

these years¹⁸². As noted, by the Ottonian period the scribe of the main text would normally supply the full eschatocol, including royal subscription and chancery recognition. These clauses thus have an artificial character, since the same named authorities „recognize“ acts in many different hands. It may be that the royal subscription, which had not been autograph since the Merovingian period¹⁸³, offered the model here; if scribes could ventriloquize the king, then why not also the chancellor, who now typically acted as recognitioner? That these clauses had not lost all meaning is, however, revealed by the periodic appearance of other individuals, particularly in the reigns of Henry I and Otto I. These figures often bear the title of notary (*notarius*) rather than chancellor; and in all cases, they appear in the work of a single draftsman-scribe. Informed by the belief that recognitioner and main scribe had been one and the same in the Carolingian period, Sickel saw this as a throw-back to earlier practices¹⁸⁴. While this now seems unlikely – recognitioner and notary were rarely the same in the early ninth century – an argument can still be made for identifying these figures with the scribes in question, as Sickel did. The key point is that in all cases their appearances are restricted to the work of a single notary; and a particular concentration can be seen in the years 951–952, when previous arrangements for charter production seem to have been disrupted (in part, by Otto I's bid for the Italian throne). The situation is clearest with Otpert and Wigfrid, who appear repeatedly in the recognition clauses of a single well-attested draftsman-scribe. Most of the other named notaries only appear in a sole surviving single sheet, and sometimes only in a single diploma, so the identification of recognitioner with scribe is more of a working hypothesis. That this is a likely one, however, is revealed by the case of Abraham, who appears as recognitioner of a diploma of 952 for Osnabrück, which is in the same hand as a later privilege for a vassal of Abraham of Freising (in which the bishop himself intervenes). This makes it all but certain that the scribe in question is Bishop Abraham himself, and that the first recog-

182) Cf. HUSCHNER, Transalpine Kommunikation (as n. 10) p. 63–93, largely focusing on what these clauses offer our understanding of the „chancery“ as an organization (and how Sickel and Kehr modelled this).

183) Theo KÖLZER, Ein „Neufund“ zur merowingischen Diplomatik, in: Mediaevalia Augiensia (as n. 8) p. 1–11, at p. 8–11.

184) SICKEL, Beiträge VII (as n. 2). Cf. Die Urkunden Konrad I., Heinrich I. und Otto I., hg. von Theodor SICKEL (MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae 1, 1879–1884) p. 83.