

The otherwise unidentified *Adalman notarius* appears as recognitioner in one of PB's later documents; and as with Otpert and Wigfrid, there is a strong case for identifying recognitioner and scribe here. If so, then we can safely exclude the possibility that PB was a leading prelate, since no bishop or abbot of this name is known in these years¹¹⁵. In any case, PB fully warrants Huschner's designation as an „occasional notary“: his activity is periodic rather than regular and shows no clear regional dimensions.

Huschner sees similarities between PB and five other occasional hands of the era: Bruno D, Bruno E, Bruno F, Italian E and Italian F¹¹⁶. Sickel identified the first of these (BD) as having been responsible for four diplomas, produced in Eastphalia, Westphalia and the Rhine-Main district for recipients from Eastphalia, the Rhine-Main and Angaria. There are, however, reasons to suspect that behind this old chancery designation lie at least two (and probably three) different notaries: one who drew up two diplomas of early 946 in favour of Magdeburg and Quedlinburg; another who produced a privilege for Enger in summer 947; and a third (clearly distinct from the first two) responsible for a diploma for Fulda in spring 951¹¹⁷. Bruno E (BE), by contrast, was identified by the editors of Otto I's diplomas as responsible for four privileges of the late 940s and early 950s, and a further one of 963¹¹⁸. These were produced in Eastphalia, the Rhine-Main district and Emilia, for recipients in the Rhine-Main, Upper Lotharingia, Swabia, eastern Saxony/Thuringia and among the Elbe Slavs. Yet as with BD, the original Sickelian identifications require revisiting. The three surviving single sheets ascribed to BE clearly belong to two distinct hands. One was responsible for the famous diploma of 948 in favour of Branden-

115) D O I 33. See further Josef FLECKENSTEIN, Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige 2: Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche (Schriften der MGH 16,2, 1966) p. 35 f.

116) HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 60–62, 114 f.

117) D O I 74a, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 1, I 7a; D O I 75, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 9, A 1a 6; D O I 91, Münster, Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen Abteilung Westfalen, W 701, KU 40; D O I 131, Marburg, Hessisches Staatsarchiv, Urk. 75, 71. What most clearly distinguishes the first two of these from the third is the absence of descenders on the second stroke of **h** and the differently formed **g**. The fourth is in an entirely different performance: different **g**, no flourishes on ascenders, different abbreviation sign, etc. In the latter case, similarities emerge with Fulda script of the period, particularly in the rounded aspect and form of ampersand, raising the possibility of recipient influence: HOFFMANN, Buchkunst (as n. 29) 1, p. 132–180.

118) DD O I 105, 121, 122, 152, 255.