

Deutsches Archiv

für

Erforschung des Mittelalters

Namens der

Monumenta Germaniae Historica

herausgegeben von

ENNO BÜNZ

MARTINA HARTMANN

CLAUDIA MÄRTL

STEFAN PETERSEN

81. Jahrgang

Heft 1

2025

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The Annales regni Francorum: the ninth-century manuscript evidence and its implications¹

By

BART VAN HEES

In the first decade of the tenth century, Regino of Prüm, the “Edward Gibbon of Carolingian historical writing”², wrote his *Libellus de temporibus dominicae incarnationis*, commonly known as his *Chronicon*³, in which he recounts the tale of the “rise and fall of the Carolingians”⁴. Although Regino is usually known by his epithet “of

1) I should like to thank, in alphabetical order, Mayke de Jong, Sören Kaschke, Rosamond McKitterick, Helmut Reimitz and Dominik Trump for discussing various stages of this text between September 2023 and Christmas 2024 and for their helpful comments. I am also grateful to David Ganz, who took a fresh look at images of Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 2391: p.

2) Stuart AIRLIE, ‘Sad stories of the death of kings’: Narrative Patterns and Structures of Authority in Regino of Prüm’s *Chronicle*, in: *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Elizabeth M. TYLER / ROSS BALZARETTI (*Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 16, 2006) p. 105–131, at p. 126.

3) For the edition, cf. Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*, ed. Friedrich KURZE (MGH SS rer. Germ. [50], 1890); for a reconsideration of the manuscript evidence and the implications on our understanding of the text, cf. Wolf-Rüdiger SCHLEIDGEN, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Chronik des Regino von Prüm* (Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelhheinischen Kirchengeschichte 31, 1977). For the most recent discussion of the work, cf. Hans-Werner GOETZ, *Die Chronik Reginos von Prüm. Geschichtsschreibung, Geschichtsbild, und Umgang mit Zeit und Vergangenheit im frühen Mittelalter* (Libelli Rhenani 82, 2022).

4) Erik GOOSMANN / Rob MEENS, A mirror of princes who opted out: Regino of Prüm and royal monastic conversion, in: *Religious Franks. Religion and power in the Frankish Kingdoms: studies in honour of Mayke de Jong*, ed. by Rob MEENS /

Prüm”, of which he was abbot between 892 and 899⁵, he was ousted from the royal abbey and resided in Trier from 899 onwards and it was there that he wrote his chronicle. It remains uncertain whether the writing took place in St Martin, where he became abbot, or St Maximin, where he was buried⁶. Both abbeys in Trier as well as the one in Prüm, however, suffered from raids by Northmen in the 880s and 890s. These raids not only inflicted loss of life, but also loss of cultural objects⁷. Regino therefore faced a problem: where could he acquire a source of information in order to write about the Carolingian history of days gone by? Luckily for scholars, Regino was meticulous in the way he kept track of his sources and explained to his audience that, for the part of his chronicle covering the years from 741 up to and including 813, he had “discovered the things which have been laid out above in a certain booklet composed in the language of plebeians and rustics” continuing that he “corrected them in places to regular Latin” and, wherever the source was lacking, he felt at liberty to add “certain things which I heard from the stories of the elders”⁸.

It is a paradox that the source used by Regino, an unpolished work to which he could add new things and maybe also just as easily could take inconvenient things out, has been known to scholars since the

Dorine VAN ESPELO / Bram VAN DEN HOVEN VAN GENDEREN / Janneke RAAIJMAKERS / Irene VAN RENSWOUDE / Carine VAN RHIJN (2016) p. 296–313, at p. 296.

5) For a brief discussion of the events that led to the deposition of Regino in Prüm, cf. Bernd ISPHORDING, *Die zeitgenössischen erzählenden Quellen aus Prüm*, in: Lothar I. Kaiser und Mönch in Prüm. Zum 1150. Jahr seines Todes, hg. von Reiner NOLDEN (Veröffentlichungen des Geschichtsvereins Prümer Land 55, 2005) p. 99–112, at p. 106.

6) SCHLEIDGEN, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte* (as in n. 3) p. 131.

7) On Prüm, cf. ISPHORDING, *Die zeitgenössischen erzählenden Quellen* (as in n. 5) p. 104–106; on St Maximin, cf. *Das Erzbistum Trier 13: Die Benediktinerabtei St. Maximin vor Trier*, bearb. von Bertram RESMINI, 2 vols. (Germania Sacra. Dritte Folge 11, 2016), here 1 p. 68, 119, 148. Isabel KNOBLICH, *Die Bibliothek des Klosters St. Maximin bei Trier bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (1996) p. 7, 16, works from the supposition that much of the library of St Maximin was destroyed in 882; more sceptical about the supposed losses is Hartmut HOFFMANN, *Bernhard Bischoffs Katalog der karolingischen Handschriften*, in: DA 71 (2015) p. 1–56, at p. 52f.

8) Regino, *Chronicon ad a. 813* (as in n. 3) p. 73: *Haec, quae supra expressa sunt, in quodam libello repperi plebeio et rusticano sermone composita; quae ex parte ad latinam regulam correxi, quaedam etiam addidi, quae ex narratione seniorum audivi*. The used translation comes from Simon MACLEAN, *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe. The Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg* (Manchester Medieval Sources Series, 2009) p. 129.

most recent edition of 1895 as the *Annales regni Francorum* (ArF)⁹, commonly translated into English as the *Royal Frankish Annals* and only rarely as *Annals of the kingdom of the Franks*¹⁰, in German as the (fränkische) *Reichsannalen*¹¹ and in French as the *Annales du royaume des Francs*¹². It is this work that has been dubbed as “the closest thing to ‘official history’ we have from the early Carolingian period”¹³, which, according to some scholars, was written at the royal court¹⁴. If the ArF, as part of the “veritable explosion of history-writing” of the eighth and ninth centuries¹⁵, truly are a major historiographical enterprise composed at the court, written for the court and subsequently disseminated from the court throughout the Frankish

9) *Annales regni Francorum* inde ab a. 741 usque ad a. 829 qui dicuntur *Annales Laurissenses maiores* et Einhardi, ed. Friedrich KURZE (MGH SS rer. Germ. [6], 1895).

10) *Carolingian Chronicles. Royal Frankish Annals* and Nithard's *Histories*, translated by Bernhard Walter SCHOLZ / Barbara ROGERS (1972) p. 35–125; Paul David KING, *Charlemagne. Translated Sources* (1987) p. 74–107, contains the entries from 768 up to and including 814 and translates the artificial Latin title correctly as *Annals of the kingdom of the Franks*, abbreviating them as AKF.

11) Reinhold RAU, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte 1: Die Reichsannalen. Einhard Leben Karls des Großen. Zwei “Leben” Ludwigs. Nithard Geschichten (Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des MA. Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe 5, 1955) p. 9–155.*

12) *Annales du royaume des Francs. Texte d'après l'édition de Friedrich Kurze. Introduction générale, traduction, notes et index sous la direction de Michel SOT / Christiane VEYRARD-COSME, 2 vols. (Les Classiques de l'histoire au Moyen Âge 58, 2022).* They were formerly also known as the *Annales royales*, as dubbed by the very influential Louis HALPHEN in the articles that appeared in the 1910s as a response to Kurze and were ultimately collected and published in a single volume as *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Charlemagne* (1921).

13) The quotation comes from Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne. The Formation of a European Identity* (2008) p. 31, but the list of literature either explicitly claiming this or implicitly hinting at it is endless. It goes back to Leopold RANKE, *Zur Kritik fränkisch-deutscher Reichsannalisten*, in: *Abh.* Berlin 1854 (1855) p. 415–458.

14) Wilhelm WATTENBACH / Wilhelm LEVISON / Heinz LÖWE, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Vorzeit und Karolinger, 6 vols. (1952–1990), here 2: Die Karolinger vom Anfang des 8. Jahrhunderts bis zum Tode Karls des Großen* (1953) p. 248: “Am Hofe müssen die Annalen geschrieben sein.”

15) MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 36; cf. also Matthew INNES / Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *The writing of history*, in: *Carolingian culture: emulation and innovation*, ed. by EADEM (1994) p. 193–220, at p. 193.

realm¹⁶, it must have left its mark on the manuscript evidence during the period of Carolingian hegemony¹⁷.

Although there is a plethora of secondary studies on the ArF, almost all deal with the content of the ArF rather than the manuscript evidence itself¹⁸. No survey of the extant ninth-century manuscript evidence has been undertaken to support those studies and their results; it has remained a scholarly desideratum. An article by Helmut Reimitz focuses on the codicological context of the textual witnesses of the ArF, but it offers a panorama of witnesses rather than examining the ninth-century manuscript evidence in its own right¹⁹. The work of Matthias Tischler has contributed substantially to our knowledge about the manuscript transmission of Einhart's *Vita Karoli magni*²⁰, but not that many ninth-century textual witnesses of the *Vita* survive with the ArF in the same codex. There are a number of other exceptions as well in which the manuscript evidence is at least touched

16) Rudolf SCHIEFFER, *Geschichtsschreibung am Hof Karls des Großen*, in: *Die Hofgeschichtsschreibung im mittelalterlichen Europa. Projekte und Forschungsprobleme*, hg. von DEMS. / Jaroslav WENTA unter redaktioneller Mitwirkung von Martina GIESE (*Subsidia historiographica* 3, 2006) p. 7–18, at p. 7: “Eine Geschichtsschreibung, die am Hof entstanden ist, für den Hof gedacht war und vom Hof aus Verbreitung gefunden hat, scheint es in der europäischen Geschichte zuerst unter Karl dem Großen gegeben zu haben.”

17) On the phrase “Carolingian hegemony”, cf. Marios COSTAMBEYS / Matthew INNES / Simon MACLEAN, *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge Medieval Textbooks, 2011) p. 51–65.

18) The best starting point that summarises the scholarly debate up to the early 1950s is WATTENBACH / LEVISON / LÖWE, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (as in n. 14) p. 245–254; for overviews of later scholarship cf. especially Helmut REIMITZ, *History, Frankish identity and the framing of Western ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought. Fourth series 101, 2015) p. 335–345 and p. 410–432; Michel SOT, *Pour une relecture des Annales du royaume des Francs*, in: *Entre texte et histoire. Études d'histoire médiévale offertes au professeur Shoichi Sato*, sous la direction de Osamu KANO / Jean-Loup LEMAÎTRE (*De l'archéologie à l'histoire*, 2015) p. 323–337; for new perspectives, cf. in particular Jennifer R. DAVIS, *Reframing the Carolingian Annals*, in: *The Medieval Chronicle* 14, ed. by Erik KOOPER / Sjoerd LEVELT (2021) p. 184–215.

19) Helmut REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum in den historiographischen Kompendien der Karolingerzeit*, in: *Der Dynastiewechsel von 751: Vorgeschichte, Legitimationsstrategien und Erinnerung*, hg. von Matthias BECHER / Jörg JARNUT (2004) p. 277–320.

20) Matthias M. TISCHLER, *Einhardts “Vita Karoli”. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption*, 2 vols. (MGH Schriften 48, 2001), provides an excellent start for witnesses to the ArF that survive in codices that also transmit Einhart's *Vita Karoli*. Individual cases are discussed below.

upon²¹, but many studies pass over it in silence²². It is therefore all the more urgent to put together a conspectus librorum of manuscripts containing the ArF and to analyse the implications thereof, not least because there is still no certainty about how many extant witnesses of the ArF have survived the vicissitudes of time. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated by Rudolf Schieffer's reference to the fact that Friedrich Kurze, the most recent editor of the ArF, had dated four codices to the ninth century, but that these had been reduced to three by Bernhard Bischoff²³. As will be shown in what follows, however, there are actually six, hence the need for further research.

21) MCKITTERICK, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 31–39, which deals in a succinct manner with a number of textual witnesses; EADEM, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (2004), dealing with various witnesses in various parts of her monograph, such as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), lat. 10911, on p. 13–19; REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19), deals with basically all known textual witnesses. For Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), Cod. 473, cf. IDEM, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch aus Saint-Amand. Der Codex Vindobonensis palat. 473*, in: *Text – Schrift – Codex. Quellenkundliche Arbeiten aus dem Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, hg. von Christoph EGGER / Herwig WEIGL (MIÖG Ergänzungsbd. 35, 2000) p. 34–90; Mayke DE JONG, *The Penitential State. Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814–840* (2009) p. 63–65.

22) The work of Matthias BECHER, *Eid und Herrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen* (VuF Sonderbd. 39, 1993), whose magnificent study on the early history of the ArF has profoundly shaped our understanding of this set of annals, for example, leaves out the manuscript evidence of the ArF, but does look at other manuscript evidence with regard to oaths.

23) SCHIEFFER, *Geschichtsschreibung* (as in n. 16) p. 10: “Überhaupt nur vier Exemplare schrieb Kurze noch dem 9. Jahrhundert zu, was sich mittlerweile durch Bernhard Bischoffs Forschungen auf drei vermindert hat.” Although he does not mention it, Schieffer must have been referring here to Bischoff's catalogue of ninth-century manuscripts, of which the first two volumes had appeared already when Schieffer published his article. Cf. Bernhard BISCHOFF, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) 1: Aachen – Lambach* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Herausgabe der ma. Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, 1998); IDEM, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) 2: Laon – Paderborn*. Aus dem Nachlaß hg. von Birgit EBERSPERGER (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Herausgabe der ma. Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, 2004); IDEM, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) 3: Padua – Zwickau*. Aus dem Nachlaß hg. von Birgit EBERSPERGER (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Herausgabe der ma. Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, 2014); IDEM, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) 4: Gesamtregister*, bearb.

This article aims to contribute to a better understanding of the manuscript evidence from the ninth century. To do so, it provides a preliminary survey of the extant ninth-century textual witnesses of the ArF – none survives from the eighth century – and aims to consider the implications that the manuscript evidence might suggest²⁴. What is not in this article, however, is an in-depth analysis of the recensions, although I have added, inasmuch as possible, the recensions to which witnesses belong that were discovered after the edition by Kurze appeared in 1895. Nor do I at this stage provide a palaeographical and codicological description of the codices that transmit those witnesses. The revised version of the ArF, commonly known as the *Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi* (AqdE), which Kurze classified as the E recension of the ArF, will not be studied in detail here²⁵. The reason for this is that scholars have, at least since the edition of Pertz appeared in 1826, tried to solve the many riddles the ArF and the AqdE present, but unsuccessfully. Perhaps part of the problem is in the scholarly paradigm. With “scholarly paradigm”, I mean that it has become an unwritten rule that in order to shed light on one of the two works, the other must be taken into account as well. This is working backwards from the assumption that both works are end products in their own right, with the final stage being the complete AqdE. To contemporaries, however, it was not known that someday the ArF would be rewritten and later become known to scholars as the AqdE. I am therefore following here what is probably closer to the contemporary experience than the scholarly paradigm and follow the development of the ArF rather than the other way around, differentiating very clearly between this work and the AqdE. Finally, it is precisely because of the rather different focal point in this contribution that no effort has been made here to provide a thorough assessment of the literary corpus that deals with the ArF and their content.

von Birgit EBERSPERGER (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Herausgabe der ma. Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, 2017).

24) I am preparing a research project to deal comprehensively with the matter. Although I have either seen the easily accessible digital versions of the codices or am in the possession of high-quality photographs, I have yet to perform a codicological autopsy of each codex and am therefore reliant on secondary studies mentioned in the footnotes. All links to the digital versions available online provided in this article have been tested on 31 December 2024.

25) See below, p. 26–28, for a succinct discussion of the sole ninth-century textual witness of the AqdE.

Before dealing with the actual manuscript evidence, three topics need to be addressed. The first of these is how to deal with library references to annals and the issue of lost copies of the ArF. It exposes the difficulty of identifying specific sets of annals in a rather generic field of titles in contemporary book catalogues and book lists. Second, the recensions of the ArF as distinguished by Kurze must be touched upon, because the reader needs to be familiar with the basic elements of Kurze's system of recensions in order to have an understanding of how the ninth-century witnesses relate to each other. Third, a provisional overview of the ninth-century dissemination and reception of the ArF by means of looking at other works that borrow from it is a necessity to avoid any semblance of reliance on the extant witnesses to provide the full story. There is much more evidence for the transmission and dissemination of the ArF than the manuscript copies of the text itself suggest, but this too will be considered in greater detail elsewhere. Indeed, at the end of this article, it will be clear that the manuscript evidence not only answers questions, but also raises new ones that may be answered, in turn, by looking in closer detail at the dissemination and reception of the ArF.

The problem of the title

The titles of Carolingian historiographical texts are, as a rule, modern ones, usually invented by the first editor of the work. Attempts made to locate the ArF in ninth-century library catalogues, therefore, do not look for the *Annales regni Francorum* as such, but something else instead. For example, Rosamond McKitterick has suggested that if the ArF are to be identified with the “*Gesta Francorum*” mentioned in ninth-century catalogues we may be able to map the transmission and dissemination better²⁶. The only contemporary set of annals I have come across so far with this header is in St Gall, Stiftsarchiv, Zürcher Abteilung X, Nr. 1, fol. 1r, which reads *Ab incarnatione domini gesta Francorum excerpta*. It contains a work commonly known as the *Annales Alamannici*, not the ArF²⁷.

26) Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *Constructing the Past in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Royal Frankish Annals*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth series 7 (1997) p. 101–129, at p. 126.

27) For the most recent edition, cf. *Annales Alamannici*, ed. Roland ZINGG, *Die St. Galler Annalistik* (2019) p. 54–104, at p. 54.

Although no manuscript of the ArF contains a header in its own right, there are two witnesses that transmit explicit references to the ArF. One of them, known as the *Annales Tiliani*, which will be discussed in greater detail below, read *Hic incipit gesta Karoli imperatoris* right between the entries for 768 and 769²⁸. Because the *Annales Tiliani* only survive in a seventeenth-century printed version, it is simply impossible to determine the age of the codex in which the work was transmitted. The second example is in Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473, which will be discussed in greater detail below as well, which contains a rubricated line on fol. 120r in the entry for 768 that reads *Incipit gesta Caroli magni regis et Carlomanni fratris eius*²⁹. This occurs in the entry rather than in-between entries, right after the death of Pippin and before the elevation of the brothers to kingship. Later, after Charlemagne's death in the entry for 814, but right before the start of Einhart's *Vita Karoli magni*, on fol. 143v, the witness reads that *Finiunt gesta domini Karoli magni et praecellentissimi Francorum imperatoris*. After the part of Einhart's *Vita Karoli magni*, on fol. 152v, the narrative of the ArF is picked up again with the unmistakable half folio-sized phrase *Incipit gesta Hludovvici imperatoris filii Karoli magni imperatoris*. From these examples, it is clear that annals supply the *Gesta*, as David Ganz has pointed out two decades ago, albeit based only on the example of the Vienna codex³⁰.

Although it is clear that *gesta* could be written in the annalistic format, this was by no means always the case. The phrase *Gesta regum Francorum* is used for the *Liber Historiae Francorum* in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), Pal. lat. 966, on fol. 1v³¹. Similarly, the famous colophon in Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 213, on fol. 139v refers to the *Historia vel gesta Francorum* but this is in fact the work formerly known as the final continuation of Fredegar's chronicle attributed

28) Because the whereabouts of the manuscript are unknown, the seventeenth-century editio princeps is crucial. *Annales Francorum auctiores ab anno Christi DCCVIII. ad annum usque DCCCVIII. quo auctor se vixisse testatur*, ed. André DUCHESNE (*Historiae Francorum scriptores coetanei* 2, Paris 1636) p. 11–21, at p. 13; cf. also *Annales Tiliani*, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ (MGH SS 1, 1826, p. 6, 8, 219–224) p. 220, where Pertz preserved it in his edition.

29) On this codex in general, cf. REIMITZ, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch* (as in n. 21).

30) David GANZ, *Einhard's Charlemagne: the characterisation of greatness*, in: *Charlemagne. Empire and Society*, ed. by Joanna STORY (2005) p. 38–51, at p. 41.

31) BISCHOFF, *Katalog* 3 (as in n. 23) p. 418 (no. 6572).

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 Einhardts*, 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*

this³⁵: Kurze distinguished between five recensions of the ArF, namely A, B, C, D and E. Only the first four concern the ArF, for the last is what is usually regarded as the revised version of the ArF that has been edited by Kurze as the aforementioned AqdE, which falls outside the scope of this article, as mentioned earlier. Peculiarities of the other four relevant recensions are as follows.

The A recension runs from the annal entry for 741 up to and including most of the entry for 788, of which the final paragraph is missing, which is taken from the B, C and D recensions in Kurze's edition³⁶. As McKitterick has underlined, this final paragraph reads like a kind of summing-up, possibly added later by a continuator of the ArF³⁷. Further, this recension lacks two narrative digressions, namely in the entries for 773, on the miracle at Fritzlar³⁸, and 776, which deals with miraculous support from God to repulse a Saxons' attack on Siegburg³⁹. Kurze maintains that these are later additions which "in der Urschrift der Reichsannalen als Nachträge am Rande gestanden haben müssen" and had not been added to the main text when the copy that survives as ArF-A had been made⁴⁰. The manuscript evidence for this recension is problematic. Except from the first nine entries, the A recension survives exclusively in an early modern printed version

Uebearbeitung, in: NA 28 (1903) p. 619–669, and the reply by Hans Wibel following directly on this response by Kurze to defend his book: *Erwiderung*, *ibid.* p. 670–686. Ultimately, Wibel provided Kurze with his own copy of the edition so that Kurze could see some of the corrections for himself. Kurze subsequently emended the edition based on Wibel's notes. The literary output was published in Friedrich KURZE, *Corrigenda zur Handausgabe der Annales regni Francorum*, in: NA 29 (1904) p. 464–467.

35) For what follows cf. Friedrich KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen bis zum Tode Einhards* (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Königlichen Luisengymnasiums zu Berlin, 1913) p. 49f., where he succinctly recapitulates his earlier suggestions and claims. It also takes into account the scholarly debate that took place between the publication of his studies on and edition of the ArF in the mid-1890s and the publication of his booklet in 1913.

36) ArF ad a. 788 (as in n. 9) p. 84. The final paragraph that is not in A is as follows: *Post haec omnia dominus rex ... se numerus annorum in DCCLXXXVIII.*

37) McKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 34.

38) ArF ad a. 773 (as in n. 9) p. 36–38. This story is ad a. 774 in C.

39) ArF ad a. 776 (as in n. 9) p. 44–46. This story is also absent in B5 and D2.

40) KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 49.

of 1603 by Henricus Canisius⁴¹. Other witnesses attributed by Kurze to ArF-A run from 741 up to and including 749 in a witness of the eleventh century which bears siglum A2 and was subsequently copied into witness A2a⁴².

The B recension has not fared much better. Kurze writes that it is “eine Gruppe von Handschriften, welche aus einer beim Jahre 813 endenden Abschrift abgeleitet sind”⁴³. That Kurze referred to a group of manuscripts instead of a clearcut recension, as he usually did, could be seen as a sign of his own uncertainty about the very existence of ArF-B as a distinct recension in its own right. Notwithstanding his ambivalence, the B recension runs from 741 up to and including the entry for 813, but, similar to ArF-A, the final paragraph is lacking, ending with the words *et multis suorum amissis recesserunt* in the entry for 813⁴⁴. This also means that in Kurze’s system, any witness that reaches beyond that paragraph cannot belong to ArF-B. It appears indeed that Kurze struggled to make sense of the B recension in the same way in which he had dealt with A, C and D. Surely, his position is difficult to maintain because of the fragmentary nature of all but one of the textual witnesses of ArF-B. One fragment, numbered by Kurze as B1, transmits the ArF from the middle of the entry for 777 up to and including the very end of the B recension, i.e. in the entry for 813⁴⁵. An apparently complete witness must have been available to Regino when writing his *Chronicon*, for it does not reach beyond 813 either. Hence, Regino’s *Chronicon* is grouped by Kurze as B2. Another fragment, numbered by Kurze as B3, contains the ArF from the start of the entry for 791 up to the middle of the entry for 806, when

41) *Francorum Annalium fragmentum ab anno DCCXLI. usque ad annum DCCXCIII.*, ed. Henricus CANISIUS (*Antiquae Lectionis tomus III,1*, Ingolstadt 1603) p. 187–217, at p. 188–214.

42) Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (BML), LXV, 35, fol. 125va–vb, from the last quarter of the eleventh century, was supposedly copied into Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 3126, fol. 43rb–43va, a codex that dates from the last third of the fifteenth century. Cf. also REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 281. A sister manuscript of the Florence codex survives as Florence, BML, Conv. soppr. 364, which was unknown to Kurze at the time. This manuscript is in need of further investigation. Cf. also TISCHLER, *Einhalts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20) 1 p. 442f.

43) KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 49.

44) ArF ad a. 813 (as in n. 9) p. 139. The final paragraph that is not in B is as follows: *At Michabel imperator Bulgaros bello ... ac patriam turpiter redire coegit.*

45) This is Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 617, which is discussed in greater detail below.

the text breaks off⁴⁶. The next witness of this group of manuscripts, B4, preserves the entire text of this recension, running from the entry for 741 up to and including the final sentence that is also in B1⁴⁷. The final witness of ArF-B is commonly known as the *Annales Tiliani*, which received siglum B5. It starts with the entry for 741 and ends in mid-sentence in the entry for 807 which is misdated to 808⁴⁸.

The C recension contains the work in full, running from 741 up to and including 829, and has some additional paragraphs not found in other recensions as well as a few changes in chronology⁴⁹. Contrary to ArF-B and D, which transmit the aforementioned narrative digression on the miracle at Fritzlar in the entry for 774, it is found in ArF-C in the entry for 773⁵⁰. Also, it contains an addition to the entry for 828 not found in ArF-D⁵¹. The C recension is transmitted through four independent textual witnesses which Kurze divided into two groups. The first of these transmits the ArF as part of a Carolingian historiographical compendium, but still ends with the entry for 829. The oldest witness of those is numbered by Kurze as C1, which is preserved in a codex in Paris and will be discussed in greater detail below⁵². The second independent witness, C2, dates from the tenth century and was probably copied from an exemplar produced during

46) This is Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 213, fol. 151bis–157v, which is discussed in greater detail below.

47) It is in Paris, BnF, lat. 5941A, fol. 1v–26r. In his edition of Notker the Stammerer's *Gesta Karoli*, Haefele states that the part of the codex that transmits the ArF dates from the eleventh century, cf. Notker the Stammerer, *Gesta Karoli magni imperatoris*, ed. Hans F. HAEFELE (MGH SS rer. Germ. N. S. 12, 1959) p. XXXII. A genealogy at fol. 26v, following immediately on the ArF and apparently written by the same hand, reaches up to the reign of Louis VII of France (r. 1137–1180) and strongly suggests the witness of the ArF was written during his reign instead, making it a twelfth-century codex.

48) *Annales Francorum auctiores* (as in n. 28). The chronology is confused from 773/774 onwards with all subsequent entries one year off, coming to an end with *eorum diversis tincta coloribus fuerunt*. For this phrase, cf. ArF ad a. 807 (as in n. 9) p. 123 l. 8 from the bottom. See also below, p. 18f.

49) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 307f.

50) See above, n. 38.

51) ArF ad a. 828 (as in n. 9) p. 176. The addition is located between the entry for 829 and the critical apparatus.

52) This is Paris, BnF, lat. 10911, fol. 56r–121v. See below, p. 33–35. A copy of this codex was made in the eighteenth century and is now preserved as Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 254a Fol., fol. 53r–110v. This is Kurze's C1a. The final folium appears to be missing, for the text ends on fol. 110v with *Augusto VVormaciam venit. Ibi que habito*.

the reign of Charles the Bald⁵³. In two other codices that transmit the ArF, numbered as C3 and C4, they are continued with the *Annales Bertiniani*⁵⁴. This continuation takes the text up to and including an entry for 882 in C3, but only up to 844 in C4⁵⁵. The latter, moreover, appears to transmit only parts of the ArF entries up to and including the entry for 814 and contains the text proper from the entry for 815 onwards⁵⁶. It is in need of a re-examination.

According to Kurze, the D recension contains the entire work and distinguishes itself from ArF-C with two brief additions in the entries for 785 and 792 on opposition against Charlemagne, namely the rebellions of Hardrad and of Pippin the Hunchback, respectively⁵⁷. A further addition is in the entry for 813, which deals with the destruction of a bridge near Mainz over the Rhine and a brief note on an ailing emperor⁵⁸. Kurze maintained that the recension has a single codex, D1, which transmits the text in full, running from the entry for 742 up

53) St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, F. v. IV. 4, fol. 37v–90v. Kurze classified Paris, BnF, lat. 5943B, fol. 1ra–16rb, as C2a and the exemplar of Adémar of Chabannes' *Historiae* as C2b. The autograph of that work is possibly partially preserved in Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 263, with another part of what was once perhaps the same codex surviving in Paris, BnF, lat. 5943A.

54) St Omer, Bibliothèque d'Agglomération de St-Omer, Ms. 706, fol. 145r–170v, dating from the tenth century, and Douai, Bibliothèque Marceline Desbordes-Valmore, Ms. 795, probably fol. 79–101, written towards the end of the eleventh century. I have not seen the Douai codex and am entirely dependent on the description by Chrétien DEHAISNES, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements 6: Douai* (1878) p. 484–487. That the text of the *Annales Bertiniani* is incomplete is claimed in René POUPARDIN, *Notes carolingiennes. I. Un nouveau manuscrit des Annales de Saint-Bertin*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 66,1 (1905) p. 390–400, at p. 390. The copy classified as C3a, which is preserved in Brussels, KBR, Ms. 6439–6451, fol. 71va–89ra, goes back in one way or another to the St Omer witness. The Brussels codex, furthermore, contains a single leaf, perhaps from the eleventh or twelfth century, that was added as a flyleaf and that transmits an unstudied witness of the ArF on fol. 1ra–vb.

55) *Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. Félix GRAT / Jeanne VIELLIARD / Suzanne CLÉMENCET (1964) p. LXXIX.

56) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 316f. It is difficult to fully grasp the content of the Douai codex on the basis of the literature I have seen so far.

57) ArF ad a. 785 (as in n. 9) p. 70; ArF ad a. 792 (as in n. 9) p. 90. The addition in the entry for 792 is also preserved in B3.

58) ArF ad a. 813 (as in n. 9) p. 137. This is also preserved in ArF-E. Further minor textual divergencies are left outside of consideration here as the point is clear. Cf. KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 50.

to and including the entry for 829⁵⁹. The lost exemplar of the *Annales Fuldenses* functions as D2 by Kurze⁶⁰. This leaves another witness that transmits the entries from 771 up to and including 829, classified D3 by Kurze, as the only other extant witness of the D recension⁶¹.

Since the edition appeared, however, several witnesses have come to light that can be attributed either to ArF-C or D and are relevant to the discussion of the manuscript evidence of the ninth century. The first of these is transmitted in a manuscript fragment now in Leiden and belongs to ArF-D⁶². Another witness was discovered in Cologne and belongs to either ArF-C or D⁶³. A third witness survives in a sixteenth-century handwritten copy, it might have a connection to Walahfrid Strabo († 849) and is in need of further investigation⁶⁴. It contains ArF-D and runs from 771 up and ends with the entry for 818.

59) This is Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473, fol. 116r–143v and 152v–169r. See below, p. 39–42. I will draw attention to the possibility that there is no authentic witness of the D recension for the entries for 741 up to and including the entry for 770.

60) *Annales Fuldenses sive Annales regni Francorum orientalis*, ed. Friedrich KURZE (MGH SS rer. Germ. [7], 1891).

61) This is Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 612, fol. 1v–73v. The part that transmits the ArF dates from the eleventh century. A copy of this witness supposedly survives in Schlierbach, Zisterzienserkloster, Cod. 27, fol. 339r–392r, written in 1615. The Schlierbach codex was unknown to Kurze. Cf. also TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20) 2 p. 1200.

62) This is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 2391: p, fol. 1r–v. See below, p. 31–33.

63) This is Cologne, Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums Köln (AEK), Best. Stift Maria im Kapitol, A II 184, fol. 1r–v. See below, p. 28–30.

64) This is Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Steinw. II Fol 3, fol. 146r–157r, formerly known as Ms. Akc. 1949 KN 397; it has now returned to its old signature. Rudolf POKORNÝ, *Die Annales Laureshamenses in einer neu aufgefundenen Teilüberlieferung*, in: DA 69 (2013) p. 1–43, at p. 10 n. 34, claims: “In das Handschriftenstemma der Edition lässt sich diese Überlieferung nicht recht einfügen.” I cannot follow this claim because (1) the witness extends beyond 813, which makes it by definition a witness of either C or D in Kurze’s system, and (2) contains references to the rebellions in the entries for 785 and 792 as well as the addition in the entry for 813, which makes it by definition a witness of D. Furthermore, (3) the interpolation of a solar eclipse right at the start of the entry for 787 with the exact hour of its occurrence, in the codex on fol. 148v, makes it clear that this witness was particularly close to the aforementioned witness D3. That witness, perhaps significantly, starts with the entry for 771, too. Further investigation between the two could shed more light on the history of this particular recension.

Ninth-century reception and reworking

Naturally, it cannot simply be stated that the extant manuscript evidence is all there is to reconsider the role the ArF played in the writing of history in the ninth century. Hence, it is appropriate to add a disclaimer here in the form of a provisional overview of the reception of the ArF throughout the Frankish realm up to and including the chronicle written by Regino, i.e. between c. 800 and c. 900.

It is commonly assumed that a copy of the ArF was present in Chelles, near Paris, where it was used in late 805 or early 806 to write the *Annales Mettenses priores*⁶⁵, quite possibly supervised by abbess Gisela, Charlemagne's sister⁶⁶. Paul Fouracre and Richard Gerberding have maintained that the author, if a woman, would have been a misogynistic one. One need not to be a misogynist, however, to criticise particular behaviour and the implicit notion that no woman would criticise another one seems rather odd. It entirely depends, moreover, on how one reads that Plectrude "decided to rule with feminine cunning more cruelly than was necessary". Does cruelty outweigh feminine cunning here? Or has the feminine cunning of Plectrude simply gone beyond the reasonable? And who was better to judge this than a woman? Furthermore, they seem to entertain the possibility that the *Annales Mettenses priores* were actually written in Metz, but ultimately conclude that "the evidence is too slight to allow us to decide for certain"⁶⁷.

Irrespective of the exact identity of the compiler, Hartmut Hoffmann has explained that the version of the ArF that was used probably

65) *Annales Mettenses priores*, ed. Bernhard von Simson (MGH SS rer. Germ. [10], 1905).

66) Hartmut Hoffmann, *Untersuchungen zur karolingischen Annalistik* (Bonner historische Forschungen 10, 1958) p. 53–61; Helmut Beumann, *Nomen imperatoris. Studien zur Kaiseridee Karls d. Gr.*, in: *Historische Zs.* 185 (1958) p. 515–549, at p. 529; Irene Haselbach, *Aufstieg und Herrschaft der Karlinger in der Darstellung der sogenannten Annales Mettenses priores. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Ideen im Reiche Karls des Großen* (Historische Studien 412, 1970) p. 24, highlights the case for St Denis as well; Janet L. Nelson, *Gender and Genre in Women Historians of the Early Middle Ages*, in: *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe. Actes du colloque organisé par la Fondation Européenne de la Science au Centre de Recherches Historiques et Juridiques de l'Université Paris I du 29 mars au 1^{er} avril 1989, sous la direction de Jean-Philippe Genet* (1991) p. 149–163.

67) Paul Fouracre / Richard A. Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France. History and Hagiography 640–720* (Manchester Medieval Sources Series, 1996) p. 338f.

belonged to the A recension up to and including the entry for 788. From the next entry onwards, the *Annales Mettenses priores* show close proximity to ArF-C for both the part up to 805 as well as the entries for 806 up to and including the entry for 829 although its exact relation to any of those witnesses remains undetermined. Hoffmann specifically narrowed it down to a version between the hypothetical Cx and Cy versions as first suggested by Hans Wibel, at least, according to Hoffmann⁶⁸. Thereafter follows a unique continuation that ends with events in the winter of 830/831. Despite being possibly written by a member of the Carolingian family itself, the dissemination of the *Annales Mettenses priores* seems to have been rather limited. Perhaps it had focused too much on the Carolingian family, in particular the sons of Charlemagne, which ultimately predeceased him, for the text to be of any more relevance after Louis the Pious ascended to the throne.

Around the same time, the ArF were also used in the *Chronicon Laurissense breve*. This work was initially edited as the *Annales Laurissenses minores* by Pertz in the first volume of the *Scriptores* in 1826 and as the “kleine Lorscher Franken-Chronik” by Georg Waitz in a little-known edition⁶⁹. Its present-day title is an invention by its most recent editor, Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld, who reedited the work in 1911 and basically translated the title Waitz had given to the work into Latin⁷⁰. It was supposedly written in Lorsch in about 807. Richard Corradini thoroughly analysed the contents of the text and concluded that the compiler must have had access to a version closely related to Kurze’s C3⁷¹.

68) HOFFMANN, *Untersuchungen* (as in n. 66) p. 38–41, esp. p. 39f.; his reference to WIBEL, *Beiträge* (as in n. 34) p. 70, about the Cx and Cy versions is difficult to follow, however, for Cx does not occur in his stemma on that page. It remains unclear, moreover, which particular version of the possibilities Hoffmann discusses he actually favours or whether he was indifferent to the matter.

69) *Annales Laurissenses minores*, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ (MGH SS 1, 1826, p. 112–123); Georg WAITZ, *Über die kleine Lorscher Franken-Chronik*, in: SB Berlin 19 (1882) p. 399–415, with the edition at p. 409–415.

70) Hans SCHNORR VON CAROLSFELD, *Das Chronicon Laurissense breve*, in: NA 36 (1911) p. 13–39, with the edition at p. 23–39.

71) Richard CORRADINI, *Die Wiener Handschrift Cvp 430**. Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie in Fulda im frühen 9. Jahrhundert (Fuldaer Hochschulschriften 37, 2000) p. 70 n. 264; cf. also Sören KASCHKE, *Fixing dates in the early Middle Ages: The Chronicon Laurissense breve and its use of time*, in: *Zwischen Niederschrift und Wiederschrift. Hagiographie und Historiographie im Spannungsfeld von Kompendienüberlieferung und Editionstechnik*, hg. von Richard CORRA-

Although the identity of the compiler remains unverifiable, Sören Kaschke suggested that whoever was behind the *Chronicon Laurisense breve* was “part of a communications network of loyal supporters of the Carolingian dynasty”, adding that this particular group consisted of a company “chiefly from the eastern parts of the realm”⁷². Although I would not go as far as Kurze’s identification of Adalung, abbot of Lorsch from 804 up to his death in 837, as the compiler⁷³, it may be helpful to take into consideration Adalung’s position in the communication networks of loyal supporters of the Carolingian dynasty, to use Kaschke’s words. As abbot, it is likely that Adalung was aware of the writing of this work that stressed both Carolingian legitimacy and concord within the dynasty. It is therefore perhaps of importance that Adalung was much more than only the abbot of Lorsch, a position that in itself was probably highly regarded given the links with the royal family. He was also the abbot of St Vaast, from around the same time the *Chronicon Laurisense breve* was written (about 807), until his death. There, he had succeeded Rado of St Vaast († 807), who was a royal notary from 772 to 776 and subsequently the chancellor from 776 to 797⁷⁴. This underscores the importance of St Vaast in Arras to the court in terms of communications network and power structures and demonstrates the prominence of Adalung in this network. He personified the links between Lorsch in the Rhineland and St Vaast in northern France. His personal connection with Charlemagne, moreover, is clear from the fact that Adalung was one of the signatories of his will⁷⁵. Kurze has suggested that Adalung

DINI / Maximilian DIESENBERGER / Meta NIEDERKORN-BRUCK (Denkschriften. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 405 / Forschungen zur Geschichte des MA 18, 2010) p. 115–122, at p. 115 n. 2.

72) KASCHKE, *Fixing dates* (as in n. 71) p. 121.

73) KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 35.

74) MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 191, 194, 204–209; EADEM, *A King on the Move: The Place of an Itinerant Court in Charlemagne’s Government*, in: *Royal Courts in Dynastic States and Empires. A Global Perspective*, ed. by Jeroen F. J. DUINDAM / Tülay ARTAN / I. Metin KUNT (Rulers & elites 1, 2011) p. 145–169; but cf. also the response by Theo KÖLZER, *Ein “System reisender Schreiber und Notare” in der Kanzlei Karls des Großen?*, in: *AfD* 62 (2016) p. 41–58.

75) Einhard, *Vita Karoli magni*, ed. Oswald HOLDER-EGGER (MGH SS rer. Germ. [25], 1911) p. 41; Josef SEMMLER, *Die Geschichte der Abtei Lorsch von der Gründung bis zum Ende der Salierzeit (764–1125)*, in: *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch. Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764*, hg. von Friedrich KNÖPP, 2 vols. (1973–1977), here 1 (1973) p. 75–173, at p. 85f.; Rosamond MCKITTERICK,

brought with him a copy of the *Chronicon Laurissense breve* from Lorsch to Arras. Even so, actually to write the text in Lorsch, a copy of the ArF might have been brought from northern France to Lorsch first⁷⁶.

It is usually believed that the ArF influenced two other sets of annals that may have been written before the death of Charlemagne in 814. The first is the aforementioned set of annals commonly known as the *Annales Tiliani*. The whereabouts of the codex have been unknown since André Duchesne first edited it in 1636⁷⁷. The initial annal entries, from 708 up to and including the entry for 740, are closely connected with the *Annales sancti Amandi*; the subsequent entries are closely linked to the ArF from 741 up to and including the entry for 808, when the text breaks off in mid-sentence⁷⁸. Virtually nothing is known about the origins of the text and the codex, which was last seen in the seventeenth century it seems, although Cuthbert Turner speculated that the origin of the annals “may be conjecturally placed

The Carolingians and the written word (1989) p. 189f.; on Charlemagne’s will, cf. most recently Anton SCHARER, *Das Testament Karls des Großen*, in: *Urkunden – Schriften – Lebensordnungen. Neue Beiträge zur Mediävistik. Vorträge der Jahrestagung des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung aus Anlass des 100. Geburtstag von Heinrich Fichtenau (1912–2000)* (Wien, 13.–15. Dezember 2012), hg. von Andreas SCHWARCZ / Katharina KASKA (*Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 63, 2015) p. 151–160; still useful is Matthew INNES, *Charlemagne’s Will: Piety, Politics and the Imperial Succession*, in: *The English Historical Review* 112 (1997) p. 833–855.

76) Friedrich KURZE, *Die verlorene Chronik von St. Denis (–805), ihre Bearbeitungen und die daraus abgeleiteten Quellen*, in: *NA* 28 (1903) p. 9–35, at p. 25f., 28; Bernhard BISCHOFF, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften* (*Geschichtsblätter für den Kreis Bergstraße, Sonderbd. 10*, 1989) p. 41–44, 62, where Bischoff supports Kurze’s theory with palaeographical evidence that the supposedly two men called Adalung were in fact most probably the same person; Matthew INNES, *Kings, monks and patrons: Political identities and the abbey of Lorsch*, in: *La royauté et les élites dans l’Europe carolingienne (début IX^e siècle aux environs de 920)*, sous la direction de Régine LE JAN (*Collection Histoire et littérature régionales* 17, 1998) p. 301–324, at p. 303.

77) *Annales Francorum auctiores* (as in n. 28).

78) *Annales Francorum auctiores ad a. 808 (= 807)* (as in n. 28) p. 21. Cf. also in general Norbert SCHRÖER, *Die Annales S. Amandi und ihre Verwandten. Untersuchungen zu einer Gruppe karolingischer Annalen des 8. und frühen 9. Jahrhunderts* (*Göppinger Akademische Beiträge* 85, 1975); WATTENBACH / LEVISON / LÖWE, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (as in n. 14) p. 183 n. 56, refer to it as an “Auszug der Reichsannalen”.

somewhere in the region of north-eastern France”⁷⁹. The textual similarities in the first part with the *Annales sancti Amandi* do indeed hint at an origin in northern France. For the part connected with the ArF, things are less clear-cut. According to Kurze the *Annales Tiliani* belong to the B recension and it is given the siglum B5 in his edition. With the exception of the lost exemplar of Regino, all other witnesses of the B recension are known to have been written in what is now France, two of them dating from the ninth century⁸⁰.

The second set of annals is commonly known as the *Annales Maximiniani*⁸¹. The medieval codex is lost, and the text survives thanks to a seventeenth-century transcription by Alexandre Wilhelm. In the margin of the transcription, he wrote that the text was taken *ex antiquissimo codice monasterii Sancti Maximini, scripto, ut apparet ex litteris, tempore Caroli magni*⁸². It is difficult to determine the point at which this work becomes related to the ArF, but, according to the edition by Georg Waitz of 1881, the entry for 797 appears to be the start of this textual relationship⁸³. It seems that the writer of the *Annales Maximiniani*, moreover, was influenced by a source that is commonly connected with Bavaria, more specifically Salzburg. Kurze suggested that this could have been Arn, bishop of Salzburg from 784 to 821⁸⁴. Arn played a key role in Frankish politics and was not just the bishop of Salzburg, and from 798 its first archbishop, but also the abbot of

79) Cuthbert Hamilton TURNER, Jean du Tillet: A neglected scholar of the sixteenth century, in: *The Bodleian manuscript of Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius*, reproduced in collotype, ed. by John Knight FOTHERINGHAM (1905) p. 48–63, at p. 60.

80) See below, p. 35–38.

81) *Annales Maximiniani*, ed. Georg WAITZ (MGH SS 13, 1881, p. 19–25); KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 305–307, where it received siglum B6 in his studies, but was left out of the edition.

82) Sören Kaschke and I are preparing a new study and edition on the basis of new discovered textual witnesses. For the most recent discussion of the text, cf. Florence CLOSE, *Les Annales Maximiniani: Un récit original de l'ascension des Carolingiens*, in: BECh 168,2 (2010) p. 303–325. Cf. also Sören KASCHKE, *Enhancing Bede: The Chronicon Universale to 741*, in: *Carolingian Approaches*, ed. by Rutger KRAMER / Helmut REIMITZ / Graeme WARD (Historiography and Identity 3 / Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 29, 2021) p. 201–229, at p. 215–219.

83) *Annales Maximiniani ad a. 797* (as in n. 81) p. 22 l. 36; cf. also Sigurd ABEL / Bernhard SIMSON, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter Karl dem Großen*, 2 vols. (Jbb. der Deutschen Geschichte, 1883–1888), here 2 (1888) p. 610f.; CLOSE, *Les Annales Maximiniani* (as in n. 82) p. 305 and p. 325.

84) KURZE, *Reichsannalen III* (as in n. 34) p. 21f.

St Amand, close to St Vaast in Arras, from c. 783 and he may have retained this position while also at the head of the bishopric of Salzburg⁸⁵. The connection between St Amand and Salzburg on the basis of palaeography has long been demonstrated by Bischoff⁸⁶. Instead of the ArF having travelled to Salzburg, the Bavarian source could just as well have made its way to St Amand instead. The lively exchange of scribes and codices between the two places further enhances the possibility that this may have been the case although conclusive proof is missing at this moment.

I have formerly suggested that the *Annales Tiliani*, which I characterised as an epitome of the ArF, and the *Annales Maximiniani* both may have derived from a longer, fuller version of the ArF⁸⁷. I no longer hold this view; there are other possibilities that have to be considered first. It is entirely possible, for example, that these two sets of annals are still so little understood as potential witnesses to the development of the ArF, for both works contain indications that they may have been written before the death of Charlemagne. They may reflect an earlier stage, or earlier stages, of writing, therefore, that could shed further light on the writing process of the ArF. Technically, this still means both are derivatives of a fuller version of the ArF, yet it also would relocate them in the stemma. Even Kurze has shown the difficulty of attributing the *Annales Tiliani* to any particular recension of his own system⁸⁸. Although Kurze jumped over the difficulties, the

85) On Arn, cf. in particular the volume *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, hg. von Meta NIEDERKORN-BRUCK / Anton SCHARER (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 40, 2004), which contains rich material and sums up scholarship until 2004. For scholarship after 2004, cf. Maximilian DIESENBERGER, *Predigt und Politik im frühmittelalterlichen Bayern. Karl der Große, Arn von Salzburg und die Salzburger Sermones-Sammlung* (Millennium-Studien 58, 2016).

86) Bernhard BISCHOFF, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, 2 vols. (1940–1980), here 2: *Die vorwiegend österreichischen Diözesen* (1980) p. 52–161.

87) Bart VAN HEES, *Minor Annals and Frankish History Writing*, in: *The Medieval Chronicle* 14 (as in n. 18) p. 92–112, at p. 106; cf. also Robert A. H. EVANS, *Christian Language and the Frankish ‘Minor’ Annals: Narrative, History and Theology in the Late Eighth Century*, *ibid.* p. 159–183, at p. 169, who, like myself in the same volume, maintained that the *Annales Tiliani* are dependent on the ArF. We have discussed this set of annals since and considered other possibilities during a conference in Wuppertal in September 2022 and the suggestion made here is partially indebted to our conversation.

88) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 305f., where Kurze discusses peculiarities of the text that make it virtually impossible to decide to which recension

Annales Maximiniani posed to him and his recension system, Hans Wibel, one of Kurze's earliest critics, has underscored the special position the text could occupy if Kurze had not pushed his rigorous ideas of Urtext at times beyond reason⁸⁹.

It has been claimed, most notably by Wattenbach, Levison and Löwe, that the compiler of the *Chronicon Moissiacense*, essentially a universal chronicle which ends with a report for 818, used a copy of the ArF⁹⁰. More recently, doubt has been casted on this claim⁹¹. Hans Kats and David Claszen have pointed out that overlap of content is to be expected as the events described became increasingly contemporaneous to the compiler of the *Chronicon Moissiacense*. They explain, moreover, that the "compiler tells a tale independent of the ArF"⁹², judging from the fact that the compiler took rather little, if anything, straight from the ArF. To support this claim, they presented a brief recapitulation of events that are mentioned in the ArF, but not in the *Chronicon Moissiacense*. Examples include, but are not limited to, the

it belongs although he ultimately provides it with siglum B5. HALPHEN, *Études critiques* (as in n. 12) p. 37, was, for once, not hypercritical but rather followed Kurze's suggestion.

89) For the reason why he decided not to include the *Annales Maximiniani* in his edition, cf. KURZE, *Reichsannalen III* (as in n. 34) p. 79; for the reason why the *Annales Maximiniani* should obtain a special place in Kurze's stemma, cf. WIBEL, *Beiträge* (as in n. 34) p. 12. The use of the *Annales Tiliani* in Kurze's edition is highly selective, too.

90) Most importantly maintained in what is still a standard work by WATTENBACH / LEVISON / LÖWE, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (as in n. 14) p. 265. The old, but still most recent "officially" published edition is *Chronicon Moissiacense*, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ (MGH SS 1, 1826, p. 280–313) with emendations edited as *Ex chronico Moissiacensi*, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ (MGH SS 2, 1829, p. 257–259). A revised edition was prepared by J. M. J. G. (Hans) Kats, an external doctoral candidate at the University of Amsterdam, who died before the manuscript of his dissertation was finished. David Claszen, a Master's student at the University of Leiden, undertook to complete what Kats had prepared so far and was able to submit it as his Master's thesis. For this work, better than the edition by Pertz, but with its own shortcomings, cf. † J. M. J. G. KATS / DAVID CLASZEN, *Chronicon Moissiacense Maius. A Carolingian World Chronicle From Creation until the First Years of Louis the Pious*, 2 vols. (Master's thesis Leiden 2012). The edition occupies the entire second volume.

91) KATS / CLASZEN, *Chronicon Moissiacense Maius* (as in n. 90), here 1 p. 122, maintain the compiler did not have had access to a full version of the ArF. This has recently been implicitly underscored by Rutger KRAMER, *A Crowning Achievement: Carolingian Imperial Identity in the Chronicon Moissiacense*, in: *Carolingian Approaches* (as in n. 82) p. 231–269, at p. 238.

92) KATS / CLASZEN, *Chronicon Moissiacense Maius* (as in n. 90), here 1 p. 122.

omission of the *Divisio regnorum*, of passages on diplomatic relations with Constantinople and of passages dealing with confrontations with the Northmen⁹³. For the entries from 804 up to and including the entry for 818, they finally conclude that “[a]t most [the compiler] might have had access to a heavily abbreviated version [of the ArF]”⁹⁴.

It is therefore somewhat confusing that the critical apparatus of their edition still points out which phrases and content might have been taken from the ArF⁹⁵. Looking at these alleged textual similarities makes things even clearer. The ArF, at least as we know it today, provide a continuous prose of annal entries. It is therefore difficult to explain why the entries for 807, 811 and 812 in the *Chronicon Moissiacense* do not make use of the ArF at all whereas others supposedly do. The chronology is also confused: the entry for 810 in the chronicle supposedly borrows from the ArF entry for 812, for example. This is all the more problematic because, as mentioned, the entry for 812 of the *Chronicon Moissiacense* itself does not use the ArF at all according to Kats and Claszen. The source of the final paragraph in the entry for 810, moreover, has not been identified despite the ArF also providing the information albeit in different wording. The textual discrepancies between the *Chronicon Moissiacense* and the ArF are, to my mind, simply too many in number and impossible to account for had there actually been a copy at the table of the compiler. I therefore follow more recent scholarship and reject the suggestion that a copy of the ArF was used by the compiler of the *Chronicon Moissiacense*.

A partial copy of a D version of the ArF that started with the entry for 771 was used to write the *Annales Fuldenses*. The exact circumstances are elusive, but it appears to have happened in the late 820s or the early 830s, possibly in the vicinity of Fulda. According to Kurze, the compiler of the work made use of a copy that stood particularly close to D3⁹⁶. Although there has been some new literature on this particular set of annals, it may be sufficient here to paraphrase Timothy Reuter’s opinion that the present edition is unsatisfactory and

93) *Ibid.* p. 122f.

94) *Ibid.* p. 123.

95) *Ibid.* 2 p. 142–150. What follows is based on the apparatus in that edition on those pages and in-between.

96) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 318. Another, still unstudied copy very closely related to D3 survives in Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Steinw. II F 3, fol. 146r–157r. See above, p. 14 and n. 64. This is a fragment running from 771 up to and including the entry for 818 of the ArF.

that a new edition, accompanied by a thorough study to the text, its witnesses and its dissemination, is necessary⁹⁷.

Not much later, perhaps during the winter of 840/841, the anonymous writer of the *Vita Hludowici*, commonly known as the Astronomer, wrote a biography of the recently deceased emperor Louis the Pious. He made extensive use of the ArF from the year 814 onwards up to and including the entry for 829, which equals roughly chapters 23–43 of the work⁹⁸. It appears that the biographer had a copy of the ArF on his desk that belonged to the C recension, with the readings of C2 and C3 being particularly close⁹⁹.

Roughly twenty-five years after the Astronomer's work, Ado, archbishop of Vienne (r. 859/860–875), wrote his *Chronicon* in 866 which he then continued up to 869¹⁰⁰. His work is still not properly understood, and its manuscript tradition has never been systematically

97) The *Annals of Fulda*, translated and annotated by Timothy REUTER (Manchester Medieval Sources Series 2, 1992) p. 7. I am unaware of more recent literature dealing with the first, compiled section of the *Annales Fuldenses* which runs to 838. On the challenges the edition poses to scholars, cf. also Richard CORRADINI, Überlegungen zur sächsischen Ethnogenese anhand der *Annales Fuldenses* und deren sächsisch-ottonischer Rezeption, in: *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, hg. von Walter POHL (Forschungen zur Geschichte des MA 8, 2004) p. 211–231, at p. 211f., and *idem*, *Die Annales Fuldenses – Identitätskonstruktionen im ostfränkischen Raum am Ende der Karolingerzeit*, in: *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, hg. von Richard CORRADINI / Rob MEENS / Christina PÖSSEL / Philip SHAW (Forschungen zur Geschichte des MA 12, 2006) p. 121–136, at p. 122–126. I am indebted to Helmut Reimitz for these literary references.

98) Ernst TREMP, *Thegan und Astronomus, die beiden Geschichtsschreiber Ludwigs des Frommen*, in: *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. by Peter GODMAN / Roger COLLINS (1990) p. 691–700, at p. 697; but cf. Thomas F. X. NOBLE, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. The lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer* (2009) p. 221, who narrows it down to 814–823. As regards the work of Thegan, the editor of the most recent edition, also Tresp, rejects any link with the ArF. Cf. his introduction to Thegan in the edition: *Theganus, Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, hg. und übers. von Ernst TREMP (MGH SS rer. Germ. 64, 1995) p. 7.

99) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 316f.; cf. also Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici*, hg. und übers. von Ernst TREMP (MGH SS rer. Germ. 64, 1995) p. 81–86, with the claim (p. 81) that the ArF “waren das offizielle Geschichtswerk des Hofes” for the entry from 814 up to and including 829.

100) Anna-Dorothee VON DEN BRINCKEN, *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising* (Diss. Münster 1957) p. 126f.; Sukanya RAISHARMA, *Much Ado about Vienne? A Localizing Universal Chronicon*, in: *Carolingian Approaches* (as in n. 82) p. 271–290, at p. 275.

investigated although a fresh start has recently been made¹⁰¹. Ado seems to have made constant use of the ArF up to 814. The edition published by the MGH has several notes in the critical apparatus that claim the ArF have been used for information about events after 814¹⁰². I have looked for those alleged borrowings but was unable to locate them in the ArF. It appears that the phrases ascribed to the ArF might actually have been general knowledge for an archbishop, such as the arrival of the relics of Saint Sebastian in the Frankish realm in 826 and need not have been taken from the ArF. In other words, there is no reason to envisage a copy that reached beyond 814 at the desk of Ado when writing his *Chronicon*.

It may be of importance to take into consideration Ado's link with the abbey of Prüm. Ado had been educated there and may have got in touch with the royal abbey to provide him with a copy of the ArF. Wilhelm Kremers studied Ado's sources and provided a very helpful starting point in which he underscored the similarities between the exemplars of Ado and Regino especially regarding the *Annales Tiliiani*¹⁰³. To put it differently, it can be established with a fair amount of certainty that the ArF had travelled to Vienne, but with the present state of the question, the precise version or recension cannot be ascertained, even though there are some hints available.

In this light, it might not be necessary to spill much ink on identifying the exemplar Regino used. The last reworking of the ArF in a chronicle occurred around the turn of the ninth century, when he wrote his *Chronicon*¹⁰⁴. The work may have been finished in 908 although it may have been started earlier. The version of the ArF as

101) Not being helped by the fragmentary edition in: *Ex Adonis Archiepiscopi Viennensis Chronico*, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ (MGH SS 2, 1829, p. 315–326); the full edition by Jacques-Paul Migne is not necessarily better, but at least provides scholars with a more complete text: MIGNE PL 123 col. 23–138; RAISHARMA, *Much Ado about Vienne?* (as in n. 100) p. 273f., gives a provisional list of extant textual witnesses.

102) Ado of Vienne, *Chronicon* (as in n. 101) p. 320f. n. 33, 35–38. This deserves further investigation.

103) Wilhelm Leonhard KREMERS, *Ado von Vienne. Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Diss. Bonn 1911) p. 93–106, deals with Ado's sources on Frankish history, cf. esp. p. 101–106; cf. also SCHRÖER, *Die Annales S. Amandi* (as in n. 78) p. 36–51, who points out some mistakes of Kremers, but I do not quite see how those mistakes invalidate Kremers's overarching main point with regard to the close relation between the exemplar used by Ado and the one used by Regino.

104) Regino, *Chronicon* (as in n. 3); for a critical assessment cf. SCHLEIDGEN, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte* (as in n. 3).

transmitted in Regino's work actually became part of Kurze's stemma codicum of the ArF and was classified as B2 by Kurze. This, moreover, is intriguing because Kurze's B recension does not reach beyond 813, roughly when the exemplar of Ado, too, seems to have come to an end. Although neither Ado nor Regino were writing their chronicles in Prüm, the link to the abbey deserves further investigation.

A special case is presented by the *Annales Bertiniani*. Hincmar, archbishop of Reims (r. c. 848–882), claimed that the annals had fallen into the hands of many¹⁰⁵. He might have exaggerated here to underscore the point that he was trying to make, namely that a confusion caused by Prudentius of Troyes in the entry for 859 could start a dogmatic scandal¹⁰⁶. Indeed, there is no manuscript evidence to substantiate Hincmar's claim that the annals had fallen into the hands of many¹⁰⁷. Janet Nelson suggested that Hincmar's own manuscript must have been a direct continuation of Prudentius, quite possibly in the same codex¹⁰⁸. No copies from before the tenth century are known to have derived from this archetype. The only text fragment of the *Annales Bertiniani* that does not derive from Hincmar's exemplar, containing the entries for 830 up to 837, breaking off in this entry with the phrase "promised to stay loyal in the future", was glued onto the *Annales Mettenses posteriores*, rather than the ArF, in a twelfth-century manuscript from Metz¹⁰⁹. In other words, there is no incentive

105) Die Briefe des Erzbischofs Hinkmar von Reims, ed. Ernst PERELS (MGH Epp. 8,1, 1939) no. 187, p. 194–196, at p. 196 l. 12f.: *unde quoniam ipsa gesta, quibus haec conscripta sunt, iam in plurimorum manus devenerunt*.

106) Ibid. p. 196 l. 13f.: *neesse est, ut taliter de hoc domno apostolico suggeratis, ne scandalum inde in ecclesia veniat*. For this particular episode in Hincmar's letter, cf. also Robert A. H. EVANS, *God's agency and the recent past in Carolingian history writing, c. 750–900* (Diss. Cambridge 2018) p. 16f. n. 115. While writing this article, I learned that his dissertation is in the process of being published any time soon as monograph.

107) For the following, brief discussion of the problematic manuscript evidence of the *Annales Bertiniani*, cf. the edition by GRAT / VIELLIARD / CLÉMENCET (as in n. 55) p. XVI–XXII for lost witnesses and p. XXII–LI on extant witnesses. Cf. also *The Annals of St-Bertin. Ninth-century histories 1*, translated and annotated by Janet L. NELSON (Manchester Medieval Sources Series 1, 1991) p. 15f.

108) Perhaps preserved in a seventeenth-century manuscript of the Bollandists as a direct copy. The early modern copy is Paris, BnF, *Mélanges de Colbert* 46(2), fol. 283r–313v.

109) This is Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Phill. 1853, olim Meermann 746. Cf. Valentin ROSE, *Die lateinischen Meerman-Handschriften des Sir Thomas Phillipps in der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* (*Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* 12, 1892) p. 317–321.

to envisage more than a single copy of the ArF in the ninth century in combination with the *Annales Bertiniani*, nor is there any reason to suppose that the dissemination of the *Annales Bertiniani* can be counted as spread of the ArF throughout the Frankish world. Evidence for such an assumption is lacking and the only extant witness version of the *Annales Bertiniani* that does not derive from Hincmar's own lost copy, possibly because it simply may be an older version, is not transmitted with the ArF.

A second special case is presented by the AqdE, commonly known in English as the Revised ArF. Although the intertextual dependencies have long been observed and the connection between the ArF and the AqdE has long been established, there is still considerable uncertainty regarding the AqdE, the most pressing of these probably being the uncertainty when precisely the AqdE was forged out of the ArF¹¹⁰. The long and short of it is that this intensive reworking of the ArF happened either shortly after 801, as suggested by McKitterick¹¹¹, between 814 and 817, as maintained by Hermann Bloch¹¹², or even after 830, as advocated by Kurze¹¹³. Problem here seems to be that scholars, at times, are not precise enough about what they mean. After all, the E recension by Kurze, which usually went hand in hand with the AqdE as a whole for 741 to 801 actually remains an independent textual family with unique textual divergencies to set it apart from other recensions up to and including at least the entry for 824¹¹⁴. This might suggest that active engagement with the common stock occurred as late as the mid-820s or indeed the early 830s. And it does not necessarily mean that the first 61 entries were first rewritten also

110) Sören KASCHKE, *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen bis 831. Herrschaftspraxis und Normvorstellungen in zeitgenössischer Sicht* (Schriften zur Mediävistik 7, 2006) p. 277–290, sums up scholarship to 2006; cf. also MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 27–31; quite unique in its suggestions and conclusions, but all the more intriguing is Tibor ŽIVKOVIĆ, *The 'original' and the 'revised' Annales regni Francorum*, in: *Istorijski časopis* 59 (2010) p. 9–58.

111) MCKITTERICK, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 27.

112) BLOCH, review of Monod (as in n. 34) p. 885f., where he maintains that the “bis 812–815 reichende Überarbeitung der *Annales regni* schon vor dem J. 817 beendet wurde.”

113) KURZE, *Die karolingischen Annalen* (as in n. 35) p. 58, where he still clings to 832 as “wahrscheinlichste[r] Zeitpunkt”.

114) Some examples are ArF ad a. 815 (as in n. 9) p. 141 n. i: *infectum* E (for *inperfectum*); ArF ad a. 823 *ibid.* p. 163 n. e: *Et – inradiavit* desunt E; ArF ad a. 824 *ibid.* p. 164 n. *: *Omortag* add. E; n. a: *non* deest E; n. h: *Interea hiemps* E; n. p: *Interea* deest E.

at this stage. That could have happened earlier than the reworking after 824 although it remains impossible to determine with absolute certainty when exactly.

It may be significant that the sole ninth-century textual witness of the AqdE, Munich, BSB, Clm 23618, Kurze's E9, a manuscript fragment that still contains 40 folia despite being severely mutilated, was almost certainly written after 824. It runs from *in terram Sclavorum qui dicuntur Sorabi*, in the entry for 806¹¹⁵, to [*conscriptam inter*] *filios suos regni*, in the entry for 821¹¹⁶, the first two words lost to trimming and water damage. Kurze had maintained that it was written in the tenth century¹¹⁷, but Bischoff suggested that it was actually written in Fulda in the second quarter of the ninth century during the abbacy of Hraban Maur (r. 822–844)¹¹⁸. Although Kurze was most likely wrong about the origin and date of the manuscript, he has rightly drawn attention to a number of readings that the fragment has in common with other recensions and sought to stress its uniqueness. Hence, Kurze thought it could not derive from the same archetype as the other witnesses of the AqdE. Wibel has highlighted the case against “die Sonderstellung ..., die ihm Kurze zuweist”¹¹⁹. The matter merits further investigation, however, not in the last place because a marginal note in this manuscript fragment ended up in the main text of the AqdE¹²⁰. Wibel has not been able to explain how that might have happened. The age of the fragment, moreover, allows this witness to be a very important and special one, quite possibly deserving the “Sonderstellung” after all.

Aside from this text fragment, all other witnesses, including those that transmit the heavily reworked set of entries from 741 up to and including 801 and subsequent entries, date from the tenth century or later. The first indirect evidence of the existence of the batch of entries of the AqdE for 771 up to and including 801 is in the *Annales de gestis Caroli Magni imperatoris* of the Poeta Saxo, written between 888 and

115) ArF ad a. 806 (as in n. 9) p. 121 l. 6 from the bottom.

116) ArF ad a. 821 (as in n. 9) p. 155 l. 3.

117) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 331f.

118) BISCHOFF, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen* (as in n. 86) here 2 p. 54 n. 7; IDEM, *Katalog 2* (as in n. 23) p. 273 (no. 3338): “Fulda, IX. Jh., ca. 1./2. Viertel”. Cf. also REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 288 n. 42.

119) WIBEL, *Beiträge* (as in n. 34) p. 74–96, at p. 95.

120) Munich, BSB, Clm 23618, fol. 19v, contains the marginal note that reads *et convalescens Aquisgrani reversus est*. Cf. ArF ad a. 813 (as in n. 9) p. 137, on the penultimate and final line of the addition only preserved in D and E.

891¹²¹. The earliest known manuscript evidence for the AqdE entries for 741–801 is in Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 510, fol. 31r–132v. That codex dates from the tenth century or even the eleventh century and was probably written in Lorsch¹²². In other words, there is no ninth-century manuscript evidence of the AqdE annal entries for 741–805 and 822–829 although the Munich fragment is clearly mutilated and might once have contained more entries of the AqdE.

In short, the reception of the ArF in the ninth century indicates that the text was very quickly available in Chelles and, following the personal network of Charlemagne and his close associates, may have been disseminated from northern France to other places rather than having been brought from the periphery to the Carolingian heartlands. Later in the ninth century, the work appears to have remained more or less confined to the royal landscape and, whenever exceeding that restricted space, a connection with the royal family by means of a royal abbey, such as Prüm, is likely.

The ninth-century manuscript evidence

What follows now is a preliminary survey of the ninth-century textual witnesses of the ArF itself. These are:

- Cologne, AEK, Best. Stift Maria im Kapitol A II 184;
- Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 2391: p;
- Paris, BnF, lat. 10911;
- Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 213;
- Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 617;
- Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473.

The first of these, Cologne, AEK, Best. Stift Maria im Kapitol A II 184, hereafter referred to as the Cologne fragment, was first dis-

121) Ingrid REMBOLD, *The Poeta Saxo at Paderborn: episcopal authority and Carolingian rule in late ninth-century Saxony*, in: *Early Medieval Europe* 21,2 (2013) p. 169–196, at p. 170f. and n. 5.

122) BISCHOFF, *Die Abtei Lorsch* (as in n. 76) p. 85 n. 83; IDEM, *Katalog 3* (as in n. 23) p. 480 (between no. 7131 and 7132); Hartmut HOFFMANN, *Buchkunst und Königstum im ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich*, 2 vols. (MGH Schriften 30, 1986), here 1 p. 221, suggests the second or third quarter of the tenth century; TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20), here 1 p. 599–607, maintains probably the last quarter of the tenth century.

covered after Kurze published his edition. It is a single folium measuring 300–305 x 195–200 mm with a text block of 220 x 140 mm with 34 lines. The fragment transmits a part of the entry for 824, starting with *Interea legati Romani pontificis Romam to Deo donante provenerat magnifice sunt*¹²³. Formerly there seems to have been some confusion whether the fragment contains the ArF or their revised version, the AqDE¹²⁴, as well as what precise recension this witness belonged to¹²⁵. Matthias Tischler has highlighted the case against the affiliation to the AqDE and has shown convincingly that the claim already falters at the first word of the fragment, which is consistent with the ArF¹²⁶. McKitterick, however, has rightly drawn attention to a number of rather peculiar readings that make it very difficult to pinpoint the exact recension to which this particular witness belongs¹²⁷.

First described by Heinrich Schäfer in 1907, the fragment was discovered as part of the collection of St Maria im Kapitol in Cologne¹²⁸. It seems to have remained largely unknown until Bischoff provided a succinct description of the fragment in 1976. He dated it

123) ArF ad a. 824 (as in n. 9) p. 164–166.

124) Heinrich SCHÄFER, *Inventare und Regesten aus den Kölner Pfarrarchiven 3* (Annalen des Historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein 83, 1907) p. 113: “aus einer Handschrift ... der Einhardschen Annalen”; Bernhard BISCHOFF, *Die Hofbibliothek unter Ludwig dem Frommen*, in: *Medieval Learning and Literature. Essays presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. by Jonathan James Graham ALEXANDER / Margaret Templeton GIBSON (1976) p. 3–22, at p. 20: “Annales Einhardi”.

125) At first hesitant to attribute the text to any particular recension was Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *Political ideology in Carolingian historiography*, in: *The uses of the past in the early Middle Ages*, ed. by Yitzhak HEN / Matthew INNES (2000) p. 162–174, at p. 171f., where she claimed it to be a witness of the E recension with some unique readings as in the manuscripts classified by Kurze as C3, D3 and five of the E group. Later, however, she was more definite and accepted Bischoff’s information that this was a fragment of the *Annales Einhardi*, i.e. the AqDE. Cf. MCKITTERICK, *History and Memory* (as in n. 21) p. 21f., 130 and p. 271, and EADEM, *Charlemagne* (as in n. 13) p. 27. Many have followed McKitterick, such as ŽIVKOVIĆ, *The ‘original’ and the ‘revised’ Annales regni Francorum* (as in n. 110) p. 11. But cf. also her upcoming article “News from Rome in the Frankish annals” where, having looked at the text again, she states that it is in fact the ArF.

126) TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20), here 1 p. 596 n. 19; IDEM, *La réforme à travers l’écriture. Transmission de savoir historique et changement de mentalité historiographique entre le IX^e et le XII^e siècle à la lumière de quelques considérations de sociologie textuelle*, in: *Francia 33* (2006) p. 131–140, at p. 134 n. 17; REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 288 n. 43.

127) MCKITTERICK, *Political ideology* (as in n. 125) p. 171f.

128) SCHÄFER, *Inventare und Regesten* (as in n. 124) p. 113: “Ein Pergamentfolioblatt aus einer Handschrift des 9. Jahrhs. der Einhardschen Annalen betreffend

to the first third of the ninth century and drew attention to a possible connection to the court school during the rule of Louis the Pious¹²⁹. It should be stressed here that the link between the fragment and the court is rather tentative. Bischoff mentioned it as part of a group of manuscripts written at roughly the same time with a script that shares one or more distinguishing features with the script of codices attributed by him to the court school and, moreover, cannot be assigned to any other known scriptorium¹³⁰. The difficulties encountered when trying to attribute the witness to any particular recension may lie in its supposed age. A possible explanation is that the fragment was written before the recensions of Kurze had become fully crystallised, i.e. before 830 or so.

Nothing is known about the fragment between the first third of the ninth century and the start of the twentieth century, except that it belonged to St Maria im Kapitol and Rosamond McKitterick has rightly remarked that “it may be of significance that St Maria in (!) Kapitol was a Carolingian family convent, said to have been founded by Plectrude, wife of Pippin II”¹³¹. After the folium was taken out of the codex, the fold in the middle of the leaf indicates that it probably served as a cover for other documents.

das Jahr 824; mit kleinen Abweichungen.” Schäfer added the new shelf mark, too: Akten capsula 34,1.

129) Cf. BISCHOFF, *Die Hofbibliothek unter Ludwig dem Frommen* (as in n. 124) p. 16, where the date of composition of the discussed groups of manuscripts is pinpointed to the first third of the ninth century; BISCHOFF, *Katalog 1* (as in n. 23) p. 408 (no. 1965). A collation made by Wilhelm Levison of this particular fragment and the edition by Kurze is preserved in MGH-Archiv A 14-3. In addition to the collation, Levison added a note on the date of the script, suggesting the fragment dates from the tenth century or late ninth century (“höchstens spätes 9.”). The collation was supposedly made for MGH SS 30,2, but never published in there. I am deeply grateful to my colleague Dominik Trump, who has tracked down this long-overlooked document in the MGH archive for me and provided me with information about its contents.

130) BISCHOFF, *Die Hofbibliothek unter Ludwig dem Frommen* (as in n. 124) p. 19: “Es gibt weitere Codices derselben Zeit, deren in Ligaturen und Abkürzungen sparsame Schrift ohne volle Übereinstimmung mit dem Stil der hier beschriebenen Handschriften mehrere oder einzelne Merkmale derselben teilt, und die auch keinem anderen bekannten Skriptorium zugewiesen werden können.”

131) Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals*, in: *The English Historical Review* 115 (2000) p. 1–20, at p. 18f. with n. 1 (p. 19).

The second fragment, Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 2391: p¹³², hereafter the Leiden fragment, was also discovered after Kurze's edition was published. This fragment, too, is a single folium measuring 215 x 125–130 mm with a text block of 185 x 115 mm on which 22 lines are still legible. Like the Cologne fragment, it was probably used as a cover for other documents after the leaf was taken out of its codicological context, but this folium is in worse shape. The top and outer sides have been trimmed. This led to a loss of a calculable thirty-two words at the top of the verso side of the folium. Depending on the number of abbreviations, this equals either two- or three-and-half lines that must have been lost at the top of the fragment. Trimming of the outer margin of the leaf has resulted in a loss of two to four words per line. The text that survives contains parts of the entries for 825 and 826. The frail leaf starts on the recto with the words *quaedam annorum circiter*¹³³, after which the slanted trimming results in the loss of the rest of the line. The recto ends with *audivit et absolvit. Inter quas*¹³⁴. The verso side picks up the text again with *regis Danorum pacis ac foederis causa*¹³⁵ and breaks off with *deceperat, receptus Rotam civitatem destruxit*¹³⁶. Despite the mutilation, the folium transmits enough text to locate it firmly in the recension system of Kurze as it contains several readings that it shares uniquely with D1, to which I will return shortly¹³⁷.

Bischoff has dated the script to the middle of the ninth century¹³⁸, but McKitterick has suggested the second quarter of the ninth century¹³⁹. Bischoff suggested it was written in west Germany, a suggestion initially followed by McKitterick¹⁴⁰, who later narrowed this down to the Rhineland and later suggested the court¹⁴¹. David Ganz has

132) Digital facsimile: <https://digitalcollections.universiteitleiden.nl/view/item/3129552#page/1/mode/1up>.

133) ArF ad a. 825 (as in n. 9) p. 168 l. 15.

134) ArF ad a. 826 (as in n. 9) p. 169 l. 18.

135) Ibid. p. 169 l. 24.

136) Ibid. p. 170 l. 7 from the bottom.

137) MCKITTERICK, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 36.

138) BISCHOFF, Katalog 2 (as in n. 23) p. 46 (no. 2166): "IX. Jh., ca. Mitte".

139) ROSAMOND MCKITTERICK, Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages (The Conway lectures in medieval studies, 2004) p. 75: "dated to the second quarter of the ninth century"; EADEM, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 36: "s. IX 2/4".

140) BISCHOFF, Katalog 2 (as in n. 23) p. 46 (no. 2166): "Westdeutschland (?)"; MCKITTERICK, Perceptions of the Past (as in n. 139) p. 75, follows Bischoff.

141) MCKITTERICK, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 36.

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.

nomine N. annorum circiter, but the Leiden fragment and D1 read *quaedam annorum circiter*¹⁴⁶. Some other readings the fragment shares uniquely with D1 are as follows. Both witnesses contain the erroneous *Pipinnus* instead of the correct *Pippinus* in the entry for 826¹⁴⁷. The dating of an assembly which, according to this fragment and D1, took place around the kalends of July (*circa kl. Iul.*) whereas all other witnesses claim the assembly took place a month earlier, namely *circa kl. Iun.*¹⁴⁸ The name of Ingelheim (*Ingilenhaim*), which follows immediately after the supposedly wrong date, is exactly the same as in D1, despite a variety of readings at this particular place in the textual witnesses¹⁴⁹. I interpret the shared readings mentioned here as conjunctive errors that indicate either a common exemplar or that one of the two witnesses was copied from the other. If the latter scenario is the case, it is important to keep in mind that the script of the Leiden fragment has been dated as the older script and therefore may have been the exemplar for D1. Unfortunately, the corrections in D1 are either illegible in the Leiden fragment or lost to trimming. Hence, it is impossible to provide conclusive results about their filiation here, but they are very closely related.

The third witness listed here, Paris, BnF, lat. 10911¹⁵⁰, hereafter the Paris codex, received siglum C1 by Kurze in his edition¹⁵¹. Contrary to the frail fragments discussed above, this robust codex, measuring 250–255 x 195 mm with a text block of 170–175 x 120 mm, contains 121 folia with 21 lines. The witness of the ArF is written on fol. 56r–121v and transmits most of the text from 741 up to and including the entry for 829, though parts of the codex are lost. A leaf is missing between fol. 109–110, which has resulted in loss of text of the entry for 819 right after *populi sui qui simul iussi vene[rant]* on fol. 109v¹⁵². The text picks up again with *adgressus pluribus interfec-*

146) ArF ad a. 825 (as in n. 9) p. 168 n. m–n. Other textual witnesses with a similar omission are E3, E6 and E7, i.e. witnesses of the AqDE.

147) ArF ad a. 826 (as in n. 9) p. 169 n. k.

148) Ibid. p. 169 n. s.

149) Ibid. p. 169 n. t.

150) Digital facsimile: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9078401h/f1.image.r=latin%2010911>.

151) Sigla: C1 (ArF [as in n. 9] p. X); C1 (KURZE, Reichsannalen I [as in n. 34] p. 308–310); 8 (Annales Laurissenses et Einhardi, ed. Georg Heinrich PERTZ [MGH SS 1, 1826, S. 124–218] p. 130).

152) ArF ad a. 819 (as in n. 9) p. 149 bottom line.

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.

the place of origin¹⁶¹. In the later published catalogue of Bernhard Bischoff, it became clear that he also thought it was written in about the second quarter of the ninth century in a west-French centre¹⁶². The divergent opinions seem to be the result of the challenges posed by the script. McKitterick has drawn attention to the peculiar script itself as an intentional design that might suggest that this codex had a distinct agenda¹⁶³. This has further been expanded on by Reimitz, who described the script as “archaising”, something Tischler had drawn attention to earlier¹⁶⁴, and explained this suggests that the copyists worked “either from a pre-existing exemplar or from a carefully elaborated outline”¹⁶⁵. The codex had been diligently crafted.

The Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana houses two witnesses of the ArF. The first of these, Reg. lat. 213¹⁶⁶, was used by Kurze in his edition as siglum B3¹⁶⁷. The codex measures 205 x 150 mm with a text block of roughly 165 x 115–120 mm and consists of 157 numbered folia and a formerly unnumbered folium between fol. 151 and 152, now numbered as fol. 151a. The number of lines differs per quire, and even within quires, but the ArF, which start on fol. 151r and brings the codex to a close on fol. 157v, is written mostly on 25 lines. The text fragment of the ArF transmitted in this codex starts with the beginning of the entry for 791¹⁶⁸. From there, it continues up to and including most of the entry for 806, before the text ends in mid-sentence with the words *qui dicitur Silli super ripam* on fol. 157v¹⁶⁹, leaving about two-thirds of the folium empty. As Maximilian Diesenberger

161) REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 295–297; IDEM, The social logic of historiographical compendia in the Carolingian period, in: *Configuration du texte en histoire. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference Hermeneutic Study and Education of Textual Configuration*, ed. by Osamu KANO (Global COE Program International Conference Series 12, 2012) p. 17–28, at p. 22f.

162) BISCHOFF, *Katalog 3* (as in n. 23) p. 170 (no. 4668).

163) MCKITTERICK, *History and Memory* (as in n. 21) p. 15: “The consistency of the presentation of the text as well as the single hand responsible suggests that this is a very particular and deliberate design rather than a mere assemblage of related texts.”

164) TISCHLER, *Einharts Vita Karoli* (as in n. 20), here 2 p. 1157.

165) REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 295f.; REIMITZ, *History* (as in n. 18) p. 428–430.

166) Digital facsimile: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.213.

167) Sigla: B3 (ArF [as in n. 9] p. IX); B3 (KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* [as in n. 34] p. 302f.); 3 (*Annales Laurissenses* [as in n. 151] p. 129).

168) ArF ad a. 791 (as in n. 9) p. 86.

169) ArF ad a. 806 (as in n. 9) p. 122 l. 1.

has rightly pointed out, this hints at the possibility that the codex was copied from an incomplete exemplar¹⁷⁰.

Frederick Carey suggested that the codex was written between 825 and 845 in Reims¹⁷¹, but Bischoff proposed the third quarter of the ninth century and the more general “Frankreich” as the place of origin¹⁷². It shows the difficulty of pinning down codices that date from the second half of the ninth century¹⁷³. Most recently, Reimitz remarked in passing that the codex was written towards the end of the ninth century, without specifying this further¹⁷⁴. Bischoff’s suggestion may be the best one to follow here because there is reason to suppose that the codex was once owned by Manno of Saint-Claude (formerly Saint-Oyen) in the Jura, judging from an *ex libris* described in 1645 but no longer extant¹⁷⁵, when the codex was in the possession of Alexandre Petau¹⁷⁶. Manno, however, was among the more important men at first in the kingdom of Lothar I (r. 840–855) and later in that of Charles the Bald (r. 840–877) before his own death, perhaps as late as 893¹⁷⁷. Manno probably received the codex at some point in

170) Maximilian DIESENBERGER, *Dissidente Stimmen zum Sturz Tassilos III.*, in: *Texts and Identities* (as in n. 97) p. 105–120, at p. 111.

171) Frederick M. CAREY, *The scriptorium of Reims during the archbishopric of Hincmar (845–882 A.D.)*, in: *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand*. Presented upon the Completion of his Fortieth Year of Teaching, ed. by Leslie Webber JONES (1938) p. 41–60, at p. 57.

172) BISCHOFF, *Katalog 3* (as in n. 23) p. 425 (no. 6641).

173) E.g. Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *Carolingian Book Production: Some Problems*, in: *The Library*, sixth series 12,1 (1990) p. 1–33, with a particular focus on the issue in west-Frankish cultural centres.

174) REIMITZ, *History* (as in n. 18) p. 315.

175) Karel Adriaan DE MEYER, *Paul en Alexandre Petau en de geschiedenis van hun handschriften (voornamelijk op grond van de Petau-handschriften in de Universiteitsbibliotheek te Leiden)* (*Dissertationes inaugurales Batavae ad res antiquas pertinentes 5*, 1947) p. 140f., esp. n. 52.

176) It was numbered as V.55 in the collection of Paul Petau (1568–1614), whose initials are on fol. 1r, and later 969, as can be seen on the spine, under the name of his son, Alexandre Petau (1610–1672). The latter sold the book collection and this codex, acquired by Isaac Vossius acting for Queen Christina of Sweden (1626–1689), came into her possession. It probably had at first the shelfmark 1632 and was later renumbered Reg. lat. 213, as the *ex libris* notes show on the inner side of the front cover, which it still bears to this day. Another *ex libris* of roughly the same time survives on fol. IVr, but it is uncertain to what this refers.

177) On Manno, cf. Anne-Marie TURCAN-VERKERK, *Mannon de Saint-Oyen dans l’histoire de la transmission des textes*, in: *Revue d’histoire des textes 29* (1999) p. 169–243, at p. 219f.; Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *The palace school of Charles the Bald*, in: *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom. Papers based on a*

his forty-year long career and took it with him to Saint-Claude. Two erased but still legible ex libris notes on fol. 1r and 2r from the twelfth or thirteenth century show that the codex belonged to Saint-Remi in Reims by that time. Perhaps the codex had been returned to Reims, where it may have been written, after the death of Manno or simply belonged to Manno's collection in Reims or its vicinity and never left the region.

The second, more substantial witness, Reg. lat. 617¹⁷⁸, was categorised by Kurze as B1¹⁷⁹. The codex of 68 folia measures 200 x 115 mm with a text block of 160 x 80 mm with 22 lines. The first part of the codex is missing and the ArF start in the middle of the entry for 777 with the phrase *placitum venerunt Sarraceni de partibus Hispanie* on fol. 1r¹⁸⁰. It ends with the endpoint of the B recension, namely with the attack of the Moors on Sardinia in 813 on fol. 68v and thus the words *et mul[t]is suor[um] amissis [rec]esserunt*, of which the letters in square brackets are barely legible¹⁸¹. Two more folia are missing in the fragment: one leaf between fol. 18–19, which has led to textual loss in the entry for 787. The text breaks off on fol. 18v after *quod rennuit et venire contempsit*¹⁸². It picks up again on fol. 19r with the words *egisse. Tunc denuo renovans sacramenta*¹⁸³. Another leaf is missing between fol. 24–25¹⁸⁴. The text breaks off on fol. 24v immediately after the phrase *de tanta victoria. Et celebravit*, which is part of the entry for 791¹⁸⁵. The narrative continues on fol. 25r with text from the

Colloquium held in London in April 1979, ed. by Margaret GIBSON / Janet NELSON with the assistance of David GANZ (1981) p. 385–400, at p. 387. For a broader take on the intellectual milieu in which Manno may have operated, cf. Pierre CHAMBERT-PROTAT, *The School at Lyon after the Death of Florus: Investigating a Poorly Documented milieu*, in: *Knowledge and Culture in Times of Threat: The Fall of the Carolingian Empire (ca. 900) / Wissen und Bildung in einer Zeit bedrohter Ordnung: Der Zerfall des Karolingerreiches um 900*, hg. von Warren PEZÉ (Monographien zur Geschichte des MA 69, 2020) p. 307–324.

178) Digital facsimile: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.617.

179) Sigla: B1 (ArF [as in n. 9] p. IX); B1 (KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* [as in n. 34] p. 300–302); 2 (*Annales Laurissenses* [as in n. 151] p. 128f.).

180) ArF ad a. 777 (as in n. 9) p. 48 l. 9 from the bottom.

181) ArF ad a. 813 (as in n. 9) p. 139 l. 12 from the bottom.

182) ArF ad a. 787 (as in n. 9) p. 78 l. 8.

183) *Ibid.* p. 78 l. 5 from the bottom.

184) I am yet to determine whether this is actually a single bifolium taken out of the codex or whether two leaves have been cut out. Technically, it could be the outer bifolium of a quaternio and codicological autopsy will have to provide certainty.

185) ArF ad a. 791 (as in n. 9) p. 88 and p. 90, bottom line and top line, respectively.

entry for 794, namely [*prae*]sencia iamfati principis et missorum domni apostolici¹⁸⁶. The loss of this folium has led to a loss of text for the final part of the entry for 791, the entire text of the entries for 792 and 793 as well as the start of the entry for 794. Because the chapter numbers which accompany the AD system reveal that, at the start of the first completely preserved entry for 778, this is chapter 37 (*XXXVII*), it can be calculated that chapter 1 would have aligned with 742¹⁸⁷. It can therefore be maintained with some degree of certainty that the witness once contained the ArF from 741/742 up to and including most of the entry for 813 as it survives today.

Nothing is known about the early history of the codex and it first surfaced as part of the collection of Paul Petau¹⁸⁸. More recently Bischoff suggested tentatively that it was written in the first or second quarter of the ninth century, possibly in the vicinity of Orléans¹⁸⁹. Earlier scholarship had attributed the codex to Theodulf of Orléans¹⁹⁰. It remains unclear whether Bischoff saw palaeographical similarities with other codices from Orléans or followed older scholarship in locating the codex to Orléans on the basis of the supposed connection with Theodulf. A study to the scriptorium of Orléans has been undertaken by Elisabeth Dahlhaus-Berg, but it focuses in particular on a number of “Prachthandschriften” and where exactly those may have been written and less on other literary output and I have not found convincing comparanda for the script of Orléans¹⁹¹. This codex is not mentioned in her study, and it still awaits a closer palaeographical analysis.

186) ArF ad a. 794 (as in n. 9) p. 94 l. 8.

187) REIMITZ, *Der Weg zum Königtum* (as in n. 19) p. 282; KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 300.

188) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 301, where Kurze writes it was Alexandre Petau. No ex libris of Alexandre Petau survives, however, whereas the number *R.55* by Paul Petau is still extant on fol. 1r.

189) BISCHOFF, *Katalog 3* (as in n. 23) p. 434 (no. 6724): “Nähe von Orléans (?), IX. Jh., 1./2. Viertel”.

190) Peter BROMMER, *Die bischöfliche Gesetzgebung Theodulfs von Orléans*, in: ZRG Kan. 60 (1974) p. 1–120, at p. 10 n. 48. There, Brommer refers to Gerit Janszoon Vos, *De historicis latinis libri tres* (Leiden 1627) p. 689: “inter alia scripsisse dicitur Annales Karoli M. & Ludovici Pii”; Bernard de MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova I* (Paris 1739) no. 989, p. 35: “Fragmentum Annalium Francicorum, a quibusdam Theodulpho adscribitur.”

191) Elisabeth DAHLHAUS-BERG, *Nova Antiquitas et Antiqua Novitas. Typologische Exegese und isidorianisches Geschichtsbild bei Theodulf von Orléans* (Kölner historische Abhandlungen 23, 1975) p. 39–91.

Last but not least, the most complete ninth-century witness of the ArF survives in Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. 473¹⁹², hereafter the Vienna codex. It was given the siglum D1 by Kurze¹⁹³. The codex consists of 172 folia and measures some 260 x 200 mm. In this codex, the ArF run in their fullest form from the entry for 742 up to and including their final entry for 829, omitting only the entry for 741. As part of a historiographical compendium, the ArF are divided into two main parts. The first part contains the entries from 742 up to and including the beginning of the entry for 814, ending with *V kl. feb. rebus humanis excessit*¹⁹⁴, and occupies fol. 116r–143v. Hereafter part of Einhart's *Vita Karoli* is interpolated. It starts on fol. 144r and ends on fol. 151v. Thereafter the ArF pick up the narrative again, continuing right where they had left off with the entry for 814 at fol. 152v, albeit with an adapted sentence to keep the reader firmly anchored in the narrative¹⁹⁵. The ArF end with the entry for 829 on fol. 169r.

In 1960, Michael Wallace-Hadrill lamented that tantalising little was known about the origin and provenance of this codex¹⁹⁶. Bischoff later hesitantly connected the codex to St Amand¹⁹⁷. The riddle was solved by McKitterick in an article published in 1998 where she pointed out the striking similarities with the script of the abbey of St Amand¹⁹⁸. Her arguments have been further refined by Reimitz in 2000, who pinpointed the date of composition rather precisely to the political setting of c. 869¹⁹⁹. Bischoff's *Katalog* simply maintains northeast France as place of origin and dates it to the second half of

192) Digital facsimile: https://manuscripta.at/hs_detail.php?ID=9841.

193) Sigla: D1 (ArF [as in n. 9] p. X); D1 (KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* [as in n. 34] p. 317f.); 5 (*Annales Laurissenses* [as in n. 151] p. 129).

194) ArF ad a. 742 (as in n. 9) p. 2 l. 3 from the bottom; ArF ad a. 814, *ibid.* p. 140 l. 5.

195) REIMITZ, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch* (as in n. 21) p. 38f. The witness reads *Post obitum igitur Karoli cum Hlodouuicus filius eius* instead of *Cuius rei nuntium cum Hlodouuicus filius eius*, cf. ArF ad a. 814 (as in n. 9) p. 140 l. 7.

196) *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar with its continuations*, translated from the Latin by J. Michael WALLACE-HADRILL (*Medieval classics*, 1960) p. LVI.

197) BISCHOFF, *Die Abtei Lorsch* (as in n. 76) p. 132f.: “IX², Nordostfrankreich; (S. Amand?)”.

198) Rosamond MCKITTERICK, *L'idéologie politique dans l'historiographie carolingienne*, in: *La royauté et les élites* (as in n. 76) p. 59–70; a reworked English version appeared later as MCKITTERICK, *Political ideology* (as in n. 125).

199) REIMITZ, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch* (as in n. 21).

the ninth century²⁰⁰. Nothing is known about its ninth-century provenance although it may have been at the court of Charles the Bald, given the possibility that it had something to do with the coronation of Charles the Bald in 869, as Reimitz has suggested²⁰¹. The oldest extant ex libris is found on fol. 1r and dates from the thirteenth century and indicates the codex was in Worms by that time.

Kurze claimed that the codex was written by a single scribe²⁰² but Reimitz has shown convincingly that Kurze was wrong and that, with regard to the ArF, one can distinguish between two textual witnesses, both of substantial length²⁰³. In other words, the codex is not only a compendium, but also a composite manuscript in which various parts of already existing codices were carefully put together to form a new codex. A third distinct writing style can be attributed to the compiler, who wrote fol. 121r–v and intervened with the text as it was found on fol. 143v and 152v. The text was adopted, adapted and improved to prepare texts on those folia that act as linchpins with other codicological entities within the same codex. The compiler ensured that the ArF in this codex, despite consisting of multiple parts, convey a clear-cut narrative and conceptualisation of Carolingian rule and its legitimacy to rule.

The first substantial part of the ArF, dubbed ArF-1 by Reimitz, runs from fol. 116r–120v and contains the entry for 742 up to and including most of the entry for 771, breaking off with *Attiniacus et pascha in Haristal[lio]*²⁰⁴. The second substantial part of the ArF, ArF-3, runs from fol. 122r–143v and again from fol. 152v–169r after an interpolated section of Einhart's *Vita Karoli*, which runs from fol. 144r–151v. In its fullest sense ArF-3 contains the entries for 774 up to and including 829. It starts with *Francorum in Papia civitate dimittens* on fol. 122r and is interrupted in the entry for 814 right after *V kl. feb. rebus humanis*²⁰⁵. After the *Vita Karoli*, ArF-3 continues again on fol. 153r with the phrase *confirmationem pacti ac foederis misit*²⁰⁶. From there, it continues to the end of the ArF on fol. 169r.

200) BISCHOFF, *Katalog 3* (as in n. 23) p. 479 (no. 7126).

201) REIMITZ, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch* (as in n. 21) p. 73 and p. 76.

202) KURZE, *Reichsannalen I* (as in n. 34) p. 317.

203) REIMITZ, *Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch* (as in n. 21) p. 77, contains a helpful codicological and palaeographical overview of the codex. What follows is mostly based on the article by Reimitz.

204) ArF ad a. 771 (as in n. 9) p. 32 l. 11.

205) ArF ad a. 774 (as in n. 9) p. 40 l. 3; ArF ad a. 814, *ibid.* p. 140 l. 5.

206) ArF ad a. 814 (as in n. 9) p. 140 l. 2 from the bottom.

The compiler, classified as ArF-2, took care to interweave the parts together. The hand is first seen on fol. 121r, an interpolated singleton, with [*Haristal*]*lio villa et inmutavit se*²⁰⁷, neatly following onto ArF-1. Ultimately, the compiler ran out of space and had to add a new top line on fol. 122r where it takes the narrative to *Italia subiugata et ordinata custodias*²⁰⁸. ArF-3 starts on the next line with *Francorum in Papia civitate dimittens*²⁰⁹. The same is true for the entry for 814 on fol. 143v, where the compiler had to rewrite *excessit* after overly enthusiastic erasing. He added on those erased lines the rubricated *Finiunt gesta domni Karoli magni et praecellentissimi Francorum imperatoris*. On the next folium the *Vita Karoli* starts. After that is brought to a close on fol. 151v, the compiler added another leaf, fol. 152, again a singleton. Although he left the recto side empty, the verso side contains the unmistakable *Incipit gesta Hludovici imperatoris filii Karoli magni imperatoris* and subsequently the twelve lines of text that have been erased on fol. 143v. To ensure that there would be no conspicuous break with the narrative, the text starts with *Post obitum igitur Karoli cum Hlodouuicus filius eius* instead of *cuius rei nuntium cum Hlodouuicus filius eius*²¹⁰. With the words *et per eos descriptionem et* the twelve lines come to a close and reach the end of fol. 152v²¹¹. From the next folium onwards ArF-3 continues the text again, as mentioned above.

Reimitz surely was right to point out that ArF-3 was meant to be the most important part of the compilation, and that the other parts were made to fit. It seems to be the case that the entire ArF-3 was once a continuous narrative before it was separated, and the *Vita Karoli* inserted²¹². Reimitz also pointed out the similarities between ArF-1 and the St Amand script²¹³, and he mentioned resemblances between ArF-1 and ArF-3²¹⁴. It remains therefore a distinct possibility that ArF-3 was written in St Amand or in its vicinity.

There are other implications that also need to be considered as a result of this. For example, Kurze had already drawn attention to an

207) ArF ad a. 771 (as in n. 9) p. 32 l. 12.

208) ArF ad a. 774 (as in n. 9) p. 40 l. 2.

209) *Ibid.* p. 40 l. 3.

210) REIMITZ, Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch (as in n. 21) p. 38f.; ArF ad a. 814 (as in n. 9) p. 140 l. 7.

211) ArF ad a. 814 (as in n. 9) p. 140 l. 21.

212) REIMITZ, Ein karolingisches Geschichtsbuch (as in n. 21) p. 49.

213) *Ibid.* p. 47f.

214) *Ibid.* p. 46.

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.

lemagne's reign that may well have been for the most part copied and altered during the rule of Louis the Pious. Although the text was first conceived during the reign of Charlemagne, no extant witness sheds light on what the text looked like before 814. Perhaps it is precisely because no such textual witness survives that scholars experience difficulties imagining what the ArF looked like when they were used in the *Annales Mettenses priores*, the *Annales Tiliani*, the *Chronicon Laurissense breve* and the *Annales Maximiniani*²¹⁸. A closer study of those works may shed further light on the earliest development of the ArF in the final decade of the eighth century and the start of the ninth century. The *Annales Tiliani*, which survive together with a set of annals closely related to the *Annales sancti Amandi*, and the *Annales Maximiniani*, which might have been tweaked by a writer with close ties to Arn, archbishop of Salzburg and abbot of St Amand, deserve particular attention in this regard as they might be less reworked than the other two mentioned works. The reception of the ArF, in the works of the Astronomer, Ado and Prudentius/Hincmar, for example, shows that they were available to writers in the west-Frankish realm. They wrote after the death of Louis and perhaps were using a version of the ArF that was already revised to fit the memory of Louis's rule, although the Astronomer, writing shortly after Louis's death, was likely to have used a version of the ArF composed during the reign of Louis. It would be worthwhile to investigate which precise version they had in front of them. This, too, will shed more light on the early transmission, dissemination and reception of the ArF and its implications.

Taken together, there are six textual witnesses of the ArF that can be safely attributed to the ninth century. These witnesses appear to be independent, meaning they are no direct copies of each other, but rather all go back to arguably different exemplars. The sole possible exception is the connection between the Leiden fragment and the Vienna codex. A further, more detailed study must investigate whether or not the Leiden fragment was the direct exemplar of the Vienna codex. Thus, not only were those six witnesses "out there", but earlier copies, which are now all lost, were as well.

218) WIBEL, *Beiträge* (as in n. 34) p. 12, underscored this already with regard to the *Annales Maximiniani*, but it may very well go for the three other texts mentioned here as well.

Of the extant textual witnesses, only the Paris codex, dated to the second quarter of the ninth century and possibly written in the vicinity of Paris, and the Vienna codex, a manuscript connected with the succession of Charles the Bald in Lotharingia after the death of Lothar II in 869 and probably written in St Amand, transmit more or less the entire ArF, that is ranging from 741 to 829. Both contain the ArF as part of a historiographical compendium. Additionally, four manuscript fragments from the ninth century have survived. Of those fragments, two transmit a substantial portion of the text. The longest text fragment, Reg. lat. 617, supposedly written in Orléans or its vicinity and dated to the first half of the ninth century, perhaps even the first quarter, contains the entries for 777 up to and including 813, with the loss of two leaves resulting in the loss of texts in the entry for 787 and the end of the entry for 791 up to the first words of the entry for 794. The other fragment preserved in the same collection, namely Reg. lat. 213, dates from the second half of the ninth century, possibly the third quarter, and may have been written in the vicinity of Reims. It transmits the entries for 791 up to and including the entry for 806, when the text breaks off in mid-sentence. There are also two shorter fragments, both unknown to Kurze when preparing his edition of the ArF. The first of these, the Cologne fragment, dated to the first third of the ninth century, may have been written at the court, although it remains uncertain where exactly the court was, in palaeographical terms at least. As it contains part of the entry for 824, this textual witness may very well have been written shortly after the text was first conceived. The Leiden fragment, which may have been written in the Rhineland or the court, dated to the second quarter of the ninth century, contains the last part of the entry for 825 and the first part of the entry for 826.

If marked on a map, it is striking that an oval-shaped area appears that encompasses the cultural centres that seem to have had access to the ArF. If these guesstimates are correct, centres that produced ArF manuscripts are mostly located between the Seine and Rhine rivers, ranging from Paris, and possibly slightly further south from Orléans, to Aachen, encompassing St Amand and Reims. As most copies were written in the Frankish heartlands, there is reason to suppose that the text may indeed have been commissioned by the ruling dynasty. A tenth-century copy of an exemplar that was offered to Charles the Bald was copied in the abbey of Saint-Médard-de-Soissons fits

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.”

to spread. On the contrary, they remained confined to the area from where Louis the Pious had ruled the empire. In that region, it may have helped to enhance the legitimacy of the Carolingian dynasty and served as a testimony of their rule. It is in alignment with earlier scholarship that the text appears to have been part of court-orientated history writing²²³. After all, the cultural centres that may have produced textual witnesses did not really function as important *sedes imperii* in themselves, but nearby palaces and *villae* in Compiègne and Quierzy were places which “Louis tended to favour ... as locations for assemblies”²²⁴. Furthermore, this region is quite similar to the area where Charles the Bald spent most of his reign, and it is a distinct possibility that the “court school”, a culturally vibrant place where not only texts were copied, but also new texts may have been produced as a result of the intellectual exchange at the court, was located in Compiègne²²⁵. As far as the manuscript evidence suggests, the ArF did not travel far beyond the very core of the Frankish heartlands.

With civil war breaking out after the death of Louis the Pious, there were now other writers who had arguably been commissioned to write an official record, such as Nithard in his *De dissensionibus filiorum Hludowici Pii*²²⁶. It seems the relevance of the ArF had

223) Cf. MCKITTERICK, Charlemagne (as in n. 13) p. 33 n. 109, who credits Mayke de Jong for the formulation “court-related annals”, with a reference to De Jong’s at the time upcoming work on Louis the Pious, which was published as “The Penitential State”. DE JONG, The Penitential State (as in n. 21) p. 67 n. 32, in turn, refers to Janet L. NELSON, History-writing at the courts of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald, in: *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, hg. von Anton SCHARER / Georg SCHEIBELREITER (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 32, 1994) p. 435–442, at p. 439, where Nelson explains: “History could be court-orientated without being official history.”

224) DE JONG, The Penitential State (as in n. 21) p. 34.

225) MCKITTERICK, The palace school of Charles the Bald (as in n. 177) p. 387f. and p. 394, where she suggests Compiègne as place of the court school under Charles the Bald. McKitterick’s arguments are based, mostly, on the work undertaken by Carlrichard BRÜHL, *Fodrum, Gistum, Servitium regis. Studien zu den wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen des Königtums im Frankenreich und in den fränkischen Nachfolgestaaten Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien vom 6. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Kölner historische Abhandlungen 14, 1968), here 1 p. 39–48; cf. also Josef FLECKENSTEIN, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, 2 vols. (MGH Schriften 16, 1959–1966), here 1: *Grundlegung. Die karolingische Hofkapelle* (1959) p. 142–155, with particular attention paid to “das räumliche Element” and the importance of Compiègne on p. 151–155.

226) Nithard, *Historiae*, prologue, ed. Philippe LAUER / Sophie GLANSDORFF (Les Classiques de l’histoire au Moyen Âge 51, 2012) p. 2–4, at p. 2: *Cum, ut optime*,

somehow ceded to the political developments in the Frankish realm in the early 830s. With new actors came a wind of change that required a different narrative. Naturally, the ArF were a monument in its own right and served, and still serve, as a testimony of Carolingian rule. The manuscript evidence, however, seems to underscore the suggestion by Reimitz to distinguish between the short history and the long history of the ArF. Four of the discussed witnesses were written in the first half of the ninth century. The Cologne fragment and the Paris codex supposedly date from the first third of the ninth century. Both the Leiden fragment and Reg. lat. 617 are less easily narrowed down when it comes to the date of composition, but both still date from the first half of the ninth century and may have been written before the death of Louis the Pious²²⁷. Then there is a gap of about 20 to 40 years until the next witnesses surface, namely the Vienna codex and Reg. lat. 213. This temporal gap may be an indicator of the end of the short history and the start of the long history of the ArF as hypothesised by Reimitz²²⁸.

Taken together, the ninth-century manuscript evidence of the ArF is ambiguous. On the one hand, their success within the Frankish heartlands is inescapably clear, strongly enhancing the possibility of a potential link with the Carolingian family. All textual witnesses from the ninth century seem to have been written in the royal landscape the kings and emperors were mostly operating in. On the other hand, it is just as clear that the ArF did not enjoy particular popularity beyond the royal landscape and there does not seem to have been a centralised attempt to actively disseminate the work throughout the Frankish realms.

mi domine, nosti, jam poene annis duobus illatam a fratre vestro persecutionem vos vestrique haudquaquam meriti pateremini, antequam Cadhellonicam introissemus civitatem, precepistis ut res vestris temporibus gestas stili officio memorie traderem.

227) A closer palaeographical examination will have to provide more certainty.

228) Helmut REIMITZ, *Nomen Francorum obscuratum*. Zur Krise der fränkischen Identität zwischen der kurzen und langen Geschichte der ‘Annales regni Francorum’, in: Völker, Reiche und Namen im frühen Mittelalter, hg. von Matthias BECHER / Stefanie DICK (MAStudien 22, 2010) p. 279–296.

Summaria

The *Annales regni Francorum* (ArF) are commonly regarded as the epitome of propagandistic writing in the Carolingian Age. But does the manuscript evidence of this work actually support this concept? On the basis of an examination of the work's textual transmission in the ninth century, when Carolingian hegemony was still prevalent in the Frankish kingdoms, and a conspectus of extant textual witnesses of the ArF in the Carolingian era, the importance of the text in contemporary history writing appears in quite a different light. The results call for a re-evaluation of the role that the text played in historiographical practice in the Carolingian kingdoms.

Die *Annales regni Francorum* (ArF) gelten gemeinhin als der propagandistische Text schlechthin der karolingischen Dynastie. Aber stützen die handschriftlichen Zeugnisse tatsächlich diese Vorstellung? Ein genauerer Blick auf die Überlieferung dieses Textes im 9. Jahrhundert, als die karolingische Hegemonie in den fränkischen Königreichen noch stark war, und die Erstellung eines Panoramas der erhaltenen Textzeugen der ArF in der Karolingerzeit werfen jedoch ein etwas anderes Licht auf die Bedeutung dieses Textes in der zeitgenössischen Geschichtsschreibung. Infolgedessen sollte die Forschung die Rolle, die er in der Praxis der Geschichtsschreibung in den karolingischen Reichen spielte, neu überdenken.