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Introduction: Group Portraits and Individual Experience

This article focuses on the problem of captivity and slavery in Leghorn, Pisa and Florence in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany between 1702 and 1826. It pursues two lines of investigation, demonstrating the presence of a uniform group of captives and slaves while simultaneously exploring slaves' individual experiences and trajectories. These two analytical lenses are complementary and fundamental to fully understanding the complex phenomenon of slavery. Three spaces in Tuscany will be examined: the Bagno (a prison for slaves, captives, convicts and forced workers) of Leghorn, the Bagno of Pisa and the House of Catechumens of Florence. The House of Catechumens was a religious institution, present in several Italian cities, which prepared people of other religious confessions for conversion to Catholicism, among them slaves. There is a general theoretical distinction between captives from the Ottoman Empire and its satellite states, defined as temporary slaves and important for their ransom, and slaves from the Atlantic or Sub-Saharan Africa, but also people originating from the Mediterranean.
basin, who could be bought and sold, as well as captured, as we will see in the first section hereunder (Fontenay 2008: 15-24).

2 Traditionally, the historiography depicted a uniform group of captives and slaves who encountered similar living and working conditions in spaces of detention including the Bagno and in other Tuscan urban settings. This approach was dictated by the sources used, such as lists of slaves captured or liberated (Salvadorini 1978; Angiolini 1997). It remained the standard perspective until alternatives on particular slaves’ lives were offered by Lucia Frattarelli Fischer (2000), Cesare Santus (2019) and, most recently, Tamar Herzig (2022) in her article “Slavery and Interethnic Sexual Violence,” which looked at the Bagno of Leghorn in the 17th century. With respect to Florence, the process of revision began with Serena Marconcini’s investigation (2012) on the differences in personal living conditions of enslaved men and women in the 16th and 17th centuries (Frattarelli Fischer 2000; Marconcini 2012; Santus 2019; Herzig 2022). Indeed, also throughout the 18th and during the beginning of the 19th century, slaves’ petitions and other sources emanating from Florence’s House of Catechumens demonstrate that there was a plurality of living and working conditions, and that slaves’ individual physical characteristics (health, strength, colour), ethnic origin, working skills and religion could affect these conditions and their chances of attaining freedom. These sources, largely unexplored, also occasionally reveal previously hidden histories of slaves who came from outside the Mediterranean or who followed special trajectories around the Mediterranean basin.

3 The study of slave trade circulation and individual trajectories has shown, from a qualitative point of view, how the life of a slave could involve geographical mobility between spaces that traditional studies considered closed off from each other and characterised as operating either as “societies with slaves” or “slave societies” (Finley 1980). The distinction is that in a “society with slaves” the practice of slavery did not define in an all-encompassing way the economic, social, and cultural reality of that society (Trouillot 1995: 18). In fact, different forms and systems of slavery coexisted in the same geographical spaces (Berlin 1998). In the Mediterranean basin, as well as in the Atlantic world, there were both “slave societies” and “societies with slaves” (Lahon 2018: 132). The “exceptional” trajectories in the Italian Mediterranean coasts, outside of the trade and types of slavery generally studied, such as the slaves of reciprocity with the Ottoman Empire, are difficult to establish from a quantitative point of view because they leave fewer traces in archives. The quantitative analysis of uniform groups of slaves and former slaves is more straightforward, however, thanks to records listing Mediterranean galley slaves, such as captives from the Ottoman Empire and its satellite states, and other slaves who were used as rowers. It is important to question whether these groups are truly uniform and whether their portrayal offers a nuanced or stereotyped vision of “societies with slaves.” These societies are often considered to have practiced a more benevolent form of slavery because they featured various types of captivity and slaves (including domestic slaves), but they had fewer enslaved people from the colonial world or Sub-Saharan Africa engaged in these types of work than was the case in “slaves societies” (Bonazza 2023).

4 The question of slaves and people of African descent in the Mediterranean and Europe, more widely, has come to occupy a central place in recent historiography of slavery (Hanß & Schiel 2014; Otele 2020). Mediterranean slavery has been approached in two directions: the study of captivity between the Ottoman Empire and Southern European
countries (the ransom of captives in Mediterranean ports) (Bono 1964; Fontenay 1988; Kaiser 2008); and more recently, the study of slaves from Sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic who arrived in Europe (Guillén & Trabelsi 2012; Hanß & Schiel 2014). This second group is most productively analysed in the context of countries which had a formal colonial empire in Early Modern Europe such as France, Spain, Portugal, Great Britain and the Netherlands (Nöel 2011; Peabody 1996; Stella 2000; de Almeida Mendes 2008; Fryer 1984; Hondius 2008). Heretofore, geographical spaces such as the Italian states and the German states were less examined for the presence of slaves that had these different trajectories, especially if they came from Sub-Saharan Africa or from the colonial world, but important new studies have recently emerged. Slaves’ personal histories were often complex because of the intricacies of global slave mobility and continuous changes of ownership (Sarti 2009; Bonazza 2019; Von Mallinckrodt, Köstlbauer & Lentz 2021).

In this context, Leghorn was a major slave centre in the Italian space in the Early Modern period because of its importance in the mercantile trade and to commercial traffic (Santus 2019). Leghorn was a Tuscan port city, and a free port from 1676. The development of customs facilities and the protection of the Inquisition encouraged the settlement of foreign merchants, mainly Greeks, Armenians and Jews (Frattarelli Fischer 2016: 28). From the mid-17th century until the rise of Marseille after 1715, Leghorn was the principal maritime hub of the Italian peninsula, and perhaps all of Europe, for global “cross-cultural trade” between the Sephardic Diaspora, the Ottoman Empire, Northern Europe and India (Trivellato 2009: 3). At the end of the 18th century, it was the third most important port in the Mediterranean and in Europe (Filippini 1984: 634). In the period taken under consideration (1702-1826), not only Leghorn, but also Pisa and Florence, cities in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, underwent significant political changes. In 1737, after two centuries, the Lorraine dynasty succeeded the Medici dynasty. From 1765, excepting the Napoleonic period (1801-1814), the House of Habsburg-Lorraine kept dominion over Tuscany until the unification of Italy. This new political context was characterised by great legislative work for the reform of the port city of Leghorn. High profile political figures were called to administrate Leghorn, including the leading military engineer Joseph De Baillou and the marquis Carlo Ginori, who was governor of the city in the years 1746-1757. The period 1737-1765 was characterised by a crisis of the maritime trade and a booming Tuscan hinterland. In 1750, a new project for the reconstruction of the Bagno of Pisa began and the Bagno of Leghorn lost its previous function (Fettah 2017: 71-87). The Bagno of Leghorn was built under Ferdinand I between 1598 and 1606 to house enslaved people (captives and slaves), convicts and buonavoglia (poor voluntary rowers), especially at night and during other breaks from work (slaves and convicts worked mainly as rowers on galleys or in construction). It was modelled on existing prisons in Alger and Constantinople. The Bagno contained dormitories, shops and also mosques for Muslims so it was not a classical prison, but a special place of detention and a biscotteria production centre, supplying food for Tuscan and other galleys. There were some forms of freedom available within the Bagno. For instance, captives and slaves could save money earned from small jobs they sometimes worked in the city or raised through smuggling activities inside the Bagno (Frattarelli Fischer 2000: 80-81; Santus 2019: 34). At the end of the 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th century, the major economic contribution of the hinterland helped to finance the urban redefinition of Leghorn that went beyond the free port. Despite all of this development, and
associated changes in the local élite, the free port system stayed in place. For this reason, Leghorn was known as a cité duale between the Napoleonic period and the Risorgimento; it operated under new social and urban logics but maintained the free port system that was such a part of the city under the Ancien Régime (Frattarelli Fischer: 171).

6 The key sources I employ in this article include Leghorn government papers, the archive of Florence’s Ginori family, the sources of the Segreteria di Guerra for the Bagno of Pisa and the records of the Magistrato del Bigallo (on the House of Catechumens of Florence for the period taken into account). I combine these sources to build two complementary methodological accounts of slavery in the specific sites under review: on one hand, I outline a general picture of slavery under uniform conditions, and on the other, I present some individual experiences and trajectories. The list of slaves and captives in the Ginori family collection provides a standardised image of a slave group from which we can paint a group portrait of slaves in the Bagno of Leghorn. In Leghorn government papers, meanwhile, slave petitions show the diversity in living conditions encountered by slaves in the same place of detention, whether it was the Bagno in Leghorn or that of Pisa. Of relevance to the treatment of slaves in these spaces and the possible attainment of freedom were their varied physical qualities, working skills and conversion status. Also, the slaves found in the records of the Magistrato del Bigallo are examples of individuals living different experiences and trajectories, even within the same place of detention, in this case, the House of Catechumens of Florence.

7 In attempting to develop a more accurate understanding of slavery in Tuscany, individual and collective experiences are of complementary interest. Slaves and captives are often studied in the context of places of detention or immobility such as galleys, prisons, and Houses of Catechumens for reasons of documentation, such as lists of slaves or lists of converted people which can be used to depict a group portrait (as in the first section of the article). Some less explored records, from these closed institutions, in reality, document personal trajectories and life histories, such as those of Esise and Ali in the House of Catechumens. Also valuable in this sense, and emanating from official Government sources, are some slaves’ supplications from the Leghorn and Pisa Bagno (as analysed in the second section of the article). A better understanding of the phenomenon of slavery and captivity requires consideration of individual trajectories and living conditions and differences that belie the superficial homogeneity of treatment and conditions in these places of detention and work. Given this picture, I will analyse in the first section of the article, after a brief discussion of the historiography of slavery in Leghorn, Pisa, and Florence, a group portrait that emerges from a slave list for the liberation of enslaved people in Leghorn in 1747. In the second section, using supplications and sources from the Magistrato del Bigallo, I will present some slaves’ individual experiences and exceptional trajectories in Leghorn, Pisa and Florence, showing how slaves’ lives could differ.
Figure 1 – Desk plans of fortresses and factories; plan of the Bagno: upper level of the dormitories with the mosques and the church (detail)

ASFi, Scrittoio delle fortezze e fabbriche, end of the 17th century, Florence, 148-g.

Figure 2 – Desk plans of fortresses and factories; plan of the Bagno: lower level of the dormitories

ASFi, Scrittoio delle fortezze e fabbriche, end of the 17th century, Florence, 148-h.
Group Portraits: Uniform Understanding of Slavery

8 There were a significant number of slaves in Leghorn in the 16th-17th centuries because of its centrality as a Mediterranean port. They were part of the workforce there rather than simply being involved in ransom operations. Slavery from the 1500s until the mid-point of the 18th century has been the subject of much scholarly attention (Calafat & Santus 2011). Between 1558 and 1604 there were 2,294 slaves in the city (Frattarelli Fischer 2000: 70). Vittorio Salvadorini counts 10,115 slaves captured between 1568 and 1668 and another 6,175 between 1600 and 1620. Franco Angiolini counts 15,000 prisoners between the middle of the 16th century and the middle of the 17th century (Salvadorini 1978: 218-21; Angiolini 1997: 69-74). Cesare Santus calculates, based on the quantitative data of the existing historiography, that the percentage of “Turks” among the total inhabitants of Livorno was around 8% at the beginning of the 1640s (Santus 2019: 42). Another estimate was that between 1600 and 1750, slaves made up 10% of the population (Calafat & Santus 2011: 481). The slaves were mainly Muslims from the Ottoman Empire, and “Moors” from Sub-Saharan Africa; there is also evidence of the presence of Jewish slaves and female Jewish slaves raped by Muslim slaves and Catholic convicts (Toaff 1985; Herzig 2022). There is a dearth of research on slavery in Pisa and Florence: there is a single study of slaves in Pisa in the 15th century and examination of the phenomenon in Florence has been limited to the Renaissance period except for Marconcini’s work (Luzzati 2001; Tognetti 2005; Marconcini 2012).

9 There are no precise figures available for the number of slaves for the period 1700-1825 for Leghorn or even in Tuscany, more generally. But we do know that there were slaves of different types, including captives and slaves who were sold in the port. Temporary captives lived in the Bagno and could return home if ransomed or exchanged. Records on Muslim individuals show that many were slaves rather than captives, having been purchased rather than captured in some fashion. The Bagno ceased operations in 1750 and the galleys were dismantled, and conservative estimates for the period 1790-1816 place 50 slave groups annually between the fortress and port of Leghorn and Pisa (Bonazza 2019: 139). The sources illuminating this progressive passage between the Bagno of Leghorn and Pisa are conserved in Florence in the Segreteria di Guerra. On September 30rd 1750, there were 9 slaves and a combined 61 convicts and forced workers who were moved to the Bagno of Pisa, and other slaves were relocated temporarily to the old fortress in Leghorn. A major reconstruction of the Bagno of Pisa began in 1750 during which all the materials and objects from the old Bagno and galleys of Leghorn were relocated to Pisa, in particular, wood for the construction of vessels. During 1750, slaves and convicts slept in the Torrione della cittadella in Pisa.

10 In the 18th century there were moves to transform the Bagno into a penal Bagno. In previous centuries, convicts were found alongside slaves in the Bagno, but in 1778 a motu proprio distinguished between Turkish slaves seized as prisoners of war and individuals convicted of crimes. Since convicts were condemned to perpetual exile or to labour on public works, in the case of short sentences, they started to live separately from slaves. This distinction was consequent to a peace treaty signed between the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires. In any case, partly because of the progressive decline in the importance of galleys during this period and the fact that reconstruction of the cities of Leghorn and Pisa required their labour, slaves were employed mainly in public
works at this time, as well as in maritime jobs at the port (Frattarelli Fischer 2000: 70). As it happened, baptised slaves could become sailors. In terms of the legal norms that regulated slavery in Tuscany, privateering was permitted until 1830 and the slave trade until 1837, but from the early 18th century the number of slaves gradually decreased (Finazzo 1970: 414; Tuccillo 2018: 64).

When a peace treaty was formally agreed between Tuscany and the Ottoman Empire in 1747, the Muslim slaves in Leghorn Bagno were freed. Other agreements were reached with Algiers, in 1748, and with Tunis and Tripoli, in 1749, but they proved ephemeral. 7 A new agreement was struck with Algiers in 1782, but in 1816, there were still 48 Tunisian slaves in Leghorn. 8 In the document entitled Dell’Atto di Libertà ai Schiavi Maomettani infrascritti per Sovrana Imperial Clemenza di Sua Maestà Francesco I Imperatore [...] in congiuntura della pace conchiusa coll’Ottomano Imperatore in Asia e Grecia Mahamut V, signed in Constantinople in 1747, 4 tables list Muslim slaves who are to be liberated in Leghorn. In 1747, however, the sultan was not Mahamud V as stated in the source, but Mahamud I. In particular, a total of 104 slaves were freed: 43 subjects of the Sublime Porte; 22 of the Regency of Tripoli; 20 of the Regency of Algiers; and although they do not appear in the final summary, 19 slaves of the Regency of Tunis. 9

Table 1 – Subjects of the Sublime Porte (1747)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Homeland</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Enslaved</th>
<th>Enslaved</th>
<th>Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All di Pery</td>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2732</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Callo di Albana</td>
<td>Dorato</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All di March</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2720</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vanez di Massoc</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All di Noorani</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Caroline</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vincenti di Corec</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Leghorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Caroline</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Corec</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Caroline</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Corec</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mazzoni di Alenoo</td>
<td>Corec</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to observe that the majority of these individuals had been bought in Leghorn and Malta rather than captured, so they were slaves rather than captives before they were liberated in 1747. From this table, statistics for the first half of the 18th century reveal that the average time members of the Sublime Porte cohort spent in Leghorn was 17.3 years, with a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 45 years of...
unfreedom and enslavement. The average duration of unfreedom was approximately 20 years. This is interesting because we do not have many statistics on the time Muslim slaves spent in captivity in Europe specifically for the 18th century, whereas we know that Christian slaves in North Africa at the beginning of the 17th century usually spent around 5 years in captivity (Tarruell 2013: 93). The slaves came from different parts of the Ottoman Empire, such as Egypt and Anatolia, but also from Mecca. It is relevant also to observe the age of slaves: at liberation the average age of slaves was around 50 years old, which was elderly. This is probably explained by the fact that they were bought or captured at the beginning of the 18th century, after which slave turnover rates were low, meaning that slaves were detained longer in captivity so as to maintain the strength of the workforce.

Furthermore, this source tells us that the Tunisians were in the new lazaret, and they were entitled to receive a paulo (a small sum of money) per day per person. The slaves’ clothing was composed of a coat, a pair of trousers and a shirt. In 1749, another 52 Turkish arrived in Leghorn and were placed in the San Jacopo lazaret. In 1755, correspondence between Carlo Ginori, governor of the city and of the port, and the British reported the rumour that the Bey of Algiers intended to declare war against Tuscany. At the time, there were probably still soldiers from Algiers in the lazaret. The 1747 slave list and other Ginori administration sources, because they relate to groups of slaves, prompt an interpretation of slave life in the city as uniform. This means that we have general and global results on war captives and enslaved people, bought in Leghorn and Malta who finish in the same place of detention: the Bagno. A source might detail name, geographical origin, year of capture or purchase and date of liberation, but it still does not allow us to recreate the individual experience lived in Leghorn. However, by undertaking a different level of analysis on other types of sources (for instance, supplications and Magistrato del Bigallo material on religious institutions, including the House of Catechumens), it is possible to recreate elements of life stories.

Individual Experiences and Trajectories

Slaves’ supplications provided insight into their working and living conditions, and the room for manoeuvre they had within their enslaved condition, even if the supplications were written by the priest or government officials rather than by the slaves themselves. Still, these mediated accounts are the closest we come to for hearing the slaves’ own voices (Rogers 2015). The supplications I will present come from slaves in the Bagno of Pisa and in the fortress of Leghorn. In the Tuscan context in the second half of the 18th century, supplications were a crucial instrument for claiming one’s rights because slaves there had no recourse to other legal institutions such as courts. Thus, slaves in Tuscany faced different circumstances to those in Britain and, as Sue Peabody has shown so clearly, in France since slaves could access courts in both of those jurisdictions (Peabody 1996).

Supplications are, in any case, complex sources for the Early Modern period. They were a precise form of communication through which certain rights could be claimed by subjects to the authority and they could only be granted by political power. Simona Cerutti and Massimo Vallerani talk about forme supplique (forms of supplication) and the strategic use that subjects can make of this practice to reach a goal (Cerutti &
Vallerani 2015: 2). There is a special relationship between concessions and claiming rights and a power relationship that always favoured the political authority. The supplications show how the State institutions extended their influence even into situations of extreme marginality, in this case, the circumstances of slaves in Tuscany who wanted to be freed. The supplications also indicate how local requests reflected the changing position of the central institutions towards marginal groups. The personalisation of the supplications is highly interesting because it provides a view of the slave’s life and agency which is often in strong contrast to the sense of uniformity conveyed by more standard sources.

On January 31st 1781, according to *Schiavi per la libertà* (Slaves for freedom), there were 10 slaves in the *Bagno* of Pisa, 9 Muslim slaves and one who had converted to Catholicism. The convert’s slave name was Isaia Champlon, and his old name was Ierma. All 10 asked to be freed and to be allowed to return to Tunis. The government decided to first free the 5 slaves who arrived in the *Bagno* in 1766 and then those who arrived in 1772, but they took into consideration time spent in unfreedom, the performance of public works, and whether individuals had behaved “well.” Eventually, all were freed. The liberation of the 9 Muslims was less problematic because they stayed in the *Bagno* until the arrival of the Tunisian vessel involved and because they not changed religion. The case of the renegade Ierma was more complex. He was almost free inside the *Bagno* after his conversion (there were 6 months of transition between unfreedom and freedom, starting from the date of baptism) and employed in public works in the city. If he returned home, his conversion could have caused a scandal, so the government offered immediate liberation and a job on a royal warship, as had been provided to another slave, named Sartori.

On April 9th, 1785, Mustafà of Mahamed wanted to convert in pursuit of freedom and recruitment to a warship. He wished to follow the example of Sartori and Ierma. Mustafà’s petition was directed to the priest who had to interrogate him. Mustafà sought to convince the priest that his conversion would be based on belief rather than a desire to return to his homeland. He was granted baptism, the priest affirming that: “I have known that he is a man of good character, his bearing has always been adjusted and he can hope that it will be so in the future, so that I ordered that in the meantime he should begin to be instructed.” The allocation for clothing of the catechumen for the function of baptism was 12 *pezze*, with an official responsible for the purchase. The commissioner of war had to pay the orator a daily sum of money for six months post-baptism. Once baptised, the slave’s chains were removed and “some discreet condescension will be used in employing him.” The priest further affirmed that following the liberation of his comrades, freedom would also quickly be granted to him, so that he would not remain without employment and could be inducted as a fourth-class sailor, a supernumerary or commoner in the service of the navy of war. In another source on the baptism of Tunisian slaves, it emerges that in addition to financial support for a white dress, the slave was provided with an apartment and four *soldi* a day for the time necessary for education in the Catholic religion. However, continuing financial support had to be provided to him, including immediately after baptism, because he would not be able to be employed in a job. Concerning slaves’ qualities, “good character” was often attributed to them, and this increased their chances of being freed. It is difficult to understand how the authorities judged a person to be of “good character,” but to qualify as such a slave had to have an unblemished record of obedience. What is more, it seems that within a certain period after baptism
(more or less six months), slaves could start to enjoy freedom of movement. Slaves were unchained after conversion and effectively free. Legal freedom came after 6 months. This is interesting because there was usually no immediate correlation between conversion and juridical freedom in other Italian cities in the Early Modern period. The exception to this rule was Rome, where we have the proof that baptised Turkish slaves were freed in the period 1516-1716 (Di Nepi 2022). There is no historiographical indication that freedom followed conversion in Leghorn during the 18th century (Bonazza 2019: 139; Santus 2019: 95) but these late-18th century sources tell a different story.

In 1775, two supplications from the Algerian Acamet di Mohamet and the Tunisian Abucherim d’Abissalem, described the physical prowess and working skills of the two slaves in Leghorn. Acamet, around 30 years old in 1775, was enslaved in 1766. He was described as having a robust and active constitution and was employed at the factory of the new lazaret. He worked on corner rafters. A good sailor, he could also bind wood and build bridges like a bricklayer. He was an experienced stonemason, could use a pick, and chisel terracotta. Abucherim, 27 years old, had been enslaved in 1771. He was also considered active with a robust constitution and a skilled labourer. He was employed in the new lazaret and, as he was a good sailor, he sometimes worked on rafts. He was adaptable to any type of heavy work. Such flexibility was valued by the captain, Fazzi, and the officials. References to Acamet and Abucherim were positive: “they have always done well,” “they have done, and they (continue to) do a great service”; they are “the most capable among all the slaves to be employed in a factory.”

These descriptions show how their manual skills and behavioural attitude made them important and meant that the officials did not want to release them immediately. Instead, they proposed liberation after a certain period because the slaves still had services to render to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. It also emerges that the State chose not to include the two slaves as part of an exchange for two Tuscan Christian captives, Palma and Palmieri. The proposed exchange was another sign of the value placed on Acamet and Abucherim. Slaves considered to be skilled labourers of good character were confronted with a double-edged sword when making supplications: the Tuscan authorities might well favour them but also be tempted to retain them as fundamental to the workforce.

Other factors that could determine the likelihood of liberation, in addition to conversion and skills, were skin colour, ethnic origin and health condition. A negotiation with Tunis on January 6th, 1775 tells much about the role of skin colour and ethnicity in the procedures of redemption and exchange: “he was able to convince them of the example of the exchange with Algiers since he replied that the Turkish soldiers were not included, nor the Moors, who still remain with few virtues, and that among the Tunisians we have here there are no soldiers.” In an exchange with Algiers, 2 enslaved Turkish people, one of whom was quite elderly, were swapped for one Christian slave. The Tunisians had pressed for 3 enslaved Turkish people. It is difficult to calculate the economic value of a Muslim enslaved in this period but, in October 1815, on the basis that the exchange rate was 5 enslaved Turks for one enslaved Christian, and the value of a Christian slave was 300 Venetian zecchini for ordinary men and 600 Venetian zecchini for captains, owners, priests and women, we can estimate that the price of an enslaved Turk in Tuscany was 60 Venetian zecchini. So, the value of
an enslaved Turkish person was inferior to that of an enslaved Christian, and “Moors” were not even considered as part of the equation.

21 A 1779 list of slaves included 5 suffering long-term illness who were proposed for liberation, among them a “Moor” named Alo Baratbarch.19 When a worker became redundant due to illness, even a “Moor” slave could return home. But “Moors,” unlike Levantines, were rarely redeemed and exchanged. An exchange of 12 “Moorish” slaves with Algiers failed that July. The Algerians despised the “Moors” as scoundrels (Bonazza 2019: 138). So, in general, “Moors” were not exchangeable or had a low exchange value but would be released when ill.

22 Cases of fugitive slaves in Leghorn also suggest how slaves in the Mediterranean could have different mobilities and life experiences. For instance, in 1782 some slaves escaped from Leghorn to France, where they felt they would have a better chance of being ransomed (Bono 2016: 295). The question of slave mobility between different Italian and European states due to escape or purchase is important. For instance, on August 9th, 1782, three slaves from Civitavecchia escaped to Tuscany, but Tuscany had an agreement with the Papal States that meant fugitive slaves would be arrested and sent back to Civitavecchia. Bianchi, the Tuscan consul in Civitavecchia, thought that the 3 slaves were probably hoping to go to France due to peace between France and the Regency.20 Treaties with the Barbary States sometimes allowed fugitive slaves to take refuge in the port of Leghorn, and this happened in a case of fugitives from Toulon.21 Slaves who fled were usually without chains, indicating that they were Christians. A slave who fled from the Genovese galleys in 1748 declared himself to be from Tripoli rather than Candia in an effort to dissimulate his identity. To establish his origins, the Tuscan authorities made him speak; he spoke the language of Candia rather than the Barbaresco. Greek and Turkish merchants were summoned to analyse his language. The fugitive was finally recognised by Turkish merchants who had repeatedly sold him to Candia.22 Language, then, was another element that impacted the pursuit of freedom.

23 Concerning other individual experiences, as well as privately-owned and State slaves, some merchants in the port of Leghorn tried to sell slaves privately. For instance, in 1825 a brother and sister were sold in Leghorn by a Russian merchant, Michael Inatvitz, to a former lieutenant, Lorenzo Guidi.23 The sibling slaves then went to live at the house of Guidi, who had bought them together with a chest of clothes for a total of 280 lire. Ali was 17 and Esise was 20 years old. They were called “African Negro slaves” and arrived at the House of Catechumens in Florence on September 20th, 1825, to be converted after due religious instruction. We do not know the exact geographical origin of Esise and Ali but the fact they were defined as “African Negroes” tells us they were from Sub-Saharan Africa.24 Their conversion was Guidi’s choice rather than their own. The case sources involve three important aspects. First, a legal dispute connected to the chest of clothes and its value; second, Esise died from hepatitis, for which she had not been well treated, and post-mortem she was dissected out of a macabre quasi-scientific curiosity about her black body;25 and third, Ali’s ownership was transferred to the Marquis Andrea Bourbon del Monte during his time in the House of Catechumens.26

24 The House of Catechumens bought the contested chest from Guidi even though the slaves had originally described two chests, so part of their wardrobe was missing. Guidi was interrogated and claimed that the Russian merchant, Inatvitz, wanted to sell him both chests but that he bought only the one with the clothes alla franca (and not the
other, which contained sabres and carnival costumes). Inatvitz then tried to sell this merchandise to other Turks in Livorno but not getting the desired price, he took the second chest to sell in the Levant. When purchased, the slaves wore two gold pendants, pendants that were never valued; they were, in essence, included as part of the slaves’ bodies. The Royal Secretariat, using various receipts, determined that the value of the chest was 299 lire, 16 soldi and 8 denari. It is interesting to note the clothing of slaves could be rich and decorous, adding value to their purchase price.  

26 During Esise’s illness, probably because of the likelihood of death, she was baptised on September 4th, 1825 as Maria Francesca Fortunati Passerini. She died, presumably due to a complication of the hepatitis, on December 10th, 1825. The night prior to Maria Francesca’s death, the custodian of the House, Settimio Puliti, called one Massimiliano Rigacci to attend to the patient, but Rigacci was not “matriculated” to practice medicine. In addition to questions about his qualifications and the efficacy of his intervention, he performed an illegal autopsy of sorts in which Maria Francesca’s hair and some of her skin were removed to be placed on a wooden head. A doctor named Galletti was commissioned to investigate the case, leading to accusations against the custodian and Rigacci. Settimio Puliti was dismissed from his position.  

27 While this was a private initiative that was officially reprimanded rather than a legal experiment or institutional action, the story shows how the body of the “Moor” was considered exotic and open to manipulation for reasons of macabre novelty. The timing here, in the early 19th century, is important because it is usually not until the 1860s that we find references to “races on display” in Italy. Studies of black bodies through dissection had begun elsewhere in Europe at the beginning of the 19th century and even earlier on slave trade ships (Abbattista 2013: 27; Taquet 2013; Schaub & Sebastiani, 2021). So, we can now establish a precedent of individuals who were manipulated in a fashion similar to that of the imperial period. These people were made objects of physical and mental curiosity, interest, and admiration but they were considered simultaneously attractive and repulsive (Abbattista 2013: 33).  

28 The sources reveal much about the attitudes of the House to the siblings as black Africans. For instance, Fr. Domenico Corsi, in telling the archbishop of Florence that Ali was ready to be baptised, wrote that: “it involved his ability to overcome the natural torpidity and the contrary habit of exercising the intellect for study.” Ali’s new ownership status was evident in his baptismal documentation. He was baptised in August 1826, and his godfather was Amaddio Pingani, a secret representative of the Marquis Andrea Bourbon del Monte. The Marquis took Ali to serve in his house, transforming Ali’s immobility in the Pia Casa into mobility. Esise’s stay in the House, however, ended in death. The racial dynamic, therefore, seems to emerge at the beginning of the 19th century. It is not only a problem of cultural differences, and in this case something new happens. The fact that a natural numbness and a decision not to exercise the intellect is perceived appears as an element that differentiates these slaves from Ottoman Empire slaves. Normally, slaves from Sub-Saharan African and the colonies were described with more discriminative connotations. Esise and Ali were probably simply “Moors” originally from Sub-Saharan Africa who sailed with a merchant from the Levant, and thus were considered colonial slaves. Moors considered to be “black” Sub-Saharanans encountered substantial isolation that was not only cultural or religious. This was most likely due to the circulation of the Atlantic categories concerning race and otherness in the Mediterranean space and in the Italian context,
with skin colour and ethnic origin starting to assume a new connotation at the beginning of the 19th century.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, the analysis of group portraits, such as of the group of Muslim slaves liberated in Leghorn in 1747, is useful in understanding the geographical origin and the numbers of slaves of the different powers: Sublime Porte, Tunis, Algiers and Tripoli. Furthermore, these tables are crucial in pinpointing the average time a slave spent in captivity before liberation and their age when liberated. There is no personalised information, however, on living and working conditions, or on exit strategies and other factors determining the pursuit of freedom, such as conversion, escape, illness and labour skills. In these statistical tables, social relations and individual histories disappear, unavoidably affecting analysis.

However, slave petitions for baptism and freedom do allow us to recreate more complex scenarios. In the requests for conversion by Muslim slaves, we see one slave’s strong discursive ability in pursuit of his goal, including his promise that he will not attempt to escape after baptism even though he will no longer be in chains. As per Giuseppina Minchella, conversion can also be considered a free choice by the slave even though he is living in a coercive condition (Minchella 2014: 210). Conversion, according to Lucette Valensi, can be interpreted as a question of supply and demand, and if a slave was an effective labourer, it was not always convenient to offer him baptism due to the relationship between conversion and eventual freedom (Valensi 2013: 149). We saw this problem manifested in the cases of very good workers such as the Algerian, Acamet di Mohamet, and the Tunisian, Abucherim d’Abissalem. The priest wanted to grant baptism, but the authority did not want to lose good skilled workers who could perform specialist building tasks.

The slave’s physical constitution and health were also part of the decision-making process. We have seen that slaves with diseases were liberated and sent back to North Africa. Moreover, we have analysed how work, communication, and behavioural skills as well as age greatly impacted the individual’s ability to enjoy better living conditions; after baptism, a liberated slave could become a fourth-class sailor or, if he was considered worthy, he could receive compensation and other forms of gratification in the territory of arrival. These specificities prove that slaves could live different forms of coercion and follow different routes to freedom, through conversion, petitions and escape, but also through sickness that limited their usefulness as workers. The individual trajectories and experiences show how within an imaginary group portrait there are many nuances concerning origin, age, work, ability, physical qualities and different fates in places of detention. The House of Catechumens normally represented a means of passage to better living and working conditions after conversion. In the case of Esise, however, her death after inadequate treatment for her illness meant that there would be no progress beyond the House, while in the case of Ali, the House represented a moment of passage because after conversion, he became Andrea Bourbon del Monte’s domestic.

On the other hand, the immediate liberation of the group of slaves in 1747, constituting a group portrait, shows how the active and individual role of a singular slave can be obscured by the contingency of a political moment which impacts on freedom.
Furthermore, group portraits rely on quantitative data that tells us little about the contribution of each individual slave and his qualities, although it is very useful to know the average age and the time spent in captivity. Also, religion in this case doesn’t affect freedom because the captives and slaves liberated are all Muslims and they have all kept their original faith. Unlike these more sterile sources, supplications and other rich records of the Magistrato del Bigallo reveal a complexity in the story of each slave’s life and help us to establish how each one intended to attain freedom, what work he did, where he lived exactly, whether or not he had a social network, and whether or not he enjoyed good health. In short, these records allow us to trace his wider life trajectory, one which is not only personal, but also geographical. Methodologically, both approaches—whether formulating group portraits or tracking the unique patterns of an individual slave’s life—are indispensable. Identifying and interrogating an array of complementary sources is vital to writing formerly hidden histories and to furthering our understanding of the phenomenon of slavery in Tuscany and the Mediterranean.
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ABSTRACTS

This article presents a group portrait of captives and slaves and a picture of some individual slaves’ lives in the Bagno of Leghorn and Pisa and in the House of Catechumens of Florence in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany during the period 1702-1826. This research is based on Leghorn government papers, the archive of Florence’s Ginori family and the records of the Magistrato del Bigallo.

The study follows two lines of inquiry corresponding to two different scales of analysis. The first draws a group portrait from a list of slaves living at the Bagno of Leghorn and released in 1747. This portrait reveals a uniform and collective life and provides quantitative information on the latter, particularly concerning the question of the time of their captivity or their enslavement.

The second line of investigation explores the experiences and individual trajectories of several slaves between Livorno, Pisa and Florence and raises questions about conclusive interpretations concerning the level of homogeneity in their living and working conditions. The presence of slaves and captives in galleys or prisons has been the subject of much research based on the many documents produced in these places, including lists of slaves that allow scholars to build a group portrait. The realization of this type of portrait requires, however, consideration of individual trajectories and differences. This is made possible by sources such as the supplications of slaves living in these places of detention as well as those resident in the House of Catechumens of Florence. The petitions of slaves, in both Pisa and Livorno, reveal the diversity of living conditions in the same place of detention. While historiography has emphasized a standardization of conditions in different environments—such as galleys and prisons—the study sheds light on how differences in physical qualities (health, physical strength, skin colour), geographical origin, professional skills or religion of captives and slaves had an impact on access to freedom, their agency, and their treatment by their owners. In addition, the sources of the Magistrato del Bigallo allow for a very subtle approach, making it possible to show for example the different experiences of a brother and a sister, both slaves and from Sub-Saharan Africa, in the House of Catechumens of Florence.

These sources, less explored, bring to light formerly invisible stories of enslaved people from the Mediterranean and outside with singular trajectories that complicate existing interpretations. The two approaches, that of the group portrait and that concentrating on the individual experiences of the captives and slaves, are fundamental to developing a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of slavery in Tuscany.

Cet article présente un portrait de groupe de captifs et d’esclaves ainsi que la vie de certains esclaves du Grand-duché de Toscane, plus précisément dans le bagne de Livourne, de Pise et dans la maison des catéchumènes de Florence entre 1702 et 1826. Les archives d’État du gouvernement
de Livourne, les archives privées de la famille Ginori de Florence et du Magistrato del Bigallo dans les Archives d’État de Florence constituent le socle de cette recherche. L’étude suit deux lignes d’enquête correspondant à deux échelles d’analyse différentes. La première dessine un portrait de groupe constitué grâce à une liste de personnes esclaves ayant vécu au bagnio de Livourne et devant être libérées en 1747. Ce portrait révèle une vie uniforme et collective et fournit des informations quantitatives sur ces derniers, notamment concernant la question du temps de leur captivité ou de leur mise en esclavage. La seconde ligne d’enquête explore les expériences et les trajectoires individuelles de plusieurs esclaves entre Livourne, Pise et Florence et permet de discuter une interprétation concluant à l’homogénéisation de leurs conditions de vie et de travail. La présence d’esclaves et de captifs dans les galères ou les prisons a été très étudiée grâce à l’abondance de documents produits dans ces lieux, notamment des listes d’esclaves qui permettent de construire un portrait de groupe. La réalisation de ce type de portrait exige toutefois de prendre aussi en compte les trajectoires et les différences individuelles, ce que permettent des sources comme les requêtes d’esclaves issues de ces lieux de détention ainsi que celles de la maison des catéchumènes de Florence. Les suppliques d’esclaves, entre Pise et Livourne, révèlent la diversité des conditions de vie au sein d’un même lieu de détention. Alors que l’historiographie a insisté sur une standardisation des conditions dans les différents milieux – comme les galères et les bagnes –, l’étude met en lumière la façon dont les différences de qualités physiques (santé, force physique, couleur de la peau), d’origine, de compétences professionnelles ou de religion des captifs et des esclaves ont eu un impact sur l’accès à la liberté, leur agentivité et leur traitement par leurs propriétaires. Par ailleurs, les sources du Magistrato del Bigallo permettent une approche très fine montrant par exemple des expériences différentes entre un frère et une sœur, tous deux esclaves et originaires d’Afrique sub-saharienne, dans la maison des catéchumènes de Florence. Ces sources, moins explorées, font émerger des histoires jusque-là invisibles d’esclaves de la Méditerranée et d’ailleurs aux trajectoires singulières qui viennent complexifier les interprétations. Ainsi, les deux approches, celle du portrait de groupe et celle sur les expériences individuelles des captifs et des esclaves, sont fondamentales pour une compréhension exhaustive du phénomène de l’esclavage en Toscane.

Este artículo presenta un retrato de grupo de cautivos y esclavos así como la vida de algunos esclavos del Gran Ducado de Toscana, más precisamente en la cárcel de Livorno, en Pisa y en la casa de los catecúmenos de Florencia entre 1702 y 1826. Los archivos de Estado del gobierno de Livorno, los archivos privados de la familia Ginori de Florencia y los del Magistrato del Bigallo en los Archivos de Estado de Florencia constituyen el soporte de esta investigación.

El estudio propone dos líneas de investigación que corresponden a dos escalas de análisis diferentes. La primera dibuja un retrato de grupo constituido gracias a una lista de personas esclavas que vivieron en la prisión de Livorno y que debían ser liberadas en 1747. Este retrato revela una vida uniforme y colectiva y brinda informaciones cuantitativas sobre ellas, especialmente relativas a la cuestión de la duración de su cautiverio o de su esclavización. La segunda línea de investigación explora las experiencias y las trayectorias individuales de varios esclavos entre Livorno, Pisa y Florencia y permite discutir una interpretación que concluye a la homogeneización de sus condiciones de vida y de trabajo. La presencia de esclavos y de cautivos en las galeras o en las cárcel de ha sido muy estudiada gracias a la abundancia de documentos producidos en esos lugares, especialmente las listas de esclavos que permiten construir un retrato de grupo. La realización de este tipo de retrato exige sin embargo tomar también en cuenta las trayectorias y las diferencias individuales, lo que permiten fuentes como las solicitudes de esclavos en los lugares de detención y en la casa de catecúmenos de Florencia. Las súplicas de esclavos, entre Pisa y Livorno, revelan la diversidad de las condiciones de vida dentro de un mismo lugar de detención. Mientras que la historiografía ha insistido en una
estandarización de las condiciones en sus diferentes medios – como las galeras y las cárceles – el estudio pone en relieve la manera en que las diferencias de cualidades físicas (salud, fuerza física, color de la piel), de origen, de competencias profesionales o de religión de los cautivos y de los esclavos tuvieron un impacto sobre su acceso a la libertad, su agencia y el tratamiento por parte de sus amos. Por otra parte, las fuentes del Magistrado del Bigallo permiten un enfoque muy fino que muestra, por ejemplo, diferencias entre las experiencias de un hermano y una hermana, ambos esclavos y originarios de África subsahariana, en la casa de los catecúmenos de Florencia. Estas fuentes, menos exploradas, revelan historias hasta ahora invisibles del Mediterráneo y de otras partes, implican trayectorias singulares que vienen a complejizar las interpretaciones. Así, los dos enfoques, tanto el del retrato de grupo y el de las experiencias individuales de los cautivos y de los esclavos, son fundamentales para una comprensión exhaustiva del fenómeno de la esclavitud en Toscana.

Este artigo apresenta um retrato de grupo de cativos e escravos, bem como a vida de alguns escravos do Grão-Ducado de Toscana, mais precisamente nas cadeias de Livorno e de Pisa, e na casa dos catecúmenos em Florença entre 1702 e 1826. Esta pesquisa baseia-se nos arquivos do Estado do governo de Livorno, e nos arquivos particulares da família Ginori de Florença e do Magistrato del Bigallo nos arquivos do Estado de Florença. O estudo desenvolve duas linhas de investigação que correspondem a duas escalas diferentes de análise. A primeira delineia um retrato de grupo constituído a partir de uma lista de pessoas escravizadas que viveram na cadeia de Livorno e seriam libertas em 1747. Este retrato revela uma vida uniforme e coletiva, fornecendo informações quantitativas, nomeadamente o tempo de seu cativeiro ou de sua escravidão. A segunda linha de investigação explora as experiências e as trajetórias individuais de alguns escravos entre Livorno, Pisa e Florença e permite questionar uma interpretação resultando na homogeneização de suas condições de vida e de trabalho. A presença de escravos e cativos nas galeras ou nas prisões foi muito estudada, devido a abundância de documentos produzidos nestes lugares, nomeadamente listas de escravos que permitem construir um retrato de grupo. No entanto, a realização deste tipo de retrato também exige levar em conta as trajetórias e diferenças individuais, o que permite fontes como os requerimentos de escravos provenientes destes lugares de retenção ou da casa dos catecúmenos de Florença. As apelos de escravos, entre Pisa e Livorno, lançam luz sobre a diversidade das condições de vida no seio de um mesmo lugar de retenção. Enquanto a historiografia insistiu numa estandarização das condições em vários contextos – como as galeras e as prisões –, este estudo realça o modo como as diferenças de qualidade física (saúde, força física, cor da pela), de origem, de competências profissionais ou de religião dos cativos e dos escravos influiram no acesso a liberdade, sua agentividade, bem como no tratamento provido por seus proprietários. Por outro lado, as fontes do Magistrato del Bigallo permitem uma abordagem muito fina mostrando por exemplo as experiências distintas entre um irmão e uma irmã, ambos escravos e oriundos de África Sub-Sahariana, na casa dos catecúmenos de Florença. Estas fontes, menos exploradas, dão a ver histórias até aqui invisíveis de escravos do Mediterrâneo e de outros lugares com trajetórias peculiares que complexificam as interpretações. Assim, ambas as abordagens, a do retrato de grupo e a das experiências individuais de cativos e de escravos, são fundamentais para entender plenamente o fenómeno da escravidão na Toscana.
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