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Abstract
The introduction of the scabini, men who served as judgement finders, has long been connected to judicial reform enacted by Charlemagne. By the thirteenth century, the term scabini had become synonymous with legal culture and courts from Norway to Hungary and beyond. This article will trace the scabini from historiographical debates over their provenance, to their introduction under Charlemagne, why and how this change was enacted, their duties and the impact of the reform on terminology and the writing of documentary texts. This touches on keystones of changing historiographical perspectives of the Carolingians: from nineteenth-century views of a ‘Germanic’ past that privileged collective judgement to twentieth-century emphasis on the written word as a mode of governance and the relationship between Charlemagne and the aristocracy, and recent attention to the function of capitularies in tenth-century western Europe. It will explore the alleged disappearance of the scabini, a development that is connected in scholarship to nothing less significant than debates concerning the feudal revolution, before considering areas for future study.
INTRODUCTION

The introduction of the class of men known as scabini, who served in law courts with a function akin to an early medieval ‘grand jury’ (Davis, 2015, p. 52), has long been connected to judicial reforms enacted by Charlemagne in the heyday of the Carolingian empire. No contemporary document outlines their responsibilities or status, and we know little of their duties or relative importance to local courts. More sporadic appearances in the written record followed their frequent appearance in capitularies and diplomas issued around the turn of the ninth century, until the twelfth century, when scabini became synonymous with legal culture and courts from Norway to Hungary and beyond.

This article will trace the scabini through historiography from debates over their provenance, to their introduction under Charlemagne, why and how this change was enacted, their duties and the impact of the reform on terminology and the writing of documentary texts. Such analysis touches on many of the keystones of changing historiographical perspectives of the Carolingians altogether: nineteenth-century views of a ‘Germanic’ past that privileged collective judgement, twentieth-century emphasis on the written word as a mode of governance and the relationship between Charlemagne and the aristocracy, and very recent attention paid to the function of capitularies in ninth- and tenth-century western Europe. It will explore the attention paid to identifying the scabini and the terminological flexibility (or otherwise) in such documents. Finally, it will turn to the alleged disappearance of the scabini across the early medieval west, a development that is connected in scholarship to nothing less significant than debates concerning the feudal revolution, before considering areas for future study.

1.1 The scabini: a ‘Germanic’ past?

The etymology of the term scabini had by the nineteenth century become the subject of intense interest. The most persuasive suggestion remains that of Jacob Grimm (1828, pp. 775–776), that the term derived from scapan, referring to the giving of something—in this case, the giving of the law, though other roots were proposed including Greek and even Hebrew (outlined in Waitz, 1882, p. 392 n. 1). In line with contemporary historiographical interests, a great deal of energy went into establishing the provenance of the scabini. Consequently, the term features in all the voluminous compendia of legal history produced in the long nineteenth century, whether in French (Beauchet, 1886; Brissaud, 1898; Chénon, 1926; Déclereuil, 1789; Fustel de Coulanges, 1885, 1888, 1892; Glasson, 1887–1903; Viollet, 1890–1903), German (Bethmann-Hollweg, 1868; Brunner, 1887; Ficker, 1868; Hermann, 1881; Savigny, 1834; Sickel, 1885; Sohm, 1871; Unger, 1842; Waitz, 1882–5) or Italian (Besta, 1927; Pèrtile, 1896; Salvioli, 1927). Their emergence was typically pinpointed to the vestiges of Roman law, pre-historic Germanic collective judgement or a mixture of both, within perceived immalleable institutional and legal-constitutional frameworks of justice. While some argued for the importation of the scabini into Francia from Italy following Charlemagne’s conquest of Lombardy, a case put forward most fully by Heinrich Brunner (1887), the discovery of earlier Frankish evidence, and the identification of some of the earliest Italian pieces of evidence as forgeries, secured the scabini’s provenance west and north of the Alps. In fact, the earliest written appearance of the term scabini dates to a Saint-Bertin text of the 740s, some three decades before Charlemagne’s accession in 774.¹ This document has attracted little attention (but see Río, 2009, p. 126 n. 153); other usages of the term in formularies and charters dated to the 760s–1980s are better known. The term was therefore nota neologism created during the reign of Charlemagne, and those responsible for its appearance in the royal lexicon probably borrowed a term from the heartlands of the Pippinid dynasty.

Ink spilled on the subject during this period, too, focused on questions of the role and place of the scabini in collective judgement, placing them within taxonomies of individuals responsible for making judicial decisions. While fundamental, for the present-day reader, these debates are now less useful. Firstly, the corpus of material comprises thousands of pages of (at times) cantankerous scholarly disagreement since weakened by a combination of some
newly discovered and some since-discredited evidence. Secondly, documentary evidence is often treated as a secure basis for broader extrapolation, accurately depicting static practices that could account for temporally and geographically broad areas and at times objective, unfiltered evidence for governance.

While historiographical trends have changed, the perceived locus of the scabini has not: scholars since the eighteenth century have agreed that Charlemagne personally carried out this change. In theory, the introduction of the scabini into the constellation of judicial authorities meant freemen no longer had to shoulder the burden of attending multiple courts every year as ad-hoc judgement finders, in Francia—but not Italy—known as rachymburgi. This has been interpreted by some as part of movement towards a professional judiciary from the time of Saleilles (1889), but the short-term political ramifications are clear. Firstly, the change brought an end to fines paid to the counts for non-attendance, which some have seen as a deliberate blow struck to comital power (Estey, 1947). Secondly, the scabini tied judgement finders and local judicial procedures to the royal court in the course of more pervasive judicial reforms that realigned and reframed kingship and justice.

1.2 | The scabini, Charlemagne and the written word

How Charlemagne implemented this reform has not been established. The scabini first appear in direct connection with the king’s authority in four documents dated to around the early 780s; any court-led change must therefore have begun early in his reign and been adopted fairly rapidly. The manner and means of their introduction became a focal point for historians of Charlemagne’s governance in the earlier and middle twentieth century (Althoffer, 1938; Estey, 1948).

We nevertheless cannot tie their introduction to a particular moment in time, and no extant text provides a holistic view of their duties. That such a legislative document ever existed is by no means certain or even necessary. Yet in what is often taken to be the definitive publication on the topic in Anglophone scholarship, Francis Estey assumed that a capitulary for the scabini had been produced and then lost to time (1951, p. 119). Similarly, François Ganshof reasoned that since no surviving capitulary delineated the duty of the scabini, either the relevant document was lost or—to Ganshof’s mind more likely—the order was promulgated verbally and ‘only the particular points concerned with its execution were promulgated and afterwards published in a capitulary’ (1965, p. 51). While the connection between Charlemagne and the introduction of the scabini to centrally promulgated documents is not in dispute, by trapping the scabini in the amber of the late eighth century, we cannot see the profundity of the change across the burgeoning empire, nor how royal and non-royal perceptions of the scabini may have developed over time. With that in mind, let us now turn to the envisioned duties of these men.

Like descriptions of the rachymburgi before them (outlined in Althoffer, 1938), a small number of capitulary stipulations dominate modern descriptions of the role of the scabini ‘on the ground’ (for instance Harding, 2002, p. 35; Riché, 1983). Scabini appeared most frequently in stipulations regarding either the regularity of their attendance at courts or their presence within the entourage of counts or missi. These stipulations are not uniform, however. A number state that a specific quantity of scabini was required or permitted to be in the entourage of such men: three, seven and twelve, respectively. But a plethora of duties were demanded of the scabini. The capitulary stipulations known as those ‘for the missi’/Capitulare missorum required scabini to swear an oath to the emperor on the commencement of their position, and subsequently, missi were ordered to record their names in a book. In other surviving capitulary texts from across the later eighth to later ninth centuries, the scabini were ordered to confirm inheritance plans, to hear cases of men displaced by viking raids alongside the count, to call assemblies, to collect fines for criminal misdemeanours and to carry out corporal punishment, alongside the judgement of other disputes and criminal hearings.

The scabini are also mentioned in a number of documentary texts dating from the eighth century onwards, of which capitularies form a part, but not the whole. Relatively few Carolingian royal diplomas and records of dispute hearings from the later eighth and ninth centuries refer to scabini, but where they do appear they are in all but one
case found in connection with disputed property, or disputed rights to property, where draftsmen recorded *scabini* finding in favour of ecclesiastical institutions, almost always alongside a count or *missi* to whom they were directly answerable. In several cases they had previously adjudicated local disputes, during which their judgement had been challenged, an action that necessitated subsequent assemblies held in the presence of the king. The majority of these date to Charlemagne’s rule, but there are scattered later examples in the ninth century.

In Italy, the duties of the *scabini* were visibly different from the middle ninth century, and earlier in some areas. As north of the Alps, the *scabini* initially slotted in the amongst pre-existing lay and clerical judgement finders were drawn from amongst secular landowners and were illiterate (Bougard, 1995; Ficker, 1872). As the ninth century went on, however, some *scabini* took on the role of notaries. Secondly, there is evidence by the later ninth century that the title of *scabini* became a hereditary title passed on from father to son (Bougard, 1995).

### 1.3 | Terminology and practice

However the *scabini* were introduced under Charlemagne, the term had a patchy impact across the empire, and it is difficult to say whether their introduction impacted on practice—and not just terminology—even in areas where changes in vocabulary can be observed (cf. Weitzel, 1985, for a particularly sceptical view). This terminological discrepancy and its impact on our understanding of the *scabini* present a particularly complex historiographical knot, bringing us to the heart of the ever-mutating relationships between textual designation, political and social identity, so ably and influentially laid out by Susan Reynolds (1994, 1997). In the case of the *scabini*, this impinges on the semantic profundity of the reform allegedly instituted by Charlemagne. Here, non-royal charters that mention *scabini* or similar group can add nuance to the picture. These are preserved in diverse archives and forms: in single sheets, monastic cartularies, town records or copied into manuscripts.

While draftsmen in some areas adopted the term, albeit inconsistently, elsewhere agencies continued to use alternative preferred regional terminology to describe men performing the same or similar functions. In the heartlands of Frankish royal power, the *scabini* appear at least on the surface to have replaced the *rachymburgi*. Another term with a disputed vernacular linguistic root, the selection criteria for these men and their origins, rights and duties were also the subject of marked interest in the nineteenth century (Bethmann-Hollweg, 1868; Eichhorn, 1808; Gengler, 1875; Grimm, 1828; Pardessus, 1839; Savigny, 1834; Siegel, 1857; Sohm, 1871; Thonissen, 1882; Waitz, 1882–5; and Weiske, 1871–5; and Weitzel, 1985; to name but a few). But *rachymburgi* continued to appear in documentary texts on their own, with other judgement finders and alongside the *scabini* into the tenth century.

In the Midi and southern Gaul, draftsmen preferred *iudices* (Beaudoin, 1888, p. 196). Looking west to Brittany, Wendy Davies (1986, p. 78) noted that those responsible for the documents collated in the Redon cartulary used multiple terms to describe individual named men, such as *scabinus* and *iudex*, sometimes within a single document. In Italy, terminological change was similarly slow and inconsistent (Bougard, 1995; Bruyning, 1985; Ficker, 1872), and while many Lombard *lociservatores*, Spoletan *sculdasci* and Luccan *locopositi* gave way to *scabini*, relationships between members of panels of judges and the presiding authority over them were perhaps opaque at the time and certainly are so now (Bougard, 1995).

Agencies responsible for producing charters and documentary texts throughout Charlemagne’s kingdom—and throughout those of his successors—continued to use diverse terminology, and records of decisions record combinations of *scabini*, *iudices* and *bonihomines*. *Bonihomines*, like *scabini*, fulfilled a number of duties. They attended judicial courts as witnesses, intervened on behalf of participants, provided advice and at times served as judges (Bourin, 2003; Davies, 2018; Nehlsen-von Stryk, 1981). In the south, *bonihomines* are in evidence working as valuers and assessors. All such activities were, too, the preserve of *scabini*.

Individuals given the above labels were therefore presented in ways that at times suggest high degrees of terminological flexibility. While Robert-Henri Bautier (1943) considered each term to represent different and distinct entities, his view remains an outlier, perhaps with the exception of Lucas Bruyning’s study of Italy (1985). Estey (1951),
in contrast, argued that in the south of the Carolingian empire, the *scabini* were synonymous with those described as *iudices*, and that those called by the older terms of *bonihomines* and *rachymburgi* were, in effect, *scabini* whose drafting agencies had simply not caught up to the new Carolingian rebranding. Yet he also asserted that the *scabini* were themselves drawn from amongst *bonihomines*, suggesting at least some contemporary differentiation in their conceptualization. According to Ganshof (1965), the *iudices* were simply *scabini* under a different name, while Barbero (2004) believed *iudices* effectively operated as an umbrella encompassing a number of terms under a single designation.

Local evidence therefore casts doubt on the extent to which the term was universally understood or accepted by contemporaries, and many have consequently concluded that the term *scabini* was in effect little more than a rebranding. Certainly, some of those who had served as *rachymburgi* before were now *scabini*. But the central change was the ties of loyalty made between judicial assessors to the ruler, and the apparent introduction of a lifelong role for these men in the service of justice. These tensions between concepts, terms and practice become less paradoxical if we follow the lead of Paul Fouracre (1995): the *scabini* were perhaps not expected to replace or become a clearly defined institution. Rather, they were a part of a broader change to the way justice was presented and conceptualized around the turn of the ninth century, in which those responsible for local judicial decisions and maintenance were more closely tied to the centre under a number of different and overlapping titles that represented not institutions, but activities.

### 1.4 The disappearance of the *scabini*

The remainder of this article will interrogate the widely accepted notion that the *scabini* disappeared with the fragmentation of the Carolingian empire (Estey, 1955; Weinberger, 1982), suggesting that debate over the evidence for the decline of the term in specific contexts has, firstly, erroneously expanded conclusions drawn from regional evidence to a broader stage. Secondly, even on a regional level the evidence is perhaps less secure than has been assumed. The disappearance of the term *scabini* from the Mâcon region and the cartulary of the monastery of Cluny became a cornerstone of debates surrounding the so-called *mutation féodale* in the middle decades of the twentieth century, and the alleged changes it brought to western European society. As is well known, these documentary sources were of vital importance in historians’ efforts to understand the changes of the eleventh century specifically, and the middle ages generally (Rosenwein, 1989).

In 1928, François Ganshof argued that the term *scabini* disappeared alongside those referring to other judgement finders (specifically the *bonihomines*) from the mid-tenth century onwards. The regular assessors who replaced them were men who owed their position and status to the count, rather than to a transregional power. No longer free or independent, these men were more or less forced to attend the court in their role as the count’s followers. Known as the *fideles*, to Ganshof they signalled a fundamental change to the balance of power in the local courts, symptomatic of the growing tendency for political fragmentation. In Ganshof’s view, this change happened subtly: courts fundamentally changed their character without attracting the attention of participants or scribes. In this way, almost unnoticed, the ancient *malluspublicus* became the feudal court. While his evidence was more or less restricted to Burgundy, Ganshof applied his findings to other areas in Francia, and continued to argue for this interpretation, in both English and French, for several decades (e.g. Ganshof, 1965, 1971). Others pressed Ganshof’s conclusions further, arguing that the disappearance of the *scabini* represented conscious and deliberate efforts made by the counts to gain greater local power at the expense of the centre (Bautier, 1943; Bongert, 1949). Francis Estey, whose contributions to our understanding of the *scabini* represent some of the most substantial since the turn of the century, also followed Ganshof. In his PhD thesis, Estey comments that both *scabini* and *bonihomines* became the count’s men in a process that was both gradual and unnoticed (1948).

Georges Duby (1947, 1953), in contrast, asserted that notarial vocabulary certainly changed around 940, but that this reflected scribal preferences. To Duby, the scribes who adopted the term *fideles* continued to use it as their
term of choice until the beginning of the eleventh century. Yet the change in terminology had limited impact, and in a number of publications (1953, and see the role of the Macon documents as summarized by Duby himself in his memoirs, 1991), Duby challenged many aspects of Ganshof’s argument. Firstly, he argued that the relationship between the count and court assessors had changed prior to this point and that terminology was therefore reflecting a change that had already happened, rather than vice versa. Secondly, Duby noted that the membership of this class of men did not change and that the change was therefore less one of profound alteration to the composition of the court, and instead a rebranding. In essence then, Duby’s argument asserts the same as that now widely accepted for the introduction of the scabini; terminology changed, but personnel did not.

Tilling different soil, historians of contemporary Italy reached the same conclusion based on a similar pattern of evidence, albeit distributed more broadly: the scabini disappeared in the tenth century. In contrast, however, this was attributed to growing royal power rather than its fragmentation, and attempts to bring judges under royal control, during the reigns of Berengar I and Hugh of Provence in particular (Bougard, 1995, p. 154). We see that before 928, the term scabini is used regularly in the archive for Lucca. Fast forward 2 years, however, and in 930, we see four men previously described as scabini now termed iudices, first identified by Ficker (1872, p. 18). There are archives where the change appears to have happened earlier: in Pavia, the term scabini dropped out of usage from the 880s.

Duby’s arguments have perhaps been more readily accepted than Ganshof’s maximalist views of the Carolingian polity, though the former has perhaps come in for greater criticism. In particular, the failure of Duby and his circle to consider the textual and literary possibilities of charters outside their (alleged) legal functions (Cheyette, 2002; Evergates, 1997). Yet while Ganshof and Duby disagreed on much, in the case of the scabini, their apparently opposing views are in reality not so different. Both agree that by the later tenth century, the ‘Carolingian’ aspects of comital courts were much diminished, and whether the shift in terminology is a retroactive measure to reflect changed circumstances, or the means of change itself, does not affect the fact that there was a change. Both, too, as contributors whose importance cannot be underestimated to the historiographical landscape, cast a long shadow. Since their focus is predominantly what replaced the scabini who ‘disappeared’, Ganshof and Duby consequently curtailed a historiographical line of inquiry. This is perhaps why so many historians remark that the scabini in some sense belonged to the ninth-century Carolingian empire, and its distinctive concepts of law, justice and the regulation of society. Wendy Davies (1988, p. 149; 1992, p. 74) twice mentions that ‘the characteristic Carolingian term scabini’, Estey (1948, p. 12) defines a scabinus as a ‘ninth-century Carolingian judge’, Alan Harding (2002, p. 35) calls them ‘the Carolingians’ other great contribution to the legal order’, Lupoi (2000, p. 208) refers to them as belonging to ‘a different historical period, the late Carolingian eighth century’ and other examples could be enumerated.

2 | AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW

Though representations certainly changed over time, the scabini, in fact, did not disappear. By the thirteenth century, the term was all but ubiquitous, used as a synonym for judgement finders from Hungary to Norway, often but not always closely connected to communes or towns. Some have seen this emergence of the term on a broader stage as evidence of a transformation of a continuous institution (Monier, 1924; Vanderkindere, 1874), while others argued for a complete dislocation between the scabini of the Carolingian era and the homonymous judgement finders of the towns of later medieval Europe (Pirenne, 1893, 1895). But in the course of such debates, evidence for the intervening centuries between Carolingian introduction and later ubiquity has rarely been mentioned.

Yet the term is used to refer to judgement finders in a number of diplomas belonging to the subsequent dominant dynasties in East Francia: under the Ottonian and Salian royal dynasties, one can find royal diplomas and records of dispute hearings containing the term sporadically. Nor is this practice limited to north of the Alps, but several survive that were issued in Italy into the eleventh century and beyond. Remarkably, before the turn of the millennium, we find the term scabini only in documentary sources, but after the year 1000, we begin to encounter
scabini in narrative texts, too, suggesting a diversification in conceptualization of these men, which spread as the eleventh and twelfth centuries progressed. The term also appears in records of decrees promulgated, and non-royal law-codes. Areas of local usage existed continuously throughout the central middle ages, both north and south of the Alps.

Finally, capitularies continued to be copied during this period. One of the most interesting examples from this period is the appearance of the scabini in a tenth-century prologue added to a single manuscript including Charlemagne’s capitulary known as Capitularelegibusadditum/Capitulary adding to the laws, issued in 803. This text records the following:

In the name of Christ begin the recently discovered capitula legis of emperor Charles in the third year of our most merciful lord emperor Charles. In this year these capitula were made and authenticated by count Stephen, to make them known in the city of Paris in the mallum publicum and to have them read in the presence of scabini... And everyone consented as one, that they wanted to observe for all time in posterity, and all scabini, bishops, abbots, and counts affirmed below with their own hand (trans. Faulkner, 2016, p. 113).

As Thomas Faulkner (2016) has noted, while a number of scholars took this as evidence of Carolingian practice, it seems rather more likely that the text reflects assumptions regarding the promulgation of capitularies held by the person responsible for drafting the text: in this case, a scribe operating in northern Francia. While on the one hand the text endorses the sense that the scabini were deemed to be characteristically Carolingian; on the other, it also demonstrates that individuals responsible for compiling and copying such texts were at least aware of the term, its meaning and the position of the scabini within the constellations of judicial authorities.

More broadly, the continued reproduction and recompilation of capitulary stipulations offer new and exciting avenues for research, building on the work of, amongst others, Sören Kaschke and Britta Mischke (2019), Karl Ubl (2016) and Steffen Patzold (2019). The availability of capitularies concerning the scabini could well have continued to effect communication between those in the upper echelons of society, and the healthy continuation of many capitularies concerning scabini points to some relevance and meaning to those responsible for copying such texts.

3 | CONCLUSION

It is almost a truism in scholarship that the scabini were the creation of Charlemagne in the course of his great series of legal reforms. But while the voluminous scholarship on the scabini might suggest their role—and perceptions of their role in ninth- and tenth-century western Europe—are thoroughly understood, there is still much to say about this class of men, their status and the connotations of the term in early and central medieval society. New research can begin by asking different questions of the evidence, including those of audience and interpreted audience, of how capitularies informed contemporary conceptions of justice, and how—and why—draftsmen selected their terminology.
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ENDNOTES

1 Diplomata Belgica ante annum millesimumcentesimumscripta, ed. Gysseling & Koch, 1950, no. 15A, p. 32.

2 These are: 23 February 780, Digne, Provence: Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Victor de Marseille no. 31 (s. xi/xii), ed. Guérard (1857) p. 45; 16 December 781, [Quierzy], DD K I 138 (s. xii), ed. Boretius, (1883), pp. 188–89; 1 January 781/ October 782 × 31 December 791/31 May 783, DD K I 148 (s. xii); ed. Boretius (1883), pp. 200–2; 3 June 783, Schwabenheim, Codex Laureshamensis, no. 228 (s. xii), ed. Glöckner (1933), vol. 2, p. 31.


6 The historiography of this subject is naturally too expansive to begin to summarise here, but see Abels (2009), in this journal, for a useful starting point.

7 The arguments on this subkect presented at length by Weitzel (1985) will be treated in a forthcoming study.

8 For broader discussion of the different terminologies used for judgement finders, see Davies and Fouracre, 1986, and the useful glossary edited by Jane Carpenter in the same volume.

9 For individuals described as scabini at Stavern and Kampen in south-west Norway in 1293 see Urkundenbuch des Stadt Lübeck, Vol. 1, ed. Techcn, pp. 541–2 and 544.

10 For instance: D O 1 52, issued in 942 at Vuesgata, s. x (ed. Sickel, 1879, p. 135); D O 1 80, issued in 946 at an unknown location, s. xii (ed. Sickel, 1879, p. 159); D H II 247, issued in 1012 at Nierstein, s. xi (p. 248); D H II 467, issued in 1022 at Campo di Pietra, s. xii (ed. Bresslau, Bloch, & Holtzmann, 1900–1903, p. 595); D H III 372a, issued in 1056 at Trier, s. xiii (ed. Bresslau & Kirsch, 1926, p. 509); D Lo III 34, issued in 1131 Lüttich, s. xii (ed. von Ottenthal & Hirsch, 1927, p. 57).


13 In Christi nomine incepit capitula legisimperatoris Karolinuperinventa anno tertioclementissimodomninostri Karoliaugusti. Sub ipso anno haec capitula facta sunt et consignata Stephano comiti, uthaecmanifestafecisset in civitate Parisius mallopubplico et ipsalegerefecisset coram illiss cabineis; quod ita et fecit. Et omnes in uno consenserunt, quod ipsivoluissent omni tempore observare usque in posterumetiam omnescabinei, episcopi, abbatis, comitis manu subter firmaverunt. Capitula que in lege Salicam mittenda sunt.

14 The forthcoming editions of capitularies and the work of Karl Ubl and others available at https://capitularia.uni-koeln.de/ [accessed 10 March 2020] is of special importance.
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