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Islands and boundaries/borders are two of the many possible keys through which we can study the post-Classical Mediterranean. Ever since the Mediterranean ceased to be a great Roman ‘lake’, that same Sea became an often-uncrossable boundary that both separated and protected the many worlds that developed in different ways and at a different pace along its extensive coast. At the same time, however, the Mediterranean continued to be a unifying element: it provided a shared identity to communities that were culturally and geographically distant; and it could still be crossed to reach other frontiers, and even beyond.

From this point of view, islands and borders, forming connecting lines and lines of separation, and offering unified identities but also socio-cultural diversities, can become spaces for reflection. As such, they are ideal for disciplines that seek to understand the past but also aim to make much more widely available the tools with which to interpret some of the basic needs of the contemporary world.

The subtitle – with all nouns in the plural – alludes to the need for a multiplicity of different approaches. Today, history and archaeology – especially in the Mediterranean – are understood as multiple disciplines – disciplines that search not so much for an a priori monolithic, specific definition, but rather for an exploration of the limits that must be overcome and the intersection points that need to be exploited.

The chronological span, 365–1556, providing a long-term vision, is essential for exploring in timedepth the multiple themes of study. AD 365, or, more precisely, the 21st of July 365, the day of the most violent tsunami documented in the literary sources, marks the moment at which, in the midst of transformation of the ancient world, the Mediterranean seems to reclaim its physical centrality. This was due to the devastating effects of this natural disaster and, above all, to its global visibility, as is evident from the many different witnesses describing the event, from both the eastern and the western shores of the Mediterranean. At the other end of the chronological span, January 16th, 1556, the day of the coronation of Philip II of...
Spain, symbolically marks the date on which the Mediterranean enters contemporary historiography, as understood through the vision of the historian Fernand Braudel and his rewriting of the rules of historiographical analysis, pursuing directions that often cross paths with archaeology.
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*Miguel Ángel Cau Ontiveros, Demetrios Michaelides, Philippe Pergola, Guido Vannini, Enrico Zanini*
Titolo, sottotitolo e ambito cronologico di una serie editoriale richiedono qualche parola di spiegazione da parte dei curatori. Il titolo gioca evidentemente sull’assonanza della radice delle parole latine che indicano rispettivamente soglie e confini, dunque frontiere, con quella della parola greca che indica il porto, che per un’isola – e in senso lato per ogni città che si affaccia sul mare – è al tempo stesso una soglia di connettività e un confine di isolamento.

Isole e frontiere sono due delle tante possibili chiavi di lettura per provare a studiare il Mediterraneo post-antico. Da quando cessa di essere un grande lago romano, il Mediterraneo diviene una frontiera spesso invalicabile, che separa e protegge reciprocamente i tanti mondi che si sviluppano con ritmi e forme diversi lungo le sue coste. Al tempo stesso però il Mediterraneo continua ad essere un elemento di unità: fornisce una identità condivisa a comunità culturalmente e geograficamente distanti; può essere attraversato per spingersi verso, e al di là di, altre frontiere.

Isole e frontiere, linee di connessione e linee di separazione, identità unitarie e molteplicità socioculturali divengono da questo punto di vista spazi di riflessione per discipline volte alla conoscenza del passato, ma che intendono mettere a disposizione della collettività strumenti per interpretare alcune esigenze fondamentali della contemporaneità, risolvendo, ad esempio, in termini di ‘Archeologia Pubblica’ spunti, risultati ed esiti delle ricerche proposte o almeno di alcune di esse, fra ricerca pura e ricerca applicata.

Il sottotitolo, tutto al plurale, allude alla necessità di una molteplicità di approcci diversi. Storia e archeologia – a maggior ragione nel Mediterraneo – sono discipline che appaiono oggi declinabili solo in forma plurale, alla ricerca non di una monolitica definizione disciplinare a priori, ma di un’esplorazione di limiti da superare e di punti di intersezione da sfruttare. Luogo di incontro tra le discipline non può che essere il territorio, inteso come prodotto della interazione tra culture e natura: unità minima di osservazione del fenomeno storico e unità minima di contestualizzazione delle tracce archeologiche.

Le date di riferimento (365–1556) – in un’ottica di ‘lungo periodo’ – sono sembrate ai curatori una possibile conseguenza logica delle premesse e possono quindi rendere più esplicito il progetto. Il 365 – per la precisione il 21 luglio del 365, giorno del più violento maremoto narrato dalle fonti letterarie – segna il momento in cui, nel bel mezzo della trasformazione del mondo antico, il Mediterraneo riconquista, quasi per metafora, la sua centralità fisica, fatta di
onde e di venti, dando vita a un fenomeno epocale, per i suoi effetti disastrosi e soprattutto per la sua visibilità globale, come dimostrano i tanti testimoni diversi che dalle sponde orientali e occidentali descrivono lo stesso evento con lingue e voci differenti. Il 1556 – per la precisione il 16 gennaio 1556, giorno dell’incoronazione di Filippo II di Spagna – segna simbolicamente la data in cui il Mediterraneo entra nella storiografia contemporanea attraverso la grande lezione di Fernand Braudel, riscrivendo le regole del gioco storiografico in una direzione che ha molti punti di intersezione con l’archeologia.

*Limina/Limites* accoglie ormai atti di convegni e seminari, singole monografie e studi collettivi che, indipendentemente dalla loro origine disciplinare, si propongano come obiettivo l’integrazione di fonti e sistemi di dati diversi in funzione di una ricostruzione globale orientata alla lunga durata e alla dimensione spaziale mediterranea.

Tutti volumi sono sottoposti a una doppia peer review anonima.
Limina/Limites

Archéologies, histoires, îles et frontières de Méditerranée (365–1556)

Titre, sous-titre et arc chronologique d’une collection éditoriale ont besoin que leurs responsables s’en expliquent. Le titre joue à l’évidence autour de l’assonance des racines des mots latins qui indiquent à la fois des lieux de passages et des limites, donc des frontières, comme pour le mot grec qui indique le port, lequel représente, pour une île -et plus largement pour toute ville qui donne sur la mer- un lieu de connexion et à la fois une limite qui isole.

Îles et frontières sont deux des innombrables clés de lecture pour tenter d’ouvrir les portes de l’étude de la Méditerranée post antique. A partir du moment où elle cesse d’être un grand lac romain, la Méditerranée devient une frontière parfois insurmontable, qui sépare et protège réciproquement les nombreux mondes qui se développent à des rythmes et sous des formes différentes le long de ses côtes. Au même moment, la Méditerranée continue à être un élément d’unité : elle fournit une identité partagée par des communautés culturellement et géographiquement distantes ; elle peut être traversée pour aller vers, et au-delà, d’autres frontières.

Îles et frontières sont à la fois des lignes qui unissent et qui séparent, des identités unitaires et des multiplicités socio culturelles. Elles deviennent ainsi de vastes espaces de réflexion pour des disciplines tournées vers la connaissance du passé, mais qui entendent mettre à la disposition des collectivités des instruments pour interpréter certaines exigences fondamentales du monde contemporain, en résolvant, par exemple, en des termes d'« Archéologie publique », des pistes, des résultats et des issues pour les recherches proposées, ou du moins pour une part d’entre elles, entre recherche pure et recherche appliquée.

Le sous-titre, entièrement au pluriel, est une allusion à la nécessité d’une multiplicité d’approches différentes. Histoire et archéologie – à plus forte raison en Méditerranée – sont les disciplines qui apparaissent devoir être aujourd’hui déclinées au pluriel, non pas à la recherche a priori d’une définition disciplinaire monolithique, mais qui doivent explorer les limites à dépasser et les points de rencontre à exploiter. Le lieu de rencontre entre les disciplines ne peut qu’être le territoire, entendu comme le produit de l’interaction entre cultures et nature, à savoir des unités minimales où contextualiser les traces archéologiques.

Les dates de référence se situent dans une optique de longue durée et se sont imposées comme l’une des conséquences logiques possibles de notre postulat de départ, pour rendre plus explicite encore notre projet. L’année 365 – et pour être plus précis, le 21 juillet 365, jour du raz-de-marée le plus violent qu’aient jamais rappelé les sources littéraires – marque le moment où, au beau milieu de la transformation du monde antique, la Méditerranée reconquiert, de manière quasiment métaphorique, sa centralité physique, faite de vagues déchaînées et de vents violents, pour donner vie à un phénomène qui marque cette époque par ses effets désastreux et surtout par la visibilité globale qu’il acquiert, comme le prouvent le grand nombre des témoins qui décrivent les dévastations de ce même phénomène, depuis les rives orientales et occidentales, en des langues et avec des voix différentes.
L'année 1556 – et pour être plus précis, le 16 janvier 1556, jour du couronnement de Philippe II d'Espagne – marque symboliquement la date retenue pour l'entrée de la Méditerranée dans l'historiographie moderne à travers la grande leçon de Fernand Braudel, en réécrivant les règles du jeu historiographique dans une direction qui a de nombreux points d'intersection avec l'archéologie.

*Limina/Limites* accueille désormais à la fois des actes de congrès et colloques, de séminaires, des monographies et des études collectives lesquelles, indépendamment de leur discipline d'origine, ont pour objectif l'intégration de sources et de systèmes, autour de données différentes, en fonction d'une reconstruction globale, orientée vers la longue durée et la dimension de l'espace méditerranéen.

Tous les volumes sont soumis à une double évaluation anonyme.
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Introduction

A recent report by the World Meteorological Organization updated to January 2022 showed that around 11% of the world’s population has no access to sufficiently safe sources of water. In addition, drought in some regions of Africa, Central Asia and the American continent is hastening the expansion of the desert belts and is causing serious difficulties in a growing number of countries, thereby contributing to migratory activity among so-called climate refugees, triggered elsewhere by ever more intense and frequent flood episodes. Furthermore, sustainable use of water resources and the need to limit the damage caused by floods have long been problematic for the regions and societies of southern Europe. With their long, hot and mostly dry summers, intense rainfall in springtime and autumn, and sudden freezes in winter, Mediterranean coastal areas have all too often experienced issues related to the supply of water and sudden, excessive rainfall. Today, with the march of global warming and soil consumption, they are seeing an intensification of these well-known phenomena.

As far as the Italian territory is concerned, the report of the Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA) issued in December 2021 revealed that more than 90% of municipalities across the entire country are affected by acute situations or hydrogeological instability. The report also levelled the criticism that more than eight million people live in areas defined as highly dangerous from this point of view.

Efficient use of water has thus become a dramatically urgent requirement in this post-industrial age. Nevertheless, an analysis of historical sources shows that this issue has a decidedly long history, suggesting that, leaving aside the gradual rise in temperatures, recent critical issues have mainly escalated, exacerbated, and made pervasive the impact of the phenomena that human groups have repeatedly and tragically had to contend with on account of their impact, great or small, on the ecosystem.

Public opinion, environmental associations and government institutions often call for legislative intervention as a means to defend the environment and to protect populations from their own harmful actions. In other words, there appears to be an established idea that only when there is targeted, well-structured legislation is it possible, at least for planning purposes, to protect the natural and social environment. Conversely, critical situations are mostly blamed on what is often called a ‘legislative void’. Verifying the validity of this thesis in the contemporary world is beyond the scope of this work. The aim here is to investigate the reasons why this conviction has gradually taken hold, beginning more or less in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when, for the first time since the Roman era, Italy underwent a period of widespread rules-setting in which human use of environmental resources, particularly

---

1 Public.wmo.int/en/our-mandate/water (access October 2023).
2 Cassi and Tinacci Mossello (eds) forthcoming.
3 Triglia, Jadanza, Lastoria, Bussettini and Barbano 2021.
6 See Kidd et al. (eds) 2014; Gentilcore et al. (eds) 2023.
water, became subject to regulation. Indeed, by referring to that period we intend to verify the supposed effectiveness of legislation and to assess whether and to what extent it has been a useful means of ensuring access to and proper distribution of water for communities, and flood prevention.

In order to know the structures and the dynamics of the environment in the Middle Ages, scholars frequently refer to legislative texts, which are abundant and detailed on this subject. The usefulness of laws in historiographical investigations should not, however, be evaluated merely in terms of the extent to which rules aligned with or deviated from practice. Getting to know the norms of the past that were established to protect environmental resources can, in fact, be more useful for investigating the will of the ruling classes in this regard and discovering when the idea of a link between the law and protection of resources was first put forward. All the while, it is important to stress that the difficult balance between norms and their application should be traced back to medieval times, the first period from which, as we have said, a relatively large number of written records have come down to us.7

This work is part of a larger project pursued for several years now and related to the social impact of statutory legislation formulated in local settings in communal Italy. Specifically, it aims to highlight the intentionality of the ruling classes when it came to managing water resources and regulating piped water, from the perspective of the most recent historiographical considerations on the very meaning of the term ‘water’. Indeed, for the legislative sources of the late Middle Ages, this was not considered in relation to its singular identity (that is, as one of the four elements of creation), but rather in a plural sense referring to its quality as clean and dirty, useful or harmful, inland – like rivers – or marine; and therefore water controlled by the public authorities (aqua publica), private property, or a resource available to all (res communis omnium).8 In this regard, the book examines and compares the choices made by town and, to some extent, rural governments within the geographical area lying approximately between Rome and the Alps in the final centuries of the Middle Ages. The territory and the period chosen are, as we will see, relatively uniform in terms of their institutions and represent the most urbanised section of medieval Italy, with almost all the major cities of the time. These included: Milan, with a population of over 100,000 before the 1348 plague; Florence and Venice with about 100,000 inhabitants each; Genoa (over 50,000); Bologna, Siena and Verona (about 50,000); Brescia, Lucca, Pisa, Padua, Rome (35/40,000); Pavia, Parma, Perugia, L’Aquila, Ancona (20/30,000).9 The areas under examination are also home to most of Italy’s rivers and water resources, albeit with important internal differences which, we can already say, led to a suspicion on our part that a ‘water frontier’ existed between the north of the peninsula and the centre. In purely geographical terms, this would have been between continental Italy – the Po area, generically referred to as ‘Lombardy’ in the past, locked between the Alps and the Apennines – and peninsular Italy and the islands (Tuscia, Roman countryside, the kingdom of Naples, Sicily and Sardinia). The two macro-regions were distinct in terms of climate, production, economy and settlements.10

---

7 For some recent historiographical overviews concerning various European countries, see Caracciolo 1988; Cortonesi and Montanari (eds) 2001; Armiero and Barca 2004: 45-55; Schenk 2008; Hoffmann 2014; Nanni 2017; Canzian and Grillo 2019; Grillo 2022. On water management, Bevilacqua 2001: 41-46.
8 See Strang 2004; Linton 2010; Cazzola 2021; Fiorentini 2023: 141-142. On the polymorphism of water, Mastrelli 2008: 43-44. See also chapters 4 and 7 of this book.
With these considerations in mind and as a preliminary matter, it is necessary to emphasise that this book is not about how water was used in the Italian Middle Ages, but rather that it examines the attitudes of legislators towards its use, particularly with regard to its supply and to flood prevention. In other words, the aim is to cast light on what, according to legislators in towns and cities and, to a lesser extent, in rural areas, needed to be regulated in water management. On the other hand, the emphasis will not only be on what today’s reader can deduce directly from legislative sources of the period, but also on what cannot be found in the records because legislators did not consider it important, even though other evidence confirms its significance for the environmental and social structures of the period.

The first chapter in this volume presents the statutes – the chief sources of law in communal Italy – and their potential to reveal information about the governance strategies of the ruling classes regarding water use and flood prevention. The next section (chapter 2) verifies one of the central hypotheses of the entire work, namely whether there was a ‘water frontier’ between central and northern Italy in that period. Two chapters (3 and 4) examine urban and rural laws and highlight the complex interrelations between them. Later sections look into the conflicts arising from access to the resource and attempts to resolve them through specific norms (chapter 5); the absolute and relative quality of water (chapter 6); hydraulic machines (chapter 7); waterways and timber rafting (chapter 8); laws aimed at preventing – albeit with profound contradictions – river floods and overflows (chapter 9); and finally, some of the religious and symbolic dynamics linked to the purifying and redemptive properties of water – a sacramental element invoked by legislators as a means for expiating guilt and, at the same time, punishing an offence.

I would like to thank those who have provided valuable information and advice, including: Duccio Balestracci, Federigo Bambi, Michele Campopiano, Dario Canzian, Paola Foschi, Maria Ginatempo, Paolo Nanni, Gerrit Schenk, Lorenzo Tanzini, Guido Vannini, and Gian Maria Varanini. The debt I owe Enrico Faini, my colleague at the University of Florence, regarding the discussion of ‘sapiential’ authorities and the value of water in the culture of communal Italy is truly immeasurable.

11 See, in this regard, the considerations of Saragosa 2005: 13-20, 89-90; and Keller and Busch (eds) 1991.
I

Medieval Statutes and Water Management:
The Italian Context

1. Why statutes?

It has been variously demonstrated that water management and the relationship between human settlements and inland waters (such as rivers, lakes, wetlands and streams) played a significant role in shaping the development of urban and rural communities in most parts of Medieval and Ancien Régime Europe. From the late eleventh to the late fourteenth centuries, in the region usually recognised as ‘communal Italy’, that is, those areas approximately extending from Rome to the Alps, urban and rural government authorities codified, *inter alia*, the use of water resources and flood management strategies into written legal instruments known as statutes (especially from the late twelfth century).

The Latin term *statutum*, from the verb *statuere* (‘to establish, determine’) referred to a corpus of written municipal laws and regulations issued in large numbers by major and minor towns and enforced through legitimate coercive power. *Statutum* indicated a municipality’s own corpus of legislation: the fundamental law exercised at the local level (*ius proprium*), complementing the *ius commune* (an amalgam of inherited Roman law, the emerging canon of the Church, and feudal law), and on which the current and deliberative community legislation, tied to ‘constitutional’ principles, firmly depended. As long demonstrated in legal historiography and other fields, the statutes were ‘open’ texts that could contain reforms, derogations, additions and corrections made in the years following their promulgation. This aspect, moreover, did not affect their status as constitutional norms and did not equate them to the more changeable legislation of the current day.

Before addressing the topic of regulatory water management, it should be noted that, at the time when most of the statutes became established and generalised, communal institutions had already existed for a long time and had evolved profoundly. In the northern areas of the peninsula, in particular, they had to some extent been overtaken, or at least been greatly transformed into oligarchic or seigniorial regimes. The main organs of government, namely the municipal councils, had seen their actual political influence diminish somewhat, although

---

3 See Balestracci 1992; Balestracci 1994.
4 I use both the Latin plural *statuta* and the Anglicised term ‘statutes’ to refer to the legislative codes examined.
they had retained most of the formal prerogatives of making and reforming laws. Otherwise, the subject we have set out to address, which pertains to the governance of environmental resources, had not been transformed too greatly by the changing political regimes and the evolution of the institutional system, since the supply of water, the use of running water as motive power, irrigation systems and flood defences were issues that remained relatively constant over time. From the point of view of environmental resources, the statutes continued to form the political and administrative agenda of the communes, regardless of the transformations to their internal organisation.

Furthermore, the municipal laws concerning these issues were, like many others, rooted in Roman law and the Justinian tradition, which once again came to the fore (mid-twelfth century) after their ‘rediscovery’ by jurists and legal theorists mainly at the university of Bologna. Jurists became particularly interested in exploring them from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards. Most prominent among these was Bartolus de Saxoferrato who, in his treatise traditionally known as De fluminibus seu Tiberiadis (1355), skilfully combined his Romanist knowledge with notions of Euclidean geometry, emphasising how this could prove useful for resolving de facto questions presented to the legislators. This fact also contributed to the enduring, effective stability of water norms – particularly in relation to private law and despite the reformulation of the statutes themselves – and to their relatively uniform distribution in the regulatory collections of cities and smaller towns. It is precisely the persistence of the needs and conditions that led to the development of water management regulations and the administration of environmental resources that justifies, perhaps better than other areas of legislative intervention, the long-standing validity of government provisions helping to define the aforementioned ‘communal’ civilisation.

Statutes gave similar answers to similar problems and did so in many different geographical contexts. They reflected both the specific physical, social, political and cultural characteristics of the local realities for which they constituted the basic law, and the shared legal culture expressed by professional legislators (statutarii). In addition to common law literature, and much else besides, these texts presented what has been called ‘living law’, that is, the concrete interaction between the law and people. They were issued in almost all the towns and cities in the regions considered in the following research, and present a fairly standard format. It should also be added that, for some smaller towns and villages, especially in the thirteenth century – a time when even statutes were still relatively few in number and often hybrid in structure – these sources are not accompanied by others offering the same type
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9 Piergiovanni, 1989; Tanzini 2013; Tanzini 2014; Tanzini 2021b.
10 For instance, Geltner 2019: 90-91 rightly writes, about Bologna, that after its entry in “its dispotic era [of the lord and papal legate Bertrand du Pouget, 1334] the city’s basic administrative structure remained largely intact”.
12 Brundage 2008: 126-162; Rosso 2018: 137.
17 Dani 2013: 57-61, 67-68; Dani 2020: 30; Cazzola 2021: 75-76.
18 Odorici 1876; Keller and Busch (eds) 1991; Keller 1998; Tedesco 2023: 139.
of information.\textsuperscript{19} For these reasons, statutes are perhaps the most fruitful kinds of texts for comparative analysis, on account of their size and structure.\textsuperscript{20}

Since the 1950s, research on municipal statutes has no longer been the exclusive domain of legal historians. There has, in fact, been increasing interest in these types of regulatory records among medievalists specialising in a variety of subfields, including economic, cultural, environmental and religious history.\textsuperscript{21} This analysis becomes self-explanatory when statutes of communal Italy are juxtaposed with similar legal documents from other European regions. For instance, the organised body of norms issued and codified in German-speaking areas had a less doctrinal foundation and an almost exclusively urban matrix (\textit{Stadtrecht}).\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, it was consulted only in exceptional cases and, despite regulating and presiding over collective life, served as somewhat of a theoretical framework.\textsuperscript{23} Apparently closer to Italian statutes were the laws of Flemish cities, whose main focus, however, was the regulation of production and trade activities.\textsuperscript{24} In these territories even very important cities like Bruges and Ghent were strongly influenced by the authority of the prince, as were their local laws.\textsuperscript{25} A decisive combination of urban legislation and provisions dictated by monarchs in parliaments also characterised the Kingdom of Castile (\textit{Partidas}). Although the Crown of Aragon was subject to the much stronger ‘bargaining power’ of city law, especially in Barcelona and Valencia (\textit{Furs}), city norms were never able to disregard the king’s authority.\textsuperscript{26} Generally speaking, only Italian municipalities and those of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century French Midi (\textit{Royeuma d’Arles}), which were closest to the models of ‘Lombard’ institutions\textsuperscript{27} and part of the shaky political context of the Empire, were able to aspire to and, in some cases, achieve the status of \textit{civitas sibi princeps} (self-governing city) and even obtained recognition to this effect from the imperial vicariate.\textsuperscript{28} These cities were, in other words, true city states, entities which, in some cases, exercised full, de facto sovereignty at the local level.\textsuperscript{29} Their statutes thus became the fundamental texts regulating the public and private lives of populations, at least until the second half of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{30}

2. What statutes can say about water management

Despite the fact that the body of normative measures mirrors only part of the landscape of transformations occurring in late medieval Italy, municipal statutes have been taken as concrete evidence of the ambitions of the dominant classes who set the social and environmental agenda

\textsuperscript{19} Salvestrini 2003.
\textsuperscript{20} See Bonfiglio Dosio 1995.
\textsuperscript{22} Szabó 2001: 84-86, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{23} Dilcher 2001; Blattmann 2001; Frank 2009.
\textsuperscript{24} Blockmans 2001.
\textsuperscript{26} García Marsilla 2015.
\textsuperscript{27} Balossino 2015.
\textsuperscript{29} See, in this regard, Ascheri 2023: 23-26.
\textsuperscript{30} Capogrossi Colognesi and Gabba (eds) 2006; Ascheri 2013; Cammarosano 2021; Tanzini 2021a. Some remarks on the comparability of European statutes with legislative systems can be found in Broussais 2018.
for urban and rural spaces.\textsuperscript{31} This is also true for water resources and water management.\textsuperscript{32} Notwithstanding, since part of the legislation under discussion was written before cities and smaller centres had fully extended their dominion over the countryside, or after they had partially lost it to larger politically dominant cities and territorial lords, this study will not initially examine the already widely investigated subject of legislative and power dynamics between cities and rural areas.\textsuperscript{33} Instead, we will try to understand the characteristics of water management legislation in both urban and rural contexts. If anything, we will highlight how choices made in country communities were sometimes later extended to the cities, regardless of the political hierarchies in place.\textsuperscript{34}

It is not always clear from the statutory sources that all the norms regarding the use of environmental resources resulted from agreements, negotiations and bargaining between families and social partners, but it is possible to get a glimpse of this from an analysis of the historical-political and historical-territorial framework of the communities producing the texts.\textsuperscript{35} Obviously not all government intervention in a territory was determined by statute. The slow move away from rigid constitutional norms – especially after the thirteenth century – and the gradual introduction of more current legislation consisting of resolutions (\textit{deliberationes}, \textit{provisiones}), meeting reports, public notices issued by local lords and so on, meant that political and administrative systems relied increasingly on the newer regulations to govern the management of water resources. However, unlike statutes, this type of source differs considerably from one place to the next and, as we have said, often no longer exists, especially in smaller centres. This makes comparison difficult. Statutes, on the other hand, were almost universally present and retained the original rationales of the planning documents local governments produced. They were on the receiving end of long-term investments, such as those for the construction of aqueducts, canals, water sources, fountains and other infrastructure. They also preserved the spirit of pre-communal local customs regarding the right to draw and exploit water.\textsuperscript{36}

From the eleventh to the late thirteenth centuries, northern and central Italy underwent unprecedented, rapid and large-scale urbanisation. According to recent studies, despite the demographic crisis from the late thirteenth century onwards and the plague of 1348, which reduced the population by a third,\textsuperscript{37} as many as 20/22\% of inhabitants were urban-based during the second half of the fourteenth century: a considerable proportion when compared to other European areas of the time.\textsuperscript{38}

Our investigation will bring to light the politics around the fresh supply of water and the conflicts of interest involved in the use of resources in the context of this extensively urbanised area. This is why the discussion will primarily be based on the statutes of urban communities and minor towns, without, however, neglecting examples of legal writings

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} See Cherubini 1985; Rao 2015: 173-177; Geltner 2019: 36, 38-39.
\item \textsuperscript{32} See Bocchi 1990; Keller 2001.
\item \textsuperscript{33} See Grillo 2003; Cengarle, Chittolini and Varanini (eds) 2005; Milani 2009; Salvestrini 2009b; Franceschi and Taddei 2012; Salvestrini 2015b; Wickham 2015; Scharf (ed.) 2022.
\item \textsuperscript{34} See Hoffmann 2007; Fiore 2012; Geltner 2019: 113-114.
\item \textsuperscript{35} See, for example, Milner 2000.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Piccinni 2002; Chiappa Mauri 2003b; Nico Ottaviani 2008: 68; Tanzini 2009; Geltner 2019: 36.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ziegler 1982: 40-62; Cohn 1992: 5-6; \textit{La peste nera} 1994; Cohn 2002.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Ginatempo and Sandri 1990; Chittolini 2010; Rawcliffe 2013: 1.
\end{itemize}
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regarding castles and rural communities. We will refer to compendia of legislation produced both before and after the outbreak of the Black Death, noting that the event appears not to have left a significant mark on the way water use was governed. In this regard, it should be noted that this study follows on from the most recent analyses of natural phenomena and human use of environmental resources in different medieval regions. The concepts of Great Geographical Divergence (Europe compared to Asia or Africa), and Little Divergence (northern Europe compared to the Mediterranean) have, in fact, become part of historiographical reconstruction and denote, from topological and chronological points of view, the different developmental processes which caused divergences on a global and continental scale. The fourteenth century, in particular, has been re-examined from this perspective, as a time in which responsive action, adaptability and local resilience were required in the face of disasters, famines and epidemics. These were the key elements of the great transition, or the different historical paths that preceded agricultural development in the early modern period and the Industrial Revolution.

The aforementioned research led to a modification and integration of the concept of Medieval Climatic Anomaly or Medieval Warm Period, that is the time of warm climate in the North Atlantic region that lasted from c. 950 to c. 1250. Specific readings to this effect have been conducted by palaeoclimatologists, in particular on the Mediterranean area. The new texts brought to light phenomena of accentuated ‘climatic variability’ (past global changes), precisely in the final centuries of the Middle Ages and outside of the traditional chronological scans linked to a rigid distinction between the Medieval Climate Optimum and the Little Ice Age of the modern era. Similarly, the distinction between before and after the plague of 1348 is hardly appropriate. The impact of the event is not neglected, but undoubtedly relativised, and, in particular, for the Lombardy area, as an example, almost completely denied in relation to the first epidemic wave.

In this regard, we can note that perhaps other traumatic events that occurred during the period under examination caused a more notable impact on the dynamics of environmental and water management. The first among these and a recent object of focus for scholars was the eruption of the Samalas volcano in Indonesia (1257-60), which had a negative impact on the global climate, in Italy most evidently from 1258 onwards. We can also mention the low pressure vortex that hit the Ligurian sea, Central Europe and northern Italy in July 1342, with exceptionally high water in Venice and severe flooding in Germany, Austria, Hungary,
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Bohemia, Lombardy and Tuscany. Albeit often indirectly, these circumstances influenced the political agenda of the municipal authorities and were reflected in the legislation they produced.

3. What statutes do not say about water management

A study of water and its uses in the Middle Ages would seem to require a look into the relationship between the sources used and the prevailing hygiene, medical and natural philosophical paradigm of Galenism, also called humoralism, which informed contemporary understanding of health and environmental hazards. These elements were undeniably fundamental to the considerations made by theorists. As demonstrated in Leguay’s work on medieval France, in Bernat i Roca’s on Mallorca in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Rawcliffe’s on England, and Coomans’s on the Netherlands during the same period, some of the sanitation and ‘hygiene’ protections implemented for the general public did not start at the height of the modern era, but go back at least to the late Middle Ages and perhaps predate the 1348 plague. This approach was followed for communal Italy particularly by Geltner who, in an exemplary study, investigated several cities and towns for which a wealth of records exists (Lucca, Bologna, Pinerolo), and also used the statutory texts from other areas of the Italian Peninsula for considerations of a more general nature.

We will not delve too much into these topics in the pages that follow, as they are only indirectly reflected in the statutes relating to water management. It is my opinion, in fact, that the norms in the codes regulating waste water and sewage systems, clean drinking water, access for healthy or sick people and animals to springs and drinking troughs, and punishments for polluting rivers are more a response to a demand for harm reduction, protection of communal and private property and social order than all-out conscious planning of hygiene and sanitation conditions; at least not in the way we understand the terms today or the way they were construed by philosophers and physicians in the Middle Ages or by some humanist intellectuals. In fact, the articles of the statutes (rubriche) are not short of theoretical considerations, for example, on justice, joint liability, good governance, the need for reform, the origins of law or respect for authority, but are lacking in general references – comparable to those found in texts like, to name one example, the hallowed classic De architectura by Leon Battista Alberti – to the protection of health through the provision of clean water. In other

51 Salvestrini 2017a: 60.
52 Bernat i Roca 1998; Rawcliffe 2013: esp. 27, 41-45, and, about water, 188-210; Coomans 2019. See also Carriero 2014. An online bibliographical resource is Geltner and Coomans (eds) access October 2023.
53 See Geltner 2019: esp. 2, 5-31, 34-67 (with special attention to statutes), and 100-112. On Bologna, see also Zaneri and Geltner 2020. In a different perspective, Zupko and Laures 1996: 114.
55 As shown in Lefebvre 1996. See also Naso 1982: 32-34; Park 1985; Leguay 1999: 48-50; Cavallo and Storey 2013 (with some texts from sixteenth to eighteenth centuries). A different interpretation of this topic is in Geltner 2019: 40, 52, 65-67.
56 See Dondarini 2003; Tanzini 2001; Tanzini 2021c.
57 “Need not stress here how important drains are in maintaining the sanitation of the city” (Alberti 1988: 4, 7: 67-68), mentioned in Geltner 2019: 41; see also 47-51, 65-67, 74, and 134-138. Considerations about the preservation of public health seem to emerge from the statute of the Podestà of Pistoia (1296) referred to by Geltner. However, I do not believe that the expression Quoniam civile est et expedit pro salute hominum has the precise meaning of public health as we understand it today, nor that it corresponded to the beliefs of physicians and theorists of the time [Zdekauer (ed.)
words, there is no explicit reference to ‘hygiene’ measures in the laws collected within the statutory corpora. Moreover, we must not forget what must have been the oldest ‘sapiential’ source in this regard for centuries, certainly known to notaries and jurists drafting statutes, as well as to the governing classes, namely the Gospel of Mark: _Nothing that goes into a person from outside can defile him, but the things that come out of a person are what defile him_ (Mark 7:15–16). This passage, in my opinion, says a lot about the beliefs of Italian legislators on the inherent dangers of ingesting polluted water.\(^{58}\)

The only evidence of any notion in the collective mind and, therefore, in the work of the statute drafters of the possible spread of diseases appears to have concerned the state of the air (often referred to in terms of _puza, fetor, fetidus, infectio aeris, malus odor, turpis putredo_),\(^{59}\) and therefore miasma theory\(^{60}\) – though in a very general sense and not to the extent of manifest and systematic recourse to ‘advice’ from ‘experts’\(^{61}\) – and conditions in which food could be sold at market (e.g. with the banning of the sale of animal meat that had not been properly butchered).\(^{62}\) Norm sources reveal less concern over the risks related to the use of dirty or infected waters, whose discharge into rivers, canals and the sea was authorised with no thought for the fact that the same waters were used for fishing and bathing.\(^{63}\) Moreover, those political treatises on good governance and the common good that touched on these issues did so by merging the search for bodily health with the pursuit of spiritual salvation and moral rigour, which were considered to be interrelated,\(^{64}\) and had been since the beginning of the Christian era.\(^{65}\) Moreover, it should not be overlooked that, although the general culture of the society and ruling classes of the communal age was in many respects broader than that of the earlier urban society, municipal institutions generally did not, with important exceptions, implement pervasive management of the school system, especially for the intermediate levels of education, perceived as essentially a private matter that concerned only the teachers and
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\(^{58}\) “In epoca medievale […] non si immaginava che l’acqua potesse essere un importante vettore di trasmissione di alcune malattie” (Mantelli and Temporelli 2007: 115).


\(^{60}\) See Fantoni 1990: 115; Vigarello 1996: 59-61, 69.


\(^{62}\) _Niuno ardisca di vendere nela città di Firençe carne d’alcuna bestia la quale di sua infermità overo per caso overo di fedita non usata sia morta_, with a clear equivalence between the animal’s death from disease and its inappropriate slaughter, therefore regardless of the health status of the livestock [Bambi, Salvestrini and Tanzini (eds) 2023 _Statuti della Repubblica fiorentina del 1355 in volgare_, t. I: _Statuto del Capitano del Popolo_: b. I. rubr. 92: 186]. This is a very frequent area of legislative intervention, to which Geltner strangely does not devote attention.

\(^{63}\) See below in this text. In general: Biraben 1985.

\(^{64}\) See, for example, the political programme of Giovanni da Viterbo’s _Liber de regimine civitatum_ (mentioned in Geltner 2019: 5–6). See also Sorcinelli 1998: 25–27, 32–42; _La ricerca del benessere individuale e sociale_ 2011; Rawcliffe 2013: 89-104 and 222-228 (water use); Smith 2018: 14-17.

\(^{65}\) See, for example, the opposition between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ water in Fulgentius of Ruspe (fifth/sixth centuries), Monceaux 1920: 335-339.
families of pupils. There is, therefore, no evidence of widespread theoretical education in what we now identify as ‘hygiene protection’.

Thus, we will limit ourselves to pointing out the existence of statutory articles on the pollution of water to show that large part of these requests did not generally come from medical treatises or from the regimina sanitatis, which the statutes do not suggest were necessarily known to their drafters or notaries, but from local customs rooted in empirical observations and/or ideas left behind by classical authors in the ius commune tradition.

4. Typological and territorial delimitations

The selected corpus of statutes we will examine consists of 183 municipal texts, mainly from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Only a few are from the fifteenth, sixteenth or later, and have been included because they contain and summarise earlier laws. Given the difference in political organisation between the semi-independent cities of northern and central Italy and those administrations that were under the monarchical thumb of the Kingdom of Naples – considering the fact that it had no local dominant city and no institutional and legislative dialectic between cities and towns – we have excluded municipalities in the South and we will refer to some of their legislative texts for comparison purposes only. With this in mind, we will also take in some of the codes of Sardinia. This island, in fact, despite poor levels of local urbanisation, was deeply influenced by the legislation of the cities of Pisa and Genoa, given the strong and prolonged political hegemony these two republics exerted over the four kingdoms (giudicati) and cities in the region. This is, by the way, to demonstrate that territorial policy and water management decisions conceived in the heart of communal Italy could be extended to regions which, although politically dependent, were socially, economically and morphologically very different.

Most of the selected statuta are written in Latin; only a few are in Italo-Romance or Catalan vernaculars. The corpus mainly includes modern printed editions of medieval texts and some digitised manuscripts. Its numerous and easily accessible published sources have enabled the wide-ranging geographical and chronological scope of this study. However, it is also important to evaluate the skew determined by a greater availability of published texts for some regions than for others. For example, fewer statutes will be examined for Lazio than for Lombardy, Veneto, Piedmont or Tuscany, because more statutes have been published and studied for the latter four regions.

68 On the culture of notaries in communal Italy, see Rosso 2018: 164-165; Salvestrini 2023c.
69 This topic can be extended from the statutes with territorial validity to those of guilds and other corporate institutions. See Doren 1940: 2: 127. See also Grossi 2000: 182-190.
70 95 from Northern Italy, 80 from the Centre, 6 from Sardinia, 1 from Sicily, and 1 from Dalmatian coast.
71 Abulafia 1977; Terenzi 2019; Terenzi 2022.
73 See Bocchi 1995: 73-75; Gamberini 2021; Seche 2021; Borghero and Salvestrini 2023.
74 On this topic, see Salvestrini and Tanzini 2015; Tanzini 2021d; Salvestrini 2023a; Salvestrini forthcoming a; Salvestrini forthcoming b.
75 Fortunately, most Italian cities and towns have experienced the modern printed edition of their municipal statutes [see Chelazzi 1943-2022; Albini et al. (eds) 1998, 2009, 2017; Raveggi and Tanzini (eds) 2001].
Some of the statute norms exemplify interesting hydraulic engineering schemes to run water technologies, which we will look at, focusing particularly on the use of watermills and fulling machines for cloth. Many texts regulate the use of waterways, since rivers were the arteries of the local economy and the medium for long- and short-distance communications. For our discussion we will look at several river cities. Part of the presentation will focus on how municipal authorities tried to avert flooding and protect inhabited centres; following on from that, the book will conclude with an analysis of some of the unfavourable choices which, owing to the overwhelming impact of political and cultural forces, effectively frustrated all normative solutions aimed at preventing natural water disasters.76

It is my contention that law codes regulating water resources provide a multidimensional interpretative key to contextualising the complex interactions between political, social and environmental factors. Although the theme of water supply has already been the object of historiographical analysis, the approach has mostly been localised to individual cities and specific territories and, moreover, in isolation from each other.77 Here I provide a comparative perspective by juxtaposing a broad range of law codes. The aim is for the selected statutory texts to cover a variety of cultural contexts and geographical areas: smaller towns and larger cities, central and northern regions of the peninsula, hilly and lowland locations. Many of the law codes examined here have never been studied before from a water management perspective. One interesting finding of this comparative study regards the use of similar terms to define the same concepts both in Latin and vernacular statutes written in cities and regions considerably distant from each other (for instance navis, stillicidium, guaçatorio and steccaia). This testifies to a widely shared, water-related, technical vocabulary and an active network of interconnected professional statute writers, despite cultural, geographical, and political differences.

76 See Alberth 2000; Canning (ed.) 2004; Matheus, Piccinni, Pinto and Varanini (eds) 2010.
77 Raggio 1995.
II

Verifying a Hypothesis

1. Environmental structures

By way of introduction, one other aspect should be emphasised. As we have said, through the lens of the water policies included, at least at planning level, in statutory provisions, I believe certain differences are apparent between the choices made by the governments of cities and smaller centres in northern Italy and the policies pursued in the centre of the peninsula; in other words, across the north-south divide of the Tuscan-Emilian and Tuscany-Romagna Apennines, regardless of whether located in hilly, flat, river or coastal areas.¹ We will try to show that these differences were based on heavier public intervention (by the towns’ governing institutions and their normative texts) in the supply and distribution of water, and irrigation in areas of central Italy and Sardinia; whereas in the cities and smaller centres of the Po region there was more freedom for private parties to take action without having close connections with local administrative orientations and alignments.

This observation should also be linked – without giving in to excesses of environmental, geographical and climatic determinism² – to the greater availability of water in the north (continental Italy) than in the centre and south (peninsular Italy and Sardinia).³ Indeed, the Po plain is a vast, integrated system with a central collector of water in the form of the Po River, almost 700 kilometres long, which receives more than 140 tributaries, each supplied by lakes and other basins located mainly on the Alpine arc (Transpadana) and, in the south, along the northern Apennines (Cispadana).⁴ An important supply of water also comes from groundwater aquifers, such as the Bacchiglione and Livenza basins in the Veneto area.

Until the nineteenth century, the main stream maintained an average flow rate of around 400 metres per second, which made saltwater intrusion from the delta in the Adriatic Sea relatively limited, enabling extensive canal systems and irrigation of the countryside.⁵ This abundance of water was particularly evident in medieval times and in the modern era. Indeed, even in the midst of the eighteenth century, the end section of the great waterway was similar to that of today’s Rhine in Germany (about 2,700 cubic metres per second, whereas today it is no more than 1,350), the distance between the banks was significantly greater, and it had far more branches along its entire course.⁶

In the vast depression dug out by the Po, there is also a large section of low hills and high plains closer to the ranges and delimited by the belt of lowland springs known as risorgive (natural) and fontanili (human-made), which stretches from central Piedmont to the Po-

¹ On the liminal value of this mountain range, see Di Stefano 2012; Foschi (ed.) 2022; Panero and Pinto (eds) 2023.
⁴ Strabo 1928: V. 4. c. 212.
⁵ See Andenna 2018.
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Veneto and Friuli area. This belt is roughly 10 to 30 kilometres wide and formed along the line where permeable and impermeable soils meet. Along this stretch can be found all the points where water rises to the surface, due to overflow, causing the water table to emerge. The belt runs along the low Alps (upper line) and also, for a shorter section, along the Tuscan-Emilian Apennines (lower line). Both of these sections of territory appear drier where, in the area south of the subalpine line and north of the sub-Apennine line, water discharge caused by changes in the composition of river drift and by the gentler slope of the terrain, not to mention human intervention often dating far back in time, have scored the countryside with a dense network of long and short waterways. These structures include the two largest canals in Lombardy. The first was the Naviglio Grande, which was excavated between 1177 and 1272. It was derived from the Ticino River and led to Milan, irrigating the western part of the region. The second was the Muzza Canal (twelfth and thirteenth centuries), which was derived from the river Adda and crossed the Lodigiano area. Branching from these two large canals were numerous irrigation ditches (rogge) that brought water to almost all localities in the plain. The artificial canals were accompanied in medieval times by numerous pools, lowland lakes and marshes, the products of soil subsidence to the right and the left of the Po and along the Adriatic coastline. These areas opened up into sub-regions that were mostly amphibious, such as the river delta itself and the entire Ferrara and Ravenna territories, or were completely marsh-ridden, such as the large Venetian Lagoon and those of Marano and Grado in Friuli, or Lakes Comacchio and Volano in Romagna. Near the Adriatic coast, the valley bottoms were of two types: freshwater and saltwater.

The situation with the water network south of the Tuscan-Emilian and Tuscany-Romagna Apennines is different. Here, in fact, the rivers are generally torrential (although with a much higher flow rate in the past), and are relatively modest in length, given the narrowness of the Italian peninsula. The scarcity of heavy rainfall, except for short periods and sometimes with disastrous consequences, together with an almost total absence of glaciers on the Apennines to retain water during the coldest months and release it in the warm season, have led to difficult-to-resolve problems in Tuscany, Umbria, Marche and Abruzzo regarding the steadiness of runoff and the use of rivers as reserves of water and as waterways. Moreover, the paucity of flat spaces (lower Valdarno between Florence and Pisa, Val di Chiana, middle Tiber valley and the Roman countryside, Tyrrhenian Maremma, Fucino depression in Abruzzo) has severely limited or prevented the formation of springs (risorgive), and therefore the accumulation and the slower release of water. This situation also applies to Sardinia. In several regions of central and southern Italy, the supply and storage of water required special characteristics, including the incorporation of buildings and rocky underground structures into settlements, architectural designs and housing modules.

---

8 Cazzola 2021: 19-33, 85-86.
13 Borghero and Salvestrini 2023.
14 De Minicis 2020.
In conclusion, the two macro Italian areas we have highlighted differ, with a prevailing regime of concentration – accumulation of water resources in reservoirs and transport infrastructures – in the south, and a prevailing regime of dispersion – given the greater availability of natural resources – in the north. A similar direction is proposed by Maire Vigueur, who draws a distinction between the cities of northern Italy rich mainly in wells, which intercepted water that was not too deep, and the hilly cities of central Italy with numerous fountains that benefited from aqueducts built in the ‘Roman style’. This reality, in Mocarelli’s opinion, certainly contributed to the shaping of the economic divide between northern and southern Italy in modern and contemporary times. Indirect proof of the situation described also comes from the use of artificial floods as a strategy of war. This was a recurring practice in the Po area up to at least the twelfth century, one which, in Tuscany and central Italy, was adopted rarely and with unsuccessful consequences in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In addition, the use of moats built for defensive purposes close to city walls played a significant strategic role in cities such as Florence, but never as important as it was for communal and Visconti Milan, for example. South of the Apennines the only actual use of water in the military field was the transportation of supplies along rivers, as was the case in fourteenth-century Sardinia. More generally, naval clashes on rivers were recurring forms of battle in northern Italy, but almost completely absent in the centre of the peninsula.

2. A ‘frontier’ in the ecosystem and regulatory provisions

The situation described diverges from Wittfogel’s famous 1957 theory (taken up in the 1980s by Worster), which was centred on the hypothesis of an existing relationship between the presence of irrigation systems and the emergence of centralised political authority. It postulated that, under certain conditions, large-scale irrigation systems lead to centralised coordination and administrative bureaucracies, which, in turn, result in greater political integration. According to this interpretation, flood control in low-lying river valleys was a big incentive for ‘state formation’ as a way of coping with water scarcity.

As Glick has pointed out, this author’s thesis appears valid, in reality, only under certain conditions that presuppose arid regions and large rivers which need to be regulated by strong centralised powers, such as Mesopotamia or Egypt. And indeed, it is important to make all the necessary distinctions between the mostly Asian contexts presented by Wittfogel and the reality of late medieval Italy. Nevertheless, I believe that where there were well-established rules, as in the case of the communes, the centralising intervention of government authorities to organise the supply of water and carry out public works to regulate and facilitate its distribution seems to have been more common in upland areas of central Italy, where water
was scarce and had to be intercepted before its rapid descent into the valley. Meanwhile, in the
flatlands, especially in the Po area, with their complex and extensive hydrographic networks
where water flowed slowly but more abundantly along canals and riverbeds, there was more
scope for private withdrawals and diversions, hence, for private initiative in the management
of the resource. According to Chiappa Mauri, this is the reason why the statutes of important
centres such as Cremona and Mantua appear singularly poor in terms of water management.26

In addition to this, I believe, the longer history of communal institutions in the towns and cities
of central Italy than could be boasted by their northern counterparts meant that municipal
magistrates had more time to manage the supply of water, the economic exploitation of rivers,
and flood defences, at least until the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when the seigniorial
regimes began to take over these sectors of social life and gradually removed the governance
of water from the sphere of the statutes also in Tuscia, Umbria or Lazio.27

Obviously, the governing regimes had control over water everywhere, both north and south
of the Apennines. This control was part of an Öffentlichkeit ('public sphere'), meaning shared
space, as well as public/governmental domain.28 This is clear from the fact that statutes
governed the lives of individuals and, as Geltner has rightly pointed out, constantly invaded
the ‘private’ sphere to protect the ‘common’ good.29 Geltner’s detailed work also highlights
that cities and small communities everywhere introduced magistrates (often called viarii and
in smaller centres camparii) who oversaw the use of water resources, among other sectors.30

However, although part of the wider agricultural economy, the public nature of water
management in central Italy and the private enterprise seen in the Po region did not necessarily
generate, as Wittfogel claims, authoritarian regimes similar to the hydraulic civilisations of
Asia.31 If anything, the German scholar’s perspective, which places more emphasis on human
activity than on geography, could apply to the area under examination, if we consider man’s
work moulding and modifying the environment, in an attempt to make up for the natural
shortage of water, with aqueducts and artificial sources. This is done by drawing on traditions
and cultural tendencies belonging to the community and by incorporating into the relatively
standardised statutes model additional features that are specific to the local ecosystem and
dependent on the availability of resources, and the convictions and demands expressed by the
local community to which the rules apply.

The purpose of this book is not to re-assert the well-known fact that water management in
central and northern Italy was a political action, just as it was in the British Isles, France, the
various contexts of the Iberian peninsula32 and, most of all, in the Netherlands – which has

26 Chiappa Mauri 2003a: 240 writes in this regard: “si può affermare che tanto più il contado [lombardo] fosse ricco
d’acqua e il rifornimento per gli usi primari agevole, tanto più rattrappite fossero le competenze che trovano
espressione negli Statuti”.
28 On this concept, developed by Habermas for the modern age and extended historiographically to the medieval
period, see Habermas 1965; Boucheron and Offenstadt 2011; Geltner 2019: 22–24, 35, 72.
29 Geltner 2019: 41–47.
31 This is something the author himself admits underlining that Venice, the Po plain and Holland underwent
important changes to their hydrogeological structure without developing government-run ‘hydraulic systems’ or
forms of ownership comparable to those in the East (Wittfogel 1957: 88–90).
32 Guillerme 1985; Glick 1996; Racine 1986; Delort and Walter 2001; Campopiano and Menant 2015: 301–307; Furió
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in fact been compared with the Po valley\textsuperscript{33} – where public and private actors squabbled and haggled over the management of a resource that would come to define the country’s identity.\textsuperscript{34}

Our focus will be on the way the interplay of the choices made by a relatively effective public authority, certain traditions, and objective environmental conditions produced different or similar forms of water management interventions at local level. Only a large-scale comparison based on relatively uniform sources from a broad territorial context will shed light on any such interventions.

On the other hand, bearing in mind the differences between the various cities and regions of communal Italy, we will try to ascertain the extent to which the laws collected into statutes reflected specific environmental management programmes, irrespective of their actual implementation.\textsuperscript{35} Rather than looking at the effects of the (bio)politics (to use a term coined by Foucault),\textsuperscript{36} the focus will be on the programmes, meaning the planning, and therefore on the intentions of the local (bio)power, which is what is most clearly reflected in the legislative sources of \textit{ius proprium}.

\textsuperscript{2015; Morgan 2017.}

\textsuperscript{33} Curtis and Campopiano 2013.

\textsuperscript{34} Kaijser 2002; TeBrake 2002 (on the relationship between government choices and the conditioning of technological culture); van Dam 2010. See also van der Linden 1984: 667–668, and Mostert 2020, who show, however, that water only became a feature of the Dutch identity during modern and contemporary times.

\textsuperscript{35} On the effective application of statutory law, see Geltner 2019: 38–39; Grillo 2021b.

\textsuperscript{36} Foucault 1997:\textsuperscript{2} 73.
III

Legal Norms for Water Management: The Urban Context

1. Water supply

The communal statutory legislation shows that among the primary concerns of municipal governments were: the supply of water for domestic and work purposes (both inside and outside the built environment), well digging, building and protecting water reservoirs, opening and preserving mains and canals, and the management of sources of fresh water.¹

A key goal of local administrations was to ensure the supply of water to both the urban and rural populations and, more precisely, to town dwellers and farmers settling in areas under the control of a privileged group of families.² The fourteenth-century statutes of Milan regulating roads and water stated the paramount necessity for a suitable natural flow of water from the Olona, one of the main rivers in the Lombard region, to power watermills and irrigate fields (Como se debbe multiplicare l’acqua nel lecto de la Olona). In the thirteenth century, Bologna, which is located in the Po valley on the northern edge of the Apennine mountains, enacted legislative norms whereby the superintendent of roads and waters (praepositus stratis et aquis) would take an oath to oversee the continuity of the water supply to the city. Similarly, the 1265 law of Reggio, the 1327 statute of Verona, the 1359 code of Forlì and the Paduan statute of 1362 (which upheld certain thirteenth-century rules) announced that one of the main responsibilities of the podestà (the commune’s chief civic magistrate) was to supervise the running of the public rivers, canals and the network of sources of fresh water, and to coordinate their conservation.³ Bergamo’s 1353 statute stated that one of the civic authorities’ responsibilities was to oversee the collection and distribution of water resources.⁴ Similarly, Parma’s municipal governing bodies were required to provide all townspeople with equal access to water.⁵ The statute of this Emilian city required the podestà to appoint a dugarolo, that is, a worker in charge of water conduction, and a notary to record his activities, for each of the gates that opened in the city walls.⁶

In central Italy, the statutes of Rome’s popular regime, which date to 1363, stated that the city’s magistrates (marescalli Curie Capitolii) were required to take care of waterways and, in

---

¹ For a comparison with pre-industrial England and the court of Savoy, see Rawcliffe 2013: 180-188, and Pibiri (ed.) 2018: 69.
² See Guillerme 2015; Maire Vigueur 2023: 223.
particular, the Claudian Water (Aqua Claudia) and the ancient Aqua Virgo pipeline, one of the eleven ancient Roman aqueducts, restored during the late Middle Ages and still existing today (Fig. 1 and 2). A clear example of hydraulic engineering and of how rivers were used as a source of hydropower can be seen in the 1276 statute of Verona. It set out the canalisation of the river water bodies of Fiumicello de Monte Aureo and extension up to Campomarcio, close to the centre of the urban area. This code also decreed that only one master (unus bonus magister solus) should set up and be in charge of the water supply and distribution system consisting of a network of moats and pipelines. Verona, whose patron saint, Zeno, is also recognised in liturgical calendars as the protector of freshwater fishermen, is unique among the cases examined in northern Italy. A lowland city close to the Alpine range, its late-medieval constitutional legislation mentions a case of direct intervention taken by the commune for the construction and management of major water supply infrastructure.

In any case, the fact that magistrates had to resort to expert inçigneriis, real professionals capable of assisting them in the control of dykes, canals and other hydraulic infrastructures, is a recurrent prescription in the statutes of the Po Valley area during the transition from the thirteenth to the fourteenth centuries. The long heading to the section on the duties of the podesta in these matters contained in the Modenese statutes of 1327 demonstrates this. Experts needed to be called in for this sphere of activity, since politicians did not consider themselves to be sufficiently qualified for the requirements they set out in law.

2. Towns and cities of the plains

During the Middle Ages, towns and cities built on level ground, mainly around the Po valley, had similar situations to that of modern-day Venice, in that they could count on a sufficient inflow of water to meet the needs of the local population. These centres and their neighbouring areas were transected by a series of torrents and canals, which facilitated water collection, internal navigation, the use of water-driven machinery and waste disposal. This unusual landscape was the result of the gradual and significant transformation of a hydrogeological environment that was mostly surrounded by wetlands during the early medieval period. The initiative stemmed from the combined wills of lay and ecclesiastical landowners and rural communities. Milan, for instance, had artificial canals, including the so-called navigli, built from the thirteenth century onwards at the behest of the ruling classes of the Commune and, later, by the Visconti and Sforza families. Its waters were praised by

9 See also Canzian 2019: 19.
10 Campori 1864 Statuta civitatis Mutine: b. IV. rubr. 188. See also Cazzola 2021: 86-87.
13 Biscaro 1908; Maire Vigueur 2023: 256-259.
the poet Bonvesin de la Riva at the end of the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{14} On the strength of the imperial concession of rights over the river Oglio obtained in 1329, Cremona had built itself a branch canal, the \textit{Naviglio Civico}, thanks to the actions of Azzone Visconti, lord of the city. The statute of 1339, promulgated four years after the local government had lost its communal autonomy to the lords of Milan, regulated the cleaning of the canals (dugali), which tended to become silted. This was to prevent floods and facilitate navigation.\textsuperscript{15} Other cities, including Padua, Verona, Parma and Bologna, also featured waterway networks.\textsuperscript{16} In particular, the then young communal institutions of Padua undertook major works in 1142 to divert the waters of the Brenta River, with the aim of opening a new river communication route in the direction of Venice. Later, between 1189 and 1201, they built a long hanging canal with landfill, which connected the city to the fortified town of Monselice, a kind of Paduan bridgehead on the Adige River, which became easy to reach by boat as a result of this construction.\textsuperscript{17} On the other side of the Apennines, in Florence and Pisa, the river Arno formed a fluvial system made up of tributary streams and artificial trenches.\textsuperscript{18}

In northern and central cities, drinking water was supplied from private and public wells and reservoirs. Less frequently, it came from aqueducts, some of which dated to the Roman period.\textsuperscript{19} Law codes from early fourteenth-century Modena (Emilia region) established that water flowing from the Apennine hills to the south of the city in the Po valley was to be stored in the commune’s cistern located alongside a public road, equidistant from the city’s two main gates, ensuring easy access to it.\textsuperscript{20} Thus, the norm confirmed the right established in \textit{ius commune} to draw freely from public reservoirs (\textit{ius aquae ductus}). Reservoirs were sometimes called \textit{castella aquae} or \textit{aquatoria}, and many had been in existence since ancient times.\textsuperscript{21} Coeval normative legislation from Ravenna (Romagna region) stated that public wells had to be maintained and that the population living in the areas around the infrastructures was responsible for cleaning them in summer and for supplying \textit{mezzine} (buckets used to collect water).\textsuperscript{22} The Florence statutes of 1325 likewise required annual cleaning of public and private wells to ensure a sufficient supply of water suitable for human use.\textsuperscript{23} The collection of legislation from the Tuscan hill town of Santa Maria a Monte, close to the Arno River valley in the Pisa area (1391) contains stipulations that such maintenance was to be carried out in August, when water basin levels were lower.\textsuperscript{24} The 1250 municipal statute of Bologna prescribed that wells were to be fitted with a pulley and an iron chain for collecting water.\textsuperscript{25} Pistoia, a city in the Tuscan lowlands with no large rivers nearby, but at the southern foothills of the Apennines, had to rely on aqueducts from nearby centres, such as Montale and Serravalle.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{15} Statuta et ordinamenta communis Cremonae: 152: 205-206.
\textsuperscript{16} Varanini 1988: 335; Pesci and Ugolini (eds) 1997; Zanotti 2000. See also Pini 1993: 15-38.
\textsuperscript{17} Simonetti 2022: 160-168. See also Bortolami 2003; Canzian 2014: 225; Tognana 2019: 44-45.
\textsuperscript{18} Redi 1991; Salvestrini 2005; Salvestrini 2009a; Salvestrini 2012.
\textsuperscript{20} Casini (ed.) 1963 Statuto del Popolo del Comune di Santa Maria a Monte: rubr. 99: 133.
\textsuperscript{22} Vicini (ed.) 1929-32 \textit{Respublica Mutinensis}: 143.
The regulatory norms found in the municipal *Breve et ordinamenta Populi Pistorii* of 1284 stated that the network of urban trenches, conduits and canals (*viae circularum*) were to be supplied continuously with water from mountain streams.\(^{27}\)

Normative regulations of the commune of Venice (the 1242 statutes survive in a manuscript datable to 1281) present an unusual scenario.\(^{28}\) In the medieval city, water management was about urban metabolism of fresh water intake and the flushing of salt water canals.\(^{29}\) The need for fresh water was met by numerous wells and rainwater cisterns located in *campi* and *campielli* (squares).\(^{30}\) The supply system involved filtering rainwater through sand. The Serenissima ordered the digging of no fewer than 50 cisterns in 1325 alone.\(^{31}\) At the time, water resource management was a strictly internal issue for the city authorities, as Venice did not have large extra-territorial dominions to administer. It was only with the acquisition of the *Terraferma* (Veneto region), from the early fifteenth century onwards, that the city provided itself with stable magistrates in charge of controlling the water supply. In particular, the Savij a le Aque derived their origin from a 1415 decree, whereby the *Consejo dei Diese*, the supreme criminal and police authority, ordered the establishment of a board of six magistrates, whose duties included overseeing the maintenance and defence of the lidos, the harbour inlets, and excavation of inland canals.\(^{32}\) On the other hand, it was in fact water that ensured Venice’s total independence. According to local jurists interpreting Roman law, the Venetian government had no higher authority precisely because the city was built on the waters of the sea and its shores (*litora*). Being by definition *res communes omnium*, the property of all men,\(^{33}\) shores were prone to falling under the dominion of anyone who erected buildings there (it was not possible on *res publicae*, which did not belong to everyone, but to the organised community that was the ‘state’).\(^{34}\) We should also remember that a new conception of property law had begun to gather pace from the twelfth century, whereby possession was no longer perceived as existing in its natural state, and thus the consequence of God’s will, but rather only as the result of man’s desire for appropriation.\(^{35}\)

Nevertheless, the Venice government did not bother to promulgate official statutory measures on the subject of freshwaters. It is noteworthy that in the 1242 statutes the only reference to the topic is the ban on hindering the flow of water in canals.\(^{36}\) It is safe to assume that the existence of non-statutory norms and a well-designed system of water tanks and wells –


\(^{28}\) See Salvestrini and Tanzini 2015: 278-279. On the previous Venetian regulations, Pitzorno 1913.

\(^{29}\) Ravegnani 2020: 13-14.

\(^{30}\) Rizzi 1982.

\(^{31}\) See Crouzet Pavan 2019.

\(^{32}\) See Besta 1899: 159, 161.

\(^{33}\) According to the *summa divisio* of the jurist Marcianus accepted in the *Digesta*, *res* were divided as follows: 1) *res communes omnium*, belonging to everyone by natural law; 2) *res publica*, belonging to the Roman people; 3) *res universitatis* belonging to the community; 4) *res nullius* – such as wild animals – belonging to no one, among which, as we know from another fragment, Marcianus also included *res sacrae*, *religiøsa* and *sancta*; 5) *res privatae* belonging to private individuals (see *Instit.* 2.1.1; Dell’Oro 1962-63; Dani 2013: 31-32; Dani 2020: 40).

\(^{34}\) *Circa aedifica quero numquid sit licium aedificare in mari sicut in litore? Et dico quod sic eadem ratione et ita Veneti faciunt, qui sunt fundati in mari et de iure gentium civitates in mari aedificatae sunt ipsorum qui aedificant [...] haec ratione Veneti prætentunt libertatem, quia non aedificaverunt in solo alicuius* (Baldo degli Ubaldi 1616: 45). See also Sini 2008 (access October 2023); Schlavon 2011: 126-129; Cangelosi 2021.


from 1386 the *corporazione degli acquaroli* (the guild of water suppliers) made sure the city had enough water throughout the year – were such that no further code chapters were required.  

3. Hill towns

Unlike lowland cities, the fairly numerous inland hill towns that were not built alongside rivers had to develop, especially in central Italy, a range of different solutions to ensure a safe and reliable supply of water. This could only be achieved through a complex and expensive hydraulic system of canalisation to store and release water in a controlled manner via distribution basins and cisterns commonly located at the end of an aqueduct (*caput aquae*) and in the centre of the communities (*in platea Communis*).  

The statute of Fucecchio, a hill town in Tuscan Valdarno, expressly stated that a stone fountain was to be built at the *cassero*, the oldest part of the town, and paid for by the municipality and the town residents. Due to seasonal changes and in order to avoid the frequent floods, the 1342 Perugia statutes (promulgated in the year of the great rains that hit central and northern Italy) required the course of the Nestóre stream to be diverted and straightened to ensure sufficient quantities of running water during the summer and non-excessive amounts in autumn. An earlier code of the same city from 1262 provides evidence of the care given to waterworks and the functionality of reservoirs of water and *canaligia* (a system of pipelines and conduits), which were managed by specially appointed *magistri*.

Mainly in central Italy, city governments erected monumental fountains (*fonti* and *fontane*) in the middle of their squares in celebration of constituted power and local identity. The construction of hydraulic infrastructures, primarily aqueducts and fountains, could play a similar role of symbolic representation to the erection of the cathedral, as has been observed for Orvieto. It was above all the People’s Regimes that, from the second half of the thirteenth century, initiated this kind of buildings, thanks to the fact that the ranks of this political faction included merchant entrepreneurs and other professionals capable of planning and managing important public works. The idea was to incorporate beauty and aesthetics into the structures designed and built for important essentials (water supply). I fully agree with Maire Vigueur that almost all of the fountains from the communal period preserved today are part of the historical-artistic heritage of the hill towns located in central Italy. Suffice it to say that most Umbrian towns acquired a monumental fountain in the short period between 1275 and 1285. The prevalence of medieval public fountains in this and neighbouring countries is a numerical fact that clearly emerges from the extensive and documented repertoire compiled by Visentin. Only a few highland or valley floor towns in the Po Valley and pre-alpine area

---

37 See Ciriacono 2018a; Maire Vigueur 2023: 229-231.
38 Vannucchi 2009: 14; Bartoli Langeli and Merli 2013.
45 Maire Vigueur 2023: 240-252. This author introduces another distinction: that between monumental fountains built primarily for aesthetic and ornamental reasons and those made especially for practical motivations, a distinction which, however, I find less incisive. Utility and decorum, in fact, I believe, almost always proceeded at the same time.
have significant examples of medieval fountains – primarily Brescia (the Statue-Fountain of the Bishop Maggi, 1309-17) and Belluno –, which, however, hardly ever achieve the structural articulation and decorative relief of the constructions in central Italy.47

We therefore focus our attention on this part of the country. The statute of Arezzo, for instance, decreed in 1327 – the year the lord of the city, Bishop Tarlati, tried, though not without difficulty, to consolidate the political role of his family – the construction of a public well just outside one of the town’s gates, in the exact location of a source of fresh water (cum ibi sit vena aquifera), which was to have a guaçatorio, that is, a space to wash animals and carts.49 Siena’s situation was unique, owing to its topography. Being an inland hill town located in an area particularly poor in water, it faced challenging water supply problems, which were only partly resolved, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, by a network of tunnels and underground conduits with settling tanks called Bottini.50 The commune’s Costituto of 1309-10 regulated the payment due to vendors who sold water in barrels on public streets and the city’s squares, a clear indicator of the scarcity of clean water.51 Masonry fountains built in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by the communal government played a major role in supplying the city with water and characterising the urban architectural aesthetic.52 The aforementioned Costituto contains a specific norm to protect the strategic fountain of Pescaia (Fig. 3) located just outside the city walls. Also mentioned is the appointment of two officials to monitor pack animals and to ensure they had access to the fountain and could be watered safely (si che commodamente possano andare le bestie ad abeverare, et lavatoio et guaçatoio si facciano ine).53 The statutes of Siena devoted appositely written sections to the maintenance of all urban and suburban fountains (for instance Fonte Branda – Fig. 4, Fonti di Follonica, Fonte di Porta Ovile, Fonte Nuova, the suburban Fonte Becci),54 and prompted the construction of private cisterns.55 The early fourteenth-century code of the Capitano del Popolo contains interesting jargon and a set of technical terms regarding access to water. These include expressions such as fontana guazatorria, lavatoriae, pescines to emphasise that specific fountains or sections of them could be used to draw either drinking water or water for washing objects and animals.56

Apart from the case of Cortona and its thirteenth-century fountain decorated with tiles depicting the Months of the year, now destroyed,57 another upland town in central Italy which

52 Bargagli Petrucci 1906; Balestracci and Piccinni 1977.
54 Salem Elsheikh (ed.) 2002 Il Costituto del Comune di Siena volgarizzato: t. 2. b. III. rubr. 26: 13; t. 2. b. III. rubr. 96-110: 43-49; D’acconciare la fonte da Montecchio; Di fare la fonte ne la contrada di Casciano; Di rivedere le fonti dintorno a la città di Siena (ivi, t. 2. b. III. rubr. 27, 28, 111: 13-14, 50; see also rubr. 112-139: 50-62). On the fountains see Visentin 2016: 98-121.
55 De la pecunia la quale si die dare a coloro e’ quali faranno ... citerne ne la città et borghi; De’ consorti de le case e’ quali volessero fare citerne [Salem Elsheikh (ed.) 2002 Il Costituto del Comune di Siena volgarizzato: t. 2. b. III. rubr. 137, 138: 61].
56 Ciampoli (ed.) 1984 Il Capitano del Popolo a Siena: b. I. 312; b. IV. 333, 387, 392-393, 398: 73, 117-119. These were common terminologies. The construction of a guaçatore annexed to an urban source was, for example, provided for in the Reggio Emilia statute of 1265 [Campanini and Vasina (eds) 1997 I rubricari degli statuti comunali di Reggio Emilia: 39].
57 Visentin 2016: 275-283.
carefully planned water provision through monumental infrastructures was L’Aquila, an atypical commune co-administered by local authorities and monarchs in Naples.\(^58\) The Fontana della Riviera, known today as Fontana delle Novantanove cannelle (Fig. 5), is a famous public fountain in the town that dates back to the thirteenth century.\(^59\) In addition to being a manifestation of the efforts made by civic magistrates in the area of water resource management, it is also a landmark of the meticulous and strategic initiatives of the communal administration. The municipal statutes of 1313 proclaimed a series of regulations for the maintenance of the aqueducts which supplied water to the local community and for conveyance to the various city districts (Quod conductus aque dividatur per Quarteria).\(^60\) Similarly, in Perugia, the main fountain (Fontana Maggiore), a masterpiece by Nicola and Giovanni Pisano (1277-78), was a major public work commissioned by the commune for the main square, significantly located at the end of a massive aqueduct that had required construction work lasting over twenty years (Fig. 6).\(^61\) On the rim of the upper basin of this monument is a long inscription in Latin hexameters that emphasises the importance of the water supply for this city, and culminates with the following invocation: “May He who sits above the stars preserve the waters” (cons[er] vet latices q[u] sup[er] a[s]tra sedet).\(^62\) This monumental structure must be closely related to the dismembered fountain a piè di piazza, intended above all for everyday use, but no less ornate than the Fontana Maggiore.\(^63\)

Also emblematic is the case of Massa Marittima (southern Tuscany), whose monumental fountain (1265) bears the rare pictorial decorative motif of trees laden with phalluses, symbolising fertility in a figurative context of possible Etruscan, or South Tyrolean and Ghibelline, origin (Fig. 7 and 8).\(^64\) In the Sardinian city of Sassari, the Fontana del Rosello was ‘monumentalised’ at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but had already been strategically important three hundred years earlier (Fig. 9).\(^65\) In San Gimignano (central Tuscany), one of the most populous and dynamic ‘minor centres’ of communal Italy, the public cistern was built in the middle of the market square in 1273, as the centrepiece of one of the largest collective spaces, second only to the area on which the mother church and the town hall were located (Fig. 10 and 11). Mentioned in the 1314 statutes, this construction was extended during those years, and the well above it became a monumental presence.\(^66\) In a similar position to that of San Gimignano was the decorated cistern built between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries in the centre of the market square, known as Piazza della Sala, in Pistoia. It is no coincidence that during the sixteenth century a stone lion representing the dominant authority of the municipality of Florence was placed above this structure, considered one of the most prominent in the city (Fig. 12).\(^67\) The last structures we can mention are: the thirteenth-century three-arched Fons

\(^{58}\) Terenzi 2016.
\(^{59}\) Visentin 2016: 169-193
\(^{60}\) Clementi (ed.) 1977. Statuta Civitatis Aquile, rubr. 280-284: 188-190; see also rubr. 93, 255, 286-290: 77-78, 175, 190-192; Bologna 1997; Berardi 2005: 155.
\(^{63}\) Sperandio 2005; Visentin 2016: 305-325.
\(^{65}\) Cadinu 2015.
\(^{67}\) See Perazzi, Millemaci and Taddei 2010.
Marosus in Genoa, now no longer existing, the fountain installed inside the Palazzo dei Consoli in Gubbio in the 1330s, and the fifteenth-century Fonte Gaia in Siena, sculpted by Iacopo della Quercia and located in Piazza del Campo, at the physical and political centre of the city.68

Monumental structures were erected primarily in urban communes.69 Nevertheless, even in a small town like Stroncone (Terni), the large cistern built in the main square from 1395 was accompanied by a similar monumental fountain completed during the sixteenth century (Fig. 13 and 14).70 Other interesting examples in this regard are the fountains in the Viterbo area, such as the Fontana dell’Olmo in San Martino al Cimino (thirteenth c.), the Fontana di Porta Tiberina in Vitorchiano (fourteenth c.), the Fontana Vecchia in Soriano al Cimino (fifteenth c.), and the Fontana Nova in Tarquinia (fourteenth c.). The fourteenth-century fountain in the Abruzzo village of Fontecchio, the lost Communal Fountain of Spoleto (ca. 1279), and the Fontana di Piazza dei Priori in Narni (TR, 1303) are clearly inspired by the Viterbo structures and Perugian masterpieces (Fig. 15).71

The town of San Gimignano had also a large public fountain near its outer walls, installed above several springs at the foot of the hill on which it stood (Fig. 16 and 17). It was a complex structure, built between 1232 and the end of the thirteenth century and based on the architecture of Sienese fountains, which could be reached via a specially built road.72 It was designed so that water could be drawn on several levels: drinking water at the top; for watering animals below that; and a third level for washing clothes. Waste water was conveyed into nearby streams and partly collected in irrigation tanks.73 According to the statutes of 1255 and 1314, a fountain, referred to as di Docciola supplied water for domestic use only.74 Lastly, we know, again from the statutes, that the commune of San Gimignano planned and began construction of an aqueduct to carry water not only to the main centre, but also to other localities in the territory.75

The architectural model of Sienese fonti was also used for the fountains in the nearby hill communities of Poggibonsi (SI, Fonte delle Fate, Fig. 18), Piombino (LI, Fonti di Marina, thirteenth c.), Montieri (GR, Fonti di Sopra and Fonti di Sotto, thirteenth c.), Montalcino (SI, Fonti Castellane, thirteenth c.), and Volterra (PI, Fonti di Docciola, Fonte di San Felice, Fig. 19 and 20), built near natural springs (vene) and featuring arches and basins.76 The thirteenth-century statutes of Volterra stipulated that the above-mentioned di Docciola fountain at Valleebuona, where the Roman theatre and an ancient spa complex stood, was to have a trough for pack animals (not separate from the one for humans), a guacçatorium and a wash basin with easy access for anyone carrying jars, barrels or other receptacles.77

76 La Fonte delle Fate a Poggibonsi 1990; Visentin 2016: 45-46, 81-91, 96-98, 123-125, 127-132.
Very similar architecture is found in the eight-arched Fonte di Scannebecco in Todi (PG, thirteenth-century, Fig. 21), from the name of Scannabecco dei Fagnani da Bologna, podestà of the town, and the three-arched fountain known as della Valle in Gagliano Aterno, near L’Aquila, commissioned during the first half of the fourteenth century by Countess Isabella d’Acquaviva (Fig. 22). Of simpler but similar design are the ancient fountains located in Gubbio (PG, Fonte al Corso, 1293), in Atri (TE, Fonte Canale, fourteenth c.), in Arischia (AQ, Fonte degli Archi, fourteenth c.), in Scanno (AQ, Fontana Sarracco, fourteenth c.), in Pennapiedimonte (CH, thirteenth-fourteenth c.), and in Fermo (Fonte Falleria, 1309). Finally, a remarkable elegance and great uniformity, marked by the orderly succession of round arches opened in a massive masonry, characterise the fountains of the Marche: Fermo (Fonte di Sfumico, 1320), Macerata (Fonte Maggiore, 1326), Ripatransone (AP, Fonti, fourteenth c.). Also worthy of note is the complex fountain of the Fraterna in Isernia, whose unique portico structure is the thirteenth century and modern result of the recomposition of numerous architectural elements, some of which certainly come from medieval buildings in the city (Fig. 23).

The aforementioned Viterbo, a town in southern Tuscia less than 70 kilometres from Rome along the Via Francigena, installed an important aqueduct in the early thirteenth century, about 10 kilometres in length, at a place known as Pietrarre, in turn originating from a Roman infrastructure, which supplied a large public fountain (Fontana Grande or Fonte del Sepale, Fig. 24). This structure and other aqueducci or alvei sub terra that formed a widespread water network supplying around twelve fountains are mentioned in the 1251 statutes, which stipulated that they were to be maintained constantly (De conductis aptandis et alveis, De aqua fluenda in abbeveratorio Sunçe, De purgatione fontis Sepalis). Known for its hot springs, Viterbo was the site of an important papal residence. In 1268, the commune had an aqueduct built specially for this building by the capitano del Popolo, Viscount Gatti. This construction had one part suspended on arches and several sections of penstock displaying significant engineering and architectural work consistent with the most advanced principles of hydraulics widespread in the towns and cities of central Italy during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Other examples that can be given, in fact, do not only concern the ancient territory of Tyrrenhian Tuscia. It emerges (from the 1296 statutes) that the water supply in the Umbrian city of Spoleto was centralised: the local code of norms mentions a caretaker for the main fountain and one for the aqueduct (which included the famous Fonte delle torri, Fig. 25 and 26), all appointed by the city government. Spoleto’s aqueduct bridge, perhaps installed on the foundations of a Roman building of which no trace remains, owes its complex and imposing structure to important works carried out by the commune and the papal legate Cardinal Egidio de Albornoz in the second half of the fourteenth century. Its structure is similar to that of the Sulmona aqueduct, again in central Italy (Abruzzi region), which dates back to 1256 and ends with the monumental Fontana del Vecchio (fifteenth c., Fig. 27 and 28). Built by King
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78 Visentin 2016: 134-146, 196.
80 Romagnoli 2020.
81 Ciampi 1872 Statuto di Viterbo del 1251: b. I. rubr. 53, 55, 61: 467-468. See also b. IV. rubr. 184: 596. As Romagnoli 2020 notes, the fountains, often equipped with a drinking trough and a wash-house, were “il principale simbolo della ricchezza e del prestigio del Comune viterbese” (155).
Manfred of Sicily and the local municipality, the Sulmona aqueduct was a suspended artificial canal that, as the local statute shows, conveyed running water from the distant river Gizio, which was also exploited for its motive force. The new aqueduct, known as the Sanguinone aqueduct, restored between 1304 and 1306 to bring water to Assisi, was built over an existing Roman construction. This structure was flanked by another, the so-called conduit of Brother Elias, a derivation of the previous one built from 1228 onwards. This second conduit had its caput aquae in the Fontana dei Leoni, originally located in an eminent position in the square in front of the upper church of the Basilica of Saint Francis. The city’s 1319 statutes regulated how the fountain and its waters were to be protected. Finally, one absolutely exceptional artefact, albeit from a later period, is the Pozzo di San Patrizio in Orvieto (Fig. 29), built in 1527 by the architect Antonio da San Gallo il Giovane at the behest of Pope Clement VII, to ensure the supply of water to that city in the event of a military siege. Although this is a Renaissance artefact, it was preceded by a well and fountain made by Venetian masters in the thirteenth century.

In the Sardinian community of Villa di Chiesa, the drought-plagued principal town of the Sulcis mining district, there are records of several fountains built by the commune and the Aragonese royal authority, and an unusual relief on the public fountain in the oldest square (Fontana di Piazza Vecchia), which was the caput aquae of the aqueduct of Bangiargia. If we compare the community’s statute (1303-04, revised before 1338) with those from which it partly derives, the 1287 Breve of Pisa revised in 1313, we see that the Tuscan code made provision for important works for the construction of a public aqueduct to be used by the nearby subject community of Livorno and a similar construction to supply a new bath (balneum) in the Pisan district of Kinzica. In this regard, however, it is worth emphasising, precisely in relation to the Breve Pisano, how the communes’ planning did not always have rapid effects. The fact that the aforementioned 1287 rule was reported in the 1313 version of the statute suggests (beyond the formal conservatism typical of these texts), that the work in question had not yet been realised.

4. Water magistrates

As we have said, the important construction works, which would become symbols for the cities where they stood, often involved a highly centralised administration. The Pisan statutes of 1287 and later reforms decreed the election of a non-resident overseer of canals and aqueducts and, from 1337, the holder of the position would be known as the operarius generalis. Assisted by several collaborators, this officer was responsible for the upkeep of roads, streams and ditches. A similar magistrate, possibly a descendant of the Roman curator aquae, was described in the Ferrara’s law (1287), in the statutes of Montepulciano, another Tuscan town

---

87 Cenci 1974-76: 16; Barbanera and Stefanucci 2015: 53-60.
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(in this case inland);\textsuperscript{94} in the code of Cremona (1339),\textsuperscript{95} in the eighth book of the \textit{bonacolsiani} statutes of Mantua (1303, \textit{iudex ... super aggeribus et laboreris}),\textsuperscript{96} and in the norms of the Pistoia territory communes of Buggiano (1378, \textit{officiale fontium}) and Uzzano (1339, \textit{operarii super muris, fontibus, viis et alis}).\textsuperscript{97} This code tasked a notary of ‘damages given’ (\textit{damnorum datorum}) with the supervision of bridges, roads, fountains and canals. The Veronese statute reform of 1276 attests to the existence of a magistracy called the \textit{Judex fossatorum}, and of an office in charge of supervising water courses (\textit{officium dugalium}). These figures and institutions were completely reorganised and their duties extended in the city statute promulgated by Cangrande della Scala in 1327.\textsuperscript{98} During this period, numerous legal codes in the towns of the lower Po Valley (statutes of Modena, Polesine di Rovigo and Lendinara) provided for the appointment of \textit{arginerii} (embankment care staff), also known as \textit{cavarzerani} or \textit{cavarzellani}. These operators worked under the supervision of officials in charge of distributing among the inhabitants of the countryside the burdens of hydraulic defence and land drainage used by both the rural areas and the cities.\textsuperscript{99} Finally, the \textit{iudex stratarum et aquarum civitatis Mediolani et ducatus}, mentioned for the first time in 1385, had extensive jurisdiction over the city and territory of the major Lombard centre.\textsuperscript{100}

At the end of the thirteenth century, immediately after the completion of the city’s aqueduct and the Fontana Maggiore, the commune of Perugia established officers to protect these monuments.\textsuperscript{101} The statutes of the Florentine Republic of 1355 placed the maintenance of bridges and embankments under the direct responsibility of the \textit{Capitano del Popolo}.\textsuperscript{102} The statutes of Pescia, in northern Tuscany (1339), provided for the election of guards similar to \textit{camparii} to oversee the use and maintenance of the \textit{Rio dell’Asino}, a tributary of the Pescia River, and the surrounding wooded areas.\textsuperscript{103} In Rieti, in Rome’s hinterland, a similar \textit{notarius viarum} was responsible for overseeing the river’s path (\textit{viam torrentis}).\textsuperscript{104} We find a comparable situation in the Umbrian city of Orvieto, whose statutes from the early fourteenth century (a period when the city’s ancient aqueduct was in a critical condition)\textsuperscript{105} prescribed a custodian for each source within the plan of the settlement.\textsuperscript{106} These administration decisions went hand in hand with what could be defined as a monopoly for the distribution of water that was held by the commune. An emblematic example is found in the 1279 statute of Perugia, which issued a ban against women selling water (\textit{aquatragole}), not long after the construction of a public fountain and a well (\textit{putei de platea communis}).\textsuperscript{107} At Villa di Chiesa, in the event of drought, anyone was allowed to draw water from public and private fountains without paying a fee; a demonstration of a greater interest in the needs of individuals being guaranteed by the

\textsuperscript{94} Morandi (ed.) 1966 \textit{Statuto del Comune di Montepulciano}: b. I. rubr. 9: 10-11.
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{Statuta et ordinamenta communis Cremonae}: 153, 155: 205-208. See also Cazzola 2021: 79-80.
\textsuperscript{96} D’Arco 1872: b. VIII. rubr. 5: 220-221.
\textsuperscript{97} See Vannucchi 2009: 13.
\textsuperscript{98} Castagnetti 1977: 81, 88-89.
\textsuperscript{100} Fantoni 1990: 119, 121-125, 131.
\textsuperscript{101} Silvestrelli 1996: 90.
\textsuperscript{102} Onorii (ed.) 2000 \textit{Lo statuto di Pescia}: b. IV. rubr. 39, 41: 233, 235.
\textsuperscript{103} Caprioli (ed.) 2008 \textit{Lo statuto della città di Rieti}: b. IV. rubr. 28 and 33: 301, 303-304.
\textsuperscript{104} Riccetti 1994: 246-248.
\textsuperscript{105} Andreani (1986-87) Un frammento di statuto del comune di Orvieto; Geltner 2019: 56, 192. note 59.
town authorities. An entirely similar rule, although with no apparent distinction between periods of drought and periods of normal water availability, are found in the fifteenth-century statute of the rural community of Montisi, near Montalcino, in the Sienese countryside.

Of course, officers with similar duties were also a feature of towns in northern Italy, where, apart from the frequent excavation and maintenance of rivers and canals and the construction of bridges, there was usually less need for expensive major hydraulic infrastructure during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, especially in smaller municipalities. The detailed legislation of Bergamo is a case in point. Nestled at the foothills of the Alps in Lombardy, this city could rely on numerous good quality sources of fresh water previously praised by local poet Mosè del Brolo in the twelfth century, and had an aqueduct since at least the previous century, accompanied by a modest fountain with very simple architectural forms (Fonte Antescolis, thirteenth c.). In spite of this, the municipal statute of 1353 declared a certain number of regulations, mostly in the fifteenth section of the code, to control and protect the communal water supply. Ferrara is an important city located close to the Po valley and the Adriatic Sea. Its communal magistracies, which came under the authority of Marquis Obizzo d’Este, allowed, in the city’s 1287 statutes, for the trade of drinking water in jars and placed it under regulatory control. It is worth noting that water and wine sellers were required to charge the same fee for the same quantity of either product (quatuor ferrarinos de anphora).

5. A comparison of northern and central Italy

Undoubtedly, in the normative tradition embodied in municipal statutes, water management was connected to the exercise of communal sovereignty, while, almost everywhere, the right of use was related to the right of citizenship. Shared throughout ‘communal’ Italy was the principle whereby proper law (ius proprium) was invoked to supplement and modify the ius aquandi of the Roman law tradition by introducing local customs and norms. Given these general principles, it should, however, be emphasised that the statutes written in the communities of central Italy and the Po valley area bring to light a different state of affairs. For example, fourteenth-century law codes from Milan regulating roads and water (1346 and 1396) demonstrate a certain flexibility around waterworks. These documents encourage private initiative and state that everybody is allowed to build channel conduits to bring water to their homes, as long as it does not hinder or damage the urban passageways. Only in the case of the Naviglio Grande or Ticinello, the main navigable artery, were restrictions imposed.
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112 Forgiarini (ed.) 1996 Lo statuto di Bergamo: b. XV. rubr. 4-24: 302-311. It is worth noting that law codes from Lombardy use the term guazatorius, which is also attested in Tuscany (20: 309).
Although not prohibited, the drawing of water was subject to stricter controls here and required a formal public concession.\textsuperscript{118}

The 1390 statute of Lodi also allowed any citizen to freely derive water from non-navigable lakes and rivers.\textsuperscript{119} The 1393 Pavia statute only invited those who wished to impose levies to share the costs of the relevant conduit by creating consortia among owners.\textsuperscript{120} Comparable provisions appear in the statutes of Verona (1327),\textsuperscript{121} and in the law of the Veneto municipality of Marano Vicentino (1429), located in a flatland area abounding with natural waterways and artificial canals, some of which date back to Roman times. The text of Marano allowed anyone to direct water along the road leading from Marano to Vicenza, with the simultaneous right to build private elevated conduits enabling the transportation of water without impeding the passage of men and vehicles along the road itself.\textsuperscript{122} Similarly, the 1305 statute of the Piedmontese commune of Savigliano allowed anyone to draw water from rivers and springs to water their fields, to draw it from the commune’s ditches running alongside the roads in communal territory and have the right to run independent conduits through public and private land.\textsuperscript{123} The 1255 statute of Parma allowed town dwellers to bring water in from the city’s systems of canals, tunnels and pipes built to convey water, in order to clean entrance halls and private spaces and for similar domestic usage.\textsuperscript{124} The 1323 normative legislation of Piacenza granted the local community permission to transfer water from powering waterwheels in canals (rivos macinatorios), confining its intervention to resolving the inevitable disputes and settling them by arbitration.\textsuperscript{125} The statute of Quarona in Valsesia (Vercelli, 1384) provided for the existence and maintenance of a number of canals (riane) derived from the Cavaglia stream, a tributary of the Sesia River, destined to irrigate the most fertile meadows and pastures at the bottom of the valley. From these canals it was possible to freely derive water for irrigation. However, water could not be taken outside of these pipelines, not so much because there was a scarcity of the resource, but because the local authorities wanted to carefully control how much water was actually taken and by whom.\textsuperscript{126} Articles of law in the codes of other subalpine communities went in the same direction, such as the statute of Orzinuovi (1341–87), in the Brescia plain, which only allowed the inhabitants of the community to derive water from the river Oglio. These men, moreover, could freely form associations for the construction of pipelines, sharing the costs among private individuals (si aliquis vicinus fecerit aliquud aqueductum, canalle vel pontem ... primo solveret sibi partem contingentem de dictis laborariis).\textsuperscript{127}

Therefore, these regulations show a desire to control the efficiency of the water supply and the functioning of the waterways, but they also show that the relative abundance of water meant that the public and private sectors shared the burden and benefits of conveying and

\textsuperscript{118} Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, ms. B.19: Statuta Civitatis Mediolanensis de anno MCCCXCVI: P. inf. c. cap. 328.


\textsuperscript{120} Statuta civilia Civitatis Papiae 1393: rubr. 133: 8.

\textsuperscript{121} De pena cavantis in fossatis alicuius vel in stratis publicis seu viis consortalibus; De pena facientis fossatum seu scolantis aut cavantis ita quod aqua faciat dampnum in alienis terris [Bianchi, Granuzzo, Mariani Canova and Varanini (eds) 1992 Statuti di Verona: t. II. b. V. rubr. 73. 74: 665].

\textsuperscript{122} Orlando (ed.) 2010 Statuto di Marano 1429: rubr. 65: 116.

\textsuperscript{123} Sacco 1932 Statuti di Savigliano: b. VI, rubr. 324: 139-140.


\textsuperscript{126} Mor (ed.) 1932 Statuti di Quarona: rubr. 43-45: 289-291.

exploiting the resource;128 and this reality continued, in many respects, into the modern age.129 Also, water theft was mostly in the form of misappropriation of one private individual’s property by another, rather than the violation of a common good.130

No article of law like those mentioned appears in statutes in central Italy. For example, the normative codes of Rome (1363) prohibited the drawing of water for private use from the public Aqua Virgo conduit using devices called giotelli.131 The statutes of nearby Rieti banned the diversion of water from one public stream to another [Dig. 43.12.2; Cod. 11.43(42).4].132 The same did the codes of the Pistoia territory (Uzzano, Monsummano, Buggiano).133 The problem of illegal diversions from public pipelines seems to have caused much concern to the city authorities in central Italy.134 Rome and the Lazio area seem to have held on to the provisions of Roman law whereby every citizen had the right to oppose any undue withdrawal from watercourses, and magistrates were empowered to remove any diversion made without their explicit consent.135 The statute of Nocera (Central Umbria), printed in 1567, but derived from a 1371 draft, prohibited any modification of watercourses and any private derivation from them.136 The statutes of the Marche city of Ascoli Piceno severely punished anyone who cut or drilled water pipes to activate diversions, and forbade the digging of private wells near pipes that collected water from public sources.137 This code also encouraged private individuals to take responsibility for maintaining public sources at their own expense.138 Conversely, despite including similar norms, the statute of Bergamo, in northern Italy, made provision for derogations to the withdrawal ban, if contractually agreed between the commune and private parties.139 The community of Pons, in Canavese (Piedmont, 1344), prohibited the drawing of water from the community’s canal (rugia), but only on days not agreed between each private individual and the local authorities.140 On the other hand, it is surprising that, Bra, another important Piedmontese community and town in the historical Roero area on the left bank of the Tanaro River, barely mentioned water for public use in its vast, well-structured statute (1461) and did so only to prohibit the fouling of springs and wells with manure and other vituperium.141 It would seem that the withdrawal and use of public water did not constitute an emergency worthy of regulatory attention.

Normative sources attest to undoubtedly greater freedom of action for private individuals in northern Italy than for their counterparts in central Italy and Sardinia. In my opinion, this was
due to the greater availability of water in the northern regions and the different significance attributed there to fountains, wells and other supply structures. From this point of view, Italy reflects the whole of medieval Europe, where, for example, miniatures in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries depicted fountains in northern countries as large ornamental structures located in the centre of gardens and castle courtyards, whereas in the south they stood out in the heart of towns, where they acted as wells, that is as functional facilities. They were also decorative. From this point of view, Italy reflects the whole of medieval Europe, where, for example, miniatures in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries depicted fountains in northern countries as large ornamental structures located in the centre of gardens and castle courtyards, whereas in the south they stood out in the heart of towns, where they acted as wells, that is as functional facilities. And let us not forget that canals also ended up fulfilling different functions in the north and centre-south of the Italian peninsula, since, in the Po valley area, these structures were relatively large and served for both irrigation and navigation, while in many regions of central and southern Italy they were mere conduits built to regulate the distribution of autumn rains. South of the northern Apennines the traditional Roman model remained prominent and Cato’s advice to dig ditches when it rained still held, so that the land would not dry out and also to prevent water stagnating.

Squatriti points out that large hydraulic works had an enormous ideological impact on the exercise of power. Moving to the issue of the relationship between water management legislation and self-representation by the ruling classes, the most representative and emblematic constructions of the Po region of Italy, hence the most widely monumentalised, were not so much the aqueducts or the fountains, but rather the bridges built over the territory’s numerous rivers and canals. The regions of northern Italy are home to numerous fortified bridges, designed as castles and used both for defence purposes and as toll collection points. Most of the structures were originally built in wood. Some of them also served as drawbridges. However, at least from the mid-fourteenth century, many of these wooden constructions, often destroyed by rivers or war events, were replaced by stone and brick bridges. Evidence of this is seen in the large late-medieval structures of Verona (Scaligero/Castelvecchio bridge over the Adige River, second half of the fourteenth c., Fig. 30; Ponte delle Navi, fourteenth century, destroyed in the nineteenth, Fig. 31); the covered bridge of Bassano del Grappa (Ponte Vecchio, thirteenth c., Fig. 32), equipped since 1315 with two defensive towers; Ponte di Rialto (thirteenth to sixteenth c.) and the profusion of bridges in Venice (Fig. 33); the large structure in Pavia (1354, covered 200 years later; Fig. 34 and 35, before and after the contemporary post-World War II reconstruction); the analogous bridge of Alessandria (Piedmont, Fig. 36); and the artefact in Fermignano (Pesaro, fourteenth c., Fig. 37). It is seen in the statutes of these cities, which provided for their construction and maintenance. In this respect, the only important exceptions in central Italy were Florence (Ponte Vecchio, rebuilt in the fourteenth c., Fig. 38, and Ponte Santa Trinita, thirteenth–sixteenth c., Fig. 39, although these constructions only acquired a monumental dimension in the early Renaissance), and Pisa.
Still on the subject of exceptions, but regarding fountains as visual manifestations of constituted power and its action for the common good, the famous monumental structure of Madonna Verona located in the centre of Piazza delle Erbe is the symbolic personification of this northern city (Fig. 40). The artefact was built in 1368 at the behest of Cansignorio della Scala, lord of the city, using reclaimed Roman materials. On the stem supporting the pedestal of the allegorical statue are carved the faces of the four rulers of the city: the legendary Vero, Alboin the king of the Lombards, Berengar and Verona regina. The monument had more of a symbolic and political function than a practical one, and despite the later civic tradition, was made primarily to celebrate the ruling dynasty, which needed a clear reference to classicism, and thus to an object that evoked the artistic heritage of the ancients and their morals, as the inscription on the cartouche shows: est iusti latrix urbs hec et laudis amatrix (this city is the bearer of justice and the lover of prise). In any case, this fountain is an important artefact perhaps built in conjunction with the restoration of the Roman aqueduct.150

Regardless of the differences we have highlighted, the actions of city authorities, aimed at ensuring a sufficient supply of water for all, emerge from statutes throughout the different areas of Italy we have examined. Indeed, it is significant that many normative texts in both northern and central Italy more or less explicitly imposed easements for the public good, referred to in legal historiography as servitù di acquedotto (servitude of aqueduct) or acquedotto coattivo (enforceable aqueduct), related to the more general right of passage through neighbours’ land to reach one’s own (ius itineris).151 This meant that anyone who owned land that was not naturally irrigated, or an inadequately supplied lodge, could ask for or buy water from a neighbour, and then convey it across other people’s land, provided that they caused the least amount of damage possible and provided that the owner of the land on which the diversion channel was built was adequately compensated.152 All this revealed a need for water that was not always met by available natural sources and the will of the public authorities to act as guarantors of the fair distribution of both public and private water.

---

149 Baldaccini 1947: 9-12; Salvestrini 2005: 21-25; Paolini et al. 2016. Even the first monumental fountain in Florence is not earlier than the sixteenth century (Cresti 1982: 9; Butters 2010; Ferretti 2016).


IV

Legal Norms for Water Management: Rural Areas

1. From countryside to city and back

As specified earlier, municipal statutes of communal Italy cover water management in both the urban context and rural areas, often within similar regulations. In town and country alike, landowners along rivers were naturally rivales and faced the common issue of the right to draw water.1 This pattern can be seen in the normative legislation of several centres in the Veneto region. For instance, the statutes of Treviso (twelfth and thirteenth centuries) approved the reclamation of the swamp areas around the city,2 perhaps inspired by what had already been accomplished for the marshland in the Verona suburbs during the last decades of the twelfth century.3 In the municipal statutes of the areas surrounding the Po valley, where the agrarian economy relied on permanently irrigated meadows named marcite (a dominant feature of the landscape in this region, related to the extensive presence of rivers and canals), water resource regulations were mostly concerned with irrigation practices.4 An analysis of the norms from Milan dating back to 1216, for example, demonstrates that two statute chapters (titoli), namely De aqua and De iure molandinorum, and each section therein, attempt to regulate the transmission and distribution of river water for public and private use and provide adequate supplies of the resource at a usable quality for irrigation in the surrounding area (ex flumine publico vel privato ad irriganda sua prata vetera vel nova). It also mentions that this practice should be carried out with consideration for the watermills located alongside the natural water sources of the region. Watermills were to be protected from any potential damage and supplied with a sufficient quantity of water.5

In the Breve del Comune e del Popolo di Pisa (1287), in the statutes of Arezzo of 1327 and in the later statutes of Massa in Lunigiana (Tuscan coast, 1591, but with prior legal material incorporated and declared in force), municipal governments authorised the annual election of an official to oversee natural and artificial waterways, aqueducts, wells, fountains, reservoirs and mains (note that Massa elected an official for each district or local community or vicinia). It was their duty to ensure that all locations were constantly supplied with clean water (aqua munda) and to manage irrigation water coming through the local springs.6 We find a similar rule in the statutes of Ascoli Piceno, which entrusted the maintenance of the fountains to the villae and castles of the suburban territory (districto), and in the Latium code of Castel Fiorentino (1298), which required the inhabitants of the countryside to clean the community’s major
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1 On the etymology of the term and its meaning in the Digest (fragment of Ulpianus), see Schiavon 2011: 117-119. See also Cavallar 2010: 103-106.
4 Campopiano and Menant 2015; Campopiano 2018: 29-30.
fountain (*fons maior*) twice a year, indicating exactly which families would have to pay for this work. The statute for the *viarii* of the Republic of Siena dated 1290 devoted 19 sections (*rubriche*) to the management of the trenches and natural and artificial waterways in the nearby countryside. The 1253 statute of Bologna mentions officials called *notarii aquarum et yscariorum* who were in charge of water management in the suburban area. Elsewhere, taxation from local communities assisted by public services would pay for the compensation of magistrates like these. The mid-thirteenth-century and the 1335 statutes of Bologna cover water transmission and distribution schemes from the various local torrents in great detail.

It was common for the city’s judicial institutions to initiate canal-building works for conveying water to the countryside, even though it was the inhabitants of those areas who had to pay for it and provided the labour. Under the 1265 statute of Reggio Emilia, the small waterways called *rioli* were to benefit the whole community, not only the landowners and private citizens who could pay for the service. This fact illustrates that, as they benefitted from the greater autonomy granted to private parties, landowners in this northern Italian commune perhaps had the upper hand when it came to exploiting the resource. It is worth noting that, while granting non-exclusive permission to irrigate agricultural areas by bringing in water from the city’s pipes, canals and rivers, the 1255 statute of Parma also urged everybody to respect the rights of landowners (most of whom were town dwellers).

2. Countryside water in service to the city

We have already remarked that the populations of the Po valley area had greater freedom of access to water resources than those of central Italy. However, this freedom was not uniformly possessed by town dwellers and inhabitants of the countryside. Privileged water rights were legitimate for urban-based individuals and institutions. For instance, the fourteenth-century statutes of Forlì established a city water basin (*bignale*) from which Augustinian and Dominican friars could draw larger quantities of water than other subjects so they could water their vegetable gardens. The statute legislation of Parma granted the Friars Minor and an unspecified abbot (*dominus abbas*) exclusive ownership and control of two tributaries of the large Parma stream. Similarly, a law code of Bologna (1250) granted the Franciscans exclusive and continued access to the sources of running water from a torrent. The statutes of the Tuscan municipality of Colle Val d’Elsa imposed higher penalties on anyone occupying or

---

8 Ciampoli and Szabó (eds) 1992 *Lo Statuto dei Viarî di Siena*.
12 Con ciò sia cosa che il fiume d’Arno, vagando e distruggendo, guasti et renda disutili del terreno ... del comune di Fighino ... li signori Priori dell’arzi ... possano ... elegere et diputare ... officiali ... che possano deliberare et provvedere ... et ... fare parate et opere ... alle spese degli’uomini del detto comune di Fighine et delli huomini che ànno terre in quella ysola [Bambi, Salvestrini and Tanzini (eds) 2023 *Gli Statuti della Repubblica fiorentina del 1355 in volgare*: t. II: *Statuto del Podestà*: b. IV: 122: 601-602].
16 Statuta Communis Parmae 1856: rubr. IV: 379-381.
damaging the abbot’s castle aqueduct, the conduit that brought water from the countryside to the residence of the abbot of Spugna Monastery, the first lord of the town.\(^\text{18}\) The Parma statute gave greater tax freedoms to town-dwelling landowners, often at the expense of the freedom enjoyed by inhabitants of the countryside. This was especially the case if the latter took canal water away from the properties of the former. In fact, one section of the statute specified that, in cases of disagreement, and as a matter of course, one was to believe whoever accused the other person of having illegally taken the water away. Less credence was given to the oath of innocence sworn by the accused. However, this order only applied to town dwellers (\textit{in civibus tantum}). If the disagreement involved a town dweller against a \textit{rusticus}, the judge was to give more weight to the statements made by the \textit{civis} in the first instance, even in cases where the latter was the accused. Further, if the town dweller was the complainant, his hearing would take place without delay. This only occurred provided that he was supported by the testimony of the local magistrate of the canals, who had to declare that he had seen the farmer take water from the town dweller’s reservoirs without permission.\(^\text{19}\)

The law favoured inhabitants of cities in various ways. Almost all construction and maintenance works carried out in the territory were planned within the urban walls and undertaken in the countryside at the expense of rural communities, although they were contributed to in part by town-dwelling landowners. These actions were designed for the protection of fields and urban settlements, but the planning decisions favoured the interests of urban society.\(^\text{20}\) For example, the 1306-07 statutes of Modena, a lowland city located between the Secchia and Panaro tributaries of the Po, often subject to flooding,\(^\text{21}\) entrusted the maintenance of river embankments to the rural community of Sorbara and others nearby, on the basis of actions decided by the civic authorities.\(^\text{22}\) A similar provision can be found in the statute of Mantua of 1303, which tasked two officials (\textit{ducalieri}), one from the city and one from the countryside (\textit{rusticus}), with ordering the works in each rural community (\textit{villa}) to be carried out at the expense of the peasants.\(^\text{23}\) The 1266 and 1304 statutes of Parma required the inhabitants of the countryside to work on the maintenance of the \textit{dugarie} (canals), which irrigated the land and provided access to the capital city.\(^\text{24}\) The 1265 Reggio statutes did the same, stipulating that the city magistrates were to involve the rural community of Campagnola in the excavation and maintenance of the canals necessary for access to the city.\(^\text{25}\) The 1287 statutes of Ferrara and those of Mantua (1311), Cremona (1339) and the Tuscan town of San Miniato al Tedesco of 1337, to name just a few, levied the cost of maintaining embankments (monitoring plant growth and goat grazing) on the localities under their political control, despite charging some of the work to the town-dwelling landowners who had interests in those areas.\(^\text{26}\) A strict division of competencies between city and countryside is set out in the Ferrara statutes of 1287 and, above all, in the specific \textit{Statuta ad Offitium Argerum} drawn up and reformed several times.

\(^{19}\) \textit{Statuta Communis Parmae} 1856: rubr. IV: 386.
\(^{21}\) Fumagalli 2007: 60.
\(^{23}\) D’Arco 1872: b. VIII. rubr. 5: 220-221.
\(^{24}\) \textit{Statuta Communis Parmae} 1856: 146-149; b. IV: 300, 382. See Parente 2000: 58-60.
times between 1320 and 1394. The first of these texts, in fact, dedicates a specific section (rubrics 12–48) to the regulation of public works (therefore also hydraulic works) in urban and rural spaces. The second is a collection of rules specifically dedicated to the care of canals and ditches. The vast district of Ferrara was transected by various branches of the Po and was therefore subject to frequent flooding, also on account of its very low gradient. Space management involved defining individual hydraulic units (pollicine), whose surface area was determined by the hydrographic configuration of the river delta. Watercourse embankment works were divided between large public works pertaining to the magistracies in charge of the entire city domain (laboreria que pertinent generaliter ad comitatum et districtum Ferrarie), and local works (laboreria specialia) pertaining to each pollicina. The system of interventions, especially the digging and cleaning of public canals, carried out from the end section of each ditch, came under the political responsibility of one iudex and 18 ditch bank guards (superstites agerum). At the operational and administrative level, in addition to the notaries of the iudex, a number of operators (cavazelleni) acted as representatives of the individual territorial units. In time, it was ordered that the surveys the officers conducted on the state of ditches and embankments were to be recorded in special registers, one for each villa. This documentation was kept with the Friars Minor, the Friars Preachers and the Augustinians and, to all effects, became a registry of owners for the purpose of sharing out the burden of maintaining waterways. Generally speaking, although the system provided for the active participation of rural folk at the administrative level, the influence imposed by the city remained strong. Urban magistracies retained for themselves the planning phase and assigned the execution of works to the rural populations.

Only the statutes of Treviso and Perugia of 1279 show that the cost of building some of the rural infrastructures, such as bridges, was met solely by the urban city-state. The Treviso statutes also specified that maintaining an efficient road network should allow the normal flow of water (consuetus cursus aquarum). In a previous reform of this code, water was identified as being public (aque que publice sint), suggesting that only the commune was responsible for its management; whereas, in line with the legislation typically found in other towns in northern Italy, everything else was mostly left to private parties. The city authorities’ allocation of the burden usually followed the general principle whereby contributions were proportionate to the estimated direct benefit that individuals and communities derived from construction and maintenance work. Thus, contributions for embankments and drainage ditches were primarily made by frontier farmers and individual rural communities for the stretches of rivers and canals that belonged to them. In some cases, as the Modenese code of 1327 shows, requirements were different for the excavation of drainage ditches next to roads. In the case of ditches next to public roads, the burden was to be shared per head (per testata), that is, by requiring rural dwellers to excavate and resurface the section of ditch facing the land they cultivated. When it came to collector ditches, on the other hand, the principle applied was

27 Zucchini 1962.
29 See Zucchini 1965: 263-266.
that of sharing the burden among the owners concerned. There was, however, no strict division by degree of use, firstly because city owners were favoured over rural ones; and secondly, because city authorities could, for political reasons, grant exemptions and privileges to individual communities and landowners.

Generally speaking, what distinguished the duties of one rural population from another was the extent to which they depended on urban law. In fact, there were rural centres whose administration was directly mentioned in urban legislation, including as regards water management, as well as centres that had obtained the right to draft their own rules, as was often the case in the Bolognese and Florentine territories. Although each text depended on the legislation passed by the ruling towns and cities, the level of autonomy of those communities that were politically subordinate to it but had their own statutes, according to an albeit limited principle of subsidiarity, was obviously greater.

It is important to highlight (as Campopiano has done) that civic governments often made full use of the skills of inhabitants of the countryside, by incorporating their legislation (legislation often of monastic origins) into water-related matters. A clear example can be seen in the statute of the Lombard community of Nirone, near Parma (1260). This code has come down to us almost entirely in the regulations on public water of the territory of Milan (1346). Another interesting case is that of Pernumia, south of Padua, whose statute, which was partly absorbed into the city’s regulations, provides important insight into the settlement and production dynamics related to marshland reclamation along the Bacchiglione River. Nevertheless, it was clear that the integration that had taken place was urban-centric and that the provisions that had been selected were in the interests of the cities. As a result, urban governments exploited the water management experience that rural populations had acquired over time.

Furthermore, urban public magistracies attempted to reconcile the varied interests of the entire population, as testified in the frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti in his Effects of Good Government in the city and the countryside in the sala consiliare of Palazzo Pubblico in Siena (1338-39). Under the 1342 statute of Perugia, any decision concerning contributions from rural communities for the construction and maintenance of bridges were to be taken by a Franciscan Brother of Penance appointed by the urban authorities. As a member of the clergy, the friar might have seemed a useful intermediary between the city government and the rural population.

---

33 Campori 1864 Statuta civitatis Mutine: b. V. rubr. 414.
35 See Canzian and Valenzano (eds) 2022; Destefanis and Garanzini (eds) forthcoming.
37 Gloria 1873 Gli statuti del comune di Padova, b. IV. rubr. 2: 300–303.
40 See Frugoni 2019; Piccinni 2022.
3. Wetland management

Worthy of close examination are the statutes produced by or for rural communities and consortia of landowners located in marshlands. In fact, wetlands had a considerable economic impact on the resources they provided for populations: fishing and fish breeding, the harvesting of aquatic plants, wild bird hunting, and so on. These were no less significant in symbolic terms, given that the communities living close to them had often inherited ancient rights of collective use, which were then enshrined in local statute law. On the other hand, urban authorities claimed public prerogatives over these regions as heirs to imperial authority. The special features and the productivity of these territories, considered to be completely unhealthy during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, are revealed in important scientific literature, especially from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

Significant examples of regulatory interventions dating back to the communal era emerge from the laws of the Mantuan Oltrepò and several statutes from central Italy. With regard to the first territorial area, that is, the lower plain surrounding Mantua, the 1303 statutes mention the existence of the digagne, which were consortium institutions for the self-government of water drainage works. These collective organisations gradually defined their tasks and, in the fifteenth century, adopted their own statutes similar to those that had produced some comparable associations in central Italy. In the Po delta area, a vast landed property had been created over the centuries, belonging to the ancient monastery of Santa Maria di Pomposa, located on a river island in the Ferrara area. This vast, largely amphibious space was home to a population of monastery settlers for whom the abbots of Pomposa drew up a statute as early as 1295. This code was reformed several times during the fourteenth century and contained numerous provisions concerning the collective governance of water. Banks and ditches were monitored, following the model of Ferrara’s municipal code (though undoubtedly in a one-to-one relationship between urban and rural-monastic legislation), by the cavarzellano. In this region, the task of planning interventions did not emanate from a town or a village, but from monks primarily interested in defending the abbey from flooding. In this sense, the statutes of Pomposa incorporated laws dating back to at least the twelfth century.

In central Italy, Perugia’s code (1389) gave prominence to the Comunanze del Chiugi, administrative and tax institutions covering an area of about 120 square kilometres largely occupied by farmland, which included both the coastal strip of lake Trasimeno and a section of the Val di Chiana marshes. This particular administration was established by the municipality of Perugia for the economic development of farmers and fishermen. This shows that, even when it came to managing these kinds of territories, the urban authorities’ control was very tight.

---

42 See Prosperi (ed.) 1995. For a ‘positive’ view of the marsh habitat between antiquity and the Middle Ages, see Cracco Ruggini 2006: 100-102. On wetlands in northern Italy, see Raviola 2011.
43 See Arquer 2007: 22; Malvolti, Micheli, Prosperi, La Tosa and Zagli (eds) 1990. For the contemporary age, see D’Amato and Nannucci (eds) 2004.
44 D’Arco 1872: lib. 8, rubr. 5: 177.
45 Masé Dari 1960 Lo statuto gonzaghesco.
46 See Mezzetti (ed.) 2016.
47 Samaritani (ed.) 1958. See also Cazzola 2021: 97-98.
The actions of communal magistracies also emerge from the statute of neighbouring Foiano della Chiana, in south-east Tuscany (1387). This community was located in an area dominated by stagnant waters. The statute was drafted a few years after the locality was brought under Florentine control. This code contains a rubric explicitly protecting fish ponds created for fish farming, which highlights the importance of the marsh economy for the local community.

Undoubtedly noteworthy is the situation reflected in the statute of the Consortium of Piano del Padule d’Orgia to the south-west of Siena. This authority was established around 1250 by the municipality of Siena in partnership with a large local landowner, the Abbey of Santissima Trinità e Santa Mustiola in Torri. The purpose of the agreement was to promote exploitation of water and reclamation of a vast marshy area located near the Via Francigena, between Siena and Valdelsa. The consortium was a private entity made up of all the large and small landowners in this wetland area. It was structured so that it could essentially operate autonomously from the public authorities. However, in line with the more ‘interventionist’ choices of the municipalities of central Italy, its statute, largely composed between 1350 and 1392 from norms drawn up from 1303 onwards, was drafted following the model of urban regulations, and compliance was guaranteed by the city magistrates. Unlike the Foiano code, this statute was less concerned with water management than it was with the reclamation of marshy areas for agricultural purposes. Nevertheless, it emphasises the careful maintenance of a complex system of drainage canals aimed at preventing water stagnation and obtaining fertile plots of land to be allocated and farmed. From this point of view, the law appears to be the result of a long experience of management gained mainly in the monastic circles involved in the consortium itself. The statute stresses that the members of this association were required to finance and promote regular maintenance work on roads, bridges and, above all, ditches and drainage canals. The latter were cleared of the debris obstructing the passage of water by means of a complex barrage system configured during the year to prevent the autumn and winter overflow.

The statute of the Sienese consortium shows the heavy involvement of land owners in the management of the ecosystem of the marshland. From this point of view, the organisation it describes was similar to that of the consortium created in the mid-thirteenth century by the river users of the Lombard Nirone stream, described in the Statuta Nironis of 1260. That said, even in this case, the city authorities’ protection of the regulatory system governing water management in rural areas remains starkly evident.

One special territorial context was the Fucecchio Marshes, in central-northern Tuscany, a lake district located roughly in the centre of the Arno River basin. The situation in the communal period emerges to a certain extent from the 1337 statute of the municipality of Fucecchio. Not many of its rubrics were devoted to the large marshy area bordering the community,

50 De pena rumpentis pescheriam vel mittentis aliquid in ea [Allegria (ed.) 2017 Statuto del comune di Foiano: b. 3. rubr. 75: 183-184].
51 Banchi 1871 Statuto della Società del Piano del Padule d’Orgia. 1303-1375.
52 Cortese 1997: 127.
54 Banchi 1871 Statuto della Società del Piano del Padule d’Orgia. 1303-1375: caput 5, 6, 26, 63, 64, 67. See Gelli 2014: 44-46.
55 Fantoni 1990: 120.
56 See Zagli (ed.) 2003; Corsi, Prosperi and Ceseri Frullani 2022.
nevertheless the code forbade fishing and the trade of fish to outsiders; it prohibited the construction of barrages along the Usciana Stream; it imposed the cutting of reed beds; and laid down rules for the proper maintenance of numerous ditches.\textsuperscript{57}

Most of the statutes of communities located in wetland areas appear to have granted inhabitants broad freedoms to fish, and only punished excesses, destructive techniques and damage to property. However, in derogation of Roman law, the texts considered fishing almost everywhere to be for civic use reserved for local residents.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57} Carmignani (ed.) 1989 \textit{Statuti del Comune di Fucecchio}: b. II. rubr. 48: 83-84; rubr. 63: 90; b. III. rubr. 38: 113; rubr. 51: 119; rubr. 58: 121-122.

\textsuperscript{58} See Balestracci and Pasini (eds) 2001; Dani 2020: 34.
Conflicts and Regulatory ‘Solutions’

1. Distribution disputes

In respect to the availability and distribution of water resources, as was also the case for other collective assets for public use, such as roads, pastureland and forests, there was a clear effort to reach a careful equilibrium between private interests and collective needs. This was because, following on from Roman law, water whose source was on public land not subject to divisio or adsignatio to private parties was in the public domain; however, this mostly benefited major centres.¹

Starting from the assumption that is confirmed by legal doctrine that, owing to a perception of its infinity, the value of water was as a collective resource and not as an asset to be protected in its own right,² one of the chief objectives of statutes was to mediate the frequent disputes caused by unequal access to it, often granted officially on the basis of social and professional status. In doing so, statuta played a central role in trying to safeguard collective stability and enabling the urban burgher elite to exercise control over large territories.³

One interesting hypothesis proposed in anthropology highlights that, in pre-industrial societies (and, in various ways, in contemporary ones, too), there is no absolute shortage of water per se, but rather conflicts of interest and power plays that determine or prevent its scarcity locally.⁴ Indeed, conflicts resulting from access to water were not just a part of the relationship between town dwellers and inhabitants of the countryside, but they characterised a large part of the social relations established around water, both inside and outside cities, and often resulted in irregular access to the resource, which municipal legislation sought to curb.⁵ Differences arose especially among those who used river and canal water for irrigation purposes, those who used it as a waterway and those who employed it to power hydraulic machinery. Diversion of the resource during the summer period, particularly when there was greater need of it to irrigate the crops, risked compromising the functionality of watermills and fulling mills, as well as restricting navigation. Moreover, water infrastructures were often damaged by timber rafts and boat transit. At the same time, dykes, which were necessary for watermills or for creating fishing reserves – because the ius commune gave everyone the right to fish in perennial rivers, as they were by definition public (Dig. 43.12.2)⁶ – hindered the free movement of navigators. Conflict prevention was therefore of prime importance to legislators. This is demonstrated, for example, in the small but ancient statute of the municipality of Claverano in the Canavese region of Piedmont (1251), which contained two regulations for

³ See Mocarelli 2011: 85; Barbot 2013a: 40-41; Di Tullio and Lorenzini 2019: 75-83.
⁴ See Breda 2005: 9.
⁵ See, e.g., Chiodi 2008: 513-414.
protecting the activities of fishermen on Lake Sirio and along the streams in the area and preventing damage to their boats and the infrastructure necessary for their work (ingenia). 7

I have shown that the most pressing concern in northern Italy seems to have been water transfer and canalisation; whereas the most frequent conflict seems to have involved private parties (especially regarding use of the artificial canals known as rogge). 8 In the statutes of these regions, water saving was required by law, especially in the dry summer period. It can be deduced from the sources that many conflicts over the distribution of water arose during the warmer season. The statutes of Parma and Reggio stipulated that, from 29 June each year, watering was not allowed before Nones on Saturday and after the end of Sunday. 9 The 1360 Turin statute given by the prince Amadeus I of Savoy talks generally about hours and days on which every person can draw water for irrigation, but does not specify which. 10 The Bologna statutory code of 1250 established that, from mid-May to mid-September, water from the river Savena was not to be dispersed along roads, except – quod deus avertat – in case of fire. Water could only be taken from the torrent between September and May and only on one day and night a week. 11 The Veronese statutes of 1327 limited the drawing of water from the Riso Torrent to certain days of the week, but allowed millers to divert the water. 12

Nevertheless, strict regulation of irrigation and a willingness to mediate between farmers and millers also features, and a fortiori, in many legislative texts of central Italy; here, often regardless of the season. For example, in Orvieto, the irrigation of vegetable plots was only allowed, at any time in the year, when mills were not in operation. 13 According to the Viterbo statutes of 1251-52, the four boni homines who rigorously oversaw the distribution of water to horticulturists let it flow from the ninth hour on Friday to the third hour on Monday, leaving it to power the mills during the rest of the week. 14 The fifteenth-century rural statutes of Rincine and Fornace (Casentino valley, north-east Tuscany) banned the drawing of water from public rivers and private canals. 15 According to the statutes of Sassari, in northern Sardinia, millers had the right to use running water throughout the week, except in the period between dawn on Saturday and dawn on Monday, when gardeners were allowed to divert channels and pipelines to irrigate the soil. The different shifts were overseen by partidores de abba (water dispensers). These three were officially chosen to represent the gardeners of each of the three sections (De Levante, De Mesu, De Ponente) into which the fertile irrigation valley of the Gurusele Stream, near the city, was divided. They used bulkheads to regulate the flow of water from canals and sources and directed it towards users, mediating the frequent disputes between garden owners and mill owners. The provisions suggest that the distribution system was operated via lifting systems and canals and locks; water flowed into them which ensured that, especially in summer, the areas exposed longest to heat during the day (in the eastern sector) were the last to be watered and therefore held on to moisture longer. 16

---

7 Frola 1918 Statuta Clauerani: rubr. 2: 289.
12 Bianchi, Granuzzo, Mariani Canova and Varanini (eds) 1992 Statuti di Verona: t. II. b. V. rubr. 16: 635.
16 Et fina a tantu qui aen aver abbatu tottu sos ortos de ponente, non pothat torrare ad abbare sos ortos de levante [Finzi (ed.)]
The norms aiming to regulate access by season, calendar and time of day had their roots in Roman law, which had provisions for a timetabled usage of the resource that clearly depended on the agricultural practices of ancient Italy. Similar forms of organisation are found in various areas of the Mediterranean, from the Catalan-Aragonese and Andalusian contexts to the Maghreb regions. In Italy, institutional figures similar to the aforementioned *partidores*, called *acquaroli*, are mentioned both in the statutes of Sulmona dating back to the first half of the sixteenth century, and in the code of Brescia printed in 1557. The commune of Sulmona contracted out to these operators water distribution services for field irrigation. They were also tasked with the management and operation of a large, publicly owned bulkhead (*scerto grande*) which controlled the inflow of water from the river Gizio towards the city, where the water came through the monumental aqueduct referred to above. The *acquaroli* paid a charge to the commune in return for the fees paid by users based on rates set by the authorities and laid out in the statute itself. It is worth recalling that, in the fourteenth-century statutes of Ravenna, the term *acquaroli* referred not so much to the men in charge of water distribution, as to the ‘officers’ who oversaw the banks and rivers, more often called *cavarzellani* in northern Italy.

2. Drainage and ducting problems

Statutes regulated the collection of rainwater and placed great importance on the sewer system. The 1216 law code of Milan makes reference to the *stillicidium*, a Latin term denoting drops of moisture or rain falling from the eaves of a house. A concept mentioned in the Justinian code, rainwater dripping into a neighbour’s lodge or land was therefore subject to sanctions. The fourteenth-century legislative framework of Genoa established more vaguely that rainwater should flow as usual (*aque pluviales decurrant ut consueverint*). The fourteenth-century statutes of the Valsolda, a subalpine territory overlooking Lake Lugano, prohibited private individuals from allowing water to fall from the roofs of their loggias or from balconies onto the public street; this problem must have been especially prominent in these communities during the spring thaw. The statute of San Marino (1352–53) prohibited the draining of water from privately owned fields to public roads or the fields of other owners. Disputes over rainwater running off onto neighbouring property were so common that the 1252 statute of Bologna imposed restrictions on allegations or accusations for this type of offence.

In an attempt to mitigate the consequences of water transfer in the Po valley area, the statute of Castel San Giovanni (in the Piacenza region, from the second half of the fourteenth century)
distinguished between canals used for irrigation (rivos adaquatorios) and those used to power mills (rivos macinators).\textsuperscript{28} The strong demand for water from artisanal activities also led the Veronese authorities to distribute hydraulic machines more evenly along the three urban rivers (Adigetto, Fiumicello, Lori).\textsuperscript{29} However, this distribution shows the relatively abundant availability of water. In this regard, we can add that, in the Milan area, conflicts over water distribution often arose, not because of water scarcity, but as a consequence of the division of land resulting from emancipation, inheritance or sale.\textsuperscript{30} In cases where reserves of clean flowing water were less plentiful, areas of disagreement – as recorded by legal codes – mainly involved landowners and field workers versus public authorities. These magistrates did not appear in the statutes as mediators of conflicts, but rather as one of the main parties. This was the case in many hill towns in central Italy, but also in Piedmont and in several cities of the Veneto plain.

We have already mentioned the prohibitions on the drawing of water from public pipelines by private individuals in the statutes of Rome and Rieti. The codes of Deruta in Umbria punished anyone who removed water from public rivers and torrents without the explicit authorisation of government magistrates.\textsuperscript{31} Legislators in L’Aquila stipulated the same provision.\textsuperscript{32} In northwest Italy, the statute of Novara (1338–39) devoted a good portion of the fifth book to the question of excavation and maintenance of trenches, canals and sluices. It banned any form of unauthorised extraction, but particularly provided for penalties for the sale of water to landowners who were not under the authority of the city government (Ne aqua rugie que vadit Casalium vendatur vel alienetur).\textsuperscript{33} The desire of the urban magistrates to appoint themselves as the principal authorities for water management (regardless of the quantitative availability of the resource) emerges clearly from the Florentine statute of 1355. This code established that floodplains included the area within 20 arm’s lengths of every running river and were to be considered state-owned property.\textsuperscript{34} In the previous century, one of the oldest statutes of the Republic of Siena, dating to between 1226 and 1242, prohibited the construction of buildings along the Arbia Torrent, which flowed to the south of the city. The statute considered its banks to be public property.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{28} Fumagalli 1985; Galetti 2000: 46.
\textsuperscript{29} Varanini 1988; Cazzola 2021: 81-82.
\textsuperscript{30} Chiodi 2008: 529-530, 538-543.
\textsuperscript{34} Della pena di chi venderà del terreno o greto allato ad Arno [Bambi, Salvestrini and Tanzini (eds) 2023 Gli Statuti della Repubblica fiorentina del 1355 in volgare: t. II: Statuto del Podestà: b. III. rubr. 171: 450].
\textsuperscript{35} Mecacci 1993: 104.
VI

Water Quality

1. Water purity

One of the aspects regulated in the legal corpus examined here is water quality. Water purity was a common recommendation in much of the legislation of the time.¹ This stemmed from the awareness that, contrary to the widespread belief rooted in classical concepts summarised by Pliny the Elder, a good, uncontaminated, flavourless, odourless drink of water was a rare thing. This was especially the case in urban contexts, where close living conditions led to the dangerous proximity of supply wells and waste systems.² The oft-referenced professional activity of water carriers (acquaïoli), quite widespread in the medieval Mediterranean area and regulated by numerous statutes, originated from the difficulty of finding clean water, which these carriers often drew from upland springs located in forests or pastures far away from human settlements.³

It should also be said that the ideas about water purity and cleanliness that emerge from regulatory contexts were not short on references to biblical images. Indeed, unblessed water was invoked to solemnise judicial procedures that, to one degree or another, were legitimised by symbolic and sacred elements.⁴

2. ‘Ordinary’ water

Norms specifically devised to protect water purity are commonly found in the legislative frameworks of communes to the south and to the north of the Apennines. For instance, a monetary fine (20 soldi) was levied under the 1309 Costituto of Siena against those who washed and watered livestock in the basins assigned for the collection of water for human use.⁵ The Verona statutes of 1327 required tavern owners to keep containers of clean water (aquam mundam) to wash the dishes used in their establishments.⁶ The communal statutes of San Gimignano (in central Tuscany) issued a decree for the construction and preservation of an aqueduct (doccia sive aqueductus) to supply the community with fresh water and specified that the cistern intended for use by residents should not be contaminated by rainwater.⁷ The 1337 communal statute of Arezzo banned the watering or washing of visibly sick cattle (bestiam morbosam) in any of the town’s water collection tanks.⁸ Similarly, the vernacular statutes of the podestà of Florence (1355) condemned anyone who watered horses that were in poor health

¹ See, for a comparative perspective, Leguay 2007.
⁵ De la pena di chi facesse soçura ne le fonti (ivi: t. 2. b. III. rubr. 127: 57).
at the city’s sources specifically designated for human consumption.9 Under the fifteenth-century communal statutes of Grosseto, large monetary penalties for breaches of water policy regulations were imposed on whoever polluted the town’s trenches with animal waste, olive pomace or human faeces.10 The statutory code of the podestà of Pistoia dated 1296 was firmly determined to fight the detrimental habit of disposing of slaughterhouse waste (intestina bestiarum).11 We find similar bans in the unpublished 1321 statutes of Lucca.12 The Fonte del Poggiolo in Montefalco (PG) preserves on its back wall the writing of a passage from the municipal statute that forbade washing in the drinking water basin (pena uno scudo chi lava qui).13 In this sense, statutory legislation framed and accompanied current legislation, often called upon to deliberate on the construction and maintenance of pipelines to supply cities with aqua clara, as was the case in Orvieto during the first half of the fourteenth century.14

Moving from the centre to the north of the Italian Peninsula, a typical distinction in Roman law was made in Bergamo ordinances for use of fountains to avoid cross-contamination, thereby keeping water for domestic purposes separate from water needed for watering or washing livestock (lavellis et guazatoribus et vasis custodiendis).15 The law code of Ravenna articulated a series of regulations to prevent urban water resource pollution due to animal waste or other types of waste disposal. In order to discourage such practices, it banned barrel filling around wells, except at a distance of one pertica.16 We can safely assume that this procedure was most likely conceived to avoid infrastructure damage and water contamination, at the same time as monitoring equal access to the resource.17 A penalty was provided for in the statutes of Verona for anyone who threw animal waste into the Adige River.18 The 1245 statute of Bologna focused particularly on both the drainage and sewage systems (clavige) and their complex network of pipes and conduits to free public water facilities from polluted water and deposits of dirt and refuse matter.19 In order to avoid affecting water quality in the community’s two streams, Flumisella and Clerinzone, the fourteenth-century statute of Lecco, in the Po valley, issued a ban on garbage (glaream, turpitudinem) removal.20 Similarly, a rubric from the 1287 statutory code of Ferrara prohibited animal slaughter and the cleaning of salty fish in the city ditch,21 whereas the statute of Cittadella forbade the disposal of crabs, shrimps or dead

---

9 Neuno cavallo o altra bestia ch’abia il male del vermine o capomorbo o altra infirmitade di male apicaccitico sia menata o si debba menare a bere o a lavare alla fonte ovelo a all’abbeveratioio fatto alla fonte di Santo Ylario o alla fonte al Porto [Bambi, Salvestrini and Tanzini (eds) 2023 Gli Statuti della Repubblica fiorentina del 1355 in volgare: t. II: Statuto del Podestà: b. IV. rubr. 76: 566-567].


13 Merli 2000: 48; Visentin 2016: 133.


16 A unit of length = approx. m. 3, 270.


20 Anderloni and Lazzati (eds) 1915 Statuti dei laghi di Como e di Lugano: Statuto di Lecco del secolo XIV: 3-11.
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fish in streets and public squares. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, the Venetian authorities tried unsuccessfully to force boatmen selling water in the city to draw relatively clean water from a canal branching off the river Brenta.

Various norms laid down similar rules in the statutes examined governing the treatment of sewage. It was generally forbidden to throw dirty water out of windows before the night curfew (after the third toll of the vespers bell), that is, before road sweepers had started cleaning the streets at night. It was particularly important not to do so without first warning any passers-by with exclamations such as ‘watch out, watch out!’ According to the Ordinazioni of the councillors of Cagliari Castle in Sardinia, it was forbidden to pour waste water from windows and along canals. It was not permitted to build latrines between houses and public walls or even in squares. Only those who had already had them for no less than 20 years were allowed to replace them, at their own expense, with channels and wells. It is interesting to compare the thirteenth-century statutes of Spoleto, which required residents to cover the sewage drains from their homes to the public street, so that neighbours and passers-by would not have to endure the bad smell. It is also interesting that the codes refer almost exclusively to buried sewers running alongside or across public streets, whereas no such obligation emerges for private spaces. These are norms that we find, with few differences, in very different geographical contexts. For example, in Padua a 1236 statute article required those with toilets and latrines (cloacalum vel sedile) near the street to conceal them with a wall; and another forbade the depositing of manure and dirty water on church parvises. In the roughly contemporary statutes of Vicenza, similar provisions appeared to prevent fetor et immundicia. We can also liken them to the statutes of Ravenna, which formally disallowed the discharge of waste into public spaces to prevent potential harm to passers-by (transeuntes possint offendi). The 1352 statute of San Marino associated, by prohibiting it, the discharge of dirty water (‘corrupted’ water) with the discharge of any other ‘ugly thing’ (bructura). The 1377 statute of Ascoli Piceno forbade the opening of ditches and drainage canals from which bad smells emanated, justifying the dictate with a requirement not to annoy neighbours and not to offend the decorum of certain religious buildings and other buildings of public use. Let us not forget the 1355 codes of the Republic of Florence written in the vernacular, which

26 Fossa cuberta en la qual caygua la sutzura: ivi: b. II. rubr. 63. 64. 65: 126-127. See also Artizzu 1992: 74; Bocchi 1995: 77-88, 91, 94-95, 103-105.
30 Lamperico (ed.). 1886 Statuti del comune di Vicenza: IV: 149.
32 Quod nullus prohibiat ... aliquam bructuram in plateas dieti castri sive aquam putridam vel coructam [Balsimelli (ed.) Gli Statuti di San Marino: b. 3. rubr. 115: 85-86]; De pena mictentis vel prohibientis bructuram in citerman de fossis (b. 3. rubr. 121: 88); Quod terrena existentes circa fontes terminetur (b. 3. rubr. 127: 90-91).
prescribed that those who dwell near the Arno bring forth from their houses the filth and cover up the stench (che coloro che abitano presso ad Arno facciano uscire delle loro case il fracidume et puzura sotterra);34 or the statute of the Mugello community of Scarperia (between Tuscany and Romagna), which speaks of inappropriate discharges that can offend or cause injury to neighbours’ (offendere o a’ vicini fare ingiuria).35 In the same vein, the statutes of the vicariate of Podere Fiorentino (Palazzuolo sul Senio, Tuscany–Romagna Apennines) and those of Bassano in Veneto forbade the discharge of sewage water into the streets, to the detriment of public spaces and those of neighbours, for the purpose of clearing the private spaces of individuals.36

Often bans were placed on discharging polluted waste water from craft production, especially textiles and tanning. In addition to the already mentioned 1313 statutes of L’Aquila, which prohibited spillage into canals and roads of molza (tannery water) that civitatem deturpat, we also mention the royal rules imposed on Palermo by King Frederick III in 1330 to prevent those who treated leathers from gitare mortilla in lo fiumi de la conciria; and lastly the statute of the Tuscan commune of San Miniato al Tedesco (1337), which heavily punished anyone who poured multiccium, pelles seu choria bestiarum into the road (note the similarity in the terms used in the statutes of places very distant from one another).37 The statute of San Marino provided for a fine for anyone who washed leather in running water.38 The statute of the manufacturing city of Chieri in Piedmont (1313) forbade the washing (deayquare) of linen, hemp and leather in the stream running through the community.39 The statute of San Marino also prohibited washing clothes in the public cistern.40

Only rarely do codes include an explanation for the bans. The most frequent definition encountered is that of water polluted by turpia, or malodorous sewage (fetor), which certainly appeared unhealthy,41 but whose removal was affixed to general requests for a polysemic munditia, or propriety, in significant areas of the urban context, and safeguard of public or private goods, not always (or at least not only and, above all, not explicitly) attributable to disease prevention.42 A clear example of this are the norms of the fourteenth-century statute of San Gimignano that forbade the taking of animals to the municipality’s cemetery, as well as urination or defecation (De turpitudinibus non faciendis) at certain symbolic places, such as the Romite or domine Nobilis hospital. Such actions were considered a physical and moral offence against the dead or suffering and were unrelated to hygienic and sanitary considerations.43

---

38 De pena lavantis coria prope aquam vivam [Balsimelli (ed.) Gli Statuti di San Marino: b. 3. rubr. 128: 91].
39 Cognasso 1913 Statuti civili del Comune di Chieri: rubr. 120: 71.
40 De pena lavantis pannos vel quid turpe prope citernam de fossis [Balsimelli (ed.) Gli Statuti di San Marino: b. 3. rubr. 122: 88].
41 See Geltner 2019: 195, note 129.
42 Geltner writes in this regard that “health-related prescriptions in the sources usually assume that rather than explain why fecal matter, grease, and industrial waste are dangerous (periculosum)” (ivi: 96). Tosi Brandi 2007: 7; and Albertani 2007: 19-21, mention the close connection existing between hygiene and decorum, in relation to the statutory regulations of Emilia-Romagna. For a comparison with the similar situation in fifteenth-century Castilian cities, see del Val Valdivieso 2007: 175-176.
It should also be remembered that the 1287 statutes of Ferrara regulated waste disposal *pro decore civitatis* (for the decorum of the city).44

As we have already said, Galenic principles undoubtedly viewed the channelling of waste water as a way to avoid infections. However, we cannot be sure that they were behind the regulatory choices of municipal governments. The rules in the Florentine statutes, for example, required sewers to be sealed off and discharged into urban canals and the river Arno;45 in other words, where, in the famous View of the Chain (*Veduta della catena*) – the first realistic representation of the city dating back to the late fifteenth century – we see people fishing, swimming, drawing water and sailing (Fig. 41).46 Another *rubrica* of the same code allowed for textile processing residues to be thrown from one of the city’s bridges.47 A provision in the same statutes required that fresh produce sold at the market should first be washed in the Arno or another river.48 Similar rules with similar outcomes are found in relation to the Adige River in the 1327 statutes of Verona, which specify that drainage channels (*scancie* or *aquaroli*) for sewage and other *turpitudo* could flow freely alongside roads as long as they were not higher than one foot.49 Again in relation to the first half of the fourteenth century, the Milanese friar and chronicler Galvano Fiamma recalls that Azzone Visconti, lord of the city, had several underground *cloacae* built for the specific purpose of preventing the formation of slush that hindered the flow of street traffic.50 After all, at the time it was normal in Milan for much of the sewage to flow into the gardens adjacent to houses.51 The Milanese statutes of 1396 refer to the aforementioned *cloacae*, and thus to the existence of a city sewer system. However, the texts suggest that these structures consisted mainly of modest drainage canals, often open (*magolzia*), which carried sewage to private land or directly into the Seveso and Nirone Rivers.52

We could make comparable observations about the channelling of waste at Cagliari Castle, since the local statute only required waste water to be removed from squares and areas in front of the defensive wall, but allowed it to be discharged in nearby areas of no particular symbolic significance or strategic and military value. The 1295 statutes of Bassano (Veneto region) forbade the use of the castle porticos as latrines.53 Similar considerations are suggested by the *androne* (covered sewers) mentioned in the 1255 statutes of Parma, and by the code of San Gimignano of 1314, which required covered sewers to be dug in secluded places in the

---

48 *Scancia Domus Nove per quam descendit aqua coquine taliter ordinetur quod aqua vadat subitus terram* [Bianchi, Granuzzo, Mariani Canova and Varanini (eds) 1992 *Statuti di Verona*: t. II. b. IV. rubr. 109: 591. See also rubr. 110. 116: 591, 593].
52 Greci 1990: 444.
districts of the community (with the exception of the Contrada di Piazza), but permitted the use of these deposits, even if located within the walls and therefore close to homes, as latrines.\textsuperscript{54} Along the same lines is the regulatory code of Uzzano (1389, Pistoia countryside) which prohibited the conversion of natural depressions in roadways into pockets for collecting sewage and other waste, so as not to obstruct transit and disturb passers-by, although these substances were allowed to accumulate elsewhere.\textsuperscript{55} Finally, the most illuminating example is perhaps the thirteenth-century Fontana dei Leoni, originally built in front of the upper church of the Basilica of Saint Francis in Assisi. The city’s 1319 statute forbade the washing of people, animals or things in this monumental structure and in the city’s other major fountains. This was out of respect for the sacredness of the entire town and for the decorum of the basilica, which drew large numbers of pilgrims, rather than consideration for the cleanliness of the flowing water.\textsuperscript{56}

It is useful to remember that it was customary at the time to wash clothes in urine, which has bleaching properties. Also, while there was widespread protection of rivers from various forms of pollution, especially as a way of safeguarding private and municipal property,\textsuperscript{57} there were generally no rules for preserving the cleanliness of the sea, which was considered \textit{res communis omnium} (that is susceptible to anyone’s use and appropriation). For example, the statutes of the Sardinian coastal town of Castelgenovese (now Castelsardo) stipulated that washerwomen, flax workers and tanners should get their water from the mouth of the river Frigianu. This way they would avoid other carefully identified points further upstream, so that the section assigned for the irrigation of vineyards and other crops would stay clean. Meanwhile, dirty water could be discharged freely at the point of outlet of the stream into the sea.\textsuperscript{58} The statutes of the communal era expressed a strong ambiguity regarding the legal status of the sea and the shores (\textit{litora}), which, ultimately, for some Roman jurists like Neratius and Pomponius were to be considered \textit{res nullius} (\textit{Dig.} 41.1.14 pr.; 41.130.4). Therefore, regardless of the legal status of maritime areas, their waters were not the direct concern of either the public administration or private owners and, for this very reason, they were not subject to any form of environmental protection.\textsuperscript{59} The major communal cities with important maritime statutes understood this type of legislation, mostly divorced from the Romanesque tradition,\textsuperscript{60} as the law of navigation relating to commercial or military matters, not as legislation protecting a public good.\textsuperscript{61}

Use of certain terminology is never unintentional, in my opinion. In the statute of the Piedmontese community of Masio, in the territory of Alessandria (1372), sewage was referred


\textsuperscript{55} Vannucchi 2009: 16.

\textsuperscript{56} Cenci 1974-76: 16.

\textsuperscript{57} See, for example, the regulations prohibiting the poisoning of running waters with lime or the use of poisonous plants as a fishing technique found in Tuscan, Sardinian and Castilian legislative texts [Finzi (ed.) 1911 \textit{Gli Statuti della Repubblica di Sassari}: 72; Caggese (ed.) 1921, and Pinto, Salvestrini and Zorzi (eds) 1999 \textit{Statuti della Repubblica Fiorentina}: t. II: Statuto del Podestà: b. III. rubr. 82: 217 (\textit{De piscibus non tossicandis}); Murgia (ed.) 2016 \textit{Carta de Logu}: rubr. 85: 326; del Val Valdivieso 2007: 176–177; Sznura 2010: 270–271, 277–278; Borghero and Salvestrini 2023]. \textit{Nemo audeat piscari, cum mazza vel quaraguasco, calcina vel simili arteficio [...] in fluminibus vel aquis aquis, per quod piscis moriantur vel infirmentur} [Gualtieri (ed.) \textit{Gli Statuti di Vernio} rubr. 29: 47, Tuscan Apennine mountains, fourteenth c.].

\textsuperscript{58} Besta 1899: 216, 218, 219; See also Bocchi 1995: 106-107.

\textsuperscript{59} See Vallocchia 2011-12 (access October 2023).

\textsuperscript{60} Tangheroni 2001, p. 165.

\textsuperscript{61} See Musarra 2021.
to as *bruterium* (with an obvious concern for the protection of decorum), and it was established that these substances should be kept, just as in the Tuscan town of San Gimignano, within walled spaces between individual properties, and between houses and the public street. The *putredo*, *soczura*, *bruttura* often mentioned in the legislative texts referred to contaminated substances that undoubtedly equated physical dirtiness with immorality. In the statutes of another Tuscan town, Colle Val d’Elsa, *aliquid turpe* is used to refer to sewage; while the code of the Veneto municipality of Portogruaro (1434) speaks of *aliquam aquam immondam* and *putrida substantia seu turpia*.

Ultimately, regulatory sources mention the cleanliness or, in a broader sense, the purity of water. In my opinion, however, this is not only in relation to its physical qualities. Water could be beneficial or harmful. It could be characterised in terms of ‘goodness’ or ‘malice’, as Pier de’ Crescenzi wrote in the first decade of the fourteenth century. According to the famous agronomist, the difference between the various waters present in the soils undoubtedly depended on the physical structure of the terrains through which they flowed (stony or non-stony soils), the direction in which the streams flowed (the waters of streams sloping towards the east were preferable for drinking), or its weight. It is more than likely that experience led to a preference for better, more pleasant drinking water, perhaps flavoured and mixed with wine. However, the ‘moral’ nature of this element also played a role in the choice of what water was to be used or protected. It was purity in terms of simplicity, ‘neutrality’ and tasteless humility that gave value to water. Moral purity recalled the dignity of the element at the expense of its consubstantial ‘banality’. The *munditia* of water redeemed its ‘inferiority’, which made it, for example, less valuable than wine and unsuitable for the privileged classes to drink. Water could assume a sacramental value or be an expression of the most fetid bodily ejections. It could be a symbol of life and regeneration or a cause of corruption, but it was above all man’s actions and the rules imposed by social contexts that determined these alterations in status, rather than its intrinsic physical quality.

As Douglas argued from an anthropological perspective, law and institutions helped to define the quality of food and drink and whether or not it was permissible to consume them, on the basis of moral dictates or, more generally, collective ethical and religious consensus. The rejection of ‘dirty’ water was not necessarily due to a need to protect people’s physical health, but was often meant to uphold the symbolic categorisations that enabled the application of social rules and order. Moreover it was better not to abuse even good water: the well-being conferred by ablutions and baths or even the simple ingestion of fresh, good water could

---

64 Duranti 2023: 21-22.
68 Comparing the perceptions of people in the Middle Ages with those of contemporary societies, Squatriti writes of “asimmetrie fra purezza microbiologica e tolleranza culturale dell’acqua” (see Squatriti 2008: 584-600). See also Pibiri (ed.) 2018: 31-32.
69 Piscitelli forthcoming.
70 Douglas 1966: 7-29.
lead to sin, lasciviousness, moral corruption and, thus, also to physical disease.\textsuperscript{71} Meanwhile, in papal Rome, the use of \textit{balnea} of classical origin long endured through the Middle Ages, despite the condemnation of bodily pleasures. This was the result of continuous use and shared social practices that were justified by both the desire for cleanliness and the need for ritual purification.\textsuperscript{72}

Water participated in the polysemy that characterised the quest for well-being in the centuries of the Middle Ages; a quest that could not separate the satisfaction of material needs from the aspiration for eternal salvation.\textsuperscript{73} For lawmakers, water could of course be dirty or clean. However, the dirtiness and purity of water had a significance that went beyond its organoleptic properties, its composition, its condition and its odour – in short, its merely physical status.

3. Thermal waters

To demonstrate the social, rather than the strictly healing value of the ‘beneficial’ liquid element, the subject of thermal waters deserves separate discussion. In some cases, the properties of these springs had been known to the surrounding populations since ancient times, and the beliefs of philosophers and doctors about them were relatively widespread.\textsuperscript{74} Although they may not have been entirely aware of the springs’ real therapeutic properties,\textsuperscript{75} urban and rural dwellers, particularly the wealthier among them, would frequent the sites that gave forth relatively famous waters, to drink there and mainly to bathe. Considering the fact that drinking water generally tasted bad and was often replaced by fermented drinks, thermal water was one of the few liquids that could also be ingested or, rather, could be bathed in, for curative reasons.\textsuperscript{76} Places like the Bormio and Masino baths in Lombardy, those of Bagnolo and Vinadio (Piedmont), \textit{Aquae Patavinae} (Termi Euganei, in Veneto), Acqui on the Ligurian Apennines, the sources of Salso (Salsomaggiore, in Emilia, known from at least the eighth century); Bagno di Romagna; Montecatini, Monsummano, and the other spa towns in the Lucca–Pistoia area; Bagno a Corsena, Monte Pisano, Bagno a Morbo (Volterra) in the Tyrrhenian region; Petriolo, Bagno Vignoni, Bagni di San Filippo and San Casciano dei Bagni south of Siena; Bagni di Roselle, Gavorrano and Saturnia in the Marmma district; the \textit{Balnea} of Fontecchio in Umbria; the sulphurous springs of Bullicame near Viterbo, and the Roman and medieval baths of Forodongianus in Sardinia were mentioned and described by epistolographers and treatise writers of the time; and we know that they were frequented intensively in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{77} As early as the end of the twelfth century, the chronicler Pietro da Eboli (or, according to other attributions, Alcadino of Syracuse) wrote the treatise \textit{De balneis puteolanis} dedicated to the thermal waters of the Campi Flegrei near Naples.\textsuperscript{78}
VI. Water Quality

It is the legislative records that reveal that the fame of these baths spread even further after the 1348 plague, when interest in places of healing undoubtedly grew;79 although for some locations the effect of the epidemics seems to have been the opposite, namely to induce fear of promiscuous places where infections were thought to be easier to contract.80

Since, from a legal point of view, thermal springs were not different from other perennial sources, they were linked to the land on which they were located, and it was possible to take possession of them by channelling water and building basins. These unusual circumstances outside of the ordinary management of public and private waters were especially recorded in central Italy and along major international routes, such as the Via Francigena. Here spa sites arose which, as Boisseuil suggests, were locations identified by place names with one or more baths fed by springs, and larger spa areas, in which waters rose from various springs and flowed into distinct baths surrounded by infrastructure designed to welcome bathers.81 Some important cities especially located south of the Apennines, such as Siena, Lucca, Pisa, Viterbo and Volterra, but also Padua, expressed a clear desire to control over these places, both by purchasing them and, above all, by formulating statutory articles dedicated to the publica utilitas of their waters.82 The local political authorities had attained an awareness of the, if nothing else, economic importance of the hot and/or mineral springs situated in their territories (balnea). For this reason, they devoted a great deal of normative measures to these resources. As the statute of Viterbo sums up effectively, local sulphurous pools had to be maintained in good condition to facilitate access for bathers, whose presence benefited the community (taliter quod ex ipsis Comunitas posit habere utilitatem).83

The communal legislation on spa waters in places in Tuscia has been published and analysed in an important work by Didier Boisseuil.84 From the collections of statutes that he has examined and recorded we can draw interesting insight into the way communes designed legislation on this subject. First, it emerges that legislators never presented the potential therapeutic virtues of the waters within their jurisdiction. The studies conducted, at least since the twelfth century, by physicians such as Pietro da Eboli (ca. 1150–1220), Pietro d’Abano († 1316) and Michele Savonarola (1385–1468) on the health-giving properties of certain waters are not mentioned and appear not to be reflected in the statutory texts.85 As we have said, the authorities were, however, aware of their economic and social importance and mandated that special care be taken of the sources, and that new veins be found, in addition to the construction and maintenance of conduits, proper management of drainage ditches and other infrastructure needed for transporting the water. At the same time, they prohibited or limited the creation of branches and obstacles (like mills) that would weaken the flow of water;86 and it was of course forbidden to throw rubbish into springs and pools or make improper use of

79 Boisseuil 2002: 129-238.
82 Boisseuil 2002: 70, 274-276; Esposito 2012; Gloria 1873 Gli statuti del comune di Padova: b. 4. rubr. 2: 300-303; b. 4. rubr. 4: 308-312.
83 De ducenda aqua ad piscinas ionketi (Ciampi 1872 Statuto di Viterbo del 1251: b. I. rubr. 34: 462).
84 Boisseuil 2002; see also Boisseuil 2009.
85 Mantelli and Temporelli 2007: 114; Simonetti 2012b.
thermal water for, say, macerating flax or softening leather. Some communes managed these sources themselves, forbade their privatisation, either entirely or in part, and levied duties on them. In the mid-thirteenth century, the municipality of Siena sent a member of the podestà’s family to several spa locations (Bagni di Petriolo and Macereto) as rector of the baths, whose activity was regulated from 1293 by specific *ordinamenta balneorum*. During the fourteenth century his area of competence was expanded and transformed into an administrative district called the *Podesteria dei bagni*. The thirteenth-century statute of Acqui, a town located between Liguria and Piedmont, established the public nature of the space surrounding the thermal pool located in the cathedral square. Smaller localities, like Gavorrano in the Siena area, preferred to tender out the management of spas and the collection of the resulting proceeds to the highest bidder every year. Statute makers also made provisions for hospices and other accommodation facilities for bathers, which were required to be orderly at all times and suitable for ensuring the physical and moral safety of visitors to the spas. There was never any distinction between the importance of keeping facilities efficient and running smoothly and that of separating the sexes and monitoring conduct in places where men and women bathed naked, once again showing that safeguarding the health of the body and the soul always went hand in hand.

We know that different kinds of people with many different types of diseases, especially of the skin, went to spas. However, legislation only made explicit reference to certain individuals, such as lepers. The statutes of the spa resort of Chianciano in the Siena area, for example, prohibited them from washing their clothes in the waters where members of the community came to wash theirs. The tone of the measure was certainly in defence of public health (although this is not made explicit in the text), but it is interesting that it only concerned the skin disease with widely known religious connotations and subject to moral stigmatisation originating from the Bible.

Aside from these, other statute rules were geared to ensuring other forms of safety for bathers, such as the ban on carrying weapons to places where naked, and therefore defenceless, people gathered; or the prohibition of gambling; and the injunction on fighting and disorderly conduct, most likely because of the large numbers of visitors. The statutes also laid down rules on the markets that formed more or less spontaneously in these locations.

---

91 Boisseuil 2002: 323-324 (Gavorrano 1465).
94 Boisseuil 2002: rubr. 16, 18, 19: 352-353 (Siena 1293); *ivi*: b. III. rubr. 159: 363 (Siena 1309); *ivi*: 387-388 (Viterbo 1469).
VII

Water-driven Machinery

1. Grain mills and fulling mills: the economy and the law

Watermills and fulling machines (gualchiere) appeared along the banks of rivers and torrents. Among these were the water-driven machinery used for grinding or processing cloth, as well as hammers used to mint coins (and in Florence to stamp florins, the most prestigious currency in the Medieval Europe) which required running water.¹ During the fourteenth century, the silk mill technique was discovered and perfected in Bologna. Hydraulic machines were used to increase productivity and improve the quality of these processes.²

Until the thirteenth century, these factories were in major cities in communal Italy, such as Bologna, Reggio Emilia, Padua, Verona and Milan, especially on church-owned property.³ Roughly speaking – although there is wide variation in the availability of documentary and regulatory sources on this subject for the various Italian regions – from 1250, with the advent of the Popolo regimes came the communal authorities’ growing interest in these workshops that were essential to the survival of the overall community. Communes not only took possession and direct management of numerous machines,⁵ but also kept them efficient and sound, mostly by incorporating masonry constructions into wooden structures and by fortifying them against potential sieges or river floods.⁶ This policy went hand in hand with control of the grain trade and taxes on milled products.

To regulate the use of these machines, the drafters of statutory texts had to resort to the experience of public administrators and economic operators, since technological developments had distanced jurists from the precedents of Roman law in this field. It was necessary, however, to rely on Romanistic tradition to assess, for example, whether the construction of a watermill altered the course of a river and whether the owners of land or buildings downstream of this hydraulic machine suffered harm from its construction or lost any advantage they previously enjoyed.⁷ One of the most interesting products of this interaction is undoubtedly the statute of the consortium of mill owners located on the right bank of the Bisenzio River, in and around the Tuscan city of Prato (Statuto dell’Arte dei padroni dei mulini sulla sponda destra del fiume Bisenzio, 1296–1484). During the communal period, Prato had a strong craft and manufacturing base, which had long made industrial use of the nearby river.⁸ Numerous grain mills and fulling

¹ Salvestrini 2005: 30; Arnoux 2008: 740; Coli and Pranzini 2023: 58.
⁶ Papaccio 2008.
mills for processing textiles lined the banks of the Bisenzio. Between 1293 and 1296, the lists of millers registered by the public authorities indicated as many as 67 mills; whereas in the early fourteenth century Florence only had 14 millers who were heads of families. To avoid conflicts and to exert a calming influence on the milling industry, the municipality of Prato acted as impresario and for a long time constructed hydraulic machines. However, private enterprise also grew during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In order to continue exercising a mediating role, the commune encouraged the emergence of an association of owners interested in this activity. This association soon became a guild, albeit without the political role held by other professional associations. The municipal authorities delegated to the association part of the management of the water intended for motive power.9 As early as the thirteenth century, guilds of mill owners were required to draft a statute. This legal text represented the consortium of owners, that is, those who normally rented their machines to millers.10 The primary purpose of the statute was to regulate the maintenance and cleaning of bulkheads and canals. This activity was financed by the owners in the consortium.11 For the distribution of water, the code stipulated the election of two council members, whose task was to ensure that sufficient water reached all operators, especially during the summer season.12 Just like the partidores in the Sassari statutes,13 these appointees had the task of mediating between the needs of the millers and those of the farmers.14

If we disregard the interesting Prato codex, it is the regulations on milling machines that highlight the gap that sometimes existed between the economic importance of these structures, ascertained from various property and administrative records, and the relative scarcity of references in statutory texts. This is the case, for example, of the community of Montalcino in Val d’Orcia (south of Siena), whose fifteenth-century statute only mentions mills in a single rubric aimed at defending them from possible damage, in the context of a local economy heavily reliant on these hydraulic machines.15

2. Machine typologies

There were, in cities and countryside, many different types of machines.16 For example, in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Florence, wooden mills stood along the urban stretch of the Arno, either suspended over the river but built along the exposed gravel bed (molendinum pendulum), or floating anchored to the banks (molendinum in navibus); both types had vertical wheels. There were also terranei mills, which stood near the artificial canals (rogge). The floating mills had the advantage of being faster to build and movable to where the current was stronger to draw maximum benefit from the motive force provided by the water. Yet they were rather fragile structures, subject to being uprooted and overturned by the waves. One interesting record in the form of a protocol of the notary Biagio Boccadibue for 1306 details the sale made by Nera, daughter of the late Ranieri, from the people of San Niccolò, who, for four gold florins, sold to Tuccio, son of Feci, all her rights to a quarter share in two ships with
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mill and tools in bad repair, that is, sunken and swept away by the waters of the Arno. It also gave permission for these items to be searched for in the river, so they could be recovered and restored to function.17 Alongside these main types were the above-mentioned terranei or terragni mills, which had horizontal wheels and were also distributed along lesser streams.18

To give one more example, in Verona, many machines afloat on the waters of the Adige had similar structures to the Florence mills (Fig. 42). The Chronicon veronense by Paride da Cerea reports that a flood submerged more than 50 in 1239.19 Even in Turin, a smaller town at the time, duties on milling facilities was a significant source of income for the public purse, and was therefore regulated by communal ordinati (statutes and deliberations). The 1360 code forbade the branching of new canals from the course of the river Dora and imposed a requirement to make use of existing canals.20

In almost all the normative texts analysed here, references are found to these types of infrastructure, especially watermills, since the presence of windmills was scarce in Italy for environmental reasons.21 The government authorities of smaller communes intervened to encourage the installation of new wheels, particularly, as in the case of San Gimignano, during the thirteenth century, when the municipality allowed landowners wishing to build machinery to dig canals that cut through neighbouring property. The law code of this populous, ‘minor’ centre in Tuscany even required landowners to sell their plots of land to whoever intended to implement such infrastructure.22

The statutes of the most important cities that were already equipped with machinery regulated various activities and aimed to encourage and protect them.23 For example, the early fourteenth-century codes of Ravenna protected canals with mills by prohibiting people from crossing over them with wagons and from watering animals there. This prevented them from getting damaged. It was also forbidden to dig further into any trench; only the owners of adjacent land had access to them.24 A similar attitude can be seen in the statutes of Perugia from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which focused on the disputes (scandagle) that often arose between landowners who wanted to extract water for irrigation and managers of mills who needed running water.25 The statutory code from Poggibonsi in Valdelsa (central Tuscany, 1332), a community with an out-of-town monumental fountain (Fig. 18), stipulated the maintenance of the fontes, puteos and aqueducti. These supplied water by order of the commune leaders, although the maintenance costs were charged to landowners and mill owners.26 On this point, many law codes seem to agree: mills and fulling machines were fundamental resources for the economies of some centres situated along rivers or torrents (as
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was the town of Colle di Valdelsa in Tuscany), but such machinery was an important source of earnings for its owners and managers. For this reason, it was the latter’s duty to bear the cost of the upkeep of mill runs, canals, dykes, splint walls and other necessary structures. In northern Italy, the municipality of Treviso explicitly required mill owners to install access stairways and bridges. The previously mentioned Milanese statutes on roads and water stated that, if disposing of water after use without discharging it into the same torrent, the owner was required to close mill races fed with water from the Olona River and used to rotate waterwheels.

Despite the substantial repetition of norms relating to grinding machinery, they nevertheless highlight some details that are worthy of mention. For example, the 1325 statute of Cortona introduced a distinction between dry mills – powered by animals – and watermills. This differentiation allows us to deduce, from the maximum wages of operators, that the latter were on average more profitable than the former.

---

VIII

Transportation of Merchandise and People.

Timber Rafting

1. Waterways

During the Middle Ages, interaction between land and water routes was very common. It was normal for a journey made by people or goods to begin, say, on a path and continue along a navigable river, across a lake or marshland, and perhaps proceed further by sea. In contrast to what seems to have happened in England from the thirteenth century onwards, navigation continued to develop in communal Italy during this and the following periods, along with the transportation of goods by waterway. According to a convincing hypothesis by Szabó, the reorganisation of the medieval road network from the thirteenth century onwards was in part due to the interaction between land and river routes. In principle, navigable rivers served to speed up and ease travel. The large number of statutory regulations that we find in the codes of the Po Valley area, aimed at enforcing the cleaning of rivers and canals, was motivated more by the need to maintain waterways than by the fear of floods. Major rivers like the Po, the Ticino, the Adige, the Piave, the Arno and the Tiber provided the quickest and safest routes of communication and goods transportation on the Italian Peninsula. For this reason, more or less large urban and rural settlements had sprung up mainly along their banks or close to them. We know that, until modern times, Venice was connected via various canals and rivers to Lake Maggiore. The development of communities in the lower Veneto plain was related to the excavation of canals at least as early as the twelfth century. Particularly evident was the joining of land and water routes in the Friuli area, at the extreme north-eastern edge of Italy (Caput Adriae), where the Adriatic Sea penetrated deep into the European continent and a network of rivers, canals and paths linked the coasts to Alpine routes and passes.

Between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Donizone, the biographer of Matilda of Canossa (1046 – ca. 1115), called the Po a road and Matilda its mistress (Ipsa Padi stratam tenet). Between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the delta branch of the river which reached the Adriatic Sea between Ravenna and Comacchio became particularly important for the transportation of salt. The waterway was long the object of dispute between the local municipalities (Comacchio, Ravenna, Cervia) and the capitals of the largest territorial domains in the region (Venice and the Papacy).

---

1 Blair (ed.) 2014.
2 Maire Vigueur 2023: 262-263.
3 Szabó 1986: 30.
4 See Fantoni 1990: 43-45; Maire Vigueur 2023: 254-255.
Moving to central Italy, all cities in northern Tuscany (Florence, Prato, Pistoia, Lucca and Pisa) could be reached by waterways.9 The intersection of water and land routes and the connection between river and sea transport constituted the backbone of the communication system both in the Po valley and in central Italy, albeit with marked regional differences.10

In 1183, the year of the Peace of Constance between the emperor and the communes, the Italian municipalities obtained from the sovereign the right to keep their consuetudines in aquis, to build and manage roads and to collect ripaticus (mooring fees).11 These rights had been in the hands of local authorities since ancient times. For instance, in Porto, near Verona, there is evidence of them as far back as the tenth century.12 The communes’ victory over the imperial authority led to a decisive takeover of the territories bordering the cities, which, in the Po Valley area, also extended to control of communication routes. These included waterways. Therefore, from this period onwards, it was mainly the cities that promoted the excavation of new canals linking urban and minor centres.13 Organising transport became an important aspect of municipal planning, which is why it inevitably made its way into statute law. Naturally, the statutes devoted more attention to the management of overland routes, which required intensive and complex maintenance. However, they also deal with waterways, which were the main routes for transporting large quantities of goods. One barge, in fact, could normally carry up to 300 times the weight that a mule could.14 The strategic importance of the transportation of people and goods in lake regions is seen in the statute of Como, drafted immediately after the city came under Milanese rule (1335). In fact, several rubrics of the code mention the maintenance of the wharves and ports overlooking the eponymous lake.15

Of course, water transport had its costs. The duties levied at landfall points, updated forms of the ancient telonaei, mainly benefited the coastal municipalities, which, not surprisingly, drew up meticulous levy statutes. In communal period and, in some cases, up to the mid-modern age, some ancient tolls were still being levied by local, mostly ecclesiastical lords, who had long been in charge of this important source of income.16 Moreover, the dynamics of the relationship between cities and subject towns also emerged in relation to water transportation and related charges. For example, the statute of the Tuscan municipality of Santa Maria a Monte charged different tolls on grain and salt transported along the road and the river in the Arno valley depending on the parties involved, favouring hauliers of the municipality of Florence, the dominant city public authority, and demanding more from individual merchants.17 The community of Verona also imposed taxes and strict control over the transport of salt by river.18 The statute of the commune of Modena (1327) devoted no fewer than 364 articles of its fifth book to the protection of waters and roads. In 1336, the municipality decided to further increase this legislation by isolating it from the rest of the law and creating a separate statute that would be periodically reformed until 1525. It was

9  Raviola 2006; Il Tevere 2006; Salvestrini 2010b; Orlando 2011; Campopiano 2018: 34-35; Coli and Pranzini 2023: 53-55.
10  Rossiaud 2005; Chiiodi 2008; Greci 2010; and, for a comparison with the modern French context, Szulman 2014.
16  On rural river lords, with a focus on Piedmont, see Rao 2016: 14-17.
published for the first time in 1545 as *Statuta civitatis Mutinae ad iudices aquarum pertinentia*, and reprinted thirty years later.\(^{19}\) According to this complex, stratified legislative tradition, a judge was specially charged with ensuring that these infrastructures were not damaged by frequent flooding events (*aquarum superabundancia*), which could interrupt the supply of goods.\(^{20}\) While it is true that most articles in all of Modena’s statute drafts concerned the maintenance of the road network and, to a lesser extent, the waterways, it was maintenance of the former that required strict supervision of running water, particularly the nearby Secchia and Panaro Rivers.\(^{21}\)

For the municipality of Asti, a city in Piedmont with a strong merchant tradition, strategically located in the Tanaro River valley, the *pedagium canalium* that it temporarily ceded to King Robert of Anjou in 1312 was an important source of income.\(^{22}\) In any case, the duties levied on river traffic (‘passages’) were less frequent and lower than those on roads, fords and bridges.\(^{23}\)

From the twelfth century onwards, the countryside around many major centres in the Po valley and northern Tuscany was torn up to create a growing number of artificial canals, defended by main and intermediate banks, which became the main access routes connecting cities. The river transport network in the Lombardy and Veneto areas is documented at least as far back as the eleventh century and was encouraged primarily by Venetian and Milanese merchants, who used both urban and suburban ports and moorings located along the principal river arteries, and managed primarily by the bishops and, later, the municipal authorities.\(^{24}\) Even ‘minor’ cities like Padua, Bologna and Udine invested in digging canals: Padua in order to have a direct connection to the Venetian lagoon from the river Brenta; Bologna in order to intercept the waters of the Reno and Savena torrents and to build a canal for navigation (Navile, thirteenth century); and Udine to draw conduits (*rogge*) from the Friulian Torre creek.\(^{25}\)

After the Peace of Constance, against a backdrop of difficult agreements between the victorious Lombard cities against Frederick I, Holy Roman Emperor, Milan claimed navigation rights on the river Lambro. Similarly, in 1198, after the wars fought alongside Piacenza and Brescia against Pavia, Cremona, Lodi, Como and Bergamo, Milan took direct possession of Lodi’s river port on the Adda and reserved the right to transport and unload essential goods (grain, pulses and wine) anywhere within the territory of Lombardy.\(^{26}\) Although nearby Bergamo had, since 1168, allowed the Milanese full access and complete exemption from tolls between the Adda and Oglio Rivers, the Lambro’s draught was too shallow for boats in the summer, which persuaded the Milanese to turn to the far more important Ticino. This river offered the advantage of a direct, convenient link to the Po and therefore the possibility of extending trade towards Lake Maggiore and all the sub-alpine regions.\(^{27}\) The excavation of the largest Milanese canal, initially called Ticinello and then Naviglio Grande, can be traced back
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to 1177–79, although it was only enlarged and made suitable for navigation in 1269. In 1220, the other Lombard city, Cremona took steps to avoid the duties levied by nearby Mantua, by joining forces with Reggio Emilia to construct a canal originating from the Po between Guastalla and Luzzara and entering the Secchia River at Reggiolo, to provide direct contact with the larger river.

The magnificent system of canals in the Veneto region was begun roughly at the same time as the Milan network in order to regulate the waters of the numerous alpine rivers and streams, and provide convenient transport routes and energy for hydraulic machines. One of the first canals to open seems to have been the Bisatto, which the Vicentines excavated in 1140–43 by diverting the Bacchiglione towards Este along the ancient Sirone canal. In 1314, in order to ensure the city was not left without water, the Paduans derived a new canal from the Brenta River, calling it the Brentella and joining it to the Bacchiglione. Paduan municipal statutes of 1362 (written during the rule of the Carrara family) mention almost all the canals in the town and its territory, including the Piovego, completed in 1209 to reach the town at the Brenta; the Battaglia, excavated perhaps in 1189 along the Rovigo road; the Bovolenta canal and the Montagnana, built in 1338 by Umbertino da Carrara. Padua was able to capitalise on the experience accumulated during the first half of the twelfth century, when an initial diversion of the Brenta carried out to favour navigation caused a disruption of the local ecosystem and major swamping phenomena. The city took advantage of the waterways that linked it to Monselice. Several regulations in its statutes were designed to ensure the efficiency of canals for the flow of merchandise within the urban walls.

In Romagna, the 1287 law code of Ferrara regulated the transport of ships that carried salt to the communities of Adria and Arcoada. The statute of the guild of river navigators in the Emilian city of Modena, going back to 1252, is a useful source for understanding the types of vessel (navi, burchielli) that travelled along rivers and canals and what they transported (wood, merchandise). Longitudinal navigation down rivers and streams was mainly on lighter, narrower vessels (sandali), known in Tuscany as navicelli. The Modena statutory code obliged owners of suspension and floating mills to raise this mobile machinery, as well as any part jutting out into the water streams, on Saturdays and Sundays, thereby allowing navigation on those two days. Still on the issue of facilitating transport, the statute prohibited the construction of splint walls (steccaie) and stakes in navigable river beds or in close proximity to their shores. This norm is also found in the 1327 Ravenna statute, which prohibited the placement of obstacles (columpnam) on the city’s canals (flumicellos). The code of Lendinara (Veneto region, 1321) forbade the construction of any structures on the Adige River that might
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obstruct its flow and use. The Vicentine statutes of 1264 established that navigation along the Bacchiglione River was unrestricted in the entire area of the city, especially for transit to nearby Padua. The statutes of Chivasso, near Turin, (1306) punished anyone attempting to change the course of the stream that ran through the community and to take water from the section within the castle, which was undoubtedly used for motive power and as a drainage channel. These provisions were based on *ius commune*, which defended the navigability of perennial rivers by rigidly regulating the construction of infrastructure along waterways by waterside landowners.

Having long acquired the right to collect *ripaticus*, as mentioned earlier, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, communes were able to force the owners of land alongside waterways to allow mooring and the unloading of goods, as required, for example, by the statute of the Ligurian community of Rossiglione (second half of the fourteenth century). Legislative codes of larger towns and smaller communities along the Arno (*Breve della Degazia del Mare* of Pisa, 1362; *Statuto della gabella* of the town of Fucecchio, 1352; *Statuto delle gabelle* of San Miniato al Tedesco, 1364, and the legislative code of Santa Maria a Monte, 1391) mention duties on road and river transportation between the port of Pisa and the city of Florence, revealing information about the types of goods that were transported to Tuscany’s largest commune. Indeed, we discover that the main commodity transiting through these mooring places, where taxes were usually paid, was wheat, which Florence imported from southern Italy, Sicily and Provence, and, in smaller quantities, Tunisia, Catalonia and the Lazio coast. Also coming into the city, especially via the river, were salt, spices from the East, ‘Greek’ wine from southern Italy and Monemvasia from the Peloponnese peninsula, oil from Campania and Provence, Spanish, French and English wool, and construction materials from nearby Maremma. Semi-finished textiles produced in Florence were taken, again via the Arno, from urban workshops to fulling mills built on the outskirts of town, thereby contributing to boat traffic on the river. A similar, though less varied assortment of produce (among which wheat and other cereals were prominent) emerges from the customs records from the harbour on the Tiber for goods entering Rome during the fourteenth century.

Naturally, river navigation, especially upstream, was very slow. Sail boats exploited the wind when travelling along the Po, the Arno and the Tiber, whereas smaller barges only used poles. *Navicelli*, especially those travelling upstream on the Tuscan river, often had to be towed from the riverbank by men and animals. A horse could tow up to 15 tonnes by rope. More often, however, cattle and donkeys were used and the intervention of men was necessary on the steepest banks. In the valleys of both the Po and the Arno, these workers were usually called
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bardotti or redaroli. They were young men who wore a harness with ropes known as alzaie (from the Latin helcium, tow rope) or restare. They towed the large barges, while moving along small paths marked out on the riverbank. On average, it took at least seven men to do the work of one horse. Towing required there to be stretches of riverbank clear of thick vegetation and constructions. Therefore, towpaths could not be created where there were large natural or artificial obstacles. It was not uncommon for the bardotti and the towing animals to have to cross several times from one bank to the other on wooden barges (navi), which therefore needed to be available at all times. Under optimum conditions, the journey from Florence to Pisa took approximately two days and it took three days in the opposite direction, but only with the aid of sails and if cargos were not too heavy. Of course, navigation on the Arno and on the end sections of the Tiber was only relatively smooth in the winter and autumn months, when rains increased the water levels. The situation was different in the Po, the only major river in Italy, whose flow rate allowed year-round traffic, bringing activity to a good number of port facilities; however, the transport methods used were no different from those on rivers in central Italy, except numerically. Indeed, rafts were also towed upstream on the large river of the North along towpaths and using various types of boats (burchiello, sandalo, barbotta, peota and others).

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the ‘lock’ system (conche di navigazione or chiuse) was introduced on the Po, perfected by Leonardo da Vinci. It enabled navigation along the tributaries and to reach the main stream of the river, while gently overcoming the differences in level between the various waterways caused by the morphology of the land and, therefore, the river and canal beds. It was this system that facilitated the linkage of the major cities to the Po. Examples include the canals of Cremona (derived from the Oglio River), Sabbioneta, Ravenna, Rovigo on the left bank of the main stream, and those of Parma, Reggio Emilia, Correggio, Mirandola, Modena, Bologna and Imola on the right side. What counted on all navigable rivers in Italy was not so much the speed at which vessels travelled, but rather how punctual they were when delivering their cargos. It was essential for riverside communities, especially towns and cities, to have guaranteed supplies of produce every day, regardless of when these set out or how long each boat took to make the journey. For this reason, departures were frequent and the waterways must have seemed extremely crowded, especially at certain times of the year.

The importance of navigation on inland waters for Italian trade at the time is demonstrated in some records from 1401, the year in which a convoy of Venetian boats coming from the North Sea found it convenient to unload at Pisa three-fifths of its cargo headed in part for Florence and in part for Venice. Thus, the portion that was directed to the lagoon city went via the Arno as far as Florence, then by land to Bologna and finally along the Po and its tributaries from Ferrara to Venice. This took no more than fifteen days, whereas the ships, which continued circumnavigating the peninsula by sea, took forty-five days to reach Venice.
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In cities and in the countryside, there was also trajectory navigation, which allowed river crossings when no bridge was available (bridges were much fewer in number at the time, and were unable to withstand heavy loads).\textsuperscript{55} Around the few fixed structures that were built outside the urban centres a number of ‘bridge areas’ were created, which usually provided, alongside the suspended passages, diagonal navigation, necessary for the transportation of the heaviest loads.\textsuperscript{56} Nevertheless, statutes rarely dealt with the latter form of transport.\textsuperscript{57} In Umbria, the codes of Todi (1275) and Deruta of 1465 mention the \textit{navi} that were employed to this end.\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Nave} was, in fact, the term adopted for the large barges that were normally used to cross rivers and the larger canals in central Italy.\textsuperscript{59} The Florentine statutes of 1355 mention two different types of navigation operators: the \textit{barchiuoli} and the \textit{navalestri}. The former, also called \textit{navicellai}, were the navigators who moved along the course of rivers to various locations. The latter were the operators of the \textit{navi}, the aforementioned barges that allowed people to cross waterways from one bank to the other.\textsuperscript{60}

2. Timber rafting

One particular type of water transport involved timber rafts brought down from mountains and hills to lowland centres. This method was deployed on the rivers of northern and central Italy from ancient times.\textsuperscript{61} It primarily involved construction wood, which was particularly in demand in towns and cities, but also in many villages.\textsuperscript{62} Control over the supply of tree trunks and beams defined the hegemony of the communal lay magistrates regarding, for example, the management of the construction site for Florence’s cathedral,\textsuperscript{63} or the transportation of wood from the forests of Cadore and Trentino to the Venetian Arsenal.\textsuperscript{64}

There were not too many differences between timber rafting in Alpine and Apennine areas. The activity is well documented in the Alps from the early fourteenth century and highlights the way Venetian dominance over north-eastern Italy benefited from self-regulating forms of local wood exploitation and transportation to accommodate urban needs.\textsuperscript{65} If we look closely at Cadore, one of the best-documented and well-studied alpine valleys, given that the Venetian Arsenal relied on supplies from this basin,\textsuperscript{66} we see that the transportation of timber from the mountains to the city began in high-elevation woodland areas. Here, trunks were stacked on the edge of forested areas, where large locks were built for collecting the material (rastere). The owners of these enclosures were usually merchants and woodland concession holders, who were territorial lords in Tyrol, such as Welsperg, the archduke of Austria and
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the mountain communities. These structures were flooded with water and then broken when strategically placed wedges were lifted. This enabled the trunks to roll down the slopes along wooden channels called variously ludali, borrali, giavate, or risine, which were raceways and slides that converged all the wood at the bottom. Once the trunks had reached stacking points near small dams (stue), they were transported via the waterway (menada), mainly in springtime, when the thaw and the rains increased the water levels in the torrents. In this regard, a distinction was made between the menada piccola, which took place from February to March when snowmelt caused the Piave or Adige rivers to rise and timber was allowed to flow freely, and the menada granda, which involved the transportation of timber in all seasons from stacking points to the lagoon in the form of large rafts. The workers in charge of transferring them were usually called zattieri or menadàs and they were documented from at least the late twelfth century. Information about them is provided in the statutes of the guilds and those of the communities involved in transportation, including Bassano (1259 and 1295) and Belluno (1392).

In the steepest sections and at the start of their journey along the Cismon, Travignolo and Avisio torrents, or even the rivers of which these were tributaries, such as the Brenta and the Adige, the trunks could be left to float unrestrained as far as the main sluice gates (cidoli). Here, they were bound into large rafts onto which climbed the raftsmen whose job it was to deliver the material to the lowland towns and Venice. At the start, fir, larch and beech trunks were numbered and marked with the merchants’ signs; they were counted frequently along their journey for the purpose of duty payments. In the Dorsoduro district of Venice, the Fondamenta delle Zattere, the canal-side area along the Giudecca Canal, was one of the main sorting areas for material arriving via the lagoon. In Appuhn’s opinion, timber rafting was most intense on the Piave and Livenza Rivers. This was because the Brenta and the Adige had already experienced massive exploitation of their riparian woodlands in ancient times. However, the statutes of the centres along all the main rivers suggest that this activity persisted for a long time at significant levels. If anything, we can differentiate between the rafting of logs and beams from the mountains that was prevalent on the Piave and the Brenta, and the transportation of lowland timber along the Livenza, a relatively short backwater river (fiume di risorgiva), which could not intercept material cut at high altitudes.

Moving from the Alps to the Apennines, we know that, even before the thirteenth century, much of the fir needed to restore the great basilicas in Rome came down the Tiber from the woodlands of the Massa Trabaria region between modern Tuscany, Umbria and Marche. In Tuscany, from around the late twelfth century, when the areas alongside the river Arno were undergoing economic and demographic development, raw materials for building infrastructure were transported along the main stream and its principal tributaries. Playing an especially important role in supplying cities were the great woodland assets of the Camaldoli hermitage, Vallombrosa abbey and Florence’s Opera del Duomo. These institutions, which owned woodland around the Apennine peaks, produced large quantities of beech trees.

70 Appuhn 2009: 40-44. See also Canzian 2012: 17-29.
71 Codignola 2005; Cortonesi 2022: 79-80.
VIII. Transportation of Merchandise and People. Timber Rafting

chestnuts and Turkish oak, and, mainly from the fifteenth century, firs. For the Florentine authorities, purchasing timber from these landowners was a chance to obtain large quantities of material at good prices and to deal with only a few, large suppliers, with the assurance that they would be reforesting frequently and extensively, thereby curbing excessive soil depletion. Trunks and beams sold to city merchants were transported along the Arno, tied into rafts similar to those on the Veneto rivers – only here they were called foderi – and steered by foderatori using long poles (Fig. 43 and 44). In Florence, timber rafting was regulated in the statute of the Woodcutters Guild, preserved in an early draft from 1301. This text stipulated the election of two officials, whose task was to monitor the efficient utilisation of rivers used as waterways (due sufficientes homines pro viis faciendis aperiri). For a long time the municipality of Florence tried to intercept most of the material that was driven from the upper Valdarno (Valdarno Superiore) to the city. The republic’s statutes of 1322–25 and 1355 forbade trunks from Casentino and Valdarno from continuing along the river any further than the urban settlement, except for small, heavily taxed quantities. This law ensured Florence’s monopoly in the supply of wood from the Apennine mountains. Furthermore, the city authorities’ interest in importing boards, trunks and planks is revealed in a provvisione (resolution of the communal council) from 1290, which introduced a tax on large-sized timber and on the foderi to be collected at Porta Ruggero da Cuona, open on the river at the port of San Francesco, in the centre of the city. In 1452, materials arriving in Florence for use by the Opera del Duomo for the construction and maintenance of the cathedral were exempted from the duties levied on the transportation of timber. Before they were shipped, these pieces were branded with the UFO (ad usum florentine Operis) mark, which led to the expression, viaggiare a ufo, which in the Florentine vernacular meant to transport goods without paying unfair taxes and, more generally, to pass free of charge. A similar mark, AUF (ad usum fabricae), was placed on timber, on Val d’Ossola marble and other materials transported along the Ticino and the Naviglio Grande for the construction sites of Milan cathedral.

Timber floating could be hampered by shallows, rapids, bridges and rocks. In some cases the entire course of larger rivers could be disrupted by dams and locks that made navigation and the transit of timber difficult. Some such barriers were the large sluice gate installed in the Tiber at Umbertide in Umbria (Fratta dam) in perhaps the thirteenth century; or the sluice in the Bruna in the Sienese Maremma, an interesting project for an artificial lake originally designed for a ‘feudal’ setting and later developed by the commune in the early 1400s. However, the most obstructive encumbrances involving the entire Arno (although
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there were similar structures on shorter waterways in Romagna) were the so-called pescaie or weirs, built near mills and fulling machines in both the city and the countryside (Fig. 45 and 46). These weirs were oblique structures (more elevated when closer to the riverbed and lower on the other side) which consisted of a frame and a series of vertical wooden poles alternating with shorter stakes, all embedded in the river basin. These in turn were connected to more beams laid horizontally to form a wall against the current. The dual purpose of these constructions was to prevent enemy boats gaining access to the city and to concentrate the river current near one of the two banks during periods of minimum flow. In fact, the canals leading off from these sluices, known as gore, accumulated and directed the water to power hydraulic machinery during the summer season. To facilitate the movement of wood, through-ways called foderai gates were constructed at the lowest part of the weir. These were narrow slipways open in the dykes and were regulated by vertically sliding bulkheads (Fig. 41, 45 and 46). This process allowed material to pass through (although not without some difficulty). As for river logging, the statutes of the Florentine republic stipulated that any construction wood floating down to the city on the Arno and its tributaries had to be pulled out on arrival at the aforementioned Piazza Ruggiero da Cuona, also known as Piazza delle Travi (Beam Square), that is, the landing place situated near Rubaconte Bridge (Fig. 47).

Timber floating was mainly practised near the major mountain ranges. However, it was so important for the building industry of the time that it was even undertaken on shorter, more-difficult-to-navigate rivers. For example, we know that local statutes regulated the transportation of small logs to be used in the construction of ships’ oars. These materials were transported on smaller rivers, such as the Sieve, a tributary of the Arno upstream of Florence, the Ombrone Pistoiese, which flowed into the Arno downstream of this city, the Magra River in Lunigiana, and the end sections of Liguria’s short waterways. We also know from a 1339 general inventory of the properties owned by the Opera della Cattedrale di Santa Maria in Pisa that timber floating was practised along the river Tirso in western Sardinia (ad flumen magnum [...] et caput ad viam maiorem publicam ubi calantur lignamina ab aqua). However, no trace of these activities can be found in the island’s surviving statutory documentation.

As always, the main task of statutory regulations was to ensure the proper pursuit of activities and therefore, in these cases, to punish the frequent thefts of timber that occurred during transportation, as did, for example, the Bassano statutes of 1259 and 1295 for logs in transit on the Brenta.

82 Firenze, Archivio di Stato. Arte dei legnaioli. 1: cc. 10v, 29r. See Bellinazzi 1993: 213.
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90 Orlando (ed.) 2010 Statuti di Bassano 1259 and 1295: b. III. rubr. 29: 80; b. IV. rubr. 16: 83. See also, in this regard, Occhi 2021: 137.
IX

Protection from Flooding and the Religious Dimension

1. Prevention, perception, resilience

One of the main concerns for governments regarding running waters was how to protect cities and rural areas from flooding. Justinian law gave political authorities the right-cum-duty to carry out works to preserve communities and also to ensure that infrastructure installed by private parties to defend their own properties did not conflict with the public interest. There are many accounts regarding floods and attempts to reduce their impact, especially on centres located along the Po, the Adige, the Arno and the Tiber. It should, however, be stated that, again, there were differences between northern and central Italy. In fact, although the Po is the longest and most important Italian river, the cities located along its course are few and mostly situated on one bank (e.g. Turin, Piacenza, Cremona). It was the road, however, especially the Via Emilia, built alongside the Apennines, that attracted most of the settlements from the Roman era onwards. The reason for this is to be found in the fear prompted by the great river, along with the idea that the most populous settlements should be kept from its course. Over time, towns and cities were linked to the major waterway via the dense network of canals we mentioned earlier. That Polesine settlements resulted from structural choices determined by a long-standing familiarity with the river and its frequent threats is demonstrated by the fact that it was not so much flooding that determined the abandonment of certain localities on the irrigated plains during the fourteenth century, as it was the broader and more complex socio-economic crises that were only partly caused by the episodic instability of climatic adversity. This can be observed in three particularly significant examples. The first is the great flood known as the Rotta di Ficarolo, which took place near Ferrara (1152) and was caused by both natural and human-made phenomena. This event affected almost the entire Veneto plain and altered the course of the Po, giving rise to its Venice branch (Po di Maestra), which flows into the Adriatic sea with no fewer than three outlets. The second example is the great, albeit insufficiently documented, flood known as the Rotta della Malopera, which caused a change in the course of the Adige River in the autumn of 1438, perhaps as a consequence of certain military operations, but without profoundly affecting the resilience and settlement of the affected region. The third took place at the start of the modern period. The Rotta dell’Adda of 1520 brought about a change in the course of this river and to some extent affected the distribution of the population in Valtellina.
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In this regard, however, it should be remembered that, despite the threat posed by the tributaries of the Po and the Adige (Italy’s second longest river), there was no lack of important centres, like Verona and Mantua, located along their banks. Mantua was surrounded by large bodies of water created artificially during the twelfth century with dams across the river Mincio. These were long part of the city’s defences against attacks and sieges, but the very abundance of water made it prone to recurring and sometimes disastrous flooding of the built-up area. This is amply demonstrated by the detailed statutes of 1303, which provided for frequent raising of embankments and monthly inspections of them, and the organisation of periodic corvées with rural labourers working on retaining walls, culverts (chiaviche) and bridges. Moreover, frequent floods in these regions were caused not only by large rivers, but also by torrents, even where their flow was relatively constant. This was the case, for example, for the Colmeda creek and its floods in the Veneto region of Feltre.

The situation has always been a little different for the rivers of central Italy. These were less sizeable and seemingly familiar, such that many important cities, like Rome, Florence and Pisa, developed and grew astride watercourses (Arno, Tiber) and, consequently, endured their disastrous floods. Towns and cities in this part of the peninsula demonstrated a strong capacity to react to these events, although not as effectively as their counterparts in the Po valley area.

The statuta analysed in this research govern the prevention of calamitous events and, to a lesser degree, the compensation due for damages caused by disasters. For example, the statutes of Parma of 1255 and, especially, 1266 address the issue of ‘bad weather’ and imply that the Emilian countryside had undergone frequent flooding in the years leading up to the eruption of the Samalas volcano. From literary sources (Salimbene de Adam, Chronicon Parmense) we learn of floods in the area from at least 1276 to 1331. The 1266 statutes hint at this situation and many of the regulations concerning the maintenance of canals must be seen in the context of a long period of bad weather. We know that during those years (1316), the neighbouring municipality of Novellara, near Reggio, passed a regulatory resolution to divide the Crostolo della Modolena stream into two sections, in order to limit its flow and facilitate the control of its waters.

Padua’s statutes contain a series of meticulous provisions mandating the construction and maintenance of embankments along its rivers and canals from at least 1236, although the height of the period of legislation on this subject was in 1267 (podestà Giacomo Rosso).
Florentine chroniclers report disastrous overflow of the Arno in the city in 1269.\textsuperscript{17} The loss of all the Tuscan republic's statutes from before 1322 prevents us from knowing the event's impact on local regulations. We do, however, find similar measures in north-west Italy relating to other periods. We might mention, for example, the statute of Chivasso, a community along the Po north-east of Turin (1306),\textsuperscript{18} prohibiting the construction of obstructions and dams on rivers; or the text of the nearby community of Chiaverano (1251), which banned alterations to waterways.\textsuperscript{19} In central Italy, the 1327 statute of Arezzo stipulated that tenants of land transferred by emphyteusis were not contractually liable to the landlord for repairs and improvements, if damage was caused by natural events.\textsuperscript{20}

Regarding other forms of prevention, the thirteenth-century statute from Parma stipulated that it was the responsibility of rural communities to clear away plant material from embankments and riverbanks. Rivers and canals were to be periodically dredged to remove sand islands.\textsuperscript{21} The statutory code, furthermore, prohibited any construction along embankments, both within the city and on suburban land.\textsuperscript{22} In the Veneto region, the statutes of Cittadella (second half of the fourteenth c.), a newly founded town planned in 1220 by the municipality of Padua, bestowed powers on the podestà to require the periodic and extraordinary maintenance of bridges, embankments, canals and public ditches.\textsuperscript{23} The 1264 statutes of Vicenza mandated the frequent cutting of plants along riverbanks \textit{ut cursus fluminum non impediatur} (so that the flow of water would not be impeded).\textsuperscript{24} In Tuscany, the Florentine statutes of 1355 encouraged boatmen to dredge the course of the Arno and other rivers in order to clear their beds and also as a way of obtaining building materials (sand and gravel).\textsuperscript{25} Another chapter of this statute prohibited throwing stones and loam into streams, canals and ditches.\textsuperscript{26} According to the fourteenth-century statute of Ravenna, within the first month of taking office the podestà was required to appoint engineering experts (\textit{unum ingignerium vel plures bonos et expertos}) to monitor rivers and canals.\textsuperscript{27} We should also mention the statutes of the Tuscan communes of Santa Croce sull’Arno, San Miniato al Tedesco and Fucecchio, located along the Arno where the river crossed the plain in the middle of its basin, dividing into many branches and occupying a riverbed of almost five kilometres. The texts contain articles devoted to banks and ditches, as well as bans on the building of dams and embankments. Finally, the statutes of the \textit{Magistri viarum} of Rome (1452) mandated that the riverbed of the Tiber should be cleared of rubble and large items of refuse, and introduced penalties for dumping in the river and certain areas.\textsuperscript{28}
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These were fairly standard norms mainly addressing the proper management of embankments, the prohibition of grazing on them and the maintenance tasks required in rural communities. Nevertheless, despite these provisions, what was lacking in most of the local legislation was a comprehensive or coherent design for environmental planning. In fact, communal authorities could rarely exercise political control over short sections of larger rivers and even some minor ones. Nor did governments have full control over hydrographic basins. Thus, statutory norms solved some problems, but inevitably created others. For example, the raising of embankments in the countryside caused an influx of water and flooding in the city on some occasions. On the other hand, hydrographic areas were sometimes managed with the risk of compromising the security of border lands under a different territorial power. A clear example on a micro-territorial level is Pistoia and its territory, which were affected by several embankment works on streams and short rivers between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. However, the demographic increase and the urbanisation of the plain on which the city stood at the foot of the Apennines rendered the river works implemented by the municipality ineffective.

2. The case of Florence

The Florentine statutes of 1355 provide particularly interesting insight into flooding, since they contain an example of the contemporary norms that were enacted following a serious event, namely the great flood of 1333. Florence is a city whose relationship with its river has been the subject of numerous studies. The same cannot be said, for example, of Rome: a recent important exhibition on the theme of the city in the Middle Ages completely ignored the relationship between its inhabitants and the Tiber. In a comparison of the regulatory codes of 1322-25 and 1355, the older Florentine statutes mention few restrictions on the construction of worksites and weirs along the Arno. Such construction was forbidden for 300 Florentine braccia (about 700 m) upstream of Ponte Rubaconte in the centre of the city. In November 1333, the municipality took just seven days to enact more severe measures following the tragic event of the flood, which caused some 300 deaths. A provvisione (deliberation) dated the 12th of the month banned the construction of mills and other types of machinery along any stretch of the river that extended 2,000 braccia from Ponte Rubaconte, and 4,000 downstream from Ponte alla Carraia (the last bridge in the urban area). The penalty for transgressors ordering any new construction was up to 2,000 lire. Non-payers could find themselves in jail or facing capital punishment. Such deliberations were made an integral part of the new edition of the statute of 1355. They can be seen as political decisions taken as an emotional response to such a serious event. In this sense, we do not know the extent to which Florentines and other people living along the banks of the Arno (and other Italian rivers) were aware of the deleterious effects of dam construction and deforestation, mainly in mountain areas, and the
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Consequences of the wash-out produced by meteoric waters. Deforestation, therefore, also produced consequences for the seasonal swelling of rivers on the valley floor. It seems clear from contemporary chronicles and records, as well as from studies carried out by some modern historians, that there was a widespread perception of there being a correlation between the different elements. The larger landholders of the properties where woods and forests grew, such as the Camaldolese and Vallumbrosan monks, had drawn up strict regulations on the cutting of wood. Furthermore, statutes from other places allow us to see the importance of mountain stream management for proper governance of wood or grazing areas situated further down the valley. Nevertheless, in fourteenth-century Florence the situation was destined to change quickly. Measures that limited plant cutting were sorely lacking at the end of the fourteenth century because of the need for timber, as was the previously mentioned moratorium on construction sites along the urban section of the Arno between the quartiere of San Frediano and Ponte alla Carraia. This is the same section where, 30 years prior, building was subject to capital punishment. Nevertheless, the government abandoned its rigour prompted by the need to allow for new mills within the city walls to deal with the threat of famine in case of military siege. The strict regulations designed to prevent such acts, therefore, had a sense of emergency about them. Since their coercive intent could not be enforced in all areas subject to flooding, and since there was a need to deal with more urgent economic circumstances, these regulations were slowly but surely flouted (Fig. 48 and 49).

The only effective protection from floods that the Florentines of the fourteenth century sought was that offered by prayers to the Madonna of Impruneta (a sanctuary located on the hills closest to the city), by devotion to St John the Baptist, the city’s patron saint, and by those of the penitent women voluntarily confined in the cells of Ponte Rubaconte and Ponte Santa Trinita. This was an otherworldly safeguard analogous to that ‘guaranteed’ by the hermitage of the Holy Cross which, again under the aegis of the municipal institutions and the protection of their laws, had risen near the springs of the Perugia aqueduct to guarantee a constant flow of water to the city.

3. ‘Ordeal’ and legislative metaphors of baptism

In this regard, other aspects are worthy of note. The concern about floods necessarily evoked the fear of divine intervention in the close relationship between humans and their use of one of nature’s most sacred elements. In fact, floods were a tragedy insofar as they involved human settlements and, by God’s will, transformed a natural element created to be dominated by man into a nemesis totally beyond his control. The dichotomy between life and death and
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between salvation and punishment that water offers was always a double-edged sword for medieval society. Indeed, water symbolised spiritual rebirth through the Christian ritual of baptism, but was also the cause of death and an instrument of divine punishment in cases of flood. In a broader sense, the sacredness of water stemmed not so much from the exaltation of its albeit undeniable spiritual dimension, but from the particular functional dignity that men recognised in it. Since objects and actions only become symbols if they are perceived as such by dint of the meaning assigned to them within a communicative union, water, like fire, was viewed as a source of purification, precisely because of its ambivalent nature.

Although the statutes were rooted in civil law, their pages were not short of references to the relations between political power and ecclesiastical institutions, and the religious life of the people. All the codes open with invocations to the deity and patron saints, meanwhile religious festivities and the protection of churches and other places of worship occupy large sections of the provisions. However, there are only marginal references to the use of water as a sacralised element and an instrument of sacramental ritualty for inflicting punishment through the medium of the forces of nature. The image of lustral ceremonies inspired by baptism or the vision of water as a tool of purification rarely emerge from the pages of these codices. Statutes show the symbolic value of water as a religious element, but they do it only in reference to its use in judicial practices. For example, the Liber consuetudinum Mediolani of 1216 mentions trial by ordeal, whereby a final judgement of guilt in civil and criminal cases was determined via the medium of freezing water (iudicium aquae frigidae). This involved submerging a child into a river. If he survived, it implicitly invalidated the accused’s defence. Legislators maintained that they had to justify such a cruel practice by having direct recourse to divine will. While these tests appear harsh, it is precisely for this reason that they were also considered efficient.

The power to purify justified the use of water as an instrument of punishment, although we do not find drowning as a penalty in Italian statutes. The Breve Pisani Communis of 1286 provided for ritual bathing in the Arno for those who organised gambling and were unable to pay the prescribed fine. In the Florentine statutes of 1415, this punishment was metaphorically referred to as baptism, as this renewed ‘sacrament’ gave deliverance to the guilty, who were thereby reborn into legality by means of a civil and religious pact (debeat cum aqua baptizari). This type of derisory punishment was often referred to as corbellatio and was almost always administered in flowing waters, similarly to the initiation ritual precepts set out in the ancient Didaché, the oldest ‘manual’ of catechesis (Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles to the Gentiles), compiled between the years 80 and 120 (βαπτίσατε … εν ύδατι ζωντι, baptizate … in aqua viva.
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7. 1). Reference to this custom recurs in many statutes in northern Italy: Verona (1228 and 1327), Vicenza (1264), Como (1281), Mantua (1303), Adria (1442). The Veronese code specifies that the punishment was to be inflicted in winter (suppozetur ter in aqua de yeme). In this kind of contexts, baptism recovered its cathartic, not only initiatory and purifying, dimension. Baptism was an image of the impending passion, of the rebirth after a metaphorical death induced by suffering; which, however, in the courtroom and before the lay magistrate, took the form of humiliation. In these Christian legislative contexts we can make out the distant echo of the caricatures of Islamic ablutions that were spread by missionaries and travellers in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, including the Florentine Riccoldo da Montecroce (1242-1320), and derided as a ridiculous image of baptism.

In any case, where the punishment of ‘propaggination’, that is the capital execution of a condemned person who was suffocated upside down in a pit filled with water, slime or dung, corbellatio was a milder punishment that emphasised the desire to cleanse and purify the offender. Many statutes reserved this type of punishment for blasphemers, whose vile sin had to be ‘washed’ away by cathartic ablation. For instance, a pole was permanently erected on the Pavia bridge from which insolvent swearers were plunged into the Ticino River. Some Piedmontese statutes, such as those of Cuneo (1380), ordered the condemned party to be exhibited in the town square and ‘washed’ with four large buckets of water. The code of nearby Savigliano established that the blasphemer was to be pilloried or forced to jump into the waters of the Maira Torrent. In Garessio (Cuneo, 1278), offenders were to be flogged and watered three times; in Genola (Cuneo, 1449), they were to be thrown into the castle moat; in Ormea (Cuneo, thirteenth/fourteenth c.), a bucket of water was to be emptied over their heads; in Ivrea (Torino, 1329), they were to be publicly flogged all over town, or plunged three times into the Dora Baltea River. These rules were perfectly mirrored in the statute of Piacenza (1264) and in the seigneurial laws of Spilimbergo (Pordenone, 1326), in other words, in the codes of two communities located respectively at the heart and at the opposite end of northern Italy.

The religious and magical significance of sources emerges, however, from some statutes, such as that of Deruta (1465), which included a prohibition on performing magic rites (alcuna malia fare) near local fountains.

60 Biosca i Bas 2013: 38-41.
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62 Pertile 1892: 346.
64 Begotti 2001 Gli Statuti di Spilimbergo; Zorzi 2010a: 130. See also Fugazza 2009: 164-166.
Concluding Remarks

Various conclusions on several levels can be drawn from the analysis made in this book. Water is life, yet its use is inherently linked to political decision-making. It is no surprise that this unique, essential resource has always been a key focus of normative and regulative forces. The statutory legislation of communal Italy shows that water was a fundamental and strategic natural resource for economies, mainly for cities in flat areas with access to streams and intersected by rivers, especially if located in the north of the peninsula. However, in this context, it is only freshwater that is the object of legislators’ interest. When it came to the sea, the regulatory focus was almost entirely on navigation, rather than the protection of certain types of water, in this case saltwater, whose availability at the time appeared to be infinite. Closely related to this is the fact that the regulatory sources were mainly concerned with two of the many features of water, which is quintessentially polymorphous: namely its geographical dimension (particularly rivers, lakes and wetlands) and the ergological aspects of it, involving human intervention (canals, wells, dams and so on). Little emerges of what we might call the meteoric side of water (rain, snow, hail, the relationship between water and air, apart from the effects of floods), which remained largely confined to theoretical reflection, only minimally known to the drafters of the statutes. Finally, human action was of interest to legislators mainly in terms of the greater or lesser availability of the resource, which had to be guaranteed or, in other cases, limited.

It is difficult to say how effective the policies adopted by individual municipalities were at securing this supply through legislative programmes. It is nevertheless clear that in no case was the availability of water ever linked to property regimes. To take up the famous thesis of the ‘Tragedy of the Commons’ formulated by Hardin in the 1960s, the traditional existence of collective rights of access to water was never perceived by legislators as a form of overexploitation of the resource. On the contrary, it was regarded as municipal authorities intervening to defend a commodity needed by the community and to protect the common right to use it, with the aim of ensuring a fair and constant supply for all.

A sufficient supply of good quality water seems to have been the main objective of all the regulatory sources examined. However, the legislative interventions for important new, expensive and monumental infrastructures needed to transport and distribute this fundamental element, including large aqueducts, sources and pipelines, appear to have been more of a concern for the hilly communities of central Italy and Sardinia, which, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, had limited access to water. Meanwhile, the communes of the Po area, home to the country’s main rivers, were able to give freer rein to the initiatives of private parties when it came to diverting waters from canals and streams flowing on private land, and even from publicly owned perennial rivers. This was because, during the early centuries of the Middle Ages, the north of the Italian peninsula boasted a dense network of artificial canals that
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had been excavated by rural populations on the initiative of large ecclesiastical owners and peasant communities. Thus, urban municipal authorities did nothing more than continue the intervention that had been started before they themselves had even come into being, and plan new works with the certainty that access to water resources would always be available.

Therefore, the Tuscan-Emilian and Tuscany-Romagna Apennines, separating the Po Valley from central Italy seem to have acted as a frontier between differing attitudes to the relationship between local laws and water usage. An area that could be defined as a buffer zone was northern Tuscany (Arno valley), with hybrid characteristics common to the north and centre of the peninsula.

Although water was crucial for town dwellers and farmers alike, and while the urban ruling classes acknowledged the right of individuals to have access to this natural resource, government elites nevertheless exerted power over the governance of water, in favour, initially, of their own needs. Also, this research has shown that the economic and strategic interests of the main urban classes had higher and stronger priorities than environmental concerns, such as the protection of public health—which does not emerge clearly from the examined texts—and hydrogeological equilibrium, especially with regard to flood risk management.4 For this reason, written rules encouraged forms of exploitation of the available resources that the legislators themselves knew were not always desirable from a strictly environmental perspective. To this end, more stringent norms were enacted only after particularly serious events had occurred, showing that government magistrates preferred, especially when it came to flood defence, repairing damage that had already occurred (intervening after the fact) rather than preventing it.5 Prevention would have required lengthy negotiation and mediation processes between the defence of public assets and the legal proceedings brought by landowners, businessmen or owners of hydraulic devices (including many religious institutions). These were tactical political manoeuvres designed to help people affected by flooding events, rather than oppose the social groups capitalising on the use and misappropriation of local water resources.6

Adopting terminology that has recently come into use in the exact sciences and which distinguishes resilience – that is, the ability to maintain, or, when challenged, quickly restore conditions considered highly desirable – from antifragility – the capacity of individuals and people to learn from adversity and emerge improved from it7 – we could say that the Italic populations of the communal era and their laws reveal a general resilience but little antifragility in the face of environmental calamities caused by water.

In any case, the emphasis that all communities with a constitution placed on developing good water resource management programmes, albeit to differing degrees of intensity and with results not always equal to expectations, highlights that communal Italy was able to devise suitable responses to the requirements of complex social contexts, at least in terms of legislative planning, and did so by combining the tradition of Roman law with the normative experimentation, the institutional dynamism, and the political culture of the later Middle Ages.

---

4 For an analysis of social behaviour in the face of natural disasters see Campbell 2016; van Bavel, Curtis, Dijkman, Hannaford, de Keyzer, van Onacker and Soens 2020; Soens 2020.
6 See, in this regard, Squatriti 2008: 612-614; Rohr 2021.
7 See McAnany and Yoffee (eds) 2009; Taleb 2012.
List of statutes examined

Northern Italy (north of the Tuscan-Emilian and Tuscany-Romagna Apennines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acqui (AL) 1276 ca.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adria (RO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albisola (SV) 1389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariano (RO) 1328</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asti 1312</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balangero (TO) 1391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbania (TO) 15th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bassano (VI) 1259</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bassano (VI) 1295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belluno 1392</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bergamo 1353</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna 1250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1252</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna 1267</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna 1335</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bra (CN) 1461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brescia 13th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brescia 1557</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castel San Giovanni (PC) 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiaverano (TO) 1251</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chieri (TO) 1313</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chivasso (TO) 1306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cittadella (PD) 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Como 1281</td>
<td></td>
<td>Como 1335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremona 1339</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cremona 1485</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuneo 1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltre (BL) 1388–90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara 1287–88</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrara (Statuta Communis Ferrariae ad Offitium Argerum) 1320–94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forlì 1359</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forlì 1373</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garessio (CN) 1278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genola (CN) 1449</td>
<td></td>
<td>Genova 1375–82</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imola (BO) 1334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivrea (TO) 1329</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecco 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lendinara (RO) 1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi 1390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mantova 1303</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mantova 1311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marano Vicentino (VI) 1429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Masio (AL) 1372</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milano 1216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano 1256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milano 1346</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milano 1396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modena 1252</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modena 1306–07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modena 1327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modena (Statuta civitatis Mutiniae ad iudicem aqaurum pertinentia) 1336–1575</td>
<td></td>
<td>Niro (PR) 1260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novara 1338–39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oltrepò mantovano (Statuto gonzaghescio delle «Digagne») 15th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Omegna (NO) late 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ormea (CN) 13th–14th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orzinuovi (BS) 1341-87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Padova 1236</td>
<td></td>
<td>Padova 1265–67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padova 1362</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parma 1255</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parma 1266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma 1304</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavia 1393</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pernumia (PD) 13th–14th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piacenza 1264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piacenza 1323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polesine di Rovigo (Statuta totius Policinij) 1440–49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomposa (FE)</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Pons (TO)</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarona (VC)</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>1327-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiglione (GE) 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Giorgio (TO)</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savigliano (CN) 1305</td>
<td></td>
<td>Savona</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Treviso 12th–13th c.</td>
<td>1321–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treviso 1260–63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Udine 14th c.</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona 1327</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicenza</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Central Italy (south of the Tuscan-Emilian and Tuscany-Romagna Apennines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arezzo</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>Arezzo</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisi (PG) 1319</td>
<td></td>
<td>Borgo San Lorenzo di Mugello (FI)</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castel Fiorentino della Provincia Romana (RM) 1298</td>
<td></td>
<td>Castelfranco di Sopra (AR) 1394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chianciano (SI) 1287</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colle di Val d’Elsa (SI) 1307–1407</td>
<td>Cortona (AR) 1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deruta (PG) 1465</td>
<td></td>
<td>Firenze</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze 1355</td>
<td></td>
<td>Firenze 1315</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fucecchio (FI) 1307–08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fucecchio (FI) 1352</td>
<td>Gavorrano (GR) 1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosseto 1421–22</td>
<td></td>
<td>L’Aquila</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucca 1331</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca 1372</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucca 1469</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucca 1485</td>
<td>Massa in Lunigiana 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsummano (PT) 1331</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montalcino (SI) 1452</td>
<td>Montepulciano (SI) 1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montisi (SI) 1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nocera Umbra (PG) 1371/1567</td>
<td>Orvieto (TR) 1313–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia 1262</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perugia 1279</td>
<td>Perugia 1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perugia 1389</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pescia (PT) 1339</td>
<td>Piano del Padule d’Orgia (SI), Consorzio 1303-1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa 1287</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pisa 1313</td>
<td>Pisa 1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistoia 1284</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pistoia 1296</td>
<td>Poggibonsi (SI) 1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prato, <em>Statuto dell’Arte dei padroni dei mulini sulla destra del fiume Bisenzio 1296</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radicofani (SI) 1255</td>
<td>Rieti 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincine e Fornace (FI) 1446</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roma 1363</td>
<td>Roma 1452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of Statutes Examined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Gimignano (SI) 1255</th>
<th>San Gimignano (SI) 1314</th>
<th>San Miniato al Tedesco (PI) 1337</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Miniato al Tedesco (PI) 1364</td>
<td>Santa Croce sull’Arno (PI) 14th c.–1422</td>
<td>Santa Maria a Monte (PI) 1391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarperia (FI) 15th c.</td>
<td>Siena 1226–42</td>
<td>Siena 1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena 1290</td>
<td>Siena 1293</td>
<td>Siena 1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena 1305–25</td>
<td>Siena 1309–10</td>
<td>Siena 1337–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoleto (PG) 1296</td>
<td>Stroncone (TR) 1707</td>
<td>Sulmona (AQ) 16th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todi (PG) 1275</td>
<td>Trequanda (SI) 14th c.</td>
<td>Uzzano (PT) 1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzzano (PT) 1389</td>
<td>Vicariato del Podere Fiorentino (Palazzuolo – FI) 1406</td>
<td>Viterbo 1251–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viterbo 1469</td>
<td>Volterra (PI) 1210–24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sardinia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arborea (kingdom, <em>Carta de Logu</em>) 1389–92</th>
<th>Cagliari (<em>Casteddu</em>) 14th c.</th>
<th>Castel Genovese (<em>Castelsardo</em> – SS) 14th c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sassari 1294 – 14th c.</td>
<td>Villa di Chiesa (<em>Iglesias</em> – CI) 1303–04</td>
<td>Villa di Chiesa (<em>Iglesias</em> – CI) 1338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sicily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palermo 1330</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Dalmatian Coast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ragusa (Dubrovnik) 1272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Bibliography

Primary sources


Baldo degli Ubaldi 1616. *In primam Digesti veteris partem commentaria*. Venetiis: Giunta.


Bibliography


Catonis, M. Porcii 1982. De agri cultura ad fidem Florentini codicis deperrdit iteratis curis, ed. by A. Mazzarino. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner (2nd ed.).


Bibliography


*Laudensium Statuta, seu jura municipalia*. 1390, in De’ Bosio 1855, appendice.


Water and the Law

Pisa. Archivio di Stato. Opera della Primaziale. 16.
Statuta civilia Civitatis Papiae. 1393, in De’ Bosio 1855, appendice.
Statuta civitatis Brixiae. 1557, in De’ Bosio 1855, appendice.
Statuta civitatis Mutine ad iudices aquarum pertinientia, cum quibusdam additionibus valde necessariis ac indice copiosissimo edita. 1575. Modena: Gadaldini.

Statuto della terra di Stroncone 1700. 1707. Terni: Salutii.


Secondary sources


Bibliography


Ascheri, M. 2010. Statutory Law of Italian Cities from Middle Ages to Early Modern, in Drossbach (ed.): 201-216.


Bertoni, L. 2022. Uso e commercio del legname nella Pavia di fine XIII secolo, in Grillo (ed.): 191-203.


Bufanio, V. 2022b. Lo sfruttamento dei boschi per l’edilizia in Piemonte (inizio XIV secolo), in Grillo (ed.): 205-216.


Water and the Law

Cangelosi, E. 2021. L’acqua bien commun, bien public. Une réflexion à partir de la Rome ancienne. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03407473.
Canzian, D. 2022b. I boschi della Repubblica di Venezia tra terraferma e laguna (XII-XIII secolo), in Grillo (ed.): 135-150.


Bibliography


Bibliography


Dotti Messori, G. 2000. Norme statutarie, magistrature e istituzioni per il governo del territorio a Modena in età medievale, in Cazzola (ed.): 103-124.


(Fa) Fonte delle Fate a Poggibonsi. 1990. Quaderni del Centro di Studi Romei 3.


Frank, Th. 2009. Rechtsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu spätmittelalterlichen Bruderschaftsstatuten in Deutschland und Italien, in Drossbach (ed.): 311-326.


(La) peste nera: dati di una realtà ed elementi di una interpretazione. 1994. Spoleto: CISAM.
Public.wmo.int/en/our-mandate/water.
Rinaldi, R. 2000. La normativa bolognese del ’200: tra la città e il suo contado, in Cazzola (ed.): 139-163.
Water and the Law


Roversi Monaco, F. 2000. L’uomo e l’ambiente nel Medioevo: la legislazione sulle acque a Ravenna tra XII e XV secolo, in Montanari and Vasina (eds): 77-106.

Saba, A. F. 2013. L’allocazione delle acque dolci fra teoria e storia, in Mocarelli (ed.): 57-73.


Salvestrini, F. 2010a. L’Arno e l’alluvione fiorentina del 1333, in Matheus et al. (eds): 231-256.


Salvestrini, F. 2017a. Le inondazioni a Firenze e nella valle dell’Arno dal XII al XVI secolo, in Bianca and Salvestrini (eds): 31-60.


Salvestrini, F. 2023a. «Patria degna di triumfal fama». Il contesto storico-politico e la matrice culturale degli Statuti fiorentini del 1355, in Bambi, Salvestrini and Tanzini (eds) I: 3-78.

Salvestrini, F. 2023b. La festa di san Giovanni a Firenze tra medioevo e prima età moderna, in Varanini (ed.): 171-211.


Bibliography


Wickham, Ch. 2015. Sleepwalking into a New World: The Emergence of Italian City Communes in the Twelfth Century. Princeton: Princeton University Press.


Figure 1. Rome, Aqua Virgo pipeline, I c. b.C., refurbished during the Middle Ages. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 2. Rome, Aqua Virgo pipeline. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 3. Siena Fountain of Pescaia, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 4. Siena, Fonte Branda, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 5. L’Aquila, Fontana della Riviera, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 6. Perugia, Fontana Maggiore, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 7. Massa Marittima (GR), Fonte dell’Abbondanza, 13th-14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 8. Massa Marittima (GR), Fonte dell’Abbondanza, Fertility Tree fresco. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 9. Sassari, Fontana del Rosello, 17th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 10. San Gimignano (SI), Piazza della Cisterna, 13th-14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 11. San Gimignano (SI), Piazza della Cisterna. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 12. Pistoia, Piazza della Sala and Pozzo del Leoncino, 13th-16th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 13. Stroncone (TR), Fontana Vecchia, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 14. Stroncone (TR), Fontana delle Tre Tazze, 16th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 15. Fontecchio (AQ), 14th c. Fountain. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 16. San Gimignano (SI), Medieval ‘Fonti’, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 17. San Gimignano (SI), Medieval ‘Fonti’. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 18. Poggibonsi (SI) Fonte delle Fate. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 19. Volterra (PI), Fonti di Dociola, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 20. Volterra (PI), Fonte San Felice, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 21. Todi (PG), Fonte di Scannabecco, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 22. Gagliano Aterno (AQ), Fountain, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 23. Isernia, Fontana della Fraterna, 13th-20th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 24. Viterbo, Fontana Grande or ‘del Sepale’, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 25. Spoleto (PG) Ponte delle Torri, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 26. Spoleto (PG), Ponte delle Torri. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 27. Sulmona (AQ), Acquedotto Svevo, 13th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 28. Sulmona (AQ), Fontana Del Vecchio, 15th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 29. Orvieto (TR), Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane, Pozzo di San Patrizio, 16th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 30. Verona, Ponte Scaligero or ‘di Castelvecchio’, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 31. Bernardo Bellotto (1721-80), Verona, Ponte delle Navi, 14th-19th c., private collection. All right reserved.

Figure 32. Bassano del Grappa (VI), Ponte Vecchio, 13th-16th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 33. Venezia, Ponte Chiodo. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 34. Pavia, Ponte Coperto, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 35. Pavia, Ponte Coperto, post-World War II reconstruction. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 36. Anonymous, 17th c., Alessandria, 'Ponte Coperto' over the Tanaro river (14th-15th c.), Alessandria, Sale d'Arte Comunali. All right reserved.
Figure 37. Pesaro, Ponte di Fermignano, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 38. Firenze, Ponte Vecchio, 14th c. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 39. Firenze, Ponte Santa Trinita, 13th-16th c., before the 20th c. reconstruction.
©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 40. Verona, Fontana ‘Madonna Verona’, 14th c., from reclaimed Roman materials. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 41. Ludovico degli Uberti (from), View of Florence known as ‘della Catena’, 15th c. Original in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett. All right reserved.

Figure 42. Caspar van Wittel (1652-53-1736), Verona, View of the Adige near the Church of San Giorgio in Braida, Verona, Casa Museo Palazzo Maffei. All right reserved.
Figure 43. Giuseppe Zocchi (1711-67), Firenze, View of the Arno from Porta San Niccolò, engraving. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 44. Giuseppe Zocchi (1711-67), Firenze, View of the Arno from Porta San Niccolò, detail. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 45. Firenze, ‘pescaia’ Santa Rosa. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

Figure 46. Philippe Galle (1537-1612), from Jan Van der Straet (1523-1605), 'La pesca nell’Arno', engraving. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
Figure 47. Bernardo Bellotto (1721-80), Firenze, ‘Piazza delle Travi’, private collection. All right reserved.

Figure 48. Approximate extent of flooded areas during the floods of medieval and modern Florence. ©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.
### Figures

Figure 49. Florence floods ($S =$ serious event)

©2023 Francesco Salvestrini.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12th century</th>
<th>15th century</th>
<th>17th century</th>
<th>19th century</th>
<th>20th century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>??-11-1177</td>
<td>??-05-1406</td>
<td>??-01-1621</td>
<td>03-11-1844 S</td>
<td>04-11-1966 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th century</td>
<td>??-12-1434</td>
<td>09-11-1641</td>
<td>06-11-1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??-1200/01</td>
<td>18-10-1456</td>
<td>06-11-1646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??-10-1261</td>
<td>16-01-1465</td>
<td>??-01-1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-10-1269 S</td>
<td>19-01-1490</td>
<td>04-11-1660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-12-1282</td>
<td>10-06-1491</td>
<td>11-05-1674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-04-1284</td>
<td>11-10-1676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-12-1288</td>
<td>16th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-12-1288</td>
<td>24-08-1508</td>
<td>18-05-1680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>08-01-1515</td>
<td>20-04-1683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??-1302/03</td>
<td>28-08-1520</td>
<td>26-01-1687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??-01-1305</td>
<td>15-12-1532</td>
<td>08-12-1688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-11-1333 S</td>
<td>28-08-1538</td>
<td>02-06-1695</td>
<td>??-01-1698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-12-1334</td>
<td>06-11-1543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-11-1345</td>
<td>15-11-1544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>13-08-1547 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1362</td>
<td>08-11-1550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-11-1368</td>
<td>13-09-1557 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-07-1378</td>
<td>31-10-1589 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-10-1380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-11-1761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personal names

A
Alboin, King of Lombards, 30.
Alcadino of Syracuse, 50.
Amadeus I, Duke of Savoy, 40.
Ambrogio Lorenzetti, 35.
Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane, 24.
Appuhn, Karl R., 64.
Azzone Visconti, Lord of Milan, 17, 47.

B
Balestracci, Duccio, xv.
Bambi, Federigo, xv.
Bartolus de Saxoferrato, 2.
Berengar, Emperor of Romans, 30.
Bernat i Roca, Margalida, 6.
Bertrand du Pouget, 2n.
Biagio Boccadibue, 54.
Boisseuil, Didier, 51.
Bonvesin de la Riva, 17.
Brother Elias, 24.

C
Campopiano, Michele, xv, 35.
Cangrande della Scala, Lord of Verona, 25.
Cansignorio della Scala, Lord of Verona, 30.
Canzian, Darío, xv.
Carrara, family, 60.
Cassiodorus, Flavius Magnus Aurelius, 61n.
Cato, Marcus Porcius, 29.
Cazzola, Franco, 12n.
Chiappa Mauri, Luisa, 13.
Clement VII, Pope, 24.
Coomans, Janna, 6.

D
Donizone, 57.
Douglas, Mary, 49.

E
Egidio de Albornoz, Cardinal, 23.

F
Faini, Enrico, xv.
Feci, 54.
Foschi, Paola, xv.
Foucault, Michel, 13.
Francesco di Marco Datini, 50n.
Frederick I, Holy Roman Emperor, 59.
Frederick III, King of Sicily, 46.

G
Galvano Fiamma, 47.
Giacomino Rosso, 68.
Ginatempo, Maria, xv.
Giovanni da Viterbo, 7n.
Giovanni Pisano, 21.
Glick, Thomas F., 12.
Geltner, Guy, 6 and n, 7n, 13, 46.

H
Habermas, Jürgen, 13n.
Hadrian I, Pope, 16n.
Hardin, Garrett, 74.

I
Iacopo della Quercia, 22.
Isabella d’Acquaviva, 23.
J
John the Baptist, Saint, 71.
Justinian, Roman Emperor, 2, 41.

L
Leguay, Jean-Pierre, 6.
Leon Battista Alberti, 6.

M
Maggi, Berardo, Bishop of Brescia, 20.
Maire Vigueur, Jean-Claude, 12, 19.
Manfred of Sicily, King, 24.
Marcianus, 18n.
Mark, the Evangelist, 7.
Matilda of Canossa, 57.
Michele Savonarola, 51.
Mocarelli, Luca, 12.
Mosè del Brolo, 26.

N
Nanni, Paolo, xv.
Nera, 54.
Neratius, Jurist, 48.
Nicola Pisano, 21.

O
Obizzo d'Este, Marquis of Ferrara, 26.

P
Paride da Cerea, 55.
Pier de’ Crescenzi, 49.
Pietro d'Abano, 51.
Pietro da Eboli, 50, 51.
Pliny the Elder, 43.
Pomponius, Jurist, 48.

R
Ranieri, 54.
Rawcliffe, Carole, 6.
Riccardo da Montecroce, 73.
Robert of Anjou, King of Naples, 59.

S
Salimbene de Adam, 68.
Scannabecchi dei Fagnani, Podestà of Todi, 23.
Schenk, Gerrit, xv.
Sforza, family, 16.
Squatriti, Paolo, 29, 49n.
Szabó, Thomas, 57.

T
Tanzini, Lorenzo, xv.
Tarlati, Guido, Bishop of Arezzo, 20.
Theoderic, King of Italy, 61n.
Tuccio, 54.

U
Umbertino da Carrara, Lord of Padua, 60.

V
Vannini, Guido, xv.
Varanini, Gian Maria, xv.
Vero, 30.
Visconti, family, 12, 16, 17.
Viscount Gatti, Capitano del Popolo of Viterbo, 23.
Visentin, Laura, 19.

W
Wittfogel, Karl August, 12 and n, 13.
Worster, Donald, 12.

Z
Zeno, Saint, 16.
**Place names**

**A**

Abruzzo, 11, 22, 23.
Acqui, 50, 51.
Adda River, 11, 59.
Adige River, 17, 29, 44, 47, 55, 57, 60, 64, 67, 68.
Adigetto River, 42.
Adria, 60, 73.
Adriatic Sea, 10, 26, 57, 67.
Africa, xiii, 5.
Alessandria, 29, 48.
Alps, xiv, 1, 11, 26, 63, 64.
Ancona, xiv.
Apennines, xiv, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 29, 43, 46, 50, 51, 64, 65, 67, 70, 75.
*Aqua Claudia* (Rome), 16.
*Aqua Virgo* (Rome), 16, 28.
Aragon, 3.
Arbia Torrent, 42.
Arcoada, 60.
Arezzo, 20, 31, 43, 69.
Arischia, 23.
Arles, 3.
Arno River, 17, 37, 46, 47, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75.
Ascoli Piceno, 28, 31, 45.
Asia, xiii, 5, 13.
Assisi, 24, 48.
Asti, 59.
Atri, 23.
Austria, 5, 63.
Avisio Torrent, 64.

**B**

Bacchiglione River, 10, 35, 60, 61.
Bagni di Macereto, 52.
Bagni di Petriolo, 52.
Bagni di Roselle, 50.
Bagni di San Filippo, 50.
Bagno a Corsena, 50.
Bagno a Morbo, 50.
Bagno di Romagna, 50.
Bagno Vignoni, 50.
Bagnolo, 50.
*Bagniargia* Aqueduct, 24.
Barcelona, 3.

Basilica of Saint Francis in Assisi, 24, 48.
Bassano del Grappa, 29, 46, 47, 64, 66.
Battaglia Canal, 60.
Belluno, 20, 64.
Bergamo, 15, 26, 28, 44, 59.
Bisatto Canal, 60.
Bisenzio River, 53, 54.
Bohemia, 6.
Bologna, xiv, 2 and n, 6 and n, 15, 17, 23, 32, 40, 41, 44, 53 and n, 59, 62.
Bormio, 50.
Bovolenta Canal, 60.
Bra, 28.
Brenta River, 17, 45, 59, 60, 64, 66.
Brentella Canal, 60.
British Isles, 13.
Bruges, 3.
Bruna, 65.
Buggiano, 25, 28.
Bullicame (Viterbo), 50.

**C**

Cadore, 63.
Cagliari Castle, 45, 47.
Camaldoli Hermitage, 64.
Campagnola, 33.
Campania, 61.
Campi Flegrei, 50.
Canavese, 28, 39.
Canossa, 57.
*Caput Adriae*, 57.
Casentino, 40, 65.
Castel Fiorentino, 31.
Castel San Giovanni, 41.
Castelgenovese (Castelsardo), 48.
Castile, 3.
Catalonia, 61.
Cavaglia Stream, 27.
Cerea, 55.
Cervia, 57.
Chianciano, 52.
Chiaverano, 69.
Chieri, 46.
Chivasso, 61, 69.
Cismon Torrent, 64.
Cittadella, 44, 69.
Claverano, 39.
Clerinzone Stream, 44.
Colle Val d’Elsa, 32, 49, 56.
Colmeda Creek, 68.
Comacchio Lake, 11.
Comacchio, 57.
Como, 58, 59, 73.
Constance, 58, 59.
Contrada di Piazza, 48.
Correggio, 62.
Cortona, 20, 56.
Cremona, 13, 17, 25, 33, 60, 62, 67.
Crostolo della Modolena Stream, 68.
Cuneo, 73.

D
Deruta, 42, 63, 73.
Dora Baltea River, 73.
Dora River, 55.
Dorsoduro (Venice), 64.

E
Eboli, 50, 51.
Egypt, 12.
Emilia, 17, 46n, 50.
England, 6, 15n, 57.
Este, 60.
Europe, 1, 5, 29, 39n, 52.
European Continent, 57.

F
Feltre, 68.
Fermignano, 29.
Fermo, 23.
Ferrara, 11, 24, 33, 34, 36, 44, 47, 60, 62, 67.
Fiumicello River, 42.
Florence, xiv, xv, 11, 12, 17, 21, 29, 30n, 43, 45, 53, 54, 55, 58, 61 and n, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71.
Flumisella Stream, 44.
Foiano della Chiana, 37.
Fondamenta delle Zattere (Venice), 64.
Fons Maior (Castel Fiorentino), 32.
Fons Marosus (Genoa), 21.
Fontana dei Leoni (Assisi), 24, 48.
Fontana del Rosello (Sassari), 21.
Fontana del Vecchio (Sulmona), 23.
Fontana dell’Olmo (San Martino al Cimino), 22.
Fontana della Riviera (L’Aquila), 21.
Fontana di Piassa Vecchia (Villa di Chiesa), 24.
Fontana di Piazza dei Priori (Narni), 22.
Fontana di Porta Tiberina (Vitorchiano), 22.
Fontana Maggiore (Perugia), 21, 25.
Fontana Nova (Tarquinia), 22.
Fontana Sarracco (Scanno), 23.
Fontana Vecchia (Soriano al Cimino), 22.
Fonte al Corso (Gubbio), 23.
Fonte al Porto (Florence), 44n.
Fonte Antescolis (Bergamo), 26.
Fonte Canale (Atri), 23.
Fonte degli Archi (Arischia), 23.
Fonte del Poggiole (Montefalco), 44.
Fonte del Sepale (Fontana Grande, Viterbo), 23.
Fonte della Valle (Gagliano Aterno), 23.
Fonte delle Fate (Poggibonsi), 22.
Fonte di San Felice (Volterra), 22.
Fonte di Santo Ylario (Florence), 44n.
Fonte di Scannebecco (Todi), 23.
Fonte di Sfumico (Fermo), 23.
Fonte Fallera (Fermo), 23.
Fonte Fraterna (Isernia), 23.
Fonte Gaia (Siena), 22.
Fonte Maggiore (Macerata), 23.
Fontecchio (Abruzzo), 22.
Fontecchio (Umbria), 50.
Fonti Castellane (Montalcino), 22.
Fonti di Doccia (San Gimignano), 22.
Fonti di Doccia (Volterra), 22.
Fonti di Marina (Piombino), 22.
Fonti di Sopra (Montieri), 22.
Fonti di Sotto (Montieri), 22.
Fonti (Ripatransone), 23.
Fordongianus, 50.
Forlì, 15, 32.
Fornace (Casentino, Tuscany), 40.
France, 6, 13.
Fratta Dam (Umbria), 65.
Frigianu River, 48.
Friuli, 11, 57.
Fucecchio Marshes (Tuscany), 37.
Fucecchio, 19, 37, 61, 69.
Fucino, 11.
G
Gagliano Aterno, 23.
Garessio, 73.
Gavorrano, 50, 52.
Genoa, xiv, 8, 22, 41.
Genola, 73.
Germany, 5, 10.
Ghent, 3.
Giudecca Canal (Venice), 64.
Gizio River, 24, 41.
Grado Lagoon, 11.
Grosseto, 44.
Guastalla, 60.
Gubbio, 22, 23.
Gurusele Stream (Sassari), 40.

H
Holland, 13n.
Holy Cross Hermitage (Perugia), 71.
Hungary, 5.

I
Iberian Peninsula, 13.
Imola, 62.
Impruneta, 71.
Italian Peninsula, 6, 11, 29, 44, 57, 74.
Italy, xiii, xiv, xv, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and n, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36 and n, 37, 40, 41, 42, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61 and n, 62, 63, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75.
Ivrea, 73.

K
Kinzica (Pisa), 24.

L
L'Aquila, xiv, 7n, 21, 23, 42, 46.
Lambr River, 59.
Lazio, 8, 13, 28, 61.
Lecco, 44.
Lendinara, 25, 60.
Liguria, 52, 66.
Livenza River, 10, 64.
Livorno, 24.

Lodi, 27, 59.
Lodigiano, 11.
Lombardy, xiv, 5, 6, 8, 11, 26 and n, 50, 59.
Lori River, 42.
Lucca, xiv, 6, 7n, 44, 50, 51, 58.
Lugano Lake, 41.
Lunigiana, 31, 66.
Luzzara, 60.

M
Macerata, 23.
Maggiore Lake, 57, 59.
Maghreb, 41.
Magra River, 66.
Maira Torrent, 73.
Mallorca, 6.
Mantua, 13, 25, 33, 36, 60, 68, 73.
Marano Lagoon, 11.
Marano Vicentino, 27.
Marche, 11, 23, 28, 64.
Maremma, 11, 50, 61, 65.
Masino, 50.
Masio, 48.
Massa in Lunigiana, 31.
Massa Marittima, 21.
Massa Trabaria, 64.
Mediterranean Sea, 5, 41, 43.
Mesopotamia, 12.
Milan, xiv, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 26, 31, 35, 41, 42, 47, 53 and n, 59, 60, 65.
Mincio River, 68.
Mirandola, 62.
Modena, 17, 25, 33, 58, 59, 60, 62.
Monselice, 17, 60.
Monsummano, 28, 50.
Montagnana Canal, 60.
Montalcino, 22, 26, 54.
Montale, 17.
Monte Pisano, 50.
Montecatini, 50 and n.
Montecroce, 73.
Montefalco, 44.
Montepulciano, 24.
Montieri, 22.
Montisi, 26.
Mugello, 26.
Muzza Canal, 11.
N
Naples, xv, 8, 21, 50.
Narni, 22.
Naviglio Civico (Lombardy), 17.
Naviglio Grande (Ticinello), 11, 26, 59, 65.
Navile, Canal, 59.
Nestóre Stream, 19.
Netherlands (The), 6, 13.
Nirone River, 35, 47.
Nirone Stream, 37.
Nocera, 28.
North Sea, 62.
Novara, 42.
Novellara, 68.

O
Oglio River, 17, 27, 59, 62.
Olona River, 15, 56.
Oltrepò, 36.
Ombrone Pistoiese River, 66.
Omegna, 26n.
Ormea, 73.
Orta Lake, 26n.
Orvieto, 19, 24, 25, 40, 44.
Orzinuovi, 27.

P
Padua, xiv, 17, 35, 45, 51, 53 and n, 59, 60, 61, 68, 69.
Palazzo dei Consoli (Gubbio), 22.
Palazzuolo sul Senio, 46.
Palermo, 46.
Panaro River, 33, 59.
Parma, xiv, 15 and n, 17, 27, 32, 33, 35, 40, 47, 62, 68, 69.
Parma Stream, 32.
Pavia, xiv, 27, 29, 59, 63, 71.
Peloponnese Peninsula, 61.
Pennapiedimonte, 23.
Pernumia, 35.
Perugia, xiv, 19, 21, 25, 34, 35, 36, 55, 71.
Pesaro, 29.
Pescia Fountain (Siena), 20.
Pescia, 25.
Pescia River, 25.
Petriolo, 50.
Piacenza, 27, 41, 59, 67, 73.
Piano del Padule d’Orgia (Siena), 37.
Piave River, 57, 64.
Piazza del Campo (Siena), 22.
Piazza della Sala (Pistoia), 21.
Piazza delle Erbe (Verona), 30.
Piazza Ruggero da Cuona (Piazza delle Travi, Florence), 65, 66.
Piedmont, 8, 10, 26n, 28, 29, 39, 42, 46, 50, 52, 59, 63n.
Pietrare (Tuscia), 23.
Pinerolo, 6.
Piombino, 22.
Piovego Canal, 60.
Pisa, xiv, 8, 11, 17, 24, 29, 31, 51, 58, 61 and n, 62, 66, 68.
Pistoia, 6n, 17, 21, 25, 28, 44, 48, 50, 58, 70.
Po River, xiv, 10, 11, 12, 13 and n, 29, 33, 34, 36, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 67, 68, 69, 74.
Po Valley, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 41, 44, 57, 58, 59, 68, 75.
Podere Fiorentino, 46.
Poggibonsi, 55
Polesine, 67.
Polesine di Rovigo, 25.
Pons, 28.
Ponte alla Carraia (Florence), 70, 71.
Ponte delle Navi (Verona), 29.
Ponte delle Torri (Spoleto), 23.
Ponte di Mezzo (Pisa), 30.
Ponte di Rialto (Venice), 29.
Ponte Rubaconte (Florence), 66, 70, 71.
Ponte Santa Trinita (Florence), 29, 71.
Ponte Vecchio (Florence), 29.
Pordenone, 73.
Porretta, 50n.
Porto (Verona), 58.
Portogruaro, 49.
Pozzo di San Patrizio (Orvieto), 24.
Prato, 53, 54, 58.
Provence, 61.

Q
Quarona, 27.
Water and the Law

R
Ravenna, 11, 17, 41, 44, 45, 55, 57, 60, 62, 69.
Reggio Emilia, 15, 20n, 32, 33, 40, 53 and n, 60, 62, 68.
Reggio, 60.
Reno Torrent, 59.
Rhone River, 10.
Rieti, 25, 28, 42.
Rincine (Casentino, Tuscany), 40.
Rio dell’Asino (Pescia), 25.
Ripatransone, 23.
Riso Torrent (Verona), 40.
Roero, 28.
Romagna, 11, 17, 46 and n, 60, 66.
Rome, xiv, 1, 15, 23, 25, 28, 42, 50, 61, 64, 68, 69, 70.
Romite or domine Nobilis Hospital (San Gimignano), 46.
Rossiglione, 61.
Rovigo, 25, 60, 62.

S
Sabbioneta, 62.
Salsomaggiore, 50.
Samalas, 5, 68.
San Casciano dei Bagni, 50.
San Francesco Port (Florence), 65.
San Frediano (Florence), 71.
San Gimignano, 21, 22, 43, 46, 47, 49, 55.
San Marino, 41, 45, 46.
San Martino al Cimino, 22.
San Miniato al Tedesco, 33, 46, 61, 69.
San Niccolò (Florence), 54.
Sanguinone Aqueduct (Assisi), 24.
Santa Croce sull’Arno, 69.
Santa Maria a Monte, 17, 58, 61.
Santa Maria di Pomposa Monastery, 36.
Santissima Trinità e Santa Mustiola in Torri Abbey, 37.
Sardinia, xv, 8 and n, 10, 11, 12, 28, 40, 45, 50, 74.
Sassari, 21, 40, 54.
Saturnia, 50.
Savena Torrent, 40, 59.
Savigliano, 27, 73.
Savoy, 15n, 40.

Saxoferrato, 2.
Scaligero/Castelvecchio Bridge (Verona), 29.
Scanno, 23.
Scarpierla, 46.
Secchia River, 33, 59, 60.
Serravalle, 17.
Seveso River, 27.
Sige River, 47.
Sicily, xv, 8n, 24, 61.
Siena, xiv, 20, 22, 32, 35, 37, 42, 43, 50, 51, 52, 54.
Sieve River, 66.
Sirio Lake, 40.
Sirone Canal, 60.
Sorbara, 33.
Soriano al Cimino, 22.
Spilimbergo, 73.
Spoleto, 22, 23, 45.
Spugna Monastery (Tuscany), 33.
St. Peter’s Basilica, 16n.
Stroncone, 22.
Sulcis, 24.
Sulmona, 23, 24, 41.
Syracuse, 50.

T
Tanaro River, 28, 59.
Tarquinia, 22.
Terme Euginue, 50.
Terni, 22.
Terraferma (Veneto Region) 18.
Tiber River, 11, 57, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70.
Ticino River, 11, 57, 59, 65, 73.
Tirso River, 66.
Todi, 23, 63.
Torre Creek, 59.
Trasimeno Lake, 36.
Travignolo Torrent, 64.
Trentino, 63.
Treviso, 31, 34.
Tunisia, 61.
Turin, 40, 55, 61, 67, 69, 73.
Tuscany, 6, 8, 11, 12, 21, 25, 26n, 37, 40, 43, 46, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 64, 69, 75.
Tuscia, xiv, 13, 23, 51.
Tyrol, 63.
### Indexes

**U**
- Udine, 59.
- Umbertide, 65.
- Umbria, 11, 13, 28, 42, 50, 63, 64, 65.
- Usciana Stream, 38.
- Uzzano, 25, 28, 48.

**V**
- Val d’Orcia, 54.
- Val d’Ossola, 65.
- Val di Chiana, 11, 36.
- Valdarno, 11, 19, 65.
- Valdelsa, 37, 55.
- Valencia, 3.
- Vallebuona (Volterra), 22.
- Vallombrosa Abbey, 64.
- Valsesia, 27.
- Valsolda, 41.
- Valtellina, 67.
- Venetian Lagoon, 11.
- Veneto, 8, 10, 11, 18, 27, 31, 42, 46, 47, 49, 50, 56n, 57, 59, 60, 65, 67, 68, 69.
- Venice, xiv, 5, 13n, 16, 17, 18, 29, 57, 62, 64, 67.
- Vercelli, 27.
- Verona, xiv, 15, 16, 17, 27, 29, 31, 43, 44, 47, 53, 55, 58, 68, 73.
- *Via Emilia*, 67.
- *Via Francigena*, 23, 37, 51.
- Vicenza, 27, 45, 69, 73.
- Villa di Chiesa, 24, 25.
- Vinadio, 50.
- Viterbo, 7n, 22, 23, 40, 50, 51, 53n.
- Vitorchiano, 22.
- Volano Lake, 11.
- Volterra, 22, 50, 51.

**W**
- Welsperg, 63.