

But as he subsequently set out to study the seven customaries in detail and prepare the introductions for CCM 7, Hallinger realized that his normative versus descriptive interpretation of the two groups of texts did not hold up to close scrutiny, and accordingly he decided not to repeat it in this new publication⁸. Evidently the German scholar had realized that far too little was known about the precise context in which these texts were created and disseminated to make any firm statements about their true nature and intended purpose. However, some remnants of his former way of thinking did filter through in his argument when he referred to Theoderic's customary of Fleury as mere "propaganda", which is an assessment that he based on the observation that the Fleury monks never used the text as an instrument of monastic governance⁹.

By the later years of the 1980s, it had become apparent that the traditional narrative about the "how" and "why" of the seven customaries was in need of drastic revision. Commentaries by (among other specialists) Rudolf Schieffer, Lin Donnat, and Isabelle Cochelin brought sharply into focus the need for more empirical research¹⁰. The publications that sought to address this lacuna in scholarship aimed to make clear the ways in which the creation, dissemination, and early reception of each text responded to a specific institutional, ideological, and practical context¹¹. A 2014 study by Cochelin

discussion in Rudolf SCHIEFFER, *Consuetudines monasticae und Reformforschung*, DA 44 (1988) p. 161–169, esp. p. 161f. In an important article from 1977 Hallinger insisted on the normative nature of medieval monastic customaries as a genre; Kassius HALLINGER, *Consuetudo. Begriff, Formen, Forschungsgeschichte, Inhalt*, in: *Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift (Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 68 / Studien zur Germania Sacra 14, 1980)* p. 140–166, at p. 146.

8) DONNAT, *Les coutumiers* (as in n. 5) p. 8 and p. 13f.

9) CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 424.

10) SCHIEFFER, *Consuetudines* (as in n. 7); DONNAT, *Les coutumiers* (as in n. 5) p. 12, and COCHELIN, *Customaries* (as in n. 2) p. 29f., 33 (for the expression "how" and "why").

11) For the Cluniac customaries cf. e.g. Susan BOYNTON, *Shaping a Monastic Identity. Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125 (Conjunctions of Religion and Power in the Medieval Past, 2006)*, and Isabelle COCHELIN, *Discipline and the Problem of Cluny's Customaries*, in: *A Companion to the Abbey of Cluny in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Scott G. Bruce / Steven Vanderputten (*Brill's Companions to European History 27, 2022*) p. 204–222. And for the non-Cluniac ones refer among other studies to DONNAT, *Les coutumes* (as in n. 1), and Anselme DAVRIL, *Points de contact entre la Vita Iohannis Gorziensis et les Consuetudines Floriacenses Antiquiores*, in: *L'abbaye de Gorze au X^e siècle*,