

another diploma in favour of Chur⁵⁰. Sickel believed he could detect LE's formulation („Diktat“) behind another seven diplomas of these years (many of them copied by LB or LC), of which three are for Chur, one for Hartbert himself (the LC privilege already mentioned), one for Schwarzach (another LC diploma) and one for Pfäfers⁵¹. That these are all southern Swabian notaries should be abundantly clear. The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that Sickel's original hand identifications are not entirely reliable here: the single sheets ascribed to LB reveal significant variation, suggesting that at least two (and probably three) hands lie behind this designation⁵²; one of the Chur diplomas attributed to LC probably also belongs to another notary⁵³; and two diplomas originally attributed to LE have (rightly) been assigned by Hoffmann to different hands⁵⁴. But regardless of how we wish to assign responsibility for these acts, the hands form a clear group, often operating together, typically for southern Swabian recipients.

50) D O I 182. Sickel also identified LE as draftsman („Verfasser“) of this diploma.

51) DD O I 148, 175, 188, 191, 224, 225, 326. Note that D O I 188 is one of the infamous forgeries of Karl Widmer.

52) DD O I 174, 175 are clearly in the same hand, but questions arise over the other two. In D O I 182, Chur, Bischofliches Archiv, 011.0016, the scribe uses a different abbreviation sign from that otherwise employed by LC; his *x* also lacks a descender on the second stroke, while the left diagonal stroke on *v* stays within the script line. In D O I 218, Einsiedeln, Klosterarchiv, A.BI.2, by contrast, the *elongatae* do indeed look to be LB's, but the scribe of the main text forms his abbreviation sign differently, while his *g* often has two loops (rather than one) at the end of the bowl; there are also often descenders on *d*, where previously there had been none. Whether these differences can be explained by natural evolution of the hand or imitation of earlier models seems questionable, not least since the *g* in D O I 94 (his immediate model here) is formed more like those in LB's first two performances: Einsiedeln, Klosterarchiv, A.BI.1. Sickel was well aware of these differences, and by his own admission was only able to consult the the former two documents side-by-side; nevertheless, he was convinced that they were all the work of a single notary: Beiträge VI (as n. 2) p. 362 f., 372–376. Note that D O I 188 is one of the infamous forgeries of Karl Widmer.

53) D O I 209, Chur, Bischofliches Archiv, 011.0018. The key differences are the form of the flourishes on the ascender of *f* (LC's most distinctive feature) and the formation of the ampersand. Sickel himself spoke of a „Nachzeichnung“.

54) DD O I 217, 279, with HOFFMANN, Notare (as n. 14) p. 441–443. On the former, the original of which is now in public hands: Theo KÖLZER, Ein wiedergefundenes Original Barbarossas, in: AfD 29 (2003) p. 81–90, at 81 f.; and on the latter, see below n. 65.