

his way into his new role; and it may be that some of the other figures who appear periodically as „chancellor“ were also acting as temporary heads of the royal writing office. In any case, the fact that Bruno does not recognize D O I 161 was sufficient for Sickel to conclude that the recorded date for the act, Frankfurt on the ides (i.e. 13th) of January 951, must be wrong; and the presence of Hoholt, whom he knew to have been active at Frankfurt in early January 953, suggested a redating to 13 January of this year. Whether Sickel thought the dating error to be original or a down to later transmission, he did not say, though the latter is suggested by the remarks in his *Beiträge zur Diplomatik*⁴⁷. Now, there can be no doubt that many notaries of these years fell into error in their dating practices, with regards both to the incarnation and the king's regnal years; and errors in transmission are even more common. But the fact that the best copies of D O I 161 bear internally consistent dates, with the correct indiction (ninth) and incarnational (951) and regnal (15) years for January 951, should give us pause. The situation is complicated by the fact that BA's charter of New Year's Day 953 (in which Hoholt is also named) bears contradictory dating elements: the incarnation is given as 958 (!), the regnal year as seventeen (so correct for 7 August 952–6 August 953) and the indication as six (948 or 963)⁴⁸. Despite the apparent confusion, Sickel was almost certainly correct to place this diploma in early 953: LVIII is presumably a slip for LIII in the incarnation, while XI would have been easy enough to misconstrue as VI in the indiction. Thus emended, all elements point to January 953. But could BA really have made such a hash of things here, only to produce an internally consistent date pointing to 951 (two years too early!) just twelve days later? Rediscovery of the single sheet of D O I 161, confirming the readings of the *Vidimationsbuch* and earlier Worms cartulary, only deepens these concerns. Is a local Worms notary likely to have erred by precisely two in all three par-

staatsarchiv, 10001 Ältere Urkunden, 00003) that of BE. D O I 151 only survives as a copy in the older Worms cartulary and reveals little by way of distinctive formulation, so its scribe cannot be established with any certainty. (A strong candidate would be our own notary of D O I 161.)

47) SICKEL, *Beiträge VII*. (as n. 12) p. 730 n. 1: „Für St. 191 [= D O I 161] bieten die mehrfachen Überlieferungen sehr verschiedene Zeitenmerkmale, so dass ich es nur aus Wahrscheinlichkeitsgründen zum 13. Januar einreihe“.

48) D O I 160, Marburg, Staatsarchiv, Urk. 75, 72. Note that BA typically reckoned the regnal year one too high (perhaps intentionally), but this would not be his first return to correct practice (cf. D O I 116, Karlsruhe, Generallandesarchiv, A 38). See further HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation* (as n. 17) p. 155 n. 631.