

Still according to Davril, Theoderic was ideally placed to assist Bernward, for he not only represented the much-admired monastic observance of Fleury but also understood the bishop's clerical viewpoint well, given that he had spent several decades of his life as a cleric prior to entering the monastic life and (so we learn from several passages in the customary) was familiar with the communal life for canons³⁶. A final point not mentioned by Davril is the fact that the customary dwells comparatively little on liturgical practices and spends a great deal of time explaining the organization of Fleury and the monks' daily routines: this might help to confirm the hypothesis of a work written to assist a commissioner who was in the process of setting up a monastic institution. Yet whether any of this is truly relevant to the customary's interpretation as a normative instrument of monastic governance is unclear, as there are no primary sources that tell us anything about a link between the text's creation and Bernward's foundation. Furthermore, the German scholar Hartmut Hoffmann remained in doubt about the customary's link to Bernward of Hildesheim and preferred to go with Trithemius's original claim that it had been addressed to Bernward of Würzburg³⁷. For his part, Kasius Hallinger speculated that the text had been issued in two distinct versions, one of which had been addressed to Bernward of Hildesheim and the other to Abbot Richard of Amorbach (r. 1010/1011–1039). If

36) Cf. for instance the passage on vespers, in which Theoderic refers to the *mos canonicorum* before discussing the Fleury monks' liturgical routines; Theoderic of Fleury/Trier/Amorbach, *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores*, in: CCM 7,3 (as in n. 23) p. 35.

37) HOFFMANN, Theoderich (as in n. 17) p. 502–504, correctly notes that Theoderic may have travelled to Italy prior to 1002. Based on this he concludes that Davril's and Hallinger's hypothesis for dating the customary (which mentions the author's experiences in Laterans and Monte Cassino) after 1006 is invalid and that the customary was therefore most likely written between 990 and 995. Hoffmann's interpretation carries with it the implication that Theoderic had either travelled to Rome and Monte Cassino prior to entering the monastic life at Fleury, or that he was held in such high regard by Abbo and his associates that he was allowed to travel extensively and to visit these places at a very early stage in his monastic career. This, and the fact that Hoffmann does not address the other arguments for linking the customary to Bernward of Hildesheim, means that the question of the text's dating remains unresolved. Pending further discoveries of new evidence pertaining to Theoderic's biography, the conventional dating in 1010–1022 remains the most likely one. Also see the evidence presented below, in n. 96.