

neatly in this pattern²¹⁹. On the other hand, the striking lack of extant ninth-century copies from culturally vibrant centres, such as Lorsch²²⁰, Reichenau, St Gall, Lyon, Tours or Flavigny, just to name a few, also suggests that the impact of the ArF appears to have been rather limited beyond the aforementioned area. There is even less evidence to suggest an active dissemination of the text by the loyal supporters of the Carolingian family at the court. It seems as if no effort was made, or at least not a conscious and intentional effort, to disseminate the text throughout the Frankish empire²²¹.

It would only be fair to put this apparently limited dissemination into perspective. The spatial range of the extant witnesses of the ArF appears to have been quite similar to the area where Louis the Pious spent his entire rule. As Mayke de Jong has highlighted, Louis the Pious “operated in a restricted royal landscape”²²². What is more, the rather limited spread of the text in the first four decades of the ninth century may have had a profound impact on its later dissemination. Even after the death of Louis the Pious in 840 the ArF did not start

219) This is St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, F. v. IV. 4. On this codex, cf. KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 310f.; Rosamond MCKITTERICK, Charles the Bald (823–877) and his library: the patronage of learning, in: *The English Historical Review* 95 (1980) p. 28–47, at p. 32, whose attention was drawn to it by Bernhard Bischoff; TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20), here 1 p. 1163–1176. For scholarship after Tischler, cf. especially Helmut REIMITZ, *Livres d’histoire et histoire du livre à l’époque carolingienne*, in: *Imago libri. Représentations carolingiennes du livre*, sous la direction de Charlotte DENOËL / Anne-Orange POILPRÉ / Sumi SHIMAHARA (*Bibliologia* 47, 2018) p. 107–119. The whereabouts of the intermediary codex offered to Charles the Bald are unknown. Even so, the very text of the ArF as preserved in the St Petersburg codex was copied either directly from the Paris codex discussed above or from a common exemplar. The St Petersburg codex, therefore, transmits a dependent textual witness.

220) No extant witness from before the tenth century survives, despite the possible origin of Kurze’s A1 in Lorsch. As pointed out, there must have been a copy by c. 807, when the *Chronicon Laurissense breve* was written in Lorsch, cf. KASCHKE, *Fixing dates* (as in n. 71) p. 11 n. 2.

221) Note the remarkable similarity to the dissemination of the so-called “*Leges-Handschriften*”, cf. Karl UBL, *Gab es das Leges-Skriptorium Ludwigs des Frommen?*, in: *DA* 70 (2014) p. 43–65, at p. 64: “Die Verbreitung von *Leges-Handschriften* erhielt folglich Impulse durch das Skriptorium von Tours, wurde aber nicht zentral gesteuert.”

222) DE JONG, *The Penitential State* (as in n. 21) p. 34: “After 814 Louis ventured no further south than Chalon-sur-Saône, no further east than Paderborn, Remiremont and Salz, no further north than Nijmegen, and no further west than the Paris region, except for two campaigns against the Bretons ... Most often, the emperor operated in a restricted royal landscape.”