

concerns. In a set of pioneering studies of the reign of Henry I, Carl Erdmann likewise urged caution regarding Sickelian teaching on the Ottonian chancery: diploma production under the first Liudolfing ruler was too small-scale and *ad hoc* to presume any sort of institutionalization<sup>4</sup>. The most sustained criticisms, however, were to come from Sickel's own former pupil, Paul Fridolin Kehr. In the course of preparing his editions of the diplomas of the late Carolingian rulers of East Francia, Kehr concluded that the chancery was a far more informal affair than Sickel had imagined, and that many of those figures once deemed „chancery scribes“ were not so much royal functionaries as individuals with periodic links to king and court<sup>5</sup>. Similar conclusions were reached independently by French scholars of these years. In the mid-1940s, Georges Tessier demonstrated that many of the Carolingian diplomas for Saint-Denis were produced by the local monks (rather than royal functionaries), despite bearing all signs of *Kanzleimäßigkeit*; much the same proved to be true of the charters of Saint-Martin, Tours. From this, it was clear that Sickel had exaggerated the reach of the Carolingian chancery. And Tessier's lead was followed by his fellow chartistes, who came to emphasize ever more strongly the role of the recipient in charter production<sup>6</sup>.

For much of the second half of the twentieth century, discussion went quiet on the subject. By and large, the criticisms of Klewitz, Erdmann and Kehr were taken on board, but significant elements of

---

4) Carl ERDMANN, *Der ungesalbte König*, in: DA 2 (1938) p. 311–340, at p. 331–333; IDEM, *Beiträge zur Geschichte Heinrichs I. (I–III)*, in: *Sachsen und Anhalt* 16 (1940) p. 77–106, at p. 98–106.

5) Paul KEHR, *Die Kanzlei Ludwigs des Deutschen* (1932) p. 3 f., 9 f.; IDEM, *Die Kanzleien Karlmanns und Ludwigs des Jüngeren* (1933) p. 7–9, 12, 15, 29 f., 36; IDEM, *Die Kanzlei Karls III.* (1936) p. 5, 9 f., 20, 36 f., 44 f., 48 f.; IDEM, *Die Kanzlei Arnolfs* (1939) p. 8, 53; IDEM, *Die Kanzlei Ludwigs des Kindes* (1940) p. 4, 7, 35–38. On Kehr and his (fraught) relationship with Sickel: Michèle SCHUBERT, *Meister – Schüler. Theodor von Sickel und Paul Fridolin Kehr (nach ihrem Briefwechsel)*, in: *MIÖG* 106 (1998) p. 149–166; Horst FURHMANN, *Menschen und Meriten. Eine persönliche Portraitgalerie* (2001) p. 174–212; Rudolf SCHIEFFER, *Paul Fridolin Kehr*, in: *Berlinische Lebensbilder 10: Geisteswissenschaftler*, hg. von Uwe SCHAPER / Hans-Christof KRAUS, 2 vols. (2012), 1, p. 127–146.

6) Georges TESSIER, *Originaux et pseudo-originaux carolingiens du chartrier de Saint-Denis*, in: *BECh* 106 (1945/6) p. 35–69; IDEM, *Les diplômes carolingiens du chartrier de St. Martin de Tours*, in: *Mélanges d'histoire du Moyen Âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (1951) p. 683–691; Robert-Henri BAUTIER, *Leçon d'ouverture du cours de diplomatique à l'École des chartes* (20 octobre 1961), in: *BECh* 119 (1961) p. 194–225; GUYOTJEANNIN, *Écrire en chancellerie* (as n. 1) p. 30 f.