Foreigners in Quattrocento Rome*

EGMONT LEE

Renaissance Rome owed most of its splendor to men and women who were not Romans. Among the patrons who after a long time of troubles launched Rome's rehabilitation, newcomers vastly outnumber the city's native sons. Only one of the Renaissance popes was born into a Roman family. The overwhelming majority of cardinals were non-Romans, with a large minority from beyond the Alps. The same is true for those curialists who possessed the resources – and the inclination – to act as patrons. Also the artists and architects who built, sculpted and painted in Rome, the scholars who wrote and taught there, and the scribes and miniaturists who produced manuscripts for Rome's libraries were for the most part *forestieri*, who had come to the city in search of profitable employment. This dynamic elite of powerful, wealthy, creative and generally interesting foreigners was responsible for transforming a delapidated and culturally backward city into Europe's first *cit lumire*. But in addition to them, Renaissance Rome attracted less conspicuous newcomers: "Slavic" market gardeners, German bakers and shoemakers, Lombard weavers and builders, and more or less specialized workmen from throughout Europe. Individually, most of these foreigners remained obscure. But collectively, their presence in large numbers helped to give Rome its distinctively cosmopolitan character.

Their numbers seem indeed to have been significant. Around 1547, the Roman chronicler Marcello Alberini wrote, "Chiara cosa , che la minor parte in questo popolo sono i Romani ..." ("It is clear that among this people [i.e., the residents of Rome] the Romans are a minority ...").¹ Though Alberini's remark was not intended as a statistically accurate observation, it contains a substantial element of truth. Modern historians agree. Jean Delumeau was "frapp(s) par l'lment non romain" in the city,² and Peter Partner describes Renaissance Rome as "a city of immigrants."³

The picture of Rome as a centre of immigration does not come as a surprise.

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies in Halifax, N.S., in May, 1981. The research on which it is based has received generous support from the University of Calgary Research Grants Committee, which is gratefully acknowledged.

In the turbulent decades of the late fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth, Rome's population seems to have shrunk to an all-time low of approximately 25,000. This situation was reversed with the return of the papacy to the city. Beginning in 1420, and more decidedly after a hiatus of about two decades, with the return of Eugenius IV in 1443, Rome's population grew again, and rapidly, to reach the level of approximately 55,000 to 60,000 by the third decade of the sixteenth century.⁴ In a period when most urban centres seem to have depended on immigration even to sustain their populations at a stable size, such growth could be achieved only through migration on a comparatively large scale.⁵ In addition, Rome had special attractions. The bureaucratic and service requirements of the Curia, its international character, and the large number of visitors who came to the city on business at the papal court or on pilgrimages ensured that a continuous stream of foreigners from throughout Europe descended upon Rome year after year. Often visitors became temporary residents, and sometimes they established permanent roots.

For some newcomers, settling in Rome meant severing all direct ties with their places of origin. For others, the change was less extreme. The Tuscan bankers and Neapolitan tailors who established their residence in Rome were, of course, on far more familiar ground, and were looked upon as less alien, than the German bakers or Spanish barbers who, like them, had not been born in the city, but whose speech and habits set them apart from their Italian neighbors. Nevertheless, Italians and ultramontanes to some degree shared the common status of "foreigner," i.e., non-Roman, reflected in the fact that the contemporary Roman records in which they appear routinely add a place of origin to their personal names.

Much less is known about immigration to Rome than the importance of the subject might suggest, and it will be some time before this situation is corrected. What follows is meant to throw light on only two of the major questions that eventually must be resolved. These are:

1. the basic question of extent of immigration and numbers of people. How numerous were the immigrants among Rome's inhabitants? Even if we cannot arrive at accurate numbers (and perhaps should not attempt to), what orders of magnitude should we accept as realistic?
2. how to visualize the social world of the foreigners or non-Romans who resided in the city. To what extent, if at all, were their personal contacts circumscribed by national communities? Or, conversely, to what degree did they merge into a "Roman" society, abandoning their national identities in a "Roman melting pot"?

Any inquiry into immigration to quattrocento Rome is bound to be an imprecise undertaking. In part this is because documentation is less than comprehensive. No municipal census survives for the fifteenth century, nor

do we have complete – or even extensive – fiscal or court records. The documents we do have in large numbers are notarial acts, and these pose their own problems. Apart from this, we normally know of the origin of individuals from the way in which they are named in the surviving sources. Quattrocento personal names often raise more questions than they resolve. The haphazard combination of elements (Christian name, father's name, family name, nickname, profession, area of residence, and perhaps origin) does not encourage one to be confident that in any single instance one confronts a person's complete name. Even where places of origin are given with some consistency (as they are in notarial records), interpretation is often problematical. Does "Prosie" or "Prusie" refer to Perugia or Prussia? Just how much diversity is hidden behind the term, "S(c)lavus"? And one is rarely fortunate enough to discover from which "Castro" or "Castello" an otherwise unknown individual may have come.⁶

Many of these ambiguities are not likely to be resolved. A strong element of imprecision will therefore remain, even if we should be able to develop much clearer answers to some of the basic questions that are as yet unresolved. These questions range from the broad theoretical problems surrounding migration in general to specific issues, such as the exact status of foreigners residing in Rome, or a more refined set of distinctions between different categories of "foreigners" and "Romans." Clearly a number of specialized inquiries are needed. It may nevertheless be useful at this point to leave such questions in suspense and to approach immigration to Rome by categorizing the city's population in a broad and pragmatic way. Without claim to excessive accuracy, one might divide the population of Rome into three large groups:

1. Non-Romans, including Italians as well as ultramontanes, who in describing themselves indicated a place of origin other than Rome and who were accordingly described in contemporary documents. Within this broad category one must, of course, distinguish many subdivisions, and important ones. But all members of this group, diverse as it may be, were not considered, and did not consider themselves, fully integrated into the society of Rome.
2. Established Roman families, who in the documents of the time were often not defined as such. That contemporary notaries or censustakers or paymasters or, for that matter, local chroniclers did not bother to specify that individuals whom they knew as Romans were indeed "de Roma" is hardly surprising. If anything, the opposite would be what we should find extraordinary. But in addition to old and well-known families, this group also contained more marginal figures. It blends, in fact, into the third group, which in Rome was particularly numerous.
3. Those residents who no longer were easily identified as foreigners, with-

out necessarily having been absorbed by the older and more unambiguously Roman part of the population. It is easy to see why someone who did not impress, for example, the compiler of the 1526 census as a foreigner would not be recorded as one. Naturally, there are risks in this assumption. Censustakers, or even notaries, did not work with machinelike precision. But in the vast majority of cases, I believe, the fact that an individual was not described as a Slav, a German, or a Florentine means that he or she had shed the most obvious characteristics of such foreigners and had reached some level of assimilation into Roman society.

This division of Rome's population emphasizes the comparative closeness between the second category (established Roman families) and the third (partly assimilated newcomers). As commonsensical and unhelpful as this may appear, this point has a fair degree of importance. It may, in fact, help in overcoming some of the serious distortions in estimates of proportions between Romans and non-Romans that have often been accepted in historical literature.

Statistics regarding the population of Rome are tenuous in the extreme. The first reasonably reliable document to illuminate the population of Renaissance Rome is the census prepared shortly before the sack of the city in 1527, a census which, *Rione by Rione*, named the heads of all households within the city and added the number of *bocche* in each.⁷ A mechanical addition of these figures suggests that Rome's residents altogether numbered 53,897. There are, however, reasons to believe that this count is lower than the actual population, and that Rome had somewhere between 55,000 and 60,000 inhabitants in the mid-1520s.⁸

For earlier periods, evidence is more ambiguous. It has commonly been assumed that Rome's population reached its low point in the two or three decades around the year 1400, but estimates for this period have ranged from as low as 17,000 to as high as 50,000. For several reasons, Julius Beloch's figure seems the most persuasive: c. 25,000 around the turn of the century.⁹

Over the fifteenth century, increases were not evenly distributed. One should most likely conceive of the dynamics of population growth as a period of stagnation up to c. 1420, followed by moderate increases up to c. 1440, and more rapid growth beginning with the return of Eugenius IV to Rome. Immigration, it seems, accelerated even further after the Jubilee of 1450. If this is so, the third quarter of the century, the years from 1450 to 1475 or 1480, was the period in which the arrival of new residents made its most marked impact on the city. Very approximately, the overall population may in those years have grown from between 30,000 and 35,000 to around 45,000.¹⁰

If the overall population of Rome is known with only a low degree of certainty, our confidence in grasping how large a fraction of the city's residents were foreigners is even less securely founded. Most estimates are

derived from the 1526 census. This document indicates a place of origin or an ethnic affiliation for less than half of all heads of households, altogether for 3,865 of 9,324. 370 of those identified were Jewish, with no specific indication of origin. Of household members, the census gives only a number, in rounded figures for the larger households. In the strictest sense, we thus know where 3,495 individuals – less than 7% of Rome's inhabitants – came from. There is, moreover, nothing to encourage us to accept this group as a "reasonable sample" of the city's population. But since no other evidence is readily available, this small minority has normally been used as the basis for various statistical analyses. Thus Delumeau calculated that only 16.4% of the city's population were native Romans or born in the city's immediate environs, whereas 63.6% came from the rest of Italy, including the islands, and 20% from other parts of Europe.¹¹ With slightly different assumptions, Peter Partner estimated that approximately one quarter of the population resident in Rome had been born either in Rome or the Roman Campagna, whereas 55% came from other parts of Italy. Almost 20% were born outside Italy.¹² A city of immigrants, indeed.

This picture is, I believe, somewhat misleading. Expressed in absolute figures, Partner's estimate places the "native" population in 1527 at approximately 15,000. Delumeau suggests about 9,000.¹³ Either way, the number of native Romans would be considerably smaller than the 25,000 who, it seems, inhabited Rome in the 1390s, before immigration had begun to make an impact. Such a sharp reduction of the indigenous population over a period in which the total number of inhabitants more than doubled is difficult to accept.

It may be more reasonable to look at the same evidence from a different direction. We may remind ourselves that we often cannot distinguish between Romans of old but less than prominent families on the one hand, and well assimilated immigrants on the other. If we accept this fact and refrain from doing what we cannot do, we may instead envision a large group of residents who were "Romans" in the minimal sense that they were permanent residents of the city and not associated with any other place of origin.

That this approach is not unreasonable appears also from the first preliminary results of a systematic study of notarial acts drawn in one of Rome's thirteen *Rioni* over the period, 1450 to 1480.¹⁴ The 250 contracts that so far have been analyzed have yielded the names of approximately 1,100 different persons. Of these, only some 280 are identified by origin, approximately one quarter of the total. Only 21 of this small group are described as being from Rome, 59 from the region of Rome, and as many as 190 from the rest of Italy. 31 individuals are from outside Italy. The most striking aspect of this breakdown, however, is that a place of origin is given for only one of every four individuals named in the records.

For our purposes as for many others, notarial records in general, and especially the notarial records of Rome, must be approached with caution.

They are more representative of the total population than the summary figures of the 1526 census, in that they include not only the heads but also the members of households, among them women and children. But in other respects they cannot be taken entirely at face value. Most surviving cartularies contain the acts of notaries who appear to have been Romans. We know, however, that a large number of non-Italian notaries practised in Rome, and it seems likely that they were commonly patronized by their compatriots.¹⁵ The documents now found in Roman archives may therefore under-represent the number of foreigners in the population of Rome. It is difficult to correct for this bias, since, on the one hand, it is quite clear that some non-Romans did patronize Roman notaries even when the transactions to be recorded involved them and one or more co-nationals. On the other hand, there is, of course, no way of knowing how many records of foreign notaries have been lost.

Deceptively accurate statistics have been built on weaker foundations, but it would be futile to create the false impression of precision where none exists. Very approximately, then, in rounded figures and with adequate margins of error, the composition of the population of Rome in the third quarter of the quattrocento may be conceived as follows:

- between 50% and 70% “Romans” in the wider sense, including members of indigenous families as well as established and thoroughly assimilated immigrants
- between 5% and 15% more recent newcomers from the region of Rome, whose absorption into urban society was comparatively easy and quick
- between 20% and 30% new residents from other parts of Italy
- between 5% and 20% newcomers from the rest of Europe.¹⁶

Although developed independently, these proportions are entirely compatible with those that emerge when the same assumptions are applied to the 1527 census – that is, if those heads of households for whom no origin is given are considered “Romans” in a loose and functional sense. 68.7% of the city’s 9,324 non-Jewish households are headed by “Romans” (including persons identified as natives of Lazio), 24% by Italians from other regions, and 7.3% by non-Italians.¹⁷

This adjusted picture still leaves one with the overriding impression that Rome was a city of non-Romans, in which close to half of the population could be identified as not coming from Rome itself. But it avoids the extremes of other estimates, which reduce the native element among Rome’s inhabitants to exceedingly small dimensions. Nor does it, on closer inspection, contradict Alberini’s well-known assertion that only “la minor parte” among the city’s residents were Romans. One must remind oneself that Alberini’s chief concern in the pertinent passage is to explain why Rome’s resistance to

the imperial troops that sacked the city in 1527 was so ineffective. It is in this context that he speaks of a multitude of "vagabondi de diverse nationi," who had nothing to lose if Rome fell and who therefore showed themselves "avidì del male et turbulentia della città." This is hardly a dispassionate comment on the ethnic composition of Rome's population.¹⁸

If we accept that a large number of residents were "Romans" who, although born elsewhere, had lost all conspicuous associations with their place of origin, then we should expect that in Renaissance Rome the assimilation of immigrants was easy and comparatively quick. At first glance, this conclusion seems to contradict strong evidence to the contrary.

In the fifteenth century, as at other times, foreigners in Rome maintained a strong corporate identity. Typical were the "national" hospitals or hostels, which normally incorporated chapels and churches. The best known are those of the Spanish, French, Bretons, Germans, English and Slavonians, but there were also hostels and churches of the Florentines, Genoese, Lombards, and a number of others. Most were maintained by fraternities, which took responsibility for financing, management, and operations.¹⁹ These corporations not only survived through the fifteenth century, they seem in fact to have been particularly buoyant toward the end of the century and in the beginning of the sixteenth. Several sizeable building projects reflect this fact.²⁰

In addition to charitable foundations and national churches, some organized groups of foreigners maintained economic associations, craft guilds open only to their own ethnic group. The best case in point is the two German guilds, one of bakers and the other of shoemakers. Both were in existence before 1420, and both tried to protect not only the economic interests of their members but also the survival of German culture among them.²¹

Even in the absence of formal corporations the practice of individual trades tended to fall under the domination of individual groups of non-Romans. What is more, this trend seems to have progressed and expanded in the second half of the century. The best example is printing, which before 1500 was almost a German monopoly. A few Italians were involved, notably Giovanni Filippo de Lignamine, but they were clearly exceptions.²² The small Roman cloth manufacture was similarly dominated by German and Lombard weavers, who arrived in Rome in the 1430s.²³ Among the less skilled workers, many of the labourers in the port of Rome seem to have been Slavs.²⁴ And the more specialized building trades were by 1475 dominated by craftsmen from Northern Italy (Lombard builders and Tuscan stonecutters) to a degree unheard of forty years earlier. Indeed it seems that as the fifteenth century wore on, non-Romans in Rome increasingly worked with others like them – Tuscans with Tuscans, Lombards with Lombards, and Germans with Germans.²⁵

In addition, groups of common origin may to some extent have been held together by the hostility of others that they experienced in common. From

what little evidence exists, there seems to have been fairly widespread ill-will directed against specific groups, especially against those who had arrived in Rome recently expecting exceptionally generous patronage by a pope of their own nation. This was a common pattern in Renaissance Rome. In the pontificates of Calixtus III and, even more, Alexander VI, the Iberian colony in Rome increased dramatically. After the election of Pius II, Sienese in large numbers descended on the city, as did Ligurians under Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII. The chronicler Infessura speaks with unconcealed bitterness of the preferential treatment given such newcomers.²⁶ It is perhaps not surprising that violence against them regularly followed the death of the pope responsible for their coming. The Spanish community, for example, furnished some of the victims in the turbulence following the death of Alexander VI, just as warehouses of Genoese merchants had been plundered after the death of Sixtus IV.²⁷ And one does not need to read much between the lines of the Roman diarists to detect suggestions of hostility – latent or otherwise – against specific national groups. Favourite targets were the Spanish and the Corsicans, and many of the diarists regularly identified the culprits of violent crimes as “a certain Spaniard” or “a group of Corsicans.”²⁸ But there are also suggestions that hostility was more widely based. When, for example, Antonio de Vascho tells us that in 1484 a band of Colonnese robbed every foreigner (*forastiero*) passing by S. Angelo and only let their own partisans go unscathed, there seems to be some suggestion that at least certain Romans harboured a more general sense of xenophobia.²⁹

It is evident that a number of forces worked against the assimilation of foreigners into Roman society. They were real enough. Their effect can be seen in the ways in which some non-Romans living in the city arranged their private lives. One example is the case of the German widow Margarete, who was a servant in the household of Sixtus, a German baker, when she drew up her last will in 1477.³⁰ In it, she left all her meager belongings (including the wages that Sixtus had failed to pay her) to the German Society of the Campo Santo, for pious works already under way “pro anima sua.” Clearly, Margarete moved in a circle of co-nationals. So did Clara of Bosnia, whose first and second husbands were both compatriots. Like many Slavs in Rome, her first husband had leased a *vigna* from its Italian owner, an arrangement Clara inherited. But when her second husband showed no interest in working the land, she had the lease transferred to yet another co-national, Franciscus Iacobi.³¹ Non-Romans often married within their own group,³² and at times even very modest transactions took place exclusively among co-nationals. The four men who on March 11, 1476, met in Piazza S. Celso for a loan of a single papal ducat were all from Canobio on the Lago Maggiore – lender, borrower, and two witnesses. Only the notary who recorded the transaction was a Roman, and the formal document he drew up illustrates that doing business with one’s compatriots in preference to others did not mean that one had to trust them implicitly.³³

But this picture of apparent cohesiveness within groups of common origin must be seen against the backdrop of a great deal of assimilation. The pressure to assimilate must have weighed especially heavily on non-Italians, who in order to function in everyday life had in any case to depart from strict adherence to their own national cultures. In fact, one wonders whether the organized and conscious attempt to preserve important aspects of non-Italian cultures was not to some extent an effort to prevent the inevitable. The guild of German bakers tried, for example, to oblige its journeyman members to take employment only with German-speaking masters.³⁴ Naturally such rules illustrate the guilds' determination to maintain German as what we would call the "language of the workplace." But the guilds' concern does seem to imply that in the absence of such rules, Italian would naturally have replaced German.

Again, notarial acts give us many examples that in important relationships the borders of ethnic groups were easily transcended. The Spanish barber Alonso Pinto, for example, employed a notary six times in the space of nine months when setting up a new barbershop in an indissoluble partnership with his son and two Italian colleagues.³⁵ Practically all the terms under which the partnership was established proved unworkable and, one by one, were amended. But Alonso carried his two Italian partners through all the legal complexities of re-organization. It turned out eventually that Alonso's son was the one to leave the shop, and his place was taken by a third Italian barber.³⁶ Business relations between Italians from different regions were commonplace.³⁷ Equally commonly, fathers and mothers apprenticed their sons with masters from other parts of Europe.³⁸

If contacts in business and work often crossed ethnic boundaries, they did so in personal matters as well. Although endogamy was common, we know of marriages between residents or their children from outside Italy and Italian spouses.³⁹ To settle disputes with their neighbours, non-Italians normally, and perhaps of necessity, turned to Italian arbiters and procurators.⁴⁰ Finally, the divisions between people of different origin were sometimes bridged in relationships of extreme trust. For example, a Polish widow, Anna' Appollonna' of Cracow, sought material security by giving away, *inter vivos*, all her property in exchange for a promise of food, shelter and clothing. She thus established her dependence not on an ultramontane family but on a certain Iacopo Piccinino of Capranica.⁴¹

Occasionally one is able to glimpse a richer picture of the social networks and of the mixture of old loyalties and new that must have been shared by many non-Romans residing in the city. One particularly characteristic example may stand for many. Pietro Passarini "de Schiavonia" of the region of Udine died in Rome in 1475. His brief will established his widow Ateresia as his universal heir.⁴² The following year Ateresia herself drew up a much more detailed will of her own.⁴³ In it she honoured her husband's wishes by making his nephew her universal heir and by arranging for her burial next to him in S.

Maria Araceli and for a common commemorative stone. Then, to fund a number of charitable bequests, she drew up an inventory of debts owing to her and of money she owed to others. Her debtors and creditors included a Corsican neighbour, a goldsmith from Viterbo, the wife of a teamster of unknown origin, a Milanese neighbour, a scriptor in the papal penitentiary from Urbino, several Florentine banks, and the Roman bank of the Massimi. Altogether, her contacts made a heterogeneous group that included comparatively few Romans and no identifiable compatriots.

Ateresia's charitable bequests were extensive. She provided modest dowries for three orphans. One of these was a Slavonian girl named Caterina, who was living with her at the time. The only other charitable bequest that recalled Ateresia's origins was the gift of a bed to the hospital of S. Girolamo degli Schiavoni. But this bequest was overshadowed by similar ones made to the hospital of S. Lazzaro *extra moenia* and to the old and wealthy Roman hospital of the Santissimo Salvatore ad Sancta Sanctorum. All of Ateresia's bequests to churches went to churches dedicated to the virgin: to S. Maria Della Quercia near Viterbo, to S. Maria Araceli, S. Maria della Consolazione, S. Maria del Popolo, and to the Chapel of S. Maria della Febbre in St. Peter's Cathedral.

More clearly than poorly-supported statistics and the bylaws and activities of corporations and fraternities, Ateresia's bequests give us an insight into the allegiances of at least one long-time resident of Rome. In the face of death she did not abandon all links with her and her husband's origins. But it is clear that her sense of pious devotion to the virgin outweighs her loyalty to specifically "Slavic" institutions. In the end Ateresia made her own contribution to some of the major churches of Rome. If it is true, as Alberini claimed, that Romans came to be a minority in Renaissance Rome, it is equally true that, at least in good measure, foreigners not only helped to build and adorn Rome but themselves became Romans.

University of Calgary

Notes

- 1 Marcello Alberini, "Diario," ed. D. Orano, *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria* (henceforth = *ASRSP*), XVIII (1895), 344.
- 2 Jean Delumeau, *Vie économique et sociale de Rome dans la seconde moitié du XVe siècle*, I, Rome, 1957, 197.
- 3 Peter Partner, *Renaissance Rome, 1500–1559* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1976), p. 75.
- 4 These figures were first suggested by Karl Julius Beloch, *Bevölkerungsgeschichte Italiens*, II (Berlin and Leipzig, 1939; retp. 1965), 1–8. Beloch's good sense and balanced judgment have stood up to detailed criticism, as is evident from the unpublished thesis by Vera M. de Haas, "Urban Development in Renaissance Rome: The Rioni Ponte and Parione, 1450–1480" (University of Calgary, 1979), pp. 67–70. Regarding the dynamic of population growth in the fifteenth century, cf. also Torgil Magnuson, *Studies in Roman Quattrocento Architecture* (Figura, 9) (Stockholm, 1958), pp. 14–15, and Carroll W. Westfall, *In This Most Perfect Paradise: Alberti, Nicholas V, and the Invention of Conscious Urban Planning in Rome, 1447–55* (University Park, Penn., 1974), pp. 63–67.

- 5 Concerning patterns of growth and "natural decline" in urban populations of early modern Europe, see now Allan Sharlin, "Natural Decrease in Early Modern Cities: A Reconsideration," *Past and Present*, 79 (1978), 126–38.
- 6 Regarding such difficulties in the interpretation of the 1526 census, see Delumeau, I, p. 198. In a more general way, and with reference to English documents, the uncertainties of assessing population mobility on the basis of individuals' names are discussed by Peter McClure, "Patterns of Migration in the late Middle Ages: The Evidence of English place-name Surnames," *Economic History Review*, 32 (1979), 168.
- 7 The census was published by Domenico Gnoli, "Descriptio Urbis o censimento della popolazione di Roma avanti il sacco Borbonico," *ASRSP*, 17 (1894), 375–520; for an extensive analysis, see Delumeau, I, pp. 197–220. I have not yet seen the study announced by Partner, *Renaissance Rome*, p. 75 n. Most figures derived from the census will require slight revisions in the light of my forthcoming new edition of the document, to be published in Rome (Bulzoni), 1984.
- 8 The census was conducted shortly before the sack of the city by the troops of Charles V, and after a significant number of residents had already left Rome in search of safety. In addition, it seems likely that the census was compiled to allow precise calculations of the amount of grain needed to feed the city, and that it therefore excluded very young children. See Beloch, II, p. 8.
- 9 Cancellieri suggested 17,000 as the population of Rome in 1377, a figure accepted by some modern scholars for the time of Martin V's return to Rome. See Gnoli, "Descriptio Urbis," p. 376; cf. Westfall, *Paradise*, p. 63. Beloch's calculations, *Bevölkerungsgeschichte*, II, pp. 2–3, are based on the best available evidence and on comparatively cautious interpretations. They have been accepted by a number of scholars, including Magnuson, *Studies*, p. 14. Pio Paschini, *Roma nel Rinascimento* (Storia di Roma, 12) (Bologna, 1940), p. 4, accepts 17,000 with reservations.
- 10 These figures are, of course, no more than rough estimates. For changes in the demand for housing, and for shifts in the occupations of new residents which may reflect changes in immigration patterns, see Anna Maria Corbo, "I contratti di locazione e il restauro delle case a Roma nei primi anni del secolo XV," *Commentari*, 18 (1967), 340–42; *idem*, *Artisti e artigiani in Roma al tempo di Martino V e di Eugenio IV* (Rome, 1969), pp. 185–92, and her "I contratti di lavoro e di apprendistato nel secolo XV a Roma," *Studi Romani*, 21 (1973), 469–89. Magnuson, *Studies*, p. 14, places the population at mid-century at c. 35,000, whereas Westfall, *Paradise*, p. 66, prefers c. 40,000.
- 11 Delumeau, I, pp. 198–9.
- 12 Partner, p. 75
- 13 A total population of 60,000 has been assumed for Partner, who, pp. 81–82, suggests that the 1526 census under-represents the city's population during the decade or so preceding the sack. 55,000 was used for Delumeau.
- 14 For what follows, see also my "Notaries, Immigrants and Computers: The Roman *rione* Ponte, 1450–1480," forthcoming in the proceedings of the symposium on "Private Acts as Sources of Social History," held in Rome, June, 1980.
- 15 See J. Lesellier, "Notaires et Archives de la Curie," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, L (1933), 250–75, and cf. Karl Heinrich Schäfer, "Deutsche Notare in Rom am Ausgang des Mittelalters," *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft*, 33 (1912), 719–41. Concerning the "natural" preference of non-native residents for notaries of a similar background, see Marino Berengo, "Lo studio degli atti notarili dal XIV al XVI secolo," *Fonti medioevali e problematica storiografica*, I, Rome, 1976, 167.
- 16 Assuming 1) that of 1100 named individuals all those not identified by origin as well as those who are specifically named as Romans can be classified as "Romans" in the wider sense, 2) that newcomers from the region of Rome are mildly under-represented (by an arbitrarily chosen factor of 2:3), 3) that Italians from other regions are under-represented by a factor of 1:2, and 4) that non-Italians are under-represented by a factor of 1:5 would yield a ratio of approximately 10 "Romans" : 1 regional : 4 Italians : 2 foreigners.
- 17 The figures underlying this calculation are those of Delumeau's table, I, following p. 198.
- 18 Alberini, "Diario," p. 344. The passage in question is normally quoted without any reference to its context.
- 19 See Paschini, *Roma*, pp. 456–64, Partner, pp. 105–11.
- 20 See the discussion of such projects as the building of S. Giacomo degli Spagnoli, S. Giovanni de'

- Fiorentini, S. Luigi de' Francesi, and S. Maria dell' Anima in Ferdinando Castagnoli, Carlo Cecchelli, Gustavo Giovannoni and Mario Zocca, *Topografia e urbanistica di Roma* (Storia di Roma, 22) (Rome, 1958), pp. 351, 382–3, 388, 392; see also Vincenzo Golzio and Giuseppe Zander, *L'Arte in Roma nel secolo XV* (Storia di Roma, 28) (Rome, 1968), pp. 159–62. There is a fine discussion of S. Maria dell' Anima from its foundation to 1523 in Clifford Maas, "The German Community in Renaissance Rome, 1378–1523," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (University of Wisconsin, 1971), pp. 156–247. At the time of writing I have not yet been able to consult the posthumous publication of Maas' study.
- 21 See Maas, "German Community," pp. 23–40, on the German shoemakers' guild, and pp. 41–46 for the guild of the bakers.
 - 22 Concerning German printers in Rome, see Konrad Haebler, *Die deutschen Buchdrucker des XV. Jahrhunderts im Ausland* (Munich, 1924), pp. 89–103. See also Ferdinand Geldner, *Die deutschen Inkunabeldrucker*, II (Stuttgart, 1970), pp. 29–61, and cf. British Museum, *Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century Now in the British Museum*, IV (London, 1916; rept. 1963), *passim*. For Lignamine, see my *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters* (Rome, 1978), pp. 99–105.
 - 23 Maas, pp. 59–60; Anna Maria Corbo, "I frati lombardi e l'arte della lana a Roma alla metà del secolo XV," *Rassegna degli Archivi di Stato*, 31 (1971), 657–76.
 - 24 Delumeau, I, p. 205; Partner, p. 77.
 - 25 See my "Workmen and Work in Quattrocento Rome," *Rome in the Renaissance: The City and the Myth* (Binghamton, N.Y., 1982), pp. 141–52.
 - 26 Stefano Infessura, *Diario della città di Roma*, ed. O. Tommasini (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 5) (Rome, 1890), pp. 157, 176, 177.
 - 27 Infessura, pp. 16, 177; Johann Burchard, *Liber notarum*, ed. E. Celani, *RR. II. SS.*, XXXIII, pt. 1, vol. II, Città di Castello, 1907–42, pp. 356, 359.
 - 28 Infessura, pp. 124, 168, 216; Burchard, II, pp. 218–20, 359; Sebastiano di Branca Tedallini, *Diario Romano*, ed. P. Piccolomini, *RR. II. SS.*, XXIII, pt. 3, Città di Castello, 1907–11, p. 305; Antonio de Vascho, *Diario della città di Roma*, ed. G. Chiesa, *RR. II. SS.*, XXIII, pt. 3, Città di Castello, 1911, p. 544.
 - 29 Antonio de Vascho, pp. 514–15.
 - 30 Archivio di Stato di Roma (= ASR), Collegio dei Notari Capitolini (= NC), tom. 1313 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 41. Cf. my "Notaries, Immigrants, and Computers," cited above, n. 14, for this and some of the following documents.
 - 31 ASR, NC, tom. 1314 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 112. The act is dated March 29, 1475.
 - 32 See, e.g., the documents cited in the two preceding notes, and ASR, NC, tom. 1313 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 36; tom. 1314 (*idem*), f. 96.
 - 33 ASR, NC, tom. 1313 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 38 (March 11, 1476).
 - 34 Maas, "German Community," pp. 41–2.
 - 35 ASR, NC, tom. 1314 (Gaspar Pontanus), ff. 83, 85, 97, 98, 105, 106, dated between March and December, 1474.
 - 36 *Ibid.*, ff. 105, 106 (December 8 and 20, 1474).
 - 37 ASR, NC, tom. 1313 (Gaspar Pontanus), ff. 9 (January 26, 1473), 13 (April 30, 1473); tom. 1314 (*idem*), ff. 84 (March 7, 1474), 90 (April 4, 1474), 103 (October 29, 1474), 119 (August 18, 1474), 130 (November 11, 1475); tom. 1651 (Ioannes Baptista de Scuttis), ff. 23 (December 4, 1470), 77 (June 8, 1472).
 - 38 ASR, NC, tom. 1651 (Ioannes Baptista de Scuttis), ff. 24 (December 7, 1470), 40 (February 28, 1471), 77 (May 16, 1472), 241 (April 11, 1476).
 - 39 ASR, NC, tom. 470 (Notary unknown), f. 40 (August 23, 1470); tom. 1314 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 110 (January 31, 1475); tom. 1651 (Ioannes Baptista de Scuttis), f. 131 (June 12, 1473); tom. 1729 (Ioannes Matthias de Taglientibus), f. 70 (October 21, 1480).
 - 40 ASR, NC, tom. 1314 (Gaspar Pontanus), ff. 103 (October 29, 1474), (110 January 31, 1475), 119 (September 24, 1475).
 - 41 *Ibid.*, f. 46 (September 28, 1472).
 - 42 *Ibid.*, f. 118 (July 1, 1475).
 - 43 *Ibid.*, tom. 1313 (Gaspar Pontanus), f. 36 (December 16, 1476).