

years before D O I 160, then the connection between Hoholt and BA is severed. At the same time, Hoholt is most unlikely to be our Worms notary, since it is hard to understand why BA would choose to accord him such prominence two years later, in a diploma with no obvious Worms connection. It is, therefore, safest to conclude that Hoholt was a prominent court chaplain, who occasionally helped cover for Bruno in these years, perhaps with an eye to securing promotion to the post of chancellor. In fact, he may be the Haolt who appears as chancellor in a privilege of late summer 952 in favour of Einsiedeln, written in two otherwise unknown (almost certainly recipient) hands<sup>54</sup>. While Sickel preferred to see this latter figure as a different individual (probably the diploma's notary), Bresslau already signalled the possibility that he and Hoholt may have been one and the same – a possibility made all the more likely should we abandon Sickel's identification of Hoholt with BA<sup>55</sup>. It is still conceivable that Hoholt/Haolt was a royal notary, but this is by no means certain; and the connection between him and BA is only marginally stronger than that with many other draftsman-scribes of the era. This is not to say that we should follow Wolfgang Huschner's alternative identification of BA with Bruno himself<sup>56</sup> – indeed, Bruno's absence from his usual position in D O I 160 would seem to militate against the proposition. But it does mean that Hoholt can no longer be allowed to stand in the way of the identification<sup>57</sup>. BA was probably one of the many resolutely anonymous draftsman-scribes of the era – figures who made a lasting mark on the diplomatic record, but only rarely left any indication as to their true identity.

### Summaria

In den letzten Jahren gab es eine Reihe spektakulärer Funde von verlorenen oder bis dahin unbekanntem ottonischen Königs- und Kaiser-

---

54) D O I 155, Einsiedeln, Klosterarchiv, A.AI.3, with discussion of the hands in Hartmut HOFFMANN, *Schreibschulen des 10. und des 11. Jahrhunderts im Südwesten des Deutschen Reichs*, 2 vols. (Schriften der MGH 53, 2004) 1, p. 58. For a partial reproduction: *ibid.*, 2, pl. 11.

55) SICKEL, *Beiträge VII.* (as n. 12) p. 728f.; BRESSLAU, *Handbuch* (as n. 45) p. 440. See also FLECKENSTEIN, *Hofkapelle* (as n. 44) p. 37 n. 109, favouring the identification of Haolt with Hoholt.

56) HUSCHNER, *Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter* (as n. 17) p. 151–159. For objections: HOFFMANN, *Notare* (as n. 20) p. 450–452.

57) Cf. ROACH, „Chancery“ of Otto I (as n. 8) p. 49–53.