

that most of LI's activity falls in the reigns of Otto II and Otto III, he suggests that all of LI's earlier documents were forgeries of these later years. The subject requires more detailed consideration than can be offered here, but Huschner certainly makes a compelling case. At best, many of these diplomas were produced later than they claim. And while delayed production is sometimes found in authentic documents, it raises suspicions when practised on such a scale⁷³. Still, we must be wary of hypercriticism. Huschner's arguments are inspired in part by Johann Lechner's similar case that Hildibald B's early documents for Worms and its neighbours were forgeries of his later „chancery“ years (i.e. post-978); and much as Fichtenau identified Hildibald B with Hildibald of Worms, so Huschner is inclined to see Archbishop Giseler of Magdeburg in LI. Yet re-examination of the Worms forgeries has shown Lechner's arguments to be severely flawed; and it may be that LI, like Hildibald B, was not (or at least not only) a later forger, but also a genuine recipient notary in his early years⁷⁴. In this respect, Huschner's case is weakest regarding D O I 299, where the only grounds for suspicion are the advanced form of the chrismon and the presence of LI's hand⁷⁵. Given the flexible arrangements for diploma production Huschner himself postulates, it is entirely conceivable that LI was a frontrunner here, whose approach to forming the chrismon first found imitation in the 970s, when he began to produce privileges for other recipients⁷⁶. Certainly these documents have a strong air of in-house production, a conclusion reinforced by the use of Otto I's rare fourth seal on all of them. With the exception of a diploma of 966 in favour of St Maximin in Trier, whence the original monks of St Maurice had been recruited, the emperor's fourth seal is only found in diplomas in

73) HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 758–779, now endorsed by KLIMM, Ottonische Diplome (as n. 18) p. 247–252. See also UHLIRZ, Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg (as n. 72) p. 81 n. 2; STENGEL, Immunität (as n. 27) p. 196 n. 5, already noting that many of these diplomas belong later.

74) ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 21–60. Cf. Johann LECHNER, Die älteren Königsurkunden für das Bistum Worms und die Begründung der bischöflichen Fürstenmacht, in: MIÖG 22 (1901) p. 361–419, 529–574.

75) D O I 299, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 1, I 20. Cf. HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 775 f. n. 731. The presence of Otto I's fourth seal, when D O I 301 (issued on the same day) bears the fifth, may also be a cause for concern: KLIMM, Ottonische Diplome (as n. 18) p. 247.

76) A parallel is offered by Hildibald B's use in 973 of a form of royal monogram only later popularized (probably under his influence) in the 980s: ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 37–40.