

the other early Ottonian diplomas in HB's hand have recently been rehabilitated³², we should be wary of hypercriticism: it is increasingly clear that the focus of forgery at Worms in these years was on Carolingian and Merovingian precedents, not on contemporary Ottonian privileges. Certainly nothing in the appearance of D O I 161 is suspicious. The hand is perfectly acceptable for the early 950s and the single sheet shows every sign of having borne an authentic (now lost) seal. Significantly, the latter was affixed using a Kreuzschnitt, rather than the Sternschnitt generally favoured after 972, not least by HB³³. At the same time, the hand of our notary and HB share a number of notable similarities, which make a relationship of sorts likely. In fact, there is one diploma traditionally ascribed to HB that displays almost all of the features noted above: D O I 84, another early toll charter in favour of Worms, dated Frankfurt 14 January 947 (Plate 4). The main distinction here is that the hand of this document is more cramped, on account of the lengthier text (itself owed to its model, a toll charter of Louis the Pious). It may be this which has dictated the use of a more restrained form of **h**, though the same distinctive descender on the second stroke can be found in *hoc* in the first line of context. Otherwise, the performances are very similar indeed – in fact, it was almost certainly this diploma which inspired Hoffmann to ascribe D O I 161 to HB. Yet the differences listed above pertain to D O I 84, too, right down to the presence of a recognition sign (unconnected to the recognition clause) and use of a Kreuzschnitt. And while Johann Lechner was inclined to see such variations as a clever attempt to hide HB's identity by mimicking earlier forms³⁴, the discovery of a similar performance dated just a few years later suggests a simpler conclusion: these were products of a different notary altogether. In other words, D O I 84 was not drafted and copied by HB, but rather by an older Worms scribe, who went on to produce D O I 161.

This finding has significant implications for our treatment of D O I 84. So long as this was thought to be the work of HB, it was hard

32) ROACH, *Forgery and Memory* (as n. 9) p. 30–50.

33) Karl FOLTZ, *Die Siegel der deutschen Könige und Kaiser aus dem sächsischen Hause*, NA 3 (1878) p. 9–45, at p. 16 n. 2; Otto POSSE, *Die Siegel der deutschen Kaiser und Könige*, 5 vols. (1909–1913) 5 (1913) p. 144 n. 7. For HB's preference for the Sternschnitt: D O II 46, Speyer, Landesarchiv, F 7, 2; D O II 189, Bückeburg, Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv, L 0, c Bd. 1, 3; D O II 226, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 5, II, 3; D O II 309, Münster, Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, W 701 / Urkundenselekt, KU 53.

34) LECHNER, *Königsurkunden* (as n. 21) p. 531.