

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: *Houghton, R. (2016) The vocabulary of groups in eleventh-century Mantua. Early Medieval Europe*, 24: 448–477. doi: [10.1111/emed.12168](https://doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168)., which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168> . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving."

© 2017 Wiley-Blackwell

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article to be published by Wiley in Early Medieval Europe

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: *Houghton, R. (2016) The vocabulary of groups in eleventh-century Mantua. Early Medieval Europe, 24: 448–477. doi: [10.1111/emed.12168](https://doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168).*, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving."

© 2017 Wiley-Blackwell

The Vocabulary of Groups in Eleventh-Century Mantua

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: *Houghton, R. (2016) The vocabulary of groups in eleventh-century Mantua. Early Medieval Europe*, 24: 448–477. doi: [10.1111/emed.12168](https://doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168)., which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/emed.12168> . This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving."

© 2017 Wiley-Blackwell

Abstract

Imperial charters issued to the cities of Italy in the eleventh century and early twelfth century have been studied extensively for their presentation of social groups and the interaction of these groups with the imperial court. However, these studies have generally overlooked the role of these documents as political rhetoric. This paper argues that the terms and phrasing used to describe the people of Mantua in the imperial charters of the eleventh century were chosen for their political and ideological power, not for their ability to indicate a concrete social group.

The Vocabulary of Groups in Eleventh-Century Mantua

In January or February of 1014 a charter concerning communal lands, trade and personal property was issued to the *arimanni* of Mantua by Henry II.¹ On 3 November 1055 a similar charter was issued to the *cives* of the same city by Henry III.² These rights were reiterated in 1090 by Matilda of Canossa,³ and in 1091 by Henry IV.⁴ This type of charter, where a king or emperor granted rights to an urban group, was not unprecedented but was nevertheless unusual. The *habitatores* of Genoa had received concessions in 958 as had the *cives* of Cremona in 996 while the *homines* of Savona would receive similar rights later in 1014.⁵ By 1100, the *civitas* of Modena, *populus* of Ferrara, and *cives* of Lucca and Pisa received similar rights from the emperor while urban groups in other cities received comparable rights from leading secular figures, such as the *habitantes* of Genoa in 1056 from the margrave Alberto.⁶ The Mantuan charters form part of this emerging phenomenon but their early appearance and frequency mean they are of great importance to our understanding of the political and social organisation of the Italian cities.

The fundamental argument of this paper is that the terms *arimanni* and *cives* were used to describe the recipients of these charters not because they referred to an existing and well defined *ordo* but because of their deliberately invoked political and rhetorical connotations. Charters were fundamental political tools which legitimised power through their recollection of the practices and customs of earlier authority.⁷ Both the terms *arimanni* and *cives* had been used by previous rulers of Italy, the Roman emperors (*cives*)

and Lombard and Carolingian kings (*arimanni* and *cives*), to define a social *ordo* with specific legal and social connections to the ruler and, in several cases, relatively well defined membership on economic, social or ethnic bases. These same terms were used by the German emperors of the eleventh century to identify and empower a group of supporters within Mantua while emphasising their inherent right to intervene in the city. In contrast with their use by earlier rulers, the terms were now used to refer to a permeable group without fixed social boundaries which could act in political or military support of the emperor. As Reynolds notes, any group, even one with an undefined membership, could act as a corporate body in this period and this flexibility created a very different dynamic of change than that of the more rigid modern definitions of social groups.⁸ In the case of Mantua in the eleventh century, these specific terms were chosen because they drew on remembered ideologies which supported the legitimacy of the authority of their donors while reserving a privileged position for their recipients.

The specific context of the charters was a prolonged interaction between the German emperors and the Canossan family which often devolved into open conflict. The Canossans were the leading secular power in northern Italy throughout the eleventh century with significant interests and titles in Lombardy and Emilia by 1014.⁹ In the early 1030s significant possessions and political rights were added in Tuscany when Boniface of Canossa was appointed margrave of the region.¹⁰ Many of these lands were obtained with imperial support and the Canossans were occasional allies of the German emperors.¹¹ This relationship was not universally amicable and the charters created for the *arimanni* and *cives* of Mantua coincide with three periods of conflict. The 1014

charter was produced alongside numerous other imperial documents between 1013 and 1015 which empowered the opponents of the Canossan family and consolidated Henry II's position in Northern Italy.¹² The 1055 charter was one of a series of documents produced in that year which undermined Canossan power while the emperor Henry III pursued military action against them.¹³ The 1090 and 1091 charters mark the start and conclusion of the siege of Mantua, then a Canossan city, by imperial forces led by Henry IV.¹⁴ These two documents present rival claims to authority over the city by the Canossans and the emperor: the 1090 charter was designed to ensure the *cives* of Mantua supported the Canossans while the 1091 document affirmed the move of the *cives* into the imperial camp. These goals and this context determined the selection of rhetorically charged terms to describe the charters' recipients.

As there are relatively few narrative sources which provide accounts of collective action in Mantua in the eleventh century we are almost entirely dependent on these charters for our understanding of the city. The only author to provide extensive details of events in Mantua is Donizone, a monk at the monastery of Canossa, in his *Vita Mathildis*, a poem praising the deeds of Matilda of Canossa written between 1111 and 1115.¹⁵ Donizone presents Mantua as a recurring antagonist and describes the city's inhabitants with an array of terms depending on their loyalty or opposition to Matilda.¹⁶ The date of composition means that the poem was created in a significantly different political environment to that of the eleventh-century charters. Furthermore, Donizone's goals in writing were rather different to those of the charters' authors: although, like the authors of the charters, Donizone stressed the authority of his patron, he had no desire to stress

the existence of a collective in Mantua with any particular remembered rights.¹⁷ Indeed, this would undermine the city's presence as a persistent villain. The motivations behind Donizone's use of language were similar to those of the authors of the charters discussed here, but ultimately his work is a product of different goals and traditions and is of limited use in the discussion of rhetoric and social groups in Mantua in the eleventh century.

After addressing the current historiographical trends regarding the social structure of the Italian cities, I will argue five connected points. Firstly, the extant copies of the original charters issued to the *arimanni* and *cives* of Mantua during the eleventh century are preserved without significant interpolation. Secondly, the rights incorporated within these charters reflect the political, economic and rhetorical goals of their donors and, to a certain extent, their recipients. Thirdly, these goals necessitated the use of rhetorically charged language and this was reflected in part by the choice of terms to describe the charters' recipients. Fourthly, although these arguments are not incompatible with the presence of a defined social structure in Mantua, the charter evidence also suggests that *arimanni* and *cives* were used to describe those with a broad range of economic interests which are not easily reconciled with traditional distinctions between *cives* and *milites*. Finally, I will suggest that these arguments can be applied in relation to several other Italian cities.

Historiography: The Social Structure of the Italian Cities

The identity and social nature of the charters' recipients, labelled *arimanni* in 1014 and *cives* from 1055 onwards, is of particular importance within current historical debate. The presence of either or both of these supposed groups in Mantua has been used to suggest a social dynamic in the city and has formed part of the broader analysis of the social structure of the Italian cities between 1000 and 1200. Cracco defines this debate beginning in the 1970s as follows: 'Historians felt the need... to ask themselves again what the origins of urban society were: what were the classes that actually shaped it, while shaping themselves at the same time?'¹⁸ Terms such as *cives* and *arimanni* have been used to demonstrate the position and power of diverse and relatively well defined social groups within the Italian cities.

Hagen Keller's 1979 work *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien* remains very influential in this debate.¹⁹ Keller argued that the social structure of the Italian cities in the twelfth century was based on three *ordines*: the *Capitani* (higher nobility), *Valvassores* (lower nobility) and another non-noble *ordo* known by various terms including *cives*, *populus*, *populares* and *plebs*.²⁰ Keller combined his model of a *Ständeordnung* (social order) with an extensive exercise in *Personenforschung* around Milan to argue that the early communes were dominated by the same group of families which had held positions of power in the proto-communal period: the *capitani* and *valvassores*; collectively the *milites*. He viewed the social structure of the Italian cities as fundamentally similar to that of the rest of Western Europe, simply applied to an urban setting. This stood in stark contrast to the traditional presentation of the commune as an institution created by newly empowered merchants

and artisans (the *cives*) who gained a share of political power by using their wealth obtained through trade, manufacture and banking to acquire positions within the fledgling consulate.²¹ Bordone and Grillo have underlined the impact of Keller's work, noting a tendency to see the *Ständeordnung* he put forward for Milan as representative of the situation in cities across Italy and an extension of this model into the eleventh century.²² Numerous important authors including Rosetti, Menant and Jones have strong ties to Keller's analysis.²³ Although several writers, mostly Italians, have challenged this shift,²⁴ Keller's arguments and concept of *Ständeordnung* still dominate the discussion of this period.

The debate has become more nuanced in recent years. Castagnetti, Tabacco and Bordone have argued that the social composition of the consulate and the citizenship in general varied in different regions of Italy, highlighting the prominence of merchants and artisans and exclusion of nobles within some city collectives.²⁵ Most recently, Wickham has completed a broad study of the emergence of the commune across Italy underlining fundamental differences in the social and economic positions of the families which dominated the consulate in different cities and heavily revising Keller's depiction of the three *ordines* involved in the rule of the early communes.²⁶ Keller himself has emphasised that his *Ständeordnung* is not universal and warned against using the results derived from his methodology on the basis of disparate or partial source documentation.²⁷ Nevertheless, the existence of distinct social *ordines* within the cities of Italy remains widely accepted. Authors such as Reynolds who rightly argue against the imposition of twelfth-century models on earlier periods are inevitably drawn to Keller's terminology

and model of society.²⁸ Wickham does much to dispute the model used by Keller and his followers, but nevertheless bases his arguments on the existence of more or less defined social strata within the Italian cities.²⁹

The connection or distinction between *arimanni* and *cives* in Mantua during the eleventh century informs this broader discussion: was the term *arimanni* used synonymously with *milites*, or with *cives*, or to distinguish an entirely separate entity? *Arimanni* of the Lombard period were warrior settlers who arrived in Italy in the sixth and seventh centuries and seem to have been defined by their ethnicity, stake in the military and theoretical link to the king.³⁰ Because of the continued occasional appearances of *arimanni* in various sources several authors, most notably Castagnetti, contend that *arimanni* survived as an *ordo* in some areas into the thirteenth century.³¹ Mengozzi, Schumann and Bordone associate *arimanni* in Mantua with the *milites* in the mid-eleventh century, highlighting an apparent distinction between *arimanni* and *cives* in documents of this period.³² In contrast, Colorni, Fumagalli, Dilcher and Gardoni have presented *arimanni* and *cives* within Mantua as synonymous, largely on the basis of the similarities between the 1014 and 1055 charters.³³ As is the case with the broader arguments over social *ordines* in Italy, both sides of this more specific debate rely on the assumption that stratified and clearly delineated social groups existed within Mantua at this time.

Authenticity of the Charters

Although the original charters do not survive, viable copies of all four documents are extant within the thirteenth-century *Liber privilegiorum* of Mantua: a collection of the privileges received by the *arimanni* or *cives* of Mantua.³⁴ The documents of the *Liber privilegiorum* are held in the *Archivio Gonzaga* and, because of their relevance to the history of Mantua, they have received a very high standard of care.³⁵ Beyond the 1014, 1055, 1090 and 1091 documents the portfolio includes charters produced at the courts of Henry V (1116),³⁶ Lothar III (1133),³⁷ Frederick I (1159 and 1164),³⁸ and Frederick II (1237).³⁹ As such, the *Liber privilegiorum* is the most extensive collection of charters dealing with an Italian city collective in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

There are some minor differences in the details of these charters, but they all provide similar rights. Their authors proclaim a desire to relieve the oppression of their recipients and confirm protection of the recipients' lands and property within the county of Mantua. Rights to trade along the Po and Mincio without payment of tolls or taxes were granted. Finally, a large fine was to be levied on anyone who violated the decree of the charters.

As Dilcher observes, the question of interpolation within the *Liber privilegiorum* cannot be avoided.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, although there may have been additions and alterations made to these documents, it is likely that these were minor.⁴¹ The phrasing of the clauses of the documents fits with that of their contemporaries: the 1014 charter is similar to a document of the same year issued to the *homines* of Savona while the 1055 charter bears a strong resemblance to a contemporary document granting similar rights to the *populus* of Ferrara.⁴² Likewise, the charters produced in 1091 and later follow the

increasingly standardised structure of imperial grants to Italian cities. The dates and locations of issue of these charters also correspond with the position of the emperor as confirmed by other documents: the copy of the 1014 charter claims production in Ravenna, where Henry held a synod in January and February of that year and issued several other charters. The copyist of the 1055 document claims the production of the original in Guastalla, 20 miles south of Mantua, on 3 November that year: two weeks after the production of another charter granting rights to the bishop of Mantua produced in Mantua itself.⁴³ The copyist claims that the 1090 and 1091 documents were produced in Mantua just before the start of the siege of the city and just after its fall respectively.⁴⁴ In each case, the purported dates and places of production fit the donor's itinerary. This strongly suggests that charters addressed to the *arimanni* or *cives* were produced in these years and contained the same basic core of rights and intentions presented in the later copies. There remain two significant issues of possible interpolation in these documents which require further discussion:

Firstly, the authenticity of the term *arimanni* has been questioned, but it has generally been accepted as reliable in recent scholarship. Torelli argued that the 1014 document was fabricated and the 1055 document altered in order to strengthen the late twelfth-century claims of the Mantuan commune to the lands and rights included in the 1159 charter issued by Frederick I.⁴⁵ He reasoned that the appearance of *arimanni* in 1014 was an interpolation based on the 1159 charter.⁴⁶ He further argued that the phrase *cives videlicet eremanos* in the 1055 document was a classic case of interpolation because of the copyist's use of the term *videlicet*.⁴⁷ Counter to Torelli's arguments and by

highlighting the appearance of the same terms in contemporary charters Tabacco and Castagnetti have demonstrated that the 1014 and 1055 charters were not reliant on the 1159 document for the use of *arimanni*.⁴⁸ The term is unusual, but not unique, within the charters of Henry II. Beyond its appearance in 1014, it appeared in a charter of 1006 issued to the bishop of Como granting him the public rights in the city, including protection of the *arimanni*.⁴⁹ The evidence that the language used in the 1055 charter is consistent with that common to the court of Henry III is more decisive: *arimanni* appear in four of Henry's other charters including two produced in 1055.⁵⁰ On this basis Tabacco and Castagnetti argue convincingly that *arimanni* and *cives* were transmitted from the original documents and that the 1159 document was an attempt to reconcile and codify the preceding charters.⁵¹

Secondly, the trading rights provided in the 1014 charter are more extensive than those provided in 1055 or 1091. The 1014 and 1159 charters detail trading rights in Garda, Lazise, Sommolago, Brescia, Ferrara, Comacchio and Ravenna,⁵² while the 1055 and 1091 documents mention only Ravenna, Argenta, Ferrara and Sommolago.⁵³ In this case it is possible that the compiler of the *Liber privilegiorum* interpolated the list of cities presented in the 1159 document into the 1014 counterpart in order to strengthen thirteenth-century claims to these rights.⁵⁴ However, the trading rights in the other charters within the *Liber privilegiorum* suggest that the 1014 list was authentic and part of broader anomalies within the charters in general. The 1090 and 1133 charters do not name any specific cities in which the Mantuans will enjoy trading rights. The 1116 document lists toll free trading rights in Lazise, Garda, Sommolago, Brescia, Bologna,

Ferrara, Argenta, Ravenna and Commachio.⁵⁵ This was the most generous grant of trading rights provided by any of these documents and includes every city mentioned elsewhere as well as one city, Bologna, which does not appear in any other charter. The trading rights provided by individual documents within the *Liber privilegiorum* varied greatly and the simple explanation that the 1014 rights were interpolated from the 1159 charter is insufficient. If an interpolation was to be made, the 1116 charter provided a more generous base of rights. It is likely that the trading rights listed in the 1159 charter were based on those presented in 1014. For the purposes of this article, it is sufficient to accept that while the precise rights detailed in the copy of the 1014 charter may be a later interpolation, the document nevertheless provides a reasonable indication of these rights.⁵⁶

Political Goals in the Charters

As Keller and Koziol amongst others have demonstrated, the performative nature of charters relied on the involvement in the construction of the document of all those party to it i.⁵⁷ Charters were not simply one way, written communications issued by the donor to passive recipients, but were the product of negotiation between the donor, recipient and any intercessors.⁵⁸ The influence of the donors and the recipients can be observed in the charters to the *arimanni* and *cives* of Mantua.

The similarities between the charters issued to the Mantuan *arimanni* and *cives* in 1014, 1055 and 1091 and several contemporary documents suggest that the imperial court

exerted a strong influence over their production and structure. For example, the 1014 charter uses an address clause identical to that used in other documents produced in Ravenna in January and February 1014.⁵⁹ The 1055 charter likewise employs very similar phrasing, layout and rights to those found in the 1055 charter to the *populus* of Ferrara.⁶⁰ Moreover, these charters were produced alongside a range of documents designed to assert imperial authority across northern Italy.⁶¹ As such their contents and phrasing were determined largely by the goals of the imperial court.

The contents of the 1090 charter were likewise heavily influenced by the Canossan court. The timing of the charter is certainly connected to the arrival in Italy of Henry IV at the head of the imperial host and the document was designed to ensure the loyalty of the *cives* of Mantua. Furthermore, in sharp contrast to the typical structure of Matilda's charters, this document follows very similar lines to the imperial charters produced in 1014, 1055, and 1091. Matilda and her husband, Welf, are portrayed undertaking the role of donor previously occupied by the emperor. This corresponds to a broader attempt by the Canossan court to cast Matilda and her family fulfilling the imperial duties while the German emperors failed to carry out their responsibilities.⁶²

The concessions in all the imperial charters of the right to trade free of tolls or market dues (*tholomei vel ripatici*) in several cities represent claims to authority over much of the Po basin while challenging the power of the Canossans. The areas in which these rights were granted fall into two distinct areas: lake Garda⁶³ and the cities in Romagna.⁶⁴ These areas describe a route from the Alps via Mantua to the key city of Ravenna whose archbishop typically enjoyed close ties to the imperial court. More

importantly, the majority of these areas were under the influence of the Canossans demonstrating imperial balances to Canossan attempts to control and tax traffic in the Po basin.⁶⁵ While these rights would certainly be of benefit to the *arimanni* or *cives* of Mantua, the specific route described complemented imperial goals in the region while omitting several lucrative routes, most notably upstream on the Po to Milan and Pavia. These trading rights were granted primarily for their ability to counter Canossan power. Notably, the Canossan charter of 1090 does not provide a list of cities alongside these rights, instead stating that the Mantuan *cives* may go where they wish by water or land without paying these tolls or market dues.⁶⁶ This general grant of rights could represent an extension of those already granted to the Mantuan *cives*, but Matilda did not have the authority to promise these rights across Lombardy nor the power to enforce them. Moreover, subsequent imperial charters retained the list format of the earlier documents, ignoring Matilda's universal declaration. Instead, it is much more likely that Matilda's scribes abandoned the more specific list of rights provided in the imperial charters of 1014 and 1055 because the more detailed clause was of no benefit to her political goals.

The areas in which the imperial charters granted protections were crucial to the Canossan powerbase and continued the theme of challenging Canossan authority. The 1014 document gave the *arimanni* the right to carry out their business on either side of the river Tartaro and as far as the river Oglio.⁶⁷ These rivers, both tributaries of the Po, defined the boundaries of the county of Mantua. The 1055 charter likewise granted the protection of the possessions and rights of the Mantuan *cives* on both sides of the Mincio.⁶⁸ The Mincio is a major tributary of the Po river running through the county of

Mantua and around the city itself: the area described implicitly refers to the county of Mantua. In 1091 the clauses of the 1014 and 1055 charters were combined.⁶⁹ By issuing rights across the county of Mantua, the emperors promoted the interests of a group that was not associated with the Canossans and did this within the most important of their holdings: Mantua was strategically and economically central to Canossan lands.⁷⁰ These declarations of general protections across the county of Mantua were made to establish imperial power across the region. Likewise, in 1090 Matilda's court used the verbatim repetition of this clause from the 1014 charter to underline her authority across the county.

The production sites of these charters were also influenced by their donors' needs. The 1014 charter was created in Ravenna, a city with a strong connection to the memory of the rule of the Carolingians and, inaccurately, that of the Lombards. By issuing the charter there, Henry II underlined his connection to these earlier kings and emperors, legitimising his rule. The 1055 charter was created in Guastalla, a Canossan stronghold.⁷¹ Guastalla was originally an imperial possession of Louis II who gifted it to his wife, empress Angilberga, in 864⁷² who in turn donated it to the monastery of San Sisto in Piacenza.⁷³ In the eleventh century it passed to the Canossans, quite possibly through usurpation by Boniface.⁷⁴ By promulgating his charter in this location, Henry demonstrated his right to move and act within Canossan territory and countered Canossan claims over Guastalla through earlier imperial claims of possession. The 1090 charter was produced in Mantua itself. By doing this the Canossans stated their control over the city and their determination to defend Mantua against imperial forces. Likewise, the

production of the 1091 charter by Henry IV within the city was a clear statement of imperial power within the walls and of the imperial victory over the Canossans.

Although the donors of these charters played the leading role in their creation and construction, the recipients of these charters were also involved. A clause within the 1055 document explains that the rights contained within the charter were issued at the request of the recipients: ‘The *cives* of Mantua approached our mercy, complaining of their misfortunes and long-sustained hardships.’⁷⁵ The 1090 document likewise includes the clause: ‘Our faithful citizens of Mantua came to our mercy asking us to free their co-citizens from oppressions, praying that we restore to them the *arimannia* (area of lands and rights) and common goods of the city withdrawn by our predecessors.’⁷⁶ In 1091 the scribe goes further, explaining the mutual obligation of fidelity and protection between the emperor and the *cives* as the basis for their request being granted.⁷⁷ In all three of these charters, the recipients are portrayed playing an active role in requesting the confirmation of their rights. In 1055 it is possible that this was a technique of rhetoric on the part of an imperial scribe; this charter is the main evidence of a politically active urban collective in Mantua at this point. Between 1090 and 1091, such a collective played a decisive role during the siege of the city and the charters issued in these years were clearly designed to secure the loyalty of this collective. Therefore, possibly by 1055 and certainly by 1090 the recipients of these charters were requesting confirmation of their rights, even if the nature of these rights was determined primarily by their donors’ needs.

The recipients’ involvement in the construction of these charters is further demonstrated through the specific rights they granted. The general rights discussed above

were accompanied by more specific details. In 1014, Henry II conceded to the *arimanni* in the city of Mantua all of their inheritable, owned and communal property, all property that their parents possessed, and all that they had acquired or would acquire in the forest Armanore, in Carpeneta, Sacca, Septimenti and many other locations in the county of Mantua.⁷⁸ These locations are repeated in the 1090 document.⁷⁹ Through several investigations of episcopal and private transactions in the county of Mantua in the tenth century and eleventh century Torelli, Tabacco and Castagnetti have demonstrated that these locations were important to the leading families of the proto-commune.⁸⁰ These specific details required local knowledge which can best be explained through the active involvement of the recipients in the production of the charters. Again, although most of the content of these documents was determined by the political and rhetorical needs of their donors, the recipients of these charters were able to influence several important details.

Language as Rhetoric in the Charters

The charters of 1014, 1055 and 1091 were designed as elements of coherent and extensive statements of imperial authority over Canossan power and the 1090 document was produced by the Canossan court as a counter to these claims. These documents were not simply the voice of their donors, but the donors did play a dominant role in their construction and rhetoric. The terms selected to describe the recipients of these charters were chosen to support the political goals of their donors and to this end, terms which

could appeal to remembered political and economic rights were selected. It is likely that both *arimanni* and *cives* were chosen for this reason and that they were externally imposed terms in Mantua: neither term appears in surviving episcopal or private documents of the preceding or following centuries, they were only used by the authors of Imperial *diplomata* and their impersonators. References to lay groups or individuals from Mantua are limited in the surviving private documents, but when they do appear they are never described as *arimanni* or *cives*. For example, a charter produced by the bishop of Mantua, Eliseus, on 6 October 1056 concerned the sale of various properties in Mantua to the *sindici et procuratoris communis*.⁸¹ Documents produced by Eliseus' court in the following year referred to *plebes* and *populus*.⁸² It was not until the twelfth century that documents began to identify lay individuals with the city of Mantua. The earliest surviving example is a transaction on 1 February 1112 between 'Belisma, daughter of Literus of Cremona, living in Mantua' and 'Veronesus of the same city'.⁸³ The significant point here is that there is no indication that a collective urban group was recognised as *arimanni* or *cives* in eleventh-century Mantua by those living in the city even in situations where the appearance of the terms could be reasonably expected. *Arimanni* and *cives* were used by the authors of the imperial and Canossan charters because of the rhetorical and ideological weight they carried not because of any local custom. Local figures made use of different terms to describe groups of Mantuans because they had different political and ideological goals. Furthermore, the changing relevance of different political traditions led to a change in terms used in the charters. While these documents were issued in part to classify and empower a community within the city, they also acted as a

statement of imperial power and it is this second function which determined the use of *arimanni* in 1014 and the change to *cives* from 1055 onwards. The terms were selected for their rhetorical value, and the switch from *arimanni* to *cives* was dictated by a change in the ideological power of these terms based on the replacement of remembered Lombard and Carolingian ideology by remembered Roman ideology as the strongest legitimising source for rulership.

It should be emphasised that the memories of the ideologies presented in these documents did not necessarily correspond to the principles and rhetoric of their original political structures. The charters were not designed as exemplars of earlier practices, but were rather pieces of rhetoric designed to benefit their donors and recipients. Their construction was also influenced by changing memories of the ideologies which they described. The authors did not, and indeed could not, recreate Lombard or Roman systems. Instead, they referenced current perceptions of these ideologies and used this as a basis for claims to authority and legitimacy. *Arimanni* originally referred to Lombard warriors and free men with a direct social and political link to the crown who were afforded the protection of their rights, persons and property against the magnates.⁸⁴ Although the term was used relatively rarely in the post-Lombard period, its appearance has often been connected to attempts to assert royal authority.⁸⁵ Carolingian rulers of Italy made references to the protection of the *arimanni* in several documents and these were imitated by their successors. By upholding the rights of the *arimanni* these kings fulfilled a key remembered role of their Lombard predecessors. A prominent example of this technique is found in the charters produced by Charles the Fat in 882 at Ravenna,

shortly after his acquisition of the kingdom of Italy.⁸⁶ The continued use of *arimanni* in this manner can be traced as far as the reign of Frederick I.⁸⁷ *Arimanni* was chosen deliberately by the authors of these documents to invoke the recalled authority of the Lombard kings. Furthermore, through their role as protectors of the *arimanni*, these kings could legitimately interfere within the lands of the Italian magnates. It did not matter that this term was not used in the same context as it had been under the Lombard kings. What was important was that *arimanni* appeared in a context where it could be expected to invoke memories of legitimate authority through both the perceived recollection of Lombard practices and the recollection of the Carolingian kings and emperors who had developed these practices.

As Bougard has argued, Henry II was aware of the rhetorical power of several remembered Lombard forms and terms.⁸⁸ The Ottonian capitularies preserve a vision of Lombard legal practices; Otto III employed these remembered traditions regarding justice for slaves for example.⁸⁹ Henry II made use of remembered Lombard forms during his Ravenna synod of January and February 1014.⁹⁰ This synod produced a *constitutio* and four *diplomata*, all of which demonstrated Lombard influences.⁹¹ The *diplomata* all followed forms of construction found in Italy but absent in Germany. Henry's Italian chancellor, also named Henry, claimed responsibility for the construction of these four documents and for many of the others produced in the imperial court between 1013 and 1016. The chancellor's origins are unknown, but his position required the understanding of the customs and concerns of Italy. His appointment as bishop of Parma by October 1015 further demonstrates his integration into the Italian political system.⁹² Furthermore,

Ravenna had a long history as a site for the production of documents which invoked Lombard ideologies: Charles the Fat is the clearest example of this. The archbishop's extensive archives, which would later a central role in the legal arguments of the investiture contest,⁹³ informed the construction of Henry's charters. Henry II, like Charles the Fat before him, used the resources at Ravenna to present himself as a legitimate ruler through his purported succession from the Lombard kings. The fact that Ravenna was never a major centre of Lombard power, indeed it was only conquered by the Lombard kings in 751 mere decades before their displacement at the hands of the Carolingians, did not lessen the importance of the city as a perceived centre of Lombard traditions. The Carolingians embraced the Roman and Ostrogothic legacies of Ravenna, recognising the political power of the city's history. As demonstrated by the documents of Charles the Fat, they combined these legacies, anatopistically, with their perceptions of Lombard legal traditions. As a result, under Henry II Ravenna was firmly connected with these perceived Lombard practices.

Henry's appeal to a remembered Lombard heritage is also evident within the protection clause of the 1014 charter, and in multiple other documents issued around this time. In addition to the typical references to *dux*, *episcopus*, *marchio*, *comes*, *vicecomes*, and *gastalio*, Henry gave his protection against the *sculdascio*. This Lombard title referred to legal officials who later obtained a military role. Henry's recollection of the term in this document is one of nineteen examples of his use of *sculdascio* in this formula within the *diplomata* of his second expedition to Italy (1013-1014).⁹⁴ Outside this brief period, Henry's charters refer to the *sculdascio* on only eight occasions spread relatively

evenly across his reign.⁹⁵ His first (1004) and third (1021-1024) expeditions into Italy were not marked by any notable increase in the appearance of this term in his charters. The inclusion of *sculdascio* in this formula underlines Henry's use of Lombard traditions to legitimise his rule south of the Alps and the concentration of these documents demonstrates the importance of these traditions to Henry's claim to authority in these years.

The presentation of Henry as a ruler after the Lombard tradition was particularly important to maintain in 1014. Between 1002 and 1014 Arduin of Ivrea had gained support from the Lombard nobility as a royal native alternative to imperial rule from Germany.⁹⁶ Although Arduin's rebellion was defeated, it underlined a continuing perception of the Kingdom of Italy as a separate entity from the German Empire.⁹⁷ The riot in Pavia in 1004 on the occasion of Henry's coronation as King of Italy was a further indication of this perspective.⁹⁸ By reasserting his own claim to legitimacy of rule based on succession from the Lombard kings, Henry attempted to counter the principal ideological threat to his control of Italy.

The term *cives* only appears in two surviving German imperial documents before 1055: in 996 Otto III issued a charter protecting the rights of the *cives* of Cremona and in 1037 Conrad II addressed a document to the city's bishop mentioning the *cives*.⁹⁹ After 1055 *cives* became the main descriptor for recipients of this sort of charter. In 1081 the *cives* of Pisa and *cives* of Lucca received such documents.¹⁰⁰ Henry continued to use this terminology in his 1091 document to the *cives* of Mantua.¹⁰¹ This proliferation can be connected to the eclipse of claimed Lombard heritage by invoked Roman ideology as the

most important basis for German claims to authority within Italy.¹⁰² Celli views the use of *cives* in these documents as a deliberate choice motivated by the inclusive connotations of the term: by including the urban population as a whole, the authors of the documents claimed greater legitimacy.¹⁰³ In addition to these inclusive qualities, the importance of the Roman origin of the term and the role this played in its perceived authority must be emphasised. The term *cives* was used for similar purposes of rhetoric as *arimanni*, but drew its power from a different invoked tradition. Over the course of the eleventh century the Imperial court gained a growing interest in claiming a Roman heritage as it offered an image of the world with the emperor placed firmly at the centre.¹⁰⁴ This ideology could be applied equally well in Germany, Italy and Burgundy and provided the emperor with a basis for his claims to seniority over his neighbours in Hungary, Bohemia and Poland. Henry IV and subsequent emperors found a claim to a Roman Imperial heritage useful in their conflicts with the papacy as it supported their claims to superiority over the pope.¹⁰⁵ In Italy in the second half of the eleventh century this meant that it was more important for the emperor to be associated with his Roman predecessors than with the Lombard kings. This shift was connected to the reinvigorated study of Roman law in the Empire. During the eleventh century, canon lawyers and Italian jurists increasingly saw Roman law as a source of legitimacy for their legal arguments. This legal practice was appealing as it provided a link to the Roman past and a degree of prestige and legitimacy which could not be provided by Lombard law.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, although the Lombard law codes provided extensive coverage of punishment for violent crimes, they were relatively quiet with regards to civic issues such

as the exchange or sale of property. Roman law provided a much greater foundation for this growing field. Works such as Burchard's *Decretum* emphasised Roman practices and terminology within canon law¹⁰⁷ and the increased accessibility of key texts including Justinian's Digest (*Digesta seu Pandectae*) provided the ideological basis for a change in terminology even if actual practices only loosely resembled Roman guidelines until the twelfth century.¹⁰⁸

This change in ideology had an effect on the terms used within Imperial *diplomata*. Of particular relevance here is the fact that *cives* was a term intrinsically linked with Roman traditions. *Cives* appears throughout the works of Justinian and other documents which transmitted Roman practices and terminology to eleventh-century Italy.¹⁰⁹ As the emperors began to invest their image with these allusions to their claimed Roman heritage they began to employ Roman terms and phrases. Evidence of this shift is provided within the documents of the *Expositio* of the *Liber Papiensis*. These works, produced between 1020 and 1070 at the law school in Pavia, are a commentary on the law codes of the kingdom of Italy between the Lombard kings and Otto I. Significantly, they juxtapose the use of *arimanni* in the text of the laws of the Lombard kings with the use of *cives* by the eleventh-century commentators.¹¹⁰ These documents equate the Roman *cives* with the Lombard *arimanni* suggesting that a transition in the use of the two terms began around the middle of the eleventh century.

Other shifts in terminology within imperial charters in Italy occurred during the eleventh century. Terms connected to Lombard traditions appeared less frequently. For example, despite regular appearances in the Italian charters of Henry II and Conrad II, the

term *sculdascio* vanishes entirely in the documents of Henry III. The term did reappear in the charters of Henry IV who spent more than ten years of his reign in Italy,¹¹¹ but did so much less frequently (eight times in the five hundred or so surviving charters of Henry IV¹¹² compared to twenty seven appearances in a similar number of surviving documents from Henry II).¹¹³ Over the same period, references to the imperial position of the emperor became more common. The 1055 charter to the *cives* of Mantua refers to the imperial excellence¹¹⁴ and imperial authority¹¹⁵ of Henry III. The author of the 1091 document extended this tradition through references to the defence of the *res publica* by the emperor. Although this term and its connotations had never disappeared,¹¹⁶ its use here is consistent with the switch to remembered Roman ideologies. Any such phrasing was notably absent from the 1014 charter.

It should of course be noted that the term *cives* appears sporadically in the documents of the post-Roman period. The Gothic wars and Lombard invasion led to a break with Roman structures and traditions, but although the integration of Lombard and Roman law and customs led to fewer appearances of *cives* in the documents of the Lombard kingdom, the term did appear occasionally.¹¹⁷ In most instances, *cives* was used to refer to individuals in the charters of this period, for example a charter dated to 13 May 769 details the sale of land by Stavile *civis Brixianus*.¹¹⁸ *Cives* all but disappeared in the charters of the Carolingian kings of Italy and their successors. A very isolated example appears in the charter issued by Otto III to the *cives* of Cremona in 996.¹¹⁹

In each of these isolated incidents, *cives* may possibly have been employed by the authors of the charters to provide a link to the remembered Roman past but it is only in

the 1055 document that it is evident that the term was used deliberately. Previous incidents could have been a result of scribal preference or coincidence, but in 1055 the author of the charter emphasised that the use of *cives* was deliberate through his identification of the *cives* namely the *arimanni*. *Cives* was chosen consciously in 1055 and the motivation behind this choice was the changing use of invoked ideologies. Furthermore, the 1055 charter was simply the start of a much stronger tradition. *Cives* appears in the imperial charters with increasing frequency under subsequent emperors. In addition to the 1091 charter to the Mantuan *cives*, Henry IV provided rights to the *cives* of Pisa and Lucca in 1081.¹²⁰ The *cives* of Parma are mentioned in another imperial document produced that year,¹²¹ while an individual referred to as a *civis* of Pavia appears as witness to an imperial charter in 1084.¹²² By the 1080s, the notaries of the imperial court were beginning to embrace this new perceived ideology, but this can be seen in an embryonic form in Mantua in 1055.

Mantua provides a particularly good example of this transition of ideology as the 1055 charter refers in passing to the ‘*cives* that is to say *arimanni*’.¹²³ *Arimanni* appears in two other charters from this year: issued to the bishop of Padua and to the monastery of San Zeno in Verona.¹²⁴ The repeated use of the term seems to have been deliberate: Henry and his scribes refer to *arimanni* in only two other documents over the course of his entire reign, produced in 1039 and 1052.¹²⁵ This argument is supported by observations by Stengel and Tabacco that Henry had access to the Ravenna charters of Charles the Fat and used this ideology and phraseology in his own charters.¹²⁶ In 1055 Henry III appealed to the same remembered ideology to which Henry II had appealed in

1014. Henry III or his chancellor Gunther, who claimed authorship of the 1055 document, did not base this appeal solely on the 1014 charter: the appearances of the term in Henry's other charters demonstrates that this was part of a broader ideological tradition which Henry was employing alongside the emergence of the a ideology based on remembered Roman customs. This linking of the two terms suggests that the charter of 1055 was issued while there was a need for the Emperor to present himself ruling in the manner of the Lombard kings and to identify himself with the methods of rule of the Roman emperors. Before this point the German Emperors had tried to associate themselves with the social, ideological and legal practices of the Lombard kings; afterwards they would attempt to do the same with those of the Roman emperors, but in 1055 Henry III or his notaries laid claim to both heritages.

Despite this change in terminology and ideology, the references to *cives* and *arimanni* were made for essentially the same purpose. Both allowed the emperor to draw upon the idea of continuity of rule and both allowed him to present himself acting in his royal or imperial role by protecting a group traditionally associated with him. At the same time, this claim to a traditional relationship with this group allowed the emperor to underline his authority within Mantua. The Canossans adopted a similar technique through their attempt to assume the imperial role. The only difference was the line of rulers and traditions from which each term was designed to claim continuity.

Social groups within Mantua

As I have argued throughout this paper, the representation of the recipients of these charters was influenced primarily by political rhetoric. Although this argument is not necessarily incompatible with the presence of a delineated social structure within Mantua composed of concrete groups of *cives*, *arimanni* or *milites*, the existence of such a system can not be demonstrated.

The theory, put forward by Castagnetti,¹²⁷ that the recipients of the eleventh-century charters were analogous to the *arimanni* of the Lombard period can be rejected. Evidence of earlier interactions involving individuals that could have conceivably been identified as part of this group are rare, most of the surviving documents concern the affairs of the king, clergy or nobility, but where these charters do exist *arimanni* do not appear. For example, in 1011, Boniface of Canossa granted lands to a number of *milites*.¹²⁸ These cases are isolated, there is no indication that any particular term was used to describe an urban collective in Mantua prior to the eleventh century. Most documents identify individuals by their toponyms, partronyms or, occasionally, locations in or around the county of Mantua. The absence of *arimanni* in these earlier documents therefore suggests that it was not a term which was in common use in or around Mantua prior to 1014. There is nothing to suggest that a group of Mantuan *arimanni* survived until 1014.

The term *cives* was also alien to the Mantuans in the eleventh century. Prior to this century the term appears only once in association with the Mantuans, in a 945 charter of Lothar II which gave Peter, the bishop of Mantua, control over minting rights in Mantua, Brescia and Verona.¹²⁹ The *cives* were mentioned coincidentally when Lothar or

his scribe states that the purity of the coinage was to be agreed with the *cives* of these cities.¹³⁰ Even in this case, the rights included in the document and the political background to its creation (the document was produced in the final years of the reign of Lothar's father, Hugh, and this is the only surviving example of a document produced in Lothar's name alone prior to Hugh's death) were extraordinary and it is much more likely that these circumstances influenced the selection of *cives* here than that the term was indicative of a concrete social group within Mantua. The term does not appear with any regularity in Brescia or Verona until the late eleventh century while in Mantua *cives* only appeared in later imperial charters, their imitators and in the narrative sources until the mid twelfth century. Private transactions and episcopal charters do not refer to the *cives*. As was the case with *arimanni*, it seems that the term *cives* was initially imposed from outside by the imperial notaries.

At the same time, it is important to underline that the *arimanni* of 1014 and the *cives* from 1055 onwards were the same figurative group. As Dilcher observes, and as demonstrated above, the 1055 document was a confirmation of the rights detailed in 1014.¹³¹ The charters also make use of very similar language.¹³² Furthermore, the *cives* of the 1055 document are portrayed as coming to the imperial presence to plead for support implying that the *cives* knew they could legitimately call on the emperor to relieve them from oppression. This forms part of the general construction of imperial interaction with *cives* but also recalls the rights issued in the 1014 document. The *arimanni* of 1014 were clearly linked to the *cives* of 1055: the author of the 1055 charter goes so far as to refer to the *cives* who are known as *arimanni* (*cives videlicet arimanni*) and to equate the lands of

the *arimanni* (the *arimannia*) with those of the *res communes*.¹³³ Superficially, this seems to allow an identification of the recipients of the 1014 and 1055 charters with the *cives* of the various *Ständeordnung* proposed by Keller and others. *Cives* was the term used in 1055 to describe the Mantuans, and this became the norm in subsequent charters.¹³⁴ Several of the rights issued in these documents were of interest to the merchants and artisans of Mantua, those traditionally associated with the *ordines* of *cives*. The exemptions from tolls contained within the charters highlight interests in an extensive trade network demonstrating links to transalpine routes through Lake Garda as well as to the lower Po and the Adriatic in Ferrara, Argenta and Ravenna.

However, other rights issued in these charters would have been of more interest to another supposed economic and social group in Mantua: the *valvassores*. Concerns regarding landholding are evident through the various guarantees of rights relating to moveable and immovable property. In 1014, the *arimanni* were guaranteed that the great men of the realm could not demand rights of hospitality.¹³⁵ They were given freedom to use public lands.¹³⁶ They were granted the right to the lands legally held by their predecessors.¹³⁷ These were all issues of great concern to the small and medium landholders in the county of Mantua, those who would typically be designated *valvassores* or *milites*. The protection of hereditary rights of landholding is particularly noteworthy as these rights were echoed in the so called *constitutio de feudis* produced by Conrad II in Cremona on 27 May 1037.¹³⁸ This document granted the *valvassores* or *milites* of Italy, which appear here as synonyms, various rights, but most significantly made the benefices they held on church and royal lands hereditary and protected them

from confiscation.¹³⁹ Notably this was the first document to present the Italian *milites* or the *valvassores* with any specific rights or status.¹⁴⁰ Although the extent to which these rights were implemented has been debated, the document itself remains the single most solid evidence of rights assigned to this group.¹⁴¹ The provision of similar rights to the *arimanni* and *cives* of Mantua suggest that they were figuratively the same group as the *valvassores* empowered by Conrad II or at least held very similar interests.

The rights issued in the 1014 and 1055 charters present a range of economic and political concerns for their recipients and are not readily applicable to a narrow element of society in the city. In terms of livelihood, the *arimanni* and *cives* can thus be identified as having an amalgam of landholding and mercantile interests. *Arimanni* and *cives* did not simply represent landholders, typically associated with the *milites*. Nor did they only represent merchants, associated with the traditional perception of the *cives*. Instead, these terms indicated a broad array of interests associated with elements from both the *milites* and the *cives*. In this case the desire of many historians to classify social orders has occluded the use of these terms in these charters for goals of rhetoric and politics.

Broader implications

. This reassessment raises questions about the use of similar models to describe social structures in other Italian cities in this period. Mantua was not unique in its receipt of grants of this kind and so the formula of using certain terms to identify charter

recipients as a method to underline authority could potentially be applied to several other cities in northern Italy. I will address three examples here: Ferrara, Parma and Milan.

Ferrara is a particularly important application of this reassessment. On 24 August 1055 the entire *populus* of Ferrara¹⁴² received similar rights to those granted to the *cives* of Mantua a few months later. The *populus* were confirmed in their rights across the entire county of Ferrara,¹⁴³ and received trading rights in Milan, Cremona, Ravenna and Venice. As Fasoli and Castagnetti have noted, like Mantua, Ferrara was a key city in Canossan territory and this document formed part of the effort to assert the authority of Henry III at the expense of the Canossans:¹⁴⁴ the rights demonstrated Henry's authority throughout the county and along the Po from Milan to the coast (cutting straight through Canossan territory). On the basis of the arguments presented above, it can be suggested that the language used in this charter was chosen to aid this purpose rather than to represent a pre-existing and economically- and socially-defined group in Ferrara. This is especially salient here as the recipients of the charter are referred to as *populus*, a term closely identified with the 'non-noble' tier of Keller's *Ständeordnung*.¹⁴⁵ Castagnetti has taken this document as evidence for the mercantile nature of the leading families of the proto-commune: he combines the emphasis of trading rights with the reference *populus* to argue for an important role for the *cives* rather than domination by the *milites*.¹⁴⁶ If *populus* was used here for purposes of rhetoric, then there are consequences for Castagnetti's argument.

References to *cives* in the narrative sources of the eleventh century are also affected by this argument: a particular example of this is the portrayal of the *cives* of

Parma in Wipo's *Gesta Chonradi II*.¹⁴⁷ Wipo records that at Christmas in 1037 a riot occurred in Parma while Conrad II was present in the city. He refers to the rioters as *cives* and this has formed the basis of the portrayal in modern accounts of the riot as an uprising by the lower orders of society who were excluded from the bishop's circle: the riot is portrayed as a conflict between the *cives* and the *milites*.¹⁴⁸ However, if we accept that Wipo, writing in the late 1040s, was privy to the emerging invoked Roman ideology of the imperial court of Henry III described above, this assumption can be challenged. Wipo was writing to present the image of an ideal ruler and his presentation of the rioters as *cives* makes sense from this ideological perspective: if the *cives*, bound to the emperor by tradition, were rebelling against their rightful emperor, then the suppression of the riot was the required action of the emperor to uphold his legitimacy.

These arguments can even be applied in relation to Milan: the archetypal example of Keller's model. Violante presents a detailed distinction between the *cives* and *milites* in Milan in the early eleventh century based in part on accounts of the conflict between Conrad II and archbishop Aribert of Milan from 1037 until the death of the emperor in 1039.¹⁴⁹ The authors of the narrative sources which dealt with this conflict, including Wipo, present a dispute between the *valvassores* of the city and the archbishop over lands and rights. The production of the *constitutio de feudis* was prompted by this conflict as Conrad supported the *valvassores* against their bishop.¹⁵⁰ Aribert was able to resist Conrad and his allies amongst the *valvassores* through the support of the *cives* of Milan. These accounts and the *constitutio de feudis* have been read as if they refer to concrete social groups but if we consider the broader political and rhetorical goals behind the

creation of these works we may find a more nuanced image of society. As demonstrated above, the *arimanni* and *cives* in Mantua in 1014 and 1055 received similar rights to the *valvassores* in 1037, highlighting the fluidity of these terms. Moreover, it is quite possible that *valvassores* was an imperial creation, chosen to describe the beneficiaries of the *constitutio de feudis* because of its rhetorical power. It was certainly a new term in Italy: Keller notes the appearance of the term only from the eleventh century onwards, even though he argues that this *ordines* existed before this point.¹⁵¹

There are several similarities between the situation in Mantua and several other cities which came into conflict with the Canossans during the eleventh century such as Pisa, Lucca, Modena and Bologna. Many of these cities received imperial charters addressed to their *cives* granting similar rights to those issued to the *arimanni* and *cives* of Mantua during the eleventh century. Individual circumstances must be considered for each city, but it is quite possible that the accounts of social systems described in these places by those following Keller's work have been based too readily on the presence of *cives* and similar terms in their documents.

Conclusion

The charters issued to the *arimanni* or *cives* of Mantua in the eleventh century formed part of a prolonged contest between the German emperors and the Canossan family. This had a strong impact on the rights granted to the Mantuans in each charter; although the recipients of these documents had some influence over their construction, the main

purpose behind the creation of the documents was to support imperial or Canossan rhetoric and claims to power. Bearing this in mind, the selection of the terms *arimanni* and *cives* to describe the recipients of these charters can be viewed as part of the political rhetoric employed by their authors to claim legitimacy of authority. The terms were not native to Mantua and were imposed by imperial notaries. The coincidence of the use of these terms with periods of political crisis indicates that they were selected deliberately in order to demonstrate their donor acting as a legitimate ruler. Furthermore, the transition from the use of *arimanni* to the use of *cives* in these charters corresponds to a shift in remembered ideological practices from Lombard to Roman. While Mantua provides the clearest example of the use of charters to evoke remembered ideologies, these trends can be observed in relation to other cities. Although the use of these terms as rhetoric does not preclude their use to describe *ordines*, it seems that in this case they were not used for this purpose. The recipients of the charters held diverse interests which can not be easily reconciled with a distinction between *cives* and *milites*. This does not mean that *ordines* did not exist at all in the cities of Italy in this period. Rather, there has often been too great an emphasis placed on the identification of these *ordines* and this has led, in this case, to the sources for the period being misinterpreted. The vocabulary of groups in eleventh-century Mantua and other Italian cities was complex and more opaque than has often been allowed. More emphasis should be placed on the actions and motivations of urban communities rather than on who was included within these communities and who led them. The use of specific terms to describe a collective may indicate social boundaries to that group, but this can only be determined through a careful and thorough

examination of the nature and motivations of the source or sources using these terms and of the political situation surrounding the events they describe. In any event the rigid application of *Ständeordnung* is a simplistic explanation for the documents, politics and societies of the cities of Italy in the eleventh century.

¹ H. Bresslau (ed.), ‘Die Urkunden Heinrichs II’, in *Die Urkunden Heinrichs II und Arduin*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 3 (Hannover, 1900), no. 278.

² H. Bresslau (ed.), *Die Urkunden Heinrichs III*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 5 (Berlin, 1931), no. 356.

³ E. Goez and W. Goez (eds.), *Die Urkunden und Briefe der Markgräfin Mathilde von Tuszien*, *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Laienfürsten- und Dynastenurkunden der Kaiserzeit* 2 (Hannover, 1998), no. 43.

⁴ D. Gladiss and A. Gawlik (eds.), *Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae*, 6 (Hannover, 1978), no. 421.

⁵ L. Schiaparelli (ed.), ‘I Diplomi di Berengario II’, in *I Diplomi di Ugo e di Lothario di Berengario II e di Adalberto*, *Fonti per la Storia d’Italia* 38 (Rome, 1924), no. 11; T. Sickel (ed.), ‘Die Urkunden Otto des III’, in *Die Urkunden Otto des II und Otto des III*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 2 (Hannover, 1893), no. 198; Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 303; O. Banti, “‘Civitas’ e ‘comune’ nelle fonti italiani dei secoli XI e XII”, in G. Rossetti (ed.), *Forme di potere e struttura sociale in Italia nel Medioevo* (Bologna, 1977), pp. 217–32, at pp. 219–20. provides an extensive list.

⁶ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 250, 251; Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 334, 357; C. Imperiale (ed.), *Codice diplomatico della repubblica di Genova dal 968 al 1190*, 3 vols, *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* 79, 1 (Roma, 1936), no. 3.

⁷ G. Koziol, *The Politics of Memory and Identity in Carolingian Royal Diplomas: the West Frankish Kingdom (840-987)* (2012), p. 4.

⁸ S. Reynolds, *Kingdoms and communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (Oxford : New York, 1997), pp. liii–liv.

⁹ G. Sergi, ‘I poteri dei Canossa: Poteri delegati, poteri feudali, poteri signorili’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *I Poteri dei Canossa, da Reggio Emilia all’Europa: atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Reggio Emilia-Carpineti, 29-31 ottobre 1992)*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1994), pp. 29–39; A. Tincani, ‘Le corti dei Canossa in area Padana’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *I Poteri dei Canossa, da Reggio Emilia all’Europa: atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Reggio Emilia-Carpineti, 29-31 ottobre 1992)*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1994), pp. 253–78; H. Zimmermann, ‘I Signori di Canossa e l’Impero (da Ottone I a Enrico III)’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *I Poteri dei Canossa, da Reggio Emilia all’Europa: atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Reggio Emilia-Carpineti, 29-31 ottobre 1992)*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1994), pp. 413–9; P. Golinelli, ‘L’Italia dopo la lotta per le investiture: la questione dell’eredità matildica’, *Studi Medievali* 3 42.2 (2001), pp. 509–28, at p. 511.

¹⁰ R. Schumann, *Authority and the Commune, Parma 833-1133* (Parma, 1973), p. 145; R. Rinaldi, ‘Da Adalberto Atto a Bonifacio. Note e riflessioni per l’edizione di un Codice Diplomatico Canossano prematildico’, *Bullettino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 101 (1997), pp. 13–91, at p. 64.

¹¹ H. Bresslau, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Kaiser Konrad II.* (Berlin, 1967); V. Fumagalli, *Le origini di una grande dinastia feudale Adalberto-Atto di Canossa.* (Tübingen, 1971); Zimmermann, ‘I Signori di Canossa’, pp. 416–7; Golinelli, ‘L’Italia’, p. 512.

¹² R. Houghton, ‘Reconsidering Donizone’s Vita Mathildis: Boniface of Canossa and Henry II’, *Journal of Medieval History* 41.4 (2015).

¹³ G. Fasoli, ‘La realtà cittadina nei territori canossiani’, in *Studi matildici, Atti e Memorie del III Convegno di Studi matildici (Reggio Emilia, 7 - 9 ottobre 1977)* (Modena, 1978), pp. 55–78, at pp. 60–1; R. Bordone, *La società cittadina del Regno d’Italia: Formazione e sviluppo delle caratteristiche urbane nei secoli XI e XII* (Turin, 1987), pp. 116–29; M. Morselli, *Le origini di un comune cittadino: analisi di alcuni documenti del liber privilegiorum communis mantue* (Modena, 1992), p. 54; A. Castagnetti, ‘Arimanni e signori dall’età postcarolingia alla prima età comunale’, in G. Dilcher and C. Violante (eds.), *Strutture e trasformazioni della signoria rurale nei secoli X-XIII*, Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico 44 (Bologna, 1996), pp. 169–285, at pp. 188–93.

¹⁴ A. Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni di Mantova (1014-1159)’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *Sant’Anselmno, Mantova e la lotta per le Investiture. Atti del Convegno Internazi*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1987), pp. 169–73, at pp. 176–7; G. Tabacco, ‘Mantova al Tempo di Matilde di Canossa’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *Sant’Anselmno, Mantova e la lotta per le Investiture. Atti del Convegno Internazi*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1987), pp. 159–67, at pp. 163–7; T. Struve, ‘Matilde di Toscana-Canossa ed Enrico IV’, in P. Golinelli (ed.), *I Poteri dei Canossa, da Reggio Emilia all’Europa: atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Reggio Emilia-Carpineti, 29-31 ottobre 1992)*, Il mondo medievale (Bologna, 1994), pp. 421–54, at pp. 442–4.

¹⁵ Schumann, *Authority and the Commune*, p. 323; I.S. Robinson, ‘The Metrical Commentary on Genesis of Donizo of Canossa: Bible and Gregorian Reform’, *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médié* 41 (1974), pp. 5–37, at p. 8; P. Golinelli, ‘Donizone’, in A.M. Ghisalberti (ed.), *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 41 (Roma, 1992), pp. 200–3, at p. 201; P. Bonacini, ‘Sulle Strade dei Canossa dal Parmense Tutto Intorno’, in P. Bonacini (ed.), *Studi Matildici IV Atti e Memorie del Convegno Il territorio parmense da Carlo Magno ai Canossa* (Modena, 1997), pp. 11–44, at p. 11; P. Golinelli, ‘Donizone e il suo poema per Matilde’, in P. Golinelli and V. Fumagalli (eds.), *Vita di Matilde di Canossa* (Milano, 2008), p. xi; E. Riversi, *La memoria di Canossa: saggi di contestualizzazione della Vita Mathildis di Donizone*, Studi medioevali nuova ser., 2 (Pisa, 2013), p. 61.

¹⁶ Bordone, *La società cittadina*, p. 89; Golinelli, ‘Donizone’, p. 201.

¹⁷ Golinelli, ‘Donizone’, p. 201; Golinelli, ‘Donizone e il suo poema per Matilde’, p. x; Riversi, *La memoria di Canossa*, pp. 194–7.

¹⁸ G. Cracco, ‘Social Structure and Conflict in the Medieval City’, in A. Molho, K.A. Raaflaub, and J. Emlen (eds.), *City states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy* (Ann Arbor, 1991), pp. 302–99, at p. 314.

¹⁹ H. Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien (9-12. Jahrhundert)* (Tübingen, 1979).

²⁰ Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, p. 20. ‘Die Sozialstruktur der Städte ist geprägt durch die Existenz dreier Stände: der Capitane, der Valvassoren und einer weiteren Schicht, die in den Quellen des 12. Jahrhunderts wechselnd durch die Begriffe cives, populus oder populares, plebs oder plebii gekennzeichnet wird.’

²¹ H. Pirenne, *Medieval Cities: Their Origins and the Revival of Trade*, trans. F. Halsey (Princeton, 1948), pp. 213–4; G. Fasoli, R. Manselli, and G. Tabacco, ‘La struttura sociale delle città italiane dal V al XII secolo’, *Vorträge und Forschungen* 11 (1966), pp. 291–320, at pp. 303–5; N. Rauty, *Storia di Pistoia, I, Dall’alto medioevo all’età precomunale (406-1105)* (Florence, 1988), p. 330; E. Coleman, ‘Cities and Communes’, in D. Abulafia (ed.), *Italy in the Central Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 27–58, at p. 37.

²² R. Bordone, ‘La storiografia recente sui comuni italiani delle origini’, in J. Jarnut and P. Johanek (eds.), *Die Frühgeschichte der europäischen Stadt im 11. Jahrhundert*, Städteforschung Bd. 43 (Köln, 1998), pp. 45–61, at p. 58; P. Grillo, *Milano in età comunale (1183-1276): istituzioni, società, economia*, Istituzioni e società 1 (Spoleto, 2001), pp. 5–13.

²³ G. Rossetti, ‘Il comune cittadino: un tema inattuale?’, in R. Bordone and J. Jarnut (eds.), *L’evoluzione delle città italiane nell’XI secolo*, Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico 25 (Bologna, 1988), pp. 25–43; F. Menant, ‘Aspetti delle relazioni feudo-vassallatiche nelle città lombarde dell’XI secolo: l’esempio cremonese’, in R. Bordone and J. Jarnut (eds.), *L’evoluzione delle città italiane nell’XI secolo*, Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico 25 (Bologna, 1988), pp. 223–39; F. Menant, *Lombardia feudale: studi sull’aristocrazia padana nei secoli X-XIII*, Cultura e storia 4 (Milano, 1992); F. Menant, *Campagnes lombardes du Moyen Age: l’économie et la société rurales dans la région de Bergame, de Crémone et de Brescia du Xe au XIIIe siècle*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome fasc. 281 (Rome, 1993); P.J. Jones, *The Italian city-state: from commune to signoria* (Oxford, 1997).

²⁴ P. Cammarosano, ‘Città e campagna: rapporti politici ed economici’, in *Società e istituzioni dell’Italia comunale: l’empio di Perugia (secoli XII-XIV)* (Perugia, 1988), pp. 303–49, at p. 314; M. Ascheri, ‘Formes du Droit dans l’Italie Communale: Les Statuts’, *Médiévales* 39 (2000), pp. 137–52; M. Ascheri, ‘Beyond the commune: the Italian city-state and its inheritance’, in P. Linehan and J.L. Nelson (eds.), *The medieval*

world (London; New York, 2003), pp. 453–9; Grillo, *Milano in età comunale*, pp. 237–8; Cracco, ‘Social Structure and Conflict in the Medieval City’, p. 315.

²⁵ A. Castagnetti, ‘Le due famiglie comitali veronesi: i San Bonifacio e i Gandolfingi di Palazzo’, in G. Cracco, A. Castagnetti, and S. Collodo (eds.), *Studi sul medioevo veneto* (Torino, 1981), pp. 43–93; A. Castagnetti, *La Marca Veronese-Trevigiana* (Torino, 1986); Bordone, *La società cittadina*, p. 179; G. Tabacco, ‘Dinamiche sociali e assetti del potere’, in *Città e campagna: rapporti politici ed economici* (Perugia, 1988), pp. 281–302, at pp. 282–8.

²⁶ C. Wickham, *Sleepwalking into a new world: the emergence of italian city communes in the Twelfth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 2015).

²⁷ H. Keller, ‘Gli inizi del comune in Lombardia: limiti della documentazione e metodi di ricerca’, in R. Bordone and J. Jarnut (eds.), *L’evoluzione delle città italiane nell’XI secolo*, Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico 25 (Bologna, 1988), pp. 45–70, at p. 60; H. Keller, *Signori e vassalli nell’Italia delle città (secoli IX - XII)* (Torino, 1995), p. xx.

²⁸ S. Reynolds, *Fiefs and vassals: the medieval evidence reinterpreted* (Oxford; New York, N.Y, 1994), pp. 75–114; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and communities*, pp. xlvi–liv.

²⁹ Wickham, *Sleepwalking into a new world*, pp. 53–54.

³⁰ G.P. Bognetti, ‘Storia, archeologia e diritto nel problema dei Longobardi’, in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di studi longobardi* (Spoleto, 1952), pp. 92–5; G.P. Bognetti, ‘La proprietà della terra nel passaggio dal mondo antico al medioevo occidentale’, in *Dopo il primo convegno internazionale di diritto agrario valutazioni e prospettive in un incontro di giuristi italiani: Firenze, 22-24 ottobre 1955* (Milano,

1958), pp. 124–38; S. Gasparri, ‘La Questione degli Arimanni’, *Bullettino Dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 87 (1978), pp. 121–53, at pp. 122–4; G. Tabacco, *The struggle for power in medieval Italy: structures of political rule* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 98–9.

³¹ F. Schneider, *Die Entstehung von Burg und Landgemeinde in Italien* (Berlin, 1924), p. 157; P. Torelli, *Un comune cittadino in territorio ad economia agricola*, I (Mantova, 1930), p. 28; G. Tabacco, *I liberi del re nell’Italia carolingia e postcarolingia* (Spoleto, 1966), p. 168; Castagnetti, ‘Arimanni e signori’, pp. 266–80.

³² G. Mengozzi, *La città italiana nell’alto medioevo* (Firenze, 1931), p. 120; Schumann, *Authority and the Commune*, pp. 189–90; Bordone, *La società cittadina*, pp. 177–8.

³³ S. Gasparri, “‘Nobiles et credentes omnes liberi arimanni’. Linguaggio, memoria sociale e tradizioni longobarde nel regno italico”, *Bullettino dell’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, 105 (2003), pp. 25–51; S. Gasparri, ‘Il popolo-esercito degli arimanni. Gli studi longobardi di Giovanni Tabacco’, in G. Sergi ed., *Giovanni Tabacco e l’esegesi del passato* (Turin, 2006), pp. 21–36.

³⁴ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 167; Morselli, *Le origini di un comune*, p. 36.

³⁵ Morselli, *Le origini di un comune*, p. 36.

³⁶ A. Gawlik and M. Thiel (eds.), *Die Urkunden Heinrichs V. und der Königin Mathilde*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 7 (München, 2003), no. 174.

³⁷ E. von Ottenthal and H. Hirsch (eds.), *Die Urkunden Lothar III und Kaiserin Richenza*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 8 (Berlin, 1927), no. 51.

³⁸ F. Appelt (ed.), *Die Urkunden Friedrichs I*, Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae 10 (Hannover, 1975), no. 263, 442.

³⁹ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 167.

⁴⁰ Dilcher, *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune*, p. 101.

⁴¹ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 167.

⁴² Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 303; Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 351.

⁴³ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 355.

⁴⁴ Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 176–7; Tabacco, ‘Mantova al Tempo di Matilde’, pp. 163–7; Struve, ‘Matilde di Toscana-Canossa’, pp. 442–4.

⁴⁵ Torelli, *Un comune cittadino*, pp. 32–5.

⁴⁶ Torelli, *Un comune cittadino*, pp. 32–5.

⁴⁷ Torelli, *Un comune cittadino*, pp. 29–32.

⁴⁸ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, pp. 167–75; Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 170–1.

⁴⁹ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 113.

⁵⁰ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 12, 292, 352, 357.

⁵¹ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 175; Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 177–8.

⁵² ‘in Garda et in Lasese et in Summo lacu, vel in Brixiana, in Ferraria, in Comaclu et in Ravenna’.

Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 278; Appelt (ed.), *F1*, no. 263.

⁵³ ‘in Ravenna, in Argenta, in Ferraria, in Summolacu’. Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356; Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 421.

⁵⁴ Torelli, *Un comune cittadino*, pp. 32–5; Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 169; Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 172–3.

⁵⁵ ‘in Lagese, in Garda, in Summolacu, in Brixiana, in Bolonia, in Ferraria, in Argenta, in Rauenna, in Comaculo’. Gawlik and Thiel (eds.), *H5*, no. 174.

⁵⁶ Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, pp. 167–75; Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 170–1.

⁵⁷ G. Koziol, *Begging pardon and favor: ritual and political order in early medieval France* (Ithaca, 1992); H. Keller, ‘The Privilege in the Public Interaction of the Exercise of Power: Forms of Symbolic Communication Beyond the Text’, in M. Mostert and P.S. Barnwell (eds.), *Medieval legal process. Physical, spoken and written performance in the Middle Ages*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 75–108, at pp. 101–6; Koziol, *The Politics of Memory*, pp. 6–8.

⁵⁸ Keller, ‘The Privilege in the Public Interaction of the Exercise of Power’, pp. 104–5.

⁵⁹ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 279, 280, 281.

⁶⁰ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 351.

⁶¹ Houghton, ‘Reconsidering Donizone’s Vita Mathildis.’

⁶² M. Nobili, ‘L’Ideologia Politica in Donizone’, in *Studi matildici, Atti e Memorie del III Convegno di Studi matildici (Reggio Emilia, 7 - 9 ottobre 1977)* (Modena, 1978), pp. 263–79, at pp. 270–1.

⁶³ ‘*in Garda et in Lasese et in Summo lacu*’ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 278. ‘*in Summo lacu*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

⁶⁴ ‘*in Ferraria, in Comaclu et in Ravenna*’ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 278. ‘*in Ravenna, in Argenta, in Ferraria*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

⁶⁵ On the Canossan control of these rights see: V. Fumagalli, *Terra e società nell’Italia padana: i secoli IX e X* (Torino, 1976), pp. 25–49; Tincani, ‘Le corti dei Canossa’, p. 267; E. Goez, *Beatrix von Canossa und Tuszien: eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (Sigmaringen, 1995), p. 50.

⁶⁶ ‘*Decernimus eciam, ut liceat omnibus predictis civibus et suburbanis per omnem nostram potestatem secure ire et redire sive per aquam et per terram, quocumque voluerint, ita ut nec tholonicum nec ripaticum dent.*’ Goez and Goez (eds.), *M*, no. 43.

⁶⁷ ‘*Scilicet utrasque ripas fluminis Tartari, deinde sursum usque ad flumen Oley.*’ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 278.

⁶⁸ ‘*ex utraque parte fluminis Mincii sitis.*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

⁶⁹ ‘*ex utraque parte fluminis Mincii sitis – scilicet utraque ripa fluminis Tartari, deinde sursum usque ad flumen Oleii, ex alia parte Fossa alta, de terciaparte eclesia sancti Faustini in capite Uariane, et deinde serosum usque in Agriciam maiorem*’ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 421.

⁷⁰ Fumagalli, *Terra e società*, pp. 25–49; Fumagalli, ‘Mantova al Tempo di Matilde’, pp. 159–60; Tincani, ‘Le corti dei Canossa’, p. 255; Goez, *Beatrix von Canossa*, p. 50.

⁷¹ Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, pp. 184–5; Tincani, ‘Le corti dei Canossa’, pp. 269–70.

⁷² K. Wanner (ed.), *Die Urkunden Ludwigs II*, Die Urkunden der Karolinger 4 (München, 1994), no. 40.

⁷³ E. Falconi, *Le carte cremonesi dei secoli 8-12*, 1 (Cremona, 1979), no. 20; P.F. Kehr and T. Schieffer (eds.), *Die Urkunden Karls III*, Die Urkunden der Deutschen Karolinger 2 (München, 1982), no. 56.

⁷⁴ Goez and Goez (eds.), *M*, no. 65.

⁷⁵ ‘*Mantuani cives nostram adierunt clementiam suas miserias et diuturnas oppressiones conquerentes.*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

⁷⁶ ‘*nostri fideles Mantuani cives nostram adierunt clementiam, quorumdam suorum concivium oppressiones relevari petentes et ermannos omnes et communes res sue civitati a nostris predecessoribus illis ablatas sibi restitui postulantes.*’ Goez and Goez (eds.), *M*, no. 43.

⁷⁷ ‘*Igitur evidenter cognoscentes omnes unanimiter Mantuanos nostram fideliter, prout debent, fidelitatem servare, eorum dignis postulationibus dignum duximus condescendere.*’ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 421.

⁷⁸ ‘*Arimannos in civitate Mantua [...] cum omni eorum hereditate, paterno vel materno iure, proprietate communalis, sive omnibus rebus, que ab eorum parentibus possesse fuerunt, et eorum adquisita sive adquirenda, nominative silva Armanore, Carpeneta, Sacca, Septinenti, sive per ceteras locas in comitatu Mantuanense [...] concessimus et coroboramus.*’ Bresslau (ed.), ‘*H2*’, no. 278.

⁷⁹ ‘*scilicet nominative Saccam, Septingenti et Carpenetam et quicquid de Armanorio*’, Goez and Goez (eds.), *M*, no. 43.

⁸⁰ Torelli, *Un comune cittadino*, pp. 32–5; Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 169; Castagnetti, ‘I cittadini-arimanni’, p. 172.

⁸¹ P. Torelli, *Regesto Mantovano: Le carte degli archivi Gonzaga e di Stato in Mantova e dei monasteri Mantovani soppressi*, 2 vols (Roma, 1914), no. 80.

⁸² Torelli, *Regesto Mantovano*, no. 82, 83.

⁸³ ‘*Tibi Bellisma filia Literii de Cremona habitatoris in burgo Mantue, amica mea, ego Veronesus de eodem burgo filius Adam Veronesus*’ Torelli, *Regesto Mantovano*, no. 151.

⁸⁴ Bognetti, ‘Storia, archeologia e diritto’, pp. 92–5; Bognetti, ‘La proprietà della terra’; Gasparri, ‘La Questione’, pp. 122–4; Tabacco, *The struggle for power*, pp. 98–9.

⁸⁵ F. Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie: de la fin du VIIIe siècle au début du XIe siècle*, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome fasc. 291 (Rome, 1995), p. 53.

⁸⁶ Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie*, p. 52; S. MacLean, ‘Legislation and Politics in Late Carolingian Italy: the Ravenna Constitutions’, *Early Medieval Europe* 18.4 (2010), pp. 394–416, at pp. 411–3.

⁸⁷ Castagnetti, ‘Arimanni e signori’, pp. 266–80.

⁸⁸ Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie*, pp. 17–54.

⁸⁹ Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie*, p. 53.

⁹⁰ Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie*, p. 53.

⁹¹ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 278–81; L. Weiland (ed.), *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum inde ab a. DCCCCXI usque ad a. MCXCVII (911-1197)*, MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum, 1 (Nachdruck, 2003), no. 30; Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie*, p. 53.

⁹² Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 336.

⁹³ I. Heidrich, *Ravenna unter Erzbischof Wibert (1073-1100)* (Sigmaringen, 1984), pp. 90–118.

⁹⁴ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 274, 278, 280, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 301, 306, 309, 311, 320.

⁹⁵ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 84, 91, 120, 173, 191, 349, 400, 425, 462, 475, 476.

⁹⁶ C. Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich: die Geburt zweier Völker* (Köln, 1990), p. 652; Golinelli, ‘L’Italia’, p. 511.

⁹⁷ Brühl, *Deutschland--Frankreich*, pp. 652, 656–8; Golinelli, ‘L’Italia’, p. 511.

⁹⁸ C. Radding, *The origins of medieval jurisprudence: Pavia and Bologna, 850-1150* (New Haven, 1988), p. 68; H. Wolfram, *Conrad II, 990-1039: emperor of three kingdoms*, trans. D.A. Kaiser (University Park, 2006), p. 63.

⁹⁹ Sickel (ed.), ‘O3’, no. 198; H. Bresslau (ed.), ‘Die Urkunden Konrads II’, in *Die Urkunden Konrads II, Mit Nachträgen zu den Urkunden Heinrichs II*, *Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 4 (Hannover, 1909), no. 251.

¹⁰⁰ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 334, 336, 357.

¹⁰¹ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 421.

¹⁰² C.G. Mor, ‘Dai “Capitularia” alle “constitutiones” (Per la storia dell’idea imperiale nel secolo XI)’, in *Studi storici in onore di Gioacchino Volpe* (1958), pp. 647–64; G. Köbler, ‘Das Recht im frühen Mittelalter; Untersuchungen zu Herkunft und Inhalt frühmittelalterlicher Rechtsbegriffe im deutschen Sprachgebiet.’, Böhlau (1971), pp. 30–42.

¹⁰³ R. Celli, ‘Il principio del potere popolare nella genesi dei comuni italiani’, in *Poteri assemblee e autonomie: Il lungo cammino verso la sovranità popolare: Miscellanea in memoria di Roberto Celli* (Udine, 1989), pp. 41–5, at pp. 42–3.

¹⁰⁴ P. Stein, *Roman law in European history* (New York, 1999), p. 42; G. Mousourakis, *The historical and institutional context of Roman law*, Laws of the nations series (Burlington, 2003), p. 423; C. Radding, *The Corpus iuris civilis in the Middle Ages: manuscripts and transmission from the sixth century to the juristic revival*, Brill’s studies in intellectual history v. 147 (Leiden; Boston, 2007), pp. 103–9.

¹⁰⁵ Stein, *Roman law in European history*, pp. 42–3; Mousourakis, *The historical and institutional context of Roman law*, p. 423; Radding, *The Corpus iuris civilis in the Middle Ages*, p. 100.

¹⁰⁶ C. Wickham, ‘Getting justice in twelfth-century Rome’, in C. Dartmann et al. (eds.), *Zwischen Pragmatik und Performanz: Dimensionen mittelalterlicher Schriftkultur*, Utrecht studies in medieval literacy 18 (Turnhout, Belgium, 2011), pp. 120–3.

¹⁰⁷ G. Austin, *Shaping church law around the year 1000: the Decretum of Burchard of Worms*, Church, faith, and culture in the Medieval West (Farnham; Burlington, 2009), p. 235; C. Rolker, *Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres* (Cambridge, 2009), p. 51,61.

¹⁰⁸ Stein, *Roman law in European history*, pp. 43–4; Mousourakis, *The historical and institutional context of Roman law*, p. 423.

¹⁰⁹ H.E. Sancti Isidori, ‘Historia de Regibus Gothorum. Wandalorum et Suevorum’, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina* 83 (1862), no. 33, 45, 51, 75, 90; H.E. Sancti Isidori, *Etymologiarvm sive*

Originvm libri XX, ed. W.M. Lindsay (New York, 1911), no. IX; 4, 7; Burchard of Worms, ‘Decretum’, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Patrologia Latina* 140 (1862), no. 16.25, 19.148, 20.14.

¹¹⁰ A. Boretius (ed.), *Liber legis Langobardorum Papiensis dictus*, MGH LL 4 (Hannover, 1868), no. Grimoald, 2, 8, Ludovici Pii. 53, Cartularium, 8.

¹¹¹ C. Brühl, *Fodrum, gistum, servitium regis : Studien zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen des Königstums im Frankenreich und in den fränkischen Nachfolgestaaten Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien vom 6. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Köln, 1968), p. 457.

¹¹² Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 170, 287, 337, 358, 363, 366, 376, 446.

¹¹³ Bresslau (ed.), ‘H2’, no. 84, 91, 120, 173, 191, 274, 278, 280, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 301, 306, 309, 311, 320, 349, 400, 425, 462, 475, 476.

¹¹⁴ ‘imperialis excellentie’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

¹¹⁵ ‘imperiali auctoritate’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

¹¹⁶ E.J. Goldberg, *Struggle for empire: kingship and conflict under Louis the German, 817-876* (Ithaca, 2009), pp. 207–8.

¹¹⁷ Fasoli, Manselli, and Tabacco, ‘La struttura sociale’, pp. 292–4.

¹¹⁸ C. Alberti (ed.), *Codex diplomaticus Longobardiae*, Historiae patriae monumenta 13 (Reggio-Emilia, 1873), no. 39.

¹¹⁹ Sickel (ed.), ‘O3’, no. 198.

¹²⁰ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 334, 336.

¹²¹ Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 341.

¹²² Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 355.

¹²³ ‘*cives videlicet eremanos*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 356.

¹²⁴ *Eremani* is a variant spelling of *arimanni*. Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 352, 357.

¹²⁵ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 12, 292.

¹²⁶ E.E. Stengel, *Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte* (Cologne and Graz, 1960), pp. 271–2; Tabacco, *I liberi del re*, p. 180.

¹²⁷ Castagnetti, ‘Arimanni e signori’, pp. 266–280.

¹²⁸ Torelli, *Regesto Mantovano*, p. 46.

¹²⁹ ‘*confirmamus, concedimus [et] restauramus sanctae Mantuanae ecclesie, ubi Petrus venerabilis pontifex presse videtur, publicam ipsius civitatis monetam a predecessoribus nostris iam dicte sedi concessam, statuentes ut in his tribus civitatibus, Ma[n]tua videlicet, Verona atque Brixia, firmum et inviolabilem habeat roborem, et absque alicuius interdictu firmiter discurrat.*’ L. Schiaparelli (ed.), ‘I

Diplomi di Lothario', in 'I Diplomi di Lothario', *I Diplomi di Ugo e di Lothario di Berengario II e di Adalberto*, Fonti per la Storia d'Italia 38 (Rome, 1924), no. 1.

¹³⁰ 'Volumus tanem, ut secundum libitum et conventum civium predictorum urbium constet atque permaneat mixitio argenti et ponderis quantitas.' Schiaparelli (ed.), 'Lo2', no. 1.

¹³¹ Dilcher, *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune*, p. 100.

¹³² Dilcher, *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune*, p. 100.

¹³³ Dilcher, *Die Entstehung der lombardischen Stadtkommune*, p. 101.

¹³⁴ Goez and Goez (eds.), *M*, no. 43; Gladiss and Gawlik (eds.), *H4*, no. 421; Gawlik and Thiel (eds.), *H5*, no. 174.

¹³⁵ 'Nullusque in eorum mansionibus eis invitis hospicium facere' Bresslau (ed.), 'H2', no. 278.

¹³⁶ 'Aliquam publicam functionem' Bresslau (ed.), 'H2', no. 278.

¹³⁷ 'Quam sui antecessores secundum legem fecerunt' Bresslau (ed.), 'H2', no. 278.

¹³⁸ Bresslau (ed.), 'K2', no. 244.

¹³⁹ Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, pp. 356–8; P. Brancoli Busdraghi, *La formazione storica del feudo Lombardo come diritto reale*, Testi, studi, strumenti 15 (Spoleto, 1999), pp. 76–93, 173–5, 265–6.

¹⁴⁰ C. Violante, *La società Milanese nell'epoca precomunale* (Bari, 1953), pp. 199–201; Schumann, *Authority and the Commune*, pp. 122–3; Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, p. 302.

¹⁴¹ On the implementation of these rights see: Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, pp. 358–60.

¹⁴² ‘*universo populo Ferrariensi*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 351.

¹⁴³ ‘*totum comitatum Ferrariensem*’ Bresslau (ed.), *H3*, no. 351.

¹⁴⁴ Fasoli, ‘La realtà cittadina’, p. 60; A. Castagnetti, *Società e politica a Ferrara dall’età postcarolingia alla signoria estense (sec. X-XIII)* (Rome, 1985), p. 44.

¹⁴⁵ Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁶ Castagnetti, *Società e politica*, pp. 47–9.

¹⁴⁷ Wipo, ‘*Gesta Chuonradi II Imperatoris*’, in W. Trillmich and R. Büchner (eds.), *Fontes saeculorum noni et undecimi historiam ecclesiae Hammaburgensis necnon imperii illustrantes*, 11 (Darmstadt, 1978), pp. 507–615.

¹⁴⁸ Schumann, *Authority and the Commune*, p. 205; G. Albini, ‘Vescovo, comune: il governo della citta tra XI e XIII secolo’, in R. Greci (ed.), *Il governo del vescovo: chiesa, città, territorio nel Medioevo parmense* (Parma, 2005), pp. 67–85, at p. 69.

¹⁴⁹ Violante, *La società Milanese*, pp. 123–67, 199–201.

¹⁵⁰ Tabacco, *The struggle for power*, pp. 133–4.

¹⁵¹ Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und städtische Gesellschaft*, p. 365.