without because of the precarious nature of the economy in which they lived and because of the sheer impossibility of building up savings from even the slight surpluses that occurred from time to time. On one day, for example, the peasant would need a little money to register a lease, and this would be 'at his expense';¹²² in the event of a wedding he would need to take his wife's dress out of pawn at the bank of the Angel of Gaio;¹²³ in the autumn of a bad year he would need to buy seed. For everything they turned to Michele, who certainly did not need to go out asking. One need only glance at the list of his tenants — 56 of them (more than a third of the total) proved to be indebted to him, and if one adds those in debt for rents the number would be more than doubled.¹²⁴ Sometimes, as we have seen, it was what was left of the peasant's own land which went to meet such expenses, and the debtor then found himself working as a tenant on a piece of land which he had once owned. But there was another method which Michele used to exploit his power as creditor to the full, and this was land improvement. What I mean is that he operated so that the onus for improvements fell mainly on his debtors who were less able to resist than his other tenants.¹²⁵ Of the 36 leases which contain obligations to carry out improvements, at least 21 (nearly 60%) were with debtors. The documents contain no explicit reference to this, but we begin to be in a position to explain why it has not been possible to find any link between improvement and reduction of rent or extension of the duration of the lease.¹²⁶ Throughout the Middle Ages¹²⁷ improvements were means whereby landowners were able to increase their income without investing capital in farming, but simply by exploiting the peasant's surplus la-

¹²² ASL, AG n. 156, *passim*. In addition to paying for registration of the contracts, the tenants also had to pay the tax for transporting the products stipulated in the rent to the landlord. For example, the 'salani' of Matraia had to take the stipulated quantities of wine to Lucca 'a loro gabella et vectura'.

¹²³ In Michele's time only Jews were allowed officially to undertake credit operations against pawn, with interest charges at 40%. Cf. *Inventari del R. Archivio di Stato in Lucca*, I, Lucca 1872, pp. 210-211.

¹²⁴ It was not by chance that the only group of tenants who seem to have been treated generally less harshly by Michele were those of Pietrasanta. Once again the fact that it was distant meant that it was difficult to impose the kind of domination which Michele always strove for.

¹²⁵ The obligation to undertake improvements was virtually a constant feature of medieval leases. For example see G. CHERUBINI, *Qualche considerazione...*, p. 116. However, while earlier medieval leases tended to stipulate sowing of marsh and uncultivated land, in the later Middle Ages the obligation were orientated more towards increasing the landlord's income.

¹²⁶ These are the two typical concessions to the tenant generally found in leases with improvement stipulations.

¹²⁷ C. M. CIPOLLA, *Storia dell'economia italiana*, vol. I, Torino 1959, *Introduzione*, p. 7.

bour. But by imposing the obligation to carry out improvements on his debtors, Michele also succeeded in avoiding the price which other landowners normally had to pay in the form of lower rents or extended leases in to provide the improving tenant with some modicum of security. When the tenant completed the works stipulated,¹²⁸ his rent would be increased. If he succeeded in paying it, Michele would have profited gratuitously from an increased rent-roll entirely at the expense of the tenant, and if he could not pay then Guinigi would simply let the improved land to someone else at a higher rent.

To conclude then, because of the expansion of the urban economy and the predominance of mercantile capital, new forms of agrarian contracts began to spread in the later Middle Ages.¹²⁹ Traditional serf relations and long term emphyteusis leases declined and short-term leases spread. This was a form of contract which constituted a sort of half-way-house between a predominantly subsistence agriculture and capitalist agriculture. It was based on an expansion of commercial activity but also at the same time on the 'market in agricultural products remaining within narrow and mainly local limits',¹³⁰ while the peasant obligations were covered by payments in kind and certain other services, some of which were semi-servile in nature. Although this form of contract does show that some capital was present, it also reflects the landowners' tendency to increase their incomes simply through increasing the amount of labour required from the peasant.

More especially, the near total predominance of leases in the contracts which we have discussed correspond very well with the agrarian structure of Michele's property. The short-term lease is typical of rural property made up of a large number of small holdings. It gives the landowner a certain distance from the business of farming, but also provides an effective means of drawing the land together into a concentrated farming unit, while at the same time showing that that process was as yet incomplete. If it might appear, on the one hand, to meet the tenant's desire for autonomy, it in fact placed great power in the hands of the landowner, thanks in particular to the possibility of changing rents with a frequency that was quite unheard of with other forms of contract which tended to be more heavily circumscribed by traditional practices.

¹²⁸ They could not avoid completing the tasks. These ran from fairly simple operations, which occur quite frequently, such as turning ploughland into plantation, meaning that the tenant must "arborare e vitare", "avitare e affossare", "apiappare e avitare", to more complex, costly and tiring operations: "con pacto che ciaschuno anno debbia mettere in dicte terre piantoni tre afferrati, cioè che quelli che non si afferrasseno l'uno anno debbe supplire di mecterne tanti più l'altro anno". (ASL, AG). There were also measures which amounted to a real plunder of peasant labour, especially those relating to the building of farm shelters etc.: "a ogni sua spesa deve fare una capanna murata d'intorno a calcina e coperta di buon legname e a pagla".

¹²⁹ GIORGETTI, pp. 745-747.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 747.

* * *

At this point it would be useful to have a detailed account of the various types of production, but a series of difficulties make it impossible for us to attempt a comprehensive reconstruction. Production cannot be studied from yields, because we have no idea what these were, so we must start by looking at the size of total harvests. However, we only have information for the years 1443-53,¹³¹ at which time Michele's property differed somewhat from what we have described above.¹³² The greatest problems arise, however, when we come to the relationship between Michele and his tenants. The payment of rents in grain even in the case of non-arable land shows why it was that there was no direct comparison between the produce stored in Michele's barns and the productive capacity of his properties. And although payments in cash, payments in installments and rents in arrears all made it possible for Michele to use credit on a wide scale to establish his power in the countryside, they all serve to distort the overall picture which we receive of his harvests. But if we bear these reservations in mind (and as a result the figures on the volume of crops harvested serve mainly to provide a general relative indication) we can make certain observations. (Table V).

Taking averages, in the period 1443-53 Guinigi obtained from his property every year some 620 *staia* of grain (between 110 and 120 quintals);¹³³ a little over 60 *some* of wine (about 50 hl); about a hundred *libbre* of oil (a little over 400 litres); about 25 *staia* of barley (less than 5 quintals), 20 *staia* of beans (about 4 quintals); some 30 *staia* of millet (more or less 5.5 quintals) a few cartloads of straw and hay, and small quantities of peas, lupins, rye and sorghum.¹³⁴

¹³¹ These are the years which are covered by the two ledgers which contain information suitable for estimating production. They are two *Memoriali* (nos. 154 & 155 of the AG) in paper, quarto, with respectively 177 and 296 pages. The headings for both are the same: "Al nome di Dio, amen. Questo è uno memoriale overo libro di ricordarse di più e diverse cose di me Michele *condam* di Giovanni di Michele Guinigi di Lucha, cominciato questo di primo giannaio anno 1443 (n. 155 has the date 1447) s(opra) s(critto). E chiamasi memoriale C (n. 155 was CD)". There follows an index of the various 'reminders' it contained, and the majority of these were accounts opened with tenants and debtors, almost all of whom were peasants. At the start of each volume, on the first ten pages or so, are yearly figures for the total harvest and, in the case of wheat, information on what was done with it.

¹³² Cf. pp. 255-265.

¹³³ After converting the *staia* into hectolitres I have converted these into the now more familiar measure of quintals, taking a maximum and minimum equivalent (hence the double set of figures for wheat) as 0.75 & 0.80. For this equivalent, the problems it implies and its validity see: D. ZANETTI, *Problemi alimentari di un'economia preindustriale*, Torino 1964, pp. 60-62.

¹³⁴ The amount of produce owed as rent and the figures in the Table do not match exactly, and this is probably due to the chronological gap between the registers used

An Attempted "Reconversion" of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca

TABLE V

Year	Wheat.	Rye	Millet	Barley	Beans	Lupins
	Staia	Staia	Staia	Staia	Staia	Staia
1443	694	5	—	32	13	2
1444	574 1/2	—	11	8	—	—
1445	683	7 1/2	45	31	33	—
1446	722	—	—	12	—	—
1447	761 1/2	—	69	35	27 1/2	—
1448	727 3/4	—	24	27 1/2	13	—
1449	475	—	—	12	24	—
1450	630 1/2	—	—	26	14	—
1451	486 1/4	—	9	40 1/2	15	—
1452	501 1/2	—	41	13	39 1/2	—
1453	582 1/2	—	9	?	21	—

	Peas	Straw	Hay	Sorghum	Wine	Oil
	Staia	Carra	Carra	Staia	Some	Libbre
1443	1/2	—	—	—	60	?
1444	—	9	—	—	46	69
1445	—	—	—	—	54 1/2	64
1446	—	—	—	—	45 1/2	134
1447	—	—	—	—	62 1/4	56 1/2
1448	—	7	1	4	68 3/4	52
1449	—	4	1	—	57	114 1/2
1450	—	7	2	—	59 3/4	174 1/2
1451	—	7	1	—	79 1/2	45
1452	—	6	2	—	74	282
1453	—	6	2	—	77	56

Staio = 24.42 litres; Carro (= 4 some) = Kg. 300; Soma (= 2 barili); Barile (vino) = 40.13 litres; Libbra = 4.01 litres.

In all, a very modest volume (and one which varied greatly from year to year) in view of the size of the property. It is certainly the case that these figures are very approximative, and are certainly lower than the total volume of produce which Michele received. But even allowing for that, they do not add up to very much, and unavoidably lead one to think of the very low yields from seed and probably also of the primitive form of crop rotation which meant that every year large areas of land were left fallow, as well as of the general

here and those on the *Renditori* which cover 1457-60. But in some of the *colonia parziaria* leases Michele referred generally to 'other products' as well as wheat, wine or oil, which would be accepted as rent.

backwardness of agricultural techniques in the Luccan countryside at that time.¹³⁵ The backwardness of the agricultural scene is also borne out by a qualitative examination of the goods which Michele collected. Although the largest shares were held by wheat, wine, and oil, that is to say by the 'richer' items of contemporary diets, we should not forget that we are dealing with the rents of a townsman, because the preference which the upper classes showed for the more prized agricultural products, especially cereals, at this time is well known. This contrasts with the tenants' tendency to grow inferior cereals which had higher yields (although their nutritional value was much lower) and demanded less attention, as a result of their concern to ensure that they had something to eat even if abundance was accompanied by poorer quality. But these too featured amongst the produce in Michele's barns, although in lesser quantities, especially millet and barley,¹³⁶ together with beans, the vegetable that for so long made up an essential part of the diet of the poor. Another indication of the backwardness of the agriculture of the period is the almost negligible quantity of hay, and this also demonstrates the scarcity of meadowland.¹³⁷ During the winter the probably small number of animals were fed on straw rather than fodder plants. A more important place was held by shrub products which were favoured by the climactic and pedologic features of the Luccan countryside, although the large quantity of wine¹³⁸ probably resulted from an indifference to quality.¹³⁹ Michele's casks contained very much less of the white harvest wine (*bianco trebbiano*), the finest wine of the Luccan hills, (only about 1/3 of total, although Michele tended to keep all that was produced for himself), than of the much less highly rated red wine.

How did Michele use this produce? We can only answer with regard to

¹³⁵ Because in so far as the distribution of income was concerned, we have seen that Michele was able to appropriate the lion's share for himself, and that he was favoured in virtually every respect by the social relations of the time.

¹³⁶ As the Table shows, on Michele's property barley successfully held out against the inroads of more 'modern' crops like rye which had arrived from damper climates. The idea that there was a drastic decline in barley production from the early 15th century needs to be checked carefully case by case then. In fact, as well as playing a major part in contemporary diets, barley also influenced the rotational system — barley was grown in biennial rotation with wheat (early barley, fallow, wheat, fallow, early barley etc.) and this was one of the most widespread systems in the Mediterranean throughout the Middle Ages.

¹³⁷ Again we must remember that we are dealing with goods stored by a townsman — it is quite possible, for example, that the greater part of the hay (although there cannot have been much of it) was kept by the tenants to feed their livestock.

¹³⁸ The consumption of wine by the upper classes during the Middle Ages was extremely high, and has been put at two litres and more per head per day. Cf. BERENGO, p. 304.

¹³⁹ Frequent references to wine that had gone bad and been turned into vinegar indicate the poor quality of the wine and its unsuitability for storing.

wheat for which alone there are detailed accounts,¹⁴⁰ but this was also something of a 'pilot' product. A considerable amount was used for consumption — between 115-130 *staia* a year on average.¹⁴¹ Another portion, on average about 300 *staia* a year, was put into commerce. In fact, the phrase is misleading because the wheat that was sold never exceeded a third (and was often much less) of the 300 *staia*, which means that out of the wheat put into the storage barns every year only a very small amount, on average 15%, was put on the market. The rest of the wheat that was used 'commercially' (that is the remaining 2/3)¹⁴² was not put on the market but fed into that credit circuit which Michele had built up in the countryside. We have already discussed this in some detail, and it only needs to be added that when Michele loaned this grain he could, within certain limits of course, charge what he liked,¹⁴³ or else, as more often occurred, he could exchange it for a whole range of services. Of course, to put the low level of Michele's marketing activities in wheat into perspective we must not forget the rigidly protectionist legislation in force in Lucca at the time.¹⁴⁴ This was a major obstacle in the path of the formation of the type of points of profit which in the period of mercantile capitalism constituted the basis on which to organise any extensive cereal trade, which was of course still hindered by the high level of transport costs.¹⁴⁵ But the reasons behind the low level of commercialization of Michele's products cannot be found solely in the policies regarding food supplies which were in force in Lucca in the mid-15th century. In fact, all the features of Guinigi's property which we have described so far point in a single direction, and there is one fact which can be af-

¹⁴⁰ Which makes one feel that the other goods stored were destined entirely for domestic consumption.

¹⁴¹ Which, bearing the rental figure of 1½ *staia* per person per month, leads one to put the size of Michele's household, including family and servants, at about 10.

¹⁴² Apart from 1.0% of this which was set aside for various purposes, for example to widows and monasteries (the wheat given 'for the Lord's sake' as Michele put it), or else to pay the miller for his services.

¹⁴³ During the period in question the highest figure paid for wheat was 8 *bolognini* a *staio*, although in some of his credit transactions Michele charged as much as 12 to 15 *bolognini*.

¹⁴⁴ The regulations of the *Offizio sopra l'Abbondanza* (ASL Ufficio sopra L'Abbondanza n. 1, ff. 5v) laid down that it was forbidden to take out of Luccan territory any quantity 'd'oglio grano farina castagne miglio ovvero d'alcuna altra generatione di biada ovvero legume' or even to sell to foreigners without 'licentia de' signori'. All were obliged to take all their cereals and sell them on 'piazza del grano della città di Luca' and to do so through a 'massaio', that is an agent of the commune whose task it was to regulate prices. Subsequent additions to the initial decree (in 1447 and 1452) stiffened the penalties for those who contravened the regulations (which leads one to think that they were not always observed).

¹⁴⁵ Before the advent of differential tariffs, so-called 'poor' goods (from the point of view of transportation) like cereals had to sustain very high costs.

firmed without any shadow of a doubt: in turning to landed property, unlike his forebears, Michele had no intention of introducing a greater degree of commercialization into the marketing of agricultural products. There is one single indirect but decisive proof of this, and that is that the amount of wheat in his barns which he either consumed or marketed did not amount to even 2/3 of the total. The remaining 200 *staia* a year or more, on average, although the amount tended to increase, were used as 'investments through fear'¹⁴⁶ — that is, set aside and stored. This of course shows that we are a very far cry indeed from the type of dynamism requisite of any meaningful commercial development. Stored supplies gave rise to direct costs, the cost of storage and the loss of whole or part of the stock through deterioration,¹⁴⁷ and also indirect costs such as the lost earnings from the capital which was tied up in this way,¹⁴⁸ even though some defence of such action could be made in terms of 'economic rationality'.¹⁴⁹ In fact, if the importance attached to keeping reserves was a function of the intense fluctuations between harvests and of the degree of inelasticity in the structure of demand,¹⁵⁰ then it is easy to understand why it was that in the Middle Ages (given the continual fluctuation of harvests) the accumulation of reserves was to be found on the largest scale precisely where the structure of demand reached the highest degree of inelasticity, in other words in the cereal sector.

If we now turn back to the problems of that 'return to the land' which we raised at the start, it seems clear that the example of Michele di Giovanni Guinigi does not conform to any of the three hypotheses we referred to. He

¹⁴⁶ This apt phrase comes from C. M. CIPOLLA, *Storia economica dell'Europa pre-industriale*, Bologna 1974, p. 68.

¹⁴⁷ When Michele visited his barns he often found bitter surprises awaiting him: "Perdesi... st. 255 grano tra in polvere e rosime, e credo una parte rubbato"; "Trovomi di mancho, in polvere e male mizure, circha st. 37 grano". Michele was also permanently engaged in a silent battle with his peasants over the measures which he received and which we have not been able to touch on. It was very rarely that he did not have further words on this or that he did not complain of 'rotten mixtures' when he checked quality. The problem is far from unimportant and impinges on the whole relationship of strength between the different classes. Needless to say the *rasatura* of the *staio* was officially laid down in a chapter of the ordinance of the *Offizio sopra l'Abbondanza*. (ASL Officio etc., n. 1, f. 12r). On the problems of the *colmatatura* and the *rasatura* cf. U. TUCCI, 'Pesi e misure nella storia della società' in *Storia d'Italia*, Vol. v, Turin 1973, pp. 581-612. But the original pioneer of this new but genuinely historical type of metrology is W. KULA, *Problemi e metodi di storia economica*, Milan 1972 (1st Polish edn 1963), pp. 497-538.

¹⁴⁸ C. M. CIPOLLA, *Storia economica*, p. 154.

¹⁴⁹ See W. Kula's theoretical discussion in W. KULA, *Problemi...*, pp. 497-538.

¹⁵⁰ CIPOLLA, *Storia economica...*, p. 152.

certainly did not approach land ownership with purely speculative motives, but we should perhaps be wary of talking simply of the immobilization of capital. Michele's activities in the countryside were dynamic as his operations as a rural moneylender witness. But were such forms of activity adequate to compensate for the drop in income following his abandonment of large scale credit and commercial affairs? Probably not, since they were conducted within the confines of entirely traditional parameters, and were basically designed to achieve purely and simply an increase in the amount of landed property and a more intensive exploitation of peasant labour. However, such activities show that as yet a more calm attitude towards 'rents' was neither in Michele's interest nor his bearing, because there was still work to be done to build up his 'estate'. In fact, we can still only detect in indistinct outline behind Michele the so-called 'fanatics for broad acres',¹⁵¹ the Luccan *rentiers* of the 16th century who were unable, neither by means of the reemergence of noble privileges or through the elegance of their country-houses to disguise the fact that they had been pushed aside from the main circuits of the European economy in which their forbears had for centuries played a vital role.

¹⁵¹ The apt phrase which we use for the second time is from E. LE ROY LADURIE, *I contadini...*, p. 166.

APPENDIX I

LEASORS OF PROPERTY

TENANTS OF PROPERTY IN LUCCA¹

Piero da Noceto	1 year	1 country house	f. 16 larghi
Tonico di Petracciuolo	3 years	1 house	f. 4½
Nicolao di Orsuccio Bacci	?	1 house	f. 5
Matteo Divini "testore"	?	1 house	f. 1½
Frediano di Michele	1 year	1 house	f. 5
Lisabetta di ser Ant. da Massa	?	1 house	f. 8
Meo di Biagio Mei	3 years	1 shop	f. 3
Frate Iacopo Salvestri	?	1 house	f. 3
Sita serva de' Rapondi	?	1 house	f. 1
Matteo di Bart. Bernardini	?	1 basement	f. 2
Domenico di Iacopo	5 years	1 house	f. 4
Iacopo di Giov. Galganetti	?	1 shop	f. 5
Bartolomeo di Giovanni	?	1 house	f. 22
Orlando di Salvestro	?	1 house	f. 5
Nicolao di Tomeo tintore	?	1 house	f. 1½

TENANTS OF PROPERTY OUTSIDE LUCCA

Ser Urbano Dacevoli	? Pisa	1 house	l. 48
Gualtieri della Alamagna	? Borgo a M.	1 house	f. 3
Piero di Bangione	? Pietras.	1 house	f. 2

(1) The amount of the rent is for 1 year; the figures in the first column give the length of the lease, and this was often tacitly renewed.

An Attempted "Reconversion" of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca

APPENDIX II

LIST OF LEASORS OF LAND IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

M = Improvements stipulated
 D = Debtor (for reasons other than rent)
 R = New lease

TYPE OF LEASE: SIMPLE RENT *

a) Length of lease: 1 year

Giul. e Domen. di Marco			?	st. 12 gr.
Andrea di Paci	D	R	1 prato c. 4 p. 278	st. 21 gr.
Duccino di Antonio			2 arat. c. 1 p. 94	st. 7 gr.
Bernardo di Giovanni	D		2 arat. p. 150	st. 1 gr.
Iacopo di Pasquino			2 arat. c. 2	st. 10 gr.
Nicolao di Stefanello			1 pr. 1 ar. ?	st. 4, 5, 6 gr.

b) Length of lease: 2 years

Antonio di Giovanni	D		vari c. 4 p. 115	st. 12 gr.
Domenico di Iacopo	M	D	R vari c. 4 p. 230	st. 21 gr.
Bartolomeo Dominichi	D		1 bosco ?	st. 1½ castagne
Pellegrino di Iacopo	D		vari ?	st. 1¼ gr.
Bartolomeo di Michele	D		2 boschi ?	st. 2 castagne
Iacopo di Giusto	D		1 ar. e capanna ?	st. 3 gr.
Simonetto di Nero	D		1 bosco ?	32 tordi
Bartolomeo di Landi			vari ?	lib. 3 olio
Pellegrino di Simone			1 ar 1 pr. ?	st. 16 gr.
Francesco di Antonio			1 ar. arb. ?	lib. ½ olio

c) Length of lease: 3 years

Bartol. di Ilarecto		R	vari ?	st. 3 orzo, poi 2 gr.
Bartol. di Puccino	D		2 arat. ?	st. 2 castagne secche
Bartol. di Martino	D		2 arat. ?	?
Ser Antonio da Galiano			1 arat. ?	?
Giov. di Francesco	D		vari ?	st. 1 gr. lib. 1 olio
Giovanni Arrighi	D	R	1 vigna ?	st. 1½ gr.
Antonio di Antonio	D		1 ar. arb. p. 150	lib. ½ olio
Iacopo, Card. e frat.			erbatico	f. 1 d'oro ciascuno
Salvestro da Matraia			casa a Matraia	some 2 vino
Agostino di Michele Massei			1 arat. ?	st. 4½ gr.
Andrea di Lunardo	M	D	2 arat. p. 147	st. 2½ gr.
Id.			1 retajo	st. ½ gr.
Nicolao di Banduccio	D		1 bosco con ret.	?

* For English equivalents of the descriptions of the type of land see Table at end of Appendix 3.

Sante Polica

Paolo di Luporino			1 bosco c. 30 con ret.	?	
Servo di Iac. da S. Paolo			2 arat. c. 2 ¹ / ₂	st. 3 gr.	
Michele di Pietro		D	vari	st. 7 gr.	
Marco di Biancalana			1 ar. 1 pr. ?	st. 4 gr.	
Nanni Massei		D	vari ?	st. 4 gr., poi 5	
Michele di Ciaramassa		R.	1 arat. c. 2	st. 10 gr.	
Antonio Iohanni			2 arat. ?	st. 4 gr.	
Benedetto Pucci			1 podere ?	?	
Giov. di Paolo Nardi		M	1 podere ?	st. 63 gr.	
Simo di Bonaccorso			1 ar. arb. ?	st. 6 gr.	
Domenico di Bianchino		D	1 arat. ?	st. 3 gr.	
Filippo di Frediano			2 arat. c. 1	st. 2 gr.	
Antonio di Guelfo		D	1 prat. ?	st. 2 gr.	
Giusto di Marco		M	R. vari c. 12	st. 64 gr.	
Id.			1 prat. ?	st. 6 gr.	
Martino di Giusto		R.	?	st. 75 gr.	
Guaspari di Bartolomeo		R.	?	st. 23 gr.	

d) Length of lease: 4 years

Matteo Iacopi		D	R. 1 uliv. ?	lib. 1 olio	
Matteo Vannucci		M	R. vari c. 14	st. 75 gr. 1 carro	paglia
Piero di Corsino		M	vari ?	st. 15 gr.	
Frediano di Giovanni			1 vigna ?	some 3 vino	
Bartolomeo Dorchi			1 arat. ?	st. 1 ¹ / ₄ gr.	
Iacopo Cardone e frat.			1 selva ?	f. 1 d'oro	
Marco Puccinelli			1 arat. c. 1 p. 44	st. 2 gr.	
Benedetto di Ant. di Borgo			1 arat. p. 114	st. 1 gr.	
Andrea di Lunardo		M	boschi c. 1 p. 230	st. 1 ¹ / ₂ gr.	
Antonio Iohanni		M	1 arat. ?	st. 1 gr.	
Niccolò di Biagio		D	vari ?	st. 66 gr. 1 carro	paglia
Francesco Anthoni			1 vigna ?	soma 1 vino, poi barili 3	
Id.			1 ar. arb. ?	lib. 1 olio	
Bartolomeo di Puccino			1 ar. arb. ?	st. 4 gr.	
Id.			1 bosco ?	st. 2 castagne	
Nanni di Nanni		M	D. 1 ar. arb. p. 371	st. 2 ¹ / ₂ gr., poi 3	

e) Length of lease: 5 years

Andrea di Giovanni		M	1 arat. ?	st. 4 gr.	
Antonio di Puccino		D	R. vari ?	st. 5 gr.	
Michele di Ant. Dini		D	1 arat. ?	st. 1 ¹ / ₂ gr.	
Iacopo di Benedetto		M	D R. ? ?	st. 2 gr.	
Niccolò di Biagio		D	1 pod. ?	st. 69 gr. 1 carro	paglia

An Attempted "Reconversion" of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca

Francesco Anthoni	M D	2 arat.	?	st. 1 gr.	
Pino di Puccino		D	1 arat.	?	st. 1 gr.
Masseo di Lippo	M D	1 arat.	?	st. 42 gr.	

f) Length of lease: 6 years

Pietro di Giovanni	M	2 arat.	?	st. 9 gr.	
Giovanni di Domenico		1 bosco c. 3 p.	115	st. 2 gr.	
Lario di Giglio	M	1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.	
Urbano di Matteo	M D	1 arat.	?	st. 1/2 gr.	
Domenico Arrighi	M	vari	?	st. 6 gr. some 3 vino lib. 4 1/2 olio	
Bartolomeo Pieri		vari c. 9 1/2		lib. 10 olio	
Cristofano di Antonio		1 ar. arb.	?	lib. 1 olio, poi 1 1/2	
Pellegrino di Piero		D	vari	?	st. 12 gr. some 9 vino lib. 5 olio
Andrea Iacopi		1 ar. 1 oliv.	?	lib. 2 olio	

g) Length of lease: 8 years

Pasquino di Mart.		2 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Ant. di Mich. Massei		1 prat. p. 403		st. 2 gr.
Orso Bonagiuncti		2 ar. e casa c. 3 1/2		st. 35 gr.

h) Length of lease: 9 years

Domenico Benatucci		R	1 arat.	?	st. 15 gr.
Ant. di Dom. Benatucci		R	?	?	st. 17 gr.
Giovanni Francisci		R	1 arat.	?	st. 10 gr.
Orso Diodati	M		1 arat.	?	st. 5 gr.
Domenico Petri			1 arat.	?	st. 1 1/2 gr.
Nic. di Giov. Tolomei			1 arat.	?	st. 3 gr., poi 4
Piero Vannucci			1 arat.	?	st. 1 gr.
Iacopo di prete Pieri		D	1 bosco	?	st. 3 gr.
Antonio di Bartolomeo			boschi	?	carra 3 legna secca
Antonio di Matteo	M	R	?	?	st. 12 gr.
Biagio di Paolo	M		1 ar. arb.	?	st. 3 gr.
Domenico Iohanni			1 arat. p. 227		st. 2 gr.
Francesco di Giusto			1 casa e terre	?	some 2 vino
Giov. di Manfredecto	M D		parte pod. Matraia		st. 1 1/2 gr., poi 2
Pietro di Antonio	M D		1 prat.	?	st. 21 gr.
Lorenzo di Nanni			1 ar. arb.	?	st. 22 gr., poi 24, poi 27

i) Length of lease: 12 years

Bartolo. di Giunta		D	1 retaio		st. 1 1/2 gr.
--------------------	--	---	----------	--	---------------

Sante Polica

1) *Length of lease: unspecified*

Antonio Bartholi		1 ar. arb.	?	st. 6 gr., poi 8
Antonio Bectuuci		1 arat.	?	st. 30 gr.
Puccinello "bastaio"		1 arat.	?	st. 4 gr.
Ser Nicola Barsuglini		1 arat.	?	st. 3 gr.
Giovanni di Orso		1 ar. e capanna	?	st. 10 gr.
Ant. di Giov. di Riviera		1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Pietro di Giovanni		vari	?	st. 100 gr.
Giusto di Marco	D R	?	?	st. 75 gr. 1 carro di paglia
Marco di Antonio	R	?	?	st. 2 gr.
Matteo Vannucci	R	2 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Giov. di Manfredecto		1 bosco	?	st. 3 castagne
Michele di Pieretto		1 bosco	?	st. 3 castagne
Mariano di Benestanti	R	1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr./coltra
Michele e Girol. da Magl.	R	1 uliv.	?	lib. 1½ olio
Luca di Andrea		1 arat.	?	st. 4 gr.
Biagio di Nicolao Cinelli	R	?	?	st. 1½ gr.
Bartolomeo Iohanni		1 arat.	?	st. 1½ gr.
Tano di Sancti	M D	1 ar. arb.	?	st. 10 gr.
Bart. di Antonio		2 arat. c. 2		st. 2 gr.
Cristofano di Antonio	R	1 ar 1 pr. c. 2	p. 115	st. 3 gr.
Antonio di Anselmo	R	?	?	st. 3 gr.
Simone di Nanni Vanni	D	1 arat.	?	st. 3 gr.
Luca Iacopi	R	1 arat. p. 290		st. ½ gr.
Antonio di Iacopuccio		1 pr. 2 ar. c. 2		st. 5 gr.
Niccolò di Biagio	M D	1 prat.	?	st. 11 gr.
Andrea di Paci	M D	1 prat. c. 2	p. 115	st. 2 gr.
Tofanello di Luchecto		1 arat. p. 345		st. 2 gr.
Bart. di Antonio		1 arat. p. 366		st. 2 gr.
Domenico Arrighi		vari	?	soma 1 vino
Bart. di Mart. Bartolomei	D	1 vigna	?	soma 1 vino
Andriolo di Domenico	M D	1 arat.	?	st. 4 gr.
Marco di Nello	M	vari	?	st. 4 gr., 6 cast. e 1 noci
Domen. Iacop. e Cristof.		2 arat. c. 1½		st. 3½ gr.
Masseo di Lippo	M D	1 prat.	?	st. 18 gr.
Piero di Stefano		1 ar 1 pr.	?	st. 18 gr., poi 2
Giov. di Nicol. Vannucci	M R	1 pr.	?	st. 12 gr.
Michele di Antonio		1 uliv.	?	lib. 1 olio, poi
Bartolomeo da Catureglio		1 iliv.	?	lib. 3½ olio
Marco Nicolai		1 ar. arb.	?	st. 2 gr.
Antonio Iohanni		2 ar. (?)		soma 2 vino
Bartolomeo di Guido	M D	1 arat. c. 6		st. 24, 1 carro paglia
Giul. e Paoletto		vari	?	?
Giovanni di Iacopo		vari	?	st. 14 gr.
Bandino Bandori	R	1 arat.	?	st. 4 gr.

An Attempted "Reconversion" of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca

Simonetto di Nero	M D	vari	?	st. 6 gr.
Lorenzo di Niori		1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Andrea di Granuccio		1 arat.	?	st. 1 gr.
Bartolomeo di Niccorino		1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Piero di Giovanni		1 ar. arb.	?	st. 10 gr.
Matteo di Regolo		1 arat.	?	st. 2 gr.
Paolo Bragi		2 arat.	?	st. 5 gr.
Andrea di Iacopo		vari	?	st. 1 gr.
Lario "lombardo"		1 arat.	?	?
Giovanni di Manfredocto		1 vigna	?	st. 1½ gr.
Id.		1 bosco	?	st. 3 castagne
Iacopo di Fanciello		3 arat. c. 1 p.	115	st. 4 gr.
Nuto di Domenico		vari	?	some 2 vino
Bartolomeo di Lando		1 arat.	?	st. 1 gr.
Antonio di Bartolomeo		2 boschi	?	st. 1½ gr.
Simone di Pellegrino		vari	?	st. 21 gr.
Antonio Vanni	D	vari	?	st. 3 gr. some 3 vino
Domenico di Michele		vari	?	st. 12 gr.
Giovanni di Piero.	M	1 arat.	?	f. 8 di moneta
Guglielmo "chatalano"	D	?	?	st. 12 gr.
Agost. di Giov. del Pucto		1 ar. arb.	?	st. 18 gr., poi 22

APPENDIX III

MICHELE DI LAZZARO'S PROPERTY (LAND)

TYPE OF LEASE: "FICTI PERPETUI"

Vicarello Peglini e Vannella	1 selva	st. 4 gr.
Giovanni Andree	1 ar. arb.	st. 1 gr.

TYPE OF LEASE: AFFITTO DI LIVELLO

Giovanni di Andrea	20 years	5 arat.	st. 24 gr.
--------------------	----------	---------	------------

TYPE OF LEASE: COLONIA PARZIARIA (variant on share-cropping)

Domenico, Iacopino e Cristof. Iacopino e Cardone	1 pod. (parte) vari	metà dei prodotti metà dei prodotti (escl. cast. e frutta)
Iacopo di prete Pieri	9 years	1 uliv.
Salvestro di Michele	6 years	1 pod. (parte)
Marco di Antonio	6 years	1 pod. (parte)
Giovanni di Andreuccio	3 years	vari
Bertone di Benvenuto	non specified	vari
		1/3 olio
		metà vino e olio; quote di altri prod.
		come sopra
		1/3 olio
		quote variab. dei prodotti

SUMMARY OF MICHELE DI LAZZARO GUINIGI'S LAND *

S. Concordio	1 arativo arborato	3	
	1 arativo arborato		?
S. Stefano a Verciano	1 arativo arborato	1	
	1 bosco e prato	2	
	1 arativo arborato con casa	4	
	1 arativo arborato con casa	6	
S. Filippo	1 arativo arborato	3	
	1 arativo arborato	5	
	1 prato	2	
	1 bosco	1	2
S. Bart. in Selci	1 arativo arborato	2	
	1 arativo arborato con casa	4	
S. Margherita	1 arativo		3
Tassignano	1 arativo arborato	1	
	1 arativo	3	
	1 bosco		2
	1 arativo arborato		?
Pieve di Lunata	1 arativo		?
			10

* For English equivalents see general table at the end of this appendix.

An Attempted "Reconversion" of Wealth in XVth Century Lucca

	1 arativo arborato		?
	1 terreno non spec.		?
Capannori	2 arativi		?
Palaia	1 arativo	1/2	
	1 arativo		271
	1 arativo		242
	1 arativo	1	
	1 arativo	1	3
	1 arativo	1/2	
	1 arativo	1/2	
	1 oliveto		89
	1 arativo		183
	1 arativo		114
	1 arativo		213
	1 arativo		291
	1 arativo		3
	1 arativo	1	
	1 arativo		106
	1 arativo		236
	1 arativo		205
	14 arativi	1/2	
	14 arativi		?
	13 vigne e oliveti		?
	16 appezz. boschivi		?
Castelvecchio	1 arativo		190
	1 arativo		248
	1 arativo		120
	1 arativo		?
Colle	5 boschi		?
	1 arativo arborato		97
	3 arativi		?
	1 oliveto		114
	1 oliveto		164
	1 oliveto		226
	1 oliveto		26
	1 oliveto		140
	1 oliveto		
S. Andrea a Compito	1 selva		82
	1 castagneto		166
	1 castagneto	1	1
Matraia	5 arativi arborati		
Coreglia	monte "Bargiglio"		?
	podere a Catureglio		?
	2 vigne con casa		?
Località non precisate	52 arativi arborati		?
	21 arativi		?
	22 boschi		?
	13 appezzamenti colt. spec.		?

