

as Chur, there was no shortage of trained scribal specialists. Hartbert had at least three (and probably more) men in his entourage who were able to produce diplomas of a decent quality – and this despite being capable of such work himself. For as Hagen Keller notes, we can almost certainly identify Hartbert's own hand in two other diplomas of these years: a first in favour of Hartbert himself, during his time as a ducal chaplain; and a second of 958, in favour of Chur⁵⁹.

If Huschner's framing of the activities of LB, LC and LE is a significant improvement on Sickel's work, his attempt to identify LE with Abraham of Freising poses greater challenges⁶⁰. Huschner's grounds are that Sickel had identified LE as the scribe of D O I 279, in favour of one of Abraham's vassals; and that Emil von Ottenthal had subsequently identified the hand of this diploma with that of an earlier privilege in favour of Osnabrück (D O I 150), in which a notary named Abraham (apparently the later bishop) appears as recognition⁶¹. This does indeed make a strong case for treating Abraham as the scribe of the latter two charters; it does not, however, follow that he was LE. For a start, it is unclear why a bishop of Freising in central Bavaria should draft diplomas primarily for recipients in southern Swabia. Huschner suggests that Abraham may have been trained at Chur and retained a connection to the see thereafter, but since we know nothing certain about the bishop's background, this is no more than speculation⁶². Even so, it would be most odd for Abraham to be more active in favour of his former rather than his present see. It is equally unclear why Abraham should cease producing diplomas halfway through his own episcopate, leaving an otherwise unknown (presumably recipient) scribe to produce a privilege of late 973 in favour of Freising⁶³.

59) D O I 8, Chur, Bischöfliches Archiv 011.0011; D O I 191, Chur, Bischöfliches Archiv, 011.0017, with KELLER, *Otto der Große* (as n. 8) p. 241 f. Hand identity here is beyond doubt.

60) HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 600–609.

61) Emil von OTTENTHAL, *Bemerkungen zu den Urkunden der sächsischen Kaiser für Osnabrück*, in: *MIÖG Erg.Bd. 6* (1901) p. 25–40, at p. 28 f. The single sheet of D O I 279 has been subject to a small amount of erasure, but there is no doubt that the original document is a product of the early 950s (and the tampering itself falls short of forgery): Christian HOFFMANN, *Markt, Münze und Zoll zu Wiedenbrück: Die Urkunde König Ottos I. für den Osnabrücker Bischof Drogo vom 7. Juni 952*, in: *Osnabrücker Mitteilungen* 108 (2003) p. 11–31.

62) On Abraham, see DANIEL, *Handschriften* (as n. 29) p. 82 f., favouring a Bavarian origin.

63) D O II 66. Note that DD O II 47, 80, both also in favour of Freising and surviving in later copies, were apparently not produced by LE either. Sickel assigned