

burg, and another for the privileges of 950 in favour of St Maximin and 952 in favour of Otto I's vassal Billing¹¹⁹. Sickel assigned two single sheets to Bruno F, from 949 and 950; and he detected his hand in the protocol and eschatocol of diplomas of 951 and 956, in the former case extending to the first line of main text¹²⁰. The first two of these were produced in eastern Saxony and the latter two in Rhine-Main district, for recipients in the Rhine-Main, Eastphalia and (probably) Hessen. Italian E (It E), on the other hand, has been assigned responsibility for a diploma for Mantua of autumn 971 and the recognition and dating clauses of a diploma for the later Venetian doge Vitale Candiano in early 972. Sickel also believed he could detect It E's formulation in a privilege of April 971 for S. Vincenzo al Volturno¹²¹. Finally, Italian F's hand has been identified in the eschatocol of a diploma of 972 and as the sole hand of a later diploma of 983, while Sickel's team was inclined to assign the eschatocol of two others to him on grounds of formulation.¹²² As such bald summaries indicate, Huschner is certainly right to question the association between these scribes and the „chancery“. These were not permanent or regular royal notaries, but rather occasional hands, a conclusion reinforced by the signs that many of these figures were less active than either Sickel or Huschner imagined.

Matters are clearer with Italian A (It A), the least active of the Italian „chancery scribes“ of Otto I's first extended sojourn south of the Alps (961–965). It A was responsible for three diplomas during this period and furnished the model for a fourth produced at Reichenau in January 965, while the court was *en route* north. Though there is no common denominator in terms of the place of issue, it is striking that the first three (all issued in Italy) are in favour of the see of Reggio¹²³.

119) D O I 105, Domstiftsarchiv Brandenburg, Urk. 1; D O I 122, Paris, BnF, lat. 9265 no. 1; D O I 152, Dresden, Sächsisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, 10001 Ältere Urkunden, 00003. On the first of these: Dietrich KURZE, Otto I. und die Gründung des Bistums Brandenburg: 948, 949 oder 965?, in: Jb. für brandenburgische Landesgeschichte 50 (1999) p. 12–30, at p. 28–30; Thomas LUDWIG, Die Gründungs-urkunde für das Bistum Brandenburg: zur Methode der Urkundenkritik, in: Jb. für brandenburgische Landesgeschichte 53 (2002) p. 9–28; and on the second: KÖLZER, Studien (as n. 88) p. 40–43.

120) Full diploma: DD O I 113, 130; protocol and/or eschatocol: DD O I 131, 178.

121) Hand: DD O I 403, 407; formulation: D O I 402.

122) Hand: D O I 409, D O II 268; formulation: DD O I 413, 429.

123) DD O I 242, 256, 268, 276. On the latter: KELLER, Otto der Große (as n. 8) p. 223, 234 f.