

or the main text) of a diploma of 962 in favour of Guy of Modena, another of the emperor's early Italian supporters¹⁶³.

The most decisive objection to identifying LF with Liudprand, however, is palaeographical. As Hoffmann notes, LF's hand is clearly transmontane, whereas we would expect Italian forms from Liudprand. Moreover, we have a number of examples of Liudprand's probable autograph in the form of the corrections and additions to Abraham of Freising's copy of the *Antapodosis* (the hand known as „the corrector“, dubbed F₂ by Paolo Chiesa). This hand is typical of mid- to later tenth-century northern Italy, characterized by its rounded aspect, thick ascenders, use of the Italian **-us** abbreviation after m and n, form of **-or** and **-orum** abbreviation, and frequent ligatures on **r**. Particularly distinctive is the second stroke on **x**, which often begins with a slight flick at the top right then ends with a point on the bottom left, and the cross stroke on **r**, which frequently extends above the script-line (Plate 17)¹⁶⁴. None of these features are to be found regularly in LF's work¹⁶⁵. At the same time, many of LF's most distinctive forms find

163) D O I 248. As HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 116 f., notes, it is likely that the recipients were responsible for the main text, which is copied in an otherwise unknown Italian hand.

164) CHIESA, *Liutprando di Cremona* (as n. 66) p. 80–82.

165) For these purposes, I have compared Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6388, fols. 82r–85v, with D O I 222a, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 1, I 14, and D O I 236, Karlsruhe, Generallandesarchiv, A 40. On the likelihood that the corrector (F₂) in the former is Liudprand: CHIESA, *Liutprando di Cremona* (as n. 66); IDEM, *Sulla presunta autografia di Liutprando nel Clm 6388 e sulla scelta dell'ipotesi più economica in critica testuale*, in: *Revue d'histoire des textes* 1 (2006) p. 153–172 (restating the thesis in light of criticism); and on the differences between this and the hand of LF: HOFFMANN, *Notare* (as n. 14) p. 469 f. LF's hand requires further consideration in light of the considerable variation attested across his corpus. It is by no means certain that D O I 203, Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Kloster St. Emmeram Regensburg Urkunden 25, on which Huschner draws, is his work: the bow on **g**, form of **x** and **et** ligatures all differ from LF's standard forms, though the form of **a**, formatting of the dating clause and recognition sign do indeed look like his. This may be the same hand as that of D O I 202, Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Domkapitel Salzburg Urkunden 1, issued on the previous day (and ascribed to LF by the editors), which strays even further from LF's established forms. See further HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 10) p. 527–529, who is inclined (probably rightly) to ascribe the former to LF and the latter to a different hand, mimicking LF's forms. By contrast, D O I 204, Nürnberg, Staatsarchiv, Fürstentum Ansbach, Urkunden vor 1401, 1246, issued three days later, certainly is LF's work. Another attribution which may require reconsideration is D O I 184, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 9, A Ia 9. Here the forms (including the architectonic recognition sign) are clear-