

Collecting Papal Letters and Privileges in Late Carolingian Bavaria.

The Salzburg *Rotulus* and its Narrative¹

The *Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv* in Vienna preserves a parchment roll composed of four sheets, about 2,04 metres long and 22 centimetres wide.² That so-called Salzburg *Rotulus* presents a collection of eight letters and privileges written in Caroline minuscule, with each item being introduced by a distinct heading in capital letters. In the first piece, dating back to about April 798, Pope Leo III (795-816) informs the Frankish king Charlemagne († 814) that he elevated, on the latter's request, Bishop Arn of Salzburg (785-821) to the rank of archbishop and metropolitan of the newly created ecclesiastical province of Bavaria. The pope adds that he bestowed upon Arn the pallium, a woollen stole granted by the pope as a gift mostly to archbishops.³ The second letter was written on the same occasion: Pope Leo notifies the Bavarian bishops about Arn's new position at the head of the province to which they henceforth belong; Leo urges them to support their archbishop and indicates, as in the previous letter, that he conferred the pallium on Arn.⁴ The papal privilege of 20 April 798, by which this grant was carried out, follows in the collection.⁵ In fourth place, one finds another letter of Leo III addressed to the bishops and clergy of the Bavarian province, dated 11 April 800: Leo exhorts his correspondents to follow Arn in any matter necessary.⁶ The fifth item is the only one having a pope as its addressee and not as an author. In a letter to Eugene II (824-827) prior to

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to the *ÖStA* for the opportunity to consult the Salzburg *Rotulus*. I am also indebted to Florence Close, Klaus Herbers and Sophie Glansdorff as well as the participants of the Durham conference for comments and helpful advice on previous versions of this paper. And finally, many thanks to Frederik Wertz for reviewing my paper. As always, all errors are mine.

² Wien, ÖStA, HHStA, UR AUR 15. On the roll see CHROUST (1902), table 8; HAUTHALER & MARTIN (1916), p. XII-XIII; *ChLA*² 116, 14. Photographs of the manuscript are available online: ÖStA (*s.d.b*), <https://www.archivinformationssystem.at/detail.aspx?ID=27604>; MONASTERIUM.NET (*s.d.a*), https://www.monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgDK/AUR_0870-0877/charter; MONASTERIUM.NET (*s.d.b*), https://www.monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR_ca_870/charter. – The items of the *rotulus* will be cited following the 2019 facsimile-edition in *ChLA*² 116, 14 (a-h), p. 76-88 (with a bibliographic overview of the different pieces as well as a list of previous editions at p. 75).

³ *ChLA*² 116, 14a. J³ 4649; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 9, no. 9; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 60. German translation by H. Dopsch in DOMKAPITEL (1998), p. 23-24. – On the pallium see SCHOENIG (2016). On the foundation of the Salzburg ecclesiastical province see FREUND (2004), p. 182-209; PANGERL (2011), p. 109-121.

⁴ *ChLA*² 116, 14b. J³ 4648; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 8, no. 8; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 59. German translation by H. Dopsch in DOMKAPITEL (1998), p. 25-26.

⁵ *ChLA*² 116, 14c. J³ 4647; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 8, no. 7; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 57. German translation by H. Dopsch in DOMKAPITEL (1998), p. 17-22.

⁶ *ChLA*² 116, 14d. J³ 4684; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 9, no. 10; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 123.

November 824, Emperor Louis the Pious († 840) recommends bestowing the pallium upon Adalram (821-836), Arn's successor.⁷ Eugene fulfils the emperor's wish in the sixth item, Adalram's pallium privilege (13 November 824).⁸ The final pieces consist of the pallium privileges granted to the next two archbishops of Salzburg: Liupram (836-859) by Gregory IV (827-844) on 31 May 837⁹ and Adalwin (859-873) by Nicolas I (858-867) in May 860.¹⁰

Palaeographic evidence suggests that the roll was assembled in the first half of the 10th century.¹¹ However, as several scholars have argued, it likely represents a later copy of a collection going back to around 870, with both versions being of Salzburg origin.¹² The particular interest of this collection in the pallium and the status of the church of Salzburg as a metropolitan see has been noted more than once and has continuously been associated with the conflict opposing the Bavarian episcopate to the Byzantine missionary and later archbishop Methodius († 885), which culminated in the capture, condemnation, and imprisonment of the latter by the Franks in 870.¹³

Although the historical frame in which the collection came forth has been pointed out early on, the collection itself has never been studied as a cohesive composition in itself. Even more so, until recently, the only comprehensive critical edition of these documents, to be found in the *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, disregards and distorts their common transmission context by editing them in a strictly chronological order amid other documents of various origins.¹⁴ In this regard, the facsimile-edition of the *rotulus* provided by the *Chartae latinae antiquiores*, which will be used in this paper, proves valuable as it reproduces the text of the collection in its original sequence. Indeed, recent scholarship on collection processes, and particularly letter and charter collections, leads to consider a collection not only as the mere sum of its parts. Extracted from their original context, the selected documents are given a new purpose within the collection which, in this process, becomes a work in its own right.¹⁵

⁷ *ChLA*² 116, 14e. J³ 5097; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 541; BÖHMER & MÜHLBACHER (1908), no. 790; KÖLZER (2018), no. B10, p. 1218.

⁸ *ChLA*² 116, 14f. J³ 5099; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 10, no. 13; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 546.

⁹ *ChLA*² 116, 14g. J³ 5223; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 10, no. 14; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no. 693. See also SCHERER (2013), p. 256-258.

¹⁰ *ChLA*² 116, 14h. J³ 5723; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 11, no. 17; BÖHMER & HERBERS (1999-2021), no. 512.

¹¹ SICKEL (1867), p. 266; HALLER (1903), p. 361; SILVA-TAROUCA (1931), p. 27-28; BISCHOFF (1980), p. 83, n. 97; FORSTNER (1998), p. 260-261. See also, *ChLA*² 116, p. 74.

¹² HALLER (1903), p. 361; WATTENBACH *et al.* (1990), p. 818; WOLFRAM (1995), p. 295.

¹³ CHROUST (1902), table 8; HAUTHALER & MARTIN (1916), p. XIII; FICHTENAU (1971), p. 97; WATTENBACH *et al.* (1990), p. 818; WOLFRAM (1995), p. 295.

¹⁴ MARTIN & HAUTHALER (1916), p. 2-10, 18-20, 27-29, 35-36.

¹⁵ On (early) medieval letter collections see CONSTABLE (1976); GARRISON (1999); YSEBAERT (2015); MERSIOWSKY (2015); WOOD (2018); ZINGG (2018). See also RICCIARDI (2023). – On cartularies, the bibliography

Such findings also apply to the collection of the Salzburg *Rotulus* whose programme will be examined throughout this paper. As starting point, I will consider the headings (or *lemmata*) of the pieces, followed by two further elements that shape the collection's narrative: the generic composition and the ordering principles of the items. I will then turn to some observations on the compiler's selection criteria. These points will eventually lead to further determining the context and possible purpose of both the original collection and its tenth-century *rotulus* copy.

1. The collection through its *lemmata*

All items of the Salzburg *Rotulus* are headed by a distinct *lemma*, providing a useful entry point to understand the collection's programme.¹⁶

| Item | Text of the <i>lemma</i> |
|------|--|
| 1 | <i>EPISTOLA LEONIS PPAE AD KAROLUM REGEM DE CONSTITUENDO ARCHIEPISCOPO ARNONE PROUINCIAE BAIUUARIAE AD IUUAUENSEM SEDEM METROPLITANAM.</i> ¹⁷ |
| 2 | <i>ITEM EPISTOLA EIUSDEM PPAE LEONIS AD EPISCOPOS PROUINCIAE BAIUUARIAE DE SUSCIPIENDO EORUM ARCHIEPISCOPO ARNONE.</i> ¹⁸ |
| 3 | <i>EPISTOLA PPAE LEONIS DE PRIUILEGIO ET CONFIRMATIONE PALLII DATA IUUAUENSIS ECCLLESIE METROPOLITANE EPISCOPO ARNONE.</i> ¹⁹ |
| 4 | <i>EPISTOLA PPAE LEONIS AD EPISCOPOS PROUINCIAE BAIUUARIAE DE INSTITUENDA METROPOLITANA SEDE IUUAUENSI, IN QUA ET MANDAT, IN QUOTA GENERATIONE DEBEANT CONIUGIA COPULARI ATQUE UT SUO SINT OBOEDIENTES ARCHIEPISCOPO ARNONI CANONICAE.</i> ²⁰ |
| 5 | <i>EXEMPLAR EPISTOLAE DOMNI HLUDOUICI IMPERATORIS AD EUGENIUM PPAAM.</i> ²¹ |
| 6 | <i>EPISTOLA PRIUILEGII ET CONFIRMATIONIS PALLII, QUAM ADALRAMMUS IUUAUENSIS ECCLLESIAE ARCHIEPISCOPUS IUBENTE DOMNO IMPERATORE HLUDOUICO DE APOSTOLICA SEDE AB EUGENIO PPA SUSCEPIT, PRAESENTE HLU DHARIO CESARE.</i> ²² |
| 7 | <i>EXEMPLAR EPISTOLAE PALLII, QUOD DOMNUS GREGORIUS PPA LIUPRAMMO ARCHIEPISCOPO DIREXIT IUUAUENSIS AECCLLESIAE.</i> ²³ |

is abundant. GUYOTJEANNIN *et al.* (1993) remains a fundamental contribution. The bibliography cited by SIRANTOINE (2023), p. 165-167 provides some useful guidance. – On the transmission of ninth-century papal letters see HERBERS & UNGER (2019), p. 24-28; UNGER (2018b), p. 7-140 (considering both letters and privileges); JASPER & FUHRMANN & (2001), p. 102-133.

¹⁶ On the opportunities presented by *lemmata* see the example of the *Codex epistolaris Carolinus*: MCKITTERICK *et al.* (2021), p. 43-74.

¹⁷ *ChLA*² 116, 14a, l. 1-2.

¹⁸ *ChLA*² 116, 14b, l. 17.

¹⁹ *ChLA*² 116, 14c, l. 34 (*DATA* is missing in the edition).

²⁰ *ChLA*² 116, 14d, l. 69-70.

²¹ *ChLA*² 116, 14e, l. 130.

²² *ChLA*² 116, 14f, l. 141-142.

²³ *ChLA*² 116, 14g, l. 154.

| | |
|---|--|
| 8 | <i>EXEMPLAR PALLII QUAM DOMNUS APOSTOLICUS NICOLAUS ADALUINO UENERABILI ARCHIEPISCOPO DIREXIT.</i> ²⁴ |
|---|--|

Before analysing these *lemmata*, one must determine if they belong to the initial collection or if they were only added in the extant tenth-century copy. There is a hint in favour of the former. Among the four archbishops mentioned, only Adalwin is presented in *lemma* 8 as *uenerabilis archiepiscopus* while the others are simply referred to as *(archi)episcopus*. There seems to be no particular reason for an early tenth-century scribe, writing at least three decades after the archbishop's passing, to qualify Adalwin alone as *uenerabilis* and not his three predecessors. From a tenth-century perspective, Adalwin does not strike as more special than his predecessors. On the contrary, it seems a later copyist would either have qualified all four prelates as *uenerabiles* or none. If ever there was only one bishop that stood out, one might suggest that it be the pivotal figure of Arn, the very first archbishop under whom the metropolitan see was erected, and who appears in half of the documents of the collection, rather than his third successor. The special mark of reverence Adalwin receives in *lemma* 8 strongly suggests that this heading was composed during his episcopate and, hence, forms an integral part of the initial collection. One can probably extend this estimate to the other headings as well: they were likely part of the original collection.

In addition, different redactors seem to have composed the *lemmata* as is suggested by syntactic differences between the first five and the last three headings. The formula *epistola N. ad N. de x*, rigidly observed in *lemmata* 1-4 and, without the *de x* clause, in *lemma* 5, disappears in the subsequent three headings, presenting the authors and recipients of the documents in a subordinate clause introduced by the pronouns *quam* or *quod*. The already mentioned description of Adalwin alone as *uenerabilis* in *lemma* 8 and, as I will later discuss, the reference in *lemma* 6 to the content of item 5 suggest that the group formed by the last three headings was written exclusively for the collection's purpose. The formula *epistola N. ad N. de x*, which is missing in these three *lemmata*, is likely to be attributed to another redactor. It is, however, difficult to assert whether and to what extent the origin of this formula as well as the subsequent parts of *lemmata* 1-4 predate the creation of the collection itself. Only the sequence of *lemma* 4 beginning with *in qua et mandat*, which strongly resembles the syntax of *lemmata* 6-8, seems to be connected to the redactor of these last three headings and can, therefore, be linked directly to the creation of the collection.

²⁴ *ChLA*² 116, 14h, l. 186.

Wherever the origins of the *lemmata* may lie and despite their structural differences, there seems to be a desire for uniformity. This is suggested by the systematic use of the term *epistola* (or *exemplar epistolae*)²⁵ to designate all the pieces of the collection as well as by the description of the pallium privilege in *lemma 3* as *epistola [...] de priuilegio et confirmatione pallii* which reappears in *lemma 6* (*epistola priuilegii et confirmationis pallii*).

Except for the short *lemma* of item 5, each heading contains terminology regarding the metropolitan see of Salzburg (nos. 1, 3, 4), the archiepiscopal rank of its bishop (nos. 1, 2, 4, 6-8), the Bavarian ecclesiastical province (nos. 1, 2, 4), or the concession of the pallium (nos. 3, 6-8). Following the sole content of the *lemmata*, this collection is unequivocally about the archiepiscopal and metropolitan rank of the Salzburg bishops, continuous wearers of the pallium.

Discrepancies between the headings and the content of the documents they were ascribed to further reveal the motivations and intentions of the collection. The *lemmata* of items 3, 6, 7, and 8 – the successive pallium grants – indicate more or less the same thing: they concern the ‘privilege and confirmation of the pallium’.²⁶ That is not a wrong description of the documents which follow. However, it should be noted that those mainly contain liturgical and pastoral prescriptions. They restrict wearing the pallium to the celebration of the Mass, mostly on specific days, and remind its recipient of the deep pastoral care that goes with being a beneficiary of the vestment.²⁷ However, judging by the *lemmata*, it was the result of these privileges, rather than most parts of their actual content that mattered.

The value of the pallium does not only amount to the *de facto* papal recognition of the different prelates and their archiepiscopal rank. Gifted by the hands of the pope, the stole was of high symbolic and ideological significance. It was a sacred object, connected to saint Peter himself on whose tomb it was laid before it was bestowed. The pallium also encompassed papal authority and expressed the worthiness, distinction, and virtue of the one who wears it.²⁸

²⁵ It is difficult to assess to what degree the author of the *lemmata* differentiated between (*item*) *epistola* (nos. 1-4, 6) and *exemplar (epistolae)* (nos. 5, 7-8). The latter could signal that these pieces were accessible only as copies. While this probably applied to the letter of Louis the Pious dispatched to Rome (item 5), it seems less likely that the two most recent pallium privileges of 837 and 860 (items 7-8) would only be extant as copies while the other pieces, going as far back as 798 and only in part addressed to the archbishops of Salzburg, would still be accessible to the compiler as originals. Moreover, once integrated in the collection, they all could be considered *exemplaria epistolae*.

²⁶ See above n. 19 & 22. See also n. 23 & 24.

²⁷ All four pallium privileges closely follow the formularies of the *Liber Diurnus* [= LD], a collection of formularies used in the papal chancery: item 3 is modelled on LD V 46 (ed. FOERSTER (1958), p. 103-106), item 6 on LD V 47 (ed. FOERSTER (1958), p. 106), items 7 and 8, similar in wording, on LD V 45 (ed. FOERSTER (1958), p. 101-103). See also SANTIFALLER (1976), p. 91-94. A summary of the content of these formularies is presented by HACKE (1898), p. 58-61. See also SCHOENIG (2016), p. 168-173.

²⁸ On the ideological significance of the pallium see SCHOENIG (2016), p. 145-177.

Depicting the granting of the pallium to each successive archbishop, the Salzburg collection presents the different prelates as virtuous men, estimated by the popes who conferred upon them one of their most precious gifts. The high value of the pallium also appears in various ninth-century narrative sources of Salzburg origin.²⁹

The first two items in the collection – the letters of Leo III to Charlemagne and the Bavarian bishops – are presented in an equally revealing manner. The *lemmata* indicate two distinct contents: while the first letter to Charlemagne concerns ‘the establishment of Archbishop Arn at the metropolitan see of Salzburg in the ecclesiastical province of Bavaria’,³⁰ the letter to the Bavarian bishops is ‘about the acceptance of their new archbishop’.³¹ However, the content of the two letters is rather similar. In both pieces, written at the same time, the pope informs his respective correspondents of Arn’s promotion and the creation of the Bavarian ecclesiastical province.³² Yet, those topics emerge only in the *lemma* of the first letter. Furthermore, as does the letter to the bishops, the letter to Charlemagne states that the Bavarian episcopate ought to submit itself to Arn as metropolitan and archbishop.³³ That, however, appears only in *lemma 2*. Considering their respective content, not only could the second letter be headed by the *lemma* of the first, but the first letter could equally have been introduced by the *lemma* of the second.

Not so much the content of the pieces, but rather their addressees seem to explain the discrepancies in the *lemmata*. In both letters, Leo states that he elevated Arn following the direct recommendation of Charlemagne.³⁴ However, associating only the papal letter to the Frankish king with the establishment of Salzburg’s metropolitan rank, rather than the letter to the bishops, was likely a way for the collector to emphasise the Carolingian roots of this act. Salzburg’s elevation to archbishopric is to be understood as the result of the close collaboration between royal and papal authority. On the other hand, the letter to the bishops, while similar in content, was meant to consolidate the archbishop’s authority regarding his suffragan bishops.

²⁹ Notably the *Carmina Salisburgensia* (ed. WOLFINGER (2006), p. 208-209), composed 854-859, and the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* (870) (ed. LOŠEK (1997), c. 8-9, p. 114-119; WOLFRAM (2012), c. 8-9, p. 68-71). See also SCHERER (2013), p. 256-258.

³⁰ See above n. 17.

³¹ See above n. 18.

³² *ChLA*² 116, 14a, 14b, l. 8-10, 22-26.

³³ *ChLA*² 116, 14a, l. 10-14: *Et eidem prouinciae Baiouuariorum episcopis nostrum apostolicum canoniumque misimus sigillum, qualiter in eorum diocesibus archiepiscopatus iura in praelata prouincia Baiouuariorum habere uidetur [...]. Quibus dedimus in mandatis, ut, sicuti in proprium illi eum concessimus sacerdotale caput, penitus canonicè obaudire et subiectos esse ecclesiastico more festinent, quia ut praefati sumus ualde nimisque eos apud uestram regalem potentiam repperimus fideles. ChLA*² 116, 14b, l. 28-31: *Qui [sc. Arn] dudum uester fuit coepiscopus, nunc autem frater et coepiscopus noster, uester autem archiepiscopus. Et uenerabilem sedem eius metropolitanam habentes, ad quam sancto Arnoni archiepiscopo uestro usum pallii tribuentes dedimus in mandatis, ut secundum canonicas institutiones omnes ecclesias superius nominatas uestras in diocesibus illi subiectas canonicè ualeat adminiculum impertire [...].*

³⁴ *ChLA*² 116, 14a, 14b, l. 5-8, 24-26.

Interestingly, Leo states in this piece that he does not only act on behalf of the king; at the very beginning, he affirms responding to the demand of the Bavarian bishops to institute an archbishop – a detail carefully left out by the *lemma*.³⁵

Both the Carolingian support for Salzburg and the definition of the archbishop's prerogatives resurface in subsequent *lemmata*. In addition to the first item, the former topic comes up in the headings of items 5 and 6. Whereas the fifth *lemma* simply states that the following document is an 'exemplar of a letter of the lord Emperor Louis – *i.e.* Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne – to Pope Eugene',³⁶ the following *lemma* is much longer:

'Letter of the privilege and confirmation of the pallium, that Archbishop Adalram of the church of Salzburg, on the order of Emperor Louis, received from the apostolic see by Pope Eugene, in the presence of Emperor Lothar'.³⁷

Louis the Pious does not appear anywhere in the text of the document. His so-called order to the pope is the subject of the previous letter of the collection. While composing *lemma 6*, the compiler clearly had the content of the preceding item in mind. It even seems as if he wanted to compensate for the scarce content of the fifth *lemma* with the following, more developed one. Regarding the mention of Louis' son Lothar I, his presence is indeed noted in the final date formula of the pallium privilege, though the Carolingian has no active role in the stipulations of the charter itself.³⁸

The mentioning of both Louis the Pious and Lothar I in the headings unveil the importance of rendering visible Carolingian support for the church of Salzburg: while Charlemagne is associated with the founding of the archbishopric, his son Louis and grandson Lothar provide subsequent assistance. The archiepiscopal rank of Salzburg is not only conferred by the popes, but it also receives continuous backing from the Carolingian kings and emperors.

A final aspect the *lemmata* reveal is the definition of the relationship between the archbishop and his suffragan bishops. In addition to the already mentioned *lemma 2*, that topic appears in the *lemma* of the fourth item:

'Letter of Pope Leo to the bishops of the Bavarian province about the establishment of the metropolitan see of Salzburg, and in which he declares the

³⁵ *ChLA*² 116, 14b, l. 20-21: *Dilectionis uestrae quas nobis petitorias emisistis syllabas, libenti suscepimus animo, in quibus ferebatur, ut in prouincia uestra Baiouuariorum archiepiscopum ordinaremus.* – Modern research largely agrees that the deciding factor in Arn's promotion was his close connection to Charlemagne. See above n. 3.

³⁶ See above n. 21.

³⁷ See above n. 22.

³⁸ *ChLA*² 116, 14f, l. 152-153: *Datum [...] Hludhario cesare praesente [...]*.

degree of kinship in which marital unions must be sealed, and that they ought to be canonically obedient to their Archbishop Arn'.³⁹

The heading precedes a long letter written by Leo III two years after Arn's promotion. It can be divided into three parts: first, the pope reminds his correspondents of the necessity of a metropolitan bishop and that they must follow theirs; the second part contains an answer to a question regarding marriage and incest; finally, the pope stresses the universal obligation for everyone in the Bavarian province to obey their respective hierarchical superiors.

The *lemma* of this letter does indeed reflect those three different parts, but, again, there are discrepancies. First, the pope dispatched his letter not only to the bishops as the *lemma* affirms; following the address of the document, Leo also wrote to the abbots as well as the clergy and people of the Bavarian province.⁴⁰ Secondly, while the pope reminds his correspondents to follow Arn in the first part,⁴¹ the final third part of the letter goes well beyond this prescription. Next to their archbishop, Leo commands that all his addressees be obedient to their hierarchical superiors: they ought to live in fear of God, submitted to the precepts of the Gospels, Apostles, and Holy Fathers.⁴² This general admonition was left out of the *lemma*, nearly exclusively concerned with the position of the archbishop vis-à-vis his suffragan bishops.

Next to displaying the common theme of the collection – Salzburg's metropolitan rank –, the reading of the *lemmata* reveals the three cornerstones of its narrative: the Carolingian initiative behind the metropolitan status and their subsequent support for it, the superiority of the Salzburg archbishop regarding his suffragans as defined by the pope himself, and, finally, the four successive papal pallium grants to the archbishops.

2. Letters next to privileges

Being composed of an equal number of letters and privileges,⁴³ the Salzburg collection can be qualified neither as a letter collection nor as a charter collection (or cartulary in its broadest

³⁹ See above n. 20.

⁴⁰ *ChLA*² 116, 14d, l. 71-73: *Leo episcopus seruis seruorum dei reuerentissimis et sanctissimis episcopis [...] simulque abbatibus unacum cuncto clero seu plebi prouintiae Baiuuariorum commorantibus.*

⁴¹ *ChLA*² 116, 14d, l. 95-99.

⁴² *ChLA*² 116, 14d, l. 117-120: *Similiter et omnes uos episcopi, abbates, presbiteri, diaconi, monachi et clerici, abbatisse, sanctaemoniales atque comites, iudices cunctique primates cum uniuersa plebe ammonere et praedicare per apostolicam auctoritatem ediximus, ut unuquisque ordine suo pleniter cum timore et dilectione dei euangelicis atque apostolicis praeceptis seu etiam statutis sanctorum patrum oboedientes existant. Et unusquisque officium suum omni deuotione secundum canonicam auctoritatem obseruet, et omnes concordiam pacis sanctamque caritatem in se inuicem custodiant [...].*

⁴³ And not, as is indicated in *ChLA*² 116, p. 73, 74, of three letters and five privileges.

sense), but only as a mixed collection of both letters and charters.⁴⁴ Thus, it showcases how blurred the lines between these two types of documentary collection can become. However, as Klaus Herbers and Veronika Unger have recently advocated, there are important differences between letters and privileges regarding early medieval papal writings, even though hybrid forms exist.⁴⁵ A privilege is a legal document that establishes or confirms an individual right of a person or institution and whose content is usually subjected to a strictly observed formulary. The letter, on the other hand, has primarily a communicative function and, compared to a charter, is drafted more freely. Moreover, Herbers remarked that papal letters and papal privileges tend to be transmitted distinctly from one another: the simultaneous presence of both papal letters and privileges in the same transmission context – as can be seen in the Salzburg collection – is rather uncommon.⁴⁶ Though the compiler of the Salzburg collection disregarded the generic differences of the pieces – all designated as *epistolae* by the *lemmata* –, looking at this collection of letters and privileges through the lenses of its generic composition proves beneficial to further understand its structure.

The collection contains four papal privileges (items 3, 6-8) each representing a pallium grant to an archbishop. The content of these documents is largely similar; the last two pieces are even identical in wording. Like most pallium privileges, they closely follow the formularies of the *Liber Diurnus*, a set of formularies used in the papal chancery:⁴⁷ they confer the right to wear the pallium by admonishing their recipient of the strictly liturgical use of the vestment and the high pastoral care that it requires. Bound to their formulary traditions, those documents do not provide any definition of the archbishop's powers in his ecclesiastical province. Nor does the privilege Arn received in 798 address the specific circumstances of this particular grant by which the metropolitan see is established.⁴⁸ However, as already established, those two topics are crucial components of the collection's programme. Yet, they nearly exclusively appear in the four letters of the collection. The three letters of Leo III (items 1-2, 4) and specifically the

⁴⁴ On non-epistolary elements in letter collections, see some recent remarks by HACK (2023), p. 1079-1080; on non-diplomatic elements in cartularies, most recently SIRANTOINE (2023). Considering both cases UNGER (2018b), p. 26-28.

⁴⁵ HERBERS (2019); UNGER (2018b), p. 7-10. – For a general perspective on the close relationship between letters and charters and the 'diplomatic letter', see SIRANTOINE (2018).

⁴⁶ HERBERS (2019), p. 136-139. See also UNGER (2018b), p. 26-28.

⁴⁷ On the *Liber Diurnus* influence see above n. 27.

⁴⁸ On the contrary, this document, following its formulary, states that Arn was granted the pallium to be used according to what was granted to his predecessors. *ChLA*² 116, 14c, l. 50-51: *Pallium praeterea iuxta antiquam consuetudinem fraternitati tuae dedimus, quod ita uti memineras sicuti praedecessores nostri tuis praedecessoribus concessere* (= *LD* V 46, ed. FOERSTER (1958), p. 104). However, Arn is the first Salzburg prelate to have obtained the vestment. SCHOENIG, p. 68 with n. 143 signals some minor modifications in the text of the privilege due to Arn's personal presence in Rome at the time of the grant.

lemmata of the latter two determine the authority of the Salzburg archbishop. The first letter, even more so its *lemma*, as well as Louis the Pious' letter of recommendation to Eugene II (item 5) and the *lemma* of the resulting pallium privilege all underline the Carolingian support for the metropolitan see.

Put together, letters and privileges serve different but complementary functions and equally contribute to the collection's programme. The series of pallium privileges establishes a connection between the four archbishops. But they seem to have lacked most of the political and ideological message the collector wanted to pass on. The selected papal letters, on the other hand, allow expressing what the pallium privileges could only have implied as they outline the archbishop's power and stress the Carolingian support for the Salzburg see. Yet, they are unable to link the succeeding archbishops with one another.

3. A mostly chronological order

The Salzburg collection presents a chronological ordering of its items, starting with the three pieces relating to the foundation of the archbishopric in 798, followed by the papal letter written two years later, Louis the Pious' letter of recommendation for Adalram in 824, the resulting pallium grant, and, finally, the two pallium privileges for the subsequent archbishops Liupram and Adalwin.

This chronological succession is a vital feature of the collection. While chronological ordering principles can be found in cartularies, at least as a subcategory,⁴⁹ letter collections do not necessarily present their items in this way; in many cases, thematic ordering principles were applied.⁵⁰ Alternative orderings could be envisaged in the Salzburg case, for example, the three letters of Leo III (nos. 1, 2 and 4) or the four pallium privileges (nos. 3, 6-8) could have been presented in the same sequence. The compiler, however, deliberately arranged the items chronologically, which was partly possible due to the presence of date formulae in the four privileges and the third letter of Leo III.⁵¹ In doing so, the compiler created an unbroken chain of succession that stretched from the founding of the metropolitan see under Arn up to his third successor Adalwin, under whom the collection was composed. The collection depicts a narrative of continuity and tradition. It highlights through the pallium grants the uninterrupted

⁴⁹ See e.g. GUYOTJEANNIN *et al.* (2006), p. 278; DECLERCQ (2000), p. 155-158.

⁵⁰ On this point see among others RICCIARDI (2023), p. 1022, with n. 3; ZINGG (2018), p. 150-151; UNGER (2018a); CONSTABLE (1976), p. 56-62.

⁵¹ On the (non-)presence of date formulae in papal privileges and letters see UNGER (2018b), p. 184-213.

papal, and partly imperial, confirmations of the archiepiscopal rank of each prelate up to the present time.

However, one slight inversion of the chronology occurred. The two letters of Leo III to Charlemagne and the Bavarian bishops, placed first and second, state that the pope granted the pallium to Arn. Yet, it is only through the pallium privilege, placed third, that Arn actually received the vestment. This privilege, and the pallium grant it attests, can only have preceded the two letters that express its result. Without a doubt, the collector was very keen to recreate the chronological succession of the documents. Even though the two letters are not dated, he would likely have been able to identify the relative succession of the first three documents. The disruption of the actual chronological sequence of the first three documents therefore seems deliberate and can be easily explained: placing the two letters before the privilege allows stressing, from the very beginning, the Carolingian roots of the metropolitan rank as well as its authority over its suffragans. Without compromising the overall historical narrative, this slight reversal of chronology provides crucial context that is missing in the pallium privilege.⁵²

4. Choosing and not choosing

The identity and workplace of the author of the collection are largely unknown. Likely established in the vicinity of Salzburg around 870 where he enjoyed access to documents of high political and legal value, the collector was probably a cleric circulating in some proximity to Archbishop Adalwin. Judging by the outcome of his collection, he was primarily, if not solely interested in papal writings, letters and privileges alike, which related to the metropolitan status of the Salzburg church, particularly the grants of the pallium. It is difficult to assert whether he had the originals at hand, separate copies, or extracted the pieces from another already existing collection. However, all the papal writings available to the collector do not seem to have made their way into his collection. Though it remains difficult to assess what he unknowingly ignored and what he knowingly dismissed, multiple signs suggest that the Salzburg collection is the result of a carefully mounted selection process.⁵³

⁵² See above n. 48.

⁵³ In the following, I will not consider the capitulary letter of Gregory II of 716 regarding the reform of the Bavarian church by calling to establish, among others, an ecclesiastical province with an archbishop at its head (J³ ?3681), nor three papal privileges by Zachary (741-752), Stephen II (752-757), and Paul I (757-767) about the extent of Salzburg's diocese (J³ *4000, *4127, *4193; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 7, no. *4-*6). Though the former is extant in a Salzburg manuscript of around 800 (see DIESENBERGER (2004), p. 175-177; KÖRNTGEN (2016), p. 44), there is not sufficient evidence to suggest that it was still known in the late ninth century. The three privileges are only mentioned in a charter of Charlemagne and its confirmation by Louis the Pious (BÖHMER & MÜHLBACHER (1908), nos. 461, 707; KÖLZER (2016), no. 170, p. 420-423).

Excerpts of three letters by Pope Nicolas I to Adalwin of Salzburg, written 859-867, are extant in several canonical collections.⁵⁴ Though the transmission context of these three letters can no longer be traced back to Salzburg, it is possible that the collector had access to these documents written only some years prior to the establishment of the collection. He was, after all, still able to copy, in one way or the other, papal documents going as far back as the late 790s. Two of these letters were undoubtedly excluded because of their apparent thematic incompatibility with the overall theme of the collection: in one letter, the pope replies on how to judge a widow who had become a nun after the death of her husband but then remarried;⁵⁵ another letter deals with sick bishops, clerics possessed by demons in their youth, and the exclusion of clerical office for those who have killed.⁵⁶ These documents do not contain anything of significance to emphasise Salzburg's metropolitan rank.

Only the third letter could have provided some useful material. In this piece, Nicolas charges Adalwin with preventing Bishop Lanfred of Säben from hunting and having a relationship with one of his daughters; he instructs Adalwin to deal with these issues at a local synod.⁵⁷ The pope charging the archbishop to investigate and judge one of his suffragan bishops would have allowed stressing the superior authority of the Salzburg prelate that prominently features in the collection, notably the three letters of Leo III. However, the compiler seems to have disregarded the Nicolas letter. That might be explained by the way the archiepiscopal prerogatives were formulated in this piece: unlike the letters of Leo III where they emerge in broad and universal terms linked to the establishment of the metropolitan see itself,⁵⁸ they appear in Nicolas' letter in relation to a singular dispute of comparatively limited scope. That later letter might have come across as too specific and not decisive enough for the purpose of the collection and its apparent interest in the foundational documents of Salzburg's archiepiscopal authority.

Another piece which does not figure in the collection is extant in a late ninth- or early tenth-century Salzburg manuscript of formularies.⁵⁹ In that anonymised letter to a pope – most certainly Leo III – the author, probably Arn of Salzburg, apologises for being unable to travel to Rome.⁶⁰ It is difficult to assess if the compiler was able to access and identify this letter.

⁵⁴ PERELS (1925), nos. 115, 116, 146, p. 630-633, 663-664. See BÖHMER & HERBERS (1999-2021), nos. 503, 703, 704 for the transmission context of these letters.

⁵⁵ PERELS (1925), no. 146, p. 663-664.

⁵⁶ PERELS (1925), no. 115, p. 630-631.

⁵⁷ PERELS (1925), no. 116, p. 631-633.

⁵⁸ See below n. 33.

⁵⁹ München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4650. On this manuscript see DEPREUX (2021).

⁶⁰ ZEUMER (1886), no. 60, p. 452-453; DÜMMLER (1895), no. 180, p. 298. J³ 4668, 4976; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 9, no. 12; BÖHMER & UNGER (2023), no 23. – On the probable authorship of Arn see BULLOUGH (2002), p. 35-36.

While likely present in Salzburg, the document did so only in a version that did not allow recognising Leo III or Arn. If those elements had been known to the compiler, the only possible reason for their exclusion in the collection would have been a lack of clarity and specificity with regard to the archiepiscopal authority of Salzburg.

Moreover, one deals here with a letter addressed *to* the pope, and not a letter *from* the pope. Other letters of this type seem to have circulated in Salzburg. The fourth item of the *rotulus* collection could suggest another letter of Arn to Pope Leo.⁶¹ As is evident in one of the letters of Nicolas I, Adalwin wrote to Rome at least once to obtain legal advice.⁶² It also seems likely that both Liupram and Adalwin requested their pallium by writing.⁶³ Having been dispatched to Rome, the original letters were most probably no longer available in Salzburg. That said, the collection itself proves that at least one copy of a letter to a pope was kept there, though its author was not one of the archbishops but Louis the Pious. In other places of the Frankish realms during the second half of the ninth century, notably the archiepiscopal sees of Cologne and Rheims, copies or drafts of letters to Rome were preserved.⁶⁴ Assuming this applied to Salzburg as well, the collector appears to have been quite indifferent vis-à-vis such letters, even though some might have overlapped with the topics of his collection, particularly those likely written by Liupram and Adalwin to obtain the pallium. His overall aim, so it seems, did not lie in the reconstruction of a corresponding dialogue between popes and archbishops. He solely wanted to capture the voices of the popes in their pursuit to uplift the rank of the Salzburg church.

5. The collection in context

⁶¹ In this letter to the Bavarian clergy dated 11 April 800, the pope states: *Prelatus vero frater noster reverentissimus et sanctissimus archiepiscopus [sc. Arn] interrogavit nos...* (*ChLA*² 116, 14d, l. 101-102). It is not clear whether Arn made this request through a letter or personally since he stayed in Rome from late 799 until the beginning of 800. See FREUND (2004), p. 214-215.

⁶² PERELS (1925), no. 145, p. 663, l. 29.

⁶³ This is suggested by the two *lemmata* of their pallium privileges in the Salzburg collection that both state that the pope sent (*direxit*) the pallium to their recipients, while Arn is said to have been given (*data*) the ‘privilege and confirmation’ of the vestment and Adalram received (*suscepit*) it. Both Arn and Adalram obtained their pallium personally in Rome. Their two successors, however, seem to have dispatched envoys with letters requesting the vestment. This practice is well attested throughout the ninth century. See SCHOENIG (2016), p. 28-56, 64-67. Twelfth- and fourteenth-century sources state that Adalwin received relics from Nicolas I in connection to his pallium grant (see BÖHMER & HERBERS (1999-2022), no. 513 (the correct reference to the mentioned *Catalogi* is MGH, SS XIII, p. 355)). Given the late date of these traditions, however, it could be that the relics came to Salzburg through Adalwin’s envoys that brought him the pallium. The archbishop could also have received the relics on another occasion, as did his predecessor Liupram (BÖHMER & HERBERS (1999-2022), no. 244) and his successor Theotmar (LOŠEK (1997), p. 57).

⁶⁴ For Cologne see RAITH (2019); for Rheims see ROBERTS (2018) and the relevant entries in FALKENSTEIN & GROBE (2023); for a general overview see UNGER (2018b), p. 128-136.

As Anton Chroust already observed in 1902, the Salzburg *Rotulus* collection appears to be a product of the time around 870.⁶⁵ Its *terminus post quem* lies in its last item: the pallium grant to Adalwin of May 860. The 877 pallium privilege of his successor, Theotmar (873-907), likely constitutes its *terminus ante quem*.⁶⁶ It is indeed difficult to support a composition after this grant for it would have undermined the very purpose of the collection if the most recent pallium privilege to a Salzburg prelate had been missing.

Between 860 and 877, the Salzburg church was embroiled in a deep crisis, linked to the presence of the Byzantine missionaries Methodius and his brother Constantine-Cyril in Pannonia and Moravia.⁶⁷ Following the Frankish victory over the Avars at the end of the eighth century, the region to the south-east of Bavaria came under Carolingian influence. This meant that the local Slavic populations were introduced into the Christian faith – a missionary effort that fell under the responsibility of the Bavarian episcopate, especially the bishops of Passau and Salzburg. Their actions resulted in tensions with the local elite. In his pursuit to push out the Frankish-Bavarian influence, Rastislav of Moravia turned, in 862, to the Byzantine emperor, Michael III, with the request to send missionaries. Michael eagerly replied and dispatched the two brothers Methodius and Cyril who rapidly gained influence in the middle Danube region. The Bavarian episcopate saw their actions very sceptically, but lacked the means to drive them out of what had been their sphere of influence. Around 868, Methodius and Cyril travelled to Rome and managed to obtain papal support for their mission. While Cyril stayed in Rome where he retired to a monastery, his brother continued the mission and was elevated, before the end of 870, to the rank of archbishop by Pope Hadrian II.⁶⁸ That was a significant step in the pursuit of erecting an ecclesiastical structure in the middle Danube region beyond Frankish or Bavarian control. Needless to say, this act directly undermined the claims of the Salzburg church.

Following internal political turmoil in Moravia, the Franks managed to capture Methodius and put him on trial during a synod held in Regensburg in late 870. In the presence of the East Frankish king, Louis the German († 876), Methodius was condemned and imprisoned in a monastery, while the Bavarian bishops were eager to reclaim their influence in the East.

⁶⁵ CHROUST (1902), table 8. However, he did consider the roll as the original version of the collection.

⁶⁶ J³ 6570; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 12, no. 24; BÖHMER & UNGER (2013), no. 290.

⁶⁷ For the historical context exposed in the following two paragraphs, a concise overview is presented by BIGOTT (2002), p. 174-177; WOLFRAM (2014), p. 28-33; CURTA (2019), p. 118-123, 178-198. See also DOPSCH (2002); GOLDBERG (2006), p. 270-288, 299-301, 319-320; WOLFRAM (2012), p. 16-25; BETTI (2014); KOUŘIL (2014); BÜHRER-THIERRY (2015).

⁶⁸ BÖHMER & HERBERS (1999-2021), no. 986; KÖNIGHAUS (2011), p. 14-15, no. *10. On the position of Methodius see BETTI (2014), p. 209-215.

Methodius was finally liberated three years later after a vigorous intervention by Pope John VIII (872-882).

The collection of the Salzburg *Rotulus* very likely emerged out of the conflicts of the late 860s and early 870s. Herwig Wolfram suggested that it was established in preparation for the Regensburg synod and served as some sort of annexe to the *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*⁶⁹ – a historical treaty written by a Salzburg cleric (possibly Archbishop Adalwin himself) to defend Salzburg's claims in Pannonia that was probably meant to be presented to Louis the German at the Regensburg synod.⁷⁰ There are indeed some parallels between the *Conversio* and the collection. Both are likely reactions to Salzburg's undermined authority caused by Methodius and both put an emphasis on Carolingian support for Salzburg. It could even be that the collection influenced some parts of the *Conversio*.⁷¹ However, one should refrain from pushing the link too far. Unlike the *Conversio*, the collection lacks any material to effectively assert the missionary territory claimed by Salzburg. The idea of mission itself is completely absent. A collection of some royal charters would have proven more useful in this regard.⁷² The collection's probative force to the issues defended in the *Conversio* and debated at the Regensburg synod is scarce: it asserts that the Salzburg church has been an archiepiscopal see since the times of Charlemagne and Leo III – a fact that was not challenged by anyone at this time. The collection proves beyond any doubt something that did not require proof. Unlike the *Conversio*, it was probably not destined for Louis the German or the Regensburg synod.

Moreover, the legal value of the collection in itself is limited. Indeed, the pallium – its main concern – is granted *ad personam*; it is a personal gift the pope confers individually on a bishop or archbishop. It does not belong to the possessions of the recipient's church.⁷³ Consequently, the validity of the pallium privilege is restricted to the recipient's lifetime.⁷⁴ The juxtaposition of four pallium privileges, as seen in the Salzburg collection, might at best present sufficient precedents for a new archbishop of Salzburg to lay claim to the garment. Henceforth, if the collection had any judiciary purpose, it would have been intended for the pope to receive the

⁶⁹ WOLFRAM (1995), p. 295. See also HAUTHALER & MARTIN (1916), p. XIII; WATTENBACH *et al.* (1990), p. 818.

⁷⁰ On the *Conversio*, see LOŠEK (1997), p. 5-53; WOLFRAM (2012), p. 15-45. See also the rich bibliography presented by GESCHICHTSQUELLEN (2023), <https://www.geschichtsquellen.de/werk/1336>.

⁷¹ The mentions of the pallium grants to all Salzburg archbishops in the *Conversio* (LOŠEK (1997), c. 8-9, p. 114-119; WOLFRAM (2012), c. 8-9, p. 68-71) could point to the influence of the collection. But see the remarks by LOŠEK (1997), p. 43-44.

⁷² See especially BÖHMER & MÜHLBACHER (1908), nos. 461, 707.

⁷³ JOHRENDT (2004), p. 63-64; SCHOENIG (2016), p. 23-26, 118-126.

⁷⁴ UNGER (2018b), p. 148-149.

pallium. But the pope does not confer the pallium based on precedent; he does so after the individual evaluation of the moral qualities of the one requesting it.⁷⁵

Alternatively, one could suggest the collection to be some sort of *vade mecum* intended for the person seeking the pallium in Rome, not to obtain it but to ensure the privilege received conforms to Salzburg traditions.⁷⁶ In such a scenario, however, the letters of Leo III and Louis the Pious would be of no use.

Rather than to propose an external audience, it seems more fruitful to consider a local one. The collection traces back the origins and the successive confirmations of the metropolitan status of the Salzburg church. It presents a succession of its pastors, who all have gained the precious gift of the pallium; their virtue was continuously recognised and rewarded by no one less than the bishops of Rome themselves. The collection thereby celebrates and perpetuates the identity and memory of the Salzburg church as a metropolitan see. Its audience was likely to be found in Salzburg itself. The focus on the archiepiscopal rank is almost certainly a reaction to the threat to Salzburg's authority posed by Methodius around 870. By reproducing the founding documents of its metropolitan status and projecting the unbroken succession of its archbishops through their continuous pallium grants, the collection highlights the seniority of the Bavarian archbishopric in contrast to the newcomer Methodius. Although the latter enjoyed active papal support around 870, the collection exhibits that the Salzburg prelates had constantly been uplifted by the bishops of Rome for four generations already.

6. The tenth-century *rotulus* copy

Several decades after its initial composition, the Salzburg collection was copied on a still extant *rotulus*.⁷⁷ This copy was not updated with additional pallium privileges.⁷⁸ Whereas the initial version linked past to present, the copy linked past times to fewer past times. Herwig Wolfram's observation of a 'perhaps stronger inner Salzburg connection'⁷⁹ of the copy must therefore be upheld, even strongly highlighted since the initial collection was very likely not intended for an external audience either. Furthermore, the lack of updates in this new version

⁷⁵ SCHOENIG (2016), p. 56-64.

⁷⁶ On such a practice see UNGER (2018b), p. 9.

⁷⁷ A second copy was made in the late thirteenth century when the collection was inserted in the *Salzburger Kammerbücher* (Wien, ÖStA, HHStA, HS W 194/1). Description by HAUTHALER & MARTIN (1916), p. XIII-XV.

⁷⁸ Up to the middle of the tenth century, pallium grants are attested to Theotmar (see above n. 66), Herold (see below n. 89), and Frederick (after April 958; J³ *7762; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 14, no. *30; BÖHMER & ZIMMERMANN, no. 277).

⁷⁹ WOLFRAM (1995), p. 295: 'Die Briefsammlung wurde am Beginn des 10. Jahrhunderts aus einem aktuellen Anlaß mit vielleicht stärker innersalzburgischem Bezug kopiert'.

as well as the likely original wording of the *lemmata*, mentioned above, suggest that the copy intended to reproduce the original collection.

However, it can no longer be determined to what extent the roll format may or may not be linked to the initial version. Though they rarely survive, rolls are not foreign to the early medieval Latin world;⁸⁰ late ninth- or early tenth-century *rotulus* collections of letters or charters can be found for example in Fulda as well as in Arezzo, Novara, and Ravenna.⁸¹ The often-mentioned relative mobility of medieval rolls does not seem to apply to the Salzburg case:⁸² its collection has a rather local scope that does not strike to be intended to a wider audience. It also appears that the roll did not circulate beyond Salzburg.⁸³ Furthermore, there is no indication for any regular or practical use of the roll – may it be judiciary or didactical, as formulae for example. Additionally, the ability of a roll to be extendable at will by adding new sheets was not considered either:⁸⁴ as mentioned, the Salzburg manuscript was not updated with new material. The roll format could be related to the small size of the collection. It allows for the collection to be presented in a manner exclusively dedicated to itself. There is no risk for it to be overshadowed by other texts, as could easily happen in a miscellaneous codex. The roll may have provided an elegant and efficient way to put this collection and its narrative into the spotlight.

Wolfram suggested a link between this copy and another episode of crisis in Salzburg occurring in 900.⁸⁵ In this year, Archbishop Theotmar, in accordance with all the bishops of his province, wrote a letter to Pope John IX (898-900) complaining that an archbishop with two bishops had been sent from Rome to Moravia.⁸⁶ Though the metropolitan authority of the Salzburg church felt similarly threatened at this moment than it did around 870, associating the copy with that episode is not self-evident. Above all, that would overstretch the palaeographic evidence presented thus far. Opposing Anton Chroust's dating of 870-877, Johannes Haller

⁸⁰ On medieval rolls see among others KÖSSINGER (2015); DOUBLIER *et al.* (2020), p. 11-13. See also the extensive bibliography presented by CRULH (*s.d.*), <https://crulh.univ-lorraine.fr/node/1042>.

⁸¹ For Fulda see MERSIOWSKY (2017), p. 111. For Arezzo see most recently BOUGARD (2022), p. 149, n. 242. For Novara see ROSENWEIN (1996), p. 281-289. For Ravenna see ROZEIN (2022). – The recent database of French cartulary rolls contains no exemplar prior to the eleventh century: ROTULI (2021), <https://rotuli.univ-lorraine.fr/s/rotuli/page/welcome>.

⁸² *E.g.* KÖSSINGER (2015), p. 164.

⁸³ SICKEL (1867), p. 266.

⁸⁴ KÖSSINGER (2015), p. 156.

⁸⁵ WOLFRAM (1995), p. 295.

⁸⁶ J³ ?7382; BRACKMANN (1910), p. 13, no. 26. Their claims were supported by Archbishop Hatto of Mainz in another letter (J³ ?7374; JAKOBS (1978), p. 71-72, no. 54). Both letters are transmitted with the forgeries of Pilgrim of Passau (971-991), which led some historians to doubt the authenticity of these pieces. However, recent scholarship tends to accept their authenticity. See LOŠEK (1997), p. 73-79, 86-87; HERBERS (2007), p. 24-27; ERKENS (2011), p. 115*-123*; SCHRÖDER (2022), p. 217-221 (who also provides their latest edition). On Pilgrim's forgeries see ERKENS (2011) and, without discussing Theotmar's and Hatto's letters, ROACH (2021), p. 61-112.

associated the writing of the *rotulus* with the *Codex traditionum Odalberti*, composed in Salzburg in 934/935.⁸⁷ Bernard Bischoff – to whom Wolfram referenced – supported this assessment; Karl Forstner, in turn, supported Bischoff's.⁸⁸

If one traces back the generally adopted 'early tenth-century' dating of the *rotulus* to its roots, Theotmar's complaint to John IX of 900 seems too early to situate the creation of the *rotulus*. A later occasion during the first half of the tenth century appears more plausible. One could speculate about another pallium-related issue, the attested pallium grant to Archbishop Herold (939-955) after September 939 for example,⁸⁹ or a moment of profound crisis, such as the aftermath of the battle of Pressburg (907) during which Archbishop Theotmar, along with many other members of the Bavarian aristocracy, died in a fight with the Huns. Another, maybe more apparent solution might be the mentioned *Codex Odalberti* itself. The latter contains around 100 copies of legal transactions mostly made during the episcopate of Adalbert (or Odalbert) of Salzburg (923-935) regarding the estates of his church. Following its preface, the *Codex* should prevent any doubt that may arise against these transactions.⁹⁰ Though their collections are quantitatively and qualitatively distinct, the *Codex* and the *rotulus* are both preoccupied with preserving the status and privileges of the Salzburg church and represent efforts to secure its institutional memory. The copy of the Salzburg collection could easily have come forth as a by-product of the enterprise of the *Codex Odalberti*.

7. Conclusion

Combining four papal privileges, three papal letters, and one imperial letter, the collection transmitted by the Salzburg *Rotulus* is to be considered among the historical narratives produced in Carolingian Salzburg.⁹¹ It recounts how Pope Leo, acting by common accord with King Charlemagne, elevated Arn of Salzburg above all bishops of Bavaria to the rank of archbishop and granted him the right to wear the pallium, subsequently conferred upon his three successors. To produce this account, the author of the collection carefully selected and arranged his material: the three documents of 798, presented in a slightly reversed

⁸⁷ HALLER (1903), p. 361. Independent and similar observations also by SILVA-TAROUCA (1931), p. 27-28. – SICKEL (1867), p. 266 already proposed an early tenth-century dating. – On the *Codex traditionum Odalberti* (Wien, ÖStA, HHStA, HS R 41) see HAUTHALER (1910), p. 55-56; FICHTENAU (1971), p. 100-104; UNTERKIRCHER *et al.* (1981), p. 82, no. 146; KININGER (2016). A digitalised version of the manuscript is available: ÖStA (*s.d.a.*), <https://www.archivinformationssystem.at/detail.aspx?ID=12021>.

⁸⁸ BISCHOFF (1980), p. 83, n. 97; FORSTNER (1998), p. 260-261.

⁸⁹ J³ *7629; BÖHMER & ZIMMERMANN (1998), no. 155a.

⁹⁰ HAUTHALER (1910), p. 63.

⁹¹ In this regard, the collection is discussed neither in the classical study of LHOTSKY (1963) nor, more recently, by NÓTÁRI (2011).

chronological order, and Leo's admonition letter of 800 form the founding documents of Salzburg's metropolitan authority; they stress the Carolingian initiative of the act, define the archbishop's superiority and due obedience of their suffragans, and associate the pallium with this newly acquired position. The following pallium grants, with or without direct Carolingian assistance, connect the subsequent archbishops to the position Arn initially gained by papal authority.

In many ways, the pallium is at the centre of the collection. Separately, the concession of the vestment represents a mark of distinction conferred upon each archbishop individually: it expresses the papal recognition of their worthiness and virtue. Put together in a sequence, the pallium grants link the archbishops to one another, creating an unbroken tradition that stretches from the very founding of the archdiocese to the present time. Through this community of pallium wearers, it is the see of Salzburg itself that appears and that is celebrated as being both highly esteemed by the popes and closely bound to the Roman church.

Although the collection represents a likely reaction to Salzburg's undermined authority by Methodius around 870, it was probably not intended for any legal or judiciary use. Instead, it was most likely destined for a local audience – an instrument to elevate the city's prestige during a time of threat. More than half a century after its composition, the collection was copied in an enterprise that might be linked to the *Codex Odalberti*. This version did not encompass any new material. It only accentuated the initial concern to perpetuate the institutional identity and memory of the Salzburg church, already present in the original. Intentionally or not, the *rotulus* format chosen to harbour this copy allowed to further promote the narrative of the collection.

The story of the collection does not end with the *rotulus*. Three centuries before it was inserted, in the late 1200s, at the beginning of what was to become the first volume of the *Salzburger Kammerbücher*,⁹² a cleric called Pilgrim, the nephew of Archbishop Frederick of Salzburg (958-991), came in contact with it. It is unknown whether he consulted the original collection, the *rotulus* copy or another exemplar. After becoming bishop of Passau (971-991), Pilgrim set up an extensive series of forgeries meant to demonstrate the old age of Passau's supposed archiepiscopal rank. At the core of these forged documents were several papal letters and privileges, largely modelled on the pieces he had discovered in Salzburg. In his pursuit to

⁹² See above n. 77.

elevate the rank of his bishopric, Pilgrim felt inspired by the Salzburg collection's narrative and was determined to emulate and surpass it.⁹³

F.R.S.–FNRS.

Matthias ROZEIN.

Université de Liège.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>ChLA</i> ² | see CAVALLO & NICOLAJ (1997-2019) |
| HHStA | Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv |
| J ³ | see JAFFÉ & HERBERS (since 2016) |
| MGH | <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i> |
| ÖStA | Österreichisches Staatsarchiv |

Bibliography

- M. BETTI (2014), *The Making of Christian Moravia (858-882). Papal Power and Political Reality*, Leiden, Boston.
- B. BIGOTT (2002), *Ludwig der Deutsche und die Reichskirche im Ostfränkischen Reich (826-876)*, Husum.
- B. BISCHOFF (1980), *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. 2, Wiesbaden.
- J.F. BÖHMER & K. HERBERS (1999-2021), *Regesta Imperii. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751-918 (987). Papstregesten 800-911. Teil 2. 844-872*, 3 vol., Köln, Weimar, Wien.
- J.F. BÖHMER & E. MÜHLBACHER (1908), *Regesta Imperii. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751-918*, Innsbruck.
- J.F. BÖHMER & V. UNGER (2013), *Regesta Imperii. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751-918 (987). Papstregesten 800-911. Teil 3. 872-882*, Wien, Köln, Weimar.
- J.F. BÖHMER & V. UNGER (2023), *Regesta Imperii. Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern 751-918 (987). Papstregesten 800-911. Teil 1. 800 (795)-844*, Wien, Köln.
- J.F. BÖHMER & H. ZIMMERMANN (1998), *Regesta Imperii II. Sächsische Zeit. Papstregesten 911-1024*, 2nd ed. (first published 1969), Wien, Köln, Weimar.
- F. BOUGARD (2022), *Le royaume d'Italie de Louis II à Otton I^{er} (840-968). Histoire politique*, Leipzig.
- A. BRACKMANN (1910), *Germania Pontificia*, vol. 1/1, Berlin.
- D. BULLOUGH (2002), *Alcuin. Achievement and Reputation*, Leiden.
- G. BÜHRER-THIERRY (2015), *La compétition liturgique entre Grecs et Latins en Europe centrale au IX^e siècle*, in P. DEPREUX, F. BOUGARD & R. LE JAN (ed.), *Compétition et sacré au haut Moyen Âge. Entre médiation et exclusion*, Turnhout, p. 255-272.

⁹³ On Pilgrim's forgeries see ERKENS (2011); ROACH (2021), p. 61-112.

Matthias ROZEIN, *Collecting Papal Letters and Privileges in Late Carolingian Bavaria. The Salzburg Rotulus and its Narrative*, in *Latomus*, 84/3, 2025, p. 521-544. DOI: 10.2143/LAT.84.3.3295229.

N. CAVALLO & G. NICOLAJ (ed.) (1997-2019), *Chartae latinae antiquiores. Facsimile-edition of the Latin Charters. 2nd series*, vol. 50-118, Dietikon-Zürich.

A. CHROUST (1902), *Monumenta Palaeographica. Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des Mittelalters. Erste Abteilung. Schrifttafeln in lateinischer und deutscher Sprache. I. Serie. Lieferung 7*, München.

F. CURTA (2019), *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500-1300)*, vol. 1, Leiden, Boston.

G. CONSTABLE (1976), *Letters and Letter-Collections*, Turnhout.

CRULH (s.d.), *Aperçu bibliographique sur l'usage des rouleaux dans l'Occident médiéval*, <https://crulh.univ-lorraine.fr/node/1042>, last accessed: 12.12.2023.

G. DECLERCQ (2000), *Originals and Cartularies. The Organization of Archival Memory (Ninth-Eleventh Centuries)*, in K.J. HEIDECCKER (ed.), *Charters and the Use of the Written Word in Medieval Society*, Turnhout, p. 147-170.

P. DEPREUX (2021), *Variations on Some Common Topics in Medieval Latin Letters. The Case of the Salzburg Formulae Collection*, in S. BRINKMANN, G. CIOTTI, S. VALENTE & E. M. WILDEN (ed.), *Education Materialised. Reconstructing Teaching and Learning Contexts through Manuscripts*, Berlin, p. 417-439.

T. DESWARTE, K. HERBERS, C. SCHERER (ed.) (2018), *Frühmittelalterliche Briefe. Übermittlung und Überlieferung (4.-11. Jahrhundert)*, Köln.

M. DIESENBERGER (2004), *Sammeln und gestalten. Erinnern und vergessen. Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg und die Ursprünge des Salzburger Episkopats*, in W. POHL (ed.), *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, Wien, p. 171-189.

DOMKAPITEL ZU SALZBURG (ed.) (1998), *1200 Jahre Erzbistum Salzburg. Dom und Geschichte. Festschrift*, Salzburg.

H. DOPSCH (2002), *Zwischen Salzburg, Byzanz und Rom. Zur Missionierung Pannoniens im 9. Jahrhundert*, in *Zala Múzeum* 11, p. 267-294.

E. DOUBLIER, J. JOHRENDT & M.P. ALBERZONI (ed.) (2020), *Der Rotulus im Gebrauch. Einsatzmöglichkeiten, Gestaltungsvarianz, Deutungen*, Wien, Köln, Weimar.

E. DÜMLER (1895), *Alcuini sive Albini epistolae*, in *MGH. Epistolae*, vol. 4, p. 18-481.

F.-R. ERKENS (2011), *Die Fälschungen Pilgrims von Passau. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung und Edition nach dem Codex Gottwicensis 53a (rot), 56 (weiß)*, München.

L. FALKENSTEIN & R. GROBE (with the collaboration of R. FRIEDRICH & S. GENSICKE) (2023), *Gallia Pontificia online. Reims I. Erzbischöfe*, Paris, <https://qed.perspectivia.net/gallia-pontificia-online/regesten/reims1/>, last accessed: 31.07.2023.

H. FICHTENAU (1971), *Das Urkundenwesen in Österreich vom 8. bis zum frühen 13. Jahrhundert*, Wien.

H. FOERSTER (1958), *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum. Gesamtausgabe*, Bern.

K. FORSTNER (1998), *Neue Funde und Erkenntnisse zum karolingischen Schriftwesen von Salzburg und Mattsee*, in *Scriptorium* 52/2, p. 255-277.

S. FREUND (2004), *Von den Agilolfingern zu den Karolingern. Bayerns Bischöfe zwischen Kirchenorganisation, Reichsintegration und karolingischer Reform (700-847)*, München.

M. GARRISON (1999), *Send More Socks. On the Mentality and Preservation Context of Medieval Letters*, in M. MOSTERT (ed.), *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, Turnhout, p. 69-99.

Matthias ROZEIN, *Collecting Papal Letters and Privileges in Late Carolingian Bavaria. The Salzburg Rotulus and its Narrative*, in *Latomus*, 84/3, 2025, p. 521-544. DOI: 10.2143/LAT.84.3.3295229.

GESCHICHTSQUELLEN DES DEUTSCHEN MITTELALTERS (2023), s.v. *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, <https://www.geschichtsquellen.de/werk/1336>, last accessed: 12.12.2023.

E.J. GOLDBERG (2006), *Struggle for Empire. Kingship and Conflict under Louis the German, 817-876*, Ithaca, NY.

O. GUYOTJEANNIN, L. MORELLE, M. PARISSÉ (ed.) (1993), *Les cartulaires. Actes de la Table ronde organisée par l'École nationale des chartes et le GDR 121 du CNRS, Paris, 5-7 décembre 1991*, Paris.

O. GUYOTJEANNIN, J. PYCKE, B.-M. TOCK (2006), *Diplomatique médiévale*, 3rd ed. (first published 1993), Turnhout.

A.-T. HACK (2023), *Vom Archiv zum Kodex. Codex Carolinus und Bonifatii et Lulli Epistolae im Vergleich*, in *I Franchi. Atti della Settimane di studi (Spoleto, 21-27 aprile 2022)*, vol. 2, Spoleto, p. 1063-1083.

C.-B. HACKE (1898), *Die Palliumverleihungen bis 1143. Eine diplomatisch-historische Studie*, Göttingen.

J. HALLER (1903), *Palaeographisches*, in *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 20/8, p. 357-365.

W. HAUTHALER (ed.) (1910), *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 1, *Traditionscodices*, Salzburg.

W. HAUTHALER & F. MARTIN (1916) (ed.), *Salzburger Urkundenbuch*, vol. 2, *Urkunden von 790-1199*, Salzburg.

K. HERBERS (2007), *Päpstliche Autorität und päpstliche Entscheidungen an der Wende vom 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, in W. HARTMANN (ed.), *Recht und Gericht in Kirche und Welt um 900*, München, p. 7-30.

K. HERBERS (2019), *Papstbriefe und Papsturkunden. Abgrenzungen und Überschneidungen im früheren Mittelalter*, in A. STIELDORF (ed.), *Die Urkunde. Text, Bild, Objekt*, Berlin, p. 125-139.

K. HERBERS & V. UNGER (ed.) (2019), *Papstbriefe des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Darmstadt.

P. JAFFÉ & K. HERBERS (since 2016), *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, 5 vol., Göttingen.

H. JAKOBS (1978), *Germania Pontificia*, vol. 4/4, Göttingen.

D. JASPER & H. FUHRMANN (2001), *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, Washington, D.C.

J. JOHRENDT (2004), *Papsttum und Landeskirchen im Spiegel der päpstlichen Urkunden (896-1046)*, Hannover.

K. KININGER (2016), *Der Codex Odalberti. Das älteste Salzburger Traditionsbuch*, in *Bischof. Kaiser. Jedermann. 200 Jahre Salzburg bei Österreich*, Salzburg, p. 166-168.

T. KÖLZER (2016), *Die Urkunden Ludwigs des Frommen*, 3 vol., Wiesbaden (MGH. Diplomata).

W. KÖNIGHAUS (2011), *Bohemia-Moravia Pontificia. Germania Pontificia*, vol. 5/3, Göttingen.

L. KÖRNTGEN (2016), *Bonifatius, Bayern und das fränkische Kirchenrecht. Zur Überlieferung des Capitulare Papst Gregors III. für Bayern (716)*, in G. BLENNEMANN, C. KLEINJUNG, T. KOHL (dir.), *Konstanz und Wandel. Religiöse Lebensformen im europäischen Mittelalter*, Affalterbach, p. 33-56.

N. KÖSSINGER (2015), *Gerollte Schrift. Mittelalterliche Texte auf Rotuli*, in A. KEHNEL & D. PANAGIOTOPOULOS (ed.), *Schriftträger, Textträger. Zur materialen Präsenz des Geschriebenen in frühen Gesellschaften*, Berlin, p. 151-168.

P. KOUŘIL (ed.) (2014), *The Cyril and Methodius Mission and Europe. 1150 Years since the Arrival of the Thessaloniki Brothers in Great Moravia*, Praha.

A. LHOTSKY (1963), *Quellenkunde zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte Österreichs*, Graz, Köln.

F. LOŠEK (1997), *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, Hannover.

- Matthias ROZEIN, *Collecting Papal Letters and Privileges in Late Carolingian Bavaria. The Salzburg Rotulus and its Narrative*, in *Latomus*, 84/3, 2025, p. 521-544. DOI: 10.2143/LAT.84.3.3295229.
- R. MCKITTERICK, D. VAN ESPELO, R. POLLARD & R. PRICE (ed.) (2021), *Codex Epistolaris Carolinus. Letters from the Popes to the Frankish Rulers, 739-791. Translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Liverpool.
- M. MERSIOWSKY (2015), *Früh- und hochmittelalterliche Briefe. Ein Überblick*, in P. RÜCKERT (ed.), *Briefe aus dem Spätmittelalter. Herrschaftliche Korrespondenz im deutschen Südwesten*, Stuttgart, p. 9-31.
- M. MERSIOWSKY (2017), *Früh- bis spätmittelalterliche Kopien karolingischer Diplome für „deutsche“ und „österreichische“ Empfänger*, in N. D'ACUNTO, W. HUSCHNER & S. ROEBERT (ed.), *Originale – Fälschungen – Kopien. Kaiser- und Königsurkunden für Empfänger in „Deutschland“ und „Italien“ (9.-11. Jahrhundert) und ihre Nachwirkungen im Hoch- und Spätmittelalter (bis ca. 1500)*, Leipzig, p. 105-116.
- MONASTERIUM.NET (s.d.a), s.v. *Urkunde. Salzburg, Domkapitel (831-1802). AUR 0870-0877*, https://www.monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgDK/AUR_0870-0877/charter, last accessed: 12.12.2023.
- MONASTERIUM.NET (s.d.b), s.v. *Urkunde. Salzburg, Erzstift (798-1806) AUR ca. 870*, https://www.monasterium.net/mom/AT-HHStA/SbgE/AUR_ca_870/charter, last accessed: 12.12.2023.
- T. NÓTÁRI (2011), *Bavarian Historiography in Early Medieval Salzburg*, Passau.
- ÖSTA (s.d.a), s.v. *HHStA HS R 41 Salzburger Traditions-codex. Codex Odalberti*, <https://www.archivinformationssystem.at/detail.aspx?ID=12021>, last accessed: 12.12.2023.
- ÖSTA (s.d.b), s.v. *HHStA UR AUR 15 Salzburger Rotulus*, <https://www.archivinformationssystem.at/detail.aspx?ID=27604>, last accessed: 12.12.2023.
- D.C. PANGERL (2011), *Die Metropolitanverfassung des karolingischen Frankenreiches*, Hannover.
- E. PERELS (ed.) (1925), *Nicolai I. papae epistolae*, in *MGH. Epistolae*, vol. 6, Berlin, p. 257-690.
- L. RAIH (2019), *Eine Kölner Briefsammlung auf Abwegen. Kölner Papstbriefe des 9.-11. Jahrhunderts und ihre Trierer Überlieferung*, in *Geschichte in Köln* 66, p. 65-86.
- A. RICCIARDI (2023), *Forme e funzione dell'epistolografia nel mondo franco*, in *I Franchi. Atti della Settimana di studi (Spoleto, 21-27 aprile 2022)*, vol. 2, Spoleto, p. 1021-1061.
- L. ROACH (2021), *Forgery and Memory at the End of the First Millennium*, Princeton.
- E. ROBERTS (2018), *Construire une hiérarchie épiscopale. Flodoard de Reims et la correspondance de l'archevêque Foulques (vers 850-vers 950)*, in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 61, p. 11-25.
- B. ROSENWEIN (1996), *The Family Politics of Berengar I, King of Italy 888-924*, in *Speculum* 71, p. 247-289.
- ROTULI (2021), *Inventaire des cartulaires-rouleaux médiévaux français*, <https://rotuli.univ-lorraine.fr/s/rotuli/page/welcome>, last accessed: 12.12.2023.
- M. ROZEIN (2022), *Die acht Briefe der Rückseite des "Rotulus von Ravenna". Eine Briefsammlung zu Erzbischof Johannes von Ravenna (905-914)*, in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 104/2, p. 269-300.
- L. SANTIFALLER (1976), *Liber Diurnus. Studien und Forschungen*, ed. H. ZIMMERMANN, Stuttgart.
- C. SCHERER (2013), *Der Pontifikat Gregors IV. (827-844). Vorstellungen und Wahrnehmungen päpstlichen Handelns im 9. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart.
- S.A. SCHOENIG (2016), *Bonds of Wool. The Pallium and Papal Power in the Middle Ages*, Baltimore.
- I. SCHRÖDER (ed.) (2022), *Epistolae variorum 798-923*, Wiesbaden (MGH. Epistolae, 9).
- T. SICKEL (1867), *Acta regum et imperatorum Karolinorum digesta et enarrata*, vol. 2, Wien.
- C. SILVA-TAROUCA (1931), *Nuovi studi sulle antiche lettere dei papi*, in *Gregorianum* 12, p. 3-56, 349-425, 547-598.

Matthias ROZEIN, *Collecting Papal Letters and Privileges in Late Carolingian Bavaria. The Salzburg Rotulus and its Narrative*, in *Latomus*, 84/3, 2025, p. 521-544. DOI: 10.2143/LAT.84.3.3295229.

H. SIRANTOINE (ed.) (2018), *La lettre diplomatique. Écriture épistolaire et actes de la pratique dans l'Occident médiéval*, Madrid.

H. SIRANTOINE (2023), *Cartularization and Genre Boundaries. Reflection on the Nondiplomatic Material of the Toledan Cartularies (End of the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century)*, in *Speculum* 98/1, p. 164-212.

V. UNGER (2018a), *Boten und ihre Briefe. Ordnungskategorien in Archiven und Briefsammlungen*, in DESWARTE *et alii*, p. 155-168.

V. UNGER (2018b), *Päpstliche Schriftlichkeit im 9. Jahrhundert. Archiv, Register, Kanzlei*, Wien, Köln, Weimar.

F. UNTERKIRCHER, H. HORNINGER & F. LACKNER (1981), *Die datierten Handschriften in Wien außerhalb der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek bis zum Jahre 1600*, vol. 1, Wien.

W. WATTENBACH, W. LEVISON & H. LÖWE (1990), *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger*, vol. 6, Weimar.

L. WOLFINGER (ed.) (2006), *Die sogenannten Carmina Salisburgensia und der Clm. 14743*, in H. WOLFRAM (ed.), *Quellen zur Salzburger Frühgeschichte*, München, p. 179-262.

H. WOLFRAM (1995), *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich. Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Wien, München.

H. WOLFRAM (ed.) (2012), *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantänien und Pannonien*, 2nd ed. (first published 1979), Ljubljana.

H. WOLFRAM (2014), *The Bavarian Mission to Pannonia in the 9th Century*, in KOUŘIL (ed.), p. 28-33.

I. WOOD (2018), *Why collect Letters?*, in G.M. MÜLLER (ed.), *Zwischen Alltagskommunikation und literarischer Identitätsbildung. Studien zur lateinischen Epistolographie in Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*, Stuttgart, p. 45-61.

W. YSEBAERT (2015), *Medieval Letters and Letter Collections as Historical Sources. Methodological Questions, Reflections, and Research Perspectives (Sixth–Fifteenth Centuries)*, in C. HÖGEL & E. BARROLI (ed.), *Medieval Letters. Between Fiction and Document*, Turnhout, p. 33-62.

K. ZEUMER (1886), *Formulae Salzburgenses*, in *MGH. Formulae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, Hannover, p. 438-455.

R. ZINGG (2018), *Grundsätzliche Überlegungen zu Briefen und Briefsammlungen des frühen Mittelalters bezüglich Quellengattung und Überlieferung*, in DESWARTE *et alii*, p. 141-154.