

tis et avertit on fol. 110r¹⁵³. Another leaf has been cut out between fol. 114–115, resulting in loss of text in the entry for 822 after *Item in parte orientali Saxonie* on fol. 114v¹⁵⁴. The text continues with *cum quo VValahum monachum propinquum* on fol. 115r¹⁵⁵. The greatest loss of text is the result of an entire quire taken out between what are now fol. 117–118. The gap starts in the entry for 823 after *imperatore non inprobabiliter reddidit. Qui* on fol. 117v¹⁵⁶. Thereafter, the rest of the entry for 823 is missing, as are the entire entries for 824, 825 and 826. The text picks up again in the entry for 827, which now misses its first part, with *Aizonis haud dubiam sibi victoriam* on fol. 118r¹⁵⁷. Neither the Cologne fragment nor the Leiden fragment were part of this codex. Not only do their dimensions not fit, but also palaeographically neither fragment can have been part of the Paris codex.

It is not entirely clear when and where this codex was written. For example, Matthias Tischler has dated the codex to 887, due to a note in the codex that explains there are 113 years to go until the millennium is fulfilled, and suggested Fleury as its place of origin¹⁵⁸. McKitterick has suggested, however, that the codex dates from the “first third or second quarter of the ninth century” and proposed Paris or its vicinity as a possible place of origin¹⁵⁹. In a later publication, she tweaked the date of origin to “c. 830”¹⁶⁰. Reimitz, too, preferred to follow the arguments in favour of the earlier date and northwestern France as

153) Ibid. p. 151 l. 9.

154) ArF ad a. 822 (as in n. 9) p. 157 l. 8 from the bottom.

155) Ibid. p. 159 l. 7.

156) ArF ad a. 823 (as in n. 9) p. 162 l. 9 from the bottom.

157) ArF ad a. 827 (as in n. 9) p. 172 bottom line.

158) TISCHLER, Einharts Vita Karoli (as in n. 20), here 2 p. 1156–1158.

159) MCKITTERICK, History and Memory (as in n. 21) p. 15: “It was written by a single scribe, possibly in Paris, in sloping early caroline minuscule and is probably to be dated to the first third or second quarter of the ninth century.” The grounds to ascribe the codex to Paris are palaeographical similarities with St-Germain-des-Prés manuscripts. Cf. also her earlier Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *Akkulturation* and the writing of history in the early middle ages, in: *Akkulturation. Probleme einer germanisch-romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühem Mittelalter*, hg. von Dieter HÄGERMANN / Wolfgang HAUBRICHS / Jörg JARNUT unter Mitarbeit von Claudia GIEFERS (Ergänzungsbd. zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 41, 2004) p. 381–395, at p. 389–393. For a much earlier work that connects the codex to Paris, cf. Gabriel MONOD, *Origines de l’historiographie à Paris* (1877) p. 7, where Paris is suggested, but the claim is made that the codex was written in 887.

160) MCKITTERICK, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 35 and p. 47.