

schöfe“, as he puts it. Nevertheless, I find his model of charter production a significant improvement on previous ones. In terms of contents, I first consider Huschner’s approach and methodology (Section 2), after which I offer an extended examination of how his model of charter production – including the resulting identifications of bishops with draftsman-scribes – works for the reign of Otto I (Section 3). Finally, I seek to draw wider conclusions on this basis (Section 4).

Until the Ottonian diplomas have been systematically re-edited – a task now long overdue²¹ – any such survey must be considered preliminary. To keep the material manageable, I have not sought to test the identifications of draftsman („Verfasser“) and scribe („Schreiber“ or „Mundator“) offered by Sickel and his team systematically, though even cursory examination has led to some important corrections and adjustments. As is well known, Sickel and his associates worked primarily from hand drawn facsimiles and tracings, rather than single sheets and photos, so further amendments are to be anticipated²². Any attempt to start reassigning scribal identities without undertaking an autopsy of the full corpus would, however, be premature. In any case, Huschner himself works largely from the Sickelian identifications, so it is on their basis that his arguments must initially stand and fall.

2. Methodological considerations on the „Huschner thesis“

There can be little doubt that Huschner’s model of charter production is a marked improvement on previous ones. He is right to note that Sickel assumed too much centralization and institutionalization; and he is equally right to observe that large elements of Sickel’s teachings survived their initial deconstruction at Kehr’s and Klewitz’ hands unscathed. Huschner’s greatest achievement, however, is not simply to question old assumptions. His model of different types of notary, with varying degrees of association with the court, allows us finally to break free of the old chancery-recipient binary. In doing so, he develops – consciously or not – a point made by Jaap Kruisheer in the

21) Cf. Carlrichard BRÜHL, *Derzeitige Lage und künftige Aufgaben der Diplomatik*, in: *Landesherrliche Kanzleien im Spätmittelalter* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung 35, 1984) p. 37–47, at p. 40.

22) On the *modus operandi* of Sickel and his team (and its limitations): SICKEL, *Programm* (as n. 2) p. 473–477; KEHR, *Kanzlei Ludwigs des Kindes* (as n. 5) p. 39–40. See also KEHR, *Kanzlei Ludwigs des Deutschen* (as n. 5) p. 4.