

sorbed the inspirational elements in this and any other West Frankish or Lotharingian tradition, and had long started to process these into accounts of best practice that reflected both realities and expectations of the monastic life in their own part of the world. More generally, we can also see that there was growing resistance in the German-speaking world to West Frankish and Lotharingian reformers who thought that they could import their own institution's customs without taking into consideration regional sensitivities and emphases, alongside ones of a more political nature⁵⁶. It is possible that in another of his works, the *Illatio sancti Benedicti Floriacum*, Theoderic alludes to this resistance when he states that he was criticized by none other than his patron Richard of Amorbach for proselytizing Fleury's customs and for mocking his German readers for their ignorance⁵⁷. Scholars suspect that Richard himself obtained a copy of FF¹: if correct, this might lend credence to Theoderic's statement⁵⁸. Given this context, it is not difficult to understand why none of the extant versions of the *Consuetudines Germaniae* or any other customary text from the Empire

56) Abbot Immo of Gorze's (r. 982–c. 1015) tenures as abbot of Prüm (1003–1006) and Reichenau (1006–1008) ended in failure; Anne WAGNER, Gorze au XI^e siècle: Contribution à l'histoire du monachisme bénédictin dans l'Empire (ARTEM. Atelier de Recherches sur les Textes Médiévaux 1, 1996) p. 39–52. And from a slightly later period we have Notker of St Gall's complaint about Richard of Saint-Vanne's and Poppo of Stavelot's arrogance in dictating their home region's customs, "each pretending that they were, indeed, St Benedict" (*quorum uterque dicit se sanctum Benedictum quidem esse*), cf. Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule 2: Psalmen und catechetische Denkmäler nach der St. Galler Handschriftengruppe, ed. Paul PIPER (Germanischer Bücherschatz 9, 1883) p. 70.

57) Theoderic of Fleury/Trier/Amorbach, *Illatio sancti Benedicti Floriacum*, ed. Johannes A BOSCO (Floriacensis vetus bibliotheca, Lyon 1605, p. 219–229) p. 220: *Quare, inquires ad haec, ironicis schematibus, nostram nostrorumque inscientiam, tam impudenter verbosando deludis?*

58) FF¹ may have been the basis for Richard's *Ordo Amerbacensis*, which the monks of the Bamberg abbey of Sankt Michael in the early twelfth century claimed he had imported there, cf. Elmar HOCHHOLZER, Überlegungen zum Amorbacher "Reformkalender" des 11. Jahrhunderts und zum *ordo Amerbacensium* auf dem Michelsberg/Bamberg, StMGBO 108 (1997) p. 112–150, at p. 125–130. An eleventh-century manuscript of FF¹ originates from Sankt Michael, but whether the monks acquired it during Bernward's tenure as bishop or during that of his successor Godehard is unknown, cf. HOFFMANN, Mönchskönig (as in n. 3) p. 185. Further on Amorbach's links with Sankt Maximin in Trier and Richard's role in founding Sankt Michael, cf. CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 425 and Heinrich WAGNER, Amorbach, in: Die Männer- und Frauenklöster der Benediktiner in Bayern 1, bearb. von Michael Kaufmann / Helmut Flachenecker / Wolfgang Wüst / Manfred Heim (Germania Benedictina 2, 2014) p. 27–61, at p. 37–39, 52.