

Incastellamento on the Po plain: Cremona and its territory in the tenth century*

Edward Coleman,
University of Reading

The Po plain suffered badly from the dynastic warfare and external invasions which accompanied the end of the Carolingian empire. It was the heart of the Italian kingdom, to which there were no fewer than ten claimants between 888 and 962. Its rich cities and their fertile hinterlands were tempting targets for the Hungarians who frequently raided across the Alps before their final defeat at the hands of Otto I at Lechfield in 952.¹

During this unsettled time the earliest references to *castra* or, to use the Italian term, *castelli*, appear in Italian sources. Naturally it has been suggested that this was not a coincidence. Initially *castelli* are mentioned only in royal charters, especially those of Berengar I (888-924), as the right to build fortifications was traditionally reserved to the king or his representative. The novelty of the charters of Berengar, however, was that he frequently granted away the right to construct *castelli*. This may have won him short-term support, but its long-term effect was the proliferation of private fortifications across northern Italy.²

In the course of the tenth century a steadily increasing number of *castelli* are mentioned in private charters. These are likely to have been built without royal permission; indeed, some of Berengar's diplomas, which retrospectively granted recognition to *castelli* that had already been built, indicate this development.³

The process of fortification of local centres in the kingdom of Italy, at first directed, or at least influenced, by the crown, and later extended largely as a result of private initiative, is generally known as *incastellamento*.

Incastellamento took place, broadly speaking, all over Italy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, not only on the Po plain. Although it is a process which has for some time been recognised as crucial to the creation of new structures of political power, it was also, unsurprisingly, an uneven process which took hold more readily and more deeply in some areas than in others. If in the past it has sometimes been seen as symbolic of other characteristic features of the period - the disintegration of the state, the militarisation of society and the need for protection - it is now less frequently viewed in such strictly military and political terms.⁴

Castelli should not be thought of primarily as 'castles'. The kind of fortification that would normally be considered a castle in this period - the stone keep - was in Italy generally termed *rocca*. *Castelli*, on the other hand, often covered a large area, were able to contain a sizable population within their walls and cannot always be shown to have fulfilled a military function. In short, they were in many cases defended villages rather than castles. I shall use the Italian term *castello* here in order to keep the distinction in mind.⁵

Moreover, it is difficult to generalise about a pattern, as there seem to be substantial differences between *incastellamento* in the north, Tuscany and the centre-south. The scenario suggested at the outset, for example, in which the origins of *incastellamento* were seen in the context of the breakdown of royal power at the end of the Carolingian empire, is often put forward for the Po plain. But Pierre Toubert has shown that this is virtually inapplicable further south in Lazio, where *incastellamento* seems far more closely linked to economic and demographic change than to the political upheavals of the tenth century.⁶

The area under consideration here - Cremona and its territory - is delimited to the south by the river Po, and to the east and west by two of its tributaries, the rivers Oglio and Adda respectively. There is no natural boundary to the north; the only other physical feature of note is the small river Serio, a tributary of the Adda. Insofar as the plain can be divided between city territories, south of the Po was the territory of Piacenza, east of the Oglio was Brescia, west of the Adda was Lodi, and to the north was Bergamo (see map).⁷

Cremona itself lies a little north of the Po near its confluence with the Adda. It was a prosperous and expanding town in the tenth century: commercial activity on the river on the part of the Cremonese is recorded from the mid-ninth century, and by the tenth century the

population had outgrown the old *civitas* and spilled over into suburbs. The town was also the seat of an important bishopric, whose most famous (if often absentee) bishop in the tenth century was the historian Liutprand.⁸

There is no doubt, however, that, absent or not, the bishop dominated both the town and the surrounding territory in the tenth century. There was never a count of Cremona, as there was in most other north Italian towns (or at least no record of one survives). The bishop therefore assumed sole secular as well as ecclesiastical authority in the town and (after 916) for five miles around it. He was also by far the largest landowner in the territory, and although not in possession of judicial authority throughout most of it, was a frequent, and, one would imagine, powerful litigant at the rural court of the count of Bergamo, who held authority beyond the five-mile limit. In any consideration of the social and economic structures of the Cremonese in the tenth century the figure of the bishop will inevitably loom large.⁹

A variety of approaches can be taken to the study of *incastellamento*. The archaeological evidence of the physical remains of *castelli* is obviously essential for an understanding of the material culture and chronology of occupation; field survey can be used to draw conclusions on demographic patterns, whilst documentary analysis can yield interesting results with regard to social and economic structure, and set *castelli* in a wider political context.¹⁰

This discussion, based on documents from Cremona, focusses on the origins and early development of *incastellamento* in this region. The main questions to be answered are who was constructing *castelli* in the Cremonese in the tenth century and why? Any sample of empirical evidence examined in detail will naturally have its own peculiarities, but it is hoped that it will be useful to review the conclusions reached here in the light of other research on *incastellamento* in north-central Italy.

It is not possible to be certain of the number of tenth-century *castelli* on the basis of documentary evidence alone. Archaeological and topographical studies can and do reveal undocumented sites, as was noted. But even if we possessed a full record of these, some sites may have disappeared completely or undergone radically different re-use. What we can say is that the evidence of the documents preserves a record of those *castelli* which were for one reason or another considered important; and the documents leave no doubt that *incastellamento* in

the Cremonese was dominated in the tenth century by the bishop of Cremona. Some *castelli* were held by others, of course, but no other individual or institution held as many *castelli* as the bishop or had such a dense concentration of landholding in the area. The point of interest here is to discover how the *castelli* fitted into the overall pattern of episcopal landholding in the territory.¹¹

I propose to look at a dozen or so Cremonese *castelli* in detail and also allude to one or two others which lie outside the area defined above, for example, S.Fiorano and Maleo.¹² Some of this ground has been covered before, but with less emphasis than will be given here to consideration of *incastellamento* in relation to the political framework of the territory of Cremona, and in particular to the scope of episcopal power.¹³

References to Cremonese *castelli* begin with a grant of Berengar I to the bishop in 916 in which all episcopal *castelli* were given imperial protection and conceded judicial immunity. This was confirmed by Otto II in 978 and 982 and Otto III in 996.¹⁴ These make general reference to the bishop's *castelli* without naming any of them. The earliest recorded episcopal *castello* is Bozzolo which the bishop received from Lupo, a priest of the church of Cremona, as part of an exchange in 949.¹⁵ In general there is a marked increase in the number of references in private charters in the second half of the tenth century. *Castelli*, or parts of them, were commonly exchanged together with other land and property. Towards the end of the century a number of these exchanges were confirmed before public hearings (*placita*) under the count of Bergamo or imperial *missi*. On one occasion (990) a *castello* formed part of the foundation endowment of an urban monastery.¹⁶

For convenience I shall discuss three groups of episcopal *castelli* separately: those near the confluence of the rivers Po and Oglio (Bozzolo and Piacenza); those near the confluence of the rivers Adda and Po (Sesto, Acquanegra and Crotta); and those along the banks of the river Serio (Camisano, Vidolasco and Antegnate). This is not intended to imply that these groupings were necessarily significant in the tenth century, although the *castelli* of the second group are, in fact, closely inter-related.

Bozzolo and Piacenza lay on the right bank of the Oglio, c.23km and c.33km respectively north of its confluence with the Po. The bishop acquired Bozzolo in 949, as was mentioned earlier. He received there a *castello*, buildings within it, thirty *casinas* in the vicinity, and

a collection of arable land, pasture and woods. This amounted to a total of 150 *iuges* (c.292 acres) He also received milling, fishing and mooring rights on the river Oglio. As we shall see, this was a more or less 'standard package' of land and rights of a kind which was commonly transacted in the tenth century. The *castello* formed one element of this; but in this example, and in general, it is given prominence at the beginning of the document and is often described and measured in detail, which suggests that special importance was attached to it.

The bishop later acquired more land in Bozzolo: in 973 he received in an exchange three pieces of arable land in the locality of Casariolo 'non multum longe da castro Vauxolo'; and in 998 he was in possession of three more pieces of land there for which a pledge of security was made. Thus, by 998 he had accumulated 312 *iuges* (c.608 acres) of land in Bozzolo.

It seems probable that the property, land and rights on the river Oglio obtained in 949 were attached to the *castello* at Bozzolo, as they were thought of as a single alienable entity. However, the later acquisitions appear unrelated to it, for in 973 the *castello* is mentioned only incidentally ('non multum longe da castro Vauxolo') and in 998 not at all. Bozzolo is not described as a *curtis* in any of these documents, which suggests that it was not, and had not been, the centre of a coherently organised estate. However, as it seems that *some* property and rights in the locality had begun to be defined by a relationship to the *castello* in the mid-tenth century, the bishop may have been able, through the acquisitions of 973 and 998, to use it as the nucleus of a gradually expanding estate centred on Bozzolo.¹⁷

The *castello* at Piadena is first mentioned in 990. The bishop (Odelrico) made a donation from his own lands to the monastery of S.Lorenzo in Cremona which he had founded, including both a *curtis* and a *castello* in Piadena. The *castello*, chapel and vineyards covered 11 *iuges* (c.21 acres), the arable land, pasture and woodland a further 250 *iuges* (c.487 acres).¹⁸

The land and property at Piadena donated to S.Lorenzo seem to have constituted an organised estate in 990, with the *castello*, chapel and vineyards being separate from the rest, as a kind of 'home farm'. This is somewhat different from Bozzolo where the *castello* may have formed the focus of various pieces of land which were gradually grouped together under the ownership of the bishop. But it is notable

in both cases that the *castello* appears to have been an important element in the configuration of the estate.

S.Lorenzo did not hold Piadena for long. By 1022 it had passed under the control of Boniface of Canossa, marquis of Tuscany, and one of the most powerful figures in northern Italy. Boniface exchanged the *curtis*, chapel and *castello* at Piadena for the *curtes* of Bressanore and Oscasale (c.18 km north-west of Cremona) which were held by the bishop of Cremona.¹⁹ It is unclear how the marquis acquired Piadena from S.Lorenzo but there are grounds for believing that he may have gained possession of it before 1009 as a result of the activities of the abbot himself. In 1009 the bishop persuaded the emperor Henry II to grant him increased powers of supervision over the estates of S.Lorenzo. This was in order to restrain the abbot, who, according to the bishop, had alienated monastic property for his own gain. It may well have been in this way that Piadena, the most important element in the foundation endowment of the abbey, had passed into the hands of the marquis.²⁰

In contrast with Bozzolo and Piadena (and with the *castelli* located near the river Serio which will be discussed later), the evidence for the second group of *castelli*, those in the lower Adda area, comes not from private charters, but from *placita* and from imperial diplomas. The texts themselves suggest that there were conflicting interests in the area and that these conflicts were sometimes insoluble at a local level. Sesto, Acquanegra and Crotta lie within a few kilometres of one another near the confluence of the Adda and the Po; indeed the *curtes* centred on each locality shared common boundaries. *Incastellamento* seems here, as in Bozzolo, to be connected with the aggregation of episcopal landholding and its concentration around a fortified centre. In the middle of the tenth century the main landholder in the area was the convent of S.Sisto of Piacenza which held the *curtes* of Sesto and the adjoining Tencara. By 960 the bishop had acquired Sesto in a transaction with the count of Lecco which also gave him rights on the river Adda. By 993 he held land also in Acquanegra, and, by 998, in Crotta too.²¹

A key document in this process is a *placitum* held in 999 in which the abbot of S.Sisto recognised episcopal possession of the *curtes* of Sesto, Acquanegra and Crotta. This set the seal on episcopal expansion in the lower Adda. Significantly, the document refers to the three localities as if they were a single entity, recording the sum total of their extent rather than separate totals for each. And this sum total

(3204 *iuges*) amounts to considerably more (roughly a third) than the bishop can be shown to have acquired in the pre-999 documentation. Moreover, although the bishop received the *curtis* at Sesto, he only received half of the *castello* at Acquanegra, and at Crotta only the *castello*, a chapel and river rights. These piecemeal acquisitions had somehow become three entire *curtes* by 999, and the common factor in each was the *castello*, which the bishop had recently acquired. Whatever the part played by the *castelli* in this development, a substantial change in the landholding pattern of the area had taken place by c.1000: the bishop emerged in possession of a bloc of contiguous estates focussed on fortified centres.²²

The third group of episcopal *castelli* to be discussed is located along the lower reaches of the river Serio. The bishop had interests in a number of localities in this area, and was involved in various transactions, principally exchanges, with local proprietors. However, the area is something of a contrast to those looked at already. The amounts of land involved are generally much smaller, and the bishop was not able to achieve the dominant position that he held, for example, in the lower Adda.²³ In fact, despite the considerable number of localities in which the bishop held land, the process of gradual aggregation observed elsewhere almost seems to be reversed here. Land in the lower Serio area was often alienated in order to consolidate holdings in the areas discussed earlier. This was the case in Castel Gabbiano, Camisano and Vidolasco in 960, in Misiano in 973 and in Sergnano in 993.²⁴ The only locality in which the bishop can be shown to be increasing his holdings is Antegnate; he acquired land there in 948, 950, 966, 973 and 980.²⁵

It may be that episcopal possessions in the lower Serio were simply too dispersed to be organised into coherent estates, apart from at Antegnate. It is interesting, however, that the bishop did not here gain control of *castelli*, as we have seen was happening elsewhere. He did hold the *castello* of Camisano, but this was exchanged for Sesto further south in 960; and he did have lands 'que esse videntur infra castro' at Antegnate. But in no locality was there sizable episcopal landholding based around a *castello* as at Bozzolo, Piadena, Crotta and Sesto. It might be wondered if the failure to control the *castelli* of the lower Serio was linked with the apparent incoherence of episcopal possessions there, or indeed if this failure partly explains the alienations of land there in return for land in other localities, such as

the lower Adda, where better opportunities for centralisation of landholding existed.

There are instructive parallels from the early eleventh century which may lend weight to these suggestions. In 1018 the bishop acquired, through a donation, land and property in Mozzanica, also in the lower Serio, only a few kilometres from all of the localities just discussed. This land and property lay within and close to a *castello*. Between 1018 and 1020 the bishop acquired more property in Mozzanica through exchanges and purchase and in each of these transactions the phrase 'tam infra castrum quam et foris' recurs. At Mozzanica, clearly, given the initial advantage of possession of the *castello*, the bishop was able to build up a compact holding in a similar way to the tenth-century examples considered earlier. In another locality - Grontardo - around the same time (1020-23) the bishop was also expanding his landholding, here by *founding* a *castello* in collaboration with a local proprietor, and then buying up the surrounding property. The implication from both Mozzanica and Grontardo is that the *castello* provided a useful focus for landholding. If these and some of the tenth century examples discussed earlier suggest that control of a *castello* may therefore have been the key to the creation of homogenous landholding in the Cremonese in the late tenth and early eleventh century, the disparate landholding pattern of the lower Serio, where the bishop did not control *castelli* and was largely unable to expand and consolidate his lands, may be taken as negative proof of the same conclusion.²⁶

Thus far episcopal *castelli* have been discussed exclusively in the context of landholding, and this is, in fact, how the documents present them. However, as an element of the nomenclature of rural landholding *castelli* are still quite rare before c.1000. Units of land and property are described in a variety of terms. The *curtis*, commonly used from the ninth century to denote a large rural estate with servile tenants (*servi et ancillae*), has been mentioned already. The documents make frequent reference also to *loci et fundi* and *vici et fundi*: villages and their environs. *Castelli* are inserted into this pre-existing framework, being erected sometimes on the centre of an older *curtis*, as at Piadena and Sesto, sometimes in *vici* or *loci*, such as Bozzolo, Camisano and Antegnate.²⁷

Castelli were a new feature in the landscape, however, virtually unheard of before c.900; and although they did become integrated into an extant pattern of landholding, their rapid spread must also be seen

in the context of the emergencies of that period during which the need for defence became so pressing. That is to say that their military, and by extension political role must be considered, even if, as is the case in the Cremonese, this investigation is somewhat frustrated by lack of evidence.

It is often stated (and the introduction to this article is no exception) that *castelli* were first constructed on the Po plain in response to the Hungarian incursions at the beginning of the tenth century. But how much damage did the Hungarians actually do? As the towns were well fortified the Hungarians tended to leave them alone and ravage the countryside, where consequently one might expect to find evidence of their activity. However, this is notoriously difficult to assess given a number of complicating factors, such as the inertia of documentation which simply repeats stock phrases to describe destruction regardless of its extent, the fact that considerable damage is said to have been caused not only by Hungarians but by *mali christiani*, and so on.²⁸

There are specific documentary references to Hungarian raiding in the territory of Cremona, but only two. The first is contained in Berengar I's diploma to the bishop, mentioned earlier, which granted protection to, and confirmed the judicial immunity of, all episcopal *castelli* in 916. This refers to *paganorum incursione*, but it also mentions, and describes at great length, how *ministeriales* (royal officials) of Brescia and Sospino, a royal *curtis* just east of Cremona, had illegally claimed judicial rights and other privileges on episcopal property. Given that this latter difficulty seems to have been the main complaint of the bishop, and the fact that the diploma was followed two years later by a grant of land in Sospino to the bishop, the Hungarian attack may not have been as calamitous after all. Indeed this may be one of Berengar's diplomas in which the Hungarian threat, which was ever present in the early tenth century, was used as a pretext for generous grants to his supporters in the internal power struggles of the kingdom.²⁹

The second reference to Hungarian destruction comes much later, in a diploma of Otto III issued in 1000. This mentions the *curtis* of Cella 'que olim paganorum persecutione destructa et funditus deleta fuisse cognoscitur'.³⁰ So clearly the Hungarians passed through the Cremonese and caused some damage. But it is unlikely that this was the only reason the bishop sought to fortify his city and build or acquire *castelli* in the countryside: local rivalries, and the exigencies of

landholding discussed earlier, also played an important part. It is certainly not now tenable to claim in the Cremonese, or indeed anywhere on the Po plain, that Berengarian *incastellamento* was part of a grand strategy for the defence of the kingdom through the fortification of strategic points.³¹

The distribution of *castelli* was, as Settia put it, 'capricious', dictated not by the direction of Hungarian attacks, but largely by attempts of Berengar I to strengthen his support in particular areas through concessions, and then by the local concerns which influenced the choice of sites where beneficiaries of his grants erected fortifications. The distribution of Cremonese *castelli* seems to reflect origins of this kind.³²

The physical reality of the fortifications cannot be denied, however. The *castello* at Bozzolo, which the bishop acquired in 949, had 'toniminas, britiscas atque reliquas propugnacula et fossatum ad defensandum ipsum castrum'. Many other *castelli* recorded in private charters in the second half of the tenth century were similarly fortified with a combination of walls, ditches and gates.³³ They were safe and defensible refuges, certainly, but did their military function end at defence? There is virtually no evidence that it did not, but nor is there in eleventh-century documents when north Italian society was generally much more militarised; it is therefore worth investigating the possibility a little further.³⁴

The distinction between a defended place of refuge and a fortified centre which has potential for *dominatus loci* (the phrase currently used to describe the concentration of power in a locality in this period), is made up of several crucial elements. One is the holding of land, especially in the immediate vicinity, a second is absence of outside interference which a grant of judicial immunity effectively bestowed, a third is direct exercise of justice and other seigneurial rights from the given centre over a localised area. The second and third elements are in effect derived from beyond the locality, in that normally only the crown could confer such rights; although, on the other hand, they could be usurped and exercised independently if the crown was too weak to prevent it. This simple model is familiar to historians of many parts of Europe in the tenth and eleventh century. It basically turns on the relationship between central authority and local power and on the complex web of personal alignments through which this was worked out. With this in mind we may now return to Cremona.

Cremonese documents record vassals of the bishop from the ninth century. They regularly appear in the witness lists of episcopal charters, and as his supporters in *placita* in the second half of the tenth century. Some were powerful figures in their own right about whom we have other information, others are obscure.³⁵ But, apart from witnessing charters and appearing at *placita*, it is difficult to know exactly how these vassals stood vis à vis the bishop, what they were obliged to do and, crucially, what they received in return. Surprisingly, the relationship cannot be shown to involve land. The individuals with whom the bishop exchanged land (and it was almost always exchanges, a point to which I will return shortly) were not, generally speaking, episcopal vassals, but men who had no obvious tie with the bishop. When we have information on the land which was held by episcopal vassals it seems to be held allodially or from someone other than the bishop.

There is therefore no evidence that the bishop of Cremona was leasing land, or indeed *castelli*, which is of particular relevance to this discussion, to his vassals in the late tenth century. The exchanges are apparently genuine exchanges in that the property and rights given seem in most cases commensurate with those received.³⁶ It is therefore not surprising that there is no evidence either for obligations of military service amongst vassals of the bishop, something which would be invariably associated with the holding of a *castello*, as it is in the eleventh century. The earliest benefice issued to a vassal of the bishop dates from 1034, and although incidental references in Cremonese documents from the first two decades of the eleventh century indicate an earlier familiarity with the form, it seems unlikely that Cremonese society was feudalised as early as Milan, where feudal contracts were common from the late tenth century. And this highlights another interesting difference between the two towns: in Milan feudal bonds were forged between the archbishop and the rural nobility, the latter holding archiepiscopal *castelli* and performing military service; at Cremona the evidence does not permit *castelli* to be similarly seen as a lynchpin of the relationship between the bishop and his vassals in this period.³⁷

So what role did vassals of the bishop of Cremona play? Some idea might be gained by looking briefly at the contrasting careers of two episcopal vassals about whom we know a good deal: Ruggero I da Bariano and Odelrico 'de Belusco'.³⁸

Ruggero I da Bariano was the founder of an important family which was to play a prominent political role in Lombardy, especially in the time of his grandson, Ruggero II, in the first half of the eleventh century. By the end of the tenth century Ruggero I was already a powerful figure. In 998 Otto III confirmed his possessions which were very extensive and concentrated west of the river Adda in the Lodigiano.³⁹

Ruggero I is recorded in attendance at five *placita* in which the interests of the bishop of Cremona were involved between 983 and 999.⁴⁰ As was remarked earlier, this was an activity with which vassals of the bishop can be shown to have been most concerned in the late tenth century. However, the disputes heard before the *placita* attended by Ruggero I lead one to suspect that his presence was not coincidental. The three *placita* held in the 990s are of particular interest. In the first of two *placita* attended by Ruggero I in 998 the case concerned a long running dispute between the bishop and the citizens of Cremona over rights on a stretch of the river Po between the port of the town at 'Vulpariolo' and the mouth of the river Adda. These rights on the river, which had been exercised by the bishop at least since the middle of the ninth century, had been granted (it would seem in error) to the citizens by Otto III in 996. The *placitum* of 998, held in the presence of the emperor himself, was to restore the position of the bishop and quash the diploma granted to the citizens.⁴¹

The second *placitum* of 998 involved the same dispute. On this occasion a group of individuals (most probably those who had challenged the bishop over rights on the Po in 996) pledged to respect episcopal control of the river. Ruggero I not only attended this *placitum*, but acted as episcopal *advocatus*. The title of *advocatus* seems to have indicated the chief supporter of a party in a *placitum*, rather than denoting a strictly legal status.

In 999 Ruggero I was present at another *placitum*, this time as a member of a group of episcopal supporters. The case concerned the *curtes* of Crotta, Acquanegra and Sesto which, as was noted earlier, were recognised on this occasion as possessions of the bishop by the abbees of the convent of S. Sisto, Piacenza.

The reason for recapitulating the matter of these *placita* is, firstly, to demonstrate the close relationship which existed between Ruggero I and the bishop of Cremona, exemplified by his acting as episcopal *advocatus*; secondly, to point out that he had more than a passing interest in the cases which were heard.

It will be recalled that Ruggero I was a substantial landholder on the east bank of the river Adda. Both the river rights on the Po disputed by the bishop and the Cremonese citizens, and the *curtes* of Crotta, Sesto and Acquanegra on the west bank of the Adda were therefore in an area of considerable interest to Ruggero I. Indeed one of the most important of his possessions, the *curtis* of Maleo, from which the family later took its name, lay immediately opposite the three *curtes* held by the bishop on the other bank of the Adda. As an episcopal vassal since 988 Ruggero I would obviously tend to give warm support to any expansion of episcopal power in the area at the expense of others. Moreover, Ruggero I's own position at Maleo was not wholly secure. The bishop of Lodi claimed Maleo and the nearby *curtis* of S.Fiorano, and in 1000 the matter was brought before a *placitum* in which Ruggero I was awarded possession. This was an unusual outcome: decisions were rarely given against the church in disputes of this kind; the bishop of Cremona, for example, never lost one of the numerous *placita* in which he was involved in the late tenth century. But Ruggero I had powerful friends: the bishop of Cremona and the emperor.⁴²

The example of Ruggero I da Bariano is instructive. The da Bariano family remained episcopal vassals and, in the eleventh century, ceded their lands in Bariano, Maleo and other localities to the bishop and performed military service. But this occurred at a time when the power of the family was undermined by the succession of a minor (Ruggero II) and was therefore a necessary expedient. The relationship between Ruggero I and the bishop of Cremona could not really be described as other than a relationship of equals. Ruggero I was a landowner on a similar scale to the bishop; moreover, he held his lands directly from the emperor. So although Ruggero I was an episcopal vassal, vassalage involved no renunciation of property or explicit obligations of service for him. Rather it was an acknowledgement of shared concerns and understanding to act together in an area where both he and the bishop had ambitions to expand their interests.

The 'de Belusco' family also had interests in the lower Adda. Odelrico 'de Belusco' is recorded as an episcopal vassal in 988, but ten years later he was clearly in dispute with the bishop over the locality of Crotta. In a *placitum* held in 998 Odelrico, his wife Berta, their sons and a nephew renounced claims on five pieces of land in Crotta held by the bishop, including the *castello*. They also recognised episcopal possession of a stretch of the river Adda from Tencara (hard

by Sesto, and still held in the late tenth century by S.Sisto, Piacenza) to the confluence of the Adda and the Po.

This might have been like many other similar *placita* in the 980s and 990s about which no more is subsequently heard, were it not for the fact that, on the request of the bishop, the emperor Otto III issued diplomas confirming episcopal rights and possessions in Crotta in 1000 and 1001. These diplomas provide more information on the dispute. It emerges, according to the text of the second diploma, that Crotta had been part of an exchange between Odelrico and the bishop. Although it is not clear who gave it and who received it, it would seem that there had subsequently been a disagreement, and that the *placitum* held in 998 had awarded possession to the bishop.⁴³

This dispute raises some interesting points. First of all, Odelrico, although a vassal of the bishop, does not appear to have held land from him, and in this he is similar to Ruggero I da Bariano. But Odelrico does *exchange* land with the bishop, which provides a bishop-land-vassal link which, it was remarked earlier, seems to be otherwise virtually absent in the Cremonese in the late tenth century. The bishop, then, might exchange land with his vassals with no further formal obligation on either side other than acceptance of the terms of the contract. But problems could arise if one or other party perhaps became dissatisfied with their part of the settlement, or took more land and exploited rights more fully than had been transacted in the exchange; or indeed, simply felt themselves powerful enough to improve their position by intimidation. Some, or all, of these factors may have been at work in the case of Crotta.

It was noted in the earlier discussion of the *castelli* of the lower Adda that by 999 the bishop had achieved a dominant position in the area through possession of the three *curtes* of Sesto, Acquanegra and Crotta, and largely, it seemed, at the expense of the Piacentine convent of S.Sisto. It was thought striking how a fairly homogenous bloc of possessions seemed to have been created out of various piecemeal acquisitions. The dispute between Odelrico 'de Belusco' and the bishop sheds further light on this.

The original *placitum* of 998 mentions five pieces of land at Crotta, including the *castello*. In 999, as we saw, the bishop apparently held the entire *curtis*. In 1000 and 1001 Otto III confirmed episcopal possession, once again of the whole *curtis*. One can only speculate, but since we have identified this as an area of marked and consistent expansion of episcopal power in the late tenth century, and

given that the emperor had unequivocally backed the bishop on the important issue of control of the lower reaches of the Adda and the Po, and that there were other powerful episcopal supporters nearby such as Ruggero I da Bariano, it is at least possible that the bishop may have felt he could squeeze out rival landholders in the area, of whom the 'de Belusco' were one. Vassals of the bishop the 'de Belusco' may have been, but the curiously loose nature of vassalage, as it seems to have been understood in the Cremonese in the late tenth century, evidently could not prevent vassals being 'bounced' by the bishop if their interests came into conflict.

Perhaps this assumes episcopal power to have been more effective than it really was. Vassals could, and did, resist, often themselves exploiting the rather tenuous nature of their link with the bishop: Odelrico 'de Belusco' is a case in point. There is reason to suppose the bishop sought confirmation of the decision reached in the 998 *placitum* on Crotta because Odelrico had subsequently gone back on his pledges. Odelrico is not expressly mentioned in the first confirmation of 1000. But in the second in 1001 the language is more precise and the tone more severe: the decision of the *placitum* is repeated at length and Odelrico and his kin are expressly charged with continuing to hold Crotta illegally. Moreover, considerable play is made of the imperial duty to intervene in defence of the church in disputes of this sort in a tradition going back to Charlemagne, and the fine imposed by the 998 *placitum* is increased from 100 pounds in silver to 1000 pounds in gold. The implication is clear: Odelrico 'de Belusco' had refused to accept the decision against him in 998, and had continued to hold Crotta.⁴⁴

So whilst the bishop might manoeuvre to expand and consolidate his possessions by exploitation of vassalage and exchanges, he could be frustrated if his opponents proved intransigent. The dispute over Crotta remained unresolved, as far as can be seen, and it left a legacy of permanent tension between the 'de Belusco' and the bishop. Sigifredo, probably a son of Odelrico 'de Belusco', held substantial benefices from the bishop in the early eleventh century, but their relations deteriorated to such an extent that the bishop cancelled his benefices and gave them to the count of Bergamo in 1036; the family then transferred itself to Milan.⁴⁵

But by then relations between the bishop and his vassals were changing rapidly. For one thing it was no longer feasible to seek redress through *placita*. They were held less frequently in the eleventh

century and, as we have seen from this discussion, their effectiveness was questionable already by the end of the tenth century. As a symbol and representative of *res publica*, the bishop was more reliant on the *placita* than others and consequently more undermined by their decline.

It is surely not coincidence, then, that the bishop was apparently constrained to make a number of disadvantageous settlements with powerful laymen in the Cremonese in the early eleventh century. In these it is clear that the bishop was being pressured by powerful neighbours and, unable to appeal to a *placitum*, had to seek the best settlement he could get, out of court' as it were. It is not insignificant, moreover, that the vehicle used for this was often the exchange, the traditional form of land transaction, here being used more as a front for what has aptly been termed *rappports de force*. This was the method adopted in a case mentioned already - Boniface of Canossa's acquisition of Bressanore and Oscasale in exchange for Piadena (1022). Boniface had not only acquired Piadena in somewhat dubious circumstances, he had previously (1019) pledged to recognise episcopal possession of Oscasale. Another example involves Sigifredo, son of Odelrico 'de Belusco', with whom, as we have seen, the bishop did not have a happy relationship. Now it was the bishop who was being 'bounced'. The difficulties experienced by the bishop provoked a serious crisis of episcopal power, a radical reappraisal of the relations between the bishop and his vassals and a consequent re-structuring of his vassal clientele. But that is another story to which I shall briefly allude in the conclusion to this article.⁴⁶

Lastly, in discussion of episcopal vassals, we must turn attention back to the *castelli*. In the basic *dominatus loci* model postulated earlier, control of seigneurial rights from a *castello* was considered a key factor. The most important rights of this kind which have featured in the discussion have been those relating to control over the rivers Po and Adda. These seem to be largely, if not firmly, in the hands of the bishop at the end of the tenth century. The importance of these rights to the bishop is certain, and one of the reasons why episcopal property was so assiduously accumulated and consolidated in the lower Adda was probably in order to secure them. Crotta is once again a case in point here. Reference is made in the 998 *placitum* to five pieces of land in Crotta, and to the river rights held by the bishop between Tencara and the head of the Adda. As the bishop did not control Tencara, and Crotta was on the Adda, it is reasonable to assume that the rights were in some way connected with that locality. The five

pieces of land awarded to the bishop in Crotta were arable, pasture, woodland, etc.; the only property mentioned is the *castello*. It seems quite likely therefore that one reason the bishop wished to control the *castello* of Crotta was to use it to administer and oversee his rights on the river.

It would be unwise to generalise from this isolated example, however, which only shows that seigneurial rights could be organised from a *castello* in the Cremonese in the late tenth century, not that it commonly happened. Indeed the balance of probability is against it: these rights on the rivers Adda and Po were, after all, ancient ones which went back to the Lombard period, and had always retained a quasi-public character through their exercise by the bishop and the official recognition of this by successive emperors. We are not dealing with the establishment of local rights around a *castello*; this does not become common until the eleventh century.⁴⁷

Much the same can be said about judicial rights, perhaps the most crucial of all in the creation of *dominatus loci*. Episcopal *castelli* had judicial immunity from the time of Berengar I, of course, but as the bishop was himself the public authority for five miles around the city, this simply made the poacher the gamekeeper, at least within those limits. All the *castelli* which have been discussed here, in fact, lay outside the five-mile limit, the majority of them within the territory administered judicially by the count of Bergamo. However, it would be incorrect to think of episcopal *castelli* as islands of autonomy within this area, for in practice the bishop and the count worked closely together over the administration of justice. The episcopal *castello* of Genivolta, for example, was used on more than one occasion for the hearing of *placita* under the count of Bergamo; indeed a special chamber in the *castello* was given over for the purpose: 'caminata maiore quod est in palatio ipsius castri. . .'.⁴⁸

It is notable that the *placita* held at Genivolta in the late tenth century all involve the bishop as a litigant and, needless to say, he won every case. But the point worth emphasising is that these *placita* involve land, property and rights in different parts of the Cremonese, not merely in the vicinity of Genivolta. Likewise, when *placita* cease to be held and Genivolta functions as a centre for the administration of episcopal business (sales, donations, pledges of security and so on) in the eleventh century, the geographical scope of its 'catchment area' remains wide. It could not be claimed, therefore, that Genivolta was the nucleus of a small area of private jurisdiction based on a *castello*.

On the contrary, in the tenth century it was a seat of public justice leased for this purpose by the bishop, as the documents expressly state. And in the eleventh century it remained an important centre for the administration of the northern part of the diocese of Cremona, at a time when some of the other *castelli* discussed here were acquiring independent local judicial rights. For the bishop of Cremona, and indeed any landowner in the Cremonese during the tenth century, the right of territorial jurisdiction, or *districtus* as it is usually termed in the sources, pertained solely to the five-mile radius around Cremona and not to the *castelli* of the territory.⁴⁹

Most of the issues examined here have, in one way or another, related to the political history of the territory of Cremona in the tenth century, and in particular the position of the bishop. It will therefore be appropriate to conclude with a consideration of the fluctuations of episcopal power during this period.

In common with the majority of north Italian bishops, the bishop of Cremona benefited from the unsettled politics of the Italian kingdom during the tenth century. In the first decades of the century successive rulers (Louis III, Berengar I, Rudolf II) granted privileges to the bishop in the hope of ensuring his loyalty. The gains made in this way, particularly the right to fortify the city and the five-mile *districtus*, provided a measure of security and independence. The bishop of Cremona was doubly fortunate in that he was untroubled by the rivalry of a count, a problem faced by many of his fellow bishops, at nearby Bergamo, for example. This allowed him further scope to consolidate his power. The Ottonians were largely content to preserve the *status quo* with regard to episcopal privileges, and the bishop consequently received confirmation of his position in the decades after 962. At the turn of the millenium episcopal power had probably reached, or slightly passed, its apogee.⁵⁰

The eleventh century brought problems. The relative stability of the Ottos gave way to the uncertainty of the early part of the reign of Henry II when Arduin of Ivrea stirred up opposition to imperial rule. The emperor rather unwisely appointed his chaplain Landulf to the bishopric of Cremona, who, arriving in 1007 after a vacancy of several years, struggled in handling various emergent problems, many of which were already evident in the late tenth century, and had become exacerbated in the meantime. Landulf, fatally for a bishop, alienated the population of his see; and in his later years, during which he himself seems to have been mortally ill, episcopal power fell into

deep crisis. This culminated in an uprising by the city population in c.1030 which expelled the bishop from the city. City and territory entered a decade or more of virtual anarchy. Episcopal power was never reconstituted on the same basis.⁵¹

Incastellamento and its political implications can be usefully seen against this background. The first phase, say c.900-950, the period of the Hungarian raids, is obscure. All we know for certain (from Berengar I's diploma) is that the bishop had *castelli*. It not possible to say that the bishop built them, for those we know about later were not built but acquired by him from their founders or previous holders; it seems reasonable to assume, for example, that the *castello* which the bishop acquired in Sesto from the count of Lecco in 960 had been originally built by S.Sisto, Piacenza in the first half of the tenth century, for the confirmations of the *curtis* of Sesto to the convent by Berengar II in 951 and Otto I in 952 contain the phrase 'cum castellis'.⁵² In fact in the entire period covered here the only known example of a *castello* founded by the bishop was Grontardo; and that was not until 1020.

The Hungarians did raid in the Cremonese, but perhaps without causing great damage. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that a general climate of fear probably existed, and this may well have led the bishop (and others) to fortify an uncertain number of localities in the countryside, principally as places of refuge. The majority of these seem to have been on or near existing centres of population and agriculture - *curtes*, *vici* and *loci*. It seems unlikely, on the other hand, that their location was planned to any greater extent than this, and there is no evidence to suggest that they were designed as active military centres for defence against Hungarian attack.⁵³

Established as a feature of the landscape, *castelli* continued to be built in the period c.950-1000. During this time their importance seems mainly to have been economic, the most striking feature of this phase of *incastellamento* being the way in which *castelli* become an important factor in the pattern of landholding. *Castelli* located on pre-existing *curtes* emerge in documents as important estate centres, or *caput curtis* as they have been called.⁵⁴ Those built in localities where landholding is more disparate seem to be used as foci for the creation of a more organised pattern. The bishop of Cremona made conscious efforts in this direction, particularly in areas, such as the lower Adda, where the safeguarding of other rights and privileges was a paramount concern.

Cremonese *castelli* were not, as far as can be seen, held by vassals of the bishop before c.1000 and in this respect the area is quite different from the neighbouring (and, admittedly, far better documented) Milanese. Vassalage is a feature of Cremonese society in this period, but there is nothing to link it with either *castelli* or military service before the 1040s when, as was remarked earlier, the political circumstances were quite different and the vassal clientele of the bishop was reorganised on much more classically feudal lines. The impression of the late tenth century is of a bishop whose power in the territory was based on the twin foundations of lucrative river rights derived from the crown, and extensive allodial landholding. This position was sustained by guaranteed support from the emperor and deft footwork on the part of the bishop in respect of his relations with the greater landowners of the area. This could, on occasion, involve ties of vassalage but, at least for the greater families, this was not a tie which was binding on either side. Sometimes, and increasingly in the 990s, this policy failed the bishop; the case of Odelrico 'de Belusco', which was examined above, is only the best documented of several similar cases.⁵⁵

In the early eleventh century, with its other attendant political problems, these arrangements began to break down. Episcopal power in the city, previously its stronghold, was undermined by disputes with the *populus*. In the territory the crown was no longer able to protect episcopal lands from the encroachment of powerful laymen, some of whom, such as the Canossa, were outsiders with little interest in preserving episcopal dominance of the area. The resultant losses, not only in episcopal land but also in seigneurial rights and tithe, were heavy; attempts to stem this development by compromises such as exchanges of land and pledges of security were stop-gap measures and only partially successful. The revolt against the bishop in c.1030, which was not confined to the city, marks a definite break.

After this the landscape becomes recognisably more feudal. The bishops' vassals hold their lands from him and do service for them. A vassal clientele with a chief vassal, or *signifer* (Ruggero II da Bariano), is organised, and flanks the bishop when he invests new members with land. The lands of episcopal vassals are usually based around a *curtis et castrum* and exercise local *districtus*. The Cremonese becomes a highly, if belatedly, feudalised society.

All this takes us well beyond the avowed focus of interest of this article: the tenth century. But the process of *incastellamento* was a

lengthy and evolving one, as was said at the beginning, and it did not end in the eleventh century. Here we have only traced some lines of this evolution between 900 and 1000 in a particular part of the Po plain.

One of the earliest writers on the subject of *incastellamento* was bishop Liutprand of Cremona. He wrote: 'So great was the fear which gripped all that nobody (in Italy) showed themselves on the arrival of the Hungarians except in well-fortified places.'⁵⁶ Liutprand obviously favoured the 'Hungarian devastation' theory for the origins and development of *incastellamento*. Hopefully this article has shown that this was only one amongst many factors.

NOTES

* My warm thanks to Brian Kemp who read the text and made many helpful suggestions, and to Jane Tyson for drawing the map.

¹ V.Fumagalli, 'Il regno Italico', *Storia d'Italia*, vol. II, (Turin 1978); G.Fasoli, *Le incursioni ungariche in Europa nel secolo x*, (Florence 1945).

² G.Tabacco, *The struggle for power in medieval Italy*, (Cambridge 1989) pp.151-66; C.Wickham, *Early medieval Italy* (London 1981), pp.172-77, 186-88.

³ Examples: L.Schiaparelli (ed.), *I diplomi di Berengario I*, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 35 (Rome 1903), nn.46 (904), 51 (904).

⁴ There is an extensive literature. For the older view see G.Bognetti, 'Terrore e sicurezza sotto rei nostrani e sotto rei stranieri', *Storia di Milano*, vol II (Milan 1954), pp.807-41. The standard work is now A.A.Settia, *Castelli e villaggi nell'Italia padana* (Naples 1984).

⁵ Settia, pp.89-246; see also P.Vaccari, *La territorialità come base dell'ordinamento giuridico del contado nell'Italia medioevale* (Milan 1963), pp.91, 159 ff.

⁶ P.Toubert, *Les structures du Latium médiévale. Le Latium méridional et la Sabine du ix^e siècle à la fin du xii^e siècle*, 2 vols (Rome 1973), and the review by G.Tabacco in *Studi medievali*, XV (1974), 901-18.

⁷ For the geography of the region in the medieval period see P.Darmstädter, *Das Reichsgut in der Lombardei und Piemont 568-1250* (Strassburg 1896), and F.Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300. La Lombardia*, pt.II, vol.II (Bergamo 1932).

⁸ For the history of the city, L.Astegiano, *Codex diplomaticus Cremonae 715-1334*, 2 vols (Turin 1896-99) is still fundamental. Liutprand is recorded in ten Cremonese documents between 962 and 970.

⁹ Astegiano, *Codex*, II, pp.243-46, 257-62.

¹⁰ For a combined historical/archaeological approach see C.Wickham, 'Il problema dell'incastellamento nell'Italia centrale. L'esempio di S.Vincenzo al Volturno', *Quaderni dell'insegnamento di archeologia medievale della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'università di Siena*, 5 (Florence 1985).

¹¹ Among the other important holders of Cremonese *castelli* were the counts of Bergamo and Lecco, and the convents of S.Sisto, Piacenza and S. Salvatore, Pavia. For a full list of tenth-century *castelli* see J. Jarnut, cited below note 13, p.111, note 191.

¹² The majority of documents cited can be found in E.Falconi (ed.), *Le carte cremonesi dei secoli viii-xii*, 2 vols (Cremona 1979-84).

¹³ In particular by J.Jarnut, *Bergamo 568-1098* (trans. G.Piccinini) (Bergamo 1980), pp.108-22 and F.Menant, *Campagnes lombardes du moyen age: l'économie et la société rurales dans la région de Bergame de Cremona et de Brescia du xe au xiiiè siècle* (Université de Paris, thèse d'état, 1938), pp.55-71.

¹⁴ Schiaparelli, *Berengario I*, n.cxiii. T.Sickel (ed.), *(M)onumenta (G)ermaniae (H)istorica, Diplomata, Die Urkunden Otto des II* (Hannover 1888, repr.Berlin 1956), nn.176, 272; T.Sickel (ed.), *Die Urkunden Otto des III* (Hannover 1893, Berlin repr. 1956), n.206.

¹⁵ Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.57.

¹⁶ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.62 (960), 65 (965), 67 (966), 68 (966), 73 (973), 79 (980), 84 (990). C.Manaresi, *I placiti del 'Regnum Italicum'*, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 92, 96, 97, 3 vols (Rome 1955-60), II, nn.180 (976), 217 (993), 245 (998), 246 (999) 252 (999).

¹⁷ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn. 73, 99. The term *curtis* usually denoted a large rural estate with servile tenants (*servi et ancillae*). There are several examples in the territory of Cremona. Some such as *Ruberino* near Fornovo (Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.15) belonged to the bishop, others such as *Sospiro* (Manaresi, *Placiti*, I, n.vii) to the crown and others such as *Faedo* and *Muciarina* (Falconi, *Carte*, I, 24) to monasteries.

¹⁸ Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.84; C.Bonetti, 'L'atto di fondazione del monastero di S.Lorenzo', *Bollettino Storico Cremonese*, I (1931), 134-44; F.Menant, 'Les monastères Bénédictins du diocèse de Crémone', *Centro Storico Benedettino Italiano, Bollettino Informativo*, 7 (1979), 42-43.

¹⁹ Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.143.

²⁰ H.Bresslau, H.Bloch (ed), *MGH, Diplomata Die Urkunden Heinrichs II und Arduins* (Hannover 1900-03), n.85; Astegiano, (*Codex*, II, p.264) raised doubts over the authenticity of this diploma, but more recently Falconi (*Carte*, I, p.309) has accepted it as genuine.

²¹ C.Porro Lambertenghi (ed.), *Codex Diplomaticus Langobardiae, Historiae patriae monumemta XIII* (Turin 1873), n.cclxx, (877); 'cortes meas Sexto et Tencaria in finibus cremonensi' (foundation endowment of

S.Sisto). Confirmed by Charles the Fat (P.Kehr (ed.), *MGH, Diplomata, Die Urkunden Karls III* (Berlin 1936-37), n.56 (882); by Berengar II and Adalbert (L.Schiaparelli (ed.), *I diplomi di Ugo e di Lotario, di Berengario II e di Adalberto, Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 38 (Rome 1924), n.1 (951); and by Otto I (T.Sickel (ed.), *MGH, Diplomata, Die Urkunden Konrad I, Heinrich I und Otto I*, n.141 (952). Episcopal acquisitions: Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.62 (960), Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn.217 (993), 245 (998).

²² Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, n.246 (999).

²³ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.54 (947), 55 (948), 56 (949), 58 (950), 62 (960), 68 (966), 70 (970), 73 (973), 75 (973), 79 (980), 83 (986), 86 (993).

²⁴ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.62, 73; Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, n.217.

²⁵ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn. 55, 58, 68, 75, 79.

²⁶ Mozzanica: Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.130, 131, 139; Grontardo: *Ibid*, nn.137, 138, 146, 147.

²⁷ Menant, *Campagnes*, pp.47-55, 265-79, 331-36; Jarnut, *Bergamo*, pp.237-48. In general, Settia, *Castelli*, p.256 ff and V. Fumagalli, *Terra e società nell' Italia padana: secoli ix e x* (Turin 1976).

²⁸ Settia, *Castelli*, pp.88-95.

²⁹ Schiaparelli, *Berengario I*, n.cxiii (916), n.cxxi (918); there were still problems with *ministeriales* in 924 (L. Schiaparelli (ed.), *I diplomi italiani di Lodovico III, e di Rodolfo II, Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, 37 (Rome 1910), n.v. Berengar's diplomas to north Italian bishops are very thoroughly discussed by G.Rossetti, 'Formazione e caratteri delle signorie di castello e dei poteri territoriali dei vescovi sulle città nella Langobardia del secolo x', *Aevum*, XLIX, fasc.III-IV (1975), 243-309.

³⁰ *MGH, Diplomata, Otto III*, n.360.

³¹ For an attempt (demonstrating the shortcomings of the approach) to explain the distribution of *castelli* in the Lodigiano in this way see A.Caretta, 'Le incursioni ungariche ed i *castelli* del basso contado lodigiano', *Archivio Storico Lodigiano*, ser.II, XXVII, fasc.I (1979), 5-16.

³² Settia, *Castelli*, pp. 78-80.

³³ Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.57, 62, 65, 84; Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn. 217, 245.

³⁴ For what follows see in general G.Tabacco, 'L'allodialità del potere nel medioevo', *Studi Medievali*, ser. III, 11 (1970), 565-615, and the two classic socio-political accounts of northern Italy in this period: C.Violante, *La società milanese nell'età precomunale* (Bari 1953, 2nd edition 1974), and H.Keller, *Adelsherrschaft und Städtische Gesellschaft in Oberitalien 9-12 Jahrhundert* (Tübingen 1979). Their conclusions set the agenda for discussion of any aspect of this theme.

³⁵ Manaresi, *Placiti*, I, nn.98 (891), 119, 120 (910); Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.53 (947), 57 (949/50), 67, 68 (966), 70 (970), 75 (973), 84 (990).

³⁶ Violante, 'Per lo studio dei prestiti dissimulati in territorio milanese (secoli x-xi)', *Studi in onore di A.Fanfani* (Milan 1962), pp.643-75, has demonstrated how an exchange could hide a different sort of contract.

³⁷ Violante, *Società*, p.142 ff; Keller, *Adelsherrschaft*, pp.194-96; I am reliant to a considerable extent here on F.Menant's perceptive summaries of the main lines of development of feudalism in the Cremonese: *Campagnes*, pp.343-69, and 'Aspetti delle relazioni feudo-vassallatiche nella città lombarde del xi secolo: l'esempio Cremonese', R.Bordone, J.Jarnut (eds), *L'evoluzione delle città italiane nel xi secolo, Annali dell'istituto storico italo-germanico*, 25 (Bologna 1988), 223-39.

³⁸ Both of these families have been studied in detail by Violante: 'Una famiglia feudale della "Langobardia" tra il x e il xi secolo: i "da Bariano/da Maleo"', *Archivio Storico Lodigiano*, ser.II, XXII (1974), 5-101; 'Una famiglia feudale della "Langobardia" nel secolo xi: i Soresina', *Studi filologici, letterari, e storici in memoria di G.Favati, Medioevo e Umanesimo*, 29, (Padua 1977) 653-708, esp. 673-76.

³⁹ *MGH, Diplomata, Otto III*, n. 288; Violante, 'da Bariano', p.14 ff.

⁴⁰ Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn.203 (983), 208 (988), 232 (998), 243 (998), 246 (999).

⁴¹ The incident is well known and has provoked much comment. For an Italian translation of the text and some useful remarks see R.Bordone, *La società urbana nell'Italia comunale (secoli xi-xiv)* (Turin 1984), pp.223-24.

⁴² Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, n. 255.

⁴³ Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn. 208 (988), 245 (998); *MGH, Diplomata, Otto III*, nn.360, 394: 'de quadam corte episcopatus eius legaliter pertinente Crotta nominata, que ab ipsius ecclesie iure iniusto et incompetenti ac nimis inracionabili concambio abstracta fuerat, set nunc iusto et legali iudicio in presentia nostri nuntii Cessonis . . . residentis in placito . . . recuperatum redditamque constat esse Ecclesie'.

⁴⁴ *MGH, Diplomata, Otto III*, n.394: 'Hii vero a quibus prefata cortis iniuste detinebatur, Odelricus (et al)'.

⁴⁵ Violante, 'i Soresina', 676-87.

⁴⁶ Boniface: Astegiano, *Codex*, II, n.31, p.57 (1019); Falconi, *Carte*, I, n.143 (1022). Sigifredo: Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.127, 128 (1015). Other examples, Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.118 (1010/11), 134 (1019). Menant ('Aspetti', p.239) uses the phrase *rapports de force* in discussion of the second half of the eleventh century, but it seems to me to be also appropriate earlier.

⁴⁷ River rights on the Po at the mouth of the Adda are first recorded in 715-30 (Porro-Lambertenghi, *Codex*, p.117; they are first recorded in possession of the bishop in 841 (Manaresi, *Placiti*, I, n.vii: in this document the rights are said to have been granted to him by Charlemagne).

⁴⁸ *Placita* held in the *castello* of Genivolta: Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn.217

(993), 245 (998), 252 (999); for the judicial activities of the counts of Bergamo see Jarnut, *Bergamo*, pp.92-101.

⁴⁹ Episcopal administration at Genivolta in the 11th century: Falconi, *Carte*, I, nn.137, 138 (1020), 152 (1026), 177 (1041), II, n.215 (1073), 223 (1078). Rossetti ('Formazione', 244), however, rightly stresses that urban fortification, *districtus* and rural *incastellamento* are in general part of a linked process.

⁵⁰ Rossetti, 'Formazione', 266-67; Astegiano, *Codex*, II, pp. 243-46, 257-62. In general, see E. Dupré-Théseider, 'Vescovi e città in Italia nel medioevo (secoli ix-xiii)', *Italia Sacra*, V (Padua 1964), 55-109.

⁵¹ Astegiano, *Codex*, II, pp.263-75; Tabacco, *Struggle*, p.324 ff.

⁵² See references cited in note 21.

⁵³ Menant, *Campagnes*, p.58; Jarnut *Bergamo* (pp.114-15) reached the same conclusions for the Bergamasco.

⁵⁴ The phrase is from F.Cusin, 'Per la storia del castello medioevale', *Rivista Storica Italiana*, ser. v, 4 (1939), 491-542.

⁵⁵ Manaresi, *Placiti*, II, nn. 228 (996), 231 (997), 252 (999).

⁵⁶ Liutprand, *Antapodosis*, (J.Becker (ed.), *Liutprandi Opera, MGH, Scriptores in Us. Schol.* (Hannover/Leipzig 1915), II, p.44: 'Tantum enim timor invaserat universos, ut nullus esset, qui horum praesentiam nisi forte tutissimis praestolaretur in locis'.

