

to envisage more than a single copy of the ArF in the ninth century in combination with the *Annales Bertiniani*, nor is there any reason to suppose that the dissemination of the *Annales Bertiniani* can be counted as spread of the ArF throughout the Frankish world. Evidence for such an assumption is lacking and the only extant witness version of the *Annales Bertiniani* that does not derive from Hincmar's own lost copy, possibly because it simply may be an older version, is not transmitted with the ArF.

A second special case is presented by the AqdE, commonly known in English as the Revised ArF. Although the intertextual dependencies have long been observed and the connection between the ArF and the AqdE has long been established, there is still considerable uncertainty regarding the AqdE, the most pressing of these probably being the uncertainty when precisely the AqdE was forged out of the ArF¹¹⁰. The long and short of it is that this intensive reworking of the ArF happened either shortly after 801, as suggested by McKitterick¹¹¹, between 814 and 817, as maintained by Hermann Bloch¹¹², or even after 830, as advocated by Kurze¹¹³. Problem here seems to be that scholars, at times, are not precise enough about what they mean. After all, the E recension by Kurze, which usually went hand in hand with the AqdE as a whole for 741 to 801 actually remains an independent textual family with unique textual divergencies to set it apart from other recensions up to and including at least the entry for 824¹¹⁴. This might suggest that active engagement with the common stock occurred as late as the mid-820s or indeed the early 830s. And it does not necessarily mean that the first 61 entries were first rewritten also

110) Sören KASCHKE, *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen bis 831. Herrschaftspraxis und Normvorstellungen in zeitgenössischer Sicht* (Schriften zur Mediävistik 7, 2006) p. 277–290, sums up scholarship to 2006; cf. also MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 27–31; quite unique in its suggestions and conclusions, but all the more intriguing is Tibor ŽIVKOVIĆ, *The 'original' and the 'revised' Annales regni Francorum*, in: *Istorijski časopis* 59 (2010) p. 9–58.

111) MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 27.

112) BLOCH, review of Monod (as in n. 34) p. 885f., where he maintains that the “bis 812–815 reichende Überarbeitung der *Annales regni* schon vor dem J. 817 beendet wurde.”

113) KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 58, where he still clings to 832 as “wahrscheinlichste[r] Zeitpunkt”.

114) Some examples are ArF ad a. 815 (as in n. 9) p. 141 n. i: *infectum* E (for *inperfectum*); ArF ad a. 823 *ibid.* p. 163 n. e: *Et – inradiavit* desunt E; ArF ad a. 824 *ibid.* p. 164 n. *: *Omortag* add. E; n. a: *non* deest E; n. h: *Interea hiemps* E; n. p: *Interea* deest E.