Journal of Social History, 2025, **00**, 1–21
https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shaf037
Article

OXFORD

Connections and Community in Sixteenth-Century Verona

Zoe Farrell*

*Address correspondence to Zoe Farrell, Leverhulme Early Career Fellow, University of Oxford, 41-47 George St, Oxford, OX1 2BE, United Kingdom. Email: zoe.farrell@history.ox.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the multiplicity of connections that were made between individuals from different trades and across the social hierarchy in sixteenth-century Verona. In the sixteenth century, Verona was a constituent part of the Venetian Empire with a large, diverse population. Each of the different neighborhoods of the city contained a heterogeneous mix of individuals, from the indigent poor to artisans, professionals, and the traditional elite, often living side by side. Through an exploration of three separate case studies from the courts of Verona, this article explores some of the ways in which these individuals socialized: at a card game, a dance, and a lottery. It is argued that connections were often made in spaces that transcended the public and private spheres, with domestic and workshop spaces being used to gather people from across the community. Despite concern from the authorities about the dangers of illicit gatherings, evidence within these cases suggests that there was an appetite among artisans of Verona to hold social occasions to earn extra income and to make new connections. Communities and culture were built among these wide and varied networks, and to understand more about everyday life and social ties in Renaissance Italy, it is important to look beyond traditional socio-economic and cultural boundaries.

On March 21, 1579, two men were accosted in their homes and arrested by the offices of the *Podesta* in Verona for having hosted illegal gambling events and causing a scandal.[1] One of these two, a man named Lelio in his thirties, pleaded his innocence, noting that he repaired hats and sold wood for a living. Although defending his virtue, he did admit that he used his home as a space where people could come to play card games which were popular at the time, such as *Trappola* and *Primera*, entertaining themselves and socializing among a wide company of individuals. This caused alarm for the authorities, keen to stamp out such informal mixing in otherwise seemingly private spaces across the city. Yet clearly this was

not an isolated case, with homes and workshops being used by those of various means, from artisans to merchants, and nobility at times transforming their spaces to host events attended by a wide variety of individuals, either by invitation or through an open door. Such events generated hybrid public-private spaces where ad hoc social interactions took place, and connections, sometimes lasting and sometimes fleeting, were made. This article will examine three case studies from the judicial records of sixteenth-century Verona, exploring card games, dances, and a lottery, and investigating what these cases can tell us about the different forms of sociability in which those lower down the social scale engaged and the ways in which liminal spaces facilitated social interaction.

In the early modern city, sociability took on many forms. From formal occasions in elite parlors to informal mixing in workshops and taverns, public and private spaces converged and were used as gathering spots for people from across the social scale to meet, drink, dance, talk, and sing. Yet, by their very nature, these occasions were often ephemeral, lost to the historical record and frequently noted only in courtly literature and humanist polemics. To understand the ways in which individuals of early modern society socialized, then, historians have turned to the princely courts and the occasions that took place among the wealthiest and best connected in society. However, this undermines the very diversity and multiplicity of daily interaction that frequently transcended social and professional boundaries in complex and shifting ways. Within the historical record, it is possible to find evidence of these connections, which were often deemed illicit, but which highlight important points about social connectivity in early modern cities.

The study of social interaction of this type crosses disciplinary boundaries. As Ronald Weissman argues in his study of Renaissance society, "Three areas of sociological inquiry have dominated the field: studies of corporate groups, of individualism, and of class."[2] However, more recently, there has been a reassessment of the nature of connections in the early modern urban environment. Most early modern people lived in diverse communities where they would interact daily with a wide variety of individuals. This created a range of connections which, as Dennis Romano argues, were not arbitrary but instead, built upon factors such as work, values, and physical proximity.[3] To study connections made in early modern communities, it is therefore important to consider the aspects which transcended traditional class, economic, and cultural boundaries.[4]

In particular, there has been an increasing amount of research that has delved into the arena of less formal social interaction. Filippo de Vivo, for example, has shown how barbershops could become forums for the exchange of political information, both oral and written, creating tensions and disagreements.[5] Moreover, recent research into spaces like taverns and inns has widened the scope of understanding when it comes to the diversity of early modern sociability in all its forms and the "dynamism of early modern urban life."[6] For example, Rosa Salzberg's work has highlighted the importance of Venetian *osterie* for a range of exchanges, which also led to points of conflict as travelers, migrants, and local residents intersected in these enclosed, yet unstable, spaces.[7] Work on the importance of taverns has also shown that they were not only central points for everyday social interaction but also played an important role in the forming of group identity and as an "agent of community."[8] As Rosenthal has argued, it was within the "public-private" space of the tavern that "social boundaries became more porous."[9] However, as Rosenthal points out, still too little is known about "either the extent or the nature of everyday social interactions between urban strata in Italian cities."[10] This article will seek to add new evidence to this growing historiography by exploring other spaces where the public-private divide was crossed—namely the home and the workshop.

In recent years the positions of artisans and small-time shopkeepers in early modern cities has also been revisited.[11] For example, Paula Hohti Erichsen has shown how artisans in sixteenth-century Siena could use "conspicuous consumption" to better their position in society and engage in the market in innovative ways.[12] Rather than speaking only of emulation and competition, Hohti Erichsen encourages us to consider "how similar or different cultural experiences were at various levels," as early modern artisans operated within varied social networks and were not defined by their trade.[13] Moreover, as Judde de Larivière and Salzberg have argued, "condition depended on context."[14] An artisan was not merely an artisan, but was also a man or a woman, a master or an apprentice, within their workshop, a tavern, church or other arena, and it was within these contexts that different identities and positions were negotiated.[15] This may particularly have been the case where people of different social standing interacted, as their identities were formed both with and against one another.

As was the case in many early modern cities, the different neighborhoods of Verona were socially heterogeneous, with nobles, professionals such as doctors and lawyers, and artisans of different trades often living side by side in neighborhoods of the city.[16] Although the wealthiest gravitated toward the heart of the city, and certain trades were confined to specific areas due to infrastructural needs, on the whole, most neighborhoods contained a mix of indigent poor, working people, and elite.[17] Such an environment could create the ideal opportunity for multiple and overlapping networks among people in seemingly diverse categories. These networks could cut across social ties, creating both tension and community. How people socialized within porous spaces where the public and the private converged within these neighborhoods and how different groups connected will be the focus of this article.

Informative within this context are Robert Putnam's ideas of "thin" and "thick" trust, which, as Nevola and Rosenthal have argued, have been particularly influential for Italianists seeking to understand more about social connectivity in the early modern period.[18] Within this model, "thin trust," which was built on "weak loyalties or connections based on values, beliefs, and institutions shared by 'strangers,'" contrasted with "thick trust," which was based on factors such as "kin, faction, [and] patronage."[19] Both types of relationships might be observed in the trial records under analysis, with the testimonies of those interrogated giving some indication of the possible levels of relationships that were fostered. However, particularly interesting are the ties of "thin trust" formed in these hybrid public-private spaces, transformed for social entertainment. This article will investigate the connections made and what they can tell us about the different forms of sociability available to those lower down the social scale in the urban environment. In particular, the malleability of private space will be highlighted as key to our understanding of the diversity of urban networks.

Evidence of what were often ephemeral connections between actors across early modern societies is limited in historical documentation. However, trial records provide unique insights into everyday social interaction in eyewitness accounts and oral testimonies. The three case studies used for this investigation originate in court cases from the *Atti dei Rettori Veneti a Verona*, which is a large set of documents concerning the judicial offices of the city and the activities of the chancelleries of the Venetian rector, especially the *Cancelleria Pretoria*. Within the *Atti dei Rettori*, there are many different types of documents. As well as trials, it is possible to find post-mortem inventories, dowries, and wills. While some of these documents were compiled by a public notary, others were produced by a third party in the presence of witnesses and then sealed by the court to acquire legitimacy.[20] Many of these

documents are badly damaged, are often incomplete, and rarely contain folio numbers, partly because of two large fires in 1541 and 1581, during which the archive suffered serious damage and loss.[21] Nonetheless, information within the extant documentation can provide rich insight into daily life in sixteenth-century society. Of particular note are the judicial records relating to illicit activities taking place within the homes and workshops of Verona. The cases recount a wide range of issues, from incidents of fraud and theft to slander and vagabondage. These documents contain testimony from witnesses who were called to present their stories related to the alleged crime. It is within these testimonies that we can identify different forms of connections in the communities of sixteenth-century Verona.

Although some have argued that testimonies in civil and criminal trials are "tissues of counter-truths," this article will build on the work of Natalie Zemon Davis and others, who have sought to use such testimonies to illuminate aspects of customs, violence, and social and cultural norms of early modern Europe.[22] Trial records necessarily reported information related to events or actions that were illicit and often involved conflict, and thus do not necessarily represent the broad spectrum of connections in early modern society. However, the oral testimony of the individuals interrogated for trials provides rich material for those studying social interaction. In particular, these trials brought in witnesses from different backgrounds and who were by no means limited to wealthier members of society, thus allowing us to "reconstruct the networking strategies of diverse groups."[23] Elizabeth and Thomas Cohen, for example, note that, because court records often provide information that is not extant in other sources and because of the insight into the thoughts, feelings, and actions of a wide range of individuals (albeit often mediated through a notary), they are "the best route into the vernacular culture of sixteenth-century Italy."[24] Moreover, as Edoardo Grendi famously proposes, when exploring individual case studies, aspects that might be seen as extraordinary can instead be seen as "normal exceptions."[25] The case studies under analysis have been chosen because they reflect seemingly normal, though illicit, activities taking place behind the doors of Verona's homes and workshops for the purposes of entertainment, at which a range of people gathered and which were facilitated by members of the artisan population. Although most of these interactions were between men, the second case analyzed touches upon the role of women at these events, demonstrating the often-unrecorded role of women in liminal public-private spaces. Utilizing these three case studies, this article provides evidence of activities that brought individuals of different crafts and statuses together, while also illuminating ways that individuals could use their domestic and workshop spaces for social events to earn extra cash, contributing to their "occupational diversity."[26]

Verona is a useful point of study for an analysis of this type, as it broadens our understanding of early modern sociability beyond the major commercial and political centers of Italy.[27] In the sixteenth century, Verona was a large gateway city at an important transitory location between northern Italy and southern Germany. As part of the Venetian Empire, Verona was subject to the rules and regulations of the *Seremissima*; yet, due in part to its long-standing trade links with cities north of the Alps, Verona was able to maintain a form of independence and identity that set it apart from Venice. In the early sixteenth century, after years of rapid increase, Verona's population almost matched that of Florence.[28] Between the mid-fifteenth and the mid-sixteenth centuries, the population of Verona more than doubled, from around 21,000 to around 46,000.[29] This rapid population growth was driven in part by a wave of immigration from other towns and cities within the Venetian Republic and Lombardy. Many immigrants were artisans, drawn in by the opportunities presented by expanding urban industries such as silk manufacturing.[30] As more people entered the city

and made a home for themselves, traditional hierarchies were re-examined and challenged. Rapid population growth occurred at the same time as the boundaries between the traditional nobility and the urban elite were shifting, as the former tried to assert their influence in the city council, in the face of the rising wealth of those previously excluded from power.[31] However, although the working population was barred from political office, there were many ways in which individuals could create status and improve their position in society, particularly through public acts of prestige.[32]

By examining three significant case studies that highlight different forms of social activity within the city and the connections made at these events, it will be argued that in organizing informal social occasions involving dancing, gambling, and lotteries alongside their more legitimate trades, artisans created "fertile spaces" between the public and private in which connections flourished.[33] This analysis will provide useful insight into the forms of sociability that were available to those lower down the social hierarchy. Although urban authorities sought to curb events in these spaces, the evidence presented within this article suggests that such efforts were somewhat unsuccessful, and utilizing domestic and workshop space for entertainment was seen as a legitimate way to earn extra money and to become involved with different members of the community. Thus, a meaningful study of early modern society and culture should look to expand its boundaries beyond distinct societal groupings. Both culture and community were made among these connections.

CARD GAMES

The house was a key setting of sociability in the Renaissance, and hosts were expected to entertain their guests with dinners, dancing, and games.[34] Although less is known about the forms of sociability in which those lower down the social scale engaged, court cases can provide us with some insight into the activities that took place within the more modest domestic setting. Card games were a particularly popular form of sociability, which were originally the preserve of the elite. However, throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, these types of games became increasingly popular with men and women across the social scale, played in palaces, taverns, and homes. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim notes the sharp increase in objects associated with such sociability in elite households.[35] While "parlour games" have often been studied as part of elite social activity, evidence of material culture suggests that many within the popular classes also could host large numbers of individuals in their homes.[36] Recent research has, for example, shown the capability of individuals within the artisan class to own a large number of chairs and tables, as well as other items associated with sociability, suggesting that people of different social rank were using the home to host events.[37] Events within the domestic setting could then be used by a variety of individuals to support "horizontal ties of friendship" and "nurture ... vertical relationships within the community."[38] Cases such as those currently under discussion can provide further insight into such domestic sociability and complicate divisions between private and public spaces.[39]

As card games grew in popularity, so did anxiety about their use.[40] Humanists like Sperone Speroni deliberated about the morality of partaking in what was seen by many as a frivolous activity, with Speroni calling card games a "diabolical invention."[41] What made card games more contentious among those who denounced them was the frequent association of cards with gambling and drinking.[42] As authorities sought to control socialization in taverns and *osterie*, they were also concerned with similar activities occurring within private homes. Drinking and gambling were associated with immorality and were thought to lead to

tension and violence. However, many, such as Pietro Aretino in "Le Carte Parlanti," defended the utility of card games.[43] George W. McClure writes that Aretino used this dialogue to demonstrate that card games could "be a mirror of character, a test of skill, and an arena for fame."[44] The case under examination attests to the popularity of cards in Verona, the controversy surrounding the playing of games in seemingly private settings, and attempts to control such activities.

As noted at the start of the article, on March 21, 1579, two men were detained by the Rectors for causing a scandal.[45] Both men were held after being accused of hosting illegal gambling houses in their residences. Within these otherwise private settings, men from the community would come together and play games, sometimes consuming food and drink, and enjoying music being played on instruments like the harpsichord. The first to be interrogated in this case was a man named Lelio who was, by his account, an artisan who repaired hats and sold wood, living in the neighborhood of S. Silvestro.[46] Lelio's two trades indicate a wider trend among artisans in this period toward pluractivity.[47] Having multiple trades allowed an artisan, particularly those in less skilled crafts, to earn precious extra income, while also widening their social networks by increasing the number of individuals they had the opportunity to meet.[48] Yet notably, despite having two trades, neither of which was particularly lucrative or prestigious, the description of Lelio's physical appearance and clothing suggests that he was able to own several items of dress which might have conferred some status. For example, he was wearing an azure riding cloak with a velvet collar, breeches, and woolen stockings.[49] Such an outfit may have allowed Lelio to present a respectable image among a wide group of peers at social occasions, particularly as he was hosting at his own house. However, despite wearing a colorful cape with a velvet collar, Lelio complained to the interrogator that he was poor. Although noting that he was "an honorable man and a citizen of this city," he also lamented that he was poor and "trying to earn a living honestly for myself and for my poor daughters and wife."[50] The true nature of Lelio's financial situation is unclear, and it is entirely possible that he was using this rhetoric to appeal for the clemency of the interrogators. However, it is also possible that he was utilizing his domestic space to earn extra income to sustain his family. When directly asked by the interrogator about financial incentives, he denied that he regularly received income from the gambling house and did not compel anyone to pay. He instead stated that he only received financial contributions from the "men of honor" attending when they deemed it necessary as gentlemen, with those who won giving him "whatever they pleased"; some did and some did not, he noted.[51] He also made a point in his testimony that he was not the only artisan in his neighborhood who held card games of this sort in their house. He recalled that for three years some unnamed spinners had also used a room on the ground floor of their home for playing card games. Although it is difficult to reach certain conclusions about Lelio's motivations for holding a gambling house within his private dwelling, there are hints that it could have served as an arena for money-making and entrepreneurship for this artisan, who may otherwise have been of low status.

As well as providing information on the accused, testimony within this document reveals the contacts made in this setting. Lelio's testimony discloses the different types of people who were in his house at the time of his arrest, for example. Among those in his house, there were artisans from a variety of different trades, including a man named Gentile, who was a dyer of silk; Virgilie, who was a shoemaker and also from S. Silvestro; Venturin, who was known only as a man from Urbino; and Giacomo from S. Zenone in Oratorio, as well as others.[52] Moreover, although not there at the time of arrest, Lelio detailed who came to play

at his house, including a carver named Simone, a color dyer named Benedetto, and Domenico, a cloth presser (*mangano*). When asked who else came to his house to play, Lelio responded with a variety of names, including some whom he designated as *Illustrious Signore* or simply *Signore* and who had surnames and no trade listed, potentially indicating higher status, including Bartholomeo Rizzo, the Pradeni brothers, Giovanni Ambrosio, Carlo Seche, and Raimondo Moretto. Lelio labeled several of these men as "*mio compadre*," potentially suggesting that he was trying to claim a level of familiarity and friendship with some of these individuals.[53] Associating with those of potentially higher rank may have been Lelio's method of aggrandizing his status in the eyes of the interrogator. Yet, like in Romano's study of Venice, in sixteenth-century Verona, social circles, however fleeting, seem to have "encompassed men from various trades" as well as those outside of the artisanal sphere.[54] Although there is not sufficient evidence to prove friendship among these individuals, it does show that events like this could create forms of social connections among people of different crafts and even social statuses.

During his interrogation, Lelio was asked several times about the type of people that were gathered in his home. For example, when asked if ordinary people from the neighborhood came to his house to play games, Lelio responded that he did not hold games for the general public but rather, only catered to "gentlemen." Therefore, although Lelio identified himself as a small-time artisan and trader by profession, he made clear that only those of a certain degree of respectability were welcome at his card games by repeatedly stating that only *gentil homo* were present, whether artisan or otherwise. He went on to state that no one came to his house whom he did not know could afford to gamble.[55] The interrogator, clearly suspicious that Lelio should know all of those present at the gathering so well, asked how he knew "so minutely every way and condition of everyone who comes here?," to which he replied that he knew the people of this city.[56] Indeed, throughout his testimony, he continued to insist that the men who attended his games were men of honor and citizens (*cittadini*) of the city. [57] As James Farr has argued, artisans, and particularly those who were members of guilds, shared a "single code of honor, that mediated their relations."[58] Appeal to such a code of honor is evident throughout the testimonies of these men, as nouns related to honor are repeated frequently. This can be interpreted in several different ways. Firstly, such an appeal to the honor of himself and his guests can be seen as part of Lelio's attempts to signal his trustworthiness and good character to the interrogators, in a society which placed such high value on reputation. On the other hand, it can also be seen as an indication of the importance of reputation in places where gambling was taking place, as money and possibly credit were exchanged frequently. However, as Elizabeth and Thomas Cohen argue, "honor is reputation contested in the public sphere," and the fact that it is a term that was called upon throughout the testimonies of Lelio and others speaks to its importance in such a social setting where the public converged with the private.[59]

These documents not only reveal the types of individuals who gathered for entertainment, potentially forming transient economic and social relationships, but also highlight the concerns of those in power about the threat of such gatherings. The first problem with Lelio's event was the prohibition of card games in private residences. Responding to Lelio, the interrogator noted that "being a Veronese person . . . you should be practiced in the ordinances of Verona" and should have known therefore that the proclamation of the *Clarissimo Signor Podesta* prohibited him from holding a gambling house.[60] However, Lelio replied that he was not aware of any penalty for these activities, reasserting his claims of innocence.[61] There are several hints both in the interrogator's questions and in Lelio's replies that indicate the

potential reasons behind such proclamations and penalties. The first is the mixing of people of social standing in domestic settings and the potential disruptiveness of this. In particular, the interrogator was concerned about the presence of those of lower social status who did not practice a trade or have a job. The interrogator demanded that Lelio tell the truth if vagabonds or "bad sorts" of people frequented his house, to which Lelio replied that no one of that sort came to his house, repeating his statement that he was a man of honor.[62] Vagabonds were habitually feared in early modern cities, not only because of the diseases and illnesses they might bring, traveling from city to city but also because, without work or other means to pay for themselves, they might beg or steal, often from the most vulnerable. For people of the popular classes, having a trade was, therefore, a key part of respectability. For the authorities, it was important to ensure that vagabonds were not gathering illicitly in domestic settings, gambling, partying, and otherwise causing mischief.

Authorities may also have been concerned with the types of ideas being exchanged in these liminal spaces, and there are hints of the religious threats such events could pose. When responding to questions related to the types of people that came to his home to play games, Lelio pleaded his defense, saying he never knew of anyone in his house who was a blasphemer, and in fact, this is something that he would not have tolerated. He also noted earlier in his testimony that he did not have any more cards in his house (other than those collected by officials), as his intention was not to play during Lent.[63] As well as indicating the honor of himself and those attending, it is evident that Lelio wanted to distance himself from any accusations of religious indiscretion, which was perhaps intimated within the interrogator's questioning. This was arguably of special importance in post-Tridentine Verona, which had been home to Gian Matteo Giberti (1495-1543), one of the most prominent Counter-Reformation bishops and one of the Pope's closest allies, and which was now home to Agostino Valier (1531–1606), successor of Giberti who was determined to implement a range of moral and spiritual objectives in the city.[64]

Another reason for the anxiety surrounding events of this nature seems to be related to the provision of food and drink. Inns and taverns, where food and drink were permitted to be sold, were tightly regulated partly, because, as Rosa Salzberg has argued, they were not only spaces full of "social, economic, and cultural exchanges" but also full of "moments of tension and conflict."[65] Salzberg notes that in early modern Venice, most locals (except the patrician elite) were forbidden from visiting the city's *osterie* for fear of illicit exchanges with foreigners.[66] In Verona, such a concern seems also to be present in the case of potential gambling houses. The interrogator wanted to determine whether Lelio provided food, drink, and lodging to his guests, and therefore illegally operated a tavern. Although he denied he was charging for lodging or drinks, Lelio's response allows room for interpretation. He noted that he did allow men to stay in his house in a room on the ground floor, in which he also slept, only on occasions of bad weather "out of kindness."[67] He further added, "they did not pay me . . . I only complain that they gave me back what I spent, and they treated me courteously like gentlemen."[68] The authorities in Verona were uncomfortable with the notion of men, particularly those without occupations, gathering for games, drinking, and gambling. Not only might authorities have been concerned about drinking and gambling facilitating violent disorder and encouraging immorality, but it was forbidden to run an inn or tavern without the proper permissions, as alcohol was meant to be taxed in these scenarios.[69]

The testimony of the second man accused in this case helps to illuminate further the types of illicit gatherings that took place in Verona in this period and the forms of social interaction these gatherings encouraged. The man, named Antheo della Sega, was also on trial for

holding card games in his home—seemingly after being accused of doing so by Lelio in his testimony, when the interrogator asked him to reveal "if there are others in this city who keep a gambling den."[70] The testimony of one of the witnesses called in Antheo's defense gives us an idea of the types of activities that were taking place within his home. This witness stated that last Christmas, gentlemen went to Antheo's house to play the game Trapola, and to pass the time "as best we could," playing musical instruments and chatting.[71] Unlike Lelio, Antheo seems to have been a small-time trader in wool, who "lived from his industry." Not only did Antheo rent a house in the city, but he also leased several hay fields in an area called Campo Marzo Grande that were worked by hand with his oxen.[72] Antheo's defense was more restrained than that of Lelio and his gambling house perhaps of a higher profile. Yet, Antheo denied any involvement with card games or ribaldry, instead stating that he was a "civil person of good condition and reputation."[73] Regardless of its legality, Antheo's house clearly served as a meeting place for socializing, featuring card games and music as entertainment.

Antheo's testimony, as well as that of others speaking in his defense, is revealing for several reasons. Firstly, it draws attention to the different forms of connections fostered within his home. Although his main residence was located on the outskirts of the city, where he lived with his wife and children, Antheo also rented a place in the center of Verona, which he said he visited occasionally. We find out through the testimony that both spaces rented by Antheo were owned by the Pellegrino family. Although no further information is given regarding the landlords, they likely belonged to the noble Pellegrino family, who were part of Verona's traditional nobility, thus establishing a connection between this trader and the political elite in the city. [74] Another link to the elite was also established, as one of the witnesses brought forward for the defense of Antheo was a nobleman named Marcantonio Sagramoso. Marcantonio confirmed that he knew Antheo, and that he knew him to be a good man whose door was "always open."[75] Indeed, he went so far as to say that Antheo was "of such good nature that it cannot be overstated."[76] He also noted in his testimony that he went to Antheo's house to play games with other gentlemen.[77] Further outlining the nature of their relationship, Marcantonio stated "Antheo sometimes left me the keys so that I could go to his house at my convenience[;] ... it is certainly a house of fun."[78] Marcantonio was not the only one to praise Antheo's character. Another of the witnesses brought forth in his defense stated that he was of such good character that "he would not even upset a cat."[79] Evidently, Antheo was highly regarded by those called for his defense, which included members of Verona's political elite. Despite his claims of ignorance, the testimonies of others suggest that he allowed his rented space to be used as a hub of social exchange, where groups gathered to be entertained with cards and gambling.

Although this alleged gambling house seems to have been of higher status than that of Lelio, the mixing of individuals of potentially different ranks was further confirmed by witness testimony. Marcantonio Sagramoso was not the only nobleman visiting this house. A witness called in Antheo's defense stated that others from the Pellegrini and the Garbella families also attended, along with merchants and other citizens. He noted, "I have sometimes seen them playing cards and playing on a harpsichord."[80] Antheo was also asked whether there were artisans and gentlemen present at the event, to which he replied there were "artisans whom I do not know the names but can recognize by sight."[81] Another witness stated that he believed artisans from the neighborhood also went to Antheo's house. Indeed, one of those called to give testimony was the son of a wool washer. The existence of testimony from a range of individuals demonstrates a certain level of coexistence within this

legally contentious space. Thus, although Antheo may not have been friends with individuals of lower status, the utilization of his domestic space for social activity facilitated connections of "thin trust" among different groups. As in Lelio's interrogation, many of the witnesses noted the "honor" of the individuals present and the fact that these were "gentlemen."[82] Through this notable emphasis on the importance of "honor," we get a sense that honor is tied not to one's trade but instead to the importance of practicing a trade and being a working artisan or merchant, or otherwise to be a member of the elite, a gentleman, or a *cittadino*. This honor was also connected to trustworthiness in a situation where money was exchanged.

Part of what seems to have allowed for the interaction of individuals on different levels of the social scale in scenarios like this was the porosity between public and private spaces in the buildings in which these games were hosted. Several witnesses attested to the fact that in the building where Antheo hosted his gambling house, there were "many tenants," and that people often came and went from the building, where the door was always open.[83] Several witnesses noted that the garden was a particular point of attraction. One witness said they visited Antheo while walking around the neighborhood, because he had a garden. Another witness even noted that in this building, there was a well in the courtyard where the whole neighborhood gathered for water.[84] Such locations could provide fertile ground for mixing, even if only transiently, among different groups. The very nature of these sites also allowed for eavesdropping and the spread of gossip.[85] For example, Francesco Malcreta noted that he was Antheo's neighbor, who had only "a wall dividing his vegetable garden from mine . . . being contiguous on every side." From his home, he sometimes looked from his window, seeing and hearing those who came out of Antheo's house, "some of them boasting about winning, and some lamenting their losses" in these games.[86] Another witness recalled a rumor about these gatherings being held at Antheo's house, where all sorts of people came to play games. Even if these games were attended by invitation only and took place within a residential setting, the proximity of the buildings and the propensity of others to eavesdrop meant that gossip about such events traveled quickly.

Such "houses of fun" were a concern for authorities, as groups played games, but also likely conversed about topics, including fashion, politics, and ideals, while they ate, drank, and listened to music outside of the purview of the law and tax authorities in a domestic space. Perhaps Lelio and Antheo allowed their spaces to be used for illicit events to bring in extra cash on top of their earnings through their other endeavors. At such events, it is likely that these men played host and were therefore not considered equal in social status. Nonetheless, reputation and honor were clearly important to all who attended, as the private and public spaces converged, and people across the community came together for entertainment.

DANCING AND MUSIC

In addition to gambling, another form of entertainment which was likely to draw individuals from across the community was music and dancing. Yet, the mixing of groups and the association of dancing with alcohol, disorderliness, and potentially sinful behavior were enough to make authorities wary of any unsanctioned events of this kind. In Renaissance Venice, proclamations prohibiting "potentially subversive" events and activities related to music and dancing were published throughout the sixteenth century, partly, as David Bryant and Umberto Cecchinato argue, to reduce violence and promiscuity that often took place at

outdoor dances (*balli*).[87] In 1512, for example, the Council of Ten legislated against renting houses for *feste da ballo*.[88] Renaissance humanists were also quick to warn against the immorality present in gambling, drinking, and dancing. Men and women of honor were expected, in theory, to avoid such activities. For example, in *On the Education of a Christian Prince*, Erasmus noted the corrupting "depravities and pleasures" that were to be found in both gambling and dancing.[89] Nonetheless, despite the legal and moral pressures to avoid these activities, individuals in early modern cities were keen to partake in what were seen as enjoyable and social occasions. Dancing was popular with both the elite and the lower classes and an important method of socializing.[90] Some even viewed dancing as virtuous, such as Guglielmo Ebreo da Pesaro, who wrote about how "the virtue of dancing is as an action demonstrative of spiritual movement, conforming with the measured and perfect consonances of a harmony that descends pleasurably through our sense of hearing to the intellectual parts of our cordial senses."[91] Dancing was, therefore, not only pleasurable for the senses but also harmonious with intellect. As with the previous case, proceedings against those who were caught holding unsanctioned events at which music and dancing were taking place can provide insight into the connections made between individuals in the Veronese community. In particular, these cases can show the types of social lives individuals within the artisanal group enjoyed, and the types of groups that would gather within these porous living spaces used for public entertainment. One case which highlights these points was brought before the Venetian Rectors and the *Cancelleria* in early 1589.[92]

On February 28th, an individual named Francesco Panza and another named Christoforo were accosted in Panza's house in the neighborhood of S. Zenone in Oratorio. They were accused of arranging a party in which there was riotous dancing (*tripudio*), and the harpsichord was played, with many men and women present, until three in the morning. As is revealed in the testimony, this case likely coincided with Verona's carnival, the Bacanal del Gnocco, which originated in the first part of the sixteenth century, if not earlier, and took place before Lent.[93] Although dances and enjoyment of music happened throughout the year, Carnival provided a particular opportunity for individuals to capitalize on the festive environment.

Once again, this trial emphasizes the way in which a domestic space was used for entertainment, so the host, who was an artisan and perhaps small-time trader, might earn extra income on top of his trade. Bryant and Cecchinato note that private entertainments of this sort "provided considerable scope for regular earnings."[94] Francesco Panza, in whose house the party took place, identified himself as a maker of woolen gloves. As the testimonies reveal, holding parties of this kind required a form of investment, however small. For example, when the musician, Christoforo, was asked by the interrogator who provided the funds for candles and other things related to the party, the musician replied that this was the responsibility of Francesco. However, Christoforo also played a role in the organization. For example, when asked why he went to Francesco's house to play, the musician replied that he was used to playing at other carnivals with Francesco, and when he spoke to him, Francesco invited Christoforo to come and play at his house. Francesco similarly confirmed this exchange, noting: "Many days ago, talking with this Christoforo, he told me, 'I don't know where to have a party this carnival,' and I replied to him, 'If there will be dancing, my place will be at your disposal.'"[95] The fact that Christoforo outlined how he "usually" played with Francesco suggests this party was not a singular occasion. In fact, he further noted that he also played there on the previous Sunday evening. Francesco's motivation for using his house for regular parties around carnival time seems to have been, at least in part, financial.

He was asked directly if he held the party for profit or pleasure.[96] Although he avoided directly answering the question, he admitted that if someone gave Christoforo something for playing, the musician would accept it, but he would not ask for anything else; Francesco then received a third of these earnings. Similarly, Christoforo, when asked why he played at the event, stated that he played because he was poor, and there was always someone to give him something. These men were, therefore, utilizing the talent of the musician and the domestic space of the artisan to host an event which fed into the festivities surrounding the carnival. This demonstrates once more the permeability of space between public and private, as well as attempts to control such porousness by authorities potentially concerned about disruption to the public order. This mutually beneficial arrangement between a maker of woolen gloves and a musician turned an otherwise domestic space into a space for entertainment, music, and dance, earning both individuals extra income.

Moreover, the documents provide insight into women's involvement in this type of party. On a practical level, it is revealed that the wife of Francesco Panza was integral to the organization of the dance. In particular, we learn throughout the testimony that she was responsible for inviting people to come to the party, especially the women of the neighborhood. Moreover, there were many women present at the party. Although most are unnamed, one woman—Violante, a wool spinner who lived below Francesco's home—is mentioned in the interrogation as one of those present. Christoforo's wife also attended, as well as Panza's wife, Domenico di Mazi's wife, and other women and girls from the neighborhood. Women were therefore involved not only in the organization of the dance but also participated in the dance with other members of their community, enjoying themselves until the early hours of the morning. Such evidence aligns with criticism of the strict division of public and private spheres in traditional scholarship.[97] As other historians have highlighted, women had an innate command over the domestic space, often through sizable dowries and administration of household affairs.[98] In this role, women could have considerable social and political influence, thus breaking down the "private" nature of the household.

The interrogation of the detained men also reveals the types of people who connected for entertainment in these spaces. In this case, we get a particular sense of the importance of community. When asked who was dancing at the party, for example, Christoforo stated that there were many young men from the neighborhood. Similarly, Domenico de Mazi noted that there were many women from the neighborhood present. This emphasis on the neighborhood suggests the importance in this case of connections linked to proximity. In his interrogation, Francesco Panza admitted he opened the party to everyone who came, thus showing that although the dance was taking place within his residence, he allowed those from his neighborhood to attend, albeit potentially for a fee. There is also a further indication of the range of individuals who assembled for this party. Although there is no suggestion of attendance by those at the higher end of the social scale, there is evidence of the mixing of artisans from different crafts. As well as a wool comber named Domenico and his wife, there were also other artisans and professionals, including a weaver named Giovanni Vicenzo, an ironmonger also called Giovanni, the musician who was playing the harpsichord, and many others whom Domenico claimed he "could not remember."[99] Evidently, artisans often socialized outside of their professional grouping, perhaps united more by their social status or indeed by proximity and community than their crafts.

As with the case previously discussed, these parties, open to the public though in otherwise domestic spaces, came under the scrutiny of Veronese authorities due to the threats they could present. According to the interrogators, it was prohibited to play music or hold

dancing parties without permission, to carry weapons at night, or to wear masks—all rules which were allegedly being violated. One individual in particular was accused of wearing a mask and a costume to the party. Domenico de Mazi, the wool comber, admitted to wearing a mask at the party in his interrogation. Francesco also revealed that Domenico was dressed from head to toe as a porter.[100] This dressing and masking is reminiscent of the Venetian carnival, where "A porter dresses up as a knight, and a gentleman as a baker," as written in one Venetian verse, and could have been part of Verona's carnival celebrations.[101] Mask-wearing and dressing up had the power to be particularly controversial, as these acts could potentially contravene social norms and boundaries, subverting traditional identities. As Rosenthal argues, "masking usually headlined anti-Carnival invective, as the adoption of 'false' personae seemed to permit every other supposed abuse" as well as "undermining 'reformers' essentialist fantasies of a consistent and unified identity."[102] This concern is manifest within the trial record from Verona, as the interrogator sought to remind the accused that wearing masks and having parties to dance was forbidden.[103] The wool comber pleaded his innocence, claiming to be unaware of the proclamation. Although mask-wearing was seen as part of the social tradition—particularly around carnival time—like dancing, playing card games, and socializing in these public-private settings, it seems to have caused concern among those in power.

While cases like these are limited in the information they provide, they do offer an insight into the ways that people of different backgrounds socialized within their communities in liminal spaces. On this occasion, there is no indication of those of notably different rank gathering. However, we do see artisans of diverse occupations and their wives drawn together for music and dancing, with women playing an integral role in the organization and attendance of this event. It is also possible to infer that such activities can be seen as a form of artisan entrepreneurship, as artisans like Francesco used the resources available to them to earn extra income. Yet, parties of this kind were prohibited by authorities, who were trying to control unregulated gatherings held outside of the purview of the law in otherwise private spaces.

LOTTERY

The workshop was another space which sat even more precariously on the boundary between public and private spaces in the sixteenth-century city.[104] In an age that witnessed increased material consumption, artisanal workshops were focal points of sociability and cultural exchange. Fixed shops or workshops (*botteghe*) were often open at the front, but within the interior, they provided a sheltered space in which conversations could be had away from the stir of the marketplace. *Botteghe* were also places in which people of different social ranks might meet, as elite conversed with artisans to find the latest products and to purchase goods both for themselves and their homes.[105] Notable customers might have been granted a private audience with an artisan in the interior of the *bottega* to discuss commissions. However, others would have congregated within and directly outside the *botteghe* of the city with artisans of different trades, merchants, and servants of elite households, if not the elite customers themselves, inspecting and purchasing items. Evidence in the city shops' inventories—in particular, within lists of debtors—can provide insight into the range of customers served by shops in Verona. Within the shop inventory of a mercer named Andrea i Gatto de Fumdris, for example, it is possible to find many artisans connected to the clothing industry among his debtors, such as Pollo, a tailor, Martin, a weaver, and Geronimo, a spinner.[106] Other

groups were also represented in i Gatto's list of debtors, including a baker named Francesco, a man named Antonio who is described as the household manager of the noble Bevilacqua family, and a widow named Madalena.[107] Lists of debtors like these provide official accounts of those who made purchases in stores at the time. These accounts include a varied customer base, comprising artisans of multiple crafts, individuals with noble links, men and women—all of whom purchased items on credit, forming bonds of trust. Yet, to obtain information about unofficial activities taking place in these spaces, it is helpful again to turn to the court records.

One such case, which illustrates the diverse activities that could take place within Verona's *botteghe*, was brought before the Venetian Rectors and the *Cancelleria* on January 24, 1580. On this date, a carpenter named Francesco had been called in for questioning, having been suspected of holding an illegal lottery within his *bottega*, from which it was claimed he had falsely drawn 62 lire. Lotteries first appeared in Italy in the fifteenth century, and like card games and dances, they were utilized as a tool by artisans and shopkeepers to earn extra income. Despite government measures to attempt to prevent lotteries from taking place, by the sixteenth century, their popularity had grown rapidly. Marino Sanudo wrote of the rising trend. He described how a practice initiated by a second-hand dealer named Girolamo Bambarara had grown to become an important industry in Venice, with prizes ranging from carpets and wall hangings to gold, silver, and other expensive commodities, worth large sums.[108] Although the case against the carpenter Francesco represents the lower end of this type of lottery, it demonstrates that the trend for lotteries had spread beyond Venice and was present also in cities like Verona.

The winnings in Francesco's lottery did not comprise gold or silver, as in the lotteries described by Sanudo, but rather several domestic commodities. Evelyn Welch has suggested that lotteries were not a sign of commercial innovation, but rather were a response to "increasingly unsustainable levels of debts."[109] These high levels of debt came about, Welch argues, due to the culture of credit and related circulation of material possessions at this time.[110] Within such an environment, Francesco may have used items from his household to acquire cash quickly. Similarly, he may have utilized the lottery as a way of disposing of items that had been left to him in pawn by other customers. The items on display in this lottery were all domestic goods that were common in artisan households. For example, there were eight carpets for chests, three table carpets, one small table carpet, eleven overgarments (*veste*) of different sorts, and a white satin doublet with gold trim.[111] Although these were not necessarily precious items in and of themselves, some were made with luxurious materials and would likely have been very valuable, appealing to those considering purchasing a ticket. Despite being a carpenter by trade, Francesco evidently deemed it appropriate to use his shop to sell these items, which had little relation to his trade, through more unconventional means.

The trial records are brief, and the information provided is limited; nonetheless, the witness testimonies provide a window into the different types of activities that took place within Verona's *botteghe*. Like the other activities discussed thus far, the interrogator reminded the accused that lotteries were banned in Verona "under the penalty of 1000 ducats and banishment from the city for ten years."[112] Such a high penalty reflects the level of concern related to the mixing of individuals from across the community in enclosed spaces for unofficial events involving gambling. Within the document, there are four separate testimonies from those who had participated in the lottery. The first to be questioned in this case was a man named Francesco Pona, who was the son of an apothecary called Giovanni Battista, whose

shop was at the sign of the "Pomo d'Oro." Francesco was likely related to the notable Veronese apothecary Giovanni Pona, whose shop had the sign of the "Pomo d'Oro" and who lived from 1565-1630, enjoying "a European-wide network of famous contacts, including Carolius Clusius in Antwerp and Ulysee Aldrovandi in Bologna."[113] Also questioned was another apothecary, called Rodomonte, whose shop had the sign of the *Mori.* There is little information about the other two witnesses: a man named Baldassare di Gentili and another called Jacobo, whose occupations and status are not listed. One might imagine that these men were drawn into the carpenter's *bottega* out of a sense of curiosity. Indeed, the witnesses' prior relationships with Francesco are ambiguous. Although the apothecary Francesco Pona knew the carpenter by name, the other witnesses did not refer to him by name but instead referred only to his trade, pointing to a lack of familiarity.[114] This was further confirmed, as the final witness, a man named Jacobo, stated that he entered the shop of a carpenter, whom he did not know. The men gathering in Francesco's shop were likely strangers or rather, men who had a passing knowledge that this was the carpenter's shop in the neighborhood. The connections forged in this scenario were thus perhaps ephemeral and on the level of "thin trust." However, events like lotteries could have drawn the unfamiliar into the space of the *bottega*, potentially creating new clients, establishing new—if fleeting—social ties, and facilitating social connectivity. Lotteries were not only a way to acquire goods or cash; they also, like the other cases previously discussed, provided entertainment. People from across the community were enticed by such events, despite their prohibition.

Notably, even though lotteries were illegal, the carpenter displayed the potential winnings openly. In the testimony of Francesco Pona, we learn that when he "passed by there" (the *bottega*), he "saw the carpets outspread [with] the garments." He continues, "I saw here many stopping by and I asked what they were doing with those things, and they said a lottery, thus I put in a ticket too."[115] By displaying goods openly, Francesco drew a crowd of curious onlookers to his shop. People from the community, running their daily errands or doing their daily shopping, who may not usually have stopped at the carpenter's *bottega*, were nonetheless intrigued by the display of goods. Baldassare di Gentili, for example, noted that he went out to the area of "the Jews," when he "saw from a carpenter many *veste* of different sorts, as well as carpets," which caused him to ask the crowd of onlookers "what the significance of the display of goods" was.[116] The witness Jacobo also noted that he passed from his house to the street when he witnessed the shop of a carpenter, who he did not know, with carpets and *veste* of different sorts displayed outside the shop.[117] Jacobo was questioned if he had asked Francesco if he had a license from the *Signori Rettori* to hold the lottery. Jacobo replied that "seeing that he displayed it so publicly, we presumed that he had license, and that the lottery was conducted with all the ordinances that are required."[118]

Given the illicit nature of lotteries, displaying the available goods publicly was a perilous strategy. However, drawing crowds from the street was likely a priority for the carpenter. This was not an event held with a pre-arranged guest list but rather one where the organizer was attempting to bring in people from across the community and potential new customers. However, when it came to the lottery draw, this did not take place on the street. The apothecary, Rodomonte, was questioned about where the lottery took place, in the *piazza* or in the *bottega*, to which he replied that it took place in the carpenter's workshop. The tickets were on sale for 9 *soldi* for an individual ticket, or 12 *soldi* for two. The prize was seen as appealing enough that a man named Giovanni, according to Jacobo's testimony, purchased four tickets at once.[119] Although the goods on display had little to do with his trade, Francesco was able

to transform the space of his *bottega* to gather individuals from across the community to earn money and acquire potential new customers.

Workshops like Francesco's could therefore be used as spaces to undertake illicit activity, to socialize, and to interact with people from across the social scale. Francesco used carpets and silks to encourage those passing, some of whom were strangers, into his workspace and to take part in what was an illegal activity. Here again, we see an entrepreneurial artisan using the space available to him to earn money through unofficial means. While he was perhaps a guild member, which restricted his activities and trade, he was involved in at least one other activity to bolster his income. Moreover, this case is a reminder that buying and selling took place in a variety of settings. [120] People acquired goods in various ways, both licit and illicit, and the possession of objects did not always necessitate large amounts of money. Lotteries provided an opportunity for those holding them to earn quick cash, particularly for those in financial need. Similarly, they allowed those with less financial means to potentially acquire goods which might otherwise have been out of their reach. The "exhibition" of goods outside the *bottega*, as in this case, was enough to draw in crowds. From this, places that might otherwise be shops or workshops could become spaces that facilitated the interaction between artisans of different trades and non-artisans.

CONCLUSION

The neighborhoods of Verona contained a heterogeneous mix of individuals, each of whom lived, worked, shopped, and socialized across the city. While society was in many ways strictly segregated by social status and wealth, there were many opportunities for those with different trades and positions on the social hierarchy to connect. Artisans played a key role in this dynamic. Rather than restricting their connections to their guilded occupation, entrepreneurial artisans could involve themselves in different activities, both licit and illicit, to earn extra income for their often-struggling families. There was an appetite for social events held in unofficial settings, on which certain individuals capitalized. With this demand, domestic and work spaces were transformed into social arenas, and in the process, public and private spaces converged to form liminal spaces of sociability. Within this context, chief among the desired qualities to be outwardly displayed was honor, which remained important for people across the social hierarchy. People of different means would come together to play games, dance, and drink. They would also gamble, looking for ways to increase their material wealth. As these cases demonstrate, lives often intersected at these events. The connections made may have been fleeting, and based on "thin trust," but they may also have laid the foundations for future acquaintances or business contacts. Individual and community identities could be formed among these connections, as artisans of different trades, professionals, and the elite met at social gatherings. These documents also attest to the perception among those in power that such connections were a threat to the social order.

As these case studies demonstrate, connections made in early modern Verona were multilayered. On certain occasions, events which offered entertainment, provided a chance to earn money, or even simply incited curiosity, could draw individuals from across the community together, blurring traditional boundaries within malleable private spaces. By studying cases like these, we can come to an understanding of the different networks that individuals in the provincial early modern city inhabited and the lesser-known forms of sociability in which those lower down the social scale engaged, moving beyond the traditional familial and professional frameworks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Professor Mary Laven, Professor Evelyn Welch, Professor Ulinka Rublack, Dr. Marini Inì, and the director and staff at the Archivio di Stato di Verona for their insightful advice and feedback throughout the development of this research and article. I am also deeply grateful to the reviewers of this article for their constructive comments. The completion of this article has been made possible through the generous support of various scholarships, grants, and fellowships, including those from the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, Murray Edwards College, Cambridge, the Cambridge Trust, and the Leverhulme Trust.

ENDNOTES

1. Archivio di Stato di Verona (hereafter ASVr), Atti dei Rettori Veneti a Verona (hereafter ARV), b. 113, March 4, 1579, "Processus con[tra] Lelius, et Antheus."
2. Ronald F.E Weissman, "Reconstructing Renaissance Sociology: The 'Chicago School' and the Study of Renaissance Society," in *Persons in Groups: Social Behaviour as Identity Formation in Medieval and Renaissance Europe. Papers of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies*, ed. Richard C. Trexler (Binghamton, 1985): 39–46, at 39. See also Giovanni Monticolo and Enrico Besta, *I Capitolari Delle Arti Veneziane: Sottoposte Alla Giustizia e Poi Alla Giustizia Vecchia Dale Origini al 1330* (Rome, 1896).
3. Dennis Romano, *Patricians and Popolani: The Social Foundations of the Venetian Renaissance State* (Baltimore, 2019).
4. Claire Dolan argues that a focus on unique groupings can disguise the diversity of urban society. See Claire Dolan, "The Artisans of Aix-en-Provence in the Sixteenth Century: A Microanalysis of Social Relationships," in *Cities and Social Change in Early Modern France*, ed. Philip Benedict (London, 1989): 147–191, at 174.
5. Filippo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford, 2007).
6. Rosa Salzberg, "Little Worlds in Motion: Mobility and Space in the *Osterie* of Early Modern Venice," *Journal of Early Modern History* 25 (2021): 96–117, at 101. See also Fabrizio Nevola, *Street Life in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven, 2020): 16; Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis, eds., *At Home in Renaissance Italy* (London, 2006); and Rosa Salzberg, "Mobility, Cohabitation and Cultural Exchange in the Lodging Houses of Early Modern Venice," *Urban History* 26 (2018): 1–21.
7. Salzberg, "Little Worlds," 96.
8. Edward Muir, "The 2001 Josephine Waters Bennett Lecture: The Idea of Community in Renaissance Italy," *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002): 10–11. See also David Rosenthal, "The Barfly's Dream: Taverns and Reform in the Early Modern Italian City," in *Biographies of Drink: A Case Study Approach to our Historical Relationship with Alcohol*, ed. Deborah Toner and Mark Hailwood (Newcastle, 2015): 14–29, at 17.
9. Rosenthal, "The Barfly's Dream," 17.
10. Rosenthal, "The Barfly's Dream," 17.
11. James Farr, *Artisans in Europe, 1300-1914* (Cambridge, 2000).
12. Paula Hohti Erichsen, *Artisans, Objects and Everyday Life in Renaissance Italy the Material Culture of the Middling Class* (Amsterdam, 2020).
13. Hohti Erichsen, *Artisans*, 304 and 63. Farr argues that artisans of multiple professions were defined by an "artisan culture," which was expressed above all by a code of honor. See James Farr, *Hands of Honor: Artisans and Their World in Dijon, 1550-1650* (Ithaca, 1988).
14. Claire Judde de Larivière and Rosa M. Salzberg, "The People Are the City: The Idea of the *Popolo* and the Condition of the *Popolani* in Renaissance Venice," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 68 (2013): 769–96, at 785.
15. Judde de Larivière and Salzberg, "The People Are the City."

16. Christopher R. Friedrichs, *The Early Modern City, 1450-1750* (New York, 1995): 31. See also Paola Lanaro, "Radiografia della Soglia di Povertà in una Città della Terraferma Veneta: Verona alla Metà del XVI secolo," *Studi Veneziani* 6 (1982): 45–86.
17. Lanaro, "Radiografia." See also Nicholas A. Eckstein, *The District of the Green Dragon: Neighbourhood Life and Social Change in Renaissance Florence* (Florence, 1995). In this study, Eckstein shows that while there was a "remarkable sense of common purpose" among the residents of the District of the Green Dragon in Florence, members of the community were also involved with others outside of their district in business, politics, and family.
18. Fabrizio Nevola and David Rosenthal, "Connected Communities. Urban Communities in Early Modern Europe (1400-1700): A Research Review" (2011) (available for download at: www.early-moderncommunities.com): 3. Robert D. Putnam, Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Nanetti, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton, 1994).
19. Nevola and Rosenthal, "Connected Communities," 3.
20. Laura Castellazzi, ed., "Rettori Veneti," in *Guida Agli Archivi di Stato—Verona* (Verona, 2000).
21. Castellazzi, "Rettori Veneti."
22. Natalie Zemon-Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford, 1987): 3.
23. Elizabeth Storr Cohen and Marlee J. Couling, "Introduction," in *Non-Elite Women's Networks across the Early Modern World*, 1st ed., ed. Elizabeth Storr Cohen and Marlee J. Couling (Amsterdam, 2023): 9–22, at 12.
24. Elizabeth S. Cohen and Thomas V. Cohen, *Words and Deeds in Renaissance Rome: Trials before the Papal Magistrates* (Toronto, 2019): 3.
25. Edoardo Grendi, "Microanalisi e storia sociale," *Quaderni Storici* 35 (1977): 506-20. See also Laura Kounine, *Imagining the Witch: Emotions, Gender, and Selfhood in Early Modern Germany* (Oxford, 2018): 36.
26. Margaret Pelling, *The Common Lot: Sickness, Medical Occupations and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England* (London, 1998).
27. Paula Findlen notes that the study of Italy "in all its parts" has increasingly become an "explicit pre-occupation" of a new generation of historians. Paula Findlen, "In and Out of Florence," in *Beyond Florence: The Contours of Medieval and Early Modern Italy*, ed. Paula Findlen, Michelle M. Fontaine, and Duane J. Osheim (Stanford, 2003): 13-28, at 17.
28. Michael Knapton, "City Wealth and State Wealth in Northeast Italy, 14th-17th Centuries," in *La Ville, La Bourgeoisie et la Genèse de l'État Moderne (XIIe-XVIIIe siècles)*, ed. N. Bulst and J. P Genet (Paris, 1988): 183-209, at 192.
29. Amelio Tagliaferri, *L'Economia Veronese Secondo gli Estimi dal 1409 al 1635* (Milan, 1966): 54.
30. David Herlihy, "The Population of Verona in the First Century of Venetian Rule," in *Renaissance Venice, ed.* J. R. Hale (London, 1973): 91-120, at 113.
31. See Paola Lanaro, "'Essere Famiglia di Consiglio': Social Closure and Economic Change in the Veronese Patriciate of the Sixteenth Century," *Renaissance Studies* 8 (1994): 428; Paola Lanaro, *Un'Oligarchia Urbana nel Cinquecento Veneto. Istituzioni, Economia, Società* (Torino, 1992); and G. Borelli, *Un Patriziato della Terraferma Veneta tra XVII e XVIII secolo* (Milano, 1974).
32. For an exploration of consumption and status in Verona, see Zoe Farrell, "The Materiality of Marriage in the Artisan Community of Renaissance Verona," *The Historical Journal* 63 (2020): 243-266.
33. Peter Arnade, Martha Howell, and Walter Simons, "Fertile Spaces: The Productivity of Urban Spaces in Northern Europe," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32 (2002): 515-548.
34. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim, "Sociability," in *At Home in Renaissance Italy*, ed. Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis (London, 2006): 206-221, at 206.
35. Ajmar-Wollheim, "Sociability," 207.
36. Hohti Erichsen, *Artisans*; Farrell, "The Materiality of Marriage."
37. See Farrell, "The Materiality of Marriage," 256. Of course, the number of chairs was lower in poorer households. For example, Renata Ago notes the seventy-four different chairs that were listed in the inventory of the elite Ugolini household in eighteenth-century Rome. See Renata Ago, *Gusto for Things: A History of Objects in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, trans. Bradford Bouley and Corey Tazzara, with Paula Findlen (Chicago, 2013).
38. Ajmar-Wollheim, "Sociability," 207.

39. The seminal work which questioned the traditional separation in scholarship between public and private spheres is Amanda Vickery's "Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History," *The Historical Journal* 36 (1993): 383-414.
40. Jonathan Walker, "Gambling and Venetian Noblemen," *Past and Present* 162 (1999): 28-69.
41. Speroni Sperone, *Opere*, 5, ed. Mario Pozzi (Manziana, 1989): 441-2. Quoted in George W. McClure, *Parlour Games and the Public Life of Women in Renaissance Italy* (Toronto, 2013): 204.
42. Ajmar-Wollheim, "Sociability," 212.
43. McClure, *Parlour Games*, 4
44. McClure, *Parlour Games*, 4
45. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "Processus con[tra] Lelius, et Antheus."
46. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "il mio esercicio è reparador de barette et di vender legne."
47. Beatrice Zucca Micheletto, "Husbands, Masculinity, Male Work and Household Economy in Eighteenth-Century Italy"; Zucca Micheletto, "Micro-Mobilités 'au Quotidien': Pluriactivité, Métiers et Appurtenances Sociales dans l'Italie Modern (Turin XVIII^{e}-XIXe siècles)," in *Travail et Mobilité en Europe XVI^{e}-XIX^{e} Siècles*, ed. Andrea Caracausi, Nicoletta Rolla, and Marco Schnyder (Villeneuve-d'Ascq, 2018): 99-122.
48. Zucca Micheletto, "Husbands."
49. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "aspertu annor tregentanto . . . ferarrolo pani turchini cum collario velluto burghessis camotie et callegis caneguchiate."
50. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "so[no] homo de honor et cittadino di questa citta anche ben son povero circa di guadagnarme il viver giustamente p[er] mi et p[er] li poveri miei figliole et mia moier."
51. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "me davano quel che li pare."
52. Romano, *Patricians and Popolani*, 78.
53. Although *compadre* can be translated as "godfather," within this context, it seems to be used to indicate a trusted acquaintance.
54. Romano, *Patricians and Popolani*, 87.
55. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "in casa mia non vien persone che non habbia saputo che habbia del suo dal zugar."
56. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "come puoi tu cosi minutamente saper el modo et la conditione d'ogni uno ch[e] venga la," "i conosco p[er]che sonno della citta."
57. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579.
58. Farr, *Hands of Honor*, 2.
59. Elizabeth Cohen and Thomas Cohen, *Words and Deeds in Renaissance Rome*, 23.
60. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "essendo tu Veronese et cosi pratica de V[er]ona et p[er] consequentia di raggione devi esser pratico di ordeni di V[er]ona no[n] sai tu p[erc]h[e] p[er] li p[ro] claimi del Cl[arriss]imo S[ignoria] Pod[est]a è p[ro]hibito a tenir redduto de giocchi."
61. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579.
62. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "se a casa tua conversano p[er]sone vagabon[d]e e di mala sorte."
63. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579.
64. Emlyn Eisenach, *Husbands, Wives, and Concubines: Marriage, Family and Social Order in Sixteenth-Century Verona* (Missouri, 2004): 15-37.
65. Salzberg, "Little Worlds," 97.
66. Salzberg, "Little Worlds," 105-6.
67. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "Processus con[tra] Lelius, et Antheus," "cosi de amorevolezza."
68. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "I no[n] me pagava . . . lamento se no[n] che i me dava quel ch[e] spendeva et me usavano cortesia come gentilhomini."
69. Salzberg, "Little Worlds," 105-6.
70. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "se sono altri in questa citta ch tengano reduto d giocco."
71. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "al meglio ch[e] poterimo."
72. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "M. Antheo vive della sua industria," "la fa lavorare à sua mano, et con li suoi buoi."

73. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "Che M Antheo della Sega è persona civile di buona conditione, et fama, et vive con buoni costume, et come fanno le persone da bene, ne mai si seppe che egli faccesse alcune ribalderia ò tristezza et tutti quei che lo conoscono diranno, et affermavanno che è gentile creatura, et da bene."
74. Edoardo Demo, "Mercanti, Archivi e Palazzi. L"esempio degli Stoppa," in *Edilizia Private Nella Verona Rinascimentale*, ed. Paola Lanaro, Paola Marini, Gian Maria Varanini, con la collaborazione di Edoardo Demo (Verona, 2000): 61-78, at 67.
75. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "la porta sta sempre aperta."
76. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "io el conosco è p[er]sona da bene et civile . . . ch[e] no[n] si potria tanta dire d[e]lla sua bonta."
77. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579.
78. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "questo Antheo mi ha lassato delle volte anche a mi la chiave da poter andar in casa sua a mio beneplace . . . è certo anco casa da spasso."
79. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "nol farai dispiacer à un gato."
80. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "quelli d[el]l Pellegrin ch[e] no[n] so il nome p[erche] no[n] vi haver pratica d[a] loro et ne vien anco delli altri co[n] loro, et credo ch[e] fiano m[er]canti et citadini, et ho visto qualch[e] volta a giochar alle carte et sonar su un ampicordo."
81. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "artesani no[n] so il nome ma li conosco p[er] visto et li zentilhomini sonno de contra[da] M carlo Novarin, et altri de contra[da]."
82. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "sono che a casa sua se ghe reduse alquanti Gentil homeni et altri a quali non tengo a mente," "visto andar delle persone honorate."
83. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "è molte affitanze ch[e] tutti pol andar dentro et for a come li piace."
84. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579.
85. Claire Judde de Larivière, "At the Neighbour's Window: From Gossip to Social Knowledge in Sixteenth-Century Venice," in *Making Stories in Early Modern Italy and Beyond: In Honour of Elizabeth S. and Thomas V. Cohen*, ed. John Christopoulos and John M. Hunt (Toronto, 2024): 155-172. See also Claire Judde de Larivière, "Senses of Neighbourhood (Vicinanza) in Sixteenth-Century Venice," in *The Experience of Neighbourhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Bronach C. Kane and Simon Sandall (London, 2022): 48-60.
86. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, March 4, 1579, "essendo cosi vicino come io sono a d[om]o Anteo ch[e] no[n] vi è altro ch[e] un muro ch[e] divide un suo brolo dal mio, et essendo contigue da ogni parte," "parte di loro di laudarse d[e]l venzer et parte d[e]l perder."
87. David Bryant and Umberto Cecchinato, "Venice, City of Music. Festivities and Entertainment in the Early Modern Age," in *Musik und Vergnügen am Hohen Ufer. Fest- und Kulturtransfer zwischen Hannover und Venedig in der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Sabine Meine, Nicole K. Strohmann und Tobias C. Weißmann (Regensburg, 2016): 39-60, at 47.
88. Bryant and Cecchinato, "Venice, City of Music," 48.
89. Desiderius Erasmus, *On the Education of Christian Prince* (1516), quoted in Margaret L. King, *Renaissance Humanism: An Anthology of Sources* (Indianapolis, 2004).
90. Bryant and Cecchinato, "Venice, City of Music": 35-48, at 47.
91. Guglielmo Ebreo da Pesaro, *Trattato dell"Arte del Ballo di Guglielmo Ebreo Pesarese*, ed. F Zambrini (Bologna, 1873): 7, quoted in Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1988): 60.
92. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579, "Processus con[tra] franc[iscu]m panza et alios p[ro] tripudio."
93. Girolamo Dalla Corte, *Istoria di Verona* (Verona, 1596).
94. Bryant and Cecchinato, "Venice, City of Music," 45-6.
95. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579, "Gia molti giorni ragionando co[n] questo christoforo mi disse no[n] so' dove far festa questo carnival, et io li rispose se si ballara il mio loco sara alcomando."
96. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579, "la festa si facevela p[er] Guadagno, o p[er] piacer."
97. Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?."

98. Vickery, "Golden Age to Separate Spheres?." See also Patricia Allerston, "Consuming Problems: Worldly Goods in Renaissance Venice", in *The Material Renaissance*, ed. Michelle O"Malley and Evelyn Welch (Manchester, 2007): 11-47; Victoria Avery, Melissa Calaresu, Mary Laven, eds., "Cities of Luxury," in *Treasured Possessions from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (London, 2015): 30-35.
99. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579, "che non mi ricordo."
100. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579. Another testimony also notes that this wool comber was dressed as a "zanol" ("l'era vestito da zanol"), which could relate to the Venetian *zanni* character from the *Commedia dell'arte* that was a common costume at carnival.
101. Peter Burke, *The Historical Anthropology of Early Modern Italy: Essays on Perception and Communication* (Cambridge, 1987): 186.
102. David Rosenthal, "The Spaces of Plebeian Ritual and the Boundaries of Transgression," in *Renaissance Florence: A Social History*, ed. Roger J. Crum and John T. Paoletti (Cambridge, 2006): 161-18, at 179.
103. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, February 23, 1579.
104. The line between workshop and domestic space is not always clear. See Zoe Farrell, "Post-Mortem Inventories and the Artisan *Casa*," in "Artisans and Consumption in Sixteenth-Century Verona" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2020).
105. See, for example, James Shaw and Evelyn Welch, *Making and Marketing Medicine in Renaissance Florence* (New York, 2011): 38.
106. ASVr, Notai di Bonis, b. 656, n. 601, 1577, "Inventarum bonor et h[e]r[e]ditatis Herdu[m] Prud. Andrea i Gatto de Fumbris d Omnibus Sanctis."
107. Ibid.
108. M. Sanudo, *I diarii di Marino Sanudo*, ed. R. Fulin et al (Bologna, 1903): 467-8, quoted in Evelyn Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance: Consumer Cultures in Italy*, 1400-1600 (New Haven, 2005): 203-204.
109. Evelyn Welch, "Lotteries in Early Modern Italy," *Past and Present* 199 (2008): 78.
110. Welch, "Lotteries in Early Modern Italy."
111. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580, "Processus formatus contra franc[ciscu]m marangonus oce. lothi."
112. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580, "si in questa citta come nella citta et luoghi dil stato nostro, ne per il publico, ne per particulari, ne etiam per q[ue]lli, alli quali fin hora fosse sta fatta alcuna concession de far Lothi, sotto pena de ducati mille, et di esser banditi di questa citta per anni dieci."
113. Sean David Parrish, "Marketing Nature: Apothecaries, Medicinal Retailing, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Venice, 1565-1730" (PhD diss., Duke University, 2015), 266. Joannes Pona (Giovanni Pona) published works such as *Monte Baldo descritto da Giovanni Pona Veronese* (Venice, 1617) and *Plantae, seu Simplicia ut Vocant, Quae in Baldo Monte et in Via ab Verona ad Baldum Reperiuntur* (Antwerp, 1601). Francesco Pona is also the name of a Veronese apothecary and philosopher, who wrote several works.
114. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580.
115. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580, "passai d[i] li, et vedendo d ivi sop[ra] la bottega, vi erano d[a] detti tapedi destesi et d[i] d[ette] veste, et vidi anco ivi molti affermati a quali dimandando cio ch[e] si facevano d[i] ditte robe mi fu risposto un loto, et cosi anchor io li missi un boletino."
116. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580, "andar giu p[er] la bina delli hebrei, et capitando alli Leoni vidi da un marango[n] molte veste d[i] diverse sorte, et tapedi, et ricercato ciò che vole signficar la mostra di tal robba."
117. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580.
118. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580, "vedendo che lui l'Haveva posto fuori publicame[n]te pressuponessemo che lui haveve havuto licenza, et che il lotho si facsse con tutti q[ue]lli ordini che si ricercano."
119. ASVr, ARV, b. 113, January 24, 1580.
120. Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance.*

Journal of Social History, 2025, 00, 1–21
https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shaf037
Article