

Francia – Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Bd. 33/1

2006

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2006.1.45273

---

#### Copyright

Das Digitalisat wird Ihnen von perspectivia.net, der Online-Publikationsplattform der Stiftung Deutsche Geisteswissenschaftliche Institute im Ausland (DGIA), zur Verfügung gestellt. Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

ALBERTO FERREIRO

»PETRINE PRIMACY« AND GREGORY OF TOURS\*

There is no question that a major development in the early Middle Ages was the missionary outreach of the papacy directed at the largely non evangelized West. Pope Gregory the Great played a significant and active role in extending papal authority by sending missionaries and bringing wayward Christian communities (Irish) and even heretical ones (Arian Visigothic Iberia) into communion with Rome. Much of this evangelization was already afoot in the fourth and fifth centuries but it seems to have reached a high point under Gregory the Great. In this study, however, I delve into the expansion of the jurisdiction of the See of Rome into northern Gaul which was part of a broader evangelization during these formative centuries.

To understand the papal involvement in northern Gaul in the sixth century it is imperative to look into our principal source for that region, Gregory of Tours. He is finally receiving the attention that he merits as witnessed by the abundant books and articles in recent years that continues unabated<sup>1</sup>. Caesarius of Arles, on the other hand, represents a southern Gallic or Mediterranean bishop who had a close relationship with the See in Rome. I have delved into his views on the papacy in a separate study<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore, we have to acknowledge at the outset that Gregory of Tours represents a limited view of (northern) Gaul, albeit an important one, as has been signaled by Raymond Van Dam, »Any discussion of Merovingian Gaul based primarily on the writings of Gregory of Tours will resolutely reflect his own parochial world«<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, recent historiography has strongly tended to play down the ecclesial links between Gregory of Tours (northern Gaul) and the papacy,

\* I want to thank Dr. Martin Heinzelmann for some very useful critique of this paper. All conclusions, however, are mine.

1 The World of Gregory of Tours, ed. Kathleen MITCHELL, Ian WOOD (Cultures, Beliefs, and Traditions, 8), Leiden, Boston, Cologne 2002. This volume of essays contains within it the most comprehensive current bibliography on Gregory of Tours and some of the most up to date scholarship. The works by Raymond VAN DAM in this article are a rich bibliographical resource. Still useful for the broader background is, Henry J. BECK, The pastoral care of souls in South-East France during the sixth-century, Rome 1950 (Analecta Gregoriana, 51, sectio B, 8). A provocative, convincing, and essential new study is by Martin HEINZELMANN, Gregory of Tours, History and Society in the Sixth Century, Cambridge 2001. Noteworthy is his compelling analysis of Gregory's theology, at p. 153–172.

2 Alberto FERREIRO, Petrine Primacy and episcopal authority in Caesarius of Arles, in: *Studia Patristica* (in press).

3 Raymond VAN DAM, Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul, Berkeley 1985 (Transformations of the Classical Heritage, 8), p. 201.



or at the very least, of holding mutual attitudes of indifference<sup>4</sup>. It has been proposed recently that Pope Gregory the Great did not seek to impose the Roman liturgy in Gaul and this is evidence of a »detachment« by Rome from the Merovingian Church<sup>5</sup>. Does such alleged inaction by Rome adequately reflect the »mind« and policy of the papacy at that time regarding regional liturgical diversity? The papacy of the fifth through seventh centuries did not impose the Roman liturgy either in Gaul or in Iberia. In the case of Iberia the Visigothic (later known as Mozarab) liturgy developed under the guidance of the papacy but not by papal insistence. The imposition of the Roman liturgy and suppression of regional ones (Braga and Visigothic Rites) by the papacy occurred in earnest in the eleventh century primarily during the pontificate of Pope Gregory VII.

To establish the extent of the mutual interest between the northern Gallic Church as presented in Gregory's works and Rome I explore the following topics: papal intervention in Gaul, the ecclesiology of »Petrine Primacy«, and the ecclesial *collegium* between bishops and the papacy by looking into his *Libri historiarum*, (*LH*)<sup>6</sup> *Vita Patrum*, (*VP*)<sup>7</sup> *Vita Sancti Martini*, (*VM*)<sup>8</sup> *Liber in gloria martyrum*, (*GM*) and *Liber in gloria confessorum* (*GC*)<sup>9</sup>.

Admittedly the evidence is not abundant in Gregory's works in reference to the papacy, nevertheless, what we do have reveals that he was hardly »indifferent« or intent on keeping his distance. Those who make such observations about »alleged« indifference on Gregory's part do not explain why one should expect him to give so much attention to Rome and the papacy in a work such as the *Libri historiarum* whose primary purpose was to relate the conversion of the Franks – via their conversion to Catholic Nicaean Christianity and to promote devotion to St. Martin of Tours. As we shall see, Gregory did not ignore Rome or the papacy altogether. What he did wish to include in all of his works regarding the papacy was precise, calculated, and in the end advanced his overall Gallic agenda.

4 Thomas F. X. NOBLE, Gregory of Tours and the Roman Church, in: MITCHELL, WOOD, *The World of Gregory* (see n. 1), p. 147, and Yitzhak HEN, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul A.D. 481–751*, Leiden, New York, Cologne 1995 (Cultures, Beliefs, and Traditions, 1), p. 59. HEINZELMANN, *Gregory of Tours* (see n. 1), p. 77, note 77, notes that Gregory did not mention Matthew 16:18 when speaking of Peter and that he avoided, »the special position and privileges of St. Peter and his successors«. While it is true that the Gospel of Matthew is not cited explicitly, Gregory did note the special position and privileges of Peter and his successors in other ways as will become evident in this study. It is rather puzzling that Heinzelmann has no discussion of Pope Clement I who is crucial for this topic.

5 HEN, *Merovingian Gaul* (see n. 4), p. 59.

6 *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Libri historiarum X*, ed. Bruno KRUSCH, Wilhelm LEVISON, in: MGH, SS rer. Mer. I/1, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Hannover 1951, p. 1–539 [hereafter *LH*].

7 *Vita patrum*, ed. Bruno KRUSCH, in: MGH, SS rer. Mer. I/2, Hannover 1885, p. 211–294. Very useful is the commentary by Edward JAMES, *Gregory of Tours. Life of the Fathers*, Liverpool 1986 (Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series, 1).

8 *De virtutibus sancti Martini*, ed. Bruno KRUSCH (see n. 7), p. 135–211. I have also used the new edition and translation in Raymond VAN DAM, *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*, Princeton 1993.

9 *Liber in gloria confessorum* and *Liber in gloria martyrum*, ed. Bruno KRUSCH (see n. 7), p. 34–111, 294–370. The insights of Raymond VAN DAM on these texts are valuable, *Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Confessors*, Liverpool 1988 (Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series, 4), and *Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Martyrs*, Liverpool 1988 (Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series, 3).



Contacts between the papacy and the Gallic church reached deeper levels of cooperation in the era of Gregory of Tours and Caesarius of Arles; however, it was built upon a preexisting growing relationship. Gregory of Tours throughout his works provides a glimpse into this background. In the last book and last chapter of the *Libri historiarum* Gregory created a chronology of all the bishops of Tours who preceded him.

The first bishop of Tours was Catianus sent to Gaul by the pope during the reign of the Emperor Decius (241–251) (*Catianus episcopus anno imperii Decii primo a Romanae sedis papa transmissus est*, *LH X*, 31, p. 526). He was one of seven men who was consecrated bishop and sent to Gaul to evangelize. We do not know for sure which pope sent this mission during the reign of Decius. It could have been either Fabian (236–250) or Cornelius (251–253) who were bishops of Rome during his emperorship. Gregory was in error when he said at *LH I*, 30 that Xystus was martyred during the Decian persecution. Gregory preserved the tradition nevertheless that seven men were sent by the Roman bishops, in the plural in, *GC*, 4, and 29, p. 301 and 316, respectively. However, at *LH X*, 30, he refers to the bishop of Rome – in the singular – who sent the missionaries under Decius to Tours, Arles, Narbonne, Toulouse, Paris, Clermont-Ferrand, and Limoges which covered the whole of Gaul<sup>10</sup>. Gregory of Tours established here the apostolic origin and succession of the Gallic bishops through one or two bishops of Rome, the successors of Peter. Those who dismiss outright the historicity of this early papal mission have then to explain why the papacy, regardless whether it was one or two bishops of Rome, and elsewhere Pope Clement I (third successor of Peter), is singled out to identify the apostolic succession from Rome. Why did not Gregory resort to an apostle as happened with the cult of Santiago de Compostela? James in this pious legend allegedly preached in Iberia before going back to Jerusalem to be martyred. Nevertheless, the succession of bishops in Gaul is presented by Gregory of Tours as having been directly established by Peter's successors in Rome. An alleged succession without being in »communion« with the See of Rome does not figure in Gregory's ecclesiology. Moreover, we should recall that there was already a burgeoning Church in Lyons that had a monarchic bishop at least since Irenaeus and there could be oth-

10 *Xystus Romanae ecclesiae episcopus* [this is erroneous chronology by Gregory as noted above]. ... *Huius tempore septem viri episcopi ordenati ad praedicandum in Galliis missi sunt. ... Hic ergo missi sunt: Turonicis Catianus episcopus, Arelatensibus Trophimus episcopus, Narbonae Paulos episcopus, Tolosae Saturninus episcopus, Parisiacis Dionysius episcopus, Arvernus Stremonius episcopus, Lemovicinis Martialis est destinatus episcopus*, *LH I*, 30, p. 22–23. Most of the bishops are attested to elsewhere by Gregory where he repeated that they had been sent by the pope to Gaul, Catianus of Tours, *GC*, 4, p. 301; Saturninus of Toulouse, *GM*, 47, p. 70–71; Stremonius of Clermont-Ferrand, *GC*, 29, p. 316; Martialis of Limoges, *GC*, 27, p. 314–315. The only one lacking this specificity, no more than an oversight by Gregory, is Dionysius of Paris, *GM*, 71, p. 85–86. Even if Catianus is a »myth« as some modern scholars maintain (HEINZELMANN, *Gregory of Tours* [see n. 1], p. 78), Gregory chose to include him for a reason; to establish the role of the See of Rome in the foundation of the Gallic church. Heinzelmänn (p. 163) points out that Gregory at *LH I*, 30 did not mention the papacy in the sending out of the seven missionaries to Gaul. We ought not to make too much of this omission for two reasons: One, at *LH X*, 31, p. 526 the papacy is mentioned. Secondly, Gregory at times when relating the same story twice sometimes alters the text as in the case of the founding of the church of Peter and Paul by Perpetuus as noted in this article, see p. 5.



ers in Gaul in the third century<sup>11</sup>. Missionary emissaries from Rome this early are not unheard of if we recall that Palladius who became the first bishop of Ireland was sent and consecrated by Pope Celestine I (422–432) in the fifth century. Furthermore, this papal missionary endeavor by the bishops of Rome is reminiscent of Augustine, first bishop of Canterbury, who was sent to the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms by Pope Gregory the Great. This one liner by Gregory of Tours is loaded with significant ecclesial implication: the principal bishops in Gaul, notably Tours, were legitimate successors of the apostles – via the See of Rome.

Martin, third bishop of Tours, set the example for those who followed by demonstrating his devotion to Peter and Paul. Among his many achievements listed by Gregory is the church he built in honor of Peter and Paul at the monastery of Marmoutier near Tours (*In monasterio vero qui nunc Maior dicitur basilicam in honore sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli aedificavit, LH X, 31, p. 527*). Heinzelmann in the study cited in this article mentions that Martin of Tours is elevated by Gregory of Tours so as to make him »equal« to the Apostles and specifically Peter. He correctly notes that Martin was, »the *typus* of all imitators of Christ, that is to say, all the saints. ... By means of this momentous organization of chapters, Martin is placed *de facto* above the representatives of the traditional hagiographical hierarchy: the apostles, especially Peter, and the martyrs«<sup>12</sup>. I concur as the study below shows that Martin is given a »primacy« within the *Libri historiarum* in comparison to the Gallic saints, with the apostles – particularly Peter. While Gregory elevated Martin in this fashion he did not envisage raising Martin and his bishopric »above« the Apostle Peter nor the Apostolic See in relation to the Church universal. The equality that Martin is accorded with Peter seems to be similar to that given to Paul in the New Testament in relation to the Twelve. He saw the risen Christ, he received the right hand of fellowship from Peter, worked miracles like Peter, founded churches like Peter, died a martyr with Peter, but he is never counted among the Twelve. The Revelation of John (21:14) says that the New Jerusalem has twelve foundations stones on which the names of the apostles are inscribed, Paul is clearly left out. Martin likewise is equal to Peter like Paul, but never »above« Peter. I do not see Martin of Tours presented anywhere in that superior manner by Gregory of Tours as I explain below.

Briectius, the fourth bishop of Tours, who had a rather cantankerous personality, was unjustly accused of sexual misconduct and was chased out of Tours by an angry mob that proceeded to install Armentarius as the new bishop regardless what the papacy might have to say in the matter. Briectius headed straight to Rome to make his

11 As for a papal mission this early I agree with F. D. Gilliard that there is no good reason to doubt this information. The See of Rome sending out missionary teams was hardly an anomaly; see Frank Daniel GILLIARD, *The Apostolicity of the Gallic Churches*, in: *Harvard Theological Review* 68 (1975), p. 17–33, at 30–32. Of equal interest on this theme is, Felice LIFSHITZ, *Apostolicity Theses in Gaul: The Histories of Gregory and the »Hagiography« of Bayeux*, in: MITCHELL, WOOD, *The World of Gregory* (see n. 1), p. 211–228. Insightful for this early period is, Roland MINNERATH, *La position de l'église de Rome aux trois premiers siècles*, in: *Il Primato del Vescovo di Roma nel Primo Millennio. Ricerche e Testimonianze*, Vaticano 1991 (Atti e Documenti, 4), p. 139–171 and *La tradition doctrinale de la primauté pétrinienne au premier millénaire*, in: *Il Primato de Successore di Pietro*, Vaticano 1998 (Atti e Documenti, 7), p. 117–146.

12 HEINZELMANN, *Gregory of Tours* (see n. 1), p. 131, 169–170.



case before the pope. In fact, he stayed in Rome for seven years giving him sufficient time to cultivate a close relationship with the papacy. Eventually the support he received from the papacy resulted in his return to Tours and Gregory states that through the authority of the pope he was restored to his bishopric (*Septimo igitur regressus anno a Roma, cum auctoritate papae illius Toronus redire disponit. ... Bric-tius in cathedram suam regressus est, septem postea feliciter vivens annos, LH, II, 1, p. 38*)<sup>13</sup>. In gratitude to the pontiffs he built in their honor at Tours a church dedicated to the apostles Peter and Paul, (*Obiitque et sepultus est in basilicam, quam super sanctum Martinum aedificavit, LH X, 31, p. 528 and VM IV, 35, p. 208 in Van Dam, Saints [see n. 8], p. 17*).

Perpetuus, the sixth bishop of Tours, encouraged devotion to Peter and Paul. He ordered construction of an even larger church for Martin of Tours replacing the one that his predecessor Briccius had built. The elegant vault of the old Martin church was placed in a new church devoted to Peter<sup>14</sup>. In the first citation Gregory identified the church as that of Peter and Paul and in the second he omitted Paul. It is telling that of the many foundations (*multas et alias basilicas aedificavit*) that Perpetuus founded Gregory mentioned by name only the one dedicated to Peter and Paul. Perpetuus, moreover, instituted a variety of fasts and vigils to Peter and Paul which Gregory said, »were observed in Tours«. Among them was the anniversary of the »Episcopate of Peter in St. Peter's Church« and a second one for the »Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul in their own Church« (*LH X, 31, p. 530*). As we shall see below there was also a deeply held tradition in Gaul that Pope Clement I had been directly involved in the evangelization of Gaul, one that was unquestioned by Gregory of Tours.

If that were not enough Gregory in the very last passage of the *Libri historiarum* sums up by saying that from the death of Martin it was the twenty-first year of his own consecration, which was in the fifth year of Gregory, Pope of Rome, and the thirty-first of King Guntram and the nineteenth of Childebert II (*A transitu sancti Martini usque ad memoratum superius annum, id est ordinationis nostrae primum et vicesimum, qui fuit Gregorii papae Romani quintus, Gunthchramni regis XXXI, Childeberthi iunioris nonus decimus, anni CXC VII, LH X, 31, p. 537*). Gregory of Tours began the list of the bishops of Tours by acknowledging the papal role and he ended by placing his own episcopate within that of Pope Gregory the Great. The great respect of Gregory towards Pope Gregory the Great was well known. Gregory relates how the pope led a procession in Rome as a penance to ask God to lift a plague that had ravaged the city. God lifted the pestilence as a result of Gregory's intercessory prayer. It is this event that led to the renaming of Hadrian's tomb to Castel San Angelo (St. Michael the Archangel) who was credited for vanquishing the plague. Gregory made sure in this section to highlight the pope's piety and interces-

13 See Zozimus, Ep. 3. 3 = MIGNE PL 20, col. 656–657 and the comments by VAN DAM, Saints (see n. 8), p. 16–17.

14 *Et quoniam camera cellulae illius prioris eleganti opere fuerat fabricata, indignum duxit sacerdos, ut opera eius deperiret, sed in honore beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli aliam construxit basilicam, in qua cameram illam adfixit. Multas et alias basilicas aedificavit (LH II, 14, p. 64); and Hic aedificavit basilicam sancti Petri, in qua cameram basilicae prioris posuit, quae usque nostris temporibus perseverat (LH X, 31, p. 530).*



sion to move God, his erudite intellect, and humility as an example for all bishops to imitate (*Tantaque ei abstenentia in cibis, vigilantia in orationibus, strinuetas in ieiuniis erat, ut, infirmato stomacho, vix consistere possit. Litteras grammaticis dialecticisque ac rethoricis ita est institutus, ut nulli in Urbe ipsa putaretur esse secundus, LH X, 1, p. 478*). Furthermore, an apocryphal story that has Gregory of Tours personally visiting Pope Gregory was disseminated by Odo of Cluny<sup>15</sup>. Gregory never made such a trip but his deep devotion, submission, and respect for Pope Gregory comes through in his works. These statements confirm that Gregory saw his episcopacy in full communion with Rome.

There is more testimony by Gregory of Tours and by others of further papal-Gallic relations prior to his episcopate. Paulinus of Nola noted an exchange of letters between the bishopric of Rouen and the papacy<sup>16</sup>. When Clovis was buried in Paris in 511 it was in the church of the Holy Apostles, that was later dedicated exclusively to Peter (*His ita transactis, apud Parisius obiit, sepultusque in basilica sanctorum apostolorum, quam cum Chrodechilde regina ipse construxerat, LH II, 43, p. 93*). The *Liber Pontificalis* (chapt. 54) – the entry on Pope Hormisdas (514–523) testified that (after his conversion to the Catholic faith), »At that time a diadem with precious jewels came from Clovis the Christian king of the Franks as a gift to St. Peter the apostle«<sup>17</sup>. It is not unreasonable that such a gift could have been sent by Clovis to Rome in gratitude for support and favors received from the pontiffs since it was a common practice.

Rome as the *locus* of the Apostolic See and hence the preeminent bishopric in Christendom – always understood after the »mother of all churches«, Jerusalem – is established in several places<sup>18</sup>. Gregory, for example, noted that Imperial Rome rose time and again from civil dissension to become the »city of cities« and the great head of the world (*Quotiens et ipsa urbs urbium [Rome] et totius mundi capud ingens bella civilia, diruit; quae cessante, rursus quasi ab humo surrexit, LH V, praef., p. 193*). This seemingly secular reference to Imperial Rome must be coupled with other references to Rome that identify the sources of its greatness. In the *Gloria Martyrum* (chapt. 82, p. 94) Gregory of Tours referred to Rome as the capital of the world on account of the relics of the apostles (principally Peter and Paul) and many other martyrs. He was even more enthusiastic when in his *Sermon in Praise of St. Martin* he proclaimed that, »I should indeed call Rome blessed, because to it have been conceded those two bright stars, namely, Peter and Paul, through whom that city was worthy to return from the darkness of unbelief to the light of the truth«<sup>19</sup>. The texts identify that the eminence of Rome once embodied by the Emperors was subsequently continued by Peter and Paul who established the apostolic founda-

15 *Vita Gregorii*, 24 = MIGNE PL 71, col. 126, in: VAN DAM, *Leadership* (see n. 3), p. 228.

16 See Ep. 18. 5 and Pope Innocent I, Ep. 2. 17, in: VAN DAM, *Leadership*, p. 166.

17 *The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis)*, trans. Raymond DAVIS, Liverpool 1989 (*Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series, 5*), p. 48.

18 Inscription no. 10 of the Church of St. Martin reads: »(Here is) the most holy church of Christ which is the mother of all churches, which the apostles founded, and in which the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles in the form of tongues of fire. In it are located the throne of the apostle James and the pillar on which Christ was whipped«, in: VAN DAM, *Saints* (see n. 8), p. 313.

19 The translation *ibid.*, p. 306.



tions of the Roman See through martyrdom. This newly acquired »greatness« carried on by the successors of Peter, the popes, is made patently clear by Gregory of Tours in his writings. When Pope Pelagius II (579–590) died of the plague Gregory said that a new pope was elected so that the, »Church could not be left without a leader« (*Sed quia ecclesia Dei absque rectorem esse non poterat, Gregorium diaconem plebs omnis elegit, LH X, 1, p. 477*), the new pope being Gregory the Great. His identification of the pope as *rector* was not meant to be taken as only locally for the bishopric in Rome since he emphasized that the *ecclesia Dei* could not be left without an apostolic leader. In the ecclesiastical usage of *rector* it was another way of identifying the authority of a bishop either over a single church or a number of churches, in this case Gregory meant over the entire Church. Heinzelmann notes that *ecclesia* appears in the singular 222 times in Gregory's work and that it referred to the diocese subordinate to the bishop. He also indicates that it is often used in the plural when identifying the individual dioceses of bishops thus noting their autonomy yet collegial relationship with one another<sup>20</sup>. It was not used in that manner to refer to the See of Rome, however. His findings are consistent with one of my major theses of this paper: while the primacy of the See of Rome is present in Gregory's works it also preserved the autonomy of the individual bishop in his respective diocese who was nevertheless in »communion« with Rome; hence revealing a *collegium* between Rome and the Gallic bishops.

Relics and miracles which were so important in the life of the Church were also used by Gregory to establish and promote the apostolic status of the Gallic Church, but never understood independent of the Holy See. He related the story of a Gallic deacon Agiulf during the reign of Childebert who went to Rome to obtain relics (*Anno igitur quinto decimo Childeberthi regis diaconus noster ab urbe Roma sanctorum cum pigneribus veniens, sic retulit, quod anno superiore, mense nono, LH X, 1, p. 477*. See also, *VP VIII, 6, p. 246–247*). Let us consider by asking: since Gaul had its share of relics, of martyrs in particular including shrines in their honor, why would there seem to be a need to travel to Rome to obtain any relics at all? By the sixth century holy places to venerate the martyrs were already abundant in Gaul. At the time of this incident Pope Gregory the Great was a deacon and he was the one who gave Agiulf the relics (*Ab hoc etiam diaconus noster reliquias sanctorum, ut diximus, sumpsit, dum adhuc in diaconato degeret, LH X, 1, p. 481*). It is noteworthy that Gregory of Tours chose this specific trip for relics – since undoubtedly there were many others – from this particular deacon who would be acclaimed as a great pope by the time Gregory of Tours was writing. It seems that relics from Rome (Apostolic See) taken to Gaul was a way to establish spiritually the apostolicity of the Gallic church through the See of Rome. Furthermore, Gregory of Tours felt equally compelled to relate that »his deacon« Agiulf witnessed the enthronement of Gregory the Great as pope in Rome (*Sed nec distetit diaconus noster, nisi ad episcopatum eius de Porto rediret et, qualiter ordinatus fuerit, praesenti contemplatione suspiceret, LH X, 1, p. 481*).

20 HEINZELMANN, Gregory of Tours (see n. 1), p. 161–163, 206. For the meanings and usages of *rector* see Jan Frederik NIERMEYER, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, Leiden 1984, p. 892–893.



In the telling of the life of St. Hospicius there is another instance of the search for relics in Rome, but this time with yet another interesting nuance. When a person from Anjou became deaf and dumb a deacon was sent to Rome to procure relics of the blessed apostles to obtain a cure. Instead, he was healed by the local St. Hospicius making it unnecessary to go to Rome. The deacon explained that he was on the way to Peter, Paul, Lawrence, and other saints who glorified Rome with their martyrdom, but instead found them (their power to heal) in Gaul through St. Hospicius (*Quaerebam Petrum, quaerebam Paulum Laurentiumque vel reliquos, qui Romam proprio cruore inlustrant; hic omnes repperi, hic cunctos inveni, LH VI, 6, p. 275*). Are we to interpret this incident as a rebuff of Rome and as a type of local ecclesial self determination? On the contrary, the miracle from the relics of the local saint (St. Hospicius) was validated because it imitated the apostles in Rome, most especially Peter and Paul. Put another way, St. Hospicius was able to heal because his life had been in conformity to that of Peter and Paul and the miracle was the »sign« that confirmed it. Gregory of Tours was affirming through these hagiographies the bonds between Gaul and Rome rather than driving a wedge between the two.

A few notable examples given by Gregory accentuate the links he wished to establish between the papacy and the Gallic Church. Noteworthy, according to Gregory, is the case of Remigius of Rheims who achieved equal sanctity with Pope Silvester when the former performed many miracles in like manner as the latter (*Erat autem sanctus Remegius episcopus egregiae scientiae et rethoricis adprimum inbutus studiis, sed et sanctitate ita prealatus, ut Silvestri virtutebus equaretur, LH II, 31, p. 77*). A further parallel made by Gregory of Tours is that as Pope Silvester had baptized the Emperor Constantine so too had Remigius baptized Clovis whom he called the »new Constantine«. It was the miracles that were the »signs« that marked Remigius with apostolic authority. Gregory of Tours reinforced this close relationship and veneration towards the Gallic Church by Rome through the papacy of Damasus. He tells us that the martyr Chrysanthus from Gaul was posthumously honored in a poem written by the pope (*GM, 37, p. 61–62*). Our last example is that of Bishop Felix of Nantes who established a church housing the relics of Peter and Paul that Venantius Fortunatus called the »new Rome«<sup>21</sup>. One can assume that the miracles that occurred there were as spectacular as those reported at the tombs of Peter and Paul in Rome. The status of Gallic saints was elevated as they measured up to the bishop of Rome (Peter) and Paul in virtue and miracles.

There are three stories that some have suggested may be a slight towards Rome on the part of Gregory. One of these is recorded in the *Vita Sancti Martini* (IV, 12, p. 202–203) and it involved the miraculous cure of a blind woman in Le Mans. The woman journeyed to the holy site to invoke the intercession of Martin of Tours. Gregory added, however, that while the relics were actually those of Peter and Paul the woman was persistent in crediting Martin and not the apostles for her cure. Gregory not wishing to give appearances of defending an alleged superiority of Martin over the apostles nor to criticize the woman's devotion to Martin for ignoring the relics of the apostles noted deftly that a single Lord worked through the powers of

21 *Carmina III/7*, ed. Friedrich LEO, in: MGH, *Auctores antiquissimi IV/1*, Berlin 1881, p. 56–58. See also VAN DAM, *Saints* (see n. 8), p. 121.



numerous saints who have an equal status in heaven insofar as miracles are concerned (*Verumtamen fides nostra retenet, in multorum sanctorum virtutibus unum Dominum operari, et nec illos disiunctos virtutibus, quos caelo pares, miraculis Dominus aequales reddit in terris*, VM IV, 12, p. 202–203)<sup>22</sup>. When Gregory referred to the »equality« of the apostles and Martin, what was he referring to? It is clear from his explanation that he meant it in terms of Martin's equal ability to perform miracles as much as the apostles. We find a corollary example in the Acts of the Apostles with Paul in relation to the Twelve. In the frescoes that were located over the door facing the Loire river that adorned the Church in Tours there were some verses composed by Paulinus of Périgueux (inscription no. 11) that further buttress this idea. They poetically testify that Martin of Tours had all of the *apostolica signa* that confirm his sanctity and apostolic authority and hence is the model Christian for the entire Gallic Church. The inscription read: »(Many) rejoice in his gift: the blind, the lame, the poor, the possessed, the distressed, the sick, the disabled, the oppressed, the imprisoned, the grieving, the needy. Every remedy rejoices in the *marvels of the apostles* (emphasis mine). Whoever has come in tears, leaves in happiness. All clouds vanish. A medicine soothes whatever guilt disturbs. Seek his protection; you do not knock at these doors in vain. Such lavish generosity extends into the entire world<sup>23</sup>.« Moreover, it should not be construed that Gregory was in any way proposing an equality of ecclesiology or episcopacy. Martin's holiness in this life and subsequently from heaven through his relics confirmed his saintliness. At another level what Gregory did was to suggest that Martin and the apostles together answered the prayer of this woman who had great devotion to Martin even when in actuality the cure came via the relics of the apostles. There is nothing that suggests that Gregory intended to say that the relics of the apostles had no role whatsoever in the miracle or were bypassed somehow by Martin. The woman received her healing from both.

The second involved a man who had been falsely accused of a crime (VM IV, 35, p. 208). The prisoner was bound by ropes and as he was on his way to prison in Tours a miracle occurred that proved his innocence. As he was being led to the public square they passed by the church of St. Peter and there suddenly his ropes fell and he was free. His captors convinced of his guilt failed to recognize this divine sign so they bound him more tightly and even added extra ropes. As they continued they passed in front of St. Martin's church where a second time the ropes fell off. This time his captors submitted to the miraculous sign and set him free. The entire episode has echoes of Peter's own imprisonment and his subsequent release from chains and prison through divine intervention in the Acts of the Apostles 12: 1–7. So what was Gregory seeking to convey here regarding Martin and Peter? As in the previous example in Le Mans that God through Martin like Peter heals and answers prayer, nothing more and nothing less<sup>24</sup>.

Our third example is the same mural of frescoes already commented upon that adorned the church in Tours. It is the one specifically depicting Jesus walking on the water and rescuing a faltering Peter seizing him by the hand thus preventing his

22 VM IV, 12, p. 202–203. See also, VAN DAM, *Saints*, p. 290.

23 Ibid., p. 314.

24 VM IV, 35, p. 208. See also, VAN DAM, *Saints*, p. 299.



drowning in the storm (Matthew 14: 22–33). The inscription that accompanied the mural read, »The disciples were sailing on the lake at the command of the Lord. As the winds were blowing and the waves were being tossed up, the Lord walked on his feet on the lake. He also extended his hand to St. Peter who was sinking; and that man was saved from danger<sup>25</sup>«, Gregory in the *Vita Sancti Martini* (I, 2, p. 139) compared the rescue of Peter by Jesus to an incident of a drowning sailor who called upon the »Lord of Martin« who was also rescued like the apostle. Again it has been suggested that Gregory was diminishing the status of Peter while enhancing that of Martin of Tours<sup>26</sup>. Upon closer inspection this does not appear to be the case. Notice that Gregory was careful to say that the sailor called upon the »Lord of Martin« and not upon Martin directly. That would be tantamount of having Martin playing the role of Jesus. Gregory was tactfully avoiding giving appearances of a superior Martin in comparison to a tepid weak Peter who sank because of lack of faith. Nowhere did Gregory ever exalt Martin over Peter and he certainly did not intend to do so here. As in the previous examples Martin is set forth as an equal intercessor before the Lord for prayer requests as much as the apostles. To posit that Gregory of Tours somehow thought of the Gallic Church as a parallel or even independent local Church from Rome or that he proposed Martin of Tours as rival to the apostles, if not even superior to them, is not only to misunderstand him but to read into his works views that were foreign to his ecclesiology.

There are examples, however, when the promotion of the saints and their relics were used to rival Rome and the apostles. This defiant attitude towards Rome should not come as a surprise to anyone acquainted with papal history for any era. Eusebius Gallicanus in his *Homily LV* on saints Alexander and Epipodius advanced devotion to them in the most defiant way, »We are exalting two prizes of victory, rivals to the apostolic city, and since we have our Peter and Paul, we oppose our two patrons to that sublime see of Rome<sup>27</sup>«. Another is from Venantius Fortunatus who tells of a demon possessed girl from Toulouse who was taken to Rome to St. Peter's to be exorcized. The demon insisted that it could only be expelled by Remigius, bishop of Rheims and not by Peter<sup>28</sup>. It is rather telling that even in such anti-papal diatribes it is still Peter and Paul and the See of Rome through which they measured their self proclaimed saintliness. One can only wonder why not against James and John or Alexandria or Constantinople? The answer is rather obvious. None of the latter was ever recognized of having any universal jurisdiction over the church and no other apostles were given the status of Peter and Paul. Most importantly, one is hard pressed to find a single example in Gregory's works that express such defiant, strident, and disrespectful attitudes towards Rome or Peter and Paul.

Gregory further acknowledged the primacy of the popes at Rome as reflected in their pastoral activities in Gaul that he chose to relate. The intervention of Pope John III (561–574) in the case of two accused bishops Sagittarius and Salonius for immoral behavior is noteworthy. Both clerics were deposed at the Synod in Lyons presided by King Guntram and attended by the venerable St. Nicetus. The deposed

25 Ibid., p. 313.

26 NOBLE, Gregory (see n. 4), p. 147–148.

27 Cited in VAN DAM, Leadership (see n. 3), p. 171.

28 Vita Remedii, 16–23, cited in VAN DAM, Leadership, p. 171.



bishops appealed to Rome, met with the pontiff, and procured a letter from him ordering their reinstatement. The pope decided to give the two bishops a second chance. King Guntram obeyed Pope John, and ordered the clerics restored only after giving them a firm reprimand<sup>29</sup>. Later the bishops fell into mischief again, King Guntram stripped them of their bishoprics, new bishops replaced them, and this time there is no mention of a second intervention by Rome (*LH V*, 27, p. 233). Given the relationship already established between Rome and King Guntram who was Catholic there is no doubt that Rome was informed of these latter developments and the pontiff most assuredly agreed with what on the surface appears to be a unilateral action by the king since he had already made his disapproval quite clear in the first instance. Moreover, was it really necessary for King Guntram to appeal to Rome having already known the »mind« of the pope on this matter? The entire affair shows the recognition of Rome's primacy in local diocesan affairs by the local bishops and civic authorities.

More to the point, the »Petrine Primacy« was clearly expressed by Gregory of Tours contrary to the views of recent commentators. An entire chapter in the *Libri historiarum* is devoted to the life, deeds, and martyrdom of Peter. The primacy of Peter in comparison to that of Paul and the Twelve although not announced explicitly is nevertheless there<sup>30</sup>. Gregory's source here was not the Acts of the Apostles rather it was the apocryphal New Testament *Acts Peter* and the *Passion of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul*<sup>31</sup>. In both of these works Peter has the primacy as expressed by his »one on one« confrontation against Simon Magus in the *Acts of Peter*. Paul is only present at the very beginning and then disappears from the rest of the narrative. In the case of the *Passion* where Paul is consistently present he takes a secondary role to Peter in the struggle with Simon Magus. Gregory and his readers were well acquainted with these traditions that had extensive diffusion through literary texts and art and hence knew of Peter's primacy promoted therein<sup>32</sup>. In the *Gloria Mar-*

29 *At illi, cum adhuc propitium sibi regem esse nossent, ad eum accedunt, inplorantes se iniuste remotos, sibi que tribui licentiam, ut ad papam urbis Romae accedere debeant. Rex vero annuens petitionibus eorum, datis epistolis, eos abire permisit. Qui accedentes coram papa Iohanne exponunt se nullius rationis existentibus causis dimotos. Ille vero ad regem epistolas dirigit, in quibus locis suis eosdem restitui iubet. Quod rex sine mora, castigatos prius verbis multis, implevit, LH V, 20, p. 227. HEINZELMANN, Gregory of Tours (see n. 1), p. 115, notes that Gregory had his chronology incorrect for Salonius and Sagittarius.*

30 *Habebat enim [Emperor Nero] secum Simonem magum, virum totius malitiae et omnes magicae artis argumento magistrum. Hunc elisum per apostolus Domini Petrum atque Paulum, commotus contra eos, cur Christum, filium Dei, praedicarent et idola adorare contempnerent, Petrum crucem, Paulum gladio iubet interficere, LH I, 25, p. 20.*

31 Ricardus Adelbertus LIPSIUS, Maximilianus BONNET (ed.), *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, t. 1, Leipzig 1891, p. 45–103 (*Acta Petri cum Simone*), p. 118–177 (*Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*). Erroneously identified by NOBLE, Gregory (see n. 4), p. 148.

32 For background consult, Alberto FERREIRO, *The Fall of Simon Magus in Early Christian Commentary*, in: *Tempus Implendi Promissa. Homenaje al Prof. Dr. Domingo Ramos-Lissón*, ed. Elisabeth REINHARDT, Pamplona 2000 (Colección Historia de la Iglesia, 33), p. 171–185; and *Simon Peter and Simon Magus in the Acts of Peter and the Passion of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul*, in: *Pietro e Paolo: il loro rapporto con Roma nelle testimonianze antiche*, Rome 2001 (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 74), p. 41–66; and *La figura de Simón Mago y San Pedro en la iconografía del Princeton Index of Christian Art: con addenda bibliográfica*, in: *Memoria Ecclesiae* 24 (2004) (= *Hagiografía y Archivos de la Iglesia*), p. 81–103.



*tyrum* (chapt. 27, p. 53–54) Gregory stated that the Church in Rome (*Romae cathedram*) was founded by Peter and as we saw above that Rome was also considered the episcopal head (*rector*) of all of the Church (*ecclesia Dei*). Gregory mistakenly said that »both« apostles knelt in prayer to bring down Simon Magus who was flying in the air with the aid of demons. In fact in the *Passion* (55 in Lipsius-Bonnet, *Acta* [see n. 31], p. 165–167), Paul prayed, presumably on his knees, while Peter invoked God's power that brought down the magician. The stone Gregory mentioned that had the alleged indentations of the apostle's knees (there is only one set of imprints) is now in the Church of San Francesca Romana in Rome in the Forum.

The succession of the bishops of Rome from Peter was explicitly promoted by Gregory of Tours when he said that Pope Clement I was the third bishop of Rome (his predecessors being Linus and Anacletus), thus acknowledging Pope Gregory the Great as successor of Peter in his day (*Tertius post Neronem persecutionem in christianos Traianus movet. Sub quo beatus Clemens tertius Romanae ecclesiae fuit episcopus passus*, *LH I*, 27, p. 21; see also *GM*, 35–36, p. 60–61). The special attention given to Pope Clement I by Gregory is of great significance. The question is not, as some have asked, as to why Gregory failed to mention this or that other pope; rather it is to ask why he included the ones that he did and even more specifically why so much space was devoted to Pope Clement I<sup>33</sup>? Part of the answer lies when Gregory recalled that the martyr Eutropius, whom he also consecrated to the priesthood, had been sent to Gaul by Pope Clement I to spread the faith of the apostles (*Eutropis quoque martyr Sanctonicae urbis a beato Clemente episcopo fertur directus in Galliis, ab eodem etiam pontificalis ordinis gratia consecratus est*, *Gloria Martyrum*, chapt. 55, p. 76). Gregory's agenda is obvious here: he wanted to establish the apostolic origins of the Gallic Church with Peter via the third bishop of Rome, Pope Clement I. Whatever aspersions of doubt some modern patrologists wish to level at this tradition is irrelevant because for Gregory of Tours and his generation this was historical verity. According to a unanimous patristic tradition, Greek and Latin, not only was Pope Clement I a direct successor of Peter he had himself been ordained to the priesthood by the apostle. Another way of seeing how important this bishop of Rome was to the early Church is the fact that the voluminous *Pseudo-Clementines* and *Recognitiones* were attributed to him in the first place. Why the authorship was attributed to this pontiff and not to Linus or Anacletus before him or any of his immediate successors has not been satisfactorily answered by current scholarship. Let us return to Gregory and the pope. In *Gloria Confessorum* St. Ursinus, according to Gregory, was ordained by a disciple of the apostles. Some commentators believe with good reason that Gregory may have in mind here Pope Clement I as being that disciple<sup>34</sup>. Gregory without a doubt as bishop of Tours saw himself in the legitimate succession of the apostle Peter – through the pivotal pontificate of Pope Clement I.

33 NOBLE, Gregory (see n. 4), p. 149–151.

34 *Bituriga vero urbs primum a sancto Ursino, qui a discipulis apostolorum episcopus ordinatus in Galliis destinatus est*, *GC*, 79, p. 346. See useful commentary in VAN DAM, *Glory of the Confessors* (see n. 9), p. 83, note 88.



While Gregory promoted the primacy of Peter he did not neglect to include Paul. Their efficacious intercessory role at the request of the faithful who prayed for their intervention is highlighted. For example, when the Huns ravaged the city of Metz a parishioner saw St. Stephen the Levite pleading with Peter and Paul asking for their intercession. The apostles answered the request by sparing the Oratory of St. Stephen but not the town since God had already judged it guilty and hence the destruction of the city was deemed a just punishment<sup>35</sup>. The fact that the town was not spared was not a sign of weakness of the apostles and indirectly that of Rome as a recent commentator has maintained<sup>36</sup>. The city was destroyed because it was not in communion with the Church because of sin and so it had to suffer for its behavior, notwithstanding the apostles. The apostles answered the prayer of St. Stephen the Levite who was in full accord with them that Metz got what it deserved for its sins<sup>37</sup>. There is a literary parallel to the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah whose sin ascended to God who then responded with a just fiery punishment. Hagiographical stories of the intercession of saints make it a point to note that God was the one who answered all prayer and chose the manner in which to manifest His designs. If anything, this incident only accentuated the need for all bishops, minor clergy, and laity to remain in communion with the bishop of Rome through his successors. To suggest otherwise of Gregory of Tours runs contrary to the overall picture that emerges in his works regarding the Holy See.

Peter was also used by Gregory of Tours to oppose heretics and false teachers. When Gregory disputed with an Arian named Agilan, an envoy of the Visigothic King Leovigild, about the Trinity he asked the heretic not in a general manner if he believed in God but specifically in the Triune God of the apostles Peter and Paul (*Et ille: »Deus est qui mittit, non est Deus qui mittitur.« Ad haec ego interrogo, si crediderit doctrinam Petri Paulique apostolorum. Respondentem autem eo: »Credo«, LH V, 43, p. 251*). The dialogue between them degenerated to shouting and name calling and Agilan left for Spain thoroughly insulted by Gregory. The confrontation had a happy conclusion from Gregory's standpoint. Agilan apparently fell ill and converted to the Nicene Creed on his deathbed – the one professed by Peter and Paul and the See of Rome – (*Sed post haec, cum in Hispaniis reversus fuisset, in infirmitate debilitatus, ad nostram reigionem, necessitate cogente, conversus est, LH V, 43, p. 252*). The cult of Peter was one of the most effective theological weapons that the Catholics in Gaul had to combat Arianism and the results confirm this<sup>38</sup>. Gregory also reported that a necromancer named Desiderius claimed to be in spiritual

35 *Nec remansit in ea locus inustus praeter oratorium beati Stefani primi martyres ac levitae. De quo oratorio quae a quibusdam audiui narrare non distuli. Aiunt enim, quia, priusquam hi hostes venerent, vidisse virum fidelem in visu quasi conferentem cum sanctis apostolis Petro ac Paulo beatum levitam Stefanum de hoc excidio ac dicentem: »Oro, domini mi, ut non permittatis obtentu vestro Mettensim urbem ab inimicis exuri«, LH II, 6, p. 47.*

36 NOBLE, Gregory (see n. 4), p. 151–152.

37 *Pro urbe vero non obtinebimus, quia dominicae sanctionis super eam sententia iam processit. Invaluit enim peccatum populi, et clamor malitiae eorum ascendit coram Deo; ideo civitas haec cremabitur incendio. Unde procul dubium est, quod horum obtentu, urbe vastata, oratorium permansit inlaesum, LH II, 6, p. 47–48.*

38 VAN DAM, Leadership (see n. 3), p. 171, note 75.



communication with Peter and Paul (what is perhaps called today »channeling« among New Age devotees) and who had deceived the masses with fraudulent miracles<sup>39</sup>. He further claimed to have greater powers than St. Martin of Tours and was himself equal to the apostles – Peter and Paul (*Tantoque miser elatus erat, ut iuniorum sibi beatum Martinum esse diceret, se vero apostolis coaequaret, LH IX, 6, p. 417*). In the above examples the following points were made by Gregory of Tours: just as Paul had been equal to Peter in terms of apostolic preaching and the charism of healing, so Martin of Tours without diminishing in any way the primacy of Peter. Just as no one ever envisaged Paul as one of the Twelve or even of holding an equal apostolic position as Peter so Gregory was not so much as suggesting the same.

Gregory of Tours provided an ample inventory in his works of the churches in existence at that time dedicated to Peter and Paul in Gaul. Even so, we know that Gregory did not identify all of the churches dedicated to St. Peter for there were other chapels, shrines, and hermitages elsewhere in Gaul. Venantius Fortunatus, for example, documented devotion to Peter's cult in Nantes (*Carmina* 3, 7) that Gregory did not mention. Moreover, it is significant for the purposes of this study that Gregory did not record a similar list of any other saint in Gaul, even the most renowned Martin of Tours whose cult was beginning to spread rapidly. In the end, however, Tours became the principal shrine in Gaul for pilgrimage on account of the crypt of Martin of Tours where abundant miracles were reported and Arles in the south received the papal *pallium* mainly through the efforts of Caesarius of Arles. In the next several centuries Martin's cult proliferated into hundreds of churches bearing his name in Gaul and Iberia<sup>40</sup>. The whole of the Gallic church eventually, with the few exceptions of resistance already discussed, came to recognize the »Petrine Primacy«; and the Gallic bishops encouraged and utilized it effectively to extend their own authority at the local level. This much bishops Gregory and Caesarius had in common.

The ecclesiology in Gregory's writings was already established in its main contours in the fourth and fifth centuries before he flourished in Gaul. It was more clearly defined and exercised in the tumultuous doctrinal debates of the fourth and fifth centuries, a good example is the case of Priscillian that affected both Gaul and Iberia<sup>41</sup>. While admittedly the references to the bishop of Rome, »Petrine Primacy«, and apostolic succession may not be extensive in Gregory of Tours the evidence

39 *Fuit eo anno in urbe Thoronica Desiderius nomine, qui se magnum quendam esse dicebat, adserens se multa posse facere signa. Nam et nuntius inter se atque Petrum Paulumque apostolos discurrere iactitabat. Ad quem, quia praesens non eram, rusticitas populi multa confluxerat, deferentes secum caecos et debiles, quos non sanctitate sanare, sed errore nigromantici ingenii quaerebat includere, LH IX, 6, p. 417.*

40 For Iberia, see, Alberto FERREIRO, Martiño de Braga: de apóstolo dos Suevos á súa memoria en época medieval na Diocese de Mondoñedo-Ferrol, in: Galicia fai dous mil anos. O Feito Diferencial Galego, ed. Gerardo Pereira MENAUT, Carlos Villanueva GRUPO, t. 1: Historia, Santiago de Compostela 1997, p. 323–356, maps and photos; and Veneration of Martin of Tours and Martin of Braga in Northern Portugal, in: Acta Historica et Archaeologica Mediaevalia 20–21 (1999–2000) (= Homenatge al Dr. Manuel Riu i Riu), p. 223–242, 12 ill.

41 Consult, Alberto FERREIRO, Petrine Primacy, Conciliar Authority, and Priscillian, in: I Concili della cristianità occidentale secoli III–V, Rome 2002 (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 78), p. 631–645.



does not in any way lend itself to a Gallic disinterestedness, or a marginalization on the part of Rome regarding Gaul, or even that the church in northern Gaul was intent of developing a regional identity somewhat distant or distinct from Rome as some maintain<sup>42</sup>. By the sixth century in Gregory's episcopacy an ecclesiology of *collegium* between bishops and the papacy at Rome was already a functioning reality. This collegial exercise of the papacy was vigorously modeled by Pope Gregory the Great who chose the title of *servus servorum* while rejecting tendentious monarchic ones such as *papa universalis*<sup>43</sup>.

Whether bishops in Gaul sought papal intervention out of »careerism« or genuine pastoral devotion they knew where to turn to for an apostolic authoritative binding intervention, the See of Rome. The popes, in turn, benefited enormously from these incremental frequent requests that allowed them to extend gradually their jurisdiction across Gaul. The *pallium* from the Roman pontiff was sought out eagerly by bishops and was in turn granted generously by the popes, as the case of Caesarius of Arles illustrates. What made the *pallium* authoritative is that it represented through the local bishop the authority of Peter via the popes who were the only ones with the authority to grant it.

The jurisdiction of the pope (»Petrine Primacy«) in northern Gaul as elsewhere came about gradually but not as the result of a militant imposition by the papacy in these early centuries. The popes intervened when asked to by the local bishops in Gaul who had a great deal of autonomy so that oftentimes the pontiffs simply ratified what had already been decided at the diocesan level by the bishop. The Gallic bishops and the papacy acted in *collegium* with each other. To be in »communion« with Rome at this time is not to be understood that the papacy micromanaged every ecclesial *minutiae* of the Gallic Church or anywhere else for that matter. In comparison to the church in southern Gaul and in neighboring Iberia it seems that in northern Gaul the relationship between bishops and the papacy was not yet as developed, much like Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England. There is, however, ample evidence as has been shown in this study that there was a significant growing acknowledgement of the »Petrine Primacy« and an emerging close relationship between the northern Gallic bishops and the See of Rome. It was the Carolingian church that especially built upon this foundation taking the »communion« to greater depths. Finally, it was not until later that the »monarchic« pastoral model of the »Petrine Primacy« developed in earnest and dominated roughly from the eleventh to the eighteenth cen-

42 Peter Brown, reflecting on the essay by Th. F. X. Noble, says, »Nor does he [Gregory] see Gaul, still less Tours, as places on a fixed map of the Catholic Church where Rome was a significant center«. In light of the evidence presented in this study it is difficult to hold such a view of Gregory in relation to Rome (P. BROWN, Gregory of Tours: Introduction, in: MITCHELL, WOOD, The World of Gregory [see n. 1], p. 6). Equally problematic is the observation, »Gregory was staunchly, aggressively Catholic, but his Catholicism was not fundamentally Roman«, NOBLE, Gregory (see n. 4), p. 155. Let us recall that in Gregory's world to be Christian was to be Catholic, to profess the Nicæan Creed, and to be in full communion with Rome, even more so for a bishop. Anyone not having all of these marks of »catholicity« was a heretic or a schismatic, as the Arians for example.

43 Roland MINNERATH, La tradizione dottrinale del Primato di Pietro nel primo millennio, in: Il Primato del Successore di Pietro nel Mistero della Chiesa, Testo e Commenti, ed. Rudolf PESCH, Vaticano 2002 (Documenti e Studi, 19), p. 51–80, at 71.



turies; it was challenged by a militant conciliarism promoted by bishops who sought to diminish papal authority, resulting in much tension between the two. In the twentieth century the *servus servorum* papal model of *collegium* resurfaced in *Lumen Gentium* of Vatican II and pastorally, but not exclusively, in the pontificate of Pope John Paul II<sup>44</sup>.

44 See, JOHN PAUL II, Bishops express the unity of the Church, in: *The Church. Mystery, Sacrament, Community*, Boston 1998 (A Catechesis on the Creed, 4), p. 215–220. As early as Pope Pius IX the *servus servorum* ecclesiology of the papacy was proposed in the wake of Vatican I as a recent commentary from the »Congregazione per la dottrina della fede« notes (Origine, Finalità e natura del Primato, in: *Il Primato* [see n. 43], p. 13, note 21): »Come spiegò Pio IX nell' Allocuzione dopo la promulgazione della Costituzione *Pastor aeternus: Summa ista Romani Pontificiis auctoritas, Venerabiles Fratres, non opprimit sed adiuvat, non destruit sed aedificat, et saepissime confirmat in dignitate, unit in carita, et Fratrum scilicet Episcoporum, jura firmat atque tuetur* (MANSI 52, col. 1336 A/B)«.