

to and including the entry for 829⁵⁹. The lost exemplar of the *Annales Fuldenses* functions as D2 by Kurze⁶⁰. This leaves another witness that transmits the entries from 771 up to and including 829, classified D3 by Kurze, as the only other extant witness of the D recension⁶¹.

Since the edition appeared, however, several witnesses have come to light that can be attributed either to ArF-C or D and are relevant to the discussion of the manuscript evidence of the ninth century. The first of these is transmitted in a manuscript fragment now in Leiden and belongs to ArF-D⁶². Another witness was discovered in Cologne and belongs to either ArF-C or D⁶³. A third witness survives in a sixteenth-century handwritten copy, it might have a connection to Walahfrid Strabo († 849) and is in need of further investigation⁶⁴. It contains ArF-D and runs from 771 up and ends with the entry for 818.

59) This is Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473, fol. 116r–143v and 152v–169r. See below, p. 39–42. I will draw attention to the possibility that there is no authentic witness of the D recension for the entries for 741 up to and including the entry for 770.

60) *Annales Fuldenses sive Annales regni Francorum orientalis*, ed. Friedrich KURZE (MGH SS rer. Germ. [7], 1891).

61) This is Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 612, fol. 1v–73v. The part that transmits the ArF dates from the eleventh century. A copy of this witness supposedly survives in Schlierbach, Zisterzienserkloster, Cod. 27, fol. 339r–392r, written in 1615. The Schlierbach codex was unknown to Kurze. Cf. also TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20) 2 p. 1200.

62) This is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 2391: p, fol. 1r–v. See below, p. 31–33.

63) This is Cologne, Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Köln (AEK), Best. Stift Maria im Kapitol, A II 184, fol. 1r–v. See below, p. 28–30.

64) This is Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Steinw. II Fol 3, fol. 146r–157r, formerly known as Ms. Akc. 1949 KN 397; it has now returned to its old signature. Rudolf POKORNÝ, *Die Annales Laureshamenses in einer neu aufgefundenen Teilüberlieferung*, in: DA 69 (2013) p. 1–43, at p. 10 n. 34, claims: “In das Handschriftenstemma der Edition lässt sich diese Überlieferung nicht recht einfügen.” I cannot follow this claim because (1) the witness extends beyond 813, which makes it by definition a witness of either C or D in Kurze’s system, and (2) contains references to the rebellions in the entries for 785 and 792 as well as the addition in the entry for 813, which makes it by definition a witness of D. Furthermore, (3) the interpolation of a solar eclipse right at the start of the entry for 787 with the exact hour of its occurrence, in the codex on fol. 148v, makes it clear that this witness was particularly close to the aforementioned witness D3. That witness, perhaps significantly, starts with the entry for 771, too. Further investigation between the two could shed more light on the history of this particular recension.