

there; his formulation has also been detected in another diploma issued at Magdeburg for St Maurice, which only survives in later copies⁶⁸. Closer examination suggests that one of these Magdeburg diplomas is in a different hand⁶⁹, but this does little to affect the overall picture: with one exception, LD only produced documents for St Maurice, often at Magdeburg itself. Even Sickel was aware that LD must have been a monk of the foundation, noting that his early work was undertaken in a recipient capacity. But since LD was active for at least one other recipient in later years, Sickel identified him as fully-fledged member of the „chancery“ from 956 on.

An analogous case is offered by Liudolf I (LI), whom Sickel also saw as a recipient scribe gazetted into chancery service. Of the four originals of Otto I's reign in which Sickel and his team identified LI's hand, all are in favour of Magdeburg⁷⁰. They also held him responsible for three further charters preserved in later copies. Of these, two are for Magdeburg and one for Corvey; however, the latter has since been identified as an early modern forgery⁷¹. This makes an important difference. In later years, LI would indeed be active in favour of other East Saxon recipients, but under Otto I, he was a recipient notary pure and simple. This was already suspected by Karl Uhlirz and Paul Fridolin Kehr, two of Sickel's most gifted students, and we would do well to follow them (and Huschner) in emphasizing more strongly these local connections⁷². Yet if Huschner is right, we can go even further. Noting

68) Hand identified: DD O I 74b, 181, 190, 214; formulation: D O I 205. On the Magdeburg draftsmen of the period: Helmut BEUMANN / Walter SCHLESINGER, *Urkundenstudien zur deutschen Ostpolitik unter Otto III.*, in: *AfD* 1 (1955) p. 132–256, at p. 177–187; CLAUDE, *Geschichte* (as n. 44) 1, p. 32 f.; Jean SCHROEDER / Michel MARGUE, *Aspects du rayonnement intellectuel de Trèves dans la deuxième moitié du X^e siècle*, in: *Échanges religieux et intellectuels du X^e au XIII^e siècles en Haute et en Basse-Lotharingie* (1991) p. 69–132, at p. 82–85.

69) D O I 181, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 1, I 12. The differences include the consistent preference for Caroline **a** over c-c **a**; the use of a spindle- rather than ampersand-shaped abbreviation sign; the form of majuscule **V**; the descenders on **g**; the use of minuscule **m** at the start of Magdeburg (rather than LD's distinctive majuscules); and the form of **ę**.

70) DD O I 293, 298, 299, 345.

71) DD O I 292, 304, 305. On the latter: Johannes BACKHAUS, *Die Corveyer Geschichtsfälschungen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Abhandlungen über Corveyer Geschichtsschreibung* 1 (1906) p. 1–48, at p. 36–39.

72) Karl UHLIRZ, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg unter den Kaisern aus sächsischem Hause* (1887) p. 81 f.; Paul Fridolin KEHR, *Die Urkunden Otto III.* (1890) p. 44.