

side, for the script of the addition is clearly not that of BA: the looped descenders on **g** are entirely different, as are the abbreviation signs (!) and decorative loops on the ascenders; **x** has a long diagonal descender to the left, where BA's has none; and so on (Plates 15–16)<sup>152</sup>.

An alternative possibility is raised by the fact that the otherwise unknown Hoholt appears in Bruno's stead in the recognition clauses of two of BA's diplomas of January 953<sup>153</sup>. The recognition clause was traditionally supplied by the individual who had checked the final text of a diploma, and only in exceptional cases would the recognitioner also be the main scribe of the act<sup>154</sup>. By Otto I's reign, however, recognition clauses had lost their original function: they were now typically supplied by the main hand in the name of the relevant chancellor, and even when added by a different scribe, they are rarely autograph (that is, in the hand of the named authority himself). When, however, names beyond those of the chancellor or archchancellor appear here, as is occasionally the case, there are often grounds for suspecting that these do indeed designate the scribe of the act (a point to which we shall return)<sup>155</sup>. Given this, it is tempting to identify BA as Hoholt. Against this identification, Huschner rightly notes that recognition clauses were flexible instruments, and that many names appear occasionally without necessarily being those of the diploma's scribe. He also observes that Bruno's name appears in all of BA's recognition clauses (even Hoholt recognizes „in place“ [*advicem*] of Bruno), whereas Hoholt is only present twice. Since Otto I's failed bid for the Italian throne in 951–952, Bruno had begun appearing periodically as arch-

---

152) RUB 250, Cologne, Historisches Archiv der Stadt, HUA, K/3A. Note that the original is missing following the dramatic collapse of the city archives in 2009. The remains are still being sifted, however, so there is a chance that it may yet be recovered. In the meantime, a good quality photographic reproduction survives in the Rheinisches Bildarchiv as RBA 052821. (For these details, I am grateful to Ann-Kathrin Höhler of the Archiv der Stadt: per. comm. 18.11.2021.) I have compared this with D O I 116, Karlsruhe, Generallandesarchiv, A 38, and D O I 160, Marburg, Hessisches Staatsarchiv, Urk. 75, 72. See similarly HOFFMANN, Notare (as n. 14) p. 451 f.

153) DD O I 160, 161. See STENGEL, Immunität (as n. 27) p. 147–149, 153–156; Kurt-Ulrich JÄSCHKE, Königskanzlei und imperiales Königtum im zehnten Jahrhundert, in: HJb 84 (1964) p. 288–333, esp. p. 297–299, 304–306, 331–333.

154) Daniel EICHLER, Die Kanzleinotare unter Ludwig dem Frommen – Ein Problemaufriß, in: Zwischen Tradition und Innovation: Die Urkunden Kaiser Ludwigs des Frommen (814–840), hg. von Theo KÖLZER (2014) p. 31–66.

155) ERDMANN, Beiträge (as n. 4) p. 98–106. Cf. KEHR, Kanzlei Ludwigs des Kindes (as n. 5) p. 45–49.