Justice, Peace and Dominicans 1216–1999

III: Recovering the Apostolic Life: Antoninus of Florence

Richard Finn OP

The *Acts of the Apostles* relates how in the Jerusalem church "the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common. With great power the apostles gave their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all."[1] The author of *Acts* is not simply reporting three separate facts about the apostles, how they felt, how they lived, and how they preached. Their preaching gains its power from their common faith and life. Their rejection of private property and redistribution of wealth, cutting at the roots of avarice, form an eloquent expression of their faith in the God who hears the cry of the poor, whose day of justice is at hand. The heart, the purse, and the voice are formed in a single apostolic life.

This picture of the apostolic life was at the heart of St. Augustine's vision of religious life and dear to the early Dominicans who adopted his *Rule.* Humbert of Romans in his *Commentary on the Rule* was adamant that the brother who even said "that's *my* book!" and meant it committed mortal sin. All things had been shared before the Fall and would be in the Kingdom. Private property was a frequent cause of envy and strife. It tied down the heart.[2] Humbert set out the different reasons why voluntary poverty was integral to the office of preaching. Preachers have to go everywhere and not everywhere could afford to support the retinue, the horses and servants, of a rich prelate. Preaching bore fruit in confession and spiritual direction, but the poor in the congregation would not have the nerve to approach someone whose fine clothes set them apart. Above all, the friar had to preach "the poor Christ and evangelical poverty." Who could doubt, Humbert asked, "that such preaching was more effective in the mouth of a poor than a rich man?"[3]

In the second half of the fourteenth century, however, after the Black Death had more than decimated the friars and killed a generation schooled in the traditional observance, the brethren led an increasingly privatised and more comfortable life. Instead of pooling all available income, friars began to keep some of the alms they received from preaching in their districts and with these or other private means built and decorated apartments for themselves within the houses. Rather than come together for meals in the refectory they either had better food brought in or dined out, eating meat normally forbidden by the constitutions. Individuals bought better clothes and excused themselves from the tiring business of joining the community for the night offices in church. Attempts to stop the rot fell on deaf ears. The 1353 General Chapter at Besançon required the provincials to stop friars from dining out more than two or three times a week. In 1370 the Valencia chapter only tried to get them into the refectory at least once a week.[4] The English were certainly no better than the rest. In 1390 Raymund of Capua dispatched one William de Bartelen as prior to Newcastle to assemble there "fratres devotos de observantia."[5] It was not a signal success. Not surprisingly, how the friars lived shaped how they were seen. Their reputation fell. The Dominicans, together with the Franciscans and others who had made similar compromises, were dismissed as hypocrites.

Something of all this can be caught in *The Vision of Piers Plowman.* On the one hand "Ancres and heremytes, and monkes and frères Peeren to Apostles through hire parfit lyvynge."[6] On the other hand friars, who should "lyve by litel and in lowe houses"[7] reliant on alms, have become greedy flatterers and hypocrisy has laid siege to the Church. In such circumstances the preachers are still teaching that "alle thynges in hevene oughte to ben in comune,"[8] but that message is not heard as a call to give justice. It is heard as an incitement of the poor to envy and social strife.

It is against this background that St. Antoninus of Florence (1389–1459) stands out as an apostolic preacher against avarice in a city of both great wealth and destitution, but whose work also betrays the difficulties faced by Christians in working out where avarice begins and ends. The boy who at the age of fifteen in 1405 committed himself to the austere common life of the Dominican reform movement, or Observance, (when the priory at Fiesole was still a building site) became the friar who brought the Observance and its preaching into the civic heart of Florence with the foundation of San Marco in 1436, who founded in 1442 an exemplary confraternity dedicated to almsgiving, the *Buonomini di San Martino,* and who as archbishop from 1446 was often pragmatic and outspoken in seeking the distribution of wealth proper to a Christian society. Yet he was also the teacher who rigidly adhered to a traditional scholastic interpretation of usury which most Catholics later rejected. His life shows the profound virtue of sticking to your principles and the difficulty in finding the right principles at which to stick.

The link between lifestyle and preaching was already evident in the career of the friar who had done much to inspire the young Antonino's vocation, Giovanni Domenici, chosen by Raymund of Capua to lead the reform first in Venice and then elsewhere in Italy at Chioggia, Lucca, Fabriano and Cortona. Domenici is the inspiration behind Antoninus's account of preaching in his *Summa Moralis,* where he explains the preacher's mendicancy: "the Lord established that those who were to preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel..."[9] Domenici taught Antoninus that in practising asceticism the friars inherited the mantle of the prophets. He wrote in one of his letters how "religious men and women were to be beacons and a mirror for the fallen world, not only enjoying peace but in that peace supporting all the afflicted and strengthening them in their patience."[10] Antoninus himself witnesses to Domenici's power as a preacher capable of converting even obdurate sinners. He was repeatedly asked at Florence to preach in Advent and Lent.

The voluntary poverty sought by the Reform stemmed in part from a view of private property as encouraging a selfish anxiety or worry. Common ownership also has its worries in looking after things, as any bursar will tell you, but in the *Summa* Antoninus notes that worrying over common property may be part of our love for others, is not self-seeking.[11] Private property could not be abolished in society at large "for the world would be turned into a desert."[12] But within the ordered life of brethren vowed to obedience its abolition was an exemplary model of right relations where each received what each needed.

The Observance did not demand the extreme renunciation of all but the barest essentials for each day associated with the early Franciscans. Nor, on the other hand, would it settle for the common ownership of much land and not a little wealth practised by the monks. The *Summa Moralis* sees the mendicant poverty envisaged by the Dominican constitutions as lying between these two extremes:

"owning something in common, though only a moderate amount, enough to suffice for food and clothing for a certain period of time if not too long."[13] This was not seen as a compromise. It was justified in terms of the Order's purpose. It gave adequate freedom from daily anxiety about where the next meal was coming from, a freedom that served contemplation, and provided sufficient resources for the preaching mission.[14] Domenici taught that in normal circumstances the mendicants should not accept property which brought in rents or other annual incomes, but he recognised that in exceptional circumstances, by papal decree, a house could receive such a fixed income for the sake of its mission.[15] This is not a history of the Observance,[16] but it is important to see how it formed Antoninus, who was not, for example, sent to the international study houses at Paris, Bologna or Oxford, and how his promotion of the Reform was integral to an apostolic preaching on property.

In this context belongs the foundation of San Marco, authorised by a papal bull of January 1436, on the site of a dilapidated Silvestrine monastery. It was unusual to establish a reformed house in a town that already contained a Dominican convent. The highly visible presence of Eugenius IV and the papal court at Santa Maria Novella, the great unreformed house, perhaps gave added reason for the move—as well as added impetus, since Eugenius was a known supporter of the Observance. Antoninus, by now vicar-general of all the reformed houses in the Roman province, would have taken a leading role in discussing plans for the new house, in gaining the extensive patronage of Cosimo de Medici necessary in order to finance the re-building, and in deciding which friars were to move into the new community (juridically still a part of the Fiesole priory).

In this way Antoninus set up before his fellow citizens an attractive model of the common life largely dependent on their generosity. He accepted Cosimo's patronage which extended far beyond the initial building costs to presenting novices with their first tunic and paying for bread, salt and medicines, as well as the extra food (wine, fish and eggs) on the feasts of the Epiphany, St. Mark, and Ss. Cosmas and Damian. In so doing he accepted money made by a banker whose trading practices were tainted with suspicion of usury (though a manifest usurer would be excommunicate) and an oligarch who rigged the city taxes in ways that impoverished his opponents but left intact his own fortune. He allowed him the prestige associated with charitable giving and the display of family symbols in the decoration of the priory.[17] Cosimo retained a cell there with a fresco of the Adoration by Gozzoli. The theme was closely associated with the Medici and San Marco. It also spoke of giving away wealth in love of Christ. The foundation of San Marco in this way presented Florentines with two separate images of virtue: the perfection of mendicants holding in common the few things necessary for life through partial withdrawal from the world, dependent on the second, the generosity to be found within this world in giving alms. Both images and practices involved the redistribution of wealth as expressing love for fellow members of the Body of Christ.

It is a measure of how important Antoninus thought the project, but also of how difficult it was to maintain, that he later had to seek the papal dispensations necessary for the Observant house to draw on a more secure income: in 1443 Eugenius entrusted to San Marco the care of the local parish with its associated income; and in 1455 Calixtus III permitted the friars to own property which would bring in further revenues. Mendicancy was valued, but unlike the common life, was not a principle on which to stick.

Antoninus preached and in other ways fostered the right use of wealth in the wider city. Fifteenth century Florence was more prosperous than it had been a century before when the starving had been heard to cry out in the streets "Mercy! Have compassion on us so that we do not die of hunger in this Easter Week! Console us and help us for the love of Jesus Christ."[18] Yet it has been calculated that in the 1420's only 100 families, 1% of the total number of urban households, owned a quarter of the city's wealth and six families (the Strozzi, Bardi, Medici, Alberti, Albizzi and Peruzzi) owned 10% of all taxable wealth.[19] It is true that the practice of almsgiving was a well known part of Christian charity and civic duty. The state itself gave annual funds to a number of hospitals, which not only tended the sick but served as soup kitchens, and in times of emergency the state regularly doled out grain. In 1411 the sum of 64,000 florins was spent on grain.[20] But endemic poverty, "maximam paupertem," remained.[21] When the population were taxed in 1427, one third had no surplus to tax beyond the bare essentials with which they scratched their living, no reserves to fall back on if their wages dropped below the bread line.[22] Malnutrition weakened resistance to the plague which even in a good year accounted for two in every five deaths.[23] And the three confraternities which had previously given much poor relief, the *Orsanmichele,* the *Misericordia* and the *Bigallo* now gave much of their moneys to other causes.

Against this background may be set first the actions of Antoninus to establish in February 1442 the *Provveditori de' poveri* *vergognosi,* known popularly as the *Dodici Buonomini di San Martino.* This was a charitable confraternity which would buy bread with money received from its benefactors for distribution to a number of impoverished artisans. It was something new in giving this targeted relief in kind to vulnerable workers and their families over a long period of time.[24] Here, too, Antoninus collaborated with Cosimo de' Medici, for Cosimo was to be by far the chief benefactor.[25] The founding statutes set out the confraternity's aims: "Considering the present famine and the multitude of poor in the city and surrounding district of Florence, especially of those who are not accustomed to beg... 'inspired by God'... the twelve citizens inscribed below decided to become procurators for the shamed poor... by seeking all together or separately according to their discretion, aid or alms from any lord, either spiritual or temporal, and from citizens or other persons, to be distributed from time to time to those shamed poor."[26] In seeking to distinguish the recipients from regular beggars and in making repeated though modest grants it might be said to have been welfare for work that avoided dependency. It was a modest achievement, with small costs, reaching perhaps only some four hundred people in any one year. Yet it was known and remembered by many as exemplary, spoke to others of their duties.

When Antoninus became a reluctant archbishop of Florence in 1446 much more was to be expected of him. He met and exceeded those expectations in often surprising ways. He took on a role in which it was traditional to be a protector and benefactor of the poor, but also to cut a great figure and to display the spiritual importance of episcopal office in orchestrated magnificence and it was all too usual for bishops thereby to neglect the poor and succumb to worldly ambitions. How Antoninus viewed these matters is evident in the *Summa Moralis* where he cites and then comments on a passage of Jerome: "*Whatever the clergy possess belongs to the poor and their houses should be the common property of all.* They should feed not dogs and birds, not horses, but men, not lords and soldiers in order to buy their friendship, not relatives, in order to enrich them, not performers and concubines, but their subjects, those in need, and they should feed them much rather with the spiritual nourishment of the sacraments and preaching."[27]

The new archbishop set a startling example of simplicity from the first days of his solemn entry into Florence and installation. It was customary for the new bishop to arrive on horseback in fine clothes surrounded by his entourage. Antoninus kept his religious habit and refused the horse. The same simplicity would be kept in his travels round the diocese, when, still in his simple habit, he would go either on foot or on a donkey lent by Santa Maria Nuova.[28] An inventory of the furnishings and properties of the episcopal palace undertaken after Antoninus's death reveals a like austerity. His bedroom was sparsely furnished with a bed, a wooden chair, a desk: his study was unadorned. Throughout the house the notary who drew up the inventory found only "sad and wretched furniture."[29] There were no works of art. The archbishop kept where possible the poverty he had practised as a friar. In part this was because he considered himself still bound to those obligations of the Rule which did not conflict with his new status.[30] But he was also motivated by a lively sense of not wasting what could be better spent elsewhere. On being presented at table with a pheasant his complaint was that the money could have fed a poor man's entire family for a day.[31] The household itself was minimal: a secretary, a lay brother who was attached to the bishop as valet, a chaplain, a vicar general, chamberlain and seven others.[32] They led a communal and quasi monastic life with silence and readings at mealtimes. According to the secretary, Castiglione, there were no security guards. The doors were always open.

Antoninus gave away whatever he considered himself free to give away—he would not, for example, give away the money required for the repair and upkeep of the city churches. Anything he thought a luxury, however, rarely stayed long in his hands. The theology was traditional. It was the practice which astounded. One of the richer citizens presented him with a sumptuous satin counterpane, only to find it on a merchant's stall soon afterwards, having been sold and the proceeds given to the poor. The donor bought the counterpane a second time, presented it to the archbishop, only to find it back on the same stall a few days later. He bought it back again, again presented it, again found that it was sold to provide alms for the poor![33] When he had no money of his own to help the starving he successfully petitioned the pope for further funds.[34] When he had no money at all to dispense he was known to give away articles of clothing or let people grow food on his land. The archbishop, typical in this respect of many fifteenth century Florentines, showed particular generosity not only to individuals but to charitable institutions, such as the big hospital of Santa Maria Nuova immediately outside the old city walls, which could house some two to three hundred patients at any one time and was at the centre of the commune's response to poor relief and aid for the victims of plague.[35]

Plague was a recurrent bane. In 1448–9 it struck with renewed ferocity. Many who could afford to do so fled. Antoninus remained. According to one of those who testified during the canonisation process Antoninus would take a donkey laden with food and medicines and go into the poorest hovels and the prisons to comfort the sick. His example was followed by the friars at San Marco, Fiesole and Santa Maria Novella, with the result that many died. The archbishop was given 3000 florins by the city authorities to give out on their behalf.[36] In a move thought to be inspired by Antoninus the Signoria "appointed additional priests to hear confessions and administer the sacraments, four physicians and four barber-surgeons, forty women and twenty men to attend the sick, particularly the indigent, and they considered the necessity of a special hospital for plague patients."[37] Not for the first time Antoninus' personal example gave an authority which led to concerted action and institutional reform.[38]

In what has so far been described Antoninus co-operated with the tight-knit oligarchy comprised of the city's leading merchant bankers. He re-directed something of their wealth and relied on their support. This did not prevent the archbishop from challenging the oligarchy where he saw fit, or as prudence determined, in particular when they failed to give justice to the Church, to the commune, or to the poor.

Antoninus did not object to properly authorised taxation of the Church, which was normally exempt. He even oversaw the necessary collection at his own suggestion to ensure its fair administration, but he opposed any laws or taxes "against the liberty ... of ecclesiastical persons and charitable institutions" and threatened the authorities with excommunication after a proposal in 1451 to levy a gabelle of twenty five percent on sales of property passing from taxpayers to non-taxpayers, a move which he denounced as "contrary to your salvation and the salvation of those who enacted it, those who support and enforce it, and those who do not work for its repeal."[39] Yet he acquiesced in another levy that same year which had received papal approval.

It was the same concern for legality or procedural justice that brought him into further public conflict with the governing elite a year before his death. For many years Cosimo de' Medici and his fellow oligarchs had ensured that their political opponents were kept out of office by suppressing the traditional practice of drawing lots and introducing ten *accoppiatori*, popularly known as the Ten

Tyrants, whose task was to choose the new officials or priors every two months from among the names in the *burse*. In 1455, however, the secret ballots had been restored. When the oligarchs attempted to reverse the decision in July 1458 Antoninus vigorously opposed them. He fixed an uncompromising declaration to the cathedral doors and a number of other churches setting out the impropriety of the changes. Failure to return to the legal method which the officials had sworn to uphold would be met with excommunication. It is said that the archbishop was threatened with the loss of his see. He stood firm. The oligarchy, led by Luca Pitti, the gonfaloniere, summoned a 'parliament' or popular assembly under the eyes of its soldiers to approve the measures. Antoninus did not win, but in the series of banishments which followed (of the Barbadori, Brancacci, Bardi, Perruzzi, and Strozzi) Antoninus was left untouched and named among the orators sent to congratulate the new pope Pius II. The fifteenth-century life by Vespasiano da Bisticci rightly said of Antoninus that he was able to "stare fermo nella giustitia et da quella non si muovere."[40]

How did Antoninus view the business practices which underlay the prosperity of the governing elite? Florence's wealth came from a combination of industry, in particular the weaving and dyeing of cloth, commerce and banking. These were international operations and the first was unworkable without the drafts and bills of exchange provided by the third. All three had their risks. Wealthy bankers had gone bust in the mid-fourteenth century when the king of England defaulted on his loans. Yet the merchant bankers also made huge profits from such money-lending at high rates of interest. It was here that Antoninus was a vocal, if largely unoriginal, preacher against the sin of usury. Antoninus' teaching against usury in the pages of the *Summa Moralis* is marked, on the one hand, by sticking to the principle that all secure lending at interest for the sake of coming out richer is usurious and avaricious (rather than defining usury as lending at *excessive* rates which impoverish the borrower) and, on the other, by the detailed analysis of financial instruments and practices, as well as the discussion of arguments by other moralists. Like Aquinas, Antoninus allowed lending at interest in limited circumstances as damages for late repayment. Following Peter of Ancarano he also allowed interest to be paid on the grounds of *lucrum cessans* where the loan deprived the merchant or investor of capital previously earmarked for legitimate business (though this exception did not apply to loans made in the express hope of making money from them, only charitable loans to the indigent).[41] He accepted the Florentine practice of paying interest on compulsory shares in the public debt or *monte,* though not the speculative trade in those shares. He did not condemn the bankers for dealing in bills of exchange and charging a rate of commission for various transactions, but like other moral theologians condemned any attempt to disguise profit-making loans as foreign currency exchanges *(cambia sicca).*[42] He also ruled out as usurious the so-called 'gifts' of interest made by bankers to their depositors.

For several hundred years the Church would continue to rehearse the same principle, to find its teaching less and less acceptable or workable. One question must be whether Antoninus did not in this respect do us a disservice, did not put the weight of his authority behind a traditional but wrong view of money and money-lending which meant that, when one view of usury was gradually abandoned, there was little teaching on ethics in finance to put in its place.

Antoninus' teaching on industry and commerce, however, if similarly detailed, was grounded in a wider understanding of justice. He argued that citizens could invest money in a business providing that the risks as well as profits were shared.[43] Importers and exporters could sell at a higher price than they bought to cover costs and make a living, but no-one was to hold on to goods in order to sell them later at an unfair price. Two further practices came in for his particular condemnation. The first was the truck system in the textile industry, where if business was bad wages were paid in kind when the contract called for cash, leaving workers with goods they could not sell at a decent price. The second was the debasement of the silver coinage in which wages were paid, without debasing the gold florins which made up the merchants' wealth or altering the nominal wages. [44]

The impact of Antoninus' teaching is impossible to assess. His *Summa,* written between 1440 and 1454, proved highly popular. Parts circulated in manuscript before its final completion. By the end of the century it had run through nine editions and many parts had once again been published separately.[45] His diocesan secretary Castiglione commented: "He not only wrote about universal things, but he also adapted doctrine, coming down to the particulars, to our very way of living, to the basic practice of the specifics of human life."[46] In this and in synthesising other writers' works to make their teaching more accessible to busy clerics you could say that Antoninus showed the same attitude to intellectual property that he did to other goods. What mattered was getting the goods to where they were needed. If one quotation from his writings were to sum up his unchanging theory and practice it would be the assertion that "only our sins properly belong to us: all goods must be the common property of all, even the spiritual goods".[47]

1 *Acts* 4:32–33.
2 *Expositio regulae B. Augustini,* in *Opera de Vita Regulari,* ed. J.F. Berthier, Turin *1956,* Vol.1 Pp.79–80.
3 ibid, pp.51–53.
4 Mortier, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs,* vol.III, pp.289–305.
5 Mortier, op. cit., p. 570.
6 Langland, *The Vision of Piers Plowman,* ed. AV.C. Schmidt, London 1978, xv, ll. 415–416.
7 ibid, xv, 1.421.
8 ibid, xx, 276.
9 *Summa Moralis,* 3a pars, tit. xviii, cap. 1, ii.
10 "Debbono i religiosi e religiose essere luce e specchio del mondo caduco e non solo avere pace in se ma a pace confortare tutti i tribulati e in pazienza confermare." Letters, p.94.
11 *Summa Moralis,* 3a pars, tit. xvi cap. 1, iii "sollicitudo, quae adhibetur circa res communes, pertinet ad amorem caritatis, quae non quaerit quae sua sunt, sed communibus intendit."
12 *Summa Moralis,* 3a, iii, 2, i, citing the Franciscan John de Ripa, trans B Jarrett, *Medieval Socialism,* London, p.50.
13 ibid, cap. 1, iii; "habere aliquid in communi, moderate tamen, quod sufficere possit ad victum et vestitum pro aliquo tempore non prolixo."
14 ibid, cap. 1, ii: "In religione autem illa, quae est ordinata ad tradendum aliis contemplata per doctrinam et praedicationem, congruit permaxime illa paupertas, quae mobilia pro tempore reservat in communi..."
15 *Summa Moralis,* 3a, xvi, 1, xii.
16 See R. Creytens O.P. & A. D'Amato O.P., *Les actes capitulaires de la Congregation dominicaine de Lombardie, AFP* (1961).
17 M. Hollingsworth sees Cosimo as breaching all rules that restrained the self-aggrandizement of patrons in their commissions, *Patronage in Renaissance Italy,* 1994, p.55.
18 Domenico Lenzi, *Specchio umano,* 1329, cited J. Henderson, *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence,* Chicago 1994, p.276.
19 D. Herlihy & C. Klapisch-Zuber, *Tuscans and their Families: A study of the Florentine catasta of 1427,* Yale 1985, p.100.
20 J. Henderson, op. cit., p.361.
21 Report by the captains of the *Orsanmichele* in 1413, cited I. Henderson, Op. cit., p.382.
22 Herlihy & Klapisch-Zuber, Op. cit., p.100.
23 ibid, p.279.
24 J Henderson, op. cit., pp.388–397.
25 D. Kent, 'The Buonomini di San Martino' in *Cosimo il Vecchio...* ed. F. Ames-Lewis, Oxford 1992, p.50. Cosimo was behind half of all the

money given in the first three years.

26 ibid, p.52.

27 "*Quidquid habent clerici, pauperum est, et domus eorum omnibus debent esse communes.* Non canes et aves, non equos, sed eos, scilicet homines, debent pascere, non dominos et milites, ut sibi eos amicos faciant, non histriones aut concubinas, sed eos, scilicet subditos, indigentes, et multo magis pascere debent cibo spirituali sacramentorum et praedicationum." 3a, xix, 11, i

28 Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vita,* ed. A. Greco, Florence 1970, vol. 1, p.228.

29 R. Morcay, *Saint Antonin.* Tours, p.133.

30 In the *Summa* Antoninus distinguishes between the poverty and chastity to which a religious is still bound after the consecration as a bishop and the withdrawal from public life, silences and fasts from which he is dispensed by reason of his public duties. 3a, xx, vii. Bisticci's description of the palace furnishings repeats the phrase *come i frati.*

31 *Vita S. Antonii, Summa Moralis,* Verona. 1740, cap. 2. 10. n 4.

32 ibid, where the Vita describes it as "modestissimam." Da Bisticci's *Vita* puts a figure of 500 florins on his household expenses from an income of 1,500 scudi. op. cit., p.228.

33 Morcay. op. cit., p.176.

34 Vespasiano da Bisticci, op. cit. p 230.

35 K. Park, 'Healing the Poor' in J. Barry & C. Jones, *Medicine and Charity before the Welfare State*, London 1991. p 32.

36 Morcay, op cit, p 178.

37 A. Carmichael, *Plague and the Poor in Renaissance Florence.* CUP, 1986, pp.101–102.

38 Gilbert Márkus has also linked Antoninus with the establishment of the *montes pietatis* (*The Radical Tradition*, p.80), but most historians date their foundation to the work of the Observant Franciscans at Perugia in 1462. It was they who set up a *monte pietatis* in Florence after Antoninus' death in 1488.

39 P. Gavitt, *Charity and Children in Renaissance Florence,* Ann Arbor 1990, pp.96–97.

40 Da Bisticci, op. cit., p.235.

41 De Roover, *San Bernardino of Siena and Sant' Antonino of Florence,* Boston 1967, p.31.

42 *Summa Moralis,* 3a, tit. 8, col. 299a.

43 ibid, 3a, 8, col. 312a,

44 De Roover, op. cit., Pp. 26–27.

45 P. F. Howard, *Beyond the Written Word: Preaching and Theology in the Florence of Archbishop Antoninus 1427–1459,* Rome, 1995, p.25.

46 ibid, p.52, n40.

47 R. Morcay, op. cit., p.184.