



Pious Landlords: Confraternal Landownership in 1561 Florence

Natalie Majda

Volume 33, Number 1, Spring 2022

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1100293ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/confrat.v33i1.41098>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

1180-0682 (print)

2293-7579 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Majda, N. (2022). Pious Landlords: Confraternal Landownership in 1561 Florence. *Confraternitas*, 33(1), 4–86.

<https://doi.org/10.33137/confrat.v33i1.41098>

Article abstract

This article maps and analyses patterns of confraternal land ownership (commercial and residential) using public data made available through DECIMA's WebGIS tool that maps the 1561 Decima ricerca among other historic documents. Analysis of confraternal property data identifies social, economic, and spatial organisation patterns and use of property to support charitable work, supplement group funding, house staff and members, and more. GIS mapping of DECIMA data allows for 1561 Florentine confraternal property ownership to be mapped city-wide, creating opportunities for new and exciting academic examinations and testing of theories such as laudesi versus disciplinati geographic spread. All article maps have public links below the map descriptions which may be used to explore, manipulate, and draw from embedded 1561 Decima ricerca data as desired.

© Natalie Majda, 2023



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

Pious Landlords: Confraternal Landownership in 1561 Florence

Natalie Majda

Summary: This article maps and analyses patterns of confraternal land ownership (commercial and residential) using public data made available through DECIMA's WebGIS tool that maps the 1561 *Decima ricerca* among other historic documents.¹ Analysis of confraternal property data identifies social, economic, and spatial organisation patterns and use of property to support charitable work, supplement group funding, house staff and members, and more.² GIS mapping of DECIMA data allows for 1561 Florentine confraternal property ownership to be mapped city-wide, creating opportunities for new and exciting academic examinations and testing of theories such as *laudesi* versus *disciplinati* geographic spread.³ All article maps have public links below the map descriptions which may be used to explore, manipulate, and draw from embedded 1561 *Decima ricerca* data as desired.

In 1561, on the Borgo San Friano in Santo Spirito, Francesco di Niccolo, a *fornaio* (baker), rented his home for eighteen *scudi* a year.⁴ He shared his home with four unnamed men and one woman, presumably his wife and

¹ I'd like to thank all who helped me achieve this milestone. To Dr. Nicholas Terpstra, thank you for your generous encouragement and support through this iterative project. Our collaboration on this work began pre-pandemic when I originally prepared a version of this as an independent study supervised by Dr. Terpstra. Since then, I have had the pleasure of seeing the project evolve and collaborating further by working through and assessing the confraternal property data together. I'd also like to thank my partner, Jacob Belluz, and my mother, Beata Majda, for their endless support. It takes a village.

² Should the reader have any questions regarding the article and/or its data, please contact Dr. Nicholas Terpstra at decimatoronto@gmail.com.

³ The *Decima ricerca* is a city-wide property census detailing demographic, economic, and spatial information for all properties in Florence, conducted as part of Duke Cosimo I's new ten percent property tax. The *Decima ricerca* consists of four residential property volumes (one for each city quarter) and one commercial property volume. Citations will reference the *Decima ricerca* (part of the *Decima Granducale*) found in the State Archive of Florence (*Archivio di Stato di Firenze*, hereafter, *ASF*). It will also reference the associated volume (i.e., 3780 (S. Spirito), 3781 (S. Croce), 3782 (S. Maria Novella), 3783 (S. Giovanni), 3784 (Botteghe)) and the entry number (ex: 2023). For more information on the *Decima ricerca* and the DECIMA project, see <http://www.decima-map.net>.

⁴ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 2023.

children.⁵ His landlords were the Compagnia di San Frediano also known as “la Bruciata”, one of Florence’s oldest and largest laudesi confraternities, originating in the local neighbourhood in 1321.⁶ Just around the corner, where the Canto al Leone meets the Piazza del Carmine, the Compagnia di Sant’Agnese nel Carmine (otherwise known as Sant’Agnese) housed six widowed women “senza pagamento, amore di dio” (“without payment, [for the] love of God”)⁷ despite the home being valued at ten scudi, highlighting the unique economic and charitable living arrangement between the company and their widowed tenants.⁸ Florentine residential property ownership during the mid-sixteenth century included the extensive and diverse landholdings of confraternities that intimately shaped living patterns and social experience in their neighbourhoods.

The 1561 census prepared for a new property tax known as the “Decima” recorded demographic and financial data for all commercial and residential property within the city walls. This article will analyse the socio-economic data and map the spatial distribution of Florentine confraternal properties in 1561. The Decima census, known as a “ricerca” allows us to tabulate and map property according to which confraternity owned it, where it was located, how much the property was valued and rented/leased for, who the tenants were (name and occupation), and whether the property was rented, leased, or provided for free in exchange for the tenant’s service to the company (“per servizio”) or as charity (“per amore di dio”). It will compare this data against privately-owned (i.e., non-institutional) property data as a marker of general market data. Along the way, it will test questions about whether the use of property for charity was related to the company’s property portfolio size, and whether confraternal properties aligned or diverged from the general property market patterns in 1561 Florence.

This article will use geographic information system (GIS) mapping tools and digitized census data made available through the digital mapping project known as DECIMA (Digitally Encoded Census Information and Mapping Archive) to map, analyse and highlight Florence’s confraternal residential and commercial property ownership patterns on a city-wide scale. Of note, public map links have been included below each map description. Through these links, the reader may extract, manipulate, and examine map data more closely, filtering by additional features like Tenant Gender, Number of Tenants, Building Type, Quartiere, and more. You can build upon and change the maps for your own purposes as well – uploading your own data, adding new layers, and more. The reader is encouraged to examine maps of particular interest in closer detail by clicking various data points.

⁵ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 2023.

⁶ Henderson, *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence*, 455.

⁷ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 2031.

⁸ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 2031.

This paper will analyse 1561 confraternal property holdings by property holding amounts, type, and location in five sections. Sections One to Three will compare companies by the number of owned landholdings, distinguishing large (i.e., six or more properties), medium (i.e., three to five properties), and small (i.e., one to two properties) confraternal landholding portfolios. The size of property portfolios had a significant impact on how those properties were used. It will also place this data in the context of city-wide private land-owner trends. Section Four will then compare property holding patterns by four different confraternity types: NAD/S [Neighbourhood/Artisanal/Devotional/*Stendardo*], P/D [Penitential/*Disciplinati*], C/O [Charitable/*Ospedale*], Y/F [Youth/*Fanciulle*], with an additional category U for those that are Unknown. This will test the theory that confraternities with differing devotional forms also had different forms of spatial distribution, and specifically whether NAD/S companies held property near their originating parishes/communities while P/D companies had more dispersed and city-wide holdings. Finally, Section Five will spatially analyse Florence's overall confraternal properties holdings according to the city's four quarters: Santo Spirito (south), Santa Maria Novella (west), San Giovanni (north) and Santa Croce (east). These quarters extended across the two sets of walls constructed between 1078 and 1333.⁹ The core area within the oldest circuit of walls contained most of Florence's commercial properties and its highest-value homes. Dense residential areas between the second and third sets of walls were home to fewer wealthy residents and some patricians.

By comparing 1561 confraternal urban residential property patterns throughout the city, this essay demonstrates that property was valued and used in different ways by different companies, illustrating how confraternities intimately shaped the urban physical and social fabric of Florentine society. Companies held and used urban residential property for different reasons: to engage with local religious sites, generate economic revenue and relationships, pursue and support charitable work, and create meaningful social relations at an individual and communal level. Confraternities differed significantly in how they generated revenue from property to support confraternal activities, enmeshing companies with local individuals through important and personal economic ties (i.e., housing), locating companies in key ritual and administrative areas, and providing charitable opportunities through housing vulnerable persons or company staff at discounted or free rates. This varied company to company and within a single company.

Historiography

The historiography of early modern Florence identifies confraternities as major players in the religious, social, economic, and civic ritual lives of lay

⁹ Litchfield, *Florence Ducal Capital*, 18.

citizens. The importance, roles, and facets of confraternities were closely analysed in the 1980s and 1990s by Nicholas Eckstein, Konrad Eisenbichler, John Henderson, Richard Trexler, Ronald Weissman, Justine Walden, Nicholas Terpstra, and others.

Richard C. Trexler's *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (1980) emphasised the meaning and importance of ritual in civic life, and the ways in which it (as well as the religious relics it was associated with) informed civic activity.¹⁰ Trexler offered a detailed analysis of confraternities' participation in civic ritual activities, tracking Florence's civic processional routes, and the ways in which various confraternities engaged with events.

Ronald F. E. Weissman's *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence* (1982) similarly emphasised the importance of ritual experience in early modern Florence, using it as a lens to highlight the importance of social associations and lay religious confraternities.¹¹ He drew his research framework from the Chicago School of Sociology, which emphasised the scientific study of social life, promoted symbolic interactionism, and held that urban environments and social structures shaped one's behaviour or relationships.¹² Weissman examined confraternities in terms of their ritual relations, seeking to understand how Florentines created meaning and complex social associations through the brotherhoods, and identifying ritual practises as critically important to members' social and religious lives. Weissman posited that *laudesi* and *disciplinati* confraternities maintained different property patterns due to their diverging membership patterns.¹³ He claimed that *laudesi* confraternities often concentrated their property and presence within or near their originating neighbourhoods and core membership, whereas *disciplinati* confraternities' properties were dispersed across the city, reflecting the broad urban recruitment of members.

Nicholas A. Eckstein's *The District of the Green Dragon* (1995) took a closer look at the social, economic, religious and communal roles of confraternities by using a neighbourhood-level case-study, examining how the Bruciata and Sant'Agnese confraternities in the *Drago Verde* ("Green Dragon") working class district south of the Arno River shaped and unified local neighbourhood identity.¹⁴ Eckstein argued that confraternities meaningfully shaped, and were shaped by, local neighbourhood cultures/identity because they facilitated valuable social, economic and religious relations among residents.¹⁵ He argued that confraternal institutions functioned as "chief unifying

¹⁰ Trexler, *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*, 1–8.

¹¹ Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*.

¹² Hammersley, "Chicago Sociology," 63–77.

¹³ Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*, 67–69.

¹⁴ Eckstein, *The District of the Green Dragon*.

¹⁵ Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, xiv.

agents” within local neighbourhood districts such as Drago Verde.¹⁶ Eckstein examined the subject from an anthropological perspective, emphasising the impact of confraternities upon human society, culture, and development.

John S. Henderson’s *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence* (1994) built upon the earlier historiography of religious confraternities by offering a large-scale, detailed analysis on the institutional development, structure, activities, and socio-religious importance of Florentine confraternities during the thirteenth to fifteenth century.¹⁷ Henderson’s analysis was grounded in the role and importance of charitable activities across various religious confraternities, establishing how confraternal activity was both a social and religious experience. Through his research, Henderson was able to compile a richly detailed appendix assembling data on confraternities’ origins, their parish, full and alternative names, and more.

Konrad Eisenbichler’s *The Boys of the Archangel Raphael: A Youth Confraternity in Florence, 1411–1785* (1998) is a seminal monograph on youth confraternities.¹⁸ Eisenbichler’s writing provided an interdisciplinary, whole-life examination (from founding to suppression) of the Compagnia dell’Arcangelo Raffaello. Eisenbichler’s treatment of the company highlighted greater social, religious, and political forces that affected many other similar confraternities. His writing also provided insight into the educational, cultural, and devotional elements youth confraternities played in Florence.

Justine Walden and Nicholas Terpstra’s recent article “Who Owned Florence? Religious Institutions and Property Ownership in the Early Modern City” (2021) compared landholding patterns of various religious institutions such as mendicant and monastic houses, confraternities, and military-religious orders.¹⁹ Using the 1561 Decima ricerca and the maps and databases of the DECIMA project, they compared investment patterns between the one third of Florentine property that was owned by lay or clerical religious institutions and the two thirds owned privately and found that religious institutions typically rented their residential properties at below market rates to realise charitable and spiritual values.

Through the work of these authors and others, the social, religious, and societal roles and importance of religious confraternities has been examined at the individual, neighbourhood, and institutional levels, demonstrating how confraternities intimately shaped, and were themselves shaped by, urban Florentine society.

This article will offer a deeper city-wide examination of the use, dispersion, and patterns of confraternal urban residential landholdings. Through GIS mapping of the 1561 Decima ricerca tax census, it will develop a city-wide

¹⁶ Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, xx.

¹⁷ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*.

¹⁸ Eisenbichler, *The Boys of the Archangel Raphael*.

¹⁹ Walden & Terpstra, “Who Owned Florence?”

analysis of how urban residential properties were used by religious confraternities, the value they presented for the companies, community, and individuals, and how these economic, social, and geographical patterns contribute to the greater discussion on the role and impact of confraternities in early modern Florence. It demonstrates how digital mapping using tools such as the DECIMA project generates interactive findings at both the individual and city-wide level. By comparing property management patterns throughout the city, this essay demonstrates that property was valued and used in different ways by different companies, illustrating the ways in which religious confraternities intimately shaped the urban physical and social fabric of Florentine society in the mid-sixteenth century.

Methodology / Resources

This essay restricts its scope to confraternal properties held within the city walls of Florence in 1561. Spatial property analysis will be organised according to the city's traditional quarters of Santo Spirito, Santa Maria Novella, San Giovanni, and Santa Croce.

The essay assumes the common definition of confraternities as voluntary lay associations grounded in religious patronage and devotional practises that perform charitable activities for their members and community.²⁰ As noted above, they are divided into four general categories. The largest group is made up of those described as Neighbourhood, Artisanal, and Devotional, often described as *laudesi* and known generically in Florence as Companies of the Standard (or *Stendardo*) after the banners they carried in processions. These have the acronym NAD/S. *Laudesi* companies, such as the *Compagnia di S. Agnese nel Carmine*, were among the earliest types of religious confraternities. They practiced religious devotion by regularly singing *laude* (i.e., vernacular devotional songs).²¹ The second group is made up of Penitential confraternities known as *disciplinati*, here having the acronym P/D. *Disciplinati* confraternities, originating after the *laudesi*, also performed *laude* but primarily practised religious devotion through self-flagellation and disciplined prayer.²² Major charitable institutions like hospitals (*ospedali*) were often established and/or operated by confraternities, and these have the acronym C/O. This includes companies like the *Orsanmichele* that provided charity to vulnerable members of society or the *Compagnia del Tempio* that exercised devotion by comforting individuals designated for execution. Florence also had a rich variety of confraternities dedicated to youth or *fanciulle*, designated here as

²⁰ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 17–22; Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, 88–90.

²¹ For more on the *laudesi*, see Wilson, *Music and Merchants*; Barr, *The Monophonic Lauda*; and Glixon "Singing Praises to God."

²² Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*, 46.

Y/F.²³ Fanciulli companies were structured to promote the religious devotion of their young male members through activities like religious education, performing laude, and participating in ritual processions. Finally, those that we have not been able to identify are designated U for Unknown.

This essay is not intended to provide a broader view or analysis of confraternities. Rather, it uses the identification of confraternal groups to develop a city-wide spatial analysis of their residential property holdings. Furthermore, by drawing residential data from the 1561 Decima tax records, this essay aims to provide a meaningful glimpse into some of the confraternal residential property patterns and behaviours present in 1561, showing how property was used to support institutional functions and foster economic, social, and religious relations within and outside the companies.

Though the Decima ricerca offers detailed accounts of Florence's property, citizens, and spatial makeup, it has limitations generated by the scope of the records, the way in which data was recorded/verified, and potential for human error. First, property owners were asked to self-declare the value of their property and the 10% tax was calculated on this value. The financial implications associated likely have led some landowners to undervalue their property and there is no consistent way to correct or control for this. The data therefore should be interpreted with some flexibility. It is also limited in its scope as it only represents property-holding confraternities, excluding confraternities that did not own property. Finally, user error in recording or stating data for the census may have impacted the validity of certain records. Despite these limitations, the Decima ricerca still offers a very valuable and thorough image of 1561 Florence.

The DECIMA Project: Digitising Mid-Sixteenth Century Florence

As noted above, the Decima ricerca was a city-wide tax census commissioned by Duke Cosimo I in 1561.²⁴ It recorded the names, occupation, number of tenants, housing agreement types (i.e., rent, lease, and more), property value, landowner names, and geographic/contextual property information (i.e., the street it is located on, its contiguous surroundings, and more). By identifying the tenants, landowners, and economic agreements associated with a property, the Decima offers a rich view of the urban physical and social fabric of Florence in 1561.

Although the 5 manuscript volumes of the Decima ricerca are held in the *Archivio di Stato di Firenze* (ASF), the data they contain is accessible digitally through the Open Access DECIMA Project. The DECIMA Project is an interactive web application that plots data from various Florentine tax

²³ For more on youth and *fanciulli* companies, see Eisenbichler, *The Boys of the Archangel Raphael*; Polizzotto, *Children of the Promise*; Trexler, "Ritual in Florence."

²⁴ Wilder, "DECIMA."


censuses, such as the 1561 Decima ricerca, using geographic information systems (GIS). DECIMA researchers transcribed every tax entry in an easily accessible data base and geo-referenced the data according to its historical location, combining a 1584 aerial view of Florence drawn by Stefano Buonsignori with a base layer to visually convey the physical organisation and development of Florence at the time of the censuses. By using the DECIMA web GIS, this essay can accurately identify the location, ownership, tenant demography, and financial detail of all confraternal properties in 1561 Florence. The visual representation of this data allows for large-scale comparative analysis of the spatial patterns of confraternal investment, as well as providing the necessary detail to conduct smaller-scale analysis neighbourhood to neighbourhood, street to street, or company to company. DECIMA's public-facing, searchable web-application significantly contributes to both the accessibility and interactivity of historical data. By digitizing historical data, the user is enabled to work with it in new and exciting ways.

Section One: Data Analysis by Portfolio Size (Large, Medium, Small)

Large Confraternal Landholders

Florence's religious confraternal property was predominantly owned by three confraternities: San Pier Martire e Laude della Vergine Maria (NAD/S, and hereafter called "S. Pier Martire"), Santa Maria della Croce al Tempio (C/O, and hereafter called the "Tempio"), and the Madonna di Orsanmichele (C/O, and hereafter called "Orsanmichele"). A staggering 34% (50/149) of all commercial and residential confraternal property in Florence was owned by these three companies.

Whereas most companies owned two to three residential properties, three confraternities each held 6 or more: S. Pier Martire held 6 properties, the Tempio held 19, and Orsanmichele held 17. These properties concentrated in four areas. S. Pier Martire's property clustered by its founding parish and neighbourhood in Santa Maria Novella. Tempio property clustered primarily around its founding parish in Santa Croce and along the route used for public executions, and Orsanmichele held property across all quarters north of the Arno with most clustering by S. Pier Martire's properties and in the north, by the S. Trinita syphilitics hospital known as the Incurabili. The original city centre also contained a high density of large-landholder properties, particularly commercial property. None of the large landholding confraternities held residential or commercial property in Santo Spirito, unlike many medium or small confraternal landholders.

Large Confraternal Landholdings - Heat Map, 1561 Florence

Heat map of 1561 Florentine confraternal companies with large commercial and residential landholdings (i.e., six or more properties) superimposed on Stefano Buonsignori's map of Florence (1584/1594). Data drawn from 1561 Decima ricerca data, digitised by DECIMA (Digitally Encoded Census Information and Mapping Archive) project: <https://decima-map.net/>. Click map icons to learn more about the associated confraternal properties.


Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Georeferencing by Colin Rose. Image courtesy of Harvard College Map Library | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS

Map 1. Heat Map of Large Confraternal Commercial and Residential Properties

<https://arcg.is/00njiG>

GIS mapping such as Map 1 above demonstrates that large landholding companies often clustered their property together. Several contiguous properties would be held by a single company, monopolising a street corner and stationing the company across key areas of the city. Indeed, these clusters would occasionally be located near landmarks that were ritually, socially, and/or religiously significant, or facilities such as hospitals, churches, or the city gallows. The Tempio and Orsanmichele held a significant number of residential properties that were located contiguously to each other. Since the Decima ricerca does not indicate whether property was received via bequest, it is unclear why companies held property in particular areas (i.e., by their own choosing or via bequest). These locations may have been intentionally selected to position the company in certain areas of the city.


Large Confraternal Landholdings - Owner Versus Rent (Scudi), 1561 Florence



Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS

Map 2. Cost of Rent: Residential and Commercial Properties, Large Landowners
<https://arcg.is/Hm8K>

Large Confraternal Landholdings - Owner Versus Value (Scudi), 1561 Florence



Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS

Map 3. Property Values: Residential and Commercial Properties, Large Landowners
<https://arcg.is/aPrCi>

Table 1²⁵
 Economic Data
 (Large Confraternal Landowners versus Individual Landowners)²⁶

Owner Category	No. Comps	No. Props	Median Rent/ Lease Charged	Median Prop Value	% Scudi Charged Relative to Value	Median Tenants Per Prop	% Rented	% Leased	% Held Without Payment / By Service
Large Landowners	3	50	6	9	67%	5	38%	42%	20%
Individual Landowners	0	277100	11	13.8	79.7%	5	84%	3.9%	12%

²⁵ All currency values shown in tables and maps have been converted to the decimalized scudi for clarity. Using Richard Goldthwaite's conversions, 1 *scudo* = 7 *lire* 10 *soldi*. See Goldthwaite, *The Economy of Renaissance Florence*, 48–57, 609–614 and Walden & Terpstra, “Who Owned Florence?,” 225–226 for more on Florentine currency.

²⁶ Individual landowners were independent persons who owned properties, distinct from institutional landowning organisations or groups like confraternities.

All three major confraternal landowners rented their property at 67% of median declared value (i.e., a 33% net loss).²⁷ These are significant losses when contrasted against average individual landowners, who rented their property at approximately 79.7% of the property's value (i.e., a 20.3% net loss).²⁸ The discounted housing compared to the median of what individual landowners charged may result from most properties having been leased rather than rented, several properties being offered at a discounted rate for staff or members in exchange for labour, and some properties being charitably provided for free to vulnerable individuals such as widows.²⁹ Approximately half of properties in this first group were rented/leased at rates equal to the reported value and the other half were offered below-value. There were some exceptions, such as one Orsanmichele property that was leased for approximately 200% of its value, generating a significant 10 scudi in profit, and a S. Pier Martire property that was leased for 150% of its value, generating 4 scudi in profit.³⁰

To fully understand the use and significance of the landholdings, it is helpful to contextualise the mission and functions of these three companies. The Tempio and Orsanmichele were both large C/O companies with significant membership and important charitable functions. The Tempio comforted individuals sentenced to death.³¹ Orsanmichele distributed food in times of famine and provided care and alms to the needy.³² Its function was not as geographically defined as the Tempio's, which anchored around key execution and processional sites. Finally, S. Pier Martire was a NAD/S company that originated in the Santa Maria Novella quarter and drew most of its members from this area. It practised its devotion primarily through performing lauds and hosting public processions or festivities in accordance with religious holidays.

Confraternities in this group generally located property near to key administrative and religious sites that supported the company's mission. This

²⁷ S. Pier Martire rented/leased its residential properties for 2 scudi on average, though its average residential property valued was 12 scudi (83% less than value); the Tempio rented/leased its properties for 4.59 scudi on average, despite its residential property valuing at 7.32 on average (63% less than value); the Orsanmichele rented/leased its properties for 10.94 scudi on average, despite its properties averaging 19.53 scudi in reported value (44% less than value).

²⁸ The average individual landowner in 1561 Florence had property valued at 11.15 scudi which they reported renting for 10.27 scudi (an 8% loss relative to the reported value). They also overwhelmingly rented their homes: 723/765 homes held by individuals were rented, and 10/765 were rented.

²⁹ Property was arranged under hereditary, lineal, and term leases; The Tempio provided 4 of its 19 residential properties at a discounted or free rate to staff/members; S. Pier Martire provided 1 of its 6 residential properties for free as an act of charity – housing three women (two of whom were widows).

³⁰ These were ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780:3163 and ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780:754, respectively.

³¹ Terpstra, "Body Politics," 35.

³² Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 202–274.

allowed a confraternity to leverage property to support its functions, extend its presence into important areas, and ensure that members, staff, and employees were present and available to respond to the company's religious duties as needed. For example, the majority of Tempio property concentrated around key stops of the Florentine public execution route. Its properties were contiguous to the *Chiesa di Santa Maria Vergine della Croce al Tempio*, where execution processions often stopped to pray, adjacent to the city gallows, and around the city centre.³³ A significant number of its properties were used as free housing for staff members, supporting its religious purpose by embedding staff in key areas. Whereas the Tempio had a localized function and property locations, the Orsanmichele performed its charity city-wide and its property was similarly reflective of this. It held property across all city quarters except Santo Spirito. Finally, just as S. Pier Martire performed its charity and devotion primarily within the Santa Maria Novella quarter, and its property was almost exclusively located around the Santa Maria Novella parish and quarter.

The correlation between primary locations of function and actual property locations suggests that property was often used by large landholders to facilitate and support their religious work. It also enmeshed the company in local social and economic networks by collecting income from their tenants and increasing their presence/visibility in the area. Finally, the property itself was sometimes a representation of its relationship with members of the community. For example, S. Pier Martire received much of its property through bequests.³⁴ Its strong membership base in Santa Maria Novella may have resulted in local members bequeathing their property to the company, reinforcing S. Pier Martire's dense local property portfolio.

All of S. Pier Martire's residential property was nearby its founding church, S. Maria Novella (see Map 4). This was located on the western side of Florence in a dense residential area. Unlike the Tempio and Orsanmichele, its properties were not contiguous to each other. Rather, they were single properties located along key transportation corridors that lead to the western city gate or the city centre. It also co-owned one commercial property with the chapter of the church of San Lorenzo, located on the north side of the Mercato Vecchio. By maintaining several properties in proximity to the church of Santa Maria Novella, S. Pier Martire bolstered its presence within the community and fostered additional economic ties as landowners.


The Tempio held residential property primarily in eastern Florence, near its founding church and the city gallows. Map 5 shows that unlike S. Pier Martire's dispersed holdings, the Tempio's eastern residential properties were densely clustered and often contiguous to each other, monopolising entire city corners and sections of the streetscape. This is especially evident near the

³³ Falvey, "Scaffold and Stage," 28; Litchfield, *Florence Ducal Capital*, 137; Prosperi, "Consolation or Condemnation," 101; Rose, "Walking the Last Mile"; Terpstra, "Body Politics," 35.

³⁴ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 171, 175.

eastern gate (Porta della Croce) that led to the city gallows. The Tempio held three contiguous properties along the main road to the gallows, and these provided free housing to staff members such as Antonio di Piero, guard for the Tempio³⁵ (“guardia della Compagnia del Tempio”). By housing a company guard near the city’s gallows, the Tempio was able to maintain staff next to the gallows during any execution procession. The property was used to house members nearby important ritual sites, adding nuance to the economic webs property created between a company, their religious function, and citizens.

S. Pier Martire Properties (Contract Versus Rent) - 1561 Florence



A map showing all properties owned by the S. Pier Martire confraternity in 1561 Florence. Features the distribution of properties by contract type (illustrated using different colours) versus the rent accrued from each property (illustrated by varying shapes size with larger sizes signifying greater rent charged for property). Values in decimalised scudi.

Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS


Map 4. S. Pier Martire Properties: Contract Type versus Rent Charged (Scudi)
<https://arcg.is/0uLLP4>

The Tempio held most of its properties directly next to its church: it owned nine contiguous residential properties directly west of the church which wrapped around the street corner and occupied about half of the block. Like the gallows cluster, these properties were a mix of discounted/free member or staff housing and general rental accommodations. Of the nine properties, two were freely offered as payment for the member’s services to the company. A servant Bartolomeo (“servo della compagnia”), enjoyed free accommodation for himself and another male and female occupant (possibly wife and son).³⁶ He lived just around the corner from Piero d’ Antonio, hospice worker for

³⁵ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 2429.

³⁶ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3781: 340.

the Tempio (“spedaliero”) who similarly enjoyed free accommodation from the Tempio through his service to the company.³⁷ Piero’s home was directly next door to the Tempio church: the Decima describes it as contiguous to the hospital of the Tempio (“spedalo del Tempio”), suggesting that it may have been used as a hospice for travelling pilgrims, the sick, and/or the needy.³⁸ The Tempio also held some residential property along the circuit of the second set of city walls (1173–1175). These were singular properties but were among the few held by religious confraternities in proximity to the city centre. The Tempio also held six commercial properties – an impressive amount in comparison to other confraternities that held one or fewer commercial properties on average. The commercial property was mostly in the city centre, as was common with other confraternal commercial properties – particularly companies with larger property holdings.



Map 5. Tempio Properties: Contract Type versus Rent Charged (Scudi)


<https://arcg.is/LbmCj>

As shown in Map 6, the Orsanmichele’s residential property fanned north, north-east, and north-west of its founding location between the cathedral and the Palazzo della Signoria. The dispersed locations of the Orsanmichele’s landholdings reflects its broadly distributed membership and

³⁷ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 347.

³⁸ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3781: 347.

functions, as they performed city-wide rituals and provided city-wide relief.³⁹ Orsanmichele held four properties nearby the Santa Maria Novella gate and the old Santa Maria Novella piazza, nearby S. Pier Martire's holdings.⁴⁰ It also held four contiguous properties just south of Florence's northern San Gallo gate, four contiguous properties in the northern Piazza dei Servi, two properties within the old city walls, and three properties along the eastern edge of the Second communal circuit walls, along a major roadway into Santo Spirito. The vast majority (70.6%) of these properties were leased, diverging from the dominant rent-based residential economy of 1561 Florence.⁴¹ The number of these leased properties suggests that Orsanmichele's properties may have been received as bequests, as many bequests were arranged under lifelong leases.⁴² Of these properties, most were valued around 8–15 scudi (closer to the city-wide residential property value average of 11.15 scudi).



Map 6. Orsanmichele Properties: Contract Type versus Rent Charged (Scudi)

<https://arcr.is/1HjHf40>

³⁹ See Henderson's *Piety and Charity* for more about the Orsanmichele.

⁴⁰ Via dell'Amore, via di Gualfonda.

⁴¹ Of the 765 total residential properties owned by Florentine individuals, only 10 were leased. Comparatively, 12 of the Orsanmichele's 17 residential properties were leased, highlighting the significant disparity in lease versus rent patterns.

⁴² For example, many bequests included conditions of hereditary leases for the bequester's loved ones, providing housing until their passing. After that time, the company could inherit the property for their own uses. See Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, for more.

A notable exception was the Orsanmichele's four properties by the Piazza dei Servi and Innocenti hospital, which were each valued between 40–45 scudi, significantly above the average home value of 11.15 scudi. All other properties along this road were valued around 16 scudi. These were the highest-valued residential properties held by any confraternity in 1561 Florence. The properties were occupied by 3, 6, 12, and 13 tenants, the majority of whom were men with family names and occupational honorifics.⁴³ The high property value combined with average to significantly below-average numbers of tenants suggests that the properties were larger and more highly valued in comparison to the average home.




Figure 1. Image of the Orsanmichele's four properties, located at the southern entry to the Piazza dei Servi, just west of the *Innocenti* hospital and across the *Palazzo d'Altospacio*.

⁴³ One of the properties (ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3783: 2060) was occupied by Redi di Messer Vincenzo di Jacopo Cancellieri and Ser Filice di Ricuardo Camellieri. The contiguous property (ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3783: 2059) was leased to Pierfilippo di Gramiozzo Pandolfini, who's surname has patrician linkages to the Medici family. Two doors down, a confraternal property was occupied by a Messer and Ser (ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3783: 2062).

GIS mapping shows that the Orsanmichele held property in all quarters but Santo Spirito. The exclusion of Santo Spirito is notable, as many other companies owned property in that quarter. The Orsanmichele's property clustered in three areas: it held four high-value properties at the southern mouth of the Piazza dei Servi, near the Spedale degli Innocenti and Spedale S. Matteo.⁴⁴ One of the properties was used as housing for Pier Filippo di Gramiozzo Pandolfini, a family with possible political ties to the Medici.⁴⁵ Pier is described in the Decima ricerca as one of the captains of the Orsanmichele confraternity, demonstrating the property was used as member housing. These properties were the highest-valued residential properties across all confraternal property holdings in 1561 Florence. Near the northern gates, along the original Roman road, Orsanmichele held four contiguous residential properties. This cluster was in proximity to the syphilitics Spedale di S. Trinita degli Incurabili. The third Orsanmichele cluster was a set of three contiguous residential properties along the Via dell'Amore in Santa Maria Novella, near to three residential properties held by S. Pier Martire.

Confraternal property locations demonstrate how property was variably used and adapted to a company's particular religious beliefs, purposes, and needs. Property ownership created nuanced economic and social relations between confraternities and their tenants. It also influenced the urban landscape as a result of a concentrated presence in an area, density of area occupation, and the value of one's property. Property was demonstrably an important part of a company's religious work, as it offered housing to members and staff (locating staff in key ritual or administrative areas), allowed companies to secure property near religiously significant sites, and created long-term income to support one's religious missions.

The Tempio, S. Pier Martire, and Orsanmichele companies were major property owners in 1561 Florence. The location, use, and profitability of these properties is a snapshot into of how Florence's religious confraternities comparatively held and used residential and commercial property, occupied (and in some cases, monopolised) space, and engaged with the Florentine public through commercial and residential property.

Medium Confraternal Landholders

The second group of landowning confraternities held 3–5 residential and commercial properties. Within this category, nineteen religious confraternities held 64/132 (48.5%) of all residential confraternal properties and 2/15 (13%) of all commercial confraternal properties – 50% of total city-wide confraternal properties. The medium land-holding companies therefore held

⁴⁴ Litchfield, "Online Gazetteer of Sixteenth Century Florence".

⁴⁵ Plebani, "PANDOLFINI, Pier Filippo: Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani".

13% more property than the large-landholding group, though their properties were held by eighteen companies instead of three.⁴⁶

Spatial Patterns

GIS mapping of medium landholders demonstrates four spatial trends: first, property was more dispersed through the city compared to large landholders. Whereas large landholders often held several contiguous properties in one area, medium property owners tended to hold isolated, dispersed properties.⁴⁷ Second, medium confraternal landowners held property in all quarters of the city, with a significant portion in Santo Spirito (34.8%).⁴⁸ In comparison, large landholders held no property in Santo Spirito despite it being a major residential quarter. Third, medium landholder properties north of the Arno River was held nearby other confraternal properties: like large landholder companies, their property traced the edges of the old city walls, dotted through dense residential areas, and extended towards the various city gates. Their commercial property was also located exclusively in the city centre. Finally, medium landholders sometimes held property nearby the company's originating neighbourhood or parish (*sede*).⁴⁹ For example, S. Frediano (la Bruciata) owned property exclusively in its originating neighbourhood, Santo Spirito.⁵⁰ The linkages between property, company types, and proximity to one's seat will be discussed further in Section Two.

Using property, confraternities shaped and contributed to the physical and social fabric of Florentine society – particularly at the neighbourhood-level. It allowed confraternities to physically occupy and be present across the city – including near key ritual routes, by their seat, along major roads, and more. The use of stone placards attached to the exterior of confraternal property expressed this ownership and presence, increasing public visibility. Property location was also very important to the history and function of the companies themselves, as shown by several confraternities holding property nearby their patron church, meeting places, and/or ritual routes.⁵¹ Property

⁴⁶ Large land holding companies held 34% of all Florentine confraternal property, medium landholders held 44%.

⁴⁷ Except for three contiguous properties in Santa Maria Novella owned by S. Benedetto Nero e S. Giuliano [S. Benedetto Bigio], and four contiguous properties in Santa Croce owned by S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi.

⁴⁸ Of the 23 properties in Santo Spirito, 20/23 were held by NAD/S companies, 2/23 were held by P/D companies (S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo] and the SS. Innocenti) and 1/23 was held by a C/O company (S. M.a de' Poveri).


⁴⁹ This is evident with the Bruciata and Sant' Agnese properties, for example, which held all or most of its property in its originating neighbourhood, Santo Spirito.

⁵⁰ See Eckstein, *The District of the Green Dragon*.

⁵¹ See section two for more information.

location had religious importance: proximity to one's patronal church was associated with patronal protections for the company, its devotional members, and the city at large. It was also functionally important to remain within one's originating neighbourhood as the majority of members, particularly of NAD/S companies, were located near the company's seat.⁵² In his analysis of the Y/F confraternity of the Purification of the Virgin, Lorenzo Polizzotto argues that when the company was displaced from its original meeting place, it was critical for it to "remain in the neighbourhood that had been its home since its foundation and the area from which it drew most of its members. To move away would have constituted an abandonment of its mission."⁵³ Some confraternities were willing to take on significant debt and meet in poorly-suited spaces so long as it maintained their proximity to the company's patronal church.⁵⁴ The geographical and spatial patterns demonstrated in the 1561 Decima ricerca therefore highlight how property may have been used and valued by confraternal companies to strengthen the connection to their faith – highlighting the complex relationship confraternities had between location, religion, community, and how property sat at the centre of these relationships.

Medium Confraternal Landholdings - Heat Map, 1561 Florence



Heat map of 1561 Florentine confraternal companies with medium commercial and residential landholdings (i.e., three to five properties) superimposed on Stefano Buonsignori's map of Florence (1584/1594). Data drawn from 1561 Decima ricerca data, digitised by DECIMA (Digitally Encoded Census Information and Mapping Archive) project: <https://decima-map.net/>. Click map icons to learn more about the associated confraternal properties.

Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Georeferencing by Colin Rose. Image courtesy of Harvard College Map Library | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS

Map 7. Heat Map: Medium Confraternal Landholders – Residential and Commercial
<https://arcg.is/0ynfDn1>

⁵² Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*, 69.


⁵³ Polizzotto, *Children of the Promise*, 182–183.

⁵⁴ Polizzotto, *Children of the Promise*, 182–183, 189.

Table 2
Medium, Large Confraternal Landholder, Individual Owner Property Data

Owner Category	No. Comps	No. Props	Median Rent / Lease Cost	Median Prop Value	% Scudi Charged Relative to Value	Median Tenants Per Prop	% Rent	% Lease	% Held Without Payment or by Service
Medium Landholders	19	66	6.5	7	92.8%	5	68.2%	27.3%	4.5%
Large Landholders	3	50	6	9	67%	5	38%	42%	20%
Individual-ly Owned Properties	0	2771	11	13.8	79.7%	5	84%	3.9%	12%

Large Confraternal Landholdings - Heat Map, 1561 Florence



Heat map of 1561 Florentine confraternal companies with large commercial and residential landholdings (i.e., six or more properties) superimposed on Stefano Buonsignori's map of Florence (1584/1594). Data drawn from 1561 Decima ricerca data, digitised by DECIMA (Digitally Encoded Census Information and Mapping Archive) project: <https://decima-map.net/>. Click map icons to learn more about the associated confraternal properties.

Esri, Intermap, NASA, NGA, USGS | Georeferencing by Colin Rose. Image courtesy of Harvard College Map Library | Esri Community Maps Contributors, Esri, HERE, Garmin, Foursquare, GeoTechnologies, Inc, METI/NASA, USGS


Map 8. Heat Map: Large Confraternal Landholders – Residential and Commercial
<https://arcg.is/00njiG>

Economic Patterns

Table 2 demonstrates that economic data varied significantly between medium and large confraternal landholders, particularly in median property values, the relative slippage between a property's stated value and amount charged for accommodation, rent/lease ratios, and charitably provided property. Whereas most medium landholders rented (68.2% rented, 27.3% leased), large landholders predominantly leased their property (38% rented, 42% leased). Furthermore, charitable or service-based provision of property was significantly less common for medium landholders than it was for large landholders: whereas 4.5% of all medium landholder property was offered charitably or as member/staff housing, 20% of large landholder property was offered as such. This begs the question – were charitable property uses dependent or related to holding several profitable properties? Decima data suggests yes, as there is a linear relationship between the total quantity of owned properties and the number of properties used charitably (e.g., as free housing for vulnerable persons, staff, or members). Whereas most large landholders provided 1–3 properties as charitable housing, only 2 of the 19 medium landholding companies and none of the 27 small landholders provided rent-free accommodation through service and/or for charity. This demonstrates that

confraternal willingness to provide charitable housing corresponded with total quantity of properties owned.

Though medium landholders rented more property than large landholders, they still rented much less than market averages amongst individual landowners. Whereas 84% of individually owned properties were rented, 67% of medium landholder properties and 38% of large landholder were rented. The percentage of leased medium and large confraternal landholder property far outweighs that of individual landowners as well: whereas only 3.9% of all individually/non-institutionally owned property was leased, 29% of medium confraternal landowner property and 42% of large confraternal landowner property was leased.




Map 9. Medium Confraternal Landholders – Company Type versus Property Value (Scudi)
<https://arcg.is/1CjSOe1>

Table 3
Medium Confraternal Landholders – Property Data by Company Type

Type	No. Comps	No. Props	% Total Prop	Median Rent / Lease	Median Value	% Rent	% Lease	Workdays needed to afford median rent/lease (unskilled labourer) ⁵⁵	Workdays needed to afford median rent/lease (skilled labourer)
NAD/S	10	38/66	57.6%	6 Scudi	7 Scudi	76.3%	18.4%	78.5 days	41.8 days
P/D	4	14/66	21.2%	6 Scudi	8 Scudi	57.1%	48.9%	78.5 days	41.8 days
C/O	2	6/66	8.7	5 Scudi	5.5 Scudi	66.7%	16.7%	64.4 days	34.8 days
Unknown	2	8/66	12.1%	3.2 Scudi	4 Scudi	50%	50%	41.9 days	22.3 days

⁵⁵ Workday calculations made using Richard Goldthwaite's *The Building of Renaissance Florence*, 435–438, and Walden and Terpstra's "Who Owned Florence?", 230.



Map 10. Medium Confraternal Landholders – Company Type versus Rent Charged (Scudi)
<https://arcgis.com/maps/n0yu80>

Cost for rent/lease varied significantly between large and medium landholding confraternities. Whereas large landholding companies charged 33% below median stated property values and private landowners charged 20.3% below median stated values, medium confraternal landholders discounted tenants 7.1% of the stated property values. Medium landholding companies therefore charged higher accommodation rates relative to the value of the property compared to large landholding or individual owners. These figures also varied by confraternity type: Table 3 shows that NAD/S companies rented/leased their property for 85.7% of its stated value, P/D companies rented/leased their property for 75% of its stated value, and C/O companies rented/leased their properties for 90.9% of its stated value.⁵⁶

Properties held by medium landholding companies had values ranging between 2 and 25 scudi, with an overall median value of 7 scudi.⁵⁷ Using average daily wages in 16th century Florence, an unskilled labourer would need to work approximately 91 days to afford this housing and a skilled labourer

⁵⁶ Of statistical note, there were only six medium landholder C/O properties, whereas there were 38 NAD/S and 14 P/D properties in this category.

⁵⁷ A commercial property partially owned by the Carita di San Lorenzo confraternity skews the average figure as it was valued at 67 scudi. To provide a more accurate representation, this analysis uses median values.

would need to work approximately 48.7 days.⁵⁸ This contrasts against large landholder properties, which had significantly higher value ranges (between 2 and 45 scudi) and had a considerably higher median value of 9 scudi.⁵⁹

The median values and amount charged for both medium and large landholding companies was significantly less than what was charged and valued by private landowners. As shown in Table 2, individually owned properties (i.e., not owned by religious, political, or trade institutions) had a median value of 13.8 scudi and was rented/leased for 11 scudi, 4.5–5 scudi more than medium and large confraternal landowners. Both medium and large confraternal landholders therefore rented and leased property at significantly discounted rates compared to individual landowners.⁶⁰ This meant that an unskilled worker could work 58–65 fewer days to afford rent if their landlord was a religious confraternity.

In summary, medium confraternal property owners held property city-wide but charged more per property relative to its value than large confraternal owners did, and predominantly rented their properties instead of leasing. Data also identifies that medium confraternal landowners were made up of more diverse company types and significantly more companies in total than large landowners. A notable drop in use of property for charity relative to large-landholder rates also touches on the possible relationship between charitable property usage and landholding portfolio size.

Small Confraternal Landholders

Though large and medium landholding companies held most of Florence's confraternal property in 1561, the majority (55%) of landowning confraternities were small landholders (i.e., companies with 1–2 properties total).⁶¹ Like large and medium landholders, small landholder properties were located outside the city centre and in residential hubs. Their property had similar value as medium landholding companies, ranging between 2 and 20 scudi with a median value of 8 scudi. The companies were predominantly "Unknown", P/D, then NAD/S.

Small confraternal landholders charged the least and generated among the lowest rates for revenue across medium confraternities, large confraternities, and individually owned properties. Small and large landowners both

⁵⁸ Goldthwaite, *The Building of Renaissance Florence*, 435–438; Walden & Terpstra, "Who Owned Florence?", 230.

⁵⁹ A commercial property partially owned by the S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M. confraternity skews the average figure as it was valued at 56 scudi. To provide a more accurate representation, this analysis uses median values.

⁶⁰ Walden & Terpstra, "Who Owned Florence?", 234–235.

⁶¹ It is possible that many other companies existed because the Decima ricerca only recorded land-owning companies.

charged 6 scudi median for rent (or, 78.5 days of work for an unskilled worker and 41.8 days of work for a skilled worker). For small landowners, this was also 75% of the median property value. Whereas individual landowners had median property values of 13.8 scudi and rented it for 11 scudi, small confraternal landowner properties had a median value of 8 scudi and rented it for 6 scudi. Small landholders therefore provided more accommodations at below-market rates.

Small landholding confraternities represented the smallest portion of confraternal landowners in 1561 Florence (20% of total properties was owned by small confraternal landowners). Over three-quarters of their residential property was located north of the Arno, as demonstrated in the heat map below. Surprisingly, although the small landholders only had 1–2 properties, they held more commercial property relative to the medium or large landowners. Small landowners owned 5/15 total confraternal commercial properties in 1561 Florence. Unlike large and medium confraternal landholders, these commercial properties were not concentrated within the city centre. As demonstrated in Figure 2, most small landholder commercial property was in eastern Florence with little located in the city centre.






Figure 2. Small Landholdings Heat Map (Left; <https://arcg.is/0LTiqi>) versus Medium Landholdings Heat Map (Right; <https://arcg.is/0ynfDn1>)

Table 4
 Small, Medium, Large Confraternal Landholder, Individual Owner Property Data


Owner Category	No. Comps	No. Props	Median Rent / Lease Charged	Median Prop Value	% Scudi Charged Relative to Value	Median Tenants Per Prop	% Rented	% Leased	% Held Without Payment/ By Service
Small Comp.	27	30	6	8	75%	5	63.3%	33.3%	0%
Medium Comp.	19	66	6.5	7	92.8%	5	68.2%	27.3%	4.5%
Large Comp.	3	50	6	9	67%	5	38%	42%	20%
Individual Owners	0	2771	11	13.8	79.7%	5	84%	3.9%	12%



Map 11. Small Property Holdings – Company Type versus Rent (Scudi)
<https://arcg.is/1vyD51>



Map 12. Small Property Holdings – Company Type versus Value (Scudi)
<https://arcg.is/4ium9>



Map 13. Small Property Holdings – Property Contract Distribution
<https://arcg.is/njiSS0>

Both small and medium confraternal landholders dominantly rented their property, in contrast to large confraternities dominantly leasing their properties. Approximately 63% of small landholder property was rented whereas 33% was leased. This contrasts with large landholders who primarily leased their properties (42% leased).


Unlike medium or large landholders, the origins and devotions of most of the small landowning confraternities are unknown. 14/27 small companies are Unknown (U), 7 were P/D, and 6 were NAD/S. This may reflect that these were generally smaller, less documented, and perhaps shorter-lived companies. However, the amount of property held did not always indicate the size or influence of the company. For example, the Misericordia, a very well-known charitable confraternity, held only three properties, for reasons noted below.

As shown in Map 14 below, small landholder property did not cluster by company type. Rather, companies of all types were intermixed along the circuit of the old city walls, near piazzas, and along major roads.

Overall, small landholding confraternities held the lowest median value property among all three groups and rented it for less than the full stated value. Unlike large landholders, they primary rented this property, and their properties were often non-contiguous to each other. The small landholding group represented significantly more companies than medium or large landholders, demonstrating that most landholding confraternities in 1561 Florence only held one or two properties, if any.

Section Two: Penitential (P/D) versus Devotional (NAD/S) Confraternal Property Analysis

This section will use the 1561 property data to test Ronald Weissman's hypothesis regarding spatial and locational differences between devotional (i.e., NAD/S) and penitential (i.e., P/D) confraternities. In brief, he argued that NAD/S companies were more localised, composed of members who lived near or in the quarter containing the company's church/seat; by contrast, P/D companies drew members from across the whole city.⁶² While we do not have locational data for individual members, analysing confraternal property holdings allows us to draw inferences on the companies' key areas of membership, as confraternities often held property close to their oratories and were bequeathed property in locations that had members. We can also examine John Henderson's assertion that P/D companies held less property than NAD/S companies but were coming to acquire and maintain more property as they relaxed their more ascetic beliefs.⁶³



Map 14. Small Confraternal Landholders – Company Type Distribution
<https://arcg.is/eynOP>

⁶² Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*, 67–69.

⁶³ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 146.

Table 5
Small Confraternal Landholders – Property Data by Company Type

Type	No. Comps	No. Props	% Total Prop	Median Rent / Lease	Median Value	% Rent	% Lease	Workdays needed to afford median rent/lease (unskilled labourer)	Workdays needed to afford median rent/lease (skilled labourer)
NAD/S	6/27	6/30	20	7 Scudi	9.5 Scudi	50%	50%	91.6 days	48.8 days
P/D	7/27	9/30	30	5 Scudi	9 Scudi	55 %	45%	64.4 days	34.8 days
Unknown	14/27	15/30	40	6 Scudi	7 Scudi	73.3%	20%	78.5 days	41.8 days

Table 6
Economic Data of all P/D, NAD/S, and Unknown Property, 1561 Florence

Type	No. Comps	No. Prop	Median Rent / Lease Charged	Median Prop Value	% Scudi Charged Relative to Value	Median Tenants Per Prop	% Rent	% Lease	% Held Without Payment / By Service
NAD/S	18	53	8	8	100%	5	64%	30%	5.6%
P/D	11	21	5	8	62.5%	5	48%	52%	0%
Unknown	4	10	3.4	4.5	75.6%	6	70%	30%	0%

In 1561, Florence had more NAD/S landowners and significantly more NAD/S properties than P/D landowners or properties. NAD/S companies held 53 properties across the city whereas P/D companies held only 21 properties. This disparity may be influenced by ascetic considerations that discouraged P/D confraternities from property ownership. Many P/D companies believed that accumulating property undermined what ought to be a total dependence on God, and so would sell any properties they received as gifts or legacies and direct all proceeds to charity.⁶⁴ By contrast, NAD/S companies generated significant revenue through property. Henderson writes that NAD/S companies were bequeathed property more often than P/D companies, perhaps because of these differences in spiritual principles between the two types of confraternities, and this would have influenced the scale of the property ownership disparity between the two company types.⁶⁵

Though P/D companies held less property overall than NAD/S companies, they still held a significant amount in the context of 1561 confraternal land ownership: P/D companies held 14% of all confraternal property and NAD/S companies owned 35.6%. Drawing comparisons from Henderson's 1427 P/D property ownership statistics, we can see that more P/D companies were holding property by 1561, supporting Henderson's argument that the companies were loosening their ascetic associations with property.⁶⁶ He found the 1427–1429 Catasto recorded only four landholding P/D companies, and the Decima ricerca shows that by 1561, this number grew to 11.⁶⁷ According to Henderson, the P/D Compagnia di S. Giovanni Battista, also known as the “Scalzo” held only small amounts of property in the early fifteenth century and discouraged land ownership for ascetic reasons in its statutes.⁶⁸ However, by 1561 the Scalzo was among the largest landowning companies with 5 properties.

The 1561 property data demonstrates that though NAD/S and P/D properties both had a median value of 8 scudi, NAD/S companies charged significantly more for rent or lease than P/D companies did. Median figures for amounts charged shows that NAD/S companies generated 8 scudi in revenue for their properties (charging for 100% of its stated median value) whereas P/D companies generated 5 scudi per property (charging only 62.5% of its stated median value, a 37.5% slippage). The difference in these figures may represent the continuing legacy of the ascetic principles guiding many P/D companies, and particularly their disinclination to be generating profit through possessions. It may also have been practically influenced by the differences in operational costs between P/D and NAD/S companies. NAD/S companies had higher annual operation costs and fell

⁶⁴ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 146.


⁶⁵ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 134.

⁶⁶ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 146.

⁶⁷ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 146.

⁶⁸ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 146.

into considerable debt due to the scale and ornamentation of their festive processions, plays, and more.⁶⁹ This may have encouraged them to charge more for tenancy, though median figures show they still charged rents that were below-market-value.



Map 15. Heat map of all P/D (blue), NAD/S (yellow) and Unknown (purple) properties in 1561 Florence
<https://arcg.is/05verO>

As the heat map above shows, P/D and NAD/S companies tended to hold property in different areas or streets from each other except for some high-density areas such as the Santa Croce cluster, near the Piazza del Carmine, and around the Santa Maria Novella church.

NAD/S property was often near other NAD/S properties and stretched linearly along particular roads or piazzas. It clustered most along visible, high traffic areas such as the road connecting the southern Romana gate to the northern San Gallo gate, neighbourhoods, and squares like the modern-day Piazza della Repubblica and Piazza del Carmine, and along the roads that replaced the circuit of old city walls. Examined in the context of their high-profile public processions and feast-day celebrations, NAD/S properties located along high-traffic roads and piazzas likely supported these civic religious functions and brought them closer to spaces of devotion and performance.⁷⁰ For example, the Compagnia di S. Agnese nel Carmine owned several

⁶⁹ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 147; Walden & Terpstra “Who Owned Florence?”

⁷⁰ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 95–97.

properties in and around the Piazza del Carmine, where they performed their famous annual plays demonstrating the Ascension of Christ.⁷¹

P/D properties were generally more dispersed than NAD/S properties. Rather than clustering, their properties were spread across the city. Most P/D property was in the Santa Maria Novella quarter and along the border of the northern San Giovanni/eastern Santa Croce quarters.

Table 7

Weissman's Theory versus NAD/S and P/D Property Ownership in 1561 Florence

Type	# Comps with Property Mostly Local to Seat	# Comps with Property Mostly City-Wide	# Comps with Unknown Seat Location	% Companies that Fit Weissman's Theory	% Companies that Do Not Fit Weissman's Theory
NAD/S	6 ⁷²	5 ⁷³	7 ⁷⁴	54.5%	45.5%
P/D	4 ⁷⁵	5 ⁷⁶	1 ⁷⁷	55.6%	44.4%

GIS mapping allow us to test whether by 1561 P/D companies continued to have a city-wide presence while NAD/S companies remained close to their founding church or oratory.⁷⁸

⁷¹ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 99.

⁷² NAD/S companies near seat (54.5%): S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M., S. Frediano [la Bruciata], Annunciazione/S Giorgio, S. Concordia, S. Maria delle Laude e dello S. Spirito, detta del Piccione [?], S. Zanobi o di S. Reparata dei Laudesi.

⁷³ NAD/S companies non-proximal to seat (45.5%): S. Zanobi, S. Agnese [S. Ma. delle Laudi], Carita di San Lorenzo, S. Maria del Giglio e S. Giuseppe dei Caligai e Conciatori [?], Compagnia della Vergine Maria degli Laudi di S. Croce.

⁷⁴ NAD/S companies with unknown seat location (45.5%): Assunzione della Nostra Donna (Ciottolo), S. Maria delle Laude e di S. Ambrogio, S. Sebastiano de' Genovesi, S. Gilio e della V.M., detta la Crocetta, S. Caterina dei Barbieri, S. Giobbe, SS. Eligio e Lorenzo dei Manescalchi [S. Lo.].

⁷⁵ P/D companies near seat (36%): Compagnia di S. Maria Maddalena in S. Croce, Compagnia di S. Benedetto Bigio, Compagnia di S. Antonino da Padova, Compagnia dell'Agnolo Raffaello.

⁷⁶ P/D companies non-proximal to seat (18%): Compagnia di S. Giovanni Battista detto dello Scalzo, SS. Annunziata [della Nunziata], Compagnia di S. Maria Maddalena in S. Croce, Compagnia di S. Paolo, Pellegrini d'Oltremare.

⁷⁷ P/D companies with unknown seat location: S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo].

⁷⁸ Seat location determined by recorded data. If companies identified a quarter in their name, that quarter was assumed to be their seat location as companies often met in their originating parish or neighbourhood.

Data on eleven NAD/S companies with known or reasonably well-known seats shows that 6 (54.5%) held most of their property near their seat and 5 (45.5%) held properties further away.

The mapping shows that P/D companies with known or reasonably known seat locations were nearly tied between holding property nearby or away from their seat. Four P/D companies (44.4%) held property near their oratory or confraternal seat while five (55.6%) did not; in the case of one other it is difficult to tell.

In short, by 1561 there were few differences in the spatial distribution of properties between landowning NAD/S and P/D companies. The former held a slight majority of their properties close to their oratories or churches, while the latter held a slight majority away from their seat. Of course, Weissman's theory related to confraternities' members rather than their properties, but if we assume that most confraternities received their properties as gifts or legacies from members, the locations of those houses and shops does offer some indication of where members themselves clustered. It seems then that the sharp locational distinctions that Weissman found in fifteenth century confraternities had practically disappeared by the mid-sixteenth century.

Section Three: Spatial Mapping of Confraternal Residential and Commercial Properties

This section will take a closer look at confraternal density, property value, and rent/lease values and how these varied by city quarter. It will also compare these patterns to 1561 census data on individual landowners in Florence, showing how Florence's confraternal properties varied in value, location density, and revenue generation by its location in the city.

Table 8
Confraternal Property Data by City Quarter

Quarter	Total # Prop	Amt Res'l	Amt Comm'l	% NAD/S	% P/D	% C/O	% Other	Median Rent (Scudi)	Median Value (Scudi)	# Rent	# Lease	# Char- ity or Service	# Other
Santo Spirito	30	29/30	1/30	67%	17%	3%	13%	6	7.5	21/30 (70%)	6/30 (20%)	1/30 (3.3%)	2/30 (6.7%)
Santo Croce	32	28/32	4/32	12.5%	6.3%	62.5%	18.8%	6.4	7	20/32 (62.5%)	9/32 (28.1%)	3/32 (9.4%)	0/30 (0%)
Santa Maria Novella	17	17/17	0/17	29.4%	47.1%	11.1%	12.4%	7	8	8/17 (47.1%)	8/17 (47.1%)	1/17 (5.9%)	0/30 (0%)
San Giovanni	68	58/68	10/68	33.8%	8.8%	38.2%	19.1%	8	9	36/68 (52.9%)	31/68 (45.6%)	1/68 (1.5%)	0/30 (0%)

Florence's northernmost quarter of San Giovanni had the most confraternal properties by a large margin: 58 residential properties and 10 commercial properties, or 46.3% of all Florentine confraternal properties were located here. Confraternal properties in San Giovanni had the highest median values (9 scudi) and rents charged here were closest to the declared property value: 8 scudi – a 1 scudi or 11% loss in potential revenue. Among different confraternal types, C/O held 38% of properties (no surprise perhaps given the number of charitable institutions in this quarter) and NAD/S held 34%, while few were held by P/D brotherhoods (19%). Of the 68 confraternal properties in the quarter, only 1 was provided as free/charitable housing. Just over half of the properties were rented (53%) with all but one other property being leased (46%).

Confraternal properties in San Giovanni clustered near each other. Two areas had high-density, localized clusters and another two were more loosely clustered. The most significant cluster was in the heart of the old city between the cathedral and the Piazza della Signoria. The second cluster was near the square where both the Innocenti foundling home and the Church of Santissima Annunziata were located. Confraternal properties in this cluster had the highest values of all confraternal properties and were predominantly leased. Interestingly, Daniel Jamison's wealth index study of all Florentine properties circa 1561 finds that this area had the second-lowest property value across Florence.⁷⁹ As stated in section one, these high-value properties were primarily held by the Orsanmichele and were used as housing for company members. There was a loose clustering of confraternal property to the west where it joined with a Santa Maria Novella cluster. There was another loose concentration of confraternal property in the east, from the Borgo Pinti to the Borgo La Croce.




Figure 5. Confraternal Property Locations in City Centre (<https://arcg.is/1P108P>).

⁷⁹ Jamison, "Shaping the Streetscape," 67.

San Giovanni included the northern half of the city centre. Confraternal property, particularly commercial properties, clustered around the Mercato Vecchio. Although the city centre was the *de facto* heart of the city – containing many Florence’s churches, its oldest and most important religious centres and important sites of political and civic ceremony – it also had dense clusters of residential properties. Of the properties located within the city centre, many were owned by some of Florence’s oldest and most influential confraternities such as the Orsanmichele, the Tempio, and the Compagnia di S. Zanobi.⁸⁰ Many city centre properties were leased and had generally higher value compared to other properties in the city, ranging between 4 and 22 scudi. The higher valued properties were owned by companies such as the Compagnia della Nuntiata, Orsanmichele, and the Compagnia di S. Zanobi.

Many of the city centre properties were commercial or had a mercantile element such as a “*casa con bottega*” rented to a tailor on the Via de’ Martelli, a “*casa della Compagnia di S. Giuseppe con piu bottege sotto*” rented to a *rigattiere* (second-hand dealer) on the Chiasso del Piovano – Serrato, and a *hosteria* on the Chiasso del Piovano – Serrato.⁸¹ Yet overall, only 19 of 149 properties (12.75%) were in the city centre, suggesting that confraternities preferred to hold and develop their residential and commercial holdings in peripheral areas.

Santa Croce



Figure 6. Confraternal Property Locations in Santa Croce quarter. Polygons aligned with Buonsignori’s map of Florence (<https://arcris.org/1P108P>).

The second greatest concentration of confraternal residential and commercial property was in Santa Croce, south-east of San Giovanni. There were

⁸⁰ Weissman, *Ritual Brotherhood*, 72.

⁸¹ ASF, *Decima Granducale*, 3780: 1515 (casa con bottega), 3780:1225 (casa della Compagnia di S. Giuseppe), 3780:1237 (hosteria).

32 confraternal properties in Santa Croce, 28 of which were residential and 4 commercial; this represented 21.8% of all citywide confraternal property. They were spread widely, with a cluster between the Porta Santa Croce and the Via dei Malcontenti, particularly around the Chiesa di Santa Maria Vergine della Croce al Tempio.

C/O companies such as the Tempio and Orsanmichele held a significant majority (62.5%) of all confraternal property in this quarter. Many landholding companies fall into the category of those Unknown (18.75%), followed by NAD/S (12.5%) and P/D (6.25) brotherhoods.

Although it was not the poorest quarter in Florence, confraternal properties in Santa Croce had the lowest median values (7 scudi) and had the second-lowest residential rents (6.4 scudi) of all quarters. Median declared residential values were 2 scudi or 22% lower than in San Giovanni. Confraternities in Santa Croce charged their tenants 0.6 scudi less than the declared value, a discount of about 8.57%. They charged rents similar to those of companies in Santo Spirito, the poorest quarter of Florence. Most confraternal property in Santa Croce was provided under rental (62.5%) as opposed to lease (28%) agreements.

Notably, Santa Croce provided the largest number of charitable properties across the city, with three (9.98%) provided to residents without cost for charity. The Tempio led here with the free accommodations it provided to its members or staff in properties concentrated along the public execution route and particularly around their church of *Santa Maria Vergine della Croce al Tempio* and near the city gallows (by the Porta Santa Croce).

Santo Spirito




Figure 7. Confraternal property locations in Santo Spirito quarter (<https://arcgis/1P108P>).

The Santo Spirito quarter south of the Arno river had the third-most confraternal residential and commercial properties in 1561 (30 in total, or 20.13%). Nearly all were residential with only 1 commercial property. This property clustered around the Piazza del Carmine and the Porta San Piero Gattolini, with the significant majority of properties (close to three-quarters) clustered within the Drago Verde district, one of Florence's poorest neighbourhoods.⁸² Decima records reveal that Santo Spirito housed many trade workers, widows, and families without surnames – the most common lower-income groups.⁸³ The area had a vivacious sense of neighbourhood identity, influenced in considerable part by the activities and participation of local lay confraternities such as S. Frediano, known as “la Bruciata.”⁸⁴

NAD/S confraternities like the Bruciata owned 67% of all confraternal property in Santo Spirito. There were few properties owned by P/D companies (17%), or those in the categories of Unknown (13%) or C/O (3%). Although this data does not definitively prove whether Santo Spirito had a predominantly NAD/S membership, their significant presence in the area is telling. The properties could be used to provide long-term supports for members and community services.⁸⁵ They therefore helped maintain companies' survival by creating complex webs of economic and personal ties between individuals, families, and the confraternities.⁸⁶

Although it had the poorest demographic across Florence, Santo Spirito's confraternal properties did not have the lowest value compared to other quarters. Confraternities did however charge the least for accommodation across all of Florence (6 scudi, with a 1.5 scudi/20% slippage relative to median value). One property held by the Compagnia di S. Agnese in the Piazza del Carmine housed six widows without payment. A significant majority of confraternal properties in Santo Spirito were rented (70%), while only 20% was leased and 3% was charitably provided; arrangements for the remaining 7% are unknown. The dominance of rental properties underscores the poverty of inhabitants in the poorest quarter of the city. It is possible that some tenants could not financially commit to term-based leasing agreements. Economic mapping of the properties according to their contract type (e.g., rent, lease, etc.) shows that higher value homes were often leased whereas lower value homes were predominantly rented. Justine Walden and Nicholas Terpstra demonstrate that renting afforded tenants fewer rights than leasing did.⁸⁷ Therefore, the decision to rent or lease could entail complex economic

⁸² Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, 8.

⁸³ Litchfield, “Online Gazetteer,” Square 73 of map; Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, 8.

⁸⁴ Eckstein, *District of the Green Dragon*, xxii–xx.

⁸⁵ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 64, 170–171; Polizzotto, *Children of the Promise*, 194–195.

⁸⁶ Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 64, 170–171.

⁸⁷ Walden & Terpstra, “Who Owned Florence?,” 227.

relationships for confraternities that complicated their social and religious roles.

In sum, tenants in Santo Spirito lived in higher value homes for lower rents, had fewer legal protections and rights than confraternal tenants in other parts of Florence, and were predominantly engaged with NAD/S companies.

Santa Maria Novella




Figure 8. Confraternal property locations in Santo Spirito quarter (<https://arccgis/1P108P>).

Santa Maria Novella in the west of the city had the smallest concentration of confraternal property of all quarters: 17 residential properties and no commercial properties, constituting only 11.6% of the city's confraternal properties. These were widely spread, with a small cluster north and east of the church of S. Maria Novella itself.

The median value of confraternal properties in Santa Maria Novella was 8 scudi, the second highest in the city, with the highest-value properties located close to the church of S. Maria Novella. Companies in the area charged 1 scudi less than the median declared value, a 12.5% slippage relative to the property's value and potential revenue. As in Santo Spirito and San Giovanni, one confraternal property was provided as free charitable housing. The rest were split evenly between rental and lease tenancy agreements (47.06% each). These were primarily owned by P/D companies (47.06%), making this the

only quarter in which these confraternities held the majority of properties. NAD/S confraternities owned 29.41%, followed by C/O (11.11%) and Unknown companies (12.42%). In comparison to other quarters, it had among the highest median stated property values and the highest relative rents.

Conclusion

Using the DECIMA web application and GIS mapping, this essay has plotted and analysed confraternal residential and commercial property ownership in 1561 Florence. It divided the brotherhoods into three groups according to the scale of their landholdings (small, medium, large), and by company type (P/D, NAD/S, C/O, and Other) and location within Florence's four quarters. Digital tools allow us to analyse how property was used and valued differently by different confraternities. It identifies broad patterns, such as NAD/S companies tending to hold property near to each other and in particular areas of Florence while P/D companies were more dispersed. By the mid-sixteenth century the spatial differences that had formerly distinguished penitential (P/D) and devotional (NAD/S) companies seem to have disappeared, and P/D companies were relaxing the ascetic beliefs that had led them to reject property ownership in the previous century. Residential properties were found along the major streets that followed circuits of the old city walls and in the quarter of Santo Spirito, while most commercial property was in the city centre. Confraternities tended to hold property near other confraternities, particularly NAD/S brotherhoods, and some areas of the city exhibited high-density confraternal property ownership. Confraternal patterns in accommodation arrangements also emerged: confraternities that leased their property (i.e., large landholding groups) did so at significantly higher rates than the average individual landlord – they leased approximately 29–42% of their landholdings whereas only 3.9% of privately-owned properties were leased. Confraternal property therefore differed from privately-owned property because it generally had lower median property values (7–9 scudi versus 13.8 scudi), charged less for accommodation (6–7 scudi versus 11 scudi), and arranged significantly more of their properties under leases (29–42% versus 3.9%). A considerable number of residences were offered to house staff or members in exchange for service or to charitably house vulnerable and needy tenants at no or very low rents.

By analyzing these patterns, an image of how Florentine religious confraternities adapted residential property to suit their economic, social, and religious needs emerges. It demonstrates how the confraternal use of property was unique to the company itself, often aligning with the company's particular devotional character, its mission, and its values. This is evident in the pattern of companies holding property near institutionally significant sites (such as near their patronal church, or in the case of the Tempio, along the

public execution route). These conclusions are made possible by digital mapping tools such as the DECIMA WebGIS that allow comparative analysis of historical data on a city-wide scale. Using these tools, we can trace patterns in confraternal property ownership in 1561 Florence and highlight the complex economic, social, and religious relationships that confraternities created and supported through their properties.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Appendix⁸⁸Santo Spirito:**Residential (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3780) and Commercial (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3784) Confraternal Properties, 1561**

Standardised Name	Origin Year	Company Type	Prop. Type	Rent (Scudi)	# Ten'ts (Male)	# Ten'ts (Female)	Contract	Prop. Descr.	Street	Vol.: Entry #	Reference
Annunciazione / S. Giorgio	Unknown	NAD/S	Residential		1	1	Lineal Lease	House	Costa di S. Giorgio	3780:339	Eisenbichler BAR, 30–31; Ferrini #93 [see Ferrini #10, 56, 57 for associated adult groups]
Annunciazione / S. Giorgio	Unknown	NAD/S	Residential	3	2	1	Rent	House	Costa di S. Giorgio	3780:316	Eisenbichler BAR, 30–31; Ferrini #93 [see Ferrini #10, 56, 57 for associated adult groups]

⁸⁸ Information regarding properties (number of properties, value/rent, holding type, location, tenants) drawn from 1561 *Decima ricerca*. Information regarding alternate company names, years of establishment, and some meeting places/patronal churches is credited to John Henderson's "Appendix: Confraternities Meeting in Florence, 1240–1499" in *Piety and Charity*, 443–474, and to Ludovico Ferrini's "Sommario delle compagnie e fraternite della citta di Firenze (1589)" in G. Aranci, *Formazione religiosa e santita laicale a Firenze*, 335–339.

Annun- ciazione / S. Giorgio	Un- known	NAD/S	Residen- tial	6	3	6	Rent	Cottage	Costa di S. Giorgio	3780:280	Eisenbichler BAR, 30–31; Ferrini #93 [see Ferrini #10, 56, 57 for associated adult groups]
Archangelo Raffaelle [Raffa]	1454	P/D	Residen- tial	11	2	3	Rent	House	Via delle Caldaie	3780: 986	Henderson P&C #12; check Sebreghondi TCF; Ferrini #1; adult group in S. Spirito
Assunzione della Nos- tra Donna (Ciottolo)	1429	NAD/S	Residen- tial	7	1	1	Rent	House with work- shop	Via S. Piero Gattolini	3780:664	Henderson P&C #13; Ferrini #37; Record name is Compagnia del Ciostolo
Assunzione della Nos- tra Donna (Ciottolo)	1429	NAD/S	Residen- tial	8	1	1	Rent	House	Via S. Giovanni	3780:842	Henderson P&C #13; Ferrini #37; Record name is Compagnia del Ciostolo
Assunzione della Nos- tra Donna (Ciottolo)	1429	NAD/S	Residen- tial	6	3	3	Rent	House	Borgo S. Niccolo	3780:73	Henderson P&C #13; Ferrini #37; Record name is Compagnia del Ciostolo

Purgatori	Un-known	Un-known	Commercial	3			Rent	Workshop	Borgo San Niccolo	3784: SS.24	
S. Agnese [S. M.a delle Laudi]	1249	NAD/S	Residential		0	6	Held without Payment	House	Piazza del Carmine – Canto al Leone	3780:2031	Henderson P&C #2; Ferrini #3
S. Agnese [S. M.a delle Laudi]	1249	NAD/S	Residential	12	2	1	Lineal Lease	House	Via del Campuccio	3780:1567	Henderson P&C #2; Ferrini #3
S. Agnese [S. M.a delle Laudi]	1249	NAD/S	Residential	11	8	7	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2001	Henderson P&C #2; Ferrini #3
S. Agnese [S. M.a delle Laudi]	1249	NAD/S	Residential	4	3	3	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2267	Henderson P&C #2; Ferrini #3
S. Antonio da Padova	1466	P/D	Residential	2	0	0	Rent	un magazzino sotto la compagnia	Costa di S. Giorgio	3780:349	Henderson P&C #9; Ferrini #10 [S. Antonio da Padova Disciplina d'huomini in San Giorgio]

S. Corino nella Nuntiata	Un- known	Un- known	Residen- tial	6	3	6	Rent	House	Via del Fiore	3780:1805	Unknown
S. Fred- iano [la Bruciata]	1324	NAD/S	Residen- tial	6	5	2	Rent	House	Via Nuova	3780:2019	Henderson P&C #58; Ferrini #52 [S. Fri- ano detto la bruciata Stendardo]
S. Fred- iano [la Bruciata]	1324	NAD/S	Residen- tial	9.5	0	3	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:1983	Henderson P&C #58; Ferrini #52 [S. Fri- ano detto la bruciata Stendardo]
S. Fred- iano [la Bruciata]	1324	NAD/S	Residen- tial	7	3	3	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2195	Henderson P&C #58; Ferrini #52 [S. Fri- ano detto la bruciata Stendardo]
S. Fred- iano [la Bruciata]	1324	NAD/S	Residen- tial	18	4	1	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2270	Henderson P&C #58; Ferrini #52 [S. Fri- ano detto la bruciata Stendardo]

S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo]	1376	P/D	Residential	3	4	1	Rent	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2197	Henderson P&C #66; Ferrini #58 [S. Giovanbattista Disciplina d'huomini detta lo Scalzo dietro a san Marco]
S. Iacopo de' Bianchi	1405	P/D	Residential	4	5	5	Life Lease	House	Canto al Leone	3780:2024	Ferrini #67 [S. Iacopo Disciplina d'huomini in borgo San Iacopo]
S. Maria del Giglio detto de' Ciechi [S. M.a de' Poveri]	1347	C/O	Residential	2.4	1	3	Owner Occupied	House	Borgo S. Friano	3780:2061	Henderson P&C 104 [record name is Compagnia dei Ciechi]
S. Maria del Giglio e S. Giuseppe dei Caligai e Conciatori [?]	1405	NAD/S	Residential	4	3	4	Rent	House	Via di Gusciana	3780:1659	Henderson P&C #103; Ferrini #64 [S. Giuseppe standardo d'huomini da pelacani]; Source name is Compagnia di S. Giuseppe
S. Maria delle Laude e dello S. Spirito, detta del Piccione [?]	1329	NAD/S	Residential	8	5	5	Lineal Lease	House	Via Chiara	3780:929	Henderson P&C #110; Source name is Compagnia del Pippione

S. Maria delle Laude e dello S. Spirito, detta del Piccione [?]	1329	NAD/S	Residential	8	2	4	Rent	House	Via S. Maria	3780:704	Henderson P&C #110; Source name is Compagnia del Pippione
S. Maria delle Laude e dello S. Spirito, detta del Piccione [?]	1329	NAD/S	Residential	10	4	1	Rent	House	Via s. Giovanni	3780:724	Henderson P&C #110; Source name is Compagnia del Pippione
S. Sebastiano de' Genovesi	1474	NAD/S	Residential	4.1	2	2	Rent	House	Via S. Salvatore	3780:1814	Henderson P&C #147
S. Zanobi	1281	NAD/S	Residential	5	4	3	Rent	House	Canto al Leone	3780:2023	Henderson P&C #162; Ferrini #143
S. Piero a Monticelli	Unknown	Unknown	Residential	3.2	2	4	Unknown	House	Via Nuova	3780:2075	This is the parish church of Monticelli. Not in Ferrini

SS. Innocenti	Un- known	Un- known	Residen- tial	6	2	2	Life Lease	House	Via Mazzetta	3780:1035	Henderson P&C #78; Ferrini 69
SS. Innocenti	Un- known	Un- known	Residen- tial	7	3	3	Life Lease	House	Via d' Ardi- glione	3780:1874	Henderson P&C #92; Ferrini #69; JH =P/D; Ferrini = NAD/S; Source name is In- nocenti di S. Maria Novella]

Santa Croce:

**Residential (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3781) and Commercial (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3784) Confraternal Properties,
1561**

Standardised Name	Origin Year	Company Type	Prop. Type	Rent (Scudi)	# Ten'ts (Male)	# Ten'ts (Female)	Contract	Prop. Descr.	Street	Vol.: Entry #	Reference
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	4	4	2	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3069	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	4	3	2	Rent	Home	Via dei Pelacani	3781:3071	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		2	1	Held without Payment	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3155	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6	1	1	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3156	Henderson P&C #102

S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6	2	2	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3157	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		4	6	Rent	Home	Via del Crocefisso	3781:3158	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6	1	2	Rent	Home	Via dell'Agnolo	3781:3177	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6.5	6	3	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3194	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	7	4	4	Rent	Home	Via del Crocefisso	3781:3195	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	7	5	3	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3274	Henderson P&C #102

S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	10	5	5	Rent	Home	Via S. Francesco	3781:3384	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		2	2	Held without Payment	Home	Via del Crocefisso	3781:3385	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		2	3	Lineal Lease	Home with shop	Via della Condotta	3781:4275	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6.4	3	2	Lineal Lease	Home	Via della Condotta	3781:4276	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	15	N/A	N/A	Lease	Workshop	Via della Condotta	3784:SC.212	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	2	N/A	N/A	Lease	Home with shop	Via della Condotta	3784:SC.213	Henderson P&C #102

S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	8	N/A	N/A	Rent	Workshop	Via della Condotta	3784:SC.214	Henderson P&C #102
Carita di San Lorenzo	1379	NAD/S	Residential	22	3	2	Rent	Home	Via Ghibellina	3781:4784	JH: this = Compagnia della Carità in San Lorenzo. See their records in the Capitolo of San Lorenzo, Biblioteca Lauranziana. NT: Ferrini #32 as: 'Carita' stendardo d'huomini in via mozza'
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential		6	2	Lineal Lease	Home with shop	Piazza S. Croce	3781:4120	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	9	5	6	Lineal Lease	Home with small shop	Piazza del Grano	3781:4651	Henderson P&C #92

Misericordia	1244	C/O	Residential	7	1	3	Rent	Home	Via Torta / Via dei Vassellai / Via de' Cocchi	3781:4186	Henderson P&C #124
S. Maria del Giglio e S. Giuseppe dei Caligai e Conciatori [?]	1405	NAD/S	Residential	4	4	3	Rent	Home	Via dei Pelacani	3781:3072	Henderson P&C #103; Ferrini #64 [S. Giuseppe stendardo d'huomini da pelacani]
S. Maria del Giglio e S. Giuseppe dei Caligai e Conciatori [?]	1405	NAD/S	Residential		1	1	Held by Service	Home with shop	Via dei Pelacani	3781:3203	Henderson P&C #103; Ferrini #64 [S. Giuseppe stendardo d'huomini da pelacani]
S. Maria Maddalena	1449	P/D	Residential	7.5	3	2	Rent	Home	Borgo Allegri	3781:3291	Henderson P&C #113 [address]; Ferrini 75 [S. Maria Maddalena Disciplina d'huomini in Santa Croce]

S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi [?]	1415	Un- known	Resi- den- tial	3.2	1	1	Rent	Home	Via di S. Verdiana	3781:3025	Henderson P&C #121? All 5 of these are contiguous – by modern S. Ambro- gio market on Via Visdomini where there was a ruined casolare; OR Fer- rini #84 [S. Michele stendardo d'huo- mini nella Vergine Maria de' Ricci]
S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi [?]	1415	Un- known	Resi- den- tial	2	1	2	Rent	Home	Via del Casolare	3781:3044	Henderson P&C #121? All 5 of these are contiguous – by modern S. Ambro- gio market on Via Visdomini where there was a ruined casolare; OR Ferrini #84 [S. Michele stendardo d'huo- mini nella Vergine Maria de' Ricci]

S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi [?]	1415	Un-known	Residential	3.4	2	2	Rent	Home	Via del Casolare	3781:3082	Henderson P&C #121? All 5 of these are contiguous – by modern S. Ambrogio market on Via Visdomini where there was a ruined casolare; OR Ferrini #84 [S. Michele stendardo d'huomini nella Vergine Maria de' Ricci]
S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi [?]	1415	Un-known	Residential	3.2	4	3	Life Lease	Home	Via del Casolare	3781:3083	Henderson P&C #121? All 5 of these are contiguous – by modern S. Ambrogio market on Via Visdomini where there was a ruined casolare; OR Ferrini #84 [S. Michele stendardo d'huomini nella Vergine Maria de' Ricci]

S. Michele Arcangelo della Pace e de' Bianchi [?]	1415	Unknown	Residential	3	4	2	Life Lease	Home	Via di S. Verdiana	3781:3116	Henderson P&C #121? All 5 of these are contiguous – by modern S. Ambrogio market on Via Visdomini where there was a ruined casolare; OR Ferrini #84 [S. Michele stendardo d'huomini nella Vergine Maria de' Ricci]
S. Zanobi	1281	NAD/S	Residential	8	5	6	Rent	Home	Via di S. Verdiana	3781:3314	Henderson P&C #162; Ferrini #143
S. Gioseppe [Giuseppe?]	If Giuseppe, 1405	If Giuseppe, NAD/S	Commercial	10			Rent	Workshop	Via de' Malcontenti; Via Pelacani	3784: SC.4	Henderson P&C #103; Ferrini #64 [S. Giuseppe stendardo d'huomini da pelacani]
SS. Annunziata [della Nunziata]	1454	P/D	Residential		2	4	Life Lease	Home with shop	Piazza del Grano	3781:4758	Henderson P&C #6; Ferrini #94; Source name Compagnia della Nuntiata

Santa Maria Novella:
Residential (Volume 3782) and Commercial (Volume 3784) Confraternal Properties, 1561

Standardised Name	Origin Year	Company Type	Prop. Type	Rent (Scudi)	# Ten'ts (Male)	# Ten'ts (Female)	Contract	Prop. Descr.	Street	Vol.: Entry #	Reference
Compagnia della Parita Seggi del Sacramento	Unknown	Unknown	Residential		3	4	Life Lease	Home	Via di Guelda-fonda	3782:119	Ferrini #101; Source name Compagnia del Pellegrino di S. Maria Novella
Crocifisso dei Bianchi o di S. Agostino o di S. Maria	Unknown	P/D	Residential	4	1	3	Rent	Home	Piazza di S. Donato	3782:1427	Henderson P&C #50; Ferrini #42 [Crocifisso Disciplina d'huomini detta in Bianchi che si raguna in S. M.a Nuova]; [? – in S. Spirito; this isn't]
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	20	5	8	Rent	Home	Piazza di S. Andrea	3782:1520	Madonna di Orsanmichele
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	8	2	5	Term Lease	Home	Via di Guelda-fonda	3782:887	Madonna di Orsanmichele

Pellegrini d'Oltramare	1279	P/D	Residential	11	3	2	Rent	Home	Via di Guelda-fonda	3782:129	Ferrini #101; Source name Compagnia del Pellegrino di S. Maria Novella
S. Agnese [S. M.a delle Laudi]	1249	NAD/S	Residential	7	0	5	Life Lease	Home	Via del Moro	3782:1185	Henderson P&C #2; Ferrini #3; Source name Compagnia di S. Agnese nel Carmine
S. Benedetto Nero e S. Giuliano [S. Benedetto Bigio]	1357	P/D	Residential	4	1	2	Rent	Home	Via Gora	3782:596	Henderson P&C #22; Ferrini #26 [S. Benedetto Disciplina d'huomini vestiti di bigio in S. M.a Novella]
S. Benedetto Nero e S. Giuliano [S. Benedetto Bigio]	1357	P/D	Residential	5	2	3	Rent	Home	Via Gora	3782:597	Henderson P&C #22; Ferrini #26 [S. Benedetto Disciplina d'huomini vestiti di bigio in S. M.a Novella]
S. Benedetto Nero e S. Giuliano [S. Benedetto Bigio]	1357	P/D	Residential	7.5	2	4	Rent	Home	Via Gora	3782:598	Henderson P&C #22; Ferrini #26 [S. Benedetto Disciplina d'huomini vestiti di bigio in S. M.a Novella]

S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo]	1376	P/D	Residential	5	2	1	Rent	Home	Chiasso dei Teri	3782:1415	Henderson P&C #66; Ferrini #58 [S. Giovanbattista Disciplina d'huomini detta lo Scalzo dietro a san Marco]
S. Paolo	1434*	P/D	Residential		3	4	Lineal Lease	Home	Piazza S. Maria Novella	3782:773	JH=In Piazza S. Maria Novella; near one of S. Paolo Martire; NT=Ferrini #100 as "S. Paulo Disciplina d'huomini nel Vangelista"
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential		1	4	Term Lease	Home	Via dell'Amore	3782:974	Henderson P&C #138
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential		2	1	Term Lease	Home	Via dell'Amore	3782:1029	Henderson P&C #138

S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential		3	1	Term Lease	Home	Piazza Vecchia di S. Maria Novella	3782:1046	Henderson P&C #138
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential		0	3	Held without Payment	Home	Via di Guelda-fonda	3782:889	Henderson P&C #138
SS. Annunziata [della Nunziata]	1454	P/D	Residential		2	2	Term Lease	Home	Via di Guelda-fonda	3782:150	Henderson P&C #6; Ferrini #94
SS. Innocenti	Unknown	Unknown	Residential		4	4	Rent	Home	Via Nuova da S. Paulo	3782: 642	Henderson P&C #78; Ferrini 69; JH =P/D; Ferrini = NAD/S

San Giovanni:

Residential (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3783) and Commercial (ASF Decima Grande Ducale 3784) Confraternal Properties, 1561

Standardised Name	Origin Year	Comp. Type	Prop. Type	Rent (Scudi)	# Tenants (Male)	# Tenants (Female)	Contract	Prop Descr	Street	Volume: Entry #	Reference
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		2	2	Held by Service	Guard's home	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2429	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	6	2	3	Rent	Home	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2427	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	7	1	2	Rent	Home	Via di Cafaggiolo	3783:2019	Henderson P&C #102

S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential		0	0	Life Lease	Home	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2428	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Residential	12	2	3	Rent	Home	Via del Giardino (Canto)	3783:3167	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	6	N/A	N/A	Lease	Workshop	Via fra Rigattieri	3784:SG.526	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	8	N/A	N/A	Lease	Workshop	on the Via fra Rigattieri	3784:SG.527	Henderson P&C #102
S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	12.2	N/A	N/A	Hereditary lease	Workshop	Via Macchiana, near Canto de' Pecori	3784:SG.593	Henderson P&C #102

S. Maria della Croce al Tempio ['Neri']	1347	C/O	Commercial	12	N/A	N/A	Rent	Workshop	Via fra Rigattieri	3784:SG.523	Henderson P&C #102
Carità di San Lorenzo	1379	NAD/S	Residential	10	2	1	Rent	Home	Via Mozza	3783:138	JH: this = Compagnia della Carità in San Lorenzo. See their records in the Capitolo of San Lorenzo, Biblioteca Laurenziana. NT: Ferrini #32 as: 'Carita' stendardo d'huomini in via mozza'
Carità di San Lorenzo	1379	NAD/S	Residential	69	0	0	Rent	Hosteria	Chiasso del Piovano – Serrato	3783:1237	JH: this = Compagnia della Carità in San Lorenzo. See their records in the Capitolo of San Lorenzo, Biblioteca Laurenziana. NT: Ferrini #32 as: 'Carita' stendardo d'huomini in via mozza'

Carità di San Lorenzo	1379	NAD/S	Residential	10	3	3	Rent	Home with work-shop	Via de' Martelli	3783:1515	JH: this = Compagnia della Carità in San Lorenzo. See their records in the Capitolo of San Lorenzo, Biblioteca Laurenziana. NT: Ferrini #32 as: 'Carità' stendardo d'huomini in via mozza'
Carità di San Lorenzo	1379	NAD/S	Commercial	112	N/A	N/A	Rent	Tavern	Chiasso Malacucina	3784:SG.582	JH: this = Compagnia della Carità in San Lorenzo. See their records in the Capitolo of San Lorenzo, Biblioteca Laurenziana. NT: Ferrini #32 as: 'Carità' stendardo d'huomini in via mozza'
Concezione	1491	Unknown	Residential	18	2	3	Rent	Home	Via dei Pilastrì	3783:2369	Henderson P&C #41; Source name Compagnia della Concezione

Crocifisso di S. Piero del Burrone	Unknown	Unknown	Residential	N/A	1	2	Life Lease	Home	Via S. Gallo	3783:1329	Not in Henderson or Ferrini
Lacuini (?)	Unknown	Unknown	Commercial	6	N/A	N/A	Rent	Workshop	Canto a Monteloro	3784:SG.71	
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	8	2	5	Rent	Home	Via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino	3783:935	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	N/A	2	3	Term Lease	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:57	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	N/A	3	3	Term Lease	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:58	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	12	3	5	Term Lease	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:59	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	15	5	4	Term Lease	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:56	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	16	0	2	Rent	Home	Via dell'Amore	3783:936	Henderson P&C #92

Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	N/A	1	2	Rent	Home	Via dell'Amore	3783:937	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	N/A	2	1	Lineal Lease	Home	Via dei Servi	3783:2060	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	26	6	7	Lineal Lease	Home	Via dei Servi	3783:2061	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	40	7	5	Term Lease	Home	Via dei Servi	3783:2062	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	20	3	3	Lineal Lease	Home	Via dei Servi – Piazza dei Servi	3783:2059	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	19	3	3	Lineal Lease	Home with workshop	Canto alle Rondine	3783:3163	Henderson P&C #92
Madonna di Orsanmichele	1291	C/O	Residential	8	3	4	Rent	Home	Via Santucce	3783:3143	Henderson P&C #92
Misericordia	1244	C/O	Residential	4	0	4	Rent	Home	Borgo Allegri	3783:3000	Henderson P&C #124

Miseri-cordia	1244	C/O	Resi-dential	N/A	5	5	Term Lease	Home	Via dell'Ariento	3783:697	Henderson P&C #124
Pellegrini d'Oltra-mare	1279	P/D	Resi-dential	5	1	2	Life Lease	Home	Via Nuova	3783:2205	Ferrini #101; Com-pagnia del Pel-legrino di S. Maria Novella
S. Zanobi o di S. Rep-arata dei Laudesi	1281	NAD/S	Resi-dential	10	2	3	Term Lease	Home	Via de' Martelli	3783:1651	Henderson P&C #162; Ferrini #143
S. Catar-ina de' Barbieri	Un-known	NAD/S	Resi-dential	20	4	4	Lineal Lease	Home	Via S. Sebastiano	3783:1902	Ferrini #34 "S Caterina Stend-ardo d'huomini barbieri dietro alla Nuntiata"
S. Concordia	1429	NAD/S	Resi-dential	5	1	4	Rent	Home	Via S. Bernaba	3783:451	Henderson P&C #42; Ferrini #38 [Concordia Sten-dardo d'huomini ricontra a S. Bernaba]

S. Concordia	1429	NAD/S	Residential	10	8	6	Rent	Home	Via S. Bernaba	3783:450	Henderson P&C #42; Ferrini #38 [Concordia Stendardo d'huomini ricontro a S. Bernaba]
S. Concordia	1429	NAD/S	Residential	9	1	5	Rent	Home	Via dell'Ariento	3783:700	Henderson P&C #42; Ferrini #38 [Concordia Stendardo d'huomini ricontro a S. Bernaba]
S. Concordia	1429	NAD/S	Residential	8	4	3	Rent	Home	Via S. Orsola	3783:534	Henderson P&C #42; Ferrini #38 [Concordia Stendardo d'huomini ricontro a S. Bernaba]; [property on S. Orsola = close to church S. Barnaba]
S. Gilio e della V.M., detta la Crocetta	1278	NAD/S	Residential	3.2	2	4	Rent	Home	Via Chiara	3783:495	Henderson P&C #61; Source name Compagnia della Crocetta

S. Gilio e della V.M., detta la Crocetta	1278	NAD/S	Residential	6	3	5	Rent	Home	Via del Giglio	3783:2294	Henderson P&C #61; Source name Compagnia della Crocetta
S. Gilio e della V.M., detta la Crocetta	1278	NAD/S	Residential	6	3	2	Life Lease	Home	Via del Giardino	3783:2635	Henderson P&C #61; Source name Compagnia della Crocetta
S. Giobbe	1499	NAD/S	Residential	N/A	3	5	Term Lease	Home	Via S. Sebastiano	3783:1903	Ferrini #54 [S. Giob Stendardo d'huomini dietro alla Nuntiata] 2006 AMF Confraternity Itinerary; Source name Compagnia di S. Giobbo
S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo]	1376	P/D	Residential	8.5	0	0	Term Lease	Home	Via de' Pinti	3783:2590	Henderson P&C #66; Ferrini #58 [S. Giovanbattista Disciplina d'huomini detta lo Scalzo dietro a san Marco]; Source name Compagnia di S. Giovanni Battista detto dello Scalzo

S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo]	1376	P/D	Residential	8.5	5	3	Term Lease	Home	Via Fiesolana	3783:2569	Henderson P&C #66; Ferrini #58 [S. Giovanbattista Disciplina d'huomini detta lo Scalzo dietro a san Marco]; Source name Compagnia di S. Giovanni Battista detto dello Scalzo
S. Giovanni Battista [lo Scalzo]	1376	P/D	Residential	N/A	2	5	Life Lease	Home	Via della Colonna	3783:1971	Henderson P&C #66; Ferrini #58 [S. Giovanbattista Disciplina d'huomini detta lo Scalzo dietro a san Marco]; Source name Compagnia di S. Giovanni Battista detto dello Scalzo
S. Lorenzo delle Donne [?]	1303	P/D	Residential	3.5	0	1	Rent	Home	Via S. Gallo – Via S. Catarina	3783:45	Henderson P&C #87 [female tenants; see location]) OR Ferrini #71 [S. Lorenzo in piano Disciplina d'huomini dietro alla Nuntiata]; Type is Sorority/P/D

S. Lorenzo delle Donne [?]	1303	P/D	Residential	7	0	2	Rent	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:46	Henderson P&C #87 [female tenants; see location]) OR Ferrini #71 [S. Lorenzo in piano Disciplina d'huomini dietro alla Nuntiata]; Type is Sorority/P/D
S. Lorenzo delle Donne [?]	1303	P/D	Residential	14	1	3	Rent	Home	Via S. Catarina	3783:47	Henderson P&C #87 [female tenants; see location]) OR Ferrini #71 [S. Lorenzo in piano Disciplina d'huomini dietro alla Nuntiata]; Type is Sorority/P/D
S. Maria del Giglio detto de' Ciechi [S. M.a de' Poveri]	1324	C/O	Residential	5	2	3	Rent	Home	Via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino – Cella di Ciardo	3783:681	Henderson P&C 104 [via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino; also called Compagnia di S. Maria a Quarto]

S. Maria del Giglio detto de' Ciechi [S. M.a de' Poveri]	1324	C/O	Residential	6	2	5	Rent	Home	Via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino	3783:934	Henderson P&C 104 [via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino; also called Compagnia di S. Maria a Quarto]
S. Maria del Giglio e S. Giuseppe dei Caligai e Conciatori [?]	1405	NAD/S	Residential	25	10	7	Term Lease	Home with small workshop	Chiasso del Piovano – Serrato	3783:1225	Henderson P&C #103; Ferrini #64 [S. Giuseppe standardo d'huomini da pelacani]
S. Maria della Neve	~1445	Unknown	Residential	4	3	3	Rent	Home	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2784	Henderson P&C #114; Ferrini #78; JH =P/D; Ferrini = NAD/S
S. Maria delle Laude e di S. Ambrogio	1466	NAD/S	Residential	3	4	4	Lineal Lease	Home with small workshop	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2786	Henderson P&C #105 [or 121]; Source name Compagnia dei Bianchi di S. Ambrogio

S. Maria Maddalena	1449	P/D	Residential	N/A	3	2	Term Lease	Home	Piazza S. Marco	3783:1573	Henderson P&C #113 [address]; Ferrini 75 [S. Maria Maddalena Disciplina d'huomini in Santa Croce]
S. Pier Maggiore	Unknown	Unknown	Residential	7	1	2	Rent	Home	Via dell'Agnolo	3783:3033	Henderson P&C #137: JH =P/D; Ferrini = NAD/S
S. Pier Maggiore	Unknown	Unknown	Residential	7	0	6	Rent	Home	Borgo della Porta alla Croce	3783:2421	Henderson P&C #137: JH =P/D; Ferrini = NAD/S
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential	12	2	2	Term Lease	Home	Via Chiara – Via Romita	3783:754	Henderson P&C #138
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Residential	N/A	4	4	Life Lease	Home	Via S. Jacopo in Campo Corbolino	3783:850	Henderson P&C #138
S. Pier Martire e Laude della V.M.	1244	NAD/S	Commercial	14	N/A	N/A	Rented to Antonio di (?) di Antonio di Dino	Workshop	Mercato Vecchio, north side	3784:SG.932	Henderson P&C #138

S. Zanobi	1281	NAD/S	Residential	N/A	0	0	Life Lease	Home	Via Fogna Vecchia	3783:2174	JH=this is the same as the Compagnia di San Zanobi in the Duomo. NT = Ferrini #143
S. Zanobi	1281	NAD/S	Residential	6	0	0	Rent	Shop	Piazza di Chiasso	3783:1248	Henderson P&C #162; Ferrini #143
S. Zanobi	1281	NAD/S	Commercial	N/A	25	N/A	Rent	Workshop	Mercato Vecchio	3784:SG.513	Henderson P&C #162; Ferrini #143
San Bastiano del Carmine	Unknown	Unknown	Commercial	46	N/A	N/A	Rent	Workshop	Mercato Vecchio, south side	3784:SG.643	
San Joseppo	Unknown	Unknown	Commercial	5	N/A	N/A	Lease	Workshop	Canto de' Pecori, near Piazza di San Rufello	3784:SG.553	
SS. Annunziata [della Nunziata]	1454	P/D	Residential	N/A	4	3	Life Lease	Home	Via Pietrapiana – Piazza S. Ambrogio – Via dei Sbanditi	3783:2635	Henderson P&C #6; Ferrini #94; Source name Compagnia della Nuntiata

SS. Eligio e Lorenzo dei Manescalchi [S. Lo.]	1396	NAD/S	Residential	5	3	4	Rent	Home	Via S. Gallo	3783:1318	Henderson P&C #53; Source name Compagnia dei Marescalchi
Vergine Maria (della Fogna)	Unknown	Unknown	Residential	2.9	1	0	Rent	Home	Via Tedesca	3783:431	JH = I suspect that this is a reference to one of the main laudesi companies that has an entrance on a Via della Fogna. NT= Not in Ferrini – Entrance on via Tedesca next to garden of the Monasterio S. Onofrio, aka di Fuligno
Vergine Maria delle Laude	1244	NAD/S	Residential	7	2	3	Rent	Home	Via Chiara	3783:517	Henderson P&C #156; Ferrini #80; Source name Vergine Maria degli Laudi di S. Croce

CITED WORKS

Abbreviations

ASF Archivio di Stato di Firenze

Manuscript Sources

Florence. Archivio di Stato di Firenze (ASF)
Fondo Decima Granducale mss 3780 (S. Spirito), 3781 (S. Croce), 3782
 (S. Maria Novella), 3783 (S. Giovanni), 3784 (Botteghe).

Printed Sources

- Barr, Cyrilla. *The Monophonic Lauda and the Lay Religious Confraternities of Tuscany and Umbria in the Late Middle Ages*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University / Medieval Institute, 1988.
- Eckstein, Nicholas A. *The District of the Green Dragon: Neighbourhood Life and Social Change in Renaissance Florence*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1995.
- Eisenbichler, Konrad. *The Boys of the Archangel Raphael: A Youth Confraternity in Florence, 1411–1785*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Falvey, Kathleen. “Scaffold and Stage: Comforting Rituals and Dramatic Traditions in Late Medieval and Renaissance Italy.” In Nicholas Terpstra, ed, *The Art of Executing Well*. Early Modern Studies Series. Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2008, 13–31.
- Ferrini, Luca. “Sommario delle Compagnie e fraternite della città di Firenze (1589).” In Gilberto Aranci (ed), *Formazione religiosa e santità laicale a Firenze tra Cinque a Seicento*. Pubblicazioni dell’Archivio Arcivescovile di Firenze, Studi e Testi 2. Florence: Gimapiero Pagnini, 1997, 335–339.
- Glixon, Jonathan. “Singing Praises to God: Confraternities and Music.” In Konrad Eisenbichler, ed., *A Companion to Medieval and Early Modern Confraternities*. Leiden: Brill, 2019, 329–344.
- Goldthwaite, Richard A. *The Building of Renaissance Florence: An Economic and Social History*. ACLS Humanities E-Book. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- Hammersley, Martyn. “Chicago Sociology.” In Id., *The Dilemma of Qualitative Method: Herbert Blumer and the Chicago Tradition*. London: Routledge, 1989, 63–87.
- Henderson, John. *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Jamison, Daniel. “Shaping the Streetscape: Institutions as Landlords in Early Modern Florence.” In Nicholas Terpstra and Colin Rose, eds., *Mapping*

- Space, Sense, and Movement in Florence: Historical GIS and the Early Modern City*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016, 63–85.
- Polizzotto, Lorenzo. *Children of the Promise: The Confraternity of the Purification and the Socialization of Youths in Florence, 1427–1785*. Oxford-Warburg Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Prosperi, Adriano. “Consolation or Condemnation: The Debates on Withholding Sacraments from Prisoners.” In Nicholas Terpstra, ed., *The Art of Executing Well*. Early Modern Studies Series. Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2008, 98–118.
- Terpstra, Nicholas. “Body Politics: The Criminal Body between Public and Private.” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45.1 (2015): 7–52. Online at <https://doi.org/10.1215/10829636-2830004>.
- Trexler, Richard C. *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc., 1980. Online at <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015002181702>.
- Trexler, Richard C. “Ritual in Florence: Adolescence and Salvation in the Renaissance.” In Heiko A. Oberman and Charles E. Trinkaus, eds., *The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion: Papers from the University of Michigan Conference*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, 10. Leiden: Brill, 1974, 200–271.
- Walden, Justine, and Nicholas Terpstra. “Who Owned Florence? Religious Institutions and Property Ownership in the Early Modern City.” *Journal of Early Modern History* 26.3 (2021): 222–267. Online at <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/10.1163/15700658-bja10021>.
- Weissman, Ronald F. E. *Ritual Brotherhood in Renaissance Florence*. New York, NY: Academic Press, Inc., 1982. Online at <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106005284663>.
- Wilson, Blake. *Music and Merchants The Laudesi Companies of Republican Florence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Electronic Sources

- DECIMA. “DECIMA.” Accessed 26 October 2022. <https://decima-map.net/>.
- Litchfield, R. Burr. *Florence Ducal Capital, 1530–1630. Fulcrum.Org*. New York: ACLS Humanities E-Book, 2008. <https://hdl-handle-net.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/2027/heb90034.0001.001>.
- Litchfield, R. Burr. “Online Gazetteer of Sixteenth Century Florence.” Accessed 5 September 2020. https://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/florentine_gazetteer/citation.php.
- Plebani, Eleonara. “PANDOLFINI, Pier Filippo: Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani.” Treccani: Biographical Dictionary of Italians, 2014. [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-filippo-pandolfini_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pier-filippo-pandolfini_(Dizionario-Biografico)).

- Rose, Colin. "Walking the Last Mile." *Hidden Florence*, 2019. https://hiddenflorence.org/stories/ercole-crime-and-punishment/ercole5_malcontenti/.
- Wilder, Colin. "DECIMA: The Digitally-Encoded Census Information and Mapping Archive." *Spenser Review* 44.1.10. Accessed 26 October 2022. <https://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenseronline/review/volume-44/441/digital-projects/decima-the-digitally-encoded-census-information-and-mapping-archive/%2C/>.