

Odilo of Cluny, whom Huscner identifies with Heribert D, would spend years away from his own monastery – in an entirely different kingdom! – simply to draft and copy diplomas in Otto III's name. The clutch of charters Heribert D produced for Cluniac houses in northern Italy would have been poor payment indeed for such efforts.

So while Huscner's model helpfully restores agency to draftsman-scribes, it risks underestimating the significant pastoral and administrative duties of episcopal and abbatial office. Timothy Reuter once argued that even those bishops who were most active in imperial service are unlikely to have spent more than five percent of their time at court; and for many others, it would have been much less³⁷. This was perhaps an overstatement, but the point remains that the primary responsibility (and loyalty) of a bishop was to his see – a fact which the Ottonian rulers frequently learnt to their chagrin³⁸. How such local duties are to be balanced with the extended absences postulated by Huscner – absences which would be longer still, were more diplomas of the era to survive – is a question he never fully addresses. In this respect, there is a whiff of the old „Ottonian-Salian imperial church system“ to such arguments; the unspoken presumption is that bishops would happily prioritize imperial service over local commitments³⁹.

37) Timothy REUTER, *Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms*, in: *Bischof Burchard von Worms 1000–1025*, hg. von Wilfried HARTMANN (Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhochdeutschen Kirchengeschichte 100, 2000) p. 1–28, at 24 f.

38) Cf. Ernst-Dieter HEHL, *Der widerspenstige Bischof. Bischöfliche Zustimmung und bischöflicher Protest in der ottonischen Reichskirche*, in: *Herrschaftsrepräsentation im ottonischen Sachsen*, hg. von Gerd ALTHOFF / Ernst SCHUBERT (VuF 46, 1998) p. 295–344.

39) The classic deconstruction is now Timothy REUTER, *The 'Imperial Church System' of the Ottonian and Salian Rulers. A Reconsideration*, in: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982) p. 347–374. For subsequent discussion: Rudolf SCHIEFFER, *Der geschichtliche Ort der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirchenpolitik* (Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften Düsseldorf. Vorträge Geisteswissenschaften 352, 1998); Hartmut HOFFMANN, *Der König und seine Bischöfe in Frankreich und im Deutschen Reich 936–1060*, in: *Bischof Burchard von Worms* (as n. 37) p. 79–127; Wolfgang HUSCHNER, *Die ottonisch-salische Reichskirche*, in: *Heiliges Römisches Reich deutscher Nation. 962 bis 1806. Von Otto dem Großen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, 2 vols., hg. von Matthias PUHLE / Claus-Peter HASSE (2006), 2, p. 98–109; Steffen PATZOLD, *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Mittelalter-Forschungen 25, 2008) p. 521–626; BODE, *König und Bischof* (as n. 17); *Jenseits des Königshofs. Bischöfe und ihre Diözesen im nachkarolingischen ostfränkisch-*