

in post<sup>170</sup>. In this respect, they resemble Otto I's chancellors, who were typically well-connected young churchmen yet to achieve higher office: Poppo, the later bishop of Würzburg; Bruno, the later archbishop of Cologne; Liudolf, the later bishop of Osnabrück; the otherwise obscure Liudger; and Willigis, the later archbishop of Mainz. None of these figures was bishop and chancellor at the same time; and as case of Liudger reveals, there was no guarantee of promotion (though it may be that Liudger simply died before earning his stripes). And if most chancellors were not bishops or archbishops, it seems most unlikely that the majority of their notaries were. In this respect, it may be no coincidence that our one true „bishop notary“ is Italian, for it is in Italy that our evidence of episcopal involvement in diploma production is strongest in the ninth and early tenth centuries.

Such conclusions find further support in Edmund Stengel's plausible identification of Adaldag of Hamburg with the draftsman of Otto I's first three diplomas, all of which are in the same hand and recognized by a notary named Adaldag. These were produced in late 936, shortly before Adaldag's own promotion, after which this scribe and formulation promptly disappear. A connection between the two is thus likely, a conclusion strengthened by signs of similar formulation in the first diploma Adaldag received for his see the following year. And while Stengel (following Sickel) was hesitant to identify the hand of these documents with that of the archbishop – he saw Adaldag simply as draftsman – a strong case can be made for doing so, since the notary of this name only appears in the recognition clauses of this scribe's diplomas<sup>171</sup>. If Sickel's identification of LA with Adalbert of Magdeburg

---

170) FLECKENSTEIN, Hofkapelle (as n. 115) p. 20–50. Cf. KLEWITZ, Cancellaria (as n. 3).

171) DD O I 1, 2, 3, with STENGEL, Immunität (as n. 27) p. 139–142, noting the similarities with the formulation of D O I 11 (for Hamburg) at p. 140 f. n. 4. Following Sickel, Stengel believed that the hand responsible for protocol and eschatocol of D O I 1, which is clearly distinct from that of the main text, was that of Adaldag, but a connection with the main hand is more likely. Adaldag also appears in the recognition clause of D O I 6 (for Utrecht), which does not survive as an original. While Sickel suspected this was a recipient product, it is conceivable that the scribe of Otto's first three diplomas furnished the eschatocol (which Sickel deemed „kanzleigemäß“). Sickel placed D O I 466 (a late addition to the edition) before all three of these; however, its authenticity is questionable: Simon GROTH, Die Königserhebung Ottos des Großen. Revision einer Herrschaftsfolge, in: HJb 137 (2017) p. 415–471, at p. 426–431. On Adaldag: Karl SCHMID, Religiöses und sippengebundenes Gemeinschaftsbewußtsein in frühmittelalterlichen Gedenkbuchenträgen, in: DA 21 (1965) p. 18–81, at p. 70–78; Gerd ALTHOFF, Amicitiae