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THE TRUE SERVANT:
Self-definition of Male Domestics in an Italian City
(Bologna, 17th-19th Centuries)

RAFFAELLA SARTI*

ABSTRACT: Who were servants and domestics? This question has been discussed by most historians writing about domestic service. Some scholars only class as servants people living with their masters; some exclude farm servants; some consider married domestics living with their own families as well, and so on. Different historical aims justify such a variety of definitions. But how did servants define themselves? Sources enabling us to answer this question are by and large lacking, or perhaps they have not yet been exploited by historians. The archive of the Bolognese Confraternity of San Vitale, also named the “Università dei Servitori”, allows us to analyse the problem. The members of the Confraternity, founded in 1697, discussed the issue of how to define the “true” servant. Their solution sounds shocking today: people performing “filthy” tasks were excluded from the association. Moreover, most members were married, they had their own families in Bologna, and they did not live with their masters or did not always live with their masters (furthermore, many of them were born in the city). Because of the composition of the members of the Brotherhood, the archives of the Confraternity give us the opportunity to analyse male, adult, married servants living with their own family, a category of servant that has received less attention than life-cycle servants.

INTRODUCTION: HISTORIANS AND SERVANTS

After several decades characterised by a lack of interest in the topic, since the late Fifties historians have been paying increasing attention to the history of male and female servants1. Since then, demographic and family historians, male and female scholars interested in women’s history and gender history, social and economic historians have written an increasing number of books and articles on the subject, as well as chapters, paragraphs, and notes in essays on more general topics (Reggiani 1989 and Sarti 1997c).

Those who have studied the history of domestic service, particularly in modern times, have nevertheless been faced by an elusive research subject, difficult to place in a single, crystal clear category. The difficulty of identifying servants and domestics precisely has become increasingly apparent, ever since Joseph Jean Hecht (1956) and Philippe Ariès (1960) first conducted their research, or Brough Macpherson and Peter Laslett debated who the Levellers had in mind when they excluded servants from franchise2. “Early modern England contained many varieties of service”, Ann Kussmaul (1981, p. 3) wrote in one of the first monographs on the subject. At the same time, Jean-Pierre Gutton (1981, pp. 11-15), analysing the situation on the other side of the Channel, pointed out that the terms domestique and domesticité during the Ancien Régime were very ambiguous: domestique, had a very wide meaning, indicating all the people living in the same house. Some years later Cissie Fairchilds (1984, pp. 2-3) defined the terms domestique and serviteur as “umbrella terms” “that covered people from a wide variety of social backgrounds, incomes and occupations”. And Jacqueline Sabattier (1984, pp. 17-20) posed the question: “la condition domestique: une ou multiple?”. Thus, it is a question intriguing most historians dealing with the subject (e.g. recently Fauve-Chamoux 1998).

In pre-industrial Europe, in fact, domestic service was not a specific job, but rather a type of relationship that could exist between people of very different social class, geographic origin, training, income, tasks, sex, age, marital and legal status. A servant was defined as such because he or she had a master, not because he or she carried out a specific task. In this sense, the ministers of princes and kings, as well as farm servants, could be considered as servants (Sarti 1999e). Being a servant was thus a condition rather than a profession (Fairchilds 1984, pp. 2-3). This was not an absolute condition: servants could be in turn masters, just like sons can also be fathers (Sarti 1997a, p. 152).

If, on the one hand, then, the distinctive elements of being a servant could appear fairly clear, on the other hand, identifying servants from the sociological point of view presented considerable problems. All
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this has brought about the coexistence, in the context of historical studies, of different definitions of the notion of service: those historians who have been interested in the study of different aspects of this notion have used different definitions of “servant” or “domestic” as categories, with greater or lesser awareness of the many ways in which the men and women of the Early Ages used them (Sarti 1997b). The variety of definitions used by historians has been rationalised by Renate Dürr (1995, pp. 23-37) into three main approaches: that of the scholars who include as servants people belonging to the lower social classes (Unterschicht) because of their poverty and the rural origin of many of them; that of those who analyse them according to their age group, since a considerable number of them were young people between the ages of 15 and 29 who would leave service upon marriage (life-cycle servants); and that, proposed and supported by the author herself, which considers servants as the lowest class in domestic society (unterster Stand der häuslichen Gesellschaft).

The numerous studies by now devoted to domestic service could of course be classified in a different way to that suggested by Renate Dürr (Reggiani 1989; Sarti 1988 e 1997c). I have mentioned her interpretative framework not because I intend to review the research carried out so far and make a systematic comparison of the various approaches adopted, but because, in my opinion, such framework shows particularly clearly the coexistence, in the context of historical studies, of different definitions of the notion of “servant”.

Furthermore, we must not forget that the variety of definitions adopted gave rise to considerable controversy among scholars. In fact Laslett and Mepherson were certainly not the only ones to discuss the correct interpretation of the category of “servants”. Angiolina Arru (1990b, p. 564, fn. 5), for example, arguing with Rolf Engelsing and Marzio Barbagli about a totally different matter altogether, wrote: “Some domestic service scholars (...) wrongly include the garzoni (apprentices) among domestic servants, thus exaggerating the incidence of males in service”. On the other hand, Cissie Fairchilds (1984, p. 3) had already pointed out, a few years before, that it was possible, at the time, to confuse servants and shop assistants, but not servants and apprentices.

The suitability of such categories could be discussed endlessly. Personally, I feel that the desire to analyse different aspects of the issue can justify the use of different definitions. For this reason, I think it is appropriate for scholars interested in verifying the hypotheses once formulated by Laslett (1977a, 1977b and 1983) and Hajnal (1965 and 1983) concerning the role of domestic service in household formation systems, to include in the category of “servants” a great variety of people united by the fact that they lived in their master’s house (farm servants, apprentices and farm hands, etc.). It is equally appropriate, though, for scholars interested in the transformations of domestic service stricto sensu to exclude apprentices and farm servants from their investigations, whilst including servants who did not live with their masters. Finally, I think it is also appropriate, when referring to the areas where in early modern times significant legal limitations on personal liberty continued to exist or were developed, to talk about servants in a primarily legal sense, as in the case of the Russian serfs. The most important thing is, I believe, to be aware of the differences between one definition and another and of the comparative difficulties that arise with their use.

It is equally important, I think, to be aware of the relationship between the definitions used by historians and those used by the men and women of the past. Although, in fact, in early modern times, even contemporaries found the category of “servants” difficult to define, it is still true to say that the definitions used by historians can be more or less close to our ancestors’ feelings and vocabulary. The problem of the relationship between the categories used today and those in use in past centuries is, in my opinion, an extremely relevant issue, and, as such, has been tackled by several scholars. When dealing with this general problem I think it is important to ask: did the men and women that the scholars nowadays number among servants perceive themselves as such? And: are the men and women of the past who described themselves as servants or domestics nowadays included by historians among servants? Despite its importance, this aspect of the relationship between categories of the past and categories of the present seems to have had relatively little discussion. Undoubtedly, this is due to a great extent to the fact that the sources which would allow us to answer these questions are not very numerous. They are not, however, entirely missing. Some answers to such questions can be found, for example, in the archival documents of the confraternity that from the end of the 17th century to the end of the 19th century brought together the domestics from the city of Bologna, the confraternity of San Vitale or “Università dei servitori”. And these answers are often surprising.

A SEGMENTED UNIVERSE: “LIVREE” AND “CAPPENERE”

The canonical foundation of the Confraternity of San Vitale dates back to 1697. The idea of creating an association of male domestics was not entirely new, since in Bologna a spiritual association of servants
had existed before. The domestics who, in 1697, undertook to found the brotherhood were aware of this: in their first statutes they even stated that their aim was not to create a new association but to revive the old one. They stated, though, that only some memories remained of it. And, as a matter of fact, even today, in the absence of specific studies, almost nothing is known of that first instance. The Bolognese servants who in 1697 canonically founded the Confraternity of San Vitale were then straddling tradition and innovation: on the one hand they associated themselves with a precedent, on the other, though, they knew very little of that precedent.

We do not know when the project to start (or better: to re-start) a spiritual association of servants had begun to take shape. However, the first meetings of which we have a trace date back to the spring of 1697. Both servitori di cappa nera, or braccieri, and staffieri (grooms), or servitori di livrea (lackeys) took part in these meetings.

The latter belonged to what in large houses was sometimes called famiglia inferiore (lower family), that is the “low” servants, who had to wear their master’s livery. The former, on the other hand, belonged to the famiglia superiore (higher family), that is the “high” servants, entrusted with managerial tasks and responsibilities. They usually wore their own clothes, rather than the livery: hence their name, servitori di cappa nera or cappenere, which literally means servants wearing a black cape. The other definition used by the sources to identify these higher ranking domestics is braccieri. Literally, the bracciere was the servant who had the task of offering his arm to the noble ladies when they went out (a lady who went out on her own would have caused considerable scandal). The term, however, could be used to refer to all the higher servants. This was probably because, on the one hand, all trustworthy servants could accompany their mistress and the ladies of their master’s family outside the home, if necessary; on the other hand because those whose main duty was that of bracciere could also carry out other tasks when the ladies were at home (Sarti 1994a, pp. 156-159 and 1999a).

The draft of the statutes discussed at the first meeting stated that the core of the brotherhood was to be made up of 63 people, 30 staffieri and 33 cappenere. It also stated that the prior of the brotherhood should always be a servitore di cappanera, moreover one “of distinguished status”. The majority of the staffieri agreed with this policy. Maybe it seemed normal to them to put in charge those whom they had to obey on a daily basis. Two staffieri, however, held a different view. They therefore left the meeting where the draft of the statutes was being discussed, stating their “intention to set up another, similar, brotherhood”. A few days later, in fact, they met with another group of servants and drew up some statutes which did not award the cappenere any privileges.

In the city there were then two competing groups of domestics. One reflected the hierarchical relationship between cappenere and livree which existed among the great families’ domestic staff. The other one made no distinction between staffieri and braccieri. Although both types of servant were represented in both groups, for brevity’s sake we shall refer to the first one as the “group of the cappenere or of the braccieri”, and to the second as the “group of the staffieri or of the livree”. Between them, there would be several serious clashes.

With a great sense of timing, the newly formed group of the livree asked the archbishop to be allowed to found a brotherhood of servants. Shortly afterwards, the cappenere made a similar request only to be told, however, that the staffieri had already been promised they would be allowed to found one. Therefore, “they should see if they could join in with the staffieri and make one University” out of the two, and then every suitable power would be granted. The braccieri protested, saying they had been the first who conceived the idea of founding the brotherhood. But the prospect of founding a brotherhood with their competitors did not appeal to the staffieri either. Explaining the reasons for their hesitation, they have left us extraordinary evidence of their concept of being a servant and of their perception of the conflicts that existed among domestic staff.

As was the case in a great deal of brotherhoods, the one planned by the staffieri was supposed to have two classi (ranks), a classe stretta (higher rank), to which the people chosen from time to time to hold positions of power belonged, and a classe larga (lower rank), made up of the simple associates, excluded from this privilege. The staffieri, therefore, declared their willingness to join with the braccieri. But they were willing to accept them only as members of the lower rank, at least for the time being. In fact, there were no vacancies in the higher rank. They expressed their belief, though, that the braccieri would never accept such conditions: “since they wish to be superior to the staffieri, they will never accept to declare themselves either inferior or equal to the others”. After all, the staffieri’s secession had been caused precisely by the cappenere’s demands to “hold all power” in the brotherhood.

To justify their demand for superiority, the cappenere had declared that it would be unseemly for the brotherhood if, in dealing with the city authorities as its representatives, there should also be people wearing the livery of any one family. It would be more dignified, instead, to assign the higher positions to the cappenere. In the servitori di livrea’s opinion, this justification was “fanciful and utterly unreasonable”. If they really wanted to form a brotherhood of servants they had to begin by acknowledging that the “title” of servant was “applied to any person who was actually in the service of
another, regardless of whether they wore their own clothes, or their master’s clothes, the livery”. In the staffieri’s opinion, then, it was necessary above all to recognise who the servants were and then stress their common traits rather than their differences. All the more so considering that, in their opinion, it was wrong to think that to serve as a cappanera held more “distinction and honour” than to serve as a staffiere a livrea. This, in their opinion, was also due to the fact that a definitive distinction between a cappanera and a staffiere was not made: one day “a servant works as a waiter and a bracciere and another day (...) a cappanera needs to wear a livery if they both want to earn a living, because every servant ends up doing the job of serving, in one way or in the other, that is as a cappanera or as a livrea, as the opportunity presents itself, since neither has a skill, nor means, and since we cannot say that someone goes into somebody else’s service to live as a nobleman or on a whim”.

The staffieri felt it was right, therefore, to found a brotherhood in which all members were “equal” and “brothers in Christ”, “who in his own words loathes these fanciful ambitions”. All the more so because in the city there were spiritual associations formed by people whose social standing was much more heterogeneous. They therefore begged the authorities to continue to favour them: doing so, would also bring greater benefit “to the Republic” than favouring the braccieri. In Bologna, in fact, they pointed out, “there must be (...) about two thousand livree, while, between braccieri and waiters, you cannot find three hundred”.

The archbishop’s vicar, however, insisted that the two groups should join. But nothing could be done: for several years, in the city, there were two associations in conflict. Only in 1703 the association of the cappeneres (which, as we have seen, also included some livree) merged with the brotherhood founded by the staffieri. In the competition between the two groups, that founded by the livree had won. And their victory was twofold. In the first place, its egalitarian ideology had eventually triumphed in the competing group, since the discriminations against the staffieri had been dropped there as well. Secondly, the brotherhood of cappeneres had had to become part of the other, much larger and prosperous.

These changes can perhaps be taken to symbolise the greater transformations which were beginning to affect the world of servants and domestics. They may even have been evidence of them.

**THE SERVANTS’ UNIVERSE**

Let us turn to the world of servants and domestics. We have already mentioned that it was an area with fleeting and uncertain boundaries, populated by different people. A true universe, we might say. But how did our ancestors see it and regard it? Which people, in their eyes, were part of it? Here is the opinion of some of them.

Niccolò Vito di Gozze, author of a treaty on family care published just over a century before the foundation of the confraternity of San Vitale (1589), discussing the rules that a master must observe when dealing with his employees, remarks that servants are of “varying and different kinds”: “servants by nature”, “servants by law”, “servants by remuneration”, servants “by virtue or pleasure”. Among the “by nature” he includes the “barbarous and uncouth people” living in the countryside. Men with strong bodies but weak intellects, not too different from “savage animals”. Brawny but wild and brainless, they cannot but be led and ruled by wise and sensible people. The “servants by law” are the slaves. On this subject, it may be worth recalling that in Italy there were slaves (generally “Turks”, i.e. Muslims) up to the early part of the 19th century, although in increasingly smaller numbers (Sarti 1999b). According to Gozze the “servants by remuneration” are free people who place themselves in the service of a master. Even among them, however, it is possible to find some differences: some serve in exchange for board and clothing only; others receive a salary besides that; others still work “for remuneration only”, seeing by themselves to all their needs. There is finally the group represented by those who serve not “for money or out of compulsion, but for mere and sincere pleasure, feeling great affection towards their master’s virtue”. The ones in this position “are called servants, but they are not truly so, they are rather courtiers” (Gozze 1589, pp. 100-116).

As happens in other 16th-17th century texts, particularly in texts written by authors influenced by Aristotle (Frigo 1985, pp. 82-91), the categories defined by Gozze paint a very wide social picture, which includes very different people: from peasants, most of whom, if not all, are in his eyes to be considered as servants by nature, up to courtiers, who deal with kings and princes. The range of types he describes is indeed endless, which once again confirms the difficulties in defining the category “servants”.

There is also a strong impression of ambiguity when we read other works, such as the Convito Morale per gli Etti, Economici, e Politici by Pio Rossi (1639-1657), a text made up of headings in alphabetical order, which group aphorisms, examples, definitions, descriptions and academic lectures, rulings, witty remarks, curious anecdotes. Glancing through it we gather, in fact, that there is a wide and multifaceted range of possibilities for the use of the words “servant”, “domestic” “domestic staff”, in this case not only from the social, but also from the theological and philosophical point of view: “the good Prince, who is
entrusted with the well being of his people, must serve all of his subjects”; the pope is servus servorum dei; there are three types of servitude, “by punishment”, of which the theologians speak, that is the servitude of sin; servitude “attained by the reason of people”, that the jurists talk about, that started when captured enemies began to be enslaved; the kind “born of nature”, which the philosophers, particularly Aristotle, talk about (Rossi, 1639-1657, vol. 1, pp. 433-437; vol. 2, pp. 380-381).

Despite the rigour of its tone, a legal text, Il dottor volgare by Giambattista De Luca, published shortly before the foundation of the brotherhood of San Vitale, under the heading “servitude” brings together elements which to our eyes have very little in common. Analysing the servitude of people, in fact, De Luca first of all makes a distinction between the servitude which affects a person’s status, i.e. that which turns a free man into a slave, and that performed by free men. In this second instance, he differentiates between the situation of those who owe another person services “because of a contract involving their work” and that of people who owe them for other reasons, as in the case of the “son’s servitude towards his father” or of the “obligation binding vassals to their Baron, or Lord” (De Luca 1755 (1673)), vol. 1, t. 1, p. 472).

Peasants, courtiers, sons, popes, slaves...: the range of people who, for one reason or another, are included in the category of those bound to servitude by this or that author seems to extend to infinity. Furthermore, finding in the types listed a definition or a series of definitions common to, and shared by everyone, seems impossible. To complicate matters even further, the sociological parameters are intertwined with political philosophy and with theology. In particular, the advocates of the aristocratic ideology, widely followed in 16th-17th century Italy but still supported later on by some, agree with Gozze and Rossi on the existence of people who are servants by nature and who must therefore be ruled by those who are free by nature. In other words, they extend the notion of servant to more or less wide strata of the medium-low social classes (Angelozzi 1974-1975; Biondi 1980; Frigo 1985). Sometimes even later thinkers, like Paolo Mattia Doria, who reject the idea that there should be natural differences between men, arrive at similar conclusions. He, in fact, identifies two main classes or orders in society: masters and servants. In his opinion, “Masters are those who own fields and wealth (...); servants are the uncouth commoners fated to work in the fields, and those who pursue a craft to please and serve the men in the city” (Doria 1729, p. 100).

Such positions, however, are expressed - not always without disagreement - in a society permeated by a religion according to which Christ came into the world not to be served but to serve: even the pope is therefore described as a servant, or rather, as the “servant of God’s servants” (servus servorum dei). Religion states at the same time that Jesus gave his life to free men from the slavery of sin, so that in God all men are free and equal (“Freiheit” 1975). As we know, according to catholic orthodoxy, this does not at all imply bringing worldly hierarchies into question. Such a call to equality has however provided arguments in favour of egalitarian positions even from the socio-political point of view. The staffieri themselves, when criticising the cappenero’s demands, recalled Christ’s message. More than the expression of a socially subversive position, such a call represented a hope for a situation of equality within the budding brotherhood. In the staffieri’s arguments, however, as in many of their contemporaries’, religious or philosophical considerations mix with sociological observations.

In this sense, while Gozze had maintained that courtiers served “for pleasure”, the staffieri stated that no-one served “to be a nobleman and on their whim”. A quick glance at what was happening in those years at the court of Louis XIV would be enough to convince us that in reality not only were there noblemen in service, but they often served precisely in order to maintain or improve their social standing. However, the staffieri’s remarks seem to anticipate the antithetic view of service and nobility which emerges for example from Leporello’s words in Mozart’s Don Giovanni: “Voglio fare il gentiluomo, e non voglio più servir” (“I want to be a nobleman, and no longer want to serve”. The outlining of such antithesis also seems to point to a loss of status in the most prestigious servants and to a levelling of the varied world of domestics, to the slow transformation of service into a job with fairly well-defined features, carried out by people from a medium-low social background.

In Bologna, for example, between 1680 and 1740, according to an anonymous observer, among the domestic staff of the city families the figure of the butler had begun to be common: initially a prerogative of the noblest and richest households, at the end of the period in question it was present, according to our witness, even in those which had “the income of a poor citizen” (Costumi 1680-1742, pp. 78, 84). This evidence, although schematic and exaggerated, highlights a process which seems to have been quite typical in Bologna in those years, that is the spreading of a more articulated type of domestic organisation, which involved a certain rationalisation of the family administration, thanks to professionals such as, precisely, butlers, book-keepers etc. (Sarti 1994a, p. 67). Something similar must have happened with the braccieri, if at the end of the 17th century there were some middle class families who, not being able to afford a full time one, hired one “only on public holidays to give the (...) lady his arm”, to allow her to make a good impression when she went out.
It is therefore likely that, as such professional figures were becoming more common even outside the élites, the people carrying out these duties came neither from the nobility nor from the medium-high middle class, the social groups from which the members of the famiglia superiore (higher family) of the courts and the most important households were recruited. But it is possible that the picture described by the Bolognese staffieri was also the consequence of a certain decline of a type of service carried out by members of the high and medium-high social classes to obtain fame, honour, a pension and protection rather than as a real job. If in fact the courts still swarmed with courtiers, we cannot deny, for example, that in Italy the institution of pagery was gradually going into decline: the training of nobles was increasingly being entrusted to schools (particularly to the Gesuits’ seminaria nobilium) rather than to domestic service as pages in a court or a noble household (Brizzi 1976).

From this point of view, the foundation of the Confraternity of San Vitale itself probably reflected and strengthened such tendencies. The people who had brought it to life were obviously convinced that, despite everything, it was possible to identify servants, although there were different types, even using the term in a restricted sense. Furthermore, the staffieri thought that these differences were not so large after all and that, in other words, being a servant was more important than being a staffiere or a cappanera, whereas it is likely that the countless people ascribed by the various authors to the different servants’ categories, and even those who could all be classified as servants for remuneration, would often think they had little or nothing in common with each other. Significantly, the staffieri managed to convince the braccieri as well to follow their view (Sarti 1999a, p. 736).

A “CORPORATIVE” RECOMPOSITION: THE TRUE SERVANT

The brothers presented themselves from the beginning as representatives of a group which up until then had been very undefined and indefinable and which, moreover, would remain so to a great extent even later on: in the middle of the 18th century Bolognese legislation on domestic theft stated that, for example, “under the name of servants, domestics and family members will also be included all youngsters, apprentices, or porters and others, who serve in the shops of merchants, jewellers, barbers, carpenters, blacksmiths and of whichever other type of craftsman, as long as they receive a salary from the master of these, be it daily or monthly or otherwise, even if they only receive their board” (Bando 1756, p. 45). Once again the category of “servants” was proving to be extended and extendable, even if the text mentioned, like many of those so far analysed, showed awareness both of the differences between the various categories listed and of the similarities which made it possible to assimilate different types in the group of servants. The fact that we have underlined the vagueness of the term “servant” and the difficulty of giving it an exact definition must not encourage the belief that its use by contemporaries created only confusion: generally they were able to infer from the context in what way the term was being used and in the case of laws or orders involving servants the sense in which it was to be understood would often be specified, as in the notice just mentioned (Agnini 1994; Sarti 1999a, p. 750).

The originality of the confraternity’s policy does not lie then only in its having presented itself as representative of a previously not clearly definable group and in having allowed in to the association as equals, in the name of their common station of domestic staff, people who were probably becoming closer in social standing but were undoubtedly still far apart, staffieri and cappanere. Such originality lies also in having defined authoritatively who the “true servant” was, in a context where the term “servant” had very many different meanings. So much so that letters were signed off with the statement “most devoted and humble servant”, and people could greet each other saying “your servant” or “your slave”, a use of which the modern term “ciao” bears the trace.

But the members of the brotherhood did not only propose themselves as general representatives of the Bolognese servants. They, in fact, pursued a sort of “corporative” policy. In the months that followed the first clashes between staffieri and cappanere, the archbishop’s vicar, as we said earlier, exercised varying pressure to encourage the two groups to heal the split between them. At the end of 1698, however, heard the archbishop’s opinion, he approved the statutes of the staffieri’s brotherhood, maybe because he had promised them his approval from the beginning. According to such statutes, the Bolognese servants would not be able to found other confraternities. The brothers of San Vitale were thus fully entitled by the archbishop’s opinion, he approved the statutes of the

The monopoly exercised by the Confraternity of San Vitale was strengthened in 1703, when the cappanere group merged with it. In the city, no-one would be able to start up any kind of association “of people who could be called servants, to the detriment of the Confraternity of San Vitale”. These were not to be just empty words: every time the opportunity presented itself the monopoly was in fact fiercely
defended by the brothers. Not by accident the brotherhood was usually also called the “University of Servants” (Sarti, 1999a, pp. 739-741).

As well as presenting themselves as representatives, and exclusives ones, of the Bolognese servants, the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale took it upon themselves to define who could be part of the association and could benefit from its membership. Maybe this choice was inevitable, considering how vague the term “servant” is. So, the confraternity ended up proposing a less doubtful profile of the figure of the servant. It is significant, from this point of view, that if at the beginning the brotherhood had had various dedications, the one to San Vitale was quickly to prevail. San Vitale had been a servant in his lifetime (Gordini, 1969; Fasoli (ed.), 1993). We could say, in short, that the brotherhood was proclaiming the identity of its members starting with the name.

The problem of defining the identity of the members of the confraternity was there even from the first draft of the statutes drawn up by the group of staffieri. In this draft, on the one hand the desire to overcome the divisions between staffieri and braccieri, creating a brotherhood which could really be for all servants, was emerging; on the other hand, the problem of defining who could be described as a servant was becoming clearer. There was also the obvious concern to avoid the introduction of new divisions precisely when they were objecting to those between servitori di livrea and cappenereli. In the first years of life of the confraternity, this concern prevailed over the other: they undertook therefore to avoid fractures and to underline the common identity of all servants29. Later on, on the contrary, the concern to establish who really was a servant and who was not prevailed. Such a matter would be raised, of course, at the precise moment when they had to decide who to accept and who to exclude. One instance, in particular, forced them to take an unequivocal stand.

In 1752 Giovanni Serantoni (or Sartoni) asked for and obtained admission to the confraternity. Later on, however, it was discovered that he was not “an actual servant but was in another, much lower, position”. He was in fact a porter who worked here and there, without a permanent position, working, when it happened, also as a sedan-chair carrier. Quoting the statute, which allowed the admission of “actual servants” only, it was argued that those doing the job of porter or sedan-chair carrier could not be considered as such. Serantoni’s membership was revoked. However, he appealed to the vicar general, who ruled in his favor. The confraternity members decided therefore to define more clearly and explicitly than in the past who could become a member29.

Up until then the statutes had maintained that “since this brotherhood is called the University of Servants, servants of all ranks and types can and will be allowed to join it”30. In 1753 it was decided, on the contrary, that only “actual servants of the following types and not others, that is: ministers, cappenereli, staffieri, lackeys, first coachmen, second coachmen, lead-horse riders (cavalcanti), cooks, undercooks doing only this single service job, and butlers” could be admitted. They all also had to satisfy the condition of not having to carry out “in public” “any base job” which would cause them to be considered as something other than “actual servants”. Therefore, “those commonly called kitchen boys, or scullery boys, stable boys, and porters” were absolutely excluded. Porters, in particular, were excluded even if they worked for a single master as sedan-chair carriers and were wage earners. The explanation was that since their job was not widespread, it often happened that, once work was finished, they would agree to carry out “vile jobs” “on the streets”30.2. The brothers were trying to identify themselves as representatives of a job which (at least in public) did not involve carrying out vile and degrading tasks.

The policy of prestige which they, as we shall see, were pursuing, was bringing with it the exclusion of entire categories of workers. Founded on a statement of unity and equality of all servants, the brotherhood was now introducing a clear split among those who were commonly ascribed to the multifaceted world of servants. The staffieri had once founded the confraternity attacking the cappenereli, who were above them in domestic staff hierarchy. Now the brothers, livree or cappenereli, were implementing a ban which excluded the lowest orders of the servants’ hierarchy. This was maybe the inevitable outcome of a policy designed not only to define the identity of domestics, but also to give this identity a prestigious appearance. With this in mind, it is not surprising that on the one hand porters and kitchen hands were excluded and on the other a priest, who worked as a secretary with an aristocratic family, was accepted33.

The reform of 1753 was justified by the confraternity members, however, by recalling the recent transformations which had involved the activity of service, in which people who could certainly not be described, in their opinion, as “actual servants”, were now engaged34. It may sound odd that in a context where the concept of servant was still not very restricted, statements of this kind could be made. This however shows that the transformations taking place were slowly undermining this vagueness, although the direction towards which the members of the confraternity were moving was opposite to the one which, as we shall see, would ultimately prevail.

It is unclear to which new developments they were alluding. In actual fact, as regards the possibility of admitting some of the people who in 1753 were excluded, there really must have been doubts from the outset: already on the list of types of servants contained in the first draft of the statutes, dating back to 1697, the definition of “stable boy” had been crossed out35. At that time, unifying reasons had prevailed:
in the final version of the statutes this list is missing. As far as sedan-chair carriers were concerned, it is possible, however, that they referred to the custom of paying them not with a monthly salary, but according to the number of journeys done, as was the case for porters (Sarti 1994a, p. 140). We cannot exclude the fact that the habit of paying sedan-chair carriers according to the number of journeys done was spreading, creating a dangerous association between servants and porters, who usually were people of extremely low social extraction, often newly arrived from the countryside and lacking any training (Ferrante 1978, pp. 796-797). If this were true, the reform can be interpreted as a reaction to the worsening of their working conditions and to the loss of status which were perhaps affecting some types of servants. Because of this, the way in which, in 1763, the exclusion of sedan-chair carriers was moderated is significant: “sedan-chair carrier servants” would be allowed to join so long as they were really “such, and paid as such” and not “porters pretending to be and disguised as sedan-chair carriers”.

What advantages did the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale enjoy? The founders of the brotherhood had considered it their aim “to help servants when they had the need”, as well as leading a morally exemplary life. Particularly, the founders aimed to “help the infirm, the disabled because of illness or old age, bury their bodies, and help their souls after death”. As a matter of fact, this would be the case in the two following centuries.

In this sense, the members of the brotherhood had the right, in the event of an illness forcing them to take to “their bed, in their own homes” to be assisted. The initial project was intended to provide them both with a cash benefit and to cover their medical expenses. Being too ambitious, such a project soon had to become more realistic. The cover of medical expenses was withdrawn, never to be re-introduced. For the whole of the 18th century, the sick were able though to count on a benefit of 5 soldi per day until they recovered completely. In 1801, following a brief period during which all benefits were suspended, the amount was reduced to 2 1/2 soldi per day in the case of chronic illness. The old system was restored later on, but in 1855 the duration of payments was limited to a maximum of 4 months for brothers affected by long term illness “with no possible hope of recovery”.

To the aid for the infirm and housebound, in 1783 two further benefits were added: one to the sick admitted to hospital, which varied from 3 to 5 soldi per day according to whether the invalid was employed or unemployed (benefit withdrawn in 1800), and another to those who had left hospital and were convalescing, amounting to 8 soldi per day. Initially this benefit, paid up to complete recovery, as confirmed by a doctor, from 1800 was paid only for the first 8 days after the patient had been discharged from hospital.

In the event of death all brothers were entitled to a decent funeral and to a certain number of masses for their souls, which during the 18th century increased progressively: 20 at first, then 25, finally 30. In 1800 the masses were reduced to 22, and to as few as 12 in 1801. In 1806, while keeping the number of masses the same, it was decided “to increase suffrages for the greater dignity of the brotherhood”. The masses stipulated by the statutes of 1821 and 1855 were 16.

From 1734 the so-called “disabled” benefits were also created: old and needy servants no longer able to serve could ask to be allocated one of the four available places, which gave the recipient the right to 40 soldi per month for life. Abolished in 1800, the “disabled” places were re-introduced a few years later and for a brief time their number was raised to six. Towards the middle of the 19th century, though, they were definitively abolished.

A considerable number of servants benefited from the confraternity’s material assistance: at the time of its maximum expansion, in the 1780s, it assisted up to seventy people a year. Significantly, the number of people receiving benefit is largely proportional on the one hand to the number of members, and on the other to the amount of benefit paid out. Let us glance then at the size of the brotherhood.

If the servants who had taken part in the first meetings of the group which, for simplicity’s sake, we have called the group of cappeneres, had been about 60, only 34 people took part in the meeting called for the 4th July 1697 to found what would become the Confraternity of San Vitale. But only a few months later there were already about 280 brothers (all strictly men). The quick initial success was followed however by a phase of falling membership, perhaps precisely because of the reduction in the initially ambitious project. So, just over a decade after its canonical foundation, the brotherhood had about 150 members. After the first imbalanced years its growth was steady: there were 183 members in 1719, by all accounts just over 500 in the 1780s.

The 1780s marked the peak of the expansion. In the turbulent period which followed the arrival of Napoleonic troops in Bologna, in 1796, members (at least those paying their membership fee) went down drastically. Their number started growing again during the Restoration without ever reaching 18th century levels. In the 1830s a definitive decline started. There were some brief revivals, but after the unification
of Italy (1859-1861) this decline became more and more evident. At the beginning of the 1840s there were about 250 members, about 130 in 1867. In 1883 the number of members, deduced from the amount of money paid in fees, was reduced to about 34 people: ironically, the last figure available on the size of the brotherhood coincides with the number of those who, almost two centuries before, had founded it, almost to show that a cycle was truly concluded (Fig. 1).

The 19th century decline was undoubtedly due, to a great extent, to the radical transformations in domestic service which characterised the 19th century compared with the 18th and to the watertight attitudes to them of the Confraternity of San Vitale’s policies, as I shall show in the following pages. It could also be due to the brothers’ incapacity, or impossibility of maintaining an interest in the type of assistance they supplied. This was due essentially to the way in which such assistance was financed.

“We thought of depriving ourselves of some share of our possessions to help each other”46, explained a document dating back to the time of the foundation of the brotherhood. The considerable charitable burden on the confraternity was in fact for the most part financed by the brothers themselves. Membership required the payment of an admission fee. This was initially set at 3 lire (4 for members who were over 30) and then reduced first to 1 lire and 10 soldi (i.e. to 1 1/2 lire) plus a charitable sum to have a mass celebrated; then, in the 19th century, to 1 lire. Another small source of income was represented by the sale of a copy of the statutes to each new member. Furthermore, each new member had to pay a monthly fee. At the beginning, this was 5 soldi. In 1723 it was raised to 5 1/2 soldi and in 1735 to 6. Afterwards it remained unchanged. Up until 1855 unemployed members without any income were exempt from paying most of the monthly fees while they were out of work47.

This self-financing system could only work by keeping a certain balance between the number of healthy and employed members and those drawing benefit. Not accidentally, then, the statutes (from 1719) contained strict rules related to the health and maximum age of prospective members, which varied between 35 and 40 (Sarti 1999a, pp. 728-729). If the members did not pay, if healthy and employed youngsters did not join regularly, if the number of the unemployed, the sick and the dead increased too much, the benefit paid out inevitably had to be reduced. And if benefit was reduced, joining the brotherhood became less attractive. In this sense, while in the 18th century, after the first settling years, a virtuous circle had begun between the increase in membership and the size of benefit, from the crisis years between the 18th and the 19th century there were signs of a vicious circle, from which, in the 19th century, it was possible to emerge partially and only for brief periods.

The arrival of the French troops, in 1797, caused a series of upheavals which seem to have caused a reduction in domestic staff (Sarti 1994a, tab. III.24). The number of young male servants seems to have suffered a particularly marked reduction, probably because of the recruitment of soldiers for the army, of the imposition of a sumptuary tax on male servants younger than 50, of the abolition of liveries (servitori
a livre were generally rather young, cfr. Sarti 1994a). In the central parish of San Giovanni in Monte between 1796 and 1799 the average age of male servants went up from 39 to 45. The percentage of the over 50s shot up from 17% to 41% (Sarti 1992, p. 239)\footnote{I cannot say for certain whether all over Bologna there had been similar changes, but there is no reason to believe that the parish analysed represents an exception. If then the transformations were such, both the drop in membership and the drastic reduction in benefit paid out by the Confraternity of San Vitale are not surprising. What is surprising is its capacity to survive not only the crisis, but also the abolition of religious confraternities implemented by the new authorities. And to manage instead, later on, to recover a certain number of members and part of its ability to assist. The splendours of the 18th century never returned: perhaps in order to encourage membership in the 19th century the maximum age to join was again increased to 40\textsuperscript{th}, and, as mentioned, the entry tax was lowered while monthly payments remained unchanged (in absolute terms and therefore even more in relative terms). But stability or reduction were also features of the amount of assistance paid out. Between 1835 and 1848 (the only period after 1806 about which data are available) the yearly number of new members was less than one. The definitive upsetting of the balance upon which the vitality of the brotherhood had been based was thus started. Most of the brothers were “of advanced age” and “new members were very few”. The “deaths of the brothers, mostly over 70 years old” are “frequent” and the expenses “for the benefits to be paid out to the many infirm survivors” were large, they wrote half way through the century\footnote{By now unable to attract new members, the brotherhood was slowly dying out because of the death of all the brothers.}.}

This image of old and decrepit servants, so far from that of a young servant destined to leave service before marriage which many studies present, brings us back to the issue of the relationship between domestic service and life-cycle. As we know, in fact, in many contexts service appears an activity carried out in one’s youth and linked with learning and to saving of resources in order to start a family. The “institution of service” would represent a fundamental in a family and marriage pattern characterised by late marriage, high incidence of celibacy, neolocality and nuclearity. These hypotheses concerning the role of service have been formulated analysing principally the case of rural servants\footnote{The True Servant}. “Purely domestic servants (often especially numerous in cities) or household heads whose occupation is ‘servant’ are clearly different from north-west European rural servants”, wrote John Hajnal a few years ago (1983, p. 97). According to Hajnal, urban domestic servants were therefore different from North-Western European rural servants who were, to a considerable extent, life-cycle servants.

From the point of view of their age distribution, the boundaries between the various forms of service were not always as clear as this statement leads us to suspect. Obviously Hajnal was writing more than 15 years ago and when fewer data were available compared to today. In any case, in very many studies, domestic service has often been found to be an occupation linked to unmarried status, so often premarital\footnote{As far as Italy in particular is concerned, Marzio Barbagli (1996 (1984)\textsuperscript{1}, pp. 212, 221-222) has argued that between 1550 and 1800 the concentration of male servants in certain age brackets diminished considerably, firstly because of the disappearance of the craftsmen’s custom of keeping live-in apprentices. For women, on the contrary, between 1750 and 1850 service became much more clearly pre-matrimonial.}. As far as Italy in particular is concerned, Marzio Barbagli (1996 (1984)\textsuperscript{1}, pp. 212, 221-222) has argued that between 1550 and 1800 the concentration of male servants in certain age brackets diminished considerably, firstly because of the disappearance of the craftsmen’s custom of keeping live-in apprentices. For women, on the contrary, between 1750 and 1850 service became much more clearly pre-matrimonial.

As a matter of fact, the relationship between age, marital status and domestic service has not always been the same. Many studies have certainly confirmed that in large areas of pre-industrial Europe a high proportion of young people worked as servants (particularly Mitterauer 1990). But marked differences in such proportions have also emerged in both time and space (recently Reher 1998). In particular it has been discovered that there were areas where the institution of service was practically unknown, for example, Southern Italy (Da Molin, 1990). The data related to Italy have shown, on the contrary, that there is no necessary relationship between domestic service, neolocality and nuclearity: in Southern Italy where neolocal marriage and the nuclear family were prevalent, servants were very few; and fairly numerous in the countryside of Central Italy where joint patrivirilocal families were common\footnote{Beyond the geographical differences, in some instances the very fact of going into service, or at least the age at which people left their family home seem to have been dependent on whether they were orphans, or on their parents’ marital status, on their profession, on the position of their brothers and sisters etc (Mayhew 1991). In particular, “the age at leaving home” (Wall 1978. But see also 1987 and 1989) has been found to be generally higher than the first studies had led us to believe (Ariës 1960): servants have, in fact, been found to be prevalent especially in the 15-25 age range. Furthermore, with time the “exchange of children” to which a consolidatory function of vertical links in the social hierarchy has been attributed, seems to have decreased (McCracken 1983) and the servants’ average age appears to have increased (McCracken 1983) and the servants’ average age appears to have increased}.
increased: the child servant has been found to be a medieval figure, fated to survive in marginal areas with particular socio-economic characteristics (Fauve-Chamoux 1997 and 1998). The length of service has also been the object of considerable interest: between the end of the Seventies and the beginning of the Eighties, several studies have in common with each other shown the link between worsening economic conditions, increase in the number of servants and/or lengthening of the premarietal period of time in service. It emerged that in particularly negative economic conditions the proportion of people for whom it was impossible to save up the resources necessary to marry and leave the condition of dependency, could increase. The link between varying economic conditions and the difficulty of leaving service seems thus, in the eyes of many scholars, to be one of the factors allowing a certain balance between population and resources, thanks to variations in nuptiality, to be reached\textsuperscript{4}. The fact that the worsening of the relationship between population and resources could imply the transformation of \textit{life-cycle servants} into \textit{life-time servants} would in fact also emerge from the study of rural servants in Sardinia between the 15th and the 19th century, of areas of Lower Carinthia or Iceland\textsuperscript{5}.

In the context of different research traditions, a decrease in many urban craft environments, in the apprentices’ chances of becoming master, has on the other hand been found: initially considered servants because they were subjected to the authority of their \textit{paterfamilias}, many of them grew old in a condition of dependency which the decision to marry (becoming a new head of family) could not but make more ambiguous (Kaplan 1979; Sewell jr. 1980).

In my opinion, this is an important issue. In fact, if the important studies conducted so far have allowed us to gather considerable data on \textit{life-cycle servants}, and at least in part, on \textit{life-time servants}, who remained unmarried and lived with their master’s family, less attention has been paid, I feel, to married and head of family servants. In particular, it seems to me that the relationship between servants living with their masters and those who had separate housing has been especially ignored. As far as urban domestic staff are concerned, these two types of servant did not in fact belong to two separate and distinct worlds. It has been said, for example, that between 1796 and 1799, in the Bolognese parish of San Giovanni in Monte, young servants were replaced in part by old servants. During the same period, the number of male servants living with their masters fell from 33% to 28% and the percentage of unmarried males fell from 41% to 34% (Sarti 1992, p. 239). From a census carried out in 1796, of which documentation still exists for 9 of the city’s parishes, that were home to around 10% of the population\textsuperscript{6}, it can be seen that shortly before the arrival of the French, in total 28% of servants lived with their masters and 72% lived with their families. Only 10% of married servants, compared with 88% of unmarried ones, lived with their employers. In Bologna, it seems, for males, domestic service (and I do not mean apprenticeship) took the form of a profession which in one’s youth one would tend to carry out while living with a master, and after marriage, with one’s own family. Unlike in the case of women, of whom the vast majority were unmarried and lived under the same roof as their master, in the men’s case residency in the master’s house seemed to be linked with life-cycle and not the profession of servant (tab. 1 and 2). Significantly, 45% of co-resident servants were under 30 while only 23% of servants living separately belonged to this age group. In short, for men, marriage and employment as a servant were not alternatives. If at all, the alternatives were marriage and living with one’s master.

Male domestic service in Bologna: was it “urban” or Mediterranean?, we could wonder paraphrasing the title of an article by Richard Smith (1981b). In other words: is this picture dependent on that fact that we are studying personal and “unproductive” urban domestic staff (those whom Hajnal distinguished from rural servants who provided the basis for hypotheses on the role of \textit{life-cycle service})? Or does it depend on the fact that we find ourselves in an area where the European model of the family characterised by neolocality and nuclearity was presumed not to exist? Given the impossibility of reducing to a single type the family forms that can be found in Italy, I personally am more in favour of the first option. But in actual fact, particularly because at the end of the 18th century there were very few co-resident apprentices, to include them in the analysis would not radically alter the picture, the problem cannot be completely avoided (Arru 1990b), even if here I limit myself to raising it.

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
\hline
\textbf{tab. 1: Distribution of servants according to sex and types of residence} & Bologna, 1796 (percentage values) \\
\textbf{sex} & co-resident with their masters & not co-resident with their masters & tot. % & no. cases \\
\hline
female & 96 & 4 & 100 & 385 \\
male & 28 & 72 & 100 & 314 \\
total & 66 & 34 & 100 & 699 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\begin{flushleft}
Source: ASB, Legato, \textit{Censimento di famiglie distinto per parrocchie (ex notificazione 2 maggio 1796)}. \end{flushleft}
\end{table}
There is little doubt about the fact that the servant to which the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale referred was an independent adult man, for whom the occupation of servant was truly a profession and not a temporary activity. If domestic service in their eyes was really a profession only carried out in one’s youth, what sense would it have made to establish an association that was concerned with helping old and sick servants? With relieving the “miseries of many poor servants, who, having spent their best years in the service of others, no longer able, because of incapacity or misfortune (...) to continue, would wander the streets without any relief”? Once again, if in their eyes, the “true servant” had been a person living with his master, how would it have been possible to decide to provide aid only to sick servants “confined to bed in their own house” or, later, in hospital?

The features of the members are less certain, though, since it is difficult to build up a prosopographical picture from the scant membership lists of the confraternity. Thanks to the possibility of cross referencing, for 1796, the census data cited and the material from the records of the Confraternity of San Vitale, it nevertheless emerged that only about 12% of members did not have a family and lived with their master.

Moreover, the relatively high percentage of those who “inherited” the profession from their father confirms the idea that for a proportion of male Bolognese servants, work as a domestic constituted a genuine profession. Of the domestics who had their family of origin in the city, because they were born there, or because they had migrated there with their parents, in 1796 as much as 43% were sons of domestics. It is likely that this percentage accounted for between 20% and 30%, probably nearer 30%, of the total number of domestics (Sarti 1997a, p. 151).

Unfortunately, before the end of the 18th century, the quantitative sources available do not allow us to understand if and how the relationship between servants living with their masters, and those living in their own house changed. The very establishment of the Confraternity was perhaps linked with the proliferation of servants who did not live with their master, or at least did not live with them permanently: there is no lack of evidence from the late 17th century of servants who rented small rooms where they stayed from time to time, alternating between days spent at the master’s house and days when they slept in their own homes.

Some evidence would seem to indicate that in the confraternity’s first years, the relationship between servants and masters was changing, and in the direction of one becoming more distant from the other. A long tradition forced the “heads of family” to provide as much for the spiritual as for the material well-being of their domestics. Masters would have had to avoid dismissing ill and/or old domestics. They would have had instead to help them when needy or infirm (Sarti 1988, ch. 2 and 1991). The Confraternity of San Vitale therefore took on a duty that, at least until the end of the 18th century, and often well after, was attributed in all the normative literature to the masters. It is difficult to decide whether masters had become less diligent, colleagues more supportive, or whether servants living on their own and who, in the event of illness, could rely on their own family rather than on their master, had become more numerous. But such possibilities are not necessarily alternatives. All the options point, moreover, to greater separation between servants and masters.

The publication in Rome, Milan and, coincidentally, in Bologna as well, of the first texts of moral and religious instruction of servants directly addressing the servants, whose education, until then, had been entirely entrusted to their masters and the clergy also points in this direction (Sarti 1990, 1991 and 1994b). Although overall such texts continued to propose traditional reciprocal values between servants and masters, the transformations identified perhaps weakened, even if only slightly, the bonds that linked the one with the other.

A certain widening of the gap, or better, a certain stiffening of the relationship between masters and servants can, on the other hand, be inferred from the fact that, in 1679, Pope Innocenzo XI had condemned the view according to which domestics could legitimately secretly take goods and money from their master in order to reward their work, if they thought that their salary was too low.

But the decreasing confrontations among the nobility and the weakening image of male servants in large families as a small private army, a process which also involved Bologna at the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century, probably favoured a loosening of the paternalistic bonds between

---

**Tab. 2**: Distribution of servants according to sex and marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>unmarried</th>
<th>married</th>
<th>widow/er</th>
<th>religious tot. % n.cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ASB, Legato, *Censimento di famiglie distinto per parrocchie (ex notificazione 2 maggio 1796).*
servants and masters, to the great advantage of solidarity among domestics, in whatever family they were employed (Sarti 1994a e 1999d).

There is evidence, then, which seems to support the view that traditional bonds between servants and masters were weakening. Bonds of residence, but also reciprocal bonds according to which the master would have had to reward the loyalty and obedience of his servant ensuring him spiritual and material well-being, education, protection. It would be interesting, of course, to view such presumed transformations in the context of the history of the family as well, in particular checking who, in the various contexts, was considered an integral member of the family group (Sarti 1999c, ch. 1). But this aspect would distract us, while we want to deal with domestic staff. In conclusion, therefore, it seems that when the Confraternity of San Vitale was founded servants were becoming slightly less dependent on their masters and a little more cohesive as a group. Maybe serving was increasingly taking on the appearance of a “profession” (Sarti 1999a).

THE IDENTITY OF SERVANTS
AND THE IDENTITY OF THE CITY

If service was becoming a profession, could it be said that it was a working-class profession? Can we in fact say whether, given the choice between service as a phase in life and service as a working-class occupation, the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale would have chosen the second option? We have already seen that the first option was beyond their mental reach. What can be said of the second? There is no doubt that during the Confraternity’s first years the cappeneri regarded themselves very highly. However, from at least 1753 onwards, the whole confraternity endeavoured to distinguish itself from the lower and deprived sections of Bolognese society: as indicated, it is possible that this had to do with a reaction to a genuine worsening of working conditions for staff generally considered to be in service. The fact is that, in terms of the brothers’ representation of themselves, they portrayed themselves as people engaged in a dignified occupation that, in public, was not at all degrading. Was there any basis for this self-portrayal though, or did it merely express an aspiration?

In her discussion of the problem of whether or not domestic servants belonged to the working-classes, Renate Dürr (1995, pp. 24-26) wondered whether, according to the classification criteria for the lower urban social classes, expanded on, in his time, by Etienne François (1982), they could be included in this class. She also emphasised the difficulty of providing an unequivocally positive answer to the question. Dürr recalls that in his criteria François includes living on a salary barely enough for survival and being constantly at risk of sliding into poverty because of illness or an increase in prices; living in poor quality housing on the outskirts of the city and finally, to have moved from a surrounding village and not enjoy the right of citizenship.

Let us try to assess, according to these criteria, the situation of the Bolognese servants. Analysis of accounts books of various city families has shown that servants’ salaries varied considerably. Two examples of this are enough: towards the end of the 18th century the steward of the noble, but not very wealthy, Casali family, earned 23 lire a month, the stable boy 5 lire (Sarti 1997a, p. 152). A few years earlier, Petronio Gabussi, the steward of the Albergati family, and member of the Confraternity of San Vitale reached an agreement with his master that allowed him a salary of 50 lire a month, a Christmas bonus of 40 lire, free fire wood, wheat, grapes, hemp, half a pig a year, sundry presents (hens, eggs, chickens and capons) and “home free of charge for him and his family” in a flat owned by the master. The total value reached the sizeable sum of around 1400 lire. So, on the one hand the only partially financial make-up of payments encourages us to use with extreme caution the salary levels as indicators of the actual living conditions of domestic staff. On the other hand, it seems to me that their extreme variation, in any case, excludes the possibility of classifying all servants as members of the lower classes.

It cannot be denied, however, that in the working-class parishes of the city, there was a large number of servants who were heads of families, while in the central areas servants living in the same residence as their master prevailed, many of whom were women (Sarti 1994a). I must admit though that differentiated data on the residence of different types of domestics are not yet available.

What can be said then about the geographical origin of servants? Unfortunately, once again it is only towards the end of the Ancien Régime that we find any sources that allow us to respond to this question. And the responses are surprising, since the example of Bologna fails to confirm the intrinsic relationship between domestic service and mobility that so many studies have emphasised: based on the data in the 1796 census already mentioned, 66% of the male servants, and 74% of female servants are actually of urban origin (Sarti 1997a p. 149). It is then, perhaps, for this reason that so many servants had a house and family in the city. Still, the most interesting thing perhaps is that so many more of the servants at the top of the servants’ hierarchy compared with those at its base were of urban origin: 79% of braccieri, waiters, stewards, etc., 75% of servants dealing with food and wine, 67% of generic servants, staffieri,
lackeys etc., 46% of servants dealing with horses and carriages (Sarti 1994a). It also became apparent that, in terms of the geographical origin of its components, the servants’ world was multifaceted and certainly could not be exclusively associated with the working classes.

Finally, as for citizenship during this period, it is difficult to say how many servants enjoyed this right. The Bolognese legislation concerning this right confirms the importance of taking residence into account in the analysis of the “servants’ universe”. The regulations in force from 1597 to the end of the Ancien Régime in fact stipulated that, amongst other things, in order to be admitted, the applicant should have “a house registered in his own name” in the city (tener casa aperta: literally “to have an open house”, in practice, that is, that he should have been a head of family) “living in a civilised way” for at least 25 years. The “time spent as an apprentice or as a tenant, or as a friend or a servant” could not be counted in the total years of residence. According to recent studies concerning the granting of citizenship in Bologna it has been found that there were higher-ranking members of domestic staff, for example stewards, who asked, and were allowed to be counted as citizens, but, in order to have a clear picture of the situation, we shall have to wait for the conclusions of these studies.

There are other interesting elements, however, related to the relationship between the Bolognese servants, in particular the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale, and the city. The Confraternity, in fact, were very much in evidence on the city scene. The very way in which its intervention in the area of aid was conceived, provided opportunities for visibility and action. It took upon itself the burden of performing the funerals of its deceased members. Neither the brothers nor we are in any doubt about the public importance of the brothers’ funerals: in 1700, for example, noticing that the association’s expenditure had to be limited, the prior suggested that they should avoid cutting back on the deceased brothers’ funerals because they represented an important function that was “public, and well thought of and honourable for the Confraternity”. The substantial expenditure on burials is not surprising then: during the years of the 18th century about which we are best informed, that is to say from 1755 to 1796, it constituted around 45% of the aid budget and about 30% of the total expenditure, although yearly the deceased were less than 20% of those receiving benefit and between 1.1% and 3.3% of fee paying members. Excluding “equipment” that was only replaced from time to time, a burial cost, on average, 55 lire: a sum equal to 15 years of a brother’s monthly contributions.

In addition to funerals, another occasion of visible public activity on the part of the Confraternity was the celebration of the festival of San Vitale. We must not forget, in fact, that Vitale - martyred in Bologna with his master Agricola, probably during Diocletian’s persecution - was, on the one hand, “specifically” the saint of servants, having himself been a servant during his lifetime; and on the other, an important member of the city’s pantheon. Therefore, celebrating worthy his festival day lent prestige not only to the confraternity that had chosen him as its protector, but also to the entire city that traditionally revered him. The festival of San Vitale was in fact a potent tool to gain credit as a member of the city as a whole and as representatives of a specific group of workers within it. It was probably for this reason that the day of the festival was often also chosen for performing other activities linked with the participation of the confraternity in the devotional life of the city, such as the opening of the boxes of alms collected in order to finance this or that religious practice. It was no accident that it was precisely this very active confraternity in the devotional life of the city, such as the opening of the boxes of alms collected in order to finance this or that religious practice, that is to say from 1755 to 1796, it constituted around 45% of the aid budget and about 30% of the total expenditure, although yearly the deceased were less than 20% of those receiving benefit and between 1.1% and 3.3% of fee paying members. Excluding “equipment” that was only replaced from time to time, a burial cost, on average, 55 lire: a sum equal to 15 years of a brother’s monthly contributions.

From the first meetings, the servants who gathered to found the confraternity presented themselves as the università dei servitori, and had presented the confraternity about to be founded as the gathering of the totality of servants. The very day that they had obtained from the vicar his promise that, provided they satisfied certain conditions, they would be allowed to form a confraternity, they actually decided to display “printed edicts inviting all servants to pay five soldi per month” to the confraternity, almost as though it were a true guild. However, the attempt to make all servants join the confraternity had failed: even during the 1780’s when the confraternity was at the height of its expansion, only a fifth or a sixth of male Bolognese servants were a part of it.

Nevertheless, the two definitions of the Confraternity of San Vitale and the Università dei servitori very soon became largely interchangeable, as though the confraternity really were the embodiment or the representative body of all the city’s servants. In fact, it cannot be denied that in certain sense this was the case, and that it was principally thanks to its great activity on the city’s public scene. It was, in fact, the members of the confraternity who encouraged all the Bolognese servants to contribute donations towards the city’s various devotional activities, who had notices and announcements concerning their collection printed, provided collectors and collection boxes, were in charge of the funds collected and at times managed their investment and took care of the maintenance of objects acquired. It was on these occasions that the officers from the Confraternity of San Vitale “so-called Università dei Servitori” addressed, in a game of reciprocal identification, all the city servants, that is, the “università dei servitori” (e.g. the totality of Bolognese servants), as was written on the notices. In this role, the confraternity organised many activities: first of all the collection of donations for the construction of the porch and the
church of San Luca on a hill just outside the city, home of ancient and deeply-rooted rituals (Fanti, Roveri (eds.), 1993). Even nowadays every Bolognese citizen, entirely regardless of his/her religious beliefs, approaching Bologna from the North, begins to feel at home when he/she sees the unmistakable outline of the church and its dome in particular, against the horizon. The construction of the dome, completed in 1742, was entirely financed with the donations collected by the Università dei Servitori from all the Bolognese servants (Matteucci 1993, p. 155; Sarti 1999a, p. 747).

**TRANSFORMATIONS OF SERVICE AND DECLINE OF THE CONFRATERNITY**

This capacity on the part of the confraternity to stand as representative of all Bolognese servants reinforces, in my opinion, the definition of “true servant” it was proposing: in the context of the city, in fact, such a definition was coming from an authoritative group, largely recognised as an expression of the totality of domestics.

During the 19th century, however, this capacity was lost, taking to its extremes a tendency that had probably already started at the end of the 18th century: ever since 1785, for example, it had been decided that the donations collected annually and distributed to a group of poor servants before Christmas, would in future be given exclusively to members. The confraternity’s tendency to close in on itself emerges also from the outcome of what seems to have been one of its last public appearances (but the 19th century sources are very incomplete). Ironically it concerned the contributions to the expenditure towards the cost of the constructions of the cemetery porch: when publishing the names of those who had taken part, it complained that many had not given the sum initially promised. Regretfully, they were forced to finance not six porches, as expected, but only two. With all likelihood, only members of the confraternity had contributed to the undertaking, and in limited numbers as well.

In the same year when they were making these bitter remarks (1822), the brothers had had the text of the newly reformed statutes printed. Chapter 1 stated that the confraternity only accepted “in its class only true and proper servants”. It went on to say: “By servants are meant: all those who by profession live in someone else’s service as domestics, or almost domestics in houses and civilian positions, with receipt of a salary; that is, stewards, book-keepers, secretaries, cappene, staffieri, coachmen, cooks, butlers, and sedan-chair carriers as long as the latter serve a single master. Then porters, scullery-boys, stable-hands, craftsmen, workers, those who practise mechanical crafts, shop assistants and the like who carry out vile and abject tasks are excluded, because they do not fall into the category of Servants as it is understood by this Confraternity”. On the one hand, then, the brothers continued to present themselves as depositaries of the capacity to determine who the true servants were; on the other hand, however, they seemed aware of the existence of other ways of understanding the definition. The same formulation, with a slight variation, would be reproposed in the reformed statutes of 1855. But compared to the 18th century, many things had now changed and their definition of the “true servant” seemed increasingly obsolete.

**Bracciieri**, sedan-chair carriers, **staffieri**, were in fact disappearing almost completely, while stewards and clerks, secretaries and bookkeepers were increasingly being considered private clerks, rather than servants. The chronology of the transformation affecting domestic staff was often different for each type of servant. With regard to these transformations, the Jacobin and Napoleonic times had nevertheless been important.

On the one hand, in fact the arrival of the French, in 1796, had allowed the attacks on the lifestyle of the nobility, based on luxury and waste, which had been brewing for sometime, to take on a practical and more emphatic form. As far as servants are concerned, as already stated, the use of liveries had been forbidden and a sumptuary tax on male domestics younger than 50 had been introduced (Sarti 1992, p. 238). The arrival of the French had also created an effervescent atmosphere, characterised, among other things, by severe condemnation of the use of sedan chairs in the name of liberty and equality. Transformations that not even the Restoration would stop, were thus started or speeded up: as mentioned, at the beginning of the 19th century **staffieri**, sedan-chair carriers and lackeys would largely disappear.

On the other hand, extolling liberty and independence, had meant stigmatising the condition of servants more than in the past. In France, electoral laws and all constitutions (with exception of the 1793 one, never implemented) had excluded servants from franchise. Since the terms domestique and serviteur were rather vague, it had been necessary to make their meaning more precise. In August 1790, it had been decided that “clerks or administrators, secretaries, carters or farm managers employed by owners, tenants or share croppers (…), librarians, tutors, craftsmen who have completed their apprenticeship, shop assistants and book-keepers” should not be considered as such. And a later measure (21st August 1792) had further reduced the number of people who could be classed as domestics, excluding from them farm workers, wage-earners and odd-job men.
In the Italian “Jacobin” republics as well domestics would be denied franchise: the only constitution which did not exclude them was the Bolognese one of 1796, never implemented (who knows if this was also due to the policy of prestige pursued by the Università dei Servitori...). I am not aware that in Italy clarifications had been made on how the term “domestic” should be understood. There were, however, measures in other areas that gave indications in this sense: “tutors, secretaries, accountants, shop or warehouse assistants, farm managers, agents and farm hands are not to be included in the term domestics” it was explained in 1798, when the tax on domestics was introduced.

The lists compiled at the end of the 18th century in France and Italy to make the boundaries of the definition of “domestic staff” more precise excluded then many of the people who, according to the members of the Confraternity of San Vitale, were true servants. They included instead many workers who carried out abject tasks, not allowed in the Bolognese confraternity. The brothers, in an attempt to pursue a policy of prestige, identified servants primarily with the members of the highest order of domestic staff; the French and Italian legislators, who had a tendency to stigmatise the condition of service, identified them with the lowest order. The latter interpretation would win: during the 19th century secretaries, bookkeepers, agents, administrators etc., would leave the ranks of domestic staff for good, becoming clerks and professionals.

The exit from the ranks of domestic staff of the wealthiest and most respected figures ultimately allowed the concept of servant to be reduced to those who had once been the lowest layers of the varied world of servants, thus contributing to what has been defined a process of degradation of domestic staff (Ariès 1980). The members of the Università dei Servitori had tried to make domestic service an honourable profession, but “History” was moving in a different direction.

The problem was not, in any case, only linked to the disappearance of “display servants” and to the exit from domestic staff of a considerable number of those who could once have been described as cappeneria. It was undoubtedly linked to other on-going transformations.

If the turbulent events that followed the arrival of the French in Bologna had caused a sudden and unexpected change of male servants (not of female), during the Restoration a return of male servants to living with their masters took place. In some cases living-in servants turned out to be more numerous than in the last few years of the 18th century. This was probably partly due to the partial return to the traditional ways of employing domestic staff but probably a more important role was played on the one hand by the crisis affecting the main industries of the city, which could make the prospect of finding a position that would allow them not to pay rent more attractive to people looking for a job; and on the other hand, the increase among domestics in immigrants from the country, presumably often without a home in the city.

Joining a confraternity which gave assistance above all to ill servants in their own home could then appear relatively unappealing in their eyes.

But the transformation which perhaps more than others made the type of servant represented and proposed by the members of the confraternity outdated was probably another one. As mentioned, the Confraternity of San Vitale was a male confraternity. When they had to represent all servants, in particular during the collection of donations, the brothers were well aware of the fact that among domestic staff there were both men and women: the notices for the collections were always addressed to “servants of both sexes”. However, women were (tacitly) excluded from the possibility of joining the confraternity: in the Statutes the only mention of female servants referred (once again) to a contribution, expected in 1719 to build a hospital. The initiative, never fulfilled, should have been financed by the yearly donation of 10 soldi by all Bolognese servants, men and women.

Female Bolognese servants did not then enjoy the various forms of assistance offered by the confraternity, with the exception of the distribution of donations to needy servants which took place before Christmas, however introduced only in 1763 and ever since 1785 limited, as mentioned, only to members. Female servants, unlike male ones, almost always lived with their masters, and were probably better part of the system of reciprocal obligations between masters and servants. But this does not mean that some female servants were not dismissed because they were old and/or sick. So female servants could recognise themselves (and be recognised) as being part of the “università dei servitori” (totality of servants) only thanks to their donations and their participation in devotional activities. On the whole, then, their position was rather ambiguous: they were part of the Università dei Servitori when with this expression one referred to all the Bolognese servants; they were not part of it when with it one referred to the Confraternity of San Vitale. In the 19th century female contribution to the activities of the Confraternity became perhaps more marginal. On the one hand the Confraternity reduced, as far as we can judge, the interventions in the religious life of the city which in the past had made it possible to involve women; on the other hand even the few interventions made apparently only involved the brothers: no women appeared in the list of the contributors to the building of the cemetery porch (Presidente 1822).

Maybe, however, it would be more correct to turn the terms of the statement around and to say that the activity of the Confraternity was becoming ever more marginal compared with that of women whose presence in the body of servants (in the majority even in the 17th-18th century) was in fact increasing,
although not linearly: towards the end of the 19th century women would make up about 80% domestic staff (Sarti 1997b). The increasing number of women among servants and the brothers’ stubborn indifference towards them probably contributed to make the confraternity less and less representative of the totality of servants. The refusal to admit women can then be considered one of the causes of its decline. Because of this refusal as well, the confraternity was proposing an ever more outdated model of the servant: a male servant, clearly of city origin, mainly of civilian status, not involved in filthy or abject tasks. But domestic service was increasingly a humble job carried out by women of peasant origin who had immigrated to the city (Sarti 1997a). The ambitious project of the Confraternity of San Vitale was defeated. And defeated to the extent that it seems inconceivable today that anyone could even think that true servants were workers with a certain prestige, carrying out “civilised tasks” and who, thanks to their reciprocal help, were able to count, in the event of illness and in old age, on resources other than those offered by the master’s family.

(translated by C. Boscolo, University of Birmingham)
NOTES

Abbreviations: AAB = Archivio Generale Arcivescovile di Bologna; ASB = Archivio di Stato di Bologna; BA = Bilanci annuali; BCAB = Biblioteca Comunale dell’Archiginnasio di Bologna; BUB = Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna; LC = Libri delle congregazioni; MLC = Memoriali, lettere e documenti; QC = Quaderni di cassa per le riscossioni; SR = Statuti e regolamenti; SS = Strumenti e scritture; US = Archivio Generale Arcivescovile di Bologna, Fondo dell’Università dei Servitori.

Statutes of the Confraternity of San Vitale:
Riforma statuti 1784 = US, cart. 1, SR (1696-1821), n. 4, Riforma per la terza volta de’ Capitoli, e Statuti della Congregazione di San Vitale detta l’Università de’ Servitori in Bologna fatta l’Anno 1784.

1. During the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth, a number of historical and/or sociological studies of the phenomenon were brought about in several European countries and in the USA. For a chronology and a review of those studies, see Sarti 1997c.
4. See also Schlumbohm 1997.
5. See e.g. Roche 1981; Sarti 1992, 1994a, 1997a.
6. In the following pages, I will partly draw, from a different point of view, upon some data that have been analysed in Sarti 1999a.
7. Statuti 1697-98a, cc. 5v-6r.
9. For the use of the term famiglia to designate the array of the servants, see Sarti 1999c, ch. 1.
10. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 1, 4/6/1697; ibid., cart. 1, SR (1696-1821), fasc. 1, untitled statutes, ch. 8.
11. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 1, 4/6/1697.
12. US, cart. 4, SS (1697-1758), Libro A, N. 1, Campione, Memoriale presentato per parte de’ servitori di Bologna al Signor Cardinale Arcivescovo per potere erigere una congregazione, 2/7/1697, cc. 1v-2r; ibid., cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 2, 4-17/7/1697, cc. 1r-7v.
13. In ancient Italian the term università, derived from the Latin term universitas, meant “totality of people belonging to a certain group”, “class of persons regarded collectively”, “corporate body”.
14. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 2, 17/7/1697, c. 5v.
15. Statuti 1687-98b, c. 3v.
16. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 2, 17/7/1697, cc. 6r-v.
17. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 2, 17/7/1697, c. 6v. From the available data, such an estimate of the total number of servants seems to be correct.
18. The “congregazione delle cappenero” had taken the title of “San Floriano”. On the fusion of the two confraternities, see US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 1; cc. 4, 23v ff.; vol. 4, 6/1-15/3/1703; cart. 4, SS (1697-1758), Libro A, N. 1, Campione, Memoriale... in occasione dell’Unione... de’ servitori di S. Floriano, cc. 27r-28v.
27. Riforma statuti 1719, p. 5; Statuti 1697-98b, cc. 20r and 26r.
28. US, cart. 4, SS (1697-1758), Libro N. 1, Campione, Memoriale presentato... al Signor Cardinale Arcivescovo, 2/7/1697, c. 1v.
30. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 5, 11/7, 30/9, 3/11/1752; ibid., vol. 6, 11/7, 13/9 and 3/12/1752. Together with the revocation of Serantoni’s membership, the request for admission by the confraternity’s bidello (factotum) was rejected too.
31. Riforma statuti 1719, p. 4.
32. Riforma statuti 1753, pp. 6 and 13-14.
35. US, cart. 1, SR (1696-1821), fasc. 1, n. 2, Statuti, Capitoli e Constitutioni, ch. 13, no. 21 (c. 1r). The definition of “pages” was crossed out as well.
36. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 7, 20/2/1763. See also Riforma statuti 1784, cc. 4, 13.
37. US, cart. 4, SS (1697-1758), Riforma statuti 1784, cc. 19-22; Statuti 1821-22, pp. 10-11; US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 5, 11/1 and 6/2/1734; Riforma statuti 1753, p. 21; Riforma statuti 1784, c. 24; US, cart. 3, LC (1767-1848), vol. 3, 7/1/1800, 4/11/1801; Statuti 1821-22, p. 9. The 1855 Statuti did not allow for the “disabled”.
38. US, Campione.
42. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 5, 11/1760; Statuti 1821-22, p. 9. The 1855 Statuti did not allow for the “disabled”.
43. US, Cart. 3, LC (1767-1848), vol. 1, 3/4 and 8/5/1778, cc. 197, 200.
45. US, cart. 1, SR (1696-1821), fasc. 1, n. 2, Statuti, Capitoli e Constitutioni, ch. 13, no. 21 (c. 1r). The definition of “pages” was crossed out as well.
46. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 7, 20/2/1763. See also Riforma statuti 1784, cc. 4, 13.
47. US, cart. 4, SS (1697-1758), Riforma statuti 1784, cc. 19-22; Statuti 1821-22, pp. 10-11; US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 5, 11/1 and 6/2/1734; Riforma statuti 1753, p. 21; Riforma statuti 1784, c. 24; US, cart. 3, LC (1767-1848), vol. 3, 7/1/1800, 4/11/1801; Statuti 1821-22, p. 9. The 1855 Statuti did not allow for the “disabled”.
48. When providing quantitative data referring to one or more Bologna parishes, among servants are counted all domestic servants (including sedan-chair carriers, secellery-boys, stable boys, and porters, if it is clear they were employed under one master), under exclusion of people serving in institutions such as monasteries and colleges (who, by contrast, were admitted in the Confraternity of San Vitale), and apprentices.
49. Riforma statuti 1719, p. 7.
50. US, cart. 2, LC (1697-1767), vol. 5, 3/11/1753; Riforma statuti 1753, pp. 14-17 and p. 20; Riforma statuti 1784, cc. 14-18; Statuti 1821-22, pp. 7-9; Statuti 1855-56, pp. 7-8 and p. 20. Unemployed members had to pay half a soldo per month.
54. Laslett 1977a, 1977b; Wrigley, Schofield 1981; Smith 1981a; Kussmaul 1981, Hajnal 1983. In a context very different from the English one, i.e. Renaissance Florence, Klapisch-Zuber (1981) has noted an increasing difficulty to “exit” domestic service as economic conditions got worse.
56. ASB, Legato, Censimento di famiglie distinto per parrocchie (ex notificazione 2 maggio 1796).
57. Riforma statuti 1719, p. 3.
60. ASB, Famiglia Albergati, Miscellanea, fasc. 108, n. 5, Affare con Petronio Gabussi già Agente della Casa Albergati Capaccelli in proposito dell’Obbligazione fattagl dal Mse Albergati col quale si convenne, cc. n.n.
61. On this point see the extensive account in Arru 1995.
62. There is a vaste literature on the point; see e.g. Zeller 1992; Sogner 1993, 1994; Fauve-Chamoux 1997, 1998; Lundh 1999.
64. For this information I am grateful to E. Casanova, who, together with G. Angelozzi, has been systematically reviewing all requests and grantings of citizenship.
66. US, cart. 15, BA (1755-1883), 1755, 1760, 1765, 1770, 1775, 1780, 1785, 1790, 1795.
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