

reveals that the work's earliest readers (or at least those who had access to a complete manuscript of the text) would have had the opportunity to know the name and the affiliation of its author. As such, the text had broadcast to those readers at least a nominal claim to authority, on account of the author's membership of the institution whose customs he described.

Beyond these two things, up until the mid-1960s what the earliest users had made of the customary was unknown, since no commentator after Trithemius had been able to track down a copy of the text. In the introductory volume of the CCM from 1963, Kassius Hallinger still listed the work as likely lost²⁰. But shortly afterwards the Benedictine monk Carl Wolff discovered an incomplete copy of the customary in a manuscript from the middle decades of the fifteenth century, which had been made for a Benedictine house in northern Germany²¹. Although it lacked the prologue cited by Trithemius, the beginning of the extant manuscript text clearly identified its contents as pertaining to the abbey of Fleury: the first of two extant parts discuss the role and duties of the monastery's main officers, while the second offers a description of how the Loire monks' routine was organized on a Sunday, beginning with Vespers and continuing until mealtime at midday, at which point the text abruptly cuts off. On realizing the importance of his discovery Wolff reported it to the CCM's chief editor Hallinger, who relayed the news to Fleury specialist Anselme Davril and asked him to coordinate the work for a critical edition²². In a brief article from 1966 Davril shared his initial findings, which he subsequently elaborated in a follow-up study from 1975 and in the introductions to

20) *Initia consuetudinis Benedictinae. Consuetudines saeculi octavi et noni*, ed. Kassius HALLINGER (CCM 1, 1963) p. LXIV.

21) Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 71.22 Aug. 2°, fol. 235r–255r. The manuscript, which was created in the context of the Observant Reform, contains a miscellaneous set of texts on Benedictine spirituality, including a Latin and German version of the Benedictine Rule, multiple commentaries (including that by Hildegard of Bingen) on that text, and Theoderic's customary; cf. OTTO VON HEINEMANN, *Die Augusteischen Handschriften 3: Codex Guelferbytanus 32.7 Augusteus 2° – 77.3 Augusteus 2°* (Kataloge der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel. Die alte Reihe 6, 1898, repr. 1966) p. 374–376, and HALLINGER's additional notes in CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 149–152. Hallinger suspected that the manuscript originated from Sankt Aegidius in Brunswick, *ibid.* p. 151.

22) Davril's work was considerably facilitated by the transcription work of two Benedictine nuns named Maria Wegener and Candida Elvert. For HALLINGER's full account of the customary's discovery, cf. CCM 7,1 (as in n. 5) p. 151f.