

to the identification are not merely circumstantial, however. As Barret notes, Heribert D's preference for starting the new year on either the Feast of the Purification (25 March) or Easter would be at least as out of place in Odilo's Cluny as it was in northern Italy<sup>173</sup>. And Heribert D's consistent use of the C-formed chrismon first popularized in East Francia in the mid-ninth century – and increasingly common in Italy by the later years of the tenth – is hard to square with an origin anywhere outside the *Reich* or *regnum Italiae*<sup>174</sup>.

So where does this leave us with the Ottonian „chancery“? Huschner is clearly right to challenge traditional thinking on many fronts. While he at times risks caricaturing the Altmeister (Sickel and Bresslau were certainly willing to identify recipient influence, where it was clear), he is correct that they overestimated the chancery – and that the old chancery-recipient binary is itself unhelpful. Most diplomas were drawn up by individuals with a connection to both issuer and recipient; and most of those capable of producing diplomas, did so on more than one occasion. In that respect, pure „chancery“ or „recipient“ production are the exception, not the rule, and only the most active draftsman-scribes (Huschner's „trans-regional“ and „imperial court notaries“) were chancery hands in anything like the Sickelian sense. Even then, there is no reason to believe that the chancery itself was a formal institution, which they joined and left in the manner of a modern government bureau. Rather we are dealing with an informal pool of scribal specialists, on whom the ruler could draw as he traversed his domains.

When it comes to appraising the activity of individual draftsman-scribes, Huschner is at his best discussing more occasional hands, which frequently display a marked regional quality. Whereas Sickel was quick to assume centralization here, identifying imperial notaries in an-

---

Mittelalter 5, 2002) p. 111–161; IDEM, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 142, 351 f., 949. Cf. HOFFMANN, Notare (as n. 14) p. 471–474.

173) BARRET, Cluny et les Ottoniens (as n. 15) p. 196–199. At least one Italian draftsman-scribe of the era may indeed have used the Purification to mark the start of the new year: Robert HOLTZMANN, Die Urkunden König Arduins, in: NA 25 (1900) p. 453–479, at p. 457–459; ROACH, Forgery and Memory (as n. 19) p. 241 f.

174) Cf. Erika EISENLOHR, Von ligierten zu symbolischen Invokations- und Rekognitionszeichen in frühmittelalterlichen Urkunden, in: Graphische Symbole in mittelalterlichen Urkunden. Beiträge zur diplomatischen Semiotik, hg. von Peter RÜCK (Historische Hilfswissenschaften 3, 1996) p. 167–262.