NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Costumed Words: Humanism, Diplomacy, and the Cultural Gift in Fifteenth-Century Florence

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of History

By

Brian Maxson

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

June 2008

ABSTRACT

Costumed Words: Humanism, Diplomacy, and the Cultural Gift in Fifteenth-Century Florence

Brian Maxson

This project argues that displays of humanist learning in diplomacy served to demonstrate the extraordinary good will of the Florentine regime towards a host ruler. I call this act of surpassing previous oratorical gestures a "cultural gift". Although the singular goal of humanism in diplomacy remained offering cultural gifts in the ritual marking the entrance of diplomats into a host space, the techniques that diplomats used towards this end changed over time and from person to person. At the beginning of the fifteenth century, basic displays of humanist rhetoric by humanist dilettantes were more than the usual oratorical display. As humanist performances became increasingly common, humanist authors increasingly lent their pens and voices to ensure successful diplomatic orations. At first, the low familial status of most of these figures prevented their direct involvement in diplomacy, forcing famous humanists like Leonardo Bruni to write orations for other diplomats. Over time, the challenges of continually offering extraordinary oratorical performances led to the involvement of figures that lacked prominent familial histories but possessed extraordinary literary reputations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The path from first generation college graduate to completing a PhD would never have been possible without the continuous help from others. I cannot thank enough Edward Muir, my advisor, for his guidance and support of me over the years. Ethan Shagan and Marco Ruffini have offered me honest and helpful advice on chapter drafts. Without them, this dissertation would have taken a far different and perhaps no shape at all. I would also like to thank Janet Afary for her helpful suggestions on various aspects of this project. As an undergraduate, Christopher Celenza and Stuart Lingo literally explained to me what graduate school was and that it was something that I could do. I thank them for starting me on this road of research and teaching. The best part of graduate school at Northwestern has been the constant exchange of ideas with my graduate cohort. I would like to thank in particular Nicholas Baker, Suzanne Lavere, Elise Lipkowitz, Peter Mazur, Beth Condie-Pugh, and Christopher Sparshott.

The procurement of the financial aid and resources for this project has been more of a team effort than an individual one. The staff of the Northwestern Library and particularly its Interlibrary Loan Department has been indefatigable in their efforts to find books and microfilms for me. The staff of the Office of Fellowships has been enormously generous with their assistance finding fellowships and helping me apply for them. I am grateful to the staff and scholars at the Archivio di Stato in Florence and Venice and the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence for their assistance and patience with my research and the Italian language. I would also like to thank the Northwestern Department of History and Graduate School, the J. William Fulbright Foundation, and the Dolores Zohrab Liebmann Foundation for their monetary support.

The constant support of my family has gotten me through the rough patches over the past six years. I would like thank my parents, Ron and Cathy, for teaching me determination, a strong work ethic, and to love learning. The encouragement of my brother Ron and in-laws Jim, Annette, Chad and Melissa Murray started on day one, continued through my defense, and filled every day in between. My uncle and friend Conover Wilkinson has shown through example the art of the autodidact, without which I never would have encountered Renaissance History in the first place. My longtime friends Jeff McClintic and Jason Sieggreen have heard more about Renaissance diplomats and humanists than I am sure they ever wanted, but have always done so with patience and understanding.

More than any person, my infinite gratitude goes to my wife Jennifer, whose love, personal strength, and sacrifices have made accomplishing this project possible. If I succeed, it is because she has lifted me up. If I fail, it is because of her that I get back up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Florentine Intellectuals lacked the familial status necessary to make civic humanism a reality in foreign politics. In an age in which scholars have repeatedly stressed the conflation between cultural and political pursuits by intellectuals, a combination called civic humanism, most famous Florentine intellectuals remained confined to domestic political positions. These intellectuals, called humanists for their obsession with the fields of study comprising the humanities, were wealthier than many of their patrician peers; however, they generally came from newer Florentine families. As parvenus, these humanists simply lacked the familial prestige necessary to serve as diplomats. In fact, it was humanist dilettantes, patricians that dabbled in humanist studies and befriended learned men - but who themselves produced little if any original scholarship - that were responsible for pushing humanist ideas and rhetorical forms into mainstream foreign politics.

To carry out this integration, these patricians used humanism in the orations that dominated the initial meeting between the diplomat and the host ruler. Previously, plain orations that greeted the host ruler and outlined the diplomats' commission were the norm for these meetings. The combination of humanist words coming from the mouth of an illustrious Florentine patrician enhanced the ritual formality of the meeting between two states. By going beyond the standard practice, Florentine diplomats offered host rulers an implicit acknowledgement of the extraordinary attention that Florence was giving its relations with the host ruler. This acknowledgement served as a cultural gift. Once humanist oratory was common in diplomacy, the Florentine government again searched for ways to go beyond what was common in particularly important diplomatic exchanges. This search for the extraordinary gradually made the literary reputations and words of famous humanists more crucial in

diplomacy. By the 1480s, these factors were of equal importance to the more traditional characteristic of familial ancestry in Florentine diplomats. The story of the integration of humanism into diplomatic oratory, thus, is the story of the elevation of the social status of humanist parvenus in Renaissance Florence.

The Current Conception in the Secondary Literature

In a revealing anecdote, Vespasiano da' Bisticci described the oration when the Emperor Frederick III entered the city of Florence in 1452.

> An address had to be delivered on the Emperor's visit, and it would have been more seemly if this had been made by one of the Signoria than by someone who was only attached to it as chancellor. Messer Giannozzo [Manetti] who was a member of the College, ought to have spoken it, rather than Messer Carlo d'Arezzo [Marsuppini], who was chancellor. However, some of those who were unwilling that Giannozzo should have this honour settled that it should be given to Messer Carlo and told him of it several days before. On the appointed day some two hundred citizens attended, and according to the arrangement Messer Carlo addressed the Emperor. When he had finished the Emperor requested Messer Aeneas [Silvius Piccolomini] to reply, proposing in addition diverse other matters which required an immediate answer, whereupon the Signoria called upon messer Carlo to reply to them. He, however, affirmed he could not do this without due preparation. The Signoria called on him several times, but he always refused on the same plea. And now those who had plotted to deprive Giannozzo of his due honour turned to him begging him to answer so that they might not be

> shamed, as they would be, before the Emperor, the King of Hungary, and all the nobility. Giannozzo, seeing that disgrace was imminent, turned on those who had worked against him, accepted, as the Emperor was awaiting a reply at once. His speech had not the air of an impromptu, but of one which had been more carefully prepared than that delivered by messer Carlo. When he had finished all men of intelligence who understood Latin decided that Giannozzo's unprepared speech was far better than Carlo's prepared one. That day his fame increased greatly, and those who had thwarted him found they had made a mistake. The Emperor and his nobles regarded him as a most remarkable man, as indeed he was, one who need not go begging for words to express his ideas, because he had already good store of them.

Clearly, Vespasiano had a low opinion of Carlo Marsuppini; regardless, his comments are illuminating regarding the current historiographical view of the role of humanism in diplomacy. Vespasiano's description of this diplomatic reception ritual, the event whose script shaped the arrival of diplomats into a foreign space, allots a primary place to famous humanists. The humanist Carlo Marsuppini delivered an oration. The humanist Aneas Silvius Piccolomini responded. The humanist Giannozzo Manetti made the eloquent impromptu response to Piccolomini. Vespasiano pointed to the widespread interest in humanist eloquence by reporting the huge crowd that gathered to witness the event. Vespasiano's horror at Marsuppini's inability to respond to the Emperor's secretary betrays the high stakes involved on these occasions.[1]

In his famous book, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy,* Jacob Burckhardt echoed this analysis and stressed the close relationship between humanism and diplomacy. Burckhardt wrote that "It was not for nothing, in the first place, that the ambassadors from one

state to another received the title of orators. Whatever else might be done in the way of secret negotiation, the envoy never failed to make a public appearance and deliver a public speech, under circumstances of the greatest possible pomp and ceremony." Burckhardt also commented on the types of people delivering these orations.

> But, at a time and among a people where 'listening' was among the chief pleasures of life, and where every imagination was filled with the memory of the Roman senate and its great speakers, the orator occupied a far more brilliant place than the letter-writer. Eloquence had shaken off the influence of the Church, in which it had found a refuge during the Middle Ages, and now became an indispensable element and ornament of all elevated lives. Many of the social hours which are now filled with music were then given to Latin or Italian oratory, with results which every reader can imagine. The social position of the speaker was a matter of perfect indifference; what was desired was simply the most cultivated humanistic talent.

Burckhardt depicted a society in which humanistic talent enabled individuals to transcend societal boundaries and raise their status. More recent scholars of humanist oratory have restated Burckhardt's contentions, writing, "…social position in no way affected an orator's selection." and "orators were chosen on the basis of talent rather than social position…" The frequency and popularity of oratorical occasions provided such individuals many opportunities for such social advancement.[2]

Since Burckhardt, scholars have also granted an extraordinary importance to the close relationship between humanism and diplomacy in both the intellectual and diplomatic spheres. Garrett Mattingly has made grand claims for the impact of humanism on Renaissance diplomacy.

In his book, *Renaissance Diplomacy,* Mattingly argued that the humanist focus on oratory led to an enhanced focus on diplomacy in early fifteenth-century Italy. This increased diplomatic focus led to the Peace of Lodi and the origins of the resident ambassador directly related to it. However, Mattingly's book famously focused on changes in diplomatic representation rather than the relationship between culture and politics. Subsequently, Mattingly offered little more than assertions regarding the importance of humanism in diplomacy. Along the same lines, Donald Queller has noted the increased importance of humanism in diplomacy during the fifteenth-century. However, like Mattingly, Queller was concerned with distinguishing the origins and developments of different types of diplomatic representation. Beyond a couple of brief assertions, the application of humanism in diplomacy fell outside of his focus. Likewise, several other scholars have examined individual humanists on diplomatic missions in order to illuminate the political particulars underlying these missions. These studies again provide only passing acknowledgment to any application of humanism by these diplomats.[3]

Ronald Witt has argued that diplomacy was crucial in the success of the humanist program at the turn of the fifteenth-century. In a 1990 article, Witt explicitly linked the success of the humanist movement in Florence with the increased number of oratorical situations in communal politics. Witt focused in particular on diplomacy, demonstrating the vast increase of diplomatic commissions around the turn of the fifteenth century. In order to succeed in these positions, patricians needed the oratorical skills that only a humanist education could offer.[4]

In his more recent book, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients,* Witt presented further thoughts on the relationship between diplomacy and intellectuals, claiming that

> Fifteenth-century Florentine examples of classicizing Latin political oratory are largely confined to the work of professional humanists. Nor should we look for

> an immediate influence of the new Latin style on vernacular oratory. Humanists like Bruni adapted the periodic style to vernacular oratory relatively late, only in the 1420s. In other words, training in ancient poetry, history, and oratory did not produce generations of toga-clad patrician senators eloquently debating the business of the republic in the Ciceronian periods that they had learned in school.

Overtime, the broader Florentine patriciate realized that "humanism was not merely the property of a professional elite [which] coincided with a shifting emphasis within humanism itself and, consequently, initiated a development that within a few generations made humanist education essential training for the upper classes in urban centers throughout Italy." In short, a few humanists began using classically inspired oratorical forms in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Eventually, a wider group of Florentine patricians followed suit. [5]

Other evidence supports the contentions of these scholars. One of the more common names by which humanists referred to themselves and other individuals who shared their intellectual interests was "orator", and the most common name for ambassadors by the fifteenth-century in Florence was the same word, "orator". Beyond simple name similarities, the demands on diplomats seem especially suited for the humanists. As Paul Oskar Kristeller famously argued, humanism was a rhetorical rather than a philosophical movement. As a rhetorical movement, it focused on spoken and written eloquence towards the propagation of moral virtue. Better classical eloquence made an individual more suited to persuade his or her contemporaries towards the correct moral action. On the same note, the individuals most suited for persuasion would seem to be the perfect choice for diplomatic appointments. Deep knowledge of words and rhetoric would give a potential diplomat an immeasurable advantage in the world where saying

nothing while saying something or saying something while meaning something else was crucial. Moreover, Lauro Martines has demonstrated that many famous Florentine humanist authors were rich members of the ruling patriciate, many of whom possessed legal training. In another book, Martines has argued that lawyers were the primary holders of Florentine diplomatic positions. The ideals of the active life traditionally associated with early fifteenth-century civic humanists would seem to offer the motivation for famous humanists to pursue diplomatic appointments. The triple threat of eloquence, legal training, and patrician status would seem to cement the dominance of Florentine humanists in diplomacy and offer them an ideal opportunity to practice the civic humanistic ideals preached in their eloquent treatises.[6]

Problems with the Current Interpretation

A deeper analysis of Vespasiano's anecdote combined with contextual archival information and detailed analyses of diplomatic orations problematizes these interpretations. Whereas Vespasiano's anecdote and the work of these scholars portray a diplomatic world dominated by humanist writers, an analysis of the Florentine diplomatic election records tells a vastly different story. Of the over 2400 diplomatic and commissarial positions assigned by Florence between 1394 and 1494, around fifty-seven positions were occupied by humanist authors. Of the fifty-eight diplomats that Florence sent on ten or more missions during these years, three were also the authors of Latin humanist treatises. An additional five humanist authors served as diplomats less than ten times, for a grand total of eight. That is, in the one hundred years that witnessed the birth, flourishing, and relative decline of civic humanism, eight humanist authors filled less than three percent of Florence's diplomatic positions.[7]

The process of electing Florentine diplomats during the fifteenth century indicates that the exclusion of such men was intentional. Unlike prominent domestic offices such as the Standard Bearer of Justice (the official head of Florentine government), the Priors (eight men with powers just below that of the Standard Bearer) or their advisors (two bodies, the twelve good men and the sixteen standard bearers), all of whom were drawn by lot, various Florentine governmental bodies picked particular individuals for particular diplomatic missions. Although a rigorous search in the Florentine archives for exact records concerning the process of nominating diplomats during this period has turned up few results, this process and the care put into it can be pieced together from other materials. The decision to write a diplomatic commission and sometimes even the identity of the diplomat could be decided in *pratiche,* that is the general meetings between the main Florentine governmental bodies and a group of invited patrician advisors. More commonly, the *Signoria* (the collective term for the Standard Bearer of Justice and the Priors) and its colleges (collective term for the twelve good men and the sixteen standard bearers) decided itself to send a diplomat. Once this decision was made, these bodies created a list of potential individuals, most likely around ten, who would be suited for the mission. It then voted on these appointees, informed the individual who secured the position shortly after, and then provided that person with his commission at some point after that, ranging from days to weeks. If that person presented adequate reasons to the *Signoria* and was excused from the appointment, the *Signoria* typically filled the vacancy with a person with similar rank (*messer* or not) and social standing. Whereas social standing was an unofficial mark based on wealth, familial antiquity, and offices held, rank was a cut and dry issue between individuals who possessed an advanced degree or a knighthood (*messer* or *dominus*), and those who did not.[8]

Examinations of election patterns reveal that the *Signoria* sent particular individuals for particular missions. In an excellent long article, Ricardo Fubini has demonstrated how members on the fringes of the Medici faction in mid-fifteenth century Florence, such as Giannozzo Manetti, Luca degli Albizzi, Neri di Gino Capponi, and Alamanno Salviati, were excluded from missions to Milan and ordinarily sent to Venice and the pope. The fact that these men were the same men who ducked the most diplomatic missions during this period indicates that the *Signoria* was repeatedly selecting them for undesirable diplomatic tasks. Moreover, the *Signoria* strongly preferred sending experienced diplomats rather than rookies. Out of 156 diplomatic missions declined by Florentines in the mid fifteenth-century, 138 or 88.5% were declined by individuals who were a diplomat at some other time. Individuals whose careers included at least ten other fulfilled diplomatic positions rejected 63 out of 156 dodged positions, or 40%. Many diplomats possessed familial, business, or other personal connections with the destination of a diplomatic mission or the host ruler. For example, the Pazzi family was especially well connected in France and therefore members of that family often went to that place. Many diplomats focused on particular types of missions or localities. Both Marcello Strozzi and Lorenzo Ridolfi, for example, focused on church matters. In its election process of diplomats, in short, the Florentine government was careful to look at the partisan loyalty, experience, and connections of an individual with the diplomatic destination. If humanists were so well trained in the skills necessary for diplomats, why did the Florentine government repeatedly and intentionally elect other people to fill diplomatic posts?[9]

Moreover, humanism was already integrated into diplomatic oratory by the time that the few humanist authors who managed to serve as diplomats joined the ambassadorial ranks. Ronald Witt argued that humanist authors blazed the trail in incorporating classical rhetoric into

their political orations. Eventually, according to Witt, humanist dilettantes followed their lead and began incorporating humanist teachings in their oratory. However, as Chapter One of this project argues, starting around 1400 humanist teachings regarding classical rhetoric began to make appearances in diplomatic orations. By 1425, such classically styled orations were a relatively common feature of Florentine diplomacy. By contrast, the first famous humanist author elected as a Florentine diplomat was Leonardo Bruni in 1426. Famous humanist authors, therefore, must have been following someone else's lead. If not familiar humanist authors like Leonardo Bruni, Coluccio Salutati, or Poggio Bracciolini, then who was behind this integration of humanism into diplomacy?[10]

The evidence also suggests that humanism played a different role in diplomacy than simply satisfying the classical tastes of elite audiences. Witt noted that humanist orators risked losing their audience with their classical orations. Vespasiano also hit on this topic in the anecdote cited above. He noted the huge crowd that attended these humanist oratorical displays; yet, he also pointed out that many in the audience had no idea what the orator was actually saying. He wrote that those in the crowd who knew Latin thought Manetti's reply to Aeneas Piccolomini was brilliant. Vespasiano was silent concerning what the rest of the crowd thought about it. The members of the audience who had difficulty following Manetti's typically complicated classical Latin, esoteric references, and obscure vocabulary choices, in fact, may have included the Emperor and members of the Florentine *Signoria*, both of whom needed their secretaries to deliver Latin orations on their behalf. This occasion does not seem to have been unusual. Paolo Giovio recorded an anecdote in which Charles V whispered to a companion during one such occasion that "Ah, my tutor Adrian was right when he told me I should be chastened for my childish idleness in learning Latin." Buonaccorso Pitti told an anecdote in his

diary about a diplomatic crisis between Florence and the King of France. On this occasion, the French king was receiving bad second hand information from his advisors because he himself could not follow the Latin words of the Florentines. The Florentine diplomats averted the crisis after one of them had the good sense to restate the Florentines' case in French. Assuming the most basic goal of diplomacy, then as now, is the pursuit of political objectives, what place did orations that rulers and nobles alike sometimes struggled to follow have in diplomacy? Furthermore, if the words of humanists were incomprehensible to so many people in the audience, why did these orations draw such huge crowds?[11]

The paucity of references to humanism in surviving primary sources makes the relationship between humanism and diplomacy even more puzzling. Whether initial commissions, diplomatic dispatches, or final reports, all correspondence between Florentine diplomats and their government declines to mention the form of the opening oration delivered on the mission. Instead, Florentine ambassadors use phrases such as "we declared [our commission] with many words" or even more simply, "we were given public audience". Diaries detailing the day-by-day activities of Florentine diplomats abroad say little about the initial oratorical performances of Florentine diplomats. The descriptions of subsequent orations, responses to orations, and negotiations likewise provide frustratingly few pieces of evidence for humanist involvement. Ermaolo Barbaro's famous treatise on the ambassador devotes little space to the opening oration. He states simply that diplomats should be brief and stick to their commissions. Francesco Filarete's records of public ceremony in Florence contain some brief references to orations, especially after the 1470s; however, although Filarete devotes enormous detail to the rituals marking the entrance of Frederick III into Florence, he is silent regarding the humanist exchanges in Vespasiano's anecdote. The relatively small number of surviving

diplomatic orations by Florentine diplomats is also puzzling, as it seems to suggest that few diplomatic occasions actually called for an elaborate oratorical performance. As Ronald Witt has pointed out, most of these surviving oratorical examples come from the pens of prominent humanist authors. If humanism and diplomacy were so closely connected, where are the references to such performances in diplomatic documents?[12]

In addition, it is clear that these diplomatic documents often masked elaborate oratorical performances. Circumstantial evidence supports this point. References exist to eloquent orations that do not survive in the historical record. For example, one reference congratulates Otto Niccolini on a fine rhetorical performance at Siena. A monk wrote to Cosimo de' Medici requesting a copy of his now lost oration before the pope. Leonardo Stagio Dati delivered an over one hour-long oration to Martin V in 1418. The summaries of speeches delivered in domestic politic situations in Florence also betray humanist influences from the turn of the fifteenth century.[13]

Poggio Bracciolini's *Facetiae* contains a story that provides further evidence for this point. The short length of the story allows it to be quoted in full here.

> When Pope Urban was in Avignon, the people of Perugia sent three ambassadors to him, and, when they arrived, they found the Pope seriously ill. His Holiness, reluctant to keep them waiting, gave them audience, begging them, however, before they began to speak, to be brief. A learned doctor, who during the voyage had learnt by heart a long speech to deliver to the Pope, had no respect for his malady, and launched into an interminable and tiresome discourse. When, finally, the doctor had ended his wearying address, Urban courteously asked the other two what was their wish. One of the other two ambassadors, who had realized the

> stupidity of his companion and the annoyance he had caused the Pope, said: "Holy Father, we have instructions from our people that, if Your Holiness does not do all you can for us in this matter, this companion of mine will read his address all over again." The jest made the Pope laugh, and he ordered that what the Perugians wanted should be done.

Whatever the tale's accuracy, the story reflects that elaborate opening orations were common: the pope's request for a short introductory session went against what the Perugian ambassadors expected and had planned to occur. However, the story also indicates that diplomats walked a fine line with their orations. In this story, the learned doctor was unable to see that the pope's sickness changed the terms of the reception ritual. Rather than criticizing the lengthy oration, Poggio is critical of the learned doctor because he delivered it when the pope was sick. The implication is that a diplomat in such a situation should have asked the pope for a later meeting after the illness had subsided for the offering of the cultural gift. Only a witty remark saved the diplomats from their colleague's carelessness and the impending wrath of the pope.[14]

There is also more solid evidence that the short repetitive statements in archival documents describing initial orations sometimes hid elaborate diplomatic performances. Diplomats used the same cursory and standard language in their reports and dispatches to describe situations where a surviving elaborate humanist oration was delivered as they did to describe missions on which undoubtedly a couple of words of greeting followed by a short list of diplomatic demands sufficed. The examples quoted earlier of cursory descriptions of initial orations offered in final reports provides evidence for this point. The first quote, "we declared [our commission] with many words", is how Leonardo Bruni describes his humanist oration before Martin V in 1426, an oration discussed at length in chapter two. The second quotation,

"we were given public audience", describes a long humanist oration by Filippo de' Medici in 1461, discussed in this project in chapter four. Certainly, some diplomatic situations only featured a short list of demands. For example, Lorenzo Benevenuti went to Città di Castello in 1422 and described his initial meeting with similar language as Bruni and Filippo de' Medici: "…[I] arrived at Castello, visited the priors, [and] put forth the usual greetings, comforts, and offers.". Agnolo Spini's and Francesco Fioravanti's report on their mission to Siena in 1398 states simply that they went to Siena and were able to accomplish nothing. Such missions demonstrate that different diplomatic missions required variation in diplomatic oratorical styles. Like all gifts, language and rhetorical style were tied to diplomatic status and were tools that Florence used to make diplomatic statements. As a statement of prestige, missions of low importance or to lesser powers had to feature less prominent diplomats and less eloquent performances in order to avoid offending more powerful states. Eloquent humanist orations for every mission would send the disastrous message that Florence viewed all rulers and diplomatic missions as equal. Yet, important missions were a frequent event in the volatile world that was fifteenth-century Italian diplomacy. If humanist orations were so prominent, why do so few exist in the historical record when compared with the amount of missions that undoubtedly called for such performances?[15]

The Argument

Diplomatic ritual shaped the practical application of humanism in Quattrocento Florentine foreign politics. Oratory was the core event occurring in a diplomatic reception ritual. In his recent book on early modern ritual, Edward Muir described this type of event. He wrote that these events formed

> … a ritual defense of the city just as the circumference of walls provided a military one. Like baptism or a knighting ceremony, the formalities of the entry constituted a rite of passage marking the spatial separation of the foreign visitor from the outside world, the dangerously liminal stage of the visitor's passing across the threshold of the town gate, and the reaggregation of the visitor with the outside world when he or she left. Since the visit of any influential foreigner, no matter how ritualized, reverberated with the discordant undertones of local power and prestige, entries were often fraught with tensions. The scrupulous observance of mutually accepted gestures and procedures pledged a certain level of security, but the rigidity of the forms meant that the slightest deviation could be interpreted as a deliberate insult.

Florentine diplomats needed two characteristics to navigate such dangerous waters. On the one hand, Florence's representatives needed familial ancestry. Through their background, the Florentine government indicated that the host ruler was worth the Republic's best citizens. On the other hand, Florentine diplomats had to possess the necessary learning to complete successfully the oratorical performances that were the main event of these reception rituals. It was the necessity of meeting both of these demands that shaped the role and form of humanism in Florentine diplomacy.[16]

The script for diplomatic reception rituals began with the social status of the individuals sent as diplomats. As Chapter One argues, a long familial history of office-holding in Florence was the unifying characteristic among Florence's most prominent diplomats. Wealth, familial ancestry, and a long tradition of office holding determined social status in Florence. When selecting from men of varying social status for diplomatic positions, Florence had to weigh not

only the prestige of the ruler at the diplomatic destination, but also the status level of the diplomats sent by other powers to that host ruler. In one striking example, the *Signoria* originally intended to send a man of high rank to the condottiere Jacopo Piccinino. After discovering that Florence's ally Milan was sending a much less renowned man, the Florentine government changed the identity of its diplomat to a man with less credentials and rank. Whether or not Piccinino would have been offended or flattered by too prestigious a diplomat, Florence could not risk showing up Milan. Moreover, such worry regarding sending a person with the correct amount of social status was a legitimate concern. The ruler Charles the Bold, for example, condemned the fact that the Neapolitans had selected a more prestigious diplomat for a mission to the King of France in 1474 than they had sent to him. Vespasiano's anecdote cited earlier betrays his own concern with status in diplomacy. In criticizing the choice of Carlo Marsuppini as the orator for the entrance of Frederick III into Florence, Vespasiano aimed his criticism not at Marsuppini's inferior eloquence to Manetti's, but rather Marsuppini's inferior social status. Marsuppini was merely the Florentine chancellor, whereas Manetti was a member of the colleges, that is, one of the advisory bodies for the Florentine *Signoria.* In the secondary literature, Richard Trexler's discussion of the "Ritual of Foreign Relations" in his *Public Life in Renaissance Florence,* likewise emphasized the key place of status in Florentine diplomatic relations.[17]

When weighing such factors, the famous humanist authors in Florence simply did not make the cut. Certainly, as Lauro Martines has pointed out, virtually all famous Florentine humanists were rich. However, as Robert Black has pointed out, most of these men were first generation Florentine immigrants. As immigrants, these men lacked the familial ancestries and tradition of political office-holding necessary for prominent diplomatic positions. The Florentine

government, thus, employed them in more anonymous domestic positions, such as secretaries, in which it could use their rhetorical training and ignore their backgrounds. It is for this reason that famous humanists are so noticeably absent from the election records. As Chapter One argues, however, the absence of famous humanists did not mean the absence of humanism. While these humanist authors aided the state at home, humanist dilettantes starting around 1400 began introducing humanist teachings into diplomatic oratory. These individuals were members of the Florentine ruling group who were interested to varying degrees in the humanist movement, but who were outside of its core group of Latin writers. These men have left strong evidence of their interest in humanism through their correspondences with humanists, classically styled orations, appearances as interlocutors in humanist treatises, participation in humanist discussion groups, and/or praise by their contemporaries for their learning. These men consistently combined the necessary familial lineage with their modest degree of learning to make them far stronger candidates for diplomatic commissions than their more famous humanist colleagues. Sending such men not only met ancestry requirements, but also the modest amount of humanist learning possessed by these men made it more likely that Florence's representatives abroad could follow the Latin orations of other diplomats.[18]

The study of the humanist interests of such individuals on the fringes of the humanist movement is a wide-open field for historical study. Two scholars have touched the tip of the iceberg with short biographical lists of some of these individuals. Lauro Martines' *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists* provides short biographies for some of the more prominent figures; yet, the body of his text focuses overwhelmingly on the more famous Latin writers. Mario Cosenza likewise provides short statements on several figures without advancing more than random connections between these men and humanist texts and authors.[19]

Other scholars have devoted a small amount of attention to these figures. Jonathan Davies has pointed to the pivotal role that they played in overseeing the Florentine university during the Quattrocento, an institution that he argues was at the center of the city's culture. His comments concerning culturally inclined patricians; however, take up only a few pages in his fine study of the Florentine university. James Hankins has looked for references to the Platonic Academy in the extant writings of many of these figures who were contemporaries of Marsilio Ficino. Hankins' article provides indispensable leads for further research on several of these figures even as Hankins himself focuses on Ficino and the existence and nature of his Platonic Academy. Along similar lines is the older Italian study, *Storia dell'Accademia Platonica,* by Arnaldo della Torre. This 1902 work is crucial for della Torre's reconstruction of intellectual circles in fifteenth-century Florence, a task which necessitates at least passing discussion by della Torre of many important humanist dilettantes. Emilio Santini's *Firenze e i suoi oratori* devoted space to these figures. However, Santini's work often amounts simply to his praise of plain Italian oratory and critique of humanism in general. Historians studying Florentine politics know many of the names of these humanist dilettantes; yet, beyond an occasional statement referring to a figure's education, such studies avoid discussions of the humanist interests of these political movers and shakers. The lack of original treatises by these men has placed them outside of studies of intellectual historians. Some brief biographical information concerning them occasionally appears in art historical literature because many of these men were patrons of Renaissance artists or held positions related to public building projects. Their role as connoisseurs and participants in Renaissance written culture, however, is unknown beyond the simple fact that it existed. This dissertation takes a first step towards understanding the cultural role of this group. In terms of the relationship between humanism and diplomacy, far from

passive recipients or removed patrons of the ideas and works of humanist authors, these dilettantes were the trendsetters while their more famous humanist colleagues followed their lead.[20]

In addition to social status, diplomatic reception rituals required men who could successfully complete the exchange of cultural and honorific gifts permeating these events. The first gift was one of esteem from the host ruler to the diplomats. In this exchange, the host ruler and/or a group of prominent citizens greeted the diplomats outside of the city walls. The distance from the city at which a host ruler greeted visiting diplomats was a statement of the esteem in which the host ruler viewed them and their home city. A greeting at a shorter or further distance from the city walls equated to the level of the gift of esteem offered by the host ruler to the diplomat. As the republic's representative abroad, the strong and weak points of a diplomat reflected on his principal just as their treatment by a host ruler reflected onto the relations between the regimes themselves. In this way, the distance at which a host ruler or his or her representatives met a diplomat became a gift of esteem from the host state to the diplomat's home state. Immediately following the entrance of the diplomats into the host city, or soon after if the time of day or some other contingency prohibited an immediate audience, the diplomats had their first meeting with the host ruler. In this meeting, the head of the embassy presented the letters of credence to the host ruler. As Muir and Trexler have argued, through these formalized events, the two states involved in the reception ritual sought to establish sincerity and thus navigate a period of tension. At this point or in a private meeting a day or two later, a member of the diplomatic entourage delivered an oration. Like the material gifts on the days that followed, these orations served as a cultural gift to express the esteem of the diplomats' principal towards the host ruler.[21]

Diplomatic missions of special importance required orations that could serve as a gesture from the Florentine government acknowledging the special nature of the mission. These occasions included missions with particularly high political stakes, to particularly important rulers, and for ceremonial occasions such as weddings, the accession of new rulers, and celebrations for newly victorious rulers. From the beginning of the fifteenth-century, diplomats began using a humanist style to make their orations surpass the standard oratorical performance. Through these gestures, diplomats offered more than diplomatic rituals required. By offering more, they offered a "cultural gift". Richard Trexler has described the role of material gifts, such as money, jewels, art, precious metals, cloths, etc., in diplomacy. He wrote that

> The purpose of the gift being first to express the love of the commune, recipients naturally compared their gifts to what their official predecessors had received and what other states' dignitaries were given. In an official gift, recipients sought personal identity. How could the commune express affection if its gift was of the same value as one previously given the same person, the same as one given to that person's predecessor in office, or inferior to one given an official equal from another state. In a traditional society with limited methods of communicating power and affection, neither rationalistic conceptions of hierarchical order nor concern for the cost of such gifts could restrain the tendency toward larger gifts. The commune of Florence recognized these realities by retaining the right to supersede the statutory limits it had set on gifts. At the same time, it attempted to individuate the gift through its *varietà* and its workmanship while staying with the legal expense limits on materials for gifts. It used art.

For Trexler, such gifts "…clearly had the purpose of identifying Florence as a city of wealth and charity…" Moreover, these gifts often fit into a larger program of rituals designed to express to the host ruler the Florentines' glee, such as informing the ruler of celebratory bonfires and bell ringing in Florence. Yet, humanism is noticeably absent from Trexler's description. This project argues that the Florentines used humanist eloquence in exactly the same way as Trexler describes their use and the purpose of material gifts. Instead of a reputation for wealth, such performances created a reputation for Florence as the most learned and eloquent city in all of Italy. Eventually, the demands of upholding and surpassing this reputation necessitated a shift in the ways that the Florentines viewed its parvenu humanists. The integration and subsequent alterations of humanism in diplomacy reflected the Florentine government's constant efforts to surpass previous diplomatic gestures in order to offer cultural gifts to host rulers. By the 1480s, the demands of diplomatic gift giving required the presence of famous Florentine humanist authors regardless of their lack of familial history.[22]

The content of humanist diplomatic orations supports the argument that the primary role of humanism in diplomacy was as a cultural gift. Aside from a couple of Manetti's many surviving diplomatic orations, each humanist speech delivered by or written by a famous humanist author focuses ostentatiously on praise while procrastinating the negotiations of political matters. These orations typically end with blunt comments stating that such negotiations will begin at the host ruler's leisure. By separating politics from culture, diplomats were able to indicate to host rulers that their orations were outside of the political particulars underlying their presence. By failing to advance these negotiations, the diplomats drew the host ruler's attention to the fact that Florence had added an additional element to their mission beyond the typical political haggling. In addition to this gesture, the separation of culture from politics

served a practical purpose. Whether or not the host ruler and the audience understood the subtleties or even the major points of praise in the oration, they could understand the oratorical action itself and the quality of the person delivering it. In diplomacy, the practical role of humanism was to provide a cultural gift through offering a show in which not everyone totally understood the content, but everyone understood the performance. This argument fits into another contention of Richard Trexler concerning Florentine public ritual. Trexler argued that forms in diplomacy were the same as meaning, that is, the act of doing something in a diplomatic setting, regardless of intention, made it sincere. In the same way, the act of offering humanism as a cultural gift made the words for some members of the audience irrelevant. The gift was the gesture itself.[23]

Yet, orations also had to cater to the members of the audience that could follow the diplomat's rhetorical subtleties. Certainly, humanist writers, dilettantes, well-educated rulers, and others in the audience understood the rhetorical moves of the orator. To appease these members of the audience, the orator's speech had to display unprecedented rhetorical skill and eloquence. As the following chapters argue, diplomats constantly searched for ways to alter the style and content of their orations to make their performances memorable. At first, basic adherence to a classical style was innovative. After a classical style was common, orators sought to include creative content, often drawing favorable comparisons between the host ruler and figures from antiquity. As the century progressed, diplomats began including ever more complicated classical forms and content as they strove to offer a successful cultural gift.

The combined focus on humanist style and humanist content in this dissertation provides in some ways a continuation of the work of Ronald Witt's *In the Footsteps of the Ancients.* In his innovative study, Witt examines the integration of humanism into different literary genres

based on the presence or absence of classical forms. This project continues Witt's narrative by investigating how a humanist style moved into diplomatic oratory after roughly 1400, the year in which Witt's narrative roughly breaks off. Witt also is concerned to demonstrate a key aspect of humanist content in his analysis. Working from the arguments of Hans Baron, Witt argues that Leonardo Bruni added republican rhetoric to humanism at roughly the same time that humanist influences moved into oratory. This project, by contrast, accepts the work of Jerrold Siegel, James Hankins, and other scholars who argued that humanists were able to change their rhetorical foci depending on the task. Subsequently, this dissertation examines the practical means by which orators used the presence and absence of particular kinds of content in their orations to make subtle diplomatic statements, rather than searching for common ideological themes in these speeches.[24]

Moreover, this interpretation of humanism as a cultural gift explains both the small number of surviving oratorical examples delivered by Florentine diplomats and the weak presence of humanism in diplomatic documents. The surviving body of Florentine diplomatic oratory reflects the oratorical examples viewed as both delivered on the most demanding missions and by the most eloquent individuals, rather than the exclusivity of humanist oratory to a handful of famous humanist authors. As Ronald Witt has pointed out, surviving oratorical examples were copied for the purpose of imitation. Those orations deemed most worthy of imitation are the speech examples surviving in the historical record. The examples of diplomatic oratory written by humanist authors, individuals unmatched in their reputations for eloquence, would have provided the obvious place for diplomats looking for models of oratory to follow. Most of these surviving diplomatic orations were delivered on occasions of special importance, that is, occasions that required a strong cultural gift. Once again, as examples of orations

delivered on missions with the strongest oratorical component, these surviving orations provided the obvious place for diplomats to look for models to follow.[25]

Furthermore, the role of humanism as a cultural gift in a ritualized event explains the small presence of humanism in diplomatic documents. Every mission to every ruler involved the same basic diplomatic entrance ritual. Humanist orations played a key part in meeting the demands of these standard ritual requirements. What differed between important missions to powerful rulers and negligible missions to Tuscan neighbors was the stress and length of particular parts of the ritual. As the following chapters demonstrate, the instructions for opening orations did reflect this change by including more detail than normal concerning the type of words an orator was to use for these opening orations. This additional information served as a reminder to diplomats of the enhanced importance of this occasion for this mission. When describing the initial meeting with a host ruler in letters and final reports, the vague and cursory statements used by diplomats were enough information to indicate to the Florentine government that the seemingly never changing diplomatic rituals had been a success. By contrast to these standard rituals, the political particulars for each diplomatic meeting were different. After all, these political particulars were usually the reason for the mission in the first place. Because these political particulars were different from mission to mission, diplomats had to devote great detail in their letters and reports to conveying all the political information that was unique to their mission.

The twin demands of diplomatic status and offering cultural gifts in diplomacy elevated the status of humanists in Florentine society. The first aspect of humanism to become integrated into diplomacy was humanist styles and ideas. Chapter One demonstrates that this initial integration occurred largely between 1400 and 1425 and was the work of patrician dilettantes.

By 1425, humanist styled orations were no longer by themselves extraordinary events. Therefore, diplomatic gestures on especially significant missions required more than the usual patrician and his basic classical knowledge. Chapter Two argues that the Florentine government began using Leonardo Bruni's literary reputation to enhance orations delivered by more respectable Florentine patricians. After Bruni's death in 1444, Giannozzo Manetti combined his old Florentine familial history with his unprecedented oratorical abilities and reputation to make such measures unnecessary. Simply put, missions that required a special diplomatic gesture required Giannozzo Manetti. Chapter Three examines his diplomatic career and many surviving diplomatic orations. After Manetti's self-imposed exile, the Florentine government was again faced with a situation where its most outstanding humanists lacked prestigious ancestries. Once again, patricians began going on particularly significant missions with orations that more famous humanists had written. Simultaneously, Florence began assigning important missions to churchmen who they expected to deliver eloquent orations. Such men combined their cultural gift with the prestige of their office in the same way as patrician dilettantes combined their familial prestige with orations written by famous humanists. Finally, in 1484, the Florentines sent the famous humanist, but parvenu Bartolomeo Scala to deliver the oration on the mission to congratulate Innocent VIII on his election to the papacy. Scala's diplomatic commission was the final step in the elevation of the status of intellectuals in Florentine diplomacy. From 1400 to 1484, this status had progressively elevated from the inclusion of only their ideas, to only their reputations, to their presence when accompanied by a familial history, to their presence alone.

These arguments provide rare insights into the social role and reputation of intellectuals outside of learned circles and in the broader Italian society. Several recent studies have begun to investigate the ways that humanism fit and spread into the world around them. However, the

theme unifying virtually all of these studies is the attempt by scholars to use the content and/or language of humanist works to examine the spread of humanist ideas into an audience wider than the handful of actual humanist authors. Such studies can prove an attempt to engage a wider audience, but ultimately must assume the reception of these attempts by the audience. For example, James Hankins has investigated the translation of Leonardo Bruni's Latin works into the vernacular, arguing that such translations not only made them more accessible in terms of language but also in terms of their ideas. Alison Brown has looked at the role of Plato in creating a legitimatization of Medici rule in Florence. Brown looks at the presence of Platonic ideas in vernacular public orations to argue for their use in legitimizing the supremacy of the Medici in Florentine politics to the city's population. John McManamon and Anthony d'Elia have examined humanist funerary oratory and wedding oratory, respectively, in order to gain insights on the broader views of Renaissance people on topics covered in these orations.[26]

Two notable exceptions to this trend attempt to find hard evidence of the views of the wider population on humanists and their ideas. The French scholar Christian Bec has published three books on the spread of humanism into the wider Florentine populations. In particular, Bec has examined the diaries and book ownership of Florentine merchants for evidence of humanist interests among Florentine merchants. However, Bec's focus on mercantile writings downplays the works of humanist authors, which are virtually absent from his studies. Lauro Martines' *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists* has argued persuasively for the high reputation that Florentine humanists enjoyed in Florence. He attributes this high reputation to the increased focus on oratory in early fifteenth-century Florence and focuses in particular on the high domestic status enjoyed by several famous Florentine authors. However, like Bec and in direct

opposition to the other studies looking at the role of humanists in Renaissance society, Martines focuses exclusively on archival documents without analyzing humanist texts.[27]

This dissertation seeks to add a new method of researching the relationship between humanists, humanism, and the broader Italian society by combining the social world of the humanists with discussions of the actual works of humanists. This project asks where exactly orations with humanist content were applied, why it was important to present it in a humanist manner, who exactly was able to present this information, and how exactly did they present it. By looking at the oratorical performances of dilettantes, the answers to these questions follow the work of Christian Bec in providing much harder evidence for the interest and application of humanist learning outside of the standard humanist ranks than scholars traditionally have offered. By examining the ritualistic demands of diplomacy, this project provides firm evidence for the social advantages that intellectuals were able to gain through the incorporation and popularity of their ideas. By looking at the exact role of humanism in diplomacy, this project argues that the origins and changes of the humanist movement, at least in diplomacy, were rooted in the demands on Florentine diplomats to offer cultural gifts. By examining the content of humanist diplomatic orations, this project demonstrates what, exactly, made these cultural gifts so successful and sought after, that is, the changing standards for humanist eloquence.

Understanding the role of humanists and the application of humanist learning in diplomacy involves crossing the boundaries that typically separate historical sub-disciplines. Without the insights into ritual and social status gained from the work of social historians, the virtual absence of famous humanist authors from diplomacy makes little sense. Without the analysis of the style and content of humanist orations gained through the methods of intellectual historians, the changing means by which diplomats offered cultural gifts to rulers likewise makes

little sense. Without the work of political and diplomatic historians, these diplomats would be men without an historical context. By combining these sub-disciplines, this dissertation seeks to open new paths for historical research into both the public world of intellectuals and the innumerable men and women who were directly responsible for the success and shaping of the humanist movement, while leaving historians only indirect evidence of this involvement. Along the way, this project also offers a re-evaluation of the texts and social place of more familiar figures such as Leonardo Bruni and Giannozzo Manetti and their relationship with their less famous colleagues and the political world around them.[28]

CHAPTER ONE: THE INTEGRATION OF HUMANISM INTO DIPLOMACY, 1375-1424

Humanism began to infiltrate Florentine diplomatic practice in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. By 1410, a handful of Florentine patricians had integrated humanist learning into their diplomatic orations. Filippo Magalotti delivered one such example in 1408. In this oration, Filippo Magalotti attempted to combine Italian prose with Latin quotations drawn from classical and humanist sources into a classically styled panegyric. Magalotti's style contrasted with fourteenth-century examples of diplomatic orations. A straightforward oratorical style that ignored classical standards marked these earlier oratorical examples. Moreover, the tiny amount of space in fourteenth-century diplomatic commissions devoted to a diplomat's opening oration reflects this plain style. Diplomatic commissions following Magalotti's oration began to devote more attention to the initial oratorical occasion. A growing number of Florentine patricians integrated humanism into their diplomatic oratory. By 1424, humanist and more traditional oratorical forms coexisted in Florentine diplomacy.

Throughout this process, Florence excluded its most famous humanist authors and scholars from diplomatic appointments. The famous humanist teacher Roberto Rossi taught numerous Florentine patricians who would later become diplomats. However, he himself lacked even a single diplomatic commission. Poggio Bracciolini and Leonardo Bruni both fled Florence for the opportunities presented by the papal curia. Bracciolini never served as a Florentine diplomat. Bruni's lackluster diplomatic career (two missions in 1426) contrasted with the prestige of his domestic offices. Niccolò Niccoli avoided all government offices, including diplomatic ones. Coluccio Salutati, Jacopo da Scarperia, Ambrogio Traversari, Cino Rinuccini, Carlo Marsuppini, and others were all prominent humanist authors who did not serve as Florentine diplomats.[29]

These humanist authors all lacked the familial prestige, antiquity, and/or legal status necessary to hold diplomatic positions. More than any other criteria, familial antiquity was the most common characteristic possessed by Florence's most prominent diplomats. In particular, these diplomats shared a long familial history of serving in the *tre maggiori,* the three major political bodies in the Florentine Republic. Election of a family into the *tre maggiori* was *the* primary requirement for entrance into the Florentine ruling patriciate. Fourteen of the seventeen individuals (82%) who served as a diplomat twenty or more times between 1394 and 1494 came from families who had held offices in the *tre maggiori* by 1326. Ten of these patricians could boast the same status before the end of the thirteenth century. The families of individuals who served as diplomats between ten and nineteen times reveal a similar pattern. Of the forty-one such individuals during this hundred year period, thirty of them (73%) came from families represented in the *tre maggiori* in or before 1326. An ancient familial history of holding office in Florence trumped both a legal degree and a knighthood. Between 1394 and 1494, Florence sent fifty-eight diplomats on more than ten missions. Of these men, eight were lawyers. Nine of these men started their diplomatic careers with knightly status and another sixteen were knighted during the course of their career as a diplomat. These figures suggest that a knighthood was a prize sought by diplomats rather than a prerequisite for a diplomatic career.[30]

Throughout the first quarter of the fifteenth century, Florence's humanist dilettantes possessed this ancient familial history whereas the city's most obvious humanist authors lacked it. Bruni, Poggio, and Marsuppini were Aretine immigrants. Ambrogio Traversari was another newcomer to Florence. Coluccio Salutati gained Florentine citizenship for himself and his heirs only in 1400. The Niccoli family had more of a Florentine history than these figures; however, it had very limited participation in the commune's highest offices before the fifteenth century.

Roberto Rossi and Leon Battista Alberti came from old families; however, their status as a magnate and an illegitimate son of an exile, respectively, prevented them from holding almost any government position, including diplomatic appointments. In fact, by 1424, humanism had undoubtedly established a place in diplomacy; yet, by the same date, Florence had employed only two men traditionally viewed as humanists as diplomats: Palla di Nofri Strozzi and Lorenzo Benevenuti. Neither of these men were prominent humanist authors. Palla di Nofri seems to have dedicated himself to translating Greek works into Latin only after his exile to Padua. Lorenzo Benevenuti wrote one invective of questionable authorship against the humanist Niccolò Niccoli. Benevenuti went on only three diplomatic missions. Rather than humanist authors, individuals with varying degrees of interests in humanism filled diplomatic roles. These humanist dilettantes, men such as Nicola de' Medici, Palla di Palla Strozzi, Salamone Strozzi, Agnolo Pandolfini, Filippo Magalotti, Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi, Lorenzo Ridolfi and Filippo Corsini, all came from ancient and powerful Florentine families and served in diplomatic roles. Starting in the first decade of the fifteenth century, a handful of Florentine patricians with scanty humanist connections were instrumental in integrating humanist oratory into diplomacy. Following the respective deaths of these men, more individuals with stronger connections to humanism added their own classical stamp on diplomatic oratory. These men continued to come from the fringes of the humanist movement while famous authors of civic humanistic treatises remained at home.[31]

The increasing integration of humanist oratory into diplomacy by these humanist dilettantes reflected the attempts of the Florentine government to offer special acknowledgement on key missions to host rulers. An increased focus on ceremony in fifteenth-century diplomacy and the novelty of humanism in the public political world of Renaissance Italy laid the

foundation for this development. For both diplomatic missions of special ceremonial importance between 1400 and 1420 (the conquest of Rome by King Ladislaus of Naples and the election of Martin V as pope), the Florentine ambassadors offered a cultural gift by integrating humanist elements into their opening oration. Diplomats on such missions went beyond offering their usual political and familial prestige by adding humanist eloquence. This addition enabled them to take their congratulations on the old ruler's victory or the new ruler's position to a level beyond that offered by familial prestige alone. Between 1400 and 1425, especially in the years around 1420, such gifts became increasingly common. Whereas in 1400 a Florentine patrician using humanist eloquence was a cultural gift, by 1425 it was common enough that host rulers no longer viewed it as extraordinary.[32]

The Fourteenth Century

In the late fourteenth-century, diplomatic orations lacked humanist embellishments. A late fourteenth-century manuscript of exemplar orations provides samples of diplomatic oratory before the influence of humanism had started. The titles of the orations contained in the manuscript reveal their instructive purpose. The topical range of the orations covers every possible diplomatic situation. One oration is entitled simply "How ambassadors sent to any commune ought to speak" Other orations are designed for more particular purposes, including orations for embassies to a hostile ruler, to the pope, to a new king, to the emperor, to request aid in a war, to reach a peace agreement, and others. Evidence suggests that at least some of these orations were examples of actual diplomatic oratory. For example, instructions for embassies to congratulate a ruler on a victory, to console a ruler suffering some problem, and to accompany a ruler through a territory contain the actual responses to these orations.[33]

An unadorned style is consistent throughout the orations in the manuscript. The orations are all in the vernacular. Quotations and anecdotes are rare. In fact, most orations contain no citations or literary allusions at all. The Bible is the most prominent source, with quotations from Christ and Solomon being the most common. An oration for a diplomat to a prince suffering from adversity contains by far the most literary allusions. This oration exclusively cites the Bible, referring to the wisdom of Solomon, the book of Job, and a story about Solomon's son David. An oration for a diplomat explaining a war between his home state and a neighbor uses a metaphor. However, the metaphor is nonsensical: A tree receives its nutrients from its roots, without these nutrients it will die, the branches of the tree enjoy the well being of the head of the tree, and the emperor is the commune's head. Orations designed for missions focused on offering praise for a ruler likewise ignored classical precepts. Cicero had deemed numerous topics suitable for a panegyric, including health, birth, friends, offices, and wealth, amongst others. Rather than following Cicero, an example of epideictic oratory offered in the manuscript makes a list of the good things to come during the reign of the new king. On one occasion, the orator even evoked a biblical image by stating that "the lamb will lie down next to the wolf". The structure of each oration in the manuscript follows a similar non-classical pattern. Each oration begins with a statement expressing the devotion of the ambassador's principal (usually a *podestà*) or commune to the host ruler. The second part states the reason for the ambassador's arrival in basic terms. None of these orations follow the classical division of an oration into exordium (the attention getter), narration (the story), partition (division of the oration into parts), confirmation (proof of an orator's case), refutation (arguments against an opponent's case), and peroration (conclusion).[34]

A closer examination of the oration, "How the ambassadors ought to speak when sent to some land for an injury done to one of their citizens", strengthens these points. The oration is in Italian and offers neither historical examples nor literary allusions. It begins by stating that a person with a just cause need not fear God. Having a just cause, the ambassador did not fear to come into the host ruler's territory. The first part of the oration thus presented an implied argument - the host ruler ought to respect the diplomat's well being - rather than an attention grabbing exordium. The oration's second part offers the reason for the arrival of the diplomats. The ambassadors do not wish to see an incident grow into something worse. "Dominus Bernardo" has done an unspecified injury to the citizens in the ambassadors' state. This action has the potential to "generate discord". The ambassador speaks for his ruler (his *podesta*) and his commune in requesting that the host ruler place this wrong under his judgment so that the two powers can continue their good relations. The orator's companion, "messer S.", can offer further details. This middle part clearly establishes the reason for the mission, but again falls far short of classical standards. The orator mentions the grievance, the accused, and the possibly harmful ramifications of Messer Bernardo's actions. The orator fails to offer the particulars of the grievance (narration), a clear division of the oration (partition), evidence for the orator's case (confirmation), or counter-arguments against any possible objections to his case (refutation). The presence of names in this oration implies that this plain Italian oration was actually delivered on a fourteenth-century diplomatic mission, rather than simply a hypothetical set of guidelines.[35]

The classical structure of an oration delivered by the Florentine ambassadors, Alessandro dalla Antella and Donato Barbadori, to Pope Gregory XI at Avignon in 1376 contrasted with the oratorical examples in the precedent manuscript. In this oration, the speaker immediately attempted to seize his listeners' attention with hypothetical statements: Had the pope's

governors in Italy been just rulers, the ambassadors would not be present. Shortly after the end of these hypothetical statements, the orator stated his partition by declaring that he will describe the horrors of the rule of the papal governors to the pope because, clearly, such terrible actions were occurring without the pope's knowledge. The orator has thus slyly established that the remainder of his oration will discuss these specific grievances. The narration of the oration describes the situation underlying the conflict between Florence and the papal governors. Namely, the starving Florentines had requested food from the papal governors, who had an abundance of it. The governors had refused their request for food and had sent an army against them. Following the story, the orator begins his confirmation by laying out his arguments defending the actions of the Florentines. In this section, the orator even evokes pitiful images of hungry children and old-women refugees – starved and evicted, respectively, by the soldiers of the papal governors – through a serious of rhetorical questions. Such attempts to move the listener emotively is an example of ekphrasis. Ronald Witt has contrasted the presence of ekphrasis in classical and humanist oratory with the lack of it in medieval oratory. Whether the oration contained a refutation or a peroration remains a mystery because of the incomplete status of the manuscript.[36]

However, in all other ways beyond its structure, this oration contained the same non-classical elements as the examples in the precedent book. The orator has maintained an unadorned Italian style, meaning that he has avoided changes in word order, word groupings, and vocabulary aimed at rhetorical effects. The speech made neither identifiable allusions nor direct quotations from either religious or secular sources. The use of history in the oration is vague and cursory. For example, the Florentines have been devoted sons of the church "from antiquity" or, later in the oration, they have suffered "infinite persecutions and damages for the defense of the

Roman Pope" The use of the concept of tyranny in the oration is typical of fourteenth-century thought. The proof that the papal governors were tyrants, according to the oration, was in the fact that they could not trust the "will of the citizens." The arms hired by these governors and the fortresses that they built to control their subjects proved that they ruled without citizen consent. This equation of tyranny with ruling without citizen consent was similar to the definition of a tyrant offered by Coluccio Salutati in his 1399 text, the *On the Tyrant.* Although Salutati was a humanist author, the ideas in this work were largely indebted to the trecento jurist Bartolo de Sassoferrato rather than a classical source. Moreover, the conception of tyranny espoused both in the oration and Saluati's treatise differed from the dichotomy between republicanism and tyranny generally assumed to have originated with fifteenth-century humanists.[37]

Ronald Witt has also observed the limited inroads of humanism into oratory in the latter half of the fourteenth-century. Witt argued that three Florentine rhetoricians – Luigi di Teri di Nello Gianfigliazzi, Cino Rinuccini, and Lapo da Castiglionchio – were instrumental in changing styles of oratory in the late fourteenth century. While Witt is undoubtedly correct in attributing oratorical reforms in general to these men, these men made only limited inroads in changing the forms of diplomatic oratory. Witt argues that Gianfigliazzi was a frequent diplomat who wrote a summary of Cicero's *De inventione* and the Pseudo-Ciceronian *Ad Herennium.* Witt points out that the lack of a surviving oration written by Gianfigliazzi prevents a detailed analysis of his oratory. The fact that Gianfigliazzi's scholarship on Cicero lacks novel elements may suggest that he continued to prefer traditional oratorical forms. Witt argues that "the speeches of [Cino] Rinuccini himself probably come closest to representing the best of humanist efforts at composing speeches in Florence in the late fourteenth-century." Witt convincingly demonstrates

the teacher Rinuccini's focus on classical elements in his pedagogical oratory; however, Rinuccini has left no evidence that he ever served as a diplomat.[38]

The three surviving diplomatic orations by Petrarch's friend Lapo da Castiglionchio to the pope in Avignon in 1366 provide a rare exception to the typical style of diplomatic oratory during the fourteenth century. Witt argues that certain aspects of these orations fit into the medieval *ars dictaminis* tradition. In particular, he points to Lapo's use of abstract nouns and set phrases as evidence of the continuation of tradition in Lapo's oratory. It could be added that all three of these orations lack adherence to a classical structure. However, Witt also points out that the orations make the first use of ekphrasis since antiquity. They, also according to Witt, do not display an overt concern for *cursus* (the prose meter underlying the *ars dictaminis* tradition). Moreover, Lapo was well aware of classical standards for oratorical structure, even if he avoided uses them. In fact, Lapo declared in the exordium to his first oration that he would omit an exordium from his oration. Lapo used classical citations in his orations, referring to Caesar, Ovid, and Seneca. Lapo's third oration begins with a long section that stresses his lack of eloquence, thus stressing his attention to it. This entire oration focuses on an exhortation to the pope to return to Rome. This exhortation is full of references to classical history, biblical history, and Roman topography.[39]

Yet, Lapo's integration of humanism into his diplomatic oratory was idiosyncratic rather than standard practice. The oratorical examples in the precedent manuscript and the 1376 oration to the pope strongly support this claim. Moreover, late trecento diplomatic commissions provide evidence that Lapo's peers used oratory closer to the precedent book than to Cicero. The parts of these commissions dedicated to the initial oration between a diplomat and a host ruler typically are short. For example, in 1375, the *Signoria* sent an ambassador to Siena with the

instructions to greet the Sienese rulers as "affectionately as you are able and in the usual way." Later fourteenth-century examples retained this brevity. An ambassador to Faenza in the summer of 1398 – over twenty years later - was to greet the ruler, Astore, "affectuosamente". Instructions to a diplomat to Lucca used the identical word "affectuosamente" to describe the type of greeting the ambassador was to make. Instructions for ambassadors orating to the pope sometimes included more detail. For example, a mission by top ambassadors to the pope in Rome in 1399 contained long and detailed instructions for their first oration. On this occasion, the ambassadors were to stress the ancient Guelf ties of Florence. They were also to recommend King Ladislaus to his holiness. Another similar example occurred in a commission of ambassadors to the pope in 1401. Such detailed instructions served to remind orators that greater attention than normal must be paid to the opening oration on these missions. However, other missions to the pope, such as one in 1394, indicate that not even all papal missions required close attention to oratorical display. This commission told the ambassador simply to "make the owed reverences to the pope and recommend us (the *Signoria*) and all this people to his holiness." The typical brevity of these trecento instructions for diplomatic oratory indicates that it suffered a more subordinate status to other, more political concerns in a diplomatic mission. The greater attention in the instructions for especially significant missions or embassies to the pope reflects the greater prestige attached to some rulers and certain crucial missions. Such missions undoubtedly required carefully constructed oratorical performances in the style of the ambassadors to the pope in 1376, or even, perhaps, Lapo da Castiglionchio.[40]

The Integration of Humanism and the Example of Filippo Magalotti

The oratory of men such as Filippo Corsini, Filippo Magalotti, Lorenzo Ridolfi, and Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi brought about the first real expansion of humanism into diplomacy in the late 1390s and early 1400s. The evidence for the involvement of Corsini and Gianfigliazzi comes from their extensive diplomatic careers and surviving summaries of their domestic oratory. Gene Brucker has described the integration of humanism into the domestic orations of these two men. Brucker writes that

> …citizens who met in the *pratiche* became accustomed to speeches larded with quotations from classical authors, or references to Roman history. Though one might expect that statesmen with humanistic training – Agnolo Pandolfini and Roberto de' Rossi, for example – would have been in the forefront of this vogue, the lawyer Filippo Corsini and the knight Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi were its most active promoters. Corsini's favorite author was Livy, and he cited events from the Punic Wars – the massacre at Cannae and the siege of Saguntum – to bolster his argument for a tough and uncompromising posture toward King Ladislaus. The old lawyer also quoted from Valerius and Sallust to stress the necessity for decisive action in times of crisis. Gianfigliazzi cited Seneca – "only that which is honest is good" – and the example of the Spartan king Lycurgus who "in promulgating laws stated that public affairs are properly directed by the few with the authority of the many…"

Brucker likewise relates how Lorenzo Ridolfi incorporated classical history into his domestic oratory. Ridolfi attempted to warn the Florentines that "Rome was the greatest power in the world and then declined almost to nothing on account of her quarrels, and we are not greater than

the Romans once were." In addition to such examples, Ridolfi also was a member of a learned group that included the prominent humanists Luigi Marsili, Coluccio Salutati, and others. His *Treatise on Usury* shows traces of humanist learning in addition to a number of treatises written in his youth.[41]

Although examples of diplomatic oratory are scanty for these men, Corsini, Gianfigliazzi and Ridolfi all had ample opportunities to give humanist styled orations. Between 1388 and 1415, Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi went on twenty-two diplomatic embassies, including missions to the pope, emperor, and Florence's key ally during many of these years, Bologna. Filippo Corsini's mission total was identical, with twenty-two missions performed to rulers including, the pope, the emperor, and the King of France amongst others. Between 1395 and 1436, Lorenzo Ridolfi was a diplomat twenty-seven times. The fourth member of this group, Filippo Magalotti has also left evidence of his integration of humanism into a long diplomatic career. Magalotti was a diplomat twenty-two times between 1393 and 1408. Although Brucker did not mention Magalotti's name among those individuals who sprinkled their domestic oratory with classical allusions, Magalotti has left historians a diplomatic oration testifying to his application of humanism in diplomacy.[42]

Filippo Magalotti's oration to congratulate King Ladislaus of Naples on his conquest of Rome in 1408 provides an outstanding example of the oratorical innovations of this group. Magalotti's diplomatic colleague on the mission, Jacopo Salviati, himself noted these changes in his chronicle.

> ...The next morning we all together went to see and state our commission [to the king]; the first time that we spoke [to him], Messer Filippo Magalotti spoke for us in the palace of the Pope at Saint Peter's. The king had with him many notable

> barons and knights for the purpose of display (per magnificenza di se). Every man thought that the said Messer Filippo spoke as well and notably as was done long ago (fusse udito già fa gran tempo). It is true that his speech was not of substantive things, but pertained to the recommendations [and] the offerings, which are used in the beginning [of missions]. Moreover, he demonstrated how consistent and long the friendship had always been between the king's ancestors and our people. In concluding, Magalotti stated that those other more secret parts [of the commission] would be stated to the king at his wish.

Salviati's praise highlighted the format of Magalotti's oration. He points out the unusualness of Magalotti's epideictic structure: "It is true that his speech was not of substantive things…" The implication is that typically, a diplomatic speech focused on the substance of the mission. By ostensibly focusing on praise and other issues not directly pertinent to his specific commission, Magalotti was giving an atypical oration. By giving an atypical oration, Magalotti was offering the victorious King Ladislaus a cultural gift.[43]

Magalotti's oration was unusual because of the prominent role of humanism in it. Salviati classified the oration as classical in style by comparing its quality with those speeches of "long ago." Beyond Salivati's statement, the Latin quotations that dominate the oration testify to humanist influences. The first half of the oration in particular patches together short Italian phrases with long Latin quotations. Magalotti refers to biblical, classical, and humanist sources, including Boccaccio, Vergil, Jeremiah, Cicero (twice), Seneca, Petrarch, Samuel, Daniel, Dante, Jerome, the Book of Job, Peter, Aristotle, Deuteronomy, Psalms (four times) and Didymus at Alexander. Biblical authors in this list are clearly the most abundant; however, these biblical quotations occupy less conspicuous positions and are shorter in length than Magalotti's secular

references. Magalotti packed his classical and humanist citations into the most noticeable parts of the oration. In the exordium, Magalotti jammed quotations from Boccaccio's *On Famous Women* and citations from Vergil, Cicero, a quote from Seneca about Cicero, Petrarch and again Cicero. Similarly, Magalotti concluded his oration with an obscure quotation from the late fourth-century blind-man, Didymus at Alexander, about the art of rhetoric. This citation from Didymus (four lines) actually takes up more space in Magalotti's conclusion than the orator's well wishes and hopes for the king's long reign (three lines).[44]

Magalotti juxtaposed learned citations with statements bemoaning his lack of oratorical abilities in order to disprove his feigned modesty and emphasize his rhetorical skill. Magalotti began his oration by making his audience aware that he knew of the importance of rhetoric in his oratorical presentation. "My heart is scared and trembles, thinking on the glorious ancestors of your serenity, knowing of the little talent (ingengnio), less ability (arte) and even less practice (esercitio) that I possess in the art of speaking. These things occur to such an extent that those members (membri) that nourish, rule, and perform all fall back to the heart's aid, as to their source, abandoning the tongue to the activity (actitudine) of speaking (parlare)." Magalotti immediately attempted to disprove himself by showing off his learning with quotations from Isaiah and Boccaccio. After several more quotations designed to praise various aspects of the king, Magalotti returned to self deprecation, this time stating that his small reputation makes speaking before the king and "so many notable barons, princes, and gentlemen (singnori)" "frightening". Once again, Magalotti distilled his own argument by citing a learned source, this time Petrarch. Magalotti drew attention to his lack of rhetorical abilities again soon after. He evoked "divine aid" to "give correct speech to me" and begs the king to forgive "the imperfection of my speech", a statement which he follows with a quote from First Samuel.

Magalotti concluded the oration with more self-deprecation, stating that he is well aware that his oration fell far short of meeting the importance of the material or the "dignity" of its authors. He followed this statement with a quotation from Didymus of Alexander.[45]

The style of the oration further demonstrates Magalotti's rhetorical care in preparing it. Unlike the examples of trecento diplomatic oratory, Magalotti used long sentences and rearranged his words for better rhetorical effect. The oration, for example, begins with the gerund "chonsiderando". The following example has been left in Italian to highlight Magalotti's word order and overflowing use of subordinate clauses. Conjunctions and finite verbs have been italicized and underlined.

> Avendo a parlare nel chospetto della gloriosa eccelsitudine *e* della mirabile profondita dintellecto della vostra serenita *e* chosi mangnificha esistenza di tanti notabili baroni principi *e*singnori dove per la excelentia della molte chose mangnifichamente trattate *e* per la profonda aquita dingengnio etiandio quantunque ongni adorno dire *e* di pocha reputatione veramente ispaventato *e* attonito piu *mimaravilglio* cheio nonmi *confido* di parlare.

This run-on sentence with its multiple conjunctions and finite verbs pushed to its end conformed to the long sentences and word arrangement of Ciceronian prose, which also favored long sentences, subordinate clauses, and a flexible word order.[46]

The structure of the oration likewise conformed to classical standards. The praise of King Ladislaus in the exordium falls into two basic groups, external things (such as his ancestry, lands, and titles) and innate qualities (the kings' virtues and intelligence). These categories closely conform to the three general topics recommended by Cicero and the Pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* both of which had suggested praising external things, physical

attributes, and internal qualities. Magalotti's partition distinguishes four reasons for the joy felt by the Florentines and all Guelfs at the king's accomplishments. Magalotti declares that he will elaborate on two of these reasons: the king's "conservation of Italy" and his "hoped for exaltation of our (that is the Florentines') own interests." The oration's confirmation lays out in considerable detail these two topics. During this part, Magalotti is careful to maintain his focus on praising the king. He uses the topic of conserving Italy as an opportunity to return to the king's illustrious ancestors and their actions against various Ghibilline rulers. The section offering hope for favorable policies towards Florence reverts to more praise and thanks for the deeds of the king's family towards Florence and another list of the king's ancestors, with especial space given to Charles of Anjou. This use of historical specifics contrasted with the total absence or vague use of history in the fourteenth-century oratorical examples. Magalotti avoids a refutation in order to keep the focus on positive arguments regarding the king's good qualities. Magalotti's clear conclusion declares that that the ambassadors have come at the request of the king and will discuss the particulars of their mission at the king's convenience.[47]

Although showing strong influences of humanism, a close analysis of Magalotti's oration unveils the novelty of integrating humanist elements into diplomatic oratory. Magalotti packed Latin quotations into his exordium and narration. For example, the exordium contains nine citations in two printed pages, many of which are the longest quotations in the speech. Similarly, the narration is one page long and contains four more citations. By contrast, the confirmation contains four short citations spread over five pages. Magalotti, thus, had been successful at integrating the ostentatious use of quotations, one of the quintessential aspects of humanist oratory, into only the beginning of his oration. Moreover, Magalotti wrote all of the original sections of his speech in Italian, rather than classical Latin. Rather than using his oration to

begin clearly the negotiation process of the political particulars underlying the mission, Magalotti bluntly stated that the ambassadors would speak with the king about particulars later. He thus tried to present a division between the goal of praising the king now and overtly discussing politics later. In short, he had created a spot for humanism in diplomacy rather than integrating it into the established diplomatic practice.[48]

Moreover, Magalotti seems to have used an oration by Lapo da Castiglionchio as a model for several of his own phrases. The statements by both men bemoaning their respective oratorical abilities are nearly identical. Lapo began his oration by mentioning his trembling heart and sticky tongue. Magalotti began his oration with a similar statement to which he added words about his body abandoning his tongue. Just as Magalotti evoked divine aid for his speech, Lapo "called on the aid of the divinity." Magalotti contrasted the worth of his material with his lack of oratorical skill. Lapo stated the same: "Of course, the weight of these great things [in my commission] overwhelms me about to speak, for what kind of style [is] worthy of the material and what [kind of] speech seems eloquent, to whom is the eloquence of the heart itself, the abundance of talent, the quickness of tongue thought to be worthy of such and so great material?" Lapo even attempted to disprove his own statements with literary references in the same way as Magalotti. Following Lapo's statements contrasting his eloquence with the worth of his material, he quoted Vergil without naming the great poet (Vergil's lines are in italics): "Habet suum quisque inicium, michi vero, *si lingue centum oraque centum, ferea vox* esset, vix digne satis facturus videor tante rei et laudibus sanctitatis vestre." In another similar statement to Magalotti, this time expressing his fear at speaking, Lapo immediately followed his statement with a quotation from an address to Caesar. Magalotti's methods to integrate humanism into diplomatic oratory revisited the path started by Lapo da Castiglionchio forty years previously.[49]

The methods used by Magalotti to introduce humanism into diplomatic oratory are also attributable to his commission. The portion of the commission pertaining to his initial oration instructed the ambassadors to congratulate Ladislaus on his successful conquest of Rome. The ambassadors were to present Florence as "true sons" of the King. In fact, they were to tell the king "…how we [the Florentines] have *always* been true sons and servants of the king's ancestors and of the king." (italics are mine). The ambassadors were to express the willingness of the Florentines to aid the King in anything "possible and honest". The ambassadors were to respond as best as they could to any statements by the king on these matters. The instructions then explicitly end this short opening section, stating that "After this speech (espositione) either immediately or in that time that seems more useful…" begin addressing the political particulars of the mission. Ostensibly following his instructions, Magalotti's speech twice referred to the later discussions in which the ambassadors would address the particulars with the king. Through these statements, he was able to give the appearance of drawing a stark division between the opening oration and the subsequent negotiations. By drawing such a distinction, Magalotti appeared to focus exclusively on the act of praising the king in a classical matter. This focus was Florence's cultural gift.[50]

In violation of his commission's recommended division of tasks, in opposition to his stated words, and with his colleague Jacopo Salviati obliviously looking on, Magalotti's entire oration was designed to meet the general goals of the diplomatic mission. The political purpose of the mission hinged on establishing that a defensive league between Florence and the King was unnecessary. Should that fail, the ambassadors were to obtain clauses that exempted the pope, the emperor, and especially the King of France from the requirements of such a league. A combination of justifications for exempting these parties and sample responses to potential

inquiries from the king take up the overwhelming majority of the commission. Jacopo Salviati summed up his impression of the major diplomats' goals by stating that they had to convince the king not to further enlarge his state, to establish the long friendship between the two powers, and to find out if the King planned to invade Tuscany. Magalotti attempted to start these goals while simultaneously stating that he was putting them off until later. Through quotations from learned sources, Magalotti sought to make the king more amenable to the Florentines. These quotations both attempted to seize the king's attention and, by expecting the king to appreciate such references, to flatter the king by complimenting his majesty's own learning. Magalotti argued that Ladislaus should abandon his state extension plans into the papal state by presenting the long tradition of Ladislaus' ancestors at protecting the papacy. Magalotti devoted most of his oration to laying the foundation for the lack of desire by the Florentines to enter into a league with the king. He argued for the close ties between Florence and the king, a point made by stressing the common Gulf orientation of both powers. Magalotti stressed the bonds between Florence and the house of Anjou, of which King Ladislaus was a member. After establishing these long and close relations, Magalotti began his conclusion by restating the response of the Florentine *Signoria* to the ambassadors sent by the king: The Florentine ancestors and also the progenitors of the king had never been in a league and the Florentines did not see a reason to break this tradition. Far from lacking "substantive things", all of the content of Magalotti's humanist-styled oration was to present subtly Florence's political position and key arguments.[51]

Magalotti's integration of humanism into diplomatic oratory fit a wider trend towards an increased focus on ritual in diplomacy. One piece of evidence for this increase comes from Florentine diplomatic law. Just three months after Magalotti and his companions returned from their mission to King Ladislaus, the Florentine government passed changes to the ways in which

it paid its diplomats. Previously, diplomats had "… been given merely expenses for themselves and their companions chosen through election (ordinate per eligentes)." In 1408, new laws were implemented that capped the amount of money that active diplomats of different ranks could receive per day. Knights and lawyers could receive five florins per day and ten horses; all others could receive a maximum of four florins per day and eight horses. Moreover, the law stipulated that ambassadors must receive their clothes from the government. Such laws certainly indicate that some individuals were trying to turn diplomatic positions into profitable ventures. Yet, these laws also suggest that the government in 1408 disapproved of recent trends in the diplomatic practice of presentation. By controlling the clothes that ambassadors wore and their expenditures abroad, the government sought to control the ever more ostentatious displays of its diplomats. Magalotti's diplomatic colleagues were attempting to cloth their bodies better through fine garments and enrich their reputations through higher expenditures. Magalotti attempted the same goals by better costuming his words.[52]

Magalotti's oration also reflected the beginnings of a changed intellectual climate in early fifteenth-century Italy. A quotation in a diplomatic oration expressed the learning of a diplomat. This display also served to honor a host ruler by implicitly expecting the ruler to understand and accept the learned display. In the fourteenth century, diplomatic orations focused these displays on the Bible. Such citations by diplomats characterized host rulers as pious and learned men. While Magalotti and his colleagues maintained this cultural gift, they changed the requirements for a successful gift exchange. By the early 1400s, a handful of common biblical or even classical references were not uncommon in a diplomatic oration. In order to go beyond this typical gift on missions of especial significance, diplomats had to exceed what was a standard gift. Magalotti sought this goal by combining a classical structure, word arrangement, and both

standard biblical quotations with more trendy secular sources. By citing Didymus and Cicero, Magalotti characterized Ladislaus as more than simply learned, but in particular a learned participant in the new intellectual dialogue. The growing prominence of humanists in bureaucratic positions in Italian governments had undoubtedly laid the foundation for this shift in taste. Although secretarial humanists in Florence typically lacked the familial prestige necessary in the early 1400s to serve as a diplomat, their original treatises and stylistically informed public letters were creating the cultural climate into which the humanist-styled diplomatic orations of Magalotti and his contemporaries fit.

The root cause of the changes in diplomatic oratory and these various contexts was the growing consolidation of the Italian peninsula into a handful of major powers. The expansion and greater centralization of territorial states like Florence, Venice, and Milan led to a decline in the number of diplomatic missions sent by Florence overall in the first half of the fifteenth century. Small Tuscan towns and minor Italian powers like Lucca witnessed the most significant decreases in the number of visiting Florentine diplomats. As a vastly superior power, Florence's missions to its Tuscan neighbors placed the onus of the diplomatic gift exchange squarely on the shoulders of these small towns. In the early 1400s, Florence's trimmed diplomatic agenda gradually shifted to the powers that would eventually survive the hardening of the Italian state system in the 1450s and 1460s. Such missions between powers of comparable status required stronger tangible and intangible gifts in order for a successful meeting between states. Fewer diplomatic missions in general meant fewer opportunities to leave an impression of the power and/or goodwill of the Florentine state. The diplomatic oration that dominated the ritualistic exchanges governing the entry of a diplomat into a host space made or broke this impression.

This process of increased state expansion and centralization mirrored the increased integration of humanism into diplomacy until both emerged as unchallenged dominators by around 1460.[53]

The Limitations of this Integration and the Examples of Bartolomeo Valori and Palla di Nofri Strozzi

However, this triumph of humanist oratory over its competitors occurred over several decades. In fact, while Magalotti and company began sprinkling their orations with classical references and structured their speeches according to Ciceronian precepts, the majority of Florence's top diplomats between 1405 and 1425 rejected their innovations. These men continued to use more traditional oratorical forms. During these two decades, eleven individuals participated in ten or more diplomatic missions. The humanist connections necessary for their integration of the new learning into their diplomatic oratory was weakly present in only five of these diplomats. For example, Rinaldo degli Albizzi copied a portion of a Latin treatise by Francesco Filelfo, a work in which Rinaldo himself was featured as an interlocutor. Leonardo Bruni dedicated a Latin treatise, the *De militia,* to Rinaldo. Gino Capponi took an interest in writing history. He even included facets common to humanist history writing, such as a concise topic and speeches. Niccolo da' Uzzano most likely had his bust sculpted in a classical style by Donatello. One scholar of early humanism, Arthur Field, has described Niccolò as "an extremely powerful oligarch who had occasional scholarly and artistic interests." Matteo Castellani's grandniece married Leonardo Bruni's son Donato, although Matteo died a year before the wedding took place. The strongest influence of humanism on the members of this group was undoubtedly Lorenzo Ridolfi, whose humanist credentials were discussed above. The other six men making up this group – Bartolomeo Popoleschi, Jacopo Gianfigliazzi, Vieri

Guadagni, Jacopo Salviati, Cristofano Spini, and Marsilio Vecchietti - lacked any ostensible connections with the humanist movement..[54]

The limited role of humanism among even those figures with humanist connections suggests that their respective interests in the new learning were in fact limited. Classical quotations, for example, are few in the voluminous collection of letters written to and from Rinaldo degli Albizzi during his diplomatic career. Gino Capponi's history writing is in Italian and contains many of the traditional aspects of the old chronicle tradition. The surviving political verses of Niccolo da' Uzzano likewise fit into late medieval Florentine traditions. Even the man with the strongest humanist connections in this group - Lorenzo Ridolfi – presents questions regarding his degree of interest in the new learning. In his biography of Ridolfi, Vespasiano da Bisticci portrays him as a deeply religious man, a "profound scholar in sacred learning", and as a collector of the letters of St. Jerome, rather than a man learned in ancient Greek and Roman letters. Ridolfi refers to classical Roman authors in his *Treatise on Usury;* however, his reliance on scholastic sources in the treatise eclipses his few classical references. The economic hardship and long familial history of the Castellani family made a perfect match for the rich and ambitious parvenu Leonardo Bruni, rather than a common intellectual interest between the Castellani family and the famous humanist. In fact, the marginal humanist connections of these five men – with the possible exception of Lorenzo Ridolfi - made them more similar to a man like Buonaccorso Pitti – a frequent diplomat at the turn of the fifteenth century who was a friend of the humanist Roberto Rossi but who has left no evidence that he shared Rossi's intellectual pursuits - than to a famous humanist author such as Coluccio Salutati.[55]

Other specific factors, in fact, better explain the diplomatic prominence of these men during these years. The political reputation of several of these men undoubtedly was both a precursor and a product of their diplomatic careers. Niccolò da' Uzzano and then Rinaldo degli Albizzi were the leading men of the Florentine state during the first third of the quattrocento. Cristofano Spini's political prominence earned him a state funeral in 1414. Jacopo di Giovanni Gianfigliazzi served on the priorate seventeen times between 1394 and 1434. Matteo Castellani was likewise a leading member of the Florentine government. Vieri Guadagni seems to have cultivated ties with foreign leaders. In 1406, a Sienese ambassador mentioned him as a man with whom he had conversed in Florence. Later, Bartolomeo Coscia, formerly Pope John XXIII, named Guadagni along with three other powerful Florentines (Bartolomeo Valori, Niccolò da Uzzano, and Giovanni de Bicci de' Medici) as an executor of his will. While certainly a powerful man in politics, Lorenzo Ridolfi was especially suited for diplomatic concerns related to the Church. The commission behind Filiippo Magalotti's oration in 1408, in fact, singled out Lorenzo Ridolfi to handle such affairs. Legal factors were the most significant qualities for Bartolomeo Popoleschi. Popoleschi was one of the city's most distinguished lawyers in the early fifteenth century, a man who was especially well suited for negotiations focused primarily on politics. Several of the rest of the men in this core group were repeatedly selected for commissarial posts and/or diplomatic posts near war zones. Gino Capponi's notes on the conquest of Pisa (the focus of four of his missions) formed the basis of Neri di Gino Capponi's Italian and Matteo Palmieri's Latin respective histories of these events. Jacopo Salviati was a member of one of the core families in Florence and specialized in military matters. Six out Marsilio Vecchietti's ten missions were commissioned by the *Dieci di Balià,* a government body usually concerned with war.[56]

The powerful political leader and frequent diplomat, Bartolomeo Valori, offers one outstanding example of the continued prominence of non-classical oratory among this group. In 1423, Bartolomeo Valori went on an unsuccessful mission to Filippo Maria Visconti in Milan. A fifteenth-century life of Valori quotes the speech that he delivered upon returning to Florence. Rather than the usual fictional orations written by humanists into their histories, the presentation of the oration in this biography gives credibility to its legitimacy. The author of the life, Luca della Robbia, states that "…the day after [he returned to Florence], [Valori] rose in the Council with the intention of doing anything possible (con intenzione di far capace ciascuno) towards the end of holding Visconti, as a tyrant, [who had] his eyes in particular on Florence. In order to move the people against [Visconti], [Valori] spoke in this sense, as one sees in a book of his various records." This specific source citation contrasts with the typical prefaces of fictional speeches in humanist histories. When a humanist historian such as Luca invented an oration, he typically prefaced the speech with a standard phrase from a classical historian. For example, Luca introduces a fictional oration in his biography of Valori with the words "he spoke to them in this way (ardentissime parlato loro in questo tenore)". This phrasing is a direct parallel with the ancient historian Sallust's wording in his *War against Catiline.* Sallust wrote "he held an oration of this type (huiuscemodi orationem habuit)" or "he spoke words of this type (huiuscemodi verba locutus est)"[57]

Bartolomeo Valori's domestic oration reflects very little humanist influence. In terms of its structure, the oration presents a logical and focused argument similar to fourteenth-century examples. The oration jumps into its confirmation, or argument and evidence. Valori argues that the Duke of Milan is more inclined to war than peace. Therefore, Florence needs to impede his expansion. Valori lists three major reasons for this point: The Duke has already hinted at his

interest in "tyrannizing" Florence. Visconti's actions are not surprising given the poor qualities of his ancestors. He has consistently taken actions against the Florentines and against peace. By jumping straight to the argument, the oration lacks an attention grabbing exordium or clear delineation of the argument in a partition. Moreover, although Visconti's rebuffing of the Florentine ambassador, Valori himself, offered an obvious choice for the oration's narration, Valori subjugated this story to a subordinate clause in a sentence stating Milan's desire for war. This argumentative structure clashes with the story-telling aspect of the narration advocated by Cicero in the *De inventione.* Valori next moves onto the oration's second part. Here, he argues that Florence must stand united in order to retain its liberty and evoke divine aid in order to get God on the republic's side. After making these points, the oration moves onto a loose refutation. Here, Valori states that an unwillingness to take offensive action will lead to the city's repression under this "monster". He urges his listeners that the time for action is now and stresses his own willingness for action by being the first to volunteer, regardless that he is "so old" (così vecchio). In this second part, Valori has thus stated the potential effects for not acting as he advises; however, he avoids addressing potential objections to his arguments, which would have formed the center of a classically-styled refutation. He concludes with a sentence briefly summarizing the major points of his arguments. Valori's two-part oration is most similar to the two-tiered format of the trecento precedent manuscript. Like Valori's oration, those examples focused on first stating the situation (the belligerence of the Duke of Milan) and then declaring the orator's proposed action (unity).[58]

In fact, in terms of content and style, Valori reflects a vague humanist influence on only one occasion. Valori beseeches his listeners to "find *virtù,* wherever it is (andar ritrovando la virtù dove ella è) with the example of our ancient Romans: and then we will be able to quench

the desire for combat in those who have the taste for nothing other than blood." Valori hoped that the city's location of its mythical ancient Roman valor combined with divine aid would allow the Republic to emerge victorious from war with Milan. Such vague uses of history again suggest the older trecento oratorical tradition. The remainder of the oration focuses on logical arguments and references to contemporary politics, without further direct or indirect allusions to antiquity. Valori did nothing to enhance the rhetorical quality of his word arrangement. Rather, like his fourteenth-century predecessors, he presented his sentences in a standard subject/verb format. Valori's argument for the unity of the citizens in the face of an external threat was a consistent thread in Florentine history from its earliest foundations. As the early twentieth-century Italian historian Emilio Santini has noted, "the oration seems to be still in the time of Dino Compagni, when sentiment found sincere (sincera) expression in words."[59]

Even an individual with unquestionable humanist credentials, Palla di Nofri Strozzi, was inconsistent in his oratorical style in the early 1420s. Palla di Nofri was a ubiquitous Florentine diplomat between 1410 and 1434. He was a student of Manuel Chrysoloras and translated books from Greek into Latin. The evidence from his two surviving political orations suggest that he alternated between oratorical styles depending on his audience. Palla di Nofri copied two orations that he delivered to visiting ambassadors in Florence in a diary he kept while serving on the *Dieci di Balià.* He delivered both orations in 1423, the same year in which Valori delivered his oration. Palla di Nofri delivered the first speech in unadorned Italian on June 29 to the Archbishop of Genoa. The oration amounts to a partial list of the grievances held by Florence against the Duke of Milan and a conclusion that the Duke must retreat into his boundaries before negotiations between Florence and him would. The oration lacks any embellishments of a classical structure, word arrangement, or source citation.[60]

Palla di Nofri's second recorded oration marked a drastic shift from this plain Italian speech. He delivered it to the ambassadors of the King of France the next day, June 30. First, Palla di Nofri delivered this oration in a classicized Latin For example, note how Palla places the finite verbs at the end of the following main and relative clauses: " Et primo, cum debita reverentia salutationes tantae Maiestatis gratissimo animo *susceperunt,* tamquam a patre, protectore et benefactore huius civitatis cui se ac universam civitatem humiliter *commandant."* Palla di Nofri also demonstrates his rhetorical care in constructing the sentences in his oration. For example, he uses alliteration in the repetition of the "c" sound at the end of the sentence. He uses assonance in his pairing of the words "protectore et benefactore". He has intentionally joined two groups of polysyllabic words, each group with similar sounds ("patre, protectore, et benefactore huius civitatis" and "universam civitatem humiliter") with three short words ("cui se ac"). In the next sentence of the oration, Palla di Nofri uses anaphora by beginning multiple clauses with the preposition "a" plus the name of a king: "a Carolo Magno… a Carolo primo… a Carolo de Valosa… a rege Roberto." However, alongside these rhetorical moves, Palla di Nofri's oration maintains the list like structure of his Italian oration from the previous day. Palla's only use of history or a classical source comes in his citation of the rebuilding of Florence by Charlemagne, a trope ubiquitous in Florentine diplomatic relations with France. In fact, rather than showing a knowledge of humanist writings, Palla's citation of this refoundation story was in direct contradiction of the arguments of his friend Leonardo Bruni in his *History of Florence.* In this work, Bruni had argued that this refoundation myth lacked evidence. Both this Latin oration and the preceding day's Italian oration reflect the presence of both traditional and humanist elements in Florentine diplomatic oratory in the early 1420s.[61]

The Increasingly Common Presence of Humanism and Additional Case Studies

Florence often combined tradition with humanist innovation in its diplomatic missions in the years preceding and proceeding 1420. The personnel making up the Florentine obedience mission to Martin V in 1418 provides a snapshot of this coexistence. Of the six men sent on this mission, half of them had limited connections with the humanist movement. The connections of Rinaldo degli Albizzi were already noted above. Ridolfo Peruzzi had business connections with the humanists Carlo Marsuppini and Niccolò Niccoli. Peruzzi also appeared as an interlocutor in book two of Francesco Filelfo's *Florentine Comments Concerning Exile.* Bartolomeo Valori had no connections with the new learning. The connections of Marcello Strozzi were stronger than these men and similar to those of Lorenzo Ridolfi. Strozzi attended the lectures on Aristotle's *Ethics* given by the humanist Giannozzo Manetti in 1430-31. He also received letters from the humanist Ambrogio Traversari. Yet, Strozzi's expertise at matters of the church, again like his colleague Lorenzo Ridolfi, best explains his presence on this mission. Lorenzo Ridolfi was present explicitly to deal with church matters. The commission singled him out to discuss issues concerning the church in Florence with Martin V. Moreover, Rinald degli Albizzi records that Ridolfi spoke to the pope about the future council and the coming to Florence by the pope. The fact that the Florentine government asked Marcello Strozzi to remain after Ridolfi had left further suggests their similar role on the mission.[62]

The weak humanist connections of Albizzi, Valori, and Peruzzi likewise point to other explanations for their respective appointments on this most prestigious of missions. Albizzi and Valori were two of Florence's most powerful citizens. In this role, Albizzi took the lead in speaking to the pope and the nobility in Milan on behalf of the diplomats. Valori was asked to remain after Albizzi left, presumably to fit the same role. Although this mission was Ridolfo

Peruzzi's first, Machiavelli described him as one of the leading figures of the anti-Medicean party. Puzzlingly, Peruzzi was the only man not singled out in the diplomatic correspondence to fill a particular role.[63]

The man assigned to head this mission, Leonardo Dati, single-handedly offers further evidence for the mixture of humanism and tradition in diplomatic oratory around 1420. On the one hand, strong evidence points to Dati's religious and diplomatic prominence as the key factors behind his selection. Leonardo Dati was a Dominican friar like Martin V, a similarity that Florence valued in its initial missions to Pope Martin. Moreover, he had been Florence's orator to the Council of Constance. In later years, Leonardo Dati would develop a strong professional relationship with the Martin V, even serving as a spokesman for the pope at the Council of Pavia/Siena in 1423/24. In fact, the instructions to Dati and his colleagues for this 1418 mission state that it was Leonardo Dati himself, serving as Pope Martin V's "ambassador" that had informed Florence of Martin's accession.[64]

On the other hand, Dati was an extraordinarily eloquent and learned man. For example, Dati's treatise on the decadence of the Dominicans, in the words of one historian, demonstrates "great rhetorical knowledge". Dati delivered countless sermons at the Council of Pisa, Constance and undoubtedly the Councils of Pavia/Siena. Dati was a doctor of theology. He may have written a learned work, *La Sfera,* on geography and astronomy. Moreover, Dati's primary role in this 1418 mission was to deliver the ambassadors' initial oration. Dati's oration to Martin V does not survive; however, Filippo Rinuccini testified to its success, stating that

> We found the said Pope Martin at Milan, and there the first visitation was made and it lasted around one hour. Never before had a similar oration been heard.

> There were perhaps a hundred inkwells to write the oration while he was saying it. He made the greatest honor for himself and for Florence.

Rinuccini's testimony is especially valuable because he was a youth accompanying the mission and thus most likely an eyewitness[65]

Although Dati's oration to Martin V is lost, sermons that Dati delivered at the Council of Constance suggest that Dati's oratorical style combined traditional and humanist oratorical concerns. In these sermons, Dati attempts to play with his word order. However, beyond biblical references, Dati rarely mentions classical sources. He makes a reference to the early church father Maximus. He makes a vague statement citing "the old canons". In one sermon, Dati refers to two ancient Greeks, Anarcharsis and Socrates, and two citations from Seneca. Such citations indicate Dati's awareness of the importance of such authorities in humanist orations. However, all four of these references undoubtedly come second hand through the popular *Manipulus Florum,* a medieval collection of sayings. Moreover, Dati's references to scholastic works are much more prolific, citing several scholastic writers. Other council participants at Constance were more overtly referring to humanist sources. For example, an anonymous oration cites Petrarch and the Roman architect Vitruvius. Taken together, this evidence suggests that Dati was a learned theologian who dabbled in the rhetorical concerns prevalent among prominent humanists.[66]

An anonymous oration – possibly delivered by a Florentine merchant - from an event surrounding Martin V's accession to the papacy give another glimpse at what Dati's long eloquent oration may have looked like. It survives in a fifteenth-century manuscript compiled by the Papal Secretary and humanist Rinuccio Aretino between the 1420s and 1450s. James Hankins has suggested that Cosimo de' Medici delivered this oration to congratulate Pope

Martin V on his election. He bases this hypothesis on the presence of this rare oration in the same manuscript as two rare letters to Cosimo de' Medici requesting a copy of an oration that he had delivered before the pope. Although this attribution is extremely tantalizing, the evidence against this attribution is much stronger than the evidence for it. The letters requesting Cosimo's oration occupy pages 9r-13r in the manuscript, whereas the anonymous oration appears long after on page 110v. Moreover, Hankins dates the letters requesting Cosimo's speech to post 1426; yet, the congratulatory topic of the oration indicates that it was most likely delivered in 1417 (the year of the pope's election) or 1418 (the year of the pope's entrance into Italy). Perhaps the Paduan humanist teacher Gasparino Barzizza wrote the oration. Barzizza was a prolific orator in domestic settings and wrote numerous orations for orators to give before foreign leaders. He was an apostolic secretary at the Council of Constance and thus undoubtedly knew Martin V. The pages of the manuscript directly preceding this anonymous oration (102r-110r) are all other orations by Barzizza. Lastly, an oration attributed to Barzizza written for an appointee to "the papal college of advocates" begins with the phrase "Beatissime pater et sanctissime domine, posteaquam hunc…", which is very similar to the beginning of this anonymous oration "Posteaquam te, pater sanctissime ". Barzizza may have written the oration for a merchant at the papal court. The absence of any reference to a home government in the oration makes a mercantile origin or other non-diplomatic role the most plausible.[67]

Whoever delivered and/or wrote this anonymous oration, it provides an early example of a humanist-style. Unlike Magalotti's oration from a decade before, this oration is entirely in Latin. Although the oration lacks explicit quotations from classical authors, it may begin with a veiled allusion to Cicero's *Letters to Friends.* The anonymous oration begins "Posteaquam te, pater sanctissime, in pontificatum apostolice sedis dei aspiratu electum audivimus, tanta sumus

affecti letitia, ut illam disserere nunquam posse despiciemus…" Cicero's letter begins with an identical use of vocabulary "Maxime sum laetitia affectus, cum audivi consulem te factum esse…". This quotation from this anonymous oration also reflects its complicated arrangement of words. The following sentence provides examples of several of the rhetorical moves made by the speaker: "qualem profecto desiderabat et qualem egebat ecclesia pastorem habet, et Columna comperta est qua ad ipsam erigendam constituendam atque firmandam melior nulla desideretur et expectetur." In this sentence, the orator has jammed alliteration ("Columna comperta"), anaphora ("qualem… qualem…"), assonance (both "erigendam constituendam atque firmandam" and "desideretur et expectetur"), and prolepsis ("qualem…desiderabat, qualem egebat, and pastorem habet). The orator also achieves a nice aural effect through his clause balancing. Such attention to rhetorical detail points to an individual well versed in classical rhetoric as its author.[68]

The oration's unexciting content and organization contrast with its style. In terms of content, the oration reflects the situation in which it was given much more than classical precepts. The oration lacks any overt reference to classical authors and contains few veiled allusions to such sources. The oration has two major parts. The first part states how the new pope will drive out the Church's past problems. The second part focuses on Pope Martin's election. The orator, not surprisingly, stresses on more than one occasion that Martin is the only pope. The orator uses these two sections to express his two major ideas: the orator's joy and hope at the pope's election and his pledge of servitude to the one true pope. The orator concludes with a recommendation of himself and his colleagues to the pope. This content was far from the praise of deeds, attributes, and virtues recommended for a classical panegyric. The oration also lacks a strong classical organization. Its two-tiered structure, in fact, is most similar

to the fourteenth-century sample orations. In both these earlier examples and this anonymous oration, the orator states the situation (here the joy at the election of the pope) and follows it with the purpose of the mission (here to offer the orator's "servitutem"). This oration does contain a clear conclusion, however, which the fourteenth-century examples had lacked. As a whole, this oration demonstrated a strong humanist influence, yet the road towards a diplomatic oration in full classical attire was far from complete.[69]

All this evidence suggests that Leonardo Dati's lost oration most likely combined humanist influences with more traditional oratorical formats and content tailored to his own areas of expertise. Humanism was clearly a factor in the anonymous oration, which was delivered at the same rough time as Dati's own performance. Dati's sermons indicate that he was at least marginally concerned with new rhetorical styles. The presence of humanism in Dati's lost oration would also explain Filippo Rinuccini's outpouring of praise. However, these influences probably played a subordinate role to Dati's more developed interests in theology. Moreover, his views on papal supremacy and his shared Dominican brotherhood with the pope gave him common ground on which to focus his oration without resorting to classical organizational or topical frameworks. Dati's presence alone was a gift, anything more was just icing on the cake.

Following Dati's hybrid oration, Florentine patricians with strong connections to the humanist movement continued to push humanism more intricately into Florentine diplomacy. Nicola de' Medici was a friend of Leonardo Bruni and may have translated one of this works into Italian. Nicola was a diplomat twice during this period (1412 and 1422). Lorenzo Benevenuti wrote a humanist invective against Niccolò Niccoli. He was a diplomat three times (1419, 1420, and 1422). Leonardo Dati was a diplomat several times during the 1410s. Other

individuals of similar stamp began illustrious diplomatic careers during these years. Agnolo Pandolfini was praised for his learning by Vespasiano da' Bisticci. Moreover, Pandolfini was an interlocutor in two humanist treatises. He was a frequent Florentine diplomat starting in 1403. He even consulted Leonardo Bruni about absolving himself from a diplomatic election because of his advanced age in 1437. The great humanist patron and student of Roberto Rossi, Cosimo de' Medici, started his diplomatic career in 1420. In 1426, a Benedectine humanist asked Cosimo for a copy of an oration he had delivered before the pope. Luca di Maso degli Albizzi, who studied under both Roberto Rossi and Poggio Bracciolini, started his long diplomatic career in 1416. Giuliano Davanzati borrowed classical works from the humanist and statesman Matteo Strozzi. Davazati began his prominent diplomatic career in 1421 Salamone Strozzi had a reputation for giving long domestic orations and served as a diplomat five times between 1406 and 1422.[70]

Another member of this group, Palla di Palla Strozzi, has left tantalizing glimpses of the influences of humanism on his diplomatic missions. Like his better-known relative Palla di Nofri Strozzi, Palla di Palla Strozzi possessed strong connections to the humanist movement. Leonardo Bruni wrote a Latin letter to Palla di Palla addressed to "the most outstanding man and best brother (praestanti viro ac fratri optimo)". The strongest evidence of Palla's interest in humanism comes from a manuscript in the Florentine state archive. This manuscript contains a domestic oration by Palla in which he cites Bruni's translation of Aristotle's *Ethics,* Plato, and Livy. This manuscript also contains a portion of a history, which the archive's inventory attributes to Palla di Palla. The manuscript concludes with partial copies of Latin translations of Greek authors by Leonardo Bruni. This manuscript also contains samples of orations delivered by Palla while a diplomat. The close similarities between the learning and familial status of

Palla and other diplomats with humanist connections suggest that his oratorical style was similar to that of his colleagues.[71]

A working draft of the oration that Palla di Palla delivered on a mission to Naples in 1423 betrays his humanist influences. The fragment hardly offers enough content for a detailed analysis of the oration's substance; however, it is unique in that it demonstrates the steps and care taken by a diplomat to write an introduction for his oration. The fragment has two major parts, for which Palla left two versions of each part in the manuscript. The first part consists of Palla's attempt to create a proper greeting for the king. The content and Palla's use of Italian is consistent in both versions. The variants between the two versions consist of minor changes of phrasing. In the original version, for example, Palla wrote "*vostra dignita e la gloria dell vostro serenissimo illustrissimo e egle tanta laltezza del vostro sublime*". In the revised version, Palla shortened the phrase to "*vostra gloriosa venoranda dignita della vostra spectabilissimo*". In the second part of the speech fragment, Palla worked on the rest of his exordium. He described his nervousness on account of his youth and inexperience; his fear that he could not adequately praise so glorious a majesty and his councilors; and how this fear had gone away upon learning of the reputation of his majesty for so many positive traits.[72]

This second part shows the influence of humanism on Palla's diplomatic oratory. In particular, Palla looked to Filippo Magalotti's humanist-styled oration for guidance. Palla wrote (for comparative purposes, I have left the following passages in Italian)

> avendo a parlare nel cospetto de tanta maiesta nella presentia di tanta gloriosa signoria e di tanto splendido consiglo di tanta ornatissima congretatione io potessi chome debitatmente si conviene agrandire e magnificare la vostra imensa maiesta e satisfare al disiderio de miei magnifici e potentissimi signori vostri devotissimi

> fedelissimi figluoli ma poche io me venuto anititia sentito quante le vostre mensa clementia della vostra sacratissima signorla e la ineffabile e infinita humanita…

Magalotti had written on the same subjects in the same order and at times with the same words.

> Avendo a parlare nel cospetto della gloriosa eccelsitudine e della mirabile profondita dintellecto della vostra serenita e chosi mangnificha esistenza di tanti notabili barone principi e singnori dove per la excelentia delle molte chose mangnifichamente trattate e per la profonda aquita dingengnio etiandio quantunque ongni adorno dire e di pocha reputatione veramente ispaventato e attonito piu mimaravilglio chio nonmi confide di parlare…[here is a long section where Magalotti states that he has been selected to state the ambassadors' commission, cites Petrarch and Cicero, and calls upon divine aid to help his speech]… E umilmente suplichando la clementia della vostra umanita che none alla inperfetione del mio dire. Ma beningnamente raguardi alla divota affetione singhulare reverentia e sincero animo della chomunita di firenze veramente conongni affetione di vita figliuola della Reale eccielsitudine vostra

Magalotti and Strozzi used the same language in the beginning of the two passages, "avendo a parlare nel cospetto". They also both referred to the same qualities in the rulers (clementia and umanita) and used the same filial metaphors at the end of their passages. They ordered their presentation in exactly the same way: fear of speaking before such a group of individuals, desire to fulfill their respective commissions, and references to the abstract qualities of the ruler. Whatever the final version of Palla's oration looked like, he had used Magalotti's humanist-styled oration as an initial model.[73]

Palla's oration demonstrated that Florentine humanist dilettantes had further integrated humanism into diplomatic oratory since 1408. Whereas Magalotti had delivered an Italian oration laced with Latin quotations, Palla attempted to rework his speech into Latin, the language of the humanists. Palla wrote (again for comparative purposes this passage has been left untranslated)

> …cum apud uncum sacratissimam magiestatem in presentiam splendissimi atque ornatissimi consili (i e?) michi orandum fuisset (s?) postque ad regnum splendidissime vostre maiestatis accessi certificatus tam de clementia q. de humanitate omnia que in principio aspera e timenda michi appuriere (i?) leta securitate iocunda e (hortamontie e vaserie) tanta e affabilitas vostre dominationis tanta serenitas vostre benifinitatis tanta iocunditas in vostra maiestate.

This passage demonstrates that Palla continued to rework his oration, especially in his attempts at getting the right words and phrasing to praise the king. He attempts at classical word order by pushing the verb "accessi" to the end of the clause following "postque". Palla's working his Italian draft into Latin is also clear. He has retained the two qualities "clementia" and "humanitate" from his Italian draft, this time highlighting the qualities with a "tam…quam" clause. He reworked the phrase "avendo a parlare nel cospetto de…" by changing the word order (the verb is pushed to the back of the clause) and using a pun on the word "orare" (to instruct/order rather than to orate): "cum… michi orandum fuisset". Perhaps the fact that he found both these clauses in his model oration encouraged Palla to focus on reworking these particular passages into his Latin speech. Yet, copying these passages from Magalotti into his own oration was not enough for Palla: he had to attempt to classicize his oratory further by reworking his Italian draft into classical Latin.[74]

Other evidence suggests that Palla and this group of humanist dilettantes were having an effect on Florentine diplomatic oratory. The diplomatic commissions covering the 1410s and early 1420s suggest an increase in the attention paid to rhetoric during these years. As in the late fourteenth-century, many missions to the pope or important missions to other rulers contained long instructions for the initial oration (the Magalotti example from 1408, for example, covers roughly a half of a printed page). The key difference between the latter fourteenth-century and the 1410s and 20s was the increased detail given to less prominent missions. In 1414, diplomats to Bologna were told that "You will greet and comfort them [the rulers] with an abundance of agreeable and commodious words." In 1418, an ambassador to Mantua was told to greet the ruler "affectuosamente" (the same word used in late fourteenth-century commissions), but added to greet him as a "brother and friend". A diplomat to Ferrara was instructed to "greet and comfort him [the Marquis of Ferrara] on behalf of the our *Signoria* as a most singular and good brother and friend and offering to him generally those words and means required among good friends and brothers…" In 1421, a diplomat to Faenza was to "greet and comfort" the rulers "affectuosomente", but again added another phrase to this word, as "our intimate and most singular friends". In 1424, a diplomat to Siena was told to use "those effective and hot words that you know to be desirous and useful for the occasion."[75]

These findings fit with the arguments of the Italian historian Emilio Santini. Santini had also argued that a change began to occur in Florentine diplomatic commissions in the early fifteenth century. Santini argued that

> Frequently, the <<commissarie>> are presented according to the *partitiones* of Cicero. Here is one of the usual schema: "Greet and comfort. Next make the narration. The intention of this Signoria is… make the exposition." Nor do these

> commissions fail to suggest frequent classical examples: "Reply sweetly, demonstrating to him that no less glory is acquired using mercy and clemency towards adversaries… than in victory, of which thing both Caesar and infinite princes and gentlemen have obtained perpetual and immortal reputation." To Rinaldo degli Albizzi, ambassador to Naples in 1414: "In order to recall to memory (pure per ridurli a memoria) the saying of Cicero: The strong and constant of mind are not disturbed by adverse things.

Whether imitating classical prescriptions in their form or citing classical examples, the influence of humanism was clear on diplomatic commissions.[76]

The spread of humanist culture to other cities had created a receptive audience for these humanist orations. Ronald Witt has examined briefly the beginnings of the integration of humanism into overtly public occasions in various Italian centers. From the 1390s, Pier Paolo Vergerio had been delivering humanist-styled domestic orations in Padua. According to Witt, Zaccaria Trevisan, Gasparini Barzizza, and Andrea Giuliani introduced humanist-styled oratory in domestic settings in Venice. However, Witt is careful to point out the slow integration of humanism into the Venetian patriciate. Nevertheless, by 1421 an anonymous writer pointed to Florence, Venice and Padua as centers "flourishing magnificently in this (that is the humanist) art of speaking." The situation in Milan, however, was far different. Witt notes that little evidence exists linking the Milanese patriciate with humanist learning. Moreover, "in the first half of the fifteenth century, even professional humanists at the Visconti court showed no inclination to share in the enthusiasm for ciceronian oratory that was seizing their counterparts in republican centers." Witt's final case study of the wandering Augustinian friar Andrea Biglia provides evidence that by the late 1410s and 1420s, humanism had established a foothold in the

Italian diplomatic scene in general. Biglia spent periods of his life at Padua, Florence, Bologna, Milan, Perugia, and Siena. Between 1423 and 1428 his oratorical reputation enticed the Milanese to request that he return to his home city of Milan and deliver a humanist styled funeral oration for Giangaleazzo Visconti. Even in a city without a strong domestic tradition of humanist-styled oratory, a value was placed on this type of rhetorical performance by the early 1420s.[77]

The history of the integration of humanism into diplomatic oratory is the story of a consistent attempt by the Florentine government to gain a diplomatic edge. Diplomatic missions required individuals from prominent families. From Magalotti to Palla di Palla Strozzi, a humanist oration offered something more than this usual component of diplomatic protocol. By offering more than was required, Florence implicitly acknowledged the special care it placed on its relationship with the host ruler. This acknowledgement served as a cultural gift, to which the Florentines expected reciprocation. Most commonly, host rulers expressed their return gift by treating diplomats honorably or granting the diplomats special privileges. Florentine diplomats who described their honorable entrance or reception by a host ruler, the frequency of which Richard Trexler has described, were informing their city of a successful gift exchange. The hybrid oratorical culture in diplomacy during the early 1420s suggests that a humanist oratorical gift was still only one potential gift available to Florence. Sending a powerful man from an illustrious family, such as Barolomeo Valori, remained a way to meet the demands of the diplomatic gift exchange. As the next chapter will argue, the optional status of humanist oratory in diplomacy was about to change. The shift from optional to requirement forced the Florentine government to search for new ways to distinguish missions of particular importance from more middling ones.[78]

CHAPTER TWO: THE GIFT OF HUMANISM, 1425-1444

In early April 1473, the Florentine herald Francesco Filarete described the reception ritual of orators from Ferrara. Sigismund, the brother of the Duke of Ferrara, was on his way to Naples with a large diplomatic entourage to meet Eleanore, daughter of the King of Naples and future wife of the Duke of Ferrara. Having arrived in Florence,

> He visited the *Signoria* at the *ringhiera* and then dismounted at the house of the Pazzi, where he was appropriately greeted. The next day he went to vist our excellent *Signoria* accompanied by many citizens and by a most noble company of his companions. He was received in the *Sala del Consiglio* by our excellent *Signoria*, where a most elegant oration was recited concerning the mandate of the the most noble above mentioned prince Ercule (the Duke of Ferrara), as will be written below here. Sigismund was a man more to equivocate than to orate. Thus, the Duke Ercole, wishing to show his good will towards this republic, provided for the presentaton of a elegant orator (fè mestiere de elegante horatore), to which Luigi Guicciardini made a worthy impromptu response.

In order to express the special regard in which the Duke of Ferrara held the Florentines, the Ferrarese ambassadors offered a humanist oration as a cultural gift[79]

Although occurring decades after Bruni had died, Carbone's oration filled exactly the same role as Bruni himself and his words had played for Florence in the 1420s, 30s, and 40s. By the mid 1420s, humanist styled orations frequently dominated initial diplomatic ceremonies. In order to go beyond this established norm, the Florentine government looked to integrate the words of famous humanist authors. At first, the Florentine government experimented with simply sending a diplomatic entourage that featured the famed humanist writer Leonardo Bruni.

The Florentine government quickly retreated from this option. A humanist author such as Bruni brought literary fame and eloquence, but lacked the familial history necessary to avoid offending status wary host rulers. Instead, the government continued to send patrician dilettantes, whose long familial histories accentuated their basic humanist learning; yet, on those missions of special importance, these Florentine diplomats delivered orations that Leonardo Bruni had written. Bruni's style differed only slightly from the orations of his recent predecessors, but his reputation and his creative oratorical content surpassed them. The combination of Bruni's literary reputation, creative oratorical content and the face of a person from an illustrious Florentine family brought Florence the ability to offer its acknowledgement of the special nature of the host ruler's accession to the throne or military victory.

Cultural gifts featuring a combination of creative content and Bruni's reputation could serve different practical purposes depending on the exact diplomatic circumstances. On Bruni's own mission in 1426, the creative content in his initial oratorical performance enabled him to highlight his intellectual abilities and friendship with the pope. It also allowed him to downplay the weakness of his low familial standing in Florence. Thus, Bruni's extraordinary oratorical performance served a compensatory role. Several later diplomatic speeches survive by Bruni's pen; however, the archival documentation and manuscript tradition clearly indicate that Florentine diplomats other than Bruni delivered these orations. While the evidence is indirect concerning who exactly decided Bruni should write these speeches, it seems most likely that host rulers were at least aware that Bruni was the author. Combining Bruni's words with the family standing of notable Florentine patricians enabled the Florentine diplomats to add an additional gift to the diplomatic reception ritual. The social standing of the diplomats had been the first offering. On particularly noteworthy missions, Florence sent Bruni's words to add a second

offering to the host ruler. In these circumstances, therefore, the cultural gift served to enhance already prestigious missions.

Attaching Bruni's reputation to orations delivered on diplomatic missions while keeping Bruni himself at home was necessary because of a crucial difference between a speaker in a domestic setting and a diplomat abroad. Bruni and other famous Florentine humanists serving as chancellors wrote countless state letters in a domestic setting to the allies and enemies of Florence. In a domestic letter writing capacity, a humanist writer disappeared with the presentation of his words as the utterances of the state. In the same way, individuals responding to visiting diplomats or rulers became the voice of their societal betters. Evidence points to numerous examples of Bruni, Scala, and other chancellors delivering political orations in domestic settings. On such occasions, a humanist chancellor, such as Leonardo Bruni, responding to a visiting diplomat or ruler became the eloquent voice of the Florentine patricians present at the oration. Bruni himself provides evidence for this claim. In his oration to the ambassadors of King Alfonso delivered in 1443, Bruni stated that "This is the response that is made to you on behalf of my magnificent Signori, with the deliberation and consensus not only of this numerous multitude of outstanding citizens, whom you see to be present and in the audience, but also with the consensus and deliberation of all the city in which, you should understand, all our people are of one wish, consensus, and mind." In this passage, Bruni made clear that his mouth uttered the words of the patricians present and even of the entire city. He reinforced his role as a mere conduit for their common decisions by drawing the attention of the King's ambassadors to the audience present.[80]

The different role of a diplomat abroad minimized the physical presence of Leonardo Bruni and other parvenu humanists on diplomatic missions. A Florentine diplomat abroad was

the embodiment of the Florentine regime. For example, a host ruler could select the city of Florence as a godparent for his or her child. A Florentine diplomat (or in this case technically a "proctor"), such as Maso degli Albizzi, performed the necessary ceremonies on behalf of the Florentine government. As the regime personified, a diplomat could represent it in such rituals. However, again as the regime personified, a diplomat's prestige and shortcomings became the same as his principal's strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, not only did sending diplomats with little social prestige and learning risk offending host rulers, such diplomats risked presenting Florence as a city of ignorant ruffians, void of established families and culture. As such, a Florentine diplomat had to possess both familial antiquity and eloquent words. Subsequently, the physical presence of Leonardo Bruni on a diplomatic mission presented insurmountable difficulties in diplomatic terms because of his parvenu status. However, Bruni's literary reputation carried no such baggage. By attaching Bruni's reputation to an oration, it automatically became more than the typical oratorical performance. Simultaneously, the mouth speaking the words carried the familial status that their author had lacked. Such performances were effective whether the audience members understood the oration's content or not. For those individuals who could follow the oration, Bruni used creative content to surpass ordinary orations. For those Latin illiterate members of the audience, the attachment of Bruni's name to an oration enabled these listeners to imagine the most eloquent oration possible based on their perception of Bruni's learning and talents.[81]

This use of Bruni's words in diplomatic settings helped to elevate the status of intellectuals in Italian society. During these decades, the words and reputations of humanists began to add prestige to diplomacy previously reserved for men with long ancestries. Orations that combined Bruni's words with patrician faces marked a shift from the total exclusion of

humanist authors in diplomacy towards the inclusion of their reputations. Previously, patrician diplomats had themselves co-opted humanist styles while simultaneously divorcing them from the humanists themselves. By contrast, in missions that combined patrician prestige with the reputations and words of humanist authors, humanist authors were able to enter into an indirect diplomatic role. After the introduction of humanist oratory into diplomacy in the early 1400s, the presence of intellectual reputations and words in diplomacy was the next step in the elevation in the status of intellectuals in the fifteenth century.

The New Banality of Humanism and the Example of Nello Martini

Before the mid 1420s, the novelty of humanism in diplomatic oratory enabled the simple presence of a classically styled oration to add prestige to missions. The praise of two orations that incorporated humanist elements in the first quarter of the fifteenth-century provides evidence for this statement. In the praise of Filippo Magalotti's oration before King Ladislaus in 1408, Jacopo Salviati had focused on the novelty of Magalotti's style. Magalotti's oration marked such a departure from more traditional forms that Salviati had felt the need to defend the focus of his colleague's oration. Similarly, in 1418, Filippo Rinuccini had explicitly tied the success of Leonardo Dati's oration with the fact that such an oration had never before been heard. By presenting humanist-influenced orations, both Magalotti and Dati were exceeding the requirements of diplomatic protocol. By exceeding what was necessary, the city of Florence was able to present its acknowledgement that Ladislaus' conquest of Rome and Martin V's election as pope, respectively, were extraordinary events.[82]

By 1425, however, the mere presence of a Florentine patrician offering humanist-influenced words was no longer outside of the realm of standard diplomatic protocol. In this

year, the Florentine *Signoria* instructed its orator to Martin V, Nello Martini, a frequent diplomat and prominent lawyer, to avoid old historical examples that would bore the pope. This statement indicates that displays of such learning, the presence of which undoubtedly reflects the influence of humanism, were now common. The instructions for Martini's oration told him that

> You will begin by stating that our community of the most devoted and faithful servants of the Church of God and the Pope has always done anything possible for their state and their protection and has not abandoned it because of dangers, damages, or expenses, nor has it exercised or held its power contrary to it, as we are certain is well known to all those present. It is for our comfort and in order to make them advised of some things that they do not, on account of the war, have news, that you are there. Say this omitting all old things (cose antiche) that would also be relevant (che sarebbano assai) and again, in order to avoid boring the listeners, state those things that you know, with that way which you think might be most agreeable to who is present.

The Florentine government assumed that the Florentine orators would look to the distant past to make their diplomatic case and was careful to instruct them not to do so. Moreover, a later letter from the *Dieci di Balià* further ensured that the diplomats would stay away from "old things" by providing the ambassadors with the exact historical references that they were to use in their opening oration. This letter from the *Diecì*, in fact, re-emphasized the *Signoria's* instructions by beginning, "in order that we pass over older things (ut antiquiora pretermittamus), it is fitting that you begin with the times of Frederick II (constat per tempora Federigi secundi…)". Martini followed their suggestions closely adding few of his own examples.[83]

The lawyer Nello Martini intentionally avoided humanism in his oration and organized it into a legal case as a deliberate statement of the cold relationship between the Pope and Florence. Martini's instructions had used a smooth narrative framework to present him with the different topics that he was to address in his oration. The commission began by stating that the Florentines had always been devoted to the pope; however, some of the pope's representatives in the papal lands had forgotten this devotion and acted against the Florentines (without, of course, the pope's knowledge). The commission then told the story of the wrongs inflicted upon the poor innocent Florentines by the Duke of Milan. Throughout the narrative, the Florentines are presented as lovers and seekers of peace who wish only to "conserve their liberty" against the treacherous and bellicose Duke. This presentation style should have provided Martini with an easy translation of the material into an oratorical narrative, a key aspect of a classical oration.[84]

Martini broke apart this narrative, identified four major points in his commission, and proceeded to present them in a plain list format. He began with his argument that the Florentines had always been devoted to the pope, citing the examples from the recent past that the *Dieci di Balià* had provided to him. Next, he turned to the actions committed against Florence by rulers in the pope's lands, taking his examples from his commission. Third, he made the case that Florence was justified in going to war with Milan, again taking his information from his commission. Lastly, Martini argued against the contention that the Florentines have not been active seekers of peace, again using his commission. In addition to making bullet points out of the story structure in his commission, Martini avoided classical citations and classical word phrasings. In fact, the only Latin that appears in the oration is a quotation that echoes the legal language found in Florentine laws. Although ostensibly following a classical structure – the oration contains a clear exordium, partition, peroration and each of the four topics is grouped

into a confirmation and a refutation - Martini's destruction of the narrative framework provided to him in his commission left his oration to be little more than a blunt list of items, arguments, and proof. Martini made repeated statements expressing his worry about the length of his oration. This concern for succinctness combined with plain language and a clear presentation of evidence drove Martini's legal case rather than the desire to conform to classical standards of eloquence.[85]

Martini and his audience were both well aware of the plain rhetorical style that he chose to use and the humanist style he chose to avoid. Albeit long, Martini's exordium, by far the most rhetorical part of his oration, makes this point explicitly.

> We are not unaware, blessed father, that in the thing which we have to do before your Holiness and sacred College of Cardinals, it would be necessary to praise and magnify the magnificence of the apostolic Church and of your Blessedness with an ornate speech (parlare) and polished (pulita) oration. Moreover, concerning this material it would be necessary to use a long sermon (sermone) prior to beginning to expound that material which we have to discuss. But the immense fame of your praiseworthy work (opera) and the filial love (dilezione), by which the Florentine people is raised up by your holiness, combined with the quantity and importance of the material which we have to present, make it so that our *Signoria* will not descend to those praises and the magnificence of the Holy Seat and of your holiness, as we believe is customary. This fact much afflicts and pains us, we greatly assure you. Moreover, we are not unaware that it would be necessary to speak before such Saintliness in Latin (per gramatica), with that ornamentation that the material would require, material which has been imposed

> and ordered to us by our magnificent *Signoria*. However, because it is not the custom of other orators and Florentine ambassadors, and also because really it is more fitting to the task of those that have committed it to us, it is best to address every part through the vernacular, stating and narrating the material committed to us with that ease and brevity for which it is most suited, and thus lessening the need for the benign endurance (mediante la benigna sopportazione) of your Holiness and of your Sacred College. I place myself under the correction and supplements of these my esteemed and excellent fathers (the other Florentine ambassadors present), by whose wishes (ai quali abbidendo), I will begin to speak and narrate that which has been committed to them and to me.

In this passage, Martini states that usually a lengthy oration of praise precedes an exposition of the diplomat's commission. Regrettably, Martini states, the length and importance of his material will not enable him to perform this action. Moreover, the quality of the audience requires a Latin oration. Both Martini's commissioners and custom, however, have forced him to speak in the vernacular. While these statements undoubtedly point to the persistent presence of the vernacular in diplomatic oratory, Martini betrays his concern about his choice to follow this tradition by offering numerous explanations for his stylistic choices. His statements hint that a different tradition, that of panegyrics, was common and an increasingly expected aspect of highly important missions such as his. Why did Martini avoid this practice and present his plain styled Italian legal case?[86]

Martini's choice of style in his oration was a deliberate statement on the icy relations between Florence and the papacy. The famous insult to Martin V in Florence in 1420, in which the people of the city sang a mocking song about the pope, reflected the deepest disagreements

between the pope and Florence concerning the lands of the Romagna. The root of the problem lay in the Florentine support of petty lords in this area of the papal state, such as the Malatesta, Montefeltri, Manfredi, and especially Braccio Fortebracci. Such support made assertions of papal power over these lands difficult. During the peace negotiations that followed Martini's oration, the Visconti highlighted the Florentine support of these petty rulers by suggesting a clause that would cut the ties between Florence and them, a clause which the Florentines rejected. During peace negotiations with the pope, the Florentine ambassador Rinaldo degli Albizzi declared that "in secret, the Pope agrees with the Duke about everything." On June 22, 1426, the Duke of Milan wrote to his Roman ambassadors to express his glee that the pope had conceded Citta di Castello to him. As Peter Partner writes, Città di Castello "… commands the passes into Tuscany, and whoever holds the city threatens – and thus may alienate – Florence." Although Città di Castello did not actually pass into Milanese hands, this letter provides further evidence for Martin V's pro-Milanese sentiments.[87]

These relations meant that the outstanding persons that Florence sent on this mission carried enough prestige to meet the requirements of the diplomatic reception ritual without adding an additional cultural gift. Florence had sent its most powerful citizen, Rinaldo degli Albizzi, its most prolific diplomatic lawyer, Nello Martini, and a third extraordinarily powerful Florentine patrician, Agnolo Pandolfini, to the pope's peace talks. The reputations of these men alone were enough to demonstrate Florence's interest in the peace negotiations and carry out the events of the diplomatic reception ritual. Yet, Nello Martini twice stated in his exordium that he would not offer a panegyric to the pope. By avoiding this tradition, the Florentine ambassadors were making the implicit statement that they would not offer any further demonstration of good will towards the pope. There would be no cultural gift. A man opposed to Florentine interests

and sympathetic to their enemies did not deserve one. By using a plain styled oration rather than a humanist one, the Florentine diplomats made a complicated statement about their relationship with the pope. In short, by 1425, humanist oratory was not only common in diplomacy, but the choice to avoid a humanist oratorical style could even contain subtle diplomatic meanings.[88]

The growing number of individuals with humanist connections sent as diplomats by Florence during the latter 1420s and early 1430s provides further evidence for the successful integration of humanism into diplomatic oratory by that time. Over an eleven-year span (1425-1435), 197 diplomatic and commissarial positions have been identified. Nine individuals went on five or more missions during this period. Eight of these men possessed at least marginal connections with the humanist movement. Some had very strong ties, such as Agnolo Pandolfini and Palla di Nofri Strozzi. Men with more of a middling interest in humanism, such as Luca degli Albizzi, Rinaldo degli Albizzi, and Marcello Strozzi, were also part of this group. Weaker connections were present in the remaining five individuals. Piero Guicciardini made the first surviving reference to the story of Giangaleazzo Visconti thinking that Coluccio Salutati's letters were more valuable in war than "500 horses". Felice Brancacci was the stepfather of the famous humanist Donato Acciaiuoli. He also oversaw the painting of the Brancacci chapel by Masaccio. Ridolfo Peruzzi's business connections with humanists were discussed in the last chapter. The only exception was Francesco Soderini, whose only ostensible connection to humanism was a discussion of his exile in a treatise by Francesco Filelfo. Although varied, the humanist connections of this group of prominent Florentine diplomats were much stronger than the group of the most prominent diplomats between 1405 and 1425 discussed in Chapter One. Moreover, eleven other individuals with humanist connections, but who were diplomats less than five times,

occupied an additional thirty-one missions between 1425 and 1435. Taken together, diplomats with varying degrees of humanist connections occupied Eight-seven out of 194 diplomatic missions during these years, or just under 45% (44.8%)[89]

The personnel of Florence's obedience mission to Eugenius IV in 1431 provide a final piece of evidence for the strong presence of humanism in diplomacy by the latter 1420s. Three of the six diplomats on this mission possessed very strong connections to the humanist movement. Palla di Nofri Strozzi and Giuliano Davanzati were discussed in Chapter One. Lorenzo de' Medici.was a frequent correspondent of Ambrogio Traversari. Leonardo Bruni even sent a translation to him for commenting. Lorenzo Ridolfi's connections, noted in Chapter One, were close behind these three other individuals. Ridolfo Peruzzi's extraordinary political prestige overshadowed his business relationships with humanist authors, his only connection. Zanobi Guasconi lacked connections to the humanist movement; however, he was one of the most learned lawyers in the city, starting a series of lectures on the *Decretals* at the University of Florence in 1431. Certainly, political power and familial antiquity remained key factors underlying the diplomatic selection of these men; however, the strength of their connections to the humanist movement were much stronger than the diplomats sent to Martin V thirteen years previously.[90]

The Cultural Gift, Part One: the Failure of Leonardo Bruni as a Diplomat

With the presence of humanism in diplomatic oratory established, the Florentine government began using humanism as a tool to help the Republic balance the complicated tightrope of Renaissance diplomacy. At first, the Florentine government attempted to send Leonardo Bruni himself as a diplomat. Bruni's combination of a *novus homo* social status and

an unparalleled literary reputation could send conflicting messages to host rulers and other observing powers. Occurring in 1420, Bruni's first election as a Florentine diplomat fit into the context of the wider presence of men with close humanist connections in diplomacy, such as Palla di Palla Strozzi and Giuliano Davanzati, who started their diplomatic careers around the same time. Unlike these men, Bruni lacked an illustrious Florentine family name. Bruni was a first generation Florentine, having gained citizenship only in 1416. Moreover, the marriages of Bruni and his family suggest that his social position was on the fringes of the ruling Florentine patriciate, rather than the core from which Florence selected its diplomats. Bruni himself married an Aretine. Bruni married his only son Donato into the prominent Castellani family. Two factors lessened the prestige of this connection. First, the estate of Michele Castellani, the father of Donato's bride, was in financial need. A marriage with Bruni offered a way out of their financial troubles. Second, Michele Castellani himself died before the wedding in 1425, thus destroying the greatest potential personal connection that Bruni could gain from the marriage. This marriage enabled Bruni to attempt to a lay the foundations for a powerful family lineage in Florence, but these were long-term goals rather than immediate returns.[91]

In 1420, the *Signoria* attempted to use Bruni's parvenu status to deemphasize a diplomatic mission while simultaneously employing his literary reputation to avoid offending a host ruler. In this year, Bruni was elected as a diplomat for a complicated mission to Alfonso, King of Sicily and Aragon. The mission was problematic for the Florentines because the city needed relations with Alfonso, whose territories were full of Florentine merchants. Moreover, Alfonso had employed the Florentine ally Braccio Fortebracci as his condottiere. Yet, Florence was also a traditional ally of the House of Anjou, the head of which, Louis, was Alfonso's rival claimant to the throne of Naples. The pope himself had originally encouraged Louis to pursue

his claim to Naples. Flooding Alfonso with a rain of congratulations would sink the Florentines' papal and French relations. Conversely, the weakness of the pope and France in 1420 made any decision to support them difficult because of the unlikelihood of their ultimate success.[92]

Florence decided on neutrality in its foreign policy and subtlety in its diplomatic representation. The *Signoria* had to acknowledge the accession of King Alfonso to the Neapolitan throne, an event brought about by his adoption by Queen Giovanna of Naples in September 1420. Yet, as a neutral power, the diplomats had to be individuals whose status would avoid offending Alfonso's rival, Louis of Anjou, and Louis's ally, Pope Martin V. Bruni was a perfect choice. Bruni's smattering of legal training could enable him to negotiate slippery mercantile matters with the king. Bruni's total lack of familial status implicitly assured the pope and King Louis of the triviality that the Florentines placed on the mission. Concurrently, Bruni's learning would provide an extraordinary oration to compensate for his low familial status. The culturally inclined king would surely appreciate this cultural gift and look past Bruni's modest background. Depending on a ruler's diplomatic perspective, the Florentines had sent different messages.[93]

Bruni's rejection of the mission and the status of his replacement, Jacopo Niccoli, provide further evidence for this interpretation. On November 20, 1420 (eight days after Bruni's election), Bruni argued that he could not serve on the mission. The *Signoria's* scribe recorded his reason as "impediments", a common term used to describe the excuses of dodgers of diplomatic duties. The *Signoria* replaced Bruni with Jacopo Niccoli, the brother of the famous humanist Niccolò Niccoli. Like Bruni, Niccoli possessed no diplomatic experience. Moreover, he suffered from the same low diplomatic prestige due to his lack of a strong Florentine familial

history or office holding tradition. However, whereas Bruni possessed a smattering of legal training, Niccoli was a prominent Florentine lawyer. In fact, Niccoli had served as consulate for the lawyers' guild ten different times. Therefore, the presence of Niccoli enhanced the legal learning of the entourage over what Bruni would have provided. This gain offset what the entourage lost in terms of humanism. Jacopo's humanist connections were limited to his fraternal relationship with the famous arbiter of classicism Niccolò Niccoli. By replacing Bruni with Niccoli, the *Signoria* revealed that it sought a man with some legal training, no diplomatic experience, little familial background, but above average learning. In 1420, a year in which humanism was still establishing itself in diplomacy, whether the diplomat possessed above average humanist learning or the more traditional high level of legal learning carried the same degree of additional prestige.[94]

Attempting to use Bruni to send conflicting diplomatic messages was similar to other means by which the Florentines sent ambiguous diplomatic signals when pressed by all sides. Richard Trexler has argued that, in terms of ritual celebrations at home aimed at a diplomatic purpose, "the most common response to complex diplomatic relations was neither silence or deceit, but ambiguity: carefully constructed, artful celebrations designed to maintain and augment friendships without estranging others." Trexler offers the example of the celebration in Florence concerning Pope Julius II's defeat of the French, a Florentine ally, and conquest of Bologna. In its celebration, the Florentines performed the least amount of ritual celebration necessary to avoid offending the papacy. At the same time, the government ordered particular aspects of the procession to be suppressed in order to avoid offending the French. In the same way, the Florentines attempted to send an ambiguous diplomatic message in the person of

Leonardo Bruni, who lacked traditional diplomatic prestige but who could offer his literary reputation and humanist eloquence as a compensatory cultural gift.[95]

Bruni went as a diplomat to Pope Martin V in 1426 in a further attempt by the Florentine *Signoria* to deal with a difficult diplomatic situation by making an ambiguous diplomatic statement. In this case, the Florentines sent Bruni to appease the pope while simultaneously implying their lack of serious interest in the pope's peace negotiations. In this round of the peace talks, the Pope's ambassador, Domenico da Capranica, had requested that the Florentines send diplomats to negotiate peace with Milan under the watchful eye of Pope Martin V in Rome. The Florentines could not refuse such a request without heavy diplomatic ramifications, particularly driving the pope further to the side of Milan. However, it was to the advantage of the Florentines to avoid peace and to continue the war in the summer of 1426. At the time of Bruni's election, two of the city's most prestigious diplomats, Rinaldo degli Albizzi and Nello Martini, were at the court of the emperor "…in order to make peace between the emperor and the Venetian Republic. Once the fighting with those armies subsided, the Venetians could conduct their full force against the Duke of Milan." Moreover, the recently allied Florence and Venice were actively seeking to gain another serious advantage in the war by adding Savoy to their number. This agreement, which was eventually reached while Bruni was a diplomat, placed Milan in a precarious geographic position between two enemies, Venice and Savoy. Reaching agreements with Savoy and the Emperor would almost definitely give Florence an immense advantage in the war and eventually a much stronger bargaining position in the inevitable final peace agreement. By sending a less prestigious diplomat such as Bruni, the Florentines could send the implicit message to such potential allies that Florence was represented, but not interested in the papal peace process.[96]

Venetian and Florentine diplomatic documents from the summer of 1426 provide further evidence that Bruni's selection as diplomat reflected the Florentines' half-hearted interests in the peace talks. The league agreement between Florence and Venice stated that Venice was to be in charge of peace negotiations. Subsequently, the ambassadors in Venice had been in Rome about a month longer than their Florentine counterparts. Bruni and Tornabuoni's instructions and a later letter emphasized that they were to follow the Venetians lead and work closely with them in this area. The surviving diplomatic correspondence between Florence and the city's diplomats focus overwhelmingly on Faenza and the restoration of lands to the Republic rather than making peace. The Venetian correspondence, by contrast to the letters to the Florentine diplomats, focused overwhelmingly on the peace process. These letters frequently dwell at length on the proposed peace capitals. One letter from the Venetian Senate to the Florentine diplomat in Venice, Marcello Strozzi, responds to Strozzi's request on behalf of the Florentine government to add a section to the peace agreement. This letter further suggests that Florence was looking to others in the peace process. Bruni's commission, in fact, instructed Bruni and Tornabuoni that they were to tell the pope that the presence of the Venetians at the peace talks had made it seem to the Florentines that their own presence was unnecessary.[97]

In addition to implying their low interest in the pope's peace, sending Bruni gave the Florentines a practical advantage at the negotiating table. Bruni seems to have been especially suited to deal with the contentious issues of the Romagna, the issue that dominates the diplomatic letters between Florence and its ambassadors at Rome. In fact, after Bruni returned from his mission to the pope, the Florentines sent Bruni to Forlì to continue talks regarding this issue. In particular, the lands under the control of Florence's commissary, Giovanni Gambacorta were a part of the dispute between Florence and Forli. Giovanni Gambacorta was a powerful

Pisan patrician. He was also the grandfather of Alessandra Castellani, the future wife of Bruni's only son Donato. Therefore, Bruni was in charge of defending the claims of a man who five years later would join his extended family.[98]

Moreover, Bruni's humanist learning gave him a connection with members of the supporting cast at the diplomatic table. The famous humanist and Venetian patrician Francesco Barbaro headed the Venetian legation, which served as Florence's key diplomatic ally to the pope. The meeting between the Florentine and Venetian diplomats as soon as the Florentine diplomats entered Rome suggests the closeness with which they worked. Perhaps the common intellectual interests of Barbaro and Bruni enhanced their ability to work together. Domenico Capranica, the pope's ambassador that had requested the mission in the first place, also had strong humanist interests. Capranica was a patron of the humanist writers Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (later Pius II) and Biondo Flavio. His huge library contained several classical and humanist works. Although Capranica took little or no part in the negotiations at the papal court in the summer of 1426, he was the governor of Forli with whom the Florentine government sent Bruni to negotiate in the fall of 1426.[99]

Yet, in spite of all his strengths, Bruni's low familial reputation remained. His immigrant status sharply contrasted with the ancient Florentine lineages of the men who filled other peace missions during the mid 1420s, men like Rinaldo degli Albizzi, Agnolo Pandolfini, and Palla di Nofri Strozzi. His parvenu status and lack of official diplomatic experienced also contrasted with his much more prestigious colleague Francesco Tornabuoni. Most noticeably, Bruni's mission, featuring one prominent citizen, sharply contrasted with the three powerful men making up Nello Martini's diplomatic mission to the same pope for ostensibly the same reason less than a year before. Whereas Tornabuoni had a noble ancestry and official diplomatic experience,

Bruni lacked such a luxuries. Unless he compensated for his lackluster background, the pope could potentially view his presence as a veiled insult.[100]

Bruni compensated for his humble ancestry through his friendship with the pope and his presentation of a cultural gift. Bruni possessed the closest relationship with Martin V of any Florentine during Martin's papacy. Bruni himself provides a strong piece of evidence for his close ties with the pope. In his *Commentaries on his Own Times*, Bruni records a discussion he had with the pope before he left Florence. In this account, Bruni described the anger of the pope towards his treatment in Florence. Bruni worked and succeeded to some degree in pacifying the pope's wrath. Moreover, as recently as late 1420, Martin V had employed Bruni in the papal curia. The fact that the *Signoria* elected Bruni as a diplomat in 1420 only after the pope had left the city is most likely not a coincidence: this fact most likely reflects the importance of Bruni in the city as an intermediary between the papacy and the Florentine government. Most notably, Bruni served in this role in the events leading up to Martin V's departure from Florence in 1420 and during the long years of Eugenius IV's sojourn in Florence between 1434 and 1441, especially at the Council of Florence. Bruni had dedicated his translation of Aristotle's *Ethics* to Martin V. Poggio Bracciolini asked Bruni to write a letter to Martin V defending secretaries shortly after Bruni returned from his 1426 mission. Bruni's career as a papal secretary made him more knowledgeable and more socially connected than most regarding the papal curia in general.[101]

Bruni's rhetorical abilities and learning enabled him to offer a cultural gift to the Pope that could compensate for his humble ancestry, stress his connections with the pope, and make the pope more amenable to Florentine demands. Whereas in the first quarter of the quattrocento a classically styled oration had been the prized method for offering a cultural gift, by 1426, such

a style fit into an acknowledged common practice. In fact, in terms of its style, Bruni's opening oration is remarkably similar to earlier humanist styled diplomatic orations. Like the fifteenth-century orations discussed in Chapter One, Bruni arranged the words of his oration in a classical way. Take the following sentence for example: "Qui igitur sedem hanc non admirabilem modo verum etiam stupendam *adveniunt*, si sapienter facere *voluerint*, ora *claudent*, corda *aperient*, vocem *compescent*, affectum *diffundent*, nec tam facundi eam *alloquentur* quam venerabundi et taciti *adorabunt*." In this sentence, Bruni has pushed finite verbs to the end (underlined and italicized), balanced clauses (here the pairing of two syllable words with a finite verb), used alliteration (claudent… corda… compescent), and assonance (the repeated third person plural verb forms and accusative nouns and adjectives). In terms of structure, the entire oration serves as an exordium, using praise for the pope as an introduction to later political negotiations. Near the end of the speech, Bruni declares his narrative, stating that the pope had requested diplomats from Florence for the peace process. Bruni's speech lacks the final parts of a classical oration, the partition, confirmation, refutation, and peroration. These oratorical parts would have pertained to the diplomatic arguments from Florence. Rather than officially beginning this process, Bruni coyly states "There are certain others things that must be explained separately to your blessedness by us, which we will set out when the time will be given to us." Like his predecessor Filippo Magalotti, Bruni was attempting to draw a clear distinction between his oration, the missions' cultural gift, and the subsequent political particulars. However, the simple presence of a classical style in Magalotti's oration had been enough to serve as a cultural gift in 1408. Twenty years later, Bruni's structure and word style were no longer extraordinary occurrences. In order to complete a successful cultural gift, Bruni had to add something new.[102]

Bruni's oration to the pope successfully offered a cultural gift through its creative content. By 1426, Bruni was a renowned author, Greek translator, and orator. Having worked for years in the papal curia, Bruni's reputation for learning and eloquence preceded him. Bruni was careful to hint at his expertise in diplomatic oratory, to remind his listeners that they were about to hear something new, and of his close relationship with the pope, all in the first part of his oration. Bruni stated

> Those filling the office of legate that approach to the apostolic and most holy seat are accustomed, Blessed Father, to attempt to raise it up with the most exquisite praises, as much as they are able to exert with their mouth and words. Yet, when I often present carefully and accurately heard them and would ponder on the one hand their language and on the other hand the greatness and majesty of this seat, I always judged that the words were so deficient that the people praising their attempts all seemed absurd. Surely, it is correct that this observation deservedly occurs. Who indeed in possession of the senses believes that he or she can assign worthy praises of this seat with human words? This seat whose authority and power is not content with the lands nor the extent of the seas, it enters and transcends the heavens. What kind of person thinks that he or she can equal the greatness of this seat with low thoughts/statements (sententia)? Indeed, my opinion is that the person who hopes that he or she would be able to do this, does not recognize his or her own weakness. The person that dares to attempt this is found out to be imprudent. As is rightly said by philosophers, some things of quality are worthy of praise, others of veneration. Those things of praise fall into

> earthly esteem. However, those things of veneration are more heavenly and greater. This latter is the type which our praises seek to approach.

By referring to his time in the curia ("I often present…"), Bruni first transformed himself to become, not a Florentine diplomat from a parvenu family, but rather an old friend of the pope deserving of an audience in his presence. Moreover, Bruni has reminded his audience of his expertise in diplomatic oratory by stating the innumerable times he has been a witness to such performances. Lastly, Bruni has informed his audience that he is offering a cultural gift by differing from these past performances. Previously, orators have foolishly focused on praising the pope. Bruni has chosen a new route, venerating that which words cannot possibly succeed in praising. The evidence for Bruni's new tactics comes from unnamed "philosophis", a reference to Plato. Bruni's subtle reminders of his rhetorical skill make this move all the more powerful: even the famed manipulator of words Leonardo Bruni was at a loss when it comes to praising the holy seat.[103]

In the remainder of his oration, Bruni used more creative content to surpass previous oratorical performances and offer the pope a cultural gift. In contrast to the apostolic seat, which is so glorious that it can only be appreciated through silent veneration, Bruni states that it is possible to praise the person in possession of the seat. This substance of Bruni's praise for this particular pope is identical to that offered in the anonymous oration before Martin V discussed in chapter one. In this earlier oration, the anonymous orator had repeatedly returned to references that Martin was the only the pope, focusing on how Martin would end the previous problems of the papacy and his legitimate election as the only pope. Bruni sought to make exactly the same points, stressing the pope's status as the only pope and his glorious accomplishments (accomplishments instead of anticipated actions because by 1426 Martin had been pope for

almost a decade). However, whereas the anonymous orator had been content to state his case with simple statements and rhetorical questions, Bruni employed an elaborate and multi-leveled metaphor. On the surface, Bruni simply praised various actions of the pope. First, he praised the pope for making the roads to Rome safe again. Next, he praised the pope's building efforts in Rome and church reforms. Such praises fell clearly into the classical oratorical category of external things: the pope's office, his deeds, and his favor by God. Yet, like a cake, Bruni's praise had another layer. [104]

Bruni structured his praise to present the pope as a second founder of the Roman Church. Previously, the roads to Rome were traveled only "with extreme danger of life and the greatest fear". They were full of "thieves". The valleys and mountains offered "deathly fear to travelers" These woods are a symbol of the problems and ruin of the church before the papacy of Martin V. Through Martin's restorative efforts, these same lands are peaceful and the trees and bushes, like those exhorted to praise the Lord in the Book of Isaiah, sing their praises for the Pope. Inside the city walls, the Pope is a second founder of the Church. Martin has refounded basilicas and temples in general. The only refurbished building that Bruni mentioned by name is the Lateran, the traditional home of the popes. As if restoring the home of the popes was not enough, the pope has rebuilt bridges, the word from which the Latin name for the popes (pons (bridge) pontifex (pope)) derives. Lastly, Martin has restored the ceremonies of the church to their original pristine state. Rather than simply stating that the pope has restored the Church and the papacy, Bruni has demonstrated his point through an elaborate metaphor.[105]

Bruni structured his creative content on the suggestions of the newly rediscovered ancient rhetorical master Quintillian. The use of this new author further emphasized Bruni's learning and thus his cultural gift. Regarding panegyrics, Quintillian had stated that

> However, just as panegyric applied to practical matters requires proof, so too a certain semblance of proof is at times required by speeches composed entirely for display. For instance, a speaker who tells how Romulus was the son of Mars and reared by the she-wolf, will offer as proofs of his divine origin the facts that when thrown into a running stream he escaped drowning, that all his achievements were such as to make it credible that he was the offspring of the god of battles, and that his contemporaries unquestionably believed that he was translated to heaven.

Rather than simply stating that Martin had restored the church after the disaster of the Great Schism, Bruni followed Quinitllian in proving his case. Moreover, Bruni looked to Quintilian for instructions in how to structure his oration. Quintillian wrote that "In praising the gods our first step will be to express our veneration of the majesty of their natures in general terms: next we shall proceed to praise the special power of the individual god and the discoveries whereby he has benefited the human race." Similarly, Bruni began by focusing on venerating the pope's office in general terms. He followed this action with praise for the deeds of this individual pope. By following Quintillian's precepts, Bruni was able implicitly to transform the pope from not only the restorer of the Church, but into a god.[106]

Whereas Bruni's cultural gift was a success, his mission was much less so. Through stressing his reputation and adding creative and multi-layered content, Bruni's oration surpassed previous oratorical performances and offered the pope a cultural gift. As usual, the Florentine diplomats reported this successful gift exchange using a brief trope statement before proceeding onto a detailed description of the political particulars. In this case, Bruni wrote "…we explained to his holiness with many words and with the owed reverence the reasons of our coming, explaining one part and the other, that is, the reason of peace and the reason of Romagna,

according to the tenor of our commission." The remainder of the report states Bruni's mixed results concerning the restoration of lands and the impediments faced in the peace process. A peace agreement would finally be reached between later and different Milanese and Florence diplomats in 1428.[107]

After 1426, the Florentine government abandoned its experiment of sending Bruni on diplomatic missions. In fact, the implications for Bruni's two diplomatic missions on his career lie not in his success, but rather in his ultimate failure as a diplomat. The Florentine government had attempted to overlook Bruni's lack of familial history and concentrate on his unparalleled literary reputation in sending him as a diplomat. This attempt fit into a wider context of the attempts of the Florentine government to use Bruni's extreme erudition to its advantage, such as its hiring Bruni's eloquent pen in 1411 as chancellor, commissioning in 1415 his *History of the Florentine People*, and commissioning him to help rewrite the statutes of the Guelf party in 1420. Unlike a diplomat, however, who served as a representative, all of these positions involved using Bruni's eloquence domestically, as the communal voice of the patriciate. In 1427, a similar option presented itself in the opening of the position of chancellor of the Republic. Re-employing Bruni as the Florentine chancellor enabled the Florentine government to make constant use of Bruni's eloquent words without worrying about his background. As chancellor, Bruni would write public letters, orations for Florentine diplomats, responses to visiting diplomats, and literary works to further Florentine foreign policies. In his role as secretary, he was the scribe and voice of his societal betters. Never again would he personally be their representative abroad.[108]

The Cultural Gift, Part Two: Bruni's Words as a Cultural Gift Contrasted with Palla di Palla Strozzi

During Bruni's chancellorship (1427-1444), the Florentine *Signoria* shifted its diplomatic use of Bruni's humanism from the compensatory role it played in missions featuring a low-status diplomat, to an enhancement of missions already packed with prestigious personnel. Between 1427 and 1444, the Florentine *Signoria* sent diplomats on four major missions that demanded more than the usual level of diplomatic prestige. Major ceremonial missions occurred in order to congratulate a new Pope, Holy Roman Emperor, King of France, King of Naples, Duke of Milan, a wedding involving one of these figures, or an exceptionally noteworthy military victory. Florence sent missions of this sort to the new Pope Eugenius IV in 1431; the hostile emperor Sigismund in Italy in 1432; the newly crowned emperor Albrecht III in the Empire in 1438; and the victorious Alfonso of Aragon in 1442, who had defeated Renè of Anjou and entered the city of Naples. The Florentine Republic does not seem to have sent an official embassy to the new emperor Frederick III in 1440. The extraordinary ceremonial component of these missions demanded that the Florentines prove how special the host ruler's accession, election, or success was to their city. Except for the earliest of these events (the humanist packed obedience mission to Eugenius IV), Leonardo Bruni wrote the opening oration for each congratulatory mission. In each example, Bruni continued to use his reputation and creative content to offer the host ruler a cultural gift.[109]

In 1432 the Florentine government sent Leonardo Bruni's reputation and words to enhance the prestige of a diplomatic mission to the Holy Roman Emperor. Scholars have traditionally assumed that Bruni delivered this 1432 or 1433 oration himself to the Emperor Sigismundo. Hans Baron, relying in part on the nineteenth-century German historian J.G.

Aschbach, contended that Bruni delivered this speech in 1433 after relations between Florence and the Emperor had warmed from their frost in 1432. Baron focused more on when and where Bruni delivered the speech than if Bruni spoke its words. Paolo Viti and Concetta Bianca agree that Bruni gave the oration. The problem with this assumption is the lack of any diplomatic documentation to support it. Sigismundo was forced to send diplomats to Florence from Siena because the Florentines had denied him entry into the city. Therefore, a Florentine diplomat must have delivered Bruni's oration outside of Florence. The Florentine *Signoria* sent five ambassadors to the Holy Roman Emperor between 1432 and 1433, none of whom was Leonardo Bruni. The earliest mission featured Biagio Guasconi. Guasconi went to the emperor in the spring/summer of 1432 in order to find out the ruler's designs during his trip through Italy. A second mission in 1432 featured Francesco Tornabuoni and Brun's friend Palla di Nofri Strozzi. This mission lacked an opening oration because hostilities with the emperor forced the Florentine government to recall the diplomats. The third mission featured another Guasconi (this time Zenobi) and the head of the Florentine state Rinaldo degli Albizzi. Zenobi Guasconi and Albizzi sought to make peace between the emperor and Florence. Since Bruni undoubtedly wrote the oration but did not serve as a diplomat to the emperor, his costumed words must have dressed the speech of one of these other orators.[110]

The evidence suggests that Biagio Guasconi delivered Bruni's oration in 1432 in order to placate the emperor's hostile sentiments towards the Florentines. The oration does not mention the emperor's coronation by the pope, suggesting that this event (in 1433) had not yet occurred. Moreover, Biagio Guasconi was a humanist dilettante and friend of Matteo Strozzi, which may have placed him in contact with Bruni. Elements of the oration and the commission overlap, such as the stress of both texts on the Florentines as devoted sons of the emperor and their hopes

for his rule. Lastly, the diplomatic environment suggests the need for a cultural gift. Whereas Palla and Tornabuoni did not reach the emperor and Zenobi Guasconi and Rinaldo degli Albizzi were diplomats to negotiate peace, Biagio Guasconi faced the task of explaining a potential insult. The commission laid out the problem facing the Florentines concerning offending the emperor.

> Next, make an excuse for yourself for the fact that his majesty came into Italy and our city did not mandate an obligatory visitation through a solemn embassy, as the dignity of the empire and the most devoted affection that his person has towards us requires. Show that the reason for this has been that his person has been in the lands and among the forces of the Duke of Milan, with whom we are at war. Into such lands we could not send an ambassador to his eminence without enhancing greatly the reputation of our enemy in the opinion of the people and of the rulers of Italy. You will have the evidence of the letter written to the emperor on this point and on other parts touched on above which you can cite.

Because the Florentines were late in sending an ambassador to emperor in Italy, they felt the need to bring documentary proof explaining their late arrival. Such measures reveal their uneasiness about the ultimate success of Guasconi's goodwill mission. Beyond cold political papers, they needed to add something to his mission to show the emperor the city's true good will. For this goal, they turned towards Leonardo Bruni.[111]

In order to appease the emperor, the Florentines sent Guasconi with Bruni's cultural gift. The strongest part of the gift was the attachment of Bruni's reputation. Bruni and the emperor had known one another for almost two decades. In addition to being acquaintances, other trans-alpine rulers knew and appreciated Bruni's literary reputation. For example, the Florentine

Signoria sent Bruni's *Praise of the City of Florence* as a propagandistic piece to the Council of Basel. Bruni wrote to a noble as far off as Humphrey of Gloucester in England. In addition to his reputation, Bruni again ostentatiously divided his oratorical content from the later political negotiations. As in earlier speeches, Bruni signaled his oration's donative function with a clear statement: "…Concerning the part of those topics that must be presented to your majesty, we will save them until the time will be given to us." [112]

Bruni shaped his remaining oratorical content to offer a cultural gift to the emperor. The oration focused on portraying the emperor as a man who combined all virtuous aspects into one person. Few in history had paralleled such a combination. Bruni stated that words and time do not allow the speaker to detail all the topics of praise of the emperor. Nevertheless, Bruni still contended that these praises contended among themselves for excellence. Bruni's gift was to laud the emperor in exactly the same terms as a classical figure that combined learning with action. In fact, in this passage Bruni used exactly the same language to describe the Emperor as he had Xenophon thirty years earlier. In the preface to his enormously successful translation of Xenophon's *Hiero*. Bruni had pondered the competing attributes within the person of Xenophon.

> For what from among the most illustrious things did that man lack? What characteristics were not the highest? Do you seek learning in a man? Xenophon is most learned. Do you praise prudence? He is most prudent. Do you delight in eloquence? This man is counted among the princes. Do you love virtue? This man was the best of all the men of his age. Do you admire accomplishments? In this area of praise as well, he excelled considerably. Many are held the highest, because they were endowed with one or another memorable aspect. In what place,

> at last, will we think that this man must be held, who so embraced all things together, that they seem to struggle amongst themselves for excellence.

Bruni's oration to the emperor used the same wording and topics for praise

> We read that certain kings were outstanding in war, nevertheless the same men were deficient in the arts of peace. On the same note, certain kings meek and adapted to civic life, have however collapsed in terms of glory in war. In some others sharpness of the mind, other prudence, others eloquence, others appearance, others generosity, others magnanimity were lacking. In you, however, all things which deserve to be praised come together in one amazing and happy struggle to such an extent that they seem to struggle amongst themselves for excellence. The same man that is the most formidable in war is the most humane in peace. Who could say whether he is more ferocious against his enemies or more merciful towards his conquered foes? Concerning your generosity and magnaminity and all other qualities of the mind and body, it is best to be totally silent than to say too few words.

Bruni drew his audience into his forthcoming comparison between this emperor and the great kings of the past, "we read that certain kings…" According to Bruni, all of these great men had lacked one positive trait or another. The emperor, like the model for the praise Xenophon, possessed them all. Next, Bruni offered the proof of his assertions by citing specific examples of the emperor's virtues. For example, he described the emperor's efforts both against the enemies of the Christian faith and at bringing the end to the Great Schism. Through Bruni's efforts, the emperor becomes more virtuous, more outstanding, more laudatory than any fabled historical king. Bruni's words and reputation had completed the gift giving ritual and hopefully provided

the framework for Guasconi's negotiations. The role of Bruni's words and reputation was at an end.[113]

Palla di Palla Strozzi's sharply contrasting speech from 1434 further stresses how Florence offered a cultural gift with the words of Leonardo Bruni. In 1434, a disguised Eugenius IV fled the hostile mobs of Rome. He arrived in Pisa, where the Florentines sent a delegation to escort him to the Florentine church of Santa Maria Novella. As the diplomat selected to speak for the delegation, Palla used a classical structure and style in his oration. He pushed finite verbs to the ends of clauses and employed the same types of rhetorical devices as his diplomatic predecessors. For example, he used alliteration ("nostra nobis non" and "seperatiora sunt"), assonance ("turbulentissimus dolorsissimusque" and "gratulatio ex exultatio") and anaphora ("...*e pro* consolatione popoli nostri *e pro* quiete *e* (re) sanctitatis *pro* curialum commoditate..."). Note the placement of the verbs in the following clauses: "...fama certe residentie vostre in illa civitate inumerabilem multitudinem ad curiam *provocabit* propter securitatem loci atque mari omni pericuolo *vacantium erit*." Thus, Palla and Bruni both offered similar orations in terms of the then standard style.[114]

Yet, in terms of their diplomatic credentials, literary reputations, and oratorical content, Bruni and Palla differed dramatically. Unlike the highly successful humanist author but parvenu Bruni, Palla di Palla was a humanist dilettante from the powerful Strozzi family. Reflecting these differences, Palla's oration honed in on the particulars of his mission whereas Bruni had separated his cultural gift from the later political negotiations. Palla's oration consists of joyful statements regarding the pope's safe arrival from Rome. Palla assured his Holiness that he would find safety in Florence. Not only does Palla's oratorical content lack the elaborate and creative praise found in Bruni's orations, it lacks *any* explicit praise for the pope. These content

contrasts point to the different role of Palla's and Bruni's oratorical performances. Whereas Florence had used Bruni and his words as cultural gifts to disarm two potentially volatile situations, Florence held all the cards in Palla's mission in 1434. Florence had already offered its gift to the pope in the form of providing him a safe haven from the Roman hoards. By focusing his oration on the pope's safe journey to Florentine territory and his upcoming stay within their city walls, Palla di Palla Strozzi implicitly referred to Florence's diplomatic gift. Since their gift was residence rather than eloquence, the Florentines sent a typical ambassador who combined an old familial lineage with a modest degree of humanist learning.[115]

The Cultural Gift, Part Three: Continuation of these Themes in Bruni's Later Career

Florence continued to use Bruni's words in the mouths of more illustrious Florentines as a cultural gift in another mission to the Holy Roman Emperor in 1438. Bruni's oration followed the now familial routine of offering a cultural gift by adhering to the standard humanist style while adding creative content. Bruni infused the same exordium format and classical writing style as in his two previous orations. In this case, he was to some extent following the instructions that he himself had drafted for the ambassadors. These instructions stress to the ambassadors that they were to say that they were present for congratulating the emperor only. The commission states "…you are mandated by the city of Florence and by his governors and citizens to praise (aralegrarsi) and congratulate him concerning his happy assumption." Moreover, the commission betrays a clear apprehension about the phrasing and presentation of the Florentine diplomats' oratory, twice instructing the diplomats on the exact types of words they were to use. Ultimately, they provided the departing diplomats with an oration by Bruni. In addition to his enhancement of the oration with his literary reputation and creative content,

Bruni's oration ensured that the Florentine diplomats would not fail in filling their commission.[116]

Once again, Bruni's content carried a cultural gift from Florence to a host ruler. In this oration, Bruni attempted to portray him as Christ himself. Bruni began with a quote from Matthew "We see His star in the east and we come to adore Him." Through this quotation, Bruni has changed the setting of the diplomatic audience from diplomats visiting a ruler, to the three wise men - not coincidently the number of Florentine ambassadors on the mission - visiting the Son of God. Just as the wisemen, the Florentine diplomats have come to pay homage and offer gifts. Next, Bruni attempted to prove that his comparison was justified, stating "Not without probable reason is this parallel made between the imperial dignity and a star shining in the sky." A series of comparisons meant to proof this statement follow, climaxing with an eschatological quotation from Vergil, "lest you think that all these things were now newly invented by me, hear what Virgil, most learned of the poets, says: Behold the star of Dionysian Caesar appears ‖ a star by which the grain fields and also crops would rejoice ‖ the grape would ripen on sunny hills." Bruni argued that this quotation showed Vergil's wish that the emperor would bring "tranquility and peace". This interpretation continues the metaphor of the emperor as Christ. Like God in Isiah 9:5-7, the emperor will be the "Prince of Peace."[117]

The oration continues along the same lines. As if Christ had returned from the dead, the entire world experiences more joy at the emperor's accession than at any past ruler. He will bring peace to the Christians and war to the infidels. Bruni argues that the emperor's virtues - "trust (fides)", "moderation (moderatio)", "strength (fortitude)", "clemency (clementia)", "incorruptible justice (ncorupta iustitia)", "admirable wisdom (admirabilis sapientia)" and "the

highest intelligence (altitudo consilii)" - have warranted such hopes in "the states and peoples". These virtues once again echo Isaiah, this time chapter 11 verses 1-5.

> A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. The spirit of the Lord shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. His delight shall be in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge by what his eyes see, or decide by what his ears hear; but with righteousness he shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the ear; he shall strike the earth and the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall kill the wicked. Righteousness shall be the belt around his waist, and faithfulness the belt around his loins.

The virtues attributed to the emperor parallel those attributed to the Messiah prophesized in this eschatological passage, particularly sapientia, consilium, fortitudo, iustitia, and fides. Bruni concluded the oration by reminding the emperor of the gift purpose of the oration. The Florentines had already sent letters congratulating the emperor, "nevertheless, through live addresses too the city wished to express its congratulations more fully through our orators and with them present to rejoice with your most sublime highness on account of your happy assumption." The gift drew to a close "Certainly, most serene prince, we have something some things to discuss separately, which we will present more fully to your majesty when the time and place will be given." Whereas simple statements of praise in a classically styled oration would have been typical, Bruni exceeded the norm through portraying the new emperor as Christ reborn.[118]

Towards the end of Bruni's life, a final opportunity presented itself for the Florentine government to use his words to add prestige to a mission featuring diplomats from older Florentine families, this time to congratulate the recently victorious King of Naples in 1442. In this year, Alfonso finally defeated his Angevin rival and the Florentine ally, Renè, and entered the city of Naples, an event which Bruni's oration was meant to celebrate. The diplomatic election records once again suggest that Bruni did not himself accompany this embassy. Moreover, it seems that this oration was not delivered on the initial mission sent by Florence to Alfonso after his conquest of Naples. On July 16, 1442, the Florentine republic sent a letter to Alfonso congratulating him on his conquest. Four days later, the *Signoria* elected Giovannozzo Pitti to go to Naples. He returned September 15. Two months later on November 17, the *Signoria* elected Bernardo Giugni to go to the King Alfonso. A week after that, Giuliano Davanzati was elected to join him. As this was the only mission by Davanzati to the King of Naples during this time and the manuscript tradition links this oration with Giuliano Davanzati, it was for this mission that Bruni must have written this speech.[119]

Thorny diplomatic issues between Florence, Renè of Anjou, and Alfonso of Aragon necessitated a cultural gift from Florence. After the seizure of Naples by Alfonso, the traditional Florentine ally Renè of Anjou took refuge in Florence from July until October of 1442. An official congratulatory mission to King Alfonso while Renè was in the city or in the time directly surrounding this stay would have affronted the Angevin king. Some form of acknowledgement to Alfonso and explanation for why Florence was housing the new ruler of Naple's enemy was necessary, however. Thus, on July 14, the Florentine *Signoria* sent a letter downplaying Renè's presence in the city. On the sixteenth, they sent a short letter congratulating Alfonso. On the twentieth the Florentine *Signoria* sent Giovannozzo Pitti as a stop gap diplomat until they could

send a more elaborate congratulatory mission after Renè was safely back in France. Such temporary congratulatory missions were not unprecedented in Florence, as they had sent a similar mission to Pope Martin V directly after his election as pope. However, putting off an official congratulations in order to house and appease the king's enemies undoubtedly did not escape Alfonso's notice. Moreover, even with Renè out of the city, like in the mission to Alfonso in 1420, Florence had to be careful with its official congratulatory mission in order to avoid alienating the city's friends while appeasing its enemies.[120]

In mid-November, the Florentine *Signoria* finally sent its congratulatory mission, featuring Bernardo Giugni and Giuliano Davanzatii, to King Alfonso, with cultural gifts in order to warm the king's undoubtedly cold opinion of Florence. In order to offer the republic's special acknowledgement to the king, the diplomats came bearing an oration by the famous Florentine chancellor to the culturally inclined king. However, this oration is interesting because Bruni's enormous erudition and eloquence are only weakly present in it. The oration offers King Alfonso a diluted version of the praise given to the Emperor in 1432. Namely, the diplomats do not need to cite ancient examples because the King himself possesses any such possible examples and more. In effect, this statement allowed the orator to pass over any such examples, the presence of which would have highlighted Bruni's erudition, and speed through the oration. Following the precepts of Cicero, Bruni praised the king's abilities in war (external things); his justice, humanity, beneficence, faith, and religion (internal things). Yet, the methods chosen for praise and the topics in general are again standard. For example, Alfonso is an example of "living well" in terms of "faith and religion." His military acts are "most excellent and glorious". The oration's third section states the king's "recent victory" and "acquisition of the kingdom" have pleased the Florentines. As with Bruni's other orations, the speech concludes

with a clear distinction between its end and the beginning of the political negotiations: "There are other more specific things, most serene prince, which we will relate when the time and place will be given to us." The gift had ended; yet, beyond Bruni's reputation, what exactly had it constituted?[121]

The Florentine *Signoria* attempted to solve an impossible diplomatic situation with Bruni's short and vague oration, his reputation, and the presence of well-respected Florentines. The Florentines had to praise a ruler who had driven their ally Renè back into France and whom the pope still did not recognize as the King of Naples. To solve this conundrum, the Florentines did three things after Renè finally returned to France. First, they sent men of reputation to Alfonso. Both Bernardo Giugni and Giuliano Davanzati were ubiquitous Florentine diplomats. Vespasiano da Bisticci provides further evidence for this point, stating that

> When King Alfonso entered Naples for the second time Messer Bernardo and messer Giuliano Davanzati were sent to greet him. The King, knowing how much Bernardo was beloved in Florence, received him with great honour, and when he conversed with him saw that his merits were real. Messer Bernardo often was obliged to restrain his companion, who was somewhat of a hothead and carried away by passion. One day when the two were talking with the King, Davanzati spoke words which were both unseemly and inappropriate. Bernardo, so as not to shame him in the King's presence, kept silence, but when they returned to their lodgings he told Davanzati that he must be more careful in his speech, especially with a prince of Alfonso's temper. Messer Bernardo returned to Florence in high favour with Alfonso, having discharged his mission admirably and strengthened the King as a peace-maker in Italy.

Vespasiano betrays the care with which the Florentine diplomats had to speak with the king. Any mistake could mean the wrath of the king's terrible anger upon them personally and Florence in general. Given the king's accomplishment and temper, the Florentines had to send status heavy diplomats regardless of the diplomatic risks involved.[122]

However, once these diplomats arrived, they delivered an ambiguous oration that both offered a cultural gift and declined to do so. This was the Florentines' second action. As in the past, attaching Bruni's literary reputation to an oratorical performance automatically made it more than the standard speech. However, unlike his earlier orations in which Bruni used his erudition and cleverness to live up to his reputation, this oration possesses only the most basic rhetorical flourishes. The consistent stated and unstated theme in the oration is brevity. Through succinctness and plainness, the *Signoria* betrayed its unease at praising its enemy. By attaching Bruni's name to this statement, the Florentines attempted to attach a bow to its last minute and shabby gift. Through this juxtaposition, the *Signoria* sought simultaneously to complete the two diametrically opposed goals of appeasing two diametrically opposed rulers.

Third, the Florentines made use of the ambiguity of the public and private worlds of politics and literature in order to both congratulate and not congratulate King Alfonso. Just one month before Davanzati and Giugni arrived in Naples, Leonardo Bruni dedicated his *History of the Italian War*, a work drawn from Procopius focusing on the wars of Justininian against the Goths in Italy, to King Alfonso. On October 17, 1442, Bruni wrote to King Alfonso stating that he was sending a copy of his history, in which it is shown that Belisarius had conquered Naples in the same way as Alfonso had. Bruni stated that he would have sent the history six months before when he had completed it, but he had feared offending somebody, an obvious reference to Renè of Anjou who had asylum in Florence at that time. On the surface, this dedication seems to

be an example of a humanist attempting to gain favor from a powerful foreign prince. Bruni had done similar actions in the past, dedicating original works and translations to powerful men and women in order to gain personal advantage. In the same way, this dedication and the letter were the private works of Leonardo Bruni, being collected in his published private epistolary correspondence.[123]

However, Bruni's position, timing, and language imply another motive. Bruni had been the Florentine chancellor by this point for over fifteen years. A letter and dedication from such a prominent Florentine citizen and official could not help but be, at some level, a reflection onto the Florentine regime. Bruni's dedication letters strongly supports the public side of this seemingly private action. Concerning his delay in sending the book to Alfonso, Bruni wrote "But a certain consideration delayed me, because I feared that I would offend some people if I would demonstrate the way and hidden approach by which to seize the city." Bruni was afraid that Alfonso could use his book as an instruction manual for defeating the Florentine ally Renè. Such an action would certainly have angered the Angevin King, but it also would have run counter to Florentine foreign interests. These interests were opposed to Alfonso at this time. By waiting until after the siege, such hints were a mute point. The content of the work and Bruni's dedication to the king became, instead, a cultural gift by comparing Alfonso to his classical predecessors. In doing so, Bruni performed the same comparative action between a modern and an historical example that he did in so many of his diplomatic orations. In this example, Bruni drew parallels between Alfonso's actions and classical figures, this time Belisarius and Totila.[124]

Dedicating cultural objects such as books served a dual gift giving function in diplomacy. On one level, they served as a material gift. Richly decorated and transcribed by Florence's best copyists, presentation books were expensive and prized possessions of many wealthy patricians.

In terms of their value, therefore, they served a very similar role as other expensive material objects. However, a lavishly decorated book possessed a second layer that was absent from other costly material objects. Books contained content that could play an identical role as an extraordinary diplomatic oration. Like the content of Bruni's orations, for example, a book could draw favorable comparisons between a ruler and an ancient figure. Such comparisons not only made statements about a ruler's abilities, but also his or her learning by expecting the host ruler to understand and appreciate the comparison. Such an expectation actually began with the presentation itself: regardless of content, the presentation of a lavishly decorated Latin book automatically made a bold statement about a ruler's knowledge.

After Bruni's death in 1444, the Florentine government turned to another means of offering a cultural gift to a host ruler on especially important missions. The obvious move would have been to look to Bruni's successors as Florentine chancellor to write cultural gifts for Florentine diplomats. As Chapter Four argues, the Florentine government did eventually return to this method of having famous Florentine humanist authors write orations for more illustrious diplomats. However, such examples resumed only two decades after Bruni's death. As the next chapter will argue, the reason for this temporal gap was the rise to prominence of Giannozzo Manetti, the first humanist author who combined an old familial history with an unparalleled reputation for eloquence.

CHAPTER THREE: THE GIFT OF POLITICS, 1447-1452

Giannozzo Manetti combined familial antiquity, a reputation for eloquence, and oratorical innovations in content and structure in order to offer cultural gifts to host rulers. For the first time, a Florentine diplomat possessed not only the old familial ancestry necessary to meet diplomatic status requirements, but also an extraordinary reputation for and skill in humanist rhetoric. This combination made his diplomatic status greater than that of his peers. Moreover, Manetti surpassed their oratorical performances through form and content innovations. Rather than focusing exclusively on lauding a ruler as Bruni's orations had done, Manetti gradually broke down the boundaries between politics and praise in his speeches. He accomplished this boundary breakdown while maintaining demonstrations of greater classical learning through frequent classical citations. Yet, Manetti's use of humanism in diplomacy remained confined to the culminating event of the diplomatic reception ritual. Even as the quintessential humanist orator changed its form and content, the function of humanism in diplomacy remained exclusively to serve as a cultural gift.

Vespasiano da Bisticci highlighted the Florentines' transition from using cultural gifts that Bruni had authored to a period dominated by Giannozzo Manetti. Concerning Manetti's first diplomatic mission in 1437, Vespasiano stated

> Manetti's first mission was to Genoa when Tomaso da Campo Fregoso was Doge, Pasquale Malipieri, a distinguished Venetian, being his colleague. It was a great honour to Messer Giannozzo that he, an untried man, should have been chosen out of the many men of eminence who had been nominated. Messer Lionardo d'Arezzo, who was present, said that he would prefer Messer Giannozzo as Genoese ambassador to all others – even to himself. When the ballot was taken

> not a single vote was given against him, and in this mission he served the state with the greatest honour.

The famously eloquent Leonardo Bruni had vouched for Manetti's rhetorical abilities. Bruni thus assured the Florentine government that the diplomatic rookie Manetti could provide the mission's necessary humanist performance. Manetti did not disappoint. Between Bruni's death in 1444 and Manetti's self-imposed exile in 1453, Giannozzo Manetti delivered the oration on all but one mission that required an exceptional oratorical performance. For the first time, the Florentines repeatedly sent a famous humanist author as a diplomat. [125]

Manetti's diplomatic emergence coincided with the dominance of humanist interests among the Italian patriciate. In Rome, Naples, and Venice, humanist authors, dilettantes, and their patrons dominated government positions. Humanist and non-humanist popes alike employed the skills of learned rhetoricians. Humanist learning had successfully conquered the Venetian ruling group. Alfonso, King of Naples, used humanists on prominent domestic and foreign political positions. In Florence, Jonathan Davies has argued that humanists began dominating the University of Florence in the late 1420s and humanism became a widespread interest among Florentine patricians after 1450. Concerning education in general in Renaissance Italy, Paul Grendler wrote that "By about 1450 schools in a majority of northern and north-central Italian towns taught the *studia humanitatis*.[126]

Diplomatic commissions suggest that this humanist educated audience expected a display of humanist eloquence by diplomats. In the decades leading up to and paralleling Manetti's success, the Florentine chancellors Leonardo Bruni and Carlo Marsuppini standardized and elongated the instructions for opening orations. Under Bruni (chancellor, 1427-1444), even missions to middling powers began to include longer speech instructions. For example, the

commission to ambassadors to Siena in 1428 began "First, express the customary greetings and comforts, as if to our good, true, and closest older brothers, with those sweet and extensive words that seem appropriate to your prudence." In 1431, a commission for ambassadors to Perugia similarly instructed, "First, arriving at Perugia, offer the greetings and comforts to those Signor Priors as true and good brothers and most flawless friends of our community, as is the tradition, and as you know well to do by your prudence."[127]

Carlo Marsuppini (chancellor, 1444-1453) continued Bruni's trend towards prolixity. For example, in 1447 he informed the Florentine ambassadors to Francesco Sforza that

> When the time will be appropriate, present first the letter of credence with the obligatory and accustomed reverences on behalf of this *Signoria*. Comfort and greet his excellence with words that are affectionate, honorable, and full of singular affection, making broad gestures (offerte) to him in general, with those words that seem to your prudence to be commodious to the time, the material, and the person that you represent and similiarly the person before whom you speak.

In another example, Marsuppini instructed the ambassadors to Venice in 1450 that

> …when the time of audience will be given to you by that excellent *Signoria,* present first your letter of credence, next greet and comfort their eminence (celsitudine) on behalf of this *Signoria* with words honorable, friendly, and full of singular affection as the time, material, and the person that you represent and the person before whom you speak requires.

The similar wording from commission to commission suggests that the ritual was the same from mission to mission. Their increased verbosity (remember the late fourteenth-century single word

guidelines to speak "affectuasamente"!) reflects the expectations for an eloquent performance. In the mid fifteenth century, eloquence meant humanist rhetoric.[128]

Florence's diplomatic personnel possessed the ability to meet the humanist expectations of their audiences. Between 1436 and 1455, eight of the nine individuals serving as Florentine diplomats ten or more times were connected to humanism. Seven more humanist dilettantes filled between five and nine positions. Seven such individuals were diplomats less than five times. Altogether, individuals with humanist interests made up eight out of the nine people serving as a diplomat more than ten times during this period (89%), 16 out of 28 of the people who served five or more times (57%), and filled 190 out of 414 possible diplomatic positions (45.8%). In short, humanist authors and their dilettante colleagues dominated the core ambassadorial group and filled just under half of all Florentine diplomatic positions during the years of Manetti's diplomatic career.[129]

However, several missions during these years required more than the usual diplomatic status and humanist performance. Such diplomatic assignments included congratulating the King of Naples on the marriage of his son in 1445; offering obedience to a new pope in 1447; congratulating Francesco Sforza on his conquest of Milan in 1450; and greeting and escorting Frederick III through Italy for his coronation as Holy Roman Emperor in 1452. Moreover, several political situations required extraordinary diplomatic gestures from Florence in order to earn the good will of host rulers. Each of these missions revolved around the political turbulence left in the wake of Filippo Maria Visconti's death in Milan in 1447. Visconti's death left several hopefuls to the Milanese throne, including the westward looking Venetians, the conquest hungry King of Naples, and the state seeking condottiere Francesco Sforza. Rather than pushing his claim to Milan, however, in the summer of 1448 King Alfonso of Naples had built up his army in

preparation for a conquest of Piombino. This harbor town was dangerously close to Florence. To avoid a disastrous incursion from the bellicose King, the Florentines sent a diplomat to request aid from their allies in Siena. Soon after, the undeterable King Renè of Anjou offered to assist the Florentines in their efforts against his longtime rival King Alfonso. Florence sent a diplomat to the city's Venetian allies requesting monetary and military assistance to secure the Angevin King's support. Francesco Sforza's ultimate conquest of Milan in 1450 brought about a cataclysmic shift in the political alliance in Italy, with Florence switching from its friendship with Venice to an agreement with Milan. In the fall of 1450, Venice signed an agreement with King Alfonso towards the end of ripping apart Francesco Sforza's Milan. In early 1451, Florence sought to avert this disaster for their new ally through a diplomat seeking peace in Naples.[130]

Manetti's combination of an old familial ancestry in Florence and an unparalleled reputation for learning and eloquence made him an ideal choice to represent Florence in each of these situations except the congratulatory mission to Francesco Sforza in 1450. This unique combination made him more than the typical patrician ambassador, who would posesss a similar familial background but lack the additional prestige brought by Manetti's literary reputation. Giannozzo Manetti came from an extraordinarily wealthy family with an over century long history in the Florentine patriciate. Manetti's father, Bernardo Manetti, had amassed the second largest fortune in the Santo Spirito quarter of Florence. In the fourteenth century, Manetti's ancestors had married into prominent families such as the Strozzi and the Rucellai. Manetti's grandfather, Giannozzo di Lambuccio, sat on the priorate in 1358. Certainly, the Manetti family's political prominence declined under Manetti's father, Bernardo. Bernardo had focused on successful business ventures while simultaneously ignoring an active political career.

Bernardo ended his son's schooling and started him in a bank at age ten, indicating his similar ambitions for Giannozzo. However, Manetti rejected his father's plans. His prominent political career, starting with his election to the Colleges in 1429, returned the family to the trajectory begun by his grandfather. Unlike the immigrant Bruni, Manetti had a successful Florentine ancestry to look back to. His ascendancy to the heights of Florentine politics was the return to an earlier trajectory rather than the start of something new.[131]

In addition to his familial history, Manetti enhanced his diplomatic prestige through his extraordinary ability in and reputation for humanist learning. Domestically, an entire generation of Florentine humanist authors and dilettantes idolized him. As Arthur Field has argued, these men admired Manetti's combination of metaphysical and humanist interests and his pursuit of an active citizen life. Once abroad, Manetti used his learning to cultivate the friendships of powerful rulers, thus creating connections that further enhanced his viability as a Florentine diplomat. In fact, during the latter 1440s and early 1450s, Manetti's strong relationship with major Italian political players made him a key liaison between Florence and two out of the four major Italian powers (not counting Florence). He was a close friend of Alfonso of Naples, eventually serving in his court in the final years of his life. He was also a friend of Tommaso Parentucelli, who would become Pope Nicholas V.[132]

Yet, even on the missions of the quintessential humanist diplomat, the function of humanism in diplomacy was restricted to the role of a cultural gift. In the extensive surviving letters that Manetti wrote to Florence while on a mission to Venice in 1448, Manetti slipped into a brief Latin quotation on only one occasion. Otherwise, his numerous letters to Florence relay the responses of the Venetian government towards political particulars and news and speculation

concerning the military. The letters that the Florentine government wrote to Manetti likewise instruct him in political particulars and lack humanist references.[133]

The diary of Manetti's chancellor Griso di Giovanni provides further evidence for this point. This diary details an almost obsessive daily log of Manetti's activities, including the dates and times that Manetti went for walks, the myriad of churchs at which Manetti heard mass, and an expedition to the island of Murano, on which Manetti watched glass makers and admired their beautiful works. The diary also describes the interactions between Manetti and the Venetian government. In particular, the diary contains accounts of the words spoken between the Venetian doge and Manetti. Manetti's diplomatic dispatches also contain reports of these exchanges, but the sources sometimes differ in their respective accounts. By comparing the accounts of these words in the diary with the descriptions of the same events in Manetti's diplomatic dispatches, a reasonable snapsnot of the content of these exchanges emerges. For example, the Venetian government met with an ambassador from Naples on November 23. On the 26, Manetti went to the government palace to find out the reason behind the arrival of the King's ambassador. His dispatch to Florence contains a long description of the political particulars involved in his meeting with the Doge. Griso summarized Manetti's account of the Doge's explanation in his diary. He introduced the words of the doge in terms reminiscent of a classical or humanist historian prefacing an oration delivered by an historical figure. However, this possible classical allusion in Griso's diary is the only trace of humanism in the description of either source.[134]

The reports of Manetti's own spoken words in both sources also lack humanist influences. The diary and Manetti's letters always describe the same events, but Manetti frequently provides more details concerning his actual spoken words than Griso's diary does.

On September 10 and 21, for example, Manetti's and Griso's descriptions are substantively the same although they differ in their wording and phrasing. Manetti gave a much fuller account of the proceedings in his dispatch than the summary account found in Griso's diary. On other occasions, both Manetti and Griso state explicitly that Manetti's actual words were more eloquent than the provided description. One such example is in a letter from November 18 describing an audience two days earlier. Griso gave the reason behind Manetti's audience: Manetti had a new commission from the *Signoria* that instructed him to seek changes in the league between Florence and Venice. After this brief summary, Griso wrote that Manetti told these things to the Venetian government "with more elaboration and in a different way…" Manetti's account of the same events began with similar language, stating that he had presented his commission to the Venetian government "with those words that seemed to me most apt and convenient to clarify best and demonstrate most effectively…" At this point, Manetti's account went much futher than Griso's diary. Maneti claimed that he was supplying his actual wording ("dissi in questa forma"). Once again, the account lacked any traces of humanist rhetoric. Instead, Manetti focused on the great friendship between Venice and Florence and the political particulars of his commission. This evidence suggests, therefore, that even Giannozzo Manetti, the man who combined humanism and diplomacy to a greater degree of success than any other fifteenth-century Florentine, restricted his use of humanism to a gift-giving role in the opening reception ritual.[135]

Manetti's Success at Exceeding Status Expecations and Offering Cultural Gifts

Vespasiano da' Bisticci provides strong evidence that Manetti exceeded the status requirements necessary to begin a diplomatic reception ritual. Concerning Manetti's mission to

the wedding in Naples in 1445, Vespasiano described the crowds drawn to see Manetti's unique combination of family and learning. Vespasiano implied that a normal diplomatic entourage drew a crowd, but Manetti's presence made the arrival of the Florentine diplomats a must see event. He wrote that escorted by "many signori and all the ambassadors that were at Naples", the ambassadors and youth made their way through the packed streets. "Everyone was present in the streets where they passed in order to see both the sights of so many worthy men and also because of the reputation of Messer Giannozzo [Manetti], which was so great that everyone wanted to see him." Vespasiano described a similar setting in Venice in 1448. He recorded that Manetti "…was honourably received at Venice by the Doge Foscari and granted a public reception in the Council: his fame attracted more than five hundred gentlemen and as many others as could get entry." Such crowds suggest that Manetti easily surpassed the status requirement of the diplomatic reception ritual. In 1447, Vespasiano wrote that Manetti entered fifth out of the six ambassadors, the sixth being Piero di Cosimo de' Medici. Such a position is again indicative of the higher status that Manetti enjoyed over his fellow diplomats because of his unique combination of humanist learning and familial ancestry. This combination, in fact, made his prestige greater than the other powerful citizens present, men such as Neri di Gino Capponi, Alessandro Alessandri, Agnolo Acciaiuoli, and Giovannozzo Pitti and second only to a member of the unofficial Florentine ruling family.[136]

In addition to his status, Manetti mastered the art of delivering cultural gifts in the reception ritual. In 1445, Vespasiano da' Bisticci wrote that the day after their fantastic parade through the streets, Manetti orated before the King. Vespasiano wrote that

> There was a large attendance to see his opening oration. That morning, Messer Giannozo [Manetti] delivered a most worthy oration and renewed that custom

> long ago lost of an oration praising marriage. The oration was so pleasing to his majesty that he never moved a muscle, he remained absolutely still; Manetti was observed on every single point by the great princes, because his majesty, having a fly on his face, did not move his hands to shoo it away. There were many with paper, pens, and ink that wrote down what he was saying in the oration. That oration of messer Giannozzo acquired a great a reputation both for himself and for his city. He had done that which no ambassador there (at Naples) had done, and the honor in the celebration of the Florentines was such that fathers that had sons made them study beyond the abacus, because they saw how much honor to a city and to a family is a citizen like that.

Whether Manetti was actually the first humanist to revive the epithalemeum, Vespasiano attested to the successful deliverance of the cultural gift. Manetti immobilized the king and impressed the audience in a way like no one before. Through this action, he won honor – a reward for a successful gift – for his city.[137]

Vespasiano provides further evidence in his description of Manetti's oration in Venice in 1448. He wrote that

> Giannozzo spoke for more than an hour without interruption, and at the end all were amazed by the power and vigour of his rhetoric, and, as they quitted the palace, all declared that if Venice possessed such a citizen as this the finest estate in the republic would not be too much to offer him. He gained the greatest reputation a citizen could gain.

The Venetians envied Manetti's oratorical skill. Vespasiano remarked on the novelty of Manetti's oratorical presentation, stating that "…the oration that he made the first day that he

spoke to the *Signoria,* being a new and unusual thing, he wrote it out and it is outstanding, although he delivered it in Italian and later translated it into Latin." It was this novelty that made Manetti's oration surpass the ordinary and become extraordinary. Vespasiano related that years later a Venetian Patrician serving as ambassador to Florence came to Vespasiano's bookshop still raving about Manetti's skill: "Messer Giannozo has been the ornament and pride (bontà) of his city and of his century, and I for one have the greatest admiration for his talents (virtù)". Vespasiano did not explicitly tie the man's statements to Manetti's Venetian oration; however, he appended this anecdote directly following his discussion of the fabulous reception of Manetti's performance. Manetti's successful cultural gift had earned his city and himself honor that lasted long after his diplomatic mission had ended.[138]

Vespasiano went even further in his description of Manetti's successful oration to the new pope Nicholas V in 1447, dedicating several fascinating pages to Manetti's preparation for the oration, his fear of failure, and his ultimate success, all of which Vespasiano claims he witnessed first hand. After the diplomats and their finely dressed youth entered Rome, the pope decided to honor the Florentine diplomats and especially Manetti because of his long lasting friendship with the Republic. Vespasiano wrote that

> The same evening the pope decided to honor him (Manetti) by giving the Florentine diplomats an audience in a public consistory. Concerning this, the pope said to me, the author, the night before: I want to give the greatest honor to the Florentines, therefore I will give them audience in a public consistory, where audience is given to ambassadors of the king and the emperors for their first audience. A little later he ordered (comise) that this be told to the ambassadors, and thus Roberto Martelli came to tell them it. The ambassadors told him that he

> should go to Messer Giannozzo Manetti and tell him about it. I was with Messer Giannozzo and although the pope had told me about it, I still did not have any details. It seemed to me a very great (degna) thing. A little while later, the mandate of the pope telling him of the deliberation that the pope had made reached him. It was said to Manetti (decta che gliel' ebbe), the courier took license from him, and Manetti went into the room with a very different look on his face. I went into the room and asked him what was the reason for the change. He responded that I ought not to be amazed, he being in the court of Rome, where all the most important men are found in all of Christendom, more now than had been in a long time. He said that the following morning he could earn little and lose so much, because many had spoken as well as he could or better: "And if to my disgrace I should make a mistake, I lose the outcome of the forty years of study, and where would this occur? In the first city of Christians, where so much can be lost and little gained. Thus, you ought not to marvel that my mood has so changed. He said that the Cardinal Niceno and other cardinals had come, worthy men from a distance from Rome of more than 150 miles, only to see and hear his opening oration (literally "declare his commission). All these things made him afraid.

Manetti was afraid because he viewed himself in a no win situation. In order to pull off his oratorical performance, he had to offer the pope an oration that was both fitting of his election as pope and as reciprocity for the pope's unprecedented goodwill gesture towards the Florentines. Manetti feared that his oration would not surpass previous performances, stating "many have spoken as well as I can or better". Manetti took his statements even further, explicitly tying his

years of study to the goal of offering a successful cultural gift. If he performed poorly or even if he just delivered a typical oration, his entire life of study would have been for nothing. The stakes of the cultural gift could not have been higher.[139]

Eventually, the long stressful night ended and the time for the audience finally arrived, Vespasiano's description of which is again illuminating concerning Manetti's extraordinary success at offering cultural gifts. Manetti rose up with a white hat, so that he seemed like "Demosthenes". He gave an over hour-long oration, during which Vespasiano marveled at the silence of everyone in the room and the attention given to Manetti's words, a description suggesting the success of Manetti's oration. Equally marvelous was the pope's response to each point of the oration, that is, the pope's reciprocation to Manetti's oration. Yet, the most interesting part of Vespasiano's account is his description of the events following the pope's response, which albeit long deserves quoting.

> Exiting the consistory, all the Florentines celebrated greatly, the hands of all touched them, and all their foreign friends that were there embraced them. These people said, "Because of you, your city has earned some honor today (pro vi faccia dell'onore che ha avuto oggi la vostra città)", concerning which will be spoken of through the Christian lands of this act done this morning… This act of speaking in the public consistory was the first the Florentines had ever done, because this was the place for the opening orations of the ambassadors of the King and of the Emperors. The pope gave this audience to the Florentines in order to give them honor. All others that have spoken there since have taken the structure of their own orations from Messer Giannozzo, being a new custom because the oration that day was so outstanding (degna). The Venetian cardinals,

who were at court at this time, saw what Messer Giannozzo had done and advised Venice, which had already selected its ambassadors, about it through their own runner. When the Venetians heard this, they immediately added another ambassador. The Cardinals sent a copy of Manetti's oration to Venice, and later it was seen that in that oration of the Venetians, they had placed a few lines of Manetti's here and there. When the Florentine ambassadors left the pope's presence, Neri di Gino Capponi turned to Messer Giannozzo and said to him: I had never considered the danger that confronted our city. If the embassy had not been declared because you had been hurt at Viterbo when that horse fell into a hole, if you had not been here, where would the honor of our city and of us have been? (Because all things visually ruined and would have cheated us and there is no one that would have thought to think to try and act that you did this morning?? Perché a guatarci tutti in viso et non ce ne ingannare, e' non c'è igniuono che avesse saputo pensare non che fare un acto che hai facto istamane tu.) Our fatherland and we especially are in your debt. When the ambassadors left the palace and returned home on foot, they could not walk down the street because there were so many that touched them and said to them: "Through you an honor has been earned both for yourselves and your city this morning (Pro vi faccia de l'onore avete avuto istamne et voi et la vostra città). Consider everyone how much honor and glory the city of Florence had that morning, and by this is shown how much value a single man has for a republic. This undertaking (Questa andata) was a greater honor for Manetti than being reappointed Captain of Pistoia.

In this important passage, Vespasiano repeatedly comes back to the theme of the successful gift exchange between the pope and the Florentine ambassadors, particularly Giannozzo Manetti. The pope had honored the ambassadors through the location and type of audience granted to them. Manetti had reciprocated the gesture through his oratorical performance, or rather, his cultural gift. Manetti's successful cultural gift earned a concrete reward: it established a new tradition of granting an audience in a public consistory rather than a private one, placing the Florentines on the same level as diplomats from kings and emperors. Neri di Gino Capponi tied the city's honor to Manetti's oration. According to Vespasiano, the crowds, pope and cardinals could not have honored Manetti and his city more. Manetti's oration was so much more than had ever been offered by a diplomat before that the Venetians had to send home and add another member to their diplomatic entourage. This move ensured that they too could offer a cultural gift. The successful delivering of a cultural gift, according to Vespasiano, meant more to the Florentine patrician Manetti than holding a political office; a bold statement given the all-encompassing importance of office-holding for the Florentine patricate.[140]

Archival evidence corroborates Vespasiano's claims concerning the success of Manetti's orations. Griso di Giovanni's diary recorded the Venetian Doge Francesco Foscari's response to Manetti's oration in 1448. Griso wrote

> The honor and benevolence, magnificent ambassador, between your magnificent *Signoria* and ours from the fourth day of December 1443, on which day a league was made that joined us (qua che si fecie la lega [è] suta) so continuously from that point that we have seen any of your ambassadors so willingly and with such affection that whether they spoke briefly or for a long time, greatly they have pleased us and very courteously we have seen them. Therefore, do not make any

> more apologies because whenever and in whatever way you speak to us, it will be very pleasing to hear you, and at whatever time you visit us, day or night, we will see you most willingly. It is this way because you are Florentine, to which, as was said, we are greatly allied (acietti). It is even more than this because I had heard the rumor of your talents (virtù), and because of which I had the greatest affection for you even before I had seen you. Now I am as much more fond of you as I ought to be for having seen your presence and having witnessed first hand that which I had heard about.

Manetti had ended his oration with the worry that he had offended his host by speaking too long. The doge began by putting these fears to rest. This reassurance implied that the Florentine ambassador had upheld the tradition of honor and benevolence between the two states. Foscari went as far as to say that any Florentine ambassador could do this, regardless of the way or length that he spoke. At that point, the doge set the standard for a successful gift exchange. Next, he acknowledged the fact that Manetti had exceeded the typical diplomatic gesture. He had heard of Manetti's reputation. This statement spoke to the extraordinary gesture that the Florentines had offered by sending such a famous man. Moreover, this reputation only increased by witnessing the orator in person. In this statement, the Doge told Manetti that through his eloquence, Manetti had bestowed a cultural gift that the Venetian government delightfully received.[141]

Florentine diplomatic records provide a final piece of evidence. In 1451, Giannozzo Manetti offered a cultural gift through his oration to the King of Naples. Manetti arrived and found a hostile king, whom he sought to appease through a cultural gift. Vespasiano da' Bisticci claims that he was successful, writing "…he recited a most worthy Latin oration concerning

observing the peace. That morning he earned the greatest amount of honor, because all the ambassadors of all the powers of Italy were present in addition to his majesty the King." King Alfonso reciprocated this gift by sending an eloquent diplomat of his own to Florence. The Florentine *Signoria* wrote to its diplomat Manetti on March 20 that, on the fourteenth, Alfonso's diplomat had arrived in Florence.

> ... the following day, that most outstanding (clarissimo) ambassador and poet gave and orated a most elegant oration in the presence of this *Signoria,* the Venetian ambassadors, and all the colleges plus many of our most esteemed citizens.... [here is a summary of the particulars of the commission]... You as a prudent men render in the name of this *Signoria* innumerable thanks to his majesty for having mandated such oustanding ambassadors and with such a humane (humanissima) commission.

On April 3, the Florentines were still raving about oratorical performance of the king's ambassador. They summarized their letter of the twentieth by stating that they do not doubt that Alfonso acts towards the end of "vera Gloria". This opinion

> has been confirmed and secured by his ambassadors, who expounded with such humanity (humanita) the affection of this most serene king towards this republic, to whom without a doubt one can say his majesty already has the minds of this our people. You, most prudent, with all our abilities and diligence engineer (ingegnerai) to preserve such benevolonce.

This benevolence was the result of a successful exchange of cultural gifts. Manetti had combined his illustrious name with a novel oration to surpass status expectations and offer an exceptional oration to King Alfonso. Alfonso had reciprocated with a diplomat who did the

same thing in Florence. The Florentines expected Manetti to maintain the goodwill accomplished through the gift exchange.[142]

Manetti offered these cultural gifts on important missions through structure and content changes in his oratory. In terms of content, he gradually replaced the epideictic with the deliberative oratorical genre, an oratorical form that the Milanese humanist Pier Paolo Vergio had pronounced dead at the beginning of the quattrocento. Beyond creating impressive oratorical performances, the practical result of this oratorical genre shift was the temporary collapse of the previously clear distinction between cultural gift and political particulars. Previous orators like Filippo Magalotti or speechwriters like Bruni had maintained the façade of the separation between the cultural gift and political negotiations even as they occasionally implied the politics behind their missions. During Bruni's lifetime, this distinction had served the purpose of highlighting Florence's gift of Bruni's words to the host ruler. With the temporary combination of extreme eloquence and familial ancestry that Manetti possessed, such highlighting was unnecessary. Manetti's reputation preceded him. The reminder of Florence's cultural gift to the ruler was Manetti's presence itself.[143]

Manetti's Content and Structural Techniques in Offering Cultural Gifts, Part One: 1445 and 1447

Manetti first used his innovative arrangements of oratorical form and content on a mission to congratulate King Alfonso on his son's marriage in 1445. In terms of content, Manetti used the prominent placement of Greek sources and historical figures to demonstrate his extraordinary erudition. For example, he began with an anecdote about Demosthenes appearing as a diplomat before Phillip of Macedon, father of Alexander the Great. In this anecdote, Manetti followed Bruni's technique of comparing a host ruler favorably to an ancient

predecessor, here King Alfonso to King Phillip. Yet, Manetti went beyond Bruni, who had typically avoided overt uses of famous Greeks and their sources, by immediately highlighting the Greek source of his story with the words "Demosthenese grecorum (Demosthenes of the Greeks)". Through these words, the anecdote not only praised the king, but also flouted Manetti's Greek abilities. By expecting the king to appreciate this learned gesture, Manetti implicitly offered the king additional praise. Moreover, Manetti's choice of this particular anecdote added yet another layer to his laud. Demosthenes had feared being able to praise adequately a king so great as Phillip. Manetti stated that his task as a diplomat was even greater than that of Demosthenes because the object of his praise, Alfonso, rules more lands than Phillip had. Moreover, Alfonso's learning and talents come in a far worse cultural age than Phillip had inhabited, thus making them more exceptional. The Florentines had charged Manetti with a more difficult task than one that had stupefied the great Demosthenes. In a worse cultural age, Manetti had to offer praise to a peerless king. Should Manetti succeed, his oration would become a cultural gift by not only surpassing the oratory of his contemporaries, but also by doing that which even Manetti's great Greek predecessor would have been unable to do.[144]

In another display of learning and comparative history, Manetti devoted the last part of his oration to telling the story of Pyrrhus, which he drew from the Greek author Plutarch. In this story, Plutarch had described a conversation between Ceneas, a pupil of Demosthenes, and the ruler Pyrrhus. Pyrrhus was contemplating an excursion into Italy. Seeking to talk him out of it, Cineas asked Pyrrhus about his post conquest plans. Pyrrhus responded that he planned for another conquest. Cineas replied to him with another question concerning Pyrrhus' post conquest plans, and so on. After several such exchanges, Pyrrus finally said that after he had conquered North Africa

> We shall be much at ease, and we'll drink bumpers, my good man, every day, and we'll gladden one another's hearts with confidential talks." And now that Cineas had brought Pyrrhus to this point in the argument, he said: "Then what stands in our way now if we want to drink bumpers and while away the time with one another? Surely this privilege is ours already, and we have at hand, without taking any trouble, those things to which we hope to attain by bloodshed and great toils and perils, after doing much harm to others and suffering much ourselves."

Manetti's citation stopped at this point. In his version, Manetti left out Plutarch's information about Cineas being a student of Demosthenes. Moreover, whereas Plutarch posited desire as the reason behind Pyrrhus' ultimate rejection of Cineas' advice, Manetti stated that it was Pyrrhus' lack of Christianity that led to this rejection. Manetti pointed out that Alfonso did not suffer from the same detriment. Therefore, Manetti, mirroring the student of Demosthenes, Cineas, urged the King to resist further conquests and instead focus on aiding the church. Thus, just as with his beginning anecdote, Manetti used a Greek source both to demonstrate his learning and to serve as an historical parallel. Manetti's advice to the king came of his own accord, as his commission contained no instructions to seek peace or discuss it with the king.[145]

Manetti further demonstrated his learning by more closely adhering to the oratorical topics suggested by the ancients. In this oration, Manetti followed the recommendations of Quintillian concerning how to praise a person in a panegyric. Quintillian had stated that the praise should start with a focus on the period before the speech object's birth, particularly the person's "… country, his parents and his ancestors…" Manetti dutifully began his praise with statements concerning Spain, its glories in war, and the people who came from there. Next, Quintillian suggested praise for the individual him or herself, including "…character (animo), his

physical endowments (corpore) and external circumstances (extra positis)." Manetti thus started his praise of Alfonso by arguing that an outstanding mind (mentis) and body combine in Alfonso. Alfonso's successful conquests in Italy provide the proof of this statement. Manetti's description of these conquests enabled him to display his learning by comparing the deeds of Alfonso to those of Belisarius. Moreover, by stating the time between the two men, "around more than a 1000 years", Manetti again followed Quintillian's advice. Quintillian had stated "…bear in mind the fact that what most pleases an audience is the celebration of deeds which our hero was the first or only man or at any rate one of the very few to perform." Certainly, an accomplishment occurring once every millennium fit the bill! Quintillian also suggested praising a ruler's virtues. Manetti stated that Alfonso has used his conquest to express many other praiseworthy qualities, such as his mercy to the vanquished and his generosity, among a long list of virtues. Finally, Manetti proceeded to praise of the wedding. Quintillian had written that "children reflect glory on their parents…" Again following the ancient rhetorician, Manetti's praise addressed the topic of children; however, Manetti again focused on the King by describing the glories that he will pass down to them rather than on praising the children themselves.[146]

In addition to his exceptional content, Manetti attempted to surpass previous oratorical performances through his closer adherence to a classical structure. Unlike Bruni's brief speeches that lacked any ostentatious adherence to the structural precepts of classical oratory, all of Manetti's orations were much more elaborate and obvious in their use of classical oratorical structures. In 1445, Manetti began his oration with a clear exordium and narration, namely the story from Demosthenes and the comparison between that Greek orator's task as an ambassador with Manetti's own. He laid out his partition clearly: First, he must greet the king; second, he will offer some praises of him; and third, he will congratulate the king on the wedding.

Moreover, Manetti was careful throughout the body of his oration to notify his audience that one section was ending and another was beginning. For example, at the conclusion of his brief section offering the greetings of the Florentines to the king, he stated, "With one part of our partition most briefly completed, as we had laid out, let us therefore now move onto the second part which concerns singular praises of your remarkable virtues."[147]

Manetti used the same oratorical techniques in his oration to congratulate the new pope Nicholas V in 1447. As in 1445, Manetti stuck ostentatiously to a classical structure in his oration, using explicit statements to mark the transition from section to section. For example, Manetti declared that although he wants the oration to be brief, he must declare the "division of the parts" for the sake of clarity. As in 1445, this structure made Manetti's oration much longer than the orations of his predecessors and showed off his knowledge of classical oratorical structures. Manetti's oratorical content in 1447 also followed the same pattern that he had used two years previously, albeit admittedly on a lesser scale. Taking a cue from Bruni, Manetti drew a comparison between the announcement of the new pope in Florence and to the star marking the birth of Christ in the book of Matthew. Manetti included the standard account of Florentine support for papal causes over the past century and a half, recounting the stories of the emperor Manfred, Charles of Anjou, and their descendants; however, he added a few twists designed to allude to his exceptional learning. For example, Manetti cited "ancient histories, old annals, and chronicles" as the source for his historical references. The fact that Nello Martini had used the exact same examples in 1425 to show the more recent relations between Florence and the pope, suggests that Manetti used this phrase to allude again to his knowledge of these types of sources, rather than footnoting his actual research. In another example, he provided a long list of the emperor Manfred's negative traits, which he concluded by alluding to his Greek learning:

"…Manfred, as the Greeks more elegantly and concisely call a person hostile to religion and without God, was an atheist." In another display of learning, Manetti favorably compared the pope to the more than 214 of his predecessors (he refrained from listing them all for the sake of time. Just as at the time of the birth of Christ under Augustus or in the time of Numa Pompilius (second king of Rome) there will be peace. The name Nicholas itself, whether addressed from Greek or Latin eyptomology portends this peace.[148]

Manetti was also careful to introduce the political particulars of each respective mission into both these oration. Although this integration was a minor point in these two early examples, Manetti's innovations at integrating culture and politics in later speeches would become a crucial aspect of his cultural gifts. In 1445, the Florentine *Signoria* sent Manetti to congratulate King Alfonso's son Ferrante on his wedding. The 1445 oration concluded with the Bruni like line "We say that there are certain other particulars of our commission that must be declared separately and we reserve them for a time more appropriate, convenient, and agreeable to your majesty." That Manetti's entire oration served a donative function is not surprising because the entire purpose of Manetti's mission was to represent Florence at the wedding festivities and to demonstrate the great joy of the Florentines to the king. After his initial words of congratulations, Manetti's commission instructed him to "…give the present and gift of the piece of brocade (brociato) with words agreeable and fitting, the effect of which should be that this *Signoria* teaches of the love, benevolence, affection, and singular devotion that all this people have toward this majesty, and for this reason it sends this present and gift to him." These words refer to the brocade, yet easily could be applied to Manetti's cultural gift that accompanied the presentation of this material offering.[149]

Manetti's 1447 oration marked a step further along this integration of culture and politics. Unlike the 1445 mission, this mission featured an important additional element beyond simply offering congratulations to the pope. In addition to showing the pope that Florence had never received such good news as the announcement of the pope's election, Manetti and his colleagues were to discuss peace with the Pope and the representatives of the King of Naples in subsequent audiences. The instructions for the mission were explicit in its division between the initial cultural gift and the subsequent political negotiations. The commission's author gave long instructions for the first oration before stating "…Including at the end of your speech that another time when you are again at the feet of his holiness, you will sepeak of some other things that have been committed to you." Manetti followed these instructions closely by ending his speech with a now familiar statement alluding to later political negotiations. However, he had already added an inkling of the political reasons underlying his mission. Just like the star marking the birth of the Prince of Peace was the announcement of the new pope; just like Numa, the pope will usher in a new era of peace; through these laudations focused on presenting the new pope as the person who will bring peace to Europe, Manetti has previewed the later political particulars. Like Magalotti many years before him, Manetti was thus highlighting the gift-giving function of his oration by ostentatiously separating it from the mission's other concerns while simultaneously raising the political reasons underlying his mission.[150]

Manetti's Content and Structural Techniques in Offering Cultural Gifts, Part Two: 1448

Manetti's missions to Siena and Venice in 1448 used further structural innovations aimed at eliminating the separation between culture and politics in order to offer an exceptional oration. In particular, Manetti changed his oratorical genre on these missions from epideictic to

deliberative. A deliberative oration contained the same sections as a classical panegyric, but it possessed a much longer argumentative section (confirmation and refutation). At the beginning of the quattrocento, Pier Paolo Vergerio had declared that deliberative and judicial oratorical genres were dead in his day. Vergerio had argued that no place existed for such oratorical formats in his society. Although examples of humanist deliberative oratory exist between Vergerio's statements and Manetti's missions, Manetti's orations in 1448 are the first surviving examples of the use of this oratorical genre by a Florentine diplomat abroad.[151]

The political particulars of Manetti's missions underlay his genre shift. Manetti's two 1448 missions and their opening orations fit into the political whirlwind surrounding the war of Milanese Succession. Therefore, unlike the earlier orations by Bruni and Manetti, the 1448 missions had a central political rather than ceremonial component. In his oration at Siena in 1448, Manetti delivered a vernacular oration in order to shore up the resistance of the Sienese to the incursions of King Alfonso around Piombino. In the late summer of the same year, Manetti gave another vernacular oration in the deliberative style in Venice. The goal of this mission was to convince the Venetians to contribute money and troops to entice Renè of Anjou into Italy, to prolong the league between the two republics, and to procure payments for their joint condottiere Sigismund Malatesta. By pushing his Italian speech into a classical deliberative oration, Manetti was able to present a clear political case while still offering an extraordinary oratorical performance.[152]

The argumentative focus of the deliberative genre allowed Manetti to focus on the political rather than the praise purpose of his missions. However, if Manetti used his opening oration to discuss the particulars of his commission, he had to ensure that his audience could follow his argument. The mixed degree of Latin learning among his republican audience

required a vernacular rather than a Latin oration. By using Italian, Manetti assuaged any fear that his audience would not understand his complicated Latin. He stated this explicitly in the Sienese speech, saying that he feared that the Sienese might not have a thorough knowledge of Roman history. At the same time, the importance of his missions necessitated a cultural gift.[153]

Manetti combined a deliberative style and classical citations to his Italian words in order to offer an exceptional oratorical performance to the Sienese. As in his first two orations, Manetti marked the transition from point to point. This explicit demarcation both displayed his understanding of classical rhetoric and ensured that his readers could follow his speech. Manetti carefully constructed each of the three parts of his argument in his confirmation. After arguing that agreements should be kept and for Florentine friendship in part one, he described the armies of King Alfonso as destructive and contrary to Sienese interests in part two. With the king vilified, he asks that the Sienese send aid to resist him. Third, Manetti masterfully points to the friendship between Florence and Siena, a friendship that has historically been "true and not faked" (vera & non simulata) and worked towards the benefit of both states. Granting the subsidies will take only "as the masses say, the dip of the pen in the ink", and will benefit not only Siena, not only Tuscany, not only Italy, but be pleasing to God, who will reward the Sienese. If the Sienese refuse, God will destroy them. Manetti summed up his arguments with a lengthy and clearly demarcated peroration, reiterating the advantages of Siena granting the grain subsidies, urging a quick decision to the issue, highlighting Alfonso's insatiable ambition, and the horrible consequences of the wrong decision.[154]

Manetti added numerous examples from the classical past in order to flatter his audience with his display of learning and further his political arguments. Manetti structured his content on the recommendations of Cicero's *De inventione.* Cicero had argued that a deliberative oration

could seek three different ends: things that are honorable (honestas), things that are useful (utilitas), and things that are both. Manetti explicitly tied his arguments to Cicero's instructions, stating repeatedly that the Florentine requests are both "honestas" and "utilitas". Beyond this general framework, Manetti sprinkled classical citations throughout the speech. In his partition, Manetti revealed that his major evidentiary source for his arguments were ancient examples. He wrote

> Certainly, if there are any of you who would concede as true these things that I have declared, yet would doubt that the wise ancients were accustomed to give aid to their allies and partners, peoples and princes by the wise ancients; if by chance in so many and so great a number of citizens would be found someone unaware of the histories of the Romans, whoever that person might be, we beg that that person listen with kind favor…

Manetti cited Cicero and Livy in his argument that Siena should maintain agreements and the friendship of Florence. Manetti's examples of aid given to Rome against common enemies include the Galli Senones, the Carthaginians in the first, second, and third punic wars, Philip of Macedonia, Antioch Sirorum, and others. He cited Cicero's *Pro lege Manilia* by name. Manetti promised to pass over the more than "600" other examples that exist, but still sneaks in a dozen or so sample focusing on Roman resistance to foreign invasions into Italy. [155]

Manetti used the exact same methods to offer a cultural gift to the Venetians later in the same year. Many aspects of the two orations, in fact overlap, such as a quote about Caesar drawn from Cicero. In the Venice oration, Manetti's close adherence to the deliberative oratorical structure can be seen by comparing his commission with his oration, a luxury not available for the Sienese oration for which no commission survives. Manetti's commission

instructed him first to offer greetings to the Venetians "with those words that seem to your prudene to be most useful to the time and place and to the person that you repreesent and the reason for which you have departed." He was to mention the hardships through which Florence was enduring. Next, he was to procure Venetian aid in order to convince Renè to come to Italy. The commission contained two more major points, the prolongation of the league between Venice and Florence and obtaining payments for the republics' joint condottiere Sigismondo Malatesta, whom Manetti had recently convinced to enter the services of the league; however, Manetti's commission told him to focus only on the issues concerning King Renè in his opening oration.[156]

Manetti adopted this commission to a deliberative oration. Manetti bluntly stated his exordium by declaring that he does not have time to state one. In his narrative, Manetti described how the hopelessness of the Florentine position had led them to try to make an unfavorable peace with the king; however, miraculously, the legates of the King of France arrived in the city at that moment and stated, "in the name of the king, plainly and openly" that King Renè could come into Italy and drive back King Alfonso. Manetti reminded Venice that its ambassador and letters to that ambassador in Florence "openly and plainly" had agreed to particular terms regarding troops and money in order to entice Renè into Italy and help his efforts once present. Manetti made his case in his confirmation along the same lines as he had in Siena a few months previously. Manetti continually stressed that Venice had agreed to this action, the infinite gratitude and friendship from Florence that such an action would incur, the temporal and heavenly rewards that will come for Venice, and the duty of Venice, as an empire that had grown by God's will, to fulfill its divine mission by resisting foreign invaders (two emperors are named) with their eyes on Italy. Having made his case, Manetti's refutation addressed potential

counter arguments to his contentions. Namely, he argued that a fear of the cost involved is not an issue, as the mere rumor of the advance of the royal house of France will bring ruin to Alfonso and the return of wealthy territories Venetian and Florentine allies. Second, he addressed the Venetian's possible objection that they could gain territorial security by means of peace with Alfonso. Manetti refuted this contention by citing Alfonso's insatiable desire and drive for territorial expansion. He offered the examples of Julius Caesar (the same as the Siena oration) and Piombino as proof. The oration ended with a clearly delineated peroration.[157]

Manetti again added to his structure by citing classical history in his oration, such as in the Julius Caesar example. However, Manetti's use of such examples was far more limited than in his oration to Siena. The reasons for Manetti's restraint are unclear. One possibility is the close connections that the Sienese attempted to draw, like the Florentines, between themselves and Republican Rome. The problem with this hypothesis is that Francesco Foscari and many Venetian patricians were engaged in the humanist fascination with the ancient world. The more likely reason is the different purpose underlying the two orations. Whereas in Siena Manetti's main goal was to inspire the city to action, in Venice, Manetti was seeking funds. Through offering the example of the ancients, Manetti sought to inspire the Sienese to imitate their illustrious ancestors. In a mission to acquire money, by contrast, Manetti deemed arguments based on utility, practicality, and loyalty, more useful than offering ancients examples of Romans and Greeks paying monetary debts.[158]

Finally, Manetti sprinkled statements throughout his oration that informed his audience that his rhetorical flourishes served as a cultural gift. Since Manetti's oration addressed the political particular of his mission, Manetti eliminated the typical closing statements that had explicitly separated the gift-giving role of the oration from the later political negotiations. In

place of this statement, he added repeated references to the openness of his argumentation, even as he draped his argument in humanist dressings. In the Sienese oration, Manetti stated that "…our demands are so bright and open that they seem to be brighter than the noon light." Later, he wrote that his arguments were "…proven and shown singularly, plainly, and openly…" among other examples. The same statements occur in the Venetian oration. Florentine diplomats had negotiated "plainly and openly" with King Alfonso. King Renè's diplomats had declared their proposal concerning the king's coming to Italy "plainly and openly". The Venetians had stated their enthusiasm "plainly and openly". In his refutation, Manetti claimed that his points were again proven "plainly and openly…" When the subjugated territories under Alfonso "plainly and openly" hear of King Renè's coming, they will rebel. Manetti began his peroration by stating that he had stated his commission "plainly and openly".[159]

Manetti used these statements to point his audience towards the gift-giving function of his rhetorical flourishes. Certainly, such statements attempted to reassure the listeners that Manetti was confident of his accounts of third party actions and statements. However, through these statements, Manetti also attempted to soothe the fears of his listeners that he would use his ability to manipulate words towards political ends. With these statements he separated the naked substance of his words from their costumed form. They reassured his audience that he was not using his long sentences and rhetorical flourishes to deceive them. Far from it, he was using these flourishes towards the same ends that his predecessors had done in their own outstanding orations. These previous orators had signaled to the audience that their orations served a separate purpose from negotiating their political particulars with concluding statements drawing this stark contrast. With his statements, Manetti also drew a contrast between political particulars and rhetorical flourishes. His message was open to all: Florence's political statement

was plain and unadorned. The wrappings in which he presented it served a different, less treacherous purpose than advancing or complicating these particulars. They served as a cultural gift.

Manetti's Content and Structural Techniques in Offering Cultural Gifts, Part Three: 1451

Manetti adapted these innovations for a regal audience in 1451. Whereas privileging politics in an opening oration was acceptable for a republican audience, a learned king like Alfonso of Naples expected an opening Latin oration focused on praise. In response to this challenge, Manetti's 1451 oration for the first time integrated political particulars, praise for the host ruler, and close adherence to a classical oratorical style into an epideictic oration. On this mission, the *Signoria* had sent Manetti to discuss the relations and alliances of the major Italian powers (minus the papacy) and merchant issues. Explicitly, Manetti's instructions told him to present his letters of credence with "those words that seem (best) to your prudence". He was to acknowledge that the king's ambassador in Florence had shown his majesty's devotion to their Republic. This same ambassador had expressed a desire for peace in Italy, a topic which was "the real reason (cagione principalmente)" for Manetti's arrival. In fact, his commission was explicit on this point: "The effect of your commision is that with all zeal and diligence, with effects (effacti) and with words, you will engineer that the peace is preserved, as much as you are able." Yet, rather than presenting a logical or legal case or a deliberative oration, Manetti framed his commission into an epideictic oration praising peace.[160]

Manetti turned this commission into a cultural gift that both praised the king and subtly began the political negotiations. Manetti continued both the innovative structural and content

aspects of his previous orations. In terms of structure, he again ostentatiously clung to a classical format. His exordium referred to his 1445 oration to the king in which the king had listened so intently, "it being mid summer, by chance three flies, by the agreement of all I say (pace cunctorum dixerim), completely and unfortunately clinging to your nose throughout, amazing to say, almost the entire oration, you forgot to repel and shoo them away until we were concluding." Manetti followed this attention-grabbing anecdote with a declaration that his oration did not need an oratorical preface to attain the king's attention and goodwill. His partition divided the oration into three parts. The first will praise peace. The second will examine the benefits for people seeking peace. The third will urge the king to turn his armies to the peoples of the east. Each of these sections ended with a clear statement declaring the beginning of a new point. Manetti concluded by stating he will omit an epilogue, which he followed with a discussion of the purpose of an epilogue in an oration.[161]

In terms of content, Manetti delivered an oration in Latin that focused exclusively on making peace and citing the ancients. He covered the first two points of his oration by citing authorities of the "Latins and Greeks and also the Jews", including Vergil, Homer, Livy, Herodotus, Demosthenes, Cicero, Seneca, Aristotle, many and various books in both the Old and New Testaments, and Augustine. He offered praise of Alfonso, "not all, not most, not many" of the praiseworthy possibilities, but "a select few". All of these aspects combine to create a king that shows God's favor. Because of this favor, Manetti argued, Alfonso must use his talents towards the good of the church. This argument allowed Manetti to conclude by urging Alfonso to set out against the Turk rather than using his army against Christians.[162]

Yet, Manetti again added a new aspect to his oration to make it an exceptional oratorical performance. In the exordium, Manetti stated "If now first of all, most serene and glorious

prince, we discharge the duty of our commission to your majesty; we would openly and plainly use, especially in the first part of our oration, that established and usual form of exordii, in accordance with the celebrated and widely known teachings of the art of oratory." The presence of so great a king demands an oratorical style like Manetti's predecessors had used, namely one totally devoted to praising the king. However, "We noticed that as often as diplomats and orators have been sent and addressed you, that many times we realize that we have acquired and established your certain and singular benevolence towards us: that many times again we recognize your special and almost incredible attention in listening to even orators speaking at length (vel maxime oratoribus)." At this point, Manetti provided his anecdote about his previous speech and the flies on the king's nose. Through these statements, Manetti has declared that the typical oration would focus on praise alone; however, Manetti has noticed that King Alfonso is no typical monarch.[163]

Because the King is so exceptional and attentive, Manetti can begin his commission

> Therefore so that we might be briefer, we have arranged auspiciously to begin, to make a start, and to declare this our oration without any opening words, since such words are unnecessary to seize your benevolence and attention. When in accordance with the faithful and accurate duty of our commission, we exhort, most briefly (vel parumper) your majesty to the continuous and perpetual preservation of the peace, begun a short while ago with us, of which in this alone and more than anything else, the most important aspect of our commission seems to be fixed and to consist.

Manetti has made the fact that he will start discussing the political particulars a sign of the extraordinary opinion that Manetti and Florence had concerning the King's learning. Manetti's

willingness to discuss the political particulars in his opening oration had become an aspect of praise. Each syllable uttered concerning peace was a statement regarding the extraordinary learning of the king. In short, Manetti solved a problem present in diplomatic orations from at least as early as Filippo Magalotti's 1408 oration before King Ladislaus: How could an orator combine political particulars and the cultural gift into the same performance? Filippo Magalotti had subtly implied the major arguments of his commission through the particular topics on which he focused his praise. Leonardo Bruni had removed politics almost completely from his diplomatic orations and focused instead on offering creative means of praise as a cultural gift. Giannozzo Manetti used creative content and structures to present an oration almost completely about the political particulars of his mission while simultaneously turning this discussion itself into the cultural gift.[164]

The Twilight of Manetti's Diplomatic Career: 1452-1453

Manetti's final two Florentine orations eliminated politics and returned to an exclusive focus on praise because they fit into different types of situations than his other diplomatic orations. Manetti did not actually deliver his oration on the coronation of Frederick III in 1452. Instead, he presented it in written form to the newly crowned ruler as a more concrete, material gift. Manetti delivered his last oration as a commissary on a mission to name the condottiere, Sigismondo Malatesta, the leader of the Florentine forces. Rather than a cultural gift, Manetti's oration served to cement the connection between the Republic and its hired mercenary captain. This event typically occurred in Florence and Manetti's oration fit snugly into this domestic oratorical tradition. Neither of these acts featured the juggling act between culture and politics thrust upon Manetti in 1451.[165]

Manetti used his two characteristic methods of offering praise in his 1452 oration written for the Emperor Frederick III. As in his earlier oratory, Manetti discussed the different portions of classically structured oration and signaled his transition from each. In terms of classical sources, Manetti claimed that Demosthenes and Cicero together could not successfully meet the challenge presented to him by this occasion and audience. Manetti evoked divine aid for assistance, which he assumed was granted to him ("we, therefore, now armed with heavenly and spiritual weapons…"). With divine aid, Manetti set out to deliver the oration that neither Cicero nor Demosthenes nor their combined talents could have delivered. Manetti defended the *dignitas* of the emperor through a myriad of classical citations and biblical passages. He celebrated the emperor's 'power and jurisdiction over all temporal things", using the same methods. Manetti lauded the emperor for seeking papal recognition for his power (the coronation). This praise turned into a history lesson covering crowns in ancient Rome, Greece, the Bible, a discussion of the iron, silver and gold crowns that the emperor will wear and the tradition of various popes crowning previous emperors, starting with Charlemagne. Manetti concluded that the emperor and pope, respectively, are superior to a variety of Old Testament figures, including Samuel, Saul, David, Sadoch, and Solomon. Throughout these sections, Manetti continually used his signature phrase "openly and plainly" to reassure his readers that his rhetoric served as a gift, not as a means of trickery or concealment. Since this work was a written text rather than a spoken speech, it lacked a final statement signaling a later political discussion.[166]

Manetti's return to an epideictic form focusing on praise over politics reflected the works' purpose to serve exclusively as a diplomatic gift. As a tangible object rather than a spoken speech, Manetti's written gift was in some ways similar to the presentation of a rich piece

of cloth. Yet, just as Bruni's dedication of history to King Alfonso in 1443, Manetti's written work could surpass other material gifts through its additional second layer to the gift, its content. In the unambiguous role of a gift, this content could focus entirely on the objective or praise leaving all political considerations to the spoken negotiations between the diplomats and the emperor.

Similarly, Manetti clung to a classical structure and itemized classical references in his oration before Sigismundo Malatesta in 1453. The oration contained clear and ostentatious structural divisions. He began his partition, for example, with the words "the partition division, which will be in this form…". This oration, however, is striking in its overwhelming use of antiquity, particularly obscure facts and figures from the military history of Greece and Rome. The first section discussed the commendableness of being a military captain (more praiseworthy than any other position save the government of a republic). This section cited Thucydides, followed by Herodotus and Homer before moving onto the Roman experience. Manetti proceeded to discuss at length the origins of the position's eminence, citing several further classical sources. He discoursed on the eight means that the Romans used to honor a successful military captain. He followed this impressive display of erudition with another long list of obscure classical examples, this time pertaining to the punishments inflicted on ancient military men who disobeyed orders. Next, he set out to prove that the military captain is, in fact, the best possible pursuit for a person. Toward this end, he argued that it was more useful for the Romans to have several different military captains born to them than had Plato been born in Italy. More glory goes to the military captain than to any other pursuit, proven again through a myriad of historical sources and examples. Manetti's second and third sections relaxed his overwhelming

classical source citations. In these parts, he focused on the four major attributes necessary in a good military captain and how Sigismundo Malatesta possessed each one.[167]

Although similar in form and content to Manetti's earlier orations, Manetti's final Florentine political oration fit into a different context than a diplomatic reception ritual. Manetti's oration occurred on the transfer of the republic's military forces to a mercenary captain. It fit into the only such fifteenth-century Florentine ritual occurring outside of the city walls. However, the fact that Manetti's oration is little more than a longer version of Leonardo Bruni's oration for a similar occasion twenty years earlier indicates that the speeches served the same function. Namely, this oration before Sigismundo Malatesta and his army soothed the Florentine fears of placing the city's protection into foreign hands and challenged the condottiere to work towards the benefit of his employer.[168]

Manetti's oratorical content provides evidence for this claim. Unlike many diplomatic orations, in which comprehension by the audience was not necessarily a priority, Manetti's oration was delivered in Italian. According to Vespasiano da' Bisticci, Manetti made this decision explicitly so that all could understand his words. This content, focused on the potential glory of a carefully defined, outstanding military captain and reminders to him of his duties to Florence, urged the captain towards great things for the greater benefit of Florence. At the same time, the incredible erudition of Manetti oration would have been far over the heads of all but the most learned soldiers. At one level, this erudition offered ancient authority and examples as incontrovertible proof of the orator's arguments. However, the classical erudition of the oration and its focus served another more abstract purpose. By focusing on the ancient connections between republics and military captains, Manetti's oration linked the transfer of military power to a foreigner to a long historical chain of such connections. This broader historical context

served to soothe the Republic's fears of placing their security into another's hands. The Florentines, in short, were acting only as their illustrious ancestors had also done. Through following their example, the city hoped to emulate their ancestors' stunning military successes. After the oration, the Florentines formalized their connection with the condottiere with the physical handing over of the military "baton (bastone)", an object that carried the Florentine military authority with it.[169]

Manetti himelf hints that his oration sought to soothe Florentine fears and inextricably tie their condottiere to them.

> ... for these reasons, the magnificent and generous (generoso) people of Florence, knowing that all four of these prestated things are necessary in any good and competent (sufficiente) captain, according to the old and approved custom of their Roman forebearers and ancestors, which suggests never to give nor conceed the rule of their armies to any person in whom all the four prestated characteristics do not flow (such a person is called in latin "*imperator"*, which means nothing else in our language than a *"comandator"*(commander) and through them, as often as they went to war (per tanto inter venuia che nelle Guerra), most of the time they won, and wishing to to follow in their praiseworthy footsteps and have victory as they had victory, for that reason they made sure (intendono) that all these things run together in the magnificent person of this illustrious and vigorous captain Messer Sigismundo.

In this passage, Manetti tied the ritual to ancient precedent, joining it to the practice and success of the Ancient Romans. Soon after, Manetti stated what the Florentines hope will come from this transfer of power.

> ...And although it does not seem necessary to us, because we know your admirable talents (virtu), to compel you to good and praiseworthy conduct (governo), in order to satisfy nothing less than our charge and duty, we dearly beseech you and closely comfort you (strectamente vi confortiamo) that it pleases you to rule and order the army in such a way, by means of your experience, clear and apparent to all the world, that not only do you not fall short from our prestated ancestors who were such talented (valenti), such magnanimous, such vigorous (strenui) captains, but you advance further with your praiseworthy work and surpass their glorious deeds. The highest glory for such actions follows for your magnificent person, close to (appresso) the honor and utility for this our people, who have such faith in the excellence of you amzaing talents (virtu), the degree of which you understand through this new authority, which they universally (grandissima hunione) grant you with the highest hopes (voglia).

The Florentines hope for the past to return in new and improved form in their captain. As with the Romans, his glory will be their glory. Rather than a cultural gift, therefore, these orations served the purpose of cementing the ties between the republic and its top condottiere. This different role explains the absence of politics in this oration so aptly integrated into Manetti's previous diplomatic speeches.[170]

Manetti's success at offering cultural gifts contributed to his self-imposed exile to Naples after 1453. Manetti cultivated the friendship of the pope, the King of Naples, and the Venetians during his diplomatic missions. Such support abroad in Renaissance Italy usually went hand in hand with domestic power, as witnessed by the relationship between both the Medici and Milan and also the Bracceschi and Angevins with several prominent anti-Medici

figures. Manetti's close relationship with Alfonso of Naples, a man continuously at odds with Florentine interests, in particular helped to push him to the fringes of the Medici faction. Certainly, domestic disputes with prominent Medicians also played a crucial role; however, without the support of foreign princes, Manetti would never have been in a position of political prominence in the first place. Without the necessity of offering a cultural gift on key diplomatic missions, Manetti would have undoubtedly been passed over for more reputable members of the Medici group. Manetti's absence from Florence removed a powerful political opponent from the Medici's midst. However, it left the city of Florence with a pressing problem: How could the city's diplomats hope to surpass Manetti's combination of familial status, eloquence, and innovation and continue to offer cultural gifts?[171]

CHAPTER FOUR: THE TRIUMPH OF HUMANISM, 1456-1485

The departure of the Giannozzo Manetti from Florence opened the door for a wide range of diplomats and cultural gifts on key missions. These diplomats varied in their respective interests in humanism. They varied in the source of their extraordinary status. They varied in the oratorical techniques that they used to make their orations extraordinary. However, the expectation that they would offer exceptional status and an unparalleled oratorical performance remained the same. Among the people selected to fill these roles, the Florentine government extended a small number of diplomatic positions to parvenu humanist authors. A figure with a questionable familial background, Matteo Palmieri, enjoyed a successful diplomatic career in the 1450s and 1460s. Soon after, the son of a miller, Bartolomeo Scala, joined the city's finest figures on a congratulatory mission to the new Pope Innocent VIII. Scala derived his preeminent status from his humanist reputation. Therefore, Scala's inclusion on this mission suggests that his literary reputation and ability with words had reached a comparable level of status in Florentine diplomacy as an old familial ancestry.

Between 1456 and 1485, most missions featured an opening humanist oration. During these years, seven out of eight individuals filling more than ten diplomatic positions were humanist dilettantes or authors. *Thirty* more individuals with humanist connections served as Florentine diplomat less than ten times. These individuals varied in their degree of interest in humanism, ranging from famous authors to occasional correspondents with them. However, each of these individuals undoubtedly could integrate humanist rhetoric into a diplomatic oration, be it in Italian or Latin. Altogether, humanist authors and dilettantes occupied 176 positions out of 365 total diplomatic and commissarial positions from 1456-1485, or 48.2%. Just

as previous decades, the typical diplomatic mission featured a patrician with basic humanist words.[172]

Several missions occurred during these decades that required more than basic patrician status and a sliver of humanist learning. The Florentines congratulated five new popes. They sent two congratulatory missions to new Kings of France. Two weddings at Naples required special gestures from Florence. Moreover, in the late summer of 1465 the city sent extraordinary diplomats to Naples in order to negotiate a difficult political situation. Florence charged these diplomats with congratulating the King of Naples on a military victory over the French. However, Florence's neglect of its treaty obligations to assist the king during this war had soured relations between the two regions. To make matters worse, the Florentines had refused to let the exile, Lorenzo Strozzi, enter into their city earlier in the year. Lorenzo was the brother of Filippo Strozzi, an important man in King Ferrante's court. The Florentines' refusal so angered the king that, rather than meeting the Florentine diplomats entering Naples soon after the event, he went hunting. In the late summer, a different set of Florentine diplomats sought to appease the hostile king with soothing words.[173]

The lack of a dominating diplomat like Manetti led the Florentine government to elect a variety of people who possessed more status than the typical patrician diplomat did. One method was to send high-ranking churchmen, who combined the prestige of their office with a humanist oration. By electing churchmen, the Florentine government offered individuals who brought their office into the status equation. In fact, in the example of Antonio Pierozzi, the diplomat's church office enabled him to conquer a modest familial ancestry. Vespasiano da' Bisticci recorded that Pierozzi came from an "honest" family, a nice way of saying "fringe patrician". The *Tratte* records lack listings for the Pierozzi family before the mid-fifteenth century. Dale

Kent lists the family as part of the quattrocento *reggimento*; however, the Pierozzi possessed only one person eligible for the city's highest offices. This small number combined with the *tratte* records and Vespasiano's comment point to a family on the fringes of the Florentine ruling group. Pierozzi's office and saintly reputation enabled the Florentines to look past such drawbacks. Another option when selecting diplomats for key missions was to elect patricians who delivered opening orations written by famous humanist authors. This practice mirrored that which had existed during Bruni's chancellorship. Third, the Florentines looked to individuals who combined their familial history with their outstanding literary reputations, as Manetti had been able to do. However, such individuals were rare.[174]

The rise to princely power of Lorenzo de' Medici expanded the range of acceptable criteria for diplomats on key missions. Even during the lifetime of Lorenzo's grandfather, Cosimo de' Medici, other rulers in Italy viewed the family as possessing princely power over Florence. This image only grew under Lorenzo the Magnificent. Richard Trexler has argued that Florentine public rituals featured Lorenzo as a princely figure. The increasingly personal nature of Florentine diplomacy under Lorenzo reflected his monopolization of power. Loyalty to Lorenzo replaced the old emphasis on familial ancestry as the key trait in a diplomat. This development followed a similar pattern as other princely areas in Italy, which prioritized personal loyalty over familial antiquity in their diplomats. For example, personal loyalty was the common characteristic among core Milanese diplomats under Francesco Sforza. Many such individuals possessed a long and close relationship with the Duke, but little history in Milan. The development of loyalty to Lorenzo de' Medici as a crucial trait in a diplomat made the inclusion of humanist parvenus in Florentine diplomacy a possibility. The demands of the cultural gift made it a necessity.[175]

Religious Learning + Humanist Learning = Cultural Gift, 1455-1458

Florentine diplomats possessed different foundations for their diplomatic status and used varying techniques to offer cultural gifts after 1455. Florence sought to accentuate the status of its diplomatic entourage on key missions by using churchmen as early as 1452. In this year, the Florentines needed diplomats to escort the Holy Roman Emperor through the Italian peninsula. Originally, the Florentines elected the Archbishop of Pistoia, who refused the commission. Undettered, they elected the Archbishop of Florence followed by the Bishop of Fiesole, both of whom refused to go. The man ultimately selected, Otto Niccolini, was as close to a churchman as one could get without taking vows, serving as unofficial Florentine resident ambassador to Rome throughout the 1460s. The 1452 election was part of a wider trend. After Manetti left the city in 1453, the Florentines elected churchmen to head all four missions between 1455 and 1464 that required a special diplomatic gesture from their city to a host ruler.[176]

Florence's mission to congratulate the new pope Calixtus III in 1455 marked Florence's first successful use of a churchman in this manner. In this year, the Florentine government elected its archbishop, a reluctant Antonio Pierozzi, to deliver its congratulatory oration to the new pope. Pierozzi's presence brought the same kind of fame to the mission as Manetti had brought on his own missions in previous years. Vespasiano da' Bisticci wrote

> The archbishop went dressed in his usual way, although everyone had tried to get him to dress differently. He arrived at Rome and since his ever increasing reputation preceded him, he was honored no less this second time than the first because of the great reverence that he had in his life and customs.

Just as for Manetti, the crowds that came to hear Pierozzi's words suggest that his prestige surpassed the ordinary. However, Manetti enjoyed exceptional status because of his literary reputation. Pierozzi added status to his mission because of his saintly way of life. His choice in clothing served to highlight the source of his status. The added effect of sending Pierozzi or Manetti in a diplomatic entourage was the same even as the reason for their preeminence differed.[177]

The expectation that Pierozzi would offer the new pope a cultural gift was also the same as it had been for Manetti. In the words of Pierozzo's commission, his oration had to show the pope that "…in our city, not even the oldest memories recall the arrival of news as happy as that of this election, and for this reason, unanimously, all our city, old, young, and middle-aged (grandi piccoli et mezzani), of every status and sex, have taken immeasurable joy and happiness because of it." Pierozzi's oration had to prove to the pope that *this* obbedience to *this* pope was more important to Florence than any previous one. Towards this end, Antonio Pierozzi focused on combining religious and humanist elements in his opening oration. Such techniques enabled him to maintain the humanist style of his predecessors while differing from them in his choice of content. Pierozzi discarded the classical structure, to which Manetti had ostentasciously clung, in favor of following the structural guidelines provided in his commission. Whereas Manetti had given Greek sources a primary place in his oratory, Pierozzi saturated his speech with biblical references. Even Pierozzi's rare references to non-biblical sources radically differed from Manetti's literary allusions. Rather than Plutarch or Demosthenes, parts of Pierozzi's oration are direct citations from medieval works such as Isidore's *Eytmologies,* Bernard of Clairvaux's *De consideratione,* the *Donation of Constantine*.[178]

Even as Pierozzi's oration differed drastically from Manetti's classical content and blatant classical structure, the saintly archbishop still had to adhere to a humanist oratorical style. For example, Pierozzi began his oration with the following long sentence, which has been left untranslated for the sake of stylistic analysis.

> Beatissime pater & domine, quia eum qui coram tua loquitur sanctitate commoveri contingeit & tremere, tum propter celsitudinem throni tui, quo in humanis nullus est altior, tum propter intelligentiam tuam divino munere auream, utriusque iuris & sacrae sophiae notitia foecundam, nec non propter reverendissimos dominos cardinals, venerandosque antistites & doctores egregius adstantes vatiis scientiis refertos, mirandum non est, si nunc ego cui nec sententiae suppetund nec verba quibus a diri debeat tanta maiestas, palleo & pene voce deficio.

Pierozzi used anaphora by beginning three consecutive clauses with "propter". He used alliteration repeatedly with both "c" and "t" (commoveri contingit & tremere, tum propter celsitudinem throni tui". The sentence begins with an example of prolepsis, with the accusative pronoun "eum" appearing outside of the "qui" clause in which it grammatically functions. The word "quia" appears at the sentence's beginning, but explains the "si" clause that does not appear until its final words. Such attention to rhetoric suggests that, just like Manetti, Pierozzi sought to offer an oration in a humanist style.[179]

Pierozzi's rearrangement of words in a direct citation provides striking evidence for his interest in speaking with a humanist style. Bernard of Clairvaux had written (left in Latin for comparative purposes).

> formam justitiae, sanctimoniae speculum, pietatis exemplar, assertorem veritatis, fidei defensorem, doctorem gentium, Christianorum ducem, amicum Sponsi, Sponsae paranymphum, cleri ordinatorem, pastorem plebium, magistrum insipientium, refugium oppressorum, pauperum advocatum, miserorum spem, tutorem pupillorum, judicem viduarum, oculum caecorum, linguam mutorum, baculum senum, ultorem scelerum, malorum metum, bonorum gloriam, virgam potentium, malleum tyrannorum, regum patrem, legum moderatorem, canonum dispensatorem, sal terrae, orbis lumen, sacerdotem Altissimi, vicarium Christi, christum Domini: postremo deum Pharaonis.

Antonio Pierozzi copied this passage verbatim with the exception of his placement of several nouns and modifiers. For comparative purposes, the sections that differ from Bernard's have been placed in bold. Passages that Pierozzi omitted have been placed back into his text in brackets.

> Formam fore iustitiae, sanctimonie speculum, pietatis **exemplum, veritatis assertorem, defensorem fidei**, doctorem gentium, **ducem Christianorum**, amicum sponsi, sponsae paranymphum, **ordinatorem cleri**, pastorem plebium, magistrum insipientium, **oppressorum refugium**, **advocatum pauperum**, & **spem misorum**, tutorem pupillorum, iudicem viduarum, oculum [**caecorum linguam mutorum baculum senum ultorem scelerum malorum metum] gloriam bonorum,** virgam potentium, malleum tyrannorum, **patrem regum moderatorem legum,** canonum dispensatorem, **[sal]** orbis terrae lumen, **[sacerdotem altissimi]** vicarium Christi, Christum domini, Deum Pharaonis.

To take just one example from Pierozzi's changes, in Bernard's phrase "sanctimonie speculum pietatis exemplar assertorem veritatis fidei defensorem fidei ", Pierozzi has changed "exemplar" to its synonym "exemplum", this change allows for removal of an "ar" sound and the continuation of the "m" sound: "speculum…exemplum…assertorem defensorem…etc". Moreover, flipping "assertorem veritatis" and "fidei defensorem" to "veritatis assertorem" and "defensorem fidei" likewise improves aural effect. Compare the following: In the words from "speculum" to "defensorem" Bernard's word order creates ending sounds without any pattern: "um, is, ar, em, is, ei, em". However, Pierozzi's altered word order combined with his replacement of "exemplar" with "exemplum" achieves much greater assonant effect: (the same seven words) "um, is, um, is, em, em, ei". [180]

Pierozzi added deep religious learning to this basic humanst style in order to make his oration more outstanding than the oratorical performances of his predecessors. Just as Manetti had used his extensive Greek and rhetorical knowledge to highlight his extraordinary learning, Pierozzi brought attention to his religious learning and piety through his use of biblical and late antique sources. Pierozzi saturated his language with biblical references to Psalms, Genesis, Kings, Exodus, and Matthew among others. He referred repeatedly to a line from Psalm 121, "I rejoice in those things that have been said to me (Laetatus sum in iis, quae dicta sunt mihi…)". Rather than a great classical figure, Pierozzi compared the new pope to the biblical figure Solomon.[181]

Pierozzi also used ancient history, a humanist subject, but added a distinct religious interpretation. Pierozzi related the entire history of the papacy as leading up to a great battle between a unified Italy under the pope against the Emperor Mehmed, pawn of the antichrist. Following various ancient eastern empires, God had established Rome as the seat of the papacy

and the empire. After the fall of Rome, God saved the church from the barbarian invasions. With God and Christ the instigators, Pope Nicholas V had brokered a peace to unite the peninsula. Pierozzi urged the pope to maintain this peace so that all of Italy can embark against Mehmed and retake Constantinople. Yet, Pierozzi's use of history turns his request into more than simply a desire for peace among Christians and war with the Turk. Following God's plan, Nicholas V had united Italy. The "Angel of Satan" threatened them. Now, Pierozzi implicitly urged, was the time for Callixtus to begin the last battle between a united Christian front and the forces of the Antichrist. This focus on the divine role of the pope in Armageddon highlighted Pierozzi's particular strengths. Attired in his simple religious garb, Pierozzi used religious content dressed in humanist words to offer a cultural gift.[182]

Pierozzi's innovation of combining religious learning with a humanist style was successful. Vespasiano da Bisticci's wrote that

> It was established that the ambassadors would have audience in a public concistory in order to honor the city of Florence, in which he was beloved (alla quale era affezionatissimo) The morning that he had his audience, a great many people were present for the sole purpose of seeing and hearing him because of his singular reputation. He recited a most outstanding (degnissima) oration, which was much praised and commended by both the pope and by all those that were present. In this way, he earned the greatest honor that morning for himself and for the city that had sent him.

Pierozzi had successfully exceeded the expectations of his audience and earned honor for himself and for his city. A letter from the Florentine diplomats to Florence supports Vespasiano's account.

> Wednesday morning we were in the public consistory. Accompanied in our entrance by many prelates and having made the obligatory reverences, Monsignor Pierozzi deliverd a most elegant oration according to the suggestions (effecti) in the commission. The speech was more pleasing (grata) to the Holy Father and to the Cardinals than we can express. The Holy Father responded, commending our obedience very much and then commending the city of Florence and its citizens. He said that they exceeded all others in any possible pursuit (et che a qualunche esercitio si davano, excedevano tucti gli altri), in knowledge, in mercantile affairs, and greatest in the Christian religion and faith, which had defended the city from all hostile forces (oppressione). He accepted the obedience as from true and most devoted sons of the Holy Church, as in past as much in the present, etc, having acquired (essene acquistata) great gratitude (gratia) and reputation in the eyes of this court for your Signori and for Monsignor Pierozzi.

Pierozzi's oration succeeded in demonstrating the exceptional joy of the Florentines. According to the letter, Pierozzi's oration was more "pleasing" to his audience than words can express. The pope reciprocated the gift with his kind statements, accepting the city's obedience and praising them above all others. The letter concluded that Pierozzi's cultural gift had heightened the reputation of the city and its speaker.[183]

In 1458, Antonio Pierozzi used the same methods in an oration to congratulate the new humanist pope Pius II, a gesture particularly striking due to the pope's reputation as a first rate humanist author and orator. Once again, Pierozzi's commission instructed him to show the pope the Florentines' collective joy, so great that "…the like of which is not remembered for any news that has ever been announced in this city." Although this election makes all Christians rejoice,

the great devotion and friendship that has always existed between the pope and Florentines means that they are particularly happy. The commission granted Pierozzi unprecedented leeway to demonstrate their unprecedented goodwill towards the pope.

> We would have elaborated the words in more places, demonstrating as much as one ought how to speak, if it were not you, messer Archbishop, speaking about this material before the Holy Pope. For which, as a man most outstanding in every aspect, we give free commission concering the before stated things to say well as it seems to your Reverence, elaborating as much as is fitting for the honor of this Republic and of the Holy Father. At the end, you will say that you have some things to say to his Holiness, which we will defer to another more convenient time.

Perhaps because of the tremendous success of his oration three years previously, this time Pierozzi's commission explicitly gave him the leeway to flesh out his commission as he saw fit.[184]

Antonio Pierozzi used the same combination of religious erudition and humanist eloquence to deliver an exceptional oration on this occasion as he had three years previously. The following quotation demonstrates this technique (left untranslated for stylistic analysis).

> Et certe nullum horum nec animam unam ad portum valuit perducere salutis aeternae, sed post haec inquit Daniel ipse propheta Suscitabit Deus coeli regnum aliud, quod in aeternum non dissipabitur, nec regnum ipsum alteri tradetur, & comminuet omnia regna haec, & ipsum manebit in aeternum.

The passage containing Pierozzi's original language, from "Et" to "propheta", features alliteration ("nullum…nec", "animam…ad", and "portum…perducere") and assonance ("nullum

horum…animam unam". He followed this display of rhetorical prowess with a quotation from the Bible, thus demonstrating his religious learning. In addition to Daniel, cited and uncited references to the Bible fill the oration, such as Pslams, Romans, the Gospels, and others. He added a long discussion of papal power to his biblical citations in another display of more traditional topics presented in humanist rhetoric.[185]

However, he also added standard humanist content to his oration as a concession to the humanist pope. For example, he offered Gregory of Nazianus as proof of the supreme power of priests, introducing this thinker as "an outstanding thinker among the Greek theologians". He urged the pope to take on the Turk. In the process, he compared the pope to illustrious figures in the past, such as Moses and the Emperor Theodosius. According to Pierozzi, these men had defeated enemies more with oratory than with arms. He urged the pope to listen to the council of others, just like Alexander Severus had done. The pope must undertake clerical reform and appoint pious and qualified men to church positions. Pierozzi offered this advice not as "Minerva", but as a "most affectionate son". However, such references fit into the broader context of his more traditional religious learning. For example, the result of the clerical reforms will be that "the skies rejoice and the earth exults it", a quote from the Psalms. In fact, Pierozzi worried that his minor concessions combined with his humanist style and religious learning would not be enough to offer an extraordinary oratorical performance. He stated "Also, let you spare me punishment, Blessed Father, if I spoke too long, or if I was pronouncing things incorrectly, without style and without skill." He hoped that if he had missed something, his colleagues would supply it.[186]

Contemporary sources suggest that Pierozzi's 1458 oration succeeded, but just barely. The diplomatic dispatches from the Florentine diplomats give an interesting description of the occasion.

> And thus, at the established date, we presented ourselves before his Holiness in a public consistory, according to the form and custom. In this setting, Monsignor our Archbishop gave his oration, with such elegance, dignity, and honor for your Signori that it seemed to everyone and to us that the Holy Spirit was in his body. Although doing that which was contrary to the opinion of many, he orated and presented his oration with a full audience of all the cardinals, many bishops, and others for about an hour with a high voice and perfect pronunciation. According to us, he earned the greatest honor for your Signori, for himself, and for all this people in general. No less excellent and beautiful was the response of his Holiness to us. In truth, we do not know how it could have been more pleasing, more worthy (degna) more demonstrative of carrying great love and having singular affection for your Signori and for your city. He spoke with such eloquence and dignity of speech that in truth, we judged that never had been heard in anyone such eloquence and pronunciation of speech.

Pierozzi's fears of failure had been warranted. It seems that some audience members deemed the oration a failure (contrary to the…); however, the letter quickly turned to the diplomats' own opinion. They had deemed it a success (according to us…). They turned to the pope's response for their evidence. The brilliant response of the pope demonstrated that the oration pleased him. The summary of this initial meeting provided in a later letter contains further evidence.

> In our last letter, which was dated the tenth day of this month, we advised your *Signoria* how we had a public audience in the consistory by his Holiness, and the response that he made to us, which could not have been more worthy (degna) and more pleasing. In a way that was displeasing to some present, he praised, exulted, and extolled our city very much.

Once again, the orators focused on the pope's reply as evidence for Pierozzi's success. Had the pope not viewed the oration as a worthy offering, he would not have reciprocated the gesture with such eloquent words of his own. Some in the audience viewed the oration as a failure; thus, they were angered to hear the pope's praiseworthy reply. However, their opinions were less important: whatever the rest of the audience thought, the pope had accepted the cultural gift and reciprocated.[187]

The Cultural Gift as Humanist Overload, 1461-1464

Florence continued to use a churchman, in this case the Archbishop of Pisa Filippo de' Medici, to offer an extraordinary diplomatic gesture on congratulatory missions in 1461 and 1464. Filippo's status as an archbishop enhanced his diplomatic status, just as it had in the case of Antonio Pierozzi. Yet, whereas Pierozzi had relied on his office and saintly reputation to supplement heavily his otherwise low familial prestige, Filippo's family presented no such problems. In fact, Filippo's close relationship with Cosimo and then Piero de' Medici made him an extraordinary diplomat with or without his church office. This key difference is reflected in the two men's respective choices for oratorical content. Pierozzi had used a combination of humanist rhetoric with displays of deep biblical learning to draw attention to his personal holiness. In possession of the familial status that Pierozzi had lacked, Filippo de' Medici

returned to the types of classical displays favored by Giannozzo Manetti. More than any previous or future fifteenth-century Florentine diplomat, in fact, the humanist dilettante Filippo showed off his classical learning with piles of classical quotes.[188]

In 1461, the crowning of a new King in France called for a cultural gift and diplomats with extraordinary social standing. Strained relations between Florence and France further acerbated an already important mission. War between Milan and Naples on one side and the Angevins on the other side filled the late 1450s and early 1460s. The Florentines were traditionally a strong ally of the French and particularly the Angevin House, a relationship that carried the expectation of concrete assistance. Simultaneously, the Peace of Lodi demanded that they support their Neapolitian allies. Facing an impossible dilemma, Florence tried to help no one overtly and the Neapolitians secretly. To display the Florentines' goodwill and to make up for their lackluster support of the French in recent events, the Florentine diplomatic entourage had to offer individuals with extraordinary social standing, connections with France, and an extraordinary oratorical performance. Yet, domestic politics complicated the selection of diplomats that could meet these criteria. The leading opponents of Florence's unofficial rulers, the Medici family, were the Pazzi family. The Pazzi family possessed the strongest ties to the French of any Florentine family. How could the Medici-controlled government send the Pazzi family, as the situation demanded, without strengthening their enemies? With no ready solution, they procrastinated making a decision. Finally, on September 22, 1461, the *Signoria* presented to the Florentine executive council that the Venetians and the Duke of Milan had already sent congratulatory diplomats to the new King of France. The extraordinary "benevolence" between Florence and France combined with the fear that "…they could be seen by others to have sent offense", meant that the Florentines must reach a decision and send congratulatory diplomats.[189]

The Florentines worked out these conundrums through the personnel that they selected and not one, but two cultural gifts. Florence sent several bulwark Medici supporters to solve the domestic issues, particularly Buonaccorso Pitti, Filippo de' Medici, and Donato Acciaiuoli. Buonaccorso Pitti was the son of Luca Pitti, a leading Medici supporter during the 1450s. Like the Pazzi, the Pitti also had old familial ties in France. Filippo de' Medici was a close confidant of both Cosimo and Piero de' Medici, owed his position to Cosimo's efforts, and in the mid 1460s offered troops to Piero de' Medici to help him control the city. Accompanying the diplomats in an ambiguous role was a young Donato Acciaiuoli, who would eventually become a prominent Florentine diplomat under Lorenzo the Magnificent. Donato's offocial role is uncertain, as he was not elected for the mission but was paid for his trouble upon returning to Florence.[190]

The Medici also sought to check the influence of their enemies on the mission. Alongside the Medici supporters, the head of the Pazzi family and thus the leader of the Medici opposition faction in Florence, Piero de' Pazzi, was a prominent member of the entourage. The connections between the House of Anjou and the Pazzi undoubtedly made the presence of Piero necessary. Moreover, his presence stressed the special relationship between Florentine families and the French. The diplomats' commission, in fact, singled out Piero to speak to King Renè of Anjou. Yet, the presence of Piero de' Pazzi presented the Medici with problems. Afterall, the primary antagonism between the Pazzi and the Medici revolved around differences of opinion concerning the French and their role in Florentine foreign politics. To stunt Piero's influence, the Medici-controlled government elected a more loyal Medici supporter, Pandolfo Pandolfini, to go separately to visit Renè of Anjou soon after Piero had departed Florence. In the letter to the Florentine ambassadors declaring Pandolfini's election, it was stated that the Florentines feared

that Piero would be unable to act fast enough in pressing matters concerning Renè. Of course, if Pandolfini should be unable to find King Renè, then Piero's commission to speak with him still stood. However, a note in the margin of the letter indicates that this scenario was not expected to occur. The note stated "Thus (onde) we wish that you, Piero, do not go to the beforestated Renè unless we write stating otherwise." Pandolfini found King Renè in Milan while the Medici enemy, Piero de' Pazzi, was far away in France. Thus, the Florentines and the Medici met the prestige requirements of the congratulatory mission while quelling internal factions, or rather by out maneuvering their enemies.[191]

In addition to the Florence's gesture of the social standing of its diplomats, Filippo de' Medici successfully offered the first of two cultural gifts through a humanist styled oration packed with classical references. Much like Pierozzi's instructions in 1458, the actual means to offer a cultural gift were left to the orator's discretion. Filippo's instructions, in fact, provided him with few guidelines. They told Filippo to stress to the new king the grief felt by the Florentines at the death of the late king and their joy at the accession of the new king. These sentiments are especially strong for them because of the benefits received by Florence from the king's ancestors. The diplomats were to state their "strong hope (ferma speranza)" of the continued strong relationship between Florence and France, a hope based not only the outstanding personal qualities of the king, but also the past goodwill of the French kings towards Florence. Rather than examples to cite, the instructions tell the ambassadors that "...concerning the preceding part, use those words and expressions that seem best and most fitting to you, [we are] entrusting everything to your prudence and discretion."[192]

Whereas Antonio Pierozzi had used such leeway to stress his religious learning, Filippo de' Medici filled in the gaps with references to historical events and people in a humanist

oratorical style. The oration met the basic requirements for a humanist style. In one of many passages in praise of Charlemagne, for example, he stated, "Nam quanta in ipso principe pietas, quanta moderatio, quanta omnium morum et virtutum claritas et lumen effulserit, vestris testimoniis magis quam mea oratione probari potest." This passage presents the now familiar rhetorical aspects of humanist oratory, including anaphora (repeated use of quanta), alliteration (principe pietas and probari potest), assonance ("omnium morum… virtutum") and a flexible word arrangement (for example, couching "in ipso principe" between pietas and its modifier quanta).[193]

The strongest and most innovative aspect of Filippo's oration was his dominant use of history, which Filippo used to frame his oratorical performance into the context of a gift exchange. Filippo's instructions stated that the Florentines felt more grief than others at the previous king's passing because of the "many good deeds and presents (benefici molti e prestanti)" from the French to their city. The commission told Filippo to recall repeatedly the good relations between the two states and the glorious memories of past French Kings. Filippo started his oration, therefore, by stating

> Perpetual memory of kindnesses received and the necessity of old benevolence, most Christian prince, led us, orators of the Florentine people to you lest we seem thankless and equally forgetful of gifts received. For your ancestors exhibited great and memorable kindnesses for our republic, through which we recognize (cognoscamus) that our republic is bound and obligated to their memory and to your majesty as we know that no kind of retribution will equal such great kindnesses.

The orators were present for the sake of reciprocating the gifts that previous French Kings had given to Florence. The Florentine's reciprocation had started with the status of their diplomats. The oration then turned towards reminding the audience of the donative gestures of the French. Filippo cited specific examples of French benevolence towards the Florentines, such as various exploits of Charlemagne, including his refounding of Florence after it had lain empty for 200 years, the honors showered by Florence on Charlemagne's son when he visited their city during his reign, and the aid of Robert King of Sicily.[194]

With the quality of the French gifts laid bare, the Filippo's oration proceeded to offer one aspect of the Republic's reciprocation. After completing a section dedicated to praising various aspects of the deceased king, Filippo transitioned into praise for the new one through a myriad of erudite comparisons. The transition from the diseased King to his son was like that of David to Solomon. After several interjections, undoubtedly meant to echo Cicero's use of the same device, Filippo compared the relative successes and failures of various classical figures with the presumed future glory of the new king. In this final section of the oration, Filippo compared Louis XI favorably to Africanus (the younger), Manlius, Torquatus, Cneo Flaminius, Curtius, Publius Decius, Africanus (the elder), Saul, Calgula, Nero, Naab, Ahab, Julian, David, Vespasiano, Titus, Trajan, and Theodosius, *among others*. Through such comparisons and learned displays, the orator offered the gift of learning and praise to a king whose ancestors had already offered so much to the Florentines.[195]

The Florentines supplemented Filippo's oration with a second cultural gift. In 1443, Leonardo Bruni had blurred the lines between private and public through a dedication of his *On the Gothic Wars* to Alfonso of Aragon. On the 1461 mission, Donato Acciaiuoli made a

similarly ambiguous gesture by presenting a humanist biography of Charlemagne to the new King of France. According to the diary for this mission, three days after Filippo's oration

> ...our ambassadors had a private audience in the room of the king... That day Donato Acciaiuoli, with our ambassadors and me present, presented the *Life of Charlemagne*, which he had composed, to his majesty the King. It was very pleasing to him (the king) and he accepted it with good words (buone parole).

The semi-diplomat Acciaiuoli presented his history in an official setting. However, the private or public nature of the dedication is ambiguous. In addition to the grey area of Acciaiuoli's actual role on this mission, he stated in the preface to the work

> Since orators of all Christians have come publicly on behalf of their governments and also many private men have come in their own name to congratulate you on your accession to the throne, it seemed suitable that I also come to this so excellent celebration on account of the benefits both to my family and to our city by both you and your predecessors and to present a gift to your majesty according to my abilities as a sign of my faith and devotion.

Acciauoli declared that he has both private and public reasons for congratulating the king, but declined to state which of these two reasons actually underlay the dedication. This ambiguity served multiple ends. First, the presence of the Florentine diplomats at the presentation gave it an official quality as a gesture from the Florentine regime. Second, as a semi-official diplomat and confidant of the Medici, the work became a personal gift from the city's unofficial masters. Third, for enemies of the French King in Naples and Milan, the presentation was from a private citizen simply seeking personal gain. Through this ambiguity, the Florentines sent different implicit messages to different parties.[196]

Just as in previous dedications of humanist works, Acciaiuoli's presentation of a humanist work was a gift with two layers. The fine quality of the manuscript made it a material gift. Its contents added a second component. Donato Acciaiuoli wrote his *Live of Charlemagne* in order to reinforce the gift exchange begun with Filippo de' Medici's oration. Acciaiuoli argued that that not only had Charlemagne rebuilt Florence, but that the city owed everything, including its freedom and laws, to Charlemagne. He reiterated his point explicitly, stating that: "…a city (Florence) which in the beginning the Romans founded, then the foundation was overtaken by the rage of the barbarians, [and then] the most famous Emperor of the *Romans* (stress Acciaiuoli's, he is talking about Charlemagne) restored it to such an extent that the fatherland of the Florentines rose up (accederet) as much from the overthrow of grief as from the restoration of happiness." Acciaiuoli's history, thus, again presented the gift offered by the French to the city of Florence. His presentation of these events is all the more striking because he quoted verbatim Leonardo Bruni's *History of the Florentine People* in his biographry. Bruni's history had argued that the myth of the refoundation of Florence by Charlemagne was not accurate. By including returning this story into his own historical work, Acciaiuoli was able to focus on the French gift offered to Florence under Charlemagne. Acciaiuoli's finely decorated manuscript full of costumed words fit into Florence's reciprocation.[197]

Speech instructions for Filippo de' Medici in 1464 provide further evidence that that the Florentine government held the same expectations for extraordinary prestige and eloquence in its chruchmen diplomats as it had for the humanist Giannozzo Manetti. In this year, the Florentine *Signoria* charged Filippo de' Medici with congratulating the new Pope Paul II. Filippo's instructions for his oration were identical, to the word, to those guidelines given to Antonio Pierozzi in his 1458 mission to congratulate Pius II. Far beyond the handful of similar sentences

between speech instructions in previous commissions, the 1458 and 1464 speech guidelines are long (several hundred words) and completely the same. The fact that both Pierozzi and Filippo were archbishops even allowed Benedetto Accolti, the author of both commissions, to maintain the same phrasing for the individualized addresses ending both sets of speech instructions.

> We would have elaborated the words in more places, demonstrating as much as one ought how to speak, if it were not you, messer Archbishop, speaking about this material before the Holy Pope. For which, as a man most outstanding in every aspect, we give free commission concering the before stated things to say well as it seems to your Reverence, elaborating as much as is fitting for the honor of this Republic and of the Holy Father.

Accolti was able to cut and paste these passages from one mission to the next because the ritual and the expectations for it were the same on both missions. This ritual began with the social standing of the Florentine diplomats and ended with the presentation of the cultural gift. The outstanding personnel of both missions, each featuring the city's most powerful citizens from the oldest families, accomplished the former. The latter demanded a humanist style, but beyond these basics, the specifics were left up to the individual orator.[198]

As in 1461, Filippo de' Medici used an ostentatious display of learned citations surrounded by humanist rhetoric to make his 1464 oration extraordinary. In terms of style, one example is "Nos enim et si parva diximus animi tamen tui sapientiam et magnitudinem liberalitatem et clementiam pietatemque non ignoranimus, quibus omnia nobis fausta et felicita future esse non dubitatmus. Nec nos etiam…", which features the rhetorical devices of alliteration (fausta…felicita future), assonance (sapientiam…magnitudinem

liberalitatem…clementiam pietatemque), and prolepsis (nos is outside the si clause into which it grammatically fits). In terms of content, Filippo devoted the first third of his oration to displays of learning. After a short greeting declaring the usual praises for the greatness of the Holy Seat and his fear speaking before it, Filippo offered stories about Demosthenes, Scaevola, and Moses as his proof. Through these particular sources, Filippo established his knowledge of three major areas of study: Ancient Greece, Rome, and the Bible. He referred to a fourth historical period with his next literary reference "…since the words of the Blessed Gregory come to my mind…" The New Testament was Filippo's fifth different kind of source. He wrote that, if the Pope works for the good of God, "…you will receive the reward of eternal happiness not only thirty or sixty, but also 100 times." These numbers are a direct reference to a parable of Christ recorded in Mathew 13 3-8, where Jesus states that a farmer dropped seeds in various places, some of which "…fell on good soil and brought forth grain, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty." Just before the oration's conclusion, Filippo told the story of Matthias and Barabas, which he drew from Acts 1 23-26.[199]

Filippo further enhanced his oration through creative content. He presented two standard metaphors of the the pope as shepherd of the Christian sheep and righter of the Christian ship; yet, he used them in a unique way. Through these metaphors, Filippo crafted the pope into a person who will bring all the Christians together. The topic of Christian unity enabled Filippo to praise the pope's family. Filippo described the efforts of Pope Eugenius IV, a member of Pope Paul's family, to unify the Greek and Latin churches. Beyond praising the pope's ancestors, referring to this event implied the devotion of the Florentines to the papacy and the Barbo family: Eugenius' church council had taken place in Florence while the pope was seeking asylum in the city. Moreover, this reference led up to the pay off of the entire oration. Pope Paul II will

exceed his familial ancestor and perfectly fulfill the mission of the pope as Christian uniter. Whereas the Turks had only trembled at the name of Eugenius, they will flee in terror before the name of the new pope, before their final submission to his will. The Pope will rule the world. A lengthy section of praise for the pope's virtues proves his worth to be a judge over all the world.[200]

1465 and 1477: The Return to the Separation of Words from Diplomats

In addition to churchmen with humanist tongues, Florentine diplomats returned to delivering orations written by learned humanist authors on key diplomatic missions. In August 1465, Jacopo Guicciardini joined Pandolfo Pandolfini as ambassador in Naples for the two-fold purpose of congratulating King Ferrante on the nuptials of his son and on the king's victory over the Angevins the previous month. The Florentine Chancellor Bartolomeo Scala wrote the congratulatory oration for these diplomats. In 1477, Pierfilippo Pandolfini delivered an oration to King Ferdinand of Naples on his second wedding. Although Pandolfini was the Florentine ambassador to this event, Alamanno Rinuccini wrote the oration.[201]

The combination of humanist words and patrician diplomats allowed Florence exceed both the status and the oratorical expectations on two delicate diplomatic missions. The Pandolfini family was a favorite of King Ferrante in Naples. King Alfonso had knighted the Florentine diplomat Giannozzo Pandolfini in 1450. Giannozzo's son, Pandolfo, became so popular with Alfonso's successor Ferrante that the King served as Godfather to his son. After Pandolfo died in Naples, King Ferrante offered several services to Pandolfo's widow, which, according to Vespasiano da' Bisticci, showed that the King was "…a benefactor after death as well as in life, and that the love and respect he had for Pandolfo was real and not simulated."

This goodwill undoubtedly extended to Giannozzo's other son and Pandolfo's brother, Pierfilippo Pandolfini. Like the orators bearing Bruni's words decades before, both Pandolfo and Pierfilippo Pandolfini were humanist dilettantes with patrician status; yet, the diplomatic situation thrust upon them called for more than a smattering of humanist rhetoric. Like Bruni before them, the Pandolfini brothers each brought orations written by humanist authors, the men in Florence possessing the greatest reputations for eloquence and thus the greatest possible chance of offering a successful cultural gift.[202]

The complicated politics underlying the 1465 mission demanded an extraordinary gesture from the Florentines. In August of that year, Jacopo Guicciardini joined Pandolfo Pandolfini as ambassador in Naples to congratulate King Ferrante on his victory over the Angevins, for the wedding of his son, and for the implied goal of keeping Ferrante in the Italian League. In addition to Florence's treatment of Lorenzo Strozzi and its neglect of the city's treaty obligations, the condottiere Jacopo Piccinino had recently died in Naples under suspicious circumstances. His death made the Florentines uneasy: the victory of Naples over the Angevins promised peace for the Italian peninsula; yet, Piccinino's death threatened this hope. The problem was that King Ferrante was suspected of having Piccinino killed. Piccinino was an in-law of the Sforza in Milan. Piccinino's murder thus put on hold the marriage alliance between Naples and Milan, an alliance that held the promise for lasting peace in Italy. The Florentine diplomats Jacopo and Pandolfo, therefore, had to congratulate an ally, to whom they had failed to offer the full level of obligatory aid, over an enemy, to whom they were known to have connections, *and* to convince the king to stay allied with an angry Duke of Milan.[203]

Either Jacopo Guicciardini or Pandolo Pandolfini delivered the words of Bartolomeo Scala, who sought to offer an extrarordinary oratorical performance by reviving several

techniques that Giannozzo Manetti had used. The body of the oration presented an argument concerning the concepts of "utilitas' and "honestas". Just as in the oratory of Giannozzo Manetti, this discussion enabled the orator to both display his knowledge of classical rhetoric and to begin the pressing political matters underlying the mission. However, Scala added a unique twist to these terms. Whereas Manetti had followed Cicero's *De inventione* for his use of these terms, Scala framed his use of them into an argument *against* Cicero. Scala's oration argued that the desire for "utilitas" and "honestas" rules the behavior of people. Some have argued that the two concepts are one and the same (an uncited reference to Cicero), but Scala's vicarious voice follows the opinion of the masses in seeing them as different things. While people pursue different ends and different times, there is no doubt that people prefer those ends that combine both "honestas" and "utilitas". At this point, Scala's argument is actually in agreement with Cicero's presentation in the *De inventione.* However, the compatibility between Scala's argument and Cicero's was irrelevant: Scala has *presented* his argument as opposing a classical authority. This move enabled him to include a simple abstract argument in his oration. This display of learning was another trick in the endless bag from which Florentine orators drew to make their respective orations more outstanding than their predecessors had done.[204]

The remainder of Scala's oration turned towards using his knowledge of classical rhetoric to include the political particulars of the mission in his oration. In particular, three consecutive paragraphs link the ideas of "honestas" and "utilitatas" to Florentine and Neapolitian diplomatic relations. The first paragraph bluntly stated that nothing is more useful and honest than peace. The second paragraph is more subtle. Scala offered the Florentines' adherence to the league with the King as proof of their desire for peace. He argued that the Florentines have a long history of assisting the Angevins. Yet, "…nothing ever was or is an older principle for the Florentine

people than the inviolable observance of trust and treaties." Therefore, although it was probably advantagous for the Florentines to back the Angevins (seeing that Ferrante was facing a most strong "validissimus" enemy and that enemy had a history of enjoying Florentine support), "honestas" had driven the Florentines to maintain their agreements. Implicitly, the Florentines hope that the king will do the same thing and seek "honestas". The third paragraph turned toward proving that good relations between Naples and Florence also served the end of "utilitas". The alliance between the Florentines and the King keeps potentially expansionist rulers in their place. A parable proves this point, "No alliance is sacred, no kingdom trustwory. All wish by nature to rule everything." The alliance with the Florentiens adds to the "durability, and stability of his (the king's) kingdoms". The Florentines directly control Tuscany and indirectly control their neighbors through fear. They desire nothing more than peace and quiet. Thus, peace with the Florentines will be advantageous to the king.[205]

A marriage in Naples in 1477 once again called for extraordinary orators with extraordinary words. In this year, Florence sent diplomats to congratulate King Ferrante on his second wedding. The political situation between Florence and Naples accentuated this necessity. In late 1474, the Florentines, Venice, and Milan and extended the Italian League amongst themselves, leaving out the papacy and King Ferrante. King Ferrante's son, Alfonso, and his diplomat had requested that the Florentines and Milan join a league with him instead, and break off from Venice. The Florentines had stated and instructed their diplomats to say again that such an alliance shift would not appeal to Milan. The importance of the Milanese alliance to Florence makes these remarks believable. Florence's diplomats had to offer an outstanding performance in order to congratulate the king on his wedding while putting off his league overtures without invoking the his anger.[206]

Florence's diplomatic personnel combined with an oration by Alammano Rinuccini was perfectly suited for meeting the difficult requirements of this mission. Bongianni Gianfigliazzi combined his noble family background with his membership in Lorenzo de' Medici's inner ruling circle. Alongside Bongianni, the Florentines sent another key Medicean, the rookie diplomat Pierfilippo Pandolfini. Pandolfini more than made up for his lack of diplomatic experience (this was his second mission) through the incredible ties between King Ferrante and his family. In order to make sure that his opening oration was a success, the novice Pandolfini asked Alamanno Rinuccini to write the oration for him. Rinuccini himself possessed an old family and outstanding learning, but he had recently lost Lorenzo's favor. This loss of trust excluded him from Florentine diplomatic positions after 1476.[207]

The oration itself reveals the perceived importance of offering a cultural gift on this mission. Pandolfini stated that "...when the most famous and decorated knight, my colleague, whose orders I neither wish nor can honestly reject, imposed this necessity of speaking to me…" Gianfigliazzi had judged the importance of the opening oration as so great that he gave the task to his colleague Pandolfini, who was much more versed in humanism. Moreover, the relationship of the Pandolfini with the king made the vessel pouring the oration more likely to be pleasing to the king. Whether prompted or under his own volition, Pandolifini had judged the occasion significant enough to ask his humanist friend, Alamanno Rinuccini to author the words. Armed with exceptional social status, connections, and the words of a humanist author, the diplomats sought to exceed the king's expectations for the Florentines diplomatic representation.[208]

Once again, the technique used in the diplomatic oration differed from previous orations even as the expectations for a humanist performance remained the same. Rinuccini's oration for

Pierfilippo combined several different techniques to create a unique oration. For example, the oration contains some ostentatious elements of a classical structure, a few classical citations and allusions, and extraordinary attention to word placement aimed at maximum aural effect. Yet, Rinuccini's vocabulary is the most striking aspect of his oration. Rather than referring to the Florentine government as "*Signoria",* this oration chooses the classical term "praeses" (governors) on three separate occasions: "...we will try to tell certain brief mandates in the name of the Florentine governors (praesidum), by whom we have been sent…"; "First, therefore, in the name of the Florentine governors (praesidum) and of all the city's people"; and at the end of the oration "There are some other things, most serene king, which our governors (presides) mandated to tell your majesty separately…" By using a classical term to refer to the Florentine *Signoria*, the orators flaunted their understanding of classical Latin. The speech concluded by tying the diplomats' status and their performance explicitly into the gift offerings marking their entrance. They stated "Moreover, in order that we testify to the benevolence and devotion of the Florentine people towards your regal majesty on this nuptial celebration not only by our presence and our oration, we offer a certain small gift to the new queen, as we think will not be scorned." In addition to their status and cultural gift, the orators brought something tangible.[209]

Both the Florentine orators and the King himself attest to the success of the orators' gift offerings. The Florentine *Signoria* summarized the diplomats' own description of their initial meeting. The letter stated "…the majesty of the king, of the honor made for you in your entrance, as you wrote on the thirtieth, and of the pleasing audience and of the demonstrations of affection made to you". The King himself wrote to Florence

> We saw and received gladly the legates that you sent to honor our wedding. Indeed, their arrival in the winding down (peragendis) nuptials was most joyful,

> and the gift that they gave to us in your name was most boundlessly pleasing. We receive it, done with a most kind mind (equissimo animo) as if from you, whom we know are most affectionate to us. Therefore, we give thanks to you for the orators sent, for the gift, and for the outwards signs of your so great affection and benevolence towards us. We, remembering them in the future, promise to return the favor when future custom demands.

The King thanked the Florentines for all three gifts. He thanked them for the material gift (the gift, "munus"); the status of the ambassadors (those ambassadors sent, "ipsis oratoribus missis") and for the cultural gift, the oration (the outward singes of your so great affection and benevolence, "tantae vosti in nos amoris et benivolencie significationes"). He even promised to reciprocate these gestures at a future time.[210]

The Triumph of the Humanists

The use of high-ranking churchmen delivering humanist orations and humanist dilettantes speaking the words of humanist authors reflects the crucial importance of diplomats possessing both outstanding status and humanist words in diplomacy. Antonio Pierozzi, Filippo de' Medici, and the vicarious orations of Scala and Rinuccini all occurred at periods when Florence lacked an individual who could lay claim to Manetti's legacy of extraordinary family status and humanist learning in diplomacy. In the 1470s, two shortlived successors to Manetti presented themselves, Alamanno Rinuccini and Donato Acciaiuoli. Alamanno Rinuccini's family had a long history in Florence dating back to the early fourteenth century. He combined this familial ancestry with a position as one of Florence's top humanist authors. Subsequently, Rinuccini served as Florentine diplomat to the Pope in 1475-1476. However, Rinuccini's potential as a

Florentine diplomat was cut short by disagreements between him and Lorenzo de' Medici. These disagreements stemmed, in part, from Rinuccini's diplomatic mission. In particular, Rinuccini's letters to the Florentine *Signoria* met with Lorenzo's disapproval. Rinuccini would never serve as a Florentine diplomat again, even as the desire to use his ability with words continued, as shown through his ghost writing an oration for Pierfilippo Pandoflini in 1477.[211]

Another diplomat that combined an ancestral and literary reputation was Donato Acciaiuoli. Acciaiuoli was much more successful than Rinuccini at using his learning and political aspirations towards the benefit of Florence. Acciaiuoli came from an impeccable Florentine lineage, albeit one with anti-Medician ties. Between the early 1460s and his death while traveling as a diplomat to France in 1478, Acciauoli was ubiquitous in Florentine internal and external positions. He was the author and translator of several works, including his *Life of Charlemagne* and his translations of Plutarch from Greek and Bruni's *History of the Florentine People* from Latin into Italian. He was the leader of a group of humanists that held up Giannozzo Manetti's combination of rhetorical and metaphysical learning with an active citizen life as an ideal. Moreover, unlike Alamanno Rinuccini, Acciaiuoli he was trusted associate of the Medici [212]

In 1471, Acciaiuoli's combination of familial antiquity, Medici loyalty, and an extraordinary humanist reputation secured him a position on Florence's congratulatory mission to the new pope, Sixtus IV. Beyond offering the pope congratulations, Margery Ganz has argued that this particular obedience mission had enormous significance for the Medici family. Ganz argued that good relations with the new pope could mean huge profits for the city's bankers. The Florentine gesture of exceptional prestige in the city's diplomatic entourage and in their oratorical performance began the Medici's quest for increased coffers. The Florentine

diplomatic entourage featured the city's best citizens, including Lorenzo de' Medici himself. In addition to their status, Donato Acciaiuoli set out to offer the pope a cultural gift. The fact that Acciaiuoli's friends asked Piero Parente to translate the oration into Italian suggests that the Florentines viewed it as a successful offering. A contemporary description quoted by Emilio Santini stated that "he gave the best oration that now exists"[213]

Acciaiuoli framed his oration into the context of a gift offering. The oration began by presenting the pope as a "present (donum)" and "gift (munus)" that God had given to the world. Acciaiuli described the incredible joy of the Florentines towards this unprecedented gift. He implied the quality of the gift through his list of the many praiseworthy qualities of the pope. He stated that "…since immortal God who has ornamented you with such talents (virtutibus), great thanks must be held by you and no less must be offered by us, for whom He brought forth into the light and gave so distinguished (ornatum) a shepherd for men." Acciaiuoli feared that his oration would not be enough to reach the level of gift required for such a divine offering. He wrote

> But since now it is the old custom of almost all orators who in their first audience approach this most holy seat to give an oration full of congratulations and joy, I fear that you think that I speak in this standard style (communi consuetudine) on behalf of the Florentine people. I speak not in this standard style, not a sermon, not in the habit usually seized upon by all, but in devotion, observance, affection for the apostolic seat, which is above all innate for us, then confirmed by the many services for the church of our republic and its many duties for us, which make it so that we rejoice in all prosperity for the church and grief for its calamities as if they were our own.

Rather than the oratorical custom, Acciaiuoli hoped that the pope would recognize that his oration offered something new. Through innovation, he sought to offer the pope an oration that surpassed the typical oratorical performance.[214]

Donato Acciaiuoli relied on style alone to make his oration extraordinary. Namely, he presented the standard content of his predecessors with different costumed words. For example, Acciaiuoli gave the typical list of papal virtues and history of Florentine devotion towards the papal seat. Yet, his presentation of these topics is more moving than his predecessors, which he accomplishes through his evocation of imagery. Rather than providing classical or religious examples to flatter the pope's intellect, Acciaiuoli gives concrete form to these virtues. He "sees' their combined product in the pope. He wrote

> I omit knowledge of sacred letters, because all talents (virtutes) adorn you just like a most precious robe (pretiosissima vestis). Although what can be omitted or passed over concerning the knowledge of such a man? For I see when I look at your face (te praesentem), Holy Father, the glory (decus) of Italy. I see the ornament of the Roman curia. I see the light of the Christian republic. I see a most wise man and the great theologian, by whose teaching many leaders in theology, most serious authors and masters, spill out as if from a Trojan Horse.

Later in the oration, he produced the same effect in his description of Florentine devotion to papal causes. Acciaiuoli lists the regular subjects, Manfred et al. as examples of the historical ties between Florence and the pope. Yet, he also highlighted the potential consequences of their loyalty. In one such example, he wrote "The Florentine community (civitas) did these things and neither fear of arms, nor the magnitude of the immense danger, nor weaknesses of its allies (multarum urbium) drew it away from the observance of the true Roman seat and pope." This

use of imagery, combined with his proficient use of assonance, alliteration, etc, to create an outstanding oratorical performance.[215]

Alongside Acciaiuoli's combination of learning and family, for the first time a humanist with far less ancestry was enjoying a successful diplomatic career. Matteo Palmieri was a frequent diplomat in the 1450s and 1460s; however, unlike Giannozzo Manetti, Alamanno Rinuccini, and Donato Acciaiuoli, Matto came from a modest Florentine ancestry. Palmieri family first joined the priorate in the early fifteenth century. Moreover, he possessed a reputation among his peers for possessing little background. Vespasiano da' Bisticci stated that he was "…born of relatives of moderate (mediocre) condition, called the founder of his house, and earned nobility (nobilitolla) through his singular talents (virtù)." Alamanno Rinuccini concurred with these statements, saying in his funerary oration on Palmieri that he was "born of honest (honesties) relatives, of course he possessed his original origins in certain German princes…" Whoever these princes were, Matteo Palmieri had risen from humble beginnings in the eyes of his Florentine contemporaries.[216]

In spite of this reputation, the Florentine government sent Palmieri on several diplomatic missions. It seems that he was valued for his abilities in political matters, especially regarding the church, and his loyalty to the Medici regime. His missions to Milan and his position as *accopiatore,* an office that was essential to the Medici control of Florence*,* demonstrate his perceived loyalty to the Medici. Nearly half of his diplomatic commissions were to the pope for political negotiations rather than missions stressing a ceremonial component. A diplomatic election on September 30, 1466 demonstrates Palmieri's strenghths as an ambassador. On this day, Florence sent diplomats to Bologna, Ferrara, the Pope and Naples, and Venice and Milan, to reassure the major powers of Italy as to the security of the regime following the attempted coup

in 1466. Palmieri was selected to go on the mission to Bologna, indicating the esteem in which Piero de' Medici held him. The fact that Palmieri was involved in one of these missions at all suggests that he was a core Florentine diplomat. However, Bologna was undoubtedly the least prestigious of the missions, a fact that indicates Palmieri's low status among this core. Moreover, Palmieri was passed over repeatedly for high level ceremonial missions, such as the missions to great the emperor in 1452 and 1468, the obedience missions of 1455, 1458, and 1464, and the French congratulatory mission of 1461. Palmieri had overcome his modest background and broke into the Florentine diplomatic core. However, his success was incomplete. This humanist from a new family remained on the outside looking in on the missions that featured the strongest humanist component: the ceremonial missions necessitating a cultural gift.[217]

In 1484, the congratulatory mission to Pope Innocent VIII required diplomats of extraordinary status and an outstanding oratorical performance. To meet this first requirement, the mission featured several key Mediceans such as Antonio Canigiani, Giovanni Tornabuoni, and Guidantiono Vespucci. Two other men with Medici ties were featured, Agnolo Niccolini and and the archbishop Francesco Soderini. Yet, alongside these prestigious knights, lawyers, and members of ancient Florentine families, the Florentine government charged the humanist parvenu Bartolomeo Scala to deliver the opening oration. Scala's presence and his oratorical role is even more compelling because Francesco Soderini, a churchman with a successful oration to a pope on a diplomatic mission already under his belt, was also part of the diplomatic entourage. Scala's inclusion marked the final step of the integration of humanism into diplomacy, for on this mission Florence finally looked past the social history of a humanist parvenu and sent him as part of a mission to congratulate the new pope Innocent VIII.[218]

Scala described his background to Angelo Poliziano in 1494. He wrote, "I came to the republic naked, disadvantaged, of the lowest parentage, full of confidence but absolutely penniless, without reputation, patrons or kinsmen." a statement which Alison Brown's biography affirms. In the latter 1450s, he began working in the service of the Medici family, first Pierfrancesco and then as the Medici's handpicked chancellor of Florence in 1465. By the 1480s, Scala was enjoying prominent political positions inside Florence in addition to serving as chancellor. He was a key representative of Lorenzo de' Medici in negotiating foreign affairs. In terms of his literary career, Scala wrote numerous works treatises, poems, orations, and the beginning of a *History of Florence.* Humanist authors, dilettantes, and even the broader Florentine population knew and appreciated his literary and rhetorical abilities. Moreover, Scala possessed legal training, an attribute that enabled a few individuals with little familial history to become prominent diplomats, such as Bernardo Buongirolamo. Scala's relationship with the Medici combined with his rhetorical abilities and legal training to make up for his familial background in 1484.[219]

Although Scala's legal training and relationship with the Medici helped Scala's status, his humanist abilities were the primary reason for his selection. In fact, the Florentine *Signoria* elected Scala exclusively to deliver the congratulatory oration. Scala arrived in Rome on December 7. On week later on December 15, he gave his speech. He was granted rewards for his oration on December 25 and 28. He had already planned his route back to Florence on December 31. He arrived in Florence on January 12. Scala, in short, went to Rome, gave his oration, and returned home. The Florentine government had elected individuals for a similarly limited diplomatic role on obedience missions in previous decades. Both Antonio Pierozzi and Donato Acciaiuoli had also been elected for obedience missions, delivered their orations, and

returned shortly thereafter. Like Pierozzi and Acciaiuoli, Scala was elected exclusively to give an opening oration. Like his predecessors, Scala was expected to offer extraordinary status and learning in his oratorical performance. Unlike the churchman Pierozzi and the member of the ancient Acciaiuoli house, Scala's literary reputation enhanced his status. This key difference suggests a rise in prestige attached to humanist learning in diplomacy by the 1480s.[220]

Scala offered the pope an exceptional oratorical performance through his oratorical structure and content. He returned to the ostentatious use of a classical oratorical framework that Manetti had preferred. Like Manetti, Scala's oration contained a clear partition followed by an obvious demarcation of each oratorical section. Moreover, Scala devoted a great deal of attention to the stylistic organization of his material. For example, note the beginning consonants of the words in the following phrase: "…fidemque faciat venturae vitae qui non quae nobis… " (f, f, v, v, q, n, q, n). Scala repeatedly used rhetorical questions to stress his praise of the papacy, a technique that he employed more than his predecessors had. These types of stylistic and structural moves placed his oration well into the realm of an acceptable oratorical performance.[221]

Scala added creative content to his speech in order to surpass the orations of his predecessors. In particular, he used the focus of his praise to turn the pope into a man comparable in his virtues to Christ himself. The pope has power over the salvation and damnation of souls. Scala stated that "Who has learned to open the gates of heaven for us, to close them, to damn and to give salvation for men? The Highest Pope." According to Scala, God takes direct action in the selection of the pope in order to avoid filling such a powerful position with wicked men. The qualities that God looks for in this position are the same as the virtues that Christ possessed. As Christ said, "I gave my example to you, as I have done, you

ought to do." God picks popes that possess spiritual and intellectual talents in order to meet the pope's obligations as shepherd for the Christian flock. Scala subsequently lists a variety of virtues that the pope ought to share with Jesus Christ. He concludes this list with passages that connect further the power and virtues of Christ with the pope. Christ and the Pope share the same task. Christ had stated that he was "pastor bonus (good shepherd)". He then told Peter, the founder of the papal seat, to take care of his flock. The new pope has selected the name "Innocent", just like the "innocent Lamb Christ is often called in holy writings. (agnus innocens Christus in sacris saepe litteris appellatur.)" In possession of Christ-like virtues and handpicked by God, the new pope must emulate the virtuous actions of his predecessors and work for peace.[222]

The humanist parvenu's oration was a stunning success. On Christmas day, the pope dubbed Scala a knight and a senator of Rome as reciprocation for Scala's cultural gift. Three days later, Innocent VIII granted Scala patronage of a church in his hometown of Val d'Elsa. One of Scala's assistants in the chancery copied the oration in the same book used to record instructions to diplomats. This inclusion gave the oration an official quality. Just as members of the Florentine government could look back to books of ceremony and various examples of diplomatic dispatches for models to follow, future diplomats could look at Scala's 1484 oration as an extraordinarily successful example of a diplomatic oration. The title of the oration reads "Oratio Bartholomei Scalae Florentini Oratoris ad summum Pontificem Innocentium octavum (Oration of Bartolomeo Scala, Florentine Orator, to the Highest Pope Innocent VIII)." For the first time in Florentine diplomacy, "the social position of the speaker was a matter of perfect indifference; what was desired was simply the most cultivated humanistic talent." The son of a miller had surpassed the status requirements of a diplomatic reception ritual through his literary

reputation. He had subsequently used his stunning rhetorical abilities to offer the pope a cultural gift.[223]

CONCLUSION

This project has argued that displays of humanist learning in diplomacy served to demonstrate the extraordinary good will of the Florentines towards a host ruler. I have called this act of surpassing previous oratorical gestures a "cultural gift". Although the singular goal of humanism in diplomacy remained offering a cultural gift at the end of a diplomatic reception ritual, the techniques that diplomats used to offer these cultural gifts changed over time and from person to person. At the beginning of the quattrocento, basic displays of humanist rhetoric by humanist dilettantes were more than the usual oratorical display. As humanist performances became increasingly common, humanist authors increasingly lent their pens and voices to ensure successful diplomatic orations. At first, the low familial status of most of these figures prevented their direct involvement, forcing figures like Bruni to write orations for other diplomats. Over time, the challenges of continually offering extraordinary oratorical performances led to the involvement of figures who lacked prominent familial histories but possessed extraordinary literary reputations. By the 1480s, the literary reputation of a humanist parvenu enabled him to overcome his short familial ancestry.

The rise in the status of intellectuals had reached its conclusion; yet, many questions, remain to be answered. For example, how widespread was the use of parvenu humanist authors in Florentine diplomacy after Bartolomeo Scala? Prelminary results suggest that the Florentines remained wary of using such men in diplomacy even after Scala's spectacular success. Florence continued to send prominent churchmen on key missions. Francesco Soderini was a Florentine diplomat several times. Angelo Poliziano wrote the oration for Florentine diplomats sent to congratulate the new King of Naples, Alfonso, in 1496, although he does not seem to have accompanied them. The Bishop of Arezzo, Gentile Becchi was another prominent churchman on

missions that required an extraordinary status gesture from Florence. Several accounts exist that attest to his success at offering cultural gifts to Kings and Popes. In fact, Becchi's invincible combination of church office and outstanding literary reputation would have been more appealing than a humanist parvenu and, thus, Becchi may have effectively closed the door to diplomatic opportunities for his less prestigious peers in the 1480s and 90s. The overthrow of the Medici in 1494 removed the prince from Florence. Without him, the social connections that had helped Scala's status were no longer a key trait in a diplomat. Without the inclusion of these criteria, parvenus were less able to compete with their patrician peers. The rise in status of the humanist parvenus had arrived too late for them to make much use of it.[224]

What was the fate of the cultural gift in the 1490s and the sixteenth century? Preliminary results point to the continued prominence of cultural gifts into the 1500s. Diplomatic orations continue to survive from these years. Silvio Bedini's study of a Portugese obedience mission to Leo X suggests the continuation of the importance of gifts on such settings. The fact that cultural gifts in diplomacy survived at least into the sixteenth century is especially striking due to the increasingly omnipresence of the resident diplomat. Until the 1460s and 70s, temporary ambassadors dominated Italian and European diplomacy. Under this system of ad hoc diplomatic representation, Florence constantly sent a myriad of different diplomats on different missions to the same powers over a short period. Each of these temporary diplomats had to go through the same diplomatic reception rituals, the core components of which were the status of the diplomats sent and their delivery of a cultural gift.[225]

However, a system of resident ambassadors meant that fewer such rituals actually occurred. Replacing one resident ambassador with another simply changed the face of Florence's representative. These events required much simpler ritualized actions, such as simply

presenting the host ruler with a revised letter of credence. For example, in 1488 Pierfilippo Pandolfini went to Milan to replace the Florentine ambassador Piero Alammani. In contrast to the prolix speech instructions given to temporary ambassadors, Pierfililippo's commission is concise. It instructed that he approach the Duke with Florence's old ambassador, Piero Alamanni, "and you will say that you have been mandated by us, seeming to us that it was necessary to make this demonstration on the transition to our new ambassador (al ponte di nuove imabasiadore) to his excellent Signor and for no other reason..." followed by a brief description of the political particulars of Pandolfini's mission. Gone are the instructions about greetings and the type of words to use. Instead, the new diplomat appears with the old diplomat as a symbolic transfer of power from one representative to another. In this web of permanent diplomatic representation, it would seem that humanist orations became increasingly limited to missions explicitly for congratulations. Yet, such missions continued and, judging by the survival of sixteenth century diplomatic orations and anecdotal descriptions of oratorical performances, the cultural gift remained a component of Renaissance diplomacy in the 1490s and beyond. Moreover, the practice seems to have spread across geographic divides. The first chapter quoted an anecdote about an oratorical performance before Charles V. A Hungarian manuscript records an oration delivered by a Neapolitan diplomat in the court of King Matthas in Hungary. Regardless of changes in diplomatic representation, the cultural gift, it seems, continued to spread even as the actual frequency of such donative presentations undoubtedly declined.[226]

Third, what was the unofficial role of humanism in diplomatic missions? Future research will reveal more humanist dedications that served both a private and public purpose, like those of Bruni and Acciaiuoli discussed in Chapters Two and Four, respectively. Shared humanist interests enabled some diplomats to gain extra access to host rulers. For example, Giannozzo

Manetti was a frequent participant in learned discussions at the court of Naples while he was present in that city as a Florentine diplomat. Diplomats may also have used the guise of humanist discussions as a façade behind which diplomats and Florentine enemies or individuals with conflicting political views could meet. Giannozzo Manetti again provides an outstanding example, as the diary of his 1448 mission to Venice records his meetings with Palla di Nofri Strozzi, a political exile. Diplomats also undoubtedly used the cultural gift towards their own personal ends. The evidence provided in this essay of favorable receptions of cultural gifts usually refers not only to the great honor the gift has done for Florence, but also for the orator personally. Outstanding oratorical performances could lead to concrete personal rewards, such as in the example of Bartolomeo Scala in 1484. Giannozzo Manetti cultivated connections between rulers through his orations, literary dedications, and participations in learned discussions to help fend off the ruinous intentions of his enemies in Florence.[227]

This study and these suggested future inquires fit under the research umbrella of the functional place of humanism in Renaissance society. In diplomacy, the form, content, author, and mouth delivering humanist words combined to fit into a very particular role in a diplomatic reception ritual. Approaching humanist diplomatic orations from these various angles has suggested the importance of the humanist dilettantes in the humanist movement and the concept of the cultural gift. Yet, many other political situations featured a humanist element. The Florentine government charged Leonardo Bruni with delivering a plain Italian oration to commemorate the peace between Florence, Venice and Milan in 1428. The symbolic transfer of command of the Florentine armies often called for a humanist oration. At least two such orations survive beyond that delivered by Giannozzo Manetti. Did humanism earn a place in other types of public rituals? Did humanist dilettantes and authors seek to include their learning in more

private ones? What roles outside of ritualized settings did humanist content, forms, dilettantes, and authors play? By combining the tools of social, political, and intellectual history, scholars can begin to form arguments about these questions. Only through such integrative studies can historians look beyond the ideals presented by humanist authors and glimpse the frameworks that shaped the creation, form, and content of Renaissance cultural production.[228]

Archival Abbreviations

ASF Acquisti: Acquisti e doni, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Car.Cor.: Carte di Corredo, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Car.Stroz.: Carte Strozziane, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Con.Prat.: Consulte e pratiche, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Dieci Leg: Dieci di Balià. Legazione e Commissarie, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Dieci Miss.: Dieci di Balià. Missive, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Dieci Relaz.: Dieci di Balià. Relazioni di ambasciadori, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Otto.Leg.: Otto di Pratica, Legazione e Commissarie, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Sig.Leg: Signoria. Legazione e Commissarie, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Sig.Minutari: Signoria. Minutari, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Sig.Miss.I: Signoria, Missive I Cancelleria, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Sig.Rap: Signoria, Rapporti e Relazioni di Oratori fiorentini, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp: Signoria, Dieci di Balià, Otto di Pratica. Legazione e commissarie, Missive, Responsive, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASF Misc.Rep: Miscellanea Repubblicana, Archivio di Stato, Florence
BML Plut.: Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plutei, Florence
BML Redi: Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Redi, Florence
BNC Magl: Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliabechiana, Florence
BNC Pac.: Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Paciatichiano, Florence
M.A.P.: Medici avanti il Principato, Archivio di Stato, Florence
ASV Sen.Sec.: Senati Secreti, Archivio di Stato, Venice
Vat. Lat.: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Latina
B.U.Padova: Biblioteca Universitaria Padova

Bibliography

Aguzzi-Barbagli, Danilo. 1965. Dante e la Poetica di Coluccio Salutati. *Italica* 42, no. 1: 108-31.

Aiazzi, Giuseppe, ed. 1840. *Ricordi storici di Filippo di Cino Rinuccini dal 1282 al 1460 colla continuazione di Alamanno e Neri, suoi figli, fino al 1506, seguiti da altri monumenti inediti di storia patria estratti dai codici originali e preceduti dalla storia genealogica della loro famiglia e della descrizione della cappella gentilizia di S. Croce, con documenti ed illustrazioni*. Florence: Stamperia Piatti.

Antonino. 1586. *Chronicorum*. 3 vols. Vol. 3.

Antonovics, A.V. 1976. The Library of Cardinal Domenico Capranica. In *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, ed. Cecil H. Clough, 141-59. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Archivio di Stato di Firenze. 1987. *Carteggi delle Magistrature dell'età repubblicana : Otto di Pratica*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki.

Armstrong, Lawrin. 2003. *Usury and Public Debt in Early Renaissance Florence: Lorenzo Ridolfi on the MonteCcomune*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

Arrighi, Vanna, and Francesca Klein. 2003. Da *Mercante avventuriero* a *Confidente dello stato:* Profilo di Bongianni Gianfigliazzi attroverso la sue *Ricordanze*. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 161, no. 1: 53-79.

Balbi, Giovanni Petti. 2004. Un Uomo delle istituzioni: Gottardo Stella di Sarzana, Cancelliere e Diplomatico genovese del '400. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 167, no. 2: 259-89.

Baldassarri, Stefano Ugo, and Arielle Saiber. 2000. *Images of Quattrocento Florence : Selected Writings in Literature, History and Art*. Italian Literature and Thought Series. New Haven [Conn.]: Yale University Press.

Barbaro, Ermolao, Vittore Branca, and Ermolao Barbaro. 1969. *De Coelibatu, de Officio Legati*. Nuova Collezione di Testi umanistici inediti o rari, 14. Firenze,: L. S. Olschki.

Baron, Hans. 1955. *Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice at the Beginning of the Quattrocento; Studies in Criticism and Chronology*. Cambridge,: Harvard University Press.

———. 1966. *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance; Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. Rev. 1 vol. with an epilogue. ed. Princeton, N.J.,: Princeton University Press.

———. 1967. "Professional Rhetorician" or "Civic humanist"? *Past and Present* 36: 21-37.

———. 1968. *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1968.

Barzizza, Gasparino. 1723. *Opera*. Ed. Joseph Alexander Furiettus. Rome: J.M Salvioni.

Baxandall, Michael. 1971. *Giotto and the Orators: Humanist Observers of Painting in Italy and the Discovery of Pictorial Composition, 1350-1450*. Oxford-Warburg Studies. Oxford,: Clarendon Press.

Baxendale, Susannah Foster. 1991. Exile in Practice: The Alberti Family in and out of Florence 1401-1428. *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 4: 720-56.

Bayley, C.C. 1961. *War and Society in Renaissance Florence: The* de militia *of Leonardo Bruni*. ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bec, Christian. 1967. *Les Marchands Ècrivains Affaires et Humanisme à Florence 1375-1434*. Paris: Mouton & Co.

———. 1981. *Cultura e Società a Firenze nell'Età della Rinascenza*. Rome: Salerno Editrice.

———. 1984. *Les Livres des Florentins (1413-1608)*. Biblioteca di "Lettere italiane" ; 29. Firenze: L.S. Olschki.

Bedini, Silvio A. 1997. *The Pope's Elephant*. New York: Penguin.

Bentley, Jerry H. 1987. *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bessi, Rossella. 1990. Un Traduttore al Lavoro: Donato acciaiuoli e l'Elaborazione del Volgarizzamento delle <<historiae>>. In *Leonardo Bruni Cancelliere della Repubblica di Firenze*, ed. Paolo Viti, 321-38. Florence: Leo s. Olschki.

Bianca, Concetta. 1990. Le Orazioni di Leonardo Bruni. In *Leonardo Bruni Cancelliere della Repubblica di Firenze*, ed. Paolo Viti, 227-45. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

Bigazzi, P. 1843. Vita di Bartolommeo Valori (il vecchio). *Archivio Storico Italiano* 4: 235-83.

Bisticci, Vespasiano da. 1963. *Renaissance Princes, Popes, and Prelates*. Translated by William George and Emily Waters. New York, Evanston, London: Harper & Row.

———. 1976. *Le Vite*. Ed. Aulo Greco. 2 vols. Firenze: Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento.

Bizzocchi, Roberto. 1987. *Chiesa e Potere nella Toscana del Quattrocento*. Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico. Bologna: Società editreice il Mulino.

Black, Robert. 1985. *Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1992. Florence. In *The renaissance in National Context*, ed. Roy Porter and Mikulás Teich, 21-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. The Revival of Latin, and Humanist Education. In *Italy in the Age of the Renaissance: 1300-1550*, ed. John M. Najemy, 29-36. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Black, Robert, and ebrary Inc. 2001. *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Eenaissance Italy Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press. http://turing.library.northwestern.edu/login?url=http://site.ebrary.com/lib/northwestern/Doc?id=10006809

Borgia, Luigi. 1990. La Famiglia dei Bruni d'Arezzo. In *Leonardo Bruni Cancelliere della Repubblica di Firenze*, ed. Paolo Viti, 191-203. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.

Botley, Paul. 2004. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance : The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bracciolini, Poggio. 1928. *The Facetiae of Poggio and Other Medieval Story-Tellers*. Translated by Edward Storer. London: G. Routledge & Sons; New York: E.P. Dutton.

Branca, Vittore, ed. 1986. *Mercanti Scrittori: Ricordi nella Firenze tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*. Milano: Rusconi.

Brown, Alison. 1979. *Bartolomeo Scala, 1430-1497, Chancellor of Florence : The Humanist as Bureaucrat*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

———. 1992. *The Medici in Florence : The Exercise and Language of Power*. Italian Medieval and Renaissance Studies ; 3. Firenze; Perth: L.S. Olschki; University of W. Australia.

Brucker, Gene A., and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977. *The Civic World of Early Renaissance Florence*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. http://turing.library.northwestern.edu/login?url=http://name.umdl.umich.edu/HEB00019

Brucker, Gene A., Julia Martines, Buonaccorso Pitti, and Gregorio Dati. 1967. *Two Memoirs of Renaissance Florence; the Diaries of Buonaccorso Pitti and Gregorio Dati*. Harper torchbooks ; tb 1333. New York,: Harper & Row.

Bruni, Leonardo. 1914-1926. Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarius. In *Raccolta degli Storici italiani dal Cinquecento al Millecingquecento*, vol. XIX, part III, ed. with Giosue Carducci and Vittorio Fiorini L. A. Muratori, 421-58. Castello: Casa Editrice S. Lapi.

———. 1928. *Leonardo Bruni Aretino: Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften*. Ed. Hans Baron. Leipzig and Berlin.

———. 2001-2007. *History of the Florentine People*. Translated by James Hankins. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———, ed. 1741. *Epistolarum libri VIII* ed. Lorenzo Mehus. Florence.

Bruni, Leonardo, Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins, and David Thompson. 1987. *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni : Selected Texts*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies ; v. 46. Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America.

Burckhardt, Jacob. 1990. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. Translated by S.G.C. Middlemore. London: Penguin Books.

Buzinkay, Gèza. 2003. *Compendio di Storia d'Ungheria*. Budapest: Folpress Nyomda.

Camugliano, Ginevra Niccolini di. 1933. *The Chronicles of a Florentine Family 1200-1470*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Canestrini, C. 1843. Testamento del Cardinale Baldassarre Coscia, già Papa col Nome di Giovanni XXIII. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 4: 292-96.

Canestrini, G. 1843a. Discorso sopra alcune Relazioni della Repubblica fiorentina col Re d'Ungheria e con Filippo Scolari. *Archivio storico italiano* 4: 185-232.

———. 1843b. Versi fatti da Niccolò da Uzzano, predicendo la Mutazione dello Stato. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 4: 297-300.

Cardini, Roberto, and Paolo Viti. 2003. *I Cancellieri aretini della Repubblica di Firenze*. Firenze: Polistampa.

Carnesecchi, Carlo. 1889. Un Fiorentino del Secolo XV e le sue Ricordanze domestiche. *Archivio Storico Italiano* Series 5, Volume 4: 145-73.

Carpetto, George M. 1984. *The Humanism of Matteo Palmieri*. Biblioteca di cultura ; 274. Roma: Bulzoni Editore.

Catellacci, Dante. 1881. Diario di Felice Brancacci Ambasciatore con Carlo Federighi al Cairo per il Comune di Firenze. *Archivio Storico Italiano* Fourth Series, Vol. 8: 157-88.

Cavalcanti, Giovanni. 1838-1839. *Istorie fiorentine*. 2 vols. Firenze: Tipografia all'insegna di Dante.

Celenza, Christopher S. 1999. *Renaissance Humanism and the Papal Curia : Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger's De curiae commodis*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome ; v. 31. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. 2004. *The Lost Italian Renaissance : Humanists, Historians, and Latin's Legacy*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chambers, D.S. 1988. Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga in Florence. In *Florence and Italy: Renaissance Studies in Honour of Nicolai Rubinstein*, ed. Peter Denley and Caroline Elam, 241-61. London: Committee for Medieval Studies.

Chiappelli, Luigi. 1923. Inventario dei Manoscritti raccolti dal Lanaiolo fiorentino Dietislavi di Nerone (a. 1433). *La Bibliofilia* 25, no. 8-9: 247-52.

Clarke, Paula C. 1991. *The Soderini and the Medici*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cochrane, Eric. 1981. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Compagni, Dino. 1986. *Chronicle of Florence*. Translated by Daniel E. Bornstein. Ed. Daniel E. Bornstein. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Connell, William J. 2000. The Humanist Citizen as Provincial Governor. In *Florentine Tuscany: Structures and Practices of Power*, ed. William J. Connell and Andrea Zorzi, 144-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cosenza, Mario Emilio. 1962. *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists and of the World of Classical Scholarship in Italy, 1300-1800*. 6 vols. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.

Crabb, Ann. 2000. *The Strozzi of Florence : Widowhood and Family Solidarity in the Renaissance*. Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Civilization. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

D'Amico, John F. 1983. *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome : Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science ; 101, 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

D'Elia, Anthony F. 2004. *The Renaissance of Marriage in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Davidsohn, Robet. 1897. Tre Orazioni di Lapo da Castiglionchio Ambasciatore fiorentino a Papa Urbano V e alla Curia in Avignone. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 20, no. 4: 225-46.

Davies, Jonathan. 1998. *Florence and its University during the Early Renaissance*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Davies, M.C. 1984. An Emperor without Clothes? Niccolò Niccoli under Attack. In *Maistor: Classical, Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning*, ed. Ann Moffatt, 269-308. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Davisson, Darrell D. 1980. New Documents on Gentile da Fabriano's Residence in Florence, 1420-1422. *The Burlington Magazine* 122, no. 932: 759-60 + 63.

Desjardins, Abel, and Giuseppe Canestrini. 1859. *Négociations Diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane; Documents Recueillis par Giuseppe Canestrini*. Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France. 1. Série: Histoire Politique. Paris: Impr. impériale.

Diario di Palla di Noferi Strozzi. 1883. *Archivio storico italiano* 11: 20-48, 145-56.

D'Elia, Anthony F. 2006. Heroic Insubordination in the Army of Sigismundo Malatesa: Petrus Parleo's *pro milite,* Machiavelli, and the Uses of Cicero and Livy. In *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt,* ed. Christopher S. Celenza and Kenneth Gouwens, 31-60. Leiden and Boston: Brill

Fancelli, Manlio, ed. 1941. *Orazioni politiche del Cinquecento*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli Editore.

Ferente, Serena. 2003. La Confessione di Brocardo da Persico, Cancelliere di Jacopo Piccinino, e il Partito braccesco a Firenze. *Archvio Storico Italiano* 161: 249-60.

———. 2005. *La Sfortuna di Jacopo Piccinino : Storia dei Bracceschi in Italia, 1423-1465*. Studi Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere la Colombaria 229. Firenze: L. S. Olschki.

Field, Arthur. 1988. *The Origins of the Platonic Academy of Florence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1998. Leonardo Bruni, Florentine Traitor? Bruni, the Medici, and an Aretine Conspiracy of 1437. *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 4: 1109-50.

Filarete, Francesco, Angelo Manfidi, Richard C. Trexler, and Florence (Italy). 1978. *The Libro Cerimoniale of the Florentine republic*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance ; no 165. Genève: Droz.

Finke, Johannes Hollnsteiner von Heinrich. 1923. *Acta concilii constanciensis. Zwieter band. Konzilstagebücher, Sermones, Reform- und Verfassungsakten*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Münster i. W.: Regensberg.

Fischer, B., I. Gribomont, H.F.D. Sparks, W. Thiele, Robert Weber, H.I. Frede, and Roger Gryson, eds. 1994. *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatem versionem*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Fubini, Riccardo. 1979-1980. La Figura politica dell'Ambasciatore negli Siluppi dei Regimi oligarchici quattrocenteschi. Abbozzo di una Ricera (a Guisa di Lettera aperta). In *Forme e Tecniche del Potere nella Città (Secoli XIV-XVII)*, 33-59. Perugia: Tipografia Guerra.

———. 1994. *Italia quattrocentesca : Politica e Diplomazia nell'Età di Lorenzo il Magnifico*. Studi e Ricerche storiche ; 181. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

———. 1996. *Quattrocento fiorentino: Politica, Diplomzia, Cultura*. Pisa: Pacini Editore.

Ganz, Margery. 1982. Donato Acciaiuoli and the Medici: A Strategy for Survival in '400 Florence. *Rinascimento* n.s. 22: 33-73.

———. 1990. A Florentine Friendship: Donato Acciaiuoli and Vespasiano da Bisticci. *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 2: 372-83.

Garin, Eugenio. 1963. *Portraits from the Quattrocento*. Translated by Victor A. and Eizabeth Velen. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper & Row.

Gatti, Daniela. 1981. *La Vita Caroli di Donato Acciaiuoli. La Legenda di Carlo Magno in Funzione di una Historia di Gesta*. Bologna: Patron Editore.

Giustiniani, Vito R., and Alamanno Rinuccini. 1965. *Alamanno Rinuccini, 1426-1499; Materialien und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Florentinischen Humanismus*. Studi italiani, bd. 5. Graz,: Böhlau Verlag.

Gragg, Florence Alden, ed. 1927. *Latin Writings of the Italian Humanists*. New York, Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, and San Francisco: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Grendler, Paul. 2002. Review of *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*. *Renaissance Quarterly* 55, no. 4: 1382-85.

Grendler, Paul F. 1989. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy : Literacy and Learning, 1300- 1600*. The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science ; 107th ser., 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gualdo, Germano. 1990. Leonardo Bruni Segretario papale. In *Leonardo Bruni Cancelliere della Repubblica di Firenze*, ed. Paolo Viti, 73-95. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

Guasti, Cesare. 1857. *Due Legazioni al sommo Pontefice per il Comune di Firenze presedute da Sant' Antonino Arcivescovo*. Firenze: Barbera, Bianchi E C.

———. 1867-1873. *Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi per il Comune di Firenze dal MCCCXVIX al MCCCCXXXIII*. 3 vols. Vol. 1. Firenze.

Haas, Louis. 1995. Il mio buono Compare: Choosing Godparents and the Uses of Baptismal Kinship in Renaissance Florence. *Journal of Social History* 29, no. 2: 341-56.

Hankins, James. 1990. *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, v. 17. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill.

———. 1991. The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence. *Renaissance Quarterly* 44, no. 3: 429-75.

———. 1995. The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56, no. 2: 309-38.

———. 2000. *Renaissance Civic Humanism : Reappraisals and Reflections*. Ideas in Context ; 57. Cambridge, UK ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2003. *Humanism and Platonism in the Italian Renaissance*. Vol. 1. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

———. 2006. Humanism in the Vernacular: The Case of Leonardo Bruni. In *Humanism and Creativity in the Renaissance: Essays in Honor of Ronald G. Witt*, ed. Christopher S. Celenza and Kenneth Gouwens, 11-29. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Hough, Samuel Jones. 1977. An Early Record of Marsilio Ficino. *Renaissance Quarterly* 30, no. 3: 301-04.

Ilardi, Vincent. 1972. The Assassination of Galeazzo Maria Sforza and the Reaction of Italian Diplomacy. In *Violence and Civil Disorder in Italian Cities, 1200-1500*, 72-103. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Jones, P.J. 1988. Travel Notes of an Apprentice Florentine Statesman, Giovanni di Tommaso Ridolfi. In *Florence and Italy: Renaissance Studies in Honour of Nicolai Rubinstein*, ed. Peter Denley and Caroline Elam, 263-80. London: Committee for Medieval Studies.

Kendall, Paul M., and Vincent Ilardi, eds. 1970-81. *Dispatches with Related Documents of Milanese Ambassadors in France and Burgundy*. 3 vols. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Kent, Dale. 1975. The Florentine Reggimento in the Fifteenth Century. *Renaissance Quarterly* 28, no. 4: 575-638.

———. 1978. *The Rise of the Medici : Faction in Florence, 1426-1434*. Oxford [Eng.] ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Kent, F.W. 1991. *Bartolommeo Cederini and his Friends: Letters to an Obscure Florentine*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.

King, Margaret L. 1986. *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, and Michael Mooney. 1979. *Renaissance Thought and its Sources*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Labalme, Patricia H. 1969. *Bernardo Giustiniani; a Venetian of the Quattocento*. Uomini e Dottrine, 13. Roma,: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Latini, Brunetto. 1877-83. *Il Tesoro*. Vol. 4. Bologna: G. Romagnoli.

Lerz, Nadia. 1959. Il Diario di Griso di Giovanni. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 117, no. 2: 247-78.

Leverotti, Franca. 1992. *Diplomazia e Governo dello Stato: I <<Famigli Cavalcanti>> di Francesco Sforza (1450-1466)*. Pisa: ETS editrice.

Lewin, Alison Williams. 2003. *Negotiating Survival : Florence and the Great Schism, 1378-1417*. Madison N J; London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press ; Associated University Presses.

Lowe, K.J.P. 1993. *Church and Politics in Renaissance Italy: The Life and Career of Cardinal Francesco Soderini (1453-1524)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luiso, Francesco Paolo, Lucia Gualdo Rosa, and Leonardo Bruni. 1980. *Studi su l'Epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*. Studi storici / Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo ; fasc. 122-124. Roma: Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo.

Luzzati, Michele. 1964-66. Filippo de' Medici, Arcivescovo di Pisa e le Visite pastorale del 1462-1463. *Bollettino storico pisano* 33-35: 361-401.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. 1988. *Florentine Histories*. Translated by Jr. Laura F. Banfield and Harvey C. Mansfield. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mallett, Michael. 1994. Ambassadors and their Audiences in Renaissance Italy. *Renaissance Studies* 8, no. 3: 229-43.

Marsh, David. 2002. Review: Leon Battista Alberti at the Millennium. *Renaissance Quarterly* 55, no. 3: 1028-37.

Martin, John. 1997. Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe. *American Historical Review* 102, no. 5: 1309-42.

Martines, Lauro. 1963. *The Social World of the Florentine Humanists 1390-1460*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1968. *Lawyers and Statecraft in Renaissance Florence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2003. *April Blood: Florence and the Plot against the Medici*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Mattingly, Garrett. 1971. *Renaissance Diplomacy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

McManamon, John M. 1989. *Funeral Oratory and the Cultural Ideals of Italian Humanism*. Chapel Hill & London: The Unviversity of North Carolina Press.

Mercer, R. G. G. 1979. *The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza with Special Reference to his Place in Paduan Humanism*. London: The Modern Humanitites Research Association.

Milanesi, C. 1864. Il Viaggio degli Ambasciatori fiorentini al Re di Francia nel MCCCCLXI descritto da Giovanni di Francesco di Neri Cecchi loro Cancelliere. *Archivio Storico Italiano* series 3, vol. 1,part 1: 3-62.

Molho, Anthony. 1977. The Brancacci Chapel: Studies in its Iconography and History. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40: 50-98+322.

———. 1994. *Marriage Alliance in Late Medieval Florence*. Harvard Historical Studies ; 114. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Monzani, C. 1857. Discorso di Leonardo Bruni Aretino. *Archivio Storico Italiano* 5, no. part 1 & 2: 29-59; 3-34.

Muir, Edward. 2005. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe*. 2nd ed, New Approaches to European History. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, James J. [1974] 2001. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of the Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Nogara, Bartolomeo. 1927. *Scritti inediti e rari di Biondo Flavio*. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana.

Olson, Roberta J. M. 1992. *Italian Renaissance Sculpture*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Orlandi, Stefano. 1955. *Necrologio di S. Maria Novella 1235-1504: Testo e Commenti biografici Cardinali, Vescovi, Teologi, Letterati, Missionari, Artisti fiorentini*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.

Osio, Luigi. 1869. *Documenti diplomatici tratti dagli Archivi milanesi* 3vols. Milano: La Goliardica.

Palmeri, Matteo. 1906. *Annales*. Ed. with Giosue Carducci and Vittorio Fiorini L. A. Muratori. Vol. 26, p. 1, Raccolta degli Storici italiani dal Cinquecento al Millecinquecento. Città di Castello: S. Lapi.

Parenti, Marco. 2001. *Ricordi storici 1464-1467*. Ed. Manuela Doni Garfagnini. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Partner, Peter. 1968. Florence and the Papacy in the Earlier Fifteenth Century. In *Florentine Studies: Politics and Society in Renaissance Florence*, ed. Nicolai Rubinstein, 381-402. London: Faber and Faber.

———. 1972. *The Lands of St. Peter: The Papal State in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance*. London: Eyre Methuen Ltd.

Pastor, Ludwig. 1923. *The History of the Popes*. Ed. Frederick Ignatius. 5th ed. 14 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.

Petriboni, Pagolo di Matteo, and Matteo di Borgo Rinaldi. 2001. *Priorista (1407-1459)*. Ed. Jacqueline A. Gutwirth and Gabriella Battista. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Phillips, Mark. 1987. *The Memoir of Marco Parenti: A Life in Medici Florence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pintor, F. 1911. Le Due Ambascerie di Bernardo Bembo a Firenze e le sue Relazioni coi Medici. In *Studi letterari e linguistici dedicati a Pio Ranjna nel quarantesimo Anno del suo Insegnamento*, 785-815. Firenze: Enrico Ariani.

Pius II. 2003. *Commentaries*. Ed. Margaret Meserve and marcello Simonetta. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Plebani, Eleonora. 2002. *I Tornabuoni: Una Famiglia fiorentina alla Fine del Medioevo*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

Plutarch. 1996. *Lives*. Ed. Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. IX. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Queller, Donald E. 1967. *The Office of Ambassador in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Queller, Donald E., and Francis R. Swietek. 1977. *Two Studies on Venetian Government*. Vol. 33, Etudes de philosophie et d'histoire. Geneva: Librairie Droz.

Quintilian. 1920. *The Istitutio Oratoria*. Ed. H.E. Butler. Vol. I. London: William Heinemann.

Rinuccini, Alamanno. 1953. *Lettere ed Orazioni*. Ed. Vitto R. Giustiniani. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

Ristori, R. 1987. Dati, leonardo. *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* 33: 40-44.

Romano, Dennis. 2007. *The Likeness of Venice: A Life of Doge Francesco Foscari, 1373-1457*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Rubinstein, Nicolai. 1995. *The Palazzo Vecchio 1298-1532: Government, Architecture, and Imagery in the Civic Palace of the Florentine Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1997. *The Government of Florence under the Medici (1434-1494)*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rubinstein, Nicolai, and Giovanni Ciappelli. 2004. *Studies in Italian History in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Storia e Letteratura ; 216. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

Rucellai, Giovanni, Alessandro Perosa, and F. W. Kent. 1960. *Giovanni Rucellai ed il suo Zibaldone*. Studies of the Warburg Institute, v. 24. London,: The Warburg Institute University of London.

Russell, Joycelyne g. 1992. *Diplomats at Work, Three Renaissance Studies*. Wolfeboro Falls, NH: Alan Sutton Publishing Inc.

Ryder, Alan. 1990. *Alfonso the Magnanimous: King of Aragon, Naples, and Sicily, 1396-1458*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Salviati, Iacopo. 1784. Cronica. In *Croniche fiorentine di Ser Naddo da Montecatini e del Cavaliere Iacopo Salviati*, ed. Fr. Ildefonso di San Luigi, 175-361. Delizie degli Eruditi toscani, Tomo XVIII. Florence.

Sandeo, F. 1611. *De regibus siciliae et apuliae*. Hanoviae.

Santini, Emilio. 1910. *Leonardo Bruni Aretino e i suoi "Historiarum florentini populi libri XII"*. Pisa: Reale Scuola Normale Superiore.

———. 1922. *Firenze e i suoi "Oratori" nel Quattrocento*. Biblioteca "Sandron" Di Scienze e Lettere n. 77. Milano: Remo Sandron.

Scala, Bartolomeo, and Alison Brown. 1997. *Bartolomeo Scala : Humanistic and Political Writings*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies ; v. 159. Tempe, AZ: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies.

Stieber, Joachim W. 1978. *Pope Eugenius IV, the Council of Basel and the Secular and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Empire: The Conflict over Supreme Authority and Power in the Church*. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman. Vol. XIII, Studies in the history of christian thought. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Struve, B. G., ed. 1717. *Rerum germanicarum scriptores*. Vol. III. Argentorati: Sumptibus J.R. Dulsseckeri.

Torre, Arnaldo della. 1902. *Storia dell' Accademia platonica di Firenze*. Pubblicazioni del r. Istituto di Studi superiori pratici e di Perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di Filosofia e Filo. Firenze: Tip. G. Carnesecchi e figli.

Traversari, Ambrogio. 1759. *Ambrosii Traversarii generalis camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum: Et ad alios de eodem Ambrosio latinae epistolae, a domno Petro Canneto abbate camaldulensi in libros XXV tributae variorum opera distinctae, et observationibus illustratae: Accedit eiusdem Ambrosii vita in qua historia litteraria florentina ab anno MCXCII usque ad annum MCCCCXL ex monumentis potissimum nondum editis deducta est a Laurentio Mehus*. 2 vols. Florence: Caesareo.

Trexler, Richard. 1980. *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Trivellato, Francesca. 1994. La Missione diplomatica a Venezia del fiorentino Giannozzo Manetti a meta Quattrocento. *Studi Veneziani* 28: 203-35.

Vedovato, Giuseppe. 1946. *Note sul Diritto diplomatico della Repubblica fiorentina*. Firenze: G.C. Sansoni.

Virgil. 1981. *The Aeneid*. Translated by Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage Books.

Viti, Paolo. 1992. *Leonardo Bruni e Firenze : Studi sulle Lettere pubbliche e private*. Pubblicazioni del Centro di Studi sul classicismo. Roma: Bulzoni.

———, ed. 1996. *Opere letterarie e politiche di Leonardo Bruni*. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese.

Walsh, R. J. 2005. *Charles the Bold and Italy (1467-1477) : Politics and Personnel*. [Liverpool Historical Studies]. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Watkins, Renée Neu, ed. 1978. *Humanism & Liberty: Writings on Freedom from Fifteenth-Century Florence*. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Weinstein, Donald. 1960. *Ambassador from Venice: Pietro Pasqualigo in Lisbon, 1501*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Witt, Ronald. 1990. Civic humanism and the Rebirth of the Ciceronian Oration. *Modern Language Quarterly* 51, no. 2: 167-84.

Witt, Ronald G. 1969. The De tyranno and Coluccio Salutati's View of Politics and Roman History. *Nuova Rivista Storica* 53: 434-74.

———. 1976. *Coluccio Salutati and his Public Letters*. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance ; 151. Genève: Librairie Droz.

———. 2000. *In the Footsteps of the Ancients : The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, v. 74. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

Wittschier, Heinz Willi. 1968. *Giannozzo Manetti, das Corpus der Orationes*. Studi italiani ; bd. 10. Köln: Böhlau.

Notes

INTRODUCTION

[1] For this anecdote, see (Bisticci 1963, 386-87)

[2] For these quotations, see (Burckhardt 1990, 154 and 55), (McManamon 1989) and (D'Elia 2004).

[3] For Mattingly, see (Mattingly 1971) For Queller, see (Queller 1967). For the use of humanist orations towards the illumination of politics, see (Weinstein 1960), (Labalme 1969), (Fubini 1996, 99-122, esp. 08ff), (Balbi 2004), (Pintor 1911)

[4] (Witt 1990)

[5] For these quotations, see (Witt 2000, 451-53)

[6] For the name "orator" attached to the humanists, see (Baxandall 1971). For Paul Oskar Kristeller, see especially (Kristeller and Mooney 1979). For Martines, see (Martines 1963) and (Martines 1968) For the ideal of the active life among Florentine humanists, see (Baron 1966) and also (Field 1988), who argues that this ideal remained even after Florentine humanism took a more metaphysical focus after the mid Quattrocento.

[7] This information is based on a database that I have constructed of over 2400 ambassadorial and commissarial positions sent by Florence between 1394 and 1494. 1394 is the first year of the archival series, *Legazione e commissarie,* which contains diplomatic dispatches. 1494 was the year of the French invasion and the expulsion of Piero de' Medici. This database is derived from various Florentine archival sources and references in primary literature to missions. Florence often employed individuals as diplomats in such unofficial capacities, most often to places generally outside of the Florentine political sphere, such as Buda, but also to more common destinations like France and the Pope. I have not attempted to include these individuals or their missions in the database. Similarly, decisions had to be made concerning some records in the diplomatic election books, which do not always indicate whether the elected individuals ever actually left Florence. Serious gaps in the archival record, especially concerning diplomatic reports and records related to the *Dieci di Balià* have prevented this database from being complete; however, the miraculous recovery of such records would not alter the various conclusions offered in this project based on this data. The eight famous humanist authors who served as Florentine diplomats between 1394 and 1494 were Leonardo Bruni, Lorenzo Benvenuti, Palla di Nofri Strozzi, Giannozzo Manetti, Donato Acciaiuoli, Matteo Palmieri, Alamanno Rinuccini, and Bartolomeo Scala. The fifty-eight individuals identified on ten or more diplomatic missions during this period were: twenty or more missions: Agnolo Acciaiuoli, Luca degli Albizzi, Maso degli Albizzi, Rinaldo degli Albizzi, Neri di Gino Capponi, Filippo Corsini, Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi, Vieri Guadagni, Luigi Guicciardini, Filippo Magalotti, Bernadetto de' Medici, Pierfilippo Pandolfini, Bartolomeo Popoleschi, Antonio Ridolfi, Lorenzo Ridolfi, Cristofano Spini, Niccolò da' Uzzano; ten to nineteen missions: Donato Acciaiuoli, Filippo Adimari, Alessandro Alessandri, Palmieri Altoviti, Matteo Arrighi, Biliotto Biliotti, Bernardo Buongirolamo, Felice Brancacci, Gino Capponi, Matteo Castellani, Paolo DaGhiacetto, Giuliano Davanzati, Dietisalvi di Nerone Dietisalvi, Jacopo Gianfigliazzi, Bernardo Giugni, Niccolò Giugni, Bernardo Guadagni, Jacobo Guicciardini, Piero Guicciardini, Lorenzo Machiavelli, Bardo Mancini, Giannozzo Manetti, Nello Martini, Piero Nasi, Otto Niccolini, Agnolo Pandolfini, Carlo Pandolfini, Benedetto Peruzzi, Ridolfo Peruzzi, Buonaccorso Pitti, Giovannozo Pitti, Francesco Rucellai, Tommasso Sacchetti, Jacopo Salviati, Tommaso Soderini, Marcello Strozzi, Palla di Nofri Strozzi, Angelo Stufa, Francesco Tornabuoni, Marsilio Vecchietti, and Andrea Vettori.

[8] This synchronic picture, of course, changed over the course of the century with the creation of different governmental bodies such as the *Council of 100* and the *Otto di Pratica,* to say nothing about the changes in control exerted by the Medici. However, this general picture remained, I think, similar regardless of the governmental bodies involved or the machinations behind the scenes. For the decision to send a diplomat decided in a *pratica,* see ASF Con.Prat. 52, 44v. Here in a meeting on May 13, 1448, concerning whether Florence should make peace with Naples, Giovannozzo Pitti suggested that peace be made and that an orator be sent to King Alfonso. Giannozzo

Manetti suggested that Florence send Bernardetto de' Medici, a man who had been to the king in 1445, 1446, 1447, and who had not yet even returned from a mission to Naples begun in February 1448. Ultimately, on May 23, the *Signoria* sent a letter but no ambassador to Alfonso stating their desire for peace. Bernardetto de' Medici did not go to Naples as Manetti had suggested, but was rather assigned as a commissary with Neri Capponi. For the letter to the King, see ASF Sig.Miss.I. 37, 112r. For the references to Bernadetto de' Medici's diplomatic missions, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 93v and 150v; 12, 45r and 54r; for Bernadetto's mission with Capponi, see (Palmeri 1906, 157). For the list of nominees, see ASF Sig.Leg. 26, 40v-72r and following. This file contains several lists of ten men nominated for different missions with a mark next to the individual eventually selected to go. The amount of time that elapsed between election, commission, and setting out from Florence varied greatly from mission to mission. For example, Luca di Maso degli Abizzi was elected on September 23, 1436 to go the Pope in Bologna. He received his commission almost a month later on October 16 and set out the same day. See ASF Car.Cor. 51, 15v and ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 109v. On a mission to Venice from the following year, by contrast, the process was much shorter. Luca was elected on June 4, received his commission on June 9, and set out the same day. See ASF CAR.Cor. 51, 24r and ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 2 and 5. Florentine law as of 1408 established that persons of the rank of knight or who had completed a doctorate, such as lawyers, should be granted ten horses and no more than five florins a day. All others were to receive no more than four florins a day and eight horses. This law was followed closely as can be seen in numerous instances where individuals with far more wealth and political power were given fewer horses than their knighted or highly education companions. For the laws establishing that pay for diplomats be determined by social rank, see (Vedovato 1946, 60-61). A law in 1430 changed many aspects of reimbursement and pay for diplomats in order to curtail abuses; however, the pay scale for doctors/knights and others remained the same. See (Vedovato 1946, 4952) One can see this law being followed in the obedience mission to Nicholas V in 1447, where two ambassadors with the rank of dominus get ten horses: Agnolo Acciaiuoli and Giovannozzo Pitti, whereas four others receive eight: Alessandro de Alessand ri, Giannozzo Manetti, Neri Capponi, and Piero de' Medici (Cosimo's son) (ASF Car.Cor. 51. 75r.. Another example in 1454 involved Giannozzo Pandolfini (ten horses) and Piero de' Medici (eight) (ASF Car.Cor. 51. 130v). For the replacement of knighted diplomats with other knights, see in general ASF Car.Corr. 31. One notable is example can be found on 129v, where on May 1, 1454, the Signoria selected Neri di Gino Capponi and Piero de' Medici to go to Venice, neither of whom was a knight. Neri Capponi stated that he was sick and was thus excused. On the same day, the Signoria elected the knight Agnolo Acciaiuoli. On May ninth, Acciaiuoli's election was revoked. ASF Sig.Leg. 13. photo-reproduction 97 records that on May 10, the Signoria issued a commission to Piero de' Medici and the knight Giannozzo Pandolfini. Michael Mallett has argued that "At the beginnings of resident diplomacy Florence had tried to impose rules limiting and spacing out the embassies of individuals, and making the choices through use of the traditional sortition bags." (Mallett 1994, 234). Mallet's citation to (Fubini 1979-1980, 46) is correct concerning the limitations placed on how often individuals could be diplomats; however, the information regarding the election bags comes from (Fubini 1979-1980, 55). This statue was passed outside of the temporal reaches of this study in 1494. Moreover, it is unclear how long this provision was followed. The evidence in ASF Sig.Leg. 26, 40v-72r suggests that by 1500 lists of potential diplomats were being made and final decisions based on them. One speculative hypothesis is that a drawing occurred after 1494 to determine this list of potential diplomats.

[9] For Fubini, see (Fubini 1996, 11-98) For the statistics concerning dodged diplomatic missions, including ducking of missions by men on the fringes of the Medici circles, see ASF Car.Corr. 51. The leaders in dodging missions were Neri di Gino Capponi (8), Alamanno Salviati (6), Luca degli Albizzi (6), Agnolo Acciaiuoli (5), Bernardo Gherardi (5), Domenco Martelli (5), and Marcello Strozzi (5). For the connections between the Pazzi and France, see (Fubini 1994, 93) and (Ferente 2005, 93-94). The Pazzi family went on nine diplomatic missions between 1394 and 1494, six of which pertained either to France or King Renè of Anjou. See ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 115r; 14, photo reproduction 85; 15, photo reproductions 4, 62, 108, and 245; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto. Leg.Miss.Resp. 7, 15; ASF Car.Cor 51, 39r. For M. Strozzi and L. Ridolfi, see Chapter One of this study.

[10] For these arguments by Witt, see above.

[11] For Witt and Vespasiano, see above. For Charles V, see (Burckhardt 1990, 364). For Pitti, see (Brucker et al. 1967, 57-58) For language in diplomacy in general, see (Russell 1992, 1-50)

[12] For the first citation, see (Monzani 1857, 32). For the second, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 127) For diaries, see for example Felice Brancacci's in 1422 (Catellacci 1881), Giovanni di Tommaso Ridolfi accompanying his father to Milan (Jones 1988) or the discussion in Chapter Three of Giannozzo Manetti's diary in Venice in 1448 or the ambassadors to King Louis XI of France in 1461, discussed in Chapter Four. For Barbaro's treatise, see (Barbaro, Branca, and Barbaro 1969, 163). For Filarete, see (Filarete et al. 1978). For orations, see for example pages 86, 91, 94, and 96. For the elaborate description of the emperor's entrance into Florence, see pages 71-74. For the surviving diplomatic orations by Florentines, see Chapter One - Four of this study. For Ronald Witt, see above.

[13] For Niccolini, see (Camugliano 1933). For Cosimo de' Medici, see (Hankins 2003). For Leonardo Dati, see Chapter One of this study. For the domestic orations at Florence, see (Black 1985, 157ff and esp. 64-65)

[14] For this story, see (Bracciolini 1928, 75-76)

[15] For Benevenuti at Città di Castello, see ASF Sig.Rap. 2, 97v. The Italian is "iunto in castello e vicitato i priori permesse ledebite salutione conforti e offerte." For Spini and Fioravanti, see ASF Sig.Rap. 1, 22v. The report, in its entirety, states "Noi agnolo di luisi degli spini francescho di neri fioravanti fumo mandati ambasciaodri a siena per gli fatti del porto e sno. Ad 27 di setembre 1398 e tornamo de 25 d novembre 1398 la praticha tralloro e noi fu lungha e niente conchudemo cholloro."

[16] For this quotation, see (Muir 2005)

[17] For the importance of office-holding and familial history in determining social status in Florence, see (Kent 1975). The interlocutors of Poggio Bracciolini's *On Nobility* determined that "…social rank in Florence was defined by a family's wealth, lineage and political experience." See (Black 1992, 31) See especially page 605 of this study for the importance of familial antiquity amongst the city's most powerful citizens. For the example of Jacopo Piccino, see ASF Car.Cor. 51 161r-162r.. This example is actually very bizarre. On September 13, 1458, the Signoria elected Angelo Lorenzo della Stufa, whom the Signoria decided carried too much prestige. On October 5, they elected Ser Antonio Cecci de Bicavo (whose lack of prestige is betrayed by the government assigning him a mere three horses). This man, however, did not get enough votes to secure the election and also held a conflicting governmental post. The Signoria thus elected Bernardo Buongirolamo, a lawyer (thus by law he had to receive the highest salary and horse retinue (ten)), on October 10. Wheras Bongirolamo was a relatively new diplomat (this was his second mission), Stufa had much more experience, especially in matters dealing with Sigismundo Malatesta. For Charles the Bold, see (Walsh 2005, 268). For the relevant sections of Trexler, see (R.C. Trexler 1980, 279-330) Although Richard Trexler's fascinating study of ritual in Renaissance has been crucial in forming much of the framework for this dissertation, it is important to note that Trexler and I disagree about many points. See Chapter One for our disagreements about who served as diplomats. I argue that knights played a more subordinate role in Florentine diplomacy than Trexler argues. Moreover, Trexler points to nobles and youths as the most prominent Florentine diplomats; however, most diplomats were the same men who were the most powerful domestic individuals. Youths were common because of Florentine tradition of sending them to learn under more established diplomats. For Trexler on Florentine youths in diplomacy, see (R.C. Trexler 1980, 292). For a critique of Trexler's main thesis, see (Lewin 2003)

[18] For Martines, see (Martines 1963). Robert Black writes "The striking fact is that almost all the leading professional humanists in Florence at this time were non-Florentines: some from Tuscany, including the chancellors Salutati, Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, Carlo Marsuppini, Benedetto Accolti, and Bartolomeo Scala, and still others like Cristoforo Landino, Ficino, and Poliziano; some from outside Tuscany, like Ambrogio Traversari, Francesco Filelfo, and Guarino, and a few non-Italians, including Chrysoloras and John Argyropulos. Alberti was a Florentine exile…" Black proceeds to argue for the "…relative weakness of Latin culture in the city of Florence before the later fifteenth century.", a point with which I disagree. Although humanist writers in Florence were undoubtedly immigrants, the Florentine patriciate as this dissertation argues, was heavily involved in Latin letters. For Black, see (Black 2004, 30).

[19] For Martines, see (Martines 1963, esp. 303ff.). For Cosenza, see (Cosenza 1962)

[20] For Davies, see (Davies 1998, 106-24). For Hankins, see (Hankins 1991). For della Torre, see (Torre 1902). For Santini, see (Santini 1922). Gene Brucker mentions most of these Florentine patricians, but says little about their humanist interests. See (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977). See also (D.V. Kent 1978). For the division between the study of humanism and other subfields of Renaissance history, see (Celenza 2004). For biographical information and artists, see (Davisson 1980), which includes documents and some information about Palla di Palla Strozzi.

[21] For Florentine diplomatic ritual and the importance of distances, see (R.C. Trexler 1980, 279-330). See also the summary by Edward Muir (Muir 2005, 262-64) For the sequence of events marking the entrance of a diplomat into a host space, see, for example, the diary kept for the Florentine mission to France in 1461-1462. Enroute, the ambassadors arrived in Bologna on October 31 and met with the city ruler (the Legate) the next day and presented letters of credence. On November 8, the Florentines entered Milan, but the Duke could not meet them because he was sick. Two days later, the diplomats went to his feet. On December 23, the King himself met the diplomats around six miles outside of Tours. He stated that he was leaving town for the "feste", but wanted to greet the diplomats before he left. Since the king was out of town, the diplomats were granted an audience on December 30. (Milanesi 1864, 7-8, 10-11, 23-24). The thirtieth actually was only one day after the king returned to town. At this meeting, the diplomats presented their letter of credence and one of the Florentine orators, Filippo de' Medici, delivered their initial oration. (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 124).

[22] For Trexler, see (R.C. Trexler 1980, 323ff). Compare also the focus on keeping meticulous records of the level of extravagance given to visiting rulers and diplomats kept by the Florentines. See (Filarete et al. 1978, 97-115). These pages are a long list of the expenses paid in honoring visiting rulers and diplomats. Such records were necessary for guidance in granting the necessary prestige and extravagance at future reception ceremonies. With such records, the Florentines could avoid showing too much good will to particular visitors and the offense that such demonstrations could offer other rulers.

[23] For this argument by Trexler, see in general (R. Trexler 1980, 279-330). See for example page 286, where Trexler writes "But for all the duplicity of which the Florentines were capable, one fact must be constantly recalled: Forms created sincerity by committing their authors." For a summary of these arguments, see (Muir 2005, 264)

[24] For Witt, see (Witt 2000). For the humanists as rhetoricians, see the historiographic summary in (Hankins 1995). See also (Hankins 2000)

[25] Writing about the fourteenth century, Witt wrote that "The speeches we have were not saved because they were expected to become historically important but because they could be used as models. That the number of surviving speeches increased noticeably after 1360 and that they were principally of Bolognese and Florentine origin suggests that a new interest in oratory was stirring in those two cities after that date. In the fifteenth century, such an interest would become widely shared throughout Italy." See (Witt 2000, 360-61)

[26] For Hankins, see (Hankins 2006). For Brown, see (Brown 1992, 215-45). For McManamon, see (McManamon 1989). For d' Elia, see (D'Elia 2004)

[27] For Christian Bec, see (Bec 1967, 1981, 1984). For Martines, see (Martines 1963). Christopher Celenza has also noted the absence of humanist texts from Martines' book. See (Celenza 2004)

[28] For the traditional division between social and intellectual history, see (Celenza 2004)

CHAPTER ONE

[29] For Roberto Rossi's political career, see (Martines 1963, 155-59). For Bruni, see Chapter Two of this study. For Niccoli, see (Martines 1963, 160-65). I have concluded that Poggio, Salutati, Jacopo da Scarperia, Traversari, Rinuccini, and Marsuppini did not serve as Florentine diplomats based on my database of these positions covering 1394-1494 (On this database, see the Introduction to this study).

[30] The seventeen individuals who served on more then twenty missions were (with the year that their family entered the *tre maggiori* in parentheses) Agnolo Acciaiuoli (1291), Luca degli Albizzi (1284), Maso degli Albizzi (1284), Rinaldo degli Albizzi (1284), Neri di Gino Capponi (1304), Filippo Corsini (1326), Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi (1382), Vieri Guadagni (1289), Luigi Guicciardini (1302), Filippo Magalotti (1287), Bernadetto de' Medici (1291), Pierfilippo Pandolfini (1304), Bartolomeo Popoleschi (1390), Antonio Ridolfi (1287), Lorenzo Ridolfi (1287), Cristofano Spini (1286), and Niccolò da Uzzano (1363). The individuals serving between 10 and 19 times as a diplomat were Donato Acciaiuoli (1291), Filippo Adimari (1387), Alessandro Alessandri (1378), Palmieri Altoviti (1282), Matteo Arrighi (1287), Biliotto Biliotti (1297), Bernardo Bongirolamo (1467), Felice Brancacci (1317), Gino Capponi (1287), Matteo Castellani (1317), Paolo DaGhiacetto (1294), Giuliano Davanzati (1358), Dietisalvi di Dietisalvi (1292), Jacopo Gianfigliazzi (1382), Bernardo Giugni (1291), Nicolo Giugni (1291), Bernardo Guadagni (1289), Jacobo Guicciardini (1302), Piero Guicciardini (1302), Lorenzo Machavelli (1283), Bardo Mancini (1291), Giannozzo Manetti (1306), Nello Martini (none found); Piero Nasi (1376), Otto Niccolini (1341), Agnolo Pandolfini (1304), Carlo Pandolfini (1304), Benedetto Peruzzi (1286), Ridolfo Peruzzi (1286), Buonaccorso Pitti (1283), Giovannozo Pitti (1283), Francesco Rucellai (1302), Tomaso Sacchetti (1333), Jacopo Salviati (1302), Tomaso Soderini (1282), Marcello Strozzi (1284), Palla di Nofri Strozzi (1284), Angelo Stufa (1323), Francesco Tornabuoni (1428), Marsilio Vecchietti (1371), Andrea Vettori (1320). For these dates, see the online tratte: http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/search/. For the identification of lawyers, I have relied on the appendices found in (Martines 1968) For the identification of knightly status, I have relied on the titles used to address diplomats in diplomatic commissions and correspondences. The breakdown is as follows: *Started diplomatic career as a knight*: Maso Albizzi, Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi, Filippo Magalotti, Cristofano Spini, Filippo Adimari, Palmieri Altoviti, Jacopo Gianfigliazzi, Francesco Rucellai, Tomaso Sacchetti; *Started diplomatic career as a laywer:* Filippo Corsini, Bartolomeo Popoleschi, Lorenzo Ridolfi, Bernardo Bongirolamo, Giuliano Davanzati, Nello Martini, Otto Niccolini, Marcello Strozzi; *Attained knighthood during diplomatic career:* Agnolo Acciaiuoli, Rinaldo Albizzi, Luigi Guicciardini, Antonio Ridolfi, Alessandro Alessandri, Matteo Castellani, Dietisalvi di Dietisalvi, Bernardo Giugni, Giannozzo Manetti, Carlo Pandolfini, Bonaccorso Pitti, Giovannozo Pitti, Jacopo Salviati, Tomaso Soderini, Palla di Nofri Strozzi, Angelo Stufa; *Status did not change during diplomatic career:* Luca Albizzi, Neri Capponi, Vieri Guadagni, Bernadetto de' Medici, Pierfilippo Pandolfini, Niccolò da Uzzano, Donato Acciaiuoli, Matteo Arrighi, Biliotto Biliotti, Felice Brancacci, Gino Capponi, Paolo DaGhiacetto, Niccolò Giugni, Bernardo Guadagni, Jacobo Guicciardini, Piero Guicciardini, Lorenzo Machiavelli, Bardo Mancini, Piero Nasi, Agnolo Pandolfini, Benedetto Peruzzi, Ridolfo Peruzzi, Francesco Tornabuoni, Marsilio Vecchietti, Andrea Vettori.

[31] On Bruni, Poggio and Marsuppini, see (Cardini and Viti 2003). On Traversari, see (Martines 1963, 311). For Salutati, see (Martines 1963, 148-49). For the Niccoli and Sostegni families, see the online tratte at http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/search/. The Niccoli family had one person serve in the *tre maggiori* on only one occasion in the fourteenth century. The Sostegni (the family name of Jacopo da Scaperia), by contrast, had five. In fact, Jacopo da Scarperia was the sole exception to the trend of a prominent humanist author coming from a low status family. The Sostegni family entered the *tre maggiori* in 1332. Jacopo did not serve as a Florentine diplomat. On Roberto Rossi as a magnate, see (Martines 1963, 155). On the Alberti exile, see (Baxendale 1991) and for a summary of recent works on Alberti, see (Marsh 2002). On Palla di Nofri Strozzi, see (Bisticci 1963, 243), (Rucellai, Perosa, and Kent 1960, 64), and (Martines 1963, 316-18) For Lorenzo Benvenuti, see (Martines 1963, 324-25) and (Davies 1984). Benevenuti was a diplomat to Bologna and Ferrara in 1419 (ASF Sig.Leg. 6. 100r); Genoa in 1420 (ASF Sig.Leg. 6. 111v); Città di Castello (ASF Sig.Leg. 6. 140v). For the humanist dilettantes, see below.

[32] Richard Trexler writes that "Fifteenth-century Europe witnessed a focusing upon formal behavior unparalleled in earlier European history… In the so-called age of individualism Europeans spent more time, money, and genius controlling spontaneity and enforcing conformity than they had before or would later." (Filarete et al. 1978, 9) For the early relationship between politics and humanism, see (Witt 2000, 1976; Baron 1966). On the concept of a "cultural gift", see the introduction to this study.

[33] For this precedent manuscript, see BNC Naz. II II 72. For the oration, "How ambassadors sent to some commune ought to speak, see BNC Naz. II II 72, 137r-137v. The Italian title is "come denno dire lambasciadori mandate in alcuno commune. The inventory for this manuscript in the BNC states that at least part of this manuscript is derived from Brunetto Latini's thirteenth-century encyclopedic work, *Il tesoro.* Although large sections of this work address rhetoric, I have examined this work in its entirety and have been unable to find any of these sample orations. For *Il Tesoro*, see (Latini 1877-83). For Latini, see (Witt 2000)

[34] For the oration to a suffering prince, see BNC Naz. II II 72, 140r-140v. For the metaphor, see BNC Naz. II II 72, 143r:-143v "Si come elie natura cosa chel nutrimento del albore vene e descende tucto dela radice et per lo bono nutrimento lalbore si cresce e mantiensi et sanza lonutrimento dela radice non si puo mantenere cosi e naturalcosa che ciasche duno membro prenda e dabbia conforto dalaprosperita del capo onde per quello che voi sete nostro capo nostro rector…" . For Cicero's topics for praise, see Cicero, *De inventione* II 177. For the lamb lying down next to the wolf, see BNC Naz. II II 72, 145r-145v. For a summary of the *De inventione* and other rhetoric work, see (Murphy [1974] 2001)

[35] This oration is found at BNC Naz. II II 72, 146r-146v

[36] For this oration, see BNC Magl. 24 348, 46v-50v; this oration is undated, however, Ronald Witt has published a letter by Coluccio Salutati issued on February 21, 1377 that tried to "…publicize the barbarities of the papal troops." The letter seems to mention Antella's and Barbadori's mission: "Quot ut fieret solennes, oratores nostros in Romanam Curiam destinavimus et habemus cum omni humilitate pro nobis et omnibus colligates nostris pacem instantissime petitutros." See (Witt 1976, 101); For Witt on ekphrasis, see (Witt 2000, 366)

[37] For the vague use of history, see the first example "ab anticho" BNC Magl. 24 348, 46v, the second is on 48v, "habbiamo soferto infinite persecutioni et Danni per la difesa de pontefici romani"; for the will of the citizens: "volonta de cittadini" 48r; For saluati's use of Sassoferrato, see (Witt 1969, 436) For the union of republicanism and humanism, see especially (Baron 1966), although the literature is vast. I am currently preparing an article in which I argue that the political writings of Leonardo Bruni argued for legitimacy of rule rather than favoring republicanism.

[38] For Witt's discussion of these figures, see (Witt 2000, 363-70); For the quote, see (Witt 2000, 367)

[39] For Lapo's connections with Petrarch, see (Witt 2000, 364 and in general 63-66); On page 365, Witt argues that only one of these three orations was delivered, stating that "all three are purported to have been delivered before Pope Urban V at Avignon in the fall of 1366 in anticipation of his embarkation for Rome the next spring. While the embassy surely took place, internal evidence suggests that the second and third speeches were not given by the ambassador. The second, a description of the origin and significance of the Guelf and Ghibelline parties, was probably a teaching exercise from the beginning, while the third is merely an amplification of parts of the first. Nevertheless, the first laden with details about the contemporary political situation and Florence's contribution to facilitating the pope's return, was in all probability the only speech actually delivered by Lapo in Avignon." However, it seems more likely that these orations represent three different oratorical occasions on this mission. The first oration was for the first public audience. The second oration was delivered on the same occasion or shortly after on behalf of the *Parte Guelfa*. The third was delivered at the first meeting in the presence of the pope and cardinals. For Lapo's orations, see (Davidsohn 1897, 234-46)

[40] For the orator to Siena in 1375, see Sig. Miss. I 15, 18r; For the ambassador to Faenza in 1398, see Sig. Leg. 1 117v; for the ambassador to Lucca, see Sig.Leg. 1 160v; for the mission to the pope in 1399, see Sig.Leg 2, 13r; for the mission to the pope in 1401, see Sig.Leg. 2, 45v; for the mission to the pope in 1394, see Sig. Leg. 1, 19v; On

very rare occasions, diplomatic commissions from these years are more detailed for locations other than the pope, such as a mission to Bologna in Sig.Leg. 2 30l. Such variation is again attributable to reminding orators that particular missions required more care in the initial oration than others. Such added care does not indicate an influence by humanism but, more likely, the increased sensitivity of a diplomat's mission. This mission to Bologna, for example, occurred on March 5, 1400. Hans Baron describes the Florentine situation at this time. In March 1400, the Venetians signed the "peace of Venice". Baron writes, "From then on the Florentine Republic, protected no longer by membership in any league except for her alliance with Bologna, and enjoying that protection only so long as Bologna could avoid surrender, was left alone to confront one of those challenges of history in which a nation, facing eclipse or regeneration, has to prove its worth in a fight for survival." (Baron 1966, 35) The added instructions for the opening oration of this mission reflect its critical importance for Florentine interests.

[41] For the block quotation, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 293) Brucker also lists three other patricians who cited from antiquity. Two of these men did not serve as diplomats: Alessandro Bencivenni and Francesco Leoni. The other man Agnolo Pandolfini was a diplomat numerous times, but only twice before 1410. Alison Lewin has also noted the widespread integration of humanist style oratory into the records of the *Consulte e pratiche* (summary records of orations delivered before the Florentine *Signoria*). Lewin notes that "…the skill and diligence of the scribe (that is, the individual recording the orations) clearly varies with the person: the entries in the 1380s and 1390s are fairly concise, with one day's debate filling perhaps one half of a folio page; by the 1410s a single speaker's oration, preserved in much smaller handwriting, may fill an entire page. To some extent the longer, more elaborate entries reflect the flowering of humanist rhetoric; references to the Florentine as well as the classical past increase exponentially over these few decades. The degree of detail recorded increases dramatically as well, however, and we must acknowledge the individual scribe's role in that change." (Lewin 2003, 12) Both of Lewin's suggestions point to an increased awareness of rhetorical style by the 1410s. On the one hand, orators were displaying their classical learning in domestic political orations. On the other hand, the increased detail recorded by the scribe indicates that the scribe himself was taking more interest in their oratory. Corsini's contemporary Buonaccorso Pitti commented on Corsini's diplomatic oratorical abilities. Concerning a mission to France, Pitti claimed that Corsini did such a good job declaring his commission to the King and his attendants that "…all the Lords of the Council and many who did not belong to it begged for a copy of his speech and we, at the request of the King himself, provided a written text." (Brucker et al. 1967, 57); The Italian is "Fummo subito alla sua presenzia nel suo consiglio, e per messer Filippo si spose la nostra ambasciata, la quale fu tanto altamente detta, che tutti quelli signori del consiglio e degl'altri di fuori assai ne vollono la copia di quello che disse." (Branca 1986, 406-07). (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 293). Brucker invites the reader to compare these comments to those made by Lippozzo Mangioni, a man who did not serve as a diplomat.; For Ridolfi's intellectual friends, see (Martines 1963, 249); For Ridolfi's humanism in Ridolfi's *On Usury,* see (Armstrong 2003, 217); For his earlier humanist inspired works, see (Armstrong 2003, 107-08)

[42] For Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi's missions, see ASF Dieci.Leg. 1, photo reproduction numbers 50, 67, 107, 128, 141, 174, and 184; ASF Dieci.Leg. 2, 1v, 9v, 68v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 3, 65v, 90r, 93r; ASF Sig.Miss.I 22, 135v; ASF Sig.Miss.I 28, photo reproduction number 3; ASF Sig.Leg. 1, 14v, 79v; ASF Sig.Leg. 2, 51v; ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 13v; ASF Dieci Relaz. 1, 1v; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8, 12r; and (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 30); For Filippo Corsini, see ASF Dieci.Leg. 1, photo reproduction number 22, 32, 73, 106, 159, 73, 205; ASF Dieci.Leg. 2, 46v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 3, 65v; ASF Dieci.Relaz. 1, 1v, 5v; ASF Sig.Leg. 1, 2r; ASF.Sig.Leg. 2, 7v, 21r, 25r, 35v, 42v; ASF Sig.Leg. 3, 59v; ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 14v, 26v, 91v; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 31v; ASF Sig.Miss.I 28, photo reproduction number 3; For Lorenzo Ridolfi, see ASF Dieci.Relaz. 1, 7v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 2, 23r, 45r; ASF Dieci.Leg. 3, 9v; ASF Dieci.Miss. 2, 1r; ASF Sig.Leg. 2, 13r, 60r; ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 42v, 45r, 50v, 55r, 108r, 143r; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 127v; ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 16r, 57r, 90r, 108v, 111v; ASF Sig.Leg. 9, 32r; ASF Sig.Leg. 28, 29r; ASF Sig.Rap. 1, 43r, 44r; ASF Sig.Miss.I. 28, 124r; ASF Sig.Miss.I, 31, 22r; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8, 12r; ASF Car.Cor. 51, 6r; For Filippo Magalotti, see ASF Sig.Miss.I 23, 97v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 2, 51v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 3, 20v, 59r, 85r, 94v; ASF Sig.Leg. 1, 74v, 86r, 93r, 100v, 101r; ASF Sig.Leg. 2, 2v, 13r, 30v, 51v; ASF Sig.Leg. 3, 51v; ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 42v, 55r; ASF Sig.Leg. 28, 13r, 23r; ASF Dieci.Relaz. 1, 42v; ASF Sig.Rap. 1, 19v

[43] Little is published about Filippo Magalotti. Neither Cosenza's collection of Italian humanists nor Lauro Martines' biographical sketches mentions him. See (Cosenza 1962; Martines 1963) Magalotti had connections with the

Alberti family. In fact, it was Magalotti's election to be Standard Bearer of Justice in 1387 that led to the disenfranchisement of most of the Alberti family, see (Baxendale 1991, 724) and (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 78). Magalotti was one of very few citizens allowed to carry arms (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 250); The Italian of the block quotation is: "L'altra mattina tutti insieme l'andammo a visitare, et a sporre la nostra Ambasciata; et prima parlammo noi, et per noi parlò Mess. Filippo Magalotti, e fu nel Palagio del Papa a S. Piero, et haveva esso Re gran quantità di notabili Baroni, e Cavalieri per magnificenza di se, e fu tenuto per ogni huomo, che detto Mess. Filippo parlasse tanto altamente, e notabilmente quanto fusse udito già fa gran tempo. Et è vero, che questo parlare non fu di cose sustantiali, ma fu circa alle raccomandigie, et offerte, che s'usano ne' principii, et altra ciò mostrare quanta stretta, et lunga amicitia era stata sempre intra i suoi antenati, et il nostro popolo; et poi conchiudendo, che altre parti più secrete gli si sporrebbero a sua volontà. " See (Salviati 1784, 292-93)

[44] For the oration in general, see (Salviati 1784, 371-81); Emilio Santini is extraordinarily critical in his analysis of this oration, stating that "Il Megalotti (sic) era uomo pubblico di grande abilità, un erudito, ma non molto esperto delle arti retoriche. <<Artem bene dicendi retorum oratorum non didici>> confessa nella sua orazione." He wrote further "L'orazione, che ancor oggi è rimasta ad attestare la fama ch'ebbe a' suoi tempi, non merita tutte quelle lodi." Santini claims that the oration lacks any structure. He sums up his opinion by stating that "Sovrabbondano le citazioni classiche generalmente lunghissime, separate solo da qualche breve e inopportune passagio. I concetti più comuni si diluiscono in esagerazioni, il senso della misura è bandito." (Santini 1922, 148-51) Santini's harshness can be attributed to his preference for plainer fourteenth-century Italian oratory, a bias which he himself admits in his praise for the oratory of Bartolomeo Valori, an orator whose style remained untouched by humanism: "L'orazione, tratta da un libro delle sue memorie, è grande forza oratoria. Sembra di essere ancora ai tempi di Dino Compagni, quando il sentimento trovava sincera espressione nella parola. Oh come si desiderebbe avere altri saggi di così calda eloquenza!" (Santini 1922, 153) Santini's description of this oration, namely that it is a collection of Latin quotations from humanist, classical, and biblical authors connected by brief Italian passages, is, however, mostly correct, especially for the first part of the oration. (Santini 1922, 150)

[45] The first quotation is, "El chuore spaventa e triema conosciendosi di pocho ingengnio e meno arte e minimo esercitio siche glispiriti che nutrischano reghano exercitano I membri richorrono al suo sochorso chome alla loro fonte abbandonando la lingua per actitudine del parlare pensando alla gloriosa progenia della vostra serenita…" (Salviati 1784, 371); the second quotation is "Avendo a parlare nel chospetto della gloriosa eccelsitudine e della mirabile profondita dintellecto della vostra serenita e chosi mangnificha esistenza di tanti notabili baroni principi e singnori dove per la excelentia delle molte chose mangnifichamente trattate e per la profonda aquita dingengnio etiandio quantunque ogni adorno dire e di pocha reputatione veramente ispaventato e attonito piu mimaraviglio cheio nonmi confide di parlare." (Salviati 1784, 372-73); the third quotation is "Adunque invochato il divino aiuto divotamente dicendo chon ester domine da mihi sermonem rectum. E umilmente suplichando la clementia della vostra umanita che none alla imperfectione del mio dire." (Salviati 1784, 373) "Dignity" or "dengnita" is on (Salviati 1784, 381); Magalotti has yet another self-deprecating passage in the main body of the oration: "Percerto nonche amme ma aqualunque altro di qualunque memoria edeloquentia sisia nonpotrebbe dire quanto la cipta nostra e stat difesa cresciuta redificata e exaltata da vostri gloriosi progenitori. Prima per carlomangno Re e Inperadore Reedificata per carlo primo Re di gerusalme e dicicilia…" in this passage, Magalotti uses self-deprecation to emphasize the pinnacle historical example of the connections between Florence and the House of Anjou.

[46] For the block quotation, see (Salviati 1784, 372-73); The passage translates to "Having to speak in the presence of your glorious excellence and of the amazing profundity of the intelligence of your serenity and the so magnificent presence of so many notable barons, princes, and rulers, where, because of the importance of the many things magnificently commissioned [to me] and because of the little reputation [that I possess], I am frightened and astonished more than I marvel that I do not trust myself to speak."

[47] For the recommendation of Cicero and Pseudo-Cicero, see Pseudo-Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* 3:10 and Cicero, *De inventione,* II 177. The close relationship between Charles of Anjou and Florence is seen through the presence of Charles' arms on the façade of Palazzo Vecchio. See (Rubinstein 1995, 18). For the narration, partition, confirmation, and conclusion, see (Salviati 1784, 373-74, 74, 74-81, and 97-81, respectively).

[48] For Magalotti's procrastination of the political particulars, see (Salviati 1784, 381)

[49] For Lapo's begininning, see (Davidsohn 1897, 240). For Lapo's evocation of the divine, see (Davidsohn 1897, 241), the Latin is "…Ego autem invocate in auxilium divinitate…" For the block quotation, see (Davidsohn 1897, 240), the Latin is Rerum quippe magnarum gravitas me locuturum obruit, nam quis stilus materie dignus, que parata dicendis eloquentia, cui tauti pectoris facunditas, ignenii ubertas, lingue mobilitas, ut tali atque tante materie se fore ydoneum arbitretur." For Lapo's use of Vergil, see (Davidsohn 1897, 240). For Vergil, see Vergil, *Aeneid,* VI, 625-626. Lapo's lines translate to "Whoever holds this beginning (says the lines), it is true to me, if I had a hundred tongues and a hundred mouths, if my voice was iron, hardly would I seem worthy enough about to speak of such things (that is, the items in his commission) and the praises of your holiness." Compare the translation of these passages of Vergil in (Virgil 1981, 181). For Lapo's use of Caesar, see (Davidsohn 1897, 240). Lapo states "…et video sanctitati vestre congruere verba olim ad Cesarem dicta: ignorant profecto magnitudinem tuam, imperator, qui coram te loqui presumunt, qui nun mutuant humanitatem. Nunc vero cogor ut dicam…" I have been unable to locate the source of this quotation.

[50] The relative brevity of the relevant instructions allows them to be quoted in full here. "Andrete al serenissimo Principe e Signore Ladislao al quale farete quelle reverentie chessi convenghano alla sua maesta. E per parte di questa Signoria chon lui posatamente vi ralegrerete della trionfale vittoria la quale Idio e anche la sua virtu glia conceduta della cipta di roma mostrando con quelle magnifiche parole che richiede simile materia quanta allegreza e chonsolatione se auta per noi e per tutto il nostro popolo della nuova felicite la quale esso a auta di tanto magnificho e di si grande acquisto. Pero che chontindianamente noi lanticha nostra benivolentia inverso quella gloriosissima chasa naturale chosa e che noi ralegriamo delle prosperita sue chome veri figliuoli della exaltatione de padri la grandeza de quali non puo essere che non sia anchora di figliuoli. Dipoi rachomanderete noi e tutto el nostro popolo alla sua clementia quanto più efichacemente potrete chome veri figliuoli e servidori che sempre siamo istati de suoi serenissimi progenitori e della sua maesta. E chosi in perpetuo sanza manchare mai dalla ferma e pura nostra fede siamo disposti d'essere hofferete anchora noi ella nostra potential essere sempre presta e aparechiata a ongni beneplacito della sua sublimita in ongni chosa la quale annoy sia possible e honesta. Pero che chon effetto troverra effatti rispondere a quanto sofferisce intorno a queste parti di sopra narrarete (*così*) agiungnierete e sciemerete chome vi parra dovere essere piu utile none usciendo degli efetti detti. Dopo questa espositione ho inchontinente ho in quell tempo che vi parra piu tuile…" (Salviati 1784, 362-63). For Magalotti's references to the later political discussions with the king, see (Salviati 1784, 380 and 81). The passages are : "…siamo presti a pratichare piu partichularmente questa materia echoneffetto venire alle conchluxione checci sono possible consalvamento delonore nostro e sichurta del nostro istato chome per efetto pienissimamente vedra la vostra maesta." And "E altra volta serenissima Re ongni vosto chomandamento: Abbiamo a parlare alla vostra maesta di piu altre materie edenziandio di piu altre partichularmente e alpresente fofine alla nostra esposizione…"

[51] For the terms of any potential league, see (Salviati 1784, 363-71). For Salviati's summation of the missions' goals, see (Salviati 1784, 291-92), the passage is "Et l'effetto della commisione fu, che per lo nostro popolo s'havea dubbio, che esso con le sue brigate non havesse intentione di voler passare verso Toscana, et che così essendo, per salvare i nostri terreni, e la nostra libertà ci sarebbe di bisogno provedere di farci forti, havendo questo a seguire, sarebbe un turbare la strette amicizia tanto lungo tempo stata tra i suoi Antenati, et la nostra comunità; la qualcosa non era utile allo stato suo, nè al nostro, anzi ne poteva seguire gan diminutione dell'uno, e dell'altro, et che seguendo nel futuro come era stato nel preterito, era conservatione, et accrescimento di ciascuno parte, et che dal canto nostro eravamo ben disposti a mostrargli con effetto la buona nostra intentione verso lui, et che così piacesse a lui di mostrare verso noi; et in effetto, che con tutti I modi, che si sapessero per noi tenere, noi ci certificassimo di non essere da lui offesi; e che se pure vedessimo la sua intentione esser malevola verso noi, che prestamente sen'avvisasse quì, acció si potesse a' rimedj provedere, et che noi provedessimo di levargli delle brigate sue il più che ci fusse possible." The commission also summarizes the mission's goals. See (Salviati 1784, 367), the passage is : "Voi siete di tanta prudentia che a voi none mestiero di parlare troppo partichularmente ma l effetto della nostra intentione e questo che in farlo rimanere chontento d exciettuare e reali di francia el papa ellonperadore e di conservare questo popolo nella sua gratia et chiarirlo bene della divotione nostra verso la sua maesta di questo vi diamo pienissima chommessione che voi parliate in quella forma vi pare utile e uxerete tutte quelle ragioni che

crediate avere a produrre questo effetto." For Ladisalus, Florence, and the papal states, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 228-29)

[52] Salviati's chronicle states a return to Florence on June 29 (Salviati 1784, 297). The 1408 law changed in September of the same year. (Vedovato 1946, 60). For the quotation, "…been given…", see (Vedovato 1946, 49) For the new laws, see (Vedovato 1946, 60)

[53] For the hardening of the state system in fifteenth-century Italy, see especially the fascinating recent book by Serena Ferente, (Ferente 2005). The conclusions in this paragraph about changes in the patterns of diplomatic destinations from Florence are based on counting the places Florence sent diplomats in ten year intervals during the first half of the fifteenth century. Counting these missions is somewhat problematic due to the loss of diplomatic records, especially for the *Dieci di Balià.* However, all the evidence points towards an increase in diplomatic missions in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century following by a great decline in the general number with a simultaneous increase in the number sent to major powers. For example, examine the following figures: Lucca: 1400-1409: 27 missions; 1410-1419: 3 missions; 1420-1429: 7; 1430-1439: 2; 1440-1449: 5; Venice: 1400-1409: 5 missions; 1410-1419: 10; 1420-1429: 13; 1430-1439: 18: 1440-1449: 26; In addition, examine the following comparative figures: missions sent to major powers in the Florentine diplomatic sphere (Pope, Milan, Venice, Naples, France/Angevins, and the Emperor): 1400-1409: 68; 1410-1419: 57; 1420-1429: 51; 1430-1439: 57; 1440-1449: 64. compared with the missions everywhere else (Bologna, Siena, Lucca, Ferrara, Genoa, Commissaries, and other minor, usually Tuscan, towns: 1400-1409: 260; 1410-1419: 135; 1420-1429: 132: 1430-1439: 105; 1440-1449: 104. The number of missions to major powers maintained basically the same levels: in the first decade there were 68 missions, in the final decade analyzed there were 64. By contrast, missions to more minor players were cut more than half with 260 in the first decade and 104 in the decade 1440-1449. Put another way, whereas between 1400 and 1409 missions to major powers made up about 21% of all missions, between 1440 and 1449 this number had almost doubled to around 38%.

[54] The eleven individuals were Rinaldo degli Albizzi, Gino Capponi, Matteo Castellani, Bartolomeo Popoleschi, Jacopo Gianfigliazzi, Vieri Guadagni, Lorenzo Ridolfi, Jacopo Salviati, Cristofano Spini, Niccolò da' Uzzano, and Marsilio Vecchietti. For the connections of Rinaldo degli Albizzi, see (Witt 2000, 446) and (Guasti 1867-1873, 5vol. III, 95ff). For the *De milita,* see (Bayley 1961, 369-97). For Gino Capponi, see (Cochrane 1981, 14). For Niccolò da Uzzano, see (Olson 1992, 91) and (Field 1998, 1114). For Matteo Castellani, see (Martines 1963, 209). For the remaining six individuals, I have found nothing concerning potential humanist interests by them in (Martines 1963) or (Cosenza 1962). Future studies may link these men with humanist learning; however, such future potential connections would undoubtedly be limited and not alter this paragraph's central contention.

[55] For Albizzi, see (Guasti 1867-1873). For Capponi, see (Cochrane 1981, 14). For Niccolò da Uzzano, see (D.V. Kent 1978, 211-15) and (G. Canestrini 1843b). For Lorenzo Ridolfi, see (Bisticci 1963, 316-19, esp. 18) and (Armstrong 2003). For the match between Bruni and the Castellani family, see Chapter Two. For Buonaccorso Pitti, see (Brucker et al. 1967, 19-106), for his friendship with Roberto Rossi, see (Brucker et al. 1967, 95)

[56] For Cristofano Spini's state funeral, see (Martines 1963, 240-41). For Jacopo di Giovanni Gianfigliazzi, see the online Tratte at http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/. Search for "gianfigliaz". Jacopo's diplomatic and domestic prominence may also be in part attributed to the role of his kinsman, Rinaldo Gianfigliazzi, as one of the top men in the Florentine *reggimento* in the early fifteenth century. On Rinaldo, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 276-78). For Matteo Castellani, see (D. Kent 1978, 219). For Vieri Guadagni, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 266) and (C. Canestrini 1843, 295). For Ridolfi in Magalotti's instructions, see (Salviati 1784, 368 and 69). For Bartolomeo Popoleschi, see (Martines 1968, 369 and 483). For Capponi at Pisa, see ASF Dieci Leg. 3, 117v, 120v and 121r; ASF Sig.Leg. 28, 30v. For his history, see (Cochrane 1981, 23) and on Palmieri's version, see (Carpetto 1984, 100-11). For Salviati, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 263-64). For Vecchietti, see ASF Dieci.Leg 3, 41r, 51v, 78v, 86v, 87v, and 129r.

[57] For Valori's mission, see (Bigazzi 1843, 271). The biography of Valori incorrectly states that Valori went on this mission alone. The commission in ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 29v is to both Nello Martini and Bartolomeo Valori and the report is signed by both men in ASF Sig.Rap. 120v. For the first quotation, see (Bigazzi 1843, 272), the Italian is "E così tornado in Firenze, il giorno dopo salito in Consiglio con intenzione di far capace ciascuno che il fine del Visconte tendeva a tirannide, avendo l'occhio in particolare a Firenze; per commuovere il popolo contro di lui, parlò in questa sentenza, come si vede a un libro di varie sue memorie." For the second quotation, see (Bigazzi 1843, 268). For Sallust, see Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae,* 57.6 and 50.5.

[58] For Valori's oration, see (Bigazzi 1843, 272-75). For his mention of his rebuff by Visconti, see (Bigazzi 1843, 272-73), the Italian reads "Il Duca Filippo, col suo vario modo di procedere, non dà segno che buon sia a speranza di pace; poichè non si è curato che gli si parli, mostrando timore di quello che poteva far di meno, ed in superficie di tener pur conto de' Fiorentini (crederò io) per giugnerli più sprovveduti, in mentre che siamo dietro a prometterci di lui inclinanzione all'accordo." For Cicero, see Cicero, *De Inventione,* xix-xxi. For his reference to Visconti as a "monster", see (Bigazzi 1843, 274-75), the Italian is "di questo vi consiglia l'utile; vi grava l'onore delle donne; l'amore de' figliuoli, da venire (quando che sia) in preda del nemico, insieme con le facultà, quando tutti conformi non ci disponghiamo a dominare tutti gli affetti derivanti da una civile concordia e bellica difesa, per non essere dominate da questo mostro". For "così vecchio", see (Bigazzi 1843, 275). For a the standards for a classically-styled refutation, see Cicero, *De inventione,* I, 42-51

[59] For the first quotation, see (Bigazzi 1843, 274), the Italian is "…e nel raccomandare andar ritrovando la virtù dove elle è, coll'esempio de'nostri antichi Romani: ed allora potremo cavare la voglia del combattere a chi non ha sete d'altro che di sangue." At least as far back as Dino Compagni Florentine writers had called for unity among competing groups. Compagni wrote "All the magistrates were there, and when I thought it was time, I said: "Dear and worthy citizens, who have all alike received sacred baptism at this font, reason compels and binds you to love one another like dear brothers, especially since you possess the most noble city in the world. Some enmity has sprung up among you over competition for offices – offices which, as you know, my companions and I have promised on our oaths to apportion equally. Now this lord Charles is coming and he should be received honorably. Set aside these enmities and make peace among yourselves so that he does not find you divided. Set aside all the grudges and wicked desires that you have harbored till now. Let everything be forgiven and set aside, for love and the good of your city. And on this sacred font, where you received holy baptism, swear a good and perfect peace among yourselves, so that the lord who is coming may find all the citizens united."(Compagni 1986, 38). For Santini, see (Santini 1922, 153)

[60] A sample of Palla di Nofri's missions can be found in ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 5, 6, and 7. For his relationship with Chrysoloras and translations, see (Bisticci 1963, 235 and 43) and (Rucellai, Perosa, and Kent 1960, vol. I, 64). For Palla's two orations, see (Diario di Palla di Noferi Strozzi 1883, 35-38).

[61] For the quotation, see (Diario di Palla di Noferi Strozzi 1883, 37). The passage translates to "And first, with the owed reverence, they undertook with a most gracious mind the greetings of so great a majesty. As if by a father, protector, and benefactor of this state, they recommend humbly him/themselves and all his/their state." For the use of Charlemagne in Florentine diplomatic relations with France, see Chapter Four of this study. For Bruni on the refoundation of Florence, see (Bruni 2001-2007, 95-97)

[62] For Ridolfi Peruzzi, see (Martines 1963, 128-29 and 232) and (Field 1998, 1127). For Valori, see (Martines 1963, 70) and (Bisticci 1963, 208) This Bartolomeo di Niccolò di Taldo Valori was a different person than the Bartolomeo di Niccolò Valori praised by Marsilio Ficino around 1457. In this letter, Ficino wrote to Piero de' Pazzi that "Bartholomeus Valor, vir admodum elegans et, ut ita dixerim, urbis nostrae delitiae, una cum socero suo Petro Paccio, clarissimo, equite, enarrationibus disputationibusque in Platonem nostris frequenter interfuit, atque omni studio celebravit." (Hough 1977, 303) The letters is also in (Torre 1902, 733). Bartolomeo di Niccolò di Taldo Valori was sevnty-nine according to the 1427 catasto. See http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/catasto/newsearch/. Search for "Valori".) In 1428, he was drawn to be Standard Bearer of Justics, but was dead. See http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/. Search for "Valori" Della Torre states that "…ossia attorno al 1430, era in un convento, quello degli Angeli, ma presso un frate, che era essenzialmente un umanista, Ambrogio Traversari.

A costui molti avevano già domandato, e domandava tuttavia, di ammaestrarli nelle lettere latine e greche, e fra gli altri furono suoi discepoli fra' Iacopo dei Tornaquinci, frate Michele, Giannozzo Manetti, a cui lesse fra le altre opera greche la Ciropedia di Senofone, Bartolommeo Valori, Leonardo Dati e Matteo Palmieri." If della Torre is correct in his dating, then this Bartolomeo Valori must be the same man praised by Ficino and not the diplomat who went to Martin V in 1418, who had died by 1428. This Leonardo Dati mentioned by della Torre also was not the Dati who went to Martin V. This Dati was also dead by 1425. On Dati, see below. For Marcello Strozzi, see (Botley 2004, 75), (Traversari 1759) and (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 397-404, esp. 397). Marcello was often the contact between Florence and Rome between 1409 and the 1440s. See (Martines 1968, 483). Moreover, he was a diplomat to various popes at least seven times: ASF Dieci.Leg. 3, 3r; ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 90r; 7, 28v; 9, 38v; 28, 19r; ASF Sig.Miss.I 28, 52v; ASF Car.Cor. 51, 6r. On Ridolfi, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 306-07). For asking Marcello to stay, see, (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 305). The Italian states ""Per levarvi disagio, e ancora perchè siamo informati che molesto v'è la stanza per più cagioni, vogliendo alleggerarvi di tali passioni, e perchè da alcuni vostri congiunti ne siamo stati richiesti, et ancora perchè speriamo quasi a tutte le cose commessevi, all'avuta di queste, avrete dato perfezione; abbiamo deliberato, che voi reverendo Padre maestro Lionardo, messer Lorenzo, messer Rinaldo, e Ridolfo, presa licenzia dalla Santità di nostro Signore, ve ne torniate prestamente qua; e voi messer Marcello e Bartolomeo seguitate quanto si continene nella commissione fatta a tutti."

[63] Throughout the fifteenth-century, Florence manned its obedience missions with its most prominent citizens, as examination of the personnel of these missions discussed in this and later chapters clearly demonstrates. On Valori, see (Martines 1963, 226). For Albizzi's role in the mission, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 291-309, esp. 07). For Valori remaning, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol.1, 305). On Ridolfo, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 306-07), where Albizzi recorded that Peruzzi spoke with the count of "Carmignola" and to the pope on a later occasion. See also (Machiavelli 1988, 181), where he is described as one of the "principals" of the anti-Medici party.

[64] Outside of this project, Dati is perhaps most famous for being one of the individuals to preside over the trial of John Hus at the Council of Constance, commissioning his tomb marker in Santa Maria Novella from Lorenzo Ghiberti, and being the brother of Goro Dati. See in general (Orlandi 1955, 134-66) and (Ristori 1987). That Florence favored Domenican representatives to the pope is demonstrated through their initial sending of a Dominican friar, Jacopo da Riete, to congratulate him on his election as Pope at Constance. See (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 292-93) and ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8, 77r (election record), ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 78r (commission), and ASF Sig.Rap. 2, 47v (report). For Dati to Constance, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 43r and (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 292). For Dati at Pavia/Siena, see (Ristori 1987, 42). For Dati as the pope's ambassador to Florence, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 296). This passage is very interesting for its stress that the ambassadors show the pope the sincerity in their words. : "Et udito dipoi voi maestro Lionardo, della sua Santità ambasciadore, e quanto benignamente, amorevolmente e con soma dilezione per la sua Beatidudine sponesti, e ancora dipoi per lettere e commissioni dalla Santità ricevute; la nostra allegreza e letizia grandissimamente raddoppiò: e ciascuno di più cresce e multiplica, sentendo e veggendo quanto di fede e amore, con soma clemenzia e benignità, piglia della Signoria e Communità nostra: e a esplicare la nostra letizia e guadio di questa sua felicissima ssunzione presa, nulla lingua sarebbe sufficiente: delle quali cose alla sua Santità, con soma devozione, renderete debite e infinite grazie, quali e quante per alcuno devotissimo figliuolo e servidore sieno possibili rendere; faccendo la sua Beatiudine certissima della soma festa e allegreza evidentissimamante monstrata per la communità nostra: non tanto in apparenzia e demonstrazione, quanto intrinsecamente ne'nostri petti e animi. E bene che noi pensiamo nostro signore Papa di questo esser bene avvisato, e della purità della nostra sincera fede e devozione: pur nondimeno, con quelle parole e modi che giudichiate esser utili alla sua certeza, e della nostra allegreza e volonta nel chiarificate e fate certissimo, perchè siete chiari della nostra pura e buona intenzione, e di tutta la nostra citttà." Later in the commission, the issue of sincerity comes up again: "E bene che noi ci rendimao certissimi, tutte le cagioni di tale tardità e indugio comprenda per sua infinita prudenza: purnondimeno, voi che ne siete informati, chiarmente la sua Santità ne renderete avvisata: acciò che la nostra buona intenzione, sincerità e fede concesa, della quale non dubitiamo lui esser certissimo; e le nostre scuse benignamente e con grandissima clemenzia accettare e ammettere."

[65] For the first quotation, see (Ristori 1987, 41) On Dati's sermons, see (Orlandi 1955, 142-43 and 63-64; Ristori 1987, 42) and (Finke 1923). On *La Sfera,* see (Ristori 1987, 43), which contains a good discussion of the issues involved in attributing this work to Leonardo. For the quote from Rinuccini, see (Aiazzi 1840, lvi). The Italian is

"Trovammo il ditto papa Martino a Milan, e quivi si fe'la prima vicitazione, e fecela il generale, e durò circa a un'ora, che mai s'udì simile orazione, che v'era forse cento calamai a scriverla mentre che diceva, e fece grandissimo onore a se e al commune." Rinuccini's chronicle provides one of the only full lists of youth accompanying a diplomatic mission in the period covered by this study. Rinuccini writes "I nomi degl' imbasciadori sono questi, e così de' giovani: Maestro Lionardo di Stagio Dati, generale dell'Ordine de' frati predicatori – giovani con lui: ‖ Ser **** notaro. ‖ Borghino di Zanobi Borghini. ‖ ----- ‖ Messer Lorenzo Ridolfi. ‖ Messer Rinaldo degli Albizzi. ‖ Giovani con loro: ‖ Pietro di Goro del Benino. ‖ Bernardo di Messer Lorenzo, ditto Gerozzo di Piero Gerini. ‖ Ser **** prete. ‖ ----- ‖ messer Marcello degl Strozzi. ‖ giovani con lui: ‖ Benedetto di Marcuccio Strozzi. ‖ Niccolò di Neri Macinghi. ‖ -----‖ Bartolommeo Valori. ‖ giovani con lui: ‖ Filippo di Cino rinuccini. ‖ Niccolò di Domenico Giugni. ‖ ----- ‖ Ridolfo di Bonifazio Peruzzi. ‖ giovani con lui: ‖ Domenico di Bernardo Lamberteschi. ‖ Antonio di Niccolò del buno Busini."

[66] For Dati's word order, see a sermon delivered on September 15, 1415 in (Finke 1923, 417-19). For a biblical quotation, see (Finke 1923, 417). For "old canons", see (Finke 1923, 418). For Maximus, see (Finke 1923, 488). For the sermon with Seneca, Anarcharsis, and Socrates, see (Finke 1923, 488-92). For the *Manipulus Florum,* see http://info.wlu.ca/~wwwhist/faculty/cnighman/MFedition/index.html. (Accessed November 28, 2007). Socrates is under *rapina l;* Anacharsis is under *lex;* Senca is listed under *curiositas AN;* the second Seneca quote "quod non perdidisti…" is from *curiositas am.* Compare, for example, the references to Socrates. Dati stated "…cum semel a Socrate quesitum fuisset, cur rideret, respondit: video magnos latrines ducentes ad suspendium parvos latrines: sacrilegia, inquit, minuta puniuntur, set magna in triumphis feruntur." The *Manipulus Florum* has "Quesitum erat a Socrate cur rideret. Respondens ait: Video magnos latrines ducentes paruum latronem ad suspendium qui digniores sunt suspendio. Sacrilega, inquit, minuta puniuntur sed magna in triumphis feruntur." For scholastics, see (Finke 1923, 481). For the references to Petrarch and Vitruvius, see (Finke 1923, 507-13, esp. 08 and 10)

[67] For this manuscript, see (Hankins 2003, 99-101). For Hankins' hypotheses, see (Hankins 2003, 431 and the relevant documents on 119-21). For the detailed description of the manuscript contents, see (Hankins 2003, 102-14). Hankins dates the letters to Cosimo on (Hankins 2003, 431). On Barzizza's oratory, see (Mercer 1979, 101-05). I have been unable to examine all of Barzizza's extant orations, however a description of one by Mercer sounds especially promising: "Later, Barzizza wrote four eulogies to Pope Martin V. one, which was given at Padua on the election of the new Pope, rejoices in this turn in events after the lamentable conditions of a divided church." (Mercer 1979, 102). For Barzizza at Constance, see (Mercer 1979, 25) For the similar beginnings to orations, see (Hankins 2003, 110-11). Some of Barzizza's orations have been published, none of which is this anonymous oration. See (Barzizza 1723)

[68] For the text of this oration, see (Hankins 2003, 120-21). The quotation translates to "After we heard that you, Most holy Father, were elected to the apostolic seat (literally, "into the pontificate of the holy seat") by the influence of God, we were moved by such joy that we disdain never to be able to set it out in words…." The quotation from Cicero is, Cicero, *Epistularum ad familiars,* XV, 7, and translates to "I was moved by the greatest joy when I heard that you were made consul…". For an example of the complicated word order in this oration, see the following sentence: "Qui tali afflavit spiritu patres electioni constitutos et tanta fugavit luce tenebras superiors", which translates to "he who breathed with such spirit (tali afflavit spiritu), the fathers ordained by election and drove away the former shadows with his so powerful light." (Hankins 2003, 121). The second quotation translates to "The kind of pastor that the church was especially desiring and pushing for, it has, and a Colonna has been verified (that is, agreed upon as the true pope), by whom nothing better is desired or hoped for to erect, set up, and fortify it (all of these verbs, erigendam, constituendam, and firmamdam can have military connotations).

[69] The only such veiled allusion thus far identified is the quote beginning the last paragraph.

[70] Nicola de' Medici and Bruni corresponded, see, for example, (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 21, 33, 42, 57, 59, and 120) For Nicola as a possible translator, see (Hankins 2006, 22). For Nicola as a diplomat, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 22r and ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 15r. On Lorenzo Benevenuti, see above. For Leonardo Dati as a diplomat, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 29r, 43r, 90r, 131r; 7, 17v. On Agnolo Pandolfini, see (Martines 1963, 313-14). For a summary of Agnolo's letter to Bruni, see (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 132) For Pandolfini as a diplomat, see ASF

Dieci.Leg 3, 1v, 78r; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8, 4r; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 39r; 6, 6v, 36r, 68v, 79r, 98r, 139r; 7, 46r; 9, 51r, 76v, 119v; For Cosimo's diplomatic career, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 198v; 7, 28r, 36v, 65v; 9, 40v; ASF Sig.Miss.I, 31, 33r; M.A.P. 124: 652 and 11: 365. For the request for an oration from Cosimo, see (Hankins 2003, 119-21 and 431). For the studies of Luca degli Albizzi, see (Viti 1992, 379) and (Martines 1963, 256). For his diplomatic career, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 63r, 96r, 138r; 7, 76v; 9, 91r, 135v; 10, 109v, 164v; 11, 38v; 12, 97r; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 2; 4; 5; 60; 62; ASF Car.Cor. 51, 30r; 51, 34v; ASF Dieci.Leg. 4, 65r; (Palmeri 1906, 165) For Davanzati, see (Martines 1963, 328-29). For Davanzati's diplomatic career, see ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 10r; 6, 123v; 7, 15r, 32v; 9, 32r; 10, 32r, 34v, 60v, 155v; ASF Sig.Minutari, 6, 4r; ASF Sig.Miss.I, 31, 27r; ASF Car.Cor., 51, 26r, 35r, 40r, 47v. For Salamone Strozzi's reputation, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 286). For Salamone's diplomatic career, see ASF Sig.Leg. 2, 76r, 76v; 6, 9r, 46r; 7, 2v.

[71] For Bruni's letter to Palla, see (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 69-70). For Palla's domestic oration see ASF Car.Stroz. III, 125, 123rff. and (Field 1998, 1112). For the manuscript in general, see ASF Car.Stroz.III, 125. On Palla's oratory, see also (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 286-87)

[72] For this working draft, see ASF Car.Stroz. III, 125, 124v. The two quotes translate to "your dignity and the glory of your most serene and illustrious [majesty] and the so grate loftiness of your sublimity" and "your glorious and venerable dignity of your most esteemed [majesty]". This Palla is also known as "Palla Novello".

[73] For Palla's passage, see ASF Car. Stroz. III, 125, 124v. The passage translates to "Having to speak in the presence of such a majesty, in the presence of so glorious a ruler and of such an outstanding council with such decorated members, I could, as is the owed custom, shower with praise and magnificence your extraordinary majesty and satisfy the desire of my magnificent and powerful *signori*, your most devoted sons. However, I, having come with little age, heard of the immense clemency of your most sacred ruler and the inestimable and infinite humanity…" For Magalotti, see (Salviati 1784, 327-73). The passage translates to "Having to speak in the presence of your glorious excellence and of the amazing profundity of the intelligence of your serenity and the so magnificent presence of so many notable barons, princes, and rulers, where, because of the importance of the many things magnificently commissioned [to me] and because of the little reputation [that I possess], I am frightened and astonished more than I marvel that I do not trust myself to speak… and humbly supplicating the clemency of your humanity that [you look past] the imperfection of my speech, but instead regard benignly the devotion, affection, singular reverence, and sincere mind of the community of Florence as truly [that of] all the affection of a son of your royal excellence.

[74] For this passage, see ASF Car.Stroz. III, 125, 124v. Palla's handwriting has made this transcription extraordinarily difficult, leaving many words and spellings uncertain. The Latin translates to "When I was instructed to your singular most sacred majesty in the presence of such an outstanding and decorated council, and after I approached the kingdom of your outstanding majesty, having become aware of your clemency and humanity, all things that previously had appeared to me difficult and fearful, became propitious, secure, and agreeable because of the so great (harmony?), gravity and affability of your lordship and the so great serenity, beneficence, and amicability of your majesty."

[75] For the first quotation, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 61r. The Italian is "saluterete e conforterete con largheza di parole et commodo a loro grato…" For the second quotation (a brother and a friend), see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 92v. For the third (the mission to Ferrara), see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 100r. The Italian is "Quando sarai a ferrara o ove sara lo illustre signore marchese predetto salutatolo e confortatolo per parte della signoria nostra come singularissimo e buono fratello e amico et offertogli generalmente con quelle parole e modifi richiede fra buoni amici e fratelli…" For the Faenza mission, see ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 125v. For Siena in 1424, see ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 35v. The Italian is "quelle effectuose et caldo parole che conosci disidersi et conveniris al caso"

[76] For this quotation, see (Santini 1922, 123-24). Santin's final quotation concerning Rinaldo degli Ablizzi is actually from a letter to Rinaldo from his brother Luca while Rinaldo was in Naples, rather than an official diplomatic dispatch.

[77] For Vergerio at Padua, see (Witt 2000, 383); for Venice, see (Witt 2000, 454-67); for the first quotation, see (Witt 2000, 476) This quote is in an anonymous letter to the Duke of Milan "For since we see Florence flourishing magnificently in this art of speaking well, thanks to Leonardo Bruni, a most eloquent man, and also Venice and Padua, on account of Gasparino of Bergamo, a man endowed with the highest genius and greatest learning, by how much more will you Milanese flourish on account of that dignity by which your most flourishing city excels other cities." Witt argues in the subsequent pages that this foretold golden age of oratory never occurred in Milan. For the second quotation, see (Witt 2000, 477); for Biglia, see (Witt 2000, 489-90)

[78] For special privileges granted to visiting Florentine diplomats, see the discussion of the Florentine mission to Nicholas V in 1447 in Chapter Three of this study. For Trexler, see (R. Trexler 1980, 290-97)

CHAPTER TWO

[79] For this quotation, see (Filarete et al. 1978, 85-86). The Italian is "Visitò la Signoria alla ringhiera ae andò a smontare a casa e Pazi, dove era molto gintilmente parato. E l'altro dì venne a visitare la nostra excelsa Signoria accompagnato da molti cittadini e da molta nobilissima compagnia di sua gente. Fu ricevuto nella sala del Consiglo da nostri excelsi Signori, dove per Lodovico Carbone huomo dottissimo fu ricitata elegantissima horatione di mandato del nobilissimo principe Hercule prenominato, come qui da piè si farà mentione. Era Sigismodo huomo più da adoperarsi che da horare. E volendo Hercule duca che s'intendesse la sua buona vogla verso quest republica, fè mestiere de elegante horatore. Al quale messer Luigi Guicciardini fecie inoppinato degna risposta." For a document related to this occasion, see (Baldassarri and Saiber 2000, 306-08)

[80] Evidence of at least two responses by Bruni to visiting dignitaries survive. The earlier of these two – the oration for which no copy seems to exist – was delivered by Bruni to the visiting Greek intellectuals and emperor upon their arrival in the city for the Council of Florence in 1439. Bruni delivered the second of these orations to the ambassadors of the King of Naples in 1443. Alfonso's ambassadors had requested that Florence cease aiding Francesco Forza. The chancellor Leonardo Bruni presented the city's reply, rather than the Signoria, as was custom. For Bruni's oration at the Council of Florence, see (Bianca 1990, 227) and (Black 1985, 165) For the later responses of the Gonalonier of Justice to visiting ambassadors, see (Black 1985, 164). A third oration that Bruni delivered while in Florence, which falls outside of the category of diplomatic orations, was his Oration to Niccolò da Tollentino in 1433. This oration was deliverd to commemorate the appointment of Niccolò as head of the Florentine armies. Such an oration could occur on a commissarial mission. For example, an oration survives by Giannozzo Manetti for the same type of occasion to Sigismundo Malatesta. Manetti delivered the oration while serving as a commissary for Florence. By contrast Bruni's oration was delivered in Florence as a part of the festivities surrounding the feast day of John the Baptist. For this oration by Bruni, see (Viti 1996, 815-23) For Manetti's oration on a similar occasion see Chapter Three. For the domestic orations of other chancellors, see (Black 1985, 165) and (Brown 1979, 153-58) For the quotation, see (Viti 1996, 853 and 61). The Italian for the quote is "Questa è la risposta che vi si fa per parte de' miei magnifici Signori con diliberatione et consenso non solamente di questa numerosa multitudine de' spettabili cittadini, i quali vedete essere presente et audienti; ma ancora con consenso et diliberatione di tutta la città acciò che intendiate tutto il popolo nostro essere d'uno volere et d'uno consenso et d'un pezzo." Another common speaking occasion for the chancellor was when a visiting diplomat spoke in Latin and had little knowledge of Italian. (Brown 1979, 156-58). Vespasiano da' Bisticci provides an excellent anecdote for one such occasion. "The Emperor sent as ambassador one who was of the Gherardini, and the gonfalonier then was one of the Veccheti who, together with all his associates, was completely illiterate. After the ambassador, who was also an archbishop, had delivered his message in Latin, the chancellor was chosen to answer it, and a day was fixed when this reply should be given. The archbishop duly attended and waited in the hall; but as the chancellor was absent not one of the others could say a word in answer, and the gonfalonier was at his wits' end. Ser Filippo [di ser Ugolino], in his vexation that such disgrace should have fallen on the Signori, said that he would have paid heavily to be able to teach the gonfalonier enough Latin to make an answer; after having done this he might have forgotten it as soon as he would here it is shown how much honour and profit letters may bring, looking at the disgrace the Signoria suffered on this occasion." (Bisticci 1963, 321)

[81] For a Florentine diplomat serving as a godparent, see (Haas 1995, 346). See also (R.C. Trexler 1980, 285; Queller 1967, 48-49). The Venetians tried to limit this role for the city's diplomats, see legislation passed on July 18, 1409, (Queller and Swietek 1977, 39)

[82] On these points, see the longer discussion of these orations in Chapter One of this study.

[83] For the first block quotation, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 329). The Italian is "E principierete, come essendo la nostra communità devotissimi e fedelissimi servidori della chiesa di Dio e del sante Padre, e per lo stato e conservazione d'essi sempre fatto ciascuna cosa possible , e non lasciato per pericoli, Danni o spesa, nè potenzia che contro a quella abbia fatto o tenuto (come siamo certi a tutti i presenti essere notissimo), è per nostra consolazione, e per rendere avisati alcuni che per aventura non hanno notizia; omettendo delle cose antiche, che sarebbano assai, et

ancora per non dare tedio agli auditori; reciterete quelle che voi sapete, con quello modo che pensiate sia più accetto a chi sarà presente". For the letter from the *Dieci,* see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 336)

[84] See the commission in (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 328-33). The quotation is on page 332.

[85] Compare the examples in the letter with the oration: The letter has a narrative of Alexander IV, Manfred, Clement, Charles, John XXII, Ludovico, Azzo de' Visconti, Robert of Sicily, etc. The oration has Manfred, Alexander IV, Clement, Azzo de' Visconti, Robert of Sicily, John XXII, etc. (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 336-37, 535-36). Examples in the part about rulers acting against the Florentines in the commission: Rettore della Marca, Giovanni da Camerino, Ardiccione da Carrara, Govenatore di Bologna, followed by the opposite has been done for the Duke of Milan, etc. The oration has Governatore della Marca, Piero di Navarrino, Ardiccione, followed by the opposite has been done for the Duke of Milan. (Guasti 1867-1873, 329, 536-37). Justification for war, for example, begins in the commission with a statement about how after the death of Giangaleazzo the Florentines restrained from pushing their advantage, which is the same beginning as in the oration. Compare the following pages for further examples (Guasti 1867-1873, vol.II, 329-31, 537-38) The final section about the Florentines being active seekers of peace again parallels the narrative in the commission, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 331, 539-40). The oration adds some minor details, probably drawn from the first hand experiences of Rinaldo degli Albizzi and Nello Martini. One area with some added information are the peace talks in Ferrara, concerning which Rinaldo degli Albizzi was a participant. The oration (but not the commission) also referred to the rejection of audience for Bartolomeo Valori (a mission discussed in Chapter One), on which mission Nello Martini was also present. See ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 29v. See the brief mission summary at (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. III, 358). The Latin quotation in Martini's speech is "dirette o indirette, vel ullo quesito colore", which parallels language in a diplomatic law from 1430 "…non posit vel debeat, directe vel indirecte…" For the Latin quote, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 538) For the law, see (Vedovato 1946, 50). For the classical structure, see the exordium on (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 534-35) partition (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 535) confirmation and refutation (Guasti 1867-1873, 535-40) and peroration (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 540). For statements expressing concerns about the oration's length, see (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. II, 535, 37, 40)

[86] (Guasti 1867-1873, 534). The Italian is "Noi non siamo ignari, Padre beatissimo, che nella cosa la quale abbiamo a fare dinanzi alla tua Santità e del sacro Collegio de' signori Cardinali, sarebbe necessario con ornato parlare e pulita orazione laudare e magnificare la magnificenzia della Chiesa apostolica e della tua Beatitudine. Et intorno a questa materia sarebbe di bisogno d'usare lungo sermone, innanzi che noi cominciassimo a esporre quella materia, della quale abbiamo a trattare . Ma la fama grandissima delle tue opera laudabile, e la filiale e benigna dilezione, della quale dalla tua Beatitudine il Popolo Fiorentino magnificamente è esaltato, con la necessità della larga e gran materia la quale abbiamo a trattare, molto ci molesta e affligge, si ci assicureremo, come noi crediamo dinanzi alla tua Beatitudine convenirsi, a quelle lode e magnificenzie della prefata Sedia appostolica e della tua Santità non discendera la nostra Signoria. Ancora non siamo ignari che sarebbe di bisogno, innanzi a tanta Santità di parlare per gramatica, con quello ornamento che richiederebbe quella materia, la quale a noi dalla nostra magnifica Signoria è stata imposta e ingiunta: ma perchè non è costume degli altri oratori e ambasciadori Fiorentini, et eziandio propiamente è piu congruo al proposito di quelli che ce l'hanno commessa, per volgare si potrà meglio soddisfare a ciascuna parte, con quella facillità e brevità che meglio si potrà, a espingere e narrare la materia a noi commessa , mediante la benigna sopportazione della tua Santità e del tuo sacro collegio: e ancora sottomettendomi alla correzione e supplimento di questi miei spettabili et egregi Padri; ai quali abbidendo, incomincerò a parlare e narrare quello che a loro e a me è istato commesso."

[87] For the insult to Martin V, see (Bruni 2001-2007, vol. III, 357-63) For the problems between Florence and the Pope over the Romagna, the attempts of the Milanese to exploit them, and Albizzi's quote (the Italian is "in segreto il Papa s'intende col Duca *per omnia"*, see (Partner 1972, 87-88) For the letter from the Duke of Milan, see ASF Misc.Rep. 2:65, 53. For the final quote from Peter Partner and the lack of success of the transfer of the city, see (Partner 1972, 73 and 81-82)

[88] On Rinaldo degli Albizzi and Agnolo Pandolfini, see Chapter One. On Nello Martini, see (Martines 1968, 499) See also (Santini 1922, 144-46). Santini noted that Martini had the humanist knowledge to make a different kind of oration: "L'orazione, che è una delle poche veramente politiche rimaste a noi, è tenuta proprio <<con la reverentia....

e con efficacia>>, come desiderava la Signoria. Il classicismo, che non doveva manifestarsi nelle citazioni e nei richiami dell'antichità, traspira dalla sapiente distribuzione delle parti, dall'opportunità degli argomenti, dalla <<onesta disposizione>> com'ebbe a dire il pontefice stesso. Ecco che cosa Firenze domandava a' suoi oratori, che, se erano giuristi come il Martini, dovevano anche sapere di lettere." (Santini 1922, 145-46)

[89] On Agnolo Pandolfini, Palla di Nofri Strozzi, Luca degli Albizzi, Rinaldo degli Albizzi, Marcello Strozzi, and Ridolfo Peruzzi, see Chapter One. For Piero di Luigi Guicciardini, see (Brucker and American Council of Learned Societies. 1977, 292) and (Black 1985, 137). His missions during these years were ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto. Leg.Miss.Resp. 3, 23; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 133r; 7, 76v; 9, 1r, 51r, 135v; 10, 2v. Black offers Guicciardini's statements as evidence that the humanists had succeeded in convincing the Florentine patricians "...of the power of eloquence and the importance of employing a humanist chancellor." On Felice di Michele Brancacci, see (Garin 1963, 57) and (Molho 1977). His missions during these years are at ASF Dieci.Miss. 2, 42r; ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 70r; 8, 1r, 9r, 20r; 9, 28v, 88v, 97r, 117r. For Francesco Soderini, see (Torre 1902, 309). His missions for these years are at ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 127v; 7, 21v; 8, 46r; 9, 85r, 99v; Diplomats less than 5 times: Alessandro Alessandri (3: ASF Sig.Leg. 8, 85r; 9, 28v, 85v); Leonardo Bruni (2: see Chapter Two); Neri di Gino Capponi (3, although one mission has two commissions, see ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 95r, 96r; 9, 28v, 130v); Matteo Castellani (2: ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 43v, (Cavalcanti 1838-1839, vol.1, 154)); Giuliano Davanzati (3: ASF Sig.Miss.I 31, 27r; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 10r; 9, 32r); Biagio Guasconi (3: ASF Sig.Leg. 8, 79r; 9, 44r, 82v); Cosimo de' Medici (3: ASF Sig.Miss.I 31, 33r; ASF Sig.Leg. 7, 65v; 9, 40v); Lorenzo de' Medici (2: ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 105v; 9, 32r); Lorenzo Ridolfi (3: ASF Dieci.Miss. 2, 1r; ASF Sig.Leg. 5, 127v; 9, 32r); Matteo Strozzi (4: ASF Sig.Leg. 9, 83v; (Crabb 2000, 27); Palla di Palla Strozzi (3: ASF Car.Stroz. Series III, 119, 19r and 37r; 125, 1r). On the humanist connections of Lorenzo Ridolfi, Matteo Castellani, and Palla di Palla Strozzi, see Chapter One. Neri di Gino Capponi delivered celebrated diplomatic orations and wrote a "humanist commentary", in the words of the historian Eric Cochrane. See (Santini 1922, 183-85) and (Cochrane 1981, 23). Matteo Palmieri also dedicated a history to him. (Cochrane 1981, 26). For Biagio Guasconi and Leonardo Bruni, see Chapter Two. For the remaining figures, see (Martines 1963)

[90] For the commission for this mission, see ASF Sig.Leg. 9.32r. On Lorenzo de' Medici, see (Martines 1963, 332-33), On Zanobi Guasconi, see (Martines 1968, 484-85) and for further information on his activities in the Florentine university, see (Davies 1998, 169)

[91] For Bruni's first election as diplomat, see ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8.20v. For Bruni gaining citizenship, see (Bruni et al. 1987, 36) and (Santini 1910, 133-39) On Bruni's domestic office holding, see (Martines 1963, 165-76) For Bruni's family, see (Martines 1963, 121-23) and (Borgia 1990) For the Castellani family, see (Martines 1963, 199-210) For two different listings of the Florentine *reggimento*, see (Kent 1975) and (Molho 1994). I have searched for Bruni's descendants with the online Tratte database of Florentine office holders available through Brown University. Leonardo's son Donato Bruni and grandson Piero Bruni were drawn most often for Florentine office. However, tax problems and age requirements were large impediments to the careers of both men. For example, Piero was drawn sixteen times for positions on the *Tre Maggiori* between 1441 and 1493. However, he was not old enough to hold office on three of these occasions. Tax debts prevented his taking office ten other times. Out of sixteen total chances, Piero was a prior once and a standard bearer twice. The Online Tratte is available at http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte.

[92] On the importance of the merchants in Naples in Florentine foreign policy, see (Lewin 2003, 178), where she credits the safety of Florentine merchants and revival of trade with Naples as key factors in prompting the Florentines to make peace with Naples in 1411. For this political narrative and the treacherous diplomatic path presented to the Florentines, see (Partner 1968, 387-90)

[93] For Alfonso's adoption, see (Partner 1972, 68) For Bruni's legal training, see (Martines 1963, 165-69). For Alfonso's interests in humanism, see (Bentley 1987). Accompanying Bruni was another man with low diplomatic prestige, Antonio Panzano. Antonio Panzano enjoyed a strong domestic political career; however, this mission was his only diplomatic assignment. For Panzano's domestic career, see the online Tratte (http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/), search for dapanzano under surname and look for Antonio di Luca. Anthony Molho lists him as possessing only middle status in the Florentine patricate. See (Molho 1994, 368)

Interestingly, Panzano's son would later buy a house next to Bruni's and Bruni would be a godparent for one of his children. See (Carnesecchi 1889, 157). See this article in general for further information on Panzano.

[94] For the election of Bruni's replacement, see ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 8, 20v. For Jacopo as Niccolò Niccoli's brother and his legal career, see (Martines 1963, 161). For the low family status of the Niccoli, see (Martines 1963, 160) Evidence for Jacopo's lack of humanist interests comes from a short list of books that he possessed, none of which pertained to humanist subjects. See (Bec 1984, 159)

[95] See (R.C. Trexler 1980, 287-88)

[96] For Capranica as the pope's diplomat to Florence, see (Monzani 1857, 26). For the diplomatic relations between Florence, the papacy, and Milan during the mid 1420s, see above. For the quotation, see (G. Canestrini 1843a, 204). The Italian is "conchiuso il trattato, Rinaldo degli Albizzi in persona, accompagnato da un dottore di legge, reccossi in qualità di ambasciatore all'Imperatore Sigismondo, per trattare la pace tra lui e la Repubblica veneziana; onde, levata la Guerra da qualle bande, questa potesse portarsi con tutte le forze contro il Duca di Milano." For the negotiations with Savoy, see ASV Sen.Sec. 9, 142v, 147r and ASF Dieci.Miss. 2, 95v-96r, 98v and 103v. For Palla di Palla Strozzi's commission to Savoy, see ASF Car.Stroz. Series III, 119, 37r. For a copy of the capitals of the agreement with Savoy, see ASF Car.Stroz. Series III, 125, 7r. This interpretation contrasts with the existent scholarship on this mission by Bruni. Relying on the instructions, two letters, and report given by Bruni and published in the mid-nineteenth-century by C. Monzani, scholars have stressed the importance of this mission, Bruni's prestigious role in it, and the positive effects for Bruni's career brought about by his success on this mission. Lauro Martines argued that Bruni headed this important albeit failed mission to make peace with Milan. Sometime before the mission officially ended, Bruni's colleague, Francesco Tornabuouni, left Bruni alone at the papal court while he returned to Florence. Newly discovered documents in the Florentine *Archivio di Stato* make clear that Bruni actually left first. A letter dated August 25 instructs Bruni to return to Florence and for Tornabuoni to stay. See ASF Dieci.Miss. 2, 122v. Monzani argued that Bruni's good relations with the pope had secured him a position on this "onorevole e delicate commissione. La quale egli adempì con tanta soddisfazione del governo, che questi non lasciò poi passare qualunque occasione se gli porse di onorla." The few other scholars to address this mission have been content to summarize these published documents or focus on Bruni's speech delivered for this mission in a likewise cursory fashion. See (Monzani 1857, 46-47 and for the published documents, 25-34) For Martines' interpretation, see (Martines 1963, 168-69) Se also (Bianca 1990) (Bayley 1961, 90) (Plebani 2002, 121-23).

[97] According to Bruni's commission, the league agreement between Florence and Venice stated that "…come v'e noto per gli capitoli della lega, la Signoria di vinegia può disporre quanto è sua volontà della pace." The date the the Venetian ambassadors entered Rome is unknown; however, after many failed attempts to elect diplomats, the Venetian Senate elected Francesco Barbaro and Andrea Mauroceno as their diplomats in Rome on April 8. See ASV Sen.Sec. 9, 98r. There commission was given on April 20. ASV Sen.Sec. 9, 106v. (Monzani 1857, 27) For the instructions to work closely with the Venetian ambassadors, see (Monzani 1857, 26-27) See also ASF Dieci Miss. 2, 86r. Of the two surviving letters from the *Signoria* to Bruni and Tornabuoni, neither refers to the peace negotiations. Short references to the peace negotiations do appear in the letters from the *Dieci*; however, they are always refered to after the other matters (such as disputes over lands in the Romagna or issues concerning Faenza). References to peace occupy a few lines in many of these letters (the letters from June 8 (76v-77r), June 22 (85r-86r), July 10 (93v-94r), July 20 (98r-98v), August 4 (103v-104r), and August 25 (112r-112v) and about half of an extremely short letter from August 18 (109r). For Venetian letters mostly about making peace see ASV Sen.Sec. 9, 117v, 120v, 121r, 129v, 131r, 132v, 133v, 136v, 138v, 142v, 147r, 149v, 158v, 163r, ; other letters that focus on concerns about Faenza, troops, or lands in the Romagna are 133r, 146r, and 154r. For the letter to Marcello Strozzi, see ASV Sen.Sec. 9, 175v. For the stress in Bruni's commission that the Venetian presence had made their own unnecessary, see (Monzani 1857, 26) The surviving Milanese correspondence for this period is unfortunately not overly helpful. A collection of Milanese archival documents from this period were published in (Osio 1869) However, most of these documents are letters between Milan and the Holy Roman Emperor or Milan's ambassadors at that location seeking the Emperor's aid in the war with Venice and to a lesser extent, Florence. At one point in the summer of 1426 (July 23), Visconti asked his ambassador at the Emperor's Court to mediate a peace between the Duke and Florence so that he would concentrate on the war with Venice. See (Osio 1869, 239)

[98] For a letter from the *Dieci di Balià* to Bruni while in Forlì, see ASF Dieci.Miss 2, 133v. Paolo Viti is the only scholar that I have found to refer to this letter. See (Viti 1992, 128) Viti, however, states that this evidence is proof that Bruni returned to Rome after he had returned from his mission. That Bruni was in Forlì is supported by the beginning of this letter in which Bruni's last letter is mentioned as being written in Forlì. Moreover, James Hankins has noted, using information in a letter written to Cosimo de' Medici, that Bruni was in Forlì on November 18, eight days after the *Dieci* letter is dated. Hankins quotes this letter to Cosimo as stating "Vedute le lettere che il r.s. cardinale de sancto marcello, di comandamento della Santità Sua, scripse a messer Leonardo da Arezo sopra 'l facto della restitutione delle nostre terre et de nostri acomandati occupate da i nostri inimici, mandammo il detto messer Leonardo, come vedremo essere intentione della Sua Beatitudine, al Reverenda Paternità governatore di Forlì". (Hankins 1990, vol. II, 385-86). Giovanni Gambacorta was the head of the defenses at Pisa in the 1406 besiegement by Florence. He was bribed and let the Florentines into the city. (Bayley 1961, 76). Martines describes the Gambacorti as an "ancient Pisan house."(Martines 1963, 205) Roberto Bizzocchi also lists the Gambacorti as a prominent Pisan family. See (Bizzocchi 1987, 21-22 and 47) Field also states the high position of the Gambacorta in Pisa and provides this information regarding the relationship between Alessandra Castellani and Giovanni Gambacorta. See (Field 1998, 1132).

[99] For Francesco Barbaro, see above. For the meeting between the Venetians and Florentines as soon as Bruni and Tornabuoni entered Rome, see (Monzani 1857, 32). For Capranica as the pope's diplomat to Florence, see above. For Capranica and Piccolomini, see (Pius II 2003, vol. I, 10-13); and Biondo Flavio, see (Nogara 1927, L-LIV). For Capranica's library, see (Antonovics 1976). Capranica left Rome in the summer of 1426, which made his participation in the peace talks unlikely. He was appointed governor of Forlì on June 6 and entered Forlì in July. See (Partner 1972, 88)

[100] On Francesco Tornabuoni, see (Plebani 2002). Tornuaboni's pre-1426 diplomatic career consisted of Pisa (ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 99r), Venice (ASF Sig.Leg. 4, 145v), the Count of Urbino (ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 28v), Genoa (ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 72r), Toscanella (ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 95v), Bologna (ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 122v), Captain Agnolo dalla Pergola (ASF Sig.Leg 6, 131v) and a commissary position (ASF Sig.Minutari 6.8r) On his diplomatic career, see (Plebani 2002, 85-131)

[101] For Bruni and the pope in Florence, see (Bruni 1914-1926, 445-46) For Bruni in the curia in 1420, see (Gualdo 1990, 80) The pope had left Florence and entered Rome by September of 1420. See (Monzani 1857, 46) Bruni was elected a diplomat only in November. For Bruni as a intermediary between Florence and the papacy, see (Gualdo 1990, 81 and 92) Gualdo, however, is unsure of the level to which Bruni was used. Bruni argued against his fellow Florentines in favor of letting Pope Eugenius leave the city after the conclusion of the Council of Florence. See (Bisticci 1963, 362-64) Giovanni Dominici had advised Rinaldo degli Albizzi as early as 1406 to work with Leonardo Bruni at the curia. See (Guasti 1867-1873, 104) For Bruni's dediction of the *Ethics,* see (Bruni 1928, 75-76) For Bruni's response to Poggio in late 1426, see (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 104-05)

[102] For the Latin quotation, see (Viti 1996, 808). The sentence translates to "Therefore, the person that approaches this not only amazing but also astounding seat, if they will wish to do so wisely, will close their mouths, open their hearts, restrain their voice, express their emotion, and not so much as address it with eloquence as they adore it with veneration in silence." On page 810, the narration begins with the words "Ceterum, Beatissime Pater…" The Latin of the final quote, also on page 810, is "Sunt alia quedam a nobis seorsum tue beatudini exemplificanda, que cum tempus dabitur exponemus." Concetta Bianca has noted that Bruni's oration, his oration instructions, and his discussion of his oration in his final report do not match up and points to this as evidence of a growing divide between oratorical performance and instructions. She argues that Bruni addressed this problem by splitting the chancery in two in 1431 and then addressing more attention to these orations and allowing diplomats less personal control. Bianca continues that the most original aspect of this 1426 oration is Bruni's focus on things "res", rather than praise "laus", which set up "in forma concreta l'esortazione a realizzare la pace, in questo caso la pace con il duca di Milano." See (Bianca 1990, 232-34). The evidence suggests that Bruni discussed the particulars of his mission immediately after his initial oration, which would explain why his commission, the description of his first meeting, and the content of his oration do not match up. The letter to Bruni and Tornabuoni on June 15 from the

Signoria states that the diplomats' letter had stated that they had spoken with the pope and he had responded to each part, rather than implying two separate meetings. (Monzani 1857, 30) I agree that the oration focuses on things rather than praise, but I am unsure how this technique sets up an exhortation to praise. After discussing all of Martin's good actions, Bruni argued that Martin had been moved by the same desire for good deeds to call this peace conference. Yet, I see no reason that Bruni could not have used an oration focused on offering various praises of Martin's attributes in the same way. However, an oration focused on praise would have been a standard oratorical performance. By focusing on things (res) and adding a second metaphorical level of praise to this discussion, Bruni's oration surpassed the ordinary and became a cultural gift.

[103] The Latin of the block quotation is "Consueverunt, Beatissime Pater, qui legationis officio fungentes sedem apostolicam et sanctissimam adeunt, quantum ipsi verbis oreque adniti possunt, exquisitissimis eam laudibus conari extollere. Quos tamen cum sepe presens diligenter accurateque audiverim, atque una ex parte verba illorum, alia vero ex parte amplitudinem maiestatemque sedis huius pensitarem, usque adeo deficere verba animadverti, ut laudatores ipse eorum conatus omnes ridicule viderentur. Neque sane id immerito evenire constat. Quis enim mentis compos humanis verbis digne huius laudes referre se posse credit, cuius auctoritas atque potestas non contenta terris neque maris ambitu celos insuper penetrat et transcendit angustisque sententiis amplitudinem huius sedis equare se posse existimet. Mea quidem sententia qui se hoc factuarum sperat, imbecillitatem suam non cognoscit. Qui vero attentare ausus est, temerarius reperitur. Ut recte a philosophis dictum sit, bonorum alia esse laudis, alia venerationis; laudis ea esse que in commendationem cadunt humanam; venerationis autem, illa que diviniora maioraque exsistunt, quam ad ea laudationes nostre queant accedere." See (Viti 1996, 806-08). For the "philosophis" being a reference to Plato, see (Viti 1996, 808)

[104] For the oration, see (Viti 1996, 806-11) The Pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states that "…External circumstances belong such as can happen by chance, or by fortune, favourable or adverse: descent, education, wealth, kinds of power, titles to fame, citizenship, friendships, and the like, and their contraries." *Ad Herennium* III VI.10

[105] For the quotations, see (Viti 1996, 808-10). The Latin is "Tuas porro laudes, Beatissime Pater, non solum lingue gentium ac populorum sed vepres et saltus, qua huc proficiscentes iter fecimus, omnibus predicare celebrareque videbantur. Per que enim loca nunquam nisi extreme vite periculo et summa formidine vadebatur, per eadem nunc tanta pax est, adeo secura tranquillitas, ut mutate rerum conditione et in contrario plane versa appareat. Quid enim infestius fuit latrociniis hactenus quam romanus age? Contra vero quid nunc pacatius? Quid ab omnibus insidiis violentiisque remotius? Itaque valles ipse et nemora, que prius metum exanimem viatoribus afferebant, tua summa providentia factum est, ut hunc letitiam iucunditatemque diffundant, sapientiam bonitatemque aucoris sui non modo vocibus nuntiantes: huic eximie beneficentie tue extra urbem conspecte alia intra urbem ipsam addita oculis occurrunt. Reparatio basilicarum atque templorum principis apostolorum vigenti erogatione refecta, porticus et parietes instaurate cum iam prolaberentur, et Laterani puro marmore pavimenta eademque picturis insignita pulcherrimis, ceraque huius generi a te edita dignissimas laudes tuas gloriamque perpetuam attestantur. Pontium quoque refectionem instaurationemque, nomen a quibus inditum creditor pontificali dignitati, quis reticere aspiciens queat? Tiberino quidem impetus disrupti arcus tua nunc diligentia et impensa refecti, te vero pontificem non falso denuntiant. Quid dicam de cerimoniarum cultu, observantia et castimonia? Quid de incorrupta ecclesiarum provisione, in quiubus nunc curia tua tanto abest a sordibus quanto dudum aberat a puritate? Te igitur et divina caste et religiosa munifice et humana circumspecte benivoleque tractantem non immerito deus secundavit, ut tandem aliquando longa post tempora verum antistitem bona romane ecclesie vera obedientia possidentem videamus." For trees praising the Lord, see Isiah 44:23

[106] On Quintillian, see *Institutio* III VII. 4-7

[107] This quote is from (Monzani 1857, 32). The Italian is "Poi fummo col Sancto Padre, et alla Sanctità Sua sponemmo con molte parole et con debita riverentia le cagioni di nostra andata, explicando l'una parte et l'altra, cioè il facto della pace et il facto delle castella di Romagna, secondo il tenore della commissione nostra." For the commission in general, see (Monzani 1857, 31-34). For the final peace agreement, see (Petriboni and Rinaldi 2001, 208) Pages 210-211 of this work detail the official announcement of this peace in Florence, interesting as a short

vernacular oration by Bruni: "domenicha mattina circha a ore xiij, a dì 16 di maggio 1428, si fecie solenne processione et venneci la tavola di Nostra Donna di Santa Maria Impruneta, et prima passassi concominciossi le corcie de' battuti e de' riligiosi, essendo i Signiori a sedere in sulla ringhiera del Palagio et con loro gli 'mbasciadori veniziani et tre rettori, e il piccolo fanciullo de' Malespini tra lloro. Si notifichò questo, conposte le parole per meser Lionardo d'Arezzo, cancelliere de' Signiori: <<I Signiori priori dell'Arti e 'l Ghonfaloniere della giustitia del Popolo et Comune di Firenze fanno notifichare a ciaschuna persona: A llaude et honore et riverentia dello omnipotente Iddio et della gloriosa Vergine Maria, sua madre, et di tutta la celestia corte del Pardiso, et ad tranquillità et riposo perpetuo delle infrascripte parti: come a dì 19 del mese d'aprile prossimo passato, la illustrissima et potentissima legha da una parte e llo illustrissimo principe ducha di Melano, et dall'altra parte per loro et per loro colleghati, aderenti, racomandanti, feudatarii, confederate, complici et seghuaci feciono, contrassono et fermorono buona, vera, pura et sincera pacie, la quale per la gratia di Dio in perpetuo debba durare delle ghuerre, offese et ingiurie et altre oppressioni fatte fra lle detti parti co' capitoli, patti, conditioni, et effetti che nel contratto di ciò fatto, roghato per più notai, stesamente si contiene>>. Detta hora, in sulla ringhiera, ditto dì, miser Lionardo ditto donò a' Signiori uno libro dell'opere sue et fecie un diceria, et poi sonorono le trombe et pifferi, et incominciò a passare la prcessione." For the letters from the Florentine ambassadors in Ferrara to the *Diecì di Balià*, see (Cavalcanti 1838-1839, vol. II, 313-73)

[108] This interpretation contrasts with that of Hans Baron, who asserts that Bruni's diplomatic success made him a strong candidate for the chancellorship in 1427. (Baron 1967, 34)

[109] The diplomatic records in the Florentine archives for 1440 are fragmentary; however, the election book of diplomats sent by the Signoria during these years survive and possess no record for a congratulatory mission to te new emperor in 1440 or his coronation in 1442 (for coronation date, see (Pius II 2003, 391). The reasons for this, perhaps, were issues concerning imperial-papal relations The emperor did not offer obedience to Eugenius IV, in fact, until early 1447. See (Pius II 2003, 393) For the political relations of Eugenius IV in the late 1430s and 1440s, see (Pastor 1923, vol. I, 329-50). See also (Stieber 1978) The importance of imperial-papal relation was accentuated for the Florentines because Pope Eugenius IV spent a great deal of time living in Santa Maria Novella, particularly in the 1430s and early 1440s.

[110] For Baron, see (Baron 1955, 176-77) Paolo Viti erroneously states that Bruni delivered this oration to the emperor in 1433 at Piacenza. He writes "L'orazione fu ricita dal Bruni in occasione del suo incontro, nel 1433, a Piacenza con l'imperatore Sigismondo del Lussemburgo, venuto in Italia per essere incoronato a Roma dal papa Eugenio IV. Di questo incontro con l'imperatore il Bruni stesso – che già lo aveva conosciuto a Costanza negli anni del Concilio – ha lasciato un ricordo nel *Commentarius:* <<Hunc Principem nos Placentiae primum vidimus in congressu illo Iohannis Romani Pontificis et aliquem cum eo usum conversationemque habuimus, dum Laudae Cremonaeque constitimus. Postea vero Constantiae magis naturam illius moresque conspeximus>>. (Viti 1996, 826) This quote from Bruni's *Commentary* refers to their encounter about twenty years previously. For this encounter, see below. Branca uses Baron and simply assumes that Bruni delivered it before Sigismundo in 1433. See (Bianca 1990, 229-30) That the emperor was denied entrance into Florence, see (Bisticci 1963, 451) For Guasconi's mission, see ASF Sig.Leg. 9, 44r; For Tornabuoni and Strozzi, see (Palmeri 1906, 137). For Zenobi Guasconi and Albizzi, see ASF Sig.Leg. 8, 55v.

[111] The oration uses both the singular and the plural in its verbs (in the first sentence: "aggrediar" and "conspicio", but then later verbs "legimus" and the use of "nobis" at the oration's end), thus failing to offer clues as to how many orators were present. For Biagio Guasconi and humanism, see (Bec 1981, 132-44) Guasconi's commission stated that "Quando tu sarai alla presentia della sua celsitudine fatte le debite e consuete reverentie raccomandrai humilimente noi et la nostra communita et tucto il nostro popolo come divotissimi e fidilissimi figluoli et come affecti con singulare e principua benivolentia alla persona sua singularissimo benfactore et ex altatatore de nostri cittadini et per questo singularmente amato dala citta nostra distendrai queste parole che sanza dubio anno fondamento verissimo in quel modo che veduti essere bisogno dimonstrando che singularmente fede speranza abbiamo nella celsitudine sua in qualunque nostro caso et farai le preferte larghe et efficaci d noi e dogni nostro potere e forza a tutti beneplaciti della sua grandeza. Apresso farti scusa si poi che la sua maesta venne in italia non se mandato per la citta nostra a fare la debita visitatione per solenne imabasciata come richiedua la degnita

dellomperio et la divotissima affectione nostra verso la sua persoan dimonstrando di questo ess. suto cagione less. stata la persona sua nelle tere e forze del dua di milano col quale noi abbiamo guera dove non si poteva mandare per noi ambasciata alla sua celsitudine sanza acrescere grandemente la riputatione del nostro nimico apresso lopinone de popoli et delle signorie ditalia e. tu arai lo exemplo della lett. scripta allomperdore sopra questa parte et sopra alcunaltra parte toccata di sopra con la quale tupterai conformare." (When you will be in the presence of his eminence, make the owed and usual references. Recommend us and our community and all our people humbly as most devoted and faithful sons and as struck with singular and principle benevolence to his person, who is a most singular benefector and supporter (ex altatore) of our citizens. It is for this reason above all else that he has been loved by our city. You will lay out (distendrai) those words that leave no doubt concerning their true foundation, (queste parole che sanza dubio anno fondamento verissimo) in that way which seems be be necessary. Demonstrate that singular faith and hope that we have in his eminence in all things (in qualunque nostro) and make the offerings extensive and convincing of our power and force and all the well wishes (beneplaciti) of his greatness. (the remainder of the translation of this passages is in the text). Like the commission, the oration states the Florentines are "devotissimi vero et fidelissimi filii tui" (your most truly devoted and faithful sons) and their hope for his rule "Ceterum quo plura perfertur virtus tua, eo magis te homines intuentur et omnia adversa et gravia per te emendari posse, confidunt. Debere enim te putant, quoniam imperator es, posse autem te sciunt cum anteriora prospiciunt; nam de voluntate bona nemo ambigit."(Concerning the rest, as much as your virtue is so spread, so much more men consider you and trust that you can fix all adverse and grave things. They think that you can, since you are emperor, moreoever they know that you can since they watch for your previous ways, for no one doubts your good will.). (Viti 1996, 830). Biagio Guasconi's history with the emperor most likely influenced the Florentines' decision to send him on this delicate mission. In particular, he had served as an ambassador from Sigsimund to Florence in 1424. See (G. Canestrini 1843a, 223)

[112] Bruni first met the emperor while working under Pope John XXIII between 1413-1415. (Baron 1955, 176). See also (Bruni 2001-2007, vol. III, 377). For the use of the *Praise* as propaganda at the Council of Basel, see (Baron 1968, 228) and (Viti 1992, 137-96) For Bruni writing to Humphrey of Gloucester, see (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 122-23), in which Bruni stated he was sending a copy of his translation of Aristotle's *Ethics*. See also (Bisticci 1963, 366-67) For the quotation, see (Viti 1996, 830). The Latin is "Devotissimi vero et fidelissimi filii tui, et qui se pedibus serenitatis tue humillime recommendant, nobis iunxerunt quedam pro eorum parte vestre maiestati explicanda, que cum tempus nobis dabitur reserabimus."

[113] The Latin of the *Hiero* preface is "Quid enim illi abfuit pulcherrimarum rerum? Quid non summe fuit? Quaeris doctrinam in homine? Doctissimus Xenophon. Laudas prudentiam? Prudentissimus. Gaudes eloquentia? At hic inter principes eius rei connumeratur. Virtutem amas? At hic omnium aetatis suae optimus vir fuit. Admiraris res gestas? In hoc quoque genere laudis non mediocriter excelluit. Multi quod una aut altera commemoratarum rerum praediti fuere, summi habentur: Hunc vero, qui ita universas complexus est, ut ipsae inter sese de excellentia certare videantur, quo tandem loco habendum putabimus? For the second long block quote, the Latin is "Legimus quosdam reges bello prestantes, eosdem tamen in pacis artibus defecisse. Quosdam rursus ad urbanas conversationes aptos et mites, in belli vero Gloria succubuisse. Aliis quibusdam acritatem ingenii, aliis prudentiam, aliis eloquentiam, aliis formam, aliis liberalitatem, aliis magnanimitatem defuisse. In te autem uno mirabilis felicique concursu cuncta quae laudari merentur ita convenient ut ipsa inter sese de excellentia certare videantur. Idem fortissimos bello; idem in pace humanissimus, nec facile quis dixerit, utrum feroocior in hostes an in subiectos clementior. Nam de liberalitate et magnamitate tua caeterisque animi et corporis dotibus tacere ommino melius est, quam pauca referre." See (Bruni 1928, 101)

[114] For the pope's flight from Rome, see (Pastor 1923, 294-95). Vespasiano da' Bisticci provides information about the delegation to meet the pope at Pisa. After describing the pope's flight from Rome, he wrote "This happened in the year fourteen hundred and thirty-three (sic) and he entered Florence in the month of June in the same year, all the leaders of the city going to meet him, some to Pisa and some to greet him on the road. While he was at Pisa he abode with Agnolo di Filippo Pandolfini, where he remained long enough to allow the ordering of the festival in his honour, which indeed was a thing marvellous to behold. All the chief citizens went on horseback to Signa and accompanied the Pope to Florence with full ecclesiastical pomp, according to the custom of the Popes, and with something more if that was possible. And at that time the city was crowded with citizens of worth and reputation."

(Bisticci 1963, 19) I have located no diplomatic records for Palla's mission to greet the Pope. The phrases taken from Palla's oration are from ASF Car. Stroz. Series III, 125, 129r. The phrase using anaphora translates to "and on behalf of the consolation of our people and on behalf of the peace and safety of his holiness and on behalf of the safety of the curia." The final quote translates to "a certain rumor of your residency in that city will call for an innumerable multitude and because of the security all danger will be lacking on land and sea."

[115] On Palla di Palla Strozzi, see Chapter One.

[116] James Hankins has attributed this oration to the Florentine mission to either the coronation of Albrect III in 1438 or Frederick III in 1440, see (Hankins 2003 61); however, no record of a diplomatic mission to Frederick III in 1440 exists. By contrast, in 1438 the Florentine *Signoria* sent Giuliano Davanzati, Carlo Federighi, and Bernardo Giugni to the emperor. The fact that Bruni undoubtedly wrote an oration for Davanzati on a mission in 1443 further suggests that this oration accompanied this mission. The commission for this mission, found at ASF Sig.Leg.10.155v, reads: "Anderete allomperadore o vero secondo ilparlare commune al re de romani nuovamente electo et rapresentatovi nel suo conspecto con quella solennita che sirichiede racomanderete la nostra cita et il popolo di quella ala sua celsitudine come devotissimi figluoli et servidori delomperio romano et de la sua maesta. Et subsequenter fare te lofferte larghe et piene offerendo ingenere a tutti e suoi beneplaciti [156r] la nostra communita con buono et perfecto desiderio di fare tucte le cose che sieno honore et grandeza dela serenita sua et del sacro imperio tucte queste cose direte con parole costumate et submisse et nel parlare al re non usate didire la signoria nostra che parre superbo et non si confa usare al principe tal parlare. Facte laracomandigie et offerte consolenita diparole descenderete alle particularita dicendo che voi sete mandati dalacita di firenze et da suoi governatori et citadini aralegrarsi et congratularsi de la sua felice assumptione demostrando il gaudio et la letia grandissima la quale prese questo suo devotissimo et fedelissimo popolo quando prima senti la sua exaltatione ad tanto fastigio di degnita et meritamente considerate le sue excellentissime virtu et optimi costumi et honestissimi portamenti I quali in lui si sono continuamente veduti per tutto il corso di sua vita per li quali sispera che sotto il governo di tale principe il mondo ricevera tranquillita et pace et univerassi in somma felicita per tutti I popoli subiecti al suo imperio come sotto giustissimo et sapientissimo governatore questa parte ingrasserete con parole dolci et piene di reverentia et di devotione in modo che gli paia le parole venire et procedere dal cuore sanza fictione et sanza adulatione. Se voi farete sermone solenne dinanzi dalui come susa abiate amente che il semone sia conforme a quello e scripto disopra et facciendo sermone le racomandigie et lofferte si fanno infine del sermone et non nel principio."

[117] For the oration, see (Hankins 2003, 61-62) The Latin of the first quotation is "'Vidimus stellam eius in oriente e venimus adorare eum'. Verba sunt Matthei Evangeliste in capitule <secundo>". The second quotation is "Non sine probabili ratione similtudo facta est ab antiquis inter fastigium imperiale et astra in celo fulgentia." The third quotation is "Que quidem omnia, ne nunc noviter a me reperta putes, audi quid dicat Virgilius poetarum doctissimus: ecce Dyonei processit Cesaris astrum ‖ astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus quoque ‖ duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem."

[118] For the block quotation, the Latin in the Vulgate is "Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius ascendet et requiescat super eum spiritus Domini spiritus sapientiae et intellectus spiritus consilii et fortitudinis spiritus scientiae et pietatis et replebit eum spiritus timoris Domini non secundum visionem oculorum iudicabit neque secundum auditum aurium arguet sed iudicabit in iustitia pauperes et arguet in aequitate pro mansuetis terrae et percutiet terram virga oris sui et spiritu labiorum suorum inteficiet impium et erit iustitia cingulum lumborum eius et fides cinctorium renis eius." (Fischer et al. 1994) Translation is New Revised Standard Version. For "nevertheless, thorugh…" the Latin is "tamen vivis quoque affatibus per nos oratores suos demonstrai plenius voluit ac presentes tuo culmini sublimissimo gratulari pro hac felici adsumptione tua…" For the final quotation, the Latin is "Certum, serenissime princes, non nulla seorsum exponere habemus, que, cum dabitur locus et tempus, tue maiestati seriosius exprimemus." For these quotes, see (Hankins 2003, 62)

[119] For the letter of explanation and congratulations, see BNC Pac 148, 186v & 187r. For the election of Pitti, Giugni, and Davanzati, see ASF Car.Cor 51, 38r & 40r. Giovannozzo Pitti was also one of the men selected to

welcome King Renè to Livorno, see ASF Car.Cor. 37v. The others were Orlando de' Medici, Carlo Pandolfini, and Francesco Ventura.

[120] For Renè in Florence after Alfonso's conquest of Naples, see (Ryder 1990, 246-47) Concerning Pope Martin V, Florence initially sent Jacopo Riete, a Dominican Friar, to the Council of Constance to congratulate Martin V on his election. It did not send an official congratulatory mission until September of the same year. See ASF Sig.Leg. 6, 78r

[121] For the text of this oration, see (Viti 1996, 843-47). The quoted phrases in Latin are "Quid de fide ac religione in quibus es unum bene vivendi exemplar?", "…res bello geste querantur, tua excellentissima et gloriosissima facta per effectum operum intuemur.", and "Florentinus igitur populus universus eiusque magistratus et gubernatores tue celsitudinis devotissimi ex corde et animo tecum gratulantur et gaudent pro maximis victoriis tuis ac pro nova ista ac felici acquisitione regni." The final quotation is "Ceterum, serenissime princeps, alia quaedam particularia habemus tuae serenitati seorsum referre, quae alias cum tempus locusque dabitur referemus." Concetta Bianca has also noted that Bruni's oration on this occasion was intended to "underline the exceptionality of the event." (Bianca 1990, 227). Bianca notes that Bruni only intervened in exceptional circumstances, but she attributes this fact to Bruni's old age see pages 227-228.

[122] For the negotiations between Alfonso and Pope Eugenius concerning the investiture in Naples, beginning in June 1443, see (Ryder 1990, 255-56) Bernardo Giugni was a diplomat several times between 1436 and 1466, see ASF Car.Cor. 51. 6r & 40r; ASF Sig.Leg. 10.155v, 161r; 11.1r, 143r; 12.24r, 69v; 13 photo reproduction 63, 66, 85; 16. photo reproduction 23 and 41; 28.40r. Giuliano Davanzati also was a prominent diplomat between 1421 and 1443, see ASF Sig.Leg. 5.10r; 6.123v; 7.15r, 32v; 9.32r; 10.32r, 34v, 60v, 155v; Sig.Minutari 6.4r; sig.Miss.I 31.27r; Car.Corr. 51.26r, 35r, 40r, 47v. For anecdote from Vespasiano, see (Bisticci 1963, 326-27)

[123] For Bruni's letter, see (Bruni 1741, 165-66). The letter in its entirety reads: "Rem incredibilem, serenissime princeps, sed tamen veram excellentiae tuae per has litteras indicabo. Nec erit tibi ingratum, ut opinor, eam rem ex me potissimum conovisse. Scripsi nuper libros quatuor De Bello Italico adversus Gothos gesto. In eo bello, quia urbs Neapolitana bis obsessa fuit & bis capta primum a Belisario Justiniani Duce, postea vero a Totila Gothorum Rege, & utroque tempore magna & notabilis fuit obsidio, decreveram eos libros tibi eandem urbem obsidenti transmittere. Sed retardavit me respectus quidam, quod veritus sum, ne aliquos offenderem, si viam, & occulutum adytum quodammodo monstrarem ad urbem capiendam. Cum igitur ob hoc respectum detinerer, ecce tua virtus admirabilis Neapolim coepit per eum maxime modum, ut audivimus, quo in eisdem libris discribitur a Belisario fuisse captam. Itaque ego haec audiens obstupuit post mille ferme annos eandem urbem eodem modo captam, & servatam fuisse. Neque enim minorem humanitatem tuam fuisse audivimus in conservando cives, quam tunc fuerit Belisarii, neque minorem industriam in capiendo. Nec putet aliquis me ista fingere. Nam libri illi sex mensibus ante editi a me fuerunt, quam tu urbem illam coepisti, multique jam illos non legerant modo, verum etiam transcripserant. Ut autem videas modum, quo Belisarius tunc Neapolim coepit, mitto tibi partem illam libri, in qua capivitas ejus urbis describitur. Vale Decus seculi nostri." Paolo Viti has suggested the Bruni may have dedicated his letter on the *Origin of Mantua* to the Gonzaga for the purpose of finding a position with that family. (Viti 1992, 368). Bruni also dedicated his translation of Plato's *Gorgias* to Pope John XXIII to mollify the pope so that he could return to the papal curia. (Hankins 1990, vol. I, 53)

[124] For the quotation, see the previous footnote "Sed…capiendam"

CHAPTER THREE

[125] For this anecdote, see (Bisticci 1963, 374). The only congratulatory mission that Manetti missed was the congratulations offered to Francesco Sforza on his conquest of Milan. On this mission, see below.

[126] For humanism in Rome, see (D'Amico 1983). On humanism in Venice, see (King 1986). On humanism in Naples, see (Bentley 1987) Jonathan Davies argues that "the *studia humanitatis* began to blossom at the *Studio* in the late 1420s." (Davies 1998, 110). However, he also writes that "…it must be recognized that support for the *studia humanitatis* filtered slowly through the Florentine ruling class. At first, it was restricted to an avant-garde minority and it was only after 1450 that appreciation of the *studia humanitatis* began to become more widespread." (Davies 1998, 116) For the quote from Paul Grendler, see (Grendler 1989, 404). See also (Black and ebrary Inc. 2001, 225-74) together with Grendler's review (Grendler 2002)

[127] For the first quote, the Italian is "In prima espongano l'usate salute e conforti, come a nostri buoni, veri e cordialissimi magiori frategli, con quelle dolci e larghe parole, che alla loro prudenzia parrà convenirsi." See (Cavalcanti 1838-1839, vol. II, 374) The Italian of the second quote is "In prima conferitosi a Perugia, saluti et conforti et profferisca a quelli Signori priori come veri et buoni fratelli et perfectissimi amici della nostra Communità, sì come è usanza, et la sua prudentia saprà ben fare." See (Cavalcanti 1838-1839, vol. II, 395)

[128] The Italian of the first quote is "quando sara il tempo presenta prima la lettera della credentia con le debite et consuete reverentie per parte di questa signoria conforterai et saluterai la sua excellentia con parole affectuose honorifice et piene disingulari affectioni facendogli larghe offerte in generale con quelle parole che parrano alla tua prudentia essere accommodate al tempo alla material et alla persona la quale rapresenti et similemente a quella apresso alla quale hai adire." See ASF Sig.Leg. 12, 63v. For the second quote, see ASF Sig.Leg. 12, 154v. The Italian is "…quando vi sara dato tempo dudientia da quella excellentia signoria presenta prima la lettera della credentia saluterete et conforterete la loro celsitudine per parte di questa signoria con parole hon.ce. amichevoli et piene di singular.me affectioni come parra alla vostra prudentia richiedere il tempo la materia et la persona la quale rapresentate et apresso la quale avete adire."

[129] Individuals with ten or more missions: Agnolo Acciaiuoli (24 missions during these years), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 37r; 11, 4r, 158v, 185v; 12, 91v, 120v; 13, photo reproduction number 73; Dieci.Leg 4, 37v, 59r; Car.Cor. 51, 6r, 11v, 21r, 28v, 35v, 40v, 44r, 47v; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp 61, 143; (Kendall and Ilardi 1970-81, vol. I, xli; Camugliano 1933, 211, 24) For his connections with humanism, see (Martines 1963, 335-36) Luca di Maso degli Albizzi (14), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 109v, 164v; 11, 38v; 12, 97r; Dieci.Leg 4, 65r; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp 2; 4, 7r; 5; 60, 73; 62, 74; Car.Cor. 51, 30r, 34v; (Palmeri 1906, 165). For his connections with humanism, see above. Neri di Gino Capponi (18), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 67r; 11, 27v, 89r, 143r, 185v; 12, 24r, 132v, 137v, 154v; Car.Cor. 51, 21v, 35v, 36r, 41v, 48v; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp.7, 1; 61, 143; (Palmeri 1906, 157). For his connections with humanism, see above. Dietisalvi di Neroni di Dietisalvi (14), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 167r; 12, 69v, 137v; 13, photo reproduction number 90, 174; 28, 40r; Dieci.Leg 4, 4r, 13v, 29v, 44v, 57r, 69v; Car.Cor. 51, 30v; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 7, 1. For his connections with humanism, see his list of books in (Chiappelli 1923) and the description of one of his orations in the *consulte e pratiche* 52, 124v as a "longa et optima oratione" Bernardo Giugni (12), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 155v, 161r; 11, 1r, 143r; 12, 24r, 69v; 13, photo reproduction number 63, 66, 85; 28, 40r; Car.Cor. 51, 6r, 40r. For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 321). Vespasiano states that Giugni had "...notitia delle lettere latine..." Luigi Guicciardini (10), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 43r; 11, 41v, 92r; 12, 52v; 13, photo reproduction number 205; Dieci.Leg 4, 51r, 65r, 68v; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 9, 1;62, 37. For his connections with humanism, see the inventory in BML Plut. 3, 378, which describes him as the owner of a copy of Bruni's *De bello italico adversus gothos.* Giannozzo Manetti (12), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 56r, 185v; 12, 56v, 119r; 13, photo reproduction number 8, 66, 83; Dieci.Leg. 4, 61v; Car.Cor. 51, 22v; (Martines 1963, 185-86). Giovannozzo Pitti (12), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 163r; 11, 185v; 12, 45r, 60r, 96r, 97r; 13, photo reproduction number 50, 85; Car.Cor. 51, 102r, 26v, 37v, 38r. For his connections with humanism, see (Davies 1998, 116-17). Pitti argued in favor of the *studia humanitatis* in a debate over the Florentine *Studio.* Bernadetto de' Medici (22), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 56r, 59r, 70v; 11, 12r, 93v, 150v; 12, 45r, 54r; 13, photo reproduction number 174, 350; Dieci.Leg. 4, 40r, 42r, 53r, 61v; Car.Cor. 51, 32r, 34r, 35r, 35v, 41v, 102v; (Palmeri 1906, 157, 65). I have been

unable to find a link between Bernadetto and humanism. Individuals with humanist connections that filled less than ten positions: Alessandro Alessandri (9), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 44v; 11, 185v; 12, 60r, 63v; Dieci.Leg. 4, 70r; Car.Cor. 51, 25v, 35r, 122r, 143v. For his connections with humanism, see above. Giuliano Davanzati (8), see ASF Sig.Leg 10, 32r, 34v, 60v, 155v; Car.Cor. 51, 26r, 35r, 40r, 47v. For his connections with humanism, see above. Piero Guicciardini (7), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 37r, 162v; Car.Cor. 51, 64, 24v, 29r, 31r; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 1, 11. For his connections with humanism, see above. Domenico Martelli (5), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 113r; 12, 994, 103v; Dieci.Leg. 4, 63r; Car.Cor. 51, 39r. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 289-91). Della Torre publishes a letter from Domenico Martelli to Matteo Strozzi about a book attributed to Lactantius. Cosimo de' Medici (2), see MAP 11, 365; 124, 652. For his connections with humanism, see above. Giovanni di Cosimo de' Medici (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, photo reproduction number 276, 320; Car.Cor. 51, 143v. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 526-29). Lorenzo di Giovanni de' Medici (6), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 64v, 81v, 158v; Car.Cor. 51, 64, 29r, 31v. For his connections with humanism, see above. Piero di Cosimo de' Medici (4), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 185v; 12, 137v, 154v; 13, photo reproduction 97. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 563-66) Otto Niccolini (8), see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, photo reproduction number 63, 83, 90, 276; Dieci.Leg. 4, 15v, 21r, 67v; (Palmeri 1906, 171). For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 397). Della Torre records an anecdote about Cosimo de' Medici, Giovanni Argrypolous, and Otto Niccolini about philosophy. Matteo Palmieri (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, photo reproduction 266; Dieci.Leg. 4, 23r. For his connections with humanism, see Chapter Four. Giannozzo Pandolfini (7), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 5r; 12, 129r, 175r; 13, photo reproduction number 97, 276; Car.Cor. 51, 122r; (Palmeri 1906, 165). For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 255). Vespasiano records that Giannozzo entrusted the education of his sons to Ser filippo di ser Ugolino, a man learned in Greek and Latin. Piero de' Pazzi (1), see ASF Dieci.Leg. 4, 67r. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 391-92, 547) Guglielmino Tanaglia (6), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 144r; 13, photo reproduction number 141; Dieci.Leg. 4, 22r; Car.Cor. 51, 43v; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 7, 7r; (Palmeri 1906, 161). For his connections with humanism, see (Rubinstein 1997, 112). Tanaglia quoted the *Bellum Catilinae* in a *pratiche.* Franco Sacchetti (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 59v; 12, 129r, 165v. For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1963, 403-05) Marcello Strozzi (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 10, 148r; Car.Cor. 51, 6r, 14r. For his connections with humanism, see above.

[130] For this narrative, see especially (Ryder 1990, 278-83). See also (Romano 2007, 209-13) and (Martines 1963, 186-88) For the diplomatic missions to Siena, Venice, and Naples, see below.

[131] For this paragraph, see especially (Martines 1963, 131-32, 76-79) For Giannozzo Manetti's schooling, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 519) Vespasiano claims, in fact, that Manetti's father opposed his son's humanist studies. The only diplomatic mission requiring an exceptional cultural gift from which Manetti was absent was the congratulation mission to Francesco Sforza in 1450. See ASF Sig.Leg. 12, 137v. This mission to the Medicean ally Sforza featured three staunch mediceans, Dietisalvi Nerone di Dietisalvi, Piero di Cosimo de' Medici, and Luca Pitti, and the less stanch supporter Neri di Gino Capponi. Like Giannozzo Manetti, Neri Capponi was a powerful oligarch outside of the core Medici supporters. For the absence of such individuals from missions to Milan, see Chapter One. However, Capponi had three attributes that Manetti lacked that most likely secured his position on this mission. One, Capponi was more powerful than Manetti in Florence, ranking as Cosimo's chief rival in the 1440s and 50s. (Martines 1963, 189). Two, Capponi had a history with Sforza, having served on four missions to him between 1437 and 1442. See ASF Car.Cor. 51, 21v, 35v; ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto. Leg.Miss.Resp. 61, 143. Three, Capponi seems to have been more careful regarding his domestic political position than Manetti. Whereas Manetti eventually acquired several powerful enemies and ended up in self-enforced exile in Naples, Capponi died in Florence and is recorded by Vespasiano da Bisticci to have warned Manetti about his domestic dealings. See (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 569). Finally, Manetti was in venice when this mission went out. See his election in ASF Sig.Leg. 12, 119r.

[132] For Manetti as an ideal, see (Field 1988). For Manetti's friendship with King Alfonso and Pope Nicholas V, see Vespasiano's biography of him (Bisticci 1963, 372-95)

[133] For these letters, see Vat. Lat. 931. The Latin quotation is on 26r: "Quondam verbis ne quaquam opus erat ubi tot e tanta verum testimonia apparebant" (Since it was not at all necessary [to elaborate] with words where such and so

great evidence certainly is apparent". This Latin appears in Manetti's summary of his response to the Venetians after they responded to this opening oration. I have been unable to find this Latin statement in another source.

[134] For Manetti's diary, see (Lerz 1959) and (Trivellato 1994). Pages 228-231 of Trivellato's work provides a calendar of Manetti's activities while in Venice as recorded by Griso. For the words on November 23, see Vat. Lat. 931, 51r-53r and (Lerz 1959, 273-74) Griso uses the phrase "…el doggie parlò in questa forma:" to introduce his account. On this issue, see Chapter One.

[135] For the letters from September 10 and 21, see (Lerz 1959, 260-61, 63-65) and compare Vat. Lat. 931, 24v-27v and 30v-32v. For the audience on November 16, see (Lerz 1959, 271-72) and Vat. Lat. 931, 44v-47v. For the first quote, see (Lerz 1959, 272). The Italian is "con più lunghezza di parole e con altro ordine…" For the second quote, see Vat. Lat. 931, 45r. The Italian is "...con quelle parole che miparrono piu adapte e piu convenienti achiarire meglo e adimonstrare evidentemente quale era il desiderio vostro mingegnai disatisfare aldebito mio." Compare Griso's and Manetti's accounts of these later occasions to their accounts of Manetti's initial oratorical performance. Manetti himself wrote actually very little: "…giunto allpresenza della Signoria e fatte le debite reverentie e presse lusutate e salutationi e conforti e aggiunte leconsuete offerte in nome della Signoria vostra vieni alla expositione duna sola parte sustantiale della mia commessione della passata del Re renato nelle parti diqua conquelle circumstantie e conditioni che sono interchiuse nella prefata commissione laudienza della Signoria fu molto grata e molto benigna e larisposta fu in questo effecto…" Vat. Lat. 931, 24r. Griso is far more verbose: "giunto che fu nella sala dell'udienza, lo illustrissimo dugie se gli fecie inchontro et abbracciollo et lo prese per mano et menolo insino al luogho della risedenzia, et posti che furono a sedere havendo lo 'nbasciadore in chonmessione la prima mattina dovere solo exporre la principa parte della sua conmessione che chonteneva la praticha della passata del re Renato in Italia, parlò chon tanta alleghanzia et chon tanto ordine assegngniando tante ragioni che tenne lo illustrissimo doge e la signioria con grandissima attentione circha a una hora ch'è d'uso il suo parlare, dimostrando prima in che pericholi si trovava la nostra città per la opressione del re di Raona, quanta sia l'ambizione di quello prencipe el quale expressamente si vede desiderare e ogni studio cierchare lo 'mperio d'Italia e dopo il disfacimento nostro, in che chonditioni si truovi lo stato loro. Di poi quanto utile e honore sia non solamente alla signioria loro e alla nostra la passata del re Renato, ma a tutta Italia per la mezanità e aiuto del quale non solamente di Toscana ma d'Italia si chacierà questo prencipe barbero il quale disidera e apertamente dimostra volere pervertere tutta Italia con chiare e manifeste ragioni dimonstrine in modo che piacque grandemente a qualunque l'udì non solamente le sue ragioni che furono infinite, ma anchora el modo e l'ordine del parlare e la eleganzia e gientileza de' vocaboli: preso che ebbe schusa d'aver parlato forese più a lungo che non si richiedeva parlando inanzi a simile prencipe e tale signoria, non avendo avuto rispetto alle grandi e molte occhupationi nelle quali quella illustrissima signioria continuvamente si truova. Imputando ogni chosa alla materia ch'era di sì grave e di tanta importanza che meritamente più breve non se ne poteva parlare, fecie fine alle quali expositioni; il sernissimo dugie in questo modo rispuose…" (Lerz 1959, 258)

[136] For Manetti's entrance into Naples, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 542-43). The passage is "… giunti presso a pochemiglia alla città di Napoli, essendovi giunto già tutte l'ambasciarie d'Italia et fuori d'Itaia, et tutti I signori del regno, gli vennono incontro discosto parechie miglia alla terra moltissimi signori et tutti gli ambasciadori che v'erano. Eravi, tra trombetti del Re et de' signori et degli ambasciadori, che ogniuno n'aveva menati, tanta quantità che per vergognia non lo direi, erano piene tutte le strade dov'egli passavano. I cavagli che vennono loro incontro furono più di duemila, ché v'era concorso in questa festa tutto el mondo. Era tanto el suono che facevano le trombe et i pifferi et gli stormenti varii che v'erano, che si sentivano assai discosto. Ogniuno era conspetto di tanti degni uomini, il simile ancora per la fama aveva messer Giannozo, che ogniuno desiderava di vederlo. Vennogli incontro infino all'ambasciaodre vinitiano, che in quel tempo non erano molto amici della città. Giunto in Napoli fu acompagnato infino alla stanza che gli aveva facto consegnare la maestà, del Re ch'era dignissima. La seguente mattina la maestà del Re gli dette udienza pubblica dove era sua maestà, v'era la corte et tutti gli ambasciadori v'erano." For the 1448 mission, see (Bisticci 1963, 382) For Manetti's entrance rank in 1447, see (Bisticci 1976, 553). For Manetti's colleagues on this mission, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 185v.

[137] The Italian of the block quote is "Fuvi grandissimo concorso per vedergli isporre l'ambasciata. Fece messer Giannozo quella mattina una degnissima oratione, et rinovò quella consuetudine già per lungo tempo lasciata in laude delle noze. Fu tanto grata alla maestà del Re, che mai si mosse punto, sempre istette sanza muovere senso

alcuno; a' Prencipi grandi si guarda a ogni minima cosa, perchè, avendo la sua maestà mosche in sul viso, non mosse le mani a mandarle via. Eravi molti con fogli et penne et calamai che scrivevano quello che diceva nell'oratione. Aquist`o quel dì messer Gianozo grandissima riputatione et a sè et alla città, fece quello che non aveva facto più ambasciadore che vi fusse, et l'onore fu in quella festa de' Fiorentini. Imparino i padri che hanno figliuoli a fargli imparare altro che l'abaco, vegano quanto onore è a una città et a una casa un simile cittadino."(Bisticci 1976, 542-43). Anthony D'elia argues that the Guarino Guarini was in fact the first individual to deliver the first wedding orations in the Renaissance. See (D'Elia 2004, 40ff). However, Manetti was undoubtedly the first Florentine ambassador to use this form.

[138] For the block quote, see (Bisticci 1963, 382). For the novelty of Manetti's oration, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 565). The Italian is "l'oratione che fece il primo dì che parlò alla Signoria, essendo cosa nuova et inusitata, l'ha lasciata in iscritti, et è molto degna, et benché la facesse volgare l'ordinò di poi in latino." For the Venetian patrician commenting on Manetti, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 566). The Italian is "messer Giannozo e' fu l'ornamento et la bontà della sua città et del suo secolo, et io per la mia singularità l'ebbi in grandissima riverenza per la sua virtù." Vespasiano attributes this unnamed person's oppinion simply to "Come per la sua riputatione aquistò nel tempo che vi stette ancora..." (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 565)

[139] Here is the Italian for this story. "La sera medesima il Papa diliberò per onorargli, di dare loro udienza in concestoro publico, et per questo la sera dinanzi disse a me scrittore: Io voglio fare grandissimo onore a' Fiorentini, perché io darò loro udienza in concestoro publico dove si dà a' Re et agli Imperadori, per dare loro questo principio. Et poco istante comise che fusse ditto agli ambasciadori, et così venne Ruberto Martegli a dirlo loro. Dissono che andasse a messer Giannozo Manetti avisarnelo. Essendo io con messer giannozo, benché il Papa me l'avesse decto, non gli avevo ancora dettogliene nulla, parendomi cosa molto degna. Poco istante vi giunse il mandato del Papa a significargli la diliberatione che aveva facta il Papa, decta che gliel'ebbe, prese licenza dallui, et andossene in camera tutto cambiato nel viso, et giunto in camera lo domandai quale fusse la cagione di tanta mutatione. Rispose che io non mi maravigliassi, che, essendo lui in corte di Roma, dove si trovavano tutti I signulari uomini che avevano i Cristiani, più in questo tempo che già è lungo tempo non v'erano istati, et che la mattina seguente poteva poco guadagnare et perdere assai, perché molti hanno decto bene come lui o meglio: et se per mia disgratia mi venisse errato, io perdo la fatica d'anni quaranta ch'o ho studiato, et dove? Nel primo luogo de' Cristiani, dove si può perdere assai et guadagnare poco, si ché non ti maravigliare se io mi sono alterato. Aveva ditto il cardinale Niceno et altri cardinali che v'era venuti uomini degni discosto da Roma più di cento cinquanta miglia, solo per vederlo e per udire isporgli l'ambasciata, tutte queste cose lo facevano temere." (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 551-52)

[140] For this story, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 552-55). The Italian for the block quotation is "Uscendo il concestoro, a tutti i Fiorentini fu facta grandissima festa, et tocò loro da tutti la mano et abracciati da' forestieri amici loro che v'erano, dicento: Pro vi faccia dell'onore che ha avuto oggi la vostra città, che se ne dirà per tutti i Cristiani di questo acto che s'è facto istamane. Isposta l'ambasciata secondo l'usanza gli ambasciadori andorono al Papa, et uno di loro prese la coda dell'adrieto, et acompagnorono secondo l'usanza il Pontefice infino alla camera. Questo acto di parlare in concestoro publico fu de' primi che facesseno mai i Fiorentini, perché questo Messer Giannozzo gli dette principio luogo era de' Re, et degli Imperadori, el Papa lo dette a' fiorentini per fare loro questo onore. Messer Giannozo donde hanno preso dipoi tutti gli altri che v'hanno parlato l'ordine della sua oratione, essendo nuova consuetudine come era e l'oratione oggi molto degna. I cardinali vinitiani, che erano in corte in questo tempo, veduto quello che aveva facto messer gianozo, per fante proprio n'avisorono a Vinegia che avevano già facti gli ambasciadori, et udito questo, subito v'agiunsono un altro ambasciador. E' Cardinali mandorono a Vinegia la copia della sua oratione, et veddesi poi in quella de' Vinitiani avervi messo alle volte parechi versi di quella di messer giannozo. Nel partirsi dipoi dal Papa, Neri di Gino si voles a messer giannozo et sì gli disse: Io non ho mai considerato il pericolo che la città nostra ha portato, se none è isposta l'ambascita, perché se tu t'avessi facto male a Viterbo quando quell cavallo cadde giù per quella grotta, se tu non c'eri dove si trovava l'onore della nostra città et l'onore nostro? Perché a guatarci tutti in viso et non ce ne ingannare, e' non c'è igniuono che avesse saputo pensare non che fare un acto che hai facto istamane tu. La nostra patria et noi in ispetialtà te ne restiamo obligate. Nel partirsi gli ambasciadori dal palazzo et tornare a casa ché erano a piè, non potevano passare per la via, da tanti era loca toca la mano, et decto loro: Pro vi faccia de l'onore avete avuto istamne et voi et la vostra città. Consideri ogniuono quanto onore et Gloria abbia avuto la città di Firenze questa mattina, et a questo si conosce quanto vaglia

uno singulare uomo a una republica. Questa andata gli fu maggiore onore che l'essere raffermo capitano di Pistoia, et fecegli Idio sempre questa gratia, che quanto più fu perseguitato et cercato di fargli vergogna, tanto più fu onorato. In questa stanza di Roma fu molto onorato et dal Pontefice et da tutti i cardinali che v'erano, ché v'era in questo tempo singulari uomini. Di tutte queste cose di Roma fui io presente, et tutto quello ch'io scrivo vidi et udii."

[141] The Italian for this quote is "L'onnore e la benivolentia, magnifico ambasciadore fra la vostra Magnificha Signoria e la nostra da dì IIII di dicembre 1443 in qua che si fecie la lega [è] suta tanta che continovamente di poi che qualunque vostro ambasciaodre abiamo visto tanto volentieri e chon tanta affezione che brieve o lungo che s'abbino parlato, grandemente ci sono piaciuti e molto cortesemente gli abbiamo visti, e pertanto non pigliate più scusa alcuna che sempre e in qualunque modo parlerete ci sarà molto grato audirvi, e in che hora ci visiterete e di dì e di notte vi vedremo molto volentieri, sì che perchè siete fiorentino; e quali, come è detto, ci sono grandemente acietti, sì anchora perchè ò udito la fama delle virtù vostre per le quali inanzi vi vedessi n'avevo grandissima affetione, ora tanto più v'amo quanto meritamente debbo per l'avere veduto la presenzia vostra e avere cogniosciuto per effetto quello avevo udito per fama." See (Lerz 1959, 258)

[142] The fact that Alfonso was hostile comes from an anonymous poem written about this occasion. The poem states "in questo tanto il cinquanta arrivato / era, ma pochi giorni ebbe passati / che fu Giannozzo inbasciadore pregiato / a Re Alfonso allor la volta quarta / ch' era al gran segnio suo Napol vochato/" Manetti's successful appeasement comes from Vespasiano: "Nel 1450 (Florentine calendar) fu mandato a Napoli… Giunto l'uno dì, l'altro dì gli dette la maestà del Re udienza publica, dove recitò una degnissima orazione Latina *de pace observanda.* Ebbe la mattina grandissimo onore, perchè v'era, oltre alla maestà del Re, tutti e ambasciadori di tutte la potenzie di Italia. Ebbe in questo tempo con la maestà del Re singularissima grazia". Both of these accounts are quoted in (Wittschier 1968, 107-08). For the first quotation, see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, 11r. The Italian is "…il giorno seguente quello clarissimo ambasciadore et poeta in conspecto di questa Signoria et del vinitiano ambasciadore et d tucto il nostro collegio agiunto il numero di molti nostri principali citadini ebbe oratione elegantissima gravissima et ornate... Tu come prudente in nome d questa Signoria renderai inumerabili gratie alla maesta del re in avere mandati si clarissimi ambasciadori et con si humanissima legatione." The second quote is from ASF Sig.Leg. 13, 13r. The Italian is "Et in verita qui ciascuno sta di buono animo et anno di pre certissimo cotesta serenissimo principe dovere atttender anima altra cosa se none alla vera Gloria con la quale ha acquistato et acquista in tucta Italia piu con benivolentia et humanita che non si potrebbe acquistare con veruno altro modo et questo nostra credentia ci e stata confermata e stabilita dalli suoi ambasciadore i quali exposono con tanta humanita et affectione d cotesto serenissimo re verso questa re public ache sanza dubbio si puo dire la sua maesta havere gia tucti glanimi d questo nostro popolo. Tu se prudentissimo et con ogni studio et diligentia tingegnerai conservare tale benivolentia…"

[143] For Vergerio's comment, see (Witt 2000, 377)

[144] BNC Magl. VI, 39r and (Sandeo 1611, 169-70)

[145] For this story in Plutarch, see Plutarch, *Life of Pyrrhus,* XIV. Translation found in (Plutarch 1996, 385-89). Manetti's account is in (Sandeo 1611, 174-75). For Manetti's commission, see below and (Martines 1963, 185). Martines mentions that Manetti was "…expected to justify the Republic's friendly attitude towards the *condottiere,* Francesco Sforza" to the King. However, Manetti was only to talk about this if the King brought it up.

[146] For Quintillian on panegyrics, see *Institutio Oratoria* III, VII. The translation of the quoted passages comes from (Quintilian 1920, 467-73). For the quote from Manetti's oration "around more…" and the long list of Alfonso's virtues, see (Sandeo 1611, 172-73)

[147] For Manetti's oration, see (Sandeo 1611, 169-75). The exordium and narrative are on pages 169-170, the partition is on page 170. For the quote, see (Sandeo 1611, 170). The Latin is "Una igitur nostre divionis parte brevissime quemadmodum instituerimus absoluta adsecundam de egregiis quibus dum admirabilum virtutus tuarum laudibus deinceps accedamus…" On this oration, see also (Wittschier 1968, 85-90)

[148] For Manetti's oration in general, see BML Plut 52 15, 1r-9r. For the partition, see 1v. The Latin is "partium divsione." For "ancient histories…", see 2v. The Latin is "…quem si antiques hystorias veteres annales et cronicos libros parumperante occulos posueris…". For Nello Martini, see Chapter Two. For Mandfred the Atheist, see 3r. The Latin is "… ut greci elegantius & expressius dicunt atheus qui in religiosos & sine deo Manfredus." For the pope's 214 predecessors, see 6r. For Numa, Augustus, and the name Nicholas, see 7r-7v. Witthshier argues that Manetti's use of historical examples linking the papacy and Florence had the intention of fulfilling Manetti's underlying political purpose: making the pope amenable to Florentine interests in the Italian political scene. However, this interpretation fails to take into account the presence of these examples in nearly every surviving diplomatic oration delivered by Florentine diplomats to the pope. For Wittschier, see (Wittschier 1968, 79-84)

[149] For these instuctions, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11 56r-58v. The first quote is from (Sandeo 1611, 175). The Latin is "Diceremus atque alias quasdam commissionis nostrae particulas seorsum maiestate tue oportunvis exponendas commodiori & gratiori temprori reservavimus…". For the second quote, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 56r. The Italian is "Quando sara tempo farete il presente et dono della peza del brociato con parole convenienti et accommodate delle quali sia leffecto che questa signoria insegno damore dibenivolentia daffectione et divotione singulare che ha tucto questo popolo inverso la maesta sua glimanda decto presente et dono."

[150] For never such good news, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 185v. For the peace, see ASF Sig.Leg. 11, 186r-187v For the quotation, see ASF Sig.Leg. 186r. The Italian is "…fine subguignendo che altra volta quando pratera alla sua b. ne. sarete a piedi dessa per dire alcune altre cose a voi commesse." For Manetti's similiar statement in his oration, see BML Plut. 52 15, 9r. The Latin is "Caeterum quadam alia restant quae cum sanctitati tuae placuerit opportunioribus locis atque temporibus referemus."

[151] All classical orations technically had the same parts, exordium, narration, partition, confirmation, refutation, and peroration. However, this schema is aimed at arguing a point rather than praising a ruler. The praise offered for a ruler could be considered the confirmation, but in such an oration a refutation would have no place. (Murphy [1974] 2001) provides an outstanding summary of various works on rhetoric by ancient authors. For Vergerio, see above. One excellent example of deliberative oratory is an oration that Leonardo Bruni delivered Neapolitan diplomats in Florence in 1443. The genre of this oration is shown through Bruni's use of the six oratorical sections and his focus on the confirmation and refutation. For this oration, see (Viti 1996, 853-61)

[152] On this political situation, see the references cited above.

[153] For the mixed Latinity among a republican audience, see Introduction. For Manetti's fear that some audience members might not be versed in classical history, see below. Further evidence for this statement is Manetti's repeated references to things that the "masses say". See the three examples in (Wittschier 1968, 160 and 164)

[154] For the first quote, see (Wittschier 1968, 159). For the second quote, see (Wittschier 1968, 160). The Latin is "…vel unica atramentati, quemadmodum vulgo aiunt, calami intinctione…"

[155] For Cicero, see *De inventione* II, 157ff. For examples will come from the classical past, see (Wittschier 1968, 156). Manetti's Latin is …in tantis tamen & tam arduis rebus satius & utilius fore putavimus, si de postulatorum nostorum honestate & utilitate ac iocunditate & denique de deo & bonis hominibus gratificatione pauca quedam singillatim brevissime simul atque verissime diceremus ac preterea celebrate quedam Romanorum maiorum nostorum exempla in medium adduceremus." For Cicero's *Pro lege Manilia,* see (Wittschier 1968, 161). The passages comes from VI. This oration is also called *De imperio Cn. Pompei ad Quirites. For* the 600 more examples, see (Wittschier 1968, 162). The Latin is "Quid denique da Allobrogibus & Alvernis referemus, quos cum adversus Eduos socios & amicos populi romani belligerarent, ab illis bello victos & superatos extitisse scribitu? Quid plura? Sexcenta adhuc huiusmodi rerum exempla supersunt, que nunc singillatim recitaremus, nisi nimam sermonis prolixitatem timeremus."

[156] For the quote from Caesar, see (Wittschier 1968, 173). For Manetti's commission in general, see ASF Sig.Leg. 56v-58v. For the quote, see 56v. The Italian is "...con quelle parole che parranno alla tua prudentia essere accommodate al tempo e alluogo e all persona la quale tu rapresenti e apresso alla quale hai abire."

[157] For both quotes, see (Wittschier 1968, 168). The Latin is "…regio nomine palam & aperte…" and "…palam & aperte…" For the exordium, narrative, confirmation, refutation, and peroration, see (Wittschier 1968, 166, 66-69, 69-71, 71-74, 74-75). The oration lacks a clearly delineated partition. See (Wittschier 1968, 98-99) who also argues that this oration follows a five part setup.

[158] For the Caesar example, see (Wittschier 1968, 173). For Siena's connections with Republican Rome, see (Rubinstein and Ciappelli 2004, 75-98). On Venetian humanism, see (King 1986) On Francesco Foscari in particular, see (Romano 2007, 8)

[159] For the first quote, see (Wittschier 1968, 156). The Latin is "postulata nostra ita clara & aperta sint, ut luce meridiana clariora esse videantur" For quote, see (Wittschier 1968, 160). The Latin is "quod si cuncta hec, quemadmodum singillatim a nobis plane & aperte probatum & demonstratum est vera esse constat…", The Latin for "plainly and openly" is "palam & aperte". In the Venetian oration, the quotes appear in (Wittschier 1968, 168, 71, 72). This use of "open" words fits into the argument of John Martin concerning Renaissance individuality and particularly his arguments about sincerity and prudence in Renaissance Italy. See (Martin 1997) Martin argued that the early modern period witnessed the detachment of "prudence" from Christian morality and the development of a conception of "sincerity". Although Martin argues that these changes occurred largely in the sixteenth century, both words occur in fifteenth-century diplomatic documents with regularity, suggesting that these changes occurred earlier than Martin had argued. For example, the Florentine government instructed diplomats to Martin V in both 1418 to convince his holiness of their "sincerita". See (Guasti 1867-1873, vol. I, 296-97). As these two conceptions of sincerity and prudence developed, new means of masking the true intentions of the Florentines behind its diplomats' words called for more artful ways of speaking before foreign rulers. The increased integration of humanism into diplomatic oratory mirrored the developments of these two new conceptions of the self in Renaissance society.

[160] For Manetti's commission, see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, 3r-4v. The Italian for the first quote is "con parole che parranno alla tua prudentia". For the second long quotation, "Loeffecto della tua commissione sue che con ogni studio et dilgentia tingegni con facti et con parole quanto te possible che la pace si conserve."

[161] For this oration in general, see (Sandeo 1611, 177-84) The Latin for the first quote is "…ut forte tres illas (pace cunctorum dixerim) muscas nares tuas tunc aestivo tempore medio fere orationis cursu (mirabile dictum) importune admodum apprehendentes, unquam antequam peroraremus, exinde abigere ac repellere obliviscereris" (Sandeo 177). For an example of one section clearly delineated from the next, see (Sandeo 1611, 180) "Sed haec de egregiis quibusdam pacis laudibus, quemadmodum antea propsuisse videbamur, hactenus dixisse & praedicasse sufficiat: quod erat primum nostrae divisionis membrum. Nunc vero de admirabilibus quorumcunque; pacem colentium praemis deinceps persequemur."

[162] For the oration being in Latin, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 571) For the first quote, see (Sandeo 1611, 179). The Latin is "Huiusmodi tam claris & tam apertis rationibus, multae omnium & Latinorum & Graecorum atque Hebraeorum celebratae auctoritates convenire & consonare videntur." For the second and third quotes, (Sandeo 1611, 183). The Latin is "non omnia, non pleraque, non multa" and "pauca quaedam".

[163] For the quotes, see (Sandeo 1611, 177). The Latin is "Si nunc primum, serenissime ac gloriosissime princeps, penes maiestatem tuam legationis munere fungeremur; profecto in hoc orationis nostrae principio tita illa & consueta exoridorum forma, iuxta celebrate & pervulgata artis oratoriae praecepta, plane & aperte uteremur. Sed quotiens legatos & oratores ad te missos & destinatos fuisse animadvertimus, totiens singularem quondam tuam erga nos benivolentiam acquisivisse ac comparasse intelligimus: totiens quoque praecipuam ac pene incredibilem in audiendis vel maxime oratoribus attentionem tuam recognoscimus…",

[164] For these two quotes, see (Sandeo 1611, 177, 84). The Latin is "Quocirca hanc nostrum, ut breviores simus, orationem absque; ullis praefationibus, utpote nobis ad captandam benivolentiam & attentionem tuam minime necessaries, feliciter incipere, inceptamque perficere & absolvere constituimus. Ubi fideli & accurate commissionis nostrae officio, cuius summa in hoc solo prae caeteris consistere ac residere videtur, ut Maiestatem tuam ad continuam & perpetuam pacis Paulo ante nobiscum initae conservationem vel parumper exhortemur…" and "Caeterum quaedam alia restant, quae alias, cum regiae Celsitudini placuerit, opportunioribus locis & temporibus referemus."

[165] On Manetti giving the work in written form rather than delivering it, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 580). Vespasiano wrote "Andò onoratissimamente et stettevi più mesi, et fu facto cavaliere a papa Nicola in questo tempo, et nel dargli la militia usò degnissime parole in loda sua. Fece in questo tempo a Roma una degnissima oratione allo 'mperadore della sua coronatione, questa gli mandò egli, ma non la rectiò." Sometime after presenting this written oration to the emperor, Manetti wrote a panegyircal work for the King of Naples. Although the manuscript tradition portrays this text as an oration, in fact it is a short panegyircal treatise. See (Wittschier 1968, 120-26). Wittschier explicitly wrote on page 121, "Das Werk ist keine Rede, sondern ein rein literarisches, an einen Panegyrikus erinnerndes Werk." See Vat. Lat. 1604 for this treatise. The work was written to seek personal gain in a period of trouble in Manetti's life. The ending of Manetti's treatise suggest this point: "Vale Italie decus ac iannotii fidissimi ac verissimi famuli tui quesumus non nunque meminisse digneris si quanto amultis et magnis plurimorum regnorum tuorum occupationibus requiescendi gratia respiraveris." Vat. Lat. 1604, 22v. For Manetti's problems in 1452, see (Bisticci 1963, 390-92. On Manetti's mission to Sigismundo, see (D'Elia, 2006). For the other rituals making the transfer of power to a mercenary captain in 1433 (see Bruni's oration in BML Redi 130, 53r-56r), 1472 (Brown 1979, 154) 1481 and 1485 (Filarete et al. 1978, 94, 96). Alison Brown has published two of Bartolomeo Scala's orations for these occasions, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 205-11, 15-23). For Manetti's oration fitting into a domestic oratorical tradition, see below.

[166] For this oration, see (Struve 1717) An online edition is available at http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahist/rgs/bd3/jpg/s009.html; last accessed March 13, 2008. For the first quotation, see (Struve 1717, 9) The Latin is "nos igitur nunc coelestibus & spiritualibus telis armati…" For the second, see (Struve 1717, 12). The Latin is "…magna quaedam & aequalis cunctarum rerum secularium iurisdictio ac potestas…" For examples of "openly and plainly (plane & aperte)", see (Struve 1717, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16,). Rather than a statement alluding to later political negotiations, the treatise ended by reemphasizing its purpose exclusively to praise: "Atque haec habuimus, quae in hac tam admirabili, tam fausta & tam felici imperatoriae coronationis celebritate primo ad aeternam omnipotentis Dei gloriam, ad perpetuam deinde beatitudinis tuae, Beatissime Pater ac etiam Maiestatis tuae, gloriosissime Imperator, laudem & commendationem, ad consolationem insuper vestram, praestantissimi auditores, praeterea ad generalem quondam & immensam totius Christiani generic laetitiam atque hilaritatem, & sempirternam denique tantarum & iam magnarum rerum memoriam in praesentiarum diceremus." (Struve 1717, 19)

[167] For the quotation, see BML Redi 130, 127v. The Italian is "partita divisione la quale sara in questa forma…" For the oration in general, see BML Redi 130, 127-143v.

[168] For the occasion of this ritual, see above. Bruni's oration to Niccolò Tollentino contains the anecdote about Rome being better off with great captains than with Plato, the four key attributes in a military captain, and a few great examples. Manetti's oration contains the same Plato anecdote, more classical references, and the same discussion about the four key attributes. See both orations in BML Redi 130. Bruni's oration is found from 53r-56r.

[169] For Manetti's oration being in Italian, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 599) cf. (Wittschier 1968, 27-28)

[170] For the first quote, see BML Redi 130, 142v. The Italian is "…per queste cagione cognoscendo il magnifico & generoso popolo di firenze che tucte quarto le predecte cose sono necessarie ea qualunque buno & sufficiente capitano secondo lantica & aprovata consuetudine de romani antinati & maggiori loro e quali nonsi conducevano mai e adare ne aconcedere elgoverno degli exerciti loro adalcuna persona dove non concorressino tutte Quattro le cose predecte & chiamavasi nel sermone latino imperator che niente altro nel nostro vulgare significa che comandator et per tanto inter venuia che nelle Guerra il piu delle volte evincevano et volendo seguitare le loro

laudabili vestige per havere la Victoria come havevano eglino per che glintendono che tutte concorrono nella magnifica persona di questo illustre s & strenuo capitano s messer Gisimondo." For the second quote, see BML Redi 130, 143r-143v. The Italian is …Et benche enonci paia necessario perche cognosciamo le vostre admirabili virtu dipersuaderve abuono & alaudabile governo per satisfare niente dimeno aldebito nostro & del nostro officio caramente vi preghiamo & strectamente vi confortiamo che vi piaccia exercitarvi & governarvi in tal maniera per manifesta & evidente experientia epaia a tutto mondo che nonsolamente & voi non de generiate da vostri predecti antinati equelli furono si valenti s. & si magnanimi & si strenui capitani ma piu tosto con le vostre laudabili opera avanziate a superiate e loro gloriosi gesti accio che ene seguiti prima Gloria alla vostra magnifica persona a presso honore & utilie a quello nostro popolo el quale ha tanta fede & nella excellentia delle vostre mirabilis virtu quanta voi comprehendete per questa nuova auctorita che con grandissima hunione che di bonissima voglia vatribuisce." Richard Trexler examined these baton rituals for the early sixteenth century and reached similiar conclusions as to mine, arguing that "In the ritual of the *presa di bastone",* the city legitimated a military authority it feared."(R.C. Trexler 1980, 502).

[171] For the Braccheschi and the anti-Medici families in Florence, see (Ferente 2005) For the problems with Manetti's relationship with Alfonso, particularly his dedication of his *De dignitate et excellentia hominis* to him, see (Martines 1963, 190). For Manetti and domestic disputes, see (Connell 2000, 157-64). On Manetti's diplomatic career as indicating he was on the fringes of the Medici group, see Introduction.

CHAPTER FOUR

[172] This tally does not include a mission to the pope in 1480 that featured twelve unnamed orators. See ASF Sig.leg. 21, 22r. For Gentile Becchi's role in this mission and the success of his oration, see below. Individuals filling more than ten positions: Donato Acciaiuoli (14), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, photo reproduction number (from here forward "pr#") 295; 17, pr# 40, 156, 204, 262, 275, 280, 291; 18, pr# 136, 149; 19, pr# 110, 248; 20, pr# 21. For his connections with humanism, see below. Jacopo Guicciardini (18), see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, pr# 15, 73, 279, 305, 347; 17, pr# 40, 104; 19, pr# 6; 20, pr# 5; 28, 42r; Sig.Dieci.Otto. Leg.Miss.Resp. 1, 32; 12; 14, 1; 60, 1; Dieci.Leg. 5, 298v; 6, 1r; Dieci.Miss. 21, 26r; Otto.Leg. 3, 3v. For his connections with humanism, see {Torre, 1902 #227}. Fircino dedicated a translation to him. Luigi Guicciardini (21), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 4, 15, 171, 246, 249, 289; 16, pr# 41, 207, 289, 299, 326, 369; 17, pr# 285; 18, pr# 136; 19, pr# 64, 90; 20, pr# 70; 21, 24v, 37r; Sig.Dieci.Otto. Leg.Miss.Resp. 60, 1; Otto.Leg. 1, 1rv. For his connections with humanism, see above. Otto Niccolini (11), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 62, 183, 240, 245, 249; 16, pr# 275, 321, 347; 17, pr# 65; 28, 42r; (Palmeri 1906, 188) For his connections with humanism, see above. Pierfilippo Pandolfini (11), see ASF Sig.Leg. 17, pr# 329; 19, pr# 202; 20, pr# 12, 45, 65; 21, 28r, 43r, 60v; Otto.Leg. 1, 1v; Dieci.Miss. 22, 91v. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 387-89). Antonio Ridolfi (17), see ASF Sig.Leg. 13, pr# 365; 14, pr# 89, 119; 15, pr# 52, 121, 132, 149, 267; 16, pr# 73, 289, 315, 357; 17, pr# 139, 217; 19, pr# 130; 20, pr# 3, 5. For his connections with humanism, see (Aguzzi-Barbagli 1965, 131). He translated Bruni's translation of San Basilio's Omelia from Latin into Italian. Tomasso Soderini (12), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 205, 249; 16, pr# 73, 301; 17, pr# 137, 189, 264, 305; 18, pr# 124; 19, pr# 90; 20, pr# 38. Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 4, 33r. For his connections with humanism, see (Clarke 1991, 134). Clarke writes that Tommasso became interested in humanism late in life, but his children were active members of the Platonic Academy. The only diplomat at this level of frequency not connected with humanism was the lawyer Bernardo Buongirolamo (13), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 21, 83, 101, 173; 16, pr#73, 267, 320; 17, pr#30, 177, 241; 18, pr# 180; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 12; Dieci.Leg. 5, 262r. Individuals with humanist connections filling less then ten positions: Agnolo Acciaiuoli (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# number 4, 15. For his connections with humanism, see above. Piero Acciaiuoli (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr#159. For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1963, 269-76). Luigi Alamanni (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 40v, 43r; Dieci.Miss. 5, 151v. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 30). Torre lists him as a member of the Platonic Academy in Florence. Alessandro Alessandri (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 62. For his connections with humanism, see above. Gentile Becchi (1), see ASF Otto.Leg. 4, 1r. For his connections with humanism, see below. Dietisalvi di Dietisalvi (4), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 126, 179, 274; 16, pr# 10. For his connections with humanism, see above. Francesco Dietisalvi (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 141. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 555) Marsilio Ficino dedicated a translation to him. Francesco Dini (7), see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, pr# 143, 249; 17, pr# 126, 175; 19, pr# 5; 21, 24v, 18v. For his connections with humanism, see (Brown 1992, 228). He printed a dispute between Lorenzo de' Medici and others about original sin. Bartholomeo Fortini (2), ASF Sig.Leg. 16, pr# 245, 319. For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 409) Vespasiano claimed that he had "bona notitia de le lettere latine." Francesco Gaddi (3), See ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 19v, 41v; Otto.Leg. 3, 171r. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 730). According to Torre, he was a friend of many humanist authors like Scala and Poliziano. Bernardo Giugni (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, pr# 23, 41. For his connections with humanism, see above. Agnolo Manetti (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 19, pr# 56. For his connections with humanism, see (Celenza 1999, 48) Agnolo published an edition of his father Giannozzo's translations. Domenico Martelli (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 14, pr# 82; 17, pr# 204. For his connections with humanism, see above. Nicolao Martelli (1), see ASF Dieci.Miss. 21, 162v. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 30). Torre lists him as a member of the Platonic Academcy in Florence. Filippo de' Medici (3), see Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 108, 249; 16, pr# 321. For his connections with humanism, see his orations discussed below. Lorenzo di Piero de' Medici (Lorenzo the Magnificent) (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, pr# 279, 17, pr# 204; 21, 43r. Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 48v; Otto.Leg. 4, 14. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 542) Ficino included in his will that a Greek book of Plato should be given to him. Pierfrancesco de' Medici (3), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 4, 171; 17, pr# 104. For his connections with humanism, see (Brown 1979, 24-25). While employing Bartolomeo Scala in his house, Pierfrancesco requested books from Rome. Niccolò Michelozzi (2), see ASF Otto.Leg. 4, 18rv; Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 11, 1. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 716-19) Bernardo Nero (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 38r; Dieci.Miss 21, 64v. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 728-29). Ficino dedicated works to him. Matteo Palmieri (6), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 14; 16, pr# 55, 73, 266; 17, pr# 293;

(Carpetto 1984, 22). See (Carpetto 1984) for his literary works. Domenico Pandolfini (1), see ASF Sig.leg. 18, pr# 252. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 389-91). Donato Acciaiuoli wrote letters to him. Pandolfo Pandolfini (2), see Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 115, 289. For his connections with humanism, see (Bisticci 1963, 257-69). Vespasiano claims that Pandolfo was a intimate of such men as Bruni and Manetti. Piero de' Pazzi (5), see ASF Sig.Leg. 14, pr# 85, 15; pr# 4, 62, 108, 245. For his connections with humanism, see above. Alamanno Rinuccini (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 18, pr# 263. For Rinuccini, see below. Bernardo Rucellai (4), see ASF Sig.Leg. 17, pr# 270; 20, pr# 86; 21, 35r, 59r. For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 824). Marsilio Ficino wrote to him. Franco Sacchetti (2), see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, pr# 52, 88. For his connections with humanism, see above. Bartolomeo Scala (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 51v. For Scala's humanism, see (Scala and Brown 1997). Francesco Soderini (1), see ASF Sig.Leg. 21, 51v. Francesco Soderini delivered an eloquent oration on a mission, see below. Paolo Soderini (1), see Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 22, 1. For his connections with humanism, see, (Torre 1902, 726). Torre claims that Paolo was "carissimo" to Ficino. ; Piero Vettori (3), see ASF Dieci.Miss. 21, 175v; Otto.Leg. 4, 82v; (Scala and Brown 1997, 56). For his connections with humanism, see (Torre 1902, 833). He frequented the house of a Platonist. For documents related to the Otto di Pratica, I have relied on (Archivio di Stato di Firenze. 1987)

[173] On these missions, see below. For the political situation with King Ferrante, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 242-45). For Ferrante and the Strozzi, see (Phillips 1987, 99, 120). Other occasions that may have necessitated cultural gifts were missions to the emperor in 1468; Milan upon the death of Francesco Sforza and Galeazzo Maria Sforza in 1466 and 1476, respectively; and Naples upon the death of Alfonso and the accession of Ferrante in 1458. However, if such occasions required an outstanding oration, the speeches have not survived. For the mission to the emperor in 1468, see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, photo reproduction number 321. For Naples, see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, photo reproduction number 15. For Milan on Francesco Sforza's death, see (Parenti 2001, 93) and ASF Sig.Leg. 16, photo reproduction number 41. For Milan at Galeazzo's death, see see (Ilardi 1972, 96-97) and ASF Sig.Leg. 19, photo reproduction number 90.

[174] For Vespasiano's statement, see (Bisticci 1963, 157). For the Tratte, see http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/search/personinfo.php3 and search for "Pierozzi" under surname. For Kent, see (Kent 1975, 630) Concerning Pierozzi's reputation, Vespasiano wrote "Era di tanta riverenza et riputatione, che con quella cappa di fraticello in dosso, con pochi famigli, aveva tanta reputatione, che mai passava di luogo ignuno, che ognuno quando passava non si gitassi in terra ginocchioni. Et sanza cavagli et sanza vestimenti et sanza famigli, et sanza ornamento ignuno in casa, era più istimato et più reverito, che s'egli fussi andato colle pompe vanno e' più de' prelati. Questa sua autorità non era solo in firenze, ma per tutta la corte di roma, perchè Eugenio nel suo pontificato assai cause rimitteva di giudicio dell'arcivescovo Antonino, et non voleva cosa ignuna, che non gli fussi conceduta per la sua autorità, non solo dal pontefice, ma da tutto il collegio de' cardinali, et da tutta la corte di Roma." (Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 229-30). Certainly, specific reasons also help explain the presence of churchmen in diplomacy. For example, the Florentines hoped in 1455 that the presence of the Archbishop of Florence, Antonio Pierozzi, might entice the pope to make him a cardinal. See (Guasti 1857, IX, XIII-XIV). However, such particular reasons leave unexplained the frequent presence of churchmen on important missions to secular rulers as well as the pope.

[175] For the personal nature of Medici diplomacy, see (Fubini 1996, 11-98). For the view of the Medici as having princely power, see (Rubinstein 1997, 145-46) For rituals with Lorenzo as prince, see (R. Trexler 1980, 453) For the characteristics of Milanese diplomats, see (Leverotti 1992, 11). The pope may have also viewed viewed personal connections, together with ties between an individual and the diplomatic destination, as the key criteria in a diplomat. In 1408, the pope selected Leonardo Bruni to serve as a diploma to Florence in 1408, although the mission never took place. See (Luiso, Gualdo Rosa, and Bruni 1980, 51)

[176] For this election, see (Guasti 1857, XI-XII) On Otto Niccolini, see (Camugliano 1933)

[177] For Pierozzi's reluctance, see (Guasti 1857, VI, XII). For Vespasiano's quote, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 234). The Italian is "Andò l' Arcivescovo vestito a modo usato, bene che fusse istimolato del contrario da ognuno. Giunto a roma, sendo la sua fama del continovo cresciuta, non meno fu onorato questa seconda volta che la prima, per la grande riverenza che gli era avuta per la sua continovata vita e costumi." The reference to Pierozzi's first time in

Rome refers to his time there after the death of Eugenius IV at the request of Pope Nicholas V. See (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 232-33)

[178] For Pierozzi's commission, (Guasti 1857, 3-4). The Italian is "Et qui apirrete e vostri pecti, ornerete le parole in dimonstrare la incredible exultatione et gaudio che hanno havuto questa Signoria et tucto el nostro populo et i principali e'esso della vocatione di si sancto et optimo pastore; et che nella città nostra non è memoria anticha, che si ricordi venire mai nuova reputata felice quanto questa, et per la quale universalmente da tucta la città, grandi piccolo et mezzani, et d'ogni grado et d'ogni sexo, se ne prendesse si smisurato gaudio et letitia." For the commission in general, see (Guasti 1857, 3-11). For the oration in general, see (Antonino 1586, 585-89). Both the oration and these instructions focus on the joy of the Florentines at the new pope's election, followed by praise for the pope's qualities, and concluding with a call for joint action against the threatening Turks. For the reference to the *De consideratione, Eytmologies,* and the *Donation of Constantine,* see (Antonino 1586, 586-87, 87, 88). The *De consideratione* is quoted silently. The passages are "tu igitur sacerdos…unctione Christus" (Book II, Ch. 8 of *De consideratione)* and "formam fore iustitae… Pharaonis" (Book IV, Ch. 7). I have accessed an online version of the *De consideratione* at http://www.binetti.ru/bernardus/10.shtml

[179] For this quote, see (Guasti 1857, 585). The passage translates to "Blessed father and lord, because it happens that whoever speaks before you sanctity is shaken up and trembles, partly because of the celestial nature of your throne, in which among people nothing is higher; partly because of your intelligence, by which heavenly gift is abundant in your familiarity with both law and holy scriptures; no less because of the presence of the most reverend lord cardinals, most venerable bishops, and learned doctors with their vast knowledge; is it any wonder if I, who am sufficient in neither knowledge nor words, before an audience that such majesty must be spoken, having to speak before such majesty, I pale and almost lose my voice.

[180] For the passage from Bernard, http://www.binetti.ru/bernardus/10.shtml, Book IV, Chapter 7, accessed March 14, 2008. For Pierozzi's passage, see (Antonino 1586, 587). The passage is a description of things the pope should be: "Form of justice, mirror of holiness, example of piety, asserter of truth, etc…) In addition to his humanist style, Pierozzi added a few humanist styled elements to his content. For example, he compared the peril facing Italy to the Gothic Wars, the history of which both Leonardo Bruni and Biondo Flavio had written. Pierozzi examined the Greek eyptomology of the name Callixtus, even writing out in the published version "ηάλλισος". See (Antonino 1586, 587-88)

[181] See each page of the oration. The sixteenth-century editor has noted when the language echoes biblical passages. (Antonino 1586, 585-89)

[182] For this use of history, see (Antonino 1586, 587-88). He calls Mehmed the "angelum sathanae" on 588. A comparison of Pierozzi's oration with that of the undelivered practice oration by Alamanno Rinuccini for the same event further demonstrates the freedom of technique available to Florentine diplomats for offering cultural gifts and Pierozzi's preferred use of religion and humanism to accomplish this goal. Rinuccini's oration was written "exercitationis gratia" and thus did not follow a diplomatic commission. Like Pierozzi's oration, Rinuccini's speech lacked a clear partition which hindered its organizational flow. Whereas Pierozzi had focused on following the suggestions in his commission, Rinuccin's oration was largely a generic presentation of one praiseworthy topic after another. Neither oration makes ostentatious use of classical sources or a classical structure, suggesting that neither aspect was absolutely necessary for a successful oration. Such similarities point to the basic stylistic requirements of a high level diplomatic oration in 1455. Yet, in terms of content, the two orations were strikingly different. Unlike the litany of biblical references in Pierozzi's oration, Rinuccini avoids such allusions. Pierozzi's ability to combine deep religious learning with the established humanist oratorical style set his oration apart from his predecessors and his contemporaries. For Rinuccini's oration, (Rinuccini 1953, 3-10)

[183] For Vespasiano, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 234-35). The Italian is "Fu ordinate che la mattina avessino udienza in concistoro publico, per fare onore alla città di Firenze, alla quale era affezionatissimo. Vennono la mattina che s'aveva avere audienza moltissimi, solo per vederlo ed udirlo per la sua singulare fama. Recitò una degnissima orazione; la quale fu assai lodata e commendata e dal Pontefice e da tutti quegli che vi si trovorono, in modo che la

mattina fece grandissimo onore a sè ed alla città che lo aveva mandato." For the letter, see (Guasti 1857, 17-18). The Italian is "Fummo mercholedì mattina in consistorio publico: et accompagnati nello entrare dentro da più prelati, facte le debite reverentie etc., fu facta per Monsignor nostro una elegantissima oratione secondo gli effecti della commissione: la qual fu tanto grata et al sancto Padre et a' signori Cardinali quanto per noi si potesse exprimere. E el sancto Padre rispose, molto commendando la obbedientia, et di poi commendando la città di Firenze et e cittadini di quella; et che a qualunche esercitio si davano, excedevano tucti gli altri, et in scientia et in merchature, et maxime nella religione et fede cristiana; la quale era quella che ha difesa cotesta città da ogni oppressione: et che acceptava la obbedientia come da veri et devotissimi figluoli di sancta Chiesa, così pe'tempi passati come al presente etc. Essene acquistata grande gratia et riputatione nel conspecto di questa corte, et alle signorie Vostre et a Monsignore" (Guasti 1857, 41) has a list of the cardinals in attendance and verifies that the oration in pierozzi's history is authentic. I have been unable to locate the manuscript that Guasti refers to on this page or for his book in general. On page. IV (Avertimento), he cites Archivio Centrale di Stato (Archivio di Stato Firenze) Carte Strozziane, CCCLXIX, 3. Another biographer of Pierozzi provides a third account of this oration. This quotation is somewhat more elaborate concerning Pierozzi's performance, but adds little more to the argument than the previous two accounts. Francesco Castiglione wrote "…qui cum Perusio iter facientes Romam magno apparatus pervenissent, statute die in consistorio publico ad praesentiam Pontificis admissi sunt, quo in loco, qui et personarum auctoritate et magna hominum etiam doctissimorum frequentia celeberrismus erat, talis fuit ad Summum Pontificem oratio Antonii, tanta verborum ac sententiarum venustate, tantaque gestus ac vultus gravitate vocisque sonoritate prolata, ut stupentibus somnibus non iam theologus aut orator sed missus e coelo Angelus prolocutus esse videretur. Tangebat in ea oratione abstruse mysteria, senteniasque gravissimas adiecerat, … quae ex re id factum est, ut cum Antonius magnum antea civitatis nostrae nomen maiori tum Gloria maiorique auctoritate illustrasset…" (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 234)

[184] For the commission in general, see (Guasti 1857, 45-52). The first quote appears at (Guasti 1857, 45). The Italian is "…simile mai per alcuna nuova qui adnuntiatat in questa cità essere stato non si ricorda." The second quote appears at (Guasti 1857, 46). The Italian is "Saremoci in più lunghe parole distesi, dimostrando quanto dire si dovesse; se non che voi, messer l'Arcivescovo, intorno a questa materia dinanzi al Padre sancto a dire harete, al quale come huomo in ogni cosa prestantissimo diamo libera conmissione intorno alle predette cose dire egregiamente come alla Reverenza vostra parrà, distendendovi tanto quanto allo honore di questa Republica si conviene et del sancto Padre. Et nella fine direte, voi avere alcuna cosa alla Sanctità sua a dire, le quali in altro tempo più congruo si differiranno."

[185] For this oration, see (Antonino 1586, 593-98). As with the oration to Callixtus III, the sixteenth-century editor has indicated cited and uncited biblical passages. For the quote, see (Antonino 1586, 594). The translation is "Certainly, none of these (empires) strove (valuit) to lead a single soul to the door of eternal salvation, but after these empires, the prophet Daniel said "God will awaken a certain kingdom of heaven, which will never be dispersed, nor will that kingdom be exchanged for another, and it will crush all these other kingdoms and it will last forever."

[186] For Pierozzi's use of Gregory of Nazianus, see (Antonino 1586, 594). The Latin is "Hoc attestatur Greco Nazian inter Graecos theologos doctor praecipuus…" For Moses, Theodosius, Alexander Severus, and Minerva, see (Antonino 1586, 596-97). The Latin for affectionate son is "filius affectuosissimus". The Latin for "the skies…" is "laetentur coeli, & exultet terra". This phrase appears repeatedly throughout the speech and ultimately comes from Psalms 95, 11. However, it was also the opening lines to the bull joining the Greek and Latin churches at the Council of Florence in 1439. For the final quote, see (Antonino 1586, 598). The Latin is "Mihi quoque, pater beatissime supplico parcas, si prolixus fui, vel si non recte, non apte, non indonee e pronunciaverim iniuncta."

[187] For the first block quote, see (Guasti 1857, 53-54). The Italian is "Et così secondo l'ordine dato, ci siamo rapresentati dinanzi alla sua Santità in publicho concestoro, second la forma et modo consueto: dove monsignore l'Arcivescovo nostro fecie el suo sermone, con tanta elegantia et dignità et honore dellae Signorie vostre, che quanto a tucti universalemente et a noi è paruto che lo Spirito Santo sia stato in quell corpo; etiamdio facento quello che era contro all'openione di molti, che con voce alta et optima pronuptia, per tempo d'una buona ora, orò et fecie el suo sermone con perfecta udientia di tucti e signori Cardinali et molti vescovi et molti altri. Et secondo noi à fatto

grandissimo honore alle Signorie vostre, et alla persona sua, et generalemente a tucto cotesto popolo. Non fu poi meno egregia et bella la risposta della Sanctità di nostro Signori: chè in vero non sapiamo come si potesse essere stata più grata, più degna, più dimostrativa di portare grande amore et avere singhulare affetione alle vostre Signorie et alla vostra città; et con tanta eloquentia et degnità di parlare, che in vero per noi s'è giudicato non avere mai udito in niuno tale eloquentia et pronuptia di parlare." For the secon quote, see (Guasti 1857, 55). The Italian is "Per l'ultima nostra, che fu de' dì x del presente, avissammo la Signorie vostre come avavamo avuto publicha udientia in concestoro dalla Santità del Papa, et la risposta che ci aveva fatto la sua Santità; la quale non poteva esser più degna et più grata, et in modo vi fu di quegli a cui dispiaque, tanto lodò et exaltò et magnificò la nostra città." Two other accounts of Pierozzi's oration survive that attest to Pierozzi's success. Vespasiano da Bisticci states the following about the oration: "On the election of Pius II he was again chosen as Florentine ambassador, and this second mission brought him yet greater honour than the first. He was now old and greatly weakened by fasting and vigils. The six ambassadors were honourably received by the Pope, and when the archbishop rose to announce his mission he fell, being overcome by age, the fatigue of the journey and the long waiting. It seemed to the court and the other ambassadors that he was in serious case, but after he had been revived by rubbing and a cup of malmsey in an adjoining room, he returned to the consistory and delivered a speech even finer than that which he had spoken before Pope Calixtus. After the consistory he visited the cardinals according to custom, and then returned to Florence." (Bisticci 1963, 162) Francesco Castiglione wrote "…ad successorem Calisti Pium Secundum Romanum Pontificem, eodem legationis officio fungi summo itidem volente magistrate cogeretur. Nec fuit ea legatio priore deterior, aut apparatus aut personarum dignitate, in qua etiam elegans ac gloriosa fuit oratio Antonii. Fuerunt autem collegae Antonii in hac secunda legatione Angelus Acciaiolus, Loysius Guicciardinus, Petrus Pazius, Guillielmus Ruccellarius, Petrus Franciscus Medices. Qui vero benevolentia ac dilectione Pius papa ex tam parva quam in illa legatione cum eo habuerat, consuetudine Antonium complexus fuerit, quamquam de eius sanctitate opinions conceperit." (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 239). Emilio Santini held a similiar opinion to this dissertation concerning Pierozzi's oratory. Santini stressed the combination of an almost sermonlike quality with a classical foundation. He wrote that "Le orazioni di Antonio hanno pregi veramente singolari di calore e colore. In esse, come nei sermoni religiosi, si sente alitare la fiamma di quell divino entusiasmo, che fu il suscitatore di ogni suo atto. Ma più che nelle prediche qua si nota elaborazione formale e compostezza non comune. Sono bandite le citazioni antichema il classicismo prende la sua rivincita nella oculata scelta delle parole e delle frasi."(Santini 1922, 195)

[188] For Filippo's relationship with Cosimo and Piero, see (Chambers 1988, 60), (Martines 2003, 48). On Filippo more generally, see (Luzzati 1964-66)

[189] On the political situation between Florence, Naples, and France during the 1450s and 60s, see above. For the connections between the Pazzi and the French and particularly the Angevins, see (Bisticci 1963, 314), King Renè had also been a guest of Piero's father, Andrea, in 1442. See (Martines 2003, 64) See also (Ferente 2005, 93-94) (Ferente 2003), (Fubini 1994, 93). For the deliberations concerning this oration, see ASF Con.Prat. 56, 177vff. The quotes are from 177v. The Latin is "benivolentie" and "…ne offensibus cuiusmodi ab aliis mitti videri possint…"

[190] For Buonaccorso's father Luca, see (Rubinstein 1997) and (Phillips 1987, 93). For the ties between the Pitti and France, see (Brucker et al. 1967). Buonaccorso Pitti was singled out to talk to the Duke of Burgundy (Borgogna) in the diplomats' commission. See (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 114) for Filippo de' Medici, see above. Donato Acciaiuoli's role in the mission is difficult to discern with certainty. In his life of Piero de' Pazzi, Vespasiano da' Bisticci claims that "Donato Acciaiuoli begged leave to accompany him (Piero de' Pazzi), and he took with him the *Life of Charlemagne*, which he had written, as a present to the King of France." (Bisticci 1963, 312). However, in his life of Donato Acciauoli, Bisticci wrote that "Donato had gone as ambassador with messer Piero de Pazzi, and had taken as an offering to the King *The Life of Charlemagne* which he had written." (Bisticci 1963, 282) Abel Desjardins wrote "Peut-être Acciajuoli n'était-il revêtu alors d'acun caractére public, mais accompagnait-il, comme simple particulier, l'ambassadeur Piero de Pazzi." (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 100) Arnaldo della Torre cites Desjardins and wrote that "…Donato accompagnò [the embassy] come semplice privato… ". (Torre 1902, 408) The letters to and from Florence and the city's diplomats do not mention Acciaiuoli. Moreover, the instructions to the ambassadors do not mention him. However, the account tally at the end of the diary for the mission lists payments to him. (Milanesi 1864, 61-62) On Donato's later diplomatic career, see above.

[191] For the Pazzi and the Angevins, see above. For the singling out of Piero in the commission, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 113). It states "E, non trovando voi nella corte il Re Renato, tu, Piero de' Pazzi solo, nel tornare addietro, dopo l'ambasciata esposta al Re di Francia, al prefato Re Renato ti transferirai, quanto di sopra è ditto a lui esponendo, se dal messo avete inteso la lettera nostra non avere fatto debita operazione." For the election of Pandolfo Pandolfini, see ASF Sig.Leg. 15, 57v-60r. The quote is from 57v. The Italian is "Onde vogliamo che tu piero non vada al prefato re renato se altre scripto noti fuisse." For Pandolfo in Milan, see 60r.

[192] For this commission in general, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 109-15) For "ferma speranza", see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 110). For "…concerning the…", see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 111). The Italian is "…interno alle predette parti, quelle parole e sentenze userete, che migliori e più congrue vi parranno, rimettendo tutto nella vostra prudenza e discrezione.".

[193] For the oration in general, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 117-24). The Latin translates to "For how much piety in this prince, how much moderation, how much clarity of all habits and talents and light will shine forth, can be shown testified more through your witnesses than by my oration."

[194] For the first quote, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 109). For the second quote, see (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 117-18). The Latin is "Eterna susceptorum beneficiorum memoria veterisque benevolentie necessitudo, Christianissime Princeps, nos, Florentini populi oratores, usque perduxit, ne ingrate accepti muneris et immemores pariter videamur. Prestiterant namque tui progenitores magna memorandaque semper Reipublice nostre beneficia, quibus eorum memorie Tueque Majestati Rempublicam nostrum devinctam atque obnoxiam adeo esse conoscimus, ut nullum sciamus genus retributionis tantis beneficiis equandum esse."

[195] (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 119-24)

[196] For the first quote, see (Milanesi 1864, 25). The Italian is "…i nostri ambasciadori ebbono private audientia in camera del re, dove furono solamente il re et nostri ambasciadori, et loro cancelliere et monsignore di Bellavalle et monsignor di Presignì, et lo cancelliere del re, et msser Iacopo di Valpergha cancelliere del duca di Savoia. Detto dì Donato Acciaiuoli, presenti nostri ambasciadori et me, presentò all Maestà del re la Vita di Carlo Magno per lui composta, la quale gli fu molto grata et acceptolla con buone parole.". See (Milanesi 1864) for this diary in general. For the second quote, see (Gatti 1981, 99). The Latin is "Cum oratores omnium Christianorum privatique etiam homines undique ad te concurrunt, serenissime rex, qui felicitati tuae gratulatum veniunt, ego etiam qui pro tuis ac maiorum tuorum, non solum erga nostram rem publicam, sed etiam familiam meam, singularibus meritis amplitudini tuae plurimum debeo, non alienum putavi aliquid regio nomine dignum ad hanc tantam celebritatem pro viribus meis afferre." See (Gatti 1981, 79-80) for an Italian translation.

[197] The presentation copy of this work is actually in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge, although I have not seen it. The first two folio pages are available for online viewing at http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/gallery/cambridgeilluminations/themes/7.html. Last accessed March 17, 2008. Margery Ganz suggests that this is not, actually, the presentation copy. (Ganz 1990, 56-57) For Acciaiuoli lifting passages from Bruni, see (Gatti 1981, 116). On this passage Acciaiuoli wrote "Sub consulibus postea ac dictatoribus… sexaginta annos" and "Imperatores hinc creari… dominatione erat." Both of these passages come verbatim from the first book of Bruni's *History of the Florentine Republic.* See (Bruni 2001-2007, vol. I, 86-88). For the quote "…a city…" see (Gatti 1981, 117). The Latin is "Illud autem loco summae gloriae Florentia urbi tribuendum puto, quam initio eam condidere Romani, conditam deinde ac barbaroum furore eversam, romanorum quoque clarissimus Imperator restituit, ut non tantum doloris ex deicta, quantum laetitiae ex restituita patria Florentinis accederet." Acciaiuoli's familiarity with Bruni's history is not surprising as later in life the Florentine government officially commissioned him to translate it into Italian. On this translation, see (Bessi 1990) For Bruni's version of the Charlemagne story, see (Bruni 2001-2007, vol. I, 97).

[198] For these instructions, see ASF Sig.Leg 15, 125r-128r. For the quote, see 125v. The Italian is "Saremoci in più lunghe parole distesi, dimostrando quanto dire si dovesse; se non che voi, messer l'Arcivescovo, intorno a questa materia dinanzi al Padre sancto a dire harete, al quale come huomo in ogni cosa prestantissimo diamo libera

conmissione intorno alle predette cose dire egregiamente come alla Reverenza vostra parrà, distendendovi tanto quanto allo honore di questa Republica si conviene et del sancto Padre."

[199] For Filippo's oration, see B.U.Padova, M.S. 537, 28r-32r. The first quote translates to "Indeed, if we said few things, nevertheless we are not unaware of your mind, wisdom, greatness, liberality, clemency, and piety, because of which we have no doubt that all things will be auspicious and fortunate. For the second quote, see B.U.Padova, M.S. 537, 29r. The Latin is "…cum michi beati Gregorii verba veniunt in mentem…". For the second quote, see B.U.Padova, M.S. 537, 29v. The Latin is "non solum trigesimam aut sexagesimam, sed etiam centesimam eterne felicitatis eris recepturus mercedem." The Biblical quotation in the text is taken from the New Revised Standard Edition.

[200] See B.U.Padova, M.S. 537, 29v-32r

[201] For Scala as the author of the first oration, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 242). For Rinuccini as the author of the second, see (Rinuccini 1953, 68)

[202] For the knighting of Giannozzo, see (Kent 1991, 84). For Pandolfo and Ferrante and the quote "…a benefactor…". See (Bisticci 1963, 265-69). For Pierfilippo's relation to Pandolfo, see (Torre 1902, 385). For Pandolfo and Pierfilippo and humanist dilettantes, see above.

[203] On this political situation, see above. For the complication brought about by Piccinino's death, see ASF Sig.Leg. 16, 8r. For the marriage on hold, see (Phillips 1987, 136-37). See also (Parenti 2001, 78-87; Ferente 2005)

[204] For this oration in general, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 242-45) Although undated, Alison Brown has attributed this surviving oration by Bartolomeo Scala to this mission. (Scala and Brown 1997, 242). Moreover, supplementary evidence supports the argument that either Jacopo Guicciardini or Pandolfo Pandolfini delivered this oration on this mission. The commission and the oration have very similar beginnings. The commission contains the following passage "Se le ragioni et lecagioni che cisiamo devotissimi figliuoli della sua excellentissima maesta et che necessariamente legamo et stringono gli animi del nostro popolo a singularissima et maraviglosa benivolentia et observantia d sua non fussino in prompto et manifestissima che sarebbe forse nostro uficio in qualche parte dimostrarne alcuna cosa." ASF Sig.Leg. 17, 7r. The oration contains a similiar phrase: ""Si vultus et ora Florentini populi quemadmodum corda mentesque omnium afferre nunc ad te potuissemus, invictissime et gloriosissime Rex, frustra nunc apud Maiestatem tuam orationem ullam haberemus." On Manetti and "utilitas" and "honestas", see Chapter Three.

[205] For these three paragraphs, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 243-44). The Latin is "…nihil unquam Florentino populo fuit aut [est] antiquius quam fidei ac foederum inviolatissima observantia.", "Est enim ea regnorum et imperii natura ut appetantur ab omnibus et illud tragicum nimis late patet: 'Nulla sancta societas Nec fides regni est.' volunt natura imperare omnes." (Brown attributes the quote to Ennius, quoted in Cicero); and "…ad diurtunitatem stabilitatemque regnorum…"

[206] For the political situation between Florence, Venice, Milan, and Naples, see the commission for this mission found at ASF Sig.Leg. 19, 131v-136r. See also (Giustiniani and Rinuccini 1965, 239-43; Fubini 1994, 220-52). and (Ilardi 1972, 80-96-100)

[207] On Bongianni Gianfigliazzi, see (Arrighi and Klein 2003). On Pierfilippo Pandolfini's missions, see above, although he was also a diplomat numerous times after 1485. For his relationship with Lorenzo de' Medici, see (Kent 1991, 30) On the Rinuccini family's history in Florence, see the Online Tratte and search for Rinuccini under surname. http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/search/personinfo.php3. On his learning, see the works published in (Rinuccini 1953). Rinuccini's most famous work for modern readers is his *On Liberty.* For a partial translation, see (Watkins 1978, 193-224). For further information on his diplomatic mission, see below.

[208] For the oration in general, see (Rinuccini 1953, 68-72). The Latin of the first quote is "…quando clarissimus et ornatissimus eques collega meus, cuius iussa abnuere nec volo nec honeste possum, hanc uni mihi dicendi necessitatem imposuerit." As with Bruni's orations delivered by others, the role of the Florentine government in procuring this oration for the diplomat is unclear. Giustiniani supplies two titles in the manuscript tradition: "Hanc orationem composuit Alamannus Rinuccinus nomine Petri Philippi Pandolphin, qui missus fuit orator…" and "Oratio ab Alamanno Rinuccino composita rogatu Petriphilippi Pandolphini, cum orator missus fuit Neapolim…" (Rinuccini 1953, 68). Most of the commission for this mission has been published in (Giustiniani and Rinuccini 1965, 241-43) The commission stresses that they are to speak only of the wedding in the beginning: The ambassadors were to state that they are there "to honor the wedding celebration". Next, they were to "proceed in honoring the celebration, accommodating yourselves to the time and atmosphere (qualita) of the thing." At the appropriate time and place, the ambassadors were to present the commune's gift, "ornamenting it with the words that seem best to you." They were to stress that although the gift could not equal the good will shown to Florence by the king, the Florentines hope that it will at least show their "volonta" towards him. The speech instructions concluded with the statement "In your first audience, you will not speak other than in general [that] the primary reason for your arrival [is] for the wedding, etc…" For the first quotation, see ASF Sig.Leg. 19, 132r. The Italian is "perhonorare la festa delle sue noze…". The second quote is "seguirete in honorare la festa accomodandovi altempo et alla qualita della cosa conconservatione (percio?) della dignita vostra come pella vostra grandissima prudentia saperrete fare Aluogho et a tempo farete il (pnte.) nostro ornandolo con quelle parole che viparra convenienti..." (132v) The last quote is "Nella vostra prima audientia non direte altro che in generale la cagione prima della vostra andata pella noze etc. Ne per allora chiedete piu secreta audientia privata nella quale exporrete. Ma poi a luogho et a tempo domanderete audientia privata..." 132v, checked in (Giustiniani and Rinuccini 1965, 241).

[209] The oration begins by referring to classical structure, a technique formerly used by Giannozzo Manetti. It states "Si quando licuit oratorum cuiquam de rebus grandioribus loquuturo ab auxilii divini imploratione exordium capere, quod in rebus fictis poetae facere consueuerunt..." Following the exordium, the orator begins his first point with "primum"; although the oration follows a standard classical structure, the remainder of the oration neglects to display ostentatiously its adherence to such precepts. The oration adds to these hints at structural understanding through a few classical citations and allusions. In particular, he cites Vergil, the story of Pyrrhus, and describes the king's constitution in terms that echo ancient descriptions of the indefatigable Catiline. The explicit citation to Virgil allows the orator to compare the king's offspring to gods "Ille enim *diis genite,* inquit, et *geniture deos;* nos autem *regibus genite et geniture reges* verissime dixerimus..." Rinuccini pays extremely close attention to this word constructions and the sounds of letters. In one typical example, "tot audientibus sapientissimis viris", the orator has used hard t and d sounds before sliding into a series of s sounds. Two long words are introduced by a short one. The next word grouping "in hoc amplissimo atque ornatissimo nuptiali coetu" uses a simliar sounding introduction "in hoc" to introduce more long words that fit together with assonance (by relying on the o sound). The orator makes a shift towards hard sounds in t and c, which he introduces with an n (ornatissimo nuptiali coetu) This n sounds introduces the alliteration of the next word grouping "quo nullum aut nubentium nobilitate", which is again introduced with a short word with a hard o sound, and so on. For this oration, see also (Giustiniani and Rinuccini 1965, 239-43). The Latin for the quotes in his paragraph is "brevia quaedam florentinorum praesidum nomine, a quiubus missi sumus, mandata referre conabimur..." "Primum itaque, florentinorum praesidum et totius populi nomine quam merito debemus venrationem praefati..."; "Nonnulla sunt praeterea, serenissime rex, quae tuae maiestati seorsum referre mandarint praesides nostri, quae, cum illius commodo nobis licebit, enarrabimus." And "Ut autem florentini populi benivolentiam devotionemque erga regiam maiestatem in hac nuptiali pompa non solum praesentia nostra et oratione testemur, attulimus novae reginae munuscula quaedam, ut putamus, non asperanda." For the importance of vocabulary in these orations, see the concerns and praise of Antonio Pierozzi's oration to Pius II, discussed above.

[210] For the letter from Florence to the city's diplomats, see ASF Sig.Leg. 19, 136v. The Italian is "...la maesta del re dello honore factovi nella vostra entrata come scrivete a 30 et della grata audientia et delle dimostrationi damore facte." For the letter from the King to Florence, see (Giustiniani and Rinuccini 1965, 240). The Latin is "Vidimus et excepimus libentissime legatos quos ad nostras honestandas nuptias misistis. Eorum enim adventus et in ipsis peragendis nuptiis iucundissima fuit, et munus quo nos vestro nomine donarunt longe gratissimum; accepimus illud ut a vobis quos nostri amantissimos scimus perfectum equissimo animo. Agimus igitur vobis maximas gratias et pro

ipsis oratoribus missis et pro ipso munere et tante vostri in nos amoris et benivolencie significationes et, memores futuros et cum usus postulaverit gratiam prolixe relaturos pollicemur."

[211] On Rinuccini, see above. See also (Watkins 1978, 186-91), which on page 187 has the information about Rinuccini's letters and Lorenzo's disapproval. On Rinuccini's mission to Rome, see (Fubini 1996, 108-22). Letters from Rinuccini to Lorenzo de' Medici while in Rome are published in (Rinuccini 1953, 214-18)

[212] On Donato Acciaiuoli, see (Ganz 1982; Garin 1963, 55-117) and (Martines 1963, 348-49; Bisticci 1976, vol. II, 21-52) On Manetti as an ideal, Chapter Three.

[213] Ganz argues for the incredible importance of his mission, although she mistakenly states that no instructions for Acciaiuoli's oraton survive. She wrote "On 22 August 1471 the signoria once again selected Donato Acciaiuoli as Florentine ambassador to Rome; along with Domenico Martelli, Piero Minerbetti and Lorenzo de' Medici, Donato was to represent Florence at the festivities surrounding the coronation of Pope Sixtux IV. Even though this was only a brief embassy of ceremony, the purpose of which was to congratulate Sixtus on his accession to the papal throne, it was also Florence's first step in the process of making a friend of the new pontiff. Both Felix Gilbert and Melissa Bullard have examined the enormous patronage that was available for distribution by the new pope and have shown how the maintenance of a good relationship with the pope meant the possibility of proft for the city's bankers. So, not only was peaceful co-existence with the pope necessary to Florentien foreign policy, but it was essential that the Medici Bank enjoy a good relationship with the new pontiff. This mission, and in particular Donato' oration congratulating Sixtus, was the first move in establishing a good working relationship between Florence and the Papal States – a relationship which was ultimately to fail in spectacular fashion. Although negotiations on several issues that had been unresolved at the conclusion of Acciaiuoli's previous mission were to be reopened, the most important aspect of this embassy was the oration Donato gave on behalf of his city on 3 October 1471. The selection of Donato to give this oration reveals both the Medici's trust in Donato and their reliance on his ability to influence Sixtus. Unfortunately, while none of the written instructions concerning this important oration have survived, Lorenzo de' Medici's presence on the embassy permitted the Signoria and the Medici to keep their options fluid until the last minute, and so there may not have been any written instructions. Donato could modify his speech after Lorenzo had consulted with the ambassadors of Florence's allies. Thus, this embassy enabled Donato to collaborate with Lorenzo on a vital aspect of Florentine foreign policy." (Ganz 1990, 58-59, 1982) The speech instructions left out these monetary goals. Instead, the *Signoria* instructed its orators to stress the devotion of the city towards the pope and their unprecedented joy at his election. However, these gestures implicitly would earn the pope's goodwill towards the city. The Florentines could then use this goodwill in more practical matters. For the election of the diplomats, see ASF Sig.Leg. 17, 112rff. The diplomats with Acciaiuoli were Bongianni Gianfigliazzi, Domenico Martelli, Lorenzo de' Medici, Piero Minerbetti, and Angelo della Stufa. For Gianfigliazzi and the Medici, see above. Piero Minerbetti was an *accopiatore* twice during the 1470s. See (Rubinstein 1997, 277-78) Angelo della Stufa was an advocate for appointing Bartolomeo Scala as chancellor; was knighted by Galeazzo Maria Sforza of Milan; and served as Standard Bearer of Justice in 1471 at the suggestion of Sforza and through the influence of Lorenzo de' Medici. See (Brown 1979, 42-43, 54, 64-66,) On Domenico Martelli, see (Davies 1998, 127). Vespasiano wrote that Piero Parente translated Acciaiuoli's oration into Italin at the "petizione degli amici." (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 30) For the quote in Santini, see (Santini 1922, 213). The Latin is "habuit luculentissimam quae nunc extat orationem."

[214] For the oration in general, see BNC Magl. XXXII, 39, 77v-80r. For "donum", "munus", and "since…", see BNC Magl. XXXII, 39. 77v and 78v, respectively. The Latin is "cum immortali deo qui te tantis virtutibus ornavit maxime sunt a te gratie habende non minores a nobis agende sunt quibus hominem tam ornatum pastorem dedit in lucem pertulit." For the block quotation, see (Santini 1922, 213). The Latin is "Sed cum iam inveterate consuetudinis sit omnium ferme oratorum, qui primum ad hanc sanctissimam sedem veniunt, ut orationem habeant gratulationis et laetitiae plenam, vereor ne de populo florentino hac communi consuetudine me loqui putes. Non est haec communis consuetude, non sermo, non mos ab omnibus usurpari solitus, sed est devotio, observantia, caritas in apostolicam sedem natura nobis primum innata, deinde multis nostrae reipublicae in ecclesiam meritis multis suis in nos officiis confirmata, quae facit ut omni ecclesiae prosperitate letemus, ut nostra calamitate doleamus."

[215] Emilio Santini, an author rarely pleased with humanist rhetoric, similiarly praised Acciaiuoli's Latin and his creative sylstic presentation. He wrote "L'orazione è contenuto di gran parte nuovo ed è scritta con gusto di abile latinista. Gli stessi elogi non sono espresso con i soliti luoghi comuni." (Santini 1922, 213-14). For the block quote, see (Santini 1922, 214). The Latin is "Omitto sacrarum litterarum scientiam, quia caeteras virtutes tuas tamquam pretiosissima vestis exornat. Quamquam quid omitti aut praeteriri tanti hominis scientia potest? Video enim cum te praesentem intueor, Beatissime Pater, nostrae italiae decus, video romanae curiae ornamentum, video christianae reipublicae lumen, video sapientissimum virum summumque theologum e cuius disciplina permulti in theologiam principes gravissimi auctores atque magistri tamquam ex equo troiano exierunt. For the final quote, see BNC Magl. XXXII 39, 79v. The Latin is "Civitas florentina atque ita tulit ut neque eam terror armorum neque immenentis periculque magnitude neque multarum urbium defectiones ab observantia romanae sedis verique pontificis abvocarit."

[216] For Palmieri's diplomatic career, see above. For the entry of the Palmieri into the priors, see online tratte: http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/tratte/search/personinfo.php3. search for Palmieri under surname.. Lauro Martines has pointed out that Palmieri did, in fact, have a father and an uncle who were active in citizen affairs. See (Martines 1963, 191-96). However, his reputation as a parvenu remained. For Vespasiano, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 563). The Italian is "naque di parenti di mediocre conditione, dette principio alla casa sua, et nobilitolla per le sua singulari virtù.". For Rinuccini, see (Rinuccini 1953, 80). The Latin is "Mattheus igitur Palmerius honestis parentibus natus, quippe qui in germanos quosdam principes originis suae primordia referat…"

[217] For Palmieri among the *accopiatore*, see (Rubinstein 1997, 161, 325). For the 1466 missions, see (Palmeri 1906, 184) and ASF Sig.Leg. 16, photo reproduction number 73.

[218] For the connections of these families with the Medici, see (Rubinstein 1997, esp. 123, 219, 21, 354) Francesco Soderini was a Florentine diplomat in 1480 and 1484, in addition to several missions outside of the temporal range of this study (Lowe 1993, 27-35) The 1480 mission featured a huge number of official diplomats (twelve) and was to persuade the pope to raise the interdict leveled on Florence after the Pazzi Conspiracy (Lowe 1993, 20) On this mission, Soderini delivered an outstanding oration before Sixtus IV that was copied and praised. (Lowe 1993, 20, 276)

[219] On Scala, see (Brown 1979). The quote is from (Brown 1979, 217), Brown's translation. Scala had a small amount of experience serving as a Florentine representative abroad, although the 1484 mission was his first and only diplomatic appointment. In particular, he had served as a Florentine representative at San Gimignano in 1479. As a member of the Otto di Guardia, a powerful political body in charge of prosecuting political crimes (Brown 1979, 24), Scala was sent to encourage the army. On September 25, the Florentine commissaries reported Scala had "demonstrated in his speech with great wisdom and ability how important the territory of Colle was to your state, and with powerful arguments he urged and exhorted [the army] in your name to defend it in every possible way He was welcomed and what he had to say was well received." (Brown 1979, 87-88). The decision to send Scala and his apparent enthusiasm in this oration were no doubt influenced by the fact that Colle Val d'Elsa was Scala's hometown. The following month, Scala again went to the army, this time for the purpose of moving the army to a new camp, a charge that was ultimately unsuccessful even as Scala's work met with the approval of his commissioners the *Dieci* (Scala and Brown 1997, 89) On Bernardo Buongirolamo as a new man, see (Brown 1979, 202). On his missions, see above.

[220] For Scala's itinerary, see (Brown 1979, 107-08) Pierozzi gave his oration to Pius II on October 10. On October 14, the *Signoria* wrote to the ambassadors instructing them all to return to Florence except Agnolo Acciaiuoli and Luigi Guicciardini. (Guasti 1857, 53, 58). On Accaiuoli, see (Ganz 1982, 58-59)

[221] For Scala's oration in general, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 224-31). The partition is on page 225, "De qua quidem nos… orationi modum." For rhetorical questions, see the first three sentences of the speech on 224. The quote is on page 227. The entire sentence is "Quo enim pacto aliis futuram gloriam proponet fidemque faciet venturae vitae qui non quae nobis salvator noster est pollicitus cuncta tanquam ea, quae certissima habentur, sibi persuaserit? "By this agreement he (the pope) puts forward future glory for others and holds faith for the life to

come (the afterlife). Who has not been convinced concerning this thing, just as all those things that our savior has promised to us, which are most certain?"

[222] For the first quote, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 225). The Latin is "Quis aperire caeli nobis portas, quis claudere edidicit damnareque et dare salutem hominibus? Summus pontifex.". For the second quote, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 227). The Latin is "Exemplum meum dedi vobis ut quemadmodum ego feci, et vos faciatis." For "pastor bonus", see (Scala and Brown 1997, 228). For "agnus innocens…" (Scala and Brown 1997, 229) One aspect that Scala argues is not necessary in the pope is noble lineage. This statement may have served to address Scala's own lack of ancestry. See (Scala and Brown 1997, 227)

[223] For Scala's knighting and earning church patronage, see (Brown 1979, 107) For Scala's oration in the *Legazione e commissarie* and its title, see (Scala and Brown 1997, 224). Filippo Redditi made this copy. On him, see (Brown 1979, 205) The final quotation is from Burckhardt, quoted in Introduction.

CONCLUSION

[224] Francesco Soderini was a Florentine diplomat in 1480 and 1484, in addition to several missions outside of the temporal range of this study. (Lowe 1993, 27-35). The 1480 mission featured a huge number of official diplomats (twelve) and was to persuade the pope to raise the interdict leveled on Florence after the Pazzi Conspiracy (Lowe 1993, 20). On this mission, in fact, the evidence suggests that Soderini delivered an outstanding oration before Sixtus IV that was copied and praised (Lowe 1993, 20, 276). On Angelo Poliziano's oration, see (Gragg 1927, 199-201). I have concluded that Poliziano wrote this oration for others based on Gragg's title "Pro oratoribus florentinorum ad Alfonsum Siciliae Regem" She does not, unfortunately, give the source from which she took this oration. Gentile Becchi was part of Florence's mission to congratulate the new King of France in 1483 (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 193-205) Becchi's cultural gift on the mission was a success: "Monsignor di Arezzo molto elegantemente e con grandissima gravità orò iusta il mandato della S.V. che veramente a noi parve che fussi per lui molto egregiamente esplicato et narrato la antiquissima amicitia et benivolentia, corroborate hinc inde con moltissime egregie opera et finalmente concluso onorevolmente in benefitio della nostra città. Fu udito dal Cristianissimo et tutta la Corte con grandissima attentione et con soma laude della città et di lui." (Santini 1922, 203-04). An oration before the pope in 1485 by Becchi survives, although Becchi was a diplomat for the Italian League rather than Florence. (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 205-14), although his quotation is wrong. The oration is found in MAP 147, document 31 rather than "137" as Desjardins states. Another oration from 1493 is found in (Desjardins and Canestrini 1859, 205-14). On this oration, see also (Santini 1922, 203-04). Praise also exists for Becchi's oration to the new pope Alexanderr VI, see (Santini 1922, 207). This type of effective dominance of highly prestigious congratulatory missions was similar to that of Giannozzo Manetti during his diplomatic career. This dominance eliminated the need for humanist parvenus, since an individual with a more traditional status foundation offered the same literary advantages as a parvenu did. On Becchi's reputation for learning, see (Bisticci 1976, vol. I, 285-86)

[225] For sixteenth-century diplomatic orations, see (Fancelli 1941). See also ASF Acquisti, 140, insert 9, which contains an anonymous obedience mission by Florentine diplomats. The oration refers to "Dux illustrissimus inclitus Soderinus" and thus must be to Julius II in 1503. For Bedini's study, see (Bedini 1997)

[226] For Pandolfini's mission's see ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 75, 91r. The Italian is "Et dirai essere mandato da noi parrendoci necessario fare questa dimonstratione al ponte di nuovo imab. Nostro alla ex. S. no. per altro bisogno…" I have seen a picture of the Hungarian manuscript referred to in this paragraph in an Italian compendium of Hungarian history. The caption cites the manscript as "Petrus Ransanus, legato napoletano davanti a re Mattia e alla regina Beatrice. Miniature dalla biblioteca reale di Mattia tratta dal codice Ransanus 1490." See (Buzinkay 2003, 9). My thanks to Peter Jakab for this book and drawing my attention to this picture. Michael Mallett argues that the rise of the resident ambassador made celebratory missions even more crucial. He wrote "If the day of the resident ambassador had undoubtedly arrived by the middle of the fifteenth century, this by no means meant the end of shortterm missions for specific purposes; nor did residency mean the same thing for all the Italian states. The practice of sending a prestigious company of three or four ambassadors, or even eight as the Venetians did for the elections of Popes Eugenius IV and Paul II, to congratulate a new prince or pontiff, became an even more regular feature of diplomatic exchanges. The very presence of a resident made it necessary to make a particular additional effort for a celebratory occasion. The accession of Louis XI of France in 1461 was the first time that all northern Italian states had sent major embassies to France for such an event. On such occasions the embassy would usually include a senior ecclesiastic and a distinguished patrician orator, as well as high-ranking figures who would not normally go on missions." (Mallett 1994, 233)

[227] For Manetti's learned discussions with rulers, particularly King Alfonso, see (Bisticci 1963, 375-77). For Manetti's meeting with Palla di Nofri Strozzi, see (Trivellato 1994, 235) A letter from the Florentine archives suggests that meetings with exiles might cause problems for a diplomat. In the 1430s, a letter from the *Otto di Guardia* to Luca di Maso degli Albizzi records that a priest had approached Luca on behalf of the exile Rinaldo degli Albizzi, Rinaldo's son Maso, and Biagio Guasconi, with regards to a proposal for representation. Luca, seemingly worried about creating questions regarding his loyalty to the Medici regime, sent the priest away and informed the Florentine government. Meeting with the wrong crowd while abroad concerned Luca, even if the reply

from Florence told him to try and get information or the actual letter from the priest and send it along to Florence! See ASF Sig.Dieci.Otto Leg.Miss.Resp. 2, 77

[228] For Bruni's plain oration, see (Petriboni and Rinaldi 2001, 210-11) For humanism and the transfer of military command, see Chapter Three.