

More significant objections emerge from an examination of the relevant documents themselves⁶⁴. For while the hands of D O I 150 and D O I 279 are indeed sufficiently similar to warrant identification, they are quite distinct from that of LE: their chrismons are formed differently, their **d** often lacks descenders (and certainly never has the longer descenders so distinctive of LE), their descenders on **r** are much shorter, and so on (Plates 1–3)⁶⁵. They also differ notably from the hand Natalia Daniel identified as that of Bishop Abraham (**t** is formed differently, **mi** are rarely ligatured); but since Daniel's identification is itself highly speculative, their evidence should take precedence⁶⁶. If so, then Abraham was indeed an occasional draftsman-scribe, but his activity conforms to the profile of the bishop-notaries identified in earlier scholarship: he is only periodically active, largely on behalf of his own see and its associates⁶⁷. As for LE, he can safely be left as a Swabian regional recipient scribe, closely associated with Bishop Hartbert.

Somewhat similar to LC, LB and LE are the many Magdeburg draftsman-scribes of the era. As Sickel and his team were well aware, the monks of the new foundation on the Elbe played an active part in the production of diplomas in their favour, a role which continued following the monastery's transformation into an archbishopric in 968. A fairly typical case is offered by Liudolf D (LD), a scribe mostly active in the mid- to later 950s. Of the four single sheets assigned to this figure, three were in favour of Magdeburg and two were produced

these to WB; however, since WB's formulation lies behind D O II 66, which is clearly not in his hand, it may be that recipient scribes were at work here too. On the latter: LANDI, *Otto Rubeus fundator* (as n. 18) p. 119–134.

64) See already BRESSLAU, *Handbuch* (as n. 2) 1, p. 440 n. 1.

65) D O I 150, Osnabrück, Bistumsarchiv, Jostes 10; D O I 279, Innichen, Museum Kollegiatstift-Mensalfonds, Urk. XXIII/4. I have compared these with D O I 163, Chur, Bischöfliches Archiv, 011.0015; and D O I 189, Einsiedeln, Klosterarchiv, A.AI.4. For reproductions of the first two: LANDI, *Otto Rubeus fundator* (as n. 18) Tafel V; Franz JOSTES, *Die Kaiser- und Königs-Urkunden des Osnabrücker-Landes* (1899) Abb. X. My conclusions confirm those of HOFFMANN, *Notare* (as n. 14) p. 441–443, though I am more confident than he that DD O I 150, 279 are indeed products of the same hand. Cf. HOFFMANN, *Rezension von WELLMER, Persönliches Memento* (as n. 25) p. 486, happily accepting both as *bona fide* autographs of Abraham.

66) DANIEL, *Handschriften* (as n. 29) p. 91, 106, 130, 146. For doubts about Daniel's identification: HOFFMANN, *Notare* (as n. 14) p. 443–445. See also Paolo CHIESA, *Liutprando di Cremona e il codice di Frisinga Clm 6388 (Autographa medii aevi 1, 1994)* p. 22 n. 36, already signalling a degree of uncertainty.

67) Note that D O I 150 was produced before his promotion, so we are left with just one diploma for one of his own vassals during Abraham's episcopate.