

addition in the entry for 757 in this codex that might suggest close proximity to the C recension²¹⁵. But he went on to propose that the addition probably derived independently from ArF-C²¹⁶. Yet Kurze's suggestion might have been based on his proven faulty assumption that the witness was written by a single scribe. Taking Reimitz's analysis into account sheds a different light on this. It is entirely possible, for example, that the process of compiling various witnesses from different manuscripts and merging them into a single composite codex resulted in a combination of a C recension witness from 742 up to and including most of the entry for 771. It begs the question why the part up to and including 770, which is the final complete entry of ArF-1, had to precede ArF-3. Further clues may lie in the part copied by the compiler. The key here is that the compiler copied the miracles that occurred in Fritzlar in the entry for 774, which aligns with recensions B and D, but not ArF-C, where this narrative digression is placed under 773. Since the text was made to fit ArF-3, it may be supposed that the compiler copied the bridging section, fol. 121r-v, from ArF-3 rather than ArF-1. As has been pointed out above, two other ArF-D witnesses start with the entry for 771 and so did the exemplar of the *Annales Fuldenses*²¹⁷. As it turns out, so does the Vienna codex because the entries for 742 to 770 are from a different codicological entity than the rest of this witness of ArF-D. In other words, there is no reason to suppose the existence of a clear-cut D recension for the entries for 741 up to and including 770 at all.

By way of conclusion

Summing up, it is evident that all ninth-century witnesses of the ArF were copied at the earliest during the reign of Louis the Pious (r. 814–840). In other words, the ArF provide a perspective on Char-

215) Ibid. p. 37f.; KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 307; Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473, fol. 118r.

216) The entry for 757 ends in this codex with *Natalem domini et pascha Corbonaco celebravit* on fol. 118r l. 11. This entry ends in ArF-C with *Eodem anno celebravit natalem Domini in Corbonaco et pascha*, cf. ArF ad a. 757 (as in n. 9) p. 16 n. *. Instead, Kurze argued it must have been borrowed from the same source that also provided the phrase *Hoc anno natalem Domini in Theodone villa, pascha in Carisiaco celebravit* in the entry for 753, which is uniquely preserved in this codex as well.

217) See the discussion above, p. 14.