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The notices produced by law courts are among the most fruitful types of evidence for early medieval societies and social change that we possess, as Chris Wickham’s work amply demonstrates. As he has rightly observed, ‘dispute documents are so regular in Italian archives, from the late eighth century onwards, that gaps in their survival are always potentially significant …’[[1]](#footnote-1) I should like here to consider the significance of precisely such a gap in a handful of geographically diverse Italian archives of documents dating between the ninth and eleventh centuries.

The gap in question occurs in runs of documents of a particular sort: dispute notices – produced at or immediately following law court hearings – which take a particular limited set of formats, known variously in the literature as ‘undefended’, ‘fictitious’ or ‘apparent’ court cases.[[2]](#footnote-2) This paper is not therefore about disputes but about the documents generated by law courts, and in particular about the sub-genre of those documents that records no dispute at all. Through the course of the ninth century, Italian law court notices began to take formats that expressed the court case in question as undefended until, by its last quarter, whole templates had emerged that categorically obscured any real arguments that may have taken place in court, and replaced them with anodyne agreements and concessions.[[3]](#footnote-3) The earliest such identifiable form to appear, in the 870s, is known as *finis intentionis* (*finis intentionis terrae* or *finis intentionis status*), in which, typically, a plaintiff made a statement of his rights in a thing, declared himself ready to confront an opponent, and requested a formal recognition of his rights from a ‘defendant’; the latter party then simply stated that he had no rights in the thing.[[4]](#footnote-4) A related form was the *ostensio cartae*, first appearing in 880/1, which differed from the *finis intentionis* largely by including a copy in extenso of the plaintiff’s written proof.[[5]](#footnote-5) The third format, appearing first in 874 (but not again then until 896), was the *investitura salva querela*, which concluded with the court formally investing the plaintiff with possession of the claimed property.[[6]](#footnote-6)

In choosing this genre of documents I do not intend to dwell on the content of their texts, but on their patterns of preservation. My comments therefore contribute to the debate about the relationship between social change in this period and the documentary record, and can be seen as contradicting what we might call an extreme *mutationniste* view that encourages the idea that what we see most often for this period is change (*mutation*) in the pattern of our documentary sources, rather than real change in society.[[7]](#footnote-7) I argue here that the profiles of the transmission of particular classes of documents in particular archives actually grant us better access to real social changes than the words of their texts. In any case, Italian dispute notices present a direct contrast to those from France that have provided the grist for *mutationniste* arguments. Where the latter become less standardized, Italian law court notices become more formulaic, more restricted to a few tightly scripted formats. While the ‘undefended’ versions of these scripts are not much use as evidence for actual disputes, since they do not record them, this does not mean that they do not document social change.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The function that these ‘undefended case’ scripts were intended to perform is evident from the generally very short space of time between the redaction of the charters copied into notices using the *ostensio cartae* formula and the redaction of the notice itself: too short a time, realistically, for an actual dispute to have arisen. The notice therefore seems to have been drawn up not as a record of dispute resolution, but rather as a final corroborative stage in the validation of a transaction.[[9]](#footnote-9) Looking for ‘real’ disputes in this evidence therefore runs the risk of missing its true point.[[10]](#footnote-10) The proliferation of the ‘undefended case’ model should be seen rather as indicating a desire to exploit the rhetoric of harmony under royal jurisdiction that underpinned the court system and, almost as a by-product, produced stronger validation of property rights; and the surviving examples suggest that the parties best able to take advantage of these kinds of scriptural elements in law court documents were cathedral churches and monasteries. Their ability to do so became more important as lay interest groups, especially increasingly identifiable signorial families, sought to draw properties and offices into their hands. To the extent that documents like this became the currency of proprietorship, then, they might be seen as constituting an Italian episode in the broadening and deepening of ideas of ownership noted in their different ways by Chris Wickham and Charles West.[[11]](#footnote-11) But in any case, although we might rationally suppose that ‘undefended case’ notices were kept initially for the same reason that they were produced – in order to strengthen rights, especially to property – this in itself only takes us part of the way to explaining fully why such documents continued to be kept in such a way that they might come down to us.[[12]](#footnote-12) All archives present patterns of survival, and the challenge for us is to determine when and how those patterns were formed.

An instructive example is provided by the documents from S. Salvatore on Monte Amiata, a collection of originals that constitute the substantial remnants of the archive of that abbey, founded 762x770.[[13]](#footnote-13) Every law court record dated after 828 in Monte Amiata’s surviving collection belongs firmly to one or other of the ‘undefended case’ document models.[[14]](#footnote-14) Equally notable in Monte Amiata’s run of early medieval documents is the long lacuna in the survival of any type of document in the mid-tenth century: from the thirty-five years from 927 to 961 inclusive, only two documents survive. It is *prima facie* unlikely that these were the only such transaction to have taken place across that period: we must be dealing with an effect of transmission.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Those who preserved documents at Monte Amiata were evidently deliberately selective in their work. Dorsal notes on some of the earliest charters indicate that some attempt was made to arrange an archival system almost from the abbey’s inception.[[16]](#footnote-16) They also show that those attempts were periodically repeated, in different ways: attempts, that is, to sort, select and, unquestionably, to discard.[[17]](#footnote-17) In practice, of course, there must in fact have been numerous moments of selection in the long history of the archive from its inception to the transfer of many of its documents to Siena and Florence in the modern age.[[18]](#footnote-18) But we can add a little more definition to the history of Monte Amiata’s archive in the early middle ages thanks to the very fortunate survival of a theological tract, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. pal. lat. 165, written in part on palimpsested mid-ninth century charters from the abbey’s archive. Some of these were re-used as soon as the transactions they contained had expired, either because the contract was time-limited, or because the land in question had become subject to a new contract.[[19]](#footnote-19) They indicate that the late ninth century marked a watershed in Monte Amiata’s archive. Moreover, recent research by Mario Marrocchi has emphasized the importance in shaping the abbey’s memory of efforts during another watershed period in the first half of the eleventh century (from the abbacy of Winizo II, 1004-1035).[[20]](#footnote-20)

We can observe this kind of sea-change in the preservation of documents in a number of cities and institutions of northern and central Italy, but the rise and fall in Monte Amiata’s overall numbers of charters follows most closely those of the abbey of Farfa. The difference between the two is of course that Farfa’s documents survive only in a very deliberately concocted set of cartularies. As is well known, the abbey’s archivist and chronicler at the turn of the twelfth century, Gregory of Catino, wrote in succession four works through which he sought to reinforce his abbey’s claims by emphasizing the recovery of its properties after periods of loss, which occurred especially, as at Monte Amiata, in the late ninth and tenth centuries. His attitude is evident in his inclusion of dispute notices: in the first and largest of Gregory’s works, the *Regestum Farfense*, there are just three for the 149 years between 845 and 994, one of which is an imperial adjudication in a dispute over the abbacy; the other two are undefended cases from the 940s.[[21]](#footnote-21) Pierre Toubert’s interpretation of this striking gap looks still to be the most satisfying: that apart from these three all the other disputes notices were regarded as mere ‘tabellionage’ – the business only of notaries.[[22]](#footnote-22) The superficial similarities between Farfa and Monte Amiata – that both were monasteries and both theoretically enjoyed royal protection – do not seem sufficient to explain this parallel in their transmission of dispute notices. Rather, these common patterns have to be seen as having been caused by similar decisions on the part of the guardians of the two monasteries’ institutional memories; and it seems prima facie likely that similar decisions responded to similar social pressures. An association of this sort would certainly help to confirm that the profile of Monte Amiata’s archive was established in this, rather than a later, period, because Farfa’s record has the clear terminus ante quem of Gregory of Catino’s work: that is, between 1099 and c.1130.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The complete dominance of ‘undefended case’ types among the law court notices in the Monte Amiata archive is an extreme expression of a more general trend. Across the kingdom of Italy as a whole, at the beginning of the tenth century ‘traditional’ dispute notices – that is, those that do not fall into one of the ‘undefended case’ categories – constitute no more than one in three of the total. By the Ottonian period (from 962) this proportion has become one in five. After a slight rally in the 1020s, the traditional form of dispute notice disappears from archives altogether over the course of the next few decades.[[24]](#footnote-24) Farfa certainly conforms to the trend, with nine of the fifteen dispute notices that survive after the lacuna of 845-994 taking ‘undefended’ formats.[[25]](#footnote-25) Monte Amiata’s surviving archive looks like the shape of things to come.

Examples of monastic archives whose patterning bears visible imprints of developments in the world beyond the cloister help to explain Monte Amiata’s distinctive profile. One such is St Gall, whose archive of original documents shows detectable signs of systematic efforts at (re-)organisation in two instances in the Carolingian era, *c*. 802-15 and *c*. 840, both linked with the political vicissitudes of the abbey and its region at the time.[[26]](#footnote-26) We can also point to the changes in monastic archival practices north of the Alps in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Cogent arguments link the growth of ideas associated with the reform of Christian life, both in monasteries and more widely, and the related reconfiguration of the relationships between monasteries and their lay patrons and neighbours, with the cartularization of monasteries’ records, when loose original charters were selectively copied into books that set out a particular version of the house’s history.[[27]](#footnote-27) This phenomenon is not entirely absent in Italy, but is confined to the large rural abbeys of the centre and south of the peninsula: during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries cartularies or cartulary-chronicles were written for Farfa, as we have seen, and also for San Vincenzo al Volturno, San Clemente a Casauria, and San Benedetto a Montecassino.[[28]](#footnote-28)

In this regard, one feature of Monte Amiata’s law court notices, indeed, of the abbey’s surviving charters more generally, is clearly relevant: the growing prominence in them of the highest elite.[[29]](#footnote-29) Demonstrable members of the elite were the ‘opposing’ party to Monte Amiata in five of its nine extant notices from the late ninth century onwards.[[30]](#footnote-30) Overall, of the seventy-five genuine charters surviving between the years 1000 and 1071 (not counting the law court notices) thirty-four concern either a ruler or the pope, a count, a member of a count’s family, or, in a handful of cases, someone who held land next to that of a count (and took care to say so).[[31]](#footnote-31) A large proportion of the others involve members of aristocratic families, even if they are not immediately identifiable through distinguishing titles.[[32]](#footnote-32) In short, Monte Amiata’s surviving charters engage in a sort of ‘social climbing’, increasingly confining themselves to the business of the rich and titled.

This trend must arise from the uneven preservation of documents, rather than from any cessation in the production of documents about and for the poorer classes. Tenth-century peasants were in general no less likely to need and have access to documents than had been their ninth-century predecessors, and this is true despite the increasing use of the *libellus*, a form of agrarian contract that tended to give details about the terms of peasants’ practical relationships with their lords that had previously sometimes been set down in writing in law court notices.[[33]](#footnote-33) Even taking this into account, there is every reason to think that in the tenth century people outside the high elite continued both to make legal claims against each other and to use charters.

If we examine Monte Amiata’s history for reasons for the particular profile of its surviving charters, we quickly notice that its landholdings had to be re-established by Otto I after the depredations of ‘evil men’, and its fortunes were not properly revived after a mid-tenth-century slump until the abbacy of Winizo I (996-1002), with the help of privileges from Otto III and Henry II. Although this sketch of its history has to be reconstructed from its surviving archive (the abbey having produced no reliable house chronicler),[[34]](#footnote-34) it nonetheless rings true in general, partly because it helps us to observe the rise in the region of a family whose power is evident in plenty of other sources: the Aldobrandeschi. The starting-point for tracing the growth of their power in southern Tuscany is a list of Aldobrandeschi *castelli* in a charter of 973 preserved in the Monte Amiata archive:[[35]](#footnote-35) it coincides, in other words, with the end of the lacuna in Monte Amiata’s documentation, and the subsequent shift in its character. The fact that the abbey was not a party to the 973 charter is an indication of its role as a repository for the important documents of the local laity. As this suggests, for some time after their first appearance relations between the Aldobrandeschi and Monte Amiata seem to have been good. The first evidence of the Aldobrandeschi possessing explicit signorial rights in the region does not come until 1077,[[36]](#footnote-36) and Chris Wickham has argued persuasively that it was only around then that the family’s power began to threaten that of other entities in the region, and then not because they were seizing lands but because of their privatization of the powers of local office, which allowed them to impose new exactions on the locality.[[37]](#footnote-37)

We can therefore identify two periods that brought trauma to the abbey and its monks: the mid-tenth century, when its estates were widely appropriated by unfortunately nameless predators, and the later eleventh century, when a family with a very firm identity and status threatened its material well-being. Either or both of these may have prompted a reshaping of the abbey’s archive, but it is the pressure of the Aldobrandeschi that seems most likely to have had an impact on that aspect of monastic life. Charters that Monte Amiata itself held show that this was a lay family that placed some emphasis on written documentation in their own affairs. They may thus have exerted an influence on the monks to shape their archive according to their relationship with that family. To the extent that the monk-archivists had until then kept records of all the abbey’s property transactions (as well, indeed, as those of some lay families), they now concentrated their energies on building a record of their monastery’s relationship with signorial power. Thus, the lower – even the middle – classes, who are evident in the documents preserved from the Lombard and Carolingian periods, fade out of the picture.

Monte Amiata’s unique archive bears the imprint of social change not so much in the texts of the documents it preserves, but in their overall profile. This contrasts with French documents of this period which, as said earlier, show changes in their actual wording; in Tuscany the documents’ wording retained the range of types that it had always had, and change came instead in the way they were kept. Moreover, while advocates of *mutationnisme* have has seen no significant social pressure behind French documentary change, there is a good case for saying that the change in this Italian archive was directly occasioned by a real social movement, the rise of a signorial family.

To test the representativeness of the Monte Amiata evidence, we can turn to the city of Piacenza in Emilia, which, like the south Tuscan monastery, fortunately preserves a relatively large number of original documents (or, occasionally, generally reliable copies). Early medieval documents actually survive at Piacenza in four different archives: the vast majority reside either in the archive of the cathedral chapter or in that of the church of S. Antonino, but there are also survivals from the monasteries of S. Sisto and S. Savino in two Archivi di Stato; many of the tenth-century documents remain unpublished in full (almost uniquely for Italy).[[38]](#footnote-38) If we take all four together for the purpose of comparison we find that, unlike at Monte Amiata, charters of sale constitute the most prevalent type across the whole period to 1000; the numbers of *livelli*, by contrast, dwindle markedly through the tenth century.[[39]](#footnote-39) In the profiles of their law court notices, however, Piacenza and Monte Amiata present clear parallels. The complete lacuna in Monte Amiata’s record in the mid-tenth century is echoed across an even longer period in Piacenza’s run of dispute notices, of which there is none between 911 and 976.[[40]](#footnote-40) Furthermore, and very like Monte Amiata, nearly all follow one or other of the ‘undefended case’ models.[[41]](#footnote-41) Twenty of the thirty-four charters classed as dispute notices by Manaresi and Volpini take an ‘undefended’ format (ten take the *ostensio cartae* form, and five each the *finis intentionis* and *investitura salva querela*), two conclude with an *amica pactuacio*, and a further six can be regarded as early versions of these forms.[[42]](#footnote-42) Of the remaining six, only one might record an actual dispute resolved through a court.[[43]](#footnote-43) When we examine just the notices surviving after the long lacuna (that is, from 976 through to the final pre-1100 example, from 1077), we find a far greater concentration on the activities of the very highest in society. Seven of the sixteen such documents involve the bishop of Piacenza, another bishop or members of comital families.[[44]](#footnote-44) Three concern marquises who were prominent landowners in the region, and one has a count of the palace as its main protagonist.[[45]](#footnote-45) Four were legal actions by prominent local clerics (a deacon, an archdeacon, an abbess and an abbot) and the final one is a grant of royal *bannum* to S. Antonino.[[46]](#footnote-46) We no longer find preserved documents relating to figures a rung or two down the social ladder such as the *sculdahis* from Niviano, Petrus, whose dossier of documents, extending for forty years from the 870s, found its way into the archives of S. Antonino.[[47]](#footnote-47) To judge from the notices, archivists at Piacenza were increasingly selective about what they preserved, just as at Monte Amiata.

Piacenza’s overall documentary profile bears signs of its political vicissitudes at least as strongly as Monte Amiata’s.[[48]](#footnote-48) The lacuna in its dispute notices between 911 and 976 is a deeper version of a trough in the whole of its tenth-century documentation: of the major types of documented transaction, only *livelli* appear in the archive in consistent numbers for the whole century. This near-silence in the documentary evidence was associated by Vito Fumagalli with a generational change, and fragmenting of power, within the Gandolfingi family then dominant in the Piacentino.[[49]](#footnote-49) This raises the possibility of a similar connection between archival and political development as at Monte Amiata. In Piacenza, such an association is especially evident in traces of the influence over archiving of the city’s bishop. Increasingly, Piacenza’s bishop was the most important focus of power in the city, because the tenth century saw the gradual shift of comital powers into his hands. This was effected partly by royal grant, from Berengar I’s creation of Bishop Guy as permanent royal *missus*, with attendant judicial prerogatives, between 915 and 920, to Otto III’s concession of all royal prerogatives over the city and its suburbs to Bishop Sigefred in 997.[[50]](#footnote-50) Partly too, though, it was a side effect of the intermittent familial links between the bishop and local signorial families: Bishop Guy had been a member of the then-dominant da Gorgo family, for instance.[[51]](#footnote-51) Both aspects are reflected in the dispute notices: their tight adherence to formulae speaks of close institutional direction, and the bishop’s own relations with comital aristocrats is reflected in, for instance, the cathedral’s possession of two *investiturae salva querela* to the benefit of Marquis Boso, the principal representative of the important Gandolfingi family.[[52]](#footnote-52) What records we have of the Gandolfingi are in fact mostly preserved at the cathedral. But the final document of their property testifies to a second major current in Piacentine politics: while the bishopric’s power was growing in cahoots with local *signori*, the Obertenghi family was achieving a dominance of its own among lay aristocrats, largely through the sheer extent of its estates and attendant client network.[[53]](#footnote-53) Thus we find the last representative of the Gandolfingi passing his lands on to Marquis Hugh of the Obertenghi in 1028, an act given full force by its confirmation in an *ostensio cartae* in 1034.[[54]](#footnote-54) It is tempting to suggest, then, that the social changes of the late tenth and eleventh centuries, which as in southern Tuscany saw a greater concentration of local power in the hands of fewer signorial families, had a general effect on Piacentine institutions’ archival perspective.

At Piacenza, therefore, we can suggest that the ecclesiastical archivists’ role became both more important and more discriminating in response to political developments in the city. The draining of the count’s administrative (and, especially, judicial) powers into the bishopric heightened the importance of ecclesiastical archives as repositories of the right kinds of models. At the same time, the concentration of effective non-comital power into the hands of a few, and then one, preponderant landowning signorial family greatly simplified the political relations of their client institutions. The result was a change in the role of the archives themselves: from being open to the civic community, they came to be concentrated on reflecting the interests only of their immediate patrons. The dénouement of this process was surely the bishopric of Dionysius (1062-1082x85), who explicitly combined the roles of bishop and count.[[55]](#footnote-55) The traditional documentation of comital justice faded away thereafter, as Piacenza made the transition to communal government. By 1126, the city had consuls, and different means of recording disputes and court proceedings started to become available.[[56]](#footnote-56)

The patterns of survival of documents at Monte Amiata and Piacenza show a number of parallels. Both include a significant lacuna in the mid-tenth century. In both that gap occurs equally in their overall run of documents and in those emanating specifically from law courts. Among the latter, in both places notices of the ‘undefended case’ type were entirely dominant by the tenth century; notices reporting actual court proceedings were no longer kept. These parallels exist despite obvious differences in the context of preservation in each place: Monte Amiata was a single monastic institution, while the record from Piacenza is actually that of four institutions, of which the most important was the bishopric. The parallel patterns of their documentation in spite of these differences suggest that each was affected by similar external influences.

Beyond numbers and genres, the most striking element of similarity is the growing dominance among both sets of documents of the social elite. This is noticeable at Monte Amiata after 1000; in Piacenza, it is obvious after the long lacuna in the city’s dispute notices ends in 976. A similar chronological pattern is evident also in the more specific interactions of the institutions in each place with particular groups of aristocrats. Monte Amiata was involved amicably with the Aldobrandeschi from, apparently, the second quarter of the tenth century until about the year 1000, but relations soured in the middle decades of the eleventh century, and were evidently inimical by the 1070s. In Piacenza the bishop had a symbiotic relationship with prominent local families such as the da Gorgo and the Gandolfingi until the first decades of the eleventh century, when the Obertenghi seized the organs of secular power and became the principal protagonist for the Piacentine clergy. It is unlikely that this concentration of our record is accidental. But as for France, for Italy the key question is how far it reflects real social change, and how far it attests the constraints acting on, and choices exercised by, archivists.

Although the archives at Monte Amiata and Piacenza were, as we have seen, as prone as any other medieval archive to later disruption, the most prominent shared traits of the survivals are best explained by selection decisions taken closer to the time of the documents’ production.[[57]](#footnote-57) What was distinctive about the tenth and eleventh centuries in this respect was not a concern with property rights per se – these were, of course, a perennially important element of legal documentation – but a concern with rights defined in particular and limited forms and applied to a particular and limited social group. This must be related to the bundle of social changes that historians have highlighted in this period: the weakening of supra-local jurisdictions, the coalescence of landholdings, the emergence of apparently new, locally-based aristocratic lineages, the fragmentation of comital responsibilities and their assumption by new entities to legitimate their landed power. In short, power in Italian city territories was collecting into the hands of more sharply defined ecclesiastical institutions and of signorial families, and both groups were as a consequence developing new techniques of estate management and record-keeping, evident in archival notes – usually on charter’s dorses – that attest storage not according to the norms of modern reference literacy but in terms of the geography of estate ownership.[[58]](#footnote-58) At Monte Amiata and Piacenza, legal instruments were responding to the efforts of ecclesiastical institutions and aristocratic networks to formalize their power in new ways (or at least, ways new to them). Prominent among the evidence for this are law court notices of ‘undefended cases’, which reveal that it was precisely the new signorial lineages and their associates who had the readiest access to this mechanism for substantiating their rights.
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