

**Online appendix (not for publication) for the paper:
“Multigenerational Transmission of Wealth: Florence 1403-1480”
by Belloc, M., Drago, F., Fochesato, M., and R. Galbiati**

A Data appendix: Spelling rules

In preparing the various datasets for the merging procedure, we verified that the spelling of names and surnames followed the same rules. We visually inspected the most similar records and evaluated their correspondence case by case. The spelling rules are defined according to the following sources: Herlihy et al. (2002), Molho (1994), and Padgett (2010). When it appeared that the same name or surname was written with a different rule, we followed the spelling used in the *Tratte* dataset.

Surnames

Concerning surnames, we implemented the following rules.

1. Variants and information on multiple surnames followed Herlihy et al. (2002). (<https://cds.library.brown.edu/projects/tratte/doc/TLSNAM1VAR.html>). Accordingly, when a family had two or more surnames as reported in Herlihy et al. (2002), we associated individuals always with the same single surname, that coming first in alphabetic order. For instance, ALDOBRANDINI, NERI and DELNERO according to Herlihy et al. (2002) were the same family, in our dataset NERI and DELNERO became ALDOBRANDINI.
2. Surnames were always truncated to 11 digits, and changed accordingly whenever in the original dataset this rule was not followed (this is true both when the surname reported in the original dataset was longer than 11 digits and when it was shorter -in general 10 digits long- with the last letter missing). For instance, ARDINGHELLI was changed in ARDINGHELL; BOLDRONCINI was changed in BOLDRONCIN; BRACCIOLINI was changed in BRACCIOLIN; DELLANTELL was changed in DALLANTELLA.
3. When multiple variants appear or in case of suspected typo mistakes, surnames were changed to follow the spelling rules in the *Tratte* dataset.

A non exhaustive list of cases is reported below:

- (a) A letter of the surname is in a different position: for instance, BELFRADELLI and BELFARDELLI.
- (b) There is a double consonant instead of a single consonant (this can happen even twice in the same word): for instance, CERRINI and CERINNI; DAVIZZI and DAVIZI.
- (c) The *H* appears in some variants and not in others: for instance, DELTEGHIA and DELTEGLIA; BARDUCCHI and BARDUCCI.
- (d) There is a different vowel in the same position within the word: for instance, CAVICCIOLI and CAVICCIULI; CEFFINI and CEFFONI; CAMPIOBBESI and CAMPIUBESI.

- (e) There is an extra vowel, in general the *I*: for instance, DELCECE and DELCIECE; TERI and TIERI.
 - (f) The vowel *O* appears in the place of the diphthong *UO* (following the *Tratte* we always kept *UO*): for instance, BONFIGLIO and BUONFIGLIUO.
 - (g) The prefixes *DE*, *DEGLI*, *DELLA*, etc not always appear: for instance, MEDECI and DEMEDICI; BAGLIONE and DELBAGLIONE.
 - (h) The letter *J* is used instead of *I*: for instance, JACOPI and IACOPI.
 - (i) A diminutive of the word is used: for instance, SASSOLI and SASSOLINI.
4. In few cases, we suspected typo errors in the *Tratte* dataset and changed them. For instance:
- (a) Both MATTEO BUONACCORSO GIANNI ALDEROTTI and MATTEO BUONACCORSO GIOVANNI ALDEROTTI appear in the dataset. We changed GIANNI in GIOVANNI.
 - (b) Both GIOVANNI PIERO VANNI MANNUCCI and VANNI PIERO VANNI MANNUCCI appear in the dataset. We changed VANNI in GIOVANNI.
 - (c) Both BUONACCORSO PAOLO CORBELLINI and BUONACCORSO PAOLO CORBELLINI appear in the dataset. We changed CORSELLINI in CORBELLINI.
 - (d) Both MAFFEO CANTE CATTANO PITTI and MAFFEO CANTE GUATANO PITTI appear in the dataset. We changed CATTANO in GUATANO.
 - (e) Both IACOPO GIOVANNI CIAIO ARRIGUCCI and IACOPO GIOVANNI CIARO ARRIGUCCI appear in the dataset. We changed CIAIO in CIARO.

First names, patronymics, and avonymics

Concerning names, general rules are more difficult to identify because names appeared in several different variants in the various datasets. A non exhaustive list of cases is reported below (the total list of case changes is available upon request):

1. Names were in general truncated to 11 digits, with the exception of the 1480 *Catasto* where they were truncated at 5 digits. Hence, whenever a name from one of the other datasets had to be matched with a name in the 1480 *Catasto*, it was truncated accordingly: for instance, GIOVANNI was changed in GIOVA.
2. The name has a number of diminutives: for instance, GUCCIO, GUCCIONE and GUC-CIOZZO.
3. The name appears with double or single consonants: PIEROZZO and PIEROZO, MARCHIONNE and MARCHIONE.
4. *J* is used instead of *I* and *viceversa*: for instance, JACOPO and IACOPO.
5. An extra consonant appears between two vowels in some variants of the name: for instance, PAOLO and PAGOLO.

6. An extra vowel, in general *I*, appears in some variants of the name: for instance, RICCARDO and RICCIARDO.
7. A different consonant appears in the same position within the name: for instance, BERTO and BETTO.
8. A different vowel appears in the same position within the name: for instance, VETTORIO and VITTORIO.
9. The prefix of the name is sometimes omitted: for instance, SALA and DELSALA.
10. *U* is used instead of *O* and *viceversa*: RUBERTO and ROBERTO.
11. The vowel *O* appears in the place of the diphthong *UO* (following the *Tratte* we always kept *UO*): for instance, BONANNO and BUONANNO; AMBROGIO and AMBRUOGIO.
12. There is an extra *H* (sometimes followed by an *E*): INGHELESE and INGLESE; BELCARO and BELCHARO.
13. In the *Tratte* dataset, since woman could not be assigned an office, we suspected female names were typo errors, and changed them in the male version: PIERO and PIERA; ANTONIO and ANTONIA.
14. We always implemented truncation at 11 digits: ALDOBRANDINO and ALDOBRANDIN.

B Supplementary material: Tables and figures

Table B.1: Wealth status transmission across two adjacent generations: Family, occupation, and neighborhood fixed effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Reg. coefficient:	Panel A: Perc. ranks 1457-1427			Panel B: Perc. ranks 1480-1457		
$\hat{\beta}_{-1}$	0.310 (0.120)	0.473 (0.058)	0.470 (0.062)	0.413 (0.080)	0.482 (0.036)	0.492 (0.034)
R-squared	0.489	0.129	0.143	0.516	0.207	0.220
Reg. coefficient:	Panel C: Top deciles 1457-1427			Panel D: Top deciles 1480-1457		
$\hat{\beta}_{-1}$	0.211 (0.079)	0.209 (0.037)	0.217 (0.036)	0.247 (0.068)	0.283 (0.030)	0.282 (0.030)
R-squared	0.488	0.087	0.092	0.462	0.145	0.147
Surname fixed effects	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Occupation fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Neighborhood fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	768	768	768	1,005	1,005	1,005
Number of surnames	326	326	326	370	370	370
Avg. freq. of surnames	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.7

Notes. Coefficients estimated from equation (1) at the individual level on the matched sample with surname, occupation, and neighborhood fixed effects (plotted in Figure 2 in the paper). Percentile rank (Panels A and B) in t is the rank position of individual i in the wealth distribution of generation t . Top decile (Panels C and D) in t is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is in the top decile of the wealth distribution of generation t , and to zero otherwise. Families for which information on neighborhood (occupation) is missing for all family members are associated with a unique neighborhood (occupation) identifier to obtain results reported in columns (2) and (4) ((3) and (6)). Excluding families with missing information on occupation (neighborhood) would not change the results. Family clustered s.e. in parentheses.

Table B.2: Wealth status transmission across two adjacent generations: Marriage network (entry)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Reg. coefficient:	Panel A: Perc. ranks 1457-1427			Panel B: Perc. ranks 1480-1457		
$\hat{\beta}_{-1}$	0.436 (0.077)	0.002 (0.138)	0.497 (0.084)	0.424 (0.049)	0.234 (0.147)	0.438 (0.053)
$\hat{\beta}_0$	28.848 (6.931)	60.270 (12.567)	24.555 (7.543)	33.487 (4.105)	44.301 (10.027)	32.531 (4.498)
R-squared	0.845	0.815	0.851	0.877	0.824	0.881
Reg. coefficient:	Panel C: Top deciles 1457-1427			Panel D: Top deciles 1480-1457		
$\hat{\beta}_{-1}$	0.198 (0.041)	0.029 (0.097)	0.223 (0.044)	0.270 (0.032)	0.239 (0.126)	0.272 (0.034)
$\hat{\beta}_0$	0.135 (0.022)	0.143 (0.070)	0.134 (0.023)	0.081 (0.018)	0.077 (0.044)	0.082 (0.019)
R-squared	0.276	0.158	0.296	0.292	0.236	0.296
Baseline	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Entry into network	-	Yes	No	-	Yes	No
Observations	550	70	480	746	58	688
Number of surnames	182	26	156	225	29	196
Avg. freq. of surnames	3.0	2.7	3.1	3.3	2.0	3.5

Notes. Coefficients estimated from equation (1) at the individual level on the matched sample after splitting according to “entry into network” (plotted in Figure 3 in the paper). Percentile rank (Panels A and B) in t is the rank position of individual i in the wealth distribution of generation t . Top decile (Panels C and D) in t is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is in the top decile of the wealth distribution of generation t , and to zero otherwise. “Entry into network” denotes families that entered the marriage network in $t - 1$ (the cohesion indicator changes from zero or one to a number equal to or larger than two). Family clustered s.e. in parentheses.

Table B.3: Wealth status transmission across two adjacent generations: Marriage network (permanence)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Reg. coefficient:	Panel A. Perc. ranks 1457-1427		Panel B. Perc. ranks 1480-1457	
β_{-1}	0.510 (0.094)	0.303 (0.202)	0.446 (0.057)	0.160 (0.193)
β_0	23.382 (8.461)	38.519 (17.494)	31.898 (4.847)	56.251 (12.134)
R-squared	0.854	0.825	0.879	0.916
Reg. coefficient:	Panel C. Top decile 1457-1427		Panel D. Top decile 1480-1457	
β_{-1}	0.222 (0.046)	0.300 (0.323)	0.275 (0.036)	0.195 (0.143)
β_0	0.128 (0.025)	0.100 (0.076)	0.086 (0.021)	0.036 (0.036)
R-squared	0.296	0.250	0.305	0.182
Always in network	Yes	No	Yes	No
Never in network	No	Yes	No	Yes
Observations	422	25	624	41
N. surnames	125	14	164	21
Avg. freq. of surnames	3.4	1.8	3.8	2.0

Notes. Coefficients estimated from equation (1) at the individual level on the matched sample after splitting according to “always/never in network”. Percentile rank (Panels A and B) in t is the rank position of individual i in the wealth distribution of generation t . Top decile (Panels C and D) in t is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is in the top decile of the wealth distribution of generation t , and to zero otherwise. “Always in network” denotes families that were in the network in $t - 1$ and $t - 2$ (the cohesion indicator is always equal to or larger than two). “Never in network” denotes families that were out of the network in $t - 1$ and $t - 2$ (the cohesion indicator is always smaller than two). Family clustered s.e. in parentheses.

Table B.4: Wealth status transmission across two adjacent generations: Political network

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Reg. coefficient:	Panel A. Perc. ranks 1480-1457		Panel B. Top decile 1480-1457	
β_{-1}	0.395 (0.104)	0.515 (0.039)	0.287 (0.065)	0.277 (0.034)
β_0	33.685 (8.684)	25.570 (3.020)	0.076 (0.032)	0.069 (0.013)
R-squared	0.846	0.875	0.325	0.267
Entry into politics	Yes	No	Yes	No
Observations	248	757	248	757
Avg. freq. of surnames	4.0	2.9	4.0	2.9
Number of surnames	124	320	124	320
Reg. coefficient:	Panel C. Perc. ranks 1480-1457		Panel D. Top decile 1480-1457	
β_{-1}	0.534 (0.040)	0.366 (0.087)	0.291 (0.036)	0.269 (0.059)
β_0	24.162 (3.086)	36.477 (7.424)	0.069 (0.013)	0.074 (0.030)
R-squared	0.875	0.851	0.276	0.304
Dynasty in politics	Yes	No	Yes	No
Observations	701	304	701	304
Number of surnames	316	143	316	143
Avg. freq. of surnames	2.9	4.1	2.9	4.1

Notes. Coefficients estimated from equation (1) at the individual level on the matched after splitting according to “entry in politics” (Panels A and B, plotted in Figure 4) or “dynasty in politics” (Panels C and D, plotted in Figure 6 in the paper). Percentile rank (Panels A and C) in t is the rank position of individual i in the wealth distribution of generation t . Top decile (Panels B and D) in t is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is in the top decile of the wealth distribution of generation t , and to zero otherwise. “Entry into politics” denotes households whose parents held at least one political office and grandparents held no office. “Dynasty in politics” denotes households whose parents and grandparents both held at least one political office. Family clustered s.e. in parentheses.

Table B.5: Wealth status transmission across two adjacent generations: Political and marriage networks

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Reg. coefficient:	Panel A: Percentile ranks 1457-1480				Panel B: Top deciles 1457-1480			
$\hat{\beta}_{-1}$	0.277 (0.129)	0.493 (0.069)	0.524 (0.117)	0.447 (0.068)	0.317 (0.093)	0.262 (0.041)	0.228 (0.107)	0.216 (0.068)
$\hat{\beta}_0$	45.481 (10.785)	28.802 (5.758)	20.930 (9.998)	29.483 (5.037)	0.075 (0.052)	0.098 (0.025)	0.054 (0.031)	0.061 (0.017)
R-squared	0.851	0.895	0.837	0.866	0.370	0.295	0.233	0.195
Entry into politics	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Core network	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Observations	142	389	95	246	142	389	95	246
Number of surnames	68	114	48	122	68	114	48	122
Avg. freq. of surnames	4.6	4.3	3.7	2.5	4.6	4.3	3.7	2.5

Notes. Coefficients estimated from equation (1) at the individual level on the matched sample after splitting according to “entry into politics” and “core network” (plotted in Figure 5 in the paper). Percentile rank (Panel A) in t is the rank position of individual i in the wealth distribution of generation t . Top decile (Panel B) in t is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is in the top decile of the wealth distribution of generation t , and to zero otherwise. “Entry into politics” denotes households whose parents held at least one political office and grandparents held no office. “Core” denotes families that were in the core network in $t - 1$ (cohesion indicator equal to or larger than four). Family clustered s.e. in parentheses.