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by Fabrizio Ricciardelli

1. The sense of civic identity

«Now tell me, would man on earth be in a worse condition if he were not a citizen? Yes, I replied, and here I seek no proof»1. Dante answers Carlo Martello in the Divina Commedia without a shadow of hesitation, revealing, by the importance that he attaches to citizenship, his view of the city as the fundamental and typical form of human association. Civic consciousness, indeed, pervaded the whole literary oeuvre of the Florentine poet, and its relevance in the most important Italian literary source of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries is no accident; it shows just how strongly rooted in the mentality of people the idea of the city was2. The word città, in fact, is a keyword not only in the Divina Commedia, but in the entire period in which Central and Northern Italian cities were at their apogee3, when Florence was one of the largest and most powerful ones4.

In Florence, as elsewhere, the cosmopolitan outlook of merchants, ready to cross borders to reach unknown destinations, contrasted with the close feeling of municipal belonging. Being a citizen of a Central and Northern Italian city-state meant combining a strong involvement in the life of the consortheria or clan to which one belonged with an open mentality keen to investigate the world’s curiosities. A fundamental element which was at the basis of the collective identity of the Italian communes was the shared awareness of their inhabitants of belonging to the same urban reality in which reciprocal ties and interests bound the citizens together, for better or worse. In the development of this awareness an important role was played by the chroniclers5, whose narratives stressed the relationship between the new civitas and the memory of the past, favouring the growth of a municipal spirit which in the course of the fourteenth century would beget the myth of Florentina libertas6.

The civitas, in fact, was associated with the idea of freedom, of which the city-republic of Florence was, according to the myth, first the originator, and later the jealous protector7. And this civic awareness was reinforced by the fact that the city had undergone in the span of little more than a century, from...
the beginning of the thirteenth century to the first decades of the fourteenth, an economic and demographic expansion that permitted it to become the dominant power in Tuscany.8

Nevertheless, persistent internal political conflicts within the ruling class, in which the prize sought by opposing parties was the lion’s share of political power, became part of this otherwise dazzling general context. A conspicuous and enduring feature of life in Florence in this period was the violent struggle for political supremacy between wealthy families, which accompanied the extraordinary economic growth and the equally extraordinary achievements in literature and the arts. Although in theory these struggles should have destroyed the common civic identity, they did not succeed in eradicating the civic passion and love for freedom to which literary records bear witness. Observing the Florentine political scene in the time of Dante, it is possible to perceive continuous divisions between social classes, caused by contrasting political programmes and courses of action, but it is also possible to register the strong sense of belonging that emerged when a citizen was banned by the society of which he was a member. In fact, although these internal conflicts led to the systematic exclusion of the defeated political party, paradoxically this exclusion did not destroy the spirit of civic identity in those subjected to it, because the hope of every exile was to return home, to come back to a world of shared values, and this hope, which was generally disappointed, is evidence of a common identity upon which the city was founded.9

In a commune a citizen could be excluded when he took sides, but if he stayed out of the fray, it generally meant that he was not a citizen in the fullest sense. The history of the Italian communes is articulated around the awareness that the destiny of each individual was indissolubly linked to that of his household, with a cascade effect that as a consequence each member of the family was involved, even if he did not take part actively in the political struggle.10 Internal strife in the political sphere, as remarked above, did not destroy the strong sense of belonging of those who were part of the city, because a defining feature of these divisions was the recognition by every citizen that thanks to its communal form of government Florence was a free city. These bonds, already existent in the consular period, were strengthened during the period of the podestà and then during the period of the government of the popolo, in whose name the collective interest survived despite lacerating internal conflicts. Every city could be divided into opposing factions, just as easily as it could be united when fighting against a common external enemy. This is because within these struggles lurks the virus of antagonism between lineages, which were at the same time united by strong ties of solidarity and divided by the contingencies of politics.11 The contradictions inherent in these struggles are exemplified by the conflict between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines (1215-1269), the magnates and the popolo (1282-1295), and the Whites and the Blacks (1295-1313).12

According to Florentine public law, in fact, civil rights were not innate to men, because men acquired them by becoming citizens of a state. Thus, the
loss of membership of a civic community, mostly caused by internal conflicts between two political groups, was generally regarded as a matter of extreme gravity. In the language of factional strife, concepts of friendship and enmity played a fundamental role, and observing these conflicts and the political exclusion to which they gave rise (in the case of the Guelfs and Ghibellines and Whites and Blacks it was complete. In the case of the magnates and the \textit{popolo} it involved a ban on holding public office) we see clear evidence that at the root of these conflicts lay both the desire of individual citizens to defend their identity and that of lineages to defend their honour within a political society\textsuperscript{16}.

\section*{2. Violence and exclusion}

Even though this is not the place to engage in a detailed analysis of the principal events which dictated the course of politics in Dante’s Florence, it will be enough to point out that following factional strife the first and second exclusion of the Guelfs took place in 1240 and 1248, followed by that of the Ghibellines in 1251 and 1258, by that of the Guelfs again in 1260, and by that of the Ghibellines again in the period between 1268 and 1269\textsuperscript{17}. The events which culminated in the exclusions of 1302 and 1313 have numerous important features, but what is important to underline in this discussion is the crisis of personal identity caused by these exclusions, which obliterated the essential traits of the individual citizen who, once banned, was compelled to search for another place in which to live, a new world in which to insert himself\textsuperscript{18}.

During the thirteenth century Florence was scarred by a series of political exclusions which illustrate the devastating impact that the political use of the ban could have on a losing faction, forced by public decree to abandon the urban community that was their home, but whose political life was now dominated by their victorious opponents. To speak of exclusion during the communal period, therefore, is to speak of the penalty of the ban, because through the political use of the ban the dominant parties in the city-republics struck at their political opponents in moments of particular tension\textsuperscript{19}. To speak of the ban, which could be revoked in particular moments\textsuperscript{20}, is to speak of that political instrument by means of which the political élite were vanquished and removed from their own city, of that political instrument by means of which the public vendetta was consummated, once the street fighting was over\textsuperscript{21}.

The ban gave the victorious faction the legal power to remove the losing one, and it is probably for this reason that at the end of the thirteenth century the governors of the Florentine republic paid much attention to the matter. On 24 October 1286, for instance, the commune established the \textit{sindacato} for the sale of the goods of exiles\textsuperscript{22} – this law was reaffirmed on 4 January 1287\textsuperscript{23} –, and the very fact that such a magistracy was created to sell the confiscated goods of those who suffered political exclusion shows that these properties were considerable, and that it was necessary to rationalize their administration\textsuperscript{24}. With a similar purpose in mind, the commune, with a law of 3 August 1294,
instituted a register in which the names of all those who had been banished by Florence had to be recorded\textsuperscript{25}, and it is obvious that within it not merely the names of those who had committed minor offences, but also the names of those condemned for political reasons would have been inscribed\textsuperscript{26}. On the other hand, the rationalization of public order went hand in hand with the need to regulate the exclusion of those whom the government considered to be undesirable persons, because these last, like those who suffered political ban, were condemned on the basis of criminal charges\textsuperscript{27}.

Political exclusion was one of the peculiar aspects of Florentine public life, and the frequency of this practice at the time of Dante can help us to discern the existence of a common identity, linked to strong values and reinforced when people were overtaken by such a fate\textsuperscript{28}. The condition of those who suffered political exclusion, deprived of their native country, produced extraordinary echoes in literature, and the connection between this evidence and the political context, permits one to analyse the social repercussions on popular mentality as a perfect mirror in which the existence of a common civic identity can be detected\textsuperscript{29}. Exclusion from the community was more than a judgement passed on the political importance of the individuals who suffered it, because it was precisely a damning verdict on the identity of the families from which they came. Exile as a historical condition of exclusion from a particular local context for political reasons was a far from uncommon feature of the lives of citizens in the communes in the second half of the thirteenth century\textsuperscript{30}.

3. Voices from outside

Notaries, for instance, are a particularly good case of this, because from the second half of the thirteenth century these professional figures, thanks to their mastery of language, became the symbol and the cornerstone of communal identity\textsuperscript{31}, and they became the mouthpiece of social hierarchies, regulating with their work, economic, ethical and political relationships in the cities in which they lived\textsuperscript{32}. The example \textit{par excellence} of this phenomenon in the Florentine environment is certainly that of Brunetto Latini, son of a notary and a notary himself, a man who dedicated the majority of his literary works to the defence of his city, the city that had excluded him. At the end of the 1250’s, the city government, seriously threatened by imperial troops and Ghibellines, had sent Brunetto as representative of the commune to ask the King of Castile for help, but news of the Guelf defeat at Montaperti (1260), which reached him \textit{en route}, deprived him and his political associates of the possibility of returning to the city. Brunetto was expelled from his city for six years in France, where he continued to practise his profession as a notary between Paris, Bar-sur-Aube and Arras\textsuperscript{33}. He survived by drawing up loan agreements entered into by his fellow exiles, but he also began working, during his period of exclusion, on the three books of the \textit{Tresor}, from which one learns that the citizen’s love for his own city has to be understood by politicians as fundamental to the stability of government\textsuperscript{34}. We know from the
chronicler Giovanni Villani how much Brunetto contributed to the education of Florentines, teaching them to guide and to rule their republic «according to policy»\(^35\), because according to him love of the city, guaranteed by politicians, had to be based on the fundamental values of civic culture, and it had to be renewed, in the name of the common identity, by the interaction between power and the citizens\(^36\). The primary task of every governor, wrote the Florentine notary, was the maintenance of consensus among the citizens, to whom politicians had to guarantee that common customs would be respected; and the preservation of this equilibrium would be the best way to ensure that respect\(^37\). Back in Florence after the victory of Carlo d’Angiò at Benevento in 1266, Brunetto was appointed to a series of important offices by the Guelf commune such as expromissor and mallevador, prior of Porta del Duomo and city chancellor, and even if the experience of exclusion had deeply marked him, he did not disregard his city’s expectations, accepting these offices and continuing to sustain the view that belonging to a city-republic, «a union of people made to live according to reason»\(^38\), was an unqualified good\(^39\).

Even in the so-called minor literature we can trace some useful evidence relevant to the argument, such as the case of Monte di Andrea da Firenze, expelled from Florence in 1268, whose name appears on the list of those who lived in the parish of Santa Maria sopra Arno\(^40\). He wrote some tenzioni in memory of Florence, some verses, inspired by a deep love of his own city, written following the Ghibelline defeat which forced him to live in Bologna, where he remained until 1274\(^41\). It is here that he presumably composed some of his poems, and in one of them there is a dialogue between five defenders of different views about the war waged by Carlo d’Angiò, in the course of which the author refers to his circumstances as an exile, unjustly excluded from his own civic environment\(^42\). Behind his elegant writing, quite academic and similar to a literary exercise, is hidden the regret at having had to abandon his own native land and his own identity as a citizen\(^43\). Another testimony is that of the Ghibelline poet Schiatta di messer Albizzo Pallavillani\(^44\), a Florentine from the sexto (sixth) of San Piero Gattolino, expelled, like Monte di Andrea, following the publication of the list of proscribed Florentines that was drawn up on the orders of Carlo d’Angiò in 1268\(^45\). He wrote some sonnets, two of them focusing on the privilege of citizenship as a supreme good which even any sort of exclusion is unable to nullify\(^46\).

Following the exclusions of the 1260’s, the popolo reinforced its political position within the commune, and in addition to the conflict between the Guelf and the Ghibelline nobility, the struggle between magnates and popolani broke out\(^47\). At first, the contest between milites and populus had the characteristics of a social and economic conflict of interests, and of a violent confrontation between two sides which had chosen to have recourse to arms to achieve their political objectives; these were struggles between social groups of different formation and composition, even though they were complicated by family rivalries and party divisions\(^48\). The progressive rise of popular families into the ruling class of the Florentine commune – a phenomenon which culminated in
the establishment of the priorate of the guilds in 1282⁴⁹ – represented a social change in the city’s political equilibrium, because the political class was now composed not merely of members of the old consular families (represented by Guelfs and Ghibellines), but of representatives of a new galaxy of families, composite and heterogeneous, of mercantile origin⁵⁰. Following the decline of the social predominance of the *milites, nobiles* and *domini*, represented by the Guelfs and Ghibellines, representatives of the *popolo* began to regularly hold positions of power and responsibility in government; now the conflict took on a new meaning, of which the first laws against the magnates provide eloquent testimony⁵¹. The conflict became less of a class struggle, more of a contest between individuals, because the knightly nobility, on the whole, was no longer seen as a formidable social group, even though individual nobles or noble families could still pose a dangerous threat⁵².

The first Florentine measures against magnates, which were intended to control urban violence – violence produced by factional divisions and armed struggles between groups contending for power –, were an essential element in the *popolo’s* political strategy of definitively establishing its supremacy within the commune⁵³. This was achieved by obliging the magnates to pledge security with the commune, but the violent behaviour that distinguished the magnates was nothing less than an element that served to distinguish them socially and to classify their identity⁵⁴. In any case, the criteria used to define the magnates were not all that precise, because among the families compelled to pledge security were some who were part of the commercial oligarchy that dominated the priorate of the guilds during the first decade of its existence⁵⁵. The *Ordinamenti di giustizia*, in other words, called into question the very identity of communal experience as a political laboratory in which social discipline had to be combined with the preservation of an open criticism of institutions⁵⁶.

Remigio de’ Girolami’s analyses of the city’s discords, used by him as a starting-point of his work, are an example of this⁵⁷. The Florentine Dominican theologian argued, especially in *De bono commun*⁵⁸, that the principal goal of peace was to preserve the common identity of the citizens, because every individual, born to live with his fellow men, cannot be considered a man if he is separated from his city⁵⁹. To be a citizen, in other words, was for Remigio not only good, but necessary, because man was considered, according to Aristotle, a civil animal by nature, an animal who could find the good life only in the *polis*, for there alone could he realize his potential⁶⁰. Remigio’s sermons, nevertheless, did not have any political impact; on the contrary, they were followed by the beginning of the conflict between the Whites and the Blacks, an internal fight within the victorious Guelf party, which complicated still further a political scene hitherto dominated by the struggle between magnates and *popolo*⁶¹. With the division of the pro-papal party, it became clear that Remigio’s idea of a citizen as a patriot filled with a love derived from a sense of belonging to an urban community, had failed to convince his listeners and his readers⁶².
Before its denouement, which occurred in 1302, the conflict between Whites and Blacks had produced numerous moments of tension, one of which was certainly Guido Cavalcanti’s confinement to Sarzana, located between Tuscany and Liguria. Guido was a member of a blazoned Florentine family which belonged to the old feudal nobility, and which was at that point, like so many others, in open conflict with the popolo. The new communal ruling class, in fact, was composed both of the old feudal nobility, of which Guido was a member, and the so-called new bourgeoisie, which had its roots in representatives of the guilds. The personal story of Guido Cavalcanti, who was at the same time a poet and a politician, helps us to understand how important factional alignments were in Florentine political life at the end of the thirteenth century, and how membership of a party could influence the relationship between the identity of an individual citizen and the wider community to which he belonged.

Cavalcanti’s lineage was allied with the White Guelfs, namely with the Cerchi family, so that Guido played an active part in Florence’s turbulent political life until the Ordinamenti di giustizia, promoted by Giano della Bella in 1293, which excluded from public office the representatives of the old nobility. The movement against the magnates was followed by internal strife within the Guelf élite, strife that in 1300 provoked the reaction of the communal government, which impartially excluded the representatives of both political factions. Among those who suffered exclusion from their city was Guido Cavalcanti, who, as a politician, could testify to the sufferings about which his imagination had only been able to speculate, and as a poet could bear eloquent witness to the wounds inflicted by the condition of exile. Guido Cavalcanti’s misfortune, in other words, helps to bring into focus the frame of mind of someone forced to undergo separation from his birthplace, whose private life was badly damaged, and who had to exchange the security of his civic life for fear and precariousness.

While the internal strife between nobility and popolo continued to spread, Carlo di Valois entered Florence, tipping the balance of power in favour of the Blacks, whose attempt to win a dominant position in the city was heavily supported by Boniface VIII. Between January and October 1302 the representatives of the Florentine nobility who were Whites or Ghibellines were expelled from the city, and while the more radical Guelf elements also condemned a very considerable number of popolani, who had embraced the «wrong cause», serious attempts were made to define the new civic identity in terms of the new political order. The charges of «fraudem, falsitatem, dolum vel malitiam, baracteriam vel illicitum extorsionum» or «maleficia» included all crimes associated with the holding of public office and with intrigues and sedition against the commune and the Guelf Party.

«Many wicked sins», wrote the chronicler Dino Compagni, «were committed against virgin women; children were robbed; helpless men were despoiled of their goods and driven from their city. The victors passed many ordinances, as many as they wanted and of whatever sort and in whatever form.
Many men were accused, and it was in their interest to confess to conspiracy, even though they had done nothing, and they were fined a thousand florins each. Those who did not come to defend themselves were charged nonetheless, and were condemned in their persons and their goods for contumacy. Those who obeyed the summons, paid the fine; and then, accused of new crimes, were expelled from Florence without the slightest compassion. The penalties were written in the language of violence, with the defamatory tones of blame and condemnation, because the wretched men, «desperati et masnaderii et homines male conditionis et fame», who were purged from Florence, lived in closer proximity – as the historian Isidoro del Lungo wrote – to the «thorns» than to the «flower», persecuted as they were for the rest of their days. Those who tried to oppose this wave of persecution with legal arguments were overcome and defeated, as happened, for instance, to Dino Compagni, sentenced to confinement but not expelled from the city because he claimed immunity as an ex-prior. The chronicler often returned to the subject of the civic values of the common good and peace as essential elements of a common civic identity, and even if he acknowledged that those ingredients had been dangerously put at risk by party interests, when discussing the government of the popolo and his own love of the city he asserted that «those who spoke badly of them were lying», and he added that they had acted for «the common good and the well-being of the republic». The course of Dante Alighieri’s life, a man with a partisan spirit who was deeply involved in the city’s factional struggles, is connected, as is well known, with these events, events in which a conspicuous number of Florentine citizens experienced, as Dante did, the violation of their civic identity, the confiscation of their goods, the demolition of their houses and expulsion from their community. The condition of exile was for Dante a source of literary inspiration, but it was also testimony to a mentality based on the common values of the civitas. The condition of the «exul innerezus», as Dante often described himself in the Epistole, entirely conditioned his literary production, but despite the bitter grief the expulsion from his city caused him, he never sought to denigrate his own identity as a citizen, as emerges clearly from the letter, rich in advice, that he addressed to the «scelleratissimis Florentinis intrinsecis». The sense of belonging to a well-defined and comforting community was one of the key elements in Dante’s literary work. Before the rift between Guelfs and Ghibellines, «Florence, within her ancient ring of walls […] lived in tranquillity», and even when he was in exile, the poet continued to think of Florence as a model city robbed of her civic unity by internal strife and factions based on blood ties. His ancestor Cacciaguida’s description of Florence in the Paradiso is an idealized picture of the city, through which the poet emphasises, in a nostalgic tone, that man has to live subject to the precepts of city life and citizenship, in order to participate fully in a common civic identity, that implied, however, common civic obligations. The old Florentine who could be a good citizen, as well as a good Christian, was lucky, and the hope of returning «to a citizen’s life so peaceful and so fair, to
a community so loyal, to so sweet a dwelling-place» was for Dante associated with the conviction that the good city, with its ancient identity, was the only place for a man to live84. Exile, with its catastrophic effects on a man’s life, was not able to erase the positive value of the city-state, and the recognition of Dante as a witness to the city’s political identity is found in Giovanni Villani’s words, who wrote in his chronicle that in 1321 there died in Ravenna «in exile from the commune of Florence, at about LVI years, [a] great writer excelling in almost every branch of knowledge, even though he was a layman […], to whom it is right to give an everlasting memorial in this chronicle, although his noble works, which are left to us in written form, bear true witness to him, and confer honourable fame on our city»85.
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