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I. Introduction

1.1. Florentine-Hungarian economic relations – The geographical context of the research

The political and economic relations of the medieval Kingdom of Hungary with Italy have always been of great interest for Hungarian researchers. Considering the geo-political situation of medieval Hungary, however, it seems more apt that Venice would be actively present in Hungary’s economic life than Florence. In fact, Venice became the most important commercial partner of the kingdom from the thirteenth century onwards, despite the somewhat fractious political relations connected to the ambitions of both parties regarding the Dalmatian territories and the Adriatic ports.¹ The intense commercial relations between Venice and Hungary were mostly motivated by the Venetians’ need for Hungarian copper, silver (later also gold) in order to finance the Levantine trade and the yearly mude of the Serenissima.² In the first decades of the fourteenth century, however – after the sudden death of the last ruler of the House of Árpád, King Andrew III (1290-1301), known as “the Venetian” because of his descent from the Venetian patrician family of Morosini on his mother’s side – Venetian-Hungarian trade relations ceased somewhat abruptly, although Venetian goods were still available in Hungary, just as Hungarian precious metals and – from the mid-fourteenth century – Hungarian cattle – found their way to Venice. This trade involved Florentine and Southern German middle-men (mostly from Nuremberg from the mid-fourteenth century onwards), and to a lesser extent, other Viennese and Hungarian businessmen.³

As opposed to Venice, the Florentine city state had a different policy concerning international trade, as Peter Spufford observed. In fact, Florence did not really attract foreign representatives of international trade to its territory, and acted, as a trade and banking emporium through its citizens who were sent out and encouraged to launch their business activity in foreign trade hubs and bank centers. Thus, Florentine merchants were intensively present all over medieval Europe, trading in a wide range of goods, providing large loans, and holding key offices in financial administration in several lands. The same patterns may be observed in their Hungarian operations, but in contrast with the long historiographic tradition on the activity of medieval Italian merchants in the major medieval European and Mediterranean trade hubs, for a number of reasons Central Europe has until recently been a secondary target area for research. Recently, however, the strong presence of Florentine businessmen in the Kingdom of Hungary during King Sigismund’s reign (1387-1437, has been confirmed. In some cases they were even members of the same kin group). At any rate, it needs to be stressed that although Hungary did not belong to the main targets of Florentine business interests, studying it provides a challenging possibility to survey in multiple ways the social and economic strategies of highly skilled Italian merchants and their adaptation to different regional situations.

What is more, this region was also targeted intensively by Upper German tradesmen. Their presence and activity in Hungary has been thoroughly investigated by both Hungarian and German researchers. Nevertheless, the question of their attitude towards Florentine businessmen in


Hungary has never been addressed in detail although based on a few bits of information, it has been labeled “competitive”. The idea of competition was closely linked to the South Germans’ appearance in royal financial administration, formerly a clear part of Florentine interest at the turn of the fifteenth century. The research presented in this dissertation, therefore, also addresses the connections between these two major business diasporas, focusing particularly on Buda. In this respect, the question becomes extremely interesting since it deals with the interaction between these two ethnic entities in an environment which remained “foreign” for them both.


1.2. Long distance trade – basic features

Long distance trade is usually the best documented commercial activity in medieval written records. Although such trade involved only few professionals, it produced a sizable share in the total volume of trade. Finally, it is to be emphasized that the financial, economic potential of a region is also reflected to a certain extent in the availability of the economic-social infrastructure necessary to carry out such transactions.

How businessmen viewed long distance trade can best be described in their own words. The fifteenth-century Florentine chronicler, Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli advices his offspring in his well-known *Ricordanze* as follows:

“Be with others in the trade ventures, in banks and go abroad, exercise the commerce, see with your own eyes the lands and countries where you plan to trade … and if you trade abroad, go there personally often, at least once a year, to see and to settle the yearly account”.9

Yet, longer sojourns abroad running trade ventures could often be a dangerous and tiresome business as described by Giuliano di Marco Marcovaldi, a Prato merchant working in Ragusa in a letter to his brother:

"My brother, learn that I had not even one good day since I find myself away from home to gain a bit of profit".10

The response from the brother, Sandro di Marco Marcovaldi may also be considered emblematic:

"you tell me you do not want to return here because we are in great distress and without profit ... however, I believe that all of you estranged from our land, having seen us being in such misery for the huge and excessive expenses (taxes) and having no exercise, no profit and having lost all, hope to have them sometime".11

---


11 “tu m’avissi che non vuoi mai tornare di qua perché noi siamo in grandi tribulazione and senza ghuadangnio ... and però credo v’avette tutti gittato dirietto alle spalli di qua per la nostra terra, vedendo noi esserre in tanto sterminio delle ismisurate and grandi spesse che cci sono et non esercer ci nuano ghuadangnio né aserccizio ci nuano and perdatta onni speranza di non avercci mai niuno avimento né ghuadanno” see Pinelli, *Il carteggio Marcovaldi*, 33-34.
He goes even further and stops writing to the beloved brother for some years and spreads rumors about his death in order to hide at least the profits gained in the remote region from the officials of the taxation office in Florence.\textsuperscript{12} The quotations above, in particular the last two, hint not only at the dangers, difficulties, but also at the main motivations that pushed Italian merchants, often more members of the same kinship, to work abroad.

\textsuperscript{12} “non ne facemo menzione di te se non che tu t’eri itto chon Dio” in Pinelli, \textit{Il carteggio Marcovaldi}, 35.
1.3. Time frame and economic historical background or the dissertation

The time frame of the dissertation is basically set by the archival source material that was investigated. In the case of the Florentine Catasto, the majority of the taxation information, in fact, concern approximately the last 8-10 years prior to the 1427 compilation of the declarations. However, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters, in specific cases the Catasto may also refer back the turn of the fifteenth century. The dispersed data found in the Hungarian archival records also cover a rather broad time period, but these scattered pieces of information are sometimes of particular importance. Therefore, it seemed inappropriate to rigorously stick to exact time frames.

The first half of the fifteenth century was meant to be in the focus of the dissertation, but both the last decades of the fourteenth century and the mid-fifteenth century are addressed to a lesser extent in specific cases/chapters. It seems particularly justified for financial office holders and the function of administrative institutions run by them as well as for presentation of individual careers. There are also chapters which deal with shorter time periods due to the special features of both the source and the researched topic. This is the case with chapter III where the majority of information that concerns features of the Florentines’ credit and trade activity in Hungary refers to transactions carried out in the 1420s.

It seems useful at this point to provide a short review of the economic history of medieval Hungary and the main points in the long-distance trade carried out by Florentines in order to set the historical context of the dissertation. In medieval Hungary the vast majority of the population lived from agriculture. Later, viniculture grew in importance in connection with foreign ethnic groups (for e.g. Latins) establishing themselves in the country. Wine was a profitable product, also sought after in regional markets.

The exploitation of natural resources (precious metals, copper, salt etc.) became a priority particularly from the fourteenth century onwards. The introduction of the gold currency by King Charles I in 1328 increased the importance of gold mines. The technical knowledge and

---


developed tools were mainly brought in by German groups who migrated into the mining areas. Hungary’s economy in the Late Middle Ages (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) therefore relied on the natural resources of the kingdom. By the fourteenth century these incomes became royal monopolies and were organized within a system of chambers. The income from mining, transport and the salt trade was by far the most lucrative royal income, amounting to approximately one third of the total royal yearly income (around 100,000 fl). A major reform in the management of salt chambers was introduced in 1397 by King Sigismund, when new chambers were established and fixed prices determined. During his reign, the king repeatedly tried to improve the efficiency of salt mining and trade by centralizing and then decentralizing its administration.

The mining of precious metals and minting took up a major share in the income of the kings of Hungary. Therefore, financial organization was from time to time reshaped to make the royal administration more efficient. The system of the Hungarian Angevin kings (1308-1387) relied on the leading role of the master of the Treasury (magister tavarnicorum), who was responsible for all royal monopolies and estate assets. In this period, the chambers were farmed in form of yearly lease contracts, some of which have survived from the mid-fourteenth century. King Sigismund however, after the consolidation of his power in Hungary, already altered the system in the mid-1390s by diminishing the role of the magister tavarnicorum in the financial administration and instead granting him judicial rights over the major royal towns. The newly appointed Counts of chambers were in fact directly linked to the king, in some cases as royal officers employed by him, although lease tenancy remained characteristic as well. Mining and minting was decentralized by setting up “districts” and gradually opening new minting chambers in the main mining areas such as Kremnica, Transylvania etc. (The chamber system extended to the administration of various royal


17 Engel, The Realm, 224-225.

taxes too. The custom duty on imports, the so-called thirtieth, was also one of the profitable royal incomes. In 1405, it was extended to exports as well and managed separately from other taxes which were organized into chambers with the same seat for mining and minting chambers in the late fourteenth century.\(^\text{19}\)

The development of urban centers was also a crucial element in King Sigismund’s economic policy. The commercial and economic position of the towns was strengthened by royal privileges (on manufacture of certain textiles, staple rights etc.). The king particularly focused on urban settlements along the main trade routes, the border towns where customs taxes were levied and the mining towns. In urban contexts, therefore, more structured social clusters appeared, comprising among them artisans and regional merchant elites, many of them moving into towns from both the developed western areas but also from eastern regions. In north Hungary, the Spis Saxons and in Transylvania the Transylvanian Saxons settled in blocks, whereas Cumans appeared on the Great Plain in areas that had been deserted following the Mongol invasion (1241-1242).\(^\text{20}\) In the Late Middle Ages extensive herding of livestock became widespread on the Great Plain. Thus, quality beef and became an extremely profitable product of long-distance trade as well and one characterized by easy “shipping” in form of cattle drives.\(^\text{21}\)

Such was the economic context in which the Florentines found themselves when they arrived in the country. Their increasing interest in Central Europe was motivated by shifts in long distance trade in the second half of the fourteenth century. After the well-known mid-fourteenth-century economic depression and the bankruptcies that followed, the Florentine companies reassumed their leading role quickly in international commerce. However, the difficulties of long-distance trade towards the traditional markets of Florentines such as England and Flanders in the 1360s and 1370s\(^\text{22}\) were increased by transport problems caused by the war against Pisa (1356-1369). The emerging overproduction crisis and merchandizing problems intensified the general economic depression. \(^\text{23}\)


On top of all these troubles Florence also came into conflict with the papacy. These problems encouraged Florentines to seek new, even if less prestigious, target areas for their wares, as Sandro di Marco Marcovaldi claimed in the letter quoted above. In 1427 and in the subsequent years, the burden of a feared, newly introduced taxation system, the *Catasto*, caused further anxiety and alarm among businessmen subject to the Florentine State.\textsuperscript{24}

In the case of Hungary in the 1360-70s, however, Florentines still faced transport problems caused by the wars between the kingdom and Venice, which played an intermediary role in international trade directed from Italy towards east Central Europe by controlling Adriatic ports, especially Zadar and Senj. The peace of Turin signed in 1381, thus, favored long-distance trade towards the inland parts of the realm.\textsuperscript{25} Owing to these factors and despite the uncertain or sometimes even turbulent political relations between Florence and the new king of Hungary, Sigismund of Luxemburg (1387-1437), the number of Florentine merchants in the main Hungarian cities already increased considerably in the last decades of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{26} Finally, Hungary’s position changed in a wider European context particularly from 1411, the year of the election of King Sigismund as King of the Romans. Hungary and Buda, its developing capital, in fact, became part of a wider political-economic context, the Holy Roman Empire, further contributing positively to the appearance of Florentines in greater numbers on its territory.


\textsuperscript{25} Teke, “Zsigmond és a dalmát városok,” 233-243.

\textsuperscript{26} András Kubinyi, “Budapest története a későbbi középkorban Buda elestéig 1541-ig” [The History of Budapest in the later Middle Ages until the Fall of Buda in 1541] in *Budapest Története*, vol. 2 [History of Budapest 2.], ed. László Gerevich – Kosáry Domokos (Budapest, 1973) (hereafter: Kubinyi, “Budapest története”), 49.
1.4. Research Questions

Research on the economic and social role played by Florentine kin groups in Hungarian business is of particular interest for the purposes of the dissertation. Thus, rather than study single merchant, I will concentrate on families and even multiple generations in fortunate cases by placing the preserved, isolated records on these businessmen’s activity in Hungary into a broader social and economic context.

Florentine businessmen played a notable role in the Hungarian royal financial administration and in the commercial life of the country in the first half of the fifteenth century. Therefore, these merchants’ main activities in the kingdom first need to be outlined and analyzed. Their presence was mainly tied to the collection of papal incomes and to the lease and exploitation of mines for precious metals until the second half of the fifteenth century. The formation of royal monopolies however required their prolonged presence in the country and their regular interaction with both the royal court and, in the case of second-level “officers” of the royal monopolies, also with members of the local nobility and citizenship. In Hungarian scholarly literature particular emphasis was set on the Florentines’ presence in the royal finance administration, relying on the sources held in Hungary. Here, I aim at investigating these businessmen’s economic and social background back in Florence in order to identify the business circles interested in such long term Hungarian business dealings, their possible motivations and finally, the financial potential needed to embark upon such activity in Hungary. The question is fundamental, since the importance of a trade hub can be assessed on the basis of the financial potential represented by foreign, in our case Florentine merchants, who targeted the area. Naturally, in the second stage of this investigation the particular features of these business operations also need to be analyzed. In other words, where there is trade in textiles, luxury goods and the primary sources hint at the use of developed business practices such as the use of checks, bills of exchange and money transfers, the trade hub will be considered significant. Closely linked to these questions are the set of criteria, which defined Hungary and particularly Buda as a royal seat in formation, needs to be surveyed within the context of the European economic network of Florentine merchants.

As collaboration versus competition among Florentine companies abroad has been recently surveyed for the Bruges and London Florentine colonies, the same point shall be addressed here in relation to the Florentines in Hungary. However, in the case of Hungary, it is not only research on

---

competition between Florentines that is legitimate. One may even ask whether there really was such a strong competition of Florentines with Southern German businessmen settled in Buda and elsewhere in the kingdom as has been argued in the international and Hungarian scholarly literature for decades.

The analysis of the main factors of integration is strongly connected to the previous points as we will see. For Florentines living in urban environments, all the related details such as the possession of a house, the acquisition of citizenship or any other information about marriage or about their participation in the everyday life of urban society may provide hints to their intention to settle permanently in a town. In the very few cases of ennoblement, the relation of businessmen to the king and the types of services rendered to Sigismund need to be surveyed.

For those who left the kingdom after short sojourns ranging from the time it took to fulfill a single commission to apprenticeships of two to three years (activities, which in most cases resulted unsuccessful), research about their later careers back in Florence and - if feasible- eventual changes in the business and social conditions of the next generation/s will also be of interest.

The question of returning families shall also be addressed as research on Florentine-Hungarian economic relations in the course of the whole fifteenth century has recently provided more and more data on Florentine families reappearing in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary over the course of the century.

also Lorenzo Tanzini and Sergio Tognetti ed. “Mercatura è arte”. Uomini d'affari toscani in Europa e nel Mediterraneo tardomedievale (Rome: Viella, 2012)
1.5. The Sources

Giovanni di Niccoló Falcucci, a Florentine merchant who stayed in Hungary at least between 1419 and 1427 says in his catasto:

“...and I have more debtors and creditors in Hungary, whom I cannot list to you as the accounts are not closed yet, and I should go and see the books, which are spread in diverse places, but altogether it seems to me that I am in debt by some hundreds of florins, but I do not record it here, as they are people, most of whom do not keep records nor any other writings, and he who must deal with them and asks for it, has to content himself with their oath, as they do not trust the [account] books ...”

Falcucci’s words can be considered emblematic of the difficulties connected to economic research in east Central Europe. Very fragmentary written evidence survived in Hungary on long distance trade. It is dispersed in different types of sources and may seem insignificant. The history of the families operating in Hungary can be reconstructed from a puzzle of data taken from a number of sources. Thus, the present study relies on various archival materials preserved in Florence, mostly information from the fond of the Florentine Catasto, the documentation on the new, direct taxation system introduced in Florence in 1427. This system was in use up to the end of the fifteenth century. The records of the Florentine Catasto of 1427 document at length the economic and social life of the Florentine state. The introduction of the tax reform was caused by the financial problems faced by the Florentine state during the decades of war against the Duke of Milan, and to

---

28 “E più ò debitori and creditori in Ungheria, and quali non vi posso dare perché non sono salde le ragioni and converebbevi andare a mne. E’ libro è là. Sono in diversi paesi. Paremi così in di grosso piuostro restero a dare qualche Cº di fiorini. Non metto nulla. Sono persone la maggiore parte non tengono scritture né nulla, and chi à fare col loro e’ domanda. Se n’à a stare al giuramento loro; a libri non danno fede, sicché lascio a dietro questo. and so ch’io fo a mio danno ma non so che m’à dire” in Portata of Giovanni di Niccoló (Falcucci): ASF, Catasto, 53. fol. 1096v. I would like to thank Professor Robert Black for his kind help in reading the passage from Falcucci’s declaration.


the unreliable and low incomes derived from indirect taxation.\textsuperscript{31} In the new system, the Florentine government aimed at taxing more efficiently profits (“sovrabbondante”) arising from the investments of its burgers whether private (investment in trade, banking, companies or even estates) or public (forced loans granted to the state).\textsuperscript{32} The costs of living such as dwellings and their contents (“masserizia”) plus the costs of living fixed at 200 florins per head for each household member were exempted from taxation. Therefore the original declarations called “portate”, submitted in a standardized form, list the estate properties, the revenues deriving from the estates, the investments into the different types of forced loans, the partnerships, and the lists of debtors and creditors of open accounts at the moment the declaration was submitted. Moreover, they also name the members of the household, usually also providing the approximate age, and for young males, in some cases even the work they did. The incomes (“sostanze”), declared in the “portate”, represented the total assets of the householder, out of which the living costs of the household and the liabilities of the householder were put down. The records of the first Catasto of 1427 comprise around 60,000 portate and the respective abstracts made by the officials of the Catasto (“campione”) were on more than 250,000 persons. Both the “portate” and the campioni are of interest, the first are more detailed, including information on the data and on the transactions behind the sums of debts and credits and further additional information related to the circumstances of the householder, whereas the “campioni” show the information considered relevant for taxation, and as such were examined and accepted by the officials of the Catasto. The Catasto corrections from 1430 and 1433, and the subsequent Catasti submitted in 1438 and 1457 are less detailed and reliable particularly concerning business carried out abroad. However, they still contain useful additional evidence and the possibility of retracing the changes over time and over generations for those Florentine families identified as having business interests in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary in the records of the first Catasto.

The surviving volumes of the Mercanzia, the commercial tribunal established in Florence in 1308, provide records on commissions in the form of limited partnerships (“accomandita”), controversies surrounding Florentine businessmen working abroad and inheritance cases. The archival unit has only been used in this study in a very limited way due to the difficulties of examining the seriously damaged volumes.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 27-28.
\textsuperscript{32} Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 86-89.
\textsuperscript{33} ASF, Archivio della Mercanzia (hereafter: ASF, Mercanzia) On the Mercanzia see Guido Bonolis, La giurisdizione della Mercanzia in Firenze nel secolo 14. (Florence, 1901); Antonella Astorri, La Mercanzia a Firenze nella prima metá del ’300 (Florence: Leo Olschki editore, 1998)
Beside the notarial deeds preserved in the State Archives of Florence which are very difficult to research because of the limited finding aids, the material of the Tratte also proved to be of utmost interest as it provides information on the electoral rolls that were revised every five years as well as the lists of holders of the main urban offices in Florence (the Signori, that is: the eight priors and the gonfaloniere di giustizia, and the so-called Collegi, the advisory board: the 12 Buonuomini and the 16 gonfalonieri di compagnia). The Tratte contains data that sheds further light on the social standing of the researched families.

The Ricordanze or Ricordi, a particular kind of self-reflective writing, proved to be particularly useful. The Ricordanze of the Corsini kept over three generations in the family or those written by Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli and Buonaccorso Pitti not only register the main events connected to both the economic and domestic life of the family but also reflect relations and strategies over generations within the family and the broader kin group. This rather mixed genre, written by a number of different merchants, incorporates a wide range of texts. These texts range from chronological accounts of household affairs, the description of the origin of the kin paternal group to very practical advice on urban political life and business to the offspring. All these sources provide very colorful and fascinating evidence on the life and business strategies within Florentine merchant families.

The manuals of trade, the so-called Pratiche della Mercatura, like those by Francesco di Balduccio Pegolotti or Giovanni da Uzzano include general information on contemporary long-distance trade and banking, knowledge gathered in various parts of the Mediterranean where Florentines were present.

---

34 ASF, Archivio Notarile Antecosimiano.
37 See for example Morelli, “Ricordi”., or Bonaccorso Pitti, “Ricordi”, Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini.
The Datini Archives of Prato provides information mostly on previous generations of a number of merchant families, mostly from Prato, working in Hungary and therefore included in the database. The correspondence preserved in Prato reveals particularly interesting details on the fields of activity and geographical areas of interest of some of the families and kin groups selected for closer analysis.

The diplomatic correspondence of the Florentine Comune with King Sigismund, the commissions, instructions and reports of Florentine legates sent to Hungary realm also contain information on the presence and activity of these merchants within the Hungarian kingdom, mainly in the form of general recommendations and support for those merchants suffering any kind of calamity.39

The Archival fond “Mediceo avanti il Principato”, that is, the Medici Family Archives containing records dating from the fourteenth century up to the 1530s, the period before the reign of Cosimo dei Medici as Duke of Florence (1537), also includes documents related to Hungary.40

I extensively used the documentation of the online “Regesta Imperii”, particularly for information related to King Sigismund’s Florentine noble retainers (familiares) and I also took advantage of the digitized archival records and database of Monasterium.net for the same purpose.41 Both on-line collections proved very useful for my research.

The data yielded by Hungarian archival material is much smaller. These very isolated pieces of information used alone suggest the presence of occasionally appearing Florentine businessmen disappearing again from the region after a few successful commissions carried out in the kingdom. Consequently, they seem to convey a picture of merchants who were only temporarily present, marketing just a single cargo. Nevertheless, I consider these records very important complementary evidence since the data provided by them can be used as precious control information for the records preserved in Florence. In some cases, this data considerably modifies the image emerging from Florentine sources on these businessmen.

39 For the purposes of this dissertation the following records of the Florentine Chancellery’s correspondence were researched: ASF, Signori, Missive, I. Cancelleria; ASF, Dieci di Balia, Legazioni and commissarie. Filze 1–3; ASF, Signori, Dieci di Balia, Otto di Pratica, Legazioni and commissarie, Missive and responsive. Filze 5, 77; ASF, Signori, Rapporti and relazioni di oratori fiorentini. Filze 1-3.
The source material available in Hungary comprises the so-called Charter Collection and the Photograph Collection of Charters, both held in the National Archives of Hungary. The latter collection is unique and ever-growing, considering that beside the around 108,000 items of medieval records held in the original by the archives, there are also a number of items connected to Hungarian medieval history that have been gathered in copy form from diverse archival units found in the most important European archives and filed in the collection. Thus, this collection can be regarded a sort of virtual archives for the Carpathian Basin in the Middle Ages.

The available published source material includes the Hungarian Diplomatic Records from the Angevin Period, the Collection of Charters from the Angevin Period, the Decreta Regni Hungariae 1301-1457, the Collection of Charters from the Reign of King Sigismund, volumes of the Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae, and the Charter Collection of the Frankopan Family. Hungarian researchers, being aware of the unfortunate source conditions, launched systematic research in Western European Archives as early as the mid-19th century. In the case of Florence, the first archival survey in the materials of the State Archives of Florence was carried out between 1863-67 by Ernő Simonyi, commissioned and co-coordinated by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He mainly researched the records of the Florentine Chancellerly and that of the Medici fond. He also gathered and copied in Florence records connected to the medieval Kingdom of Hungary. The material is accessible under the title of “Flórenczi Okmánytár” in the Manuscript Collection of the Academy. The material is valuable although it needs to be revisited because in some cases the selection of the records seems to have been erroneous.

---


45 MTA Könyvtár Kézirattára [Manuscript Collection of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences], Flórenczi Okmánytár [Charter Collection from Florence], Ms 4994/ two vols.
Finally, the publication of charters of fifteenth century Popes edited by Pál Lukcsics in the 1930s also contains supplications handed in to the Papal Curia by some Florentines working in the Kingdom of Hungary. The supplication letters include interesting information both on their business activity and on the social network that these merchants established in the kingdom. 46 Moreover, they provide further evidence on the eventual intentions of integration into Hungarian society of some of these Florentines’ through their self-identification at the introduction of the petitions. Concerning Buda, beside the available records in the Medieval Charter Collection, the Buda Town Law (Ofner Stadtrecht) compiled from the early fifteenth century onwards, also contains useful information on the trading activities and legal standing of foreigners operating within the territory of the town.47


1.6. Database of Florentine families working in Hungary in the first half of the fifteenth century

This analysis relies mainly on information from a prosopographic database of Florentine families working and investing in business in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. The database includes the data gathered in the framework of my research on the *Florentine Catasto* of 1427, the diplomatic correspondence of the Florentine *Comune* with King Sigismund, the commissions, instructions and reports of Florentine legates sent to the kingdom and is implemented with information respective to these Florentines and their families preserved in the quite fragmentary source material preserved in Hungary started in 2000. In a second phase of my doctoral research I carried out a detailed survey on the already identified families, focusing on the sources which could provide further indications on the social and economic background of the kin.

At present, altogether 191 persons belonging to 100 Florentine families who worked in Hungary are included in my database. Out of this sample, 81 persons (43 families) appeared personally in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary on at least one occasion. The database contains 31 families who had several family members (altogether 94 persons) interested in business on the territory of the kingdom of which 77 businessmen personally worked in the region. Where there were several family members from the same generation (basically brothers or cousins) 10 families (17 persons) are listed and another nine families (31 persons) who stayed and established themselves in the kingdom for at least two generations. The latter two groups, altogether 19 families with 48 persons, are particularly relevant for the analysis of their attitude towards integration within the socio-economic structures they encountered in the Hungarian Kingdom. In the case of those who left the kingdom after a relatively short sojourn, further research about their Florentine background may clarify the possible reasons behind their decision to leave.

---

48 My preliminary research in Florence served as basis for my MA. See Krisztina Arany, “Politikai és gazdasági kapcsolatok Firenze és Magyarországon között az Anjou-k és Zsigmond korában” [Political and economic relations between Florence and Hungary during the rule of the Hungarian Angevin and King Sigismund], 2001. MA Thesis at the Department of History, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (Budapest, Hungary), and was extended in my MA thesis at the Department of Medieval Studies, CEU, see Krisztina Arany, “Florentine Merchants in Hungary during the Reign of Sigismund. Economic and social strategies,” 2005. An earlier version of the prosopographic database in Hungarian was published with the aim of providing useful information on Florentines for a larger academic audience, see Arany, “Prosopographic database”. 
1.7. Methodology – Limits to the Analysis

The aim of the dissertation is to analyze the economic activity and social strategies of the Florentines living in the Hungarian kingdom on two levels: a quantitative and a “micro” level, the latter in the form of case studies. The prosopographic database will serve as the basis for the quantitative analysis and the quantitative level is understood as a generalized survey of the already introduced research questions from the whole data set.

Some of the proposed research questions will also be investigated in case studies focusing on the reconstruction of some of the most characteristic and best documented families. This qualitative analysis will serve as a control for the results of the quantitative investigation. The selection of the merchants and their families, namely the Panciatichi, Buondelmonti, Corsini, Melanesi, Lamberteschi, Attavanti (in some documents also written as “Ottavanti”) and the Manini families as subjects was, of course, largely influenced by the available documentation, possibly encompassing more than one generation. In the course of selection, I particularly focused on those persons and families whose activity was also documented in the surviving Hungarian source material in order to contrast and refine the picture of these merchants and families emerging from the Italian source material. Thus, the records, particularly the “portate” by Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi, the fourth wealthiest person in Florence in the surveyed period, provide a rare opportunity for the research into his Buda company within the context of the whole of his business activity. The case study of the activity and network of Filippo di Simone Capponi, Panciatichi’s brother-in-law (member of his kin by marriage, the so-called “parentado”), serves as an example of a salaried employee (agent) focusing on his activity and socio-economic background. The magnate Buondelmonti family seems to be worth analyzing due first to the manifold interests of the members of the kin. Second, members of the Buondelmonti kin group belonging to two generations were present in Hungary and had apparently cherished ambitions of integration into the Hungarian nobility.

Finally, the families proposed for the qualitative survey represent a cross-section of Florentine merchant families as regards wealth and social standing. From the Panciatichi, taxed as one of the wealthiest families in Florence at that time, through the Buondelmonti and Corsini families with high social status but a somewhat weakened financial situation at the time of their stay in Hungary, up to the Manini and Attavanti families, the last families recorded in the Catasto of 1427 as “miserabile” with no taxable wealth at all.
I also propose a comparative and complementary survey of the available Florentine taxation-related source materials with the rather scattered Central European records. This survey will serve both as control information and valuable evidence for the Florentines’ social and economic integration in this region, something not documented in the Italian archival material. During the course of the research, these archival materials proved to be particularly rich in some cases, especially for the investigation of office holders within the royal chamber system and their integration into local nobility or for a few of the families, even the Hungarian aristocracy. The results of the proposed analysis will provide a detailed picture of the Florentine settlement, possibilities and ambitions in Central-Europe.

The Medieval Charter Collection held in the National Archives of Hungary can also shape and refine the picture yielded by the Florentine Catasto, especially as the debtors’ and creditors’ lists included in the Catasto alone cannot be used as primary evidence in a clear cut economic history survey because they comprise the most uncertain part of the declarations as we shall see in the following chapters. Therefore they may be used to define tendencies in business customs and strategies, but cannot be used to assess the absolute volume of business directed towards the Kingdom of Hungary and Central Europe. Such research aims are clearly beyond the bounds of feasibility for this dissertation.
II. Review of the scholarly literature

2.1. Florentine merchants in east Central Europe

The study of the activities of Florentine merchants in diverse geographical regions of medieval Europe looks back on a long historiographic tradition. However, for a number of reasons, in this context east Central Europe (comprising Poland, Hungary, the South German territories, and Dalmatia to the south along the main international trade route leading to the north) has mostly been considered a target area of lesser importance by scholars. The time-lag in urbanization and associated lower levels of consumer demand made the region less interesting. Since trade in textiles and luxury goods was one of the basic operations engaged in by Florentine entrepreneurs, this reservation seemed to be justified. Also, the lack of surviving homogeneous source material (company books, account books etc.) connected to business directed towards this region, and consequently the difficulty of carrying out thorough research seemed rightly to work in favor of such conclusions since there is only sporadic evidence concerning long distance trade in Hungary. Recently, an increasing number of studies related to the activity of Florentine merchants have focussed on particular regions, especially Dubrovnik due both to the particular features of Florentine presence in the city and to the unusually rich documentation preserved on it in Dubrovnik, Florence and Prato. The increasing interest can also be ascribed to general research trends which from time to time focus on changing aspects in the economy, social mobility and interactions between different regions. Research on economic, social etc. networks carried out in the last decade also promoted such investigations, when feasible, based on archival sources such as the fonds held in the State Archives of Florence.

As far as Silesia and Poland are concerned, there is a long scholarly tradition from as early as the first decades of the twentieth century, with scholars such as Jan Ptasnik, whose works were introduced into Italy by Armando Sapori.49 The Italians, mainly Genoese in the first phase until the fifteenth century and afterwards Florentines were present in the area. The collection of papal incomes, the lease of royal incomes, particularly the occidental and oriental salt mines (Bochnia, Wieliczka, Drohobycz, Dolina and Przemyśl), considered a major source of revenue for Polish kings, the exploitation of lead mines in Olkusz and Trzebinia and the iron mines of Świętokrzyskie

all attracted Italian businessmen to medieval Wrocław, Cracow, Lviv, similarly to Hungary. The existence of a “platea romanorum” in thirteenth-century Cracow (called “platea gallica” in the following century) is similar to medieval Buda, and at any rate indicates a relatively intensive presence of Italians in the city. However, the overwhelming presence of Genoese in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is a clear indication of the importance of a different transcontinental trade route for Poland, which linked Flanders with Eastern Europe and with the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea through Cracow. A second transcontinental trade route running north-south towards Gdańsk through Cracow subsequently gained in importance. Scholarly literature dates the first appearance of Florentine merchants in greater number in the territory of Poland in the early fifteenth century, and ascribes their presence to the increasing importance of Florentine banking houses in the collection and transfer of papal revenues besides the working of the royal Polish salt mines. The strong presence of Florentine merchants and their trade in luxury goods has been dated mainly to the mid-sixteenth century.

When investigating the material of the Florentine Catasto I also found some references to Poland, in particular Cracow. I could identify a few permanent representatives of Florentine banking companies, interested mainly in the collection of papal fees and incomes, and a few tradesmen (Niccoló di Vaggio Giuseppi for example) being sent as an agent for a limited time period (a year in this case) to Cracow with textiles in the form of accomandita. This latter document also includes the commissioner, the so-called “socius stans”, Michele di Giovanni di Marco. He was a Florentine businessman with a seat in Venice. In this case also the value of the goods sent to Cracow is specified and is a remarkable sum running to 3120 florins. However, I could not find any reference

50 On the history of mining, minting in the Middle Ages see Ian Blanchard, Mining, Metallurgy and Minting in the Middle Ages, vol. 3. Continuing Afro-European Supremacy, 1250-1450 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005), 926-1063, 1343-1525. (hereafter: Blanchard, Mining, Metallurgy)
53 Sapori, “Gli italiani”, 156.
55 See the portata di Michele di Giovanni: ASF, Catasto, 39. fol. 338v.
to trade companies with head quarters in Poland in the material of the *Catasto* within the approximate time frame of 1410-1430. As Venice and the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* functioned as the main piazza (a main trade hub) for the exchange of Levantine goods between Germans and Italians, the first settled Florentine merchants in Germany, mainly in Nuremberg and Augsburg, Cologne etc. appeared only in the late fifteenth century. The first appearance of an Italian/Florentine merchant interested in the trade in luxury textiles in Nuremberg dates back to around 1471 based on recent findings.

As far as economic relations are considered one must also It should be emphasized that medieval Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia were important in economic relations as mediating lands and trading centers. Very early on, Hungary and Venice as well as certain other Italian states had direct political and economic contact with these areas. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, these territories became a real battlefield because of their location along the Adriatic coast between the expanding Kingdom of Hungary and Serenissima. The significant role of the Dalmatian ports and the inland cities along the long distance trade routes in the medieval Italian-Hungarian commercial exchange was already emphasized at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Tomislav Raukar noted that at the end of the fourteenth century the Florentines in the town showed a declining interest in Zadar, which – he argues – was again due to the decreasing possibilities in connection to the export of salt and the administration of the royal salt chamber in 1397.

---


Paola Pinelli in her research on the Marcovaldi correspondence held in the State Archives of Prato stressed that Ragusa (Dubrovnik) became a popular target for a group of Prato merchants as market for medium quality textiles in exchange for the precious metals (particularly silver) from the hinterland of Dubrovnik.\(^6^0\) Ragusa belonged to the Hungarian Crown from 1378 and achieved remarkable autonomy in terms of its economic policy. The town is of particular interest with the increasing presence of Florentines and with them a remarkable group of Prato merchants (as pointed out by Pinelli) occurred in the time period of when Florentines, and among them Prato merchants, had a strong presence in the Kingdom of Hungary, particularly in Buda. Recently, Francesco Bettarini has thoroughly researched various socio-economic aspects of the Florentine presence in Dubrovnik in a number of publications.\(^6^1\)

Adding to the above mentioned urban centers in east Central Europe, I would like to propose an interpretation of Buda’s position in the Central European context within the framework of this dissertation based on the general features and tendencies of the presence and activities of the Florentines in the region.

---


2.2. Review of the scholarship on Florentines in Hungary

Ideas about Italian-Hungarian trade relations in Hungarian scholarship were primarily based on the quite fragmentary and poorly preserved Hungarian written source material which was much less informative than the source material preserved in Italy. First, the extremely high level of literacy characteristic among Italian businessmen in the fifteenth century was not so widespread in other geographical areas of contemporary Europe. In Hungary, literacy was particularly applied in legal documents, providing and securing rights and immobile possessions, more characteristic of the nobility. Commercial transactions, business ventures were not recorded similarly to the custom in the Mediterranean in the same period as the quotation in the words of the merchant Falcucci’s words showed. The relatively underdeveloped character of pragmatic literacy is also reflected in the paragraphs of the Buda Town Law (Ofter Stadtrecht) where both written and verbal agreements (oath) were regarded as being of legal force.

Thus, the comparison and evaluation of the information obtained from these sparse materials of different origin alone is often vague. Hungarian scholarly research therefore turned early on to the richer archives of Western Europe. Regarding Hungarian-Italian economic relations in general, the first authors were mainly concerned in their articles with the activity of Italian tithe collectors’ in the kingdom. Moreover, especially in the case of Venice, some Hungarian scholars in the 1920s primarily emphasized the outstanding importance of the rich stock of precious metals in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary and their exchange for imported import of luxury goods such as spices and fine cloth from the Serenissima. According to this theory, relations declined after the monetary reforms introduced by King Charles I (1308-1342) as they included the prohibition of the export of silver and gold bullion.

The role of Florentine businessmen as papal tax collectors in Hungary was surveyed in the early twentieth century as well. Within the framework of the first economic historical and numismatic research on the monetary reforms introduced by the Angevin rulers and in the assessment of the importance of precious metal mining in Hungary launched around 1910, researchers considered the eventual role and motivations of Florentines in promoting and supporting the ambitions of the

---

62 See the quotation in Chapter 1.5 footnote no. 27.
63 Budai Jogkönyv, II. § 382, § 383.
65 Ambrus Pleidell, A nyugatra irányuló magyar külkereskedelem a középkorban [Hungarian foreign trade towards the West in the Middle Ages] (Budapest, 1925).
Angevins of Naples in Hungary. Bálint Hóman supported the latter largely debated point that Florentine banks tried to access the Hungarian gold production by financially supporting the Angevins’ accession to the Hungarian throne.

The first monograph on Italian-Hungarian economic relations in the Middle Ages was published by Dénes Huszti in 1941. In his work, he defined medieval Hungary as the economic hinterland of the Venetian Republic. Moreover, he identified some constant and changing factors, as he called them, connected to the consolidation and development of economic relations between these lands. Among the recurring issues he listed the remarkable stock of precious metal possessed by the realm, the relatively small number of craftsmen in Hungarian towns, and, last but not least, the route-network connecting medieval Hungary and Dalmatia, which he called as good. Among changing factors he emphasized the political connections between the two states.

Regarding the Florentine merchants’ presence and activity in the kingdom, special attention was dedicated in Huszti’s work to features of their operation and related information. As a scholar, Huszti was particularly interested in the main characteristics of the Florentine economy, trade, and social history and therefore his work will be crucial for the purposes of this dissertation. Huszti’s interest, however, was not generally shared by contemporary Hungarian scholarship and his work may therefore be considered exceptional.

In his monograph, Dénes Huszti rejected Hóman’s theory, arguing that the Florentine economy was flourishing in the first half of the fourteenth century and therefore, Hungary, struggling with anarchy, could not provide sufficiently promising possibilities for Florentines or in general for Italian merchants. Oszkár Paulinyi, working mainly on the history of precious metal mining in Hungary, agreed with Huszti in an article published in 1972. Zsuzsa Teke has recently reaffirmed

71 Dénes Huszti, *Irásbeliség és társadalmi fejlődés Firenzében a középkor és az újkor határán* [Literacy and social development in Florence between the end of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period] (Budapest, 1935).
this point as well in her research on Florentine-Hungarian economic relations and dated the first appearance of great numbers of Florentines in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary to the 1370s. She claims that this phenomenon overlaps with the narrowing of traditional Italian and Mediterranean markets for the goods of Florentine textile industry leading to the development of an overproduction crisis.\textsuperscript{74}

In the late Angevin period and in the first decade of King Sigismund of Luxemburg’s reign, the majority of the information on Florentines is connected to businessmen interested in the exploitation of royal monopolies. Oszkár Paulinyi investigated the company founded by Vieri di Cambio dei Medici, established for the marketing of Hungarian copper exploited from 1385 up to 1387. Zsuzsa Teke’s investigations shed further light on the details of the activity of this company in Hungary. Both Paulinyi and Teke emphasized that the company of Vieri di Cambio did not become involved in works related to the exploitation or refinement of copper ore. They provided credits to small scale local entrepreneurs in exchange for the copper exploited for marketing.\textsuperscript{75}

Another theory emerged in the 1970s that was still closely related to the farming of royal monopolies and mining and minting chambers. It concerned the connections between South German and Italian, mainly Florentine, businessmen working in the kingdom at the turn of the fourteenth century. Elemér Mályusz formulated the theory that these businessmen competed amongst themselves in the exploitation of precious metals.\textsuperscript{76} Recently however, in light of new findings, the image of a strong conflict of interests among South Germans and Florentines needs to be revisited. Zsuzsa Teke argues that the gradual withdrawal of Florentines from the trade in precious metals observed in the sources dating to the first decades of the fifteenth century is mainly due to the fact, that such goods were not within the range of products traditionally marketed by them.\textsuperscript{77} In any case, increasing amounts of albeit fragmentary information reveal that Florentines also participated in the copper trade in the 1430s.\textsuperscript{78} There is also clear evidence for the co-operation

with other Buda citizens of Southern German origin. Records on credits provided to them by Florentines were also identified in some cases.

The strong presence of Florentines can be identified through the first decades of the fifteenth century in the administration of other royal monopolies such as the chambers of salt, the thirtieth (customs) and minting. This presence can be ascribed to Filippo Scolari, one of King Sigismund’s closest advisers beyond any doubt. Filippo Scolari, in sources often also called Pipo of Ozora or Pipo Spano (1369–1426) was a Florentine businessman who arrived as a youth in Hungary and had an extraordinary career in the kingdom. He married a Hungarian noblewoman and so entered the nobility. He became one of the closest counsellors of the king and held significant offices in the central administration of the land. Among other dignities he became comes of the gold mining and minting chamber at Kremnica around 1399, he controlled the salt chambers of the kingdom and was also appointed treasurer. In 1420, he was appointed lay governor of the Kalocsa archbishopric. His highest dignity was that of comes of Temes, which elevated him to the rank of Hungarian baron. He supported and promoted his fellow countrymen and their activities in Hungary. Scolari’s importance is clearly shown by the appearance quite early on of a biography on him by Gusztáv Wenzel and later the thorough study on him by Pál Engel. Recently, Zsuzsa Teke’s research has provided further details on his economic impact and trading activity in Hungary although a concise summary of this is yet to be compiled. István Draskóczy has investigated the network of noble retainers (“familiares”) employed by Scolari in the management of the salt chambers and published valuable information on them.

80 Kubinyi, Budapest története, 50.
Last but not least among the royal monopolies, Lajos Huszár investigated the role of Italians in the minting chambers in the fourteenth century by. The manifold activities of Francesco Bernardi of Carmignano’s were researched in great detail by Elemér Mályusz. Recently, Márton Gyöngyössy’s numismatic investigations provide further details on Bernardi’s minting activity. The Italian, particularly the Florentine businessmen’s role in Buda during the reign of King Sigismund was also addressed in a survey of a supposed South German – Italian economic controversy. In reality, the very few, and extremely fragmented information available in Hungarian records on suggested conflict of interests alone did not permit a closer assessment of the socioeconomic position of these men in Buda. At the same time, however, the development of the “Platea Italicorum”, containing data on Florentine properties in Buda and the sales transactions related to these merchants are well recorded in contemporary written evidence. These factors hinted at least at the long term presence of Italians in Buda as the city gradually developed into the seat of the Kingdom of Hungary. András Kubinyi’s studies on the Italians working in Buda at the end of the fifteenth century brought significant new results. The issues of the settling of Florentines in other Hungarian towns, has been addressed by both István Draskóczy for Transylvania and Judit Majorossy in her investigation of late medieval Pressburg.88


85 Lajos Gyöngyössy, “Zsigmond király aranypénz-verésének első korszaka 1387-1401,” [The first period of King Sigismund’s minting of gold coins], in “Es tu scholaris”. Ünnepi tanulmányok Kubinyi András 75. születésnapjára [The role of Buda merchants in the fourteenth century], in Honoris causa. Tanulmányok Engel Pál tiszteletére [Essays in honor of Pál Engel], ed. Neumann Tibor and Rácz György (Társadalom- és Művelődéstörténeti Tanulmányok 40/ Analecta Mediaevalia III) (Budapest–Piliscsaba, 2009), 105–123. Bernardi was working as “mercator” in Buda as early as 1374 and carried out exchange operations for the papal collectors. See Rationes collectorum pontificorum, I/I 459.; See also the entry “Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano” in Arany, “Prosopographie database”.


The crediting activity of Florentine merchants operating in Hungary could not be investigated in detail so far due to the lack of information available in the medieval records preserved in Hungary. The existing information is mainly connected to single credits and commissions performed to the ruler and to the members of high ecclesiastic order and lay aristocracy. A rare exception is a preserved debtors-list by Angelo and Odoardo/Eduardo Manini from 1463 which has been published and analyzed at length by István Draskócy. The list provides high quality evidence for long term, small scale crediting activity of Florentine businessmen settled in a provincial environment and the client network, mainly coming from the local nobility and citizenry.99

Economic historical investigations in the Florentine archival material were first launched in the 1980s, when Zsuzsa Teke surveyed the Florentine Catasto of 1427 and the volumes of the Florentine Mercanzia.90 As a result of her research, she could demonstrate the existence of rather intensive commercial relations between the Italian city-state and the Kingdom of Hungary, a point which had been debated in former Hungarian scholarly literature.91 Recently, my research in Florence and Hungary and the overview of the scholarly literature resulted not only in the publication of the already mentioned prosopographic database of Florentines in Hungary, but based on that, I also explored in detail features of their economic and social strategies in the form of case studies.92 Lately, Katalin Prajda worked on the same topics, relying particularly on Zsuzsa Teke’s

---


research and my own while adopting our results. In a few cases, she was able to complete the picture with some new details.\textsuperscript{93}

Contrary to research trends in the past, the vast yearly production of recent international scholarly literature poses a real “challenge” which at times is hardly manageable. However, here also there is an evident trend reflecting a shift away from the almost complete omission of the region in comprehensive works on Florentine economic history in the Middle Ages to a better assessment of the impact of the Hungarian Kingdom in later works. In any case, international scholarly literature considers Western Europe to be the traditional and main geographical target of Italian businessmen.\textsuperscript{94}

Federigo Melis, based on his discoveries in the Archivio Datini of Prato\textsuperscript{95} emphasized the Florentines’ marked presence in the piazzas in the periphery of the Mediterranean such as Tana, Caffa, Kerch or Constantinople and in Western Europe. they exchanged goods with Scandinavian and Baltic merchants in the business hubs of the periphery and Genoese ships shipped the ware to Bruges. According to Melis, Bruges seems to have been the main market for “Germans” and “Romans” up to the mid fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{96} In any case, fifteenth-century Buda also shared this feature, as we will see in the following chapters of the dissertation.

Raymond de Roover, working on a history of the Medici bank, shared Melis’s opinion, emphasizing that the relations of the Medici bank with German areas and with east Central Europe were rather occasional.\textsuperscript{97} According to De Roover this geographical area had its own economic, political and social system, somewhat underdeveloped compared to contemporary Italy, which meant that intensive intercourse between the two geographical areas was not promoted. However, his research could only provide limited additional information on the interests of the Medici bank in Hungary as the Hungarian transactions were mainly carried out by the bank’s Venetian branch. Richard Goldthwaite, in his overview on the sixteenth century role of Florentines within European economic


\textsuperscript{94} Fernand Braudel, “L’Italia fuori d’Italia”, 2109-2110.


\textsuperscript{96} Melis, Aspetti, 29-42.

\textsuperscript{97} De Roover, The Rise and Decline, 201-202.
circles emphasized the role of Florentines in royal administration and in the mining and minting chambers.\(^98\)

In a conference held in honor of Federigo Melis in 1985 in Florence, Hermann Kellenbenz, based on previous results and his own findings stated that although the Florentine presence in Central Europe compared to other regions was clearly of lesser importance, it was nevertheless more significant than stated in former works.\(^99\) As Kellenbenz emphasized, the Florentines were mainly interested in the collection of papal revenues in the region. The taxes were then transferred to Rome through Bruges and Venice. Beyond the collection of taxes, the few Florentines choosing this geographical area for their business activity figured mainly in the centers of exploitation of precious metals. Kellenbenz adopted as well the theory of the conflict of interest and competition between Florentines and Southern Germans in the region. Kellenbenz observed a shift in the commerce of Florentines in the Central Europe from the 1450s onwards and identified it as being “Renaissance” commerce, meaning that it focused on the marketing of luxury goods to the royal court and to the aristocracy, which, in imitation of the royal court, gradually took over the demand for courtly representation.

In 1994, Bruno Dini used the notion of Renaissance commerce, but claimed that it could only be found in the last two decades of the fifteenth century. Dini also acknowledged that the Florentines’ presence in the late medieval Kingdom of Hungary was much more intensive than had been previously estimated in a reference to Teke’s findings.\(^100\) In the most recent work on the comprehensive economic history of medieval Florence, the role of Hungary, and in general that of Central and Eastern Europe markets is addressed in a more detailed way.\(^101\) Studies addressing features of the Florentine businessmen’s activity abroad nevertheless still focus on the most relevant Western European trade and banking hubs and leave east Central Europe out of consideration with Dubrovnik as the only exemption as has been shown above.

---


III. General features of the Florentine merchants’ business activity in Hungary

3.1. Chronology of the Florentine businessmen’s arrival to Hungary

The dynamics of the vacillating presence of Florentine businessmen in Hungary were connected both to general shifts in the available regional possibilities and changes in the Florentine economy and conditions as well. Not much has been uncovered so far concerning their presence in the kingdom in the early fourteenth century. In any case, the coinage of the Hungarian golden florin with a design similar to that of the Florentine golden currency was issued as part of the monetary reforms introduced in 1326 by King Charles I (1308-1342), the first king of the Hungarian branch of the Angevin dynasty. In addition to issuing the florin, the Neapolitan Angevins’ traditional close ties to Florentine entrepreneurs, their privileged legal and financial standing in Naples and the role Florentine banking houses also played in the successful claim of the Angevins to the Hungarian throne suggest the increasing presence of Italians in general and Florentines in particular in Hungary, although the written evidence from this period is too incomplete to entirely support this thesis. Particularly Identification of the more precise geographical provenience of foreign persons called “gallicus” or “italicus” in the few records that do exist is difficult or even impossible in most cases. There is also very little archaeological evidence at hand on the burgeoning trade relations of Florence with Hungary. As opposed to Venetian ducats, the Florentine golden florin found among Hungarian archaeological finds was first dated to as early as the second half of the thirteenth century but did not reappear among later finds.  

In any case, the acquisition of the Dalmatian coast with its ports along the main trade route between Italy and Central Europe must have favored the growing presence of Florentines from 1358. Most of this information is connected to members of the royal financial administration with a focus on the minting chambers.

102 Bálint Hóman, Monetary history of Hungary, 1000-1325 (Budapest, 1916) quoted in Tibor Kardos, “Coluccio Salutati levelezése a magyar Anjoukkal,” [Correspondence of Coluccio Salutati with the Hungarian Angevins], Századok (1936): 407-432, here 412; According to Márton Gyöngyössy, late medieval Hungarian coin finds do not include Florentine florins, although a few (at least 29) Venetian ducats were identified among the coins. See Gyöngyössy, Florenus Hungaricalis. Aranypénzverés a középkori Magyarországon [Florenus Hungaricalis. Coinage of golden florins in medieval Hungary] (Budapest: Martin Opitz, 2008), 107 (hereafter: Gyöngyössy, Florenus Hungaricalis); On the absence of Florentine florins in the archaeological finds see Ibid., “Appendix I, Aranypénzverés a középkori Magyarországon” [Archeological findings of golden coins in the territory of medieval Hungary, 1325-1526], 119-124. See also the recently published catalogue by András Lengyel, Aranykönyv 1325-1540. Középkori magyar pénzverés. [Golden Book 1325-1540. Medieval Hungarian coinage], (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum-Pannonia Terra Numizmatika, 2013)

The period between 1370-1450 is more suitable for such analysis as source conditions are better. Two time intervals can be identified in which “new names” appear in the greater number of records including the first references to Florentine businessmen in Hungary. After a constant increase in numbers starting from the 1370s, the first peak in the presence of new Florentines can be dated to the late 1380s and early 1390s, also due to the simultaneous presence of more Florentine partnerships taking various organizational forms in the country. The political insecurities were mainly caused by a shift in the ruling Hungarian royal dynasty, the extinction of the Hungarian Angevins, and the subsequent arrival of Sigismund of Luxemburg as successor to the throne. Sigismund’s loss of Dalmatia influenced the strategies employed by Italian newcomers as well as a tendency for the decreasing presence of Florentines, earlier mainly interested in the administration of royal salt chambers in Dalmatia. Some records reveal the trend for these Florentines to gradually migrate from Split and Zadar to other inland trade hubs of the kingdom, prevailingly Buda.

In 1397, after the consolidation of King Sigismund’s power in the kingdom, a financial reform was introduced that had considerable impact on the ambitions of Florentine businessmen in relation to holding offices in the royal financial administration. These reforms referred particularly to royal monopolies, mainly incomes from the salt and thirtieth chambers. The reforms definitely aimed at improvement in the efficiency of tax collection and required that businessmen have a more solid presence on the spot. As has been claimed before, the reforms were at least in part shaped by influential Florentine businessmen at the royal court. Not by chance was Filippo Scolari appointed count of the Hungarian salt chambers in 1401 by the king.

At the turn of the fifteenth century, however, representatives of South German origin also gradually appeared in the kingdom’s relevant financial offices. Moreover, the first signs of technical

---

(Zagreb, 1981). Letter by John of Palisna, Ban of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, prior of Vrana and ally of King Charles III. of Naples, pretender to the Hungarian crown, written about his noble retainer (familiaris) and officialis Chiono Marini [known as Macigni] de Florentia, to whom the revenues from Dalmatian salt and customs chambers had been leased for years, that he was managing the office well. Datum Jan. 28, 1387.

104 See the recommendations on behalf of Florentine merchants working in Hungary in the diplomatic correspondence of the Florentine Government with the Hungarian King. ASF, Signori-Carteggi Missive, I Cancelleria, 21. fol. 12r-13r.


problems related to mining operations emerged making exploitation a more difficult enterprise. Finally, King Sigismund’s tense relations with Florence between 1396 and 1403 also rendered the situation unfavorable for the newly arriving Florentines. As a result, the number of references to Florentine newcomers drops in the first decade of the fifteenth century.

In the early 1410s, however, a changing tendency can again be observed in this respect, partly due to the efforts of the ruler struggling with constant money shortages and aiming at the centralization of the financial administration of the land. By that period Filippo Scolari was already one of Sigismund’s councilors. His prominent position in the central financial administration attracted several fellow countrymen to the kingdom, among them members of his extended kin, particularly after 1415. As the revenues from royal monopolies did not cover the financial requirements of the ruler, wealthy Florentine businessmen, such as Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi, provided loans to the king. Buda’s evolution to royal seat and residence hosting the permanent royal court and consequent increasing demand for luxury goods for both members of the royal court and wealthy Buda burgers encouraged Florentine merchants to bring their manifold wares to town. The period between 1412 and 1427 is marked by the extremely intense presence of Florentines, to an extent which, has not been documented for earlier periods.

The subsequent decline in their number and activity dates to the years 1427-28 based on information from the prosopographic database, a decline due to a number of factors. The death of Scolari in 1426 must have affected seriously his fellow countrymen concerning both the possibilities and the safety of business ventures in the kingdom. Also, the aggravated relations of King Sigismund with Florence made the loss of Scolari’s protection even more problematic for the other Florentines staying in Hungary. Finally, King Sigismund’s financial needs must have influenced the persecutions of Florentines in Hungary, as the diplomatic records of the Florentine Signoria testify, although the king himself denied this in a letter sent to the Florentine


109 Engel, The Realm, 205, 223.


Government. The Florentine Catasto preserves references to the imprisonment of the Buda burgher and royal noble retainer (familiaris) Domenico di Giovanni Arrighi, a clear hint that serious business problems were generated by the unstable situation in the kingdom. In records preserved from this period “new” Florentine names are hardly encountered. The businessmen appearing in the documents were at most employed in the financial administration and were already living in the kingdom. Some of them had already settled in Buda or elsewhere pursuing their trading activities as well. A few of them even managed to be raised to the nobility, consequently adopting lifestyles typical of the Hungarian local nobility they integrated into.

112 See the copy of the report by the Florentine legate to King Sigismund, Piero di Luigi Guicciardini, on the reprisals against Florentines in Buda MNL OL DF 289088. April 21, 1428, and on Guicciardini’s efforts in mediating peace negotiations between Venice and King Sigismund see RI XI,2 n. 7148, in Regesta Imperii Online, URI: http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1428-12-08_1_0_11_2_0_1187_7148 (Last downloaded: May 27, 2013). See also ASF, Signori-Carteggi, Missive, I. Cancelleria 33. fol. 116-117. See the letter by King Sigismund to the Florentine Government on the detention of Florentines staying in Buda, denying that financial reasons lay behind the arrests and confiscation of goods. ZsO III/no. 3131. April 19. 1404. See the answer of the Florentine Comune to the king Ibid. no. 3304. July 11, 1404; Also see Bruno Dini, Saggi su una economia-mondo: Firenze e l’Italia fra Mediterraneo ed Europa, Secc. XIII-XVI, (Pisa: Pacini, 1995), Zsuzsa Teke,"Firenze külpolitikája és Zsigmond (1409-1437)” [Foreign policy of Florence and King Sigismund (1409-1437)], in "Magyaroknak eleiről”: Űnnepli tanulmányok a hatvan esztendős Makk Ferenc tiszteletére [“About the Hungarians’ forfathers”. Essays in honor of the sixty-year-old Ferenc Makk], ed. Ferenc Piti (Szeged, 2000), 559-568.

3.2. Florentines in the financial administration of the kingdom

The administration of royal revenues was a traditional field of activity for Florentine businessmen working abroad. The written records reveal their presence in the financial administration of a number of countries from England through France up to the German lands or Poland.\(^{114}\) This kind of activity differed in its possibilities and duties from the activity of the collectors of papal revenues. Whereas collectors acted as part of an extended international network which also involved the great banking houses, the activity of the officers of the Hungarian royal chambers was based on their relationship as noble retainers (*familiares*) to the chief officers, in other words, the counts of the chambers who employed them, whereas the leading office holders were also bound as servants to the king himself.

Based on information from the prosopographic database, out of 35 persons settled for a longer period in Hungary, 30 individuals belonging to 19 families worked in the financial administration, mainly in the salt, mining, and minting chambers and at the customs of the thirtieth. In the framework of the reforms between 1395 and 1397, and again in the 1420s, King Sigismund appointed high officials and administrators as heads of the centralized chamber system for the first time, instead of leasing them to entrepreneurs investing capital as had been usual earlier.\(^{115}\) In fact, the prominent office holders, especially in the case of the salt chambers and the customs of the thirtieth seem to have become royal officers rather than entrepreneurs. In a few cases, however, members of the same family substituted for each other in the same office with royal permission, particularly in the case of the offices of salt chambers. Generally speaking, a restricted circle of leading officers of the salt and mining chambers replaced each other in the most important offices from year to year. This “mobility”, in my understanding, hints that this replacement represented a shift in the top positions of the financial administration rather than new business/lease contracts. Sometimes they were responsible for several offices in the same royal monopoly or even managed different monopolies at the same time. The *comes* of mining and minting chambers also had to fulfill local jurisdictional tasks. All these factors worked in favor of their at least partial integration into the nobility or one of the urban communities in Hungary. As a result of the administrative reforms introduced by King Sigismund in 1395-1397, a mixed system of appointed officers and entrepreneurs managed the centralized chamber system, contrary to the previous general lease

\(^{115}\) Draskóczy, “A sóigazgatás”, 289.
system of the chambers. The only common feature demonstrated in the records for almost all of them is their direct connection with the king.

The social standing and financial situation of some of these officers back at home can be investigated based on their Catasto records. (See Table 1.) As a result, it seems that most of them, particularly the lower-ranking officers left a rather poor economic situation behind when they moved to Hungary. It also suggests that their stay and activity in Hungary must have been at least fairly acceptable compared to their homeland possibilities. From the Catasto records it seems that most of these businessmen acted primarily as financial experts since they did not dispose of nor did they need notable capital when they entered the lower offices of financial administration of the kingdom of Hungary. Together, these pieces of information confirm the general picture formed from the detailed analysis of the Hungarian office holders/ noble retainers (familiares) of King Sigismund. Of course, the financial position of these Florentines acquired while chamber officers is not reflected at all in the Florentine archival sources, but based on the above mentioned comparative material of other lower chamber officers employed in the royal administration, one may assume that these offices offered a fair opportunity to grow both in wealth and social status.

Only the Manini, successfully working in an earlier period in England and Jacopo di Filippo del Bene seem to be exceptions from this general tendency, as they were definitely in a better financial situation, particularly Del Bene, whose father, Filippo had also been interested in the collection of papal revenues in the Kingdom for a long time. The other Florentines on the list were, based on taxation records, apparently not in any financial condition to effectuate major investments and neither do their declarations even hint at involvement of substantial external capital from other Florentine businessmen. Tommaso di Piero Melanesi’s family ranks among the wealthy families and yet he is not included in the list, because, according to the catasto records, the household headed by Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews lost the majority of its assets between 1427 and 1433, as we shall see in the following chapters, whereas the first known mention of Tommaso’s holding royal office only dates to the mid 1430s’. To sum up, this information seems to confirm that the changing royal financial administration and the close relationship of “familiaritas” with the

---

117 Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 47. fol. 522r-523r. His household was made up of his mother and his five year old son, Riccardo. The catasto was submitted by a kinsman, Ormanno di Iacopo degli Rinaldeschi, who acted as procurator for the widow and the boy in Florence, as Rinaldo was absent from the city. He did not declare any profits to the Florentine authorities, which reflects his economic situation back at home. The Attavante brothers were in a similar situation, their economic and social status will however be addressed in the chapter dealing with the role of kin in Hungarian business life.
King in the first half of the fifteenth century provided a business possibility for those Florentines with financial expertise even in cases where they initially lacked substantial assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florentine officer of royal financial administration or the taxational household the officer belonged to</th>
<th>Total wealth Florentine fl</th>
<th>Taxable wealth Florentine fl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo di Domenico Attavanti/Ottavanti</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betta widow and heirs [Leonardo and brothers – Arany] to Domenico Attavanti/Ottavanti</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaggio de Mazza Giuseppi</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Giovanni Manini</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Giovanni Zati</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo di Giovanni del Bene</td>
<td>3716</td>
<td>2122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Total wealth and taxable wealth of the Florentine officer of royal financial administration or the taxational household the officer belonged to, calculated by the officers of the Catasto

The mining- and minting chambers’ administration in particular was regarded as an area where there was competition between Florentine and South German business circles in the early fifteenth century. In 1417-1418, Onofrio di Bardo, first Filippo Scolari’s and later King Sigismund’s direct financial expert was appointed comes of the Kremnica chamber. By the same time the leading role of the Buda minting chamber was overtaken by Kremnica.122 Onofrio and his three sons were assigned a competence over the kingdom’s chambers, and this position was also transferred to the management of the thirtieth customs. Onofrio was one of the few royal financial advisers who were invested from time to time with country-wide competence in the management of royal monopolies. His sons, the Noffri brothers, also managed different chambers, among them the Buda mint chamber and the thirtieth chambers of the kingdom in 1430 as well.123 The Noffri were granted noble status although they continued with their activities in the central financial administration even after their father’s passing. They also managed to maintain their position after the death of King Sigismund.124 The lower-ranking officers of the chambers were, as mentioned above, their personal

---

120 Information based on Online Catasto of 1427. (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013)
121 Information based on Online Catasto of 1427. (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013)
122 On the Buda minting chamber and officers there of Florentine origin see Huszár, A budai pénzverés, 60-82, 122-123; On Kremnica see Draskóczy, “Kamarajövedelem”, 148-149.
123 Fejér, CD, X/7. CDLXIV.
124 MNL OL DF 239531. May 12, 1438; Engel, Archontology, I/53.
attendants, in other words their noble retainers (familiares). One can also find Florentines employed by them including Leonardo Attavante, comes of the thirtieth customs in Zagreb.\textsuperscript{125}

The financial reforms of King Sigismund also influenced the administration of the copper mines, already a field of intense interest for the Florentines in the late fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{126} They were followed in this business by two Nuremberg companies, the Kammerer-Seiler and the Flextorfer-Zenner firms, and the Genoese Gallici company at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{127} There seems to be some evidence that Hungarian copper was also marketed by the Mallorca branch of the Datini company, through Giovanni Tosinghi, who appeared in Buda, first in 1388, still as an agent for the Vieri de Medici partnership.\textsuperscript{128} Thus, the interest of Florentines in the trade of copper did not disappear with time. Probably around 1427, following another organizational reform of the royal financial administration, an independent copper chamber was set up for the first time by the king.\textsuperscript{129} Tommaso di Piero Melanesi from Prato was appointed first officer or count (comes) of this chamber in 1435.\textsuperscript{130} He was followed by his former assistant, another Prato businessman, Rinaldo di Degol degli Rinaldeschi, who actually took over the office in 1437 after Melanesi’s death and also held the office of castellanus of Gelnica.\textsuperscript{131} One can encounter Rinaldeschi’s name in the administration of other royal monopolies as well. He was employed as a financial expert first by the Melanesi

\textsuperscript{125} Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206.


\textsuperscript{128} In the following years he set up more partnerships for his Hungarian activities about which only sporadic evidence exists. In 1408, his name figures in the correspondence of the Mallorca branch of the Florentine Datini company because the established agent of the branch successfully marketed over 213 out of 550 quintals of (probably Hungarian) copper, consigned them on commission by Tosinghi. Tosinghi also had another partner in Mallorca for the sale of copper. IN general, Mallorca was a major trade hub for copper cargoes coming from Venice. ASF, Signori-Carteggi Missive, I. Cancelleria, 21. fol.41r, Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138. See the notes in Martin Malcolm Elbl, “From Venice to the Tuat: Trans-Saharan Copper Trade and Francesco di Marco Datini of Prato,” in Money, Markets and Trade in Late Medieval Europe. Essays in Honour of John H. A. Munro, ed. Lawrin Armstrong – Ivana Elbl – Martin Malcolm Elbl (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 411-460., here footnotes no. 45, 47, 49-51 on 433-434. p. See also Stefanik, “Metals and power”, 93. In general, on the Tosinghi kin groups activity in Spanish hubs such as Barcelona and Valencia in the first decades of the fifteenth century see Maria Elisa Soldani, Uomini d’affari e mercanti toscani nella Barcellona del Quattrocento (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2010). Chapter on Tosinghi-Rucellai partnership 473-475. Tosinghi referred in a letter to the Mallorca branch of the Datini family to his friendship and kin relation (“per la buona amicizia and parentado che io tengo chon [Francesco] di Marco”) to the prominent Prato entrepreneur. See ASPo, Datini, 1102137. Jan. 29, 1406.

\textsuperscript{129} MNL OL DL 39286. Febr. 1, 1427 I would like to thank István Draskóczy who recalled my attention to the mention on revenues of copper mines in the record.


brothers and then similarly to Attavante in a later period directly by the ruler. Recent results show that these men may have managed the Hungarian mining and minting monopoly in cooperation with some prominent South German businessmen. Rinaldeschi, in fact, may be identical with a certain "Leonardus Italicus", castellanus of Gelnica in the Hungarian records, who was accused of illegal occupation of a possession, and was summoned before the Palatine Laurentius Hédervári accused of violent trespass of their possession called Keys by Johannes and Nicolaus, sons of Laurentius de Jekelfalva.

### Florentine officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Seat of office</th>
<th>Date of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartolomeo di Guido Baldi</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Talenti and “Gallicus” Azzo</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano count of lucrum camerae</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano</td>
<td>1392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132 by King Sigismund appointed Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi to the position of Count Palatine of the Palace of the Lateran, see XI,2 n. 11304, in Regesta Imperii Online, URI: [http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1436-03-20_11_0_11_2_0_5583_11304](http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1436-03-20_11_0_11_2_0_5583_11304) (Last downloaded: May 27, 2013).

133 Druskóczky, “Kamarai jövedelem”, 158.


135 Pität, Ricordi, 367.

136 Márton Gyöngyössy, Magyar pénztörténet 1000-1540 [Monetary history of Hungary 1000-1540] (Budapest: Martin Opitz, 2012) Appendix, 217. The brothers, Simone and Thalentus Talenti are stated to be from Bologna in a record from 1384, preserved in the National Archives of Hungary, On "Simoni de Talentis de Bononia concivi nostro" see MNL OL DL 7089 June 2, 1384. Yet, the family presumably migrated from Florence around the mid-fourteenth century. The Talenti family in Florence is recorded in a number of Florentine records, some of them dating to the mid-fourteenth century (Piero del fu Mazzetto Talenti da Sesto). See the hits of the database of monasterium.net on the following link: [http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/search?null=&sort=date&arch=&q=Talenti&block=3](http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/search?null=&sort=date&arch=&q=Talenti&block=3). In 1390, two Talenti brothers (Stefano and Angelo del fu Francesco di Giovanni Talenti) are mentioned as living in Empoli, near Florence. See [http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IT-ASF/DNReformagioni/000080610/charter?q=Talenti](http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IT-ASF/DNReformagioni/000080610/charter?q=Talenti).

Finally, two records held by Archivio di Stato di Firenze refer to the migration of a branch of the Talenti family to Forli, a town near to Bologna and close to the Adriatic ports, important transport hubs along the trade route towards East Central Europe. The first mention in a record dated to August 7, 1345 refers to a certain ser Filippo del fu Lando Talenti living in Forli but of Florentine ancestry (“ser Filippus di Landi Talenti populi sancti Felicis in piazza de Florentie”), see ASF, Diplomatico, San Pancrazio, 00049149, available in the database of monasterium.net under the link: [http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IT-ASF/DNFirenzeSPancrazio/00049149/charter?q=Talenti](http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IT-ASF/DNFirenzeSPancrazio/00049149/charter?q=Talenti). The digitized record is available on the following link: [http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/pegasfi/index.php?op=fetch&type=permagema&id=909198](http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/pegasfi/index.php?op=fetch&type=permagema&id=909198).

The second record from 1363 mentions a certain Thalentinus de Talenti, who had a house in Forli, where a notarial deed was issued on behalf of Florentines sojourning in the town of Forli with a date of August 19, 1363, see ASF, Diplomatico, Pergamene, Camera Fiscale, cod. 00059790. See the database of monasterium.net: [http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IASFi/DNCameraFiscale/00059790/charter?q=Talenti](http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/IASFi/DNCameraFiscale/00059790/charter?q=Talenti); and the digitized record on the following link: [http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/pegasfi/index.php?op=fetch&type=permagema&id=1201619](http://www.archiviodistato.firenze.it/pegasfi/index.php?op=fetch&type=permagema&id=1201619). Talentino Talenti, although no reference was made to his father’s identity, is presumably linked by family ties to Filippo. He obviously maintained contacts with Florence and the Florentines operating in the area. In Forli the urban palace of Talenti-Framonti preserves the memory of the family.

When also considering the use of the personal name Thalentus/Talentinus, shared by one of the Talenti brothers active in Hungary as well, it appears possible that members of the subsequent generation of the Florentine Talenti living in Forli reached Hungary. Nevertheless, no clear evidence on the descendants of the Talenti brothers living in Hungary is available at the moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Ventur</td>
<td>Mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalentus Talenti</td>
<td>Count of lucrum camerae</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano</td>
<td>Count of minting and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo di Stefano Scolari</td>
<td>Count of mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo with Jodok</td>
<td>Count of minting and thirtieth chamber</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1417-1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo, count of Buda chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Nofri with Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1430 (or 1437)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Francesco Zati</td>
<td>Count of minting and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Pécs</td>
<td>1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Bardi and Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sighişoara</td>
<td>1433-1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>Count of copper chamber, castellanus of</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardus Nofri</td>
<td>Urbura</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Dego degli Rinaldeschi</td>
<td>Count of copper chamber and</td>
<td></td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaspare da Colle</td>
<td>Count of Keve and comes camerae of Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus</td>
<td>Count of mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Sibiu</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus</td>
<td>Count of mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Sighişoara</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

139 ZsO I/3971. May, 8, 1395.
140 ZsO I/4225.
141 ZsO I/5945. June 27, 1399.
143 Gyöngyössy, *Magyar pénztörténet*, 211.
145 Gyöngyössy, *Magyar pénztörténet*, 211.
146 Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206
147 Gyöngyössy, *Magyar pénztörténet*, 212.
148 MNL OL DL 44156. Also in Kumorovitz, *BTOE*, III/1169 with a different date (1437).
154 RI XI,2 n. 11764, in *Regesta Imperii Online*, URI: http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1437-04-18_1_0_11_2_0_6068_11764 (Last downloaded: July 31, 2013)
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Table 2. Florentines in the administration of mining and minting chambers, the chambers of *urbura* and those of *lucrum camerae*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Francesco Zati mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Baia Mare</td>
<td>1444-1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius de Florentia (Antonio di Francesco Zati) and Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?)</td>
<td>Cluj</td>
<td>1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odwardus Italicus (Odoardo Manini?)</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odwardus Italicus (Odoardo Manini?)</td>
<td>Baia Mare</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?) mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Sibiu</td>
<td>1453-1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi, count of chamber</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?), mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Baia Mare</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Francesco Zati, mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Baia Mare</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi, Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?), Osvald Wenzel mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Sibiu</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?), mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Sibiu</td>
<td>1458-1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noffry Bardo</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noffry Lénárt</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noffry Bardo</td>
<td>Kremnica</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?) mining and minting chamber</td>
<td>Baia Mare</td>
<td>1463-1464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. includes mentions of “*comes camerae*” arranged according to place and year. These data must be handled with caution, as they normally do not reveal the whole term of office. In a few cases however, they refer to the beginning or to the end of the term of office, particularly in cases where the officer was replaced. Nevertheless, the table shows two important aspects of the Florentine presence in the offices of mining and minting chambers. The chronology in any case
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173 The set of data included in the table comes from both written records and scholarly literature on numismatic finds, because an increasing number of master marks could be identified on the coins minted in Buda in the researched period. On the administration of mining and minting chambers, the chambers for royal revenues on mining, (*urbura*), and the usually separately and parallel operating chambers for the collection of *lucrum camerae*, the tax which in 1336 replaced the former yearly renewal of money, and was paid by the peasantry see Engel, *The Realm*, 224.
seems to confirm a regular presence in the administration of mining and minting chambers from the 1430s up to the 1460s. I assume that it is partly due to the lack of representative data from earlier periods, with regard to the sporadically surviving set of data on office holders in general. At the same time, however, it needs to be emphasized that from the bits of existing information it seems that a few members of another influential ethnic group, the South Germans, mainly from Buda, took over and particularly controlled the Buda and Kremnica minting chambers from 1399, 1402 onwards, following the reforms introduced by King Sigismund.

Geographically, in the first period, the assignment of control over various chambers seems to reflect the decentralization in the minting system intended by King Sigismund in the 1400s-1420s. Thus, Buda’s role in minting decreased, whereas Kremnica (the town was only founded around 1328) rose to a prominent position in Hungary, hosting the most important royal mining and minting chamber. However, in subsequent decades Kremnica faced military campaigns which weakened the general security of mining and minting operations. In any case, a clear shift can be observed in Florentine activity, which, as the data suggest, turned towards the Transylvanian minting centers, whereas Pressburg and Kosice are the only minting chambers apparently not managed by Florentine officers. Taking closer look at the officers in the financial administration in these two towns, it seems that in general local burghers (among them members of the Venturi family of Italian origin in the Pressburg chamber of the thirtieth customs) held offices. Contrary to the situation in Pressburg, a narrow circle of persons from only a few families can be identified in Table 2, mainly Buda burghers, who held and exchanged offices almost permanently, in some cases also in different regions over the long term, particularly in Buda and Kremnica. The Florentines working in Transylvania, however, tended to stay in that region. In this respect, the Florentines acted similarly to the South Germans of Buda with whom they dominated the management of the mining and minting administration.

Table 2 also contains information on the appearance of South Germans with Florentines in the royal administration, in particular on a count of the Buda minting chamber, Michael Nadler, a Buda burgher and judex, a member of the leading urban elite of South German origin. He shared this office with Giovanni Noffri. In my understanding, such data are rare evidence of the cooperation between the two foreign ethnic groups present in Buda in the royal financial administration. We shall see in the following chapters that particularly in the case of Nadler the Florentine taxational records also confirm his cooperation with Florentines. Thus, the role of business competition between South German and Italian, mainly Florentine, businessmen in the royal monopoly of

precious metal mining at the turn of the fifteenth century needs to be reconsidered. The image of strong conflict of interests should be revisited, particularly for Buda, in light of new findings.

Generally speaking, though cooperating in the royal administration, the Florentines seem to have demonstrated a decreasing interest in transactions related to mining by the 1430s compared to the situation at the turn of the fifteenth century when companies were founded for trade in Hungarian copper and silver export. This can hardly be explained on the basis of a supposed business competition with South Germans who would have replaced them in these offices, since the South Germans also seem to have reduced their participation in this activity because of various unfavorable factors such as the increasing technological problems of exploitation, and the above-mentioned Hussite attacks against the mines of Upper Hungary and the general political insecurity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florentine officers</th>
<th>Seat of office</th>
<th>Date of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Giovanni count of salt and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Talenti, lease of salt and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Giovanni count of salt and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>1383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cione de Macigni lease of salt and thirtieth chambers</td>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalentus de Talenti</td>
<td>Sâlard</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo di Stefano Scolari count of all salt chambers</td>
<td>Ocna Sibiului</td>
<td>1401-1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias Baldi officialis (that is lower rank local official)</td>
<td>Ocna Sibiului</td>
<td>1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Manini-Bardi</td>
<td>Dej</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Dej</td>
<td>1427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristoforo Italicus (di Rosso Rossi?)</td>
<td>Ocna Sibiului</td>
<td>1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Francesco Zati</td>
<td>Sic</td>
<td>1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini, Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Ocna Sibiului</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini, Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Dej</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaspare da Colle count of the salt chamber, captain of Újlak</td>
<td>Máramaros</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacopo di Filippo del Bene</td>
<td>Sálard, Dej</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini, Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Transylvania</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Transylvania</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini Odoardo di Antonio Manini (and minting chamber too?)</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo di Antonio Manini</td>
<td>Dej, Sic</td>
<td>1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini, Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Máramaros</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo di Antonio Manini</td>
<td>Dej</td>
<td>1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo di Antonio Manini</td>
<td>Déj</td>
<td>1449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Antonio Manini, Pape di Salvestro Manini</td>
<td>Máramaros</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Seat of Office</th>
<th>Date of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo di Antonio Manini</td>
<td></td>
<td>1452-1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odoardo di Antonio Manini</td>
<td>Dej</td>
<td>1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi da Empoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1456-1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi da Empoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi da Empoli</td>
<td>Sic</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Florentines in the administration of salt chambers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Seat of Office</th>
<th>Date of Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano</td>
<td></td>
<td>1382-1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambusculus de Florentia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobus and Giovanni Ventur</td>
<td>Pressburg</td>
<td>1392-1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano count of minting and thirtieth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaspare di Francesco di Bernardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo count of thirtieth chamber</td>
<td></td>
<td>1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo di Domenico Attavanti</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardi Nofri count of Hungarian thirtieth chambers with brothers Bardo and Giovanni</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1430-1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardi Nofri</td>
<td></td>
<td>1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Nofri castellanus of Skalica with Leonardi Nofri (thirtieth)</td>
<td>Skalica</td>
<td>1435-1436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Florentines in the administration of thirtieth chambers
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Similar tendencies can be observed in the customs on foreign trade (the thirtieth) and the salt chambers, another lucrative business for both ethnic groups. A record from 1388 issued by King Sigismund at the beginning of his reign states the earlier presence of “Gallici”, in general Italians, in the forming of customs on the thirtieth. The document also hints at the motivation for holding these offices, first control of the Zagreb thirtieth along the main overland trade route where Italian merchants passed with their wares. In fact, when considering the lower offices of the thirtieth chambers in places others, than Buda, only one Florentine officer, Leonardo di Domenico Attavanti (employed by Giovanni di Noffri) can be encountered in Zagreb, based on a mention from 1430.

Another piece of information reflects the rather complex relationship of these officers to the king and, in the case of the thirtieth to the queen as well, as until 1427, the thirtieth incomes were used to cover the queen’s expenses. In that year, the incomes from the mining and minting chamber to Kremnica were assigned to her (including the revenues from the royal estate and castle of Zvolen as well). The records reveal occasional royal commissions, like that issued by Queen Barbara to Gaspare Bernardi, count of the thirtieths in 1417, along with that issued to another Italian, Marioth Gallicus to purchase goods in Venice (they claimed that their servants were robbed at Lake Balaton and thus, they suffered damages of fl 1.300). Marioth Gallicus is most probably identical to Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini di Arezzo, who until the 1420s had extensive business interests in Buda. His venture ended badly, with losses amounting to fl 5.000.

In the first two decades of the fifteenth century, the presence of Florentines in the management of the thirtieth seems rather sparse based on the records. In the 1430s, however, the Noffri brothers, sons of the Florentine Onofrio di Bardo who also controlled the Buda thirtieth (1426) and in general the Buda chambers without specifying which revenues he managed there in some years) controlled all thirtieth customs in the country. As the Buda customs tariff from 1436 (issued by the South German Johann Siebenlinder, “castellanus” of Óbuda and “tricesimator” of the queen on the orders of King Sigismund) shows, the Noffri tried to reshape the management of the thirtieth system probably to render it more efficient and lucrative. Thus, their officers collected thirtieth “iuxta
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232 Mariotto di Biagio Griffolini was the father of “Franciscus Aretinus” (1420 - before 1490), a renowned humanist, pupil of Guarino Veronese. See his catasto ASF, Catasto, 201. fol. 334 bis r., On him see also Robert Black, Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance, 7. I would like to thank Prof. Black, who called my attention to this record.
novas adinventiones et statute”, to the obvious disadvantage of merchants, whose complaints resulted in the introduction of the tariff.\textsuperscript{233} Stephanus Egenburger, an officer employed by Leonardus Noffri, was in fact accused of collecting the thirtieth based on the above-mentioned new use.

The tasks of the counts of the thirtieth chamber also included the collection of taxes/yearly gifts etc. from the free royal towns etc.\textsuperscript{234} A record from 1426 also mentioned officers employed by Onofrio di Bardo, including “Grepiolus Ytalicus”, the thirtieth officer in Buda and a certain “Laurentius Tributarius” from Sopron.\textsuperscript{235} Another receipt written by a Buda burgher, “Martino dito Armeno” also refers to Onofrio di Bardo, who received fl 900 as “taxa” due on St. George’s day from the town of Kosice. Based on Onofrio’s letter, Martinus issued the receipt when the town paid up.\textsuperscript{236} The language of the receipt addressed to the town of Kosice is surprising because it was written in Italian. The reasons for the choice of language are unclear, as it was pointless for the addressee and also unnecessary for Onofrio, who corresponded in Latin. Martinus seems to have been fluent in German as well, something shown by another receipt of his on Onofrio’s confirmation of the sum of fl 1.200, paid by the same town. This time, the language of the record is clearly connected to the town of the addressee.\textsuperscript{237}

Finally, the administration of the salt mines, and trade in salt, another royal monopoly, needs to be analyzed. In fact, this income was of utmost importance for the king, as it produced the highest share of the royal revenues. It is therefore not surprising, that here also Italians and the Germans of Buda, among them the closest advisors of the king, alternately held the offices of \textit{comes} of the salt chambers and already played a determining role from the end of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{238} In the 1380s, only the Dalmatian salt chamber of Zadar was managed by Florentines. The Florentine businessmen with the greatest influence on the royal financial organization, such as Onofrio/Noffri di Bardo and his four sons and Filippo Scolari etc., provided further lucrative possibilities for their fellow countrymen in Hungary. At the same time, of course, the Florentine Onofrio di Bardo as count of the Buda chamber of salt also provided a safe-conduct for a Nuremberg merchant on the

\textsuperscript{234} On yearly gift see for e.g. MNL OL \textit{DF} 202463. Jan. 28, 1430.
\textsuperscript{235} MNL OL \textit{DF} 202344. Aug. 19, 1426.
\textsuperscript{236} Kumorovitz, \textit{BTOE} III. no. 679. The record also figures in the Abstracts by Elemér Mányusz (manuscript), no. 407. Mányusz transcribed the following verso as well: “Quitatorie de Martino Kesseler de Buda”. Martinus Armenus must have acquired citizenship of Buda in the same years. A record from 1406, issued by King Sigismund, states that in that year he was only “inhabitator civitatis […] Budensis”. The document also hints at his privileged position with King Sigismund, because the king exempted him from paying taxes after his goods shipped to Buda. MNL OL \textit{DL} 9213. June 17, 1406. Published in ZsO II/1. no. 4819; Kumorovitz, \textit{BTOE} III/no. 459.
\textsuperscript{237} MNL OL \textit{DF} 270677. Nov. 27, 1417, published as abstract in ZsO VI/no. 1178.
\textsuperscript{238} Draskóczy, “A sóigazgatás”, 288-289.
orders of the king. In 1401, within the framework of the administrative reforms, Filippo di Stefano Scolari was commissioned with the country-wide management of the salt chambers. He remained in charge of them until his death in 1426, which shows his prominent role as financial advisor to the king. Some of his noble retainers (familiares) of Florentine origin held offices of varying rank in the salt chambers of Dalmatia, Transylvania, Máramaros and Szeged. Thus, the three Manini brothers managed the Transylvanian chambers from 1424 up to the 1440s. A list of their local debtors has survived from 1463 and was analyzed at length by Draskóczy. Again, in the late 1420s, reorganization in the management of royal revenues, particularly in the salt chambers took place. The office of "comes salium" was again taken over by another Florentine, Niccoló di Vaggio di Mazza Giuseppi from 1454 at least up to 1457. He previously worked as a merchant commissioned by other Florentines staying in Venice with trade connections in Hungary and Poland. He apparently also worked in Buda for a time.

The importance of the salt chambers is best shown by the rather lengthy Table 3 listing officers of Florentine origin. Scolari’s leading role in its management and consequently his need for learned financial experts in the higher and lower offices of the salt chambers promoted the cooperation of his fellow countrymen. The keen participation of large numbers of these businessmen in the proffered positions is further evidenced by the high profitability margin of the salt trade and the solid business interest of Florentines in its management. A clear shift can be observed after a first period in the last decades of the fourteenth century when the Dalmatian salt chamber was mainly targeted by Florentines until its closure. At that time the more distant but still profitable Transylvanian and Máramaros salt mines and chambers remained available for them. Many of the businessmen figuring in the table of officers of mining and minting chambers often held also offices in the salt administration, in some cases even in parallel. The only striking exceptions are the members of the Manini family who focused almost exclusively on salt administration. Geographically, the Maninis’ strategy also seem to have differed from most of their Florentine colleagues, as their activity was necessarily confined to Transylvania and the Máramaros region, where most of the salt mines and chambers were to be found. Similarly to the Manini, also Antonio
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di Francesco Zati’s activity, who held offices in salt, mining and minting chambers, remained confined to Transylvania.

Table 3. shows, that the presence of Florentines in salt management declined for approximately a decade after the death of Filippo Scolari (1426) until around 1437, the year of King Sigismund’s death. From the late 1430s onwards, an opposite tendency can be observed with a strong presence of Florentines documented in the salt chambers until the mid 1460s.

As we could see in the previous paragraphs, the Florentines were, more or less, intensively present in the financial administration of the kingdom. However, their interests turned towards the salt chambers and the customs on the thirtieth particularly that of Zagreb along the southern trade route. They gradually abandoned business related to the mining chambers from the turn of the fourteenth century onwards. The important role played by the Florentines in the royal financial administration is also reflected in the leading offices which were assigned to King Sigismund’s close advisers, Filippo Scolari, Noffri di Bardo, Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano, and the Manini brothers and, in some cases, even their descendants.

### Leading Florentine office holders of the Hungarian royal financial administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filippo di Stefano Scolari</td>
<td>Thesaurarius</td>
<td>1407-1408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano</td>
<td>Vice magister tavernicorum</td>
<td>1420-1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardus Nofri</td>
<td>Thesaurarius</td>
<td>1438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Leading Florentine office holders of the Hungarian royal financial administration

### Leading Florentine office holders of Hungarian royal chambers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iacopo Venturi, count of all minting chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano, count of all minting chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Nofri count of thirtieth and Buda chambers</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonards Nofri count of all minting chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni, Leonardus, Bardus and Jacobus Nofri counts of</td>
<td></td>
<td>1437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hungarian thirtieth and minting chambers, captains of Skalicza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Manini-Bardi count of all the royal chambers</td>
<td>1442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Manini-Bardi count of all the royal chambers with Emerich Szapolyai</td>
<td>1459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Leading Florentine office holders of Hungarian royal chambers

Counts of not identified chambers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo count</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo count</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo count</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onofrio di Bardo count</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccoló di Vaggio di Maza dei Giuseppi</td>
<td>Buda</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Counts of not identified chambers

The lower offices of the financial administration were in some cases assigned by their fellow countrymen to other Florentine businessmen employed as noble retainers (familiares) as well. When there was a shift in the management of these royal revenues, these lower-ranking officers of Florentine origin continued in the service of the newly appointed count, whether Hungarian or Florentine (such as the Noffri, Matkó Tallóci, or Nicholas of Újlak). After King Sigismund’s death in 1437 some Florentines such as the Manini family or Niccoló Giuseppi could retain some of the chief offices of financial administration. The records and the available information on their presence in the kingdom, however, declines for the following three decades, not to mention that the number of names of new Florentine businessmen appearing in the records also drastically drops in this period, due in part to the rather scattered nature of source material too.

The diminishing tendency of the Florentine presence in the administration of the royal chambers intensified in the second half of the fifteenth century. The conditions for holding such offices definitively changed in 1467-1472, within the framework of King Matthias’s reforms. The system of financial administration was altered and the formerly representative office of the treasurer

253 Fejér, CD, X/7. CDLXIV; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206.
256 Deutschordenszentralarchiv, Vienna. Urkunden, 2932. Thorn, April 5, 1413. See.monasterium.net: http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/AT-DOZA/Urkunden/2932/charter?q=Florenz
257 MNL OL DF 239399. Nov. 23, 1418; ZsO VI/2565.
258 MNL OL DL 10770. Febr. 6, 1419.; ZsO VII/87.
259 Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206.
260 MNL OL DL 93254. Aug. 5, 1454; Draskóczy, "Olaszok", 129.
(“thesaurarius”) was filled with real competencies, among them that for coordination and supervision of the officials of the royal chambers.\textsuperscript{261} Consequently, the direct relationship of the members of the administration to the king ceased. Moreover, a Hungarian learned elite also started to emerge to hold these offices.\textsuperscript{262} For these reasons, Florentines generally retired from such posts. At the turn of the fifteenth century, the great Southern German firms took over management of the mines acquiring the monopoly for their activity.

The efficacy of the management of the mining and minting chambers, the customs of the thirtieth, and particularly the earlier, very lucrative, salt chambers, however, declined by the close of the Middle Ages. The chambers were pawned or leased and salaried office-holders as noble retainers\textsuperscript{263} of the royal treasurer were appointed to administer them. At the turn of the century, and particularly in the decades prior to the defeat at Mohács in 1526, these chambers yielded relatively low profits while the high costs of maintaining them impacted the royal treasury.\textsuperscript{264}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{261} András Kubinyi, “A kincstári személyzet a XV. század második felében” [The personell of the treasury in the second half of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century], in\textit{Tanulmányok Budapest Múltjából} XII (1957): 25-49. 25.
\textsuperscript{262} Already in the 1439 diet among the articles one aimed at reorganization of the lease of minting chambers with the constraint of possible leaseholders to the “subjects to the Hungarian Krown”. See Gyöngyössy, \textit{Magyar pénztörténet}, 255.
\textsuperscript{263} Kubinyi, “Budai kereskedők”, 353-354.
\textsuperscript{264} István Draskóczy, “Szempontok az erdélyi sóbányászat 15-16. századi történetéhez,” [Points to the history of the Transylvanian salt mining in the 15-16\textsuperscript{th} centuries], in\textit{Studia Professoris – Professor Studiorum. Tanulmányok Érzségi Géza hatvanadik születénapjára.} [Essays in honor of Géza Érzségi for his 60\textsuperscript{th} birthday], ed.Tibor Almási, István Draskóczy, Éva Jancsó (Budapest, 2005), 83-117. here 83-91.
\end{flushright}
3.3. Florentines in ecclesiastic positions in Hungary

A less known although interesting feature of the Florentines’ presence in the kingdom is related to the fact that among the very few bishops of bourgeois origin in fifteenth-century Hungary, there are a remarkable number of foreigners. According to some explanations, the management of these dioceses was meant to function as a sort of payment for his close collaborators. Three Florentines occupied such high ecclesiastic positions during King Sigismund’s reign; two of them were part of the network of Filippo Scolari. First, the bishopric of Zagreb in 1408 and in 1409-1426 the bishopric of Oradea was held by Andrea Scolari. He was famous for his business capabilities and business activity through the years of his episcopate. He was also very active in improving the economic situation and representational conditions in Oradea, the seat of his bishopric. His endeavors, however, to increase the financial resources of his bishopric at times ended in controversy. In fact, in his last will, he also bestowed around fl 880 and other incomes on the pious institutions of Oradea. After his death, another Florentine, Giovanni di Piero Melanesi was appointed bishop of Oradea. He was the brother of the Melanesi in Buda. Giovanni Melanesi was a member of the royal council in the 1410s. Filippo Scolari was appointed lay governor of the vacant seat of the archbishop of Kalocsa for several years. As a


266 Fügedi, “A XV. századi magyar püspökök”, 94-95.

267 Elemér Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon (Budapest: Műszaki kiadó, 2007), 166-167.

268 Engel, The Realm, 210; His tomb stone was found during the 1883 excavations in Oradea, see Gyula Forster, Magyarország műemlékei 2, A Műemlékek helyrajzi jegyzéke és irodalma, (Budapest, 1905), 227-228; His death is dated to Jan. 18, 1426 according to the inscription on the tomb stone, see Vincze Bunyitay, A váradi püspökség története alapításától a jelenkorig, (Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1883), vol. 1-4. here vol. 1. 232-243; vol. 3. 104; For his pendent seal as bishop of Oradea with the legend “SIGILLUM A-REE ---COLARIO ----WARADIENSIS” see MNL OL DL 11218. June 4, 1422; for his applied seal with ring matrix see MNL OL DL 54385. June 2, 1424.


270 See Bunyitay, A váradi püspökség, I. 232-243. See the mention of the episcopal palace, his residence in the datatio of the record under MNL OL DL 25187. Jan.1, 1426.

271 MNL OL DL 89717, June 7, 1413.

272 MNL OL DF 289064 , Jan. 14, 1426. copy of the last will of Andreas Scolari written in Oradea: He recorded the hospital of Saint Elisabeth near the parish church of the Holy Cross, money was bestowed to the parish church of Saint Michael to restore the building of the church, he left money to the nuns of the monastery of Saint Anne, he also left income to maintain the altar of Saint Appollonia which he founded in the parish church of the Holy Mary. Finally, one can also encounter among the bestowed institutions mention in his will of the Augustinian monastery of Saint Nicholas, situated in “Olaszi”, [meaning “Italian”), part of the Episcopal district of the town of Oradea.


274 Engel, The Realm, 214.
settlement of debts towards him, he also obtained the management of the revenues of the Benedictine monastery of Bulcs along the Maros River in 1408.275

Scolari’s kinsman launched his carrier in the Benedictine order. Giovanni di Andrea Buondelmonti was appointed abbot of the Pécsvárad monastery at the age of 20. He later became provost in spite of the fact that he had not even taken the lower ecclesiastic orders.276 He was archbishop of Kalocsa first in 1425-1435 and then restored to his office in 1438-1447 after several turbulent years of captivity.277 As shown above, Sigismund’s policy towards ecclesiastical incomes was influenced by his continuous need for money. Therefore, in some cases, the king left some bishoprics vacant for years and appointed lay governors to administer the incomes, among them his Florentine financial experts.278 During Sigismund’s reign alone, three Florentines were invested in Hungarian bishoprics for long periods, presumably also for economic reasons.

275 Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom, 224.
276 Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom, 222.
277 Engel, Archontology, I/66, 335, 515, II/43.
278 Engel, The Realm, 227; Engel, Archontology, I/65.
3.4. The three Florentine commercial partnerships in Buda in the 1420s – their backgrounds and organization.

The municipality of Buda was founded in the mid-thirteenth century, after the Mongol invasion by Béla IV (1235-1270). The majority of its first settlers were of German origin, coming mainly from Regensburg with only a small number of its inhabitants being Hungarian. The town was granted the royal privileges of Pest, situated opposite Buda on the left riverbank of the Danube. Pest, as opposed to Buda, was considered one of the most important market towns in the kingdom throughout the Middle Ages although already in the fifteenth century the majority of long-distance commercial transactions took place in Buda. Buda’s merchants definitely played a leading role in the large-scale commerce of the kingdom, mainly due to the presence of the royal court. How did this seemingly paradoxical situation come about?

Buda had been a notable long-distance trade center with staple rights. By the fifteenth century it also gradually developed into the permanent royal residence for the kings of Hungary. Under the reign of the Angevin Dynasty in the fourteenth century, Buda gradually gained increasing importance, first with the establishment of the minting chamber and the coinage of the Hungarian golden florin (from 1326) most probably after the model of the Florentine florin and secondly because of the possibilities connected with the establishment of the offices of minting and mining chambers. Italian, mainly Florentine inhabitants appeared in the town, also motivated by the lack of interest shown by Buda’s patrician class in participating in long-distance trade, something generally explained by the staple rights given the town which brought commercial goods there.

At the close of the fourteenth century, just as in other towns of the region, a “platea or vicus Italicorum” can also be identified in Buda in the sources. In the case of Buda, the street named after the Italians was a significant one in the urban road-system. However, as research has clearly

282 For Buda see for e.g. MNL OL DL 13588. Oct. 28, 1440, MNL OL DL 93303. Aug. 10, 1460, MNL OL DL 106070. Nov. 11, 1498. etc. For towns in Poland see Sapori, “Gli italiani,” 151.
shown, Italians were also living in other parts of the town. The “platea Italicorum” was inhabited mainly by Hungarian and to a lesser degree by German burghers too.283

Within the town, the Italians were already mainly interested in the trade in luxury goods, particularly textiles, in the second half of the fourteenth century. However, the establishment of the permanent royal residence in the town, dated to the years 1405-1408, caused a further increase in the demand for luxury goods.284 Buda also became the center of royal administration, with the most important juridical and financial offices moving into the town. Being the juridical center of the kingdom meant occasional at first and later on the regular appearance of landed aristocracy in the town for the management of their legal affairs and providing an additional market for goods imported by foreign merchants. This trend was further reinforced by the transfer of the diets to Buda and Pest, or on some occasions to the nearby fields of Rákos.285 Finally, it should also be emphasized that through Buda’s development into the permanent residence for King and also later Emperor Sigismund of Luxemburg, the town acquired a prominent position in a European context.286

As the result of royal urban policy and its role in administration and commerce, Buda became one of the most prominent settlements of the Central European region throughout the fifteenth century.286 These factors contributed to the establishment of three Florentine companies in the town in the 1420s, rendering Buda’s position particular to the Central European context.287

These partnership systems appeared in the late fourteenth century in Florence and had a variety of combined organizational forms. The basic structure of a company (that is, partnership), however, relied on the startup capital invested by the partners of the partnership, the so-called “corpo”. On the basis of the shares of each partner in the capital, a final accounting of losses and profits was

283 Végh, Buda város, I, 245-247.
287 Based on the systematic research of the Florentine Catasto of 1427 and the Hungarian charter collection, at present we know of 81 Florentine persons (43 families) operating in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary between 1371-1450. For most of them see (The Carnesecchi-Fronte, the Melanesi and the Panciatichi companies operated in Buda in the same decades. In these terms Buda is the only Central-European trading centre with such an intensive Florentine presence. See Arany, “Firenzei–magyar”, 291-296.
made at the termination of the contract, a process which usually lasted from one to three years and could also be renewed. The partners were liable for eventual losses and shared the profit based on the amount of “corpo” they invested into the partnership. The startup and operating capital of the Florentine companies in Buda was, of course, increased by other forms of investments by the partners themselves and also external investors such as the so-called “sopraccorpo” or the deposit. They also invested, though not often, in “accomandite”, a sort of limited liability partnership.


290 Based on the analysis of the records of the Florentine Catasto of 1427 carried out by Christiane Klapisch-Zuber and David Herlihy, it seems that these three established Buda companies were present in the region in the form of partnerships. This is a clear indication of Buda’s prominent role as a regional trade hub in the early fifteenth century.


289 Catasto of Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews, ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I, fol. 649v-655v, for the Campioni see ASF, Catasto 1427, 77. fol. 247r-249r. The catasto on the Buda company of the nephews, Tommaso and Simone di Piero Melanesi see ASF Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I, fol. 654r-655v, and Campioni,ASF, Catasto 1427, 77. fol. 248v-249r.

293 From later period, apparently from the early 1430s,
a catasto record of Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi has survived containing details on the business he ran in Hungary.\textsuperscript{294} The poor data set for the family business in Hungary in the catasto records may be ascribed at least in part to the already rather particular economic situation of the family in the year of the submission of the \textit{catasto}. Yet, data on their Hungarian venture, particularly in connection with their most important client, King Sigismund of Luxemburg, were handled in the tax declarations separately. Also, the catasto of Filippo di Simone Capponi (“Philipp Kapun” in the German sources), their agent in Buda, needs a closer look. Finally, information on their business with other partners are sparse in all kinds of available archival records.\textsuperscript{295} Naturally, in the case of such scattered evidence, the information on the debts and credits need to be handled with caution.

### 3.4.1. The partners of the three Florentine companies of Buda in the 1420s

The Melanesi brothers can be listed among the Florentine merchants working in Hungary who had relatively strong financial potential. Based on textual sources, Simone first arrived to Buda around 1415-1416, as an employee of the already operating Carnesecchi-Fronte partnership. In fact, he still had an open debt account running to fl 45 with the Carnesecchi from this early period in 1427.\textsuperscript{296} Simone and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi, owners of a successful Buda company and descended from a noble lineage in Prato. Their company members occupied important ecclesiastical and lay offices in that town. They acquired Florentine citizenship and some members of the kin settled in Florence, while others remained in Prato.\textsuperscript{297} Two householders belonging to this lineage appear in the \textit{Catasto} of Florence from 1427. Filippo di Filippo and his nephews, Tommaso and Simone di Piero, the latter working and living mainly in the Kingdom of Hungary, handed in a joint fiscal declaration. We learn that Filippo and his nephews possessed assets totaling 10,996 florins. After deductions, the \textit{officials of the Catasto} assessed their taxable wealth at 3,389 florins,\textsuperscript{298} which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{294} Because I focused on the Catasto records from 1427, I did not consult this source. See Katalin Prajda, “Florentine merchant companies established in Buda at the beginning of the fifteenth century,” Mélanges de l’École française de Rome - Moyen Âge [Online], 125-1 | 2013, Messo online il 26 settembre 2013, consultato il 08 aprile 2014. URL: http://mefrm.revues.org/1062.
  \item \textsuperscript{295} RI XI,1 no. 3582, in Regesta Imperii Online, URI:http://www.regestae-imperii.de/id/1418-09-24_2_0_11_1_0_4043_3582 (Last downloaded May 01, 2013)
  \item \textsuperscript{296} Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 28. fol. 1008r.
  \item \textsuperscript{298} ASF, Catasto 1427, 77. fol. 249r.
\end{itemize}
positioned them in the upper social stratum in Florence. Other members of the Melanesi lineage in Prato also worked for Tommaso and Simone Melanesi in Hungary.

The Melanesi kin belonged to the wealthy and prominent families of Prato, its members held significant ecclesiastical and lay offices in the Tuscan town. The kin acquired Florentine citizenship and some of its members moved to Florence, whereas others – among them the father of the Melanesi brothers, Piero – remained in Prato. In the brothers’ declaration, at least two other members of the kin, their uncle, Filippo di Filippo Melanesi, and other household figures. Based on the data of the Online Catasto, Filippo and his nephews disposed of a total wealth (before deduction of tax) amounting to 10,996 Florentine florins. Their business portfolio was mainly made up of private investments, as high as 8,647 florins, compared to which the investments listed in the “monte commune” were a quite modest fl 225. The value of their immobile assets’ ran to about fl 2,124, also including income from the management of estates remaining after deduction of the relative costs. The officials of the Catasto finally set the taxable wealth of the brothers and their uncle at fl 3,389 after negotiating with the latter, Filippo, who lived in Florence. Another householder from the Melanesi kin disposed of an even higher total asset running to fl 16,641.

Based on the above data, both families of the Melanesi kin ranked among the 137 families in 1427, comprising the social cluster with the greatest wealth (whose total wealth was set above 10,000 fl) in Florence based on the classification by David Herlihy and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber. If one looks at the records from subsequent “Catasti”, however, a rapid decline in wealth can be observed. By 1430, the total wealth of the common declaration of the uncle and his two nephews sank to fl 1,085. Three years later, the separate declaration of Tommaso di Piero Melanesi and nephews did not report on any taxable profit, stating, however, that the creditor and debtor lists of the Hungarian business would be submitted at a later date. Other members of the kin also figure in entries related to the Hungarian business venture of the Melanesi brothers. However, no information is available on their financial situation.

At this point, a comparison of the Melanesis’ financial position as reflected in the tax return submitted by the uncle with those of Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi, investor in Florence of the

299 Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 348-352.
300 ASF, Catasto 1427, 175. fol. 272r.
301 Among the members of the kin one can find a knight of Malta, a provost of Prato, and a bishop as well. Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1-5; Fiumi, Movimento, 433-434.
302 Baldassare’s father may be one and the same as a certain Luigi Melanesi, who was secretary and councilor to Pope John XIII. Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1-5.
303 Online Catasto of 1427 ( Last downloaded: May 11, 2014)
304 Online Catasto of 1427 ( Last downloaded: May 21, 2007)
305 Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews, ASF, Catasto 1430, 406. fol. 401r-402v.
306 Tommaso di Piero Melanesi and nephews, ASF, Catasto 1433, 496. fol. 499v.
Carnesecchi-Fronte company with a seat in Buda is of interest.\textsuperscript{307} The Carnesecchi (Durante, Grazini, Mattei) kin figures in the \textit{Florentine Catasto} of 1427 with seven households. Except for one, they are all ranked among the group possessing the greatest wealth with taxable assets above fl 2300, so the financial background of the kin seems to have been solid. The total wealth of Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi appears to have been similar to that of the Melanesi. At the same time, however, the taxable wealth if the Carnesecchi differs notably. Carnesecchi could declare fewer liabilities and debts, so his taxable assets ran higher. The partition of his investments, particularly for his private transactions and his investments in the public debt, also hint at a different business strategy. The \textit{Catasto} records show that Carnesecchi invested more in the public debt of the Florentine state ("monte commune"), clearly a longer-term investment.

Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi’s being elected to consul of the wool guild in 1431, one of the consuls of the \textit{Mercanzia} in both 1432 and 1436, and finally, in 1436 and 1450 his election to “gonfaloniere di giustizia”, member of the Florentine urban government further hint at the prominent role of the family in Florence. This latter office was also invested by other members of the Carnesecchi kin group.\textsuperscript{308} Altogether, among the founding families of the three Florentine partnerships working in Buda, the Carnesecchi held the highest urban offices in Florence in the period of the \textit{Catasto}.

The Fronte brothers, the partnership’s representatives in Buda already possessed extensive information on the regional possibilities, enough to consider that Antonio di Piero Fronte, after having sojourned in Zadar as “habitator” from at least 1392, seems to have left the Dalmatian port town at some time between 1395 and 1402 to move to Buda, the evolving royal seat of the Kingdom of Hungary.\textsuperscript{309} In this period he was away from Florence according to the records of the Florentine \textit{Tratte} and in fact, did not hold the urban offices he was nominated to.\textsuperscript{310} After 1402, he returned to the Tuscan city, because in 1404 he was drawn to hold a prominent urban office, the “gonfaloniere di compagnia” (the “Tre Maggiori”, the highest executive offices of the Florentine government) and twice in the same year he was also elected consul of the wool guild.\textsuperscript{311} The entries of the Online \textit{Tratte} provide a relative chronology of his sojourns in his home town, returning from his foreign affairs. According to them he entered two-months-term Florentine urban offices

\textsuperscript{307} Teke, “A firenzeiek vagyonjai helyzete,” 55-59; Information on the wealth of Carnesecchi are available in his \textit{catasto} ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 79. fol. 81.

\textsuperscript{308} \textit{Online Tratte} of Office Holders, 1282-1532.

\textsuperscript{309} Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok,” 211. footnote no. 9, According to the records of the Florentine \textit{Tratte} he did was not living in Florence between 1398-1402 although was asked at least twenty times to hold various offices within the guild that he could not accept as he was dwelling outside the Florentine State. See \textit{Online Tratte}.

\textsuperscript{310} \textit{Online Tratte} of Officeholders, Antonio di Piero (di Fronte).

\textsuperscript{311} \textit{Online Tratte} of Officeholders, Antonio di Piero (Fronte) 10993. For the “Tre Maggiori” see \textit{Online Tratte} of Officeholders, Antonio di Piero (di Fronte), 10905.
another 10 times (1410, 1413, 1415, 1417, 1420, 1421, 1422, 1424, 1426) in subsequent years until his death around 1428, hinting that he regularly commuted between Florence and his foreign residence (in his case, Hungary).  

In 1404 his brother, Fronte di Piero Fronte, is also reported to have stayed in Buda as Florentine envoy, commissioned to negotiate with Sigismund following the reprisals against the “Latin” inhabitants, among them many Florentines from Buda after the town government favored the pretender to the throne, Ladislaus of Naples. Fronte’s name was drawn 19 times in 1400-1418 but during this time he was staying permanently abroad according to the records, because he entered office only twice in these years: in 1401 as one of the 8 “Priori” and 1406, as one of the 12 “Buonuomini”. So it seems that Antonio assumed the role of contact person between the partners in Florence and the Hungarian company, and also preserved a very active political role in Florence. Interestingly enough, records on him also prevail in the Hungarian material. Altogether, the brothers’ social standing seems to have been prominent, considering that they held the most prominent urban and guild offices in Florence.

The economic situation of the Fronte family can be assessed based on both declarations of the elderly Antonio di Piero Fronte and his nephew, Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte, because the other brother, Fronte, business partner of Antonio the senior, died between 1418 and 1421. His young heir reported a lower taxable wealth of fl 1.063 (after deductions from a total of fl 1.993). The partition among the different forms of investment suggests his business activity was active with private investments running to fl 1.166, compared to investments in estates in a value of fl 818. It is clear that the young Antonio di Fronte did not favor long-term investment such as public debt, more characteristic of people disposing of substantial capital. At the same time, however, the entries in the tax return report of many outstanding debts on the account of his deceased father with King Sigismund and Queen Barbara, running to around fl 4.000, unfortunately appear without noting their date or scope or any other detail of the loans taken by the king. The elderly Antonio di Piero Fronte, the uncle also seems to have died right after the submission of his catasto to the Florentine authorities. His assets were quite substantial compared to that of his nephew. He had a taxable

---

312 Online Tratte of Officeholders, Antonio di Piero (di Fronte), 10924, 10939, 10942, 10942, 10944, 11001, 11014, 11015, 113699, 113701.
313 See ZsO II/3131. April 19, 1404.
314 Online Tratte of Officeholders, Fronte di Piero (di Fronte), 117571, 45943.
316 In 1418, he was absent from Florence, in 1421, when he was again drawn for urban office although according to the entry he was already dead. Online Tratte of Officeholders, Fronte di Piero (di Fronte), 301238 and 45972. Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte, ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 100r-101v; Antonio di Piero di Fronte, ASF, Catasto 1427. 27. fol. 116.r.- 117r.
317 ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 100v.
wealth running to fl 5,778 (out of a total wealth of fl 7,476). Here also private investments prevail with a declared sum of fl 4,774, compared to a public investment of fl 2,029. His estates were rather modest (worth fl 673), suggesting that Antonio di Fronte concentrated his wealth on his trading and crediting activity (mainly with King Sigismund). The data also suggest that two partners of equal economic potential set up the Carnesecchi-Fronte partnership in Buda. This impression is also reflected in the equal sums of startup capital shares ("corpo": fl 2,500) invested by them into the company of Buda in 1415.

The third company in Buda was launched by the Panciatichi. Judging from the Florentine Catasto of 1427, the Panciatichi seem to have been the most prominent of the families in this study. Originally belonging to one of the leading merchant families of Pistoia, Giovanni and Gabriello di Bartolomeo Panciatichi had moved to Florence by the time of the first Catasto, at which time these two households possessed 1.7 per cent of the total wealth in Florence. Giovanni di Bartolomeo and his sons established two companies in Buda and Venice with a long-term perspective. The analysis of their joint fiscal declaration places the father in fifth place among the wealthiest Florentine citizens of his time with total assets of 52,820 florins.

However, the economic situation of the Panciatichi probably did not flourish as well, as the Catasto of 1427 suggests. In 1424, they had even tried to leave the city because of the heavy tax levied on their wealth. Their problems reflect the general financial depression that Florence experienced in those decades. Many otherwise wealthy merchant families faced heavy tax burdens and the scarcity of cash compelled them to sell landed properties or ask for credit on interest due so that they could pay their taxes in time. This situation could rapidly lead to the bankruptcy of a family. In the case of the Panciatichi, the company in Hungary, in business until 1435, may be considered an attempt to evade taxation in Florence. Their business was probably much more lucrative than they declared, for despite their bad financial situation they figured among the creditors of the "ufficiali del banco" in these years with notable sums.

---

318 ASF, Catasto 1427, 68. fol. 24.
319 ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 116v.
320 On the Panciatichis see David Herlihy, Medieval and Renaissance Pistoia: The Social History of an Italian Town (Yale University Press, 1967).
321 Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 343.
322 On his Venice branch established with Giovanni Portinari see ASF, Catasto 1427, 32. fol. 297r; ASF, Catasto 1431, 39. fol. 339r, also see Francesco Bettarini, “I fiorentini all’estero ed il catasto del 1427: frodi, elusioni e ipercorrettismi,” Annali di Storia di Firenze 6 (2011): 37-64, here 43, 45-49.
323 Ibid.
324 Ibid, Appendix E, 217.
The analysis of the financial background of the branch of the Panciatichi family coming from Pistoia (the third partnership in Buda), is somewhat misleading if only the 1427 catasto record is considered because their declared wealth ranks only old Giovanni di Bartolomeo in fifth place among the richest householders of the Tuscan city with assets of fl 52,820. At the same time, however, as revealed in other records, he already owed major tax arrears (in 1429 around fl 11,419 fl) to the Florentine Comune. Although the Panciatichis’ embarked upon their Hungarian business venture earlier, it may be considered at least in part a means of tax evasion. This impression is further supported by the Panciatichi tax return which lists the majority of their business transactions in Hungary among the “bad” debts found among the losses, clearly in order to cut the size of taxable profit. Despite the allegedly difficult economic situation of the Panciatichi, seven years later (in 1435), Giovanni di Bartolomeo still acted as a business partner in the affairs of both the Hungarian and the Venetian companies, the latter branch founded together with Giovanni di Gualtieri Portinari. All in all, the Panciatichi catasto mainly provides details of those incomes that were difficult to hide from the Florentine authorities such as the considerable estate properties and the loans provided to the Florentine state (running to 49,266 fl). The incomes resulting from their business ventures run to a considerably lower sum of fl 10,694. They lost the most of their fortune by 1434 anyway and became impoverished. The members of the next Panciatichi generation tried to stabilize and improve their financial situation by holding urban offices. The firm also employed a salaried agent, Filippo di Simone Capponi. In the reality, he was also a member of the “parentado”, being the brother-in-law of Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi.327 In any case, in his declaration Capponi defined himself as a paid employee working abroad.

The entries of the Catasto also reveal that the three Florentine companies were tied by marriage alliances too. Not only taking into consideration the elderly Antonio di Piero Fronte whose wife was Bindella di Bindo Tosinghi (member of the prominent Tosinghi kin, active in Hungary in the 1380s), who had first been married off to Piero di Luca degli Albizzi.328 Bindella’s sister, Nanna di Bindo Tosinghi was married off to Luigi Melanesi, a close relative to the Melanesi brothers who also financially supported the father of Simone and Piero.329 At the same time, the young Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte declared that he had returned to the household of his aunt (named Lorenza), wife to Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti.330 Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti was in partnership with the

327 ASF Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 479v- 481v. See the Hungarian scholarly literature on Capponi: Kubinyi, Budapest története, 50; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok,” 197-198.
328 Bindella, daughter of the late Bindo Tosinghi and wife of Antonio (di Piero) di Fronte, ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 248r.
329 Baldassare di Luigi Melanesi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 52. fol. 368r.
330 Francesco, son of the late Niccoló di Marcho and Donna Lorenza, wife of the late Niccoló, ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo I. fol. 167r.
Fronte brothers.\footnote{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 27. fol. 100v, 101v.} Therefore, the families of the partners of the two Buda partnerships were linked by marriage alliances with each other, even if it can only be regarded as a very distant “parentado”.

### 3.4.2. Organizational forms of the Buda companies’ trade activity

Florentine businessmen acted within various organizational structures in differing geographical regions and their centers. From the second half of the fourteenth century, however, it became a generally applied strategy to be present with their investments in European economic centers in manifold business forms but at the same time such investment was aimed at minimizing high business risks linked to banking and trade in the luxury goods typical for long distance trade. The information on relatively long and manifold business activity and presence partnerships, as stressed before, of course also hint at the position of the single hubs or regions in the business network of the given businessman, and in a broader sense, also in the contemporary European economic context.

The Panciatichi family operated a “classical” branch in Buda, in which the father, Giovanni and his two sons, Zanobi (staying for most of the period in Hungary and mentioned also as “Zanobi Panzacii” in some records) and Antonio worked alongside Filippo di Simone Capponi, Giovanni’s brother-in-law.\footnote{In 1423 Antonius Frontis, Philippus de Caponibus, Zenobius de Panzacii, Petrus and Nikolaus de Lamborteschis were exempted from the payment of customs duty for their Hungarian business by King Sigismund. See RI XI, 1 no. 5667, in Regesta Imperii Online, URI: http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1423-10-30_2_0_11_1_0_6310_5667 (Last downloaded: May 28, 2013).} Different organizational forms prevailed in the second company of the Panciatichi, founded in 1432. They sent goods to Hungary by means of “accomandita” contracts, cooperating with other Florentines regularly working in the kingdom.\footnote{ASF \textit{Catasto} 1433, 498. fol. 341v.} The shift in the business form also reflects a clear shift in the activity undertaken in the kingdom: instead of the large-scale crediting activity supplying primarily the needs of King Sigismund which prevailed during the first partnership, trade in luxury goods was favored in this second “ragione” (that is, partnership).

In the case of the Melanesi brothers and their uncle, a rather complex business venture was set up for Hungarian trade. It relied basically on the cooperation of the closer and larger kin group. The supply of goods to be marketed in Hungary and their shipping was provided primarily by the uncle, at that time living in Florence, but as records show, members of the larger kin group occasionally also took part in such transactions. Cooperation between the uncle and his nephews, however,
seems to have ceased before 1433, when they submitted separate declarations claiming not to run any common business ventures any more.\(^{334}\)

The reason for this clear split between uncle and nephews surely must be ascribed to the great losses incurred by the constant need for liquid assets for the Hungarian business and the apparent failure to settle them. Therefore, Tommaso Melanesi also founded a partnership in Florence for the Hungarian trade with the silk weaver Tommaso di Lapo Corsi, his brother Simone and Tommaso Davizzi which was renewed on at least one occasion. By 1429, however, it lead to the bankruptcy of the Melanesi in 1429 and resulted in the loss of their landed properties in and around Prato to the advantage of their former business partners, the Davizzi.

In the Kingdom of Hungary the Melanesi also cooperated with Filippo di Stefano Scolari in some form of partnership. Their long-term collaboration was particularly intensive in the first moments of their Hungarian sojourn, but they had an open account with Pipo Spano as late as 1427, as they claimed Scolari’s heirs as their debtors of fl 200 for “ragione corrente” on behalf of the Melanesi.\(^{335}\) They also employed other Florentines in Hungary, among them Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, as their agents.\(^{336}\)

The Fronte brothers seem to have had a number of partnerships from 1404 onwards in the Kingdom of Hungary, but the available records on these partnerships are rather laconic, they mostly inform us about their partners.\(^{337}\) Fronte di Piero Fronte worked together with Giovanni di Biligardi around 1404 in Hungary. The company had problems collecting outstanding accounts. They were therefore granted royal support in 1406.\(^{338}\) In 1406-1410 Filippo Scolari’s brother, Mattia di Stefano Scolari and a certain Antonio di Sunti also entered into a partnership with the Fronte.\(^{339}\) The common business venture apparently ended up in a dispute in front of the Florentine “Sei della Mercanzia”, which bound Fronte to settle his debts towards Scolari.\(^{340}\) The first information on partnership with their long-term Florentine partner, Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi, goes back to around 1411 when Carnesecchi’s “corpo di compagnia” (startup capital) invested in the partnership amounted to fl 2,500.\(^{341}\) Fronte di Piero Fronte concluded a new partnership with Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti and

\(^{334}\) Filippo di Filippo Melanesi ASF, Catasto 1433. 496. fol. 401r–402v; Tommaso di Pietro Melanesi, ASF, Catasto 1433. 496. fol. 499v.

\(^{335}\) ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I, fol. 652v.

\(^{336}\) On Rinaldeschi see also Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 208. Draskócz, “Kamarai jövedelem”, 153. ; He only submitted a tax declaration for his mother in 1433 in which he listed himself as a member of the household without income. ASF Catasto 1433. 496. fol. 193v.

\(^{337}\) Some records on Fronte and company: ZsO II/4040. July 5, 1405.

\(^{338}\) ASF, Signori-Carteggii, Missive I. Cancelleria 25. fol. 51rv, the same ZsO II/4040 July 5, 1405; ASF, Signori-Carteggii, Missive-I. Cancelleria, 27. fol. 14v. Aug. 31, 1406, the same record published in ZsO II/4959, Aug. 31, 1406.

\(^{339}\) Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195.

\(^{340}\) Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201.

\(^{341}\) ASF, Catasto 1427. 79. fol. 52r-55v; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195-196.
Iacopo Ardinghelli around 1414. The only detail seems to be the partition of investments; Benvenuti’s heir was entitled to the 3/8 of the outstanding account of King Sigismund of Luxemburg.\textsuperscript{342}

The Carnesecchi-Fronte company was founded by Pagolo del Berto dei Carnesecchi along with the Fronte brothers, Fronte and Antonio di Piero di Fronte in 1415 although from the early 1420s they operated separately.\textsuperscript{343} The Florentine company of the Carnesecchi and their Buda company, represented by the Fronte merged in 1427, but Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi who took over the inheritance of his father, left the company, apparently without making any profit.\textsuperscript{344}

Among the Florentines sojourning in the Kingdom of Hungary one can identify established salaried agents of Florentine companies, merchants operating in partnership contracts or conducting “accomandita” commissions.\textsuperscript{345} Their fields of interest varied, from the one-time or occasional merchandizing of luxury wares up to the manifold activity of the established agents (“fattore”). The latter activity is better documented in the otherwise scattered Hungarian records, whereas the Florentine taxation sources proved to be rather more unreliable. One such example is represented by Filippo di Simone Capponi, the salaried agent of the Panciatichi company in Buda and kinsman of the Panciatichi. The Hungarian records on him reveal the really lucrative activity conducted by him in the kingdom and that he was also in the service of the king. Still, within the family, Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi, son of the company’s owner Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi was also sent to Buda as a company agent. They hired apprentices from Florence too such as Matteo di Giovanni Corsini in 1429. Similarly, the Melanesi partnership employed several agents such as Rinaldo di Dego degli Rindaldeschi and Battista di Giovanni Corsini (as apprentice like his brother), in spite of the personal presence of the Melanesi themselves in Buda. These agents carried out commissions for the Melanesi in the territory of the kingdom. Finally, the Carnesecchi-Fronte partnership also employed a few fellow countrymen in Hungary as agents such as Antonio degli Strozzi, Antonio di Francesco Zati and Andrea di Giovanni Viviani.\textsuperscript{346}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{342}ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 27. fol. 100v
\textsuperscript{343}Teke, “Firenze kereskedőtársaságok”,196-97.
\textsuperscript{344}ASF \textit{Catasto} 1433. 498. fol 302r-303r.
\textsuperscript{345}Tax return of Piero di Gherardo, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 175. fol. 273r. He worked for Baldassare di Luigi Melanesi in Hungary.
\textsuperscript{346}The tax return of Rinaldo di Dego degli Rindaldeschi ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 47. fol. 522r-523r; Filippo di Simone Capponi, ASF. \textit{Catasto} 1427, 17. fol. 674r-675v; Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi’s tax return was inserted in his father’s declaration ASF. \textit{Catasto} 1427, 53. fol. 1012v; On their activity in Hungary see: Arany, “Prozopográfiai adattár”, 497, 526, 529; On Capponi see also Arany, “Apák, fiúk”, 157-191; Antonio di Bonaccorso degli Strozzi is recorded in the tax return of Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi, ASF. \textit{Catasto} 1427, 27. fol. 1009r; on Antonio di Francesco Zati ibid. 1010r; Andrea di Giovanni Viviani’s tax return, ASF. \textit{Catasto} 1427, 79. fol. 394r-v.
\end{flushright}
3.4.3. Business interests and volume

The assessment of the volume of business activity is much encumbered by the rather sparse information: for most of the open accounts we lack information on the date of the transactions while the proportion of investments of the open accounts related to the total of investments for the same period remains unknown as well. Therefore, the sums listed below can only be considered the lowest possible volume of business.

The most trustworthy pieces of information are related to the so-called “corpo”, that is, the share capital invested in the company by its partners: in the company founded by the Melanesi and Corsi, the share capital of the Melanesi ran to fl 2,000, and they were entitled to have fl 460 as their share of the profit realized in 1426-1427. No information is available on whether these fl 460 were the total or only a part of their yearly share of profits.

The share capital of the other Buda partnership was even higher, running to 4601 on the part of the Carnesecchi and fl 4,934 on the part of Antonio di Piero Fronte. The share capital of the Carnesecchi-Fronte partnership was high compared to the Melanesi. The records of the company cover approximately eight years. The liabilities of the company not settled until 1427, totaled fl 65,724 whereas their outstanding balance ran to fl 80,000. These records hint at a significantly higher marketing volume and monetary circulation compared to the activity of the Melanesi.

The activity of the Melanesi brothers focused mainly on their Hungarian transactions. Not only do, not only the debtors’ and creditors’ lists of the Buda company refer to their Hungarian business, but most of their outstanding credits and liabilities in Florence (respectively fl 8,611 and fl 6,471) may also have been linked to their activity in the kingdom.

In the originally declared portata of the Melanesi, the volume of their Hungarian business activity resulted in total of fl 18,090 of outstanding credits (out of it fl 7,000 were credited to the king) versus a sum total of fl 11,349 of liabilities with a margin of fl 6,741. These sums can be regarded as information on the open accounts in the year of the Catasto. The oldest among the

---

349 ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 653rv.
350 The above sums were calculated based on Appendix 2, which simply reports the debtors’ and creditors’ lists, similarly to the methodology followed by Teke on the Carnesecchi. The resulting sum totals, of course, differ from the numbers of the Online Catasto, where outstanding credits deemed “good ones” are described as private investment whereas the debts and losses are under “deductions”. It is also to be emphasized that the Online Catasto’s sums are resulting from decoding and processing the abstracts made by the officials of the Catasto eventually following negotiations and cross-checks, whereas Appendix 2 of the present dissertation relies on the records of the originally submitted “portate”.
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outstanding credits goes back four years according to the notes in the signed tax return, but most of the transactions were presumably concluded in the previous one to three years. Still, the ratio of this margin to the sum total of margin resulting from all transactions in this period remains an open question in the absence of integral sources. Therefore, this margin can be considered the minimum profit of business and hints at rather lucrative business activity for medium-wealth merchants.

Based on information on individual cargoes, the Melanesi marketed mainly textiles from Italy. The least expensive item in the textile cargo had a value of fl 416, whereas the most precious textile cargo was worth of fl 3,944. Mainly silver and copper was shipped to Italy from Hungary and as sporadic written evidence shows, merchandise comprising salt was among the goods as well. Complementary to trade activity and also facilitating it, hints of crediting activity are revealed in the records.

Thus, the Melanesi brothers were able to control all aspects of business the Kingdom of Hungary could offer them, and this lead to business activity that can be considered successful in the first (and longer) phase of their sojourn in Hungary. At the same time, however, the records on their business activity also confirm the high risks they ran with their investments in the kingdom. The permanent need to involve external assets in all kinds of business forms, seriously affected their financial situation back in Florence. Together with the Davizzi and the Corsi brothers, they settled the account after one year, in 1427 (July 15, 1426-June 21, 1427).351 The details of the partnership are included in the business partners’ records. The Corsi brothers inserted the debtor- and creditor lists of the account and also declared the margin (the profit) between the invested startup capital and income for each of the partners for a given time period.352 The sums show a rather lucrative business, which was presumably also renewed after 1427. The situation, however, changed radically by 1433, as the other partner, Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi, declared in his catasto. In the meantime, the Melanesi brothers accumulated a debt, whose amount remained unknown to the old Filippo himself as he grimly stated in the joint declaration. As a result, the Melanesi were condemned in Florence, presumably in their absence.353 At least Davizzi declared that he purchased some Melanesi estates in Prato and in the nearby “contado” from the Florentine officials of the condemned, confiscated most likely from Melanesi properties following a sentence passed on the

---

351 Simone di Lapo Corsi, Tommaso di Lapo Corsi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 631r-658r, the accounts of the partnership: ibid. fol. 653r-658r.
352 ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 654r. on a side note “Tomaso Chorsi proprio tra capitale and guadagno fl 400, Tomaso Melanesi proprio tra capitale and guadagno fl 2326, Tomaso Davizi proprio tra capitale and guadagno fl 1815, Simone Chorsi proprio tra capitale and guadagno fl 851.”
353 Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews, ASF, Catasto 1430, 369. fol. 717r. Filippo stated that an arbitral award be imposed for a certain heir of Papi di Bardo for some debts, confirmed to be in tax arrears with the Florentine comune for a sum of fl 600. This time the Melanesi catasto was not compiled by the elderly Filippo, but by a certain Jachopo di Marco Ghinetti as stated in the verso of the sheet.
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Melanesi. Davizzi bought the houses and estates in his and in Matteo di Giovanni Corsi’s name, and still owed fl 240 to the notary of the officials.\textsuperscript{354} This loss of properties in joint ownership must have lead to the above-mentioned definitive split among the Melanesi kin members. In fact, their bankruptcy in Florence and the loss of their immobile wealth there may have definitely obstructed any plans of returning to the homeland, something reflected in their tax returns, which over time became less and less informative about their Hungarian business. In the final step, the Hungarian accounts were not declared at all. The split between uncle and nephews in business relations in 1433, again due to the loss of commonly owned estates, suggests a turning point in their activity. The admonition in the repeatedly mentioned Ricordanze by Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli to his offspring on avoiding common business ventures with bankrupt merchants, even where friends or members of the kin group were involved, was widely shared in the Tuscan city and must have affected the Melanesi as well to a great extent.\textsuperscript{355} Thus, even after having settled their debts by losing their estates, Tommaso or his uncle could hardly have been able to conclude partnerships in Florence and send external capital into their Hungarian activity any more.

At the same time, nothing hints at a similar financial decline for the brothers in Hungary. Tommaso and his young nephew, Piero, son of the late Simone were even granted the title of Count of the Lateran Palace in 1436, which is clear evidence on the royal favor they enjoyed at the court of King Sigismund.\textsuperscript{356} Finally, in 1435, Tommaso entered into Hungarian royal financial administration as an officer appointed by the king, and this again seems a turning point in his strategy, possibly a reaction on the drastic change in fortune he had suffered in Florence, since there are no records on his eventual participation in the management of royal revenues prior to it. Moreover, the management of the newly established copper chamber also opened up wider possibilities for long distance trade facilitating access to precious metals, salt, copper etc. and securing transport and maybe even diminishing transport costs at customs of the thirtieth.

Compared to the two companies hitherto introduced, Giovanni di Gabriello Panciatichi’s tax return entries are unfortunately laconic on his Buda company but in any case mainly report losses. According to the records of 1427, the capital invested in the Buda partnership run to fl 9287, and

\textsuperscript{354} On the officials of those condemned and banned for debt see Laura Ikins Stern, \textit{The criminal law system of medieval and Renaissance Florence} (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 58-60. The evidence on the Melanesis’ trial and sentence was only documented by Davizzi because he had not settled the purchase price for the confiscated Melanesi properties in due time and had to report it in his declaration. See ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1433, 33. fōl.1005v. Also Prajda mentiones the Melanesi’ bankruptcy based on ASF, Catasto 466. fōl. 394r. See Prajda, “Florentine merchant companies” footnote 30.

\textsuperscript{355} Morelli, \textit{Ricordi} III, Quinto danno: delle trappole a’pupilli sori, 185. “E sopra tutto (e questa tieni bene a mente) non t’obbrigare mai per niuno fallito, assai si sia egli parente o amico”

\textsuperscript{356} RI XI,2 no. 11303, in Regesta Imperii Online, URI:http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1436-03-20_10_0_11_2_0_5582_11303 (Last downloaded: June 02, 2013).
ended in the hands of King Sigismund. Despite the alleged losses and the heavy liabilities in Florence, the company continued operating in the kingdom. As opposed to the extremely sparse information available from 1427, the 1432 tax return of Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi contains two separate lists on his Hungarian business; a creditor-debtor list with rather small sums (11 debtors owing a total amount of fl 2.337, and 17 creditors owing a total of fl 1.329.5), while another list was entitled the list of “business ventures in Hungary”. In the first list, the called “creditors’ and debtors’ list” he appeared to list his open accounts with his various partners in Hungary, in which of course the Melanesi of Buda, Filippo Capponi, his own agent in Buda and other Florentine businessmen interested in Hungary are strongly represented. The above-mentioned small amounts can be explained by both the intention of diminishing profits which could easily be controlled by the Florentine authorities and by the eventually decreasing number of open accounts at the time of the declaration. Yet, the second list on the “business venture in Hungary” apparently mainly concerned his most prominent clients in the country, a list, which was not surprisingly headed by King Sigismund. This list shows markedly higher sums, running to fl 24.180, which I suppose, he tried to portray as a loss. Both lists may be connected with the “new account” launched around 1432. The general picture of a rather unreliable declaration seems to prevail later as well. Giovanni, in his tax return in 1433, already differentiated between two “accounts”, that is, two partnerships, an old one, in which he allegedly invested a great deal of money until 1430. Although its account was not yet settled, it represented to great extent in a loss. He also stated that he had himself abandoned business in the kingdom and returned to Florence. At the same time, however, he also mentioned a new business account in which silk and woolen clothes valued at fl 2.420 were sent to Antonio Popoleschi, a fellow countryman working in the Kingdom of Hungary, to be marketed there. From this second account Panciatichi was paid fl 774 through the submission of his tax declaration, out of the remaining fl 1646, however, fl 300 were lent by Popoleschi to Giovanni di Andrea Buondelmonti, archbishop of Kalocsa, which Panciatichi cut as a loss in his declaration. The payment of the remaining outstanding account had been due December 14, 1432, but had apparently not been settled yet. Meanwhile, Giovanni Panciatichi petitioned for a safe-conduct from King Sigismund in order to return to Hungary to recover his

357 ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1014r. The other transactions/accounts on the page can not be unequivocally connected to Hungarian business ventures given the lack of specifying notes, therefore, I did not consider take them into consideration.

358 All the information in this paragraph were adopted from Katalin Prajda’s above mentioned recent article, see: Katalin Prajda, “Florentine merchant companies established in Buda at the beginning of the fifteenth century,” Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome - Moyen Âge [Online], 125-1 [2013, Messo online il 26 settembre 2013, consultato il 08 aprile 2014. URL : http://mefrm.revues.org/1062, The general picture provided by this later, although valuable record according to the analysis carried out by Prajda confirms my conclusions drawn from the 1427 sources.

359 On Popoleschi see Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 209.

360 Giovanni di Gherardo Buondelmonte, kinsman of Filippo Scolari, archbishop of Kalocsa 1425-1435, and later 1438-1447; Engel, Archontology I/66, 335, 515, II/43.
frozen assets so he could definitively settle his business affairs there.  

Eight years later, Panciatichi informed the Florentine authorities that in 1435 he had again lost his assets in Hungary through royal confiscation. The assets, according to his estimates, totaled around fl 12,200.

Only in the case of the Panciatichi do we have comparative information on cargoes sent to other European centers. Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi occasionally invested in various European trade hubs of first rank at the same time, apart from having the companies in Buda and in Venice. In 1422, he shipped wares worth up to fl 500 to London while he shipped a cargo to Barberia worth approximately the same value (fl 485) and a rather precious cargo to Valencia worth fl 2,328. Unfortunately, he gave no details on the goods he sent to be marketed, but he mainly traded with textiles, so presumably these cargoes were also made up of different types of textiles.

3.4.4. The companies’ network in Hungary

The business network of the Florentines working in Hungary in the 1420s can be mapped to a large extent based on the way the partners figured in the creditors’ and debtors’ lists of the two Buda companies.

All three Buda companies had close connections to King Sigismund, as we shall see in the subchapter on the crediting activity of these partnerships. His “prominent” position is clearly revealed in the creditors’ and much more in the debtors’ lists of the companies. Not by chance were members of the two partnerships granted royal support for their activity in the kingdom. The Fronte mainly provided credits to the ruler. The King in response for their services appointed Antonio di Piero Fronte in 1419, and both of the Melanesi brothers in 1424 and 1425 as his “noble retainers (familiares)”.

The Panciatichis were granted trade privileges along with their agent,
Filippo di Simone Capponi, by the king in the 1420s, but Giovanni Panciatichi’s declarations suggest that they were not as protected and well established as the representatives of the other two companies. In fact, they were also hit by royal reprisals like most of their fellow countrymen in Hungary between 1427 and 1435.

The Melanesi and Fronte brothers cooperated intensively with Filippo Scolari in Hungary, whereas his name does not figure either in the Panciatichi, or in the Capponi records. Since Scolari died without settling his accounts, the Melanesi tried to collect their rather high outstanding assets (fl 7,550 in three accounts) from Scolari’s heirs. A side note in the last entry referring to a sum running to fl 7,000 stated that Scolari borrowed the sum for King Sigismund and that it could not be collected from the Scolari heirs as Scolari’s assets were also seized by the same king. The entries in the Carnesecchi tax return confirm this information.

As there are no separate debtors’ and creditors’ lists for the Panciatichis’ Buda company in 1427, no Hungarian business partners (except for the ruler) figure in the tax return handed in to the Florentine authorities. Still, they must have had business relations with local merchants and with members of the lay aristocracy and prominent ecclesiastical dignities, as apparently stated in their 1432 catasto record, but obviously this could be easily hidden from the Florentine authorities. In any case, Filippo di Simone Capponi, their agent in Buda, possessed an outstanding network in the royal court as records kept on him in Hungary clearly show.

The proportion of Hungarian and Florentine partners/clients and the volume of business can particularly be addressed in the case of the Carnesecchi-Fronte and Melanesi companies. Among the Florentines listed in their declarations one can encounter most of their fellow countrymen working or investing in Buda and in Hungary in the period covered by the records. It is no surprise of course, that the sums involved in Hungarian business by Florentines were decidedly higher than those sums, mostly debts, listed by the names of Hungarian partners.

In fact, comparing the two latter Buda companies, the most striking difference seems to be with respect to the proportion of Hungarian partners/clients with the Florentines. The lists of the Melanesi brothers reveal fewer Hungarians compared to the Carnesecchi-Fronte company. The latter firm lists mainly members of the Hungarian lay aristocracy and prelates among their debtors and creditors, in some cases, with larger sums, usually loans (3-400 fl) by their names.

366 ASF, Catasto 1433. 498. fol. 341v.
367 Filippo di Simone Capponi, ASF Catasto 1427, 65 fol. 479v–481v.
368 ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. fol. 654r.
369 ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 1010v.
370 MNL OL DL 39287. The last will of Nicholas Perényi, master of the horse (agasonum regalium magister). Capponi was also interested in pawn transactions as the record confirms. Perényi pawned a jewel valued at fl 100 by Capponi.
The debts and loans of the Melanesis’ Hungarian partners varied in their volume: from small loans up to fl 100-200. The lists unfold a manifold cooperation with some prominent burgers of Buda, among them worth to mention Michael Nadler (144 fl), and Gregorius Gubacsi Ferenci (136 fl) interested in the cattle trade and also the town judge of Pest. Simone Melanesi acquired Buda citizenship through his marriage to a local burger’s daughter, as one can learn from the entry stating the expense of fl 60 for the yearly burgher tax. His marriage into a local family and his immobile assets in the territory of Buda show his ambition to settle and integrate in the town over the long run. At the same time, they mainly supplied the requirements and carried out various commissions of the guests, diplomats and members of the royal court. Some of these foreigners staying at the court of Sigismund can be identified in the catasto lists including the Genoese, Bartolomeo Mosca, legate of the duke of Milan (he owed fl 9 to the Melanesi of Buda). From the reports of the Florentine ambassador to King Sigismund, Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, we learn that he arrived in Tata, where the king was sojourning in May 13, 1426, so his debt was rather recent. The debt of fl 32 of the archbishop of Milan, Bartolomeo Della Capra (around 1365-1433), dated back to four years previously but as it was not yet settled, it was reported in the debtors’ lists as well. The archbishop was a close advisor of both King Sigismund and the duke of Milan, Filippo Maria Visconti (1412-1447). He had been performing diplomatic commissions for the king of the Romans in 1417-1423 during the Council of Constance, in his quality as President of the Archbishops of the Italian nation. After he returned to Milan in 1423, he went on occasionally managing diplomatic tasks for Sigismund. Another interesting figure appearing in the lists of the Melanesi is the Infant Peter, the first duke of Coimbra (1392-1449), son of King John I of Portugal.

371 The record includes information on “Michele Nodolaro,” and “Gherghely Franciscki” who can be identified securely: Michael Nadler and Gregorius Ferenci. For both of them see Kubinyi, Budapest története, 50. ; 72-73, Draskóczy, “Kamarai jövedelem”, 159.
372 There is a long list of foreign persons sojourning at the royal court of Buda from 1412. MNL OL DL 39277, published in ZsO III/2224. May 1412. “Hie stend nach ain ander di herren, di ze Ofen pey dem hof gebesen sind anno etc. duodecimo”. Among the persons listed one can encounter the king of Bosnia, the king of Poland, King Sigismund, a Turkish prince, a duke of Spalato, Prince Ernst of Austria, Prince Albrecht of Austria, prince Louis of Bryg, the prince of Teschin, two counts of the Orsini, two Hungarian counts, two counts of the Cilli, Count Albrecht of Schwarzenburg, the Burggraf of Magdeburg (from the family Hardegg), etc. high prelates from Hungary, the bishop of Cracow, bishop of Passau, the bishop of Noppeln, the ambassadors of Rome, of England, of France, legates of German lands, and two gentlemen from Padua, etc.
373 ASF, Catasto 1427, 46.Tomo I, fol. 654r.
374 Information based on the online Catasto of 1427. (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013)
376 Gisela Beinhoff, Die Italiener am Hof Kaiser Sigismunds, 1410-1437 (Frankfurt am Main-Berlin: Peter Lang, 1995), 118-119.
and from 1438, regent of Portugal. He was also known as Dom Pedro das Sete Partidas (Peter of the Seven Parts [of the World]), one of the most travelled princes of his time. From 1419 he remained for some years in the service of King Sigismund, fighting against the Hussites and the Turks. As stated in the records, he returned to Hungary around 1427/1428 again. He apparently gave an exchange bill worth fl 1.140 to the Melanesi as a payment in Florence to a renowned merchant of Spanish origin staying in the Tuscan city.

The Melanesis’ services to King Sigismund, their rank as royal noble retainers (familiares) clearly signals their close relations with the ruler and imply that they could rely on his support and protection in the kingdom even in the years 1427-1433 which proved to be extremely difficult for the other two Florentine companies in Buda and for the Florentines sojourning in the Hungary in general. Apart from King Sigismund’s and Scolari’s support, the Melanesis’ activity was to a great extent favored by the cooperation and participation of their Florentine kin group. Most of their profit resulted from their trading and credit activities at the royal court of Buda. Tommaso, who was appointed the noble retainer (familiaris) (a man in personal service) of King Sigismund, belonged to the emperor’s and king’s closest and rather international circle of financial advisers, in his final years operating in the central financial administration. Melanesi also performed diplomatic tasks and was a member of King Sigismund’s entourage both in Constance and during his “Romfahrt” in 1431-1433, as documented in both the entries of the Catasto and the records preserved about his travels.

The members of the partnerships working in Hungary mostly ranked among the merchant-bankers of middling wealth in Florence. Although they worked in a less developed region, they continued involving external capital as was general for Florentine partnerships. Their startup and working capital rank them among the average-size partnerships in Florence. The Melanesi brothers’ role can be described as intermediary and their focus on Hungarian business and the lack of investments in other geographical areas proved risky. After repeated renewals of the partnership in Buda, and after a desperate effort to involve new partners in it, they faced bankruptcy in 1429 in Florence.

---

379 ASF, *Catasto* 1430, 406. fol.101r. “you will be informed as he [Tommaso Melanesi -- Arany] says in a letter of his, he will send in the next month of July, on his profit and liabilities which he has in Hungary, which he could not comply[with] so far because he was with the emperor in Constance for about eight months ...,” Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak II/ 253 on his commission to request penitence letters in the name of two Hungarian noblemen, Michael and Ladislaus Jakcs de Kusaly. See also Péter. E. Kovács, “Emperor Sigismund’s Coronation in Rome.” in *Infima Aetas Pannonica.Studies in Late Medieval Hungarian History*, ed. Péter E. Kovács and Kornél Szovák (Budapest, 2009), 7–162.
3.5. Trading and banking activity

Many modern banking techniques were already invented and extensively used by medieval merchant-bankers and the evolving late medieval banking houses. The banking centers of first rank were located in Italy, in Florence, Venice and Rome. Florentine businessmen, in other words merchant-bankers, were extremely efficient. They were present in all important European trade and financial hubs, but their networks – directly or with help of intermediaries – covered virtually all European regions and the Levant.\textsuperscript{380} In this chapter I aim at investigating the scattered evidence on Florentines’ banking activity in Central Europe, with special emphasis on early fifteenth century Hungary.\textsuperscript{381}

The business activity of medieval industrial- and merchant-banker entrepreneurs may seem individualistic compared to the organization of the Hanseatic League but it is clear that the various forms of partnership they operated in, was based on mutual trust, a basic condition for business ventures.\textsuperscript{382}

Therefore, although transfer and deposit banking by means of a wide range of sophisticated financial techniques also involving transactions based on the fluctuation of exchange rates of various currencies formed a significant part of the activity of the great Italian banking houses by the fifteenth century, Italian merchant-bankers could and did extensively finance their business activity among themselves through inter-company credits within the framework of various partnership contracts, which implied, in fact, various types of commercial and money loans, agrarian credits and occasional or long-term investments.\textsuperscript{383}


\textsuperscript{383} On the role of economic credit in Florentine international trade network and the Florentine Catasto of 1427, as source material for such analysis see recently Padgett, John F.– Paul D. McLean, “Economic Credit in Renaissance Florence,” The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 83, No. 1 (March 2011): 1-47; see also Idem, “Organizational Invention,” 1465-1467; Raymond de Roover, “The Organization of Trade,” in The Cambridge Economic History of
3.5.1. Evaluation of the source material

The scarce data set, varying in both in quality and quantity, that can be extracted on the business activity of Florentine merchants in Central Europe from the tax returns of the Florentine Catasto may at least partly be explained by the technical difficulties the businessmen encountered when providing the necessary documents and data to the Florentine authorities on time, although the Florentine entrepreneurs working abroad were generally granted a deferred deadline for the submission of the tax return. In fact, in some of the declarations such problems, particularly those caused by the lack of availability of the account books found in the trade hub rather than Florence are noted. There are also some hints on the differing regional-local customs of contracting business, the lack of literacy on the side of the local partners and the general tendency to hide profits, whenever possible.384 In any case, this analysis relies on the debtors’ and creditors’ lists inserted in the declaration. Yet, taxation records are by no means an ideal source material for economic historical investigation for several reasons, particularly because of the isolated, contingent set of data they contain limited to the open accounts. In the absence of account books, these data alone are not appropriate for drawing conclusions on the volume of business activity. The only such written evidence, which survived in the State Archives of Florence dates to the end of the fifteenth century, and belonged to Antonio di Piero Bini.385

Evaluation of the debtors’ and creditors’ lists is also problematic because the declarations occasionally overlap. In other words, the same transaction can figure in each of the declarations of the business partners by the debts or credits depending on the position of the taxpayer in the given transaction. While sorting the available data sample from the 293 transactions related to Hungarian business, I found 11 items figuring in several tax declarations. The total sum of these 11 items runs to around fl 7.800, which was a considerable amount. This makes any further conclusions on the volume of business carried out in Hungary rather vague. Furthermore, in many cases, the identification of such “double” entries of single transactions is encumbered by the fact that slightly different sums were reported in the partners’ declarations. The margin is presumably the fee for the money transfer concluded on the commission of the client, but given the absence of detailed

---

384 On the use of the information from the Florentine Catasto for analysis related to merchants working abroad, mainly Venice and along the Adriatic coast see Francesco Bettarini, “I fiorentini all’estero ed il catasto del 1427: frodi, elusioni e ipercorrettismi,” Annali di Storia di Firenze 6 (2011): 37-64.

information, it remains uncertain.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Economy}, 436-437.} In one case of a bank transfer from Buda to Florence, approximately the same sum figures in both lists of the Florentine and the Buda companies owned by the same family.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Economy}, 436-437.} This latter example however, also hints at the closure of the transaction and figured in the lists only because the tax lists of the Florentine and Buda companies of the family were obviously not cross-checked.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Economy}, 436-437.}

The information connected to the business relations of the Florentines with King Sigismund is even more uncertain.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Economy}, Chapter Loans to Rulers. 231-236; Risks. 236-245.} There is no way to estimate the number of transactions, as the commercial and money credits provided to the king were registered in one aggregated entry, without giving further detailed information on the individual transactions. Therefore, the items related to the king were not taken into consideration when investigating the number of the transactions and consequently, could not be used in the tables either.

Altogether, I assume that the number of transactions conducted in the Kingdom of Hungary must have been higher than reflected in the records of the \textit{Florentine Catasto} of 1427. Nevertheless, the set of data recovered from the tax returns seems to be representative when compared to other, isolated information from other archival units both in Florence and Hungary, when handled with the source material’s particular characteristics taken into consideration.

After this general overview, the proportion of the number of transactions carried out between Florentine – Hungarian business first partners compared to that of Florentine – Florentine partners participating in business in Hungary confirms at the outset the predominance of the latter partners (44 items versus 237). This result can only partly be explained by the motivation of Florentines to hide those transactions which were difficult for the otherwise very thorough Florentine taxation authorities to verify. In other words, it is not exclusively related to the tendency to evade taxes on the part of the Florentine entrepreneurs. Clearly, the reference to Hungarian or local partners in Hungary could be easily avoided. However, if one takes into account that the data are mostly provided by Florentine investors in Florence whose direct business partners were mainly Florentines working in Hungary and who, therefore, rarely had detailed information on their partners’ local business contacts/clients nor presumably considered it worthwhile to enter this data into the tax return, the picture is clearer. Only in a few cases, particularly in the tax returns of
Florentine entrepreneurs employing their own agent in the region, are the names of Hungarian persons encountered, although usually they are registered jointly as “Hungarian debtors”. 390

Since the sometimes, more or less, Italicized foreign names render the identification of the client’s nationality rather difficult, all these factors lead to the conclusion that the real number of Hungarian clients was a great deal larger than figures in the database. At the same time, however, it must be emphasized that the possible Hungarian partners of the Florentines working in Hungary came from a rather restricted, but colorful social cluster headed by the king, and followed by the lay aristocracy, high prelates and the wealthiest (also South German) burghers of Buda and Pest from an urban environment. Finally, the transactions concluded with them clearly required rather large amounts of capital on the side of the Florentines (in general this is true for long distance trade in luxury wares, which required large scale investment), as evidenced by numerous Florentine investors figuring in the tax returns.

3.5.2. Crediting activity

As could be seen, the three Florentine merchant-banking companies, (that is, partnerships) in Buda operated with commercial and financial credits provided by numerous Florentine investors in various partnership formats.391

The most important client of the Florentine investors and partnerships, who at the same time was quite often declared the worst as already briefly introduced in the case of the Buda companies, was usually King Sigismund himself. The records of the Catasto include quite colorful entries describing what a bad debtor he was considered by most of his creditors. Such mentions can also be seen in the following table. The table includes the available details on King Sigismund’s cumulative accounts with Florentine creditors, after having filtered out the sums appearing parallelly in the declarations of several partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florentine partnerships/ investors</th>
<th>Florentine fl</th>
<th>Soldi</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi and Fronte Co.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>old debts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi and Fronte</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td></td>
<td>“for goods received until 1425, that he tore up the assignment (promissory note) apart and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

390 Domenico di Antonio Allegri, ASF, Catasto 1430, 369. fol. 403v–404r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co.</th>
<th></th>
<th>then reissued it and it goes on like this for long time”(^{392})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi and Fronte Co.</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi and Fronte Co.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi and Fronte Co.</td>
<td>12412</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heir to Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti (^{394})</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heir to Iacopo Ardinghelli (^{395})</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone and Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi</td>
<td>9287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Table Debts of King Sigismund of Luxemburg in the Florentine Catasto of 1427-1433

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Florentine partnerships/ investors</th>
<th>Florentine florins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heir to Iacopo Ardinghelli</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{392}\) Simone di Pagolo degli Carnesecchi, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 28. fol. 1010v. “Il detto [Serenissimo Principe Re Gismondo -- Arany] per roba avuta insino l’anno 1425 che cien ruppe lasegamento and poi l’ha ridato and così va per la lungha ... .”

\(^{393}\) Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 28. fol.1010v.

\(^{394}\) Heir to Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 53. fol.1096v.

\(^{395}\) Heir to Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 53. fol.1096v.

\(^{396}\) Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46. fol.652v. “promessi a petizione di messer Filippo Scolari e pagati in 2 partite a uno buouomo per fatti dello imperadore e lo imperadore ha promesso noi, [ha] detto di volerci soddisfare e feciene assegnamento della meta e poi me l’ha levato, e da messer Lo Spano non ho lettera nessuna, ma é publicho come per lui feci la promessa e così appare per molte persone”.

\(^{397}\) Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 53. fol.1014r. “E sono nelle mani dello imperadore che mai non ho potuto da lui ritrarre perché, chome sapete, lui é cattivissimo paghatore,, come da chi ha a fare in paese vi potete chiaramente informare ... .”
2. Table Debts of Queen Barbara in the Florentine Catasto of 1427-1433

The rather hard remarks of the Florentine businessmen also reflected that in some cases the king’s open accounts (in other words his debts) were considered not only unsafe, but also rather long-term loans, another rather unfavorable factor for the creditors. Both Melanesi and Carnesecchi had entries including valuable descriptions on how King Sigismund handled the issue of promissory notes/cheques and other contracts. The records are clear hints at the intermediary role that the Florentine officers of the royal financial administration (particularly Filippo Scolari) played for King Sigismund as contacts with other Florentine investors both in the process of negotiating loans for the ruler, and in settling them with the chamber incomes entrusted to their competence. Antonio Fronte in Buda often provided large loans to King Sigismund as we have already seen. However, in Fronte’s case a record issued by the ruler in 1412 to Košice to pledge the rather humble yearly gift of the town (usually clothes worth approximately fl 20-30) to Fronte also shows the mediating role of Scolari, who was ”relator” of the charter.\textsuperscript{398} This seems to be the case for Lionardo and Giovanni di Nofri, who were apparently commissioned by the king to settle a debt from collected sums in their role as of counts of some royal chambers, probably the thirtieth, which office they jointly held in 1430-1433 with countrywide competence. These are examples of deputating the chambers’ income directly for financing the king’s debt.

The Florentines complain about Sigismund’s default of his debts, but at the same time, he was their most important partner in the Kingdom of Hungary. First of all, by providing credits, whether commercial or monetary, dealing in credits must have been generally lucrative despite major risks, as in Hungary interest rates were clearly higher than in Italy, usually around 10% in that period.\textsuperscript{399} Of course, it still remains an open question whether the ruler paid such a high rate on the loans he took. Later, in the mid-sixteenth century, the Hapsburg rulers generally paid a definitely lower interest rate of around 5%, but in general, the tendency for interest rates to decrease can be observed by the sixteenth century. In theory, the higher interest rates can be ascribed to the higher risks in crediting activity in the region, but particularly in the case of the loans provided to the king by entrepreneurs participating in the financial administration of Hungary, the cover of the loans seems to have been safely secured by the royal incomes they managed or at least they had a clear overview of the financial situation of the ruler. In some cases entrepreneurs also stood as guarantors for the king’s debts to his the creditors, whether these creditors were their Florentine fellow countrymen such as the Melanesi or others. King Sigismund’s delayed or neglected rendering of his loans was not limited to the Florentines, of course. In a much later record, a Vienna burgher, Peter “dictus”

\textsuperscript{398} Kumorovitz, BTOE, III/608. see side note “Relatio Phei[p]onis de Ozora, comitís Themesiensís legitur”
\textsuperscript{399} Léderer, “Középkori pénzületek”, 67.
Chekel and his brother, Rudolf refer to a loan provided to the king running to fl 1.660. Sigismund with six of his guarantors, among them Nicholas Garai, the palatine, Nicholas Treutel de Newna, *magister tavernicorum*, Stibor of Stiborc, *voivode of Transylvania*, Filippo Scolari count of the salt chambers, Marcus of Nuremberg count of the royal chambers jointly issued a promissory note sealed by the guarantors. The descendant and heir Margaret, wife of Kelemen Mosoni (the granddaughter of one of the creditors) claimed in 1459 to have tried in vain to collect the outstanding credit from the heirs of the guarantors and expressed her intention to transfer the liability for her debts to George Reyher, *castellanus* of Pressburg. In the case of this promissory note issued by the king to the two burgers of Vienna and Pécs, the six guarantors for the royal debt, included the most important dignitaries of the kingdom, among them the leading officials of the financial administration and close advisors to the king. The record, thus, seems quite emblematic on the position, role and collaboration the members of these foreign leading financial elite shared in Hungary.\(^{400}\)

Altogether, Sigismund’s liabilities towards the Buda partnerships run at least to fl 34.699 (whereas another fl 1.100 figured in the queen’ account), a large, but not extreme amount compared to other records on King Sigismund’s debts, as we shall see later in the chapter.\(^{401}\) The liabilities of the king comprised both money credits and goods shipped and consigned in advance.

The sums figuring in the *catasto* records refer only to unsettled transactions with the ruler and based on other written sources they make up only a small part of the real volume of business with him. In one record the Florentine Gianozzo di Vanni Cavalcanti also mentioned having a credit of fl 1.300 towards King Sigismund.\(^{402}\) The loan, however, was not included in his *catasto*, which may be due to the fact that the account was eventually settled by 1427 or possibly his intention to hide his business activity in Hungary as much as possible from the Florentine authorities, although in this case the sum of the credit could have been detracted from his profit as a loss. In any case, the laconic *catasto* return of Cavalcanti seems to sustain the theory that he was endeavoring to completely keep back information on his profits in Hungary.\(^{403}\)

The constant need for liquidity is fairly comprehensible in the case of Sigismund of Luxemburg, both emperor of the Holy Roman Empire and Hungarian king. Nevertheless, this somewhat one-sided picture provided on him by the Florentine *Catasto*’s open accounts as a client need to be balanced and complemented with other evidence. Some records also indicate there were more

\(^{400}\) See MNL OL DL 15360. May 6, 1459.

\(^{401}\) The sum total of the liabilities has been calculated, taking into consideration only those *catasto* record entries which can unequivocally be ascribed to King Sigismund on the basis of available notes.

\(^{402}\) Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202.

\(^{403}\) Amerigo, Gianozzo and Niccolò di Giovanni Cavalcanti, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 27. fol. 103.r-106v.
fortunate transactions, settled by the debts owed by King Sigismund to Florentines as we shall see. According to these records, the payments were usually fulfilled by pledging royal revenues, like that of the yearly gift of royal free towns. Salt could also be allocated to settle larger loans.\textsuperscript{404} In other cases, possessions, even towns, were pledged with the restraint of redemption.\textsuperscript{405} A 1413 record issued by Sigismund but preserved only in an 18\textsuperscript{th} century copy, seems an interesting example of such transactions. Three Florentine merchants mentioned in the document, \textquotedblleft Balzarth filius condam Iohannis Fresingii, Nicolaus Baldoviný, Philippus de Palacio\textquotedblright, provided a loan of eight thousand florins to the king. In order to settle the account, the king ordered Andreas Kapi, vice count of salt chamber, to consign the Florentines salt in repayment.\textsuperscript{406} The transcription of the text may be uncertain, particularly with the deciphering of the Italian names, however, according to a catasto entry; a Filippo Del Palagio is present in Hungary prior to 1427, employed by Tommaso di Lapo Corsi.\textsuperscript{407} He also had a commission in the 1410s and 1420s as part of a Florentine partnership with prominent kinsmen of his, Andrea and Uberto di Giovanni del Palagio.\textsuperscript{408} The entry suggests that a partnership was founded again for a Hungarian business venture. Del Palagio also reappears in later sources regarding Hungarian business activity.\textsuperscript{409}

A certain Niccoló di Iacopo Baldovini also figures in the Catasto. In the debtor lists of his brother’s partnership on wool trade, one can clearly identify entries related to Hungarian business. The partnership seems to have relied on additional partners for trade ventures in the kingdom, among them Pape di Salvestro Manini, the count of the salt chambers. Beyond that, Baldovini’s partnership seems to have been in directly connected to a Florentine Buda Burgher, Domenico di Giovanni

\textsuperscript{404} Finally, Queen Elisabeth, King Sigismund’s daughter also followed in her father’s footsteps by repaying a major sum of altogether around fl 12.000 lent by John, son of Emericus Perényi, \textit{magister tavernicorum}, by pawning more castles, towns, customs, an iron mine and several possessions to Perényi with reference to his services to the late King as well and mentions her mother’s, Queen Barbara’s pawn of some possessions for fl 6.000. See MNL OL DL 38655, Nov. 4, 1438.

\textsuperscript{405} Sigismund of Luxemburg was not the first to settle the credits taken by him by pledging towns and other real estate. Already in the fourteenth century, his predecessor, the Holy Roman Emperor Louis IV, the Bavarian (1328-1347) and his father, Charles IV (1355-1378) followed the same financial path. On imperial finances and the pledge of towns etc. see Eberhard Isenmann, \textit{Reichsfinanzen und Reichssteuern im 15. Jahrhundert,} \textit{Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung,} Band 7, no. 1 (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1980): 1-17; The same policy may be observed in Hungary during King Sigismund’s reign, see Attila Ulrich, \textit{Geldpolitik und Geldverkehr in Ungarn während der Herrschaft Sigismunds,} in Das Zeitalter König Sigismund’s in Ungarn und im Deutschen Reich, ed. Schmidt, Tilmann, Péter Gunst (Debrecen: Debrecen University Press, 2000), 121-122. See also János Ince, \textit{My Kingdom in Pledge: King Sigismund of Luxemburg’s Town Pledging Policy,} \textit{Case Studies of Segesd and Bárta,} Master Thesis (CEU, Budapest College, 2012); Emma Léderer, \textit{A középkori pénzüzletek története Magyarországon} (1000-1458) [The history of medieval monetary transactions in Hungary 1000-1458], (Budapest: MTA, 1932).


\textsuperscript{407} Tommaso di Lapo Corsi, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 29. fol. 657v.

\textsuperscript{408} Andrea di Giovanni del Palagio was elected prior in 1411, whereas Uberto di Giovanni del Palagio held the office of consul of the woollens guild in 1430. The del Palagio family was considered a prominent smaller lineage in Florence throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. See \textit{Online Tratte.} See also Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance,} 191.

\textsuperscript{409} Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204.
Arrighi who, similarly to the Melanesi etc, was a noble retainer (familiaris) to King Sigismund, implying he had close connections at the royal court.\textsuperscript{410} Finally, according to the accounts, a Buda burgher named Iacopo di Bartolomeo also appears with a debt of 108 fl.\textsuperscript{411} This hints at the long term presence of the Baldovini brothers as investors in Hungary.

The third Florentine creditor partner in the Hungarian record can barely be made out, but taking into consideration that the name may have been misspelled then a Tosinghi may hide behind this certain Fresingii, or maybe a certain Baldassare or Baschiera di Giovanni Tosinghi, because the Tosinghi (or Della Tosa) family, particularly Giovanni Tosinghi, worked in Hungary and particularly in Buda from the late 1380s onwards and was interested in the marketing of Hungarian copper.

The above sums may seem at first sight rather large ones. A closer look at other royal loans/transactions in this period, however, the picture appears somewhat different. In comparison, a record on the fulfillment of the 1401 Augsburg contract between Florence and King Rupert, King of Germany (1400-1410), an opponent of King Sigismund in his ambitions concerning the Imperial Crown should be mentioned. Florence, according to the contract, paid 200,000 ducats in two installments to Rupert.\textsuperscript{412} The payment was effectuated by Giovanni di Averardo de Medici and partners. The receipt was consigned to Buonaccorso de Pitti (also present in Buda in the 1370s) and Paolo di ser Lando Fortnini etc. and was attested to by a certain Tommaso Corsini among others.\textsuperscript{413}

Looking closer at King Sigismund’s debts in general, one also encounters loans taken from Hungarians, whether members of the wealthy nobility or burghers with large fortunes, or members of the royal administration. Also, in most of these cases, the amount of the loan runs to thousands of florins and represented a lucrative crediting activity apparently, judging from the keen enthusiasm of the creditors as confirmed by the repeated transactions.\textsuperscript{414}

\textsuperscript{410} Kintzinger, \textit{Westbindungen}, 420.
\textsuperscript{411} Niccoló and Giovanni di Iacopo di messer Niccoló Baldovini and their mother, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 62. fol. 336r-342v, here fol. 342v. Iacopo di Bartolomeo da Buda had to pay fl 108 by October 1425.
\textsuperscript{412} [Regg. Pfalzgrafen 2] n. 1628, in \textit{Regesta Imperii Online}, URI: \url{http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1401-09-13_1_0_10_0_0_1628_1628} (Last downloaded: June 05, 2013).
\textsuperscript{413} [Regg. Pfalzgrafen 2] n. 6718, in \textit{Regesta Imperii Online}, URI: \url{http://www.regesta-imperii.de/id/1402-01-23_1_0_10_0_0_6333_6718} (Last downloaded March.06.2013). Members of the Corsini kin group were present in Hungary both as legates and as apprentices employed by the Buda partnerships.
\textsuperscript{414} A few examples of the many loans taken by King Sigismund from various creditors other than Florentines based on the surviving records: MNL OL DL 100278. April 27, 1397. George of Kővágóörs, castellanus of Esztergom gave King Sigismund a credit of fl 3,000 and received in compensation some possessions in pawn, MNL OL DL 12717. June 17, 1435. given by a certain Ulrik, son of Wolfart of Vereskő, member of the entourage in Italy during the \textit{Romfahrt}, also provided a loan of fl 3,060 to the king. Ladislaus Neczpál, castellanus of Trencsén, also provided credit of fl 400 to Sigismund, see MNL OL DL 63255. June 4, 1436. Also Andreas Kapy, \textit{familiaris} of Pipo of Ozora, member of the royal salt administration provided loans (fl 3,000 and salt worth fl 8,000 on another occasion etc.) to the king, see Draskóczy, “Kapy András”, 170.
Some records of the *Regesta Imperii* shed light on the credit provided by the Buda merchant Antonio Fronte and his company to King Sigismund to cover the costs of the coronation of King of the Romans prior to 1413. It was a rather large sum (12500 Bohemian grossi), which – based on a former agreement – was supposed to be offered by the Grandmaster of the Teutonic Order. As Sigismund claimed in his letter, the conditions of the credit transaction with Fronte were unfavorable (most probably too expensive) and the king suffered a rather substantial financial loss as a result. The next year, however, another Florentine in Buda, Onofrio di Bardo confirmed the receipt of 25,600 Bohemian grossi in his quality as count of the chamber (of Buda) to King Sigismund. It seems that the same credit lies behind the two transactions, but apparently the Fronte were not able to collect the money from the Grandmaster and I suppose that they settled their account with Sigismund in another way, as Onofrio clearly confirms repayment of the sum as royal officer of the chamber. Altogether, King Sigismund, in spite of the difficulties of settling accounts with him, remained an important client for Florentine merchant-bankers, as shown in the previous paragraphs.

The Florentine sources, however, are much more telling on the crediting activity of Florentines among themselves. In fact, some entries in the *catasto* lists of the Buda partnerships reporting of their business activity in Hungary provide information on local banking activity which varied from single loans up to exchange of money, mainly with other Florentines and other foreigners present in the town, and to a lesser extent with Hungarian clients. The only surviving record on Florentines’ local crediting activity in Hungary, beside the Buda partnerships’ lists, is the debtor lists of the Manini, compiled in 1463. In the correspondence of Florentine chamber officers among themselves in Hungary one can also find references to debtors, even mentions on accountant books. Also the last will of Nicholas Perényi, master of the horse (*agasonum regalium magister*) is of interest, because he mentioned a credit transaction made with Filippo di Simone Capponi based pledge. Perényi, in fact, pledged a jewel for fl 100 by Capponi and commissioned his wife to

---


419 Letter by Agnolo de Bardi to Papi Manini: MNL OL DL 44496. Nov. 29, 1447. “… io non so se mai mandatto fuori a rischuotere e debitori che avete fatto costui”; MNL OL DL 44495. Dec. 26, 1447. “e pero voi avette chosta il libro de debitori”
redeem the jewel described at detail probably for easier identification. Altogether, the evidence is scarce to be analysed, it only provides a glimpse into the crediting activity of Florentines with the local elite.

The importance of Venice, as the European financial and banking center closest to the Kingdom of Hungary is beyond doubt. Most of the banking transactions were concluded in Venice through Venetian banking houses and the Venetian branches of Florentine international banking houses. The banking activities developed in parallel with international trade while the rapidly increasing network of foreign branches of Florentine banking houses supported circulation of money, the handling of current accounts, and also money transfers in general for small-scale entrepreneurs who could thus extensively profit from these possibilities. Seven partners working in Venice could be identified in the lists of the Florentine Catasto, a rather modest number and surely not representative. In any case, most were Florentines although a few Venetian partners also appear in the records. A moneychanger in Senj figures in the tax returns. He cooperated in bank transfers and check operations with other Florentines in transit through the Dalmatian port city.

Looking closer at the Florentine investors’ tax returns on their Hungarian business ventures, classic financial techniques to increase the working capital of the partnerships operating in the kingdom can be identified: the introduced above “sopraccorpo” or “danari fuori del corpo”, which could be invested on specific terms by both the partners (in this case the preliminary profits were often reinvested into the business) and introduction of outsiders into the partnership and payment of a fixed interest rate. In this early period in Italy the interest rate fluctuated between 5-7%, a relatively low rate compared to rates of around 10%, usual in Hungary in the same period. This form of investment was more liquid and diminished business risks related to losses within the partnership. By the second half of the fifteenth century, the investors in “sopraccorpo” of banking partnerships were mainly foreigners, in contrast to Hungary in the early fifteenth century, since according to the transactional lists of the Catasto, it was Florentines exclusively who made use of this investment form. The shareholders of the partnership, however, rarely figure among them. As in the case of the Melanesi, no other geographical areas figure in the lists as having been targeted for investment, I assume that they did not dispose of further assets to be invested in their partnership. In the case of

420 MNL OL DL 39287. May 27, 1428.
422 Lodovico di Piero di Lodovico’s tax return, ASF, Catasto 1427, 54, fol.122r.
423 On the “corpo” and “sopraccorpo” and in general on the forms of commercial credits see Melis, Documenti, 77-79; on the example of the Medici bank de Roover, The Rise, 100-108; Goldthwaite, The Economy, 205-210.
the other two companies, however, there was evidence of commercial credits and other investments directed towards other European banking-commercial hubs. Thus, the absence of “sopraccorpo” may also be ascribed to a desire to diminish business risks by making external investments in other partnerships.

Apart from the “sopraccorpo”, the other main form of investment which increased the working capital of the partnership, the deposit, also figures in the records of Florentines investing in Hungary. There were at least two types of deposits, those “discretionary”, and the time deposits.425

3.5.3. Investment forms in the tax returns related to Hungarian business

A few businessmen of medium or higher wealth can be identified (Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri, Giovanni del mess. Niccoló Falcucci, Mariotto di Griffolini, Tommaso di Domenico Borghini, and the partnership founded by Giovanni di Iacopo Baldovini, Giovanni di Iacopo dal Borgho and Zanobi di Piero di Monte) among the Florentine investors present with their capital in Hungary.426 Their investments show individual features as they were present in Hungary with different investment forms at the same time. Another common pattern is that they employed their own agent in the kingdom. Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri for example hired Bernardo di Sandro Talani, who brought and merchandized luxury goods in the kingdom on a regular basis.427 Borghini’s employee was Filippo Frescobaldi, who in turn worked together with Gianozzo di Vanni Cavalcanti, a fellow countryman active in Hungary as well.428 In addition, however, these investors from time to time sent cargoes to the stable Florentine companies of Buda as well. On one occasion I also found a deposit made in parallel with other forms of investments. As stated above, the aim may have been to keep the proportion of long term and more liquid investments at a safe level.

The highest ranking investor entrepreneurs and partnerships in the Hungarian market disposed of notable capital, among them Domenico di Antonio Allegri, Giovanni di Bicci di Medici, Niccoló and Tommaso di Lorenzo Soderini, Ridolfo Peruzzi and Partners, Francesco and Simone

425 Goldthwaite, The Economy, 438-439. Melis, Document, 77. On the interest rates of deposits, which were already only around 5-7% in the mid-fourteenth century, see Spufford, Money, 261.
427 Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri, ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 52r-58r.
428 Tommaso di Domenico Borghini, ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. fol. 666r; Filippo di Amerigo Frescobaldi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 577r, fol. 775r.
Tornabuoni. They invested in the Florentine companies of Buda, and their investments in Hungary were not high compared to their funds in other, more developed geographical regions. Hungary attracted them with its stock of precious metals and salt, and it may also have served as secondary market to attenuate investment risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Florentine investor, Domenico di Antonio Allegri’s Debtors from Hungary</th>
<th>fl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piu debitori in Ungheria</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laicho di Sandro di Buda</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messer Lucha cancelliere di Buda</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franceschio di Buonaccorso di Buda</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio and Piero di messer Gueri che dimorano in Signa</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghostino di Pagholo Marucci che dimora in Ungheria</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccoló di Chorrado di Buda</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participation of some medium or small-scale investors, mostly belonging to the kin group of or somehow in the proximity of other Florentine businessmen working in the kingdom, is a clear indication of the solidarity within the kinship network particularly characteristic in Florentine economic context explicitly in the group of medium- and small scale entrepreneurs.

429 Domenico di Antonio Allegri, ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. fol. 453r-457r; Giovanni di Bicci di Medici, ASF, Catasto 1427, 49. fol. 1165r, fol. 1167r; Niccoló and Tommaso di Lorenzo Soderini ASF, Catasto 1427, 25. fol. 456r-458v; Breto (?) and Ridolfo Peruzzi and compagni banchieri ASF, Catasto 1427, 35.1352r; Francesco and Simone Tornabuoni, ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. fol. 901v, fol. 905r, fol. 906r.

430 Domenico di Antonio Allegri, ASF Catasto 1427, filza 46. Tomo I. fol. 457r. “debitori levati dal libro h perduti i quali non stimo niente”.

Table 1. The distribution of transactions concluded by Florentine partners for Hungarian market

The preferences of Florentine investors in terms of money and commercial credits are poorly manifested in the database (Table 1.). For most of the transactions figuring in the creditors’ and debtors’ lists the nature of the liability or debt remains hidden because of the absence of account books. Only in one third of the transactions are there hints that commercial credits predominate over money loans and other forms of money investments such as deposits etc. (around the twice as much as the latter). This seems more characteristic for economically less developed areas where the balance of trade is disproportionate because of the domination of export of raw materials (in this case precious metals, salt, copper, cattle etc.).\(^\text{432}\)

Table 2. Types and volume of transactions between Florentine partners in relation with Hungarian business

A further question which needs to be addressed is connected to the volume of these transactions; more precisely whether the rate of commercial and money credits is also reflected in their volume. As shown in Table 2, the volume of commercial credits exceeds by far that of other investments. Table 3 shows the correlation of the value of single shipments with the items for money credits in the Catasto records, also confirming the tendency. The transaction types cannot be identified for most of the transactions (158 transactions for a value of 80,267 fl). Therefore, given a lack of available information, the correlation of the identified transactions was applied to the unclassified transactions too, but do not figure in Table 3. Thus, the open accounts related to Hungarian business in the records of the Florentine Catasto of 1427 totaled approximately 124,000 fl, a considerable sum. Comparing it with the yearly royal budget from the period of King Sigismund’s reign (around 300,000 fl) it comes approximately to one third of royal revenues.433 In order to interpret it the

433 Engel, The Realm, 224.
nature of taxation sources must be considered. First, the transactions on the lists report reveal an uncertain time period even back four to eight years, or in extreme cases relating TO some failed partnerships in the 1380s. Second, overlap in transactions cannot always be reckoned with, as noted in the introductory part of this chapter.

Table 3. Number and distribution of the analyzed transactions

The volume of single transactions is also of interest (Table 3). Transactions with a volume between fl 1-100 are of various types and therefore not good for more detailed analysis: all kinds of expenses related to the business activity are listed, among them arrears in the employees’ pay, a general characteristic in a medieval environment. The two larger domains of value (that of fl 600-700 and even more the one for fl 1.000-3.000) seem to be more apt for analysis in terms of the distribution of commercial and money credits. The following table shows the results of such an investigation.
Money credits are clearly of lower value. This applies to the volume of credits provided by Florentine partners and qualifies the monetary level and financial standing of the kingdom. It needs to be stressed again, however, that the loans provided for the king (running to fl 37.491) do not figure in the last two chapters, although some of the shipments can be identified with a sum total of fl 20.033, so the majority of the credits was, in fact, provided in goods for him and the information on him seem to confirm the general tendency.

3.5.4. Transaction types in the tax returns – Money lending and commercial credit

In the last subchapter some records of major interest on transactions were analyzed following the quantitative analysis. These are some of the few detailed entries which shed light on conditions, the particular circumstances of transactions, usually hidden behind otherwise obscure sums. The specific financial techniques and transaction types are highlighted in bold characters.\textsuperscript{434}

The predominance of wares shipped to Hungary, particularly luxury clothes, is clearly shown in the analyzed set of data. A particular feature of the taxation source material, in fact, relies on its being unbalanced. Investors’ shipments towards Hungary are strongly represented in the tax records.

(because of the availability of the account books and the Florentine investor partners’ records in Florence it could hardly be hidden from the Florentine authorities) compared to the wares coming from Hungary which rarely figure in the lists. The precise definition of goods is rather uncommon as well so that mainly extremely precious textile shipments are specified in the lists. However, there is one entry of particular interest by Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri which notes the shipment of textiles from London directly to Buda in a value of 120 fl: “compera di drappi ci troviamo al presente a Buda, fattivigli andare da Londra fl 120”. 435

Apart from textiles, rarely salt, animal skins, horses, silverware and jewelry are specified in the records.436 In Hungarian records as well, references on Italian/Florentine textiles are quite often found in inserted lists of goods in the Buda Town Law (Ofner Stadtrecht) as well as all kinds of private documents.437 An order and a later reminder on the same order by Dezső Losonczi, voivode of Transylvania in 1440, was sent to Giovanni di Antonio Manini, at that time count of the Dej salt chamber in Transylvania. He had obviously carried out such orders for the acquisition of silk and scarlet textiles along with a certain kind of bell for birds.438

Not yet settled commercial credit could of course generate new credit transactions. As recorded in the declaration of an elderly Florentine merchant, his son-in-law travelled to Hungary in 1412, apparently in the hope of embarking upon a lucrative business venture. His attempt obviously failed and old Giorgio d’Andrea di Tello being accountable for his son-in-law’s debts in Florence and having also covered other expenses there instead of him, tried to subtract all these liabilities as losses in his tax return, stating, that “… and when he went to Hungary, he left me liable for fl 250 to certain wool weavers/merchants for textiles he took from them allo sconto…” The quotation documents how a commercial credit could generate an exchange operation.439 The term “togliere allo sconto” reported in the quotation hints at a particular operation, during which the merchant, obviously lacking the necessary capital, issued an individual exchange, a “sconto” for the goods he had taken from his partners. The “sconto” was a form of fictive exchange with a rather high interest rate (around 14-15%).440 Therefore, the value of textiles taken by the merchant must have been 14-15% lower than 250 fl, the value of the “sconto” issued for them and the father-in-law acted as

435 Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri’s tax return, ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 55r.
436 Giovanni di messer Niccolò Falcucci’s tax return ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1096v, Andrea di Tommaso Lamberteschi’s tax return ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. 92r, Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi’s tax return ASF, Catasto 1427, 33. fol. 1006r.
437 Buda város jogkőnyve (Ofner Stadtrecht) [Buda Town Law], II. § 423.
438 The voivode ordered textiles “ac sericum duplicatum” and also used the Hungarian version of the textile name, a rare piece of data: “wlgo sprengselem”. MNL OL DL 55216. July 18, 1440; DL 55218. Desiderius of Losoncz to Giovanni Manini, July 26, 1440.
439 “E piú quando andò in Ungheria mi lasció ubrigato a certi lanaiuoli a fl 250 di panni tose allo sconto”. – Giorgio d’Andrea di Tello’s tax return, on his son-in-law’s debts see ASF, Catasto 1427, 63. fol. 183r.
440 Melis, Documenti, 97-98.
guarantee of the “sconto” contract. This also means that the son-in-law of Giorgio d’Andrea hoped to market the woolen cloth in Hungary at a higher margin than the interest rate of the “sconto” transaction; otherwise he would not have considered it a profitable business. This also generally explains the higher proportion of commercial credit transactions versus money credit transactions in the portfolio of the Florentines in Hungary, as the interests paid on the latter in Hungary were “only” around 10%.

Several entries handle simple occasional loans, “prestanze”. Antonio di Piero Fronte, while working in Hungary, was provided with a loan of fl 90 by the bishop of Oradea on the occasion of his daughter’s marriage, and therefore the bishop’s heirs figure as his creditors in his tax return.\textsuperscript{441} The Buda companies often provided similar loans to Florentines and other foreigners appearing in Hungary. Iacopo Riccardini took a loan of 20 Hungarian florins in Hungary from Simone and Tommaso Melanesi.\textsuperscript{442} Mentions of transactions in Hungarian florins are rare in the lists of the Catasto, although the Hungarian golden florin was a valuable and stable currency throughout the fifteenth century.

The time-credits were often commercial credits such as the one taken by a certain Iacopo di Bartolomeo da Buda, presumably a Buda burgher and apparently a merchant. The entry on the Buda merchant figures in the tax return of a Florentine investor, Giovanni di Iacopo Baldovini who employed an agent in Hungary. The mediating Florentine companies in Buda do not figure in Baldovini’s declaration, whereas Buda companies do report on business transactions with Baldovini’s agent.\textsuperscript{443}

The open accounts, as already stated, could occasionally also refer to partnerships concluded two or three decades earlier, which failed to be settled at the termination of the contract. An example of such is recorded in the tax return of Andrea di Giovanni Del Palagio and his brothers, who earlier had worked in Venice, Slavonia and Hungary without success. To settle their debts towards their former creditor (investor), Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi, partner of the Carnesecchi-Fronte partnership with it seat in Buda, the Del Palagio consigned their outstanding debts in Hungary to him.\textsuperscript{444} The information hints at Carnesecchi’s long-term business activity and investment in

\textsuperscript{441} “Ho a dare alla rede di vescovo di Varadino fl 90 mi prestó quando maritai la mia figliola”. – Antonio di Piero di Fronte’s tax return, ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 117r.

\textsuperscript{442} Filippo di Filippo Melanesi and nephews, ASF, Catasto 1430, 369. fol. 716r.


\textsuperscript{444} “Pagolo di Berto Grazini (Carnesecchi) era nostro creditore insino nell’anno 1410 (…) per pagamento de sopradette fl gli lasciamo nelle mani quello che si restava a rischierere in Ungheria d’una compagnia che a lui insieme a Antonio di Piero Fronte avevamo, non ce ne mai renduto conto e pensiamo che sia paghato”. – Andrea di Giovanni del Palagio and brothers, ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 79r.
Hungary. The above-mentioned deposit is recorded in the tax declaration of Lattanzio di Bindo di mess. Niccoló Guasconi. The deposit was provided for the Corsi brothers, partners in the Melanesi partnership in Buda. Guasconi does not figure elsewhere in records related to Hungarian business ventures so that his investment is considered only an occasional one.\textsuperscript{445}

3.5.5. Transactions of exchange

The bills of exchange usually involved four parties, on one part the commissioner (who makes the payment) and the debtor (usually the money-lender or the banking house issuing the bill of exchange in the name of the grantee).\textsuperscript{446} On the other hand, an intermediary money-lender or banking house/branch of banking house was needed at the presentation of the bill and who paid the required sum in local currency to the bearer/grantee of the bill, the fourth party involved in the transaction.\textsuperscript{447} Several forms of exchange developed by the fifteenth century, from simple money transfers up to sophisticated banking transactions implying hidden payment of interest or profit on the margin of exchange rates such as the “sconto” or the so-called “cambio secco”, the dry exchange.\textsuperscript{448} In economic history it is often emphasized that regional hubs were economically and financially considered to be of primary importance if transactions with bills of exchange were carried out there. The use of such bills was rather characteristic for the collection of papal revenues in the first phase. In the case of Hungary, one only finds such banking techniques often with the papal collectors as well as between the Florentine partners cooperating in the kingdom.\textsuperscript{449}

The one isolated example of bank transfer (Peter of Portugal’s case) can also be identified in the records of the Melanesi as already mentioned at the beginning of the chapter. The bank transfer in itself, however, can be considered evidence for advanced banking activity on the part of the Melanesi. The Melanesi partnership of Buda and the Florentine Melanesi company cooperated in this transfer. The transfer of money is a factor which clearly indicated the presence of international trade.


\textsuperscript{446} Creditor in an exchange transaction related to Hungarian business: “Antonio di Filippo Rinieri, suo debitore Giovanni di Niccolò Cucchi Detto Grasso e per lui Simone and Tommaso Melanesi fl 89.” – Antonio di Filippo Rinieri, ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 55v.

\textsuperscript{447} Intermediary partner in an exchange transaction related to Hungarian business: “Antonio Panchiatici promettemoli a Tommaso di Giachomino fl 403, […] Tommaso and Simone Chorsi promettemole per Tommaso Melanesi fl 212 a Lucha di Piero Rinieri.” – Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. fol. 654r.


\textsuperscript{449} ZsO II/7864. Pope John XXIII. to Branda da Castiglione, bishop of Piacenza. Aug. 18, 1410.
banking activity, whereas simple money exchange and lesser money loans belonged to the sphere of domestic banking activity. Therefore in the case of the Melanesi, this entry clearly positions them among the merchant-banker partnerships. Simone and Tommaso were supposedly familiar with monetary operations because of their family background, particularly with regard to their father, Piero di Filippo Melanesi’s late carrier in money exchange in France.\footnote{On the previous generation of the Melanesi, and their father’s, and uncle’s connection to the renowned Francesco di Marco Datini of Prato see following chapter and Arany, “Apák, fiú”, 175-176.}

The records of the Florentine Catasto do not preserve any traces concerning Hungarian clients with promissory notes/exchange bills. A telling quotation from 1448, in fact from a letter by a Hungarian young nobleman, Stephen of Várda quite clearly confirms that not even the technique of the exchange bill was generally known in Hungary in the first half of the fifteenth century. \footnote{Stephen of Várda (around 1430-1471) had an extraordinary career in the court of King Matthias (1458-1490). He was archbishop of Kalocsa 1457-1471, see Kristóf, Vester Stephanus.} The young Várda, who studied in Ferrara at the time and was in an acute need of money, had to explain to his relatives in Hungary the main steps involved in this banking technique:

“I urgently ask you to send me in any way you wish for my expenses 130 ducats of yours, so that I can pay the 70 ducats of debt I told you about, a debt which I have to settle and with the rest I would stay for the rest of the year and would supply myself and settle the old debts . ... It is my hope to be finished with my studies in a short time if God helps me to survive in the month of December ... Do not send the money with a courier, rather commission a faithful man of yours with the transfer of the money. Reflecting better on it as I think it would be safer and I already wrote to you many times, if an Italian would pay it to me via exchange letter (“per litteras cambiales” -- Arany). This way if you could find an Italian merchant in Buda or elsewhere, by whom the money to be sent can be deposited in front of a confidential witness, and he [the merchant -- Arany] writes to Venice or to any other city, even to Florence, nothing could be as easy as that since his partner here [in Italy -- Arany] would pay that money to me on showing the letter of his partner, without any danger. If you could send that letter with an Italian or any merchant, it would not be necessary to send a courier of yours to me, while delivering that letter safely. And it is necessary that the merchant would describe to his partner some features and signs of mine as told him by you, a description on my looks and distinguishing features, like the number of my years, my physique or my face, so that if anybody else would show that letter to the merchant in Italy, the money would not be paid to some other person. Hide the letter of this Italian merchant in another letter of yours and consign it to the courier and make sure he does not know about that letter, or if you inform him, bind him to faithfully preserve the letter and safely deliver it...”\footnote{Letter by István Várda to Miklós Várda, available online, see MNL OL DL 80926, Ferrara, Oct. 9, 1448. http://mol.arcanum.hu/dldf/opt/a110505htm?v=pdf&q=JELZ%3D%2880926%29&s=DAT&m=0&a=rec. I would like}
In order to understand the relevance of the above quotation one must add that the Várdai family’s success was launched mainly in the royal financial administration of King Sigismund of Luxemburg. They moved in the close financial circles of the ruler, and István Várdai’s father, Pelbárt, was even a noble retainer (familiaris) to Filippo Scolari, not to mention their friendly relations with the Noffri brothers.\textsuperscript{453} Thus, the quotation becomes outstanding evidence on the general lack of knowledge in the circles of the Hungarian nobility about these banking operations. It also marks, however, a crucial shift and turning point in the mentality and strategy of new generations of Hungarian noble families regarding both university education and interests in financial administration.\textsuperscript{454} In any case, the Várdai family’s strategy in entering the salt chamber administration and István Várdai’s later career as archbishop of Kalocsa and his cooperation in the government of the diocese of Zagreb very much resemble the Florentines’ ambitions in Hungary in the first half of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{455}

In the records of the \textit{Florentine Catasto} of 1427, the presence of promissory notes and exchange bills were, in fact, rather characteristic of the Florentine partners interested in the Kingdom of Hungary. Such was the case of Giovanni di Niccoló Falucci, who was working with the Melanesi partnership. In one of his entries he registered an accumulative account running to fl 597 as debt for more promissory notes issued on his behalf for some Florentine textile industrials by Tommaso di Lapo Corsi and partners in the Hungarian partnership. \textsuperscript{456}

The Corsi brothers in this example figure as intermediaries for the promissory notes. As their tax return reveals, they often used exchange transactions as was the case for Luca di Piero Rinieri to whom they issued a promissory note on behalf of their partner, Tommaso Melanesi. The same transaction was carried out on behalf of Antonio di Gabriello Panciatichi, agent of the Panciatichi

to thank Dániel Pócs who kindly called my attention to the letter. For the translation I also used the transcription of the original in Latin by Lukcsics, published in Pál Lukcsics, \textit{A zichi és vásonkeői gróf Zichy-család idős b ágának okmánytára. Codex diplomaticus domus senioris comitum Zichy de Zich et Vasonkeo. XII} (Budapest, 1931), no. 169. Accessed online: http://mol.arcanum.hu/medieval/opt/a101101.htm?v=pdf&q=WRD%3D%28V%E1rdai%20istv%E1n%29%20and%20AUTI%3D%28Lukcsics%29&s=SORT&m=0&a=rec (Last downloaded: May 14, 2013)

\textsuperscript{453} In a letter written in 1437, Bardo Noffri de Bojnice calls Miklós Várdai “frater et amicus”. See Lukcsics, \textit{A zichi és vásonkeői}, XII/137. Trnava, Febr. 9, 1437.

\textsuperscript{454} A shift also reflected in legal codification, in the 1439 Diet. See Gyöngyössy, \textit{Magyar pénztörténet (1000-1526)}, 255.

\textsuperscript{455} On Várdai see the online publication by Ilona Kristóf, “Vester Stephanus de Warda Scolaris Iuris Canonici” – Várdai István egyetemi évei Itáliában (”Vester Stephanus de Warda Scolaris Iuris Canonici” – István Várdai’s university years in Italy) http://tortenelem.ektf.hu/efolyoirat/04/kristof.htm, Last downloaded: May 30, 2013.

companies in Buda and Venice to Tommaso di Giacomino Baldini. As Rinieri was a stable investor in the Melanesi partnership, they may have settled the account for a transaction in this way.\textsuperscript{457}

The selected tax returns on Hungarian business ventures registered very few money transfers beside the one initiated by the Melanesi, analyzed at length at the beginning of this chapter. However, the case of the Senj money-changer mentioned in one these records is worth being shortly addressed because of Senj’s particular importance as a transit port town connecting the maritime and overland segments of one of the main trade routes towards the Central European region. The tax return’s entry in fact offers a glimpse into the professional network of the Florentine money-changer, Lodovico di Piero di Lodovico. He cooperated with another money-lender, a resident of Senj, a certain Agostino d’Antonio di messer Gieri, presumably of Florentine origin, to cover the demand for small-scale monetary transactions by merchants in transit.\textsuperscript{458} According to the entry, a second promissory note was issued to Zanobi di Gabriello Panciatichi, who resided in Buda in the 1420s. This implies that the exchange operation was connected to Hungarian business ventures.\textsuperscript{459} Another interesting, time-bound exchange transaction figures in the tax declaration of Cecca di Amerigo Frescobaldi, a Florentine widow, who disposed of an investment in the Melanesi partnership in Buda up to its termination (January 1, 1428). In this transaction the place of the settlement of the account (Florence) and the currency (Hungarian florins) were also specified.\textsuperscript{460}

\textsuperscript{457} Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi’s tax return, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 29. fol. 654r. “Tomaso Melanesi promettemole per lui a Lucha di Piero Rinieri fl 212.”; “Antonio Panciatichi promettemole a Tomaso di Giaccomino fl 403”.

\textsuperscript{458} A certain Agostino d’Antonio residing abroad, but not in Italy or Germany: ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 83. fol. 652r-v.

\textsuperscript{459} “… piú ho ad avere da mona Papina ducha 5 viniziani, fe paghare a suo figliolo a Signa di Schiavonia, a Nofri da Aghostino d’Antonio di messer Gieri, quando a[v]ut i gli [h]a resi e promessi a Zanobi Panciatichi”. – Lodovico di Piero di Lodovico’s tax return, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 54. fol. 122r.

\textsuperscript{460} “Avere per di ad primo di gennaio 1427 da Simone e Tommaso di Piero Melanesi merchantanti in Buda per vigore prima scritta di loro mano fl 1000 ungheri e la qual soma ne sono fl 163 di Uberto Zati e de’ fratelli e quali danari mi debbono dare in Firenze”. – Cecca di Amerigo Frescobaldi’s tax return, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 17. fol. 466r (The date according to Florentine calendar needs to be altered according to the modern one to Jan. 1, 1428.)
3.6. Florentines operating on the short run in Hungary

The records of the Catasto register a, more or less, exact time period during which Florentine merchants had unsettled transactions in Hungary. This means that only in very few and specific cases is it possible to identify Florentines working in the short run in Hungary. First of all, the notion of “short run” needs to be interpreted. Initially, it seemed that it basically meant single occasion appearances or investments by Florentine merchants in Hungary. This notion, however, raises severe problems. First, based only on the information of the Florentine Catasto of 1427, it is virtually impossible to identify short-term business interests because the majority of the records themselves cover a rather short time period. In fact, in most cases, a further search in other Hungarian or Central European collections proved to contain more information on businessmen who at first glance seemed to have appeared in Hungary only on one single occasion. In a few cases, it turned out that prior to the records of the Catasto these merchants also had some sort of direct or indirect business interests in the region. Often it turned out that their appearance was not as sudden as would appear only from the information presented by the Florentine taxation sources. On the contrary, the merchants gradually “discovered” the area, proceeding from Northern Italy and Dalmatia towards the inland regions of Central Europe. Second, particularly in the case of Florentine investors not appearing personally in the kingdom, such analysis becomes not only impossible, but at times also irrelevant, as it is related to a general strategy of investing in a number of different regions at the same time.

Those few cases, where an identification of “short run” activity in Hungary becomes possible despite all the difficulties explained above, require exploration of archival materials other than the Florentine Catasto of 1427. The majority of these cases, in fact, are so well documented elsewhere that they were included among the case studies in this dissertation. One of these few short-term attempts to embark on lucrative business ventures in Hungary involves the Corsini brothers’ story, which also will be addressed in the case studies later on due to the relative abundance of information on them and on their life back in Florence.

Buonaccorso di Neri Pitti, an emblematic figure, well-known for his “Ricordi” made a journey to Hungary in the 1370s with another Florentine, Matteo dello Scelto Tinghi to market spices (saffron) in Buda bought in Venice at a notable profit. The unusual conditions of Pitti’s short sojourn, namely his gambling in Buda in 1378, revealed in his diary show the importance of the Florentine “community” in Buda as an indispensable infrastructure for fellow countrymen (and I do not only refer here to the provision of boarding). Although he calculated that he had concluded a modestly profitable business (with the gains from gambling, he could purchase horses to be marketed), he did not return to the kingdom for a second occasion, a fact that can generally be explained by the facts
that his main interest lay in Florence. In fact, his diary is a testimony to a series of rather risky, but apparently lucrative business ventures and diplomatic missions carried out in various regions of Europe. Apparently all these activities served his final goal of returning to Florence after the Ciompi revolt. There he held the highest urban offices, among them that of the “Gonfaloniere di Giustizia” (Standard bearer of Justice) in 1412, and 1416.\textsuperscript{461} In 1427, he also handed in tax declarations, according to which he ran a rather modest business totaling 117 fl, whereas his immobile wealth amounted to fl 2,394 according to information from the Online Catasto.\textsuperscript{462}

His partner on the journey to Buda, a senior merchant and diplomat, Matteo dello Scelto Tinghi, was also expelled along with his brother from Florence two years later, charged with conspiracy against the Ciompi government. However, already in 1389 he reappeared in the Tuscan town and actively participated in political life in this urban center.\textsuperscript{463} He did not reappear in Hungary either according to my knowledge. The catasto of his son, Amerigo, indicates assets mainly in immobile properties and hardly any private investment.\textsuperscript{464} In both cases, it seems that declining trading and business interests is reflected in their tax returns from 1427. In any case, the wide-scale knowledge on international business networks and regional elite acquired during these ventures served very well later, sometimes for the subsequent generations of these lineages too, as in the case of the Pitti, who returned to Hungary in the second half of the fifteenth century.

\textsuperscript{461} Pitti, Ricordi, 367-368. See also Martyna Urbaniak, “Futuro e famiglia nei “Ricordi” di Buonaccorso Pitti,” in Futuro italiano. Scritture del tempo a venire, ed. Alessandro Benassi-Fabrizio Bondi-Serena Pezzini (Lucca: Pacini-Fazzi editore, 2012), 78-97, here 94-96. Interestingly, his grandchild, Buonaccorso di Luca Pitti later took Francesca di Matteo Scolari, Filippo di Stefano Scolari’s niece as wife. See the marriage contract published in Howard Saalman, Filippo Brunelleschi: the buildings, (Zwemmer, 1993), 451. See also Katalin Prajda, Hölgy a képen. Fra Filippo Lippi kettős portréja és a firenzei Scolari család. [Double portrait of Fra Filippo Lippi and the Scolari family]. In Ars Perennis: Fiatal Művészettörténészek II. Konferenciája. 2nd Conference of Young Art Historians Budapest, 2009. ed. Anna Tüssés(Budapest: CentrArt Egyesület, 2010), 57-63. Pitti was linked also to the del Palagio and Albizzi families, which were interested in Hungary. \textsuperscript{462} See Online Catasto.

\textsuperscript{463} On the offices he held in 1389-1410 see Online Tratte, 76652, 79730, 79731, 79732, 79741. In 1395, he was apparently absent from the city based on information from the Online Tratte, 79737-39 and died before 1415, see ibid. 79733. Also see for e.g. his interventions in the urban assemblies recorded in the minutes of the Le consulte e pratiche della Repubblica Fiorentina (1404), ed. Renzo Ninci (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1991), 3, 18, 20, 21, 32, 41, 52, 57, 69, 95, 100, etc.

\textsuperscript{464} Amerigo di Matteo dello Scelto Tinghi, ASF, Catasto 1427, 23. fol. 35r-36v, his taxable wealth runs to fl 1.250.
3.7. Reappearance of members of subsequent generations in Hungary

In the mid-fifteenth century, in spite of the ongoing business activity of the Italians settled in the previous decades in the town and in the country, a clear drop in the number of newly arrived Italians in the 1440-1470s is reflected in the sources. These documents are also rather poor compared to the records of the previous decades. As soon as royal power with King Matthias Corvinus (1458-1490) reestablished stability in the country and particularly after the marriage of the king to Beatrice of Aragon in 1476 and her arrival in Buda with her Italian entourage, both the need for royal representation and consumption increased. To meet such demands, Italian, among them several Venetian long-distance merchants, reappeared in Buda. As mentioned at the end of the previous subchapter, among the Florentines supplying the Hungarian court in the late fifteenth century one can encounter familiar kin groups that had already been present in the kingdom in the first half of the century such as new generations of the Attavante, Cavalcanti, Strozzi, Albizzi, Pitti, Rucellai, Giugni, Viviani kins. Their reappearance may be interpreted as a transfer of the older generations’ knowledge and experiences to the region.

Very few of them were interested in forming royal monopolies compared to the situation in the time of King Sigismund. Exceptions can be found only in the management of the Slavonian thirtieth customs of Zagreb, which over the long run remained in the hands of Italians, namely the Florentine Domenico Giugni. As with the framework of the reforms of 1458, the administration of royal monopolies was put into the care of the royal treasurer and direct connections to the king were reduced. Consequently, the number of Italian noble retainers (familiares) of King Matthias dropped drastically compared to King Sigismund’s era. At the same time, however, with the need for long-distance trade goods, the Italian acquired the royal privilege to freely market their luxury goods in the free royal town and royal seat of Buda without the necessity of procuring urban citizenship.

---


464 See Arany, “Prosopographical database” A number of families and kins returned at the close of the fifteenth century to Buda on business, see MNL OL DL 37684, Nov. 23, 1493. see also on-line version of the collection: Collectio Diplomatica Hungarica. A középkori Magyarország levéltári forrásainak adatbázisa. Internetes kiadás (DL-DF 5.1) 2010. (Last downloaded: February 2, 2012.)

465 A telling example of Giugni’s role as tricesimator. At the bidding of King Matthias he provided an exemption from the thirtieth for his countryman, Alessandro Ottavanti, who had been directed to Buda with the ware ordered by Queen Beatrice. See ASF, Signori, Dieci di Balia, Otto di Pratica – legazioni and commissarie, missive responsive filza 77. fol. 129rv, Oct. 7, 1481. In 1495, another Italian, the Zagreb resident Giovanni Pastor, was appointed to the office of the Slavonian tricesimator. Beside this information we only know of one member of the Pitti family managing the Pressburg minting chamber in cooperation with a Nuremberg burgher, Jakob Fleischer. See MNL OL DF 241269. Nov. 11, 1524. In the record written by István Werbőczi, Pitti is mentioned as mercator germanicus. The same Niccolò Pitti has a tomb in St. Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna (died in 1558) see Renata Kassal-Mikula, 850 Jahre St. Stephan: Symbol un Mitte in Wien 1147-1997 (Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien, 1997), 50.
there. Beside the trade in luxury wares, Italians also resumed their crediting activity, mainly with members of the court. As opposed to most South Germans in Buda they relied on sophisticated banking techniques and international business networks providing easy access to capital resources in order to reduce business risks. Altogether these factors lead to the Italian merchants’ general social standing as outsiders in Buda’s burgher community.

To provide the security necessary for their sojourn, particularly in times of conflict with the local community such as in 1496, they sought the support of the Hungarian leading elite of Buda and that of their clients from the Hungarian lay and ecclesiastic aristocracy. This is clearly demonstrated in the account book of Antonio di Pietro Bini. Nevertheless, similarly to Hungarians and Venetians, controversies among Florentines and Venetians were also on the agenda according to the diaries of Marino Sanuto. In the years prior to the defeat at Mohács, Italians like Niccoló Pitti were already leaving the kingdom, and some of those remaining in Buda until its Ottoman occupation, faced bankruptcy, as did the once wealthy Florentine, Felice di Stagio in 1525.

---

IV. Florentine diasporas in east Central Europe in comparative context

The analysis hitherto addressed Florentine merchants, families and even extended kin groups working and sojourning in Hungary for a shorter or longer time period, focusing on the features of their business interests in the region. Also the ways of cooperation and the European commercial network they were part of has been analyzed.

As a final step of the investigation in this subchapter I aim to look at the social economic patterns of their communities in a wider geographical context, more precisely I question if these migrational groups can be understood as more or less integral communities, in other words diasporas. In order to show the shifts in the presence of Florentines in Central Europe a relatively broad time framework lasting from the early fourteenth century up to the end of sixteenth century needs to be set. Also the geographical context of the analysis needs further explanation. Central Europe is considered here for the purposes of this investigation in a rather broad sense, including also Ragusa (Dubrovnik, during most of fifteenth century under nominal Hungarian overlordship and with a significant Florentine community within its walls) to the South, Poland, mainly Cracow to the north, Wrocław (Breslau), Vienna and Nuremberg to the West. The case of Zagreb along the main inland route leading from Senj towards north, and also the Styrian towns such as Ptuj, Ljubljana, and finally the coastal ports of the Adriatic will be shortly addressed. Of course, limits to a comparative analysis again are set by the available sources which differ both in their quality and quantity from place to place.

As a first step, the definition of diaspora needs to be introduced. “Scholarship has distinguished between different kinds of diasporas, based on the factors motivating this kind of mobility, such as trade or labor migrations, or on the kind of social coherence within the diaspora community and its ties to the ancestral lands. Some diaspora communities maintain strong political ties with their homeland. Other qualities that may be typical of many diasporas are thoughts of return, relationships with other communities in the diaspora, and lack of full assimilation into the host country.”

Based on the above quoted definition, applied originally for modern diasporas, one can encounter a wide range of merchant diasporas at different organizational levels in medieval Central and Eastern Europe. Sometimes these diasporas are results of long-term migration, as is the case of the most relevant merchant diaspora in the region, of South German origin.

---


4.1. The South German and Florentine diasporas in east Central Europe in the fifteenth century – their main features in comparative analysis

The South Germans’ settlement (called “Teutonici” in the sources) in the just developing Central European urban environment had born patterns more apt to integration compared to the patterns that the Florentines followed.\footnote{Végh, “Buda: the Multiethnic Capital”, 90.} For the sake of comparison I shall again briefly highlight the features of this German diaspora, at this point in a regional context.

From the second half of the fourteenth century, South German, mainly Nuremberg merchant groups (but also representatives of other towns, such as Vienna, Passau, interested in long distance trade, appeared and quite soon entered the leading urban elite in a number of Central European trade hubs, like Vienna, Buda, Pressburg, Kosice, etc. The attitude of the South German new leading elite towards integration can be assessed as rather negative compared to the former settlers of German origin (mainly from Regensburg and neighborhood). This shift in the ambitions can of course be ascribed to a number of different factors, most important among them the lack of politically and economically strong enough local urban communities, which themselves could have met the challenges provided by the development of long-distance trade, or may have compelled the newcomers to tie business and social links with their members. So, the South German wealthy merchants who appeared in great numbers in several urban centers, instead of integrating into local society or even cooperating with it, replaced the former urban elite of partly also German origin. A particular cohesive force among the members of this South German diaspora was the marriage pattern generally followed by them in the fifteenth century, which interlinked the member families of the diaspora in different Central European towns (Regensburg, Vienna, Passau, Pressburg, Kosice etc.).\footnote{Kubinyi, “A budai német patriciátus társadalmi helyzete”, 498-502.} In other words its particularity lies first in its wider, rather regional than local urban character, showing a uniting force of a diaspora not confined to a single town, but extending to a whole network of towns, and second, its ambitions in occupying prominent leading positions in the urban environment of the towns within this network.

Compared to them, the presence of Florentines in the region is more sporadic and covers a shorter time period in Central Europe. Thus, in general, Florentine businessmen, with the strong individualism so characteristic to their business activity, do not seem to apply for such analysis of corporate identities in Central Europe at first sight. First of all, they were present in varying numbers in virtually all European regions, at the moments of economic growth and quickly left the areas in decline. This unusually flexible attitude which strictly followed all the shifts in regional political-economical situation rarely led to a long-term, more or less stable sojourn of a number of Florentines in one place in the less developed geographical areas, a factor indispensable to speak
about diasporas. Of course, their presence was quite intensive in the main European banking and trade centers such as Bruges, London, and those in the Italian peninsula, and this resulted in the foundation of official Florentine colonies abroad, a clear indicator for institutionalization of a diaspora. However, the only Florentine colony ("nazione") at the borderline of Central Europe was founded in Venice 1326.\textsuperscript{476} In fact, the proximity of Venice proves to be a crucial factor as we shall see in the following subchapter.

\textsuperscript{476} Gino Masi, \textit{Statuti delle colonie fiorentine all’estero (secc. XV-XVI)} (Mailand: Giuffrè, 1941), XXII.
4.2. Competition or cooperation: The Florentine and South German businessmen in Buda

Medieval international scale Florentine businessmen were involved in all sorts of business dealings; their interests were not restricted to the lease of royal revenues. Their share in the trade in luxury goods, particularly textiles, and their crediting activity is best explained through the role they played in Buda, the Hungarian royal seat, in its development as a center of trade, lying at the crossroads of significant trade routes needs to be addressed.\(^{477}\) This is especially true because Italian merchants in Buda were able to supply the demand for luxury goods for the whole Hungarian market in the town in this period.\(^{478}\) In Buda by the late fourteenth century, however, they confronted a new, fully integrated German elite (mainly coming from Nuremberg although there were Buda burghers from Basel, Passau, Vienna etc. in lesser numbers), which in the meantime took over the leadership of the town. They expelled the former, fourteenth-century urban elite who had been rather passive in long-distance trade but who were therefore eager to integrate into the Hungarian nobility in the most important urban offices. The relation of the Florentines to the other ethnic groups, particularly to the Germans in the town, is worth further investigation.\(^{479}\) Finally, their attitude towards local social and economic conditions, the way they moved within the medieval burgher town and royal residence Buda compared to members of the local merchant elite in the town, particularly the urban elite of Southern German origin provides an insight into features of the Hungarian trade. As in most towns in Central Europe in this period, the German burghers played an outstanding role in the urban

---


\(^{479}\) At that time South Germans already had a long tradition of commercial relation with Venetians through the Venetian Fondaco dei Tedeschi and Venetians operating in Nuremberg. The information available on the first Florentine businessman settled in the Southern German town, however, dates back to 1471. Direct and regular commercial relations were to be established in the subsequent decades. See Weissn, “I mercanti italiani”, 161-176; Guidi Bruscoli, “Drappi di seta”, 359-394. Goldthwaite, *The Economy*, 198.
administration and leadership of Buda, its members occupying the main urban offices and figuring regularly in the otherwise rather incomplete medieval council lists of the town.480

As the theory of Southern German and Italian competition in the region has mainly been applied to the situation of these two ethnic groups in late medieval Buda partly on the basis of Buda Town Law (Ofter Stadtrecht) compiled in the early fifteenth century. This legal collection made a clear distinction between ”Gewölbherren”, that is, long-distance merchants of foreign origin specialized particularly on luxury textiles and local “„Kammerherren” who mainly operated in the sale of lower quality wools in the town and held citizenship in Buda.481 The theory was further reinforced by the events between 1402-1403 leading to the expulsion of the Italian dwellers of Buda and to the seizure of their properties.482 This is generally interpreted as the result of business competition among German and Italian merchants in the town. Based on new evidence, however, the idea of business competition needs to be at least partly revisited, particularly in the context of Buda, as the ambitions and business targets of the two ethnic groups and the strategies they developed to meet them seem to have been more complementary rather than contrasting.

From the information gathered so far it seems that rather than competing with each other, the Italians and Southern Germans of Buda divided the fields of operation among themselves. The Germans’ activity mainly focused on the sale of lower-value wools, even those coming from North Italy (Verona), whereas trade in luxury goods and prestigious textiles was ”left” to the Italian businessmen with stronger financial potential. The Florentines were able to provide the necessary capital for such trade with the manifold possibilities of involvement of homeland investors connected to well developed banking techniques and to the extensive business networks they were operated within. They were also active in providing large credits, not only to the ruler, but to the members of Hungarian aristocracy and to foreigners visiting the Hungarian royal court.483 As has been presented in previous chapters, the sources on their business activity reveal the occasional banking services in the form of assignments and bills of exchange carried out mainly for prominent foreigners sojourn at the court.

Both Germans and Italians in Buda were interested in forming royal monopolies as shown in a previous chapter (Marcus of Nuremberg, Johann Siebenlinder, Michael Nadler, six times judge in Buda, or among the Italians: Francesco di Bernardo da Carmignano, Filippo di Stefano Scolari,

480 On the role of Germans in Hungarian towns see András Kubinyi, “Deutsche und Nicht-Deutsche in den Städten des mittelalterlichen ungarischen Königtums,” in Verfestigung und Änderung der ethnischen Strukturen im pannonischen Raum im Spätmittelalter, ed. Reinhardt Härtel (Eisenstadt, 1996), 159-175; For the lists see also Rady, Medieval Buda, Appendix II. 169-176; Véggh, “Buda”, 90.
482 Engel, The Realm, 262.
Tommaso di Piero Melanesi, Filippo di Simone Capponi, Fronte di Piero Fronte etc.).

Here as well the sources shed light on cooperation among members of the two national groups in Buda. The Italians still focused closely on the business of the sale of copper and salt and on the lease of the Slavonian export customs (the so-called thirtieth). The latter customs was extremely important, as it controlled the main commercial routes between Italy and the Kingdom of Hungary. All the officials operating in this field were noble retainers (familiares), that is, servants of the king, assessed usually as a rather medieval feature of the financial administration, which implied a personal relationship to King Sigismund of Luxemburg. Out of 12 noble retainers (familiares) of Florentine origin, six certainly had the Buda citizenship as well.

According to the Buda Town Law (Ofner Stadtrecht), retail trade or shop keeping in the territory of the town was only granted to the citizens of Buda, who also paid a tax for the right to merchandize. This norm, most probably also active in previous decades, rendered urban citizenship essential for wealthy foreign merchants from the late fourteenth century onwards. Therefore, most of both the Italians and Southern Germans in Buda acquired citizenship of the town. As citizenship required possession of immobile property, many of them also had houses, gardens, vineyards etc. within the town walls. Looking at only the Florentines, in the 1420s, at least 30 businessmen (belonging to 25 families) were Buda citizens.

Immobile property may also have played a notable role in trade transactions for the German elite of Buda. As these families frequently lacked the necessary capital for long distance trade in wool or cattle, these possessions may have also served as mortgage items for business operations. Although the medieval archives of Buda were destroyed, the existence of so-called “Verbotbücher” seems to be plausible based on analogy with other Hungarian towns interested in the same sort of trade. Such operations were inserted in the Verbotbücher of towns where Buda’s German merchant elite had both marriage and business alliances such as Pressburg or Vienna, in order to cover the potential losses of the investors.

---


486 On the conditions of trade in the town see Buda város jogkönyve [Buda Town Law (Ofner Stadtrecht)], II. § 68, the paragraphs on retail sale Ibidem §. 77, §. 80-8, §. 84.

The Germans tended to integrate into the local urban community. However, also their integration seem to be somewhat odd as they were not keen to marry into Buda’s patrician families, whether they were from the former German elites of Regensburg origin or the developing Hungarian elites. In fact, the Germans preferred to establish family ties with members of the German elite in other Hungarian towns, particularly those involved in their business network such as Pressburg, Vienna, Cracow, and especially Nuremberg, their hometown. As opposed to their marriage policies, the members of South German elite in Buda were very active politically. In fact, they were present in the town council and almost “monopolized” the office of the town judge in 1403-1439. This may seem to be a contradiction as marriage alliances and urban status usually depended on each other. Nevertheless, in Buda most of the families belonging to urban elite never existed for more than two-three generations. Two main factors contributing to this pattern have so far been identified: first that Buda town right granted equal inheritance rights to both male and female heirs, widows of the citizens, and consequently, urban citizenship could be acquired by marriage to widows of Buda citizens, which at times meant major age gaps between the spouses.

In case of the South Germans, not much changed throughout the fifteenth century: their presence in Buda and in the economic life of the kingdom was continuous, with a greater number of newcomers observed in the 1470s. Later, the Southern German trade houses such as the Welser and Fugger from Augsburg also established permanent agents in Buda. These German firms with their substantial capital finally set up real competition to Italians, first in the field of the tithe collection, which they took over in the Habsburg territories from the Italians, and then in Hungary particularly in the formation of mining chambers. They obtained a monopoly on the exploitation and sale of copper in 1494, co-operating with entrepreneur John Thurzó, burgher of Cracow. The Germans of Buda also provided supplies for the royal court on some occasions, although, still at a lower volume compared to the Italians according to András Kubinyi, who analysed the average

---


489 Kubinyi, “Budai és pesti polgárok családi összeköttetései a Jagelló-korban,” [Family alliances of Buda and Pest burghers in the Jagiellonian period], in Kubinyi, Tanulmányok, II. 513-570. here 517-520; Szende, “Integration”,206-207.
490Buda burghers represented Nuremberg firms, such as Marcus of Nuremberg for the Flextorfer-Kegler-Kromer-Zenner firm as early as the end of fourteenth century, but did not focus their investments on the area. Ian Blanchard, “Egyptian specie markets and the international gold crisis of the early fifteenth century,” in Money, Markets and Trade in Late Medieval Europe, Essays in Honour of John H. A. Munro, ed. Lawrin Armstrong – Ivana Elbl – Martin m. Elbl (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 383-411, here 392.
491 Goldthwaite, The Economy, 198
value of their shipments in the accountancy of the royal court.\footnote{Kubinyi, “Budai kereskedők”, 338.} The Germans, however, mainly went on marketing cheaper cloth for both the office-holders of the royal court and for the burgher community of Buda. They were active in the town until 1529. After the siege of Buda by the Ottomans, some of the most prominent Buda burgurers were killed and others abandoned the Hungarian capital causing irreversible changes in the economic and social structure of the town.\footnote{Vera Zimányi, \textit{Economy and society in sixteenth and seventeenth century Hungary (1526-1650)} (Budapest, 1987), 49.} Italians, in contrast, even if they were wealthy merchants or their established agents living and working in Buda even for decades, rarely married into the local urban community. Most of them had left their families in their homeland and did not settle permanently in Buda.\footnote{Krisztina Arany, “Generations Abroad: Florentine Merchant Families in Hungary in the first Half of the Fifteenth Century,” in \textit{Generations in Towns: Succession and Success in Pre-Industrial Urban Societies}, ed. Finn-Einar Eliassen – Katalin Szende (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 133-140 (hereafter: Arany, “Generations”)} Accordingly, they did not directly participate in Buda’s urban government either, but tried to maintain good relations to the leading German and later on also the Hungarian merchants of the town.\footnote{Kubinyi, “A nürnbergi Hallerek”, 714. An eventual explanation for the Florentine Buda burgher and house owner Francesco Bernardi’s lack of interest in local urban offices see Rady, \textit{Medieval Buda,} 89.} In the cases of marriage alliances into local families, they mainly chose spouses from the nobility. This often lead to their permanent settlement in Hungary and was particularly characteristic for businessmen interested in forming royal monopolies. Recently, similarly to research carried out on the Germans; I investigated the role of family and kinship in Hungarian business for the Florentines as well. The records in some cases, as that of the Melanesi brothers, Simone, Tommaso and Giovanni even show complex strategies: Tommaso’s marriage into a noble kin group, and Simone’s marriage into a Buda urban family.\footnote{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 46. Tomo I fol. 654r-655v. Lukcsics, \textit{XV. századi pápák}, II. No. 253} Their strategy shows the relative importance of Buda citizenship, since – based on the evidence about them – only Simone obtained it, whereas Tommaso defined himself as a nobleman.\footnote{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 46. Tomo I fol. 655v. On Simone and Tommaso also see Arany, “Generations”, 135. Kintzinger, \textit{Westbindungen}, 444.} The only common feature they shared (and Giovanni, their third brother joined them in it) was their nomination as noble retainer (\textit{familiaris}) by King Sigismund.\footnote{Kintzinger, \textit{Westbindungen}, 444, on Giovanni see also \textit{Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi per il comune di Firenze dal 1399-1433}. vol.2. 1424-1426. Documenti di storia italiana. Pubblicato a cura della R. Deputazione sugli studi di storia patria per le provincie di Toscana, dell’Umbria and delle Marche. Tomo II ( Florence, 1869) Vol. II. p552-613. doc. 972, Lukcsics, \textit{XV. századi pápák}, I. No. 880. 956.} This and the numerous clients linked to the royal court listed in their tax report clearly suggest both that being in the King’s service was a priority and that Buda as a royal residence and administrative center was of first importance and of secondary importance as a wealthy burgher town.
Influenced by shifts in international commercial trends and by the increasing presence of the South German capital in the region, the general security of business adventures in the Kingdom and other circumstances, some basic patterns and the intensity of the Florentines’ presence changed over the fifteenth century. The changing possibilities offered by Buda, developing as royal residence and trade center, the changing urban legal environment created by the grant and withdrawal of the staple rights of the town, not to mention the growing urban community of Hungarian origin, specialized mainly in the international cattle trade and obtaining urban leadership based on parity in 1439, need to be taken into account when interpreting the presence and activity of the various ethnic (national) groups living within its walls.\textsuperscript{500} Finally, the changes that occurred in the European trading-banking system also influenced their activity, not only in the town of Buda, but in the kingdom generally. This shift in the commercial activities of Florentines in Central Europe from the 1450s onwards was labeled a “Renaissance” commerce, as it put clear emphasis on the marketing of luxury goods to the royal court and to the aristocracy, which, in imitation of the royal court, gradually took over the demands of courtly representation.\textsuperscript{501}

In summary, the picture emerging from various records on this supposed conflict of business interests, it seems that in spite of some occasional conflicts emerging particularly in particular periods in Buda between Italians and Southern Germans in pursuit of lucrative business possibilities, they generally relied mainly on division of their fields of interest and even on cooperation in areas requiring major capital and business networks. Their ventures definitely seem to have been complementary in nature. The Italians faced more serious problems in times of conflict with the Hungarian rulers, especially with King Sigismund at the beginning of the century. The Italians’ situation also became insecure in the 1490s, on that occasion due to their activities and privileges, which seriously hurt the commercial interests of the other leading urban ethnic (national) clusters in Buda.

The Italians, in contrast to the Southern Germans, although seemingly settling themselves in the town for the long run, tended not to integrate into Buda’s urban elite. Real integration may mainly be observed with businessmen interested in the formation of royal monopolies. In those cases they tended to integrate into the local nobility and only rarely chose to live in urban environments whether Buda or other towns, centers for the administration of mining and minting. Clearly the financial possibilities offered by the gradually developing permanent royal court and administration attracted them to Buda. By the end of the fifteenth century, again in contrast to the Southern Germans working in Buda, the Italians spheres of business interest narrowed significantly, although

\textsuperscript{500} Kubinyi, “Budai német patriciátus”, 490.
\textsuperscript{501} Kellenbenz, “Gli operatori”, 333-357.
at the turn of the fifteenth century a numerous Italian community was present in the town, and some of them remained until the Ottoman occupation of the town.\textsuperscript{502}

Altogether, in spite of the changing political-economic environment in Buda over the course of the fifteenth century, the continuous, in particularly favorable periods even increasing presence, of both the Florentines and South Germans can be observed. This, however, suggests that their ambitions were stronger than simple peaceful coexistence on the part of both foreign communities in the Hungarian royal seat. There may also have been intentionally active cooperation, not only in some specific fields such as the royal financial administration, although most of the surviving explicit evidence is restricted to data on collaboration in the management of the royal chambers, but extending to a general business exchange, shaped by the differences in business culture and potential of the two parties. Following this idea, Buda’s role as a meeting point for the two most significant merchant communities also needs reconsideration which will be addressed in the following chapter.

4.3. Direct commercial contacts of South German tradesmen and Florentine merchant-bankers

As we have already seen, Florence, described as an “emissive” city by Spufford, did not host significant merchant communities of foreign origin. Therefore, if looking for direct contacts in east Central-Europe, they need to be searched in German lands. Already from the thirteenth century onwards there are scattered pieces of information on single merchants, moneylenders, tax collectors from the Rhineland up to Vienna. The notion of “Latini” and even “Gallici” to be found in the early records also referred to Italian merchants at times, like in Regensburg, an important hub on the trade route towards Venice. One may assume that there could have been also Florentines among them, if only taking into account the role they played in the collection of papal revenues, but these early records usually do not permit the identification of the place of origin of these people. The struggle with the sources diminishes in time; the records for the later Middle Ages are much more informative.

In general, however, until the late fifteenth century no information on either permanent branches of Florentine companies or significant Florentine communities has been so far found east of the Rhein. As was explicitly stated in recent comprehensive studies, the German areas were not included in the international exchange system dominated by Florentines and in general the same was claimed for Central Europe.

Nuremberg, as the main hometown and center of the dominant South German merchant diaspora in Central Europe needs to be addressed separately from the other regional trade hubs. It is telling that Florentines were appearing relatively late in the South German town; the first reference to Benvenuto di Daddo Aldobrandi, as an agent commissioned by Guasparre di Niccomendo Spinelli, is dated to 1471. The first Florentine partnership in Nuremberg, founded by Bernardo and Piero di Zanobi Saliti operated from 1512 until 1536, in a first phase in form of “accomandita”, later establishing a partnership with Bernardo Acciaiuoli. The partnership targeted Pressburg, Wroclaw up to Prague to the North, and to the South reaching to Milan and Venice. Only in the early sixteenth century, following the footsteps of Aldobrandini, also other Florentines, mainly agents

504 Goldthwaite, The Economy, 195.
appeared in the South German town, like Giovanni di Piero Olivieri in 1521, employed by Ridolfo Torrigiani and partners.507

Yet, besides the lack of direct trade contacts of Florence to Nuremberg until the end of the fifteenth century, one must emphasize that only very few Central European urban centers can be identified as hubs targeted by both South Germans and Florentines. In fact, Venice is the major trade centre to be considered a regular meeting point for the businessmen of the two emporia, where several Nuremberg merchants were active in the Fondaco dei Tedeschi. Thus, the simultaneous presence of Florentines and South Germans in these two urban centers, in my understanding, is a clear indicator on the rather significant position of Buda in Central Europe in the fifteenth century.

4.4. The role of Venice in the expansion of the Florentine merchant diaspora towards Central Europe

A short introduction to Venice, the closest important banking and trading centre seems to be appropriate, because the “Serenissima” played the role of intermediate banking centre between Central Europe and regions of Europe such as Italy and the south German lands. From Venice, the sums were transferred by Venetian banking houses and Venetian branches of Florentine banking houses in the form of assignments. For the Florentines, participation in collecting papal revenues secured a precious knowledge of the business opportunities in various European regions and provided the financial basis for their Europe-wide banking and commercial transactions. Venice also hosted a numerous Florentine community and also an official Florentine nation with consuls was founded in the town. Many of the Florentines arrived as expatriates to the territory of the “Serenissima” from an early time and established their business in the city.508 (Similarly, a numerous Florentine expatriate community can be found in Udine as early as the end of twelfth century. Both Florentine communities are at least partly results of a migration motivated by exiles following political controversies in Florence).509 At taking a closer look at the Florentine names figuring in Venice, it becomes conspicuous that many of them or their kinsmen (see the Panciatichi, Portinari, Zati, Giuseppi, Tosinghi etc.) reappear also in the records related to the Kingdom of Hungary and Poland.510 It may even be formulated that the Florentine diaspora in Venice (and earlier also that of Friuli, Aquilea, Trentino) expanded towards the inland regions of Central Europe in favorable moments of prosperity.511

At the same time, however, King Sigismund’s policy with Venice, even if the theory of the continental blockade by Stromer is debated, caused serious problems also to the Florentines to reach


510 See Mueller, “Mercanti e imprenditori”.

511 *Storia del Trentino: L’età medievale III.* Collana Storia del Trentino, ed. Castagnetti, Andrea, Gian Maria Varanini (Bologna: Mulino, 2004); See also Cino Dietisalvi, a Florentine ghibelline immigrant interested in the lease of taxes, minting chamber in Aquileia, 1277, in Pietro Kandler, *Codice Diplomatico Istriano (CDI)*, vol. II, no. 373. 666. The *CDI* accessed online: [http://140.105.55.157/cgi-bin/sa/baseweb_main](http://140.105.55.157/cgi-bin/sa/baseweb_main). (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013); Also, there is an interesting accessed, a letter by the Florentine Soldanieri living in Triest, writing on marriage plans and trade from 1328, CDI, III, no. 600, 1031.; See also the records on Florentines’ crediting activity in Triest in 1350, “… dominorum Ugonis et Forensii de Agolantibus factorum et procuratorum suorum, Lipi de Scolaribus et factorum ejus heredes q. S. Scolaris de Scolaribus, Donusdei de Agolantibus fratrum vel nepotum ipsius, Johannis de Linari, Francisci et Angli fratrum de Linari heredum quond. Ugozoni de Capitibusnigris, Baldinacii Bruni et fratrum ejus, S. Soldaneri de Soldaneriis filiorum et fratrum ipsius, heredum q. Ser Ricardi Malatesta, et Johannis Gambocii sive alicujus ipsorum aut factorum vel procuratorum ipsorum vel alicujus ipsorum vel cujuscunque alterius personae …” in Kandler, *CDI*, vol. III, no. 730. 1230. Accessed online: [http://140.105.55.157/cgi-bin/sa/baseweb_main](http://140.105.55.157/cgi-bin/sa/baseweb_main). (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013)
to the inland territories from Venice in the first three decades of the fifteenth century. This may also have played a role in the process, during which Buda seems to have acquired a prominent position as a “borderline” international trade hub in the fifteenth century.
4.5. Florentines in other east Central European urban centers

As a next step, in order to draw a more complete picture on the regional presence of Florentines, and to seek for further factors potentially useful for a better assessment of the urban centers in our region in the contemporary European commercial context, I shall propose a short overview on the remaining major regional urban centers in the following paragraphs.512

When taking a closer look first at Prague, the city’s international trade centre, the so-called Ungelt or Tyn Courtyard, an earlier royal foundation with royal staple rights, established as early as the twelfth century and particularly flourishing in the fourteenth century, it seems to have functioned as a meeting point for German and Italian businessmen in its peak period.513 In fact, some evidence hint to the presence of a few Italians, among them also Florentines, like the Macci family as early as in 1299 in Prague, but again, no Florentine community was manifest in the city thorough the Middle Ages.514

Vienna did not host apparently Florentines in larger numbers in the fifteenth century either.515 On the contrary, the South German kin and business network extended also to Vienna, and it seems, that the goods of long-distance trade which made up the majority of goods marketed in the city were shipped and entrusted to locally established branches of South German businessmen, to avoid Vienna’s staple right (granted in 1221), similarly to Buda.516 Thus, Vienna’s export trade is usually

512 When assessing the role of urban centers of medieval Central Europe the notion of urban centers, in German literature “Metropolen” has emerged in international scholarly discussion with reference to regional urban centers overcoming their local/national urban network and forming part of an international system based on geopolitical, economic factors, cultural exchange, presence and coexistence of more ethnic groups. Russel Josiah Cox, Medieval Regions and their Cities (Newton Abbot, 1972), 98-102. quoted in Peter Johanek, “Vorwort” in Krakau, Prag und Wien Funktionen von Metropolen im Frühmodernen Staat, ed. Dmitrieva, Marina, Karen Lambrecht (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000), 11-12. Cox considered Prague as the only center in Central Europe, covering a borderline region, which included Bohemia, Silesia, Austria with Vienna - Johanek, himself, claims that neither Cracow, Vienna or Prague can be classified as such regional centers, “Metropole”.
514 See Roman Zaoral, Silver and Glass in Medieval Trade and Cultural Exchange between Venice and the Kingdom of Bohemia, 19. see www.ehs.org.uk/ehs/.../Assets/ZaoralFullPaper.doc (Last downloaded: May 30, 2013). Jaroslav Miller, Urban Societies in East Central Europe: 1500—1700, 53. According to him Prague and Cracow hosted the largest Italian (not only Florentine) immigrant enclaves, but based on Kubinyi’s results, he points out, that Buda was the first, as early as the second half of the fifteenth century .
515 Vienna hosted the ducal residence first of the Babemberg, then of the Habsburg dynasties only periodically throughout the fifteenth century, but the offices of central administration including the financial offices were established in the city, which counted around 20-25000 inhabitants in the later Middle Ages. The early-sixteenth-century foundation of the “Wiener Landeshaus” in the city made Vienna also the center of the Diet. See Richard Perger, Die Wiener Ratsbürger 1396-1526. Ein Handbuch (Vienna: Franz Deuticke, 1988), 10-11.
labeled as “Transithandel”, taking into consideration that the only local product entering within the range of long-distance goods, was wine.\textsuperscript{517} In any case, as it is often stated in scholarly literature, Vienna, due to the lack of local products whose eventual regional trade could be monopolized and the shortage of capital partly due to monetary problems faced by the city, lost some of its importance as regional trade hub from the early fifteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{518} In 1515 foreign merchants were granted the right to establish an entrepôt in Vienna to store their ware.\textsuperscript{519} Also the staple right of the city was cancelled in the interest of the South German businessmen by Maximilian I. (King of the Romans 1483-1519, Emperor 1493-1519).

The same picture can be drawn for Cracow for the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{520} The city first experienced a large flow of Florentine immigrants from the early 16th century, culminating in mid16th century.\textsuperscript{521} In the earlier centuries Genoese and Venetians were present also in Cracow, an important hub along both the trade routes from Bruges towards Eastern Europe and the South-North inland trade route leading from the Adriatic to North Eastern Europe. Cracow was from the second half of the fourteenth century an important hub to the South and to the East for the Hanseatic trade although not member of the League, disposing of the control of Hanseatic long-distance trade directed towards/from Hungary (1368).\textsuperscript{522} As such, it particularly competed with the Prussian towns and Wroclaw. At this point, it is worth emphasizing that the Italian businessmen present in the city and in Poland in this early phase covered the same business fields which traditionally also the Florentines did elsewhere in the region. Thus, in the early fourteenth century, in 1344-1358 the “comes” of the Bochnia salt mines was a Genoese, a certain Paulinus Gallicus, whose father had a clothshop and houses in Cracow.\textsuperscript{523} In 1368 again, the Genoese Goffredo Fattinati leased the salt chambers of Wieliczka and Bochnia, had a great entrepôt of cloth in Cracow managed by his nephew, Erasmo Fattinati.\textsuperscript{524}

References on Florentines in the fifteenth century, as stated above, are rather sporadic.\textsuperscript{525} In the first half of the fifteenth century the Florentine Catasto preserved reference only to the collector of papal revenues who was residing in the town. Trade was carried out from Venice with

\\textsuperscript{517} Perger, \textit{Die Wiener Ratsbürger}, 11-12.
\textsuperscript{519} The Nuremberg merchants also rented a so-called „Nürnberger Hof” with offices and entrepôts already in the fourteenth century, later int he first decades of the fifteenth century also Cologne merchants followed their footsteps with the “Kölner Hof”, a well defined urban space for long-distance trade. See Perger, “Die Organisatorische”, 223.
\textsuperscript{520} F. W. Carter, \textit{Trade and Urban Development in Poland: An Economic Geography of Cracow, from Its Origins to 1795} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
\textsuperscript{522} Michels, “Handel und Handwerk”, 85.
\textsuperscript{523} Saporì, “Gli italiani”, 152-153.
\textsuperscript{524} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{525} Zaoral, “Silver and Glass”, 20-21.
commissioned agents who a few years later reappear in the Hungarian royal financial administration.\textsuperscript{526}

It is only in the second half of the sixteenth century, when an increasing demand for luxury cloths, particularly for silk in Cracow is to be observed and led to an intensive presence of Florentines in the city, not experienced prior to that period. Out of 96 merchants acquiring citizenship 26 were Florentines up to 1630s when the Florentine colony (the largest at that time in the region) shrank again.\textsuperscript{527}

When turning towards South, a traditionally important intermediary territory for Florentines directed towards the inland regions of Central Europe, first the Adriatic ports’ case needs to be addressed. The first references on Florentines date back to the late thirteenth, early fourteenth centuries. At this point, however, it is necessary to emphasize Dubrovnik’s exceptional situation. Dubrovnik was a “fortunate battlefield” between the Kingdom of Hungary and Venice, as both regional powers tried to dominate the town to be found at the crossroads of trading routes and linking the Adriatic with the Slavic hinterland and the mines of precious metals. Dubrovnik succeeded to preserve a relative internal autonomy, or at times also independence in spite of the ambitions of Venice and the Hungarian Kings through the centuries.\textsuperscript{528} Two periods of a greater influx of Florentines are to be observed. In the first half of the fourteenth century, which coincides with the peak period of the Bardi, Peruzzi (1319 Andreas di Seno de Florentiae, Taddeus Riccis de Florentia, merchants and agents of the Florentine Peruzzi company), the Acciaiuoli, and Buonaccorsi companies. The second period is most probably due to both the Angevin rule in the Adriatic and the economic crisis in Tuscany, including Prato.\textsuperscript{529} Due to this, in the early fifteenth century, when Dubrovnik was under the protection of the Hungarian king, Sigismund of Luxemburg, a notable Prato community appeared in Ragusa. Their presence covers the same time period, which saw Prato businessmen in greater numbers also in Hungary, such as the Melanesi brothers. This Dubrovnik community of Prato origin included industrials, setting up cloth manufacture, merchant-bankers, and also urban notaries, which is a clearly distinguishing feature compared to their ambitions in the urban environment of Buda.\textsuperscript{530} In Buda, learned persons from

\textsuperscript{526} See Vaggio del Maza Giuseppi, ASF, \textit{ Catasto} 1427, 26. fol. 1083v.

\textsuperscript{527} Rita Mazzei, \textit{Itinerar mercatorum}, 28.


Prato, like Giovanni di Piero Melanesi were rather linked to the imperial *aula* of Sigismund of Luxemburg, than to local urban environment in Hungary.

The Dalmatian ports and some inland cities along the trade routes also took an increasingly prominent role in Florentine-Hungarian commercial exchange as intermediate centers. As such, the Dalmatian port cities were the first to experience an increasing number of Florentines in a first phase of expansion. Senj is of utmost importance, well-known already earlier to Florentines, due to the Frankopan dynasty, hereditary counts of Senj, who had traditionally close relations with Florence and Florentine banking houses. With the expansion of long distance trade towards Central Europe, according to the information of the *Florentine Catasto*, in Senj a basic, but necessary business infrastructure was also built up. For instance the Florentine money changer Aghostino d’ Antonio di messer Gieri supplied there his fellow businessmen passing by the town on their way to the inland region of Central Europe, along the route of Zagreb, towards Buda and Cracow.\(^{531}\) Zadar, on the other hand, attracted the Florentines due to both its role as important maritime port and the royal salt and mint chamber established there.\(^ {532}\) As in the case of other Dalmatian ports, also local language favored integration which, according to some records, also manifested in a few examples of marriage into local noble families.\(^ {533}\)

In Ptuj and Ljubljana the Italian merchants and craftsmen as new ethnic element began to increase considerably only from the end of the fifteenth century onwards as recent research shows, and became integrated much faster into the town population and its Slovene-German bipolarity.\(^ {534}\) The Styrian route from Vienna through Ptuj became more important in the early 16th century, with the increasing Ottoman threat in East-Central Europe. After 1513, the year of the privileges of Ptuj, the Florentines established warehouses in the town, which then played an important role in storing the cloth destined for the Buda market.\(^ {535}\)

Among the main inland centers hosting a number of Florentines particularly in the first half of the fifteenth century Oradea, Sibiu, the Transylvanian seats of salt chambers, Pressburg and finally Buda figure from the 1370s with rather modest Italian, mainly Florentine communities. Pressburg’s role would be comprehensible if only taking into consideration the thirtieth custom office in the town. However, the town did not lie along the main trade route connecting Italy with East Central Europe, and it was quite close to Buda and Vienna; this may have been a decisively unfavorable factor impeding that a larger flow of Florentines would settle there. At any rate, one

---

\(^{531}\) ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 54. fol. 122r.

\(^{532}\) On commercial cooperation of Florentines living in Zadar and Buda see Budak, “I fiorentini”, 689.

\(^{533}\) MNL OL DL 73919. Dec. 13, 1410. Filippo Scolari issued a confirmation stating that Matteo Baldi twice married into local Sibiu burgher families, and bought and renewed his house in the town from his own funds.


Florentine family, the Venturi, settled in the town at the turn of the fourteenth century, and the second and third generations of this family became one of the most influential merchant dynasties of Pressburg, with large real estates in the town, almost a whole street, which still today bears their name and preserves their memory.\textsuperscript{536}

Most of the regional urban centers, be them trade hubs along the major trade routes or royal, ecclesiastical centers etc., addressed in the previous paragraphs did not host significant Florentine/Tuscan communities in the fifteenth century with the exception of the Dalmatian port cities, Zagreb and Dubrovnik. At the same time, however, most of them had a numerous German population, and a few of them, like Vienna, had a major flow of South German merchants too, establishing themselves in the city. Yet, Buda seems to be the only east Central-European center, which was targeted by flows of both the South German and Florentine merchant diasporas from the last decades of the fourteenth century and through the fifteenth century, as has been demonstrated in the previous subchapters. Therefore Buda seems to have functioned a kind of “borderline” regional urban center, where direct contacts, at occasions even cooperation was documented between these two foreign merchant communities, which did not appear to have had direct contacts elsewhere, except for Venice.

In the following paragraphs I intend to investigate the features of the sojourn and eventual integration of the Florentines in those urban centers in the Hungarian kingdom, where memory on their presence was in any way preserved. Knowledge on all these aspects will contribute to a better understanding of not only Florentine trade and business, but of these urban centers as well. In fact, these factors can also be perceived as additional indicators for the better assessment of the changing position of these urban settlements within a regional economic system.

The organized Florentine nations in Western Europe, as Francesco Guidi Bruscoli observed, isolated their members from the local population in social (endogamy), juridical (nations with extra territorial rights) even linguistic and also in urban topographical terms, The latter is manifested in specific toponyms.

In Central Europe, like elsewhere, there are urban toponyms which apparently hint to such isolation from the twelfth century onwards. “\textit{Vicus}” or “\textit{civitas latinorum}” appear also in Esztergom, Fehérvár, Eger, Oradea or not surprisingly in Senj.\textsuperscript{537} Of course, in this early period the precise provenance of these foreign social clusters, denominated as Latins is impossible to determine. In a

\textsuperscript{536} Majorossy, “A Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás”, 259; See also Judit Majorossy and Katalin Szende ed., \textit{Das Pressburger Protocollum Testamentorum. 1410 (1427) – 1529} (Vienna: Böhlaus Verlag, 2010), 26, 72, 84-85 etc.

later period, however, in Zagreb there was “vicus latinorum”, an earlier urban structure, a street mentioned first in 1198. The free royal town Gradec, founded in 1242, hosted a larger Latin community (many members of the community were of Florentine origin), which supported the Angevins’ claim to the Hungarian throne already in 1290.538

However, comparing these data to the information on the late medieval case of Buda with its Platea Italicorum, the latter clearly does not support the idea of topographical isolation of a foreign Italian – as we already know, prevalently Florentine – community despite the toponym, because, as recent research pointed out, the late medieval street of Italians in Buda was not mainly inhabited by Italians, among them Florentines and no distinguished Florentine colony was living there for sure. 539

No hints to such clustering are manifest in contemporary records. Therefore, toponyms indicating ethnic provenance may refer to an initial evolution of the urban clusters, but the toponyms preserved in some cases over centuries do not necessarily reflect the late medieval situation in certain urban centers, and therefore, they are not sufficient indicators of ethnic clusters in local urban environment. Therefore, also other indicators need to be formulated and analyzed.

Such an indicator is the political representation of ethnic groups in regional urban centers. Buda’s case has been analyzed in detail. Also in Cluj German-Hungarian urban shared governance was instituted. Zilina is another example of an ethnically divided town council.540 Zagreb’s case is particular: in Hungary Zagreb is the only town, where clearly an Italian, first Venetian, then mainly Florentine diaspora can be identified, which beyond having real estates, married among themselves (with other Italian families of Zagreb), held urban offices, was eligible as member of the Latin nation and can be detected in the town and in Hungary for more generations.541 If one looks at the names of members of the Latin nation of Gradec, then, however, it is to be noted that none of the Florentines can be ranked among the Florentine international merchant-bankers. After 1377, when a royal decree granted that one-quarter of the councilors be chosen from among the Italians, the ethnic clustering of Croats, Hungarians, Latins and Germans became manifest in the council. In other words, the Florentine-Latin colony of Zagreb was handled as a distinct political and ethnic group. Of course, it involved also ethnic controversies: in Zagreb in 1390 members of the Latin

538 Budak, “I fiorentini nella Slavonia”, 683; Bruno Škreblin, “Ethnic groups in Zagreb’s Gradec in the late middle ages,” in Review of Croatian History 9 (2013): 25-59, here 32-33.; Škreblin’s analysis on Zagreb’s “Porta Latina” and the social topographical aspects of the town are of interest for this chapter. He confirms that no “specific ethnic quarters” could be identified in Zagreb, See ibid. 47-49.
539 Végh, Buda város, I. 245-247.
541 Budak, “I fiorentini nella Slavonia”, 687; See also Škreblin, “Ethnic groups”.
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colony murdered the judge who came from the Hungarian community, which resulted in the temporary expulsion of Latins from urban offices.\(^{542}\)

The acquisition of urban citizenship as a crucial feature of the Florentines’ sojourn in urban centers was at times a prerequisite to retail trade, and therefore vital for foreign merchants. According to the database, 49\% of the Florentines who held any town citizenship in Hungary had that of Buda during the reign of King Sigismund. In general and when not absolutely necessary, however, Florentines did not aspire to obtain it, as it has been seen in the case of Buda, where the royal grant of retail trade for Italians rendered urban citizenship unnecessary and consequently the number of Florentine citizens of Buda dropped. The same is to be observed in the case of Zadar with the remark that the foundation of the royal salt chamber and its lease influenced a more intensive presence of Florentines there in the 1380-1390s.\(^{543}\) In fact, last wills of at least Zadar inhabitants of Florentine origin and those of their families have been preserved.\(^{544}\)

The situation in Split from the late fourteenth century onwards shows a different picture, a minor, but stable presence of Florentines, among them also members of wealthy lineages, like the Peruzzi, Albizzi and Cambi, the latter acquiring also the citizenship, whereas the others were residents, habitators.\(^{545}\) Among the habitators also “Laurencio Pacini de Florentia habitatore Spaleti” and “Nicola Bilse Cipriani examinatore” are listed.\(^{546}\) The immobile assets in Split inherited by Renieri Davanzati from his grandfather, who was citizen of Split, also figure in his Florentine catasto.\(^{547}\)

\(^{542}\) Budak, “I fiorentini nella Slavonia”, 685.

\(^{543}\) See the case of Zadar in Raukar, “I fiorentini in Dalmazia”, 660. In 1317-1350 8 habiter and 1 civis was recorded in the town. Four of them were apparently apothecari. The others were interested in salt trade, bearing offices of salt chamber, one master of the moneta. Both Cione Macigni and Antonio di Luca da Panzano were known as working in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary, on Antonio di Luca da Panzano also see Anthony Molho, “Profilo Biografico”, in Brighe, affanni, volgimenti di Stato: le ricordanze quattrocentesche di Luca di Matteo di Luca dei Firidolfi da Panzano ed. Molho, Anthony- Franek Sznura (Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2010), XIII.-XXIV.

\(^{544}\) Iacobus condam Ricouri de Florentia’s wife, Državni arhiv u Zadru [State Archives of Zadar]

\(^{545}\) Raukar, “I fiorentini in Dalmazia”, 677. note nr. 55, and 679.

\(^{546}\) On Cipriani see recently Suzanne Mariko Miller, Venice in the east Adriatic: experiences and experiments in colonial rule in Dalmatia and Istria (c. 1150-1358) (Stanford University, 2007), 187.

\(^{547}\) Bettarini, “I fiorentini all’estero”, 44.
Contrary to the previous examples, the majority of the Florentines of Zagreb’s Latin community in all probability had the citizenship of the town; they also obtained political representation, as shown above. Their community, however, came to an existence earlier, and had prevalingly persons of more modest economic background compared to both Split or Buda. Dubrovnik, again, was in a particular situation, similar to Buda, with a major Florentine, mainly Prato diaspora, whose members were of various social and economic background and fields of interest.548

As has already been observed in the case of Florentines holding offices of the royal administration, it seems that one can encounter Florentines working regularly in more than one town and having the citizenship of each, like the Talenti brothers, Giovanni acquiring the citizenship of both Košice and Zadar, whereas his brother, Simone had the citizenship of Košice, Pest and Pécs in Hungary.549 But when the business possibilities diminished they returned home even from Zagreb where after 1437 prominent members of the Latin nation, like the Attavanti, turned back to Florence, selling off all mobile and immobile assets. Single members of Florentine origin acquiring main urban offices can also be detected in the Transylvanian towns Sibiu and Cluj.550

Most towns hosting Florentines, besides Buda, are mining, minting and trade centers. Sibiu (Szeben, Romania) shows the important trading direction towards the East European areas. Sibiu’s citizenship was indispensable for this direction. Moreover, the importance of the mining and minting chamber in Sibiu increased in the first half of the fifteenth century and also the nearby minting chambers like Baia Mare attracted businessmen, and a few of them established themselves and integrated into local patrician families through marriage in the Saxon communities of these towns. They had houses and estates in the most important local towns, and in a few cases we can follow the activity of their descendants in the area throughout the century as we will see in the following chapter on integration.551

Among ecclesiastic centers, mainly Oradea, as bishopric seat hosted Florentines in greater numbers.552 During Sigismund’s reign alone three Florentines invested Hungarian bishoprics for longer periods, presumably for economic reasons and had their agents there. Also the developing permanent royal courts and residential towns increasingly attracted Florentines (and Italians in general) to their territory as it was shown in the case of Buda.

551 MNL OL DL 73919. April 8, 1408.
Finally, the adoption of local vernacular, different from the mother tongue of the members of a diaspora can also be regarded an integrative force, although East Central Europe in the late Middle Ages is generally characterized by a marked multilingualism also in written evidences.\textsuperscript{553} Tendencies of assimilation can be observed only in a later, early modern phase, in specific cases, such as the situation in sixteenth-century Cracow.\textsuperscript{554} Cracow, in fact, followed a different pattern as far as integration of foreigners is concerned. After a phase marked by a multilingual and multiethnic urban elite, a changing tendency of extreme integration and unification is to be observed in sixteenth-century Cracow, where the representatives of the urban governing elite tended to assimilate and to adopt the Polish language by 1548.\textsuperscript{555} Contrary to Cracow, in late medieval Buda urban authorities tended to use Latin and German in their writings.

Of course, the Dalmatian cities and Ragusa are not suitable to such analysis on Florentines at all, as different Italian dialects were widely spoken in these towns. In other urban centers the rare evidence of bilingualism of Florentines are confined to the use of Italian vernacular/Latin, not surprisingly, as the latter, rather than a spoken vernacular, was the language used in writing.\textsuperscript{556} This can be observed in the activity of the officers of the royal chambers, who among themselves used the Italian vernacular, whereas they had a Latin correspondence with their noble retainers (\textit{familiaris}) and clients of local origin and used Latin in their local legal affairs, too. A bilingual letter by Agnolo Bardi/Manini, count to the salt chamber of Máramaros to his kinsman, Odoardo Manini and Máté of Szeged, counts to the salt chambers of Sic and Dej survived. The main text addressed to both counts of chamber, orders the restitution of salt taken illegally by them from a person and was written in Latin. On the contrary, the postscription was meant for Odoardo Manini, is in Italian vernacular, and invited Odoardo to comply with the order in eventual absence of Máté of Szeged.\textsuperscript{557} Here the use of vernacular seems to have served to put a stronger emphasis on the order issued by Agnolo towards Odoardo. Thus, the isolating force of the mother tongue is present in the choice of language use in this case. It is the same Agnolo, a few letters of whom in Italian to Pape Manini

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Katalin Szende, “Integration Through Language: The Multilingual Character of Late Medieval Hungarian Towns,” in \textit{Segregation-Integration-Assimilation}, 205-233.}
\footnote{Miller, “Urban Societies”, 53.}
\footnote{Katalin Szende, “Integration Through Language”, 209-213.}
\footnote{MNL OL DL 44535, Odoardo to Pape Manini, Oct.? 9, 1448; DL, 44536, Angello Bardi[?] to Pape Manini, March? 22, 1448; DL 44537, Odoardo to Pape Manini, July 19, 1448; DL 44503, March 27, 1448; DL 44504. Odoardo to Pape Manini, March 8, 1448. Letters in Italian by Odoardo Manini to Pape Manini from 1448. In Latin see their legal despute with locals, MNL OL DL 36392.; See also the bilingual letter by Agnolo count to the salt chamber of Máramaros to Máté Szegedi and Odoardo [Manini] counts to the salt chambers of Dej and Sich. see MNL OL DL 44490. Dec. 14, 1447.}
\end{footnotes}
survived.\textsuperscript{558} The documents handle all kinds of official, private business and personal matters related to the family and broader kin of course.

As shown so far, the Manini family/kin group is of utmost interest for the purposes of this analysis, because, as we could see, fortunately several records of the Manini were preserved in the archives of the Kállay family, probably through the second marriage of the above mentioned Odoardo’s widow. Among these records, a surprising written evidence, a letter survived from Francesco Manini. The document was compiled in Florence in Tuscan dialect, which was addressed to John Lökös of Kállai, the new husband of the also Hungarian wife of his deceased brother, Odoardo. Francesco shortly addressed the legal dispute among his kinsmen in Hungary over the inheritance of the late Odoardo and offered in the name of the Florentine kin to take over the responsibility for Anna, the daughter of his deceased brother, even proposing to raise her in Florence.\textsuperscript{559} In this case Manini obviously supposed that the Hungarian “\textit{parenti}” could cope with the Tuscan dialect he used in his letter. There is also evidence on Hungarian words in written evidence related to Florentines. Such is the letter by Dezső of Losoncz, voivode of Transylvania, addressed to Giovanni Manini.\textsuperscript{560} Losonczi commissioned the Florentine businessman to procure some precious silk textiles for him and gave the type of the textile also in Hungarian vernacular “\textit{wlgo sprengselem}”, which is not all sorare in written records, but it implies, that Manini was familiar with the Hungarian word.


\textsuperscript{559} MNL OL \textit{DL} 45004. March 20, 1462. The handwriting is extremely elaborate compared the usual mercantesca writings, which hints to an addressee with lesser capability in reading the cursive merchant handwriting. The letter is a response to a previous one sent by the Hungarian relatives, apparently seeking support in their despute with Agnolo at Francesco.

\textsuperscript{560} Dezső of Losoncz to Giovanni Manini, MNL OL \textit{DL} 55216. July 18, 1440; \textit{DL} 55218. July 26, 1440.
4.6. Conclusions

The Florentine diaspora in Venice played a crucial role in covering the area’s business possibilities. The Venetian branches of Florentine banking houses provided the necessary banking facilities for the region. At the same time no institutionalized Florentine colony seems to have been established in the region: Very few cases of exogamy and integration are revealed in the records. Ethnic provenance appearing in urban toponyms, like the “vicus latinorum, platea italicorum” etc. were present in several towns, although Buda’s case shows, that this alone must not be overestimated as a crucial indicator for ethnic clustering of Italians/Florentines in late medieval urban centers of Central Europe. It, however, hints to a relatively dense presence of Italians in the given urban environment in a certain (probably early) phase of urban evolution. Therefore, also other factors shall be evaluated as possible indicators of a more precise assessment of possible presence of Italian/Florentine diasporas in the regional centers.

When taking a closer look at Central European towns with a relatively stable presence of Florentine families in the first half of fifteenth century, no long-term settlement or integration of the Florentines can be observed. The citizenship they acquired, in case the local rules compelled them to do so, did not lead to real integration as shown by the rare cases of marriage into local families. The Florentines in Buda definitely rank among the international merchant elite of Florentine origin, whose intensive presence is confined to favorable political-economic moments of the given regional centers. It was vital for this elite to remain flexible and follow the changes in the possibilities provided by the foreign environment, building up a very dynamic and also quite temporary diaspora at certain times.

Also the presence of established Florentine companies can be considered an important indicator when evaluating the position of an urban center in economic context. The information on the three Florentine partnerships with seat in Buda in the 1420s, analyzed at length in the previous chapter makes Buda the only east Central-European trading centre with such an intensive Florentine presence in this period. The next town to host a Florentine company was Nuremberg with the earliest reference in 1512. The presence of Florentine partnerships in Cracow also dates to the sixteenth century. Buda’s outstanding role is confirmed by the role the city played as a stable meeting point with the South German merchant diaspora.

Contrary to Buda, the Latin community of Zagreb, (also an important hub along the main inland trade route), an earlier formation from the end of the thirteenth century and made up prevailingy of

Italians/mainly Florentines disposing of lesser assets, many artisans among them, seems to have been clearly identified as an ethnic cluster within the urban community. The Latins of Zagreb also ambitioned and acquired urban political representation as the town’s “Latin nation” in a peak period from the last decades of the fourteenth century to the first half of the fifteenth century. This may be interpreted as a conscious endeavor on their part to participate and along with that also integrate into the local urban community, which is further confirmed by the higher number of marriage alliances with local families from other ethnic clusters of the town. Integration seems to have been favored by Florentines holding offices in the royal financial administration in the main administration centers of the kingdom, probably due to the duties their office involved. Therefore single merchants settled in this environment and even married into local burgher or noble families, but of course, no major communities or diasporas formed in most of these settlements due to the relatively less urbanized and socially-economically less developed area. As a consequence, this activity attracted a lower number of entrepreneurs, in cases even disposing of lesser capital, mainly agents into the region.
V. Social and economic background of the Florentine families

In this chapter, my aim is to analyze the role that the closer and extended family played in the activity of the Florentine businessmen working in the Kingdom of Hungary in the first half of the fifteenth century. I shall focus on the extent and characteristics of co-operation among the members of a kin belonging to both the same and to the consecutive generations, and compare these features to the business organisation of Florentine merchant families operating in their homeland. Finally, the business strategies of earlier generations will also be considered in order to suggest why these families chose to establish their business in Hungary.

Eight families have been selected as the main objects of this study: Panciatichi, Buondelmonti, Corsini, Melanesi, Lamberteschi, Attavante (in some documents also written as “Ottavanti”), Noffri and Manini. The basis of this selection is, firstly, that both their activity in Hungary and the history of their family ties in Florence is unusually well documented. Secondly, these families represent a cross-section of Florentine merchant families regarding wealth. The Panciatichi belonged to the wealthiest families in Florence in the early fourteenth century. The Buondelmonti and Corsini families were of high social status but at that time in a somewhat weakened financial situation. At the opposite end of the scale, the Attavante family was recorded in the Catasto of 1427 as “miserabile”.

The history of these families can be reconstructed from a puzzle of data taken from a number of sources as has been shown in the introductory part of the dissertation.
5.1. Individual and lineage in late medieval Florence

The business success of the Florentine mercantile companies involved in long-distance trade depended to a great extent on the capabilities and initiative of the individual. These personal qualities were strongly promoted and cultivated within the Florentine merchant families. Their means ranged from the early emancipation of the members of the consecutive generations via the matriculation of young sons into guilds, to the provision of their young offspring with a start capital that would enable them to embark upon their own business activity, if this was within the power of the family. The experience, strategies and solidarity provided by the closer and wider family and kin played a notable role in the success of their younger members. On the other hand, a marked individualism was crucial for the future and economic security of the family itself, as David Herlihy has pointed out. For the better understanding of these families’ motivations in Hungary a short overview of the history and historiography of Florentine family and kinship seems to be legitimate. The extensive scholarly literature on medieval household and kinship in Florence examined the changes in the relationship of private family structures to public sphere and structures, to economic-professional structures in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Also the forms and fields of solidarity among the members of the kinship have always been a central issue analysed through manifold (socio-legal, quantitative, gender-driven, anthropological etc.) approaches.

The Florentine urban elite kinship *casa* or *consorteria* included all those having the same surname. The leadership over the whole clan could shift from one to the other collateral branch

---

from time to time and depended to a great extent on personal qualities, experiences and success. In
the mid-fourteenth century the chief of the “consorteria” had the competence to decide over
business, factional and social questions.565 These patrilineal (agnatic) kin groups generally did not
differentiate between senior and cadet descendants and were often characterised by the management
of (at times partially) joint revenues.566 They even resided in the same area of the city occupying
whole streets and areas of districts. This agnatic kindred as a collective group appears in various
kinds of written evidences from private diaries of Florentine merchants, which have been preserved
from the thirteenth century onwards through treatises, legislative sources dealing with judicial
responsibilities, up to notarial and financial administrative sources such as fiscal declarations.
Finally, also the household, the nuclear family including servants and slaves living under the same
roof appears in written evidences as “familia”.

This agnatic descendent group appears in various kinds of written evidence: private diaries of
Florentine merchants, which have been preserved from the thirteenth century onwards, treatises,
legislative sources dealing with judicial responsibilities, and notarial and financial administrative
sources such as fiscal declarations. The integrity and solidarity of the members of the same lineage
is often explicitly expressed also in private ricordanze.567

The joint responsibility of the consorteria was codified in urban legislation against nepotism in the
most lucrative and sensitive urban offices, such as the officials of the Monte Comune (the public
debt). Such legal sources consider the patrilineal kin as a political and economic interest group.568
The lineage as a financial-economic unit may also be detected in a law from 1425, which
pronounced the joint responsibility of the lineage for the individual’s prompt payment of tax.
Moreover, it pronounced the right of pre-emption in favour of the members of the lineage group
when the real estate of tax delinquents in Florence was confiscated.569

Beyond the collective financial responsibility codified in legal sources, however, as most scholars
underline, the members of Florentine lineages were strongly encouraged by the family and kin
group to launch independent activity and to clarify the possessions of the individual in every case.

(thereafter: Lansing, The Florentine Magnates); John M. Najemy, A History of Florence 1200-1575 (Oxford: Blackwell,
565 David Herlihy, La famiglia, 116.
566 Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, “Kinship”, 208; Najemy, A History of Florence, Chapter 8. Family and State in the Age
of the Consensus, 219-249.
567 Pitti, Ricordi, 497.
568 Molho, Florentine Public Finances, 121–122.; on the Monte Comune see ibidem, 63–73.
569 Ibidem, 105.
They did not tend to run joint business ventures, but if they did so, they were keen on determining clearly the partition of ownership related to the given company.\textsuperscript{570}

In the course of the fifteenth century lineage and its role were also affected by the decrease in number of member branches of lineages.\textsuperscript{571} Anthony Molho in his fundamental study on marriage in late medieval Florence based on the quantitative analysis of the records of the Florentine Dowry Fund (\textit{Monte delle Doti}), could in fact demonstrate that the arranged marriages and the institution of this government-sponsored fund promoted marriages in fifteenth-century Florence and so diminish the depopulation among the propertied Florentine merchant families and kin groups.\textsuperscript{572}

Although Florentines were particularly attached to the male or agnatic kindred, they were clearly conscious of the matrilineal (cognate) and affine (relatives by marriage) kinships, too.\textsuperscript{573} The importance of honourable marriages is explicitly formulated by Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli in his \textit{Ricordi}.

Kinsmen on the mother’s side, the so-called \textit{parenti} could even act as arbiters in family matters, such as the settlement of debts, appraisal of dowries and partition of estates as well as eventual inheritance questions which emerged within the wider kin group.\textsuperscript{575} The increasing role of the \textit{parenti} may also be linked to the custom that most men married relatively late. As a consequence, there was a significant age difference between the spouses, who may even have belonged to different generations.\textsuperscript{576} Legislative sources from the mid-fifteenth century include the maternal lineage, the \textit{parentado} or \textit{parentela}, to the fourth degree in the kin group which was

\textsuperscript{570} Herlihy, “The Florentine Merchant Family”, 212.
\textsuperscript{572} Anthony Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance in Late Medieval Florence} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994) (hereafter: Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance}).
\textsuperscript{574} “… but try to contract marriages with good citizens, not impoverished ones, who are merchants and do not perform exaggerated things. They should be descendants of antique families in your town, they should be honoured by the Comune and they should be Guelf, they should not have any attaint of being traitors, burglars or homicide or bastard or any other things which are shameful and dishonourable.” trans. from the original Italian: “… ma guarda d’imparentarti con buoni cittadini, i quali non sieno bisognosi e sieno mercatanti e non usino maggiorie. Sieno antichi nella città tua, sieno onorati dal Comune and sieno Guelfi, and non abbinno alcuna macula, come di traditori o di ladro o di micio o di bastardo discesi, o d’altre cose che sono di rimprovero e di vergogna.” Morelli, \textit{Ricordi}, 168. Interestingly enough his second wife, Gherardo Buondelmonti’s daughter, Donna Drea does not figure in the \textit{Ricordanze}, although they married in 1416. Her last will from 1448 survived in the documents of the notary, ser Agnolo di Piero di Tommaso di Terranuova in \textit{Croniche di Giovanni di Iacopo and di Lionardo di Lorenzo Morelli}, published and of annotation and of ancient monuments accresciute, ed illustrate da Frate Ildefonso di San Luigi Carmelitano della Provincia di Toscana Accademico Fiorentino (Florence: 1785) (hereafter: \textit{Croniche di Giovanni di Iacopo Morelli}) CXLIII-CXIV: Giovanni di Pagolo Morelli, \textit{Ricordi}, 168.
\textsuperscript{576} Klapisch-Zuber, \textit{Women, Family}, 86.
collectively responsible for the actions of its members.\textsuperscript{577} This hints at a major shift in the juridical definition of kinship in fifteenth-century Florence, where, as Giovanni Rucellai wrote in his \textit{Zibaldone}, the members of the ruling stratum were all linked by marriages.\textsuperscript{578}

Since I mainly use the documentation of Florentine fiscal households in order to reconstruct the wider families of the merchants working in the Hungarian realm, I have selected the fiscal declarations of households with a common family name.\textsuperscript{579} Thus the analysis relies mainly on information about the patrilineal kin group of these entrepreneurs.\textsuperscript{580} This is the basis for determining a sort of fiscal household with its lists of \textit{bocche} or \textit{teste} which quite often – when other written evidence is also available – turns out to be a legal entity, rather than families living under the same roof.\textsuperscript{581} Also, the fiscal households appearing in the \textit{Florentine Catasto} may not have worked in every case as solidal lineages or even may have only made up a part of a larger kin group cooperating in business activity in Hungary which implies certain insecurity. Therefore, one should handle the lineages reconstructed in this way cautiously. In case the source material or genealogical literature enabled me, I also tried to identify at least the closest “\textit{parenti}” that is affines, relatives by marriage as well to see their eventual role in the business activity of these merchants.

In the following pages, I first investigate the means of co-operation and solidarity of the Florentine kin groups towards those of their members who were operating in remote countries. The analysis focuses on the attitudes of the Florentine merchant families and lineage groups towards any joint business activity. I investigate how many members of smaller and larger kin groups participated in the same business venture, company and geographical area, and to what extent they co-operated. I also discuss the question of joint households and joint revenues, as well as the role that the experience and activity of the previous generations in the business of these families in Hungary may have played. Finally, I address the strategies of consecutive generations of these families, a few of

\textsuperscript{577} Klapisch-Zuber, “Kinship”, 213.
\textsuperscript{578} Giovanni Rucellai, \textit{Zibaldone Quaresimale} quoted in Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance}, 343. n. 83.
\textsuperscript{579} On the risks and possibilities of the reconstruction of lineages on the basis of fiscal households bearing the same surnames see Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance}, 203; Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, \textit{Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy} (University of Chicago Press, 1987), 25 (hereafter: Klapisch-Zuber, \textit{Women, Family}).
\textsuperscript{581} On the risks and possibilities of the reconstruction of lineages on the basis of fiscal households bearing the same surnames see Molho, \textit{Marriage Alliance}, 203; Klapisch, \textit{Women, Family}, 25.
whom settled permanently in Hungary whereas most of them returned to their homeland after a shorter or longer Hungarian sojourn.

The very limited number of families in this investigation poses the major risk of drawing too generalized conclusions on the basis of some individual cases. However, very few families and kin groups are documented well enough to permit wider analysis. Therefore, while the results need to be handled with extreme caution, they may provide useful insights into the economic and social attitudes of Florentine families operating abroad.
5.2. Family economy at home and abroad

I begin this section by presenting some basic information on the financial and social standing of the lineages in Florence, based on their tax returns and confronted with the related Hungarian source material. This will serve as a background to the roles and activity of the analysed families and kin groups.

The economic and social standing back in Florence of the Panciatichi and Melanesi families in Florence were already addressed in the chapter on the Buda partnerships. The older generation of the Lamberteschi lineage also counted among the wealthy. Bernardo di Lamberto Lamberteschi, who invested in the Hungarian business of his fellow kinsmen, appears in 1427 with a taxable wealth of 43,327 florins.\footnote{ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 199r–204v.} His financial potential is clearly indicated by the fact that even in the financial crisis in Florence of 1430 to 1432, which was caused by a scarcity of liquid capital, he and his company could lend some 34,825 florins to the Florentine Signoria.\footnote{Molho, Florentine Public Finances, 180–181.} At the same time, also Andrea di Tommaso Lamberteschi invested in the trading activity of his sons Giovanni and Niccoló in Hungary. With taxable assets amounting to 1584 florins, he ranked among the merchants with middling financial potential in Florence,\footnote{ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 84r–93v.} while his sons, despite their privileged position at the court of King Sigismund, possessed no taxable wealth in 1427, according to their separate fiscal declaration.\footnote{ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 1039r–1039v; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199.} By 1431, however, as the subsequent declarations confirm, also the father’s financial situation worsened. As one of his business partners stated, he apparently went bankrupt.\footnote{See Cinello d’Ambruogio’s declaration ASF, Catasto 1430, 358. fol. 247r.} In the following years Andrea di Tommaso Lamberteschi lost most of his landed property, the major part of it being sold by the Florentine ufficiali del Monte to his kinsman, Bernardo, to cover his overdue taxes.\footnote{ASF, Catasto 1438, 486. fol. 53r.}

The Buondelmonti belonged to the ancient magnate lineages of Florence. This lineage represents a unique case. They were not involved in any major trading activity. Instead, a great part of their wealth and income was based on real estate and on joint revenues from rights of ecclesiastical patronage.\footnote{Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 4. On the right of ecclesiastical patronage in Italy see Roberto Bizzocchi, Chiesa e potere nella Toscana del Quattrocento. Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1987) Filippo Luigi Polidori, Vite di illustri italiani: inedite o rare con illustrazioni (Florence: Vieusseux, 1843), 179.} At least three members of the lineage were active in Hungary between 1387 and 1437.\footnote{ASF, Catasto 1438, 486. fol. 53r.} Gherardo Buondelmonti traded in Hungary, but by the year of the first Catasto he was dead, while his son, Giovanni, declared taxable assets of 439 florins. Most of his possessions were
real estates valued at 1650 florins.\textsuperscript{990} Most of the householders, however, declared a taxable wealth of less than 1000 florins, which seems to confirm the general economic decline of the lineage in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{991} Another member of the lineage, Andrea di Lorenzo, appears twice in the sources as an envoy to Hungary, in 1396 commissioned by the Florentine Signoria and in 1412 as Pope John XXIII’s legate.\textsuperscript{992} His son, the young Giovanni di Andrea, later became archbishop of Kalocsa.\textsuperscript{993} He was bought out by his brothers in 1416 after the death of their father, one of the wealthiest members of his kin, in 1403.\textsuperscript{994}

In contrast to the Buondelmonti kinsmen presented above, the young Corsini brothers were in a poor economic situation in 1429 when they were emancipated, enrolled at the Mercanzia, and sent to Buda as apprentices to the Piaciatrici and Melanesi companies by their father, Giovanni di Matteo.\textsuperscript{995} The Corsini banking house was among the Florentine banks that went bankrupt in 1425 because of their enormous credits to the Florentine state.\textsuperscript{996} So, like Giovanni di Bartolomeo Piaciatrici and Andrea di Tommaso Lambeteschi, Giovanni Corsini had lost most of his wealth in the 1420s.\textsuperscript{997}

According to the fiscal documents, we find Filippo di Simone Capponi and the Attavante family and kin at the other end of the economic scale. The Piaciatricis’ kinsman and correspondent in Buda, Filippo di Simone Capponi of the renowned Capponi family, was already working in Hungary in 1412.\textsuperscript{998} Capponi defined himself in the \textit{Catasto as fattore}, a salaried business representative.\textsuperscript{999} He did not declare any public or private investments, which was partly due to his absence from Florence, but also suggests that he did not work independently. His declaration reflects the picture of the impoverished businessman living in a joint household with his brother, who was probably a bachelor. However, this picture is presumably somewhat distorted, because it is quite difficult to imagine that, being so poor, he could still marry the daughter of one of the most prominent Florentine businessmen, Bartolomeo Piaciatrici.\textsuperscript{600} In Hungarian sources Capponi

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[990]{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 74. fol. 40r–40v.}
\footnotetext[991]{Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 16–17.}
\footnotetext[992]{ASF, Signori, Dieci di Balia, Lettere – Legazioni and Commissarie 2. fol. 17v. Apr. 25, 1396; ZsO III/ 2139, May 15, 1412.}
\footnotetext[993]{István Katona, \textit{A kalocsai érseki egyház története} [The history of the bishopric of Kalocsa] (Kalocsa, 2001), 228–232. See on him Chapter 4.6 of the present dissertation and the entry in the prosopograhic database.}
\footnotetext[994]{Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 21.}
\footnotetext[995]{Petrucci, \textit{Ricordanze dei Corsini}, 130–131; Herlihy-Klapisch, \textit{I toscani}, 783; Luigi Passerini, \textit{Genealogia e storia della famiglia Corsini}, 1858.}
\footnotetext[996]{Molho, \textit{Florentine Public Finances}, 153.}
\footnotetext[997]{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 66. fol. 106.}
\footnotetext[999]{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 17. fol. 479v–481v.}
\footnotetext[600]{Luigi Passerini, \textit{Genealogia e storia della famiglia Piaciatrici}, (Florence, 1858), 76.}
\end{footnotes}
figures as “Fülöp Kapun”, providing large sums on credit to King Sigismund, and obtaining privileges from him in return. It is therefore reasonable to assume that his real financial situation may not have been as bad as his fiscal declaration suggests.\footnote{ZsO VI/1910, May 14, 1418; No. 2369, Sept. 24, 1418.}

The Attavanti family, also of distinguished origin, coming from the neighbouring Castelfiorentino, was apparently also impoverished by the 1430s. They declared no taxable wealth, which was confirmed by the 	extit{officials of the Catasto}. Both Leonardo di Domenico Attavante, working in Hungary as collector of the thirtieth, and his brother Cristofano together with their mother were ranked among the 	extit{miserabili}, with no taxable assets at all.\footnote{ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 76. fol. 382v; [e]redi di Domenico di Bartolo Attavanti, ASF, \textit{Catasto} 1427, 45. fol. 706r.} This again implies the uncertainty of any conclusions based exclusively on information in the \textit{Catasto}. Leonardo di Domenico stayed in Hungary at least from 1427 until 1439. He was at first an agent of the Carnesecchi–Fronte company of Buda and later officer of the thirtieth in Zagreb, employed by Giovanni di Noffri. He had immovable property in the town of Zagreb and held town offices there.\footnote{Teke. “Firenzi kereskedőtársaságok”, 206; Budak, “I fiorentinti”, 691.} In 1439, Leonardo sold his properties and returned to Florence.\footnote{Budak, “I fiorentinti”, 691.}

The prominent merchant family of the Manini is also present in the documents of the \textit{Catasto} of 1427; however, none of the kinsmen working in Hungary in the following decades can be clearly identified in the records. Finally, no fiscal declarations by the members of the “Noffri” family figure in this archival fond. At the present stage of research it is not even possible to identify the family. The only information in the \textit{Catasto} concerns the father and founder of the Hungarian noble lineage, a certain Nofri di Bardo.\footnote{He figures in one \textit{catasto} declaration as debtor: Giovanni di Michele di Messer Parente ASF, \textit{Catasto}, 61. fol. 872v.} He was most probably wrongly identified in the earlier Hungarian scholarly literature as member of the Bardi kin based on his patronymic. Contrary to the lack of evidence in Florence, there are abundant sources covering several generations of both families in Hungary, and documenting their integration into the Hungarian nobility.\footnote{On the Noffri in Hungary see József Ernyei and József Szerémi, \textit{A Majthényiak és a Felvidék: történelmi és genealogiai tanulmány} (1912), 676–686. On the Manini, called Kodori see József Kádár, \textit{Szolnok-Doboka vármege monográfiája}, vols. I–VIII (Dés, 1900–1905); on the Manini see A \textit{Kolozsmonostori Konvent}, jegyzőkönyvei (1289–1556) I-II [The Protocols of the Kolozsmonostor convent], ed. Zsigmond Jakó (Budapest, Magyar Országos Levéltár, 1990), Vol. I/261, 340, 939, 1384, 1471, 1535, 1569–70, 1597, 1686, 1136, 1151, 1178, 1223, 1312, 1597, 1732, 1764, 1776, 1841, 2083, 2167, 2181–2, 2191, 2283–4, 2372, on Pape Manini see \textit{A Wass család cegei levéltára} [The Archives of the Family Wass in Cege], ed. András W. Kovács and Antal Valentiny (Cluj, 2006), No. 437, 439.}

5.3. Role and participation of the kin in Hungarian business

In Florence one can find examples of family members participating in different ways in joint business activities as employers or employees or even partners, but this was not a general pattern. In Hungary, in contrast, several members of the same Florentine family worked together, usually father and son or sons and very often also other kinsmen.

In families involved in trade and credit activity in the kingdom, very often two generations cooperated. The father was the commissioner and owner of the goods while the sons played the roles of agents, travelers, or resident agents. Following the general pattern, in most cases a clear distinction of divided ownership between the members of the family residing in Florence and in Hungary can be detected in the fiscal declarations. For instance, in the Lamberteschi family, the father, Andrea di Tommaso Lamberteschi, and another member of the lineage, Bernardo di Lamberto Lamberteschi, sent their young offspring Niccoló, Piero and Giovanni to trade in cloths to Hungary for at least ten years, from 1419 to 1429. In his Catasto statement, Andrea Lamberteschi claimed that his two sons had borrowed 5000 florins from him to trade in Hungary but they refused to acknowledge any obligation and „have rebelled against him … and give him no respect … nor can he expect any help from them”. This split in the family relations was probably the reason why the father and one of the sons, Giovanni, declared their assets separately. The Catasto shows that the father also worked with other Florentines in Hungary, since the Melanesi brothers and Giovanni Melanesi, the bishop of Oradea, figure among his debtors. In their cases the wider family participated personally or with their capital in the Hungarian business.

The basic structure of the Panciatichis’ Hungarian company was different from the Lamberteschi enterprise, although two generations were working together here as well, the father Giovanni and at least two sons. One of the sons, Zanobi, must have had a long and stable sojourn in Buda, while the other, Antonio, seems to have maintained relations with his father’s companies in Venice and Buda. Apparently, the owner of the company was the father, who himself stayed in Buda for a long period. The Catasto declaration of the father clearly suggests his exclusive ownership of the company, while the sons only submitted a relatively short list of their own debtors and creditors, mainly related to their personal expenses. Giovanni employed as factors not only his sons, but also another

609 ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 1039r–1039v.
610 ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 92r.
relative outside the *consorteria*, namely his brother-in-law Filippo di Simone Capponi. Capponi belonged to a fiscally impoverished branch of another mighty Florentine lineage.\textsuperscript{612}

Another example of members of a Florentine kin jointly running a company in Hungary is provided by the Melanesi brothers, Simone and Tommaso. They resided in Buda, but were in partnership with their uncle, Filippo di Filippo, who remained in Florence. Like the Lamberteschi sons, they handed in a joint fiscal declaration which was clearly divided into two parts, the uncle’s tax return and that of the nephews, thus defining the share of the uncle and the joint ownership of the nephews. However, here the similarity ends. In the case of the Lamberteschi, the share of the father Andrea di Tommaso in the Hungarian business made up only a fraction of his total business interests. The two separate declarations of the Melanesi, on the contrary, contain information on the same business activity, mainly concerning Hungary, the uncle providing the goods to be sent to Hungary, which the nephews marketed locally. They also involved other members of the wider lineage, men like Melanese di Ridolfo Melanesi, in their business operations.\textsuperscript{613}

In the families holding offices in the central financial administration of Hungary, a collective responsibility for the operation of the office can be observed. Both the Manini and the Noffri shared such offices, in some cases substituting for each other with full responsibility.\textsuperscript{614} All four Manini brothers worked in the administration of the royal salt monopoly as *comes camerae salium* of several royal salt chambers in the Máramaros region and Transylvania, the two main salt chambers of the Kingdom of Hungary, switching offices among themselves from time to time.\textsuperscript{615}

\textsuperscript{612} See Kent, *Household and lineage*.

\textsuperscript{613} ASF, Catasto 1427, 175. fol. 273r


\textsuperscript{615} MNL OL DL 55060, Dec. 31, 1436; DL 55262, June 15, 1442; DL 55352, April 22, 1447; DL 55422, March 15, 1449; see also Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125–145.
5.4. Joint households and joint revenues

The research carried out on the Florentine Catasto of 1427 by David Herlihy and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber has revealed that young brothers usually did not stay together in a joint household after the death of a head of the household. The children tried to take out all possible liquid assets to promote their incipient trade and crediting activity as soon as possible. Only if they did not succeed in embarking upon a lucrative business did they remain in a joint household for a longer period. Judging from notarial acts, it seems that the partition of wealth among the members of a family became a general practice, quite often also including patrimonies that had been under the common administration of the consorteria.

The various Florentine families working in Hungary had slightly different attitudes to joint households and joint revenues. The Lamberteschi brothers lived in a joint household in Hungary, but without family, since Albiera, the wife of Niccoló, stayed in Florence on her own in a house rented by her husband and brother-in-law. In the joint fiscal declaration of the brothers, there is no hint of any division of assets. However, in case their declaration reflects if only in part their real economic situation, their financial problems may explain why they decided to live in a shared household in Hungary, being temporary residents there.

Contrary to the general tendency in Florence, the Melanesi brothers, both of whom were married, also lived in a common household in Buda with their families. They presumably shared the profits and made common use of their real estates. Tommaso declared in his 1427 Catasto statement that he owned a vineyard in Buda together with his brother. This item was acquired by Simone, as a dowry on his marriage to the daughter of a Buda citizen, but was nevertheless listed as a source of joint revenue. All expenses and profits were declared by Tommaso as common ones. A third brother, Giovanni, also settled in Hungary. He held high ecclesiastical offices and presumably had large incomes of his own. He died in 1426 as bishop of Oradea, and we have no information about any share he may have had in the joint revenues of his brothers.

The brothers Giovanni, Leonardo and Bardo Noffri followed their father, Onofrio (Noffri) di Bardo, in the most important offices of the royal central administration. Onofrio had come to Buda with
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617 Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 4-11.
618 ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 1039v.
Filippo Scolari around 1409. In 1426 Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, in his notes taken in Buda during his mission to King Sigismund, remembered him as the *fattore* of Scolari.\textsuperscript{619} Bardi’s sons acquired noble status and were jointly granted the estate of Pölöske in Hungary by King Sigismund in 1426.\textsuperscript{620} Four years later the king took Pölöske back and instead donated to the Bardi brothers, again jointly, the estate of Bojnice.\textsuperscript{621}

The Manini brothers, who were also engaged in the royal financial administration, followed much the same pattern. They were four brothers who operated in Hungary from 1424 onwards. According to a list of debtors preserved from 1463, at least two of them, Odward (Odoardo) and Angelo conducted common credit activities.\textsuperscript{622} They were both integrated into the Hungarian local nobility and granted a common estate in 1450 by John Hunyadi, governor of Hungary.\textsuperscript{623} When Odward died around 1457, a conflict over the inheritance of the common property broke out between Odward’s wife and daughter on one side and Angelo on the other. The case had to be settled in a local Hungarian court in 1463, indicating the indivisible joint ownership of the brothers.

As we have seen in the case of the Attavante family, the solidarity and co-operation of the lineage could manifest itself in several different ways. The separate fiscal declarations of the brothers Cristofano and Leonardo suggest two separate households. However, the fact that the younger children and the widowed mother also moved to Hungary suggests that probably both brothers supported them, and that the two separate fiscal households still formed an integral economic unit.\textsuperscript{624}

The examples cited above show brothers staying together in a common household with their families and apparently running their business together, sharing the profit, the financial potential and also the risks regardless to their actual financial situation. This pattern is very different from the practice of merchant families operating in Florence.

\textsuperscript{619} Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi, 579.
\textsuperscript{620} Engel, Archontology, I/ 396.
\textsuperscript{621} Engel, Archontology, I/271.
\textsuperscript{622} Draskóczy, “Adójegyzék”, 93–112.
\textsuperscript{623} Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131.
\textsuperscript{624} ASF, Catasto 1427, 45. fol. 706r; ASF, Catasto 1427, 42. fol. 313v.
5.5. Reappearance of earlier business strategies

The experience and activity of previous generations presumably had an effect on the strategies of later Florentine businessmen. As shown above, the structure of their assets varied according to the activity of their families.

A case in point is the career of Giovanni di Andrea Buondelmonti. His advance to the most prominent and lucrative ecclesiastical positions of the Kingdom of Hungary, first as abbot of Pécsvárad in 1410, and later as archbishop of Kalocsa in 1425–1435 and 1438–1447 may be partly due to his kinsman, Filippo Scolari’s support. Moreover, the personal relations of his father, Andrea di Lorenzo as envoy to the Hungarian court in 1396 could be an aid for him. However, the particular interest of the lineage in revenues from rights of ecclesiastical patronage and their good relations to the Roman Curia may have given Giovanni his first motivation in that direction. Giovanni had already held ecclesiastical offices as a child in Italy. In fact, it was Pope Martin V (1417–1431), who promoted his career in Hungary in 1420 by writing both to the ruler and to Scolari, asking them to support the young Buondelmonti. However, neither Scolari’s death in 1426, nor Giovanni’s apparently changeable relationship with King Sigismund – around 1435 he was even imprisoned by Count Friedrich of Cilli, King Sigismund’s brother-in-law – had a long-term effect on Giovanni’s position and ecclesiastical career in Hungary. This also suggests that he had strong papal support on his side.

One can also find members of the Melanesi lineage who held ecclesiastical offices and enjoyed church revenues already in Prato. Beside Filippo Scolari’s and King Sigismund’s support, this experience may also have played a role in the consecration of Giovanni di Piero Melanesi as bishop of Oradea in 1426.

Whereas ecclesiastical careers could not be perpetuated through direct descendants, business strategies could more easily be repeated in consecutive generations. The Corsini lineage provides a typical example of sending their offspring to foreign centres as apprentices. Although very laconic about the agreement, Giovanni di Matteo Corsini registered in his Ricordanze the employment of
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625 ASF, Dieci di Balia, Lettere – Legazioni and Commissarie 2. fol. 17v, April 25, 1396;
626 Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I. No. 752; Elemér Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon [Ecclesiastic Society in Medieval Hungary] (Budapest: Műszaki kiadó, 2007), 222; Engel, Archontology, I/66, 335, 515, II/43; Bizzocchi,“La dissoluzione di un clan”, 22.
628 Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, II. No. 473–478.
629 Nuti, “Un mercante”, 2; Engel, Archontology, I/ 77.
both his sons, Matteo and Battista, by two Buda companies. His poor financial situation and lack of sufficient liquid assets did not enable him to arrange a more favourable apprenticeship with a greater and more powerful company or in a more important European commercial centre (piazza), as had been the custom in the family.\textsuperscript{630} The grandfather Matteo in the mid-fourteenth century spent decades in London and Bruges, thus establishing the wealth of this branch.\textsuperscript{631} In the following generation, Niccolò, Giovanni’s elder brother was sent to Avignon. Giovanni’s choice of Buda may also have been influenced by the previous experience of a member of the lineage in the Kingdom of Hungary. In 1386, Filippo Corsini was sent on a diplomatic mission to the Hungarian queen, Mary (1382–1395) as ambassador together with Gherardo di Buondelmonti and Vanni Castellani.\textsuperscript{632} This experience may have influenced the decision of the father, Giovanni, in his rather desperate situation, to send both sons to Hungary as apprentices.

In the case of the Melanesi family the records of the Datini Archives in Prato provide some useful information concerning the previous generation’s business activity.\textsuperscript{633} In Francesco di Marco Datini’s correspondence altogether forty letters by Piero di Filippo Melanesi (called “Milanesi” in these records) have been preserved from the time between 1393 and 1409. One can also find eight letters from 1398 to 1403 by Filippo di Filippo, the uncle who later actively supported the Buda company of his nephews. The letters shed light on some aspects of Piero’s carrier, who in the early 1380s worked with his brother, Filippo, in Genova as moneylender.\textsuperscript{634} Filippo had serious difficulties and risked to go to prison for his debts, while Piero left Genova around 1383 and worked in Lucca and Florence as Datini’s business partner and agent. In the 1390s he stayed in Florence and regularly managed the affairs of the Florentine Datini household. According to a letter from 1407, he was planning to launch again banking and trading activity with his sons and brother.\textsuperscript{635} Finally, around 1408 he left for Montpellier where he established a company for three years as moneylender with one of his sons.\textsuperscript{636} It seems that the young Melanesi brothers may have had an excellent possibility for apprenticeship at the Datini branches and according to their father’s intention they were to enter long distance trade. He was still alive in 1416 when Simone di Piero already embarked upon his
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\textsuperscript{630} Herlihy-Klapisch, \textit{I toscani}, 782–783.

\textsuperscript{631} Petrucci, \textit{Ricordanze dei Corsini}, XII–XIV.

\textsuperscript{632} ASF, Signori-Carteggi Missive, I. Cancelleria, 20. fol. 102r. Aug. 10, 1386.


\textsuperscript{635} ASPo, \textit{Fondo Datini}, n. 692.46, doc. 700754, a letter by Piero di Filippo Milanesi to Francesco di Marco Datini Pisa, Jan. 4, 1405 – Florence, Jan. 6, 1405.

\textsuperscript{636} ASPo, \textit{Datini}, 903.16, doc. 314886, letter by Piero di Filippo Milanesi to Francesco di Marco Datini and company, Montpellier, Jan. 4, 1409 – Barcelona, Jan. 10, 1409.
Buda activity. A brother of theirs, mentioned in one of the father’s last letters to a manager of the Datini branch in Barcelona, launched a trading activity in the Levant in 1408, marketing goods in commenda contracts.

Two of the examined families had business experience in Venice. Leonardo and Cristofano Attavanti’s father, Domenico di Bartolo is present in the records of the Datini Archives with four letters. The letters reveal, besides his constant financial problems, that he had an agent named Giovanni di Bartolomeo di messer Giovanni in Venice managing some business for him. This suggests some experience about the geographical area where his sons tried to set up their professional activity after his death. Although they were in a really poor economic situation, the family had a prominent social standing in Florence. Domenico di Bartolo Attavanti was elected by lot among the Priors (members of the Signoria) for May–June 1416. Andrea di Tommaso Lambenteschi also established a company in Venice between 1407 and 1410 and worked with the Datini companies and branches in Barcelona, Mallorca and Valencia, as the surviving 49 letters among the Datini records confirm. The Manini family had exiled branches established in Udine already in the early fourteenth century, and later also in Venice.
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637 The father was one of the witnesses of his marriage in 1416, see Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1-5.
641 See the hit list to queries Piero di Filippo Milanesi and Piero e Filippo Milanesi online http://datini.archiviodistato.prato.it/www/query.html.
642 Michele Zacchigna, Lavoro sottoposto e commerci in una comunità friulana: Udine fra crisi e sviluppo (secoli XIV-XV) (Triest: EUT, 2001), 171-172.
5.6. Economic and social strategies after leaving Hungary

The further career of these merchant families, especially those who returned to Florence and were eligible for public offices, can be followed in a number of sources. In the first half of the fifteenth century, urban offices were considered a remedy for families with serious financial and economic problems. Although some scholars argue that office-holding in itself was insufficient to restore the financial situation of the family, Pitti’s remark in his Ricordi can be considered emblematic: “having great expenses but not having other income than approximately hundred and fifty florins, I comforted myself by hoping in God and in the useful (lucrative) offices”. Eligibility for public offices depended on a number of different factors. Members of lineages that had been declared magnati and were included in that list, like the Buondelmonti and Panciatichi, could not take public offices. Citizens in debt to the city were also not eligible for major offices. After the exile of several prominent Florentine citizens from the party of the Albizzi in 1434, the relation to the Medicis also became a crucial factor in obtaining, recovering or losing eligibility for the major public offices.

The career of young Matteo di Giovanni Corsini on his return to Florence confirms the importance of public offices for the restoration of one’s financial situation. Due to his friendly and later marital relations with the Medicis, he held different public offices and was able to stabilize his financial situation within a relatively short time after the bankruptcy of his father in 1425. Other members of Corsini’s kin group, when meeting financial problems, also held offices in Florence.

Corsini was far more successful back in Florence than his employers, the Panciatichi sons. The failure of the second generation of Panciatichis to obtain public offices was mainly due to the fact that they were inscribed both in the list of the magnati, and in the list of debtors (the specchio). Antonio, Giovanni Panciatichi’s son, had to refuse his inheritance in 1442. He had no house in Florence and could only maintain those real estates that were consigned to his wife for her dowry.

Giovanni Panciatichi’s third son, Piero, who was not working in the business in Hungary, wanted like Corsini to improve his financial situation through marriage. To his misfortune his particular choice aligned him against the Medici, and this led to his and his descendants’ exclusion from every
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644 Pitti, Ricordi, 473.
646 Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 115; ASF, Catasto 1427, 66. fol. 267.
647 Conti, L’imposta diretta, 346.
kind of office.⁶⁴⁸ Among his four sons only one found a way to improve his finances by choosing an ecclesiastical career. As we have seen in other cases, this might be a strategy for restoring one’s financial situation.⁶⁴⁹ None of his three brothers remained in Florence. Two of them worked without success for other Florentine companies in Naples and in Pisa, while Francesco di Piero di Giovanni worked together with a member of the Capponi kindred.

Similar strategies can be detected in the case of the Attavante family as well. In Hungary, Leonardo Attavante was employed by other Florentines. In 1438 he engaged himself in a trading company with his kinsman, Giuliano.⁶⁵⁰ Back to Florence, he apparently worked again in the financial administration: in 1450, he is mentioned as tax official of Arezzo.⁶⁵¹ Among his sons we have information on Domenico di Leonardo Attavante. He worked in the papal Curia in Rome, where he held the office of abbreviator between 1479 and 1482.⁶⁵² Around 1493 Domenico figures as a notary in the Annate of the Papal Chamber, in a record related to a petition for full indulgence in the diocese of Eger in Hungary.⁶⁵³ Thus, three generations of public, private and ecclesiastical office holders can be identified in this family.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid.
⁶⁴⁹ Luigi Passerini, Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi (Florence, 1858), 79.
⁶⁵¹ Fonti per la storia del sistema fiscale urbano, 1384-1533, ed. Paola Benigni, Lauretta Carbone, and Claudio Saviotti (Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1985), 59.
5.7. Integration into the nobility

Among the few Florentine families integrating into Hungarian nobility a common factor can easily be identified, and that refers to most of these families’ interest and presence in the royal financial administration in leading offices. Again, Scolari’s case is telling, as he could integrate into the Hungarian leading aristocracy by being appointed *comes* of Temes in 1404. His ambitions to found a new aristocratic dynasty were supported by his marriage with the daughter of the noble Ozorai family, the efforts of founding a church and monastery and finally, the building of a castle, meant to be his residence.\(^{654}\) His carrier is also interesting as one factor of outstanding importance, namely a significant capital was missing on his part, but he could provide it through the Florentine network he was acting within. In any case, his success can to great extent be ascribed to his close relation and services to the king, based on his personal talent, as a contemporary chronicler claimed.\(^{655}\) He entered the close circle of King Sigismund’s *familiaris* of foreign origin, who helped him consolidate his rule over the Kingdom of Hungary.\(^{656}\) Most telling evidence on his extraordinary position within the royal court and among the barons of the realm (*barones*) is the permission granted him by King Sigismund to let his burial chapel built in the Holy Virgin provostry of Székesfehérvár, the traditional coronation and burial church of the Hungarian ruling dynasties.\(^{657}\)

Apart from Scolari, we have information on three other Florentine families, who were granted nobility in Hungary: the Noffri and Manini families, and finally the Florentine noble family of the Buondelmonti. The members of the Noffri and Manini families were hired by Scolari at first in the central financial administration of the kingdom. They never reached as high as Scolari did: the Manini, later named Szentpéterszegi, and then Kodori from their estates in Hungary resided in Transylvania and Máramaros, working in the management of the salt mines. Their local crediting activity was recorded in a document from 1463, more precisely a list of their debtors which provides a glimpse of the local network they acted within.\(^{658}\) In case of the first generation some records survived on their correspondence with the kin in Florence through a brother, who returned home from Hungary. The remaining records related to the second generation do not hint to any contact with the place of origin of the fathers. The documents mainly handle legal issues, disputed
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\(^{655}\) “Filippo Scolari úr élete (Névtelen 15. századi Florencei szerzőtől)” [Life of Master Filippo Scolari by an unknown Florentine author], in *Ozorai Pipo emlékezete*, ed. Vadas Ferenc (Szekszárd, 1987), 7

\(^{656}\) Pál Engel, *Királyi hatalom és arisztokrácia viszonya a Zsigmond-korban 1387-1437* [The relation of royal power and aristocracy during the reign of King Sigismund, 1387-1437] (Budapest, Akadémiai kiadó, 1977), 58-60


with local noble families. The strategy of working in the administration of the salt mines was however preserved by Paulus, who managed the mines of Máramaros before 1467.659

The family history of the Noffris, sons of Onofrio di Bardo of Florence is similar and still differs from the Manini kin’s strategies. First of all, it is not possible to identify the family among the householders in the Florentine catasto records. His long term absence from Florence is most probably the reason behind the lack of related tax records. In Hungarian scholarship he was identified as member of the potential Bardi family, but the only mention to be identified with him in the Florentine sources at the moment calls him “Onofrio di Bardo”, so the form “Bardi” seems to be simply a genitive of the patronym, which was rather popular in late medieval Florence.660 Also the research for an eventual member of the Bardi kin group sojourning in Hungary or any information in connection with the kingdom in the Catasto records of the family remained negative. All these evidence seem to confirm, that Onofrio was not a Bardi.

Onofrio appears in the Hungarian records in 1409, when he acted as agent to Filippo Scolari in Buda.661 Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, Florentine envoy to King Sigismund in 1426, confirms this information, because also noted to have been hosted in Onofrio’s Buda house on order of Scolari.662 Onofrio di Bardo also worked in the royal administration as we could see in the earlier chapters and can be regarded as financial expert and, at times, also creditor to the king, Sigismund of Luxemburg too. In fact, his close connection to the ruler proved to be crucial for his definite settlement in Hungary and his integration into Hungarian nobility. He was even more successful (and of course more fortunate) in founding a new Hungarian noble dynasty compared to Scolari, because he had issue, fours sons, Leonardus, John, Bardo and Jacob. Leonardus and John managed the royal financial administration of the thirtieth. From this second generation Leonardus seems to be particularly favored by the king. He played a notable role in the royal/imperial aula of King Sigismund, reaching among the high dignitaries of the kingdom, when in 1438 he was appointed treasurer (“thesaurarius supremus”) by King Albert I. (1437-1439).663 The family first owned the estate of Pölöske by royal grant from 1426,664 which the king exchanged for the property of Bojnice in Nyitra county in 1426.665 All brothers held royal offices along with Leonardus, but the records in general are much more laconic on Jacob and Bardo. Their prominent position in the financial administration of the kingdom is also demonstrated by the network, they moved in. This is best

659 Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130
661 ZsO II/2. 7240. Dec. 27, 1409; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205.
662 Guasti, Commissioni di Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, 579.
663 MNL OL DF 239531. May 12, 1438; Engel, Archontology, I/53.
664 Engel, Archontology, I/396.
665 Engel, Archontology, I/271.
proved by Bardo’s letter to Nicholas of Várda, “aul[e et con]siliar[o] d[o]m[i]ni nostril imp[er]ator[is] frat[er]Æt et amico carissimo”, later (1455) treasurer. The members of the Várdai family as we could see were interested in financial positions, entered the circles of Filippo Scolari (and obviously had connection to the most prominent Florentines in Hungary), and rapidly rised among the main dignitaries of the kingdom and ranked among the learned elite.666

The third generation, exactly John’s descendants, Emericus, Albert, Onofrius show a somewhat different picture. Most of the records on them are typical disputes on property rights. In any case, the marriage of two of John’s son, Emericus and John’ sister, Veronika shows, that the family still sticked to royal circles, choosing the spouses from the Pongrácz (Sophia Pongrácz married Emericus in 1462) and the Ludányi families (Veronika married Thomas of Ludány, who was a young member of the royal aula in 1440, and had by 1462 already deceased leaving Veronica a widow).667 The two families were also owners of neighboring landed properties in Northern Hungary, which made the choice even more advantageous for the Nofri. The emerging inheritance problems from these family ties are the best sources for this generation.668 Emericus, who represented legally his widowed sister in front of Nyitra chapter, is entitled “egregius” in a document, which shows, that his social standing was more prominent than a simple nobelman’s (but not “magnificus”, like Scolari, that is one of the barones). 669

Their apparently well-succeeded integration into the nobility however ended in 1489, when the male line of the family went extinct in 1489 with the death of “Nyffor Honoffrus” of Bojnicw and the estate of Bojnice was granted by King Sigismund to his illegitimate son, John Corvinus.670 The last information on a family member dated to 1496, when the last will of Catherine, daughter of Valentinus Nyffor Bardo was confirmed by her husband. She left some properties to the chapel of Saint Sophy of the Saint Martin parish church in the town of Bojnice for religious services.671

666 The letter is written presumably to Nicholas of Várda junior and not his father, see Kristóf, ”Vester Stephanus”;
668 MNL OL DL 63251. Oct. 1, 1472 on legal dispute over possession rights between Sophia Pongrácz, wife of Emericus Nofri of Bojnice and her maternal uncle, Blasius Nezpal; DL 268233. Jan. 12, 1473. On a legal case between Sophia Pongrácz, wife of Emericus Nofri of Bojnice and her maternal uncle, Blasius Nezpal, who charged her to have taken silver objects and jewels, fl 1000 and some documents proving the possession rights of Blasius on a few estates.
669 MNL OL DL 16415. Sept. 29, 1466. on Scolari see MNL OL DL 73919. Apr. 8, 1408.
670 MNL OL DL 37666. June 26, 1489. see also Engel, Archontology, I/271.
671 MNL OL DL 62620. May 17, 1496.
5.7.1. The unknown case of Niccoló di Andrea Buondelmonti

As Filippo Scolari’s carrier and integration into Hungarian nobility is well known in both international and Hungarian scholarly literature, and the Noffris’ three generations in Hungary have also been investigated and analysed in Hungarian literature as shown above. Therefore, I would like to propose a case study on a third, less known Florentine, Niccoló, brother of Giovanni Buondelmonti, archbishop of Kalocsa (“Nycolo Italicus frater reverendi in Christo patris domini Johannis Colocensis et Bachiensis ecclesiarum canonice unitarum archiepiscopi”).

Little is known on him in Italian sources, except for his leaving Florence for Hungary following the entourage of his brother, Giovanni, destined to invest the position of archbishop of Kalocsa. In Hungarian sources he is alternately named as Nycolo and Mykolo. His son born from his marriage with the daughter of a Hungarian baron was named Miklós (Niccoló), which, supposing, that he was named after his father, seems to be a factor in favour of identifying his father as Niccoló. Also genealogical information on the Buondelmonti kin seem to confirm this identification, although there was also a male called Michele among the brothers of Giovanni, archbishop of Kalocsa, to which the name variation “Mykolo” could be deducted. On Michele, his marriage and his descendants in Florence, however, there are a number of records in Florentine archives, whereas not much has been known so far on Niccoló, who seem to disappear from the Florentine sources in the early fifteenth century.

The Buondelmonti kin group ranks among the prominent ones of noble origin. In fact, the brothers’ declaration submitted by Simone, the third brother of the archbishop of Kalocsa and also involved in Hungarian affairs as papal legate to whom he had excellent relations.

Niccoló married Borbála, Miklós Treutel of Nevna’s daughter, and sister-in-law of Péter Lévai Cseh, belonging to the extended Garai kin group, around 1440. With this marriage Buondelmonti became related to a powerful baronial family of Hungary, and integrated into the aristocracy. His son, Miklós Tretrilo (he apparently used his mother’s Italianized name instead of the Buondelmonti

672 The agreement naming him deals with the partition of estates among Barbara, daughter of Miklós Treutel de Nevna and fiancé of Niccoló Buondelmonti and his sister, Catharina, widow of Péter Levai Cseh on one hand with László, son of the deceased Péter Levai Cseh on the other, and was issued by the Premonstratensian Convent of Ság, Aug. 01, 1440. The item, as many of the records on property rights, survived in two copies, see MNL OL DL 13565. Aug. 1, 1440; DL 59263. Aug. 1, 1440.


674 The family tree, simplyfied and corrected by Roberto Bizzocchi does not even mark him among the Buondelmonti brothers, sons of Andrea di Lorenzo Buondelmonti. See Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 44. table entitled Family tree of the Buondelmonti.

675 Nicholas Treutel de Nevna (1382-1420), among other offices held the dignity of magister tavernicorum 1402-1408, ranked among the “barones regni”, that is barons of the Realm (the chief dignitaries of the kingdom. in Engel, Archontology, II/247. Nevna castle, the property his name came from was situated in Valkó county in Srem, Peter Lévai Cseh (1393-1440) held high offices of the realm, among them count of county Bars 1412-1439, count of counties Hont and Nógrád 1415-1423, count of Macsó 1427-1431, voivode of Transylvania 1436-1437, ranked among the “barones regni”. Engel, Archontology, II/146.

676 MNL OL DL 13565. and DL 59263. Aug. 1, 1440.
family name) concluded a similarly successful marriage alliance with Orsolya, daughter of Pál Hercegh de Szekcső in 1459. Miklós Tretrilo died around 1464 without having issue. Therefore, the Hungarian “ramification” of the Florentine Buondelmonti family became extinct after two generations, but the large estates in their possession from the Lévai and Treutel families were subject to long legal debates between the son of Péter Lévai Cseh on one side, and Pál Hercegh de Szekcső on the other side. In any case, Niccoló Buondelmonti’s settlement and integration into the Hungarian landed aristocracy in 1440, long after Scolari’s death and also after King Sigismund’s death proves that the Buondelmonti kin group’s success cannot be ascribed solely to their family ties to the Scolaris.

677 MNL OL DL 15386. July 29, 1459; Paul Hercegh de Szekcső (1440?-1482) count of Macsó 1456-; ranked among the “barones regni”. Engel, Archontology, II/98. Raffael Hercegh de Szekcső was following Buondelmonti as archbishop of Kalocsa in 1450-1456 three years after the death of Giovanni Buondelmonti with the papal confirmation of his investiture only around 1453-1454.

5.8. Integration into urban society

On the basis of our present knowledge the majority of the Florentines who settled in the Kingdom of Hungary lived in urban society. Leaving aside Buda for the moment, because it was analysed at length in the earlier chapters, this subchapter is dedicated to other towns mentioned in the sources as permanent or temporary residences of Florentines in the first half of the fifteenth century, including mining and minting and trade centers, particularly focusing on Transylvanian Saxon towns.

Transylvanian towns, particularly the Saxon towns with notable autonomy from the late fourteenth century onwards seem to have offered particularly favorable context to urban integration for Florentines in Hungary.\textsuperscript{679} Also the importance of the mining and minting chamber in Sibiu increased in the first half of the fifteenth century and also the nearby minting chambers like Nagybánya (Baia Mare, Romania) attracted businessmen, and a few of them established themselves and integrated into local families of local leading elite through marriage in the Saxon communities of these towns. They had houses and estates in the most important local towns, and in a few cases we can follow the activity of their descendants in the area throughout the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{680} The case of Mathias Baldi seems worth to at least a short introduction, because his career can be considered an emblematic example of successful integration. Being count of the salt chamber to Ocna Sibiului (1408) explains his close contact to Filippo Scolari and his professional qualities won the latter’s warm support and consequently that of the king himself.\textsuperscript{681} Scolari issued a confirmation related to Baldi’s just ownership of a Sibiu town house on Baldi’s petition, which he could use in front of urban authorities to prove his rights. Scolari in this letter lists all the factors which could work in favor of Baldi, among them his service and also his marriages. His two marriages, in fact, are a further indicator in favor of a definite settlement in Sibiu. In fact, he married the daughters of two prominent burghers of Sibiu, first a certain Dorothea, daughter of Jacob senior populis, and second Catherine, daughter of the deceased John, royal judge in Sibiu (the “\textit{iudex regius}” was the representative, appointed by the king in the Saxon seats).\textsuperscript{682} He was called by Scolari “\textit{circumspectus et idoneus wir}”, burgher of Sibiu in the document issued by him on behalf of Baldi. In the Saxon town Baldi owned at least one house, and possessed landed property also in

\textsuperscript{679} In general see Kondrad G. Gündisch, \textit{Das Patriziat Siebenbürdische Städte im Mittelalter}, Studia Transylvanica, Band 18 (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna, Böhlau, 1993)
\textsuperscript{680} Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126-128.
\textsuperscript{681} ZsO II/2. 6040. Apr. 8, 1408; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 134-135.
\textsuperscript{682} MNL OL \textit{DL} 73919. Apr. 8, 1408. published in ZsO II/2. 6040. Apr. 8, 1408; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125.
neighboring Abrud and Aiud. The affair seem to have not been settled easily between Baldi and the Sibiu’s authorities, because two years later he turned to the king who let Scolari’s letter transcribed on Scolari’s petition on behalf of the salt chamber officer.

The Hungarian sources are abundant also on other settled and integrated Florentines in Transylvanian urban context, so the area clearly attracted them on the long run. Two of them, “Cristoforo Italicus” and “Zanobi de Florentia” were selected as subject to presentation of successful integration into urban community in Hungary. This time the Hungarian source material served as starting point to research. These records at least revealed that they were brothers and also mentioned another count of chamber called “Pero de Rassys”. The identification of the family they belonged to in the Hungarian sources alone was not possible; fortunately, the Florentine Catasto records provided necessary information to retrace them in Florence. Not surprisingly, also the members of the Del Rosso family, subject to the following case study were active in Transylvania. Their situation is somewhat similar to that of the Mannini: more members of a renowned family worked in Hungary due to the family’s weakened economic situation back in Florence according to their tax return submitted collectively, except for one brother, Guido. The del Rosso family ranked among the guild consular families in Florence, Rosso, the father held consular office nine times, and was interested in building constructions in the Tuscan city, producing kiln products. After his death, however, his sons seem to have abandoned this activity. In fact, the family faced financial difficulties; and some of the altogether seven brothers sought business activity abroad, like Francesco di Rosso di Piero Rosso, the householder and eldest brother of all, who went to Rome and later to Naples, and another brother, without specifying his name was in Hungary working in the service of other Florentines in 1427. Only Cristoforo’s age (Cristofano in Italian sources), can be assessed as that of a young merchant working autonomously, therefore, I suppose, the unnamed brother in Hungary must have had been him. The others, Zanobi was around sixteen years old, whereas Giovanni complied fifteen years in 1427, which makes it rather clear, that they could not have been in Hungary in the year of the first Catasto. Cristoforo appears in the Hungarian sources however only in 1438 for the first time, as count of the chamber of salt to Ocna Sibiulu in the service of Matko of Talovac. In the Florentine records he is first mentioned to be in Hungary.
only in 1442.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 279.} By that time he seem to have passed into the management of minting chambers, whereas Pero de Rossi, who worked with him in Ocna Sibiulu, remained in the salt administration in Turda and elsewhere, which can be regarded as a sort of division of business fields within a broader “family economy”.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.} Although Pero de Rossi’s identity is unsecure so far, he apparently moved with Cristoforo, and also his name hint to a kinship between them. Yet, the catasto record of Francesco di Rosso di Piero Rosso does not report any members of the household with the personal name “Pier”.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 281.} The family tree published by Richard Goldthwaite, on the contrary, includes a Piero, cousin to Cristoforo and brother on the male lineage, who in 1419 held the office of Prior in Florence.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.} Thus, I presume that “Pero” can be identified with this kinsman to the Rossi, and that the cousins went on having common business ventures outside Florence.

Among Cristoforo’s brothers, Zanobi appears in Hungary for the first time in 1442, whereas his brother, Giovanni is only recorded to sojourn in the country by 1469.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 281.} Back in Florence, he also held twice the office of Prior (1442, 1456), whereas he was guild consul six terms.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.} Thus, it seems a rather late decision of his to join his brothers’ families in Hungary. In Hungarian documents Cristoforo is the best documented member of the Rossi family. He was gradually promoted to chief offices of the royal administration, be them the salt or minting chamber management, and in 1441 he was appointed head of the minting chamber to Sibiu, and also relaunched minting in Sigishoara.\footnote{MNL OL DL 36407. Dec. 4, 1455; DL 36394. Apr. 20, 1470; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127.} Beside the citizenship of Sibiu, he was also burgher of Baia Mare, where he was officer of the minting chamber to Baia Mare, his signal can be retraced on the coins from this mint until 1467.\footnote{MNL OL DL36407. Dec. 4, 1455; DL 36394. Apr. 20, 1470; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127.} He worked with Antonio di Francesco Zati, another Florentine businessman in the administration of minting chambers in Transylvania.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.} Nevertheless the apparent ambitions to integrate he maintained contact to Florence to an extent that he even submitted his tax declaration in 1457, at least thirty years after his arrival to Hungary.\footnote{Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 279.} This clearly hints to his intention to maintain the possibility of return to his homeland. The same seems to be confirmed by the fact, that he and his brothers kept a few possessions in Florence at least until 1480.\footnote{Ibid.} Cristoforo’s business interests were not restricted to his obligations of managing royal monopolies. In fact, he also had business activity in Venice along with Pero de Rossi, as he reported in his tax declaration, but this
did not prove to be profitable and consequently, he put it as a loss.\textsuperscript{700} Theoretically, his cooperation with the Zati in Transylvania could also extend to Venice where the Zati had a long term company.\textsuperscript{701} No trustworthy information is available on Cristoforo’s marriage, usually a further indicator of ambition to integrate into local community. It seems, that he married into a local family, but the wife’s person is uncertain.\textsuperscript{702} However, his son, Paul (Pagolo) appears in the family tree drawn by Goldthwaite.\textsuperscript{703} Based on the Hungarian sources also a daughter, Catherine must be added to the family tree. Paul is also recorded in other Hungarian sources in 1472, when he sold a house in Sibiu, which he had inherited from his father.\textsuperscript{704} Thus, he also stayed in Transylvania and represented the second generation of his family in Hungary. Zanobi” wife Anna was daughter of Nicholas of Ivan of Rakovica, a nobleman and estate owner in the neighborhood of Sibiu. Anna’s brother, Michael in fact issued a sue in 1451 as her representative to recover for her a landed property named Olahpen in the district of Szászsebes, which for a while was occupied illegally by the burghers of the neighboring town, Szászpián.\textsuperscript{705} The couple had a son, called Antonio.\textsuperscript{706} He figures in the records as Antal/Anthonius Proll/Polner of Sibiu. The family, known also as the “Zanobii” in Sibiu definitely settled in the city and were forebears to the prominent Proll family, among them the renowned Nicholaus Proll of Sibiu, who controlled the Transylvanian mint and in the 1490s also the salt chambers.\textsuperscript{707}

\textsuperscript{700} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{701} See the details in the Prosopographic Database, under the entry on the Zati family.
\textsuperscript{702} In an entry of the Cluj-Mănăștur chapter register his son, Paulus and his daughter, Chaterine are named, and the record includes mention on a certain Margaret as well, who was mistakenly identified as Cristoforo’s wife. In the reality, she was the wife of another Italian mentioned in the document, a certain Franciscus Italicus, citizen of Cluj. The latter represented Paulus, Catherine’s two unidentified daughters and Margaret, when petitioned the chapter to transcribe donation letters issued by King Matthias. Thus, as the donations concerned also Margaret, I assume, that she was close kinswoman to Cristoforo and his family. See MNL OL DL 36394. later than April 20, 1470, prior to Aug. 22, 1470.
\textsuperscript{703} Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.
\textsuperscript{704} Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127.
\textsuperscript{705} MNL OL DL 36403. 1451.
\textsuperscript{706} Goldthwaite, \textit{The Building of Renaissance Florence}, 280.
\textsuperscript{707} Gündisch, \textit{Das Patriziat}, 244-245. On Proll see also Flóra, “Generations in Urban Politics”, 225-226.; the property Oláhpen was granted by King Ladislaus to Nicholaus Proll and Michael Polner of Sibiu on account of Proll’s inheritance rights “\textit{per progenitores suos iure hereditario}”, see MNL OL DL 46664. March 19, 1504); On the chamber offices see MNL OL DL 65441. July 4, 1496; DL 30943. Febr. 24, 1498; DL 65443. Aug. 20, 1499)
5.9. The case of the Corsi brothers

The previous chapters on the three Buda partnerships and the crediting activity of Florentines already addressed Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi’s role in the Hungarian business, as partners of the Melanesi in Buda including their investments and forms of participation in the crediting activity in Hungary. There is, however, one quick and rather personal comment by the Melanesi brothers in the introductory part of their catasto declaration, where they listed their immobile property in Buda, which referred to Tommaso di Lapo Corsi as someone, who could estimate the value of immobile goods, in this case a vineyard and a house with garden in Buda. This short remark reveals a rather detailed knowledge on local conditions and although there is no information on an eventual longer sojourn of Corsi in Buda, it alters the picture on Tommaso Corsi’s connection to Hungary. Thus, this subchapter shall unfold the social and economic context of the brothers, with particular emphasis on Tommaso in order to provide a more detailed picture on him.

The Corsi belonged to the prominent Florentine families of the ghibellin party, and were excluded from urban offices from 1268 until the mid-fourteenth century. The family was mainly interested in trade in silk and precious metals according to the tax declarations. According to the Catasto declarations there were three brothers, sons of Lapo Corsi, and none of them had a taxable profit above fl 800, a relatively modest sum compared to their field of interest and the partners’ economic background. In the kin group the sons of Domenico Corsi were the wealthiest with taxables from approximately fl 1.800 up to fl 3.800 in 1427. One of them, Bartolo di Domenico Corsi also appears with investment in Giovanni di Niccoló Frescobaldi’s records. Concerning Simone and Tommaso di Lapo, Simone was clearly wealthier with his profit of fl 800. Both of them are classified among the silk merchants by profession, members of the Por Santa Maria guild.

The brothers held major urban offices too, according to the Tratte records: 1422 Simone was one of the Priors, whereas Tommaso invested the offices on one occasion as one of the 12 Buonuomini, moreover, he was elected prior, and twice was drawn in the guild elections of the Mercanzia in

---

708 The declaration is unfortunately in part damaged at this entry, the following remains decipherable: “[Tom]maso Chorsi sono avisato valere detti beni [a vineyard and a so-called “chasa da ortolano” with large garden - Arany] fl 175.”, ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. fol. 655v. In the abstract of the officials of the Catasto the entry was taken over as follows: “Stimale Tommaso Chorsi perché cosi dice fu avisato valevano fl 175” ASF, Catasto 1427, 77. fol. 248v.
710 See Online Catasto, search results for the family name “Corsi”.
711 ASF, Catasto 1427, 72. fol. 40.
712 ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 631r.
1427-1432. \(^{713}\) Tommaso also held another important office, that of the chamberlain of the "gabella de contratti" already in 1415.\(^{714}\)

In 1427 Tommaso and Simone handed in separate catasti to the Florentine officials, the separate declarations and the information of their business activity clearly show that although they often partnered the same business ventures, just as in the case of their Florentine company and the Buda partnership with the Melanesi, but both did it on their own account. They even lived in Florence next to each other. In Florence Simone (the younger of the brothers, aged approximately 38) seems to be "settled", as far as his declaration reveals. He had his wife, Maddalena and four children in his house, and he also had a rather large household with servants, even two women slaves, one of them a young girl, who was sent to him directly from Slavonia (also due to the extensive business network he formed part of as investor in the region).\(^{715}\)

Also Tommaso had his wife, Aura in Florence, but did not have children and seems to be more mobile than Simone. His household also hosted two slaves, a 27-year-old sick woman, who according to him was useless and stayed for most of the time in hospital and could not bear the fatigues, thus he had to take another eleven-year-old girl from Slavonia.\(^{716}\)

Tommaso was present in Hungary as early as 1413, as partner in a company founded for trade in the kingdom.\(^{717}\) Later he had an agent in the kingdom, Filippo del Palagio, but presumably he also went on occasions to Hungary, because he appeared to be well informed on the prices of houses and vineyards in the town, as the Melanesi referred to it in their tax return.\(^{718}\) Thus, Melanesi recommended Corsi as an authentic source of information for the Florentine authorities, and this implies that in Florence Corsi was accepted as such. When taking a closer look on prices of estates, plots and houses in contemporary Buda, Corsi proves to be reliable, which confirms his unusually large knowledge on the town of Buda. He also figures in the lists related to the work of Masolino da Panicale, also having his residence in the quarter of the Santa Croce, gonfalone Bue, and with whom he had transactions related to Panicale’s sojourn in Hungary and services to Filippo Scolari.

\(^{713}\) See Online Tratte, Simone di Lapo Corsi, 123866; Tommaso di Lapo Corsi, 108291, 108292, 108293, 108294, 315041. The Online Tratte also records the birth date of Tommaso, accordingly 1384. see Online Tratte, Tommaso di Lapo di Francesco Corsi, 418900.

\(^{714}\) The “gabella” (tax) of contracts was an indirect tax in Florence, imposed on the sale of immobile goods from the early fourteenth century onwards. “Pagammo la gabella de’ contrati al comune di Firenze a rag. di 5 1/4 per centinaio, a dì 1415, a Tommaso di Lapo Corsi, allora camarlingo a’ decto comune di Firenze” Lapo Niccolini de’Sirigatti, Il libro degli affari propri di casa de Lapo di Giovanni Niccolini de’Sirigatti. http://www.bibliotecaitaliana.it/xtf/view?docId=bbibit000366/bbibt000366.xml&query=niccol%C3%B2&hit.rank=5 (Last downloaded: May 20, 2013.)

\(^{715}\) “Truovomi una schiava d’etá d’anni 30 al mio servigio e della mia famiglia, chostomi fl 70. Truovommi una fanciulletta di Schiavonia che per non portare le fatighe e quella di sopra, d’etá d’anni 11” ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 631r

\(^{716}\) “Una fanciulla di Schiavonia […] che per non portare la fatichetta quela di sopra, d’etá d’anni 11” ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo II. fol. 657r.

\(^{717}\) Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204.

\(^{718}\) ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo II. fol. 657v.
and King Sigismund, which apparently was coordinated by the Corsi and Melanesi di Buda.\textsuperscript{719} In any case he was extremely well informed and apparently also had close links to Hungary and Buda. Finally, his political influence back at home shall not be underestimated in this period. One of the major influences is that Tommaso was elected prior and at least in part the decision to introduce the \textit{Florentine Catasto} was ascribed to him (which also influenced the possibilities of this dissertation to great extent).\textsuperscript{720} He supported the Albizzi fraction, his other brother, Corso di Lapo Corsi in fact married an Albizzi girl. According to Cosimo de’Medici’s diary in 1433, Corsi was member of the Eight of the Balia with Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, when Cosimo de’ Medici was sent to exile.\textsuperscript{721} When the Medici returned, the Corsi faced difficulties at first. Later, however, they adhered to the Medici party and could return to urban offices too.

\textsuperscript{719} Not only scholarship knew about Corsi’s relation to Masolino da Panicale, in Hungary Corsi appeared also in a Hungarian novel by György Tarczali, \textit{Masolino. Regény Luxemburgi Zsigmond király idejéből} [Masolino. A Novel from the period of King Sigismund of Luxemburg], and published in parts in the ‘\textit{Katolikus Szemle}’ [Catholic Review], 17, nr. 2. (1903): 165.
\textsuperscript{721} \textit{Istorie Fiorentine scritte da Giovanni Cavalcanti con illuzazioni}, ed. Filippo Luigi Polidori (Florence, 1838), vol. 1. Libro IX, Capitolo IX, 515.
VI. Excursion: An unrevealed aspect of Florentine—Hungarian economic relations

In the framework of Florentine-Hungarian economic and social historical relations, mostly the Florentine entrepreneurs and families’ activity in Hungary is in the focus of the research, as is the case of the present dissertation too, so far. This closing chapter, however, resulted in an attempt of drawing a first overview on a mobility in the opposite direction, a short excursion and a shift in both the investigated area and persons: instead of the Kingdom of Hungary we shall return to Florence, whereas instead of the Florentines’ activity, we shall take a closer look on artisans of foreign, more precisely of Hungarian origin to observe some patterns of this migration. The possibility of such “excursion” was only feasible because of an unexpected finding during the archival research of the Florentine Catasto of 1427. In fact the catasto record of a young Hungarian artisan unfolded a hitherto unknown glimpse on this mobility, which, beyond doubt, is an interesting segment of the Florentine-Hungarian economic relations.

First I would like to briefly introduce the young man, a certain “Niccoló di Giovanni d’Ungheria”, aged approximately 24, and lived in Florence, in the quarter of Santa Croce, gonfalone Bue. The tax declaration of Niccoló does not inform us on his original home place/town. By profession he was a silk weaver, a rather prominent position among the weavers in Florence. When browsing the declarations for Florentines interested in Hungarian business, the name “Corsi” was the first to recall my attention to the tax return of Niccoló. Tommaso di Lapo Corsi and partners were namely

722 Mobility from the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary towards Western-Europe was mainly investigated in the case of students visiting universities, pilgrimages and diplomatic missions. The latter two categories, however, involved only a restricted social cluster at one-occasion travels and normally a shorter sojourn at the destination. The mobility of mercenaries is another, extensively researched topic, but that too involved only a narrow circle of people even if the mercenaries could in theory cause a broader social environment. See György Bónis, A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon [Learned people of legal qualification in Hungary prior to the battle of Mohács 1526] (Budapest, Akadémiai kiadó, 1971); Vilmos Fraknói, Magyarországi tanárok és tanulók a bécsi egyetemen a XIV. és XV. században [Hungarian teachers and students at the University of Vienna in the 14. and 15. centuries] (Budapest, 1874); Károly Schrauf, Magyarországi tanulók külföldön [Hungarian students abroad], I-IV (Budapest. 1892-1902); Endre Veress: Olasz egyetemek járt magyarországi tanulók anyakönyve és iratai. 1221-1864 [Records and registrar of Hungarian students studying at Italian universities 1221-1864] (Budapest: Akadémia, 1941); Kubinyi, “Kincstári személyzet”, Sándor Tonk, Erdélyiek egyetemjárása a középkorban [University attendance of Transylvanian people in the Middle Ages] (Bukarest, Kritéron, 1979); Enikő Csukovits, Középkori magyar zarándokok [Hungarian pilgrims in the Middle Ages] (Budapest: História-MTA Történettudományi Intézet, 2004); On Hungarian mercenaries see recently Attila Bárány, “Angol-magyar zsoldoskompániaik a XIV. századi Itáliában” [English-Hungarian mercenary troops in fourteenth-century Italy] in Angol-magyar kapcsolatok a középkorban [English-Hungarian relations in the Middle Ages], ed. Bárány Attila–Laszlósváry József–Papp Zsuzsanna (Attraktor, 2008). I used the version of the book published online: http://delfin.klte.hu/~history/magykoz/kulpolitika/kotet II.2. chapter, 227-243. I could also find entries on mercenaries of Hungarian origin in the records of the Catasto, usually due to small loans, but no information is provided by the taxational documents on the circumstances and persons involved into these transactions, therefore they cannot help us answer the questions proposed in this chapter.

723 Niccoló di Giovanni d’Ungheria, ASF, Catasto 1427, 31. fol. 853r.
Niccolò’s only commissioners, the same Corsi, who, as we could see in the previous chapter, worked in Hungary and had extended knowledge on the conditions in the kingdom, particularly Buda. The declaration by Niccolò also revealed that he was not taxed before in Florence (“non ho prestanza”), which means, he did not figure in any urban tax lists of the Florentine state. Taking into consideration this information and his young age, the only commissioner he worked for, I would claim that he may have arrived in the Tuscan city right prior to the compilation of the Florentine Catasto of 1427. All these pieces of information, as indirect evidence, also suggest that the Corsi, mainly Tommaso may have had a hand in his migration to Italy. This idea seems to be further supported by the way his tax declaration was compiled: in fact, he stated not to have been paid commission: so “I must have from Tommaso di Lapo Corsi and partners for work done and brought to their shop, as they say it entered in their book fl 50”. This means that he most probably did not keep accounts, and therefore he referred to the books of the Corsi as proof for his declaration. This also shows that he could avail of the assistance of the Corsi, when needed, to fulfill his obligations towards the urban government. Finally, both the Corsi brothers and also the young Hungarian lived in the same district (Santa Croce) of Florence. In light of these evidences, it seems that the young weaver could rely on prominent supporters in Florence, a crucial factor necessary for successful settlement of an artisan in the city as it also secured continuous work.

Corsi’s apparent role in Niccolò di Giovanni’s Florentine sojourn, even if considering it a, to my knowledge, single, but at any rate rare case, seems to be a rather interesting aspect of the Florentines’ activity in Hungary. When reflecting, however, on the more or less continuous necessity for skilled weavers in Florence, and their recruitment, particularly those specialized in the production of prestigious silk, and finally the generally known fact, that the majority of the masters of this craft were migrating into Florence, mainly from German territories, the young Niccolò’s case

---


725 “Devo avere da Tommaso di Lapo Chorsi and chompagnia per lavoro recato e rendito loro a bottegha chome dichono apariere per i loro libri fl 50”, ASF, Catasto 1427, 31. fol. 853r.

726 On the relation of the industrials (“setaioli”) and the weavers see Richard A. Goldthwaite, “An Entrepreneurial Silk Weaver in Renaissance Florence”, in I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance, 10 (2005): 69-126, here 75-76. (hereafter: Goldthwaite, An Entrepreneurial Silk Weaver). The silk weavers enjoyed a more independent standing in silk guild and were protected by guild legislation compared to wool weavers.
may not be judged to be so unique anymore, as it would be deemed at first. The exceptional fact is rather the unusually well documented circumstances of the young weaver’s arrival and settlement in Florence.

In any case, Niccolò di Giovanni’s catasto raised new questions related to migration from Hungary to Florence, and therefore I paid much more attention to the references on “Hungarians” among the tax declarations. As a result I also found the declaration of four other fellow countrymen of Niccolò and the mention on a few more Hungarians in the debtors’ and creditors’ lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hungarian person</th>
<th>in the tax declaration of:</th>
<th>ASF, Catast o of 1427</th>
<th>location</th>
<th>Occupatio n</th>
<th>ag e</th>
<th>famil y</th>
<th>Belongin gs</th>
<th>debtors</th>
<th>creditor s</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pagolo di Giovanni Unghero</td>
<td>Andrea di Niccolò Giugni e di Iacopo di Giovanni Giugni e di Giovanni di Piero Guidi</td>
<td>filza 36, c.494v.</td>
<td>Santo Spirito, gnf. Ferza</td>
<td>servant for 11 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donato di Bartolome o Barbadoro fl 95</td>
<td>Among the bad debtors of the company and left for Hungary fl 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddalena del fu Piero Unghero</td>
<td></td>
<td>filza 21, fol. 446r, reg. 66, c. 429</td>
<td>Popolo di San Pier Maggiore, Santa Croce, gnf. Ruota residence, taxed in San Giovanni, gnf. Chiave</td>
<td>trade 23 = exchanger</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>with wife, son, mothe r in law</td>
<td>Half of a house (fl 50) with household utensils</td>
<td>Pays fl 2 annual rent for the half of the house to Antonio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolò di Piero d’Ungheria</td>
<td></td>
<td>filza 296, cc.134v -135r</td>
<td>rented house in the street ”della Segnia/Fegnia, Santa Croce</td>
<td>silk weaver</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>alone</td>
<td>Half of a house (fl 50) with household utensils</td>
<td>Tommaso di Lapo Corsi fl 50</td>
<td>To Simone di Bartolo annual pay fl 16 in una chasa a pigione pagone</td>
<td>in his household: Simone di Bartolo, aged twelve, for him clothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Filza</th>
<th>Living in the street</th>
<th>Servant of</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Renting a house, few household utensils</th>
<th>Total of fl</th>
<th>Credit to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giorgio di Tommaso Unghero</td>
<td>filza 37 c. 648r, reg. c. 266.</td>
<td>living in the street San Brocholo, popolo San Piero Maggiore, Santa Croce, gonf. Ruota</td>
<td>servant of the Guild of Speziali</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>with wife</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I have to give Antonio Unghero fl 0 soldi 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filippo d'Ungheria</td>
<td>filza 49, cc. 1122r-1133v.</td>
<td>tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bad debtor</td>
<td>I have to give Antonio Unghero for credit I had from him new fl 8s libra 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni di Niccolò d'Ungheria</td>
<td>filza 49, c. 1414r, reg. c. 583.</td>
<td>San Hungari Giovan ni, gonf. Lion d'Oro</td>
<td>sew the old shoes, (shoe maker)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>with wife</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have to give Niccolò di Giorgio Unghero fl 9 new libra 38 I have to give Pagolo d'Andrea Unghero fl 4 new fl 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piero di Giorgio d'Ungheria</td>
<td>filza 51, 1063v.</td>
<td>servant of Simone di Francesco di messer Gino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>creditor of messer Simone fl 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Hungarian householders in the Florentine Catasto of 1427

The data, laconic as they are, hide among the tax declarations of householders of foreign origin. Yet, in order to provide a general context, in which the data on these Hungarian householders can be properly analysed, however, first, a short introduction on foreigners in Florence with particular emphasis on Germans seems appropriate.
6.1. “Germans” in the records of the Florentine Catasto of 1427

The Herlihy-Klapish database on the Catasto, based on the processing of the tax returns’ abstracts called “campioni”, made a distinction among three main immigrant groups in Florence: first, the householders coming from Germany (“dalle parti della Magna”);728 second, the householders coming from Italy outside of the territories controlled by Florence were identified; and finally the immigrants who did not belong to the first two groups. In the database 89 householders declared themselves immigrants from Germany, they and the others, coming from Italy outside of the Florentine state counted altogether 105 persons.729 In the Florentine Catasto of 1427, altogether 26 immigrants not coming from Italy or Germany (“della Magna”) identified their origin in their tax returns. Therefore, they make up the last, third group of expatriates in the tax records and the Hungarian householders are also listed among them. Within this last group we find two women and 24 men, mostly working as artisans or servants.730 In the case of the women ethnicity is uncertain: in the case of Maddalena del fu Piero Unghero (in the campioni, that is abstracts compiled by the Catasto administrative personnel she was named Maddalena del Piero Dalena), the deceased husband was Hungarian according to her tax return, but in the statistical analysis of the 1427 Catasto she is also listed among the foreign householders of the third group. In the original tax return of Maddalena no explicit hint is to be found on her ethnicity. Therefore, I listed her as family member among the householders, based on the idea that her economic and social situation also reflects on that of her defunct spouse. Both the women in the third group of immigrants were servants at Florentine families, and were already elderly in 1427.731

728 In Florence, the immigrants of German origin belonged to specific professional groups, among them mainly weavers, but also shoe makers. By the first half of the fifteenth century, they in fact, made up the majority of weavers working in Florence. The immigrant German communities formed confraternities, which provided social and legal support to its members towards the Florentine authorities. It is quite characteristic to their presence in the city that around 50% of the death cases among foreign (“stranieri”) patients of the Florentine hospital of San Matteo was of German origin. Also the urban topographical boundaries of areas densely populated by the Germans, mainly the weavers are to be clearly determined: on the southern riverbank of the Arno the Camaldoli and San Frediano districts (popoli), whereas the northern riverbank the San Lorenzo and the San Marco districts hosted the majority of them. They were also assessed there. Samuel Kline Cohn Jr, The Labouring Classes in Renaissance Florence (Academic Press, 1980), 110. The German were cut off from city comunity in general. See Lucia Sandri, “Stranieri and forestieri nella Firenze del Quattrocento attraverso i libri di ricordi di entrata e uscita degli ospedali cittadini,” in Forestieri and stranieri nelle città basso-medievali, Atti del Seminario internazionale di Studio, Bagno a Ripoli (Florence, 1984.), Lorenz Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung nach Florenz im Spätmittelalter, The Medieval Mediterranean Series (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006).

729 It must be emphasized, that other records and the scholarly literature confirm that the number of foreigners living in Florence was considerably higher than it was reflected in the taxational sources, see Alfred Doren, Deutsche Handwerker und Handwerkerbruderschaften im mittelalterlichen Italien (Berlin 1903).

730 See result lists on Online Catasto.

The men in the third group had mainly occupations related to weaving, and some traditional artisan professions, like the cobbler or the tailor. Apart from these men, mainly servants to families, to guilds and to the Florentine commune are listed among them.

Their taxable wealth varies between 0 and 650 florins, but 11 persons out of 26 are ranked among the miserabili. Eight persons had a profit in the lowest segment of fl 1-100, four people fell in the segment of 100-200 fl of taxable assets. Thus, in general they belonged to the wide cluster of poor urban population in Florence.

The low number of foreigners in the Catasto is due to several factors. The foreigners living in Florence temporarily, often without a stable accommodation were numerous, but they were not much documented. Their disputes were difficult to manage even for the Florentine authorities; therefore, they tried to invite them before the authorities by proclamations in the public squares favoured generally by foreigners in Florence with varying success.732

The submission of the tax return and the payment of the tax assessed on the householder was a crucial condition to acquire and preserve Florentine citizenship, but not sufficient in itself.733 On the other hand, however, also foreigners not meeting the preconditions determined by the Florentine statutes were inserted in the Catasto lists on the order of the Florentine authorities.734 The householders from Hungary presumably belonged to this social cluster. Integration, for most members of these expatriate artisan groups which successfully settled, was eased by marriage into local artisan families, by finding partners for their activity, possibly a patron/patrons in the

---

732 „alla piazza et porta del palagio di dexta universitá et luoghi publici dove stano i forestieri et chi non á propria o conducta casa in quello di Florence” [„on the square and at the entrance of the palace of the given community, and at public places, where foreigners are to be found and those, who do not dispose of an own or rented house in Florence] see Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung, 245

733 The Florentine statutes gave a very strict reading of the notion of citizenship, full Florentine citizenship was only granted to the Florentine males who completed thirty years of age, had lived in the city for longer time and were active taxpayers of the commune. They could participate in the political life of Florence, were entitled to vote and to be eligible in draws for urban offices. For foreign artisans of humble economic means and weak social network it was virtually impossible to rise to such social standing which would have granted legal safety for them in Florence. In general, one can rarely encounter grants of citizenship in the records of the “Provvisioni” (Decisions) of the Florentine authorities. On Florentine citizenship see Richard C. Trevxler, Public Life in Renaissance Florence (Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1980), 11-12.; Mario Ascheri, “Lo straniero: aspetti della problematica giuridica,” in Dentro la città: stranieri e realtà urbane nell’Europa dei secoli XII-XVI, ed. Gabriella Rosetti (Pisa, Naples: GISEM, Liguori, 1989), 33-46. On the legal standing and possibilities of foreigners (stranieri and forestieri) living in Florence see the case study on the prominent doctor from Cyprus, Giorgio di Baliano Flatro (c.1440 – 1497) which, however, does not reflect the possibilities of the average immigrant in Florence, Maria Pia Contessa, La costruzione di un’identità familiare e sociale. Un immigrato cipriota nella Firenze del secondo Quattrocento, Annali di Storia di Firenze, IV (2009): http://www.dssg.unifi.it/SDF/annali/annali2009.htm. (Last downloaded: Aug. 29, 2011.) (hereafter: Contessa, La costruzione di un’identità) Of course the Cypriote doctor, who was on good terms also with the Florentine leading elite, found himself in a much easier situation compared to simple immigrating artisans. His petition for Florentine citizenship is one of the rare cases supported also by the urban authorities; his integration was further eased by his marriage into the Bardi kin group. See ibidem. 155-156

734 Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung, 66. According to Böninger the Florentine tax lists compiled prior to 1427 included only very few German weavers. By 1431 the number of German taxable householders sank further, to one third compared to 1427, a drastic change; presumably also due to the omission of those entering the wide group of profitless householders, in other words the “miserabili”. Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung, 82-83
neighbourhood and a stable network of commissioners, not only to earn the living but also to be supported in front of local authorities in all kinds of problems life could bring them through in an unfamiliar environment. Therefore, in case they were to be identified based on features other than their place of origin, presumably they did not find it important to give their origin in their tax return.

The definition of place of origin, as a distinguishing mark, served the identification of the householder on the sheets of medieval tax returns (and not only in the declarations but presumably also in everyday life), particularly in case of immigrants of lower social standing, who did not dispose of a steady family name and whose personal name and patronymics were used in a form translated into Italian/vernacular. Of course the use of naming forms, particularly in the case of foreign immigrants can at least in part be regarded as a self-definition.

A second step in the analysis is to understand whether the definition unghero/ungaro should be regarded as geographical and/or linguistical identification. The question seems to be of particular interest if considering that many of the artisans in towns of the Kingdom of Hungary were of German origin and spoke German. The case of a mid-fifteenth century Florentine shoe maker coming from Košice, Benedetto di Guasparre can serve as model to understand the problem. Benedetto’s sojourn in Florence is unusually well-documented and also published due to the meticulous research done by Lorenz Böninger on the German colony in Florence.

The records kept in Florence on Benedetto di Guasparre, in fact, -- in spite of the time gap of around thirty years between him and the Hungarians in the Florentine Catasto of 1427-- apply as a valuable comparative source material to the analysis of a number of questions emerged on Hungarian householders in the Catasto and to be researched in the framework of this chapter. Also for the complex use of naming, his case applies as an emblematic example. The first record on the shoemaker goes back to 1457, and in general the different sources use slightly different names for him: in a volume of the notarial fond he is called „Benedetto di Guasparre di Ungheria”, whereas in book of the confraternity of the German weavers he is listed as „Benedetto von Cassaw”. In the Catasto of 1458 he figured among the bankrupt cobblers with the distinguishing remark „tedesco”

---

735 This was the case with the baker, Michele di Benedetto from Hungary, who supplied the hospital of San Matteo with bread, and also the shoe maker Benedetto di Guasparre from Košice. Both had in an early phase of their stay in Florence a Florentine business partner, but as they had financial problems, later they both were compelled to work alone. See Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung, 141. footnote nr. 93. See on the inventory of Michele’s bakery: ibidem, 245.

736 On the integration of the German weavers in Florence see Henderson, Piety and Charity, 429; apparently neither the Cypriote doctor with quick career in Florence thought it necessary to preserve his family name, although he belonged to the prominent and well-respected Cypriote families. He only used his name and his patronymic. Contessa, “La costruzione di un’identità”, 174.

737 Benedetto from Košice after a sojourn of few years in Florence left for Rome in 1458, in search of better working possibilities and fleeing from hist debts in Florence. Böninger, Die deutsche Einwanderung, 244-245.
after his name, and also mentioned as „Benedetto di Ghuasparre della Magnia”.

738 A majority of Kassa’s medieval population was of German of origin and also of mother tongue. Therefore, his identity has to be understood on various levels, on his being member of a German speaking local urban community and also as subject to the Kingdom of Hungary, called “Hungarus”. He joined the German weavers’ community in Florence, which acquired wide privileges, and identified himself alternately as Hungarus or German. His example clearly shows that the identification of immigrants coming from the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary is uncertain and can only be assessed with certainty when more records survive on a person, preferably in various archival holdings, such as the Notarile Antecosimiano, the Mercanzia, or the records of the German confraternity in Florence. The namelist of the German shoe makers’ Liebfrauen confraternity (of Our Lady) published by Bönninger was compiled in 1448-1483, which means a time gap of at least 21 years from the 1427 Catasto. The lists include five more shoe makers from the Spiš, three from Transylvania (one of them from Cluj) and finally one member from Pressburg. Moreover, Bönninger also quotes two bakers from Hungary and a Hungarian woman, whose nickname „la Graziosa”, according to Bönninger hints to her ancient profession.

With regard to these comparative examples, I assume that the adjective “unghero” at the five Hungarian householders’ name, whose tax returns are to be analysed in the subsequent paragraphs, determine geographical origin, but the ethnic affiliation and native language remain uncertain. This idea is supported by the name forms emerging from the sources in the case of another shoemaker, Giovanni di Michele of Stará L’ubovňa. The confraternity’s lists refer to him as “Hans Zipzer von Luoblaw”, whereas in the Catasto of 1458 he figures as “Giovanni di Michele Slav shoemaker opposite the episcopal palace”.

Bönninger ascribes the different ethnic identifications to the unsecurities related to the distinction of Slavic/German ethnicity. This may of course be an interpretation of the situation, but Giovanni di Michele’s case also could be understood as of an artisan belonging to the Slavic ethnic group living in and around Stará L’ubovňa in the period.

---

738 The first mention on him dates back to 1457. See the information on Benedetto di Guasparre in Bönninger, Die Deutsche Einwanderung, 244-245. Bönninger identified a number of different archival units, in which Benedetto figures: Liebfrauengesellschaft, n. 258. ASF, NA 14196, fol. 154v; 195r. ASF, Catasto 795, fol. 635r; Catasto 822, fol. 640r. In 1460-1463 he returned to Florence, lived in the San Lorenzo. ASF, NA 16778, fol. 97r, 526r, where he partnered the shoe maker, Biagio di Niccoló from Udine. According to a document from 1464 -bol Benedetto di Guasparre was not willing to denounce Biagio for his debt of 60 lire. ASF, NA 13140, fol.119v; Apart from the tax return in the Catasto and the documents of the notarial fond, he also figures among the records of the Florentine Mercanzia in 1464-1465 because of his debts, see ibidem ASF, Mercanzia 295, fol. 247v; Mercanzia 1434, fol. 116r; Mercanzia 1434, fol. 460v.--461r; Mercanzia1435, fol. 140r.-v; Mercanzia, 1436, fol. 570r; Mercanzia 1440, fol. 129v.

739 Engel, The Realm, 61, 112.

740 Bönninger, Die Deutsche Einwanderung, 130-131, 139.

741 “Giovanni di Michele Ischiavo chalzolaio dirinpetto al veschovado” quoted in Bönninger, Die Deutsche Einwanderung, 237-238.
Giovanni di Michele probably spoke German language, which was used largely in his hometown and he could join the German shoemakers’ confraternity in Florence.\textsuperscript{742}

\textsuperscript{742} Engel, \textit{The Realm}, 331.
6.2. Hungarian householders in the Florentine Catasto of 1427

The records of the Florentine Catasto of 1427 provide a wide range of data on the householders. The debtor and creditor lists of the tax returns also include some persons of Hungarian origin sojourning in Florence or being in contact with Florentines, but the mere mention of their names renders any kind of analysis impossible and therefore they are not reported in the table above. The information is still laconic on Filippo d’Ungheria (Philip of Hungary), a tailor, who is only recorded with his profession and his old debt running to soldi 19.743 Another Hungarian, Piero di Giorgio d’Ungheria (George’s son Peter of Hungary) figures as creditor of his master, Simone di Francesco di messer Gino with fl 10, probably for arrears of his pay.744

Some entries hint to temporary sojourn in Florence, which must have been quite frequent, like the case of Pagolo di Giovanni Unghero (John’s son Paul of Hungary) who after a stay in Florence returned back to Hungary, obviously leaving open accounts in Italy.745 Based on the entries, mainly soldiers and artisans figure in the creditor and debtor lists, and as they cannot be identified among the householders submitting tax returns, at the time of the compilation of the Catasto. The identification in itself is – as usual- encumbered by the italianization of the foreign names and the casual declaration of the origin on the part of the immigrants not to speak about the persons in transit in the Tuscan city. To obtain a more representative picture on the number of Hungarians, the thorough research in other archival units, particularly that of the notarial fond, and the writings of confraternities of foreigners etc. would be indispensable. In any case, as the available information is rather vague, the number of Hungarian in Florence must have been much higher than the few Catasto records show.

The declarations by the four Hungarian householders and the widow of a deceased Hungarian householder, however, provide a rare and therefore precious insight into the economic and social framework of these foreign artisans in Florence. Many of the catasti are, however, not autograph for lack of writing skills or for being absent from Florence. In some cases marginalia notes hint to the circumstances of the compilation and submission of the documents, particularly on the person writing and/or handing in the declaration in the name of the householder bound to declare. In case of autograph declarations, a “manu propria” (with one’s own hand) note is often to be read at the end of the document, whereas in the tax returns of artisans and other citizens of lower economical-

743 ASF, Catasto, 49. fol. 1122r-1133v. The tax return submitted in the name of Giovanni and Francesco brothers and sons of the late Albizzo del Toso da Fortuna, underage orphans, by the Ufficiali dei Popilli administering their inheritance, therefore, the most of the open accounts could result from the activity of the deceased father.
745 ASF, Catasto, 36. fol. 494v. A debt of 5 fl is reported at his name in the debtors’ lists of the partnership of Andrea di Nicholo Giugni, Iachopo di Giovanni Giugni and Giovanni di Piero Guidi. The detraction of the 5 fl as loss was justified with the note on the debtor’s return to Hungary.
social standing one can frequently encounter the name of the fiduciary who compiled the document instead of the commissioner. Some of these notes also give the reason for the interference of the fiduciary, namely, that the householder could not read or/and write. It is difficult to estimate to what extent the Hungarian immigrant householders spoke the Italian vernacular. The situation among the Germans, again, applies as analogy: the marginal notes in the Catasto in fact confirm in many cases that neighbours, in some cases a notary completed the tax return of German householders, who, as stated in these notes, could not speak Italian. Something similar could have happened with the declaration of the young silk weaver Niccolò di Giovanni too, whose hand writing seems quite elaborate and the Italian of the text is also fluent, therefore it can hardly be autograph. The script does not seem to be a notarial writing either, but rather resembles the so-called cursive Italian mercantesca penmanship. Based on our knowledge of Niccolò di Giovanni’s professional relationship with the Corsi brothers, one may assume that he not only turned for the information on opening an account to them, but could also rely on their help in completing his tax return.

Also the tax declaration of Giorgio di Tommaso, servant of a guild shows similar characteristics. The only declaration to be considered autograph among immigrant Hungarian householders was submitted by the cobbler. In his case a rather northern handwriting is to be recognized. Some Florentine guilds, among them also that of the shoemakers, prescribed their members to keep accounts. Also due to these ordinances, the cooperation with Italian partners was vital for immigrant foreign artisans.

The age of the five Hungarian householders in the year of the Catasto varies from 24 up to 68 according to their declaration. It can of course only be regarded an approximate age. The 24-years-old silk weaver ranks as the youngest among them, whereas the cobbler was 40, and the guild servant declared to have completed 36 in 1427. The woman working for a private household as servant was elderly, around 68 years of age according to her declaration. Age in the case of the

746 Robert Black confirmed, based on the entries to be found in the records of the Florentine Catasto, that at least 69.3% of the male householders was literate. See Robert Black, Education and Society in Florentine Tuscany. Teachers, Pupils and Schools, 1250–1500. Series Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, vol. 29 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006), 35. (hereafter: Black, Education and Society), This is considered an outstanding rate of literacy in the fifteenth century in general, see Richard A. Goldthwaite, “La cultura economica dell’artigiano”, in Arti fiorentine: la grande storia dell’artigiano, vol. ’. Il Medioevo, ed. Gloria Fossi (Florence: Giunti, 1998), 57–75. At the same time, however, most of the illiterates making up the remaining 30.7% of the Florentine householders came from the lower social and economic clusters, mainly artisans, servants and various unskilled workers.


748 I would like to thank prof. Robert Black for his precious advice formulated on the handwriting of the five tax returns analysed here, an opinion which I accepted and reported here.
other three Hungarian figuring in the lists of others, but lacking their own tax return remains unknown, whereas in the case of Pagolo di Giovanni, who left for Hungary and was named as debtor in a list reporting presumably older transactions, also his survival by 1427 seems uncertain. The number of *bocche*, which is the number of persons in the household, also varies: the lonely widow and the young silk weavers were alone in their household. The weaver, however, took a young boy to him as servant, and the boy seems to have lived with him, but could not reduce the weaver’s total wealth with the fl 200 per capita. On the contrary, the money changer counted five bocche, among them his wife and son, his mother-in-law and her son. Finally, both the cobbler and the guild servant lived with their wives. When taking a closer look on the third group of foreign householders’ records, which the five Hungarians belonged to, one can find that the majority of the households were, in fact, small ones with few members.

Turning the attention to the occupations declared in the tax returns of the five Hungarians, it seems to be justified to distinguish between the servants (both to institutions and to private persons) and the artisans, particularly those skilled ones who also needed and disposed of specific tools. The servants had keep, and sometimes also a small salary for payment of their work. The wealthy families provided a more secure situation for their servants, and usually they also took care of the elderly or ill servants.\footnote{Maddalena, the old widow was apparently fortunate with her place, because she was employed by Donato di Bartolomeo Barbadoro, a wealthy businessman (his taxable wealth totaled fl 6,824 according to his tax return). Barbadoro himself was around 79 years old, and lived alone in his household. Another servant of Hungarian origin, Piero di Giorgio d’Ungheria is also mentioned as creditor in the tax return of his master in Florence, presumably for arrear of payment. The servant of the guild of Medici and Speziali (Physicians and apothecaries) did not find himself in a better economic situation at all. The tax return does not provide information on his eventual salary, neither on any other income that he and his wife would have earned.}

The artisan cobbler, and the tailor figuring in the tax return of the orphans did not dispose of particularly valuable tools, at least the cobbler did not mention any such items among the “*masserizie*”, that is the household furnishings. Both seem to have had difficulties with earning

\footnote{Destitute widows formed a significant segment of urban paupers. Their keeping was mainly undertaken by urban hospitals and lay confraternities. See Henderson, *Piety and Charity*, 111, 263.}

\footnote{ASF, *Catasto*, 21. fol. 446r; 66. fol. 429. Maddalena del fu Piero Unghero. On Barbadoro see: Donato di Bartolomeo Barbadori, a prominent member of the wool guild ("*Arte della Lana*"), according to the guild’s records in 1431 “operaio” of the Opera del Duomo. (ASF, Arte della Lana, 163. fol.38 r-v. sacristy officials from San Pancrazio. Ragioniere per I consoli dell’Arte della Lana) [book-keeper to the consuls of the Wool manufacturers’ and merchants’ guild], see Archivio dell’Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore di Florence (AOSFM) Bastardelli di stanziamenti II. 48. 25. stanziamenti 1418. 07.19. \textit{The Years of the Cupola. Digital archive of the sources of the Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore}, 1417-1436, ed. Margaret Haines (Florence, Opera di Santa Maria del Fiore, copyright year of the edition consulted 2009.) \url{http://www.operaduomo.firenze.it/cupola}. (Last access: March 22, 2013)}

\footnote{Simone di Francesco di messer Gino’s tax return, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 51. fol. 1063v.}
their living. Our young silk weaver, on the contrary, listed among the household assets a loom apt for weaving the so-called “zetani” (satin) drape, one of the most precious drapes, usually silk velvets produced also in Florence by the early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{752} The loom was worth fl 18, according to the entry.\textsuperscript{753} Both the valuable tool and the type of drape it was used to weave are a clear indication, which ranks its owner among the skilled artisans very much in demand in Florence. Moreover, Niccoló di Giovanni belongs to the occupational and age cluster, which includes most of the immigrants, among them Germans in Florence.

The money changer Niccoló di Piero of Hungary’s occupation seems to be uncertain, as the information in his catasto seems to be contradictory. The definition of his occupation in his declaration may refer to his membership in the Bankers’ and money changers’ guild, because his assets do not reflect such activity, in fact, he mainly disposed of modest immobile assets, beyond the possession of a half house in Florence and its furnishings, he only owned another property worth of fl 80, which may refer to a small estate, because no evidence, like income from rentals etc. hint to the possession of other house fit for habitation. No profits resulting from other types of investments, be it public debt or private transactions, figure in the record, which would be expected in the case of an active money changer.

Considering the economic situation, the elderly Maddalena and the money changer were in the best financial conditions, but not well enough to fall within the segment of effective tax payers. Due to the statute of the Catasto, following the deduction of fl 200 pro capita of the household, no taxable profit was left. Maddalena’s outstanding debt is presumably due to an arrear of her pay, probably due for several years, similarly to the situation of Piero di Giorgio of Hungary, servant to Simone di Francesco di messer Gino addressed in a previous paragraph. As we know from the declaration of the young silk weaver, he had cost of a yearly amount of fl 16 for the employment of a young boy. Out of these fl 16, fl 4 were paid in clothes, which means that the remaining fl 12 must have been salary.\textsuperscript{754} Based on this information the fl 95 owed to Maddalena meant at least 8 years of arrears of pay.

The cobbler’s financial situation was very poor; his debts totaled around fl 105, against fl 3 of credit as private investment. His debts were due to money loans and ware taken on trust. In fact, this part of his declaration is of utmost interest to us, as he lists among his few creditors also two Hungarians, who do not seem to appear elsewhere in the records of the Catasto, as far as the

\textsuperscript{752} The expression “zetani” here most probably refers to the structure of the cloth, rather than to the fibres, it was made of, but these drapes were usually made from silk. See Jacqueline Herald, \textit{Renaissance Dress in Italy 1400-1500} (London: Bell &Hyman, 1981), 77.

\textsuperscript{753} At the end of the fifteenth century such looms could cost up to fl 30. See Goldthwaite, “An Entrepreneurial Silk Weaver”, 76.

\textsuperscript{754} On payment of domestic servants which was made up of provision of clothes and salary see Piero Guarducci, Valeria Ottanelli, \textit{I servitori domestici della casa borghese toscana nel basso Medioevo} (Florence, 1982), 47. Sergio Tognetti, “Prezzi e salari nella Firenze tardomedievale: un profilo,” \textit{ASI} 153 (1995): 263-333.
information permits the identification of these persons. A certain Niccoló di Giorgio Unghero lent fl 9 to the cobbler, whereas Pagholo di Andrea Unghero gave him a loan of fl 4, which, although no details of the transactions are known so far, hints to a certain form of co-operation, or even solidarity among Hungarians, living in Florence. The value of these loans are considerable among artisans, and in the case of the completely indebted cobbler, there was presumably hardly any chance to collect them.

Finally, also the urban topographical survey of the data in the five tax returns seems to be of interest. Scholarly literature, based on investigation of marriage alliances and business networks, confirmed that the role of neighbourhood, the parish affiliation was of utmost consequence particularly within the lower social economic clusters, mainly artisans.\(^{755}\) The tax returns give information on both the gonfalone (the 16 lay taxational and military districts finalized in 1343), and the popolo (called also capella, parrocchia, which were neighbourhoods organized in an earlier period around the parish churches of Florence) affiliations of the householders.\(^{756}\) The double administrational division of the city co-existed in the fifteenth century, but the areas of the gonfaloni and popoli did not overlap completely, therefore, lacking more detailed information on the residence of these artisan householders of Hungarian origin, at least the area of their closer neighborhood can be located by taking into consideration their administrational affiliation.\(^{757}\)

In the case of the money changer, Niccoló di Piero of Hungary, the tax return clearly distinguishes between his place of domicile and the residence for taxation purposes.\(^{758}\) Such distinction of living and taxational residence can often be observed, mainly due to taxational advantages.\(^{759}\) The guild servant and the silk weaver named also the street of their domicile. The silk weaver and the money changer lived in the district of Santa Croce, gonfalone Ruota.\(^{760}\) The cobbler had his accommodation in the district of the San Giovanni, gonfalone Lion D’Oro. The urban topographical situation of the elderly Maddalena del fu Piero Unghero cannot be interpreted independently as she


\(^{756}\) Herlihy-Klapisch, I toscani, 168-169.

\(^{757}\) Eventual sources for the identification of urban spaces: R. Burr Litchfield, Online Gazetteer of Sixteenth Century Florence. Florentine Renaissance Resources/STG: Brown University, Providence, R.I., 2006. http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/florentine_gazetteer/toc.php The database and the gazetteer were made on the basis of Stefano Buonsignori’s map of Florence made in 1584, but it reflects the urban topographical situation of Florence 150 years following the first Catasto, both parish and gonfalone boundaries altered and the street names were also used in alternative versions, therefore it cannot be used as a basic set of information.

\(^{758}\) ASF, Catasto1427, 296, registri diversi, fol. 134v-135r.

\(^{759}\) Morelli, Ricordi, 338-340.

had belonged to the household of her master, in the district of Santo Spirito, gonfalone Ferza, for 11 years by the time of the 'Catasto'.

Apart from the money changer, who lived in his own (half) house, none of the Hungarian householders had immobile assets. The silk weaver Niccoló di Giovanni, the guild servant Giorgio di Tommaso and the cobbler Giovanni di Niccoló rented their accomodation. Both the weaver and the cobbler lived in accommodations owned by ecclesiastic institutions: the weaver rented from the prior of San Pier Maggiore, the cobbler from the prelates of San Lorenzo. Both paid a yearly rental fee of fl 5, which can be considered a cheap accommodation in the Tuscan city. The money changer, also resident in the district of the Santa Croce, paid fl 2 of yearly lease for the other half of the house he lived in, which altogether meant a similar modest accommodation as those of the cobbler and the weaver.

From the very isolated information, however, vague evidences of solidarity and co-operation among the Hungarians in Florence can be assumed, although it never matched the extent of solidarity among Germans, with its sophisticated organizational forms around lay confraternities. In fact, in a subsequent period, apparently the German speaking immigrants coming from Hungary tended to join the institutions of Germans in the Tuscan city, and this leads to the conclusion that such German speaking persons from Hungary may be hidden among the householders identified as Germans also in the 'Florentine Catasto' of 1427. All these points however, can only be considered as starting preliminary results, which may be altered by further research in various other sources of the extremely rich Florentine archival holdings.

The few Hungarians (artisans and unskilled servants etc.) identified in the records, tried to settle and integrate in the city. The economic-social circumstances they found themselves in and their knowledge on each other, the eventual forms of solidarity are all crucial features of a mobility of economically and socially most humble clusters.

Most of the Hungarian householders in Florence “ranked” among the so-called “miserabili” (miserable), with no taxable profit at all. This is clearly reflected in their tax returns through their limited activity and poor earnings. In fact, not the value of their professional activity, but the mere existence of information on their activity renders their tax returns worth analysing.

The young silk weaver, taken as a starting point for this analysis, is, of course, a rare case, considering the circumstances of his migration and the possible role, the Corsi brothers may have played in it. Thus, his example cannot be generalized. The majority of artisans from east Central Europe did not need or have any mediators to push them towards this kind of mobility to the Western parts of Europe. Also, it is rather unlikely, that promoting such migration belonged to the

761 ASF, Catasto, 21. fol. 446r.
762 Also Benedetto di Guasparre rented a house and a cobbler workshop in Borgo San Lorenzo, which he quitted after a few months for another accommodation in the same street. See Böninger, Die Deutsche Einwanderung, 244.
Florentine merchant/business diasporas main interests. When only taking a closer look on the German artisan migrants in Florence, it becomes evident, that the stable presence of Florentine businessmen in German lands dates to a later period, than the first appearance of German craftsmen, mainly weavers in the Tuscan city.
VII. Conclusions

Florentine businessmen carried out a manifold activity in the territory of the Kingdom of Hungary. In all probability the most important and best documented among these fields is the participation in the financial administration. In the case of these businessmen we have the possibility to obtain a more complete picture on the whole of their activity, because the Florentine Catasto’s open account reported on the features of the complementing trading-banking operations, partners, and social and economical background, whereas also the majority of the scattered records preserved in Hungary and elsewhere in the region provided a precious insight into their task as royal officers, noble retainers (familiares) and their relation to local environment. Finally, they also sometimes corrected the picture depicted in the tax declarations on these merchants’ rather poor business profits in the kingdom.

On the other hand, the information of the Florentines’ crediting activity revealed in the Florentine tax returns provide hitherto unknown details both on the volume of cargos, the business and banking techniques applied among themselves to supply the Hungarian market. The general lack of references on exchange bills in the Florentine sources and its further confirmation by related Hungarian records also clearly show the limits to international trade and banking provided by the lower level of development of the region. At this point, however, one must also emphasize Venice’s role as banking center and seat of branches of Florentine banking houses, which basically covered the transfer of ecclesiastical revenues, a traditional business of Florentines in Europe. In the activity of the Florentines different forms of commercial credits among Florentine partners prevailed to supply the regional market and also the evolving permanent royal seat. The role of King Sigismund of Luxemburg was of utmost importance for these international-scale merchant-bankers, and in fact, his changing political relation to Florence rendered circumstances unstable for them at certain time periods. On the other hand the direct relation some of them acquired entering directly the ruler’s service as his noble retainers (familiares) increased notably the business potential of the region for them. Nevertheless, similarly to the Florentines’ situation in England prior to the bankruptcies, some of Sigismund’s “bankers”, like the Melanesi, faced serious losses against other Florentine investors involved in the Hungarian business, in all probability partly due to delayed or neglected rendering of the loans provided for him. The ruler seems to have compensated them for their losses in one way or another, but also their legal situation back home worsened by these circumstances.

Contrary to trade and crediting activity, working in the royal financial administration favoured continuous personal presence and integration, The office holders were rather “officers” and
financial experts than entrepreneurs, especially in the case of the salt chambers and the offices of
the thirtieth custom of the kingdom. The information gathered confirmed that most of the
Florentines working in the royal financial administration, in fact, did not dispose of larger capitals.
Their activity therefore required a greater flexibility and an ability to adapt to changing conditions
and increased the probability of their settlement in the chamber centers of Transylvania, Zagreb,
and other such places. In the case of families acquiring nobility and estates, their joint possession
also secured the perpetuation of the estate for subsequent generations of the kin group even if one of
the ennobled branches became extinct. Also, the network and forms of cooperation in trade among
kin groups of Florentine families present in the kingdom was addressed. Altogether, the solidarity
of the Florentine families was realized in different ways in Hungary compared to their homeland,
where business competition was much more intense.

At the beginning of this project I hoped that with the research on other target areas of the Florentine
families working in Hungary I would also be able to place Hungary in a hierarchy of trading and
economic centers or simply areas of interest in a broader, European context. This was really
tempting but in the course of the systematic research I had to realize that we can find many
Florentine investors in Hungary also in other traditional European trading, banking or consumption
centers, like Barcelona, Valencia, London, Bruges and Venice. Moreover, lacking any account
books and having only the list of creditors and debtors at the time of the tax declaration at our
disposal, there is hardly any possibility to assess the volume of trade and business operations in
these other geographical areas. Consequently, Hungary’s position in this respect in a medieval
European context could be analyzed on the basis of transaction types, the fields of interest and the
Florentine businessmen’s eventual tendency to establish a stable economic presence in the country.
Of course Hungary lacked intensive circulation of money. As it was claimed during the analysis of
the transaction types, commercial credit prevailed against money credits. Both credit types were
risky due to lack in necessary capital on the side of most of the potential local (Hungarian/German)
business partners. Yet, interests were clearly higher, than in Italy in the same period, which made
such transactions favorable nevertheless the relatively high risks involved in them. A rather
restricted circle of local partners was identified in the records. Clearly, the number of Florentine
partners collaborating to supply the demand for luxury goods of a narrow circle of local clients,
mainly members of the lay aristocracy and ecclesiastical leading elite, was higher, than that of the
local partners. Also the general lack of evidence on transactions with bills of exchange between
Florentines and local partners, the extremely few “banking”operations show Hungary’s lesser stage
of economic development.
In the course of the research, however, an unexpectedly large and rich set of data was gathered in the form of a database. Considering, that its main source basis in Florentine archival material was mainly restricted to the systematic research of the Florentine Catastos of 1427-1438-, this dataset still could of course be enlarged, in case further research would be feasible in other rich holdings of the Florentine archives, and so it is still far from being complete. In any case, the gradually developing database showed clear regional geographical preferences of the Florentines in the Kingdom of Hungary and in Central Europe at a wider, regional scale, and thus led to the conclusion, that the Florentines’ presence itself, and also the shifts in the intensity of their presence in the regional hubs of Central Europe may be of interest and would position the Kingdom of Hungary, and especially Buda within a regional context.

Buda had a considerable Florentine community in the period. However, as already noted, Buda citizenship was necessary also for the Florentines working for the Buda minting chamber and trading. Furthermore, after 1410 Buda became the center of the royal finances (chambers) under the leadership of Scolari, following King Sigismund’s centralizing reforms. Buda was also the center for three long-term Florentine partnerships in the 1420s.

Also the features of the Florentines’ coexistence with the the South Germans, the other determining foreign merchant diaspora which shaped regional trade, business and social network considerably had to be addressed in a comparative analysis. As a result, it seems that Buda’s role in the international commercial network needs a reconsideration, based both on the patterns identified in the business and social attitudes of the two foreign commercial diasporas operating in the town, and also on the general overview of the patterns of the Florentines’ presence in Central European urban centers.

The Germans of Buda were not as unified politically, economically and socially as it would seem for first sight. The South German newcomer elite covered long distance trade and one may even assume that similarly to the distinction among Gewölbherren and Kammerherren interpreted usually as a means to differentiate among Germans and other, mainly Italian businessmen. Further distinctions could be made within Buda’s German community, more precisely between newcomer South Germans of Nuremberg concentrating on the sale of lower value clothes within long distance trade and more humble German speaking inhabitants, artisans, and the few remaining representatives of the former German community of the town. In this respect the South Germans’ presence and social network has a marked regional character in east Central Europe and thus, despite the differing business and social organization and lower key business operations, it slightly resembles the Italians’ presence in Buda.
Buda must also be considered and reassessed as the only centre in Central Europe where the two most prominent foreign diasporas interested in regional long distance trade established themselves permanently on a long term basis. Buda disposed of an international trade deposit/market hall, a “Nyder lag” as it was called in the Ofner Stadtrecht. Its staple rights were from time to time weakened by similar privileges acquired by neighbouring towns along the main trade routes in the early fifteenth century. Nevertheless, at least three Florentine established partnerships were operating in the town in the 1420s. Neither Vienna, nor Prague or any other town in Central Europe assumed apparently such position in the fifteenth century. Only Venice with its Fondaco dei Tedeschi and numerous Florentine community could and did apply as such a trade hub, but Venice alone does not seems to have been considered sufficient to seek, find and finally cover the increasing demands and possibilities provided by East-central Europe during the reign of King Sigismund. Moreover, as it was demonstrated, the two main merchant diasporas did not appear to have had a direct contact elsewhere. Also Nuremberg, homeland of the South Germans, remains outside the Florentine sphere of interests until the last decades of the fifteenth century, and even then at first it was rather sporadic and grew stable only in the first decades of the sixteenth century.

The available information on great Florentine companies, as investors in the Kingdom of Hungary (as we could see in the previous chapters, the presence of wealthy businessmen, including also Nofri di Palla Strozzi, the Medici and Alberti companies in Venice etc. as investors in the Hungarian business) must be handled with extreme caution. Still, their investing into trade in Hungary may actually be understood as part of a conscious business strategy, motivated by Buda’s position as regional trade exchange hub in the course of the fifteenth century. Another possible factor in Buda’s evolution to such a “meeting point” is that the other European hub, which opened up towards Central and Eastern Europe was Venice. Yet, the Serenissima had serious interest contrasts with King Sigismund, and Buda, in my understanding, must have benefited greatly from this controversy.

Another point in favor of Buda’s rise as a regional trade hub is due to King Sigismund’s person and the royal court’s definite establishment in the city. When addressing the factor played by the royal court in Buda, one must also emphasize Sigismund of Luxemburg’s rise to imperial title. Thus, Buda hosted also the imperial aula from time to time, and became an European political-representational center and thus must have generated an increasing presence of Florentines in the city.

Finally, as the closing chapter shows, the presence of Florentines exerted its influence in various ways, but the migration of skilled craftsmen towards the Tuscan city, which I shortly introduced in the last chapter is a surprising element as it is rarely documented, particularly not in such details.
This phenomenon also led to another, completely new point, the question of levels of self-
identification of members of the multiethnic and multilingual communities of Central Europe. The
particular interest in this question, in my understanding, is provided by the foreign environment, in
which these Central-European immigrants defined themselves, because this foreign context lacked
an important aspect, the point/points of reference which the homeland multiethnic community
provided to clearly establish the position of the people in the local context. Thus, in Florence these
immigrants used a whole range of levels of self-identification, from the wider-closer geographical
provenance, be it the home town or the wider geo-political unit, namely the kingdom of Hungary,
up to the ethnic affiliation and the vernacular spoken by them, an identification sometimes
seemingly vague, although the few related information in the Catasto shows the prevailing use of
geographical affiliation, whereas in other, later cases found in recent scholarly literature it seems to
be clearly driven by conscious use of possibilities provided by Florentine urban organizations for
foreign artisans. This is may not be so closely connected to the main topic of the present
dissertation, yet it could be perceived as a starting point for a future investigation to be followed to
see the main features of the other extremes (be it both the destination and the social cluster involved
in it) of diasporas in late medieval Europe.
Appendix

Appendix 1. Prosopographic Database

The source basis of the present database resulted from a systematic research of the archival holding of the Florentine Catasto of 1427, carried out in the framework of the present dissertation. As first step I identified the network of Florentine merchants/families present in Hungary including both the circles of the investors in Florence, and the Florentine businessmen present in Hungary based on the representative set of records of the Catasto. Concerning the Hungarian sources, mainly the records of the Collection of Medieval Records (DL) and the Photograph Collection of Medieval Records (DF) held in the National Archives of Hungary (Budapest, Hungary) were checked.\footnote{See the introductory chapter of the dissertation for further details.}

In a second phase of the research further investigation on the already identified individuals and their families was made in various published and unpublished archival material, extending the research also to relevant scholarly literature in some specific cases, in order to obtain a more detailed picture on these entrepreneurs.\footnote{A first, shorter version of the database was published in Hungarian in 2009. See Arany, “Prosopographic database”.}

The translation of specific Hungarian medieval legal and historical terms was made in accordance with János Bak’s glossaries compiled to the critical and annotated edition of the volumes of *Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Regni Hungariae*.\footnote{See János Bak, et al. *The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary. Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae, 1000–1526*. The Laws of Hungary, Series 1. vols 1-4. (Idyllwild, CA and Budapest: Bakersfield: Charles Schlacks Jr.and Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, 1989–2012), Glossaries and Select Subject Index.}

At the translation of personal and place names, Pál Engel’s methodology was adopted, similarly to the chapters of the dissertation.\footnote{Engel, *The Realm*.}

In cases of sum entries given in florins, when not specified further, Florentine florins are reported.

I would like to thank Bruno Škreblin, who shared the results of his thorough archival research on medieval Zagreb, enriching the present database with numerous entries. I am also grateful to István Draskóczy, for their kind and eager help to provide substantial information during the compilation of the database.

**ALBIZZI,**

**Cristiano di Migliore**

1373-76 – Member of a Florentine company with seat in Venice, which was also active in Hungary. (ASF, Arte del Cambio, fol.67; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130-131)

**Pier di Banco**

1373 – Partner in a Florentine company working in Hungary and Slavonia until 1380. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1183. Jano. 9, 1373; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)

1392 – Member of the Florentine counselor board of the so called 12 Buonuomini, one of the main institutions of the Florentine urban government, the so called “Tre Maggiori”. (Online Tratte)
He died before 1395. (*Online Tratte*)

**ANGELO di BERTO,**
1391 – Burgher of Buda, he sold his house to be found in Buda to Nicholas of Kanizsa, Master of the Treasury (“magister tavernicarum”) at the price of l 600. (*ZsO. I/1921. March 7, 1391*)

**ALLEGRI,**

**Domenico di Antonio**
1427 – He listed in his Catasto Agostino di Pagolo Marucci sojourning in Hungary with a debt of fl 723. At the same time he also gave the names of some Buda burghers as his debtors: Laico di Sandro di Buda with fl 106, Mag. Luca “chancellor” of Buda with fl 18, Niccoló di Corrado di Buda with fl 22, Francesco di Buonaccorso di Buda with fl 240, and further also inserted two outstanding debts of fl 75 and fl 40 with the remark “more debtors in Hungary”. (*ASF Catasto 1427, 46. parte l.fol. 456v-457r*)

1430 – He repeatedly listed the same debtors in Hungary. (*ASF, Catasto 1430, 369. Tomo I. A-G. fol. 403v, 404r*)

1434 – As follower of Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, he exiled from Florence. (Brucker, *Florence, the Golden Age*, 260)

**ALTOVITI,**

**Leonardo**
1412 – Filippo and Matteo Scolari accepted him as their divisional kinsman (they declared their intention to share their possessions in Hungary with him). Therefore, the king commissioned the convent of Szekszárd, which functioned as place of authentication (“locas credibilia”) to install him into the possessions of the following landed properties (“installatio”): Závod, Kölesd, Ozora, Szokol, Endré, and Dalmad in county Tolna. (*ZsO. III/2650. Sept. 9, 1412*)

**ANTINORI,**

**Bernardo**
Silk merchant.
The 1420’s – he sent cloths to merchandize in Hungary. (*ASF, Catasto 1427, 79. fol. 260. Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104*)

**ANTONIUS APPARDI,**
1426 – He was a judge of Gradec. (*Monsgrecensis*). (MHLRCZ 2, p.55. Bruno Škreblin’s communion)

1430 – He was a judge of Gradec. (*Monsgrecensis*). He came in Zagreb probably a few years earlier. (MHLRCZ 9, p.204. Bruno Škreblin’s communion)

Around 1438 – A document written after Antonius’ death preserves information on Appardi’s debt that he was trading in Buda, probably clothes. (Bruno Škreblin’s communion)
ANTHONIUS RENIS DE FLORENTIA,
1380s-1390s – He was often member of the city council. He owned a bathhouse in Zagreb. (See Škreblin, „Ethnic groups”, 32). He traded in Buda with Gyuan de Benedict. (Bruno Škreblin’s communciation)

ARRIGHI,

Domenico di Giovanni
1427 – He figures among the debtors of Giovanni di Iacopo Baldovini and partners with the following remark: “Domenico di Giovanni Arrighi in Hungary put in prison fl 238”. (Niccoló and Giovanni di Iacopo di messer Niccoló Baldovini and their mother, ASF, Catasto 1427, 62. fol. 336r-342v; here fol.342v)
1430 – Noble retainer ("familiaris") of King Sigismund, mentioned as burgher of Buda in the document. (Kintzinger, Westbindung, 420)

ATTAVANTE/OTTAVANTI,

Cristofano di Domenico
1427 – His Catasto was submitted by his kinsman, Antonio di Piero Attavanti, acting in accordance with his brother, Iacopo di Piero Attavanti, guardian to Cristofano di Domenico’s younger brothers. The declaration stated that the family, including also the widow mother and the younger children except for the youngest one, moved to Zagreb in Slavonia, whereas the two eldest sons, Cristofano and Leonardo sojourned in Buda. (See the mother’s catasto: Betta donna di Domenico Attavanti, ASF, Catasto 1427, 42. fol. 313r-313v; the joint declaration of the sons: Catasto 1427, 45. fol.706r)
The guardian, Iacopo stated also in his own Catasto that his wards, Domenico’s sons all went to Hungary. (See Iacopo di Piero Attavanti, ASF, Catasto 1427, 47, Tomo II. fol. 44v)

Leonardo di Domenico
Employed by the Carnesecchi-Fronte company.
1427 – His Catasto was submitted by his kinsman, Antonio di Piero Attavanti, acting in accordance with his brother, Iacopo di Piero Attavanti, guardian to Cristofano di Domenico’s younger brothers. The declaration stated that the family, including also the widow mother and the younger children except for the youngest one, moved to Zagreb in Slavonia, whereas the two eldest sons, Cristofano and Leonardo sojourned in Buda. (See the mother’s catasto: Betta donna di Domenico Attavanti, Catasto 1427, 42.fol.313r-313v; the joint declaration of the sons: Catasto 1427, 45. fol.706r) (see the mother’s Catasto Betta donna di Domenico Attavanti, Catasto 1427, 42.fol.313r-313v) The guardian, Iacopo stated also in his own Catasto that his wards, Domenico’s sons all went to Hungary. (See Iacopo di Piero Attavanti, ASF, Catasto 1427, 47, Tomo II. fol. 44v)
1430 – He was thirtieth officer of Giovanni di Nofri in Zagreb. (Tkalcic, Monumenta Historica Civitatis Zagabriae, VI/129; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1433-1438 – He was juratus civis in Zagreb. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 213. footnote no. 108)
1439 – He sold off all his landed property in Zagreb and returned to Florence. (Budak, "I fiorentini in Slavonia", 691)
**Baldi,**

**Bartolomeo di Guido**
1376 – Count of the Buda minting chamber, he had a house a Buda where Buonaccorso di Luca Pitti was accommodated when staying in the town. (Pitti, *Ricordi*, 367; Horváth-Huszár, "Kamaragrófok a középkorban", 26; Huszár, *A budai pénzverés története*, 122; Teke, “Firenzeni üzletemberek”, 134)

**Mathias**
1408 – His second wife was the daughter of John, royal judge in Sibiu (the “iudex regius” was the representative, appointed by the king in the Saxon seats). (MNL OL *DL* 73919. Apr. 8, 1408; the same in *ZsO*. II/2. 6040. Apr. 8. 1408; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125)
1410 – According to a statement of Filippo Scolari, Baldi was burgher of Sibiu, possessed landed property also in neighboring Abrud and Aiud. (MNL OL *DL* 73919. Dec. 13, 1410. the same record published in *ZsO*. II/2. 8080. Dec. 13, 1410; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125)
He died before 1419. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125)

**Baldini,**

**Tommaso di Giacomo**
1430 – A Florentine investor, who listed among his company’s partners Antonio and Piero Davizzi staying in Hungary, Giovanni Panciatichi and Leonardo di Domenico Attavanti. (ASF, *Catasto* 1430. 370. fol. 467v)

**Baldovini,**

**Niccoló di Iacopo**
1413 – Balzarth of Giovanni Tosinghi, Niccoló Baldovini and Filippo del Palagio and their partners in Florence provided a loan (fl 8000) to King Sigismund which shall be settled from the revenues of the royal monopoly on salt. (MNL OL *DL* 71750. Sept. 30, 1413, published in Fejér, *CD*, X/5. no. 185; Teke, “Firenzeni kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1427 – He was in business contact with the Manini, also with Pape di Salvestro Manini. (Niccoló and Giovanni di Jacopo di messer Niccoló ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 62. fol. 336v-338r)

**Baroncelli,**

**Vanni di Vanni**
1427 – In his Catasto he stated to sojourn in Hungary for a longer period and that he did not disposed of assets, which was controlled and approved by an official of the Catasto according to an endnote “nulla”. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 28. fol. 999r.-1000v)

**Iacopo di Piero**
1427 – He was money changer, Andrea di Filippo Scolari, bishop of Oradea figures as a creditor of Iacopo’s company. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 551r)

**DI BERNARDO DA CARMIGNANO (“BERNARDI” IN THE HUNGARIAN SOURCES),**

**Francesco**

1373 – His first mention in Hungary, he was a merchant in Buda. (Áldásy, “Adatok”, 4-5; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 131)

1382-1389 – Count of thirtieth. (Fejér, CD, IX/7. no.293; Hóman, A magyar királyság pénzügyei, 279; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 135)

1387 – Count of lucrum camerae. (Kumorovitz, BTOE, III/147; ZsO. I/2710. Dec. 7, 1387.)

1389 – Count of thirtieth. (Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 158. 302; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 139)

1389 – King Sigismund granted him the possession of a landed property, Jaztrebarzka to be found in Zagreb county. (ZsO. I/877. Jano. 13, 1389. Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 303)

1392 – Count of the Hungarian royal minting chambers. (Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 302; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 139)

1392 – King Sigismund granted him the right to alienate his landed property to be found in Zagreb county. (Kumorovitz, BTOE, III/147; ZsO. I/2710. Dec. 7, 1392)

1393 – He sold his house in Buda to John of Kanizsa, archbishop of Esztergom at the price of fl 2.600, and within three weeks he rented it from the archbishop in the form of a life tenancy for a yearly rent of fl 50. (ZsO. I/3072. Sept. 9, 1393; Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 303)

1394 – Francesco and his sons, Philip and Francis sold their estate at the price of fl 4.000. (ZsO. I/3566. July 19, 1394; Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 303)

1396 – Count of minting and thirtieth chambers. (Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 302; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 144; on the same see ZsO I/5945. June 27, 1399)

1397 – He went to Venice as envoy of King Sigismund and the government of Venice allowed him to ship woolen cloths bought in Florence to Hungary. (ZsO I/4664. March 13, 1397; ibid. 5032. Oct.23, 1397; Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 302)

1403 – He was arrested together with other Florentines staying in Buda, but was set free soono. (MNL OL DL 9625. Febr, 23, 1410; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 149) His pawned landed properties in the counties Pest and Fejér passed into the king’s hands. (ZsO. II/5945. June 28, 1407)

1409 – He pawned his allodium in Buda to Simon of Rozgony for two years at the price of fl 200. (ZsO II/6943. July 28, 1409)

1416 – He pawned a manse (a type of tenant holding called also “sessio”) with its fields and pastures, except for a stone house and its garden to Ladislaus and Emerich of Galgóc, bans of Maeva (Macsó). (ZsO V/1844. May 1, 1416)

1417 – King Sigismund invited him to participate as an expert in a legal dispute concerning the tithe rights of the archbishopric of Esztergom. (ZsO VI/1239. Dec. 13, 1417., Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 149)

1419 – The petition of Dominic, provost of Esztergom to John, archbishop of Esztergom to confirm his donations bestowed on the church of St. Steven protomartyr, among them also the archbishop’s donation of the house in Buda pawned to Francesco di Bernardo and his sons for a yearly rent of fl 30. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak, I/169)

He died before 1424. (Mályusz, “Az izmaelita pénzverőjegyek”, 304)

**Guaspare**

1417 – Comes of thirtieth of Queen Barbara, he purchased jewels in Venice on the commission of the Queen. (Házi, Sopron, I/2. 124-25. Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 149)

**Benvenuti,**

**Niccolo di Marco**

He was brother-in-law to Fronte and Antonio di Pietro Fronte. See the Catasto of Antonio di Fronte di Fronte, who called Niccoló’s wife his aunt. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 101v)

1427 – he had died before the compilation of the catasto. From his nephew’s declaration seems clear that Niccoló di Marco founded a partnership with the Fronte brothers for the trade in Hungary not later than 1413 and therefore was creditor to King Sigismund. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 100v) 1427 – his assets were managed by the Florentine officials of orphans for his underage son, Francesco. (“Francesco figlio fu di Niccoló di Marcho Benvenuti e donna Lorenza donna fu di Niccolò detto” ASF, Catasto 1427, 29, Tomo 1. fol.167r). In the Catasto submitted by them in the name of the heir extensive outstanding debts in Hungary are mentioned. They list Queen Barbara with a debt of fl 400 and King Sigismund with a debt of fl 1.800. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol.168v)

**Biligardi,**

**Giovanni**

1404 – The Florentine government recommended him and his partner, Fronte di Piero Fronte as Florentine merchants working in Hungary to King Sigismund. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 26. fol.51v. July 11, 1404)


**Biliotti,**

**Giovanozzo di Betto**

1462 – He probably traded in Slavonia with Marabottino d’Antonio Rustichi and with another Florentine merchant staying in Ancona. They commissioned Cosimo di Domenico Martelli with the transaction (ASF, Mercanzia, no. 10831. 50v. Oct. 15, 1462)

1464 – He may be identical with a certain Jannotus Billioctus, who was mentioned as late partner of Niccoló di Vagio di Giuseppi in Buda. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

(In 1427 he was already orphan and went to live in the house of Giovanozzo Pitti, and had a modest inheritance. See ASF, Catasto 1427, 20. fol. 1072.r-v, Giovanozzo di Betto Biliotti)

**Borghini,**
Tommaso di Domenico
1408-1423 – He was drawn three times into the council of the 12 Buonuomini, at one occasion he also invested the office of the Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. Moreover, he was elected consul of the guild of silk merchants six times, and twice also invested the position of consul of the Mercanzia. (Online Tratte)
1420’s – He shipped cloths to Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 79. fol. 263. Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104)
1427 – Filippo Frescobaldi figures among his debtors in the quality of his factor/representative in Hungary. His outstanding debts in Hungary run to around fl 650. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. tomo II. fol. 666r)
1427-29 – His other partner in Hungary, Mattia Scolari died owing him fl 900 for goods shipped to him in Hungary. Borghini commissioned Gianozzo Cavalcanti to collect this sum in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
Before 1429 died. (Online Tratte)

BRANCACCI,

Felice di Michele
1420’s – Giovanni di Niccoló Zati and other Florentines working in Hungary (Fronte di Piero Fronte, Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi, Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi) bought cloths from him to trade with them in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 67. fol.792v; ASF, Catasto 1427, 24. fol.792v; Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104)

BUONDELMONTE/MONTEBUONI,

Andrea di Lorenzo
Andrea and his sons were officially using the name “da Montebugni” from 1393 onwards to distinguish from the magnate members of the kin group. (See in general R. M. Ciccarelli – L. Martinuzzi L., “Andrea Buondelmonti”, last downloaded: May 30, 2013)
1396 – The Florentine government sent him as envoy to Hungary (ASF, Dieci di Balia, Lettere – Legazioni e Commissarie 2. fol.17v. Apr. 25, 1396)
1412 – Legate of Pope John XXIII. in Hungary. (ZsO III/2139. May 15, 1412)

Gherardo di Gherardo
1386 – A certain Gherardo Buondelmonti went to Mary, Queen of Hungary as envoy with Vanni Castellani and Filippo Corsini. (ASF, Signori-Carteggi Missive, I. Cancelleria, 20. fol. 102r, Aug. 10, 1386)
1413 – He traded in Hungary. The envoys of the Florentine government turned for help to King Sigismund to release him. (ZsO IV/730. June 9, 1413; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 200)
Before 1427 he died. His son, Giovanni listed his deceased father’s Hungarian liabilities and outstanding debts in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 74. fol.40r-40v)

Giovanni di Andrea
Before 1410 – He had been a monk of the Benedictine monastery of the Virgin Mary in Pratalia, diocese of Padua before he was appointed abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Pécsvárad. (ZsO II/2. 7914. Sept. 12, 1410; ibid. no. 7915. Sept. 12, 1410; ibid. no. 7986. Oct. 14, 1410)

1410-24 – Abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Pécsvárad. (ZsO II/2. 7914. Sept. 12, 1410; ibid. no. 7915. Sept. 12, 1410; Engel, Archontology, II/43; Mályusz, Egyházi társadalom, 222)

1411 – He studied at the university of Padua. (ZsO III/302. Apr. 2 – Dec. 5, 1411)

1416 – His inheritance after his father’s death was paid off for him. (Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 22)

1419 – Pope Martin V. recommended him to King Sigismund. (Wenzel, Ozorai Pipo, 86-87)

1420 – Pope Martin V. recommended him to both King Sigismund and his kin, Filippo di Stefano Scolari. (ZsO VII/1258. 1259. Jano. 13, 1420)

1425-35 – Archbishop of Kalocsa. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I/. 752, 792; Nov. 15, 1424; March 24, 1425; Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 22; Engel, Archontology, I/ 66)

1427 – His brothers, Lorenzo and Michele were in his entourage in Hungary. (Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 22)

1427 – He turned to the Roman Curia for granting him testamentary capacity. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I/905. Jano. 28, 1427)

1431 – He possessed the castle of Kalocsa. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 335)

1435 – Count Cilli let him captured, the Pope asked for his release. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 214; Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, 473-479)

1438-47 – Archbishop of Kalocsa. (Héderváry I/251. Sept. 20, 1447; Engel, Archontology, I/ 515)

**Lorenzo di Andrea**

1426 – He acted as witness in an inheritance case of the Scolari family. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 200)

1427 – Lorenzo and Michele were in the entourage of Giovanni, their brother in Hungary. (Bizzocchi, “La dissoluzione di un clan”, 22)

**Niccoló di Andrea**

Brother of Giovanni, archbishop of Kalocsa.

1440 – The agreement naming him deals with the partition of estates among Barbara, daughter of Nicholas Treutel of Nevna and fiancé of Niccoló Buondelmonti and his sister, Catharina, widow of Péter Cseh of Leva on one hand with László, son of the deceased Péter Cseh of Leva on the other, and was issued by the Premonstratensian Convent of Ság, Aug. 01, 1440. With this marriage Buondelmonti became related to a powerful baronial family of Hungary, and integrated into the aristocracy. (The record survived in two copies: MNL OL DL 13565, DL 59263)

**Nicholas Tretrilo**

Son of Niccoló di Andrea. He used a variation of his mother’s family name: Treutel.

1459 – He concluded a successful marriage alliance with Orsolya, daughter of Pál Hercegh of Szekcső. (MNL OL DL 15386. July 29, 1459)

Around 1464 – he died. (MNL OL DL 16001. June 5, 1464; DL 15025. May 18, 1464)
Simone di Andrea
1414 – Legate of Pope John XXIII. in Hungary. (ZsO IV/2301. July 26, 1414)
1426 – He was mentioned in the last will of Andrea Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 200)

CAMBI,

Francesco di Bartolo
1427 – He lived in Split and had no profit to declare for the Florentine Officials of the Catasto. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 15. fol. 617r. “Francesco di Bartolo Chambi da Firenze abita e ista al Palatio nelle parti di Dalmazia overo di Schiavonia e nona alchuna prestanza qui” [“Francesco di Bartolo Cambi from Florenc lives in Split, in the region of Dalmatia” – transl. Arany.])

CAPPONI,

Andrea
1408 – He was appointed prior of Vrana and the Florentine government on his behalf turned to Filippo Scolari to let him be introduced in the benefice. (ZsO II/2. 6388. Dec. 27, 1408; ibid. no. 6580. Feb. 5, 1409; he does not figure in Pál Engel’s Archontology, neither in Hungarian sources, so presumably he did not enter his office)

Filippo di Simone
1412 – His first mention in Buda in a letter addressed to him and Fronte di Piero Fronte by the Florentine government in a diplomatic affair. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 29. fol. 26r. Aug. 13, 1412; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)
1413 – Debtor of the Fronte company. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)
1416 – He acted as a witness in Buda when Simone di Piero Melanesi commissioned his uncle to arrange his marriage with Tommasa di Piero Tosti in Florence. (Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1–5)
1418 – He provided a loan to King Sigismund and to members of the Teutonic Order. (See online: RI XI,1 no. 3175, 3188, 3582, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 01, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)
1418 – Pope Martin V. to the archbishop of Esztergom asking to pay Filippo di Simone Capponi and Fronte di Piero Fronte, Florentine burghers the sum they are entitled to have. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak, I/ 54. the same is to be found in ZsO VI/1483. Feb. 11, 1418)
1423 – King Sigismund granted him trade privileges. (See online RI XI,1 no. 5667, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 28, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)
1420s – He was brother-in-law to Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi and worked as settled agent of the Panciatichi company in Buda. (Passerini, Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi. Tavola V. 76; ASF, Catasto 1427.17. fol. 479v- 481v)
1428 – He figures in the last will of Nicholas Perényi. (MNL OL DL 39287. May 27, 1428)
He died before 1431. (Online Tratte)
CARDINI,

Currado di Piero
1418 – He was lector of the Oradea chapter, and was appointed papal legate and tithe collector for the territories under the rule of King Sigismund as Hungarian King. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I/ 117. July 14, 1418; the same in ZsO VI/2172. July 14, 1418; ibid. VI/2218. Aug. 1, 1418)
1418 – Currado, noble retainer (“familiaris”) of Pope Martin V. and “lector” of Oradea was appointed papal curate. (ZsO VI/2172. July 14, 1418)
1420 – He took over the payment of the “servitium commune” with the sum of fl 100 and five “servitium minutum” in two installments both within 20 months in the name of Jacob, bishop electus of Srem. (ZsO VII/1797. June 20, 1420)
1422 – He assigned the revenues of the provostry to Andrea Scolari, bishop of Oradea. (ASF, Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)
1423 – He settled the account of his business transactions with the bishop of Oradea. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)
1427 – He figures in a letter of Pope Martin V. as resigned canon of Oradea chapter. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I/ 930)
1427-28 – He was captured and imprisoned. (Flórenczi Okmt. II/29. 31, 33; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)
1433 – He petitioned the Roman Curia to be entitled to make his testament. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, II/298. 305)
1439 – As provost of Oradea he petitioned to detain two ecclesiastical benefices to finance the 50 horses he had to keep in the service of the king. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, II/657)

CARNESECCHI,

Giovanni di Pagolo
1435-1447 – he was consul of the silk merchants’ guild (Por Santa Maria) three times, twice officer of the Mercanzia, also twice member of the advisory board of the 12 Buonuomini, and once invested the office of Gonfaloniere di Compagnia (Online Tratte)
1427 – From the early 1420s Antonio di Piero Fronte’s Buda company was independent, but cooperated with the Florentine company of Simone and brothers, sons of Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi and brothers. The two companies fused in this year. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 116; 28. fol. 1008; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196)

Pagolo del Berto
1393- 1425 – he invested the office of the consul of the guild twice, again he was elected consul of the Mercanzia nine times, twice he bore the office of the Gonfaloniere di Compagnia, he was among the members of the advisory board of the 12 Buonuomini three times, and finally he was twice Prior and Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. (Online Tratte and Pitti, Ricordi, 496)
Around 1411 – He founded a partnership with Antonio di Piero Fronte. His “corpo” run to fl 2.500. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 79. fol. 52-55; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195-196)
Simone di Pagolo
1421-1450 – he was drawn consul of the guild of the five times, he held the office of consul of the Mercanzia twice, he was member of the 12 Buonuomini four times, and twice invested the office of the Gonfaloniere di Giustizia (Online Tratte)
1427 – From the early 1420s Antonio di Piero Fronte’s Buda company was independent, but cooperated with the Florentine company of Simone and brothers, sons of Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi and brothers. The two companies fused in this year. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 116; 28. fol. 1008; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196)
1433 – He settled the account of his Buda partnership and declared not to have gained any profit at all. (ASF, Catasto 1433, 498. fol. 302r-303r)
Before 1461 he died. (Online Tratte)

CAVALCANTI,

Giannozzo di Vanni
1426 – He acted as witness in the Buda house of Filippo Scolari. (ASF, Consoli del Mare no. 635; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1426 – King Sigismund was his debtor with fl 1.300. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
Before 1447 – He figures in the catasto of Filippo d’Amerigo Frescobaldi, who had a partnership for trade in Hungary together with his partner, Tommaso di ser Chini, silk merchant. Cavalcanti worked for them in the kingdom. The goods were taken in tick from Federigo Ricci and Bernardo di Domenico Giugni. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 577r; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1427 – He submitted a joint declaration with his brothers. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 103r-106v. Amerigo, Gianozzo e Niccoló di Giovanni Cavalcanti)
1427 – He managed the collection of the inheritance of Filippo Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1429 – He was arrested. (Jorga, Notes, 247; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1429 – Filippo Scolari’s heir initiated a suit against him. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)

CINELLO DI ANBRUOGIO,
1430 – The partnership of Fronte di Piero Fronte with Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi, and Andrea Lamberteschi figure among his debtors with lower sums. He was actively present in Venice and Dubrovnik with investments. (ASF, Catasto 1430, 358. fol. 247r-248v)

CHINI,

Tommaso
1427 – He was a silk manufacturer and merchant. In the Catasto of Giovanni di Amerigo di Guccio Frescobaldi he is mentioned as Frescobaldi’s partner in Hungary for two years and had a joint outstanding debt running to fl 1300. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 775r)

CORBINELLI,
Parigi di Tommaso
11427 – The main hub for his luxury cloths was Venice, but also sold cloths to Matteo Scolari in the value of fl 349, and the debt had been settled from Scolari’s inheritance in the form of “paghe sostenute” of the Florentine state. Moreover, he also had an open account with Giovanni Panciatichi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 18. Tomo 2.fol. 1285r-1286r)

CORSI,

Bartolo di Domenico
The 1420s – He sold textiles to Giovanni di Niccoló Frescobaldi for the Hungarian market. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 72. fol. 40; Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104)

Simone di Lapo di Francesco
Silk manufacturer and merchant.
1413 – The Florentine government recommended him and his partnership to King Sigismund. (Flórenczi Okmt. I/ 81. Nov. 16, 1413; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1422 – Drawn for the office of prior in Florence. (Online Tratte; Pitti, Ricordi, 496)
1426 – He sent cloths with his brother to Hungary. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 48)
1427 – The Florentine government recommended his partnership to King Sigismund. (Flórenczi Okmt. I/262. June 22, 1427; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1427 – Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi and the Melanesi brothers founded a partnership for Hungarian trade. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 652v)
1427 – In his Catasto he listed a girl from Slavonia in his house. Tommaso Melanesi is also listed in more entries, ad debtor for goods worth fl 3.181 consigned to him, on the open account of the partnership fl 630. The profit share of the members of the partnership are also declared: Tomaso Corsi fl 400, Tomas Melanesi fl 2.326, Tomas Davizi fl 1.815, Simone Corsi fl 851. Uberto and Giuliano Zati with fl 11. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 631r-632r, Simone di Lapo Corsi).

Tommaso di Lapo di Francesco
Silk manufacturer and merchant.
1413 – The Florentine government recommended his partnership to King Sigismund. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1426 – He sent banners to Hungary with his brother. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 48)
1427 – The Florentine government recommended his partnership to King Sigismund. (Flórenczi Okmt. I/ 262. June 22, 1427; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1427 – Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi and the Melanesi brothers founded a partnership for Hungarian trade. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 652v)
1427 – The Melanesi brothers declared the value of their Buda manor based on Tommaso di Lapo Corsi’s estimation. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 77. fol. 247r)
1427 – In his Catasto he mentioned Filippo del Palagio, his former representative in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 2. fol. 657v)
1427 – Tommaso di Lapo Corsi is mentioned as commissioner in the Catasto of the young Niccoló di Giovanni of Hungary, a silk weaver. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 31. fol. 853r. Niccoló di Giovanni d’Ungheria)
1427 – An investor of the partnership, Lattanzio di Bindo di messer Niccholó Guasconi put fl 200 in deposit at Tommaso di Lapo Corsi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 50. fol. 182r-183r)

**Corsini,**

**Battista di Giovanni**
1429 – In the Ricordi of his father his emancipation and hip apprenticeship in Buda at the Melanesi company is entered. (Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, 130-131)
1438-88 – He was banned from holding offices. (Online Tratte)
1458 – Gonfaloniere di compagnia. (Online Tratte)

Giovanni di Matteo
1427 – He was debtor of Tommaso Melanesi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 20. fol. 880v)
1429 – In his Ricordi he entered the information on the emancipation of his two sons and the data of thei apprenticeship in Buda. (Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, 130-131)

Matteo di Giovanni
1429 – In the Ricordi of his father his emancipation and hip apprenticeship in Buda at the Panciatichi company is entered. (Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, 130-131)
1431 – He declared his activity in Hungary and loss it resulted in Francesco di Guido di Tommaso was his partner and debtor in his Hungarian business. (ASF, Catasto 1431, 342. fol.784; Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, XXXIX)
1438-59 – Twice consul of the guild of the “Cambio”, on one occasion he was member of the board of the “12 Buonuomini”, and twice held the office of prior. (Online Tratte)

**Cristofano di Iacopo,**
1427 – he was in Hungary, his declaration was handed in by his brother, Antonio di Iacopo. He apparently had no family in Florence. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 444r)

**Da Calenzano,**

**Jacopo di Bartolomeo**
1417 – He settled in Buda. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)

**Da Colle,**

**Gaspare**
He was in service of King Sigismund on the southern borders of the kingdom. He was debtor of Bernardo di Sandro Talani. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 72. fol. 278; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)
1427 – He fell from the king’s grace, he was captured and his wealth was seized. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)
1441-46 – Count of the salt chambers, captain of Ilok and count of Keve county, in the service of Nicholas of Újlak. (Engel, Archontology, II. 140, 452; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1443 – Count of the salt chamber of Székesfehérvár with Jacopo del Bene. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

DA PANZANO,

Luca
1431 – He supplied Matteo di Giovanni Corsini with goods, when he worked in Hungary. Corsini owed him fl 140. (ASF, Catasto 1431, 342. fol.784; Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, XXXIX)

DA UZZANO,

Niccolo di Giovanni
1379-1428 – Four times elected Gonfaloniere di compagnia and also four times member of the board of the “12 Buonuomini”, on one occasion drawn for the office of prior, three times Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. (Online Tratte)


1395 – After the death of Agostino Marucci, his representative in Hungary, also the Mercanzia intervened to clear the situation of their Hungarian activity (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 121r. March 28, 1395; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142) 1427 – The account of the partnership was still unsettled according to the declaration of Iacopo, the heir of Antonio del Ubertini[?], a member of the partnership. Iacopo identified also the representatives of the partnership in Hungary, first Agostino Marucci, then a partner, Antonio Macinghi and later also Domenico Federighi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 79r)

Da Uzzano’s declaration, however, does not contain any hint on the open accounts of the partnership. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 16. Tomo 2.fol. 313r-329r)

DAVIZZI,

Tommaso di Francesco
1433 – He had a partnership of silk trade with the Corsi brothers, which supplied the Hungarian market through the Melanesi and Tommaso Corsi. According to his declaration the Melanesi were apparently sentenced in Florence for their debts on the accusation of Matteo [di Domenico?-A.K.] Corsi, and as a result, their landed properties in and around Prato were seized and sold. Tommaso Melanesi figures as debtor in the open accounts of the company of the silk merchant in more entries running altogether to fl 6.325, plus fl 700 together with Tommaso Davizzi in his own name, whereas Melanesi also had an outstanding debt running to fl 3.713 towards the partnership. Davizzi worked also with Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, who figures as his debtor with a sum totaling fl 1.074. Finally, also the account of a “cassa” sent to Buda, worth fl 1.100 was still openo. (ASF, Catasto 1433, 33. Tomo 2, fol. 1005r-1008r)
DEL BENE,

Filippo di Giovanni
1405 – The first mention on his Hungarian activity, he was the representative of the Spini banking house. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 26. fol. 136r-136v; ZsO II/1. 4291. Dec. 5, 1405; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1410 – He figures as legate of Pope John XXIII. in matters concerning the collection of papal revenues. (ZsO II/2. 7839. Aug. 11, 1410; ibid. no. 7987. Oct. 15, 1410; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201-202)
1410 – He managed the transfer of papal revenues to settle the debts of Roman Curia towards Pope John XXIII. (ZsO II/2. 7968. Oct. 7, 1410)
1410 – Noble retainer (“familiaris”) of Pope John XXIII., as papal legate he was present in the lands under King Sigismund’s rule. (ZsO II/2. 7987. Dec. 15, 1410)
1411 – He negotiated between King Sigismund and Venice. (ZsO III/2692. Sept. 6, 1412; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1412 – He received fl 10 from the apostolic camera for the courier sent from Florence to King Sigismund. (ZsO IV/357. March 28, 1413; ibid. no. 399. Apr. 6, 1413; no. 437. Apr. 13, 1413; no. 458. Apr. 17, 1413)
1413 – Petition of the governor, John of Hunyad to the Pope to suspend the excommunication of Franko of Talovac. Franko of Talovac also had a debt towards del Bene. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak, II/1041)

Jacopo di Filippo
1438-1440 – Count of the salt chamber to Szeged employed by Matko of Talovac. (MNL OL DL 44292. June 21, 1440; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)
1442 – Count of the salt chambers of Máramaros, noble retainer (“familiaris”) of Nicholas Újlaki. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 154; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)
1443 – Count of the salt chamber to Transylvania along with Gasparo da Colle. (MNL OL DL 92943. Apr. 02, 1443; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)
1450 – Peter, ban of Dalmatia and Croatia petitioned to be absolved from excommunication and also asked for negotiations of the dispute he had with Jacopo del Bene. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, II/1136)

1453 – Legate of Florence at Ladislaus V. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1455 – He was drawn for the office of prior. (Online Tratte)

1458 – The Florentine government recommended the merchant to King Sigismund. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 42. fol. 43v. Sept. 02, 1458)

1458 – Legate of Florence at King Matthias Corvinus. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1459 – He traded with cloths in Senj. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 42. fol. 164v-165r. Oct. 30, 1459; Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 46),

1459 – Count Frankopan confiscated his goods because of a debt of Niccoló Zati, probably business partner of Jacopo. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

Before 1464 he died. (Online Tratte)

DEL BUONO,

Marco
1382 – He founded a partnership with Niccoló and Zanobio Macigni and Piero di Banco degli Albizzi for trade in Hungary. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1183. Jano. 9, 1382; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)

1389 – He was sent to Hungary by Zanobio Macigni to manage his affairs in the kingdom. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)

DELLA LUNA,

Francesco di Francesco di Pierozzo
Wealthy silk manufacturer and merchant.
1407-1420 – He was mainly interested in trade in Dubrovnik, but also had a partnership with Filippo di Firenze del Panci for 13 years and the debtors of the company are Fronte di Piero Fronte and partners (fl 42), Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi (fl 1). (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo II, fol. 505r-523v)

1420-1427 – The partnership seems to have been renewed also in 1420 and was operating also in 1427. Among open company’s debtors Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi (fl 18) and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi (fl 241) can be identified. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo II, fol. 505r-523v)

1449 – He died. (On him see Brucker, Renaissance Florence, 84; Edler de Roover – Tognetti, L’arte della seta, 19; Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 459; Tognetti, Un industria di lusso, 25; Fabbri, Alleanza matrimoniale, 213)

DELLA RENA,

Piero di Bernardo
1430 – According to a supplement submitted to the officials of the Catasto he was a member of a partnership founded by Matteo Scolari, Tommaso Borghini and others for trade in Hungary and he still had outstanding debts from that company. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296, registri diversi fol. 163v)
DELLA PECCHIA,

Luca
1388 – He worked in Buda, according to sources he carried out “great transactions” and also performed diplomatic tasks for Margaret of Durazzo, Queen of Naples. (ASF, Signori, cartege, missive-I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 27v. May 16, 1388; Wenzel, Magyar Diplomáciai Emlékek, III/387; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 145)

DEL PALAGIO,

Andrea di Giovanni
1410 – In 1427 he declared to have been partner of the Carnesecchi-Fronte company in Hungary from 1410 onward, a business, which resulted in a failure. On the same folio he also reported losses in his investments “in Vinegia, Ungheria, Ischiavonia, Puglia, Bruggia, Ingtilterra e piu altri luoghi e qui in Firenze”. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 73r-79v, here 79r.) 1411 – He was drawn for the office of prior (Online Tratte)
1427 – The Florentine government recommended Filippo del Palagio, possibly agent of the partnership founded by Andrea and Uberto del Palagio to King Sigismund. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)

Filippo
1413 – Balzarth (Baldassare or Baschiera) di Giovanni Tosinghi, Niccoló Baldovini and Filippo del Palagio and their partners in Florence provided a loan (fl 8000) to King Sigismund which shall be settled from the revenues of the royal monopoly on salt. (MNL OL DL 71750. Sept. 30, 1413, published in Fejér, CD, X/5. no. 185; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204) 1427 – The Florentine government recommended the partnership of Uberto and Andrea del Palagio to King Sigismund, Filippo was their representative in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)

Uberto di Giovanni
1413 – The Florentine government recommended the partnership of Uberto and Andrea del Palagio to King Sigismund, Filippo del Palagio was their representative in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204) 1430 – He held the office of consul of the Guild of the “Lana”. (Online Tratte)

DEL PANCIA,

Filippo di Firenze
1407-1420 – He had a first partnership with Francesco di Francesco della Luna. Fronte di Piero Fronte and Giovanni Panciatichi were among the company’s partners. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. tomo II. fol. 505r-516v) 1420-1427 – A second partnership was founded by them and Iacopo di Giovanni di Antonio joined as a new partner. Also this partnership had contacts to merchants working in Hungary,
among them Tommaso di Piero Melanesi with a debt of fl 241. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46. tomo II. fol. 505r-516v)

**DEL ROSSO,**

See on the family: Gündisch, *Das Patriziat*, 244-245. On Proll see also Flóra, “Generations in Urban Politics”, 225-226.; the property Oláhpen was granted by King Ladislaus to Nicholaus Proll and Michael Polner of Sibiu on account of Proll’s inheritance rights “*per progenitores suos iure hereditario*”, see MNL OL DL 46664. March 19, 1504; On the chamber offices see MNL OL DL 65441. July 4, 1496; *DL* 30943. Febr. 24, 1498; *DL* 65443. Aug. 20, 1499

**Antonio**

Son of Zanobi. 1501-1510 – He was called also “Antal Proll”, his kinsman was Nicholaus Proll. He had a son, Cristofo, and two daughters, Katalin and Margit. (MNL OL DL 36346)

**Cristorofo Proll**

Son of Antonio Proll, grandchild to Zanobi del Rosso. He was granted the landed property called Olahpen “*por progenitors suos iure hereditario*” by King Ladislaus. MNL OL DL 46664. March 19, 1504)

**Cristofooro Italicus [di Rosso del Rosso]**

See the family tree in Goldthwaite, *The Building of Renaissance Florence*, 280. 1427 – According to Francesco, his brother was around 25 years old. The family faced serious financial difficulties; therefore the some of the brothers sought business activity abroad, like Francesco, who went to Rome and another brother, without specifying his name was in Hungary working in the service of other Florentines. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 20. fol. 790v. Francesco di Rosso di Piero di Rosso) 1438 – Officer of the salt chamber to Ocna Sibiulu, in the service of Matko of Talovac (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126) 1441 – He was head of the minting chamber to Sibiu. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126) 1442 – He is reported to be in Hungary. (Goldthwaite, *The Building of Renaissance Florence*, 281) 1443 – He relaunched minting in Sigishoara. (MNL OL DF 246450. Sept. 29, 1443; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126) 1446 – Count of the minting chamber of Transylvania with Antonio. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127) 1446 – He was burgher of Sibiu, and also had the citizenship of Nagybánya. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126) 1453-56 – He was head of the minting chamber to Sibiu. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127) 1455 – Officer of the chamber of Nagybánya. (MNL OL DL36407. Dec. 4, 1455) 1457 – He reported some losses in his catasto due to a business failure in Venice. (Goldthwaite, *The Building of Renaissance Florence*, 281) 1458 – He was ordered to collect the tax of the Saxonia. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127) 1458-1467 – He was head of the minting chamber to Sibiu. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127) 1463-64 – Officer of the chamber to Baia Mare, his signal can be retraced on the coins from this mint until 1467. (MNL OL DL 36394. Apr. 20, 1470. Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127)

**Catherine (Katalin)**

Daughter of Antonio Proll. (MNL OL DL 36346)
Giovanni
Brother of Christofer. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 280)
1427 – According to Francesco, his brother, he was around 15 years old. The family faced serious financial difficulties; therefore the some of the brothers sought business activity abroad, like Francesco, who went to Rome and another brother, without specifying his name was in Hungary working in the service of other Florentines. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 20. fol. 790v, Francesco di Rosso di Piero di Rosso)
By 1469 – he joined his brothers in Hungary. Brother of Christofer. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 281)

Margaret (Margit)
Daughter of Antonio Proll. (MNL OL DL 36346)

Paul
Son of Christopher, he also figures in the family tree compiled by Goldthwaite. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 280)
1472 – He sold the house in Sibiu, which he inherited from his father. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127)

Pero de Rosis (the identification is uncertain.)
He does not figure among the brothers of Francesco di Rosso Rossi. His identification is uncertain, he is not mentioned among Cristoforo’s brothers. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 20. fol. 790r-791r, Francesco di Rosso di Piero di Rosso) Yet, a certain Piero figures in the family tree drawn by Goldthwaite, a cousin to Cristoforo and his siblings. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 280) Also another Rossi, Giacomino figures in the Catasto of Giovanni di Bicci de’ Medici, as collector of papal revenues in Poland. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 49. fol. 1193v)
1439 – He managed the salt chamber to Ocna Sibiulu, as noble retainer (”familiaris”) of Matko of Talovac. (MNL OL DL 36390. March 24, 1439)
1440 – He was count of the salt chamber to Turda. (MNL OL DL 55213. June 19, 1440; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 125)

Zanobi di Rosso
1427 – According to Francesco, his brother he was around 16 years old. The family faced serious financial difficulties; therefore the some of the brothers sought business activity abroad, like Francesco, who went to Rome and another brother, without specifying his name was in Hungary working in the service of other Florentines. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 20. fol. 790v, Francesco di Rosso di Piero di Rosso)
1442 – He is reported to be in Hungary. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 281)
1457 – He reported some losses in his catasto due to a business failure in Venice. (Goldthwaite, The Building of Renaissance Florence, 281)
**FALCUCCI,**

**Giovanni di Niccolo**
1419 – He was representative of Andrea Scolari, bishop of Oradea, in Sibiu. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)
1424 – He wrote a letter to the bishop of Oradea concerning the purchase of horses. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 200)
1427 – He was creditor of the Melanesi of Buda with fl 387 according to the Catasto of the partnership. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 77. fol. 247r-248v)
1427 – He listed his partner and transactions carried out in Hungary in his catasto. Among the open accounts one can find cargoes of cloths and silk worth (the items are fl 392, fl 1.020, fl 295, fl 136) sent to Buda to the Melanesi by Andrea Viviani and other merchants. In 1427 he was to ship a cargo of silk to Buda in the value of fl 361. Melanesi also figures as creditor, apparently for assigns paid in his name to more persons in the value of fl 387. The same is the situation with Tommaso Corsi and company, who also paid in his name in the partnership of Hungary for more persons, Antonio di Ghezzo fl 240, Giovanni Ginori fl 190, messer Palla di Nofri fl 18, Oddo del Buono fl 31, Lorenzo and Lotteringo fl 118, the Abbess of Castello fl 100, altogether: fl 597. He could not settle the account with the Melanesi for a year. He also listed Emperor Sigismund as his debtor, and mentioned a number of partners in Hungary without naming them, claiming that there were no written records on most of those transactions, due to the general lack of literacy in Hungary. He also shipped textile to Venice, there the Zati seem to have been his main partners. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 53. fol.1094r-1096v)

Niccóló
Niccóló was Giovanni’s father, partner of the Fronte in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)

**FEDERIGHI,**

**Domenico di Francesco**
1394 – He was sent to Hungary by the Florentine government to negotiate in the case of Agostino Marucci. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 109v-110r. Feb. 9, 1394; ibid. 121r. March 28, 1394; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142-143)
1396 – In the instructions to Florentine legates sent to Hungary, Vanni Castellani and Gherardo Buondelmonte he is mentioned as merchant working in Hungary. (ASF, Dieci di Balia, Lettere - Legazioni e commissarie, 2. fol. 17v)
1427 – In the Catasto of Iacopo di Antonio di Lapaccio Rimbertini he is mentioned as agent of the da Uzzano-Federighi-Macinghi-Salvestri partnership in Hungary. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 296, fol. 79r)

**Francesco di Lapo**
1382-1411 – Nine times guild consul, eight times officer of the Mercanzia, twice drawn for the office of the Gonfaloniere di Compagnia, on other two occasions drawn for membership of the board of the 12 Buonuomini and twice incested also the office of the Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. (Online Tratte)
1390’s – Debtor of the Medici banking house. (ASF, Medici Avanti il Principato (MAP), 133. n.1. fol.33; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)
The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary concerning the affairs of the partnership founded by Federighi, Niccoló da Uzzano and Giovanni di Tommaso Salvestri. The members of the partnership gave goods and money to Agostino Marucci on trust, who did not settle the account. The Florentine government sent Domenico di Francesco di Lapo Federighi to clear the situation in Hungary and asked for the support of King Sigismund. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 109v-110r. Feb. 9, 1395; ibid. 121r. March 28, 1395; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142-143)

The Florentine government informed King Sigismund, that the officers of the Mercanzia were investigating the case and turned also for support John of Kanizsa, archbishop of Esztergom and chancellor. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 154r. Sept. 16, 1395; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142-143)

Instruction to the Florentine legates sent to Buda to recommend Federighi, working in Hungary to King Sigismund. (ASF, Dieci di Balia, Lettere- Legazioni e Commissarie, 2. fol. 17v)

Iacopo di Antonio di Lapaccio Rimbertini’s father Antonio was partner of the da Uzzano-Federighi-Macinghi-Salvestri partnership in Hungary, the son’s Catasto reveals that the account of the partnership operating 30 years earlier was not settled yet, because of the lack of account books. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol.79r) Before 1411 he died. (Online Tratte)

FOLCHI (DI FORLIVIO),

Benedetto di Niccolo
1416 – He was one of the witnesses to bear testimony of Simone di Piero Melanesi’s written commission to his uncle to arrange for him his marriage with Tommasi di Pietro Tosti in Florence. (Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1–5)

1428 – He was legate of the duke of Milan at the court of King Sigismund, he negotiated between King Sigismund and the Sultan after the battle of Golubac. (Teke, “Zsigmond és Ragusa”, 439; Djurić, Il crepuscolo di Bisanzio, 166)

1429 – Legate of Milan at King Sigismund, his task to negotiate a league against Venice remained unsuccessful. (Djurić, Il crepuscolo di Bisanzio, 170-172)

1430 – King Sigismund appointed him his noble retainer (“familiaris”). (Kintzinger, Westbindungen, 433)

1431 – Legate of Emperor and King Sigismund at the Sultano. Dubrovnik authorities turned to him on behalf of their town. (Gelcich- Thallóczy, Diplomatarium Ragusanum, no. 221. May 7, 1431; Teke, Zsigmond és Ragusa, 439)

Giovanni di Niccoló
1435 – Pope Eugen IV. urged King Sigismund to hand over Antonio Popoleschi’s seized goods to Giovanni di Niccoló Folchi. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak, II/393)

1427 – He was approximately 40 years old, his taxable wealth run to fl 400. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 24. fol. 1312.r)

FORTINI,

Bartolomeo
1420’s – Giovanni di Niccoló Frescobaldi had cloths from him to trade them in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 65. fol. 212; Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104)

FRESCOBALDI,

Cecca di Amerigo
1420’s – She was partner of the Melanesi brothers. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 65. fol. 139. Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198) She was due to have Hungarian fl 100 until Jano. 1, 1428 from Simone and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi in Buda to be paid in Florence. Out of this sum fl 163 were to be paid to Uberto Zati and his brothers, whereas she owed them fl 4. Thus, according to her altogether fl 846 were to be settled, lent to the Melanesi by Cecca’s sons. The money, as she claimed, was part of her dowry. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 466r. Cecca figlia di Antonio Covoni donna d’Amerigo Frescobaldi)

Filippo di Amerigo
1427 – He had a partnership with his brothers and Gianozzo Cavalcanti in Hungary, he was representative of their company in Hungary. King Sigismund was debtor of the partnership with fl 1.300. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1427 – He mentions in his Catasto that their outstanding debts in the Hungarian company were accumulated in the two years before 1427. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 577r)

Giovanni di Amerigo
1427 – He worked with his brothers and with Gianozzo Cavalcanti. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 577; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1427 – He mentions in his Catasto that their outstanding debts in the Hungarian company were accumulated in the two years before 1427. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 775.r)
1438 – According to his Catasto he did not dispose of any house in Florence because he was in a poor economic situation, therefore, he lived with his family (wife and three little children) in the “contado” and was lacking even the nanny for his baby sono. (ASF, Catasto 1438, 486. fol. 235r)

Niccoló di Amerigo
1427 – He had a partnership with his brothers and Gianozzo Cavalcanti in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 17. fol. 577; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1420’s – He bought textiles from Tommaso Borghini, Bernardo Antinori, Felice di Michele Brancacci, Bartolo di Domenico Corsi and Bartolomeo Fortini to trade them in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 65. fol. 212; Edler de Roover, L’arte della seta, 104)

FRONTE,

Antonio di Piero
1392 – He was in Zadar as the representative of a Florentine company. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 211. footnote no. 9)
1395 – He figures as “habitator” of Zadar in a record issued by the urban government: “Actum Iadre ante cancellariam interiorem presentibus ser Marino de Soppe, nobile ciue

1398-1402 – He was absent from Florence, because he was drawn for urban offices 20 times, he held the office of guild consul only on one occasion. (*Online Tratte*)

1404 – He was drawn for the office of the Gonfaloniere di compagnia and he held the office of the consul of the Wool guild twice. (*Online Tratte*)


1406 – The Florentine government recommended him and his partners to Filippo Scolari. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 27. fol.14v. Aug. 31, 1406)

1406-10 – Matteo Scolari, brother of Filippo Scolari was also partner of the company. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)

1407-1412 – He did not hold the offices he was drawn for except for one occasion, when he was elected guild consul. (*Online Tratte*)

1410 – He settled some of Filippo Scolari’s debts at the castellan of Kalisz. (Greater Poland). (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)


1412 – King Sigismund wrote to the town of Kosice to let the New Year’s gift (marks 20) paid through Fronte. (MNL OL DF 270132. Sept. 7. 1412)

1412 – King Sigismund wrote to the town of Sopron to let the New Year’s gift (marks 20) paid to Fronte, merchant of Buda and his partners. (MNL OL DF 202051. Sept. 29, 1412)

1413 – King Sigismund settled a debt with him. (See the online publication: RI XI,1 no. 491, May 17, 1413, in *Regesta Imperii Online*, last downloaded: May 19, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)

1413 – He wrote to the town of Kosice concerning the New Year’s gift due to the king. (MNL OL DF 270131, Feb. 10, 1413, published in *ZsO IV/152. Feb. 10, 1413; ibid. no. 230. Feb. 26, 1413)

1413 – The Florentine government sent legates to ask for King Sigismund’s support concerning his release. (*ZsO IV/730. June 9, 1413)

1414 – Castellani, merchant of Florence confirmed to have received gros 6000 from Michael Küchmeister for Antonio Fronte. (*ZsO IV/2512. Sept. 26, 1414)

1415 – He worked with his new partner, Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi. His share capital invested in the partnership run to fl 2.500, Carnesecchi invested the same amount. The first account was settled in 1424, he remained creditor of the first company with fl 3.036. The second partnership was not yet settled. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 27. fol. 116v; ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 79.fol. 52-55; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)

1417 – He was elected as member of the board of supervisors on the works of the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore in Florence. The members of this board were elected from the members of the Wool Guild since 1331. (Pitti, *Ricordi*, 472)

1414 -1417 – He held the offices of guild consul and gonfaloniere di compagnia in Florence. (*Online Tratte*)

1419 – King Sigismund appointed him his “familiaris”. (See online: RI XI,1 no. 3861,May 1, 1419, in *Regesta Imperii Online*, last downloaded: May 19, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)

1420-22 – He was elected prior, member of the board of the “12 Buonuomini” and gonfaloniere di compagnia. (*Online Tratte*)

1422. – Consul of the guild of the Lana. (Pitti, *Ricordi*, 496)
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1423 – He was granted trade privileges by King Sigismund. (See online RI XI, no. 5667, Oct. 30, 1423, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 28, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196)
1424 – Prior. (Online Tratte)
1426 – Gonfaloniere di compagnia. (Online Tratte)
1426 – He was commissioned to be the executor of Mattia Scolari’s last will by Filippo Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196)
1426 – Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi sent a letter to Florence with a Hungarian servant of Antonio Fronte. (Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi, 1869, 572)
1427 – Antonio’s company in Buda and the partnership of Pagolo del Berto Carnesecchi’s son, Simone fused in 1427. He lived in a house rented from his nephew, Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte. He was the debtor of the bishop of Oradea with a sum of fl 90, which he borrowed when his daughter had married. Finally, he was in a dispute with his nephew, due to the Hungarian affairs, and according to the decision of the arbiters he remained debtor of his nephew with fl 1,166 to be collected in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27, fol. 116r-117v; ASF, Catasto 28, fol. 1008; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196-97)
1433 – He figures among the debtors of the banking house of Ridolfo Peruzzi and partners with fl 610. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 35. tomo II. pezzo I. fol. 1352r)

His wife, Bindella di Bindo Tosinghi was first married to Piero di Luca degli Albizzi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 248r)

Fronte di Piero
1401 – Prior. (Online Tratte)
1405 – The Florentine government recommended him to Filippo Scolari. (ZsO II/1. 4040. July 5, 1405)
June-July 1406 – He was member of the board of 12 Buonuomini in Florence, in March, however, he was still absent from Florence. Subsequently, according to the records of the Florentine Tratte, he was drawn to urban offices in his home town 15 times, but he did not hold the offices due to his permanent absence from the city. (Online Tratte)
1406 – He was granted royal support to collect his outstanding debts in Hungary. (ASF, Signori-Carteggi, Missive-I. cancelleria, 27, fol. 14v. Aug. 31, 1406; the same record is published in ZsO II/4959, Aug. 31, 1406)
1411 – He agreed to comply with the decision of the Sei di Mercanzia and would settle his debts to his creditors, among them to Mattia Scolari. (ZsO III/337. Apr. 11, 1411)
1414 – He found a partnership with Niccoló di Marco Benvenuti and Iacopo Ardinghelli. Apparently they provided loans to King Sigismund. They figure in the Catasto as the king’s creditors: 3/8 of the outstanding debt is due to Benvenuti’s heir, and approximately fl 400 were due to Ardinghelli’s heir. Fronte di Piero Fronte’s heir claimed that the debt resulted from a transaction contracted 14 years earlier. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 100v)
1417 – He was drawn for the office of the consul of the wool guild. (Online Tratte)
1417-18 – He was drawn twice to urban offices in Florence, but, being absent from the city, he did not hold either of them. (Online Tratte)
1418 – Pope Martin V. ordered the archbishop of Esztergom to settle certain debts with Simone di Filippo Capponi and Fronte di Piero Fronte, Florentine burghers. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápak, I/54)

Before 1419 he died. (Online Tratte)

1427 – His son, Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte mentioned his father’s affairs in Hungary in his catasto. Both King Sigismund and Queen Barbara were his debtors. Also, his uncle, Antonio di Piero Fronte owed him fl 1.166 as a result of their activity in Hungary, according to the decision of arbiters. Also a member of the Giuseppi kin (Francesco Giuseppi, fl 200) and Zanobi Panciatichi (fl 15) figure among his debtors. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27.fol. 100r-101v)

GHINETTI,

Lorenzo di Marco
1454 – He lived in Buda, after his death his brother, Iacopo inherited his assets. The Florentine government wrote to governor John of Hunyad on his behalf to collect his inheritance in Hungary. (ASF, Signori, lettere esterne, 40. fol. 78. Oct. 7, 1454)

Nicoló d’Andrea
1427 – He was in Slavonia. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 62. fol. 744r)

Iacopo di Marco

GYUAN, SON OF BENEDICT (GIOVANNI DI BENEDETTO),
1384 – He entered the city council of Zagreb and worked as officer of the Zagreb thirtieth.
1387 – He was accused of infidelity. (Škreblin, “Ethnic groups”, 40)
1392 – He was judge of the city. (ZsO I/3258)
1398 – His brother, Franciscus came to Zagreb.
1420 – Giovanni died. His two sons, Benedict and Paul were also members of the city council. (Škreblin, “Ethnic groups”, 45; I owe all the above information on Giovanni di Benedetto to Bruno Škreblin.)

GIOVANNI DI MESSER CANOTTO,
1427 – He stated in his Catasto that he had professional relations to more members of the Scolari family. Thus, he was entitled to have fl 50 from the heir of Andrea Scolari, bishop of Oradea due to his last will. Moreover, he performed more “senserie” on commission of Matteo Scolari, who remained his debtor with fl 100. Also heirs of Filippo Scolari owed him fl 500. All these outstanding debts were declared losses by him, and apparently the officials of the Catasto approved it. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 15. fol. 841r; ASF, Catasto 1427, 64. fol. 287; see also the Online Catasto, last downloaded: March 2, 2013)

GIOVANNI DI MESSER NICCOLÓ,
1412-1420 – He was in Hungary, and left his family (wife and two daughters) at the care of his father-in-law, Giorgio di Andrea, who declared in 1427 to have had expenses worth fl 400 never settled by his son-in-law. He was also liable to certain wool merchants/manufacturers with fl 100 (out of a total of fl 250) for goods taken by Giovanni in the form of a commercial credit (“allo sconto”). Since then Giovanni went bankrupt and his creditors were summoned. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 12v)

**Giovanni di Tommaso,**

1381 – Florentine merchant in Buda, figures in a notarial deed issued in Florence, in which he was named as legal representative to Foresta di Piero Foresi of Prato. (MNL OL DF 208792. April 4, 1381, quoted in Di Francesco – Fiorato, La circulation des hommes, 23)

**Giuseppi,**

**Niccolò di Vaggio di Maza**

1427 – He was listed as member of his father’s household, who declared Niccolò’s age (years 27) and that he stayed in Cracow. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 26. fol. 1081v)

1431 – He was sent to Cracow for a year to trade with goods (worth fl 3.120), for Michele di Giovanni, a wealthy Florentine merchant, citizen of Venice with Guido, the brother of Michele. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 39. fol. 338v)

1429 – In the Hungarian sources he is mentioned as “Nicolaus de Wagio”. The Florentine government wrote to the city of Cracow on his behalf. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 128)

1450 – He was in the service of John of Hunyad. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 128-129)

1454 – Count of Buda chamber. (MNL OL DL 93254. Aug. 5, 1454; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1456 – He managed the mint chamber of Sibiu. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)


1459 – Count of salt chamber to Sic. (MNL OL DL 36392. Nov. 11, 1459; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1464 – The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary and to the city of Buda on behalf of the heirs of the deceased Niccoló. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

**Griffolini,**

**Mariotto di Biagio**

1417 – He is called “Marioth Gallicus” in a record on the difficulties and losses he faced in Hungary, when he shipped textiles from Venice to Queen Barbara on her commission. (MNL OL DF 202121. May 17, 1417)

1420s – He had extensive business interests in Buda. His venture ended badly, with losses amounting to fl 5.000. Griffolini was the father of “Franciscus Aretinus” (1420 - before 1490), a renowned humanist, pupil of Guarino Veronese. (See his catasto ASF, Catasto, 201. fol. 334 bis r., On him see also Robert Black, Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance, 7. I would like to thank Prof. Black, who called my attention to this record)

**Iacopo di Giovanni d’Antonio,**
1420 – He is mentioned in the Catasto of Francesco di Francesco della Luna, as partner in the partnership founded by della Luna and Filippo di Firenze del Pancia for their activity in Hungary. Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi (fl 18), and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi (fl 241). (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. parte II. fol. 515v-516v)

LAMBERTESCHI,

Andrea di Tommaso
From 1419 – he was a silk merchant. He and his relative, Bernardo di Lamberto Lamberteschi sent goods to Hungary, which were marketed in Hungary by Lamberteschi’s two sons, Niccoló and Giovanni. He also worked with the Melanesi brothers, they were his debtors worth fl 200 for silk consigned them, and also the deceased bishop of Óradea (Andrea Scolari or Giovanni Melanesi?) owed him fl 401. His sons were his debtors with fl 5,000, but, as he stated, he could not settle the account with them because of personal conflicts. He also had a partnership in Venice and sent silk to Barcelona, Alexandria, Valencia etc. He mentioned also Piero, his son deceased in Hungary, whose books were allegedly found at the renowned Florentine humanist, Niccoló di Bartolomeo Niccoli and Andrea remained reliable for Piero’s debts. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 27.fol.84r-93v; Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198-9)

1427 – The heir of one of his partners, Iacopo di Barnaba Filipeschi declared that Lamberteschi was debtor of his late father (fl 2339) for 10 years. He assessed it a bad debt. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 18. Tomo 1. fol.942r-944v)

1438 – One of his sons, Giovanni was already dead, his widow was entitled to most of the estates in compensation for her dowry (fl 1500), and the remaining landed properties were sold by the officials of the Florentine Monte to Bernardo Lamberteschi. (ASF, Catasto 1438. 486. 1-2 parti, fol.53r).

Bernardo di Lamberto
From 1419 – relative and business partner of Andrea di Tommaso Lamberteschi. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 27.fol.199.-208; Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198-9)

1427 – He listed in his Catasto Simone di Piero Melanesi and partners, to whom he sent textiles worth fl 145 some years earlier. The Melanesi still owed him fl 60. He had a partnership in Pisa and also sent goods to London, Bruges etc. He also recorded his nephew, Piero di Andrea Lamberteschi among his bad debtors. He owed him fl 800, but as he died in the service of Emperor Sigismund against the Turks, and as Bernardo described him, “does not know anything of trade”. Piero’s father, Andrea remained liable for his son’s debt towards Bernardo (fl 800). (ASF, Catasto 1427. 27.fol.199r-204v)

1438 – He most probably had right of pre-emption on Andrea’s landed property, sold by the Florentine taxational officials to cover Andrea’s tax arrear. (ASF, Catasto 1438. 486. fol.53r)

Giovanni di Andrea
The 1420s – he also stayed in Hungary and submitted a joint Catasto with his brother, Niccoló through his wife, Albiera, who remained in Florence. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 28.fol.1039r-1039v; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)

1427-1429 – Both him and his brother were arrested in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207; ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 32.fol.63v-64r. Apr. 5, 1429; ibid.fol.179v-180r. Feb. 7. 1429)
Before 1438 – he was dead, his widow remarried to Francesco Quaratesi. Albiera, however, encountered difficulties in regaining her dowry (fl 1500). Finally, she and her new husband acquired part of the landed properties of Giovanni’s father, Andrea. (ASF, Catasto 1438, 486. fol. 53r)

**Niccoló di Andrea**

1416 – In Buda he was one of the witnesses of Simone di Piero Melanesi’s written commission to his uncle to arrange his marriage in his absence from Florence with Tommasa di Pietro Tosti. (Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1–5)

Before 1419 – he brought textiles to Hungary commissioned by his father. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 28.fol.1039r-1039v; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)

1423 – King Sigismund granted him trade privileges. (See also online RI XI,1 no. 5667, Oct. 30, 1423, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 28, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

1427 – He was arrested in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207; ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 32.fol. 63v-64r. Apr. 5, 1429; ibid.fol. 179v-180r. Feb. 7, 1430)

1439 – Antonio Zati and Pape Manini, counts to the salt chambers to Sic and Dej made an agreement with mediation of Nikolaus Lamperteskj “homo regius”. (Gündisch, Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte, V. 25; István Draskóczy’communication).

1452 a certain Nicolaus Lampertyskus, burgher of Rivuldominarum sojourned in Buda. (Kammerer, Zichy okmtr, IX. 420; István Draskóczy’communication).

end of 1460s – His widow had contacts to the Manini. (Jakó, A Kolozsmonostori konvent, I/1841; István Draskóczy’communication)

**Piero di Andrea**

1419 – He accompanied his father’s goods to Hungary and remained there to trade them. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

Around 1422 – He offered service to the humanist Poggio Bracciolini at the royal court to Buda for three years. He apparently had connections also to Niccoló di Bartolomeo Niccoli, another renowned Florentine humanist of his time, who financed among others, also Bracciolini’s travels to discover antique texts. According to the Catasto of Andrea Lamberteschi, Piero’s numerous books were discovered in Niccoli’s possession, which hint to a collaboration between the two. (Shepherd, Vita di Poggio Bracciolini, 122; ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 93r)

1423 – King Sigismund granted him trade privileges. (See online RI XI,1 no. 5667, Oct. 30, 1423, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 28, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

Before 1427 – According to both Andrea di TommasoLamberteschi’s and Bernardo di Lamberto Lamberteschi’s catastos he had deceased. He owed Bernardo di Lamberto fl 800, but as he died in the service of Emperor Sigismund against the Turks, and as Bernardo described him, “does not know anything of trade”. Piero’s father, Andrea remained liable for his son’s debt towards Bernardo (fl 800). (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 199r-204v)

**Tommaso**

The 1420s – he stayed in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)
LOTTERI

Jacopo di Michele
1426 – He stayed in Oradea and was witness in the dispute of the Scolari heirs and Gianozzo di Vanni Cavalcanti in front of the officials of the Florentine Mercanzia. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203-204)

MACIGNI,

Antonio di Niccolo
1395 – The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary on his behalf. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 121r, March 28, 1395)
1395 – He was representative of the Tosinghi-Federighi-da Uzzano company in Hungary, and was supposed to supervise Agostino Marucci’s affairs in the kingdom. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143; Iacopo di Antonio di Lapaccio Rimbertini ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 76r)
1396 – He is mentioned in an instruction of the Florentine government to its legates sent to Hungary, as a merchant working in the kingdom. (ASF, Dieci di Balia, Lettere- Legazioni e Commissarie, 2. fol. 17v. Apr. 25, 1396)

Cione
1380 – He was the representative of the Macigni-da Uzzano-Salvestri company in Buda. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1184. May 16, 1382; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130) He had connections to the political league lead by the Horváti. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 145)
1387 – Letter by the John of Palisna, Ban of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia, prior of Vrana and ally of King Charles III. of Naples, pretender to the Hungarian crown, written on his noble retainer (“familias”) and officialis Chiono Marini [known as Macigni] de Florentia, whom the revenues from Dalmatian salt and customs chambers had been leased for years, was managing the office well. (CDC Vol. 17. Jano. 28. 1387, see also Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”,145)
He is probably identical with a certain „Chun de Florentia”, who was burgher of Zagreb. (Tkalcic, Monumenta Historica, I/397; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 133); In this case however, he was absent from Zagreb between 1375-1395, where in 1375 he was already member of th magistrate, “iuratus”. (Bruno Škreblin’s communiction.) In any case, Cion of Zagreb married Luka Bonioli’s daughter (Luka was Latin from Apulia and also very welathy citizen) upon his return to Zagreb in 1395. He was also listed in the list of expelled citizens in 1395 as “mercator et vexelifer”. He died in 1423. Cion’s second wife was the sister of Martin Klarić from Senj (judge of 1438). Cion’s daughter married noblemen from Brežice (in Empire). (All the information reported here are Bruno Škreblin’s communiction.)

Niccoló
1373-76 – Member of a partnership with Zanobio Macigni and Piero di Banco degli Albizzi, founded to trade in Hungary. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1183. Jano. 9, 1382; ASF, Arte del Cambio, fol. 67; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)
Zanobio
1373-76 – He was partner of Piero di Banco degli Albizzi in his company founded for trade in
Hungary. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1183. Jano. 9, 1382; ASF, Arte del Cambio, fol. 67; Teke,
“Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)
1373 – Servant and court supplier of the king of Hungary. (Herczeg Mihály], “Nagy Lajos
udvari szállítója”, 245; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)
1380 – The company terminated, his agent, Rubaconte was sent to Hungary to collect his
outstanding debts. (ASF, Mercanzia no. 1184. May 16, 1382; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”,
130)
1388 – The Florentine government informed the king of Hungary, that Marco Buonfilippi was
sent to Hungary to investigate Zanobio’s affairs in the kingdom. (ASF, Signori, carteggi,
missive- I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 89v. March 16, 1388)
1390s – He contracted insurance on his goods shipped to Hungary at the Medici banking
house. (ASF, Medici Avanti il Principato, 133. fol. 33; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)

MARCO DI BONINSEGNA DI MARCO
1427 – Aged 25, he was in Hungary and had a two-months-old daughter in Florence. He owed
fl 150 to Nanni d’ebertino and partners, wool manufacturers in Prato. Also, Filippo di messer
Biagio and partners, wool manufacturers fl 100, and Bartolomeo di messer Nardo[?] and
partners wool manufacturers in samartino fl 75. Verdiano di messer Donato da San Miniato fl
200. As the brothers stated, Marco was in Hungary and they did not have exact information
on the real situation: “Marcho non ne che in Ungheria non si puo chiarire”. (ASF, Catasto
1427, 62. fol. 259r-261v)

MANINI/MANNINI,
Angello [Agnolo] (Manini-Bardi)
1424 – Count of salt chamber to Dej, in the service of Filippo Scolari. His wife was daughter
of a nobleman from Doboka county. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129-30)
1442 – Noble retainer (“familiaris”) of the king, managing the royal chambers of the
kingdom. In this year he deferred his competencies to his brother, Marco. (MNL OL DL
36390, Jano. 8, 1442)
1444 – He was in the service of Gasparo de Colle. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)
1447 – Count of salt chambers to Máramaros. (MNL OL DL 44490. Dec. 14, 1449;
Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)
1448 – He addressed a letter in Italian by his kinsman, Pape Manini. (MNL OL DL 44536.
March? 22, 1448)
1450 – He and his relatives, Pape and Odoardo were granted nobility by the governor, John of
Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 24761. Feb. 25, 1450)
1450 – Angello and his relatives were granted the property of Szentpéterszeg, Bihar county.
From this time onwards the family used the name “of Szentpéterszeg”. (MNL OL DL 14342.
March 12, 1450. Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131; Draskóczy, „Adósjegyzék”, 93)
1450 – Odoardo and his relatives were granted the jurisdictional privilege called “ius gladii”
on their estate by the governor, John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 14344. March 18, 1450;
Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)
1450 – Angello and Odoardo were ordered by the governor, John of Hunyad to consign the customs of Rakasz to its lawful owners. (MNL OL DL 38298. March 21, 1450)

1457 – The widow of the deceased Odoardo married John Lökös of Kálla and sued Angello for her cloths etc. (MNL OL DL 55612. Aug. 17, 1457; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

1459 – He managed the salt chambers of the kingdom together with Emmerich of Zápolya. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

1461 – Pape sued John of Geszt, former “vicecomes” of Bistrita, (administrative head of the noble county, deputy of the county’s ispán), for violent trespass in his name and in the name of his son, Paulus and Angello in front of the convent of Cluj-Mănăstur, which functioned as place of authentication (“loca credibilia”). (MNL OL DL 36392. Aug. 2, 1461)

1463 – A list of the debtors of Odoardo Angello. (MNL OL DL 55767; Draskóczy, „Adójegyzék”)

1463 – His widow and daughter, Anne concluded an agreement with Angelo on the division of the assets in front of the chapter of Oradea, which functioned as chapter of authentication (“loca credibilia”). (MNL OL DL 55745. Jano. 20, 1463; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

1463 – The widow of Odoardo protested in her name and in the name of her daughter, Anna in front of the convent of Oradea, because Angello had not restored her cloths. (MNL OL DL 55750. March 2, 1463)

1463 – The widow of Odoardo, her daughter and Angello who lived in Szatmár took their sue in front of an arbiter. (MNL OL DL 55766. Nov. 9, 1463; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

1460s – The family resettled in Transylvania, their descendants took over the name of their new property (Kodori=of Kodor) and integrated into the nobility of Transylvania. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

1499 – The last mention on the Kodori family. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

Francesco di Antonio
1427 – He was approximately 24 years old. (see his father’s, Antonio di Giovanni Mannini’s list of “bocche” inserted in his catasto. ASF, Catasto 1427, 34. fol. 131r)

1462 – His letter in Italian to Odoardo’s widow and her new (Hungarian) husband, John Lökös of Kálla handling the family dispute with Agnolo. (MNL OL DL 45004. March 20, 1462)

Giovanni di Antonio
1427 – He was approximately 26 years old, his wife was Marta of Iklód. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131; for his age see his father’s, Antonio di Giovanni Mannini’s list of “bocche” inserted in his catasto. ASF, Catasto 1427, 34. fol. 131r., and also ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 35r)

1440 – He was count of the salt chamber to Dej, Benedict and Demetrius of Iklód pawned their estates in Vajdaháza and Füzes to him in front of the convent of Cluj-Mănăstur. (MNL OL DL 36390. July 30, 1440; see also ibid. DL 55218. Dezső Losonczi to Giovanni Manini, July 26, 1440)

1441 – Count of the salt chambers to Sâlard and Oradea. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)

1441 – He is mentioned as former count of the salt chamber to Dej. He took a deserted house and a partial ownership of a mill for fl 20. (MNL OL DL 55236. March 7, 1441; ibid. DL 36390. July 20, 1441)

1447 – Count of the salt chamber to Buda. (MNL OL DL 55352. Apr. 22, 1447)

1449 – Count of salt chamber. (MNL OL DL 55422. March 15, 1449)

He died before 1451. (Draskóczy, „Adójegyzék”, 94)
**Giovanni di Pape**

1461 – Pape sued John of Geszt, former “vicecomes” of Bistrita (administrative head of the noble county, deputy of the county’s ispán), in his name and in the name of his sons, Giovanni and Paulus in front of the convent of Cluj-Mănăstur. (MNL OL DL 36392. June 13, 1461)

1469 – He is mentioned as “Kodori Pape Giovanni” in a sue case in front of the convent of Cluj-Mănăstur. (MNL OL DL 36394. March 2, 1469)

---

**Marcus**

1442 – Angello, noble retainer (“familiaris”) and count of the royal chambers of the kingdom deferred his obligations to his relative, Marcus. (MNL OL DL 36390, Jano. 8, 1442)

---

**Odward (Edoardo) di Antonio**

1427 – He was approximately 9 years old. (See Antonio di Giovanni Mannini’s list of “bocche” inserted in his catasto. ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 34. fol. 131r)

1440 – Count of the salt chamber to Sic with Máté of Szeged. (MNL OL DL 55360 probably mistakenly dated to 1447, István Draskóczy’s communication and correction of date)

1447 – Count of the salt chamber to Buda, he probably managed also the Buda mint. (MNL OL DL 55352 Apr. 22, 1447; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130; Huszár, *Budai pénzverés*, 90)

1447 – He was appointed count of the salt chambers to Dej and Sic with Máté Szegedy by the governor, John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 55358. July 23, 1447)

1448 – Count of salt chamber to Máramaros, John of Hunyad warned him to pay off the salt Hunyadi was entitled to have. (MNL OL DL 44501. Feb. 09, 1448; ibid. DL 55383. March 22, 1448; DL 55387. Apr. 30, 1448; DL 55388. May 8, 1448)

1448 – He addressed several letters in Italian by his kinsman, Pape Manini. (MNL OL DL 44503. March 27, 1448; ibid. DL 44504. March 8, 1448; DL 44535. Oct.? 9, 1448; DL 44537. July19, 1448)

1448 – John of Hunyad warned him to consign the office of the salt chamber to Peter of Berekszó with its revenues. (MNL OL DL 55388. May 8, 1448)

1449 – Count of salt chamber with Pape Manini, Máté Szegedy. The governor, John of Hunyad warned him to first pay off the salt he was entitled to have. (MNL OL DL 55422. March 15, 1449)

1450 – He was granted nobility with his brother Pape, and his relative, Angello. (MNL OL DL 24761. Feb. 25, 1450)


1450 – Odoardo and some of his relatives were granted the “ius gladii”, a right which invested them with the power of county magistrate within the boundaries of their new property, by John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 14344. March 18, 1450; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131; Engel, *The Realm*, 180)

1450 – The governor, John of Hunyad warned Angello and Odoardo to consign the customs of Rakasz to its lawful owners. (MNL OL DL 38298. March 21, 1450)

1451 – Count of salt chamber to Dej, he took in pawn a share of the landed property of Füzes from Stephen of Iklód along with Nicholas Agman’s wood parcel for fl 18. Stephen of Iklód
was a kinsman to the wife of Giovanni, Odoardo’s brother. (MNL OL DL 36403. March 15, 1451)
1452-53 – Count of salt chambers to Dej and Sic. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)
1454-1455 – Count of salt chamber to Dej. (MNL OL DL 36407. Jan. 20, 1455; Jakó, Kolozsmonostori, no. 1136.)
1457 – Odoardo had deceased; his widow got married to John Lőkös of Kálla and sued Angello for her cloths. (MNL OL DL 55612. Aug. 17, 1457; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)
1458? – Count to salt chamber to Dej. Osvát of Iklód pawned him a parcel of his landed property for fl 150. (MNL OL DL 36403. Oct. 1, 1458)
1463 – His widow and daughter, Anne made an agreement with Angello on the distribution of the assets in front of the Oradea chapter. (MNL OL DL 55745. Jano. 20, 1463; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)
1463 – Odoardo’s widow protested in her name and in the name of her daughter in front of the chapter of Oradea against Angello, who did not restore their belongings. (MNL OL DL 55750. March 2, 1463)
1463 – Odoardo’s widow and daughter and Angello turned with their dispute to an arbiter. (MNL OL DL 55766. Nov. 9, 1463; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

Pape di Salvestro
He belonged to the circles of Andrea Scolari. Most probably he was second to arrive to Hungary after Angello from the family. He was cousin to Giovanni, Odoardo and Francesco. Their fathers were brothers. (see Antonio di Giovanni Mannini’s Catasto in which he mentioned Salvestro as his brother. ASF. Catasto 1427. 34. fol.131r)
1427 – Niccoló and Giovanni di Jacopo di messer Niccoló Baldovini listed Pape among his debtors, stating, that he stayed in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 62. fol.336v)
1427 – His father Salvestro and his uncle, Alamanno di Giovanni Mannini had common affairs according to the tax declaration of Alamanno’s widow, Monna Ginevra, daughter of Baldassare Ubriachi (she widowed twice, because she was also married with Ruberto di Luigi Canigiani, deceased by 1427). Alamanno’s assets, claimed the widow, were illegally kept by his brothers, Antonio and Salvestro (ASF, Catasto 1427. 15.fol.933r-934r)
1427 – Count of salt chamber to Dej. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)
1436-1437 – Michael Jakcs of Kusaly, vaivode of Transylvania appointed him to manage the chamber to Sâlard. He was appointed by Michael Jakcs of Kusaly, count of Székely (“Siculi”) to manage also the salt chamber to Dej. (MNL OL DL 55060. Dec. 31, 1436; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130; the information on Dej is István Draskóczy’s kind communication: MNL OL DL 55060. Dec. 31, 1436)
1439 – Count of the salt chambers ot Dej and Sic. (Gündisch, Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte V, 25-26. István Draskóczy’s kind communication)
1440 – Count of the salt chamber to Dej. (MNL OL DL 88162. Aug. 21, 1440. István Draskóczy’s kind communication)
1441 – Count of the salt chamber to Dej. (MNL OL DL 55236. March 7, 1441)
1442 – Count of the salt chambers to Sâlard and Dej. (MNL OL DL. 55262. June 15, 1442; Draskóczy, „Adósjegyzék”, 94. footnote no. 4)
1444 – Count of the salt chambers to Dej and Sic. (MNL OL DL 65058. Feb. 14, 1444; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)
1445 – Count of the salt chambers to Transylvania. (MNL OL DL 102494. March 10, 1445)
A servant of his, Simon Zaz represented him in a legal dispute in front of the vice vaivode Nicolaus of Vízakna and Mark Herepei. (MNL OL DF 253065 Sept.21, 1445; published in Wess Cs. L1. IX/9. 342)

His wife also came from the Iklódi family, her name was Anasztázia, her first husband was Paul Wass of Czege. (MNL OL DF 252957.Aug. 13, 1448; published in Wess Család Levéltára, VI/50. 342-343)

Count of salt chamber to Dej. He was addressed several letters in Italian by his kinsman, Odoardo. (MNL OL DL 18, 1448; ibid. DL 44501. Oct.? 9, 1448; see the letters in Italian: DL 44503- March 27, 1448; DL 44504. March 8, 1448; DL 44535. Oct.? 9, 1448; DL 44536. March? 22, 1448; DL 44537. July19, 1448)

Count of salt chamber wit h Odoardo Manini and Máté Szegedy. John of Hunyad warned him to first pay off the salt he was entitled to have. (MNL OL DL 55422. March 15, 1449)

He was granted nobility along with Odoardo and Angello by the governor, John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 24761. Feb. 25, 1450)

Count of salt chamber to Máramaros, he was granted the property of Szentpéterszeg in Bihar county for his merits along with his heirs. (MNL OL DL 24761. Feb. 25, 1450; DL 14342. March 12, 1450; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

He was granted the “ius gladius” on his new property by the governor, John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 14344. March 18, 1450; Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 131)

He died. (Draskóczy, “Adósjegyzék”, 94)

Paulus (di Pape)

Pape’s son. His father accused John of Geszt former “vicecomes” of Bistrita of violentia in his name and in the name of his son, Paulus and also in the name of Angello in front of the convent of Cluj-Mănăstur. (MNL OL DL 36392. Aug. 2, 1461)

Before 1467 – He governed the mining area of Máramaros. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 130)

MARTELLI,

Cosimo di Domenico

1462 – Giovanozzo Biliotti, Marabottino d’Antonio Rustichi and a Florentine merchant staying in Ancona commissioned Cosimo to trade in the territory of Slavonia. (ASF, Mercanzia, no. 10831. fol. 50v. Oct. 15, 1462)

MARUCCI,

Agostino di Paolo

1373-76 – He was partner of a company working in Hungary with his brother, Maruccio, with Giovanni di Sandro Portinari, Ardigno di Corso Ricci and Cristiano di Migliore degli Albizzi. (ASF, Arte del Cambio, fol. 67; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)

Early 1390s – He worked as Hungarian representative of another Florentine partnership founded by Giovanni Tosinghi, Francesco di Lapo Federighi, Niccoló di Giovanni da Uzzano. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142)

1395 – The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary on behalf of the da Uzzano company. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 109v-110r. Feb. 8, 1395. febr.8; the same record is published in ZsO I/3812. 3813. Feb. 8, 1395)
1395 – The letter of the Florentine government refer to Agostino’s death. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 121r. March 28, 1395 the same is published in ZsO I/3903. March 28, 1395)

**Maruccio di Paolo**

1373-76 – He was partner of a company working in Hungary with his brother, Agostino, with Giovanni di Sandro Portinari, Ardigno di Corso Ricci and Cristiano di Migliore degli Albizzi. (ASF, Arte del Cambio, fol. 67; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130)

1384 – He managed the affairs of Vieri de’Medici and partners in Hungary with seat in Buda. (MNL OL DL, 7350. Nov. 30, 1384; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 137)

1384 – Louis Helfenstein, archbishop of Kalocsa pawned his estates to Nicholas Garai in the presence of Maruccio. (MNL OL DL 7350. Nov. 30, 1384; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)

1386 – He provided a loan (fl 7000) to King Sigismund to the debit of the sums the king was entitled to have from Venice. (Wenzel, *Magyar Diplomáciai Emlékek*, II/351. Nov. 22, 1386; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)

1388 – Giovanni Tosinghi replaced him as representative of the Medici company. (Flórenczi Okmt. II/ 95. July 25, 1388; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)

**Michele**

1376 – He stayed in Buda as representative of the Portinari-Marucci partnership; he had a house in the town. According to Pitti, Michele stayed in Buda as representative of Matteo dello Scelto Tinghi. (Pitti, *Ricordi*, 366; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 131)

**MEDICI,**

**Vieri di Cambio**

Around 1382 – He founded a company with Guido di Tommaseo and Jacopo di Francesco Ventura for trade of copper in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 132-133)


1388 – The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary and mentioned Vieri de’Medici, which had as partner Andrea di Ugo, Guido di Tommaseo and Antonio di Santi for the trade in Hungary. Maruccio as the representative of the company and the outstanding debts resulting from the Hungarian transactions are also referred to in the letter: fl 11.011. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 12v-13r. Feb. 10, 1388; the same record is published in Wenzel, *Magyar Diplomáciai Emlékek* III/375. Feb. 10, 1388; ZsO I/921. Feb. 6, 1389; MNL OL DL 7350. Nov. 30, 1384; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 132-133, 137-38)

1388 – The Florentine government wrote to the king of Hungary on the liabilities of Catherine Frangipani, countess of Modrus and Veglia towards a Florentine company. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 131v-132r. Sept. 28, 1388)

1389 – Pope Urban VI. permitted the bishop of Pécs to pay the papal tax up to a total of fl 10.000 to Giovanni Tosinghi, Vieri de’Medici’s representative in Buda. (ZsO I/921. Feb. 6, 1389; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)
1389 – The Florentine government wrote to the count of Modrus and his wife to confirm that Milanus of Padova, who had extensive debts, for which also some Florentine burghers’ assets are confiscated, was never partner of Vieri de’ Medici. (CDC Vol. 17. no. 168. Sept. 28, 1389: ZsO I/1157. Sept. 28, 1389)

1392 – Gonfaloniere di Giustizia in Florence. (Online Tratte)

1393 – Gonfaloniere di compagnia in Florence. (Online Tratte)

1395 – He was drawn for the office of guild consul. (Online Tratte)

**Giovanni di Bicci**

1427 – In his Catasto on the company in Venice, a number of Florentine businessmen working also in Hungary (Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi with more transactions, mainly for textiles consigned them on trust, Niccolò di Piero Popoleschi, Simone di Andrea Buondelmonti and brothers), figure. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 49. fol. 1140r-1193v, here fol. 1162v-1168r)

**MELANESI/MILANESI (DA PRATO),**

**Bartolomeo**

1427–8 – He was arrested in Buda on the order of the queeno. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)

**Filippo**

He was the uncle of Simone and Tommaso di Piero, he lived in Florence, he and the members of the Melanesi kin living mostly in Prato provided the goods to be shipped to Hungary. (For the joint Catasto of the uncle and his nephews see ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I,fol. 649r-655v)

1427 – According to their debtors’list in Florence, sent woollen clothes worth fl 416 and silk worth fl 3,944. Altogether most of the outstanding debts of Filippo in Florence (fl 6780 out of fl 8147) can be related to their business activity in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I,fol. 652v–653r)

**Giovanni di Piero**

1424 – He was present at least at two meetings of the imperial court held in Buda. (See online RI XI,1 no. 5894, June 28, 1424; ibid. no. 5911, July 21, 1424, last downloaded: May 16, 2013)

1424 – King Sigismund’s legate to the cities Bern, Zürich, Solothurn, Schwyz, Luzern, which were supposed to participate in the military campaigne against Milano. (See RI XI,2 no. 5937. Aug. 16, 1424)

1425 – Noble retainer (“familiaris”) of King Sigismund. According to the grant letter he did legal studies and was a Florentine burgther. (See online: RI XI,2 no. 6429, Sept. 23, 1425, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 19, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”,198; Kintzinger, Westbindungen, 444)

1426 – He is mentioned as brother to Tommaso and Simone in a letter by Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, Florentine envoy to the court of King Sigismund. (Commissioni di Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi. 552–613. doc. 972)
1426-27 – Bishop of Oradea. (Engel, *Archontology*, I/ 77; for his nomination and later the Papal charter on his successor in the bishopric of Oradea see Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, I/ 880. 956; II/ 473–478)

**Melanese di Ridolfo**

1420s – He commissioned Piero di Gerardino with the marketing of goods in Hungary. Piero di Gerardino took textiles in trust from Giovanni Barbadoro, and Melanese remained reliable for those goods with a sum of fl 800. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 175. fol. 273r; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

1427 – He submitted a separate Catasto in the name of his two sons, Matteo and Ridolfo di Milanese. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 41. Tomo 1. Matteo e Ridolfo del Milanese fol.205v-206r; a supplement to the declaration of the two sons from 1438 is to be found at ASF, *Catasto* 1438, 486. fol. 697r-v. Matteo e Ridolfo di Milanese dei Milanesi da Prato)

**Simone di Piero**

He apparently entered the service of Antonio Fronte in Hungary first. (Simone and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi’s Catasto on their Buda company is to be found at ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46. Tomo I, fol.654r–655v; and for the campione see ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 77. fol. 248v–249r)

1416 – Simone stayed in Buda in the house of a certain “Alimpech” to be found in the street of the Italian “*in domo Alimpech civis Budensis et habitotionis predicti Simonis, posite strata Latinorum iuxta domum et habitotionis domini Johannis vicegerentis cancellarii regis Ungarie et domum Ladislai filii Dominici de Pachozes nobilis de Hungaria et alios confines ...” Simone gave a written comission to his uncle in Florence in front of witnesses to arrange his marriage with a certain Tommasa di Pietro Tosti. (Nuti, “Un mercante”, 1–5)

After 1416 – he married a certain Lucia, daughter of a Buda burgher. By 1427 the couple had a little son, called Piero, who after his father’s death went under guardianship of his uncle, Tommaso. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 77. fol. 248r; ASF, *Catasto* 1430, 406. fol. 402v)

Beginning of 1420s – he had an independent company in Buda. Antonio di Francesco Zati was the contact person between the Buda company of the Melanesi and the Venice company of Uberto Zati. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)


1427 – Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, according to his Catasto worked in the service of Tommaso and Simone Melanesi. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 47. fol. 522r -523r)

1427 – Based on the Catasto of the Melanesi brothers, Simone disposed of the citizenship of Buda probably also due to his marriage, because he listed the urban tax paid by him (fl 60) among his expenses. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46. Tomo I. 655v)

He died before 1430 because Tommaso di Piero Melanesi’s Catasto of 1430 reports him to be deceased. (ASF, *Catasto* 1430, 406. fol. 402v)

**Tommaso di Piero**

The Catasto of Simone and Tommaso di Piero Melanesi on their company in Hungary. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 654r-655v)
1420s – He had an independent company in Buda. Antonio di Francesco Zati was the contact person between the Buda company of the Melanesi and the Venice company of Uberto Zati. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)

1425 – King Sigismund took him in his “familia”. In the letter he was mentioned to be burgher of Florence. (See RI XI,2 no. 6428, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 19, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198; Kintzinger, Westbindungen, 444)

1426 – One of the executors of Andrea and Mattia Scolari’s last wills. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

1427 – Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, according to his Catasto worked in the service of Tommaso and Simone Melanesi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 47. fol. 522r-523r)

1427 – The debtors’ and creditors’ list of their Catasto includes several Florentine businessmen working in Hungary. One can also find prominent locals among the partners, such as the Buda burgher (also mayor of the town) Michael Nadler, working also in the royal administration and interested in copper trade or Gregory Ferenci of Gubacs, burgher and mayor of Pest on the opposite riverbank of the Danube. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 654r)

1427 – They rented a house in Buda in the street of the Latins. (“via delatini”) from the heir of a certain Daniello Cini[?] from Venice. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol. 655v)

1427 – He founded a partnership with Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi for the trade in Hungary. The Melanesis’ share of the capital (“corpo per compagnia”) ran to fl 2,000. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 46. Tomo I. fol.652v)

1427 – The Corsi brothers were liable of fl 460 remaining from Tommaso’s share of profit realized in July 15, 1426, and June 21, 1427. (ASF, Catasto 1427, Tomo I. fol. 652v)

1429-30 – Tommaso accompanied the king to Konstanz, where he made a profit of fl 500 in a time span of eight months. (Filippo di Filippo Melanesi e nipoti. ASF, Catasto 1430, 406. fol. 401r–402v)

1431 – He went to Florence as envoy of the king of Hungary. (ASF, Signori, carteggi. missive. I. cancelleria, 33. fol. 61v –63r. March 6, 1431)

1432 – He was member of King Sigismund’s entourage in Rome, where he submitted a two petitions of penance to the Papal Curia, the first in his name, whereas the second on commission in the name of two barons of Hungary, Michael Jakcs of Kusaly, comes siculorum and his brother, Ladislaus. This hints to his close relation to members of the Hungarian lay aristocracy. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápák, II/ 253)

1433 – Tommaso and his uncle submitted separate catastos on petition of the uncle, Filippo. Based on the information they had ceased meanwhile their common business venture in Hungary. (Filippo di Filippo Melanesi, ASF, Catasto 1433, 496. fol. 401r–402v; Tommaso di Pietro Melanesi, ASF, Catasto 1433, 496. fol. 499v)


1436 – He was granted the title of Count of the Latheran Palace together with his nephew, Piero. (RI XI,2 no. 11303, March 20, 1436, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: June 02, 2013)

He died before 1437. As count of the copper chamber he deposited fl 1,425 at the Viennese Simon Putel, and King Sigismund ordered Rinaldo di Dego degli Rinaldeschi, the following count of the copper chamber to collect the sum. (See online See RI XI,2 no. 11764, April 18, 1437, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: June 2, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 208. Draskóczy, “Kamarai jövedelem és urbura”, 153)
NARDI,

Bernardo di Salvestro di Michele and his brothers
1427 – He listed Antonio di Piero Fronte among his creditors (fl 120). (ASF, Catasto 1427, 27. fol. 149r-159v)

NOFFRI,


Albert
son of John
1470 – He is listed with his brothers in a legal dispute. (MNL OL DL 63242. Sept. 29, 1470)

Bardo
1430 – King Sigismund granted him and his brothers the estate of Bojnice for Pölöske. (MNL OL DL 43850. Feb. 14, 1430; Engel, Archontology, I/ 271)
1430 – Count of the thirtieth chamber. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1433 – Count of mint and thirtieth chambers. (MNL OL DL 5588. Oct. 4, 1433)
1437 – In a letter written in 1437, Bardo Noffri de Bojnice calls Nicholas of Várda “frater et amicus”. See Lukcsics, A zichi és vásonkeői, XII/137. Trnava, Feb. 9, 1437.
1452 – Bojnice was his residence. (MNL OL DF 280621. Sept. 9, 1452[?]; Engel, Archontology, I/ 271)

Emericus
Son of John.
1462 – He married Sophia Pongrácz.
1466 – Emericus, represented legally his widowed sister in front of Nyitra chapter, is entitled “egregius” in a document. (MNL OL DL 16415. Sept. 29, 1466)
1472 – HE entered a legal dispute over possession rights between Sophia Pongrácz, wife of Emericus Nofri of Bojnice and her maternal uncle, Blasius Nezpal, who accused her to have taken silver objects and jewels, fl 1000 and some documents proving the possession rights of Blasius on a few estates; MNL OL DL 63251. Oct. 1, 1472; DL 268233. Jan. 12, 1473)
He died before 1479. (MNL OL DL 63795.Febr. 1, 1482)

Giacomo
Onofrio’s son (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1430 – King Sigismund granted him and his brothers the estate of Bojnice for Pölöske. (MNL OL DL 43850. Feb. 14, 1430; Engel, Archontology, I/ 271)

Giovanni
Onofrio’s son,
1427 – He figures with his brother, Leonardus in the Catasto of the Carnesecchi-Fronte company. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 28. fol. 1008; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1430 – Count of the thirtieth chamber and count of the Buda chamber. (MNL OL DF 249985. Nov. 25, 1432; Fejér, CD, X/8. 630; Iványi, Bártfa szabad királyi város, I/223; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1427 – He was thirtieth officer in Zagreb in the service of Leonardo Attavanti. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1430 – King Sigismund granted him and his brothers the estate of Bojnice for Pölöske. (MNL OL DL 43850. Feb. 14, 1430; Engel, Archontology, I/271)
1433 – Count of mint and thirtieth chambers. (MNL OL DL 5588. Oct. 4, 1433)
1434 – He was the count of the Buda mint chamber sharing the office with Michael Nadler. (Horváth-Huszár, “Kamaragrófok”, 28)
1435 – He held the office of the capitaneus of Skalica, sharing the office with his brother, Leonardus. (MNL OL DF 282703. Sept. 21, 1434; MNL OL DL 71840. July 17, 1436; Fejér, CD, X/7. 367; Engel, Archontology, I/419)
1437 – Count of the royal chambers in Hungary with his brothers. (Fejér, CD, X/7. 910-12; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1452 – Bojnice became his residence. (MNL OL DF 280621. Sept. 9, 1452; Engel, Archontology, I/271)

Jacob
1430 – King Sigismund granted him and his brothers the estate of Bojnice for Pölöske. (MNL OL DL 43850. Feb. 14, 1430; Engel, Archontology, I/271)
1433 – Count of mint and thirtieth chambers. (MNL OL DL 5588. Oct. 4, 1433)

Leonardus
Onofrio’s son,
1427 – Relator of King Sigismund in a dispute over debt, member of the royal aula. (Engel, Archontology, I/504)
1427 – He figures along with his brother, Giovanni in the Catasto of the Carnesecchi-Fronte company. (ASF, Catasto 28. fol.1008; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1427 – Antonio di Buonaccorso Strozzi commissioned Filippo Frescobaldi to pay off fl 200 to Leonardus for textiles consigned him in Buda. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1429 – The Florentine government turned to him for a safeconduct for a Florentine citizen. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206-207)
1429 – Relator of King Sigismund in the issue of the customs duty of the salt from the Máramaros chamber assigned to the fortification of the town walls of Prešov. (MNL OL DL 43778. March 1, 1429)
1430-1433 – He and his brothers managed the customs system of the thirtieth in Hungary. (Fejér, CD, X/8.297, 313; MNL OL DF 249985. Nov. 25, 1432; DF 270220. Feb. 25, 1431; Draskóczy, “Kamarai jövedelem”, 158)
1430 – Relator of King Sigismund in an affair with the town of Soprono. (Házi, 1921-43. I/3. 6,7,14, 15; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1430 – King Sigismund granted him and his brothers the estate of Bojnice for Pölöske. (MNL OL DL 43850. Feb. 14, 1430; Engel, Archontology, I/271)
1433 – Count of mint and thirtieth chambers. (MNL OL DL 5588. Oct. 4, 1433)
1435 – Count of thirtieth. (Házi, Sopron, I/3. 107; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1436 – Leonardus Noffri figures as count of thirtieth and “urbura” chambers in a record compiled by John Siebenlinder on order of Emperor Sigismund to regulate the management of the thirtieth chambers, including the introduction of literacy, the keeping of registers and also
a new customs tariff (golden fl 2 pro Florentine cloth etc). (Fejér, CD, X/8. 313; Fejér, CD, X/8. 663; Fejér, CD, X/7. 367; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)

1435–36 – Capitaneus of Skalica with Giovanni. (MNL OL DF 282703. Sept. 21, 1434; MNL OL DL 71840. Feb. 25, 1431; Engel, Archontology, I/419)

1437 – He was the count of the royal chambers with his brothers. (Fejér, CD, X/7. 910–912; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206; Engel, Archontology, II/176)

1438 – He was appointed treasurer. (MNL OL DF 239531. May 12, 1438; Engel, Archontology, I/53)

Onofrio
Father of Bardo, Giovanni, Giacomo and Leonardus.

1409 – He worked for the Scolari in Hungary, he was count of salt chamber. (ZsO II/2. 7240. Dec. 27, 1409; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)

1413 – Noble retainer (“familiaris”) of King Sigismund. (ZsO IV/1. 1413)

1413 – King Sigismund sent him as his count of chamber to the grand master of the Teutonic order. (ZsO IV/61. Jano. 17, 1413)

1413 – As count of the salt chamber to Buda, he procured a safeconduct to a Nuremberg merchant. (MNL OL DF 241437. Feb. 25, 1413; the same record is published in ZsO IV/226. Feb. 25, 1413)

1413 – King Sigismund warned the Teutonic order to pay off a debt of Chech groš 25000 to Onofrio. (ZsO IV/243. Feb. 1413; on the same ibid. no. 311. March 17, 1413; ibid. no. 393, 394. Apr. 5, 1413)

1413 – As count of royal chamber he confirmed to have received Chech groš 25600 from Heinrich von Plauen through Ludolph Pohot, procurator in Marienburg. (Vienna, Deutschordenszentralarchiv (DOZA), Urkunden no. 2932. accessed online: http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/AT-DOZA/Urkunden/2932/charter?q=Florenz)

1413 – He leased a ruined house of the St. Mary Church, to be found in the Sathurday market square in Buda, for a yearly rent of fl 14. (ZsO IV/1135. Sept. 29, 1413)

1415 – He leased the Buda castle house of Pest parish church. (ZsO V/523. Apr. 19, 1415)

1415 – Count of the Buda chamber, collector of all royal revenues. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205-6)

1416 – Count of Buda chamber. (Kumorovitz, BTOE, III/679, 680)

1416 – He acknowledged to have received fl 200 from the town of Sopron, as payment of tax for the royal building operations. (ZsO V/2332. Dec. 1, 1416)

1417-18 – He was count of the Kremnica chamber with Jobst of Szatmár. (ZsO VI/47. Jano. 25, 1417; in the same office ibid. no. 1011. Oct. 13, 1417; no. 2242. Aug. 11, 1418; Huszár, A budai pénzverés, 122; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)

1417 – He confirmed as count of Buda chamber that the town of Kosice paid fl 840 out of the fl 1.000 imposed on the urban community by the barons of the kingdom. (ZsO VI/519. June 4, 1417)

1418 – Count of the Buda chamber. (MNL OL DF 239399. Nov. 23, 1418; the same record is published in ZsO VI/2565. Nov. 23, 1418)

1419 – Count of the Buda chamber, he is mentioned in a petition by the town of Pressburg to King Sigismund, stating that he received fl 300 from the Pressburg authorities. (MNL OL DL 10770. Feb. 6, 1419; ZsO VII/74. Feb. 1419)

1419 – King Sigismund ordered Stephen of Kanizsa, former “magister janitorum”, member of the royal aula, to pay off fl 10.000 to Nofri from Esztergom archbishopric’s revenues from last year. (ZsO VII/87. Feb. 6, 1419)
1419 – King Sigismund’s letter to Valentinus Vince of Szentgyörgy and Onofrius, count of the royal chamber to Buda and his agent ordering to support the town of Kosice to confiscate the imported foreign fustian and the wool to be exported. (ZsO VII/972. Sept. 20, 1419)
1424 – Count of the mint chamber to Buda. (Horváth-Huszár, Kamaragrófok., 27. Huszár, A budai pénzverés, 122; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1424 – Relator of King Sigismund for Nicolaus de Prata’s appointment to the emperial aula. (RI XI,1 no. 5736, Jano. 13, 1424)
1426 – Count of thirtieth chamber. (Házi, Sopron szabad királyi város, I/2. 369; Horváth-Huszár, Kamaragrófok, 27; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1426 – In the report of Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, Florentine envoy to King Sigismund he is mentioned as agent of Filippo Scolari. Albizzi was hosted in his Buda house. (Commissioni di Rinaldo di Maso degli Albizzi, 579)
Before 1430 he died. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1489 – The family went extinct. (Engel, Archontology, I/271)

Onofrius
son of John.
1470 – He is listed with his brothers in a legal dispute. (MNL OL DL 63242. Sept. 29, 1470)

Veronica
Onofrio’s daughter.
She married Thomas of Ludány, who was at a young age member of the royal aula (1440), and descended from a neighboring family in Upper Hungary.
By 1462 – She lost her husband. (MNL OL DL 15782. Nov. 1462)
1466-1480 – She was involved in a legal dispute with Ladislaus Podmaniczky over the ownership of the oppidum Bán in Trencsén county. In 1480 she was granted the possession rights by King Matthias. (MNL OL DL 16415. Sept. 29, 1466; DL 18401. Sept. 28, 1480)
1486 – Nevertheless royal grant, the dispute was relaunched by Podmaniczky. (MNL OL DL 19191. Oct. 17, 1486)
1489 – She made an agreement with Podmaniczky in connection with the ownership lawsuit. (MNL OL DL July 5, 1489)

Onofrio di Francesco,
1388 – He purchased the corner house of Michael of Hungary, goldsmith in Buda for fl 400. (ZsO I/ 648. July 12, 1388)
1390 – He stayed in Buda and sold his Buda house to Nicholas of Kanizsa for fl 1,400. (ZsO I/1379. Feb. 27, 1390; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)

Onofrio di Giovanni,
1378 – Count of the Dalmatian salt and thirtieth chambers. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)
1383 – Count of the Dalmatian salt and thirtieth chambers. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)

Panciatichi,
Gabriello di Bartolomeo
Based on his Catasto he was the fourth wealthiest Florentine householder, his total wealth run to fl 80994. (Online Catasto)

1427 – He listed in his Catasto textiles sent to Hungary worth fl 1,819. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 79. fol. 134r-147r)

**Giovanni di Bartolomeo**
The fifth wealthiest Florentine householder according to his catasto. His total wealth run to fl 70,548. (Online Catasto). See his catasto ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1004r-147r; Conti, L’imposta diretta, 345-346) According to his biographer he stayed in Buda on the long run, a worked there as the “treasurer” of the king. (Passerini, Genealogia e storia della famiglia Panciatichi, 77)

1427 – According to his Catasto his loss in Hungary ran to fl 9,287, finished in the hands of the king. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1014r)

1429 – The Ricordanze by Giovanni di Matteo Corsini preserved information on his two sons, Matteo and Battista sent to Buda as apprentices. Matteo worked for the Buda company of the Panciatichi. (Petrucci, Ricordanze dei Corsini, 130-131)

1432 -1435 – He established a new partnership for the trade in Hungary. He sent silk and woolen cloths worth fl 2,420 to Hungary through Antonio Popoleschi. (ASF, Catasto 1433, 498. fol. 341v), he also had a partnership in Venice. (Conti, L’imposta diretta, 345)

1432 – His subsequent catasto record from 1432 contains two separate lists on his Hungarian business, a creditor-debtor list with rather small sums (11 debtors with a total amount of fl 2,337, and 17 creditors with a total of fl 1,329,5), and another one entitled list of “the business venture in Hungary”(Prajda, “Florentine merchant companies”, footnote 30)

1433 – Giovanni turned to King Sigismund for a safeconduct to return to the kingdom and recover his lost assets. (ASF, Catasto 1433, 498. fol. 341v)

1435 – He lost his assets in Hungary worth fl 12,200. (Conti, L’imposta diretta, 346)

1442 – He died. (Conti, L’imposta diretta, 346)

**Zanobi di Giovanni**
1423 – Probably identical with a certain “Zenobius Panzaciis”, who obtained privileges from King Sigismund. (RI XI,1 no. 5667, Oct. 30, 1423, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 28, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

1427 – He was permanent agent in Buda of his father’s company with Simone di Filippo Capponi. He belonged to his father’s household and also his rather small liabilities were inserted in the father’s catasto. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1012v)

1427 – He figures in the Catasto of Lodovico di Piero di Lodovico, as partner in a transfer transactiono. (A certain Mona Papina transferred through him and Agostino d’Antonio di messer Gieri 5 Venetian ducats in Senj which was then “promised” to Zanobi Panciatichi) (ASF, Catasto 1427, 54. fol. 121v-122r)

**Antonio di Giovanni**
1427 – The was the contact person between his father’s Venetian and Buda companies. He did not submit a separate catasto. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 53. fol. 1012r)
Piero di Lapo
1427 – Silk merchant/manufacturer, he listed merchants working in Hungary among his partners (among the creditors Simone di Lapo Corsi fl 62, among the debtors Giovanni Panciatichi fl 530, Leonardo di Domenico Attavanti fl 52). (ASF, Catasto 1427, 18. Tomo 2. fol. 1307r.-1314v)

PETRUS/PERO DE ANGELI (PIERO DI AGNOLO?)
1390s – He appeared in Zagreb. He worked with Cione collecting local taxes. He was member of the town council. His son, John was judge in 1434 and 1459 and his grandson Dominik was also judge in 1481 and 1489. One of John's daughters (Ana) became a nun in Pécs, whereas his other daughter, Katarina married nobleman Balthasar Bathany. (Škreblin, “Ethnic groups”, 40, 49, 54, 56, 58. I owe all the information on Petrus to Bruno Škreblin.)

PIERO DI GHERARDO,
1427 – He worked in Hungary for Melanese di Ridolfo Melanesi. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 175. fol. 273r)

PIERO DI GUIDO,
1427 – He figured in the Catasto of Giovanni del Rosso and partners as debtor of a modest sum staying in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 29. Tomo 1. fol. 266r)

POPOLESCHI,

Antonio
1433 – He is mentioned in Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi Catasto of 1433, as his Hungarian representative. (ASF, Catasto 1433, 498. fol. 341v)
1435-37 – Wool merchant, he founded a partnership with his brother for trade in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 209-10)
1435 – Pope Eugene IV. urged King Sigismund to consign the innocently arrested Antonio’s assets to Folchi. (Lukcsics, XV. századi pápák, II/393)
1438 – The goods of the company were confiscated from Antonio in Buda. The Florentine government urged the restitution of the goods. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 48)

Niccoló
1435-37 – Wool merchant, the partnership founded by him and his brother appeared in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 209-10)
1438 – The goods of Niccoló’s partnership were confiscated from Antonio in Buda. The Florentine government urged the restitution of the goods. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 48)
1427 – His company was listed in Giovanni di Bicci dei Medici with a debt of fl 587. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 49. fol. 1164 v)

Salvestro di Tommaso
1395-1426 – He was drawn eight times consul of the woolen guild, twice officer of the Mercanzia, twice Gonfaloniere di Compagnia, three times member of the board of 12 Buonuomini, twice prior and on one occasion Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. (Online Tratte) 1427 – A wealthy wool merchant in Florence, he provided loans among others to the partnership of Uberto Zati, which was interested also in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 76. fol. 228; Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 48)

PORTINARI,

Bernardo di Giovanni
1420s – He invested in the activity of the Melanesi in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 60. fol.385; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)

Giovanni di Sandro
He worked in Venice. 1373 – He founded a company with Ardigno di Corso Ricci and Cristiano di Migliore degli Albizzi. The company commissioned Agostino Marucci with the marketing of their ware in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130-31)

Gualterio di Sandro
1380 – He was arrested in Zadar as Venetian citizen and spy. The Florentine government mentioned him in a letter as a merchant working in Buda and Zadar. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 132) 1392 – He named Corso di Ricci and a certain Jacobus de Prato as his partners (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142) 1390-93 – He sold silver in Venice. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142) 1390s – He was debtor of the Medici banking house. (ASF, Medici Avanti il Principato (MAP), 133. no. 1. fol.33; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)

RAMBUSCULUS DE FLORENTIA,
1384 – Count of thirtieth chamber, mentioned in a letter by Mary, Queen of Hungary to the town of Kosice on lacking payment of thirtieth. (MNL OL DF 270055. March 13, 1384)

RICCARDINI,

Iacopo
1427 – He figures in the Catasto of Filippo di Filippo Melanesi as debtor for a loan of 20 Hungarian florins obtained in Hungary. (Filippo di Filippo Milanesi, ASF, Catasto 1430, 369, Tomo I. A-G. fol. 716.r)

RICCI,
Ardigno di Corso
1373-76 – He founded a partnership with Giovanni di Sandro Portinari and Cristiano di Migliore degli Albizzi for trade in Hungary. Agostino Marucci worked in Hungary as agent of the partnership. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 130-31)
1384-1398 – Twice drawn for the office of consul of the guild of the money changers, on one occasion he was officer of the Mercanzia, Gonfaloniere di Compagnia, member of the board of the 12 Buonuomini and finally once was also elected to the office of Gonfaloniere di Giustizia. (Online Tratte)
He died before 1409. (Online Tratte)

RIMBERTINI,

Iacopo di Antonio di Lapaccio
1427 – In his Catasto he mentioned his father’s partnership in the company founded by Salvestri, da Uzzano to trade in Hungary. (Iacopo di Antonio Rimbertini, ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 76r)

RINALDESCHI,

Rinaldo di Dego
1427 – He stated in his Catasto to work for Tommaso and Simone Melanesi in Hungary as an agent on salary and had no taxable wealth. He left behind his widowed mother, monna Bartolomea and his son the five-year-old Riccardo in a rented house in Florence, under the guardianship of Ormanno di Iacopo Rinaldeschi, his kinsman, who submitted the Catasto in his name. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 47. fol. 522r-523r)
1430 – The sons of a kinsman by marriage, a certain messer Ugolino di Giovanni da Montecatini declared Dego Rinaldeschi and his heirs as their debtor of fl 37 since 1411 and saw no possibility to collect them, because Rinaldo blocked all his assets to warrant for the dowry of the mother. (ASF, Catasto 1430, 370. Tomo II. I-Z. fol. 349v)
1435 – Count of the the copper chamber and castellan (castellanus) of Gelnica. (MNL OL DF 270238. Oct. 18, 1435)
1436 – He was granted the title of the count of the Lateran Palace by King Sigismund. (RI XI,2 no. 11304, March 20, 1436, in Regesta Imperii Online, last downloaded: May 19, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 208)
1438 – He again submitted the Catasto in his name and in his mother’s name. He declared to own two houses, one in Florence and one in Prato. (ASF, Catasto 1438, 486. fol. 675r)
RINGHIADORI,

Niccoló di Bartolomeo
1427 – He lived in Venice and traded mainly in Dubrovnik. He also worked with a certain Giuliano di Stefano da Prato in Slavonia, who owed him libra 47. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 18r-v)

RINIERI,

Antonio
1427 – They invested in Hungary. He states the shipment of textile from London directly to Buda in the value of fl 120 in his catasto record: “compera di drappi ci troviamo al presente a Buda, fattivigli andare da Londra fl 120”. He hired Bernardo di Sandro Talani, who brought and merchandized luxury goods in the kingdom on a regular basis. His open accounts with Bernardo in Buda run to fl 632 in 1427. Also the Melanesi brothers figure in some entries of the debtors’ list with debts of fl 168 on Tommaso’s name. The entries referring to Hungary also include the purchase of woolen and silk cloths sent to Buda: “… compera di panni e drappi mandati in Ungheria per Bernardo Talani fl 3.127; compera di panni e drappi mandati in Ungheria aldetto fl 1.262; compera di panni e drappi mandati a detto Bernardo fl 928; compera di drappi fatta per Tomaso Melanesi fl 179”. Talani is also present in the creditors’ list due to open accounts with fl 3.152. Rinieri also worked in London with the company of Salamone degli Strozzi, and in Barcelona. In Hungary he had major investments, as he stated at the end of his catasto: “e come vedete noi ci troviamo in Ungheria gran somma di danaro”. (Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri, ASF, Catasto 1427, 60. fol. 52r-58r)

Luca di Piero
1414 – Consul of the guild of Cambio (money changers). (Online Tratte)
1417 – Consul of the guild of Cambio. (Online Tratte)
1427 – He gave Tommaso di Piero Melanesi fl 889 presumably for trade in Hungary and Tommaso figures among his debtors. Rinieri was a stable investor in the Melanesi partnership; they may have settled the account of a transaction in this way. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 62. fol. 52v)
He died before 1433. (Online Tratte)

RUCELLAI,

Antonio di Giovanni
A wealthy cloth merchant (ASF, Catasto 1427, 76. fol. 47)
1420s – He had transactions with the companies founded by the Melanesi and Fronte. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 198)
1429 – Consul of the guild of the Lana. (Online Tratte)
He died before 1438. (Online Tratte)

Francesco di Simone
1427 – Partner of Antonio di Buonaccorso degli Strozzi in a company. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 76. fol. 86; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
Guelfo di Francesco
1427 – His Catasto does not reveal any notable business activity. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 43. fol. 881r-882r)
1428 – Son of Francesco, he stayed in Buda. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)
1428 – He was arrested on the request of the Queen along with other Florentines in Buda. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)

Rugeri de Florentia
1397 – Mercator and vexiler in Zagreb. (Škreblin, “Ethnic groups”, 32)

Rustichii,

Marabottino d’Antonio
1462 – He traded with Giovanozzo Biliotti and with a Florentine merchant living in Ancona in Slavonia, they commissioned Cosimo di Domenico Martelli to manage their affairs. (ASF, Mercanzia, no. 10831. 50v. Oct. 15, 1462)
1475 – Prior in Florence. (*Online Tratte*)
1493 – Consul of the Guild of Por Santa Maria. (*Online Tratte*)

Sacchetti,

Andreuolo di Niccoló di Franco
1427 – Matteo Scolari figures among his debtors (fl 149), because he was guarantee for Andrea del Palagio. Also Matteo’s wife, Piera had a debt towards him. (ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 29. fol. 8r)

Salvestri,

Giovanni di Tommaso
1390s – He was debtor of the Medici banking house. (ASF, Medici Avanti il Principato (MAP), 133. n.1. fol. 33; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)
1395 – After the death of Agostino Marucci, agent in Hungary of the partnership, also the Mercanzia negotiated to clear their affairs in the kingdom. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 24. fol. 121r. March 28, 1395; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142)
1427 – He still claimed to have had the company in Hungary with Niccoló da Uzzano, Francesco Federighi, Antonio Rimbertini and other partners and he stated that the account books of the partnership were kept by the guild of the Calimala and he was still waiting to settle account with his partners. The real finding place of the books seems rather uncertain, because the heir of another member of the partnership, Iacopo di Antonio Rimbertini claimed in his Catasto that the account books had been lost and only recently found in the custody of
the Mercanzia. (Giovanni di Tommaso Salvestri, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 296. fol. 12r; Iacopo di Antonio Rimbertini, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 296. fol.76r)

**Guido**

1380 – He shipped wares to Charles of Durazzo with Giovanni Portinari and other Florentine merchants. (Wenzel, *Magyar diplomáciai emlékek*, III/345. June 6, 1386; Teke, „Firenzei üzletemberek”, 133)  
1387 – The Florentine government wrote to the Queen of Hungary and recommended Guido di Tommaseo, Vieri de’Medici, Andrea di Ugo, and Antonio Santi working in Hungary.  
(ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 12v-13r. Feb. 10, 1387)

1390s – He was debtor of the Medici banking house. (ASF, Medici Avanti il Principato (MAP), 133. n.1. fol.33. Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 143)  
1396 – He figures in the instruction wrote to the ambassador of Florence as a merchant working in Hungary. (ASF, Dieci di Balia, Otto di Pratica, lettere- Legazioni e commissarie, 2. fol. 17v. Apr. 25, 1396. Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142)

**SANTI**

**Antonio**

1389 – The Florentine government mentioned the partnership founded by Antonio, Vieri de’Medici, Andrea di Ugo and Guido di Tommaseo, which commissioned Paolo Marucci to trade their ware and invest their money in Hungary. According to the letter, the partnership had notable outstanding debts in Hungary. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 21.fol. 12v-13r. Feb. 10, 1389)

**SCOLARI**

**Andrea**

1407-1409 – Bishop of Zagreb. (Engel, *Archontology*, I/ 80)  
1409 – He was bishop of Oradea in that year, although the papal patent of translation is dated to 1410. (ZsO II/2. 7841. Aug. 11, 1410; Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”,199; Engel, *Archontology*, I/ 77)  
1418 – He petitioned the Roman Curia for the right of free testamentary capacity. (Lukcsics, *A XV. századi pápák*, I/76. May 3, 1418; on the same see *ibid*. no. 126. July 29, 1418)  
1419 – Pope Martin V. granted him the right of free testamentary capacity. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)  
1422 – Currado di Piero Cardini, provost of Oradea conferred the revenues of the provostry to the bishop. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)  
1423 – He settled account with Currado di Piero Cardini. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 199)  
1426 – He died. (Lukcsics, *A XV. századi pápák*, I/880. Apr. 22, 1426)  
1426 – Filippo Scolari left the assets of Mattia and Andrea Scolari to Lorenzo, Giovanni and Filippo, sons of Rinieri. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)  
1427 – Filippo Scolari petitioned a respite of one year for the execution of Andrea Scolari’s last will at the Roman Curia. (Lukcsics, *A XV. századi pápák*, I/ 903. 904)
Carmannus/Carnianus
1420 – Canon of Oradea, he asked the Pope to commission him with the administration of the diocesis of Kalocsa. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápák, I/ 241)
1420-22 – Archbishop of Kalocsa, he died in Rome. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápák, I/ 752, Nov. 15, 1424; Engel, Archontology, I/ 65)

Giovanni di Rinieri
1426 – Filippo Scolari left the assets of Mattia and Andrea Scolari to him and to his brothers. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
After Filippo Scolari’s death he moved his activity to Venice. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)

Filippo di Stefano (Pipo Spano)
Around 1388 – he arrived to Hungary with Luca della Pecchia. (Vadas, Ozorai Pipo emlékezete, 15, 55)
1398 – King Sigismund’s letter to the convent of Szekszárd, which functioned as place of authentication (“loca credibilia”), on the issue of Filippo Scolari and his wife’s “introduction” into the possession of their estates. (ZsO II/5356. June 10, 1398)
1399 – Count of the Kremnica chamber, he obtained the privilege of holding weekly market in Ozora. (ZsO I/ 6112. Nov. 5, 1399; transcribed ibid. II/1. 4324. Dec. 29, 1405)
1399 – He was granted “ius gladii” by King Sigismund. (ZsO I/ 6112. Nov. 5, 1399)
1401-1426 – Count of salt chamber. (ZsO II/1. 2689. Nov. 2, 1403; ibid. II/2. 5828. Dec. 5, 1407; Engel, Archontology, II/180)
1404 – Count of Timis (Temes), Arad, Cenad (Csanád), Kovic (Keve), and Carasova (Krassó) counties until his death. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 98. 122, 139, 145, 204)
1404 – He is mentioned as guarantee of King Sigismund in a loan transaction. (ZsO II/1. 3079. 1404)
1406 – As count of the salt chamber he negotiated with the salt transporters of Dej on the transport fee of the salt brought to Satu Mare, Tokaj and Poroszló. (ZsO II/1. 4925. Aug. 14, 1406)
1407 – He ordered his officer in Sicesfehérvár to consign salt worth fl 1.800 to John, bishop of Veszprém in exchange for the tithe from the neighbourhood of Buda. (ZsO II/2. 5397. March 24, 1407)
1407-08 – Treasurer. (ZsO II/2. 5445. Apr. 21, 1407; ibid. no. 6209. July 10, 1408; Engel, Archontology, I/ 52)
1407 – Count of Csongrád until his death. (Wenzel, Ozorai Pipo, 83. Feb. 3, 1407; Engel, Archontology, I/ 125)
1408 – Treasurer, lay governor of the abbey of Bulci. (ZsO II/2. 6017. March 20, 1408)
1408 – Member of the Order of the Dragono. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 494)
1408-09 – Ban of Severino. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 33)
1409-26 – Count of county Zarand. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 240)
1410 – Antonio di Piero Fronte settled some debts of Filippo Scolari at the castellan (“castellanus”) of Kalisz, Poland. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)
1410 – He was legate of King Sigismund at the Papal court. (ZsO II/2. 7737. June, 1410; ibid. no. 7802. 7807. 7808. 7878. 7892; on his legacy see also ZsO III/230. March 10, 1411)
1411 – He and his brother, Matthias were granted the customs of Cenk and the office of tax collector of the woods Rába and Farkasedő by King Sigismund. (ZsO III/165. Feb. 20, 1411)
1412 – He supported Nicholas of Bácska, a noble retainer (“familiaris”) of his to become canon at John, bishop of Pécs. (ZsO III/1797. Feb. 26, 1412)
1412 – He accepted Leonardo Altoviti as his divisional kinsman (co-owner of their possessions) (ZsO III/2650. Sept. 9, 1412; on the same ibid. no. 2680. Sept. 14, 1412; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1415 – He was one of King Sigismund’s guarantees, as the ruler bound himself to repay fl 23,000 to Louis, duke of Bavaria. (ZsO V/742. June 14, 1415; ibid. V/ 840. July 10, 1415)
1418 – Scolari petitioned the right to depute tithe revenues to the parish church of Ozora, founded by him. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápak, I/ 75; on the same in 1424 ibid. 774)
1418 – He petitioned for permission to found a Franciscan observant friary in Ozora, his estate. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápak, I/ 95)
1420s – A Vienna burgher, Peter “dictus” Chekel and his brother, Rudolph refer to a loan provided to King Sigismund, running to fl 1,660. Filippo Scolari was among King Sigismund’s six guarantors. (MNL OL DL 15360. May 6, 1459)
1420 – Lay governor of the archbishopric of Kalocsa. (Engel, Archontology, I/ 65)
1424 – Judge royal of the Cumans (“Iudex cumanorum”) (Engel, Archontology, I/ 148)
1424 – He petitioned for the permission of visitation (“canonica visitation”) for the the parish church in Ozora, where he intended to be buried. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápak, I/ 754)
1426 – Filippo commissioned his nephew, Filippo di Rinieri to collect ducats 3500 from Nicholas Frankopan, for an unsettled debt. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1427 – After Filippo’s death, the Melanesi tried to collect their outstanding debts running altogether to fl 7,550 in three items. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 77, fol. 247r-248v)
1428 – King Sigismund mentioned the deceased Filippo as his agent and confiscated his assets with the claim of the failing settlement of their account. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)

Filippo di Rinieri
Nephew and heir of Filippo Scolari.
1426 – Filippo Scolari assigned the assets of Mattia and Andrea Scolari to Lorenzo, Giovanni, Filippo, sons of Rinieri Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1427 – He figures in the creditor list of the Melanesi partnership with a loan of fl 1800. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 77.fol. 247r-248)
1428 – The king discharged him of the management of the salt chambers. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)
1427 – He ordered Giannozzo Cavalcanti to collect ducats 3500 from Nicholas Frankopan, a remaining outstanding debt of a loan of ducats 10000. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1430 – He submitted a declaration to the officials of the Catasto in Florence. He had outstanding debts with Tommaso Melanesi, Tommaso Davizzi, Bernardo Portinari worth altogether fl 2,200. He also claimed to be lawful heir of Matteo and Andrea Scolari without specifying the value of the inherited outstanding debts. He also mentioned Giannozzo Cavalcanti, the heirs of Guido di Tommaso, Francesco di Vieri Guadagni, Corrado Cardini, a certain Giovanni di Piero di Corrado, Giovanni di Niccoló di Luca, the least two staying in Hungary, among his debtors, without exact sums, because, as he argued, he was unclear on the details of the transactions. His brothers, according to the decision of the officials of the Catasto could also declare within the subsequent two months. (Filippo di Rinieri Scolari, ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. 160r.)
Lorenzo di Rinieri
Filippo Scolari’s nephew.
1415 – He stayed in Buda. (ZsO V/924. Aug. 5, 1415)
1426 – King Sigismund took him into his “família”. (Kintzinger, Westbindungen, 459)
1426 – Filippo Scolari assigned the assets of Mattia and Andrea Scolari to Lorenzo, Giovanni, Filippo, sons of Rinieri Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1428 – The king discharged him of the management of the salt chambers but he remained in Hungary. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 207)

Matteo di Stefano
1400 – He became joint possessor of Filippo Scolari’s acquisitions. (Engel, Ozorai Pipo, 87. footnote no. 223; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1406-1410 – He founded a partnership with Antonio di Santi and Antonio Fronte. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 195)
1407 – He was granted an estate jointly with Filippo Scolari. (ZsO II/2. 5828. Dec. 5, 1407)
1410s – He had common affairs with Santi. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1410 – He had provided a loan to Pope John XXIII. on the debit of the papal revenues from Hungary. The Pope ordered his legate to settle this debt. (ZsO II/2. 7968. Oct. 7, 1410; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1411 – Fronte di Piero di Fronte bound himself to respect the decision of the officials of the Mercanzia and to settle his debts with Mattia. (ZsO III/337. Apr. 11, 1411)
1412 – He accepted Leonardo Altoviti as his divisional kinsman (co-owner of his possessions). (ZsO III/2650. Sept. 9, 1412; on the same ibid. no. 2680. Sept. 14, 1412; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1413 – King Sigismund took him in his “família”, at that time he stayed in Italy. (RI XI, 1. no. 802, 803. Nov. 27, 1413, in Regesta Imperii online, last downloaded: May 14, 2013; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201)
1420 – He purchased estates in Tizzano from Corradino de Pardo Alamanni. (see Alamanni’s catasto: ASF. Catasto 1427, 15, fol. 464r)
1423 – his last will is dated to that year. (Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”,201)
1425 – He returned to Hungary where he died a year later. (Teke, „Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 201; ASF, Consoli del mare, no. 17. Sept. 5, 1426; Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 46)
1426 – Filippo Scolari assigned the assets of Mattia and Andrea Scolari to Lorenzo, Giovanni, Filippo, sons of Rinieri Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)
1427 – Filippo Scolari asked for a respite of a year for the execution of his last will. (Lukcsics, A XV. századi pápkák, I/ 903)
1430 – His widow, Piera had to pay extra tax for a non declared woman slave. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 296. fol. 164r)

Riniero
1426 – Filippo Scolari assigned the assets of Matteo and Andrea Scolari to Lorenzo, Giovanni, Filippo, sons of Rinieri Scolari. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 203)

SOLDANI,

Bartolomeo di Tommaso
1382 – He lived in Buda and worked with the Florentine Lodovico di Niccoló staying in Zadar. They were interested in trade between Ancona and Buda. The exchange of goods took place in Zagreb. (Budak, “I fiorentini nella Slavonia”, 689)

SODERINI,

Niccoló and Tommaso di Lorenzo di messer Tommaso
1427 – He sold silk to Tommaso di Piero Melanesi worth fl 1.652, he assessed it as a loss. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 25. fol. 457v)

STROZZI,

Antonio di Bonaccorso
1426 – He acted as witness in Filippo Scolari’s Buda house. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 202)
1427 – He was the agent of the Carnesecchi-Fronte company in Hungary, he figures as creditor in the lists of the company. (ASF, Catasto 1427, fol. 1009r; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 196)
1427 – He submitted a joint catasto with his brothers. It does not reveal any information on his stay in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 45. fol. 646r-652v)
1427 – He stayed in Transylvania and paid his debt to Leonardo Nofri through Filippo Frescobaldi. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 206)
1431 – He stayed in Hungary in that year. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)

Palla di Nofri
1427 – Presumably he provided loan to his kinsman, Antonio di Buonaccorso. In his Catasto, the debtors’ list includes Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi, and also Andrea and Uberto del Palagio, all of them with business interests in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 76. fol.169; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)

TALANI,

Bernardo di Sandro
1427 – The Florentine government turned to the King of Hungary on behalf of Talani, who allegedly had been trading in Hungary for fifteen years and was arrested and put into prison in Buda, whereas his goods were confiscated. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 33. fol. 116v-117r. June 22, 1427; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 205)
1427 – His brother, Anselmo di Sandro Talani submitted a Catasto in his name in Florence, because the 32-year-old Bernardo stayed in Hungary. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 34. fol. 416r)
1429 – The Florentine government repeatedly turned to King Sigismund asking for his support on behalf of Talani. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive- I. cancelleria, 32. fol. 63v-64r. Apr. 5, 1429)
After his release he went on with his business activity in Dubrovnik and Bosnia. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 214. footnote 135)
1430 – In his Catasto he declared to have more debtors in Hungary without however naming either these partners or the extent of their debt. (ASF, Catasto 1430, 356. fol. 263r)
TALENTI,

Giovanni
Brother of Simone.
1381 – He was interested in the farm of salt and thirtieth chambers in Dalmatia. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 134)
1387 – A certain Thalentus Talenti is mentioned as count of the salt chambers, he may be identical with Giovanni. (ZsO I/126. June 23, 1387; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 140)
1396 – Count of the chamber of the royal tax called lucrum camerae. (ZsO I/4225)
1403 – He was interested with Simone in the trade with metals. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 140)
1406 – He owed Adreas Carnissa of Cracow some money. (ZsO II/1. 4749. May 25, 1406; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141)

Simone
1380 – Simone Talenti and Nicholas of Janua appeared in front of the urban council of Kosice to settle a controversy: Nicholas apparently owed fl 1,000 to Talenti as a remaining debt of an earlier transaction and also had taken various wares (woolen cloths etc) worth fl 5,405, thus he altogether owed fl 6,405 to Simone. (MNL OL DL 6728. Aug. 2, 1380; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 134)
1384 – Count of royal chamber. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 139)
1384 – He rented a house in Pest, apparently he also had the citizenship of the town. (MNL OL DL 7089. June 4, 1384; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 139)
1390s – He was in the service of the King of Poland as count of the minting chamber, “comes monetarius”. He also went on with his affairs in Cracow focusing on the trade with metals. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 140-141)
1403 – He traded with metals together with his brother, Giovanni. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 140)
1424 – He also had the citizenship of Pécs. (MNL OL DL 11500. Apr. 19, 1424; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 148)
1388 – Lorenzo Monaci, ambassador of Venice was his kinsman. (ZsO I/651. July 14, 1388; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 134)
1388 – The Florentine government wrote to Nicholas of Gara on behalf of Giovanni Tosinigi, who had acted as guarantee to Simone’s father and to whom Simone still owed a sum paid out to warrant for his father. (ZsO I/671. July 31, 1388)
1392 – Count of the “lucrum camerae”. (ZsO I/4225. Jano. 10, 1396; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 139)

TINGHI,

Matteo de lo Scelto
1375 – A Florentine merchant, who escaped from Avignon to Venice. He also went to Hungary and traded there with saffrono. (Pitti, Ricordi, 365, 374; Brucker, Florentine Politics, 244-296; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 134)
1389-1410 – He was drawn three times Gonfaloniere di compagnia, on two occasions member of the board of the 12. *(Online Tratte)*
He died before 1415. *(Online Tratte)*

**TORNABUONI,**

**Francesco e Simone**
1427 -- They were joint creditors of Andrea Scolari, bishop of Oradea with fl 2,200, whereas Tommaso and Simone di Lapo Corsi owed them fl 83, Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi owed them fl 51, and Uberto di Amerigo Zati and partners owed them fl 267. *(ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 46 parte II. fol. 901v - 905r)*

**TOSINGHI,**

**Giovanni**
1388 – He replaced Maruccio Marucci in Hungary, his main task was to collect the outstanding debts of the banking house founded by Vieri de’Medici. Therefore, the Florentine government turned to the Queen of Hungary to provide for his safety. *(ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 41r. July 1388)*
1388 – The Florentine government wrote also to the King of Hungary on behalf of Giovanni Tosinghi. *(ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 39v. July 25, 1388; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)*
1388 – The Florentine government turned to Nicholas of Gara, ban of Maeva (Macsó), on behalf of Giovanni Tosinghi who tried to collect the sum his father paid instead of Simone Talenti as his guarantee. *(ZsO I/671. July 31, 1388. Recommendation of Tosinghi to the Queen, the bishop of Pécs, and the count palatine (“comes palatinus”).)* *(ZsO I/672-4. July 31, 1388)*
1389 – The bishop of Pécs was granted to pay the papal tax up to the sum of fl 10,000 to Giovanni Tosinghi, the Buda representative of Vieri de’Medici. *(ZsO I/ 921. Feb. 6, 1389; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 138)*
1390 – As the Buda representative of the company of Vieri de’ Medici, he issued an exchange bill to a burgher of Zadar on fl 200. Guido di Tommaso was expected to pay off the sum. *(Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 140)*
1396 – He figures in an instruction of the Florentine government as merchant working in Hungary together with Guido di Tommaso. *(ASF, Dieci di Balia, Otto di Pratica, lettere-Legazioni e commissarie, 2. fol. 17v. Apr. 25, 1396)*
1404 – He founded a partnership for trade in Hungary, the Florentine government recommended the partnership to the king. *(ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 26. fol. 28v-29r. Feb. 6, 1404; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142)*
1406 – Giovanni Tosinghi confirmed to have taken fl 158 from the chapter of Eger for the tax on royal deliberationo. *(ZsO II. I/4836; MNL OL DL 42890. June 26, 1406; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 142)*
1413 – Balzarth of Giovanni Tosinghi, Niccoló Baldovini and Filippo del Palagio and their partners in Florence provided a loan (fl 8000) to King Sigismund which shall be settled from the revenues of the royal monopoly on salt. *(MNL OL DL 71750. Sept. 30, 1413; Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 204)*
1427 – His son, Scolaio declared that his father had a partnership with Nofri di Andrea and Andrea di Giovanni and brothers until 1424 in Hungary. Scolaio inherited his father’s
outstanding debt, fl 79, remaining of his capital share put into the company. (Scolaio di Giovanni Tosinghi, ASF, *Catasto* 1427, 296. fol. 112v)

**UGO,**

**Andrea**

1379 – The Florentine government wrote to the Venetian authorities to support Andrea di Ugo, whose goods were confiscated by the Venetians. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 132)

1387 – The Florentine government wrote to the Queen of Hungary and recommended Guido di Tommaseo, Vieri de’Medici, Andrea di Ugo and Antonio Santi working in Hungary. (ASF, Signori, carteggi, missive-I. cancelleria, 21. fol. 12v-13r. Febr. 10, 1387)

**VENTURA,**

**Jacopo di Francesco**

Around 1382 – He founded a partnership with Vieri de’Medici for trade with Hungarian copper. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 132. footnote no. 23)

**VENTURI,**

**Bonaventura de Salto/ Ventur gallicus**

1358 – He settled in Pressburg and his name figures in a record related to a transaction of a wineyard. (MNL OL DF 238764. Apr. 4, 1358; the same record published in Fejér, *CD, IX/2. 706; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141; Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfratermitás”, 259)

1390 – He lived in Pressburg with his kinsman called Johno. (MNL OL DF 204745. July 7, 1390; Léderer, *A középkori pénzügyletek*, 149; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141)

1409 – He was granted “immunitas” for his estate by the king. His son was noble retainer (“familiaris”) of the king. (Léderer, *A középkori pénzügyletek*, 149-50; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141)

**Caspar Ventur/Saltó-i Bonaventura Gáspár**

Son of Jacob.

1407-1433 – He and his mother were appointed “familiares” of King Sigismund. (Fejér, *CD, X/4. 600-606. Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfratermitás”, 259)

1412 – Burgher of Pressburg. (MNL OL DL 43146. May 6, 1412)

1413 – Civis juratus of Pressburg. (MNL OL DF 239578. Apr. 20, 1413)

1436 – Civis juratus of Pressburg. (MNL OL DF 239627. Apr. 22, 1436)

1446 – He died. (Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfratermitás”, 259)

**Jacobs Bonaventura de Salto/ Jacob Ventur**

1385-1390 – He was commissioned to investigate in a dispute related to estates of Jewish by Jobst, margrave of Moravia. (MNL OL DF 239218; Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfratermitás”, 259)

1390 – He and his brother, John purchased a street in Pressburg from the urban authorities. (MNL OL DF 239097. Oct. 31, 1390. Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfratermitás”, 259)
1392-1395 – Officer of the thirtieth chamber to Pressburg. (ZsO I/2655, Oct. 25, 1392; ibid. no. 2880, March 26, 1393; ZsO I/3971. May, 8, 1395; Házi, Sopron, I/1. 317; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141; Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás”, 259)
1392 – He bound himself to restore a Pressburgh house of the Abbey of Pannonhalma within six years and to pay afterwards a yearly rent of 1 denarius. (ZsO I/2487. Apr. 24, 1392)
1401 – King Sigismund took him into his “família”. (Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás”, 259)
1402 – He was granted an estate by the king. (Léderer, A középkori pénzügyletek, 149-50; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141; Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás”, 259)
He died before 1409. (Majorossy, “Krisztus Teste Konfraternitás”, 259)

John
1390 – He lived in Pressburg with his kinsman, Jacob. (MNL OL DF 204745. July 7, 1390; Léderer, A középkori pénzügyletek, 149; Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141)
1392 – Officer of the thirtieth of Pressburg. (Teke, “Firenzei üzletemberek”, 141)

VIVIANI,

Andrea di Giovanni
1427 – He worked as agent for the Carnesecchi-Fronte company in Hungary. (Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi, ASF, Catasto 1427. 27. fol. 1009r.-1010r; see also his catasto: ASF, Catasto 1427. 79. fol. 394r-v)

ZATI,

Antonio di Francesco
1420s – He worked as agent for the Carnesecchi-Fronte company in Hungary. (Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi, ASF, Catasto 1427. 27. fol. 1010r)
1427 – He also acted as contact person between the Melanesi company of Buda and the Zati partnership of Venice. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197) His father presumably can be identified with Francesco di Giovanni Zati, who lists a son called Antonio of 21 years in his Catasto among the members of his household. (Francesco di messer Giovanni Zati, ASF, Catasto 1427. 36. fol. 371r.-372r)
1433-1437 – Count of minting chamber to Sighisoara. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126)
1439 – He was head of the salt office of Sic. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126)
1441 – He was head of the minting chamber to Cluj. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126)
1444 – Count of the salt chambers to Sălard, Dej and Sic. (MNL OL DF 65058. Feb. 14, 1444)
1444-1452 – Officer of the Chamber of Baia Mare. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 126)
1446 – Count of the minting chamber to Transylvania together with Cristofooro. ((Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127)
1448 – He was consigned half tumen of salt by Odoardo Manini and Matthew of Szeged, officers of the salt chamber to Dej, on order of John of Hunyad. (MNL OL DL 55413. Sept. 28, 1448)
1453 – He provided small loans to neighbouring clients. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 127)
1455 – Officer of the chamber to Baia Mare. (MNL OL DL36407. Dec. 4, 1455)

Filippo
1416 – He was in the entourage of King Sigismund in England, and obtained a safe-conduct from the king of England to take some jewels to the continent. He was probably ordered by King Sigismund to pawn them as the king frequently struggled with shortage of liquidity. (Bárány Attila: “Zsigmond király 1416-os angliai kíséréte”, 8)

Giuliano di Niccolo
1427 – The Melanesi owed fl 200 to Giuliano di Niccoló Zati, who was partner of the Zati company in Venice. (ASF, Catasto 1427, 77. fol. 247r-248v)
1427 – They were also working with the Florentine Francesco d’Andrea Arnoldi silk merchant living in Venice. (ASF, Catasto 1427. 29. Tomo 1. fol. 178r-180r)

Niccoló
1427 – In his Catasto he declared to be debtor of Simone and Tommaso Melanesi. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 44)
1446 – He died in Hungary. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 44)
1459 – The count of Senj confiscated the wares of Jacopo del Bene with reference to a debt of Niccoló Zati. (Draskóczy, “Olaszok”, 129)

Uberto d’Amerigo
1425 – He founded a partnership with seat in Venice. They mainly traded in Senj, Zagreb with textiles and horses. (Teke, “Firenzei kereskedőtársaságok”, 197)
1444 – After his death Lawrence of Hédervár, count palatine (“comes palatinus”), confiscated his goods and the Florentine government negotiated on the behalf of his heirs. (Teke, “Az 1427. évi Firenzei Catasto”, 44)
## Appendix 2. Business partners and transactions in Hungary in the creditors/debtors lists of the Florentine Catasto records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Florentine householders interested in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine householder working in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</th>
<th>Florentine Partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner in Florence</th>
<th>Business partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>currency</th>
<th>commercial credit</th>
<th>money credit</th>
<th>debtor / creditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 809, fol. 488r.</td>
<td>Piero di Bartolo di Amerigo Zati e la madre</td>
<td></td>
<td>certain “Giovanni” per Uberto di Amerigo Zati morto in Ungheria</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 35, fol. 1064r.</td>
<td>Niccolò e Giovanni di Giovanni Bellacci</td>
<td>Giovanni di mess. Bartolomeo Panciatichi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 35, fol. 1064v.</td>
<td>Niccolò e Giovanni di Giovanni Bellacci</td>
<td></td>
<td>rede di messer Matteo Scholari</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 35, fol. 1064v.</td>
<td>Niccolò e Giovanni di Giovanni Bellacci</td>
<td></td>
<td>rede di messer Matteo Scholari</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>706 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 35, fol. 1207v.</td>
<td>Pagholo di Matteo Morelli</td>
<td>Antonio di Giovanni Mannini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 libr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 35, fol. 1346r.</td>
<td>Breto? e Ridolfo Peruzzi e co banchieri</td>
<td>Antonio di Piero Fronte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>610 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza</td>
<td>Bardo di Antonio Altoviti</td>
<td>Giovanni Panciatichi e Giovanni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>90 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. fol. 297r</td>
<td>Portinari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Filippo di Filippo Melanesi e nipoti</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e Tommaso Davizzi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Rinaldo Rinaldeschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e Tommaso Davizzi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1005 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso Davizzi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1006 v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Rinaldo Rinaldeschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>100 0</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1007r</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>371 3</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1007r</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td>Tommaso di Francesco Davizzi</td>
<td></td>
<td>257 8</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 32. fol. 1059r</td>
<td>Filippo di Tommaso degli Alberti</td>
<td>Giovanni Panciatichi e co in Vinegia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Venetian ducats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 369.</td>
<td>Filippo di mess. Giovanni Zati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 404r.</td>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 369, fol. 716r. Filippo di Filippo Melanesi</td>
<td>Iacopo di Michele Lottieri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 369, fol. 716r. Filippo di Filippo Melanesi</td>
<td>Iacopo Ricardini</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hun gari an fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 369, fol. 717r. Filippo di Filippo Melanesi</td>
<td>Baldassare di Luigi Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 358, fol. 247r. Cinello d'Ambruogio</td>
<td>Andrea Lambertesch i</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 358, fol. 247r. Cinello d'Ambruogio</td>
<td>rede di Fronte e di Paghlo del Berto (Carnesecchi )</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 358, fol. 247r. Cinello d'Ambruogio</td>
<td>Uberto Zati e fratelli</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 63, fol. 18 3r. Giorgio di Andrea</td>
<td>Giovanni del maestro Niccolò</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 62, fol. Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Francesco Nicolosi di Vinegia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Giovanni Corsini</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>889</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Tommaso di Giacomo</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>770</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone Chorsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Luca di Pietro Rinieri</td>
<td>Melanese di Ridolfo da Prato e co con Zanobi della Badessa</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Bartolomeo di mess. Nado e co</td>
<td>Marchio di Buoninsegna Rinieri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Giovanni di Iacopo Baldovini e Giovanni di Iacopo dal Borgho e Zanobi di Piero di Monte</td>
<td>Domenico di Giovanni Arrighi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342v-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Zanobi chortigiani e Francesco di</td>
<td>Andrea di Giovanni Viviani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342v-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.  fol. 71 7v.</td>
<td>Iacopo del Pugliese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 61. fol. 873v.</td>
<td>Giovanni di Michele di mess. Parente</td>
<td>Nofri di Bardo</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>36 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 61. fol. 873r.</td>
<td>Giovanni di Michele di mess. Parente</td>
<td>Pagolo del Berto (Carnesecchi)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>80 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55r.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>120 fl ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td>Giovanni di Niccolo de Cucchi? Detto Grasso e per lui Simone e Tomaso Melanesi</td>
<td></td>
<td>89 fl ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>60 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>632 fl ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>168 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>Commercial credit</td>
<td>Money credit</td>
<td>Debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zati e frategli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>312 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>126 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>928 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>179 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simone Buondelmon ti e Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>11 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 55v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo di Piero Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernardo di Sandro Talani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>315 fl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 79v.</td>
<td>Andrea di Giovanni del Palagio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pagolo del Berto (Carnesecchi )</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>… fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 60. fol. 79v.</td>
<td>Piera del fu Matteo Scolari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rede di Matteo Scolari</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>330 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. fol. 774r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat., Filza 54. fol. 12 2r.</td>
<td>Lodovico di Piero di Lodovico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |

ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1096 v. | Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | | debtor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine household working in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</th>
<th>Florentine Partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner in Florence</th>
<th>Business partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>currency</th>
<th>commercial credit</th>
<th>money credit</th>
<th>debtor / creditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td>Zati</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53, fol. 1096 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone Melanesi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53, fol. 1097r</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53, fol. 1097r</td>
<td>Giovanni del mess. Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td>Tommaso Corsi e compagnia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 50, fol. 182r.</td>
<td>Lattanzio di Bindo di messer Niccolo Guasconi</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Chorsi e compagnia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 49, fol. 1165r</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bicci di Medici</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Chorsi e co setaiuoli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 49, fol. 1165r</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bicci di Medici</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Chorsi e co setaiuoli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 49, fol. 1165r.</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bicci di Medici</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Chorsi per ragione di Piero Mannello Mammello di vinegia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 49, fol. 1168 v.</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bicci di Medici</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone Chorsi e co</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 45 6v.</td>
<td>Domenico di Antonio Allegri</td>
<td>più debitori in Ungheria</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 45 6v.</td>
<td>Domenico di Antonio Allegri</td>
<td>Agostino di Pagolo Marucci</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 901v.</td>
<td>Francesco e Simone Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Uberto di Amerigo Zati e co</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 905r.</td>
<td>Francesco e Simone Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Andrea Scolari vescovo di varadino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 905r.</td>
<td>Francesco e Simone Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza</td>
<td>Francesco e Simone Tornabuoni</td>
<td>Tommaso e simone di Lapo chorsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. fol. 905r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 41. fol. 616r.</td>
<td>Piero di Neri Ardinghelli</td>
<td>Fronte di Piero di Fronte</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 38. fol. 417v.</td>
<td>Redi di Gherardo Buondelmonti</td>
<td>rede di vescovo degli Scolari di varadino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 654r.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso di Lapo corsi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 296. fol. 112v.</td>
<td>Scolaio di Giovanni Tosinghi</td>
<td>Nofri di Andrea, Andrea di Giovanni e frat.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 296. fol. 160r.</td>
<td>Filippo di Rinieri Scholari</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi, Tomaso Davizi, Bernardo Portinari,</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 653r.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Baldinaccio Infangati</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine household working in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</th>
<th>Florentine Partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner in Florence</th>
<th>Business partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>currency</th>
<th>commercial credit</th>
<th>money credit</th>
<th>debtor / creditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. fol. 653r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 653r.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 653r.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 653r.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 654r.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Antonio Panciatichi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 654v.</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Simone Buondelmon ti e Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 657v.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>Filippo del Palagio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29. fol. 666r.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Domenico Borghini</td>
<td>Filippo Frescobaldi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 29.</td>
<td>Tommaso di Domenico Borghini</td>
<td>Filippo Frescobaldi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol. 666r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 28. fol. 551r.</td>
<td>Iacopo di Piero Baroncelli e co cambiatori</td>
<td>Andrea di Filippo di Lorenzo Scolari vescovo di varadino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 117r.</td>
<td>Antonio di Piero di Fronte</td>
<td>rede di vescovo di varadino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 92r.</td>
<td>Andrea di Tommaso Lambertesch i</td>
<td>Tomamaso e Simone di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 92r.</td>
<td>Andrea di Tommaso Lambertesch i</td>
<td>Vescovo di varadino</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 92v.</td>
<td>Andrea di Tommaso Lambertesch i</td>
<td>Giovanni e Niccolo di Andrea Lambertesch i</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 100v.</td>
<td>Rede di Fronte di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>Antonio di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 100v.</td>
<td>Rede di Fronte di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol.</td>
<td>Bernardo Lambertesch i</td>
<td>Simone Melanesi e compagnia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202r.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 202r.</td>
<td>Bernardo Lambertesch i</td>
<td>Piero di Niccolo Lambertesch i</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 175. fol. 273r.</td>
<td>Melanese di Ridolfo Melanesi</td>
<td>Pietro di Gherardo</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 25. fol. 457v.</td>
<td>Niccolo e Tomamso di Lorenzo Soderini</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>165 2</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 18. fol. 1285 v.</td>
<td>Parigi di Tommaso Corbinelli</td>
<td>ereditá di Matteo Scolari</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 18. fol. 1312r.</td>
<td>Piero di Lapo Peri settaiuolo</td>
<td>Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 18. fol. 1313r.</td>
<td>Piero di Lapo Peri settaiuolo</td>
<td>Giovanni Panciatichi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 18. fol. 1313 v.</td>
<td>Piero di Lapo Peri settaiuolo</td>
<td>Leonardo di Domenico Ottavanti</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 18. fol. 1313 v.</td>
<td>Cecca donna</td>
<td>Simone e</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 17. fol. 466r.</td>
<td>di Amerigo Frescobaldi</td>
<td>Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 17. fol. 577r., fol. 775r.</td>
<td>Filippo di Amerigo Frescobaldi</td>
<td>ragione d'Ungheria</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Vanni di Vanni Baroncelli (factor)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Andrea Lamberteschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Tomaso d'Andrea Lamberteschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Giovanni di Niccolo Lamberteschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>?di Schiavonia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone e</td>
<td>? was his</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>factor for 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Givanni Bonguinta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Giovanni da Prato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>rede of Filippo Scholari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Filippo Scolari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Ruberto di Filippo Mucini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Giovanni di</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine householder working in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</th>
<th>Florentine Partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner in Florence</th>
<th>Business partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>currency</th>
<th>commercial credit</th>
<th>money credit</th>
<th>debtor / creditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Niccolo di Lucha?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Jacopo di Michele Lottieri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Giovanni di Nicholo di Luca cancelliere, Ruberto Mucini</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Giovanni di Papi ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Nicolo di Biondo da...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Filippo di Rinieri Scolari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Masino dipintore in Ungheria (Panicale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Bernardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debitor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Lamberteschi Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | Giovanni di Nicolo Falucci | | | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | ? | | | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | Giuliano di Nicolo Zati | | | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | Pippo Frescobaldi | | 100 fl | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | Giovanni di Iacopo Baldovini e comp. | | 301 fl | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v. | Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co | Antonio di Piero Fronte | | 825 fl | | | | | | | | creditor
| ASF, | Simone e Andrea | | | | | | | | | | | creditor
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Florentine households interested in business in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine household working in Hungary</th>
<th>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</th>
<th>Florentine Partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner in Florence</th>
<th>Business partner in Hungary</th>
<th>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</th>
<th>sum</th>
<th>currency</th>
<th>commercial credit</th>
<th>money credit</th>
<th>debtor / creditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Viviani in Ungheria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Agostino d'Antonio ????? Zenggben</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>168 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Tomaso di Lodovico da Rimini?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso Melanesi e co</td>
<td>Piero figliolo del Re de Portogallo</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>114 1 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>243 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Nicholo di ? de Lorenzo Soderini</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>165 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Antonio del Domenicho? Sarto</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>14 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Tommaso</td>
<td>Andrea di ?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Commercial credit</td>
<td>Money credit</td>
<td>Debtor / Creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Melanesi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo Rinieri</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Antonio detto? chorontesi</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>giuliano ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>? donna fu di matteo chorsini</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Iacopo de?</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Lucha di Piero Rinieri e comp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Tommaso</td>
<td>Bertino</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Melanesi</td>
<td>d’Antonio del bertino da prato</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Filippo detto erede di Luigi Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Tomaso and Simone di Lapo Chorsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>...da prato</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>panni mandati in Ungheria</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>giovanni di matteo chorsini</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46. fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>drappi di seta andati in Ungheria</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Tommaso</td>
<td>ristoro di</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householders working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Melanesi</td>
<td>giovanni speziale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>giovanni di piero tosti</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>biagio da prato</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>bastiano di paolo fabro</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Antonio di Filippo Rinieri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Giovanni di Nicholo Falcucci</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>387</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Nofri e bartolomeo di neri Melanesi da prato</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Tommaso</td>
<td>Ghuido di</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Melanesi</td>
<td>Domenico Michi fabbro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Guiduccio barbiere di Prato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Lionardo di Gromo? Da Ghalcioma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Tomaso di Lapo Chorsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Gilio d’Alfonso e Ghonsalo Ferando... di Portoghallo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 46, fol. 654r-655v.</td>
<td>Tommaso Melanesi</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 39, fol. 41v.</td>
<td>Antonio di Dino Canassi setaiuolo</td>
<td>Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>soldi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat.</td>
<td>Antonio di Dino</td>
<td>Uberto damerigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgn.</td>
<td>Florentine households interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza 39. fol. 41v.</td>
<td>Canassi setaiuolo</td>
<td>Zati e frategli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 39. fol. 299v.</td>
<td>Iacopo di Paolo di laco e Francesco di Bernardo Ghaluzzi e compagnia finaiuoli</td>
<td>Simone di Pagholo Carnesecchi e comp.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>72 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 39. fol. 299v.</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 39. fol. 299v.</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 39. fol. 299v.</td>
<td>Tommaso e Simone di Lapo Corsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 33. fol. 675v.</td>
<td>Lorenzo di Antonio Spinelli</td>
<td>Zanobi di Gio: di Bartolomeo Panciatichi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>44 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 33. fol. 940r.</td>
<td>Ridolfo Peruzzi e compagnia</td>
<td>Zanobi di Giovanni Panciatichi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>83 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Agostino d'Antonio di Gieri Zengg</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>136 fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Niccolo Piaciti falli pió tempo fa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone Melanesi e compagnia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Corsino di Iacopo Corsini</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Niccolo d'Agnolo degli Agli</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Giovanni del Niccolo Falucci</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Lipaccio di Bartolomeo Brancacci</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi lanaio</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________________</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Niccolo e Giuliano Zati che dimorano in vinegia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Niccolo e Giuliano Zati che dimorano in vinegia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Berto e Ridolfo Peruzzi e comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>579</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Giuliano di Giuliano Brancacci</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Bernardo De Bardi</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Ricoldo di Pagolo Arnoldi?</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone Melanesi e compagnia</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Luigi Saranni di Fano</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>nostri di Buda</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1008 v.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>nostri di Buda</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>102 0</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Fronte di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Useppi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Cosimo de Medici e co di Roma</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Biagio armatore</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Niccolo D'Agnolo eco</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinello d'Ambruogio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghurghue famiglio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo di Michele Brancacci</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo di messer Biagio e co lanaiuoli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bianco di Salvestro e coc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea di ser Lando e co</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Commercial credit</td>
<td>Money credit</td>
<td>Debtor / Creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Andrea di Giovanni Viviani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Bartolotto da Urbino albergatore</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Iacopo di Feline</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Domenico di Iacopo Benini</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Manetto di Iacopo Amantini?</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Bonacorso degli Strozzi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Luigi d'Andrea Saranni a Fano</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florence householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householders working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Bartolo di Nofri Bischeri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Francesco di Zati</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Michele di Franchino</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Lionardo di Domenico Attavanti</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone di Pagholo Carneccheci e comp.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1009r.</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carneccheci e Fronte co</td>
<td>Bernardo de Bardi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householders working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householder working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Franco bombiere morto</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Giovanni di Marco Nichol(I?)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Scolaio di Giovanni Tosinghi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Boccacci Giorgio</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Lionardo di Domenico Attavanti</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Nofri di Bardo</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF,</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone e Tommaso di Piero Melanesi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Agostino di Antonio di Gieri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Iacopo di Bartolomeo da Calenzano</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Niccolo di Francesco detto Traurino</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Andrea di Giovanni Viviani</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio di Francesco di Zati</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1010r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Filippo Scolari</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1011r .</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Piero Lambertesch</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine householders working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Florentine Partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1011r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Benozzo di Antonaco di Modruscio</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1011r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Giuliano di Niccolo Zati</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1011r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Antonio de Vicci e co da Zagabria</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 27. fol. 1011r</td>
<td>Simone di Pagolo Carnesecchi e Fronte co</td>
<td>Simone Carnesecchi e fratelli</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1014r</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi e co</td>
<td>Antonio di Piero Fronte</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1014r</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi e co</td>
<td>Filippo di Simone capponi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 53. fol. 1014r</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi e co</td>
<td>Filippo di Simone Capponi e Zanobi Panciatichi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign.</td>
<td>Florentine householders interested in business in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine household working in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine businessmen interested in business in Hungary with Venetian branch</td>
<td>Business partner in Florence</td>
<td>Business partner in Hungary</td>
<td>Florentine partner working both in Venice and Hungary</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>commercial credit</td>
<td>money credit</td>
<td>debtor / creditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF, Cat. Filza 498, fol. 341v.</td>
<td>Giovanni di Bartolomeo Panciatichi e co</td>
<td>Antonio Popoleschi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164 fl</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gazetteer

Baia Mare – Neustadt, Frauenbach – Nagybánya, Asszonypataka, (present-day Romania)
Bistrita – Bistritz – Beszterce (present-day Romania)
Bojnice – Weinitz – Bajmóc, (present-day Slovakia)
Buda – Ofen
Bulci -- Bulcs, (present-day Romania)
Cluj – Klausenburg – Kolozsvár, (present-day Romania)
Dej – Desch – Dés, (present-day Romania)
Gelnica – Gölnitz – Gölnic(bánya), (present-day Slovakia)
Košice – Kaschau – Kassa, (present-day Slovakia)
Kremnica – Kremnitz – Körrmőcbánya, (present-day Slovakia)
Ocna Sibiului – Salzburg – Vízakna, (present-day Romania)
Oradea – Grosswardein – Várad, (present-day Romania)
Pest – Pesth
Pressburg – Pozsony – Bratislava, (present-day Slovakia)
Ptuj – Pettau, (present-day Slovenia)
Sälard – Szalárd, (present-day Romania)
Sibiu – Hermannstadt – (Nagy)szeben, (present-day Romania)
Scic – Seck – Szék, (present-day Romania)
Sighișoara – Schäßburg – Segesvár, (present-day Romania)
Skalica – Skalitz – Szakolca, (present-day Slovakia)
Sopron – Ödenburg
Stará L’ubovňa – Altlublau – Ólubló, (present-day Slovakia)
Trnava – Tynau – Nagyszombat
Turda – Thorenburg – Torda, (present-day Romania)
Vilok – Ylok –Újlak, (present-day Croatia)

Spiš – Zips – Szepesség, (present-day Slovakia)
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