

it is significant that BC is only active outside Saxony on behalf of the foundation and its sometime abbot Anno. More to the point, BC was responsible for at least two (and probably three) second engrossments („Zweitausfertigungen“) of Magdeburg diplomas. Such charter pairs are a distinctive feature of Magdeburg diplomatic in these years; and in many cases, we can confidently speak of multiple authentic acts. In BC's case, however, doubts attach to all of his copies. For they are from the years before his other attested notarial activity, and all add a distinctive passage to the original grant or confirmation, conceding the abbot of St Maurice the right to choose the monastery's advocate. Given the problems abbots frequently encountered with their advocates, even in these early years, the suspicion must be these are not harmless additions, as Karl Uhlirz and Edmund Stengel once thought, but rather acts of forgery⁹⁶. If so, the connection between BC and Magdeburg could not have been more intimate.

Bruno G (BG) presents a somewhat similar case. This figure, too, is a regional notary with clear Eastphalian connections, active in the 950s and 960s. Yet as with BC, Huschner struggled to identify any further focus of this activity. Partly, this is because Huschner followed Stengel's lead in identifying BG with the later notary Willigis F. Whatever the strengths of Stengel's case – which seems on balance convincing: the differences in *ę*, descenders on *g* and formation of ascenders can probably be explained by the natural evolution of the hand – focusing on BG's early activity helps shine a clearer light on his (or perhaps rather her) origins. For of the four originals Sickel and his team ascribed to BG, all were produced in East Saxony, for recipients from within the region⁹⁷. One of these was issued at Magdeburg, in favour of St Mau-

96) DD O I 16, 21b, 97b, with BEUMANN / SCHLESINGER, *Urkundenstudien* (as n. 68) p. 183–186. The first of these only survives in later copies, but the presence of the same tell-tale phrase about the selection of the advocate suggests that BC has reworked the text (which Sickel otherwise attributes to Poppo A). Cf. UHLIRZ, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg* (as n. 72) p. 128–130; STENGEL, *Immunität* (as n. 27) p. 157 f. n. 2. On relations between abbots and advocates: Jonathan LYON, *Corruption, Protection and Justice in Medieval Europe: A Thousand Year History* (forthcoming 2022) ch. 3.

97) DD O I 149, 165, 228, 229. See HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 55. If we include DD O I 153, 154, of which the former was already assigned to BG by Sickel (on the advice of Foltz) and the latter added by Stengel on grounds of formulation, then we have diplomas for an Angarian and a Lotharingian, produced at Magdeburg and Quedlinburg. (Both only survive in later copies, though in the former case an early modern facsimile goes some way towards making good this deficit.)