

to Worms, whose bishop (Hildibald) was imperial chancellor at the time; and he was apparently also responsible for the infamous Worms forgeries<sup>21</sup>. As Hoffmann was well aware, ascribing D O 161 to HB posed a major challenge to traditional wisdom regarding this notary, which placed his work (including forgeries) in Hildibald's chancellorship (977–998). Yet Sickel and his Mitarbeiter had originally dated the Worms forgeries to the episcopate of Anno (950–978); and here they would seem to have found their validation<sup>22</sup>.

Hoffmann's remarks were only an aside to his main purpose, however, so the question of the precise relationship between HB (or indeed BA) and the original remains open. The surviving single sheet itself is a fairly standard privilege of the era. It measures approximately 40 × 49 cm and its opening chrismon takes the form of a large C with flourishes on the ascender, wavy lines on the descender and two sets of diagonal lines out of and then back into the main body (Plate 1). Such forms were common in the 940s and 950s and closely approximate, without completely duplicating, those of BA<sup>23</sup>. The ensuing protocol is likewise laid out in accordance with BA's conventions, with a wide ligature on *et* in the verbal invocation (*in nomine sanctae et individuae trinitatis*) and a demonstratively large N on *noverit* at the start of the publication formula. The context is in a clear, if not especially elegant, diplomatic minuscule appropriate for the era. The scribe has judged the space well and this was evidently not his first effort at charter production. At the same time, the hand is more compressed than that of many notaries, lacking the long ascenders and descenders to which

---

21) Johann LECHNER, Die älteren Königsurkunden für das Bistum Worms und die Begründung der bischöflichen Fürstenmacht, *MIÖG* 22 (1901) p. 361–419, 529–574; IDEM, Zur Beurteilung der Wormser Diplome, *MIÖG* 25 (1904) p. 91–111. See also ROACH, *Forgery and Memory* (as n. 9) p. 20–60.

22) Die Urkunden Konrad I., Heinrich I. und Otto I., hg. von SICKEL (as n. 12) p. 444, 533f.; Die Urkunden Otto des II., hg. von Theodor SICKEL (*MGH DD regum et imperatorum Germaniae* 2/1, 1888) p. 55; Karl UHLIRZ, *Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Otto II. und Otto III.* 1: Otto II. 973–83 (1902) p. 217–225.

23) Helpful comparanda are offered by D O I 100, Lille, Archives départementales du Nord, 3 G 7/69; D O I 117, Würzburg, Domkapitel Urkunden, 950 Januar 18; D O I 160, Marburg, Hessisches Staatsarchiv, Urk. 75, 72. For a reproduction (and discussion) of the first of these: Wolfgang HUSCHNER, *Diplom König Ottos I. für Cambrai*, in: *Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa 2: Katalog*, hg. von Matthias PUHLE (2001) p. 167f; and for rich illustrative material: Peter RÜCK, *Bildberichte vom König. Kanzlerzeichen, königliche Monogramme und das Signet der salischen Dynastie* (*elementa diplomatica* 4, 1996) p. 60–68.