

they typically aspired. This suggests that we are dealing with someone whose default script remained a Caroline bookhand, but who was at least periodically involved in charter production. The closing eschatocol also looks like the work of BA, with the recognition clause only slightly lower than the royal subscription, offset to the right. This is followed by a recognition sign in the shape of a robot (or a dalek, for those acquainted with British science-fiction television). Here the main distinction with BA is that while he normally includes pseudo-Tironian notes within the sign, evoking the forms of an earlier era, no attempt has been made to do so in D O I 161. Somewhat closer in this respect are the recognition clauses of Bruno C (BC), one of the less active notaries of these years – though even BC tends to produce a line of z-like letters as a nod to the Tironian tradition²⁴. The dating clause thereafter takes a fairly standard form, but is notable for the use of a wide majuscule n in *amen* at the end of the closing *apprecatio* – a feature particularly favoured by, but not unique to, BA. These observations already suggest someone modelling themselves on BA (perhaps with some influence from BC), rather than BA himself. And the script, both within the *elongatae* and context, is evidently not that of BA, as Hoffmann already noted. Thus BA's most characteristic feature, looped flourishes on ascenders that turn sharply left and then travel almost parallel to the text (Plate 2), are notably absent in D O I 161, replaced with much shorter flourishes that angle down towards the script line. This is not the only difference. While the scribe of our diploma forms his **g** with an elegant loop travelling well below the line, BA's either meets back up forming an oval or else creates a much tighter loop. And one searches in vain in BA's large and well-established oeuvre for the most distinctive feature of our scribe, an **h** with a pronounced descender on the second stroke. There can, in short, be no question of BA having produced D O I 161. But might he still have been its draftsman („Verfasser“, in Sickel's lexicon)? Sickel never elaborated on the reasoning behind his ascriptions of authorship, so here we must return to first principles²⁵. The *intitulatio* (or royal superscription) and publication formula both take forms frequently seen of BA, but these are sufficiently common formulae that it is dangerous to put too much store in them. The *dispositio*, royal subscription and chancery recognition all tell a similar

24) See, e.g., D O I 159, Magdeburg, Landesarchiv Sachsen-Anhalt, U 1, I, 10. More generally: RÜCK, *Bildberichte* (as n. 23) p. 72–85.

25) Cf. Carlrichard BRÜHL, *Theodor Schieffer als Diplomatiker*, in: Theodor Schieffer 1910–1992 (1993) p. 37–42, at 39f.