

omission of the *Divisio regnorum*, of passages on diplomatic relations with Constantinople and of passages dealing with confrontations with the Northmen<sup>93</sup>. For the entries from 804 up to and including the entry for 818, they finally conclude that “[a]t most [the compiler] might have had access to a heavily abbreviated version [of the ArF]”<sup>94</sup>.

It is therefore somewhat confusing that the critical apparatus of their edition still points out which phrases and content might have been taken from the ArF<sup>95</sup>. Looking at these alleged textual similarities makes things even clearer. The ArF, at least as we know it today, provide a continuous prose of annal entries. It is therefore difficult to explain why the entries for 807, 811 and 812 in the *Chronicon Moissiacense* do not make use of the ArF at all whereas others supposedly do. The chronology is also confused: the entry for 810 in the chronicle supposedly borrows from the ArF entry for 812, for example. This is all the more problematic because, as mentioned, the entry for 812 of the *Chronicon Moissiacense* itself does not use the ArF at all according to Kats and Claszen. The source of the final paragraph in the entry for 810, moreover, has not been identified despite the ArF also providing the information albeit in different wording. The textual discrepancies between the *Chronicon Moissiacense* and the ArF are, to my mind, simply too many in number and impossible to account for had there actually been a copy at the table of the compiler. I therefore follow more recent scholarship and reject the suggestion that a copy of the ArF was used by the compiler of the *Chronicon Moissiacense*.

A partial copy of a D version of the ArF that started with the entry for 771 was used to write the *Annales Fuldenses*. The exact circumstances are elusive, but it appears to have happened in the late 820s or the early 830s, possibly in the vicinity of Fulda. According to Kurze, the compiler of the work made use of a copy that stood particularly close to D3<sup>96</sup>. Although there has been some new literature on this particular set of annals, it may be sufficient here to paraphrase Timothy Reuter’s opinion that the present edition is unsatisfactory and

---

93) *Ibid.* p. 122f.

94) *Ibid.* p. 123.

95) *Ibid.* 2 p. 142–150. What follows is based on the apparatus in that edition on those pages and in-between.

96) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 318. Another, still unstudied copy very closely related to D3 survives in Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Steinw. II F 3, fol. 146r–157r. See above, p. 14 and n. 64. This is a fragment running from 771 up to and including the entry for 818 of the ArF.