

is upheld, then we have yet another case of a cleric who used scribal service as a means of securing promotion. It would therefore seem that notaries not infrequently rose to episcopal rank, but that their scribal service typically ended then or became restricted to their see. Still, we should not let such „future bishops“ blind us to the large number of draftsman-scribes who remain resolutely anonymous. Given the nature of the surviving sources, which privilege the elite, we are far more likely to be able to identify those scribes who achieved episcopal rank than the likes of Hoholt or even Herward, who did not; it is quite likely that they were in the majority.

#### 4. Conclusions and implications

It would be easy to extend this study, surveying the draftsman-scribes of Otto II's, Otto III's and Henry II's reigns. But we would rapidly reach the point of diminishing returns. In these periods, too, Huschner's model of charter production is immensely useful, while his identifications of individual notaries with leading prelates prove problematic. To take but one example, alluded to in the introduction, it is most unlikely that Odilo of Cluny was Heribert D, one of the most active scribes of Otto III's later years. Heribert D was clearly an associate of the abbot, who frequently produced diplomas for Cluniac centres in Italy. But it beggars belief that Odilo would abandon his own monastery for years on end, in the manner Huschner presumes<sup>172</sup>. The objections

---

und *Pacta. Bündnis, Einigung, Politik und Gebetsgedenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert* (Schriften der MGH 37, 1992) p. 157–165; Claudia MODDELMOG, *Königliche Stiftungen des Mittelalters im historischen Wandel. Quedlinburg und Speyer, Königsfelden, Wiener Neustadt und Andernach* (Stiftungsgeschichten 8, 2012) p. 25. The recent attempt to dismiss D O I 1 as a forgery by Christian WARNKE, *Die „Hausordnung“ von 929 und die Thronfolge Ottos I.*, in: 919 – Plötzlich König. Heinrich I. und Quedlinburg, hg. von Gabriele KÖSTER / Stephan FREUND (Schriftenreihe des Zentrums für Mittelalterausstellungen Magdeburg 5, 2019) p. 117–142, at p. 128–130, fails to explain the presence of the same hand as that in DD O I 2, 3. How could a later Quedlinburg forger have employed the same notary otherwise uniquely attested in Otto I's other earliest diplomas, neither of which was for Quedlinburg or its neighbours? The fact that two hands were involved in producing the diploma also speaks in its favour (*pace* Warnke). Cf. ROACH, *Forgery and Memory* (as n. 19) p. 38 f.

172) Wolfgang HUSCHNER, *Abt Odilo von Cluny und Kaiser Otto III. in Italien und in Gnesen (998–1001)*, in: *Polen und Deutschland vor 1000 Jahren. Die Berliner Tagung über den „Akt von Gnesen“*, hg. von Michael BORGOLTE (Europa im