

On this basis, Adolf Fanta already suspected that It A hailed from the city, and Huschner is quite right to see him as a local recipient notary¹²⁴. In this respect, it may be significant that in two of these diplomas a different hand, that of LH, supplied the closing eschatocol. While there is nothing usual or suspicious about such two-stage copying, it is a particularly common feature of recipient production. Either the recipients would supply the protocol and main text, leaving the authenticating eschatocol to be completed at court, or they would be given a blank parchment already bearing the eschatocol (and sometimes also a seal: a „Blankett“), which they would then complete. Whether It A should also be identified with the bishop of Reggio, Ermenald, as Huschner goes on to suggest, is less certain. It A's profile certainly fits that of other bishops who acted as recipient notaries, such as Leo of Vercelli and Pilgrim of Passau. Nevertheless, as the cases of LB, LC and LE demonstrate, not every scribe with a strong local connection need be the bishop himself; and unlike PA and Poppo in April 941, there is no clear evidence for Ermenald's presence at Reichenau in early 965. It A also provides a further reminder of the flexibility of diploma production in these years: he was essentially a recipient scribe, but could still influence charter production for Einsiedeln when the court passed through southern Swabia in January 965.

Similarly flexible arrangements are revealed by the career of Hildibald B (HB), already touched on a number of times in passing. While Huschner was happy to accept scholarly consensus that HB was an imperial notary from 978 to 994, during which time he also forged an impressive set of earlier privileges in Worms' favour (including two in Otto I's name), there are good reasons to doubt that this was so. From at least 970, HB is securely attested as a local draftsman-scribe¹²⁵. In

124) Adolf FANTA, Die Notare der italienischen Kanzlei Ottos II., in: MIÖG 2 (1888) p. 553–567, at p. 554; HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 119–121, 618.

125) ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 21–60. The key document in this respect is D O I 392, Darmstadt, HStA, A2 251/1, which Johann Lechner dismissed as a forgery but is clearly authentic. Cf. Karl UHLIRZ, Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III. 1: Otto II. 973–83 (1902) p. 217–225, whose rather idiosyncratic (but ultimately correct) defence of these early diplomas had previously won little favour. The arguments of Caroline GÖLDEL, Provenienz und Überlieferungszusammenhang. Die Urkundenformularsammlung des Codex Udalrici als Schlüssel der Fälschungsproblematik, in: Archivalische Zs. 93 (2013) p. 221–239, which would place the Worms and Passau forgeries (and presumably also HB and WC!) in the mid-1120s, are without evidential basis: Klaus NASS,