

nitition clause is notarial (that is to say, written in the name and hand of the scribe responsible for the act). On this basis, we can identify five further draftsman-scribes of Otto I's reign with reasonable confidence, many of whom we have met in passing: Adaldag, Notker, Adalman, Enno and Hoholt<sup>185</sup>. Of these, Adaldag is in all probability the later archbishop of Hamburg, and perhaps also Sickel's Simon E; Notker is a Swabian (probably St Gall) notary, who produced diplomas in favour of St Gall and the bishopric of Chur<sup>186</sup>; Adalman is probably PB; and Hoholt may be BA. It is also conceivable that Enno is BG. Other candidates for named notaries include the Haolt who appears as chancellor in D O I 155 (for Einsiedeln, written in an otherwise unknown hand) and the Tuoto who recognizes as chancellor in a lost diploma for Eichstätt of 955. In both cases, the presumption is that we are dealing with a recipient or local hand<sup>187</sup>.

The important thing to note is that no bishops appear in recognition clauses, save in those cases where they are chancellor or (more often) archchancellor/archchaplain. It may be that these offices have obscured episcopal involvement, as Huschner notes: since the chancellor and archchaplain are named in recognition clauses as a matter of course, diplomatists have rarely accorded much significance to their presence. And at least in the cases of Poppo of Würzburg, Ambrosius of Bergamo and Hubert of Parma, the chancellor recognizing the act (or in Hubert's case, the archchancellor in whose name this was undertaken) was often also its scribe. But if prelates such as Adalbert, Giseler and Liudprand had been responsible for producing diplomas on the scale Huschner proposes, we would expect them to appear at least occasionally in the resulting recognition clauses, just as Otpert, Wigfrid and their colleagues do. Indeed, there is no obvious reason why notarial subscriptions should be rarer from bishops than from other figures. And while some allowance must be made for the unusual circumstances of 951–952, the eight to ten individuals identified above can probably be taken as a broadly representative cross-section of the

---

185) BRESSLAU, *Handbuch* (as n. 2) 1, p. 439–441; FLECKENSTEIN, *Hofkapelle* (as n. 115) p. 35–39. See also STENGEL, *Immunität* (as n. 27) p. 139–141, 146, 153–156, 159–163.

186) DD O I 25, 26. See SICKEL, *Programm* (as n. 2) p. 460f.

187) D O I 155, Einsiedeln, *Klosterarchiv*, A.AI.3; Edmund VON OEFELE, *Zu den Kaiser- und Königsurkunden des Hochstiftes Eichstätt*, in: *Archivalische Zs.* N. F. 5 (1894) p. 276–283, at p. 281 (no. XIV). On the former: SICKEL, *Beiträge VII* (as n. 2) p. 728; HOFFMANN, *Schreibschulen des 10. und des 11. Jahrhunderts* (as n. 29) 1, p. 48, 58.