

to Nibelung³². A Reichenau library catalogue from 821 or 822 records a *Vita et gesta Karoli*, but this is usually identified as Einhart's *Vita Karoli magni*³³. One would therefore do well not to take a reference to "Gesta Francorum" as a synonym for the ArF. It is simply too broad and is used often for other texts, too. In other words, the apparent lack of a fixed contemporary title, or even a standardised header for that matter, makes it virtually impossible for scholars to rely with absolute certainty on ninth-century library catalogues with regard to the number of textual witnesses of the ArF. None of the scholars cited intended their writing to be read as diktats, merely as suggestions of a possibility worth pursuing. Having followed up on some of these suggestions, I only wish to underscore here that these suggestions should be handled with care. Indeed, it may be more fruitful to examine the reception of the ArF instead for a better understanding of the dissemination of the work in the ninth century.

The recensions of the ArF

Before moving to the reception of the ArF, it is unavoidable to provide an overview of Kurze's recensions of the ArF. To keep things manageable, not all the intricacies of Kurze's system are treated here with the same detail as in earlier studies, such as those by Hermann Bloch and Hans Wibel³⁴. Boiled down, it basically comes to

32) See below, p. 35–37. Technically, there is no visible break between this colophon and the annals so any unsuspecting reader may have understood the annals to have been the work by Nibelung himself.

33) INNES / MCKITTERICK, *The writing of history* (as in n. 15) p. 204; Heinz LÖWE, *Die Entstehungszeit der Vita Karoli Einhardi*, in: DA 39 (1963) p. 85–103, at p. 85f.

34) Friedrich KURZE, *Ueber die karolingischen Reichsannalen von 741–829 und ihre Uebearbeitung. I. Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung*, in: NA 19 (1894) p. 295–339; IDEM, *Ueber die karolingischen Reichsannalen von 741–829 und ihre Uebearbeitung. II. Quellen und Verfasser des ersten Theiles*, in: NA 20 (1895) p. 9–49; IDEM, *Ueber die karolingischen Reichsannalen von 741–829 und ihre Uebearbeitung. III. Die zweite Hälfte und die Uebearbeitung*, in: NA 21 (1896) p. 9–82; cf. Hermann BLOCH, *review of Gabriel MONOD, Études critiques sur les sources de l'histoire carolingienne 1*, in: *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 163,11 (1901) p. 872–897, and Hans WIBEL, *Beiträge zur Kritik der Annales regni Francorum und der Annales q. d. Einhardi* (1902), for two early replies, written within a decade after Kurze's work appeared. For Kurze's response to his early critics, cf. Friedrich KURZE, *Zur Ueberlieferung der karolingischen Reichsannalen und ihrer*