

It was Davril himself who tempered these high hopes. Beyond reasonable doubt, he argued, the text's attributing of the customs it describes to the late tenth-century community of Fleury is correct<sup>29</sup>. And his and other scholars' preliminary analysis of its contents also revealed that the Fleury monks' liturgical and other practices were anything but slavish copies of those of Cluny, which helped to invalidate earlier ideas about the relationship between the two places and their respective observances. It turned out that Fleury's customs derived from Gallican tradition, with the addition of practices that dated back to the Carolingian reforms of the early ninth century, and that the impact of Odo's intervention in this respect had been minimal<sup>30</sup>. All of this significantly added to the customary's interest as a historical source for the study of monastic life at the turn of the first millennium. But at the same time, Davril noted that there were strong reasons to suspect that the Fleury community and its leaders had nothing to do with its creation. The French scholar contended that Theoderic only began writing about his experiences at the abbey and his membership of the community in the second decade of the eleventh century, long after he had left Fleury for good in, or before, 1002. Among the arguments Davril made in support of this was the author's own admission that while he was at Fleury, he had held the lowly office of *refectorarius*, which would have hardly placed him at the centre of the abbey's bustling literary life<sup>31</sup>. Another argument was the absence in the abbey's later documentation of any indications that the monks of the Loire abbey were aware of the customary's existence, or even that manuscript copies of the text had ever circulated outside of the German-speaking world<sup>32</sup>.

It was clear to Davril that for answers about the "how" and especially the "why" of Theoderic's text, one would have to look outside of Fleury and its immediate zone of influence, and outside the chro-

---

29) CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 334 and DONNAT, *Recherches* (as in n. 26) p. 166f.

30) CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 337, 345–350.

31) DAVRIL, *Un moine* (as in n. 23) p. 101. We can infer from Theoderic's writings that he likely spent considerable time studying the community's book collection and at the time of his departure was well informed on its ideology and its liturgical practices. Regarding the timing of his arrival at Fleury and that of his subsequent departure, cf. HOFFMANN, *Theoderich* (as in n. 17) p. 504.

32) Refer also to HALLINGER's comments in CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 339–342. The thirteenth-century customary of Fleury bears no relation to Theoderic's text; *Consuetudines Floriacenses saeculi tertii decimi*, ed. Anselme DAVRIL (CCM 9, 1976).