

favour of Magdeburg, and there is good reason to suspect that it was kept at St Maurice itself⁷⁷.

As for the identification of LI with Giseler, this is not supported by any palaeographical evidence, so we can safely leave it to one side. It is no more plausible than Uhlirz's earlier suggestion that LI was Ekkehard the Red, the local Magdeburg schoolmaster⁷⁸; and perhaps less so, if any of LI's earlier diplomas are indeed authentic. Indeed, were LI Giseler, it is strange that he should be active only twice on behalf of Merseburg during the decade Giseler was bishop there – a decade in which Giseler received five other diplomas, while LI himself was active for Magdeburg and one of its provosts⁷⁹. But even if we partially part ways with Huschner, his observations remain fundamentally accurate: LI was a monk or canon of St Maurice – Stengel had already dubbed him a „Parteischreiber“ – who retained a close interest in the centre, even in his later years.

A final Magdeburg scribe Sickel saw fit to designate a full member of the chancery was Liudolf H (LH), who was active from the early 960s through to 980. Already in his early years, LH reveals strong connections with the Elbe river foundation. According to Sickel, his first two diplomas (only one of which survives in its original format) were both in favour of the abbey, issued from nearby Thuringia⁸⁰. And of his next six, three are also for the centre⁸¹. Thereafter, these regional dimensions become more pronounced, with all of his final eight diplomas from Otto I's reign (in two cases, a set of double engrossments) going to the new archbishopric or the neighbouring monastery of St John⁸². If we include three further diplomas which Sickel believed

77) Karl FOLTZ, *Die Siegel der deutschen Könige und Kaiser aus dem sächsischen Hause*, in: NA 3 (1878) p. 9–45, at p. 31 f.; Otto POSSE, *Die Siegel der deutschen Kaiser und Könige von 751 bis 1913*, 5 vols. (1909–1913), 5 (1913) p. 12; HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 776 n. 732.

78) UHLIRZ, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg* (as n. 72) p. 81 f.; STENGEL, *Immunität* (as n. 27) p. 196 f. On Ekkehard: CLAUDE, *Geschichte* (as n. 44) 1, p. 128.

79) D O II 89 (WB and WE); D O II 116 (FA); D O II 161 (FA); D O II 162 (FA); D O II 186 (LI); D O II 200 (LI); D O II 213 (HA). For LI's activity in favour of Magdeburg in these years: DD O II 82, 193. The former may, however, be a later production: HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 770–774.

80) DD O I 230, 232a. See further BEUMANN / SCHLESINGER, *Urkundenstudien* (as n. 68) p. 187.

81) DD O I 286, 287, 300, 312, 319, 331. Of these, only the last is an original.

82) DD O I 377, 382, 383a/b, 386, 387, 388a/b. Of these, all but D O I 382 and D O I 386 are original.