

formerly maintained 825 to 875 and St Amand instead but now agrees more or less entirely with Bischoff and McKitterick for the origin and suggests a date no later than around 850¹⁴². He, too, noticed a possible connection with the court, which begs the question where this court exactly was in the second quarter of the ninth century. Mayke de Jong has convincingly shown that Louis the Pious “operated in a restricted royal landscape”¹⁴³. Charles the Bald seems to have continued this. This royal landscape was located in northern France, with places such as Compiègne, Quierzy and Attigny playing a particularly important role as royal residences. Similar to the Cologne fragment, nothing is known between the approximate date of writing and 1940, when it was first discovered as part of a collection of medieval fragments in the *Nieuwe Boekenmagazijn* of the Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden at Rapenburg. It was registered in the BPL journal in November 1940¹⁴⁴. How it ended up in Leiden remains unclear.

As mentioned above, the Leiden fragment contains a number of shared readings with Kurze’s D1, another ninth-century witness which will be discussed in greater detail below¹⁴⁵. Right at the start of the Leiden fragment, the omission of *nomine N.* immediately after its first legible word *quaedam* is shared uniquely with D1 among witnesses of the ArF. To put it differently, all witnesses read *quaedam*

142) The earlier thoughts of David Ganz, announced in person on 13 November 2005, are found in the description of the fragment on the aforementioned webpage of the digitised facsimile (as in n. 132). I have been in touch with him per e-mail in October and November 2024 about this leaf and am very grateful that he kindly agreed to take a fresh look at the images provided by the library. He no longer maintains what is attributed to him on that webpage, namely that it was written in St Amand between 825 and 875. Instead, he now thinks that Rhineland is probably the best localisation. As regards the date, he has further narrowed this down to a date no later than around 850. Also, he has pointed out that there seems to be a resemblance with Paris, BnF, lat. 11379, fol. 20, a leaf written in excellent script and presumably from the court of Louis the Pious.

143) On the court under Louis the Pious, cf. DE JONG, *The Penitential State* (as in n. 21) p. 34. See also my engagement with her remarks and possible implications for the ArF below, p. 45f.

144) *Journal van de handschriften: Bibliotheca Publica Latina 3: BPL 2251–2782, unpaginated*, “Nov. 1940. Portefeuille met fragmenten, in het *Nieuwe Boekenmagazijn* gevonden. Deze fragmenten zullen succesievelijk na beschrijving worden ingeschreven”; cf. André Th. BOUWMAN, *Inventory of Western Medieval Manuscripts held by Leiden University Libraries* (Leiden 2025: Version 3) p. 143, where it is also maintained that the fragment dates from c. 850 and originates from west Germany. It is accessible online: <http://hdl.handle.net/1887.1/item:3619870>.

145) This is Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473.