

been promoted (sometimes both). The only exception is Fichtenau's suitably tentative suggestion that Hildibald of Worms may have been Hildibald B, the leading notary during Hildibald's time as chancellor (977–998). Fichtenau's reasoning was that the careers of scribe and chancellor overlapped, while Hildibald B, in addition to many authentic records, was responsible for an impressive set of forgeries in favour of Hildibald's bishopric of Worms. Yet as we shall see, further study of the Worms forgeries has revealed these to belong to the episcopate of Hildibald's predecessor Anno (950–978), when Hildibald B was already active as a recipient scribe. This makes it most unlikely that notary and bishop were one and the same. Rather, Hildibald B was a local draftsman-scribe gazetted into imperial service in the late 970s, when the new chancellor was appointed to his see³⁶.

The more serious objection to Huschner's identifications, however, is that they presume a form of sustained court service which is hard to reconcile with high ecclesiastical office. This is a point implicitly acknowledged by Huschner, who in two cases (Willigis of Mainz and Willigis B, and Poppo of Würzburg and Poppo A) sees the fact that the notary in question ceased operating upon the bishop's appointment as evidence in favour of the identification. And in at least one other case, that of Liudprand of Cremona and Liudolf F, Huschner associates a sharp decline in notarial activity with episcopal promotion. At least here, episcopal office would seem to have been incompatible with routine scribal service at court. Yet elsewhere, Huschner employs the reverse logic, identifying bishops with leading notaries precisely on the grounds that the bishop's episcopate coincides with the notary's period of activity at court. If Willigis was unable to combine archiepiscopal office with scribal work, this apparently posed few problems for his contemporary Heribert of Cologne. In all this, there is little explanation of how these bishops are meant to have fulfilled their pastoral duties. Similarly unclear are the benefits they hoped to accrue from such sustained scribal service. It is easy to see why a prelate might wish to produce diplomas in favour of his own see or its close associates; what was to be gained from the kind of extended service envisaged by Huschner, however, is far from clear. Perhaps visible Königsnähe was reward enough; but it remains hard to see why someone like Hildibald would have wanted to produce diplomas for so many recipients with whom he had little other connection. It is even harder to see why someone like

36) ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 21–60.