

LH had been involved in drafting in these later years, then we are left with two additional grants for Magdeburg and one for Worms, whose bishop (Anno) had previously been abbot of St Maurice⁸³. A degree of caution is, however, called for with these figures. All but two of LH's first eight diplomas are attributed on grounds of formulation, and Sickel's judgements are even more open to challenge here than they are with single sheet originals⁸⁴. In any case, the focus on Magdeburg is if anything clearer from LH's originals, all eight of which are for St Maurice or St John.

As in the case of LD and LI, these local interests did not pass unnoticed by the original editors of these documents. Nevertheless, Huschner is right to emphasize them more strongly. Huschner also goes a step further, identifying LH with Adalbert, the first archbishop of Magdeburg (968–981). LH's presence in Italy on at least three occasions in Adalbert's first three years in office need not be a major obstacle here. As Huschner notes, much of the impetus behind Magdeburg's foundation, including many of its earliest privileges, came from the Italian peninsula⁸⁵. More troubling, potentially, is the fact that LH was present when Anno of Worms acquired a blood relic (perhaps from Mantua) for Magdeburg, which he would later translate to the foundation upon his return north of the Alps in 971. As a former abbot of St Maurice, Anno may have had good personal reasons for wanting to be involved here; still, it is hard to see why he should have acquired the relic on Adalbert's behalf, had the latter been present in northern Italy himself. Most significant, however, are the palaeographical objections to the identification. We have at least two examples of what may be Adalbert's handwriting. The first comes from the witness-list of a charter of Archbishop Wichfried of Cologne in favour of the convents of St Ursula and Gerresheim, which states that it was copied by an Adalbert. Like most of the early archiepiscopal charters from Cologne, this document reveals strong affinities (both visual and formulaic) with royal diplomas. And the hand of the witness-list is clearly that of Liudolf A (LA), a notary otherwise active on behalf of Otto I in the

83) DD O I 310, 361, 362. On Anno: ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 21–28.

84) Cf. KEHR, Kanzlei Ludwigs des Kindes (as n. 5) p. 38–49.

85) HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 624–658. Cf. HOFFMANN, Notare (as n. 14) p. 449. Note that Adalbert's successor, Giselher, spent most of his first year-and-a-half as archbishop in Italy: CLAUDE, Geschichte (as n. 44) 1, p. 211.