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Abstract

This thesis uncovers and analyses Gregory, Bishop of Tours’ attitude towards the philosophical and theological concepts of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear. It presents a new contribution to the history of Gregory of Tours and the Merovingian World, the intellectual and theological history of the wider late antique west, the history of emotions, and the history of fear. Chapters one and three use the Vulgate and a selection of theological literature from those late antique writers whose views drastically shaped the doctrine of the Church in Gaul and perspectives of Gregory of Tours, to establish what the wider intellectual attitudes towards the fear of God and those associated with demonic figures were, and to show how they developed from the fourth to the sixth centuries. Chapters two and four use Gregory’s textual references to the fear of God and those associated with demonic beings, in his *Ten Books of Histories*, books of *Miracles*, and *The Life of the Fathers*, to argue that he used these fears to participate in the long-standing tradition of debating Christian *paideia* and the formation of the virtuous self.
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Throughout this research, a wide variety of Latin, French, and German source material has been used. All translations which appear in this thesis are my own. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, while there are many excellent, published translations of most of the primary texts already available, there are several cases in which a published English translation does not yet exist (i.e. Paulinus of Périgueux’s De Vita Sancti Martini and Gregory of Tours’ Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew). For the sake of maintaining continuity and consistency throughout this thesis, I considered it practical to use my own translations. Secondly, as the tables in Appendices 1 and 2 show, there are several cases in which I have felt that the published translations available have not accurately translated or even included ‘fear’ where it is present in the Latin source. In some cases (i.e. P. De Letter’s translation of Prosper of Aquitaine’s The Call of All Nations, 13.6, p. 108), I have found that a translator has inserted ‘fear’ where it is not signified by the presence of a Latin fear-word. In others, the translator has substituted a Latin word for ‘fear’ with a different emotive word (i.e. Thorpe, History of the Franks, 1.19, p. 81). Since fear is a primary topic of this research, correctly identifying its location within the sources is of crucial importance. By using my own translations, I have been able to ensure that the arguments made throughout this thesis concerning Gregory and his late antique contemporaries’ attitudes to fear, have foundations in the source vocabulary.

All Latin-English translations have been constructed using Lewis and Short’s Latin Dictionary, William Whittaker’s Latin Database, and the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL). It must be noted that because the TLL is not yet complete, I have not been able to use it for the primary fear terms: timor, terror, and vereor. In these cases, I have relied on the definitions and context given by Lewis and Short and William Whittaker. I hope to be able to return to these in future work.

Habitually, the reader will find that all English translations are provided in the text while the Latin translated can be found in the accompanying footnote. Here, and where a published translation is available, they will also find a reference to that translation. This practice has been followed partly to allow the reader to cross-check my translations with those that have already been subject to the rigours of the publication process, and partly because my own translations have, in varying degrees, been influenced by the published translations where available. Unfortunately, this approach has rendered some of the footnotes extensive in places. To counter some of the excess verbosity, I have created an abbreviations system for the Latin texts and their authors. In accordance with the University of York’s requirements for the sequence of thesis material, the abbreviations guide can be found after the tables of Appendices. For any and all mistakes in translation, I humbly ask the reader’s pardon. These errors are, of course, my own.
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Introduction

This is a study of how Gregory, Bishop of Tours uses and understands the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear in his works, and what this reveals about his perceptions on the theological and intellectual issues of self-control, the good Christian life, and paideia. It argues, first and foremost, that Gregory’s use of the fear of God throughout his writings demonstrates that he associated this fear with the notion of self-discipline and the good Christian, while his references to the fears employed by the Devil and his demons indicate that he linked these fears with the loss or lack of self-control. As a whole, this thesis shows three things: how and why the fear of God and the fear inspired by demonic beings were so important to Gregory of Tours, why fear is an important lens for the historical Merovingian history, and that discerning Gregory’s views about the fear of God and demonically-instigated fear is vital, because it enables historians to pursue new avenues of research into the Merovingian notion of the self and their development of Roman paideia.

In his ‘Secondary Responses to Fear and Grief in Gregory of Tours’ Libri Historiarum,’ Ron Newbold asserts that Gregory:

‘is quite sure that recognising God’s fearsome power and dreading an eternity of torment in hell are highly desirable attitudes and that not to fear God or post-mortem retribution exposes both an individual and a community to all manner of ills.’

Newbold’s declaration is quite accurate, but it needs greater refinement. For Gregory, the fear of God is not just a ‘highly desirable attitude’, it is the most important fear that an individual and community ought to have and uphold. The fear of God is the key to maintaining discipline, Christian paideia, and salvation. Its counterpart is demonically-inspired fear. The relationship that exists between the fear of God and those incited by the Devil and his demons, which filters through Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories, eight2 books of Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers, brings a sense of balance to the bishop’s world. Although this relationship could be interpreted to be one of ‘binary opposition’, since both fears directly oppose and yet simultaneously

---

2 I include The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew.
require the other in order to have meaning in the bishop’s works,³ Gregory’s depiction of the roles these fears have in helping someone become a good Christian shows that they are not always diametrically opposed. While the fear of God is unquestionably the most important fear for a Christian seeking to attain salvation, there are several cases in which Gregory shows that the human fear of demons or the fear that the Devil and his demons have inspired in someone are also responsible for aiding them in their spiritual journey.⁴ With this in mind, it is perhaps better to avoid the label of ‘binary opposition’ when characterising the relationship that exists between Gregory’s perception of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear. Though the two fears are not always polarised in terms of the roles that Gregory portrays them to play in enabling someone to be good Christian, at their core they are conceptual opposites which are constantly juxtaposed in Gregory’s writings. This juxtaposition is a consistent theme which exists throughout and binds all of Gregory’s works. For this reason, the complex relationship which Gregory perceives to exist between the fear of God and demonically-inspired-fear, is one of the most important keys to unlocking the worldviews of the man whose writings have been the foundation for historiographical debate about the late antique world since the late nineteenth century.

1. Thesis Structure

This research opens with a literature review which introduces Gregory, his texts, and the historiographical context for this thesis. It establishes, extensively though not exhaustively, the present state of the five branches of historiography to which this research contributes; highlighting the gaps which it fills and why it is significant. The remaining four chapters investigate the fear of God and the fear connected with demonic figures. Each fear has two chapters devoted to it, one which investigates the wider late antique perception of the fear and one which analyses Gregory’s use and understanding of that fear in his works. The reasons for this structure are twofold. Aesthetically, splitting the two fears evenly across four chapters brings balance to the overall thesis. Chapters one and three, as contextual chapters, are designed to mirror

---


⁴ See Gregory’s stories of Nicetius of Trier and Calappa the recluse for example. Gregory of Tours, VP, 11.Pref.,-1, pp. 259-260 and 17.2, p. 279. Discussed in Chapter 4, section 4.3.2: Calappa and Chapter 4, section 4.3.4: Nicetius of Trier.
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each other, as are two and four which both focus on Gregory’s views. Similarly, the first and second chapters, exploring the fear of God, and third and fourth chapters, investigating demonic beings and fear, complement each through their respective fear-topics. Secondly, the decision to afford each fear a contextual as well as Gregory-specific chapter, permitted the space necessary for this thesis to demonstrably handle these fears, and Gregory’s understanding of them, with academic rigour.

Chapter one supplies the reader with a background to the perceived role and purposes of the fear of God in the theological outlook of late antique Gaul. Here I argue two things: first, that the fear of God was more than what we now call an ‘emotion’. It was not just a raw fear but a highly complex Christian concept, one that was thought to have several roles and purposes in early Christian notions of theology and the individual Christian life. Secondly, the Gallic concept of this fear, which was disputed alongside other theological matters, such as role of grace and the consubstantial nature of the Trinity, continued to mature from the fourth to the middle of the fifth century. By the middle of the sixth century however, the Gallic idea of the nature, role, and purposes of the fear of God had become more refined in line with the Church’s desire to consolidate its theological beliefs and create a unified Catholic doctrine. Despite this shift, the fear of God never ceased to be understood as a complex and central component of the Christian life.

The second chapter uncovers and analyses Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God. Here I argue that Gregory primarily comprehends the fear of God in terms of self-control. Building on the views of Augustine and Cassian especially, Gregory’s fear of God was both a means of maintaining self-mastery and a form of self-control. It was his Christian version of the Classical concept of enkrateia, and it was essential to his perspective of the formation of the good Christian.

---


In chapter three, I explore the late antique perception of demonic beings and fear in Gaul. I argue that the writings of a selection of contemporary theologians show that they regarded and portrayed demonically-inspired fear as a complex Christian concept. I also highlight the differences which exist between contemporary attitudes to demonically-inspired fear and the fear of God. Unlike the fear of God, the Gallic concept of demonic fear has three different aspects to it: the human fear of demonic beings, the fear experienced by the Devil and his demons, and the use of fear by these creatures. Another dissimilarity between these fears in the Gallic tradition are their trajectories of development. While the theologians of late antique Gaul continued to expand and give greater prominence to their ideas about the relationship that existed between demonic figures and fear well into the sixth century, they did not decide to refine and consolidate this as they did for the fear of God. This, I argue, is partly because contemporaries developed their understanding of demonically-inspired fear at a much later stage, owing to its virtual absence in Holy Scripture. Chapter three, especially when read with chapter one, reveals that while both the Gallic perceptions of the fears of God and those associated with demons are similar, in that they will both be considered to play several important roles in Gallic Christian theology, they are also very dissimilar in that they neither develop nor mature in the same way or at the same rate. This is significant partly because it illustrates that the Christian concept of the virtuous self was something that emerged very gradually over several centuries and partly because it demonstrates that there were two key phases in its development.

Chapter four investigates Gregory’s use and understanding of demonically-inspired fear. Here, I argue that Gregory thought that the fears sparked in humans by demonic beings could prompt a lack of or loss of self-control. Demonically-inspired fears were the cause of Gregory’s Christian equivalent concept of the Ancient Greek akraia. The fears instigated by the Devil and his minions mirrored the chaotic nature of the demonic beings themselves. They brought about the destruction of control and order within an individual and within the wider community. The tester and counter to the fear of God in Gregory’s eyes,

---

demonically-inspired fear was responsible for providing both balance and chaos in Gregory’s view of his world and of the individual Christian within that world.

2. Methodology and Problems

Having explained the overall structure of this thesis, this section outlines the problems involved in reading fear in Gregory of Tours’ works and some of the methodological steps adopted to mitigate them. Approaching the emotional language used in Gregory’s writings does not come without its problems. I have already discussed some of these issues in my MA dissertation on which this thesis is founded. The intangibility of fear or any other emotion leaves the historian at the mercy of their subject’s accurate observation and linguistic representation of it in their writings. But this can often be consciously or subconsciously influenced by the author’s educational background, the societal pressures surrounding them (i.e. the pressure to conform to gender expectations), or their personal and political agendas. Assuming that the historian can navigate these complications, they then confront other deeper philosophical and linguistic issues relating to the changeability of language and the problem of ‘other minds’ (discussed below).

Existing scholarship that either examines Gregory and fear or uses fear as something to explain changes that occur in Gregory’s texts, does not treat fear itself as a historical topic. There is little discussion on what fear is or means either to Gregory or in the modern world. Nor has there been much effort spent on contextualising Gregory’s views on fear within the wider views of his peers and contemporaries. It is assumed that readers will already know what fear is and, even worse, that Gregory’s fears and concepts of fear will align with present-day perceptions. As this research and the analyses of my MA dissertation show, this is not the case. Gregory’s perceptions of fear belong in and create their own context. Like any other

---

9 This is highlighted in Andrew Taylor, ‘Chivalric Conversation and the Denial of Male Fear,’ in Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West, ed. Jacqueline Murray (London: Routledge, 2011), 170-182.
12 The exception to this rule perhaps is Ron F. Newbold whose article on Gregory and Secondary Responses to Fear contains a section devoted to exploring what fear is in the modern sense. Newbold, ‘Secondary Responses,’ 2.
13 Hailstone, ‘Fear in Sixth-Century Merovingian Gaul’.
historical topic, fear, what it is and what it means to the people being studied, needs to be rigorously analysed. For this reason, I decided that Gregory’s perception of fear needed to be broken down and each type of fear which he records examined on an in-depth scale. To achieve this each fear needed to be accompanied with a contextual study; a point of comparison which could show what Gregory picked, rejected, or changed from the views of his theological predecessors and influencers. None of the historiography on fear and Gregory, as far as I am aware, has ever attempted to approach Gregory’s notion of fear with such critical rigour.

The need to contextualise Gregory’s use of each type of fear in his works within the wider late antique Gallic views on fear, had an immediate impact on the nature of the research. After cataloguing every reference to fear in Gregory’s texts, it quickly became apparent that there was more than enough raw material to narrow scope of the thesis down to two categories of fear: the fear of God and the fears inspired by demonic beings.

The lack of interest that prior scholarship has shown, perhaps with the exception of Ron Newbold, in handling the fears in Gregory’s writings as a historical topic, means it has been able to skirt around the problems that come with using fear as a historical lens. One of the major impediments to any investigation of a past emotion is that a person’s emotional knowledge, much like their perception of themselves, never stops maturing. Gregory was no exception to this. The perceptions he maintained of himself, who he was, what he felt, where he fitted in with his surroundings and others and how, would have developed continuously. His understanding of his emotions and how they shaped his life would also have been in constant flux. Before the historian even begins to contemplate the factors that render Gregory’s writings opaque, there are thus considerable issues with the idea that they could ever fully discern how Gregory, or any other person, understood fear. Although contextual factors like education, religious beliefs, shared language, and wider cultural attitudes would all have shaped how Gregory recognised, considered, and articulated his views on fear, his understanding of this motion of the soul would also have been inextricably bound up with his self-understanding. Whether Gregory could have ever known himself to the fullest extent, since knowledge of the self remains in constant flux, and whether he would have ever had a thorough understanding of the emotions he experienced is impossible to ever truly know.
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Connected to this, is the fact that it is difficult, if perhaps not impossible, to fully traverse the temporal and mental gap which exists between Gregory’s mindset and our own. This ties in with the philosophical problem of ‘other minds’: the issue of whether we can ever truly discern or experience what someone else is thinking or feeling.\(^\text{14}\) Although there is always room for speculation and interpretation, it is perhaps impossible to fully access Gregory’s mindset when all we have are a selection of his writings and a temporal gap of nearly 1500 years.\(^\text{15}\) The human experience of certain fears, for example the fear of death, do transcend the centuries, but how people understand and navigate their different fears changes from person to person. The wider social, literary, and even medical attitudes to the experience and handling of different fears has changed since the late sixth century.\(^\text{16}\) Gregory was born, educated, and lived in a very different world from the present one. His occupation as Bishop of Tours would also have given him responsibilities and an outlook which few historians could now relate too. Although similarities might be traced between the people of Gregory’s world and those of the modern one, for example an enduring grumbling that comes with paying taxes,\(^\text{17}\) there is also an experiential gap between the life that Gregory lived and life today which historians simply cannot access.

Thirdly and finally, the problems associated with relying on language as a lens to try and decipher another person’s views of their world and their emotions, present a barrier to comprehensively discerning Gregory’s understanding of fear. Gregory knew and wrote in Latin. On a basic level this presents an issue through the indeterminacy of translation: the idea that there are multiple acceptable ways to translate one language to another.\(^\text{18}\) The English vocabulary has a wide range of terms to signify different degrees of fear as does Latin,\(^\text{19}\) but there are gaps that exist between the different tenors of fear which the Latin terms signify and those which are present in the English language today. Historians, translators, thesaurus, and

\(^{15}\) Both these factors increase the possibility that the texts, the meaning of the words within them, and our view of Gregory, has been intentionally or unintentionally distorted.
\(^{17}\) Gregory discusses his unhappiness when Childebert II initially tried to tax Tours since the city had been exempt from taxes under Chlotar I, Charibert and Sigibert owing to its association with Saint Martin. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 9.30, pp. 448-449.
\(^{18}\) Jeff Malpas, Donald Davidson and the Mirror of Meaning: Holism, Truth and Interpretation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), xvi, 14-20 and 55.
\(^{19}\) In English we have: Afraid, horrified, terrified, timid, worried, nervous, dread, panic, etc. Latin has: Timor, horror, timidus, dirus, pavor, ne, formido, veror, metus, trepido, etc.
dictionary composers all use collateral information, such as sentence context, to map, to the closest degree possible, English fearing terms onto the Latin equivalents. But this still involves imposing English signifiers and English logic onto Latin.\textsuperscript{20} Since Latin was a well-established and active language by the sixth century, the signs, significations, and logic which structured the Latin that Gregory used, were already malleable and open to renegotiation. Consequently, any English-Latin translation is likely to contain untraversable gaps between the signifiers and signified. Gaps which appear in the collateral information mean that a translation can never fully reflect and convey the original author’s intended meaning.

The gaps that render every translation indeterminate are both a help and hindrance to the historian. On the one hand they allow for Donald Davidson’s indeterminacy of interpretation; the idea that indeterminacy of translation means there is more than one acceptable way to interpret a person’s behaviour, attitudes, and words.\textsuperscript{21} This enables historians to continuously reinterpret their historical sources and it provides the foundation for the critical approach that shapes the historical practice in academic institutions today.

On the other hand, indeterminacy of translation also limits what historians can do with their sources. In acknowledging that there exists inseparable and sometimes inaccessible collateral information for every translated word and sentence, the historian also implicitly accepts that these gaps deny them access to the ‘pure meaning’ of the text.\textsuperscript{22} This throws an insurmountable barrier between the historian and their subject’s mindset. While written texts, and translations specifically, facilitate access to the mentality of another, they are also unable to provide comprehensive access to the ‘true’ or ‘pure’ thoughts and feelings of either the author of the text or the people they describe. Of course, this applies to all language and written texts not just translations. Within the more specific confines of this thesis however, certain inaccessible elements of collateral information, such as whether Gregory’s knowledge of any local dialects had any impact on his perceptions of fear, can bar the historian from ever comprehensively discerning the bishop’s understanding of fear. The gaps in the collateral information, in addition to those which appear between Gregory’s


\textsuperscript{21} Malpas, \textit{Donald Davidson}, xvi.

\textsuperscript{22} Malpas highlights this though not in specific respect to the historical discipline. Malpas, \textit{Donald Davidson}, 14-15.
experience of fear, his translation of that into thought, and the translation of this into written Latin, are, to a certain extent, impossible to cross.

To navigate some of these impediments, in addition to tackling those relating to the intangibility and largely elusive nature of fear as an emotion, I decided to only catalogue and use cases wherein Gregory includes a Latin fear term in this research. The uncertainty that haunts historians trying to decipher whether their subjects are discussing fear in their sources only increases once the gaps that are involved in translation are factored in. In the case of Gregory and fear there are two distinct chains:

1. Cases in which Gregory records his own experiences of fear.

   \[
   \text{Gregory’s experience of fear} \\
   \quad \downarrow \\
   \text{The translation of that experience into thought and language} \\
   \quad \downarrow \\
   \text{The translation of Gregory’s thoughts into writing} \\
   \quad \downarrow \\
   \text{The recopying of Gregory’s texts by later scribes} \\
   \quad \downarrow \\
   \text{The assimilation of the surviving MSS into critical editions by William Arndt, Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison} \\
   \quad \downarrow \\
   \text{My translation of Gregory’s (Krusch’s) Latin into English}
   \]

There are thus several layers of separation between Gregory experience of fear and the critical edition that I have worked from.

For the narratives in which Gregory recalls how someone else experiences fear the chain of separation increases further.

---

23 On this see Hailstone, ‘Fear in Sixth-Century Merovingian Gaul,’ 1.
2. Cases in which Gregory records third-party experiences of fear.

In this chain, there are additional layers of interpretation to accommodate the thoughts of the person who experienced the fear and how their thoughts were subsequently communicated to Gregory. These layers also introduce the problem of ‘other minds’ into the equation, particularly between the stage in which the third party communicates their experience of fear to Gregory, or one of his clerics, and the point at which Gregory turns this into text. The extra layers of communication can add up to three additional layers of separation between the experience of fear and the translation of this into text, especially if the person recollected their experiences to a cleric who then told Gregory who might have made a rough written note of the tale before drafting it into one of his chapters. The more layers of separation that exist within a chain, the further the historian is removed from the fear and the greater the possibility of misinterpreting or misrepresenting it. Not all these layers of separation can be navigated by the historian, and they limit what can be learnt about past experiences and perceptions of fear. Thus, in order to try and mitigate some of the
ambiguity that accompanies the study of Gregory’s fear as a historical topic, I chose to catalogue and only use cases in which Gregory textually signifies the presence of fear by the use of Latin fear words.

Before moving forward to explore the historiographical context within which this research sits and to which it contributes, a pause is merited to briefly discuss some of the interesting points that the process of cataloguing Gregory’s references to fear has revealed. Gregory, as his works show, commanded an extensive and varied vocabulary for fear. *Timor, horor, terror, pavor, metus, vereor, formido, timidus, trepidus*, and *dirus* all appear in his texts. Furthermore, he also habitually uses ‘fear constructions’ such as *metu exterriti*, *timore perterritus*, *pavore terreretur*, *metu terrerentur*, and *pavore perterritus* to add emphasis to the fear he describes. While I also included examples in which Gregory uses the terms *tremor* and *ne*, I considered these borderline cases. This is because *tremor* (tremble) is difficult to use as a signifier of fear because a person can tremble for reasons that do not include fear (i.e. fever). *Ne*, meaning ‘lest’, also relies on contextual setting for it to mean ‘for fear of’. Where Gregory uses *ne* in conjunction with more firmly established terms for fear, I did interpret it to mean ‘for fear of’. Neither *audeo* (to dare) or *anxietas* (anxiety) were included in my study. Though anxiety might be classified as a form of fear in the modern understanding, and a person may not dare to do something because they fear the consequences, there is a distinct lexical difference between the terms for fear and those denoting anxiety or daring in Latin. Furthermore, the breadth of Gregory’s Latin fear-vocabulary coupled with his careful use of it throughout his works (i.e. fear constructions and employing different words for different cases of fear), suggests that he considers there to be a distinction between anxiety and fear, at least on a lexical level. As such, I am inclined to believe that when Gregory says *audeo* or *anxietas* he is trying to signify something other than fear.

---


26 Gregory of Tours, *GM* 77, p. 90 (18); Gregory of Tours, *GC*, 77, p. 344 (22) and Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 11.1, p. 260 (5-6).


The range of vocabulary that Gregory wields, combined with how he uses it (i.e. the constructions), merits special note because it is one of the most extensive and complex of all the late antique writers used in this thesis. Moreover, while Gregory is far from the only author to use ‘fear constructions’ in his works (Sulpicius Severus uses the construction *metu exterritis* in his third book of *Dialogues* for example), he is the only writer of those cited to use these constructions on such a large scale.

Gregory’s handling of the fear vocabulary has up until now not been fully appreciated. Its significance lies in what it reveals about the bishop’s emotional style and his ability to deploy emotion language effectively. Robert Maltby and Pascale Bourgain’s research has already demonstrated that Gregory’s texts display evidence of a good grasp of the Latin language and an ‘emotional style’. Maltby’s study of Gregory’s idiolect, for example, reveals that the bishop created new words and had a comprehensive grasp of the Latin language. Bourgain’s analysis of Gregory’s literary devices enhances this knowledge. By showing that the bishop consciously used different techniques to create specific stylistic effects, for example alliteration and repetition to convey emotion, Bourgain was able to conclude that Gregory’s command of literary devices meant that ‘one could speak of an emotional style’ when discussing his works.

The results of this research’s analysis of Gregory’s fear vocabulary lends greater weight to both Maltby and Bourgain’s conclusions. Although Gregory does not create any new fearing-words, his fear constructions, usually composed of two fearing terms one a noun the other an adjective, display both an increased tendency towards using adjectives, which Maltby highlights as one of the features of Gregory’s own idiolect, and a tendency to favour using repetition to convey emotion, which Bourgain pointed out as being indicative of the idea that Gregory had an emotional style. The sheer breadth of Gregory’s fear
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31 See Appendix 3: Table 4: A table illustrating the range of fear vocabulary used by each of the authors cited in this thesis.
33 These constructions appear seventeen times in Gregory’s collected hagiographical works and fourteen times in the *Histories*. To see how Gregory compares with other late antique writers on this see Appendix 4: Table 5: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions.
35 Maltby, ‘Neologisms,’ 63-69.
36 Bourgain, ‘Works of Gregory of Tours,’ 167-170, and 188.
vocabulary, combined with the way he uses those terms available to him, indicates not only that he had a highly-developed emotional style of writing, and consequently a very good grasp of the workings of rhetoric, grammar, and dialect, but that he personally had quite an advanced understanding of ‘emotions’ like fear.

3. Literature Review
The last section highlighted that two of the major impediments to this study of Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear were the issue of ‘other minds’ and ‘indeterminacy of translation’. To further mitigate some of these problems, the focus of the thesis has shifted during its development to examine Gregory’s views of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear in an intellectual-emotion-historical context rather than a historical-emotion-psychological one. What follows reveals more about Gregory’s perception of the intellectual and theological concepts of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear, than it does his views on the fears of God and the demonic as ‘passions’ or ‘motions of the soul,’ to use the contemporary phrasing. Consequently, this thesis represents something of a historiographical hybrid. It is not a historical theology in its truest sense, but neither is it purely an intellectual history, history of emotion, or history of mentality. It is something in between. By charting the developments that appear in the wider Gallic perceptions of the fears of God and those connected to demonic beings, examining what these fears were, their roles in Christianity, how they evolved in the late antique world and why, this research contributes, in part, to the history of theology as well as the history of emotion. But through its principal focus on uncovering and analysing Gregory’s own concepts of these fears and why he thought of them in that way, this work also contributes to the intellectual history of the Merovingian world and the history of mentalities. The thesis that follows thus bridges four historical schools of thought. The following section explores the historiographical context to which it contributes.

The overarching task of this project is to answer, as comprehensively as possible two overarching questions; how did Gregory, Bishop of Tours understand and use the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear in

---
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his works, and why were they so important to him? The questions governing this thesis are important and relevant ones. A monumental volume of international historiography on Gregory and his collective works, which are some of the most important sources for our historical knowledge of Gaul and the wider continental world in the sixth century, already exists. Within that corpus there have been an increasing number of studies devoted to exploring Gregory’s intellect and mentality. With the explosion of interest in the history of emotions in the last three decades, there has also been an increase in historiography seeking to expound on Gregory and his emotions. As part of the latter body of historiography there have been a small number of studies on Gregory of Tours and fear, a potent and primary emotion. Yet, as far as I am aware, questions concerning Gregory’s understanding of fear and the importance of it to him and his works have never been tackled by historians examining the intellectual, social, economic, political, or emotion history of the late antique world. The available historiography on emotions and Gregory has seemingly avoided conducting an in-depth exploration on how Gregory understood the emotions that affected him and that he used in his works. There is, therefore, a significant gap in the historical picture of Gregory of Tours, one which must be filled if we are to: acquire a greater insight into Gregory as a historical actor, author, and person; deepen our understanding of the explicit and implicit messages contained within his writings; learn how fear, as one of the primary human emotions, was comprehended at a different point in time; and even identify how Gregory’s works can provide material for new avenues of research for Merovingian history in future.

4. Gregory of Tours, the Histories, and hagiography

The historiography on Gregory of Tours, his Histories and hagiography is wide, rich, and varied. Broadly, there are four branches of historical discussion which this thesis sits within and contributes to: Gregory of Tours and his works (Histories and hagiography), the history of emotions, the intellectual and theological
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history of the late antique west, and the history of fear. What follows is a comprehensive though not exhaustive review of the existing literature in those categories. It opens with a biography of Gregory of Tours before providing a summary and analysis of the scholarship that presently exists on the composition of and agendas behind his *Histories* and hagiography. A necessarily brief introduction to the material available on the intellectual history of the late antique west is then followed by an exploration of some of the key developments in the school of the history of emotions in relation to Gregory of Tours. A run-down of the important developments in the history of fear and demonstrating the position of my thesis within the current state of the studies on fear on Gregory and his works draw the critical review to a close.

4.1. Gregory of Tours: A Biography

Gregory, Bishop of Tours was born Georgius Florentius on November 30th c.538/9 in the Auvergne.\(^{42}\) Regarding his pre-episcopal years, historians have speculated at length as to what Gregory was doing and when. It is probable that he remained at Clermont during his very early years, at least until the death of his father, Florentius. The responsibility for Gregory’s education then fell to both his maternal great-uncle, Nicetius the Bishop of Lyons, who helped Gregory learn to read in his eighth year and whom Gregory visited at some point during 552 as a deacon, and his paternal uncle, Gallus the Bishop of Clermont.\(^{43}\) Upon Gallus’ death in 551, Gregory’s theological tutelage transferred to the-then Archdeacon of Clermont, Avitus, who later became the Bishop of Clermont as Gallus had been.\(^{44}\) While the official bond between Avitus and Gregory from 551 might have been one of legality, primarily because Gregory was still too


\(^{43}\) Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 8.2 and 8.3, pp. 242-244.

young assume his inheritance without a custodian in place, it has been speculated that Gregory was close to Avitus with whom he travelled to see the recluse Caluppa and the church at Moissat after 572.

At some point between 538 and 551 Gregory fell ill and was taken to the Church of Saint Illidius. There he received a miraculous cure and promised to devote his life to becoming a cleric. By the end of 563, Gregory was an ordained deacon, an appointment which was conferred on him after his pilgrimage to Saint Martin’s shrine while ill. Whether Gregory became a priest between 563 and 573, and exactly what he was doing for that decade, is a conjectural matter. He could, in accordance with the Canons, have been a priest from 569 onwards. Church law stipulated that episcopal candidates were supposed to have been priests for five years prior to their election. But Gregory’s ordination as Bishop of Tours was anything but regular. His appointment was decided by King Sigibert in 573 and the title, which was conferred to him by Bishop Egidius of Rheims on August 20th, 573, was done without the support of the people and clergy of Tours, nor the rest of the bishops who operated within wider the metropolitan diocese. Gregory’s appointment disregarded the conditions for episcopal election that had been stipulated by the First Council of Nicaea (325), repeated in the First Council of Clermont (535) and the Fifth Council of Orléans (549).

Gregory himself is notably silent on the issue of his appointment to Tours. While this could have been largely due to the uncanonical nature of his confirmation, it could also be partly down to the fact that
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45 On this legal relationship see Adriaan H. B. Breukelaar, Historiography and Episcopal Authority in Sixth-Century Gaul (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 31-32.
46 Gregory of Tours, VP, 11.3, p. 261 and Gregory of Tours, GC, 40, p. 323.
47 Gregory of Tours, VP, 2.2, p. 220 (5-16).
48 Gregory of Tours, VP, 2.2, p. 220 (17-20).
49 For Gregory’s pilgrimage see Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.32, pp. 153-154.
50 Breukelaar perceives that Gregory was made a priest at Clermont in order to be a thaumatographer at St. Julian’s Shrine, but accepts that there is no evidence to support Gregory’s ordination. Breukelaar, Historiography, 40. Also noted in Edward James, ‘Introduction,’ in Gregory of Tours: Life of the Fathers, trans. Edward James (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991), x.
he might not have even been qualified as a priest at the time of his selection. Gregory never mentions attaining this rank in his own works, despite being more than happy to write about his time as a deacon. While it would have been irregular for him to have been made a bishop from his post as a deacon, structures were in place which meant that such a scenario was navigable. His uncle, Gallus, had had to be hurriedly ordained a priest when he was chosen to take up the bishopric of Clermont by King Theuderic. Gregory might have undergone a similar process, but this remains largely speculative. Whatever the truth of these matters, by the end of 573 Gregory was Bishop of Tours.

Following his confirmation, Gregory’s life became filled with episcopal duties. Over the course of his career, Gregory commissioned and oversaw the rebuilding of both the Church of Tours, increasing its height and size, after the fire of 557, and the restoration of the Basilica of Saint Martin. He went on ambassadorial missions for kings and hosted ambassadors from other kingdoms in turn. In addition to fulfilling the general duties of a clergyman, such as performing mass on Kalends and feast days, holding daily and nightly vigils, and conducting liturgical services for himself and the laity of Tours, Gregory also juggled his episcopal responsibilities. He handled any complaints/abusive letters from the suffragan bishops of his metropolitan diocese, communicated with other provincial bishops, resolved any penalties acquired by his suffragan bishops for transgressions committed (this included pardoning any of his bishops who had failed to attend a Church synod without a good reason, in order that they might perform Mass again), called or attended a provincial Church Council at least once every two years, ensured that the legislation established from all Church Councils and Synods from the First Council of Orléans (511) to the Third

---

54 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.35, p. 172 and Gregory of Tours, I P. 8.3, p. 244 (3).
57 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.31, p. 534 (12-14).
58 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.31, p. 535 (13-17).
60 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.18, pp. 287-288.
61 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.14, p. 208 (2-5) and 5.23, p. 230 (3-4). Also, Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, pp. 167-168.
62 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (13). Gregory of Tours, GC, 20, p. 309 (16-17). Gregory refers to having to take a break from this after his recent illness in Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.1, p. 159.
63 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.5, p. 200 (6-14).
64 This penalty was set by the Council of Orléans (549). Gregory I. Halfond, The Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils AD. 511-768 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 74-75.
65 Stipulated by the Council of Orléans (538). Halfond, Archaeology, 74.
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Council of Clermont (584/591) were upheld, and managed any civic disputes, religious judicial cases, and political intrigues or fallouts that left people taking sanctuary under his care.

In addition to his busy work-life, Gregory also managed to find time for more enjoyable pursuits. He participated in theological debates, created new spaces to preserve relics, studied the Bible, gossiped, went fishing, experimented with various medical/herbal sciences, observed the stars, and wrote his substantial literary corpus including: The Ten Books of Histories, The Miracles of St. Martin Books I-IV, The Miracles of the Blessed Julian, The Life of the Fathers, The Glory of the Confessors, The Glory of the Martyrs, The Miracles of the Holy Apostle Andrew, On the Course of the Stars, A Commentary on the Psalms, and a Book on the Masses composed by Sidonius. Gregory was, as the above shows, a highly active man during his episcopacy which he maintained for just over two-decades. By the time of his death on November 17th, 594, he was probably only in his mid-fifties.

4.2. The Histories and hagiography: A Background

The collective works of Gregory of Tours are the bases for this thesis. Providing a background to these texts is, therefore, a necessary task. Much historiography already exists relating to the Histories, hagiography, and what they illustrate about various aspects of life in the early Merovingian world. For the sake of space

66 This was a duty of all metropolitan bishops according to Halfond. Halfond, Archaeology, 94-95.
67 See particularly the Sichar and Chramnesind affair. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.47, pp. 366-368.
68 The Revolt of the nuns of Poitiers. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.15-10.17, pp. 501-509.
72 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 1.27, pp. 21 (1-5).
73 Gregory of Tours, V3M, 2.16, p. 164 (17-20).
and clarity, the following sections will critically engage with what the literature that already exists says about the composition and agendas that shape Gregory’s *Histories* and hagiographical books.

### 4.2.1. Composition of the Histories

The composition chronology of Gregory’s *Ten Books of Histories* has been a topic of constant debate since the late nineteenth century. Broadly, historians have developed and relied on two different approaches to discern how and when Gregory composed various parts of his *Histories*. The first approach identifies the manuscript tradition and uses that to date the respective books which make up the *Histories*. The second uses the content and structure of the *Histories* themselves to examine when certain parts of each of the ten books were composed.

Gabriel Monod (1872) and Max Bonnet (1885-90) pioneered the method which favoured using the manuscript tradition to work out the compositional history of the *Histories*. Both historians argued that the *Histories* had a two-stage publication process. Using siglum B, the eldest manuscript family, they argued that Gregory originally published a six-book version of the *Histories* before adding 65 to 68 chapters and the other four books of the *Histories* at a later date. Yet in 1884 Wilhelm Arndt, who co-edited the first *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH) edition of the *Histories*, argued against this interpretation of the manuscript transmission. Arndt was joined by his apprentice Bruno Krusch who produced an article in

---


1932 which demonstrated that siglum B did not contain the original or full version of Gregory’s *Histories*. Krusch’s revised stemma of the manuscript tradition was recited again in his posthumously republished edition of Gregory’s *Histories*, which completed the work he and Arndt had set out to do back in 1884. To date Krusch’s stemma has remained largely unchallenged, though the manuscript selection process he employed to create his critical edition has been.

Alongside his conclusions on the manuscript transmission of the *Histories*, Krusch considered the idea that Gregory might still have been in the process of redacting the first six books of his *Histories* just before he died, leaving the project unfinished. This notion was taken up by Rudolf Buchner, who used the structure and content of the *Histories* to argue that books one to four were composed separately from the rest of the *Histories*. His view was also shared by Martin Heinzelmann. For Buchner, the first four books were begun in 573 and completed by 575. Buchner’s reasoning for the separate composition of these books was his presumption that Gregory, who was both new to Tours and the new custodian of Saint Martin’s basilica, would not have wished to complete his book on Martin’s miracles without having first acquired good background knowledge on Tours and his new patron saint. Books one to four of the *Histories*, in Buchner’s view, were simply a means to an end. They were created by Gregory to lay the foundations for him to create his true crowning glory: *The Miracles of Saint Martin*.

An alternative interpretation for the composition trajectory of the *Histories* emerged in the 1970s in the form of Lewis Thorpe’s 1974 introduction to his English translation *The History of the Franks*. Here, Thorpe argues that the *Histories* were composed in four stages, with the preface to book five being the earliest piece composed just after Gregory’s ordination in 573. The first book, Thorpe determined, was a fixed narrative.
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82 Detailed discussion on the manuscript families and the criticisms that Krusch faced for his selections can be found in Pascale Bourgain and Martin Heinzelmann, ‘L’oeuvre de Grégoire de Tours: la diffusione dei manoscritti,’ *Supplément à la Revue archéologique du centre de la France* 13, (1997): 277–295. Also, Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity*, 133-139.
85 Buchner, *Gregor*, xxi.
86 Buchner, *Gregor*, xxi, n.2.
written sometime after the preface to book five.\(^{88}\) It was during the third stage that the second, third, and fourth books were created to fill the gap between Saint Martin’s death and the murder of King Sigibert. In this stage, which Thorpe dates to 584, Gregory also interpolated books one to six and wrote books seven to ten.\(^{89}\) The final phase came in 591 when Gregory took up his pen for the final time to conclude book ten with chapter thirty-one.\(^{90}\)

Both Buchner and Thorpe’s arguments were criticised by Adriaan Breukelaar. Analysing the rhetorical structure of the *Histories*, Breukelaar dismissed Thorpe’s views, on the basis that they did not follow the authoritative views of Krusch, and argued that Buchner’s theory, that books one to four were composed separately from the rest of the *Histories*, was not evidenced by the text itself.\(^{91}\) Breukelaar’s own perspective was that Gregory conceived of and began collecting material for the *Histories* before his confirmation in 573.\(^{92}\) Although Gregory collected events in stories regularly or as they happened from 575\(^{93}\), it was not until the late 580s that he began to organise that mountain of material into books.\(^{94}\) The *Histories* were then brought to a natural close in either late 591 or 592, but, after Gregory’s death on November 17\(^{th}\), 594, the dating given in the tenth book was altered by the late bishop’s deacon and secretary, Agiulf.\(^{95}\)

Breukelaar’s theory on the composition of the *Histories*, especially the idea that Gregory wrote events as they progressed, is mostly convincing.\(^{96}\) Nevertheless, his argument that the *Histories* were begun pre-573 is contentious. The basis for Breukelaar’s argument is that the sections in the second, third, fourth, and tenth books, which focus on Brioude, could only have been written while Gregory was at Clermont and working as a thaumatographer at Julian’s shrine in the years 563-573.\(^{97}\) It was this which led Breukelaar to think that Gregory had already preconceived the *Histories* when he became a bishop. But this is not necessarily the case. While Breukelaar’s reading of the Brioude sections permits the possibility that these

\(^{88}\) Thorpe, ‘Introduction,’ 25.


\(^{90}\) Thorpe, ‘Introduction,’ 26-27.


\(^{93}\) Breukelaar, *Historiography*, 51-56.

\(^{94}\) Breukelaar, *Historiography*, 57-70.

\(^{95}\) This view is also proposed on different grounds by Halsall, ‘Nero and Herod?’ 339.

sections were written before 573, there are several other possibilities which can account for the level of
detail that do not necessarily indicate that the *Histories* were started this early.

The first possibility is memory. It is very conceivable that if books three to four were written between
Gregory’s arrival in Tours and the beginning of his recording of contemporary events in 575, which
Breukelaar believes Gregory documented as they occurred, then Gregory could have written the sections
on Brioude from memory. Given that his earlier years in Tours were not the most stable, he might have
written them then as a hark back to his more settled years at Clermont and Brioude. Moreover, the Brioude
sections in book ten could also have been moved there from the earlier drafts later in the composition
phase.

Another possibility is that Gregory could have written down the events and scenes that caught his
eye on scraps and then later incorporated them into the *Histories*. This would especially account for the level
of detail which Gregory was able to provide and which Breukelaar uses to argue that those sections could
only have been composed by Gregory when he was in the Auvergne.

Finally, it is also possible that Gregory might have decided to start writing a history of the Auvergne
while he still lived there. This idea might later have been put aside when he became the Bishop of Tours,
but the sections that Gregory might have wished to include in an earlier history could have been transposed
into the *Histories* at the point when Gregory eventually decided to compose them. The recollection of
material from Brioude and Clermont within the *Histories* could, but does not necessarily imply that Gregory
had decided to write the *Histories* before 573.

Writing six years prior to Breukelaar, Walter Goffart’s initial answer to the question of the *Histories’*
composition was to argue that: ‘the work was neither composed all in one piece nor systematically set down
*pari passu* with the events even in the most contemporary books.’ The compositional framework of the
*Histories* were too well hidden and, as such, historians should focus their studies more on the *Histories* as an
entity, rather than trying to trace what could never be solved. Goffart later changed his position in the
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97 It is my conjecture that this point might not have occurred until after Gregory finished coalescing the separate
tracts of writing which I perceive he used to formulate book one.
preface to his reprinted paperback edition, published in 2005. Here he rejected the methodology of using the internal structure of the Histories to discern the chronology of composition and argued, in line with Alexander Murray (discussed below), that the contents of the Histories do not pre-date 590.\textsuperscript{100}

Neither Goffart’s initial fence sitting nor his subsequent support of Murray’s view immediately caught on. In 2007 Guy Halsall suggested that the preface to book five might have been the unintentional starting point for the Histories and argued that Gregory wrote and structured the first four books from Easter 576 until 580.\textsuperscript{101} In 2015 the issue of the composition of the Histories was revisited once again, this time by Alexander Murray who argued that far from being a project produced over two-decades, the Histories were in fact composed all at once in the last few years of Gregory’s life.\textsuperscript{102} Murray’s argument, which does not discuss Halsall’s 2007 article, is founded on the idea that no part of the Histories can be dated to before 585.\textsuperscript{103} Echoing parts of Breukelaar’s theory, which he correctly criticised for not reflecting Gregory’s intellectual development accurately, Murray states that the Histories did not take their full shape until 585-594.\textsuperscript{104} While Gregory might have taken notes on previous events, he did not shape these into books until this period.\textsuperscript{105}

Murray’s view of the Histories’ composition presents several problems for both this thesis and for the wider body of scholarship that already exists on Gregory’s motives, mentality, and messages within his Histories. The dating of the Histories to a much later period means, as Murray himself admits, that the Histories only represent Gregory’s worldview in the 590s as opposed to the period from the 570s to the early 590s.\textsuperscript{106}

In this way Murray’s theory undercuts Guy Halsall and Ian Wood’s arguments (discussed below), on how


\textsuperscript{101} Halsall, ‘The Preface to Book V,’ 312. Most recently Allen Jones seems to agree with the opinion that Sigibert’s death sparked Gregory’s decision to write the Histories but he states 575 rather than 576. See Jones, Death and Afterlife, 104-110.


\textsuperscript{103} Murray, ‘Composition,’ 91.

\textsuperscript{104} Murray, ‘Composition,’ 75 and 91-92. Breukelaar also perceived that the contemporary books of the Histories were not created from a mass of material until after 585. He does not, however, relegate the whole Histories to this period. Breukelaar, Historiography, 51-56.

\textsuperscript{105} Murray, ‘Composition,’ 91-92.

\textsuperscript{106} Murray, ‘Composition,’ 92.
Gregory’s fears of the two kings Guntram and Chilperic shaped his works. More pressingly, it also places a marked limitation on what the historian can discern about Gregory and the maturation of his intellectual and emotional knowledge. If Gregory only started writing the events of the Histories from 585, then a greater layer of emotional distance must be added to his works. Though Murray’s view does not remove the likelihood that Gregory’s texts were influenced by the emotions he felt or recollected feeling at the time of writing, it does afford Gregory a longer period of hindsight which would have a dramatic impact on the emotional memory that he could draw on. What frightened, angered, or saddened him in 575 might not have done to the same extent, if it did at all, by 585. While it is unlikely that Gregory ever wrote each chapter of the Histories immediately after the event occurred, in terms of emotional infiltration and integration there would be a big difference between an account which recorded an event that happened anywhere from a day to a few months after it occurred, and one that was written up to a decade later.

Murray’s argument, however, is not without its weak points. One such point is the very lynchpin of his argument; the notion that the idea of Gregory as a diarist has long since been replaced in favour of the idea of Gregory as a historian. Murray considers there to be a distinct, perhaps overstated, difference between the two. For him, the historian, unlike the diarist, is someone who determinedly shapes the world around them. The idea that Gregory wrote as a historian cannot thus coincide with the idea of the Histories as being a ‘chronologically synchronic’ piece of work in Murray’s perspective. His chapter seems to suggest that Gregory could not have had the mental capacity to be able to interpret events ‘historically’ as they were occurring, in order to create the Histories rather than a chronicle. The ability to use the events occurring around him to make something that could shape the world around him, which he would have needed to do as a historian, is non-existent in Murray’s view of Gregory.

Aside from being an underestimation of Gregory’s intellectual faculties - a charge of which Murray declared Breukelaar guilty - the implication that arises from Murray’s argument about Gregory’s writing process, can be readily challenged on two grounds. Firstly, it assumes that Gregory had set out to write a
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107 This is the driving force of Murray’s argument. He believes that Halsall and Wood’s arguments, concerning Gregory’s fears of the Merovingian kings and how they shape the narrative, are incorrect and rely on a synchronic composition trajectory to be valid. Murray, ‘Composition,’ 75-99.
108 Murray, ‘Composition,’ 70-72.
109 Murray, ‘Composition,’ 70-72.
110 Murray, ‘Composition,’ 74-75.
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history encompassing his own times from the beginning. Secondly, it relies on the idea that Gregory must have had an intended audience, such as the Austrasians,\(^\text{111}\) whose outlook he wanted to influence; an assumption that implies that Gregory had always intended the Histories to be read from their conception. Unfortunately, the Histories themselves provide no evidence to support either of these points.

The matter of the intended audience of the Histories has attracted much assumption and discussion in last three decades. Although there is not the space here to go through the vast amount of scholarship that exists on this issue,\(^\text{112}\) it cannot be overlooked entirely because my views on this matter subtly influence the analyses of this thesis. Here I must briefly note that in that which follows I am not intending to offer either a concrete or comprehensive solution to this conundrum. The views presented on this matter are my own and have been included in a synthesised form so that the reader may contextualise my analyses of Gregory’s use of fear in the subsequent chapters.

Put simply, the views in this thesis are that Gregory never intended the Histories to be read until he started to compose book nine and that the contents of the final chapter show that the only reader that Gregory envisaged for the Histories was the next bishop of Tours. These notions can be argued on five grounds: 1) the multifarity of agendas and messages contained throughout the Histories; 2) the lack of an extant archetype; 3) the knowledge that Gregory never published or disseminated the Histories during his lifetime;\(^\text{113}\) 4) the differences that appear in Gregory’s writing style between each pair of books (one and two, three to four, five to six, seven to eight, and nine to ten); 5) in Histories 10.31, the only place in which Gregory explicitly refers to a potential reader, he only makes a general reference to his subsequent successors at Tours.

\(^\text{111}\) Murray, ‘Composition,’ 85.
\(^\text{113}\) Bourgain, ‘The Works of Gregory of Tours,’ 143.
To take the first point, the sheer complexity, variety, and volume of agendas and messages contained within the *Histories* are important because they indicate that Gregory never had a specific reader in mind. Much of the debate that has arisen on the idea that Gregory had an intended audience for the *Histories* stems from the tendency of modern scholarship to automatically assume that agendas must signify an intended audience. The various messages which Gregory wrote into the *Histories* (and which I discuss in greater detail below) must mean that the bishop had an audience in mind to receive those messages. The three topics: agendas, composition, and audience, typically appear together in the scholarship tackling this question. But therein lies the issue. As my discussion of the literature examining Gregory’s agendas demonstrates (see below), historians have identified multiple messages in, and purposes for, the *Histories*. Some of these, like Gregory’s blatant disapproval of civil war between kings, are specific to certain books or passages within the *Histories*. Others, like Heinzelmann, Goffart and Jones’ view on Christian instruction, apply more broadly to the whole work. Nevertheless, what scholars seem not to have considered is that the incorporation of specific or general themes into the *Histories* does not necessarily imply either that Gregory intended it to be read or that he had a specific audience in mind. Indeed the scale of general and more specific messages within the *Histories* might better indicate that Gregory never wrote this work for a specific person or social group. Historians past and present, may write for many different reasons. They might wish to preserve or articulate certain ideas. Alternatively they may compose something as an exercise in improving writing style. Although scholars in the current political and economic climate must write and publish with an intended audience in mind, Gregory was a metropolitan bishop by trade. While he wrote a history – a didactic piece of work filled with subtle social, theological, and political commentary - he was not obligated to publish it or to write in such a way as make it publishable. Acknowledging this does not damage either the integrity or historical value and status of Gregory’s work. It does not detract from the fact that Gregory actively selected, shaped, and organised his stories to discuss different aspects

119  This does not necessarily have to imply that the work is thus a diary. The genre of history writing with its analytical and critical approach to its subject matter can also be a good format to preserve or articulate one’s own ideas.
of Merovingian society, participate in ancient philosophical tradition, and contribute to the ever-growing Christian one. The value of the messages contained within Histories are not diminished or made redundant by the lack of an intended recipient. Agendas do not have to imply the existence of a chosen audience and the sheer scale of didactic messages and aims that litter the Histories is perhaps telling that Gregory had neither one specific purpose nor one preconceived audience in mind while he was writing it.

The lack of an extant archetype for the Histories also indirectly supports the argument that Gregory never had an intended audience in mind prior to writing book nine. The Histories are a sizeable piece of work and they would have taken a lot of parchment to compose. Studies have shown that the parchment codex replaced the papyrus scroll as the preferred media and format of writing in the fourth century. But because there is no extant archetype of the Histories, scholars have no idea what the original would have looked like. They might have been created in one beautifully bound volume, as Pascale Bourgain speculates, or in ten individual codices. But equally parts of the Histories might have been drafted on scraps of parchment or other media which could be moved around and reassembled as Gregory and later Agiulf edited the work. This fragmentary approach would likely have been more cost-effective for such a monumental and gradually developing piece of work, especially since Gregory might not have been able to predict precisely how much parchment he would have needed for each book. It might also partly explain why the archetype of the Histories has not survived. It would have been more difficult to preserve the whole work intact if it had remained unbound, but this is purely speculative. Without the archetype it is

121 For a complete list of surviving manuscript editions see Krusch, ‘Prefatio,’ v-vi and xxii-xxxviii. For an abbreviated list see Heinzelmann, Gregory, 194-195, and 199.
123 Gamble has pointed out that late antique codices might have been up to 25% cheaper to produce than a scroll because both sides of the skin could be used, but he accepts that it is difficult to conclusively know how expensive parchment and books were in the late antique world. The processes involved in producing a codex would have required the parchment to be cut to size before binding. It would probably have been more cost effective to produce a ‘living’ or ‘growing’ book like the Histories by writing the various chapters of each book on separate pieces and having them bound at the end. Even if Gregory did predetermine how many chapters each book would contain, knowing precisely how many parchment leaves this would require would not have been easy to guess. See Gamble, Books and Readers, 53-56. Also, Roberts and Skeat, Birth of the Codex, 46.
124 This would have especially problematic once the Historia Francorum, Fredegar’s Chronicle, and the Liber Historia Francorum were published from the seventh century onwards. On this see Bourgain, ‘The Works of Gregory of Tours,’ 146-151; Heinzelmann, Gregory, 196-198; Goffart, Narrators, 123-127; John J. Contreni, ‘Reading Gregory of Tours in the Middle Ages,’ in The World of Gregory of Tours, ed. Kathleen Mitchell and Ian Wood (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 423-425
impossible to prove that the *Histories* were formatted as a large codex or series of codices. There is no reason to suppose that they were a costly project that must have been created with a predetermined reader in mind.

The changes that appear in Gregory’s writing style from books one to ten also demonstrate that this was a continuously maturing project, one which Gregory might not have intended to be read for most of its composition. The style and contents of the final two books do indicate that this was the point in which Gregory might have been thinking about preserving the *Histories*. Several scholars have already pointed out that Gregory’s writing style changes throughout the *Histories*.125 Books one and two, three to four, five to six, seven to eight, and nine to ten all have subtly different writing styles and features. While there is no space here for a complete ‘book by book’ breakdown of the *Histories*, the final chapter of book six marks a crucial turning point in terms of Gregory’s writing style and awareness that the *Histories* could be read by someone other than himself.

The scholarship of Guy Halsall and Ian Wood, amongst others, has highlighted that Gregory’s obituary of Chilperic in *Histories* 6.46 show that he was becoming increasingly aware that his depiction of the Merovingian kings and their magnates could be used against him if he ever fell into disfavour or the text fell into the wrong hands.126 Their studies are important because they demonstrate that at this particular point in the composition of the *Histories*, Gregory was conscious of the possibility that this work might be read and that he started employing literary tactics like ironic juxtaposition to protect himself accordingly.127 Nevertheless, it is important not to confuse this growing awareness that the *Histories* might be read with the idea that Gregory intended or wanted them to be read. The two perspectives are very different. Although the contents of books six to eight of the *Histories* suggest that this was a point at which Gregory acknowledged that the work might be read in unfavourable circumstances, they do not show that he desired or intended for this to happen.
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127 Halsall, ‘Nero and Herod,’ 348-349.
Books nine to ten represent the first time that the Histories can be seen to demonstrate that Gregory had begun to hope that this work would be preserved. This is evidenced by two things: 1) the inclusion of complete transcripts of church and legal documents into the text and 2) Gregory’s closing statement in Histories 10.31. In books nine and ten, it is notable that Gregory starts to incorporate copies of a variety of legal and clerical documents into the body of the Histories. These include: a copy of the treaty between the kings Guntram and Childebert II, the episcopal letter sent to Radegund at the start of the uprising of the nuns at her convent in Poitiers, the judgement handed down to those nuns after the hearing, and the sermon given by Gregory the Great when the plague struck Rome.128 The inclusion of these documents into the text is important because they indicate that Gregory might have been trying to broaden the appeal of the Histories or at least give someone another reason, beyond an interest in what Gregory had to say, to seek them out and preserve them.

At first glance Gregory’s interruption of his narrative with these documents seems a little out of place with the rest of the Histories. The last time Gregory included external text was back in book two when he quoted extensively from the histories of Sulpicius Alexander and Renatus Frigeridus, and the letters of Bishop Eugenius and Saint Remigius.129 Yet Gregory’s reasons for incorporating these particular documents becomes evident once the reader gets to Histories 10.31. Here Gregory closes his tenth book with a diatribe exhorting ‘the priests of the Lord who will have charge of the church of Tours after my unworthy self,’ never to rewrite the Histories, except in verse, break them apart, or reproduce them in part for fear of being damned with the Devil at the Day of Judgement.130 This is the sole passage of ten books of Histories in which Gregory explicitly refers to a potential reader.

The final passage of Gregory’s Histories has been much studied both for its prosopography of the bishops of Tours and for Gregory’s warning not to violate the integrity and structure of the Histories.131 In his chapter on “Divine Power Flowed From this Book”, Conrad Leyser argues that Gregory wrote this curse into the

129 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.3, pp. 41-42; 2.8-9, pp. 50-57 and 2.31, pp. 77-78.
130 ‘…omnes sacerdotes Domini, qui post me humilem, ecclesiam Turonicam sunt rectores,’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.31, p. 536 (3).
*Histories* in the hope of protecting both his text and his holy legacy.\(^{132}\) The curse was intended to remind anyone who read it that Gregory’s books might become vessels through which holy vengeance could be cast down on those who disregarded the warning of their author after his death.\(^{133}\) While Leyser is specific in stating that Gregory ‘hoped to give his own detractors reason to fear the vengeance that his texts themselves might have the power to exact’, Gregory is not quite so definitive in his wording.\(^{134}\) This warning was meant for any of Gregory’s successors (*omnes sacerdotes Domini*) who might pick up the *Histories*. This knowledge is important. It demonstrates, as Leyser points out, that Gregory was aware of how fleeting a good saintly reputation could be.\(^{135}\) But it also indicates that Gregory did not trust that the *Histories* and books of miracles would be properly preserved even by his successors. This lack of trust is perhaps telling of the fact that Gregory had not started the *Histories* with the intention of creating them for his successors. If this knowledge is combined with the fact that Gregory only started to include transcripts of documents that would be potentially useful for an episcopal successor from book nine, then this cumulatively suggests that Gregory seems not to have intended the *Histories* to be read by anyone specific prior to writing books nine and ten. But why did he change his mind at this point? The answer might be found, quite simply, in the scale and complexity of the *Histories* themselves.

By the time Gregory came to write books nine and ten, the *Histories* were substantial in size. They had gone from being an experiment in history writing to being an intricate and complex project to which Gregory had become attached. The scope and complexity of the *Histories* coupled with the effort that Gregory had expended in communicating his own views and preserving various elements of the Graeco-Roman philosophical and historical tradition, likely led him to want to preserve the work by the time he came to compose book nine. By that point the safest and most logical way for him to do this would have been to leave it to the next bishop of Tours. The reasons underpinning Gregory’s careful construction of his obituary of Chilperic as highlighted by Halsall and Wood, would likely have dissuaded him from publishing the *Histories* even after Guntram’s death in 592. Gregory would still have been wary of any remaining political opponents and of the possibility that the contents of his work might offend Childebert

\(^{132}\) Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From this Book,” 294.
\(^{133}\) Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From this Book,” 294.
\(^{134}\) Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From this Book,” 294.
\(^{135}\) Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From this Book,” 294.
II or Fredegund and Clothar II in Neustria. Leaving the Histories with the subsequent bishop of Tours afforded Gregory the opportunity to preserve his work and avoid any unfavourable repercussions that might arise as a result of it being published during his lifetime. In bequeathing a didactic historical record that would have instructed the future bishops of Tours on his theological beliefs and the social and political events of his episcopate, Gregory might have hoped that his views would be directly or indirectly passed on to future congregations and rulers. But it is a stretch to claim that he ever intended these people or a specific social group to be the intended audience of the Histories from its conception.

The question of an intended audience for the Histories requires further discussion and a more open-minded approach than has previously been employed, but, for the moment, it is sufficient to state that Murray’s view of the composition of the Histories is not unquestionable. As a result, this thesis will work in tandem with both the more established perception, that Gregory wrote the Histories synchronically, and with the considerably less-established view, that the Histories might have emerged as a result of Gregory experimentally dipping his hand into history writing using the material that would eventually form book one of the Histories.136

4.2.2. The Composition of Gregory’s hagiographical corpus

As with the Histories, the composition history of Gregory’s hagiographical texts has also caused many a headache for historians. Although there is a general consensus that Gregory wrote his books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers interchangeably over the two decades of his episcopacy, deciphering when individual books and certain parts within those books were composed has proved challenging.

In 1994, Ian Wood, adapting the dates found in J. Verdon’s Gregoire de Tours (1989), perceived that the four books that made up The Miracles of Saint Martin, were composed between 574 and 593.137 The first book he dated to 574-5; the second to 575-81; book three was finished pre-587; and book four was completed sometime between 591-593.138 The dating of the first book has since been amended and most historians,

136 This is my own view.
137 Wood, Gregory, 3.
138 Wood, Gregory, 3.
including Richard Shaw and Raymond Van Dam, now date its completion to 576.\textsuperscript{139} Thus far, Verdon and Wood’s estimate regarding book two has not been dismissed, though Van Dam prefers the later end of the estimated timeframe, dating its completion to 581.\textsuperscript{140} Here Van Dam aligns with Luce Pietri (1983), who used J. Schlick’s calendar of Saint Martin’s feast days to chart the span of years covered by each book and argue that Gregory composed the contents of the second book between 573 and 581.\textsuperscript{141} In 2015 Richard Shaw refined Wood’s earlier estimates regarding the dates of books three and four of the hagiography in his chapter on the composition of the Miracles. The third book, he argued was composed between November 580 and November 581 while book four was still unfinished when Gregory died.\textsuperscript{142} Wood and Verdon’s dating for book four could also be amended to 592-93, as Gregory refers to King Guntram of Burgundy’s death which did not occur until 592.\textsuperscript{143}

The Life of the Fathers is a collection of twenty saints’ Lives which Gregory wrote alongside The Glory of the Confessors, The Miracles of the Martyr Julian, The Glory of the Martyrs, and, possibly, The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew. In Wood’s estimate, the various Lives of The Life of the Fathers were constructed at intervals. The second one was composed before 576. Lives three, four, six, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, and fifteen were all written before 580 and the sixteenth and nineteenth Lives before 587.\textsuperscript{144} He does not provide dates for the first, thirteenth, fourteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and twentieth Lives.

Edward James, in the introduction to his translation, admits that concretely dating all the books of Miracles and the different Lives contained within The Life of the Fathers is ‘hardly possible.’\textsuperscript{145} Nevertheless, using Krusch’s earlier estimates, James dates the composition of the twelfth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and nineteenth Lives to before 587, while Lives eight and twenty were written in 591/2.\textsuperscript{146} This, he then argues,
means that *The Life of the Fathers* could not have been composed as a book prior to 592. In 2015, Richard Shaw was unable to make further progress in relation to determining the dating of the various parts of *The Life of the Fathers*. On the grounds that it would have been ‘incomprehensible’ for *The Life of the Fathers* to have already been in publication when *The Glory of the Confessors* was unfinished and unpublished at the time of Gregory’s death, Shaw argues that it was probably unpublished when Gregory died.

*The Glory of the Confessors*, comprising of one hundred and ten titled miracle narratives, is also believed to have been unfinished when Gregory died. This is indicated by chapters 105, 106, and 107 which have titles but no narratives. In his introduction to his translation of this work, Van Dam states that there is no chronological pattern to the narratives within but he suggests that Gregory probably started writing the work in the winter and spring of 587-588. Several of the passages, such as chapter ninety-four, were already written before Gregory inserted them into the book. Others, like the account of Medard of Soissons in chapter ninety-three, were expansions of tales that Gregory had briefly recorded in his *Histories*, while stories such as the one about the ‘Two Lovers’ in chapter thirty-one, were clearly redactions. *The Glory of the Confessors* was, effectively, a culmination of recycled and unused material on miracles that Gregory had come across but never put into a book.

The main composition period for *The Glory of the Martyrs*, a collection of one hundred and six narratives, has been dated by Van Dam to between 585-588, with revisions and additions being made until the early 590s. Although certain chapters may have been drafted before this period, for example in *Histories* 4.5 Gregory refers to having already written about the plague that ravaged Gaul which also appears in chapter fifty of *The Glory of the Martyrs*. Van Dam’s dating covers the 586-7 period also estimated by Verdon and
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Wood and tallies with Shaw’s perception that the text was begun during the same period that parts of *The Life of the Fathers, The Glory of the Confessors, and The Miracles of the Martyr Julian*.\(^1\) The latter was argued by Breukelaar to pre-date all of Gregory’s other writings; a view which is shared by Shaw though the two men diverge in their reasoning. Breukelaar maintains that Gregory was commissioned to write the miracles that were occurring at Julian’s shrine during 563-573, while Shaw argues that Gregory composed the work with the hope of becoming the Bishop of Clermont.\(^2\) Although the two agendas are slightly different, they could be seen to complement each other. There is nothing to say that Gregory could not have been commissioned to record the miracles at Julian’s shrine while a clergyman in the Auvergne, but that, as time passed, he might have come to view the collection he was creating as a window into the bishopric at Clermont. In either case, the dating of *The Miracles of the Martyr Julian* to pre-573 renders it the earliest of Gregory’s surviving texts.

Finally, there is the text which, although included in the MGH by Max Bonnet, has largely been forgotten by most Gregory-scholars: *The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew*. The lack of historical attention afforded to this work seems to stem partly from the fact that it has been disregarded by historians as an inauthentic Gregory text, though Bonnet and other scholars such as Zelzer and Prieur have convincingly argued the contrary.\(^3\) Goffart, perhaps inadvertently, also highlights another reason for the lack of engagement with this text through his remark that it lacks the originality found in Gregory’s other *Miracles*.\(^4\) While Gregory himself admitted in his preface that the work was a condensation of an overly verbose earlier edition on the Apostle Andrew, it is uncertain to what extent he remoulded the original material he worked from.\(^5\) Despite the lack of historical attention, *The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew* has at least been afforded a composition date by Ian Wood as 593.\(^6\) It is my hope that by classing this work as one of Gregory’s texts,

\(^2\) Breukelaar, *Historiography*, 35–42 and Shaw, ‘Chronology,’ 140.
\(^3\) On this see Van Dam, *Glory of the Martyrs*, 27, n. 32. The *MA* is also listed as one of Gregory’s texts in, Contreni, ‘Reading Gregory of Tours,’ 420 and 428–429.
and subjecting it to the same rigorous analysis as its more widely known counterparts in this thesis, this largely neglected text will begin to garner a little more attention in Gregorian scholarship.

4.2.3. Agendas

Although Gregory’s writings have, as this thesis demonstrates, themes which run throughout them, there is no single agenda collectively underpinning them. This is aptly illustrated in the multiple prefaces to Gregory’s works and by the monumental body of historiography that exists on this matter. Historians have used Gregory’s works to debate an enormous variety of aspects of his world ranging from social identities, military campaigns, and political turmoil, to power, saints and their cults, the workings of miracles, food and drink, science, literary styles, friendship, and attitudes to humour, to name but a few.
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171 Goffart, Narrators, 197-203; Guy Halsall, “Don’t Worry I’ve Got the Key,” in Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4, 6-10, 12, and
Perhaps the most persistently reiterated agenda, championed by historians such as Walter Goffart and Martin Heinzelmann, has been Christian instruction. For Goffart in 1988, Gregory’s Histories were ‘above all, a vehicle of Christian instruction’ in which Gregory made clear his perception of the moral patterns of history and justified God’s actions to his readers.¹⁷² His view was bolstered by Martin Heinzelmann, who drew his highly influential book on Gregory of Tours to a close by arguing that Gregory had composed the Histories and hagiography to convey his views on how the model Merovingian society should function.¹⁷³ Most recently, this point has been reiterated Allen Jones in his Death and Afterlife in the Pages of Gregory of Tours published in 2020.¹⁷⁴ Jones’ work is significant in that it expands Goffart and Heinzelmann’s point by arguing that Gregory, whose writings were shaped in response to the constantly looming presence of death in his life, consciously made his works didactic in order to fulfil his pastoral responsibility to his people.¹⁷⁵

Beyond Christian instruction, historians have suggested that other agendas also permeate Gregory’s texts. In 1993 Raymond Van Dam argued that Gregory created his hagiographical works on Julian and Martin with two purposes in mind: to promote the cults of the saints, which Van Dam convincingly argues required the patronage of their episcopal guardians to survive, and as a way of completing a literary pilgrimage.¹⁷⁶ In Van Dam’s perception, the Miracles of Saint Martin were created by Gregory as a means for him to fulfil the pilgrimage which he had begun when he first travelled to Saint Martin’s tomb in 563.¹⁷⁷

Van Dam has not been alone in expanding on the agendas that underpin Gregory’s works. In 2002, Conrad Leyser argued that The Life of the Fathers were created by Gregory so that he could participate in sanctity himself in addition to being a means by which he could express his literary ambitions.¹⁷⁸ Leyser’s perspective on Gregory’s motives in this work are important because, as Gregory’s use of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear shows, they can be applied to all Gregory’s works not just The Life of the

¹⁷² Goffart, Narrators, 168-174.
¹⁷³ Heinzelmann, Gregory, 172-191.
¹⁷⁴ Jones, Death and Afterlife, 111, 195 and 275.
¹⁷⁵ Jones, Death and Afterlife, 111-142.
¹⁷⁶ Van Dam, Saints and Their Miracles, 11-48.
¹⁷⁷ Van Dam, Saints and Their Miracles, 142-149.
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*Fathers.* This thesis highlights that Gregory, through his employment of these fears, used *all* his works, not just the *Histories or The Life of the Fathers*, to preserve his instructions on the formation of the model self and the good Christian soul. In producing this discourse as his revered predecessors had done, Gregory was, in turn, able to participate in sanctity himself. Goffart, Heinzelmann, and Leyser’s views on Gregory’s motives for writing are, as this thesis highlights, present in all Gregory’s works and clearly detectable in his depictions of demonically-inspired fear and the fear of God.

5. *The Intellectual and Theological History of the Late Antique West*

Having outlined the basics about Gregory and his works, the remaining sections of this introduction review the wider historical themes which this research also contributes too. The theological and intellectual history of the late antique west is the first to be addressed because this thesis has the most significant impact on this area of late antique studies. The following section critically reviews select pieces of scholarship that have already discussed *paideia* and its relationship with early Christianity.

Before delving into the historiography in detail, it is first important to mention that the intellectual history and history of early Christian theology of late antique Gaul are here regarded as inseparable. This is because, as Catherine Chin argues, the religious entity that became ‘Christianity’ required the particular intellectual climate, and the gradual changes which occurred to that, in order to slowly become the central component of the western world that it came to be.\(^{179}\) The theologians who created Christianity would not have had the tools or concepts necessary to do this without the intellectual culture of the late antique world.\(^{180}\) Consequently, the developments in the Christian theology and intellectual culture of the late antique world should largely be regarded as inseparable notions.

In *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World*, Catherine Chin rightly argues that the creation and success of the religious and cultural phenomena that came to be known as Christianity was neither


guaranteed nor predetermined. Following the Emperor Constantine’s conversion to Christianity in c.312, the Empire’s thinkers and believers slowly but earnestly began to turn Christianity into a religion with a defined orthodoxy and orthopraxy. Their efforts resulted in Christianity gradually becoming the accepted and official religion of the imperial western territories and, later, the post-imperial barbarian kingdoms.

Yet without its adoption by many of the senatorial elite, men who were both educated and influential, Christianity would arguably never have become as important to the late antique west as it did. It was the educated elite, even those who would come to shun the luxuries of their elite status in favour of an ascetic lifestyle, whose literature and behaviour developed Christian theology. The establishment of Christianity was, effectively, the result of a collective effort of men like Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, and Cassiodorus, who found ways to transform the educational programme of Classical *paideia*, which they had been trained in, into Christian *paideia* - the equivalent curriculum for those who wished to convert to Christianity and who needed to be taught how to become functioning members and leaders of society and good Christians. The various texts of these educated, Christian writers, along with the Latin Bible, became the foundational texts which defined late antique education and the theology, philosophy, and orthopraxy of Christianity in the west. Any exploration of the metamorphosis of either the intellectual culture of the
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late antique west or Christian theology must, therefore, incorporate an understanding of the developmental changes that occurred in the other.

The historiography available on the intellectual and theological history of the wider late antique west is vast in scope and rich in diversity. The substantial body of work produced by scholars including Robert A. Markus, Pierre Riché, Peter Brown, Yitzhak Hen, Henri I. Marrou, Werner Jaeger, Robert Kaster, Catherine Chin, and Meghan Henning means that our knowledge of the emergence of early Christianity and the educational knowledge available to the peoples of the late Roman and post-Roman west, is already extensive. Reasons of space prohibit a thorough analysis of the substantial volume of scholarship which has solely focused its energy on discussing either the intellectual culture of the late antique west or the theological developments in early Christianity. What follows is a critical review of the literature which examines the relationship that existed between the late antique intellectual culture and the developments in early Christian thought.

Pierre Riché’s *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West* continues to be regarded as perhaps the most significant work on the intellectual and educational aspects the late antique world. Next to Henry Marrou’s study on education in Antiquity, Riché’s volume is unsurpassed in terms of the scale and depth with which it delves into late antique intellectual culture. Within his tome, one of Riché’s many arguments is that Christianity did not change the programme of the Roman school itself. Although Christianity did alter the pedagogical methods which the Roman school would come to use through the introduction of monastic
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institutions, which altered the wider intellectual picture of the late antique world, for the most part Christianity adopted and integrated itself into the Roman intellectual culture around it and remained uninterested in changing the ultimate goal of Classical Roman education: transforming a child into a man.\textsuperscript{197}

Despite being problematic in its approach to ‘Barbarian’ education, Riché’s overarching comments about the impact of Christianity on the intellectual culture of late antique west deserve consideration. When examining this subject, it is often tempting to emphasise the major transformations that the emergence and spread of Christianity wrought on the civilisations and peoples of the west as a conglomerate unit. These transformative impacts on the politics and social aspects of the wider late antique world should never be underestimated, but overemphasising them is also dangerous. Riché’s work serves to remind us of this. By contextualising the changes which occurred in the late antique intellectual culture within the wider political and social transformations that the end of the Roman imperial system wrought for each of the different imperial territories,\textsuperscript{198} Riché reduces the centrality of the role of Christianity in transforming the intellectual culture of the late antique west.

Throughout his work, Riché is careful to situate any shifts in the educational culture specifically within the unique political situations for each barbarian kingdom.\textsuperscript{199} Because the contextual situations for each kingdom are different, Riché’s scholarship thus emphasises the importance in assessing the intellectual culture of each of the barbarian kingdoms on an almost individual basis. His work, overall, remains highly commendable for two reasons. Firstly, it reminds us that when addressing the impact which the developments in Christian theology and practices had on the intellectual culture of the late antique west, it is important to remember that Christianity was just one of a myriad of political and social factors that shaped late and post-Roman education. Secondly, it cautions us to remember that because the processes and extent of the transformations which each of the imperial western territories underwent were different for each region, it is important to acknowledge that the wider state of the intellectual culture, and any impact that Christianity might have had within that, will be different for each post-imperial kingdom.

\textsuperscript{197} Riché, \textit{Education and Culture}, 7-11.
\textsuperscript{198} For examples of this see Riché, \textit{Education and Culture}, 48-60. The shifts that occur in the goals of the senatorial elite are also explored in more depth in Wickham, \textit{Framing the Early Middle Ages}, 158-302.
\textsuperscript{199} Chapters two and six of Riché are good examples of this. Riché, \textit{Education and Culture}, 52-78.
Next to the work of Riché, Henri Marrou’s *A History of Education in Antiquity* also provides a good foundation for knowledge of the education and methods of teaching that were used from the early Hellenistic period through to the initial stages of the Carolingian Renaissance. In his last two chapters, Marrou establishes that Saint Clement of Rome seems to be the first to use the term Christian *paideia* or Christian education.\(^{200}\) *Paideia*, in its initial conception, had simply referred to the educational schooling of a person.\(^{201}\) Yet as the Hellenistic Greek thought-world expanded, *paideia* came to denote a culture in which a person’s education spanned beyond his schooling years and into his whole life as he sought to reach the pinnacle of human perfection.\(^{202}\) Since Christianity was ‘an intellectual religion’ that was also focused on presenting its own idea of human perfection, it could not do without the culture of *paideia* into which it was born.\(^{203}\) Like Riché, Marrou notes that despite having their own idea of what it took to achieve human perfection, early Christian theologians were not initially interested in producing Christian “schools” with curricula that would compete with the ideals of Hellenistic *paideia*.\(^{204}\) It was not until the monastic centres such as Saint Martin’s Marmoutier and the legendary Lérins, that Marrou thought a concern to promote the Christian curriculum of *paideia* was somewhat discernible.\(^{205}\) Even then he perceived the monastic centres to have been set up primarily as places where bishops could find a supply of candidates, who had both a general education and specialized theological training, for their lesser clergy and successors, rather than being “schools” of wider education.\(^{206}\)

Although Marrou’s work is excellent for garnering a general background on the state of the intellectual culture of the late antique west, its depiction of the ways in which the theological developments of the period shaped the intellectual culture in the Latin west and vice versa is too simplistic. The relationship that existed between these two was, as more recent scholarship by Peter Brown and Meghan Henning has shown, incredibly complex in nature.
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\(^{205}\) Marrou, *A History*, 333-337. Another example of a Christian monastic centre which attributed great care to the intellectual knowledge of its inhabitants in this period would be Cassiodorus’ monastery at Vivarium. Cassiodorus wrote two books outlining a huge range and variety of biblical, exegetical, and pagan literature which he expected the monks to read. Cassiodorus, ‘Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning,’ 105-233. Discussed in Riché, *Education and Culture*, 161-169.

In his *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity* (1992), Peter Brown connects *paideia* and the intellectual culture of the late antique world with the exercise of power.\(^{207}\) Like Marrou, Brown describes *paideia* as a culture; one which those who exercised power were expected to subscribe to.\(^{208}\) Taught in schools during late adolescence, *paideia* was inseparable from the intellectual culture of the Greek and Latin world, though Brown focuses his study primarily on the former.\(^{209}\) He discusses the role of *paideia* specifically in relation to Christianity in his *Authority and the Sacred* (1995). Here he defines *paideia* as ‘the grooming of young males according to a traditional canon of decorum and of literary excellence’, and states that it played a crucial role in facilitating the creation of power relationships and the control of violence in the late Roman world by instilling the elites with a shared knowledge of how they should conduct and communicate amongst themselves.\(^{210}\) Unlike Marrou or Riché, Brown does not focus on the impact that Christianity had on *paideia* and the intellectual culture of the late Roman world. Instead, within his broader desire to ‘cut the vast notional intolerance of the post-Constantinian empire down to size’, he explores how *paideia* interacted with Christianity.\(^{211}\) He argues that *paideia* was the thing which ‘set the limits of intolerance’ when it came to the topic of religion.\(^{212}\) Because *paideia*, and the intellectual culture which instilled it, socialised and controlled how men in positions of power could and should be seen to exercise that power, *paideia* played a crucial role in limiting intolerance. Those in power, whether they were pagan or Christian, were expected to observe, display, and prioritise their self-control, courtesy, and confidence which could often mean that displaying tolerance and observing public order were more important than instigating violence for the sake of belief.\(^{213}\) *Paideia*, through the code of conduct and intellectual knowledge that it taught, helped build bridges between Christian and non-Christians, something which helped Christianity to survive the periods in which not even the culture of *paideia* was enough to stem the outbursts of religious intolerance.\(^{214}\)

Brown’s work is commendable because it highlights the complex interplay which existed between the intellectual culture of the late antique world and the spread of Christianity on a more subtle level. It
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211 Brown, *Authority and the Sacred*, 38.
213 Brown, *Authority and the Sacred*, 40-44.
shows that *paideia*, and the educational system through which it was imparted, played an important role in helping Christianity keep and expand its foothold in the post-Constantinian empire. It effectively curbed the violent resistance with which it could be met and simultaneously equipped bishops with the tools to enable them to assert their authority and beliefs in a manner that would be deemed acceptable by those in positions of power and educated in the ways of *paideia*. But while Brown’s work is particularly illuminating for what it reveals about how the intellectual culture of the late antique world helped Christianity in terms of the expansion of its authority, it does not explore how the intellectual culture helped shape the tenets of Christianity or how Christianity’s precepts affected the intellectual culture which allowed it to increase its authority. For a study of this the historian must turn to Meghan Henning’s *Educating Early Christians Through the Rhetoric of Hell* (2014).

In *Educating Early Christians*, Henning connects Christianity to late antique intellectual culture by defining it as a philosophical school of thought which used, participated, and also changed the ethical and cultural content of *enkyklios paideia* to fit its own philosophical goals. While Henning seems, for the most part, to agree with Marrou’s approach of taking the surviving papyri sources to indicate that *enkyklios paideia* was already prevalent in the Greek and Latin world by the time the earliest Jewish Apocalypses were written, thus disregarding the criticisms levelled against Marrou by Joyal et al., in the process, her methodological handling of these sources means that her work produces a much more in depth insight into how Classical *paideia* affected, and was affected by, early Christianity.

Overall, Henning’s book is remarkably interesting. Analysing the use of *ekphrasis* in contemporary depictions of Hell and Hades, Henning’s main focus is on tracing how contemporary rhetorical depictions and uses of Hell as a means of promoting and maintaining the social and cultural values that made up the structure of *enkyklios paideia*, were gradually assimilated first by the Hebrew writers of the Old Testament, then the New Testament Gospel authors, and finally the early Church Fathers, into the structure of the
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Christian paideia.\textsuperscript{219} Her work is striking in that it implicitly shows that while the writers from the Hellenistic period to the early Church Fathers are alike, in the sense that they all use ekphrastic descriptions of Hell as a rhetorical device to further their own ideas for an ethical and cultural programme of education, they are also all dissimilar, since there is no consensus in how they use Hell ekphrastically or in what ethical and cultural ideas they wish to promote. The Gospels of Luke, Mark, and Matthew for example, all use ekphrastic descriptions of Hell to convey that the reader should fear to end up there, but they do not use these descriptions in the same way, to the same extent or even to convey the same didactic message.\textsuperscript{220} The early Church Fathers also adopted the notion of Hell as a pedagogical tool, though the exact didactic value they placed upon it, and the extent to which they used ekphrastic depictions of Hell to convey their points, altered depending on the agenda of each author, their intended audience, and the social context around them.\textsuperscript{221}

The variability which comes through very clearly in Henning’s analysis, means that her work provides a greater, more detailed insight into how the relationship between early Christian theology and Classical paideia developed in the first four centuries of Christianity than previous historiography has produced.\textsuperscript{222} Henning’s decision to adopt a chronological approach, combined with the sheer volume of material which she analyses, enables her to pick up on the nuances concerning how each biblical and early Christian author adopted and changed the Classical portrayals and uses of Hades in Greek and Latin literature, to present their own ethical and cultural curriculums for people to follow. Her work uses the educative literature of Antiquity and late antiquity to show how early Christian theology transformed the enkyklios paideia of Antiquity, in subtle, non-subtle, individual, and collective ways, into the Christian paideia which formed the backbone of the intellectual culture of the late antique world. In doing this Henning’s Educating Early Christians brings the complexity which underpins the merging of the Classical intellectual culture with early Christian theological thought to the fore. It thus provides an excellent addition to the existing scholarly repertoire on the intellectual and theological history of the late antique west.

\textsuperscript{219} Henning, Educating Early Christians, 54-230.
\textsuperscript{220} Henning, Educating Early Christians, 113-175.
\textsuperscript{221} Henning, Educating Early Christians, 223-226.
\textsuperscript{222} James Hunter, for example, places the same emphasis on showing the gradual transformation of Classical paideia into Christian paideia in Hunter, To Change the World, 51-55. But his discussion of this topic lacks the depth that Henning’s work provides thanks to her methodological approach.
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6. The History of Emotions and Gregory of Tours

In choosing fear as the historical lens through which to analyse Gregory and his works, this thesis is bound to the history of emotions and the history of fear. By identifying and analysing how Gregory of Tours uses and understands the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear, this project contributes to the history of fear, both by showing that Gregory and his late antique contemporaries thought about and used fear to talk philosophically about themselves and their world, and by revealing how and why they did this. In demonstrating that late antique Gallic fear was a tool that was actively used by contemporaries in shaping and reshaping Christian world through text, this thesis presents a point which, as far as I am aware, has not yet been realised in the existing scholarship.

6.1. Gregory of Tours in The History of Emotions

Gregory and his works have attracted attention in the ever-growing school on the history of emotions. As a school of thought, the history of emotions, which originated in a call by Lucien Febvre back in 1941,\(^{223}\) has grown so exponentially over the last few decades that it not only has leading academic centres in Australia, Germany, and the UK but, in 2015, Jan Plamper felt the need to produce a book summarising the developments and existing literature on the history of emotions while the task was still feasible.\(^{224}\) There is not the space here for a complete analysis of the history of emotions literature. Over the last three decades this school of thought has produced an incredibly rich and vibrant array of scholarship. Much of this has been concerned with outlining or creating various methodological approaches to emotions studies.


Emotionology, emotives, emotion scripts, intimate scripts and emotions as appraised judgements of value are just a handful of the best-known and most recent methodologies to attract attention.

Of all the historians who have written on emotion in the last three decades, Barbara Rosenwein is perhaps the best-known. Rosenwein has devoted numerous studies to discussing the emotional world of Gregory of Tours as well as to her own methodological approach to the study of past emotions. In 2006, Rosenwein published Emotional Communities in the Middle Ages. Here she argued for a new methodological approach to studying emotions which she termed ‘emotional communities’. Rosenwein envisages emotional communities as a series of concentric circles which exist within a larger, outer circle. The outer circle represents the dominant emotional community in which the subject participates, while the lesser circles represent those smaller textual or social communities in which the subject might also move. The outer circle could be crossed with another large circle from a neighbouring or contrasting dominant emotional community.
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228 The intimate script’ was devised by Sarah McNamer, Affective Meditation and the Invention of Medieval Compassion (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 12. McNamer’s approach was heavily based on Gerd Althoff’s notion that emotions were performances or public display see Gerd Althoff “Emotionen” in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 30 (1996): 60–79. Also, Gerd Althoff, Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde (Darmstadt: Primus, 1997), 229-257.

229 This is the approach favoured by Martha C. Nussbaum, Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4-11.

230 For reasons of space and keeping the flow of the review intact, the in-depth critical discussion of each of these methodological approaches has been cut.

231 Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 24.

232 Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 24-25.

233 Rosenwein, Emotional Communities, 24-25.
Rosenwein’s emotional communities are one of the most flexible approaches to the study of historical emotions, owing to the assertion that they are made up of textual or social communities that can overlap. They are also one of the most inclusive emotion methodologies, since Rosenwein devised her ‘emotional community’ concept to allow for the relational and social nature of emotions to be included as well as Reddy’s concept of ‘emotives’. Nevertheless, while the theory of flexible emotional communities is highly appealing, it is not without problems. In her comparison of the expression of dulcedo in the works of Gregory of Tours and his friend, Venantius Fortunatus, Rosenwein’s determination to show that both men participated in a pre-determined and shared emotional community, means that she sidesteps what I perceive to be a crucial part of the historian of emotions’ job; establishing how Gregory and Fortunatus comprehended dulcedo. This also happens in her *Generations of Feeling* (2016), in which Rosenwein’s notion that both men use love to similarly emphasise family feeling in their texts, is enough for her to declare that they are part of a ‘community’ of feeling which encompassed the entire sixth-century Merovingian elite. She seems uninterested in exploring how Fortunatus and Gregory understood love as individuals and whether this would support her claim that Gregory and Fortunatus had a shared view of family feeling.

Rosenwein’s works are undoubtedly valuable for the substantial part they have played in bringing the study of the ‘emotions’ of the Merovingian world to historical attention. Yet there are a series of complicated questions implicit within Rosenwein’s ideas about Gregory and Fortunatus being part of a shared community of feeling which she does not address. To demonstrate that Gregory and Fortunatus were part of a shared ‘community’ of feeling for example, Rosenwein is quick to highlight the similarities between the two men in their uses of dulcedo and love. But she does not question whether there are any differences in how both men use these emotions in their works. Such differences are important because while differences can and do exist within communities, the subtle variations present in how different people perceive each emotion, which help make the fabric of both the emotion and the wider ‘emotional community’ in a
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particular geographical area and timeframe, also help determine the extent to which a ‘community’ of feeling truly exists.

In *Generations of Feeling*, Rosenwein analyses examples of ‘familial’ love as expressed by Gregory and Fortunatus between spouses, parents for children, and friends. But she does not discuss the impact that the different terms which Gregory and Fortunatus used to signify love in their works, would have on her analysis. Latin has a myriad of terms that signify ‘love’ of different kinds in English. *Amor*, *caritas*, *dilectio*, and *fraternitas* all denote ‘love’ for example, but each of these words might signify a different type of love to past peoples. Furthermore, each person’s notions of the types of love that existed, how they thought each type could or should be expressed, by whom, whether they were useful for a person and why, varied from individual to individual. While Rosenwein does examine different types of love, her analysis does not explore the issues that come with the specific terminological choices that Gregory and Fortunatus made in their works and what these tell us about how alike they are in their use of love. Rosenwein’s ‘emotional communities’ imply, and rely on, a certain ‘togetherness’ and ‘likeness’ between people and their feelings.

Rosenwein’s focus on identifying emotional constellations, the sets of emotions that make up a community, mean that her questions are more about emotional interaction rather than establishing how each emotion within that constellation was understood by each contemporary who used it. The result is that two multifaceted emotions, love and *dulcedo*, are reduced to a means of comparison by which Rosenwein is able to illuminate aspects of a pre-determined emotional community of which she perceives Gregory and Fortunatus to have been a part. She does not explore the possibility that these two men might also have had fundamental differences in how they perceived each of their emotions and what this would mean for her notion of a shared ‘emotional community’ amongst the Merovingian elite. Nor does she explore whether it is possible for her to discern whether Gregory and Fortunatus maintained a similar understanding
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242 Rosenwein pre-determines that Gregory and Fortunatus were part of the same emotional community in the introduction. This means that she is more focused on seeing how these men operated within this same emotional community when she examines *dulcedo*, rather than exploring what *dulcedo* meant to the two men and then assessing whether their use of the emotion actually does suggest that they were part of the same emotional community. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 30.
of love and dulcedo, since the problems posited by ‘other minds’ mean that it is virtually impossible for historians to access this knowledge.

Concerning her other notion, that the ‘community’ in which Gregory and Fortunatus were part of a network of feeling which extended to whole of the Merovingian elite, Rosenwein again neglects to explore the highly complicated problem posed by the concept of the ‘Merovingian elite’. Frankish politics in Gregory’s time, as the Histories more than adequately demonstrate, was in constant flux. Kings were assassinated.

The various territories which constituted the kingdoms of Burgundy, Neustria, and Austrasia changed hands frequently. The men who could be classed as the ‘elite’ in Gregory and Fortunatus’ works were promoted, demoted, changed allegiances, murdered, and, in some cases, even executed on a king’s order. Each of the men that make up the ‘Merovingian elite’ would have had differing levels of education and life experiences, the very things that would have shaped their emotional experiences and perceptions.

The same issues apply to the ‘elite’ women but there is less source material to work with. While Gregory
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243 Rosenwein, Generations of Feeling, 35-47.
244 King Sigibert of Austrasia and Chilperic of Neustria being the best examples. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 4.51, pp. 197-199 and 6.46, pp. 319-321.
245 ‘Tours, for example, was originally under Sigibert’s jurisdiction when Gregory was appointed as bishop, but it became part of Chilperic of Neustria’s kingdom after Sigibert’s death. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.1, pp. 194-195 and 5.4, pp. 198-199. Following Chilperic’s murder, control of Tours transferred to King Guntram of Burgundy before being returned to the jurisdiction of Sigibert’s son, King Childebert II of Austrasia. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.12, p. 323 and 7.33, pp. 353-354.
246 Ennodius who was promoted to Tours after Count Leudast, also received control of Aire and Lescar. On Ennodius’ promotion to Tours see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.26, p. 390. On his promotion to Aire and Lescar see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 9.7, p. 420-421.
247 Bishop Praetextatus of Rouen is a good case study of this see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, pp. 216-225. Bishop Egidius of Rheims, the one who consecrated Gregory to Tours, was also demoted in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.19, pp. 510-513. Duke Lupus of Champagne was forced from his jurisdiction in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.4, pp. 267-268. Ennodius was shortly demoted from Tours and Poitiers after receiving Aire and Lescar and did not keep those two territories either. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 9.7, p. 420. Berulf, the previous Duke of Tours, was demoted and nearly executed after being suspected of stealing the king’s treasure. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.26, p. 390.
250 The best examples of these are Guntram Boso, whom Guntram of Burgundy ordered to be put to death, and Magnovald, whom Childebert II had killed. On Guntram Boso’s demise see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 9.8, p. 421 and 9.10, pp. 424-426. On Magnovald see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.36, p. 404.
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wrote substantially on the Merovingian queens,^{251} he wrote very little about the female family members of the ‘Merovingian magnates’.^{252} Fortunatus’ *Carmina* include several poems both to and about various women,^{253} but they are always in his voice and not that of the women themselves. Once the notion of the ‘Merovingian elite’ begins to be unpicked, it becomes increasingly difficult to identify the existence of a community of feeling, or emotional community, which is specific to that group of people.

Besides Rosenwein, Ron Newbold has also assessed the emotions contained within Gregory of Tours’ writings. In his article exploring the ‘Nature of Anger in Gregory of Tours’ *Libri Historiarum,* Newbold argues that Gregory perceived three types of anger to exist: divine anger, which was just and conditional; righteous anger, which could also be exercised by humans; and destructive anger, which could affect anyone but God.^{254} Astute readers may notice that Newbold’s title does not specify whether he is focused on examining the nature of anger according to how Gregory understood it or the nature of anger as a modern historian might perceive the *Histories* to illustrate it. In the text of the article, it seems that he tries to tackle both aspects which results in his analysis producing two, not always clearly marked, strands of analyses: one on how Gregory perceived anger and the other on what Newbold interprets the *Histories* to show about the nature of anger. His article thus produces dual conclusions concerning anger as Gregory understood it and
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what the displays of anger in the Histories truly signified in Newbold’s perspective, but the distinction between the two is not always made clear.255

Methodologically, Newbold’s article adheres to the same standard of excellence set by his earlier work on fear and grief (discussed below), as his analyses are rigorously based on the words for anger in Gregory’s Histories.256 Yet, unlike his earlier article, Newbold does not confine his discussion of the modern aspects of anger to the beginning of the work. Instead this is woven into his analysis of anger in the Histories.257 Although this is useful in that it demonstrates an understanding of anger as a modern emotion, the tactic does leave the reader questioning whether Newbold allows modern concepts of anger to directly shape his interpretation of contemporary anger in the Histories.

The problems that confront the historical study of emotions, especially those of ‘other minds’, ‘indeterminacy of translation’, and whether it is ever possible for someone to wholly ‘know’ themselves, mean that while this thesis began with the intention of being a history of emotion, it is now centred on demonstrating how Gregory and some of his Christian contemporaries’ attitudes towards the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear, show that there was an interest in transposing Classical ideas about self-control and the mastery of ‘emotion’ into a Christian paideia in the fourth to sixth centuries. In doing this, the thesis still relates to the history of emotions, but the value of its contribution lies more specifically in what it reveals about the history of attitudes to ‘emotion’ and self-control in the late antique west, rather than what it reveals about fear or the experience of ‘emotions’ in this period.

7. The History of Fear and Gregory of Tours’ hagiography and Histories

7.1. Histories of Fear

The closing sections of this introduction sketch out the developments that have been made in studies of the history of fear and how existing scholarship has already examined Gregory and fear. This research contributes to the history of fear firstly by expanding our knowledge of contemporary attitudes towards

this ‘emotion’, within the parameters of late antique Gaul, and secondly by emphasising that fear is highly useful lens for historians seeking to examine the intellectual history that underpins their sources. It also responds to the pre-existing historiography on Gregory and fear by significantly developing Ron Newbold’s declaration that Gregory perceived that the fear of God was an important attitude for people to have, and by showing that when we expand our approach to Gregory and fear, by analysing the bishops’ attitude towards fear rather than simply identifying where he uses it or using fear as a means to explain why he does something, we can reveal that Gregory’s works are a fantastic source for exploring new areas such as the Merovingian perception of the formation of the self, the good Christian, and their transformation of Roman paideia.

With the growth of the history of emotions, various schools that channel their energies towards exploring specific emotions have materialised. It is from this move to specialisation that the history of fear has arisen. Over the last three decades the history of fear has attracted ever-increasing attention from historians who have, as Joanna Bourke has recognised, employed a wide variety of methodological approaches to study it. These approaches, which include emotionology, social constructivism, fear as narrative, psychohistory, and aesthesiology, recognisably map onto those approaches developed in the history of emotions and each approach has brought advantages and disadvantages to the historical study of fear as an entity.

One of the pioneering texts on historical fear is Jean Delumeau’s *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of A Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries*. Delumeau’s magnificent book, originally published in 1983, sought to provide a grand narrative theory of how a ‘culture’ of guilt emerged as a result of people’s changing attitudes towards sin guided by their fear of God. His tome is a mixture of astute attention to detail and problems created by his concern to explore the longue durée. In his introduction, Delumeau demonstrates academic rigour by acknowledging that historians become emotionally involved in what they write, intentionally or
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260 Detailed discussion of this can be found in Bourke, ‘Fear and Anxiety,’ 115-125.
not.\textsuperscript{261} He also shows an appropriate level of care for the complexities of fear as a topic by specifying that he wanted to explore the dread or terror of God rather than the reverential fear of God.\textsuperscript{262} Furthermore, Delumeau’s conclusions are also noteworthy for his willingness to differentiate between the two sides of the fear of sin; that which was salutary and that which was promoted to such excess that it caused mental damage to those who heard it.\textsuperscript{263} Yet his attempt to quantify the levels of fear present in the preaching of the different periods he traversed, in order to appraise the qualitative aspects of fear and guilt, is problematic.\textsuperscript{264} Although he recognises that his attempt to identify the quantity of fear in Catholic preaching would inevitably contain deficiencies, Delumeau persisted because he felt that such an assessment was necessary to enable him to assess the true role that fear and guilt played in Catholic sermons.\textsuperscript{265}

Delumeau’s attempt to measure the quantitative and qualitative levels of fear in Catholic preaching has met with criticism. In their edited volume on \textit{Fear in Early Modern Society}, Roberts and Naphy highlighted that while the early modern period has been categorised as having a ‘climate of fear’ - an idea which Delumeau’s great tome had helped to push forward - this ‘great fear’ theory was unhelpful due to the distortion created by the ever-increasing body of personally-natured source material for the period (e.g. diaries) and the recognition that fear was and remains a ‘constant phenomenon throughout history.’\textsuperscript{266} In short, the constancy of fear in historical societies, coupled with the growth and availability of a body of relevant sources, meant that Delumeau’s concern to measure the levels of fear in his societies was rendered obsolete. Moreover, no matter how large a body of sources for a ‘society’ might become, realistically it can never provide historians with the information necessary to accurately judge the levels of fear in any given society, community, or individual. There will always be thoughts and reactions left unsaid. Both the quantitative and qualitative approaches to historical fear are unhelpful.

Roberts and Naphy’s 1997 volume is striking partly because it is one of the first historical volumes on fear to stress the importance of defining fear at the outset, and partly because it explores what Roberts and

\textsuperscript{262} Delumeau, \textit{Sin and Fear}, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{263} Delumeau, \textit{Sin and Fear}, 555.
\textsuperscript{264} Delumeau, \textit{Sin and Fear}, 480-490.
\textsuperscript{265} Delumeau, \textit{Sin and Fear}, 480.
Naphy have termed the ‘logistics of fear’: its causes, who experienced it, and what types of fear existed in the early modern period. In these ways, this work breaks from previous fear historiography. It tries to create a method which allows historians to understand what constitutes fear, as opposed to simply treating it as an abstract theory or a word with no tangible meaning. With Roberts and Naphy’s volume, fear started to become a topic of inquiry rather than a simple by-product or a means by which an event could be explained.

With the establishment of fear as a historical subject came a new problem; how does the historian tackle it as such? The best place to start, it seemed, was by defining what fear was in the historical discipline. In 2005 this is exactly what Joanna Bourke sought to try and shed light on with her publication *Fear: A Cultural History*. The question of what is fear for the historian, is something which Bourke explores over five sections which correspond to a different methodological approach taken in the study of emotions: narrativity, aesthesiology, psychohistory, emotionology, and comparing fear to anxiety. In emotionology, Bourke identifies that as the word for ‘fear’ changes across time and cultures, so does its meaning. In narrativity, fear is recognised to have its own narrative structure which is determined by genre, syntax, and vocabulary, and is necessary in order for fear to be communicated from one person to another. An aesthesiological reading portrays fear as an emotion that belongs neither to individuals nor to social groups but serves as a mediator between the two instead. Fear is not just a thing but an ever-active agent in power relationships, a point which Gregory of Tours also knew well. In her conclusion, Bourke sets aside all the lessons which her analyses of the various methodological approaches to fear have uncovered in favour of seeking a more humanely driven answer to the question of what is fear. Analysing the role of fear during and in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, she concludes that fear is something that the world needs. It is not a ‘wrong’ emotion per se, rather it is a necessary both for love and for history of which it is a driving force.

It is perhaps the broadness of Bourke’s methodological scope which renders her study so valuable to the history of fear. By combining the diverse methodologies used by historians to tackle emotions,
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Bourke paints a picture of fear which pays appropriate homage to its multifaceted and highly complicated nature. The very structure of Bourke’s history serves both to instruct historians in the complexity of fear and remind them that there is no single methodology that can provide all the answers.

Barely a year after Bourke’s cultural history of fear, Peter Stearns published a behavioural history entitled American Fear. In this work Stearns proposes the bold motion that, in its present state, American fear responses and management are unique compared to the rest of the world.²⁷³ Stearns’ argument derives from his perception that fear is best interpreted through human responses and behaviours. Assessing the events of the past eighty years, he argues that shifts in the attitudes of 1920s parents towards protecting their children from fear situations, coupled with the fears experienced during the Cold War, those sparked by 9/11, and the commercialisation of fear by the American media, has resulted in American fear being characterised as an emotion that was not only more prevalent in society, but something to which American people were more susceptible and vulnerable.²⁷⁴ Stearns’ work is interesting in that he is fortunate enough to be able to take his conclusion, an observation of a witnessable attitude, and work back from that. His analysis is a selection of factors from the past which fit a pre-determined conclusion that is itself a broader generalisation of a society’s attitude. While Stearns’ approach is potentially workable for a history which seeks to explain present and observable societal attitudes, it is still problematic in that it is the conclusion which determines and shapes Stearns’ reading of the evidence, a methodology that cannot be applied to studies in which the society is not able to be observed by the historian first-hand.

More recently, Jan Plamper and Benjamin Lazier published a volume in which they adopt an altogether new approach to fear. Building on the works of Jerome Kagan, who contends that studies on the term ‘fear’ should be postponed in favour of studying fear as an emotion and for its emotional processes, Plamper and Lazier argue that the barriers between the scientific, social scientific, and humanities disciplines need to be broken down when discussing fear.²⁷⁵ Their book is a culmination of commentaries on the biological, neurological, sociological, historical, and psychological approaches to fear and their conclusions. Each

²⁷³ Stearns, American Fear, 3.
²⁷⁴ Stearns, American Fear, 3-213.
chapter questions and identifies different aspects of fear including its temporal, experiential, intentionalist (fear as a process which is always attached to an object), and non-intentionalist (fear as an entity not dependent on object) parts. The interdisciplinary approach to fear undertaken in Plamper and Lazier’s book, reflects the current attitude of the history of emotions. This point has been demonstrated at both the 2017 *Fears and Angers* conference held at Queen Mary University of London and the 2018 *The Future of Emotions* conference held at the University of Western Australia.

Nevertheless, while further discussion between the sciences, social sciences, arts, and humanities might be useful to achieve a greater understanding of fear as an entity, there are limits to which this discussion can benefit historical study. Although historians of the pre-modern world should, as part of their practice, demonstrate an awareness of the current approaches and perspectives on emotions, which shape the historian’s own mentality and interpretations, they should not impose these upon their sources. With this in mind, the knowledge that neuroscience, biology, and psychology can provide historians is limited in its usefulness, though it should not be discarded. A balance needs to be struck between acknowledging current attitudes and understanding of what fear is and ensuring that such knowledge is not then imposed on historical sources or used to judge the perceptions of historical peoples.

The final and most recent landmark in the history of fear is its assimilation with the digital humanities. Nicholas Eckstein’s chapter in *Mapping Space, Sense, and Movement in Florence*, examines whether it is possible to use digital mapping technology to produce a map of the fear of the plague in early modern Florence and Tuscany. Eckstein highlights several issues that come with attempting to digitally map a historical fear which relate to how the map is created, what would it look like, and what would be the point in trying. He then tries to tackle them using the sizeable corpus of letters left by the Florentine Officers of Health, the Sanità.

Eckstein’s chapter is highly commendable for its innovative and critical approach to the problems that come with trying to digitally map a past emotion. He correctly dismisses the idea of using the rumour-references to the plague, contained within the letters to map the fear of it, by acknowledging that the Sanità’s
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correspondence is neither scientifically nor medically reliable, thus meaning it cannot be used to accurately chart the spread of the plague.278 Most of the contents of the letters contain rumours created, circulated, and recorded by a limited social group of people, thus making it hard to uncover the general mood of everyday people.279 Nevertheless, Eckstein does not dismiss the contents of the letters entirely. Instead of using the references to the plague to create a map, he uses the spatial descriptions and details provided in the Sanità visitors’ records of August 1630, to chart where people feared the conditions for plague were present instead. Drawing on Henri Lefebvre’s spatial theory and the inspiration provided by the Hidden Florence App created by Fabrizio Nevola and David Rosenthal,280 Eckstein takes the spatial details recorded in the visitors’ records, in which they describe exactly where they travel and what they see as the travel, and charts the clusters which show the places in which people were cataloguing the poverty, bad odours, and filth which they thought led to plague.281 After applying the zoom features found on Google Earth to the Buonsignori Map, Eckstein was able to plot the “danger spots” of Florence which contained the conditions that the visitors, and people who supplied information to the Sanità, feared were ripe conditions for plague.282

In attempting to chart the early modern Florentine fear of the plague using the tools of the digital humanities, there is little doubt that Eckstein’s chapter provides an original contribution to the history of early modern Florence, the history of emotions, and the history of fear. It stands as a monument to the movement of these schools of thought into the more technologically driven world of today. Eckstein’s attempt to map and read collective fear, by quantifying the spaces in which he thinks the causes for the fear of the plague can be identified, rather than quantifying the fear as it is described by the people themselves in the gossip of the Sanità’s records, is intriguing. He sidesteps the problems involved in quantifying fear itself by opting to quantify the causes for the fear instead. Although this approach is successful, because it allows Eckstein to create a map of fear, I am less certain as to whether it allows Eckstein to create a map of a collective fear of the plague so much as it produces a map of the locations of the conditions which

278 Eckstein, ‘Mapping Fear,’ 171-172.
279 Eckstein, ‘Mapping Fear,’ 172.
people feared could cause the plague. Such a map is still useful, but it is not a map which concretely illustrates where the fear of the plague existed. In trying to digitally map historical fears there remains a gap between the identification of where the conditions that would cause the fear were present and where the fear itself was felt and existed.

7.2. Histories of fear and Gregory of Tours

Having outlined the key developments in the study of the history of fear, the final part of this critical review explores what existing historiography has done with Gregory of Tours and fear and highlights the gap in the scholarship which this thesis fills directly. While Gregory and fear is a topic that has attracted exploration in the historiography on Gregory of Tours and the history of fear, thus far these studies have been limited to either using fear as a means to explain why Gregory does something in his texts or illustrating how and where fear is represented in Gregory’s works. In their respective works on Gregory’s depiction of King Chilperic and King Guntram for example, Guy Halsall and Ian Wood argue that Gregory’s fears are what shaped his narratives of the two kings. In Wood’s perspective, Gregory’s fear of Chilperic underpinned his tainted narrative of the king both before and after his death, whereas Halsall, more convincingly, saw the obituary of Chilperic as a result of Gregory’s fear of Chilperic’s brother, Guntram.283 Both historians identify the presence of fear in the Histories, and their works are further notable as they aptly demonstrate that the historian’s reading of fear in Gregory’s narratives is determined by their wider interpretation of what Gregory is trying to do in his texts. Yet Halsall and Wood left scope for further analysis on the role of fear in Gregory’s mind and works. Although they identified the presence of fear in Gregory’s works, using it as a means to explain why a transition in character portrayal in the Histories occurred, neither historian sought to analyse the fear they identified or to examine how it fitted within Gregory’s wider perceptions and uses of fear in his works.

In the 2002 volume Fear and its Representations, Elaine Ragland published a chapter in which she argues that the interfamilial violence between the Merovingian royal family demonstrated that familial members of the royal line experienced a fear of their family members in connection with their fears of a loss of power and

rebellion. Besides the problem presented by Ragland’s lack of engagement with other scholars’ interpretation of the events in which she presupposes the presence of fear, it is her approach to fear in Gregory’s works that is the most problematic. There are contentious points with Ragland’s approach. The first is that Ragland seems not to have questioned what fear was or is. Her lack of explanation or references that would indicate such an exploration leave the reader wondering whether Ragland problematised fear as both an emotion and a historical topic of inquiry. The second issue concerns the foundations, or lack of, upon which Ragland founds her fear theories. The passages which Ragland takes as the basis for her argument, *Histories* 4.50, 4.51, 5.1, and 5.2, do not contain any words for fear of any kind or intensity. Ragland’s analysis of fear is thus not founded upon any textual indicators of fear which, as Kaster has pointed out, should form the basis for all emotional analyses. The third and final problem stems from the previous one. Because Ragland does not use any solid bases for her identification of fear in Gregory’s *Histories*, her chapter provides not a representation of fear but a logical assumption unsupported by the sources.

Ragland’s chapter was followed four years later by Ron Newbold’s study of the representations of fear and grief in Gregory’s *Histories*. Newbold’s methodological handling of the emotions he studies contrasts starkly with Ragland’s. Unlike Ragland, Newbold opts to handle fear and grief separately in the initial stages of his analysis, a decision which afforded him the necessary space to assess each emotion in detail before he compared the ways in which Gregory represented each emotion at the end of his work. The result of this is that Newbold’s article demonstrates a more rigorous academic approach to fear as a topic of historical inquiry.

To begin his analysis of Gregory’s secondary responses to fear, Newbold opens with a brief but necessary discussion of the nature of fear and grief according to the modern understanding. In outlining, if only briefly, the modern perceptions of fear as social, cultural and biological constructs, Newbold shows that he has adopted an analytical rather than a passive approach to fear as a subject of inquiry.
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Moving forward, he lists the Latin terminology which he uses to identify his examples in Gregory’s texts and also provides a list in which he identifies what the key fears in the Histories are, who experiences them, and how many examples exist. After creating four groups of fears - death; loss of persons/objects to which a person is attached; the divine; and fear for others who might intervene on their behalf - Newbold proceeds to list how many examples also include secondary responses to fear such as fleeing, placatory submission, making extra precautions, and becoming angry or violent. Once this list is complete he performs the same process for grief. His subsequent conclusions, that Gregory presents reactions to fear more in terms of self-preservation rather than cowardice and viewed fear of the divine as good for society, are thus founded upon terminological evidence which signifies the presence of fear and grief.

Conclusion

The consequence of Newbold’s methodical approach to the secondary responses to fear in Gregory’s Histories means that his article, through demonstrating an admirable handling of fear in Gregory’s works as a historical topic, is convincing. But, as Newbold himself openly professes, his work ‘is not a study of fear and grief in Merovingian Gaul but of how they are presented in Gregory’s History.’ His focus is on discerning the representation of fear and grief in Gregory’s works, rather than analysing Gregory’s attitudes towards grief and fear. In this way Newbold’s study leaves a gap which this thesis seeks to fill. Adopting Newbold’s terminology-based approach to fear, this research uncovers and analyses how and why Gregory uses and understands the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear in his works. It is important because by illustrating the attitudes towards the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear, of the man whose works remain one of our most primary sources for our knowledge of Merovingian Gaul and sixth-century continental history, this thesis reveals that the Bishop of Tours’ works are an excellent source of information to historians investigating Merovingian notions of the formation of the self and the good Christian in late antique Gaul. In demonstrating this, this research opens up new avenues for historians looking at Gregory’s
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works which include exploring the Merovingian perception of the self, the good Christian, and how the they changed the Roman and early Christian concepts of *paideia* in the late sixth century.
Chapter 1: The Fear of God in the Late Antique Gallic Worldview

Introduction

Before an analysis of Gregory of Tours’ attitude towards the fear of God can be undertaken, an examination of the late antique apperception of this fear must be completed. This is the task to which this chapter is devoted. Gregory’s texts cannot be understood separately from the social, political, economic, cultural, and religious elements of the world which he interacted with, lived in, and shaped. Each of these factors would have helped forge and mould different aspects of Gregory’s mentality, just as they do for the present historian. It is not, therefore, good practice to analyse Gregory’s comprehension of fear without first investigating the context of the specific type of fear under consideration.

As far as I am aware, this chapter represents something different in late antique scholarship which has, to the best of my knowledge, yet to produce an in-depth study on Gallic contemporary perceptions of this specific fear. There has been scholarship by Lindsay Wilson and Jean Delumeau on the fear of God in the Bible, late medieval, and early modern Church, but little to nothing on the wider attitudes towards this fear or how these developed within the theological and intellectual advancements that occurred in late antique Gaul. By shedding light on this, and revealing in the process that the Gallic concept of the fear of God has a traceable, previously unestablished trajectory of development, which coincides with the larger transitions in the wider Gallic theological tradition, this chapter makes an original contribution to the existing scholarship on the fear of God and the wider scholarship which focuses on theological and intellectual aspects of the late antique world.

Throughout this chapter I argue that in the theological discourse that shaped the Church in late Gaul, the fear of God was not just a simple ‘movement of the soul’ like anger or sadness. Nor was it regarded as an ‘emotion’; a term which was not coined until the mid-nineteenth century and which structures our understanding of fear in the present day. Instead it was a philosophical and theological concept in a system of belief which traversed a doctrinally, politically, socially, and economically tumultuous period. It

296 Dixon, From Passions to Emotions, 4-61; Frevert, ‘History of Emotions,’ 49 and Hailstone, ‘Fear in Sixth-Century Gaul,’ 21.
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was thought to have a variety of purposes and forms within the individual Christian life. As a concept, the fear of God evolved as it was discussed and debated alongside other doctrinally important matters from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century. In line with the shift in the wider Gallic Church towards consolidation and the creation of a unified Catholic doctrine, the various strands of the debates on the nature and roles of the fear of God were then consolidated and refined by Gallic theologians from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century. Despite this, the fear of God never lost its complexity. It remained an intricate fear with several, central roles in Christian theology. This renders it perhaps the most complex of all known fears in the late antique world.

A Brief Note on Influence and the Transmission of Ideas

What follows is not intended to be an exhaustive backdrop against which Gregory’s comprehension of the fear of God can, should, or will be analysed. None of us, Gregory included, can completely escape the influence of the past. The authors whose works we read, and the people whose views become incorporated into the general attitudes of society, alter and determine our perceptions on everything from morals to politics, religious beliefs to family, and our notions of the self to knowledge of our emotions. Nor can any of us avoid the influences that inevitably come with shared language. The established concepts and meanings already attached to the term ‘fear’ will influence our understanding of what fear is to some degree. The same is true of the fear words that Gregory would have known timor, terror, veroor, etc. But entrapping Gregory’s understanding of fear within the views determined by his predecessors, family, and friends limits our ability to uncover Gregory’s understanding of fear. While the language and a selection of the ideas which Gregory uses to describe fear, and specifically the fear of God, are intertwined with those views imparted by his Gallic contemporaries and peers, Gregory’s concept of this fear was his own. When it comes to discerning and comprehending our emotions, humans have an element of freedom in that they can, in private if not in public, accept certain traditional or currently held perspectives while rejecting others. They also have the ability to give words new definitions. What fear means to one person and how it is perceived, is not necessarily the same for another. Gregory was no exception to this. His views on the fear

297 Saussure, Course in General Linguistics, 105, p. 72.
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of God could be and indeed were, as shown in next chapter, original in some respects. Thus, while it is unwise to study Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God without examining the perspectives which would have influenced him, Gregory’s own views on this fear must analysed in their own right.

1.1. Methodology

Before delving into those late antique perceptions on the fear of God to which Gregory was heir, it is necessary to outline the methodological approach used to construct this chapter. The task of illustrating the wider understanding of fear of God in the late antique world is monumental. Realistically, a thorough analysis of all the sources, authors, and aspects of the fear of God which appear in this period would require a thesis of its own. To render this task more achievable in a single chapter, the focus was initially narrowed to an exploration of the Gallic theology of the fear of God. Yet the volume of authors and surviving source material connected to the Church in late antique Gaul is considerable and so further refinement was required. The choice to study only those authors and sources that Gregory’s works show that he knew, presented a tantalising but problematic option. While Gregory’s knowledge of late antique theology was thorough,299 it was not exhaustive. A study of the fear of God limited to those works known to Gregory, risked providing too narrow a context. Any transformations in the wider contemporary perception of the fear of God that could have subtly influenced Gregory’s own perceptions might have been missed. Consequently, I decided to divide the task into two parts. In the first part, I decided to grapple with the Gallic perception of the fear of God in the minds of those authors who have been definitively recognised to have shaped the theology of the Church in late antique Gaul, from its origins. In the second part I opted to perform the same analysis but with specific focus on those authors whose works were known to Gregory. Combined, the two analyses would, I hoped, create a thorough and relevant contextual background.

The sources and authors selected for each part were as follows. For the general section I explored the fear of God in the *Vulgata* and the writings of Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, John Cassian, Prosper of Aquitaine, and Julianus Pomerius. The Bible presented the obvious starting point because it remains the foundational authority on the Christian fear of God. As such, it is also the backbone
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to all theological and exegetical Christian understanding in the late antique world including Gregory’s. As a bishop who also belonged to a family with many bishops in it, the Bible would have had a fundamental impact on shaping Gregory’s knowledge of the world and himself. The *Vulgate* Bible was specifically chosen because, as I discuss in greater detail below, it is the closest the historian can currently get to the version of Scripture that Gregory would have known. The writings of Hilary of Poitiers, the first recorded bishop of that city, were selected because they shed invaluable light on the beginnings of the formation of the Gallic Church, particularly the establishment of the basic Christian doctrine and its conflict with the precepts of Arius. Because of this, Hilary’s works also provide an important window onto the fear of God in this period; illustrating how Christian contemporaries and their Arian counterparts comprehended this fear, its role in Christianity, and how they thought it should be taught and managed. The works of Augustine, particularly his *On Christian Doctrine*, *The Trinity*, and *The City of God*, were incorporated because the teachings within these texts profoundly influenced virtually all theological discussion that occurred in fifth-century Gaul.

Whether Gregory was directly acquainted with any of Augustine’s works is a subject of continual debate in Gregorian scholarship. Yet, even if Gregory did not directly know Augustine’s treatises, the influence which the Bishop of Hippo exerted on those writers who did determine Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy in fifth and sixth century Gaul, renders an indirect influence highly probable. John Cassian’s *The Conferences* and *The Institutes* were selected partly because they had wide reaching influence on monastic practice in Gaul, thanks to their integration into the monastery at Lérins, and also because, as will be shown in throughout this thesis, they had an extensive impact on the attitudes and writings of Gregory of Tours. Prosper of Aquitaine merited inclusion because through his debates on Augustine’s positions on grace, nature, and free will, he also discussed and shaped late antique Gallic Christian perspectives on the fear of God. Finally, Julianus Pomerius was chosen because his views, which were widely renowned in late-fifth to early-sixth-century Gaul, shaped those of Caesarius of Arles whom he taught in 497 and whose

301 The debates of Prosper and Cassian over his theories on the free will and grace aptly demonstrate this as do the acts from the Second Council of Orange chaired by Caesarius of Arles and the letters of Avitus of Vienne.
303 For more detail on the structure, education, and spiritual training available at Lérins see Riché, *Education and Culture*, 101-105.
304 Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From This Book”, 290-291.
Sermons and ascetic views, as chapter four will suggest, might also have influenced those of Gregory of Tours.

For the Gregory-related section, the authors selected included: Sulpicius Severus, Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, Paulinus, Bishop of Périgueux, and Venantius Fortunatus, later Bishop of Poitiers. Both Caesarius and Avitus’ works had a major impact on the shape of the sixth-century Gallic Church and the views of Gregory of Tours. Caesarius produced over two-hundred sermons and decrees from five major Church Councils while Avitus’ letter collection reveals much about the conversion of the Frankish kingdoms to Christianity in the early sixth century. Gregory acknowledges that he still had access to some of Avitus’ letters in Histories 2.34 and his description of the portents and fire that struck Vienne during Bishop Mamertus’ episcopate, which closely matches the account given by Avitus, clearly shows that he knew the contents of some of those letters. While a direct link between Caesarius of Arles and Gregory of Tours has yet to be established, it is not unreasonable to assume that the latter knew of the former’s views from his familiarity with the Canons and Church Council decrees, which he would have been required to know as Bishop of Tours, and possibly through Caesarius’ vast collection of Sermons, which the Bishop of Arles had widely distributed during his lifetime. Gregory’s first book of his Miracles of Saint Martin quotes extensively from the sixth book of Paulinus of Périgueux’s versified Life of Saint Martin. He also cites both Sulpicius Severus’ original Life, though he might have been more familiar with the copy
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produced by his predecessor Perpetuus of Tours,311 and the version created by his contemporary and close friend Venantius Fortunatus,312 to whom he was also a patron.313

Here it must be noted that there are at least four authors whose works I deliberately decided not to incorporate into this study: Sidonius Apollinaris, Vincent of Lérins, Hilary, Faustus, Bishop of Riez, and Gregory the Great. One of the chief reasons for the exclusion of these men were spatial and time constraints. Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont (c.470-485), was part of the same literary circle as Avitus of Vienne and Bishop Ruricius of Limoges.314 He had familial ties with these men and his correspondence with them led them to collectively produce the largest letter collections of fifth-century Gaul.315 Sidonius was also a contemporary and correspondent of Faustus, Bishop of Riez (c.460-490).316 Faustus was a product of the monastic training at Lérins and his De Gratia Dei (474), along with the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins (434), made important contributions to theological discussion in fifth-century Gaul.317 Yet the views of these men, like those of Cassian and Prosper, were also written in response to Augustine.318 To understand the workings of the fear of God in the chief proponents of theological discourse of fifth-century Gaul, it was necessary to prioritise a study of this fear in Augustine’s works. The time and space required for this research meant, unfortunately, that the inclusion of Sidonius, Vincent, and Faustus’ views was simply not possible.

311 This is evidenced by Gregory’s specific reference to a two-book format of Sulpicius’ dialogues which according to Chase’s manuscript tradition survived in both a two and a three-book structure. While Chase indicates that it was the Gallic family of MSS that maintained the three-book structure, the earliest surviving MS is ninth century. Gregory’s reference to a two-book edition means that it is possible that the copy re-issued under Perpetuus used a two-book structure which later developed into a three book one. Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.1. p. 136 (lin. 22-23). Also, Alston Hurd Chase, ‘The Metrical Lives of St. Martin of Tours by Paulinus and Fortunatus and the Prose Life by Sulpicius Severus,’ Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 43, (1932): 51-76.
312 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1. Pref., p. 136.
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316 Mathisen, ‘Epistolography,’ 104-106.
318 Pereira, ‘Faustus of Riez,’ 186-198; Guarino, Vincent, xvii-xviii and xx-xxix, and Casiday, ‘Vincent of Lérins’, 131-154. The same applies to Gregory the Great see Lesyer, Authority and Ascesis, 133-134.
This logic partly explains the exclusion of Gregory the Great’s views from this thesis too, but the main motive for this was my desire to keep within the regional and temporal focus on Gaul as much as possible. It cannot be denied that Gregory of Tours’ knew of his contemporary Gregory the Great. The Histories aptly demonstrate this.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.1, pp. 477-481.} Both Gregory’s also seem to have regarded the fear of God as the principal fear of the good Christian; with Gregory the Great affording it prominence over the fear of the Devil.\footnote{Carole Straw, \textit{Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 61-62 and 64.} Yet most of Gregory the Great’s influential writings, such as \textit{Pastoral Care} (590), \textit{The Dialogues} (591-593), \textit{Homilies on Ezekiel} (593-601), and \textit{Moralia in Job} (late 570s-591),\footnote{For a discussion of the delivery and dissemination of these works see Leyser, \textit{Authority and Asceticism}, 137-140.} were put into circulation either towards the close of Gregory of Tours’ life or after he had died. The dating of these works means that, with the exception of the sermon that is copied into Histories 10.1, it is unlikely that Gregory the Great’s writings had much influence on those of Gregory of Tours.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.1, pp. 479-481.} This, combined with the regional focus of this thesis on Gaul, contributed to the exclusion of Gregory the Great from chapters one and three. While the account Gregory gives in Histories 10.1 means he might have maintained an interest in the views of his namesake in Rome for the final few years of his life, a detailed comparison between the views of the two men on the fear of God and its usefulness to pastoral duty stretches beyond what the spatial and time constraints of this thesis can permit. A future study of this would prove fruitful for examining how the concept of this fear develops in the Christian thinking that occurred beyond the Merovingian kingdoms, and the extent to which Gregory the Great might have shaped the later thinking of Gregory of Tours.

With the sources and authors established, the next stage of the process was to analyse each source to understand how their authors envisaged the fear of God, its workings and role as a Christian fear. But the sheer volume of analytical material generated from these analyses meant that my original intention, to construct this chapter from individual sections on each authors’ comprehension of the fear of God, quickly became unviable. Combined, the eleven sections on each of the authors were simply too large to incorporate into a single chapter of this thesis. Consequently, I decided to create a temporally-structured chapter, since this would allow me to illustrate the key aspects of the Gallic theological treatment of the fear of God and
show how it changed during from the fourth to the sixth centuries. What follows therefore, is a summation of the analytical sections on the fear of God in Gaul which might have directly and indirectly shaped Gregory’s own understanding of this fear.

1.2. The Foundation Stone: The Fear of God in the Vulgate

The Christian tradition of the fear of God originates in Scripture. In this section, I argue that the biblical depiction of the fear of God, its characteristics and the roles that it is supposed to have in the Christian life, is characterised as much by consensus as it is diversity. The early Latin Bibles would have provided Gregory and his peers with a rich and varied array of opinions about how this fear was supposed to work and purposes it was meant to have in the Christian life and wider world.

Gregory of Tours’ biblical knowledge, unsurprisingly given his occupation, was extensive. The biblical references and allusions which he deploys throughout his works cover virtually all the New Testament and a substantial body of the Old. Accessing the exact versions of scriptural knowledge known to Gregory and the authors used in this contextual chapter is fraught with difficulty. The reason for this is that up until the ninth century there was no standard Latin bible. In the late antique world, canonical and apocryphal texts were circulated individually or in smaller collections of texts which theologians and bishops could use to form their own ‘Bible’. The earliest versions of Latin Scripture in existence are now collectively referred to as the Vetus Latina or Old Latin Bible. These biblical scripts, which were predominantly translations of the Greek versions of Scripture, pre-date Jerome’s vulgar Latin translations. Although some philological consistency did exist across the old Latin scripts, considerable inconsistency was also present in the quality of the Latin translation. This caused problems for theologians trying to write exegesis and it contributed to Jerome’s decision to produce the vulgar translations of the Old and New Testaments. Kelly, in his

323 It should be noted that the general concept of fearing a God or gods predates Christianity.
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exceptional study of Jerome, painstakingly traced the theologian’s biblical translations and commentaries to the period between c.386-405/6.\textsuperscript{329} Jerome did not manage to translate all the books and epistles that made up the Bible during his lifetime, but he did disseminate what he had translated amongst his circle of friends, as well to those who asked for them.\textsuperscript{330} His actions increased the volume and variety of biblical texts available to Latin-speaking theologians of the late antique world.

It must be noted that even after the process of translating the New Testament into vulgar Latin was completed at the start of the sixth century, these scripts continued to circulate alongside those of Jerome and the \textit{Vetus Latina} until the ninth century.\textsuperscript{331} This knowledge is important because it means that biblical knowledge of the theologians included in this thesis, like Augustine, Caesarius, Avitus, and Gregory, was likely to have been drawn from a collage of Old and vulgar Latin scripts.\textsuperscript{332} Since there was no standard Latin bible, it is unlikely that the biblical scripts known to Gregory and Fortunatus matched those of Avitus, Julianus, Cassian, or Hilary of Poitiers. Although historians can identify which biblical texts Gregory knew,\textsuperscript{333} it is impossible for us to trace which versions of Scripture Gregory used. Whether he used scripts of the \textit{Vetus Latina}, copies of the vulgar Latin scripts originally put into circulation by Jerome, or a combination of both, can never be known. There are, to the best of my knowledge, no surviving copies of the exact biblical texts that Gregory learned and worked from. While there is an ongoing project to collate surviving fragments of the \textit{Vetus Latina} scripts,\textsuperscript{334} there was no single, uniform edition of the Old Latin Bible in the late antique world. The same scenario also applies to Jerome’s vulgar translations in this period. The closest the historian can currently get to reading the Bible as Gregory might have known it, is the \textit{Vulgate}. While this knowledge arguably creates a problem for any research which uses fear vocabulary to ground its analyses of the late antique understanding of the fear of God, since it is not possible to know whether the lexicon in the standardised \textit{Vulgate} matches that of the biblical scripts used by Gregory or his contemporaries, the influence of the Bible cannot be omitted from a study of Gregory’s concept of this

\textsuperscript{329} Kelly, \textit{Jerome}, 141-162.
\textsuperscript{332} This has been proven to be the case with Augustine. See Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18–20,’ 387.
\textsuperscript{333} See Appendix 5: Table 6: A list biblical texts that are cited in Gregory of Tours’ Ten Books of Histories and Appendix 6: Table 8: A list of the biblical texts Gregory uses in his books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers.
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theologically-rooted fear. Scripture provides the foundations for Christian concept of the fear of God and most of the authors of the theological writings cited in thesis, including Gregory, were bishops by trade. Biblical knowledge was a central requirement of Gregory’s career and it, as it will later be shown, it shaped his personal actions and views as well as his professional ones.335 The inability of this research to omit the influence of the Bible on Gregory and his contemporaries’ views, or to work from the exact biblical scripts which they used, means that the analysis of the fear of God that follows has been derived from the version of Scripture that is the closest to what Gregory and his predecessors might have known: the Vulgate.

In her comparative study of the fear of God in Proverbs and in Job, Lindsay Wilson highlights that while this fear functioned, and was portrayed, as central to the acquiescence of wisdom in Proverbs, in Job it was depicted as only one aspect of wisdom which served to broaden a person’s comprehension of other ways to acquire faith and wisdom.336 Wilson’s article, which significantly demonstrates that the biblical purposes and characteristics of the fear of God, or fear of the Lord, could vary from book to book, indicates that a comprehensive analysis of the fear of God in the Vulgate needs to approach the issue on a book-by-book basis. Because there is not the space here to discuss the portrayal of the fear of God in every biblical book known to Gregory, what follows is a summary of my analysis of the fear of God in those books which Gregory cites most often: The Book of Psalms, the Gospel of John, and the Synoptic Gospels.337

The biblical image of the fear of God that would have been known to Gregory was one in which this fear was perceived to be a way to attain satisfaction338 and eternal in its durability.339 It was also thought to be capable of increasing within a person340 and one aspect of being a good Christian.341 It displaced the fear

335 Chapter 2, section 2.3: Gregory, the Fear of God, and Self-Control in Merovingian Realpolitik.
337 Catalogues detailing the frequency of all the biblical texts that Gregory cites throughout his works can be found in Appendix 5: Table 7: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses biblical texts in his Ten Books of Histories and Appendix 6: Table 9: Table 9: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses various biblical texts in his books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers.
338 This is suggested by the rewards the fear of God is meant to offer in Vulgate, Ps., 127:1-4.
339 Vulgate, Ps., 18:10.
340 John states that Pilate ‘feared the more’ upon hearing the Jews’ declaration that Christ was declaring himself the Son of God. Vulgate, Jhn., 19:7-8.
341 In Luke, the fear of God needs to be combined with doing the Lord’s work. Vulgate, Luk., 19:13-26.
of worldly death,\textsuperscript{342} while being necessary and bestowed by God to ensure that people showed reverence.\textsuperscript{343} Obtained by asking,\textsuperscript{344} the fear of God was an integral part of a person’s strength and perseverance in God.\textsuperscript{345} It was inspired by healing miracles;\textsuperscript{346} a means of grouping people together;\textsuperscript{347} experienced before a person could believe in God;\textsuperscript{348} preceded by the fear of God’s judgement;\textsuperscript{349} and a source for gaining mercy, support, care, comfort, and power.\textsuperscript{350}

The biblical fear of God as portrayed in the Psalms, Gospel of John, and Synoptic Gospels, has a wide variety of characteristics and purposes. There are similarities as well as marked differences in the portrayal of the fear of God in the Psalms and Synoptic Gospels. One example of similarity regards the relationship that was perceived to exist between the fear of God and the acquisition of divine mercy in Psalms 3 and Luke 1:50.\textsuperscript{351} In Psalms 3:2-8, the fear of God is said to be both long lasting and necessary to obtain God’s mercy.\textsuperscript{352} Cross over to Luke 1:50 and Mary is shown to refer to this fear as something which is both enduring and the means by which people could gain access to God’s benevolent mercy.\textsuperscript{353} The association of the fear of God with the ability to obtain God’s mercy in both the Gospel of Luke and Psalms 3, indicates that the authors of both scriptural texts had a similar outlook on why people should have the fear of God.

Despite the traces of agreement that appear across the Vulgate, there is also substantial diversity regarding what this fear was thought to do as well as how, when, and why it was acquired. A good example of this is the divergence that features in the Matthean, Marcan, and Lucan Gospels over the role of the fear of God in bringing people to God. While Matthew and Mark are alike, in showing that the fear of God had to strike

\textsuperscript{342} Vulgate, Matt., 10:28 and Luk., 12:4-6.
\textsuperscript{343} Vulgate, Matt., 17:5-8.
\textsuperscript{344} Vulgate, Ps., 118:120 and 85:11.
\textsuperscript{345} Vulgate, Ps., 3:2-8.
\textsuperscript{346} Vulgate, Matt., 9:8 and Luk., 5:26.
\textsuperscript{347} Vulgate, Ps., 118:63.
\textsuperscript{348} The fear of God appears before the disciples realise who Christ is in Vulgate, Matt., 14:26-33. In Mark’s version of events the realisation of who Christ is does not occur until chapter 8, though the fear of Him occurs in chapter 6. Vulgate, Mrk., 8:17-21 and 6:54.
\textsuperscript{349} The use of enim meaning ‘for’ is particularly significant, implying that the fear of God’s judgement has to be experienced before the person then asks for God to give them the fear of Him. See, Vulgate, Ps., 118:120.
\textsuperscript{350} Vulgate, Ps., 21:25 and 144:19. The fear of God is also essential for mercy in Vulgate, Luk., 1:50.
\textsuperscript{351} Vulgate, Ps., 3:2-8 and Luk., 1:50.
\textsuperscript{352} Vulgate, Ps., 3:2-8.
\textsuperscript{353} Vulgate, Luk., 1:50.
the disciples before they could acknowledge and fully believe in God,\(^{354}\) Luke’s Gospel shows that this fear could have the opposite effect instead. The fear of God, like everything else, is a fear with unintentional consequences. Rather than persuading the villagers of Gerasenes to accept Christ, it initially causes them to reject Him instead.\(^{355}\) Only after further news of His miracles reaches them, do they tentatively receive Him.\(^{356}\) The differences in the views of the fear of God that appear in across the *Vulgate* are as significant as the similarities. They indicate that, even at its biblical roots, the fear of God has multiple and sometimes conflicting ideas regarding its role in the Christian life. It was this already well-developed understanding of the fear of God, as a multifarious and complex fear, which formed the foundation stone from which the earliest theologians in Gaul drew for their own views.

1.3. *The Fear of God in Gaul during the Middle of the Fourth Century*

In the fourth century the political fractures that would eventually culminate in the ‘accidental suicide’ of the Roman Empire, and the division of the region into the barbarian kingdoms during the fifth and sixth centuries, started to occur.\(^{357}\) Alongside these political fractures, religious turmoil emerged as Christian followers began trying to establish their foundational orthodoxy following the emperor Constantine’s growing support for the religion and eventual conversion in 312.\(^{358}\) Set within this tumultuous background, I argue that the writings of Hilary of Poitiers suggest that the contemporary attitude to the fear of God was characterised by diversity. They show that various ‘Christian’ thinkers sought to negotiate and renegotiate their views on the purposes of this fear to align with, and argue for, their own perceptions on what the precepts of Christian orthodoxy and orthopraxy should be. The fear of God was a debatable aspect of Christian doctrine in this period and it was used by bishops as a vehicle to debate larger, more fundamental theological issues.

\(^{355}\) *Vulgate*, Luk., 8:35-37.  
\(^{356}\) *Vulgate*, Luk., 8:40.  
Hilary’s *Letter to Constantius* (delivered November/December 359), and his second narrative accompaniment to book one of *Against Valens and Ursacius* (356), demonstrate that the fear of God was considered to be a useful tool for navigating political and religious discourse. In his *Letter to Constantius*, Hilary attempts to use his own fear of God’s judgement, in conjunction with the fear of the world’s peril, to persuade Constantius to support the Nicene Creed and return to the simpler version of the faith by publicly abandoning the more complicated and ever-growing new doctrinal precepts. In his *exordium*, Hilary declares:

‘But now, because I fear that the world is in danger from the judgement of God on account of my silence…’

Here, he uses the fear of God as part of a persuasive technique hoping to remind Constantius that as Emperor he also ought to fear bringing God’s judgement down upon himself as well as the world. Furthermore, in his narrative accompaniment to the first book of *Against Valens and Ursacius*, Hilary condemns the Arians for tricking the emperor into following their views by acting under the ‘appearance’ of the fear of God:

‘…by the authority of their own name they [the Arians] lead an upright Emperor into error, so that under the guise of the fear of God, they surrender themselves to this perversity.’

In this passage, Hilary accuses the Arians of effectively doing exactly what he had done in his address to Constantius: using the fear of God as part of a persuasive technique in order to secure a desired outcome.
Both of these texts were written during and about what has been termed the Arian or Trinitarian Controversy (roughly c.318-381).\textsuperscript{361} The Arian Controversy, if indeed it can be called that, was formed from a series of conflicts which arose between theologians over several of the fundamental foundations of Christian doctrine, one of which was the precise nature of the relationship between God the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{362} Hilary’s own deployment of the fear of God in his oration to Constantius II, coupled with his accusation that the Arians were guilty of doing the same, illustrates that he and his Arian rivals were content to use the fear of God as a way to advertise and persuade their audience to follow their religious perspectives amidst the confusion. In the political and religious turbulence of the fourth century, the fear of God was a fear that was deployed as part of a rhetorical technique in debating issues central to Christian orthodoxy.

Ali Bonner has already pointed out that fourth and fifth Christian writers were willing to use rhetoric as an effective means to further their own views while discrediting those who maintained alternative interpretations.\textsuperscript{363} Pelagius fell victim to just such a practice.\textsuperscript{364} Of the fourteen tenets for which he was eventually convicted of being a heretic, Pelagius only ever taught half of one of them.\textsuperscript{365} ‘Pelagianism’, Bonner convincingly argues, was a made up doctrine generated by those who wanted to steer Christian anthropological views on God’s grace and human free will towards a binary model.\textsuperscript{366} Bonner’s arguments on Pelagius are important context for the following section, but the argument that fourth and fifth-century Christian writers were content to use rhetoric as a means to push forward their own views at the expense of others, is also significant here. Hilary of Poitiers’ use of the fear of God in his letter to Constantius II

\textsuperscript{361} The term ‘Arian Controversy’ was problematised by Hanson who argued that it was misnomer for the series of doctrinal uncertainties, controversies and debates that arose. Hanson, The Search, xvii-xxi. Also, Ayers, Nicaea and Its Legacy, 13-14. More recent scholarship now commonly refers to this tumult as the ‘Trinitarian Controversy’ for example Janel Abogado, Hilary of Poitiers On Conciliating the Homousians and the Homoeousians: An Inquiry on the Fourth-Century Trinitarian Controversy (Bern: Peter Lang, 2016), but this has also been cautioned against since the controversies are now recognised to have revolved more around how one ought to read the Bible, rather than being confined to strictly Trinitarian or Christological issues. Ayres, Nicaea and Its Legacy, 3.

\textsuperscript{362} For a basic outline of the dispute see Rousseau, Early Christian Centuries, 220-234. Also, Wickham, ‘Introduction,’ xv-xxii. For a more complex but thorough outline of the issues at stake during this period see Ayers, Nicaea and Its Legacy, 13-259.


\textsuperscript{364} Bonner, Myth of Pelagianism, 27.

\textsuperscript{365} Bonner, Myth of Pelagianism, 1-27.

\textsuperscript{366} Bonner, Myth of Pelagianism, xi-xvii and 27.
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and in his discreditation of the Arians in Against Valens, shows clearly that the practice of using rhetoric to
discredit alternative interpretations of Scripture was already in use before Pelagius fell victim to it.

Hilary’s second narrative text to his first book of Against Valens is notable, partly because it shows that the
fear of God was a debatable aspect of Christian doctrine in this period, and partly because it provides a
clear example to show that Nicene Christians were using rhetoric as a tool to shape the tenets of Christianity
before the catastrophe with Pelagius. In this narrative accompaniment, Hilary begins by establishing his
own position that God, in accordance with Scripture, did not wish to be learned of by any means of
coercion. He then reports that among the followers of Arius, ‘priests are compelled by chains [and]
ordered by punishments, to fear God.’ His report does two things. First it parallels the practical aspects
of Arian orthopraxy against the wishes of God, the Christian perspective, and the Roman sense of integrity
which Hilary sought to champion. On the surface, Hilary’s words create a clear divide between the methods
by which a person could and should acquire the fear of God and indicate that he perceived there to be a
‘right’ and a ‘wrong’ way by which this fear should be taught and instilled in people. On a deeper level,
Hilary can also be seen to be playing on the cultural tradition of shame that was embedded into the Roman
understanding of authority. In Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family, Richard Saller argues that in
Roman society, the whip carried connotations of deep shame for anyone that was not a Roman slave.
Being whipped or receiving a corporal beating was ‘the grossest form of invasion’ of the personal sphere.
When read in this light, Hilary’s reference to the Arians’ use of chains and punishments to persuade people
to fear God takes on a new meaning. Any Roman reading Against Valens would have found the notion of
being whipped appalling. By condemning the Arians’ use of whips to persuade people to fear God, Hilary
simultaneously portrayed the Arians as violators of the Roman sense of person and advocated Catholic
Christianity, which did not do this, as being the better religion. By effectively declaring that his Christianity
did not shame people into believing in it, Hilary can be seen to be using rhetoric to condemn the Arian’s

367 Hil., of Poit., Text., Narrat., CSEL, Vol. 65, 2.1, p. 185 (3-15); ‘Against Valens,’ 1.11.1, p. 67. Wickham reorganised
Feder’s structure of Hilary’s texts and as such the verse and section references in Wickham’s translation do not
 correspond to those found in Feder’s edition.
368 ‘at vero quid istud est, quod sacerdotes timere deum vinculis coguntur, poenis iubentur?’ Hil., of Poit., Text., Narrat., CSEL, Vol.
65, 2.1, p. 185 (13-15); ‘Against Valens,’ 1.11.1, p. 67.
369 Richard P. Saller, Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994),
133-136.
370 Saller, Patriarchy, 136.
alternative interpretation of Scripture, specifically with regard to the fear of God, as a violation of the Roman sense of self.

Secondly, Hilary’s accusation also shows that the concept of fear of God in early Christian doctrine was still very fluid. His contrast between the practices of Arius’ followers and those maintained by their Nicene counterparts, denotes that there was a lack of consensus over the acceptable means by which people could and should learn about the fear of God. In this way, Hilary of Poitiers’ works suggest that the fear of God was regarded as a focus for episcopal debate over fundamental issues of Christian orthodoxy, and that it was itself a debatable doctrinal element in Gallic thinking during the middle of the fourth century.

1.4. The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century

In this section, I argue that the theological discourse that shaped the Gallic attitudes to the fear of God from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, shows that while traces of agreement were beginning to emerge, as ideas about the nature and roles of the fear of God in the Christian life expanded and became more intricate, a large degree of variety remained in the contemporary attitude towards the role of this fear in the formation of the good Christian self and society. This is something which past scholarship, as far as I am aware, has yet to realise. Yet this is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it highlights just how gradual and fractious the transformation of Roman cultural and philosophical notions of paideia and the formation of the self into Christian paideia truly was. Simultaneously, it also shows that it is difficult for scholars to speak of the existence of a determined theological outlook on Christianity and what made Christian self in this period. Strands of consensus were beginning to emerge, but debate and disagreement continued to haunt these issues.

The disputes over the consubstantial nature of the Trinity that had littered the theological texts in the time of Hilary of Poitiers had not ceased by the time that Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, John Cassian, Prosper of Aquitaine, and Sulpicius Severus came to construct their respective works. But other elements of Christian anthropology and soteriology, such as the role of prevenient grace, free will, and the attainment

---

371 Gregory of Tours was still debating the coequal nature of the Trinity with Arians in the late sixth century. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.43, pp. 249-252 and 6.40, pp. 310-313. He discusses the differences between the Arian and Catholic Christian views on the Trinity in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.3, pp. 40-45; 3.Pref., pp. 96-97, and 3.31, p. 127.
of bodily and spiritual perfection, also became focal points of deliberation. The various treatises of Augustine, Cassian, Prosper, and Sulpicius, frame and are set within this context. The writings of these men show that they each maintained different views on these topics and, in some cases, different views throughout their lifetimes. They also responded varyingly to the notion of ‘Pelagianism’; a concept which Ali Bonner argues was fabricated by those theologians who wanted to stem the variety of opinions that had existed in relation to the role of grace and free will in human salvation. A comparative analysis of the perceptions of the fear of God maintained by these men, reveals that while diversity continued to pervade the late antique comprehension and interpretations of the fear of God, elements of harmony began to emerge.

While the various treatises of Bishop Augustine of Hippo might be considered to more accurately reflect the views of the Christian Church in Africa rather than in Gaul, the scale of influence that Augustine would exert on the theological literature of fifth and sixth-century Gaul is almost immeasurable. Any study of how the chief developers of the Christian Church in Gaul thought about the fear of God, must contextualise this within the views of Augustine. The City of God, On Christian Doctrine, and The Trinity, show that Augustine considered the fear of God to be a duplex fear. Put very simply, Augustine believed that there were two types of fear of God. The first was the “beginning of wisdom” which served to guide people to Christ.

---


374 Daniel McCann has recently noted that the fear of God was also perceived to have dual aspects in early eastern Patristic literature. McCann’s footnotes show that he identified that Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianus and Clement of Alexandria’s works did put forward ‘two categories’ of the fear of God; one revolving around punishment and the other linked with an aversion to sin. However, McCann does not explore this in depth or examine why it developed and became important. Instead he moves swiftly to discuss the five categories of the fear of God, which Peter Lombard developed in the twelfth century, and argues that these were viewed as a ‘therapeutic treatment’ for the soul. Daniel McCann, ‘Dreadful Health: Fear and ‘Sowle-hel’ in The Prickynge of Love,’ in Fear in the Medical and Literary Imagination, Medieval to Modern: Dreadful Passions, ed. Daniel McCann and Claire McKechnie-Mason (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 22-28.
by initiating the seven steps to Wisdom or Christ. In Augustine's perspective the first fear of God could do this because it produced three different fears within a person: the fear of God's judgement, the fear of His power to punish the soul and body, and the fear of Hell or Gehenna. Together these three made up the first fear of God which had the 'inevitable' purpose of causing people to reflect upon death and the judgement that awaited thereafter. Reflecting on these fears, which were given to man by God, was thought to inspire people to want to be pious, to gain knowledge of how to live a saintly life, and avoid being punished by God. The second fear of God, that which was ‘pure’ or ‘sacred’ (castus), served to help those who had progressed from the first fear of God to the caritas or love of God, to preserve that love which would help them attain salvation. It was able to do this because, unlike the first fear of God, this fear could only be experienced by someone who was in the perfect love of God. Since it was founded upon love, rather than the threat of judgement, punishment, and Hell, the second fear of God encouraged people to preserve their goodness and thus their love of God. The connection between the second ‘chaste fear’ of God with the love of God also enabled it to accompany the love of God beyond mortal death and into the next world.

Augustine's duplex fear of God, which seems to have been based on the theological views of Clement of Alexandria and to have its roots in the wider Roman cultural attitudes towards people in power, was also


376 ‘timor autem iste cogitationem de nostra mortalitate et de futura morte necesse est incutiat et quasi clauatis carnibus omnes superbiae motus ligno crucis affigat.’ Aug., De Doc., LLTA, lib. 2, cap. 7, lin. 3; 'Christian Instruction,' 2.7.9, p. 66.

377 'cum vero iudex uiuorum atque mortuorum exspectatur e caelo, magnum timorem incutit neglegentibus, ut se ad diligentiam conuertant eum que magis bene agendo desiderent, quam male agendo formident.' Aug., De Doc., LLTA, lib. 1, cap. 15, lin. 6; 'Christian Instruction,' 1.15.14, p. 38.


381 The seeds for Augustine’s duplex fear of God can be found in Clement’s Stromateis. Clement maintains a slightly different perspective to Augustine since, for him, faith introduces the fear of God not the other way around. However, the fear of God is still considered the teacher of God’s law, so while it does not start a person on the path to faith it is the thing that keeps them on it. Clement also states that the fear of God that is itself free from all passions is also regarded as a fear of losing God and falling back into evil. Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, Books One to Three, trans. John Ferguson (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991), 2.4.3-5, p. 159; 2.6.30-31, p. 179; 2.7.32-35, pp. 180-182 and 2.8.40, pp. 185-186. Simo Knuutila, Emotions in Ancient Medieval Philosophy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), 150, n. 138. The notion that a ruler ought to be both feared and loved, though preferably the latter, was also widely acknowledged in the literature and law of the Classical and late Roman world. Although this
maintained by John Cassian who, like Augustine, also composed his works in response to the ongoing theological debate on perfectionism, human nature, and salvation. Cassian notably expanded the division between the two fears of God by considering their workings, worth, and association with perfection in the eleventh part of his *Conferences*. In his portrayal of the first fear of God, Cassian depicts it as a salutary but servile fear, incited by the fear of punishment in Hell or Gehenna. In this Cassian aligns with Augustine. Where he subsequently breaks from him is in his declaration that this fear of God is not the only thing to restrain people from vice. Hope, the desire for the kingdom of God, the love of virtue, and predisposition to goodness also work alongside the first fear of God to deter people from committing evil. Thus while Augustine and Cassian both thought that first fear of God served to aid beginners on the path to God, for the latter this was not the only thing which brought people onto that path.

Like Augustine, Cassian also distinguishes the second fear of God from the first by its attachment to the love of God and its orientation. Describing the second fear of God, Cassian states that it is:

‘the sublime fear of love... which is not born of the terror of punishments nor the love of rewards but of great love. It is with this affection that the son reveres his most indulgent father or a brother, his brother or a friend, his friend or a spouse and their spouse. In this time, he does not fear strikes or insults, but rather he fears the slightest offense [against] love...’

ancient political theory does not map onto the ‘duplex fear of God’ system directly, it was used by Augustine and Benedict in their monastic *regula*. Since Roman law also upheld that masters, magistrates, and those in power ought to be feared by those beneath their status, this notion of fearing a lord or master would have shaped any educated Roman person’s general understanding of fear and their concept of the role that fear ought to play in all social and political relationships be they between people or between people and a divine being. On fear and love in ancient political theory see Karl Gross, ‘Plus amari quam timeri. Eine antike politische Maxime in der Benediktinerregel,’ *Vigiliae Christianae* 27, no. 3 (1973): 218-228. On fear in Roman law see Jill Harries, *Law and Crime in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), esp. 37, 41, 107-109 and 120 and Jill Harries, *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 118, 122-133 and esp. 144-150.

386 ‘sublimiorem caritatis timorem...quem non poenarum terror nec cupidio praemiorum, sed amoris generat magnitude, quo vel filius indulgentissimum patrem vel frater fratrem vel amicum amicis vel coniugem coniunx sollicito reverter atfectu, dum  eiusmod non verbere neque conuidit, sed vel tenuum amoris formidat offensam...’ Cass., *Collat.*, CSEL, Vol. 13, XI.XIII.1, p. 329 (2-8); *Conf.*, 11.13.1. pp. 419-420.
By comparing the second fear of God to the fear of causing a loved-one offense, Cassian indicates that he regarded this fear of God to have a different orientation from its initial counterpart. Instead of fearing God's punishment or Hell, the second fear of God is orientated towards making a person fear that they would cause God offence and thereby damage the relationship and love that had developed between themselves and Him. By stimulating this fear, the second fear of God encouraged people to preserve their love of God, a view maintained by Augustine.

After this, Cassian breaks into new territory. He distinguishes the second fear of God from the first by its value. In the Conference with Chaeremon, Cassian has the abba say:

> ‘One of the prophets elegantly expressed the richness of this [second] fear when he said: “Wisdom and knowledge are the riches of salvation: the fear of the Lord is his treasure.”’

Cassian explains that this means that the second fear of the Lord is extremely valuable because any holy riches, wisdom, and knowledge that a person had already acquired would not be preserved without it. He subsequently contrasts the words of the prophet: “Fear the Lord, all holy ones of him, for nothing is lacking to him who fears Him with this fear”, with those of the apostle John: “He who fears is not perfect in love, since fear has punishment.” He explains that the difference between the two is that the prophet refers to the second fear of God which is the treasure of wisdom and knowledge. The apostle John, on the other hand, refers to the fear of punishment and the fear of God. The second fear of God is thus worth more because those who have it would not lack wisdom and knowledge. The first fear of God does not guarantee perseverance in such wisdom. Cassian thus distinguishes the second fear of God from the

---

first by its greater worth and shows that his theology of this fear developed, at least in part, from how he thought the Bible divided it.

Cassian’s eagerness to prioritize the greater worth of second fear of God might also partly derive from his views concerning perfection in monastic orthopraxy. In his eyes, perfection had several stages as opposed to one ultimate state.393 Like Augustine, Cassian did not consider complete perfection attainable.394 For this reason, he perceived imperfection to be tolerable so long as the person was not complacent in their monastic zeal.395

The unattainability of complete perfection has ramifications for Cassian’s attitude towards the role of the second fear of God in the ascetic life. In order to progress to the love of God, a person must first be perfect in the first fear of God.396 This was one type of perfection, but Cassian perceived that there were several others:

‘Therefore, the divine word has somehow established different ranks and different measures of perfection…You see therefore, [that] there are different degrees of perfection and thus we are summoned by the Lord to go from the heights to still higher places, so that one who has become blessed and perfect in the fear of God and proceeds as it is written “from virtue to virtue” and from one perfection to another perfection, that is ascending with a liveliness of mind from fear to hope, is invited again to a blessed state, that is love...’397

Given that there were multiple ranks of perfection, it is possible that Cassian considered the love of God to be the highest stage of perfection attainable, rather than the viewing it as a sign of complete perfection. The result of this is that Cassian holds the second fear of God to be of greater value than its

395 Casiday, Tradition and Theology, 173-174.
397 ‘...et ideo ipsarum quodammodo perfectionum diversos ordines diversasque mensuras sermo divinus instituit... Videtis ergo perfectionum gradus esse diversos et de excelsis ad excelsiora nos a domino provocari ita, ut is qui in timore dei beatus et perfectus excitetur, ambulans sicut scriptum est de virtute in virtutem et de perfectione ad aliam perfectionem, id est de timore ad spem mentis alacritate conscendens, ad beatiorum deum statum, quod est caritas, invitetur...’ Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, XI.XII.1, p. 326 (15-17) and XI.XII.5, p. 327 (16-23); Conf., 11.12.1. p. 418 and 11.12.5. p. 418. Biblical quote from Vulgate, Ps., 83:8.
counterpart, because it preserves that love and the highest state of perfection which the monk has striven for. Cassian’s ascription of worth to the second fear of God stems partially from his theology on the attainability of perfection within the monastic lifestyle.

The remaining distinguishing feature of Cassian’s second fear of God was its perfect nature. Like Augustine, Cassian describes that when the second fear of the Lord emerges, it clings to the everlasting perfect love of God. Expanding on this, he writes:

'It is not diminished by the delights of temporal joy or pleasure, which sometimes happens to that fear which is accustomed to be cast out.'

Consequently, it appears that Cassian regarded the second fear of God as perfect in its nature because it was stronger than the first fear of God. Indeed, owing to its nature as servile fear, Cassian characterised the first fear of God as both fragile and imperfect. His perception that the second fear of God was perfect, ties in with its connection to the everlasting love of God, the highest state of perfection potentially achievable. If a person was able to reach that stage of perfection and able to perfect their love of God, then any other affections (‘emotions’ orientated more towards reason and goodness) which they experienced while being in that state of perfection, would be governed by the love of God and become imbued with a perfect nature because of that. It is important to distinguish here that, for Cassian, it is the love and second fear of God which has the perfect nature. The persons themselves are perfect in the sense that they have reached the stage of perfecting the love of God, yet it is not they, but rather the love of God and its accompanying fear, which are completely perfect.

---

The views expressed by Cassian in his eleventh conference demonstrate that there were strands of consensus emerging relating to the nature and role of the fear of God. Cassian broadly follows Augustine in dividing this fear according to whether a person experiences it in relation to the love of God or fear of His punishment. But his eleventh conference also expands on this distinction in ways that Augustine’s works do not. Furthermore, the Institutes and other Conferences also demonstrate that Cassian envisaged and understood the fear of God in ways that Augustine did not. Other notable aspects of Cassian’s view of this fear include: the fear of God as a weight by which the thoughts of the mind and heart should be measured,\footnote{Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, I.XXI.2, p. 33 (9-22); Conf., 1.21.2. p. 62.} the fear of God as a metaphorical cross on which the Christian was tested by the fears of pain and death,\footnote{Cass., Instit., CSEL, Vol. 17, IIII.XXXV, p. 72 (22); The Institutes, trans. Boniface Ramsey (New York: The Newman Press, 2000), 4.35, pp. 97-98. *References to Ramsey’s volume cite book, section and page numbers in order. References to Petschenig’s CSEL edition cite book, section, page and line numbers in order.} and the fear of God as God’s gift to mankind in order that they might attain salvation.\footnote{Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, III.XVIII-XVIII, pp. 90-91; Conf., 3.18-19. pp. 136.} Cassian’s expansion on the factors separating the two types of fear of God, coupled with the multitude of other ways in which he depicts it, testifies to the diversity and freedom that was available to late antique Gallic thinkers seeking to explain this fear.

The last two facets of Cassian’s portrait of the fear of God merit especial note because they align with the views of Prosper of Aquitaine. Prosper, like Cassian, also interpreted and depicted the fear of God in a variety of forms. For him the fear of God was both a second heart\footnote{Prosp., of Aquit., De Voc., PL. Vol. 51, LIX, col., 0658C, col., 0659B, col., 0660A and LXXIV, col., 0680B-0680C; The Call of All Nations, trans. P. D. Letter (London: The Newman Press, 1952), 1.9, pp. 42-45 and 1.24, pp. 78-79. *References to Migne’s volume cite book, chapter and column reference in order.} and the beginning of the path to wisdom.\footnote{Prosp., of Aquit., De Voc., PL. Vol. 51, II.XXVII, col. 0712A-0712B; Call of All Nations, 2.27, p. 136.} It was a fear that did not work as fear should since, despite his likening the experience of the fear of God to fright, Prosper states that it neither blocked reason nor inhibited free will.\footnote{Prosp., of Aquit., De Voc., PL. Vol. 51, II.XXVII, col. 0712A-0712B; Call of All Nations, 2.27, p. 136.} It also had two roles in the reception and maintenance of God’s grace and might even have been considered to be a grace
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of God itself. Yet for all their differences over the role that grace and free will had in Christian doctrine, Prosper and Cassian align in their shared recognition that the fear of God was both a gift by God to mankind and a fear which would itself be tested by fear.

In his third Conference, Cassian teaches that the monk can achieve a degree of perfection through their diligence in the fear of God. He quotes the prophet Jeremiah who states:

“And I [God] will give them one heart and one path so that they may fear me for all days and it shall be well with them and with their children after them.”

The fear of God is thus a part of the goodwill bestowed to mankind by God. It is, or should be interpreted as, a gift from God sent to enable humans to move towards salvation. The quotation from Jeremiah is also cited by Prosper of Aquitaine who, in chapters nine and twenty-four of his first book of The Call of All Nations, refers four times to the fear of God as either a heart or a gift bestowed to mankind by God. For both Prosper and Cassian, the perception of the fear of God as a gift is a shared one that derives from the Bible.

Discussing the testing of the fear of God in the fourth book of the Institutes, Cassian quotes the Book of Jeremiah when he states that to serve God a renunciant must: “remain in the fear of God and prepare [their] soul” not for peace or security or pleasure but “for trials and tribulations”.

409 This is a very tentative might. The only logical way to justify the conflicting portrait of Prosper’s fear of God, as one that both preceded the grace of God but was also instituted after a person received God’s grace, is to assume that the fear of God had two roles. It was both a grace, which introduced wisdom to a person and thus preceded the grace of God, and a means by which people were pushed to submit to that grace once they received it. The fear of God introduced grace through wisdom and then served to maintain a person’s adherence to it.


411 Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, III.V.4, p. 78 (3-4); Cassian, Conf., 3.5.4. p. 123.


indicates his belief that a person’s willingness to abide by the discipline instilled by the fear of God would be, in accordance with Scriptural teaching, tested by trials and tribulations. Significantly, in the same book, Cassian then portrays the fear of God as a cross upon which people could be crucified. Here, Cassian’s view of the fear of God resembles Augustine’s. If the two statements are compared, it becomes apparent that both men saw the fear of God as a cross on which people could be tested specifically by their rejection of vices.

Augustine: ‘and by it [the fear of God] all motions of pride are affixed to the wood of the cross, just as the flesh is fastened with nails.’

Cassian: ‘…so that, in accordance with the words of David, by fixing our flesh in the fear of the Lord, we may have all our desires and demands fixed to his death and not be subservient to our concupiscence…it behoves us who have been crucified by the fear of the Lord to have died to all these things, that is not only to fleshly vices but truly to every [worldly] substance as well, and to have the eyes of our soul fastened to that place which we hope we are destined to go every moment.’

The metaphor of the fear of God as a cross shows that, like Augustine, Cassian also typifies this fear as something which was to be tested. Yet in likening the fear of God to the cross on which Christ faced the tests of pain and death, Cassian can also be seen to align with Prosper in perceiving this fear to be something which was itself tested by fear. By associating the fear of God with the cross, Cassian attaches it to the tests of physical pain and death that inevitably accompany crucifixion. Death and pain were recognised causes of fear in mankind, Christ being the exception to this rule according to the Christology of Hilary of Poitiers and Augustine. By synonymising the test of the fear of God with an event that would have induced fears

417 ‘ut se libet secundum David adjigentes de timore domini carnes nostras universas voluntates ac desideria non nostrae concupiscientiae servantia, sed mortificationi eius habeamus addicis…ita nos quoque timore domini crucis maximam opus hunc omnibus, id est non solum carnalibus vitis, verum etiam ipsis elementis mortuas eos, illie habentes sculps animae nostrae deficis, quo nos sperare debemus momentis singulis migraturos.’ Cass., Instit., CSEL, Vol. 17, III.XXXXIII-XXXV, pp. 72-73. (14-17, 6-10); Institutes, 4.34-35, pp. 97-98.
418 Hilary accepted that Christ could experience sadness but staunchly denied the possibility that Christ experienced any fear in relation to the Passion. Hil., of Poit., De Trin., LLTA, SL 62A, lib. 10, cap. 9-34; The Trinity, trans. Stephen McKenna (New York: Fathers of the Church Inc., 1954), 10.9-34, pp. 406-423. *References to McKenna cite book, chapter, and page number in order. Augustine, unlike Hilary, does not actively discuss the matter. He does, however, notably not list fear as one of affections that Christ experienced during His time on earth. This omission could be interpreted as a silent acceptance of Hilary’s earlier view that Christ did not experience fear or it could indicate that
of physical pain and death, at least in mortal humans, Cassian’s metaphor suggests that he thought that a person’s willingness to remain in the fear of God was tested by fear.

In *The Call of All Nations*, Prosper also declares that a person’s constancy in holding to their fear of God, and thus God Himself, would be tested by fear.\(^{419}\) Unlike Cassian and Augustine, Prosper chooses to explore this notion through the example set by the Apostle Peter in the Gospel of Mark. In Mark 14, Peter became so terrified by the questions and remarks of a serving girl after Christ’s arrest that, despite having promised to die for Christ, he denounced Him three times as Christ had predicted he would.\(^{420}\) In Prosper’s perspective, the fear that tests Peter here is that of being identified as a follower of Christ who was facing trial at that time.\(^{421}\) Peter’s fear is thus indirectly connected with the pain or death that he might have faced if he was revealed to be one of Christ’s disciples at that particular moment. The example is included by Prosper to show that Peter’s fear, love, and constancy in God were all tested by his fear of worldly judgement and, possibly, his fear of pain and death. Thus, while Prosper and Cassian differ in their perceptions of how the fear of God would be tested, they share the view that a person’s willingness to live by the fear of God, and the faith and love of God which it inspired, was tested and tested by fear.

The letters of Sulpicius Severus (363-420s), suggest that while some of his perceptions of the fear of God are similar to those of Cassian and Augustine, others are subtly different. The start of his letter to the deacon Aurelius suggests that Sulpicius considered the fear of God to have two components. He writes:

> ‘After you departed from me in the morning, I was residing alone in my cell and occupying my thoughts was that which I often deliberated; the hope of the future and disgust of the present, the fear of judgement and terror of punishment. The consequence [of this] was that all thoughts descended from there to the recollection of my sins which made and rendered me sad.’\(^{422}\)

---

\(^{419}\) Prosp., of Aquit., *De Voc.*, PL, Vol. 51, II.XXVIII, col., 0713C-0714C; *Call of All Nations*, 2.28, pp. 139-140.

\(^{420}\) Prosp., of Aquit., *De Voc.*, PL, Vol. 51, II.XXVIII, col., 0713C; *Call of All Nations*, 2.28, pp. 139-140. Also, Vulgate, Mrk., 14:66-72.

\(^{421}\) Vulgate, Mrk., 14:53-65.
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Here Sulpicius makes a notable linguistic distinction when recounting his own experience of the fear of God, stating that he felt ‘the fear of judgement and the terror of punishment’. The distinction between the fear of judgement (iudicii metus) and the terror of punishment (formido poenarum) is interesting. It suggests that Sulpicius might have understood the fear of God to be comprised of two parts: the fear of God’s judgement and the terror of God’s punishment. Within that distinction, Sulpicius might also have perceived the fear of God to have varying degrees of intensity depending on the specific aspect of it that was being felt.

Although it might seem odd for Sulpicius to separate the fear of God’s judgement from the fear of God’s punishment, especially since the two are bound together in Augustine and Cassian’s depictions of the first fear of God, the distinction might not be entirely illogical. Generally, if a person has reason to fear God’s judgement it is because they fear that the outcome is likely to end in punishment. But it is possible that Sulpicius might not have considered God’s judgement to automatically equate with punishment. The notion of God’s punishment, much like the notion of being punished by late Roman law, was terror-inspiring in its own right. But the judgement process, which might itself be something worth fearing, did not necessarily have to result in punishment. It could result in reward and the attainment of salvation. Here it is also worth remembering that Sulpicius’ Life of Saint Martin, written while Martin was still alive, depicts God’s power as being active on earth amongst the living. Sulpicius was very aware that one did not necessarily have to be dead and facing their judgement in order to receive punishment from God or His servants.

When referring to God’s judgement and His punishment, Sulpicius uses two different fearing-terms. This could simply be a result of Sulpicius’ desire to vary his vocabulary and demonstrate literary prowess.
to his friend. But if the meaning of the two terms is looked at more closely then, assuming that the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Lewis and Short dictionary, and database of William Whittaker are reliable in their definitions, an interesting point arises. Sulpicius uses *metus* to refer to God’s judgement and *formido* to refer to God’s punishment. *Metus* signifies fear whereas *formido* signifies fear of a greater intensity, leaning towards terror.\footnote{Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Vol. 6, (Leipzig: B. G. Teubneri, 1912-1926) s.v. ‘formido’ col. 1099. Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Vol. 8, (Leipzig: B. G. Teubneri, 1936-1966) s.v. ‘metus’ col. 901-912. Lewis and Short, New Latin Dictionary, s.v. ‘metus’ and ‘formido’. See entries for ‘metus’ and ‘formido’ in Whittaker, William Whittaker’s Words, accessed February, 2017. http://archives.nd.edu/words.html.} If the theory that Sulpicius did not automatically equate being judged by God with being punished by God is considered, then Sulpicius might be seen to be cleverly employing his fear-vocabulary to denote this distinction. God’s judgement is always something to fear, but He may judge in a person’s favour like He does for Martin. God’s punishment on the other hand is something to fear more acutely because of its ramifications (Hell, the Devil, demons, etc). With all this in mind it is possible to suggest that Sulpicius might have considered what Cassian and Augustine regarded collectively as the first fear of God, to be divided into two separable, though still connected, components: the fear of God’s judgement and the fear of His punishment.

While Sulpicius does not divide the fear of God in the same manner as Cassian and Augustine, with the former perceiving the fear of God to have two *parts* and the latter perceiving there to be two *types* of the fear of God, Sulpicius, Augustine, and Cassian all share the perception that the fear of God is not a simple, unitary type of fear.

Of final note is that Sulpicius declares to Aurelius that the fear of judgement and the terror of punishment were feelings that he had ‘often undergone’ while sitting in his cell. His admission is notable because it suggests that Sulpicius, like Cassian, also thought that the fear of God should consistently occupy the mind of the contemplative monk. In the first of his *Conferences*, Cassian equated the fear of God with a weight on a moneychanger’s scale. Whenever a monk had a thought they were supposed to weigh it like a moneychanger and assess whether it was filled with the appropriate level of common goodness, integral meaning, and fear of God.\footnote{Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, I.XXI.2, p. 33 (9-22); Conf., 1.21.2. p. 62.} Since Cassian states that the monk was supposed to perform this process whenever a thought occurred in their minds or hearts, it is likely that he thought that the fear of God needed
to be both actively used and constantly present in monastic contemplation. Although Sulpicius does not indicate that he used the fear of God to assess the appropriateness of his thoughts, he does acknowledge that the fear of God’s judgement and punishment were feelings that had ‘often’ occupied his thoughts. Consequently, it is possible to suggest that both Sulpicius and Cassian similarly considered the fear of God to be something that should be consistently present in the mind of a contemplative monk and, consequently, a technique in the care of the self.

Combined, the individual accounts of these four fourth-to-fifth-century authors illustrate that strands of consensus about the nature and purposes of the fear of God began to emerge in this period. Traces of agreement can be found in the works of Cassian and Prosper on the perspective that the fear of God is a fear tested by fear and that it is a gift from God to enable mankind to attain salvation. Similarities can also be found between Augustine and Cassian in relation to the idea that the fear of God is a duplex fear. The correlations found between Augustine, Cassian, and Prosper concerning the fear of God are unsurprising, given that the theological precepts of the latter two men owed much to the former. Yet it is important to note that an undeniable scale of variety also exists between the four men’s thoughts of the fear of God. These differences are important because they demonstrate that a substantial amount of freedom remained in relation to how people could interpret this fear in this period. The works of Cassian, Sulpicius, and Prosper show that there was no universal concept of the fear of God in Gaul from the late fourth to middle of the fifth century. Variety, and the liberty to discuss that variety in writing, remained a perpetual characteristic of the concept of the fear of God in this period.

1.5. The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century

In what follows I argue that while the theological discourse that shaped the Gallic Church from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century shows that the fear of God continued to be regarded as a diverse and multifaceted concept, this discourse also reveals that contemporary attitudes to the nature and

---

428 For a detailed discussion of the changing levels of influence that Augustine exerted on Prosper’s theology see Hwang, *Intrepid Lover*, 1-239. For discussion of the theological and Christological relationships between Augustine, Prosper and Cassian see Casiday, *Tradition and Theology*, 6-10 and 17-71. Also, Casiday, ‘Rehabilitating John Cassian,’ 270-284.
role of the fear of God in the Christian life had become more refined as a result of the Gallic clergy’s wider desire to create a stable Christian doctrine.

An analysis of the fear of God in the works of Julianus Pomerius, Paulinus of Périgueux, Caesarius of Arles, and Avitus of Vienne suggests that by the middle of the sixth century, ideas about the nature and roles of the fear of God as a component of Christian theology were affected by a transition which led them to be coalesced and assimilated into a more solidified Church doctrine. In the time between the middle of the fifth and sixth centuries, the theological tradition in Gaul seems to have entered a third transitional phase in its development. During the fourth and fifth centuries, it had been characterised by lively theological debate, as shown by the discussions of grace, predestination, ascetic practice, human nature, and God’s nature. Towards the end of the fifth century and the beginning of the sixth, the Gallic tradition seems to have transmogrified once more, moving from a position in which widespread debate was encouraged to one that operated within much tighter constraints. While it is vital to stress that this movement did not put an end to the importance of theological discussion in the sixth-century Gallic Church, as Gregory’s own theological debates in his Histories aptly illustrate, it did result in more determined outcomes emerging for a variety of theological issues that had previously been hotly debated.

Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood have suggested two reasons why the theological tradition in Gaul became more theologically refined in the sixth century. The first is the theological interest and liberal attitude of the Arian King Gundobad towards Catholicism. According to Wood and Shanzer, the theological questions posed by Gundobad to the Catholic bishops served to highlight the diversity that existed in the early sixth-century Church’s doctrinal views and orthopraxy. This diversity presented ‘something of an embarrassment to the Catholic episcopate, who wished to put on a show of religious unity’ in the hope that this would persuade Gundobad, realising that Catholicism could provide a secure and stable religion for his kingdom, to convert. The second factor is the arrival of Clovis, whose conquests pushed the Gallic bishops to want to present themselves as capable of offering a strong and

---

429 This is suggested in Shanzer and Wood, ‘Introduction,’ 12.
useful religion to the king.\textsuperscript{434} For Christianity to fulfil these requirements, it needed a more stable theological tradition.\textsuperscript{435}

Alongside the reasons postulated by Shanzer and Wood a third factor might also explain why the bishops chose to start consolidating the Catholic theological tradition in this period: fatigue. After a century of lively theological debate, the bishops and wider clergy might have grown tired of factional disagreement and of not having a united and agreed theological tradition which they could use to govern and promote their Church.\textsuperscript{436} Such fatigue might be evidenced by the drop in subscription levels to Church Councils after the Second Council of Orange (529, ratified in 531) which Ralph Mathisen has traced.\textsuperscript{437} The primary issue underpinning the statement of faith that was issued from this Council concerned the role of prevenient grace within Christianity.\textsuperscript{438} Originally, the meeting had been instigated as a dedication ceremony for the basilica constructed by Liberius, but Caesarius of Arles, seeing it as an opportunity to push his views on grace and to clear himself from earlier charges of heresy, turned it into an impromptu Church Council.\textsuperscript{439} The decrease in the number of bishops subscribing to Church Councils in Gaul from seventeen to eleven after Caesarius’ stunt, only increasing to sixteen once he agreed to drop the issue of grace in favour of returning to disciplining bishops for their follies,\textsuperscript{440} suggests that there were members of the Gallic episcopacy who felt that there was no longer a need to debate such an issue and that they were tired of doing so.

The move towards a consolidation of the Gallic theological tradition had an impact on the contemporary comprehensions of the fear of God too. Paulinus of Périgueux (d.476-478) used Sulpicius’ prose \textit{Life of Saint Martin} as the foundation for his own epic versification of Martin’s life just before this transition

\textsuperscript{436} It is worth remembering that the bishops were also trying to persuade groups of people who adhered to the pagan, Arian or Jewish traditions to convert too. The Gallic Catholic Church was growing in strength in this period, but it was far from the only religious option available. Bishops seeking to acquire, increase, or stabilise their spiritual reputations and secular power, started to look for ways to promote Christianity in order to bring this about. For more on factionalism and fifth-century Gallic bishops see Mathisen, \textit{Ecclesiastical Factionalism}, ix-x, xiii-xvi.
\textsuperscript{438} See Mathisen’s translation of this statement, Mathisen, ‘Caesarius of Arles,’ 213-216.
\textsuperscript{439} Mathisen, ‘Caesarius of Arles,’ 212-213, 221.
\textsuperscript{440} Mathisen, ‘Caesarius of Arles,’ 228, 232.
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occurred. Paulinus’ Life of Saint Martin is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, it contains more references to the fear of God than Sulpicius’ original. Secondly, despite Paulinus’ increase in references to the fear of God, his hexametric verse does not provide evidence to suggest that there were any new developments in the Gallic perception of this fear.

Paulinus’ six-book poem indicates that he perceived the fear of God to enable saints to overcome the fears invoked by demons. While Paulinus’ specificity in stating that the fear of God allowed Martin to overcome a demon is different from Sulpicius’ account, in which this fear is shown to protect Martin from a pagan rather than a demon, the broader representation of the fear of God as a thing which protects God’s servants from their enemies by helping them maintain their self-control and focus on God in the face of distraction, is traceable in the works of both men.

Alongside this, Paulinus’ Life also shows that he comprehended the fear of God as a fear that should logically transcend all other fears and their causes; something which the infirm were encouraged to profess aloud after they had received miraculous healing and a fear that was invoked in a Christian when their faith was tested in such a way as to demand God’s favourable intervention.

If each of these aspects of Paulinus’ understanding of the fear of God are assessed in relation to the views of the writers already discussed, then it is apparent that no new elements have been added to the perception of the nature and roles of the fear of God in Gallic Christianity during this period. Paulinus’ view that the fear of God ought to transcend all other fears is, for example, traceable in both the Bible and texts of Augustine, Prosper, and Cassian. His perspective that the fear of God was something that people

---

446 In Prosper and the Vulgate the fear of God is stated to be set above all things see Vulgate, Eccles. 25:14 and Prosp., of Aquit., De Voc., PL, Vol 51. LXXIV, col., 0680B-0680C; Call of All Nations, 1.24, pp. 78-79. In Augustine the first fear of God’s punishment should transcend all other worldly things including fear, this fear is itself then replaced by the second and eternal fear of losing God’s love. Aug., De Civ., LLTA, SL 48, lib. 14, cap. 9, lin. 115-145; ‘City of
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should be encouraged to profess after a miraculous healing, has precedent in the Gospel of Luke. 447 The notion that the fear of God was invoked in Christians when their faith was tested in a way that demanded God’s favourable intervention, constitutes a different angle on Prosper, Cassian, and Augustine’s opinion that the fear of God would be tested by pain and death. 448 Although Paulinus does incorporate ideas about the fear of God into his Life of Saint Martin that were not contained in Sulpicius’ original, for example the notion that saints used the fear of God to protect themselves from their enemies, 449 he does not present new concepts about this fear in his work. Thus, while Paulinus’ poetical Life of Saint Martin demonstrates that Christian writers in late fifth-century Gaul continued to regard the fear of God as a fear with multiple uses, it does not contain any radical additions which could suggest that the nature and roles of fear of God were still being debated in Gallic theological literature.

Julianus Pomerius’ treatise On the Contemplative Life, written during the late fifth or early sixth century, also provides no evidence to indicate that there was an interest in advancing the concept of the fear of God in the theological literature produced in Gaul during this period. Julianus primarily discusses this fear in the third book of his Contemplative Life. In chapter thirty-one he argues that fear, as one of four principal affections including grief, desire, and joy, was not itself evil or bad. 450 Fear was classed as a transgression when used inappropriately, but if it was used in support of God it was a virtue. 451 For Julianus, fear could not be evil because of the fear of God. 452

According to Julianus there were two kinds of the fear of God: the fear of punishment which holds man in good against their will, and the fear of losing the good in which a person had come to delight which grew

448 See Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.
out of an increase in charity. Here, Julianus undoubtedly draws on the ‘duplex fear of God theory’ as explained by both Augustine and Cassian. Like them, he perceives the fear of God to have two types: that which keeps a man on the path to God, the fear of penal punishment, and that which keeps him in goodness, the fear of losing goodness and the love of God. Both these fears are a virtue rather than a disorder, passion, or affliction.

Julianus, born and raised in northern Africa as Augustine had been, was a highly influential rhetorician in Gaul. He became the tutor to Caesarius of Arles, whose views on the fear of God are discussed below, after setting up his own school. The influence that Julianus exerted upon ascetic thinking in Gaul, as well as his use of and interaction with the theological literature produced in this region, are the primary motives explaining his inclusion in this chapter. The presence of the ‘duplex fear of God theory’ in his *Contemplative Life* is important because it shows that this was one notion about the fear of God that had carried through to sixth-century Gaul. Yet it is notable that Julianus never adds to or develops this theory. While he references Augustine’s works for further information, he never attempts to refine or change the ‘duplex fear of God theory’. Instead he settles for disseminating it in a treatise designed to encourage priests and bishops to remember to follow elements of the contemplative life as well. Julianus’ text thus does not add anything new to the Gallic conception of the fear of God. It takes the theories thrashed out in the previous century and attempts to consolidate them within ascetic and episcopal practices of the late fifth to early sixth centuries as Julianus thought of them.

Datable to the same period as Julianus’ *On the Contemplative Life*, the letters of Avitus, Bishop of Vienne (c.490–517/18), show that he regarded the fear of God as a fear which bishops could use to check the

---

456 Pom., *Vita Contemplat.*, PL, Vol. 59, lib. 3, cap. 31.6, col. 0516C-0517C; *Contemplative Life*, 3.31.6, p. 165.
actions of their peers, and any fears they might harbour of worldly monarchs; a perspective that would be notably maintained by Gregory of Tours.

Avitus' homily *On Rogations* highlights his interest in assimilating prior perceptions of the fear of God into the solidifying theological tradition in Gaul. In showing that he thought that this fear ought to be the primary fear within a person and that its use within the parameters of rhetorical practice was acceptable, Avitus aligns with influential predecessors like Hilary of Poitiers, who used the fear of God as part of a persuasive technique in his letter to Constantius II. Since Hilary and Avitus both use the fear of God as a part of rhetorical technique, this indicates that this was one element of the fear of God that had survived from the fourth to the sixth century.

*On Rogations* further demonstrates that Avitus considered the fear of God to be an agent which protected faith. In his description of both faith and the fear of God, Avitus states:

‘Although faith is small because we fear secular things, it is still a considerable amount if we return to the Lord. There would be no fear before him, if he himself were feared.’

---


462 This is evidenced by Avitus’ use of the fear of God and rhetorical questions in: ‘Quis enim in crebris ignibus Sodomites non timere? quis trementibus elementis aut decidua culmina aut disrupta terrarum imminere non credit? quis videns, certe se patiens pavidus naturalet cervos per augusta portarum usque ad fori lata penetrantes non imminentem solitudinis sententiam formidaret?’ Avit., of Vien., Hom., MGH: AA, Vol. 6.2, 6, pp. 109-110 (18-19, 1-3); ‘On Rogations,’ pp. 382-383.

463 For discussion of this see Chapter 1, section 1.3: The Fear of God in Gaul during the Middle of the Fourth Century.

Avitus’ depiction of the fear of the God is significant because it could be seen as a synthesis of the ‘duplex fear of God theory’ maintained by Augustine and Cassian. In the fourth to fifth centuries, Augustine and Cassian had regarded the first and second fear of God as protectors of faith but in different ways. For Augustine, the first fear of God protected a person’s piety by combining with the latter to ensure that the person remained on the path to Christ.\textsuperscript{465} For Cassian, this fear protected a monk’s faith by being both a weight against which all thoughts were to be measured and a cross on which they crucified their vices.\textsuperscript{466} Avitus’ surviving letters do not explicitly indicate that he considered there to be two types of the fear of God, but his poem \textit{On Original Sin} suggests otherwise.

The description of the mental battle which Avitus portrays Eve to undergo between her desire for parity with God and the fear of losing His love, as a result of disobeying His command regarding the fruit of the tree of knowledge, serves as good evidence to show that Avitus knew the ‘duplex fear of God theory’.\textsuperscript{467}

Describing Eve’s fight, Avitus states:

\begin{quote}
‘opposites seized the mind, love from here, fear thereafter: her pride struck the law and sometimes indeed the law prevailed.’\textsuperscript{468}
\end{quote}

It is important to note that Avitus never makes an explicit distinction between the fear of God’s punishment and the fear of losing God’s love in his poem. He is clear that Eve fears losing God’s love by disobeying Him.\textsuperscript{469} Yet she is not afraid of being punished by God, since she has never been punished by Him before. She is also ignorant about the true nature of death, as her request to the fallen angel to explain what death

\textsuperscript{465} Aug., \textit{De Civ.}, LLTA, SL 48, lib. 14, cap. 9, lin. 115-127; ‘City of God,’ 14.9, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{467} This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3, section 3.5: \textit{The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century.}
\textsuperscript{468} ‘rapiunt contraria mentem
binc amor, inde metus: pulsat iactantia lex
interdumque etiam lex subvent.’
\textsuperscript{469} Avit., of Vien., \textit{Poem.}, MGH: AA, Vol. 6.2, 2, pp. 216-217 (170-180); \textit{Poems}, pp. 83-84. Chapter 3, section 3.5: \textit{The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to Middle of the Sixth Century.}
Avitus, on the other hand, would have known that his readers would be well aware of what death was and the punishment that Eve would bring about by her choice to not let her fear of God be her ultimate guide. It is in highlighting Eve’s fear of losing God’s love that Avitus’ poem carries forward the ‘duplex fear of God theory’. It reminds the reader that alongside their fear of being punished by God, the fear which Avitus might have perceived to have emerged as a result of Eve’s choice, there is a fear attached to the love of God as well. If Avitus’ knowledge of the two fears of God is combined with his depiction of the fear of God as an agent which protected faith in *On Rogations*, then this would suggest that Avitus does two things. First, he upholds the ‘duplex fear of God theory’ maintained by Augustine and Cassian. Secondly, he uses a prose homily, which might have been recited during a sermon at Mass, to communicate a synthesised version of this to those members of his audience not skilled enough to read poetry. Avitus preserves, assimilates, and synthesises the fourth-fifth century ideas about the fear of God into theological literature that would help to establish the theological tradition in sixth-century Gaul. His works cumulatively indicate that he was part of a wider transition in which the bishops of early sixth-century Gaul selected aspects of fourth and fifth century concepts of the fear of God and synthesised these as part of their desire to create a more united and stable theological tradition.

The notion that Gallic bishops of the late fifth and early sixth centuries were interested in consolidating and assimilating early notions of the fear of God into their solidifying theological tradition, is further supported by the portrayal of this fear in Caesarius of Arles’ *Sermons*. Of the four authors discussed in this section, it is Caesarius (469/70-August 27th 542) whose works give the most extensive account of the fear of God. His *Sermons* reveal that he perceived this fear to have become something which people were now born with and the precursor to the reception of God’s grace. The fear of God was important for both priests and bishops, who displayed it through their courage, strength, patience, and devotion of time to

---

470 Avit., of Vien., Poem., MGH: AA, Vol. 6.2, 2, p. 217 (181-182); Poems, p. 84. Chapter 3, section 3.5: The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century.

studying it in Scripture.\footnote{Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIV, 230.4-6, pp. 912-914; Sermons, Volume 3, trans. Sister Mary Magdeleine Mueller (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1973), 230.4-6, pp. 181-182. On the importance of the fear of God to priests see Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 1.3-21, pp. 2-17; Sermons, Volume 1, trans. Sister Mary Magdeleine Mueller (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1956), 1.3-21, pp. 4-24.} It was an identifier of the good Christian and had a specific set of behaviours, attitudes, and fears attached to it.\footnote{On the fear of God as an identifier of the good Christian see Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 16.2, pp. 77-78; Sermons 1, 16.2, pp. 88-89.} It was also, as noted in Caesarius’ \textit{Exposition on the Apocalypse}, regarded as the ultimate key to the Scriptures; the provider of the foreknowledge and survival guide to the Apocalypse.\footnote{\textit{Ac sic scripturae divinae omnibus superbis et plus mundum quam deum amantibus signatae sunt: humilibus autem et deum timentibus apertae sunt.} Caes., of Arl., Exp., Apoc., LLTA, pars: 19, pag. 275, lin. 30.} 

Caesarius’ theology on the fear of God is extensive but his twelfth sermon best illustrates that he, like Avitus, was interested in simplifying the ideas that had been debated in fourth-fifth century Gaul. In this sermon, Caesarius declares that the fear of God is a central part of perfect faith by stating:

\begin{quote}
‘And if we wish that perfect faith should remain in us and we do not do evil works fearing (\textit{timentes}) punishment, we shall strive with all our strength to that which is good, desiring reward.’
\end{quote}

\footnote{\textit{Ac si volumus ut in nobis perfecta fides maneat, et timentes supplicium opera mala non faciamus, et desiderantes praemium ea quae bona sunt agere totis viribus laboramus:} Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 17.1, p. 79; Sermons, 7, 17.1, p. 90.}

Here it is Caesarius’ specification that the fear of God’s punishment is central to perfect faith which is significant. Both Augustine and Cassian, as discussed above, associated the fear of God’s punishment with the first fear of God, which was then replaced by its counterpart when the Christian learned to love God and thus reached the highest level of perfection attainable.\footnote{See Chapter 1, section 1.4: \textit{The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century}.} But this transition from the first to the second fear of God is missing in Caesarius’ text. Instead of being a steppingstone to perfect faith, the fear of God’s punishment is now the central fear of perfect faith.

It is worth noting that Caesarius’ seventeenth sermon, in which he refers to the existence of ‘perfect fear’ in the ‘love of Christ’, suggests that he was also familiar with the ‘duplex fear of God theory’ in which the perfect fear of God was associated with the love of God.\footnote{See the line: \textit{Ipse enim pius dominus, qui est occulorum conscis, novit quia maiorum in hoc mundo gaudium non habemus, nisi quando eos tam corde quam corpore in Christi timore vel amore sanos et perfectos esse cognoscimus.} Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 17.1, p. 79; Sermons, 7, 17.1, p. 90.} The time he spent at Lérins, which held
copies of Cassian’s *Conferences* and *Institutes*, makes it virtually certain that he was familiar with Cassian’s ascetic theory. If Caesarius was familiar with the ‘duplex fear of God theory’, either through the works of Cassian, Augustine, or both (he did copy a selection of Augustine’s sermons into his own collection), then his decision to publicise a simplified account of the role of the fear of God in sermon twelve might be explained partly by his need to adhere to the genre constraints that shaped the production of a sermon. Good sermons would be able to convey the intended message to an audience consisting of people with varying levels of literary knowledge and theological understanding. This would have left Caesarius with the need to produce a more simplified image of the role of the fear of God in Christian faith. There was no other way he could ensure that all the members of his congregation stood a chance of grasping this vital Christian precept. Consequently, Caesarius’ twelfth sermon suggests that a more refined account of the nature and purpose of the fear of God in Christian life was being put forward by bishops in early sixth-century Gaul. It also suggests that Caesarius, like Avitus, was making a conscious effort to simplify and assimilate fourth to fifth century ideas about the fear of God into his theological literature, literature which would help shape the theological tradition that emerged in sixth-century Gaul.

The depictions of the fear of God in the works of Julianus, Caesarius, Avitus, and Paulinus collectively suggest that the theological attitude towards the fear of God in Gaul was affected by the wider move within the Gallic Church towards creating a consolidated Christian doctrine from the middle of the fifth and middle of the sixth centuries. The desire of contemporaries to continue openly debating and discussing the nature and purposes of this fear, was gradually replaced by the inclination to consolidate and distil past concepts of the fear of God to fit within the more defined boundaries of the Christian theological tradition in sixth-century Gaul. The predisposition to do this is apparent in Paulinus of Périgueux’s *Life of Saint Martin*. Here elements of the fear of God that were already present in the Bible and works of previous theologians were firmly traceable, but no new perceptions could be shown to have emerged. The surviving

---

478 On Caesarius’ time at Lérins see Cyprianus, Firminus, and Viventius, ‘Life of Caesarius,’ 1.4, pp. 10-11. Cassian’s second part of his *Conferences* were dedicated to Honoratus, who was Abbot of Lérins before he became Bishop of Arles in 426, and Eucherius who was a monk at Lérins. The dedication means that it can be presumed that Lérins held a copy of the second part of the *Conferences* which notably contained the eleventh conference in which Cassian discussed the two types of the fear of God and perfection. Cass., *Collat.*, CSEL, Vol. 13, Praefatio, pp. 311-312; *Conf.*, pref., pp. 399-400.
works of Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Arles illustrate that, up to the middle of the sixth century, there was a concern amongst the southern Gallic bishops to refine and consolidate the diversity that had haunted the region’s theological tradition and its components since the fourth century. This also applied to the theological interpretation of the nature and roles played by fear of God in Christianity. It should be stressed here that this transition did not impact on the variety of possibilities by which contemporaries could interpret the fear of God, nor did it result in the fear of God becoming a more simplified concept. The works of Avitus and Caesarius illustrate clearly that this fear continued to be a diverse and multifaceted concept. It was not the idea of the fear of God that was simplified; rather it was the perspectives relating to its nature and role as a component within Gallic Christianity which became more refined.

1.6. The Fear of God in Gregory’s Gaul

Having explored the views of the fear of God that existed in Gaul before Gregory’s birth, it is now time to examine the perspectives that existed during in the time that Gregory lived. As these views are contemporary to Gregory, they have the potential to have had the greatest influence on him. It is therefore both important and appropriate to end this chapter with the views of one of Gregory’s closest correspondents: Venantius Fortunatus (b.530-540, d.600).

In this final section, I argue that Fortunatus’ works reveal that contemporaries in Gregory’s Gaul continued to regard the fear of God as a complex theological and philosophical concept that had several roles in the good Christian life. Fortunatus, like Gregory, produced an astonishing corpus of texts including eleven books of poetry and seven prose saints’ Lives. An examination of these works reveals that Fortunatus, like Gregory, had a well-developed understanding of the fear of God. The preface to book eleven of his Carmina, in which he states: ‘The name of God is of sempiternal substance if of divine fear’, indicates that Fortunatus perceived the fear of God to be that which made the name of God an eternally enduring substance. Interestingly, Fortunatus also chose to make this statement within a textual passage that he devoted to expounding upon his own theological beliefs. This might suggest that his perception of the fear

479 ‘Deus autem appellatio est substantiae sempiternae sive timoris divini.’ Ven., Fortun., Carm., MGH: AA, Vol. 4.1, 11.Pro., 6, p. 254 (7-8); Poems, 11.1, pp. 708-709. God’s name is explicitly said to be constituted of divine fear but note that Roberts’ translation interprets timoris as awe. *References to Leo’s MGH edition cite poem, section, chapter, page, and line numbers in order.
of God, as that which helps to make the name of God a sempiternal substance, was both central to his understanding of the concept of this fear and his wider theological beliefs.

Other aspects of Fortunatus’ concept of the fear of God are revealed across his works. In 3.23a of the *Carmina*, Fortunatus connects the fear of God with the love, knowledge, and the worship of God. Move forward to book ten and Fortunatus argues that God ought to be feared because He was just, and because a person would be able to cleanse their soul of stains by fearing Him. Here the first fear of God, that of His judgement and punishment, implicitly filters through as Fortunatus identifies that God is the fount of justice, the One who will reward and punish according to the deeds, thoughts, and beliefs of the person in front of Him. There is also a reference to Augustine’s view of the first fear of God as being that which puts people on the path to Wisdom, since Fortunatus states that it is through fearing God that a person can cleanse themselves of their sins. The fear of God is thus still perceived as the way by which people can begin to come to redemption.

Fortunatus’ prose collection of saints’ lives also provides glimpses into his thoughts on this fear. In the *Life of Saint Hilary* for example, Fortunatus reveals that he thought people not only needed the fear of God to gain salvation; they also had to love this fear to obtain it.

‘O most perfect layman, who themselves desire to imitate priests for whom there is no other way to live unless with Christ, with love to fear and with the fear to love, those followers run to the glory and the ones who turn away [run] towards punishment, [there is] reward for they who rise to believe [and] torment for them who refuse.’

---

482 See Chapter 1, section 1.4: *The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.*
Chapter 1: The Fear of God in the Gallic Worldview

Here, Fortunatus uses parallelism to communicate his message that those who love to fear Christ run to glory and ascend to reward, while those who fear to love Christ run towards punishment and receive torment for their refusal or rejection.

1. Love to fear Christ – fear to love Christ
2. Run to the glory – run towards punishment

Within this parallelism it is notable that Fortunatus uses a small chiasmus: ‘with love to fear and with fear to love.’ Because the chiasmus is so small it is likely that Fortunatus used it mainly for rhetorical flair. Nevertheless, within the wider message that the parallelism is designed to convey, it is possible to suggest that Fortunatus might have used the chiasmus to express his views on the relationship that exists between the fear and love of God, and the role this plays in attaining salvation. Those who love to fear Christ are the perfect ones, the ones who will attain glory and salvation. Those whose fear prohibits them from loving God are the imperfect ones, those may end up punished because their lack of love for God prohibits them from reaching glory and salvation.

Next to The Life of Saint Hilary, Fortunatus’ Life of Saint Radegund also reveals much about the poet’s perception of the fear of God. His record of Radegund’s words to Bishop Medard, when he initially hesitated to ordain her as priestess, depicts the fear of God as the fear which bishops were supposed to retain above their fear of the actions and words of worldly men:

‘To which the most saintly woman [Radegund] entering into the sacristy knowing this, assumed the clothes of a nun and proceeding to the altar, addressed these words to the

most blessed Medard saying: “If you would delay to consecrate me and you fear man more than God, from your hand, O priest, the soul of the sheep shall be required.”

In her speech to Medard, Radegund reminds the bishop to remember that he should fear God more than mankind. If Medard delayed in ordaining her, which he was because of the harassment he was receiving from the retainers of her husband King Lothar, then he was not only showing that he feared mankind more than God, he was also risking incurring God’s judgement by not ordaining one of His sheep. In Hilary’s narrative, the fear of God becomes an effective ploy used by Radegund to persuade Medard to cease his dithering and make her as a deaconess. It is also portrayed as the fear which bishops are supposed to follow instead of the fear of mortal kings.

Besides depicting the fear of God as the primary fear of the bishop, Fortunatus’ Life of Saint Radegund also reveals other facets of the poet’s understanding of this fear. While I discuss it in greater detail in chapter three, it is worth noting that the chapter in which Radegund triumphs over a demon demonstrates that Fortunatus thought that the fear of God could be used by holy people to overpower demons or the Devil by inciting them to fear. In connecting the fear of God with the demonic, Fortunatus’ text shows that the two fears have become firmly linked in Gallic Christian theology at this point. Furthermore, his opening account of Radegund as one who persisted in almsgiving as a secular Queen, because she feared that her secular status would reduce her holy stature in God’s eyes, shows that he regarded the fear of God as a useful literary technique for a hagiographer seeking to portray their subject-matter’s secular career in a holy light. Collectively, Fortunatus’ works show that the contemporary attitude towards the fear of God continued to comprehend it as a complex and multifaceted fear.

---


487 See Fortunatus’ use of the fear of God in his portrayal of Radegund’s secular career the Queen of Chlothar I. ‘Igitur iuncta principi, timens ne deo degradasset, cum mundi gradu proficeret, se sua cum facilitate eleemosynae dedicavit.’ Ven., Fortun., VSR, MGH: AA, Vol. 4.2, 3.10, p. 39 (16-17).
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It is perhaps significant that a selection of Fortunatus’ perspectives on the fear of God also appear scattered throughout Gregory of Tours’ works. The perception that a bishop ought to fear God more than powerful men is also present in Gregory’s record of the trial of Praetextatus, discussed in the following chapter.488 The view that the fear of God could overpower demons is also found in a number of Gregory’s miracle tales and there is evidence in The Life of the Fathers to suggest that Gregory similarly considered that emphasising the presence of this fear could be a useful technique for hagiographer who needed to establish the holiness of their subject-matter.489

The correlations between some of Fortunatus’ perspectives on the fear of God and those of Gregory makes a two-way influence between these two men on this subject highly feasible. Yet the lack of certainty surrounding the composition dates of both Gregory and Fortunatus’ texts means that defining precisely who influenced whom on what aspects is difficult. To complicate matters further, Fortunatus’ education and early career in Ravenna means that he could have acquired his understanding of the fear of God there rather than in Gaul.490 Unfortunately, works from his pre-Gallic career do not survive to permit an assessment of this.

While it is difficult to discern whether Gregory influenced Fortunatus on the fear of God or vice versa, the correlations between certain aspects of Fortunatus’ understanding of this fear with those of Gregory does set a precedent for the argument that these aspects of the fear of God were commonly recognised in Gaul by the end of the sixth century. A more detailed assessment of the works of other contemporaries in Gregory and Fortunatus’ Gaul would be required to lend greater security to this idea. The works of Hilary of Poitiers, Paulinus of Périgueux, Avitus of Vienne, Caesarius of Arles, and Venantius Fortunatus align in their portrayal of the fear of God as: an important fear that bishops should prioritise over their fear of powerful men, a fear which could overwhelm a demon,491 and a useful element of rhetorical technique. This

488 This is analysed in greater detail in Chapter 2, section 2.3: Gregory, the Fear of God, and Self-Control in Merovingian Realpolitik.
489 On the fear of God as a way to overpower demons see Gregory of Tours, M/A, 17, p. 385 (22). Also, Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.18, p. 165 (16). For Gregory using the fear of God to emphasise holiness lifestyle see Gregory of Tours, V/P, 17.1, p. 279 (9) and 17.2, p. 279 (26).
491 This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3: The Devil, Demons, and Fear in the Late Antique Gallic Worldview.
suggests that these elements had remained a consistent part of the Gallic comprehension of the fear of God from the fourth to the sixth centuries. Hilary, Avitus, Venantius, and Gregory’s shared perception that the fear of God could be an effective rhetorical technique, denotes that this too was a perspective that had traversed two centuries of changes and developments to the Gallic concept of the fear of God. Finally, the consistent appearance of the notion that the fear of God was essential to attain salvation in the Bible and works of Hilary, Augustine, Cassian, Prosper, Avitus, Caesarius, and Gregory, indicates that while late antique thinkers maintained a variety of views about how the fear of God was necessary to salvation, the concept itself remained central to the Gallic comprehension of the fear of God in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.

Conclusion

This study shows that Gregory was heir to a worldview in which the fear of God was not simply a ‘perturbation’ or ‘passion’ of the soul which people experienced. It was a philosophical concept in a system of belief which had multiple roles and forms and traversed a doctrinally, politically, socially, and economically tumultuous period. By showing that there was a lull, evidenced by the literature of Paulinus of Périgueux and Julianus Pomerius, in which the theological thinkers who affected the Christian Church in Gaul ceased expanding their concept of the nature and roles of the fear of God, this chapter lends greater refinement to Wood and Shanzer’s argument that there was a transition in the Gallic theological tradition during the episcopal tenures of Avitus of Vienne and Caesarius of Arles.492 The various strands of the debates on the nature and roles of the fear of God that constituted and informed the concept of this fear in Gaul, which had constantly evolved as it was discussed and debated alongside other doctrinally important matters from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, were consolidated and refined by theologians in Gaul during the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth centuries. Despite this, the fear of God never lost its complexity. It retained its layers and the theological discourse in late antique Gaul continued, significantly, to regard it as a fear that had several, central, roles within Christianity and the individual Christian life. The fear of God was a complicated Christian concept and it was also perhaps the most complex and important of all theological fears in late antiquity.

Having created a general overview of the fear of God in the mentality of late antique and early Merovingian Gaul, it is now time to move forward to analyse what Gregory’s works reveal about his understanding of the fear of God. Before doing this, it must be reiterated that the analysis above is not a framework by which Gregory's references to the fear of God have been assessed or should be analysed by the reader. It is not possible to fit Gregory into an ‘unbroken tradition’ of Gallic thinkers and to try, as Peter Brown highlights in *The Ransom of the Soul*, would be to ignore the different outlook and worlds that each of these theologians inhabited. Late antique theologians did not create a unified worldview in their works. Contemporaries reading their literature might have perceived their authors to be trying to create such a unified worldview, but they were also not obliged to interpret and use their ideas in the ways which their authors had intended. Authors like Gregory could pick and choose which ideas they rejected or deployed in their own contextualised way. As a result, Gregory’s works have, but also create, their own context. The framework above does not exhaustively recreate the context in which Gregory’s work sits nor that which his texts create. The latter is the task of the next chapter. Though based on a synthesis of an analysis of contemporary records, in which their authors tried to discuss their perceptions of this fear and the concepts attached to it, the analysis in this chapter remains my own construction and interpretation. For this reason, I have opted to focus on uncovering the worldview and ideas about the fear of God that Gregory’s works create in the next chapter, rather than exploring what Gregory actively chose to use or reject from past ideas.

---

493 Brown makes the argument that historians can no longer treat all the early Christian thinkers as living in and sharing a similar outlook on the world. Although his idea that Christian thinkers like Julian, Bishop of Toledo, would not have been aware of such huge differences in thought between themselves and their sources is somewhat questionable, especially given Brown’s own subsequent declaration that Julian modified Cyprian’s statement using Augustine because it did not fully encompass what the he felt it needed too, his overall point about early Christian thinkers not always sharing a similar outlook is commendable and should be noted by historians looking at the intellectual and theological views of Gregory of Tours too. Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 1-24.
Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

Introduction

Based on the work of Giselle de Nie, Ron Newbold has already highlighted that the fear of God was ‘a highly desirable attitude’ for Gregory of Tours.494 Yet neither scholar has fully investigated the extent of the centrality of this fear to Gregory, or why this was the case. Reconstructing Gregory’s depiction and understanding of this fear as far as is possible, is the best way to remedy this. In analysing what and how Gregory selected from his theological predecessors and contemporaries’ views, this chapter reveals, significantly, that Gregory’s thoughts on this fear were a part of, but not constricted by, the wider transitions in the theological outlook of Gaul. In demonstrating, on a level that has never been reached before, that Gregory made the fear of God so important and prominent in his works because he understood it to be inextricably linked with the acquiescence of self-mastery, the good Christian life, and the achievement of salvation, this chapter establishes that fear is a useful tool for the Merovingian historian. It reveals that Gregory’s works are an excellent source for late antique discourse on the self and thus provides Gregory-scholars with the opportunity to use these writings to begin to explore new areas of study like the Merovingian concept of the self, the good Christian, and how they transformed Classical notions of paideia.

The fear of God was important to Gregory of Tours. It touched on the religious, personal, and political aspects of his daily life. It is also an invaluable key for the historian seeking to uncover how Gregory understood all the other fears known to him, and, even more broadly, how he perceived fear to shape the world and people around him. To discern how Gregory comprehended both fear and the good Christian life, one must first untangle his perception of the fear of God. This chapter asks what the fear of God was to Gregory and uncovers some of the different layers which made up his perception of it. Throughout this chapter I argue that above all else, Gregory primarily understood the fear of God in terms of self-control. For him, the fear of God was a means of maintaining self-mastery and a form of self-control itself: the Christian equivalent of the Classical concept, enkrateia.495 This overarching perception of the fear of God,

495 For more on this Classical concept see Jaeger, Paideia, 54 and Foucault, The Use of Pleasure, 64.
as a form and means of keeping self-control, shaped how Gregory used the fear of God in his life and how he characterised it in his works.

To demonstrate this, this chapter does three things. Firstly, it outlines the raw data regarding the fear of God: where, when, and to whom it is connected in Gregory’s works. Secondly, it analyses how Gregory’s depiction of this fear across his literary works reveals that he perceived the human fear of God to be a technique and form of Christian self-mastery. Finally, it demonstrates that Gregory considered the fear of God, through its connection to self-control, to be useful in those literary and political contexts in which he demonstrated how he navigated and forged power relationships.

2.1. Gregory and the Fear of God: The Raw Data

The fear of God is the most dominant fear in Gregory of Tours’ texts. In total, there are ninety-five cases in which the fear of God appears in one form or another. Across The Life of the Fathers and books of Miracles, there are fifty-two cases in which the fear of God emerges as either the primary, secondary, and/or tertiary fear. In the Histories this number falls to forty-three. Nevertheless, because the fear of God appears in several different forms and is sometimes used more than once per case, categorising its presence in Gregory’s texts is not a straightforward process. Besides appearing in the form of the explicit description ‘the fear of God’ (31), this fear also appears in the following guises: fear of Christ (6), fear of the Holy Trinity (2), fear of the Day of Judgement (7), fear of a holy person’s power (17), fear of episcopal power (4), fear of divine power (5), fear of divine punishment and/or judgement (20), fear of divine anger (2), and fear of angelic power (1).

496 The fear of God is classed as the ‘primary’ fear in cases where Gregory explicitly states, ‘the fear of God’ or ‘fear of the Lord’ for example Gregory of Tours, V/P, 17.1, p. 279 (9) and 17.2, p. 179 (26). It is considered the ‘secondary’ fear in cases where it is removed by one degree from the explicitly named fear. Gregory might describe a person as fearing the power exuded by a saint, for example Gregory of Tours, GC, 86, p. 354 (10). Implicitly nonetheless, this person also fears God, whose power the saint has been given permission to wield. The fear of God would be viewed as a tertiary fear in cases where it is removed by two degrees from the named fear. In the case of a demon that fears the sign of the cross, for example Gregory of Tours, V/SM, 2.18, p. 165 (16), the primary fear is of the sign of the cross, the secondary fear is of the person who makes the sign, the tertiary fear is of God whose power is evoked by the sign.

497 See Gregory of Tours, V/P, 2.Pref., pp. 218-219; Gregory of Tours, GM, 72, p. 86-87 and Gregory of Tours, GC, 18, pp. 307-308.

498 I include the case in which Gregory discusses how sinners will fear the Resurrection of those who are to go with God which occurs during this event. See Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.13, pp. 496-500.
Although the historian could consider the fears listed above as separate from the fear of God, they would all have been connected to God in one form or another in Gregory's mind. The fear of the power of the holy persons could be categorised as the fear of God because Gregory recognises that all saints, regardless of their status within the holy hierarchy, ultimately derive their power from God. The same applies to the power exercised by angels and bishops. To fear the power exerted by any of these figures is to fear God and His power. Likewise, the fear of the Day of Judgement is not always the same as the fear of divine punishment and/or judgement. The former refers to the fear of a specific prophesied event that has yet to happen in the linear, human perception of time. The latter involves fearing something that could and was, as Gregory’s tale of the priest Eparchius and a certain shepherd named Ingenuus demonstrates, meted out to people while they were still alive.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, \textit{GM}, 86, p. 96 (16) and Gregory of Tours, \textit{VSJ}, 15, pp. 120-121.} Nevertheless both eventualities were overseen by and connected to God. The fear of divine punishment and/or judgement and the fear of the Day of Judgement can be classified as part of the fear of God.\footnote{Whether the various aspects of the fear of God reflect different \textit{gradations} of this fear is an interesting question that merits further study. Although the fear of angelic power and fear of a martyr’s power are all aspects of God’s power, whether Gregory and his contemporaries would have differentiated the fear invoked by an angel’s appearance from the direct fear of God and how makes for interesting speculation.}

The variety of forms through which the fear of God is signified in Gregory’s works is notable, not only because it raises methodological issues pertaining to how this fear is identified in Gregory’s texts, but, more importantly, because it illustrates from the outset that Gregory perceived this fear to be one formed of several complex elements. The data described above clearly shows that Gregory considered the fear of God to have numerous facets. While he might not have explicitly described every case of this fear by using the words ‘the fear of God’ or ‘the fear of the Lord’, this knowledge is important for discerning Gregory’s perception of this fear. Historians should not, as Nussbaum has argued,\footnote{Nussbaum, \textit{Upheavals of Thought}, 11.} ‘rewrite’ Gregory’s reference to the fear of a saint to become the fear of God. Yet it must be recognised that there exists an inseparable connection between the fear of a saint’s power and the fear of God in Gregory’s theological impression of the workings of the divine. Thus, while historians should preserve the various forms which Gregory uses to denote the presence of the fear of God in his works, since there are likely to be additional and perhaps
different elements to this fear which would distinguish it from a raw and more direct fear of God Himself, it also needs to be acknowledged that Gregory would not have perceived the fear of a saint’s power to be completely distinct from the fear of God, whose power the saint was graciously permitted to display.502

The process of cataloguing all Gregory’s references to the fear of God reveals, unsurprisingly, that his terminology for this fear might have been influenced by the terminology used in the early Latin bible. Throughout his texts, Gregory uses a variety of Latin fearing terms to denote the fear of God. By far the most consistently used term is *timor* and its grammatical derivatives. It is the most used term in both the *Histories* (26) and the hagiographical corpus (19), appearing forty-five times in total. But Gregory also used other Latin fear words to denote the fear of God. *Terror* (31), *metus* (18), *tremor* (6), *pavor* (4), *vereor* (2), *formido* (1), and *horror* (1) are all used to signify this fear.

Astute readers will notice that the number of terms for fear above exceeds the total number of cases for the fear of God, one hundred and eight to ninety-five. This is because Gregory deploys more than one fear-denoting term per case on several occasions. An examination of Gregory’s Latin reveals that he had a penchant for using constructions such as *timore perterritus*,503 *metu perterritus*,504 *metu externiti*,505 *metu terrentur*,506 *pavore terrentur*,507 and *pavore perterritus*.508 Additionally, there are cases like The Miracles of Saint Martin 2.46, in which Gregory opts to repeat a fear term within the same sentence about the fear of God.509

It was noted in the introduction that Gregory’s command of the Latin vocabulary available for fear was extensive.510 What is particularly interesting about the vocabulary which he uses to refer to the fear of

502 Peter Brown has shown that the power of saints was widely perceived to be God’s power not their own. Brown, *Cult of Saints*, 5-6, 77, 107, and 113; Brown, *Authority and the Sacred*, 58, 60, 67, 69-70, 73, and 76-78, and Peter Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), esp. 121. Whether every late antique author equated the fear of a holy person’s power with the fear of God is a topic that merits further study. In Gregory’s eyes there is a connection between the two, but other author’s may have maintained a firmer distinction between the raw fear of God and the fear of a holy person’s power.

503 Gregory of Tours, *GM*, 77, p. 90 (18); Gregory of Tours, *GC*, 77, p. 344 (22) and Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 11.1, p. 260 (5-6).


505 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 5.2, p. 228 (34).

506 Gregory of Tours, *MA*, 19, p. 387 (10).


508 Gregory of Tours, *GM*, 86, p. 96, (29); Gregory of Tours, *GC*, 90, p. 356 (6) and Gregory of Tours, *VSM*, 2.33, p. 171 (30). These are all catalogued in Appendix 4: Table 5: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employs fear constructions.

509 Gregory of Tours, *VSM*, 2.46, p. 175 (32-33).

510 See Introduction, section: *Methodology and Problems.*
God is that it closely mirrors the lexicon in the Douay-Rheims Vulgate. As noted in the previous chapter, it is impossible for us to know whether Gregory used scripts of the Vulgate Bible, or the Vetus Latina, or a combination of both. The exact scripts Gregory would have learned from do not survive to tell us one way or the other. Although we can neither fully confirm nor deny whether Gregory used Vulgate scripts, the lexicon used by Gregory does closely follow that which is used in this particular edition of the Latin Bible.

An extensive search of the online index to the Douay-Rheims Latin reveals that there are three hundred and sixty-four biblical verses that contain the term *timor* or one of its grammatical variations.\(^{511}\) Of these verses, there are a significant proportion which contain the term twice or more. If this is compared to the biblical deployment of other Latin terms for fear, then it becomes apparent that *timor* is undoubtedly the most commonly used term followed by *terror* (92 verses),\(^{512}\) *metus* (57 verses),\(^{513}\) *pavor* (35 verses),\(^{514}\) *formido* (28 verses),\(^{515}\) *tremor* (25 verses),\(^{516}\) *venor*, and *horror* (10 verses each).\(^{517}\)

Concerning the fear of God and fear of the Lord, which the Douay-Rheims Vulgate contains at least two hundred and sixteen definitive references too, the term *timor* is the most popular fearing-word used followed by *terror*, *metus*, and their grammatical variants. If one compares these statistics with those for Gregory’s texts, it becomes tempting to argue that Gregory might have deliberately selected his fearing terms to align with those used in the Vulgate scripts. Although this scenario cannot be completely ruled out, it is extremely unlikely that Gregory ever purposefully sought to discern the most popular Latin fearing-terms for the fear of God in whichever version or versions of the Latin bible he had access to, with the view to letting this influence the vocabulary that he chose to use in his own writings. This would certainly be difficult to prove in any case.

Perhaps less unrealistic is the suggestion that the concentration of the vocabulary in the Vulgate might have subconsciously influenced Gregory’s own fear of God vocabulary, *if* the vulgar Latin texts were the

---

\(^{511}\) Terms yielding results: timuio, timuisti, timuistis, timuit, timuitque, timens, timas, timuerant, timentes, timor, timorati, timoratus, timor, timorem, timores, timori, timor, timeo, timeas, timeatur and timeamus.

\(^{512}\) Terms yielding results: terroribus, terroris, terribilis, terror, terrat, peterriti, exterriti, territus, terruit, terrore, terrores, terroresque, terreret and terreri.

\(^{513}\) Terms yielding results: metus, metum, metu, metuant, metuas, metuatis, metuebant, metuebat, metuendus, metuens, metuentem, metuentibus, metuere, metuerant, metuet, metuis, metuistis, metuit, metuute, metuunt, and metuunt.

\(^{514}\) Terms yielding results: pavore, pavorem, pavore and pavoris.

\(^{515}\) Terms yielding results: formido, formidolosa, formidolosus, formidinem, and formidines.

\(^{516}\) Terms yielding results: tremor and tremore.

\(^{517}\) Terms yielding results: venor, venabantur, venatur, verebar and vereatur. Horror, horror and hhororis.
ones that he used. The distribution of fear vocabulary, both throughout Gregory’s works as a corpus and in specific reference to the fear of God, shows clearly that the bishop was mindful of the rich lexicon of fear available to him. But the undeniable correlation between Gregory and the Vulgate’s use of timor, terror, and metus as the three most popular fear terms for this fear, warrants the suggestion that, if Gregory could be proved to have relied on Vulgate texts, the concentration of fear vocabulary in this version of the Bible might have subtly guided Gregory’s own lexicon. René Braun has shown that both the Vulgate and the Vetus Latina scripts of the second to fourth centuries had a profound impact on the wider development of the lexicon, syntax, style, and semantics of late antique Latin.\textsuperscript{518} It is perfectly possible that this broader influence of bible on the Latin language in combination with the repetitive reading and recitation of biblical passages that Gregory would have had to do over his lifetime,\textsuperscript{519} might have helped him develop an intuitive sense of which Latin fear-terms were most frequently used in reference to the fear of God, regardless of which Latin Bible he used. This intuitive sense could, in turn, have subconsciously determined which terms Gregory selected when writing about the fear of God.\textsuperscript{520} While it is impossible to prove this decisively, the correlation between the most used Latin fear-terms in the Vulgate compared to those found in Gregory’s texts renders this a possibility. The influence on Gregory’s language for the fear of God certainly appears to have been the Word of God.

The final aspects of the raw data collected on the fear of God which merit comment are the causes of this fear and who experiences it. Gregory’s writings show that he perceived that kings,\textsuperscript{521} queens,\textsuperscript{522} bishops,\textsuperscript{523}
priests,\textsuperscript{524} lesser clergy,\textsuperscript{525} saints,\textsuperscript{526} monks,\textsuperscript{527} magnates,\textsuperscript{528} soldiers,\textsuperscript{529} poor women, men, and children\textsuperscript{530} all experienced the fear of God. Such diversity highlights that Gregory felt that this fear afflicted, or at least it ought to afflict, all humans irrespective of their sex, age, occupation, social and economic status.

Interestingly, the fear of God also appears to have afflicted non-human beings and natural phenomena. Gregory records that the fear of God was experienced by demons, storms, and plagues.\textsuperscript{531} The only beings which appear not to be afflicted with this fear in Gregory’s works are the angels. That Gregory recorded demons as experiencing the fear of God is of especial interest because it indicates that he might have believed that this fear could transcend the mortal level.

The causes of the fear of God in Gregory's works are as diverse as the beings experiencing it. In humans, Gregory appears to perceive this fear to be sparked by divine admonitions in visions,\textsuperscript{532} biblical verses,\textsuperscript{533} religious devotion,\textsuperscript{534} unexplainable portents,\textsuperscript{535} plagues and the contraction of other ailments,\textsuperscript{536} scolding by bishops,\textsuperscript{537} saints’ reputations,\textsuperscript{538} defeat in battle,\textsuperscript{539} and the miracles exacted by holy people.\textsuperscript{540} In demons, the fear of God is typically invoked by the presence of a holy person and the invocation of God

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{524} Gregory of Tours, GM, 22, p. 51 (23, 29) and 86, p. 96, (16). Also, Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.23, p. 69 (18).
\item\textsuperscript{525} Gregory of Tours, I/P, 20.3, p. 293 (1). Also, Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.36, p. 307 (28).
\item\textsuperscript{526} Gregory of Tours, I/P, 19.1, p. 286 (25); 19.3, p. 289 (20); 17.1, p. 279 (9) and 17.2, p. 279 (26). Also, Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.1, p. 323 (22).
\item\textsuperscript{527} Gregory of Tours, VSM, 3.42, p. 192 (36) and Gregory of Tours, DLH, 4.34, p. 167 (21).
\item\textsuperscript{528} Gregory of Tours, GM, 60, p. 80 (6) and Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.4, p. 199 (7) and 6.24, p. 292 (5).
\item\textsuperscript{529} Gregory of Tours, DLH, 3.29, p. 126 (4) and 4.48, p. 185 (4).
\item\textsuperscript{530} Gregory of Tours, GC, 97, p. 361 (1). Also, Gregory of Tours, GM, 87, p. 97 (4).
\item\textsuperscript{531} See Gregory of Tours, MA, 17, p. 385 (22) and 27, p. 392 (9). Also, Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.34, p. 155 (3) and 2.18, p. 165 (16). While Giselle de Nie has highlighted that Gregory, like his contemporaries Prudentius and Fortunatus, often regarded storms as metaphors for an unclear mind, she does not discredit the perception that Gregory’s storms could experience fear. Indeed, she takes this ascription of fear to be part of Gregory’s main point for the narrative: ‘If even clouds feared the relics, how much more should men do!’ de Nie, \textit{Views From A Many-Winged Tower}, 102-104.
\item\textsuperscript{532} Gregory of Tours, GM, 22, p. 51 (23, 29) and 77, p. 90 (14, 18). Gregory of Tours, GC, 18, p. 308 (23) and 77, p. 344 (22). Gregory of Tours, VSM, 3.42, p. 192 (36). Gregory of Tours, I/P, 8.11, p. 250-1 (6).
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\item\textsuperscript{535} Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.34, p. 83 (13); 6.24, p. 292 (5) and 8.7, p. 384 (17).
\item\textsuperscript{536} Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.1, p. 479 (5). Also, Gregory of Tours, GM, 86, p. 96, (16). Gregory of Tours, GC, 97, p. 361 (1). Gregory of Tours, VSM, 46a, p. 132 (19).
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either through the sign of the cross or verbal request. Phenomena such as storms are said to fear God as a result of the power wielded through saintly relics.

The differences between the various stimuli for the fear of God in humans, compared to those for demons and other things, are striking. There are infinitely more causes of this fear in humans than there are in non-human beings and other phenomena, something which suggests either that Gregory perceived humans to be more susceptible to the fear of God or, perhaps more likely, that living humans, as the ones still on trial in God’s eyes, were permitted to have more opportunities to experience or recall their fear of Him. Throughout his texts, Gregory consistently contrasts the sinner, who the lacks the fear of God, with the good Christian, the one who has this fear. To attain salvation one needed to be a good Christian which meant having the fear of God. If the fear of God was a condition for deliverance, and, as will be shown, Gregory seems to agree with his predecessors on this, then it is not improbable that he would have thought, or at least hoped, that there would be more causes and thus opportunities for humans to experience or remember the fear of God and stay on the path to Christ. The more causes for the fear of God there were, the more opportunities were available for the person to work towards salvation. The demon, already damned, only fears God in Gregory’s works when God’s power to torment them further is presented by a holy person or invocation of God’s name. In Gregory’s texts, there are fewer causes of the fear of God for demons because they have no opportunity to return to the path of Wisdom. They do not need this fear in the same way that humans do and are, therefore, not portrayed to have a wide array of experiences that could invoke this fear in Gregory’s writings.

541 Gregory of Tours, M/A, 17, p. 385 (22). Gregory of Tours, V/SM, 2.18, p. 165 (16).
542 Gregory of Tours, V/SM, 1.34, p. 155 (3).
543 Gregory of Tours, V/SM, 3.3, p. 183 (8). Also, Gregory of Tours, GM, 60, p. 79 (24, 25) and 71, p. 86 (9). Gregory of Tours, DLH, 4.48, p. 185 (5); 6.5, p. 270 (18); 6.10, p. 280 (2); 7.15, p. 337 (8); 7.22, pp. 342-343 (22); 8.30, p. 395 (12); 10.13, p. 499 (20) and 10.25, p. 518 (5).
544 Gregory of Tours, GC, 30, p. 316 (20) and 41, p. 324 (12). Also, Gregory of Tours, I/P, 2.Pref., p. 218 (19, 20); 17.1, p. 279 (9); 17.2, p. 279 (26); 19.1, p. 286 (25); 19.3, p. 289 (20); 19.4, p. 291 (3) and 20.3, p. 293 (1).
545 Gregory acknowledges this directly by quoting from Psalms 15:4. Gregory of Tours, V/SM, 4.Pref., p. 199 (9).
546 This is explored in greater detail in Chapter 4, section 4.4: Gregory, the Fear experienced by Demonic Figures, and Self-Control.
Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

The raw data collected from Gregory’s writings on the fear of God reveals that he understood this fear to have a variety of elements and layers. His vocabulary for this fear seems to have been principally inspired by the biblical lexicon, reflecting its roots in God and His Word. Furthermore, the data shows that Gregory considered this fear to be one which was been experienced by, or at least ought to be experienced by, all humans, regardless of their age, sex, economic status, and occupation, as well as demons, and other things such as storms. For the Bishop of Tours, the fear of God permeated everyone and everything but God’s angels. The causes of the fear of God were as various as the variety of beings and entities it afflicted. Gregory appears to have considered there to be more stimuli for humans than for demons and other phenomena; a point which potentially suggests that he felt there were, or should be, more opportunities for humans to experience and remember the fear of God in order to have the maximum chance of being saved. The statistical data on Gregory’s use of the fear of God thus provides a sense of the complexity, permeability, and multifarity which he understood this fear to have. It is by illustrating this, that the importance of cataloguing the raw data is highlighted. By outlining these basic details about Gregory and the fear of God, this section has been able to provide the reader with foundational knowledge of Gregory’s views of this fear. Having assessed what conclusions the raw data reveals, it is now time to move to examine what Gregory’s narratives demonstrate about how he comprehended the fear of God.

2.2. The Fear of God and Self-Control

In this section I demonstrate the first half of the argument of this thesis: that Gregory of Tours’ descriptions of those people who display the human fear of God, and those who show a lack of this fear, show that he equated the human fear of God with the attainment and maintenance of self-mastery and good Christian behaviour. To accomplish this, the following section is split into three parts. The first part discusses the Classical notions of the formation of the self and self-control, paidia and enkrateia, and explores how these affected and were affected by the emergence of Christianity. The second part analyses how several stories located in Gregory’s Histories, Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers, show that he consistently regarded those who had the fear of God to have good Christian behaviour and self-mastery. The third part demonstrates how Gregory’s stories of those who lacked or had forgotten this fear, reinforces the argument that he considered the human fear of God to signify good Christian behaviour and the attainment of self-control.
Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

2.2.1. Notions of Self-Control and the Formation of the Self from the Classical to Early Christian World

The concept of self-control, particularly in relation to the development of the self, emerged in Ancient Greece during the time of Socrates.548 Thinkers like Socrates, Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle, regarded moral self-control, steadfastness, and moderation (*enkrateia* (ἐγκράτεια)), and its opposite, incontinence, a lack of moderation and steadfastness (*akrasia* (ἀκρασία)), as the key principles which separated a virtuous person from an unvirtuous one.549 *Enkrateia*, from the adjective *enkrates* (ἐγκράτης), signified someone who had attained mastery over their passions and instincts.550 In short they had achieved power over themselves. *Akrasia* denoted someone who either had lost control of these elements of the self or simply did not have the capacity for such control.551 Both *enkrateia* and *akrasia* were concerned primarily with power over the self and both terms fell under the much broader Classical construct: *paideia*.552

In its ancient form, *paideia* is a particularly difficult concept to pin down. Originally the term seems to have been used to refer solely to a body of Greek literature before becoming synonymous with philosophy and its goals of understanding and managing of the self in the time of Plato.553 As time progressed, *paideia* gradually expanded to signify a way of life and its essence touched on the cultural, religious, political, and social ideals of the ancient world.554

With the arrival of Christianity, the face of *paideia* began to shift.555 In the east across the third and fourth centuries, theologians including Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa all worked to assimilate Classical *paideia* and *propaideia* with Christian theology.556 In the west this

551 Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure*, 65.
552 Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure*, 76.
556 *Propaideia* refers to the training necessary to establish *paideia*. The training a person receives in rhetoric, grammar and the other liberal arts classes as *propaideia*.
duty was taken up by Augustine who re-appropriated certain precepts of Classical philosophy, such as the use of rhetoric, to render them useful for Christians.557

To understand more clearly how Christianity altered the Greek concept of enkrateia in the west, the historian must, perhaps unexpectedly, begin back in the east with the views of Gregory of Nyssa on paideia. In the mind of this fourth-century theologian, it was the duty of the Christian philosopher to spend his life trying to fulfil the will of God by attaining a Christian state of perfection.558 Paideia, the path forged by spending time performing philosophical ascesis (training to acquire self-discipline), meditating, and contemplating both the Bible and God, was the way that one achieved God’s will.559 It was the path to God and Christian perfection.

Gregory of Nyssa’s vision of paideia, founded on the perspectives of his theological predecessors Origen and Clement of Alexandria, emerged as a response to the first rule drawn up for monastic life by Basil of Caesarea in Asia Minor.560 Like Evagrius of Pontus, Basil sought to create a philosophy to underpin monastic asceticism and he re-appropriated Classical paideia to do so.561 As the philosophy which underpinned monastic asceticism effectively became the Christian form of paideia, the practices associated with monastic ascetism emerged to become the Christian form of enkrateia.

In its early stages, the monastic ascetic lifestyle was adopted by those men and women who sought to seclude themselves away in the desert with the sole aim of pursuing paideia to reach a state of Christian perfection.562 Their lives revolved around regulating all aspects of the mind and body in order to reach the

558 Jaeger, Early Christianity, 90.
559 Jaeger, Early Christianity, 90, 99-100.
560 For the views of Clement of Alexandria and Origen on Christian paideia see McGinn, ‘Asceticism and Mysticism,’ 61-64 and Young, ‘Christian Paideia,’ 485-500. On Basil of Caesarea as the originator of a monastic rule see Jaeger, Early Christianity, 90, 100.
561 Jaeger, Early Christianity, 90. The pretext for assimilating the ideals attached to ascetic practice into mainstream society already existed by the point. The work of James Francis shows that the second century had witnessed the incorporation of the ideals of ‘radical’ pagan ascetics into the established culture and structure of Roman society. Basil and Gregory were simply at the start of a process that would be repeated as Christianity began to take hold in the empire. Francis, Subversive Virtue, 116-121.
highest state of perfection attainable.\textsuperscript{563} The most important aspect that had to be regulated, according to Giuliano Gasparro and Kate Cooper, was sexual appetite.\textsuperscript{564}

Examining the anthropological elements of \textit{enkrateia} in apostolic literature and early Christian exegesis, Gasparro and Cooper place the control of sexual appetites at the heart of the early Christian encratism.\textsuperscript{565} Continence equated with one’s control of their sexual appetites and without continence one’s public reputation in the political and community circles of the late empire would quickly be left in tatters.\textsuperscript{566} In the first four centuries after Christ, two schools of thought, the moderate and the radical, emerged.\textsuperscript{567} Although the boundaries between the two positions were fluid, meaning that it was permissible for a practitioner of \textit{enkrateia} to switch from viewing complete sexual abstinence as a sacred Christian duty to regarding sex within marriage and for procreation as acceptable, considerable controversy still developed.\textsuperscript{568}

Gasparro’s chapter is commendable in that it recognises that the developments which occurred in Alexandrian Christianity’s views on \textit{enkrateia} happened alongside the maturation of the patristic fathers’ perspectives on eschatology, angelology, and the nature of the Original Sin.\textsuperscript{569} Gasparro shows clearly that the ‘tradition’ of \textit{enkrateia} in Alexandrian Christianity was flexible and constantly changing. Yet, his chapter is not wholly unproblematic. Its biggest issue lies with its treatment of the concept of \textit{enkrateia} itself. While Gasparro is concerned with \textit{enkrateia} in ‘Alexandrian Christianity’, which he regards as the hub of the form of \textit{enkrateia} concerned with anthropological questions,\textsuperscript{570} he restricts \textit{enkrateia} to being purely concerned with ‘sexual’ continence, implicitly excluding any of the other ascetic practices that desert monks used to acquire self-control and follow the path to \textit{paideia} from the Christian concept of \textit{enkrateia}.
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Although ‘sexual’ control had been a central tenet of Classical enkrateia, it was far from the only aspect of the self that the ‘continent’ person needed to manage. Early Christian ‘continence’, as Henny Hägg shows was the same. Using the works of Clement of Alexandria, Hägg explains that Christian ‘continence’ was about controlling the whole self of which sexual desire was just one aspect. Cassian’s *Conferences* and *Institutes*, were the principal means by which the ideas of Origen, Evagrius of Pontus, and other eastern ascetics, on self-regulation and Christian perfection were transmitted to fifth-century Gaul.

*The Conferences*, which discuss the views of the eastern desert fathers, show all too well that the concept of ‘continence’ and the acquiescence of self-control in Alexandrian Christianity was not limited to the control of sexual appetites. McGinn argues that Cassian’s views represented a simplification of the ascetic guidelines set out by Evagrius, Cassian’s tutor and main inspiration. This notion has since been developed further by Conrad Leyser in his *Authority and Asceticism*. Here Leyser not only demonstrates how Cassian adopted the views of Evagrius, he also shows how Cassian used them to voice his own thoughts on what it took to attain sanctification. Whereas Augustine had perceived asceticism to only bring spiritual enlightenment if it was pursued by monks living in a community which strove to bridge the spiritual differences between people, thus effectively replicating as closely as possible the community that he perceived to exist in *The City of God*, Cassian placed greater stress on reconciling the conflicts within oneself on an individual basis. The primary goal of Cassian’s monk, was to spend their lives striving to systematically progress through the levels of Christian perfection by rigorously policing virtually all aspects of their bodily needs and thoughts. Such progress was made by mastering first the body, as outlined in *The Institutes*, and then the mind, following the steps provided in *The Conferences*. The key to the higher levels of perfection lay in mastering the mind which was done by constant focus on prayer, rejecting worldly concerns, meditating on Scripture,

571 Aristotle discusses the variety of qualities needed for a temperate person in Aristotle, ‘Nichomachean Ethics,’ 2.4-7.14, 1105a-1155b; Aristotle, ‘Magna Moralia,’ 2.4-7, 1200a-1204b; Aristotle, ‘On Virtues and Vices,’ 1249a-1252a.
572 Hägg, ‘Continence and Marriage,’ 127-146.
577 Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 49.
578 Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 47.
analysing the self, and, as explored in the first chapter, by recourse to the first and second types of the fear of God.\footnote{See Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century. Leyser stresses the importance of prayer and Scripture to Cassian’s views in Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 51-52.}

The first fear of God appears as an essential requirement for Christian self-control in both Cassian and Augustine’s numerous texts. Despite their very different approaches to the notion of ‘correct’ ascetic practice,\footnote{Highlighted in Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 10-59. Discussed from the specific viewpoint of grace and free will in Dunn, Emergence of Monasticism, 73-78.} this fear remained the thing that brought and kept a person on the path to God.\footnote{See Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.} The second fear of God, the one that kept a person in the love of God if they managed to reach that level of perfection, also features as another essential aspect and sign of self-mastery in the eyes of both men.\footnote{See Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.} The two fears of God are thus not only an essential part of the late fourth and early fifth-century notion of Christian self-regulation and self-mastery, they also represent one aspect which binds Augustine and Cassian’s very divergent views about ascetic practice together.

The other more obvious link, which exists between Augustine and Cassian, is their shared concern to continue the Ancient philosophical tradition of writing discourse on striving to know the self; a tradition which I argue that Gregory of Tours would participate in. When combined, the texts of Augustine and Cassian show that the arrival of Christianity had not changed either the Ancient Greek concept of enkrateia nor the willingness of the philosophically-minded to debate it. What had altered was the purpose, which was now to reach the Christian state of perfection, and the means, or specific type of monastic orthopraxy, by which contemporaries perceived that one could attain it.

In late antique Gaul, the ascetic focus on gaining and retaining individual self-discipline that had been so artfully discussed by Cassian did not remain restricted to monks. Bishops such as the greatly renowned Martin of Tours were also portrayed by their biographers to be models of self-control and propagators of this as something which good Christians, and successful Gallic bishops, should aspire to.\footnote{See Sulp., Sev., Vita Sancti Mart., CSEL, Vol. 1, 7-10, pp. 117-120; ‘Life of St. Martin,’ 7-10, pp. 7-8.} In the late fifth century, Julianus Pomerius’ treatise \textit{On the Contemplative Life}, exhorted bishops to uphold and be models of the contemplative life pursued by monks in addition to fulfilling their active Christian duties as God’s
shepherds.\footnote{584 McGinn, ‘Asceticism and Mysticism,’ 69.} Later in the sixth century, Caesarius of Arles, who was taught by Julianus,\footnote{585 Cyprianus, Firminus, and Viventius, ‘Life of Caesarius,’ 1.9, pp. 13-14. Leyser, \textit{Authority and Asceticism}, 69-70, 79-80 and 95-96; Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius: Making of a Christian Community}, 75-82, 146, 159-160 and Suelzer, ‘Introduction,’ 4.} and might later influence Gregory of Tours,\footnote{586 Leyser, \textit{Authority and Asceticism}, 36-37.} resolved not only to preach rigorous self-discipline to his congregation, but also to provide a living example of such standards through his shabby appearance, humility, and moderation.\footnote{587 I explore this briefly in Chapter 4, section 4.3.1. Anatolius of Bordeaux.} By the time of Gregory’s birth in c.538, the practice and attainment of Christian \textit{paideia} and \textit{enkratia} was no longer the preserve of the Gallic monk, it was the bishops’ business too.\footnote{588 Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius: Making of a Christian Community}, 159-160.} Gregory of Tours, as I shall now show, used the fear of God, \textit{perhaps} intentionally, to continue both the discussion of importance of self-control to the good Christian life and the Classical philosophical tradition that was debating knowledge and improvement of the self.

\subsection*{2.2.2. Having the Fear of God}

Gregory of Tours associates the fear of God with good Christian behaviour in many of the stories that make up his \textit{Ten Books of Histories}, books of \textit{Miracles}, and \textit{The Life of the Fathers}.\footnote{589 See Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 30, p. 316 (20) and 41, p. 324 (12). Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 17.1, p. 279 (9); 17.2, p. 279 (26) and 20.3, p. 293 (1). Also, Gregory of Tours, \textit{DLH}, 2.37, p. 86 (9); 9.42, p. 471 (10); 10.31, p. 526 (11) and 10.31, p. 529 (1).} In chapter forty-one of \textit{The Glory of the Confessors}, he describes how a senator called Helarius and his wife, despite having sons, embellished their house with such chastity and purity that no one dared to practice adultery there.\footnote{590 Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 41, p. 324 (1-3).} A year after Helarius died, his wife followed him to the grave.\footnote{591 Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 41, p. 324 (8-9).} When Helarius’ tomb was opened so that his wife could be interred with him, Helarius’ right hand suddenly embraced his wife’s neck.\footnote{592 Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 41, p. 324 (9-11).} Gregory states that the people admired this because they knew what chastity, love for each other, and fear of God (\textit{timor in Deum}) the couple had maintained.\footnote{593 ‘Quod admirans populus, deposito secessit operturio, cognovitque, quae eis castitas, quae \textit{timor in Deum}, quae etiam ipsi dilectio fuisse in saeculo, qui se ita amplexi sunt in sepulchro.’ Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 41, p. 324 (12).}

Gregory’s use of the fear of God in this story is interesting because he explicitly connects it with both the earthly love which the couple had for each other and their sexual self-control. For him, it is not

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{584 McGinn, ‘Asceticism and Mysticism,’ 69.}
\footnote{586 Leyser, \textit{Authority and Asceticism}, 36-37.}
\footnote{587 I explore this briefly in Chapter 4, section 4.3.1. Anatolius of Bordeaux.}
\footnote{588 Klingshirn, \textit{Caesarius: Making of a Christian Community}, 159-160.}
\footnote{589 Hunter, \textit{To Change the World}, 54.}
\footnote{590 See Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 30, p. 316 (20) and 41, p. 324 (12). Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 17.1, p. 279 (9); 17.2, p. 279 (26) and 20.3, p. 293 (1). Also, Gregory of Tours, \textit{DLH}, 2.37, p. 86 (9); 9.42, p. 471 (10); 10.31, p. 526 (11) and 10.31, p. 529 (1).}
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\footnote{594 ‘Quod admirans populus, deposito secessit operturio, cognovitque, quae eis castitas, quae \textit{timor in Deum}, quae etiam ipsi dilectio fuisse in saeculo, qui se ita amplexi sunt in sepulchro.’ Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 41, p. 324 (12).}
just Helarius and his wife’s worldly love that kept them chaste and loyal, it is also their fear of God. Helarius and his wife were made good Christians through this fear. It helped them become the model husband and wife who, through their mastery of their passions, provided a good contrast to many of the royal and ‘aristocratic’ couples described by Gregory in his Histories.595

In highlighting that Helarius and his wife’s fear of God led them to self-control through sexual restraint, Gregory can be seen to be continuing the late Roman rhetorical tradition of using sexual chastity as means of validating an elite person’s right to hold power in a community.596 In her article ‘Insinuations of Womanly Influence,’ Kate Cooper argues that in the Graeco-Roman world, public reputation and power were inextricably linked to self-mastery.597 A harmonious marriage, in which both partners were temperate in matters of affection and harmoniously loyal to one another, was a necessity to a man’s ability to claim to self-mastery.598 Only with this reputation could the elite man compete in the public sphere for power.599 This notion of a harmonious marriage as reflective of person’s claim to self-mastery was adopted by many patristic fathers including Augustine, Jerome, Paulinus of Nola, and John Chrysostom.600 Gregory’s tale of Helarius shows that he also adhered to this view.

It is notable that Gregory labels Helarius as a descendant of senators.601 For Gregory, Helarius’ worthiness for his saintliness and elite status is evidenced by his and his wife’s sexual restraint. In highlighting that the couple were renowned throughout Dijon for their chastity within marriage, Gregory preserves and continues the Graeco-Roman and Patristic tradition of linking a person’s right to power and respect within the community to their claim to self-mastery. In connecting this control to Helarius and his wife’s fear of God, Gregory also attaches this fear both to Helarius’ claim to self-discipline and his right to his elite status. The fear of God helps to cement Helarius’ position within the city because it makes both

595 Gregory records multiple cases in which a Merovingian king’s appetite led him to take more than one wife. See the story of Charibert I, Ingoberga and the two sisters Merofled and Marcoveifa in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 4.26, pp. 157-159. Later in book ten, he also describes a case in which an ‘aristocratic’ lady Tetradia, the wife of Count Eulaliius of Clermont, became embroiled in a marital scandal after she left Eulaliius and his mistreatment of her for Duke Desiderius. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.8, pp. 489-491. A good discussion of Merovingian marital practices can be found in Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society*, 27-74.

596 See Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 153-155 and Kate Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, 3-44.

597 Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 152-155. Also, Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, 5-44.


599 Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 153.

600 Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 152, 155-158.

601 Gregory of Tours, GC, 41, p. 323 (22).
he and his wife chaste within marriage. This self-mastery, within the bounds of Roman and Patristic tradition, validates Helarius right to his position of power.

In another example, this time in *Histories* 2.37, Gregory also connects the fear of God with restraint and self-control. Midway through describing Clovis' conquest of Gaul, Gregory recalls how abbot Maxentius, a recluse who explicitly feared God (*Dei timorem*) and lived just outside of Poitiers, refused to succumb to the fear that afflicted his fellow monks when a group of enemy soldiers approached.\(^{602}\) Unafflicted by the fears that had struck his monks, Maxentius took his time going to meet the soldiers despite the monks’ persistent pleas for him to hurry.\(^{603}\) When he eventually met the soldiers, Maxentius stood fearlessly before them and did not react even when one of them attempted to strike him down.\(^{604}\)

In this short miracle story, Gregory equates the fear of God with self-mastery and good Christian behaviour. Maxentius, as the one with the fear of God, is able to withstand the fear of mortal death and destruction which the soldiers inspire and represent. His fear of God enables him to remain calm and in control of the situation; unlike his fellow monks whose fear of destruction at the hands of the soldiers, causes them to act rashly, bursting into Maxentius’ cell and physically pushing him out the door when he refused to move as quickly as they desired.\(^{605}\) The monks' actions, perpetrated by their fear of being attacked, contrast starkly with the calm actions of the God-fearing Maxentius, who, as a result of his display of control and fear of God, is subsequently protected from harm when one of the soldiers tries to murder him.\(^{606}\) For Gregory, Maxentius constitutes a model abbot, setting the example for both the monks and Gregory's readers of how someone with the fear of God should behave and the benefits that they may receive as a result.

Further examples which demonstrate that Gregory associates the fear of God with self-control appear in those stories in which Gregory discusses the relationship that this fear has to other movements of the soul like anger. Throughout his *oeuvre*, Gregory includes many stories in which fear appears alongside other

\(^{602}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 2.37, p. 86 (18-19).
\(^{603}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 2.37, p. 87 (1-4).
\(^{604}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 2.37, p. 87 (5-7).
\(^{605}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 2.37, p. 87 (5-7).
\(^{606}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 2.37, p. 87 (5-7).
movements of the soul such as shame,\textsuperscript{607} shock,\textsuperscript{608} jealousy,\textsuperscript{609} grief,\textsuperscript{610} anger,\textsuperscript{611} astonishment,\textsuperscript{612} delight or joy,\textsuperscript{613} admiration or love,\textsuperscript{614} and hope.\textsuperscript{615} But when the fear of God appears alongside anger, Gregory always depicts this fear appearing in connection with the restoration of self-control. In chapter seventy-seven of \textit{The Glory of the Confessors}, Gregory recalls how the wife of a newly-made bishop, ‘burned with fury’ (\textit{acensa furor}) upon his refusal to let her come to his bed.\textsuperscript{616} In her rage the wife suspected that he was soliciting the attentions of another woman and went to his chamber to find out.\textsuperscript{617} When she arrived, she saw a vision of a white lamb resting on the sleeping man’s chest and so became ‘terrified with fear’ (\textit{timore perterrita}) that she never dared to question what he was doing in secret again.\textsuperscript{618} Here Gregory shows how the woman’s fear of the white lamb, which is symbolic for Christ, overrides her burning anger and allows her to regain rational control over herself and jealous thoughts. The fear of God, which has been re-ignited in the woman by the vision of the lamb, brings her back to a more controlled state.

In another example, this time in the \textit{Life of Patroclus}, Gregory records how the archpriest of Néris tried to approach Patroclus’ corpse in a fit of fury (\textit{furibundus}) in order to extract dust from his body. Upon seeing the saint’s shroud glowing with a brilliant light, he was left so terrified with fear through God’s will (\textit{metu perterritus}), that he hurriedly rethought his decision.\textsuperscript{619} Once again, Gregory depicts the fear of God as the fear which, having confounded and neutralised the archpriest’s anger, restores a semblance of self-control to the archpriest.

\textsuperscript{607} Gregory of Tours, \textit{GM}, 87, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{609} Gregory of Tours, \textit{DLH}, 3.18, p. 117.
\textsuperscript{611} Gregory of Tours, Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 77, p. 344 and Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 9.3, p. 255.
\textsuperscript{612} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VSJ}, 15, pp. 120-121.
\textsuperscript{614} Gregory of Tours, \textit{DLH}, 5.36, p. 243 and 6.32, p. 302.
\textsuperscript{616} Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 77, p. 344 (17).
\textsuperscript{617} Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 77, p. 344 (17-19).
\textsuperscript{618} Gregory of Tours, \textit{GC}, 77, p. 344 (21-23). Gregory’s interest in the visionary aspect of this tale is discussed in Moreira, \textit{Dreams, Visions, and Spiritual Authority}, 94.
\textsuperscript{619} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 9.3, p. 255 (3-7).
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The relationship that Gregory portrays to exist between the fear of God, grief, sorrow, and other worldly fears also demonstrates that he thought that the fear of God would restore any self-control that had been damaged by worldly fear and grief. There are two chapters in Gregory’s œuvre which demonstrate this: the *Life of Monegundis* and the prologue to the first book of *The Miracles of Saint Martin*.

The prologue to book one of *The Miracles of Saint Martin* shows poignantly that Gregory thought that worldly fears could be overcome by the fear of God, hope, and faith. Discussing the myriad of emotions which he experienced in the run up to writing his book on Martin’s miracles, Gregory states:

‘But I, desirous to do these things [record Martin’s miracles], am afflicted by the torment of a duplex affliction of sorrow and terror. Of sorrow, because so many miracles, that were performed under our ancestors, have not been recorded; of terror, because I approach the excellent task rustically.’

In this *exordium*, Gregory lists terror as one of the emotions he experiences. The grief and terror to which he refers are situated within a rhetorical style of writing that was designed to allow someone to delicately balance their humility with their literary competency; qualities that were encouraged in, and had been embodied by, Gallic bishops such as Caesarius of Arles. The terror and grief are rhetorical constructs, but they also show Gregory perceiving that any instability caused by grief and worldly fear, in this case perhaps a fear of the critical reception the work would receive, could be trounced by hope, divine piety, and the fear of God. Gregory’s references to his hope and piety are notable because they immediately characterise him as someone on the path to Wisdom and Christian perfection. To have reached the stage of hope and piety, in accordance with the theology of Augustine and Cassian, Gregory must have experienced, achieved perfection in, and still be guided by the first type of the fear of God; the fear of His

---

620 ‘Ego autem haec agere cupiens, duplicis taedii adfligior cruciatu, maeroris pariter et terroris. Maeroris, cur tantae virtutes, quae sub antecessoribus nostris factae sunt, non sunt scriptae; terroris, ut adgrediar opus egregium rusticanus.’ Gregory of Tours, *VSM*, 1.Pro., p. 136 (7-10).
621 Leyser states that command of language was an important element of Augustine and Cassian’s views of asceticism. It became even more to Julianus Pomerius’ vision of the ascetic in power and it was put into practice by Caesarius of Arles. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 59-61 and 66-81.
623 For an exposition of Cassian and Augustine’s theology in relation to the fear of God see Chapter 1, section 1.4: *The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century*. 
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punishment and judgement.\textsuperscript{624} In declaring that his hope and divine piety were stronger than the worldly terror and grief he experienced in relation to recording Martin’s miracles, Gregory not only announces that he considers these things to be stronger than worldly terror, but also that the fear of God, the fear which he had to have in order to attain hope and divine piety, would also allow him to triumph over his worldly terror and sorrow.

The *Life of Monegundis*, the only *Life* to be focused on a woman, is the other text in which Gregory shows that the fear of God could enable a person to master their grief and regain their self-mastery. In his opening paragraph, Gregory describes how Monegundis, who had once been very happy and blessed with two daughters, fell into a state of inconsolable grief following the deaths of her children from moderate fevers.\textsuperscript{625} She is shown, initially, to succumb to her worldly grief, as Gregory says that she wept unceasingly throughout the day and night and would not be consoled by anyone.\textsuperscript{626} Yet after a short time, she declared:

“If I do not take consolation from the painful deaths of [my] daughters, I fear lest in this way I offend my Lord Jesus Christ. But now I relinquish my lamenting with consolations from the blessed Job…”\textsuperscript{627}

Monegundis’ fear of God, specifically her fear of offending Christ, enables her to regain mastery over her grief at the deaths of her daughters. From this more controlled state, she is then able to lead the life of a successful ascetic, eventually setting up her own small nunnery near Saint Martin’s tomb.\textsuperscript{628} Gregory also notably ends her story by referring once again to the fear of God with his concluding remark on the ‘…Lord Jesus Christ, who bestows eternal reward to those who fear His name.’\textsuperscript{629} For Gregory, it is the fear of God

\textsuperscript{624} Augustine held that to have reached piety and hope one had to have experienced the fear of God’s punishment and still be being guided by it. Cassian thought that one had to have become perfect in and still be guided by the first fear of God to reach the stages of piety and hope. A person also had to perfect these before they could move on the next stage. See Chapter 1, section 1.4: *The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.*

\textsuperscript{625} Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 19.1, p. 286 (18-24).

\textsuperscript{626} Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 19.1, p. 286 (22-24).

\textsuperscript{627} “Si nullam consolationem de obitu filiarum capio, vereor, ne ob hoc laedam dominum memum Iesum Christum. Sed nunc haec lamenta relinquens, cum beato lob consolata…” Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 19.1, p. 286 (24-26).

\textsuperscript{628} Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 19.1, pp. 286-291. Coon has explored the notion that Gregory might have placed extra emphasis on Monegundis’ grief in order to model her as a new Frankish Job. Coon, *Sacred Fictions*, 124-125.

\textsuperscript{629} ‘…nostro Iesu Christo, qui timentibus nomen suum praemia largitur aeterna.’ Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 19.1, p. 291 (3-4).
which allows Monegundis to regain control over her grief and herself and enables her to pursue the path towards spiritual purity.

The relationship which Gregory perceived to exist between the fear of God, self-mastery, and good Christian ascetic behaviour is also apparent in *Histories* 7.1. Here Gregory outlines the life of Salvius, the holy saint who ended his life as the Bishop of Albi. Recording Salvius’ earlier years, Gregory reports that, shortly after entering a monastery, Salvius quickly realised that it would be ‘better to enjoy poverty with the fear of God (*Dei timore*) than to pursue the riches of the perishable world.’ He subsequently spent several years following this and the rule instituted by the Fathers in the monastery. When the presiding abbot died, Gregory reports that Salvius received the task of feeding the brothers because, with the flower of his age, he had reached the full strength of intellect. Despite his new post, Salvius felt that the life of the recluse suited him better and he withdrew from public life. As a result of his abstinence and Christian charity, Salvius, after dying and being escorted into heaven by two angels, found himself unceremoniously sent back to earth by God who felt that His churches needed Salvius’ direction. Upon his miraculous return to life, Salvius was then appointed as the Bishop of Albi and spent the rest of his days exhorting his flock to pray to God and directing their minds and bodies towards good.

Gregory’s account of Salvius is notable for several reasons. Despite being more closely connected with the stories in *The Life of the Fathers* through its subject matter, it forms the opening chapter to the seventh book of *Histories*. Gregory himself states that he paused his history writing because Salvius had died that year (584) and he wanted to say something about him. There is no reason to disregard Gregory’s words, but it is worth keeping an open mind to the possibility that he might have partly decided to place Salvius’ *Life* in the *Histories* because it was a tale of hope, a light in the turmoil that Gregory’s world had once again become with Chilperic’s murder and the subsequent seizure of Tours by his brother, the sole

---

631 Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 7.1, p. 323 (22-23).
634 Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 7.1, p. 325-326 (2-25, 1).
surviving adult Merovingian king, Guntram of Burgundy. The story of Salvius reminds the reader of the rewards that those who remained fearful and steadfast in God could achieve. It serves as a reassuring guide and shows that Gregory perceived a strong connection to exist between the fear of God, the attainment of self-mastery, good Christian behaviour, and salvation. It is only after Salvius realises that it is better to live in poverty and with the fear of God that he is able to live under the rule of the monastery, reach his full intellectual capacity, and acquire enough ascetic rigour to make him a suitable abbot and model of correction for his brothers. The fear of God enables Salvius to gain his self-control which leads him to acquire a glimpse of heaven and a personal task from God as a holy reward. For Gregory, the fear of God is closely connected with the acquisition of self-control and the Christian reward of salvation.

Before discussing the final and most important example, which shows that Gregory linked the fear of God with self-control and salvation, it is worth pausing to note that in the tale of Salvius, Gregory makes this fear the thing that leads the saint to participate in the holy life. Up until his return to earth at least, the holy path that Salvius treads closely resembles that of the ideal monk as portrayed in Cassian’s Institutes and Conferences, and the ideal ascetic who combines the active and contemplative lifestyles discussed in Julianus’ Contemplative Life. Conrad Leyser has already highlighted that Gregory knew about Cassian’s ascetic model in his chapter on ascetic authority in Gregory’s Life of the Fathers. In what follows I show how Gregory’s account of Salvius’ life lends even greater support to his argument.

As already discussed in chapter one, Cassian used his eleventh Conference to discuss how people would enter onto the path of perfection through the first fear of God, before passing to the heights of perfection and then to even higher perfection, accompanied by the love and second fear of God. But in Conference eighteen, Cassian also says that a monk may pass from the coenobitic to anchoritic lifestyles as they continue

637 On Chilperic’s murder see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.46, p. 319 (13-19). Guntram takes control of Tours as well the other territories that had previously belonged to Chilperic which had transferred first to Sigibert and then Chilperic in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.6, p. 329 (16-18).
638 Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From This Book”, 290-291. Also Jones, Death and Afterlife, 125-132.
their journey through the heights of perfection. Discussing the three types of monastic lifestyles, Cassian, through abba Piamun, states:

‘The first [lifestyle] is that of the coenobites, who naturally live together in a community and are governed by the judgement of one elder…The second is that of the anchorites, who are first instructed in the coenobia and then, perfect in the practical way of life, choose the remoteness of the desert.’¹⁴⁰

In this statement, Cassian identifies that the anchorite lifestyle is for those who have already followed and perfected the coenobitic, practical way of life. The desert life, in Cassian’s eyes, is for those who already have a degree of monastic perfection. Gregory of Tours’ life of Salvius shows this transition in action. Salvius is first brought onto the path of wisdom through his fear of God and desire for poverty. He lives in a monastery and becomes so perfect in that lifestyle that he is chosen to succeed the abbot. From this authoritative position, he opts to pursue a more secluded lifestyle, one which is akin to that of the desert fathers and allows him to focus on the contemplative aspect of asceticism that was as equally important to Julianus’ ascetic-in-power as the active lifestyle.⁶⁴¹ As a result of this, Salvius temporarily attains a blessed place in heaven before he is sent back to earth by God to become the Bishop of Albi. Gregory closely models Salvius’ pre-episcopal life on the monastic path of perfection established by Cassian and incorporates the qualities important to Julianus’ ascetic-in-power into this model to prove that Salvius had become worthy of his episcopal post. It is perhaps no coincidence that the fear of God, which is the thing that drives Salvius onto his path in Gregory’s story, is also regarded as the beginning of the path to self-mastery in Cassian and Julianus’ ascetic models.⁶⁴² Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God and its connection to self-discipline and salvation seems, in part, to be directly based on his knowledge of Cassian and Julianus’ views on Christian self-mastery and asceticism.


⁶⁴² In Cassian the fear of God is one of several ways to start on the path to God. Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, XI.VI.1, p. 317 (17-20); Conf., 11.6.1. p. 411. In Julianus Pomerius’ work the fear of God is a requirement to get onto and remain on the path to God. Pom., Vita Contemplat., PL, Vol. 59, lib. 3, cap. 31.2-3, col. 515-516; Contemplative Life, 3.31.3, pp. 163-164.
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A final example which explicitly demonstrates that Gregory equated the fear of God with self-mastery can be found in the twelfth tale of The Life of the Fathers. In his prologue to the Life of the holy hermit Aemilianus and the holy abbot Brachio, Gregory openly discusses the fear of God in terms of discipline and self-control. He begins by drawing on a quote from Solomon: ‘the discipline of peace will be over him’,643 which is a slight removal from the original in Isaiah: ‘the discipline of our peace be above him’.644 What is important for the purposes of this chapter however, is not how accurately Gregory quotes whichever version of Scripture he used, but how he subsequently uses and expands upon it. What follows are his own words:

“For discipline creates the fear of the Lord, the fear of the Lord facilitates the beginning of wisdom, wisdom, rightly, teaches [us] how to love God;”645

Here Gregory draws on the view, put forward by Scripture, Augustine, and Cassian, that the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom which, in turn, enables a person to learn how to love God.646 But Gregory’s own words, that discipline either creates or makes the fear of the Lord, are more interesting. By asserting that discipline creates the fear of God, Gregory explicitly forges a link between this fear and self-control. The two become inseparably bound together. Discipline, including discipline of the self, is the thing which creates the fear of the Lord. It is effectively the backbone of the fear of God, the thing which this fear is made of in a person. Without discipline one cannot be in the fear of God. Without the fear of God, one cannot acquire wisdom and without wisdom, the love of God cannot be obtained. Discipline is a crucial part of the fear of God. It makes the fear of God the thing which enables a person to progress along the path of Christian paideia to wisdom and the love of God. The fear of God is crucial to be a good Christian. As shown in the examples of Salvius, abbot Maxentius, and Helanius and his wife, the fear of God, and the self-discipline which it requires, is central to good Christian behaviour and the holy life. For Gregory, the fear of God is tied to self-discipline, largely because it is created by it. But, as will now be shown, it is also bound to self-control because it is the thing which enables a person to maintain that discipline.

646 For this in the Bible see Vulgate, Ps., 110:10 and Prov., 1:7 and 9:10. For this in Augustine and Cassian see the discussion in Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.
2.2.3. The Lack of the Fear of God

There are several cases in which Gregory describes a decisive lack of the fear of God being experienced when it should be.\(^{647}\) Most of these narratives clearly indicate that Gregory thought that the fear of God could be undermined by a willingness to follow desire related to vice. The fear of God was far from unsurmountable. In his *Life of the holy abbot Martius* for example, Gregory tells of how ‘a certain impudent person without the fear of God, having been enslaved to desire of the gullet, often broke into the garden,’ for the purposes of stealing the monks’ fruit and vegetables which were growing therein.\(^{648}\) As might be predicted, the man was not entirely successful in his attempted theft. What is important here however, is that Gregory clearly perceived a connection to exist between the man’s lack of the fear of God and his willingness to submit to the desires of his gullet. The man’s lack of the fear of God means that he surrenders to the vice of gluttony.

In another example, this time in *The Glory of the Martyrs* chapter seventy-one, the fear of God is shown to be undermined by the wilful submission to avarice. In this tale, Gregory records how ‘another man was not afraid to tread on the tomb of saint [Dionysius], as he was seeking to strike the gold dove with a spear’.\(^{649}\) Unfortunately, while attempting to acquire the dove, the man slipped and speared himself through the testicles.\(^{650}\) Besides illustrating the consequences that could result from trying to profane a saint’s tomb, Gregory’s story is notable because it implies that the fear of God, which Gregory expected the man to have from revering and fearing the power of the martyrs, is overridden by desire, in this case the desire for the physical wealth which the gold dove represents. The man’s willingness to submit to avarice allows any fear of the martyrs and fear of God which he might have had, to be overtaken by worldly desire.


\(^{648}\) ‘Quidam autem impudens et sine timore Dei, gulae circumscriptus desiderio, effectumiam saepem horit, furtivo est ingressus accessu,’ Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 14.2, p. 269 (8-10).

\(^{649}\) ‘Alius autem super sepulchrum sanctum calcare non metuens, dum columbam auream lancea quaerit elidunt, Gregory of Tours, *GM*, 71, p. 86 (8-9).

\(^{650}\) ‘…dilapidatisque pedibus ab utraque parte, quia turritum erat tumulum, compresse sis testiculis, lancea in latere defixa, ecanimis est inventus.’ Gregory of Tours, *GM*, 71, p. 86 (9-11).
Both the narratives above have two things in common. Firstly, they show that Gregory thought that without the fear of God, a person’s desires could reign over their actions. Any self-control which the fear of God might have enabled someone to acquire, could also be undone if the person became distracted by desire and vice. Secondly, the two stories highlight that Gregory equated the fear of God with self-control and that he understood good and bad Christian behaviour in terms of one's relationship to this fear. The man attempting to thieve vegetables from the garden of the holy abbot Martius for example, was explicitly described to be without the fear of God (sine timore Dei) and thus without self-control. Whether the man might have been acting from starvation is irrelevant for Gregory. In his eyes, had the man not been ‘enslaved to the desires of his gullet’, but guided by the fear of God, he would not have attempted to commit the theft because the fear of God’s punishment would have reminded him to control his actions. Likewise, the man in The Glory of the Martyrs who allowed his desire for wealth, which the gold dove on Dionysius’ tomb proffered, to override his fear of God’s retribution, is shown by Gregory to have lost both his mental and physical control. The man's submission to avarice mooted any fear of the saint and God that he might have had. It made him lose control over his will, which then desired to steal the dove, and later deprived him of the ability to control his body leading him to slip and injure himself. Whereas, the presence of the fear of God in the narratives discussed in the previous section is shown to be inextricably connected with self-control, the lack of this fear, when it is either absent from a person or overtaken by desire and vice in the two stories above, equates to a loss of that self-control. Gregory uses the presence, or lack of, the fear of God to signify good and bad Christian behaviour.

A third example which indicates that Gregory associated the lack of the fear of God with the will to follow desire and vice, can be found in Histories 8.30. Here Gregory describes how Duke Nicetius’ unsuccessful campaign against the Visigoths, led King Guntram of Burgundy to gather his military leaders, priests, and lay people in the Basilica of Saint Symphorian and rebuke them for their lack of victory. According to Gregory, the king shouted:
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‘Truly we alone do not fear God, we destroy His holy places, kill His ministers, and in laughter we mutilate and destroy those holy guarantees (relics).’

The words which Gregory affords Guntram are significant on several levels. Firstly, they tie together the concepts of the fear of God and victory in battle; indicating that the former was perceived to be necessary for the latter. Without the fear of God, there could be no victory. Secondly, they demonstrate that without this fear, people be would unrestrained from committing great sins. In Guntram’s dialogue, his men are guilty of despoiling holy places and killing God’s servants. They are collectively guilty of the sin of murder and the vice of avarice which signifies a lack of the fear of God in Guntram and Gregory’s eyes. This lack of fear ties back into the lack of victory. Since Guntram’s men do not fear God, having chosen to murder and pillage instead, God has not favoured them with skills to be victorious against the Visigoths. Without the fear of God, Guntram’s men have no restraint or control over themselves; control which on a practical and divine level would have been necessary for victory in war. Histories 8:30 shows that Gregory equated the fear of God with self-control and the lack of this fear, whose absence allowed the triumph of the will to commit sin and submit to vice, with the loss of self-control and defeat in battle.

Notably, Guntram’s lengthy diatribe in 8.30 constitutes his reaction to the knowledge that not only had his men lost the campaign against Spain, but that they had also badly sacked Clermont; Gregory’s ancestral home and seat of his paternal family lands. Because of this, it is worth questioning whether Guntram’s words about the fear of God and expression that he received the news with ‘a great bitterness of the heart’ (magna...amaritudo cordis), are more representative of Gregory’s own reaction and thoughts about the matter. If this is the case, then it would be a significant indicator that the language that Gregory uses in this particular story has a highly personal facet to it. How he uses the fear of God in this scenario is not only reflective of what he thought Guntram should be depicted to think, but what he really thought as well.

651 ‘Nos vero solum Deum non metuemus, verum etiam sacra eius vastamus, ministros interficimus, ipsa quoque sanctorum pignera in ridiculo discerpimus ac vastamus.’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.30, p. 395 (12-14). The guarantees are probably relics since these were vessels through which divine power was channelled. This enabled them to act as sureties of God’s favour. For more on relics see Brown, Society and the Holy, 222-250. Also, Brown, Cult of the Saints, 92-105.

652 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.30, pp. 393-395.
Guntram’s dialogue in Histories 8.30 is not the first time that Gregory deploys the lack of the fear of God when referring to the perpetrators who ravaged the lands to which he was connected. In Histories 5.14, Gregory declared that Chilperic was a man ‘without the fear of God’ when referring to the repeated devastation that the king had inflicted on Tours after Gregory refused to expel his son, Merovech, from the region.\footnote{Exercitus autem Chilperici regis usque Toronum accedens, regionem illam in praedas mittit, succendit atque devastat nec rebus sancti Martini pepercit, sed quod manum tetigit, sine illo Dei intuetu aut timorem deripuit.’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.14, p. 213 (6-8).} At the time of the composition of Histories 5.14, assuming that Gregory was recording events more or less as they happened, Gregory was muddling through the political ramifications that had accompanied Chilperic’s seizure of Tours after Sigibert’s assassination. He was juggling his episcopal duty to protect Merovech, who had sought sanctuary in Tours shortly after attacking it,\footnote{Guntram restored the region of Tours to Childebert II in 585 when he conferred the control of Sigibert’s lands over to him see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.33, pp. 353-354. For the death of Chilperic see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.46, pp. 319-321.} and his need to demonstrate some degree of loyalty to his new king. Chilperic’s determination to ravage Tours and the surrounding region, in response to Gregory’s continued protection of Merovech, would have taken its toll on the bishop, making him unpopular with the people and increasing the pressure on him to tread carefully. In this light, Gregory’s labelling of Chilperic as a king who lacked the fear of God could indicate that he was using the fear of God, or lack of it, to express his dismay, frustration, and possible anger at the king’s actions. Those who knew Gregory, or at least understood the value that the fear of God would have held for a bishop, might have been able to recognise the complaint. Those who did not would simply gloss it as an atypical remark.

By the time Gregory composed Guntram’s speech in Histories 8.30, somewhere between late 585 to early 586, the political stage was very different. Chilperic was dead, murdered in 584, and Tours had recently been transferred by Guntram to the jurisdiction of Sigibert’s son, Childebert II.\footnote{On this tumult see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.4-49, pp. 193-263.} Gregory too, having come through the general and localised political tumult of the late 570s, had become more secure in his post.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.26, p. 390.} Whether he was under strain from Childebert II and local politics at this point is difficult to establish. Tours had recently had a new dux appointed to it,\footnote{Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.2, p. 195 (5-7) and 5.14, pp. 207-213.} probably in line with the recent transfer of Tours to Childebert. This turned out to be Ennodius, the count whom Chilperic had deposed when he...
claimed the city in 577. 658 Gregory gives no indication that he and Ennodius ever clashed in the same way that he had done with Count Leudast. 659 Nevertheless, Gregory does state that Ennodius was soon removed from his post and that he later stood as prosecutor to Egidius, the Bishop of Rheims who had consecrated Gregory. 660 Whether the two men got along in these circumstances is difficult to know. 661 Gregory is largely silent on the matter.

Whether Gregory would have still felt obliged to portray Guntram in a favourable light, even though the king no longer governed the region, is also uncertain. Although Guntram had restored Tours to Childebert II, 662 thereby lifting any immediate pressure which might have pushed Gregory to portray Guntram as a ‘good’ king, Guntram and Childebert were still in a fractious alliance at this point. With this in mind, Gregory might have continued to feel that he should portray Guntram as a ‘good’ Christian king, lest either Guntram or Childebert should ever gain access to his work. 663 Moreover, while it is very possible that Guntram might have concurred with Gregory’s views on his troops and the fear of God, the diatribe he speaks to the assembly can only safely be attributed to Gregory. It is not unreasonable to suggest that Gregory would have been annoyed, angered, and/or saddened by the ravaging of the properties and holy places of his ancestral home. His subsequent labelling of Guntram’s troops as men who did not fear God, might therefore have served as a means by which he could characterise their actions, justify their defeat against the Goths, and vent his own bitterness at the atrocities which they had committed. Gregory’s use of the lack of the fear of God in Histories 5.14 and 8.30 suggests that he might have viewed and used the lack of the fear of God as a method by which he could characterise his subject’s actions as examples of bad Christian behaviour, and a way to vent his own feelings on the consequences such actions.

---

658 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.24, p. 230.
659 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.47-50, pp. 257-263.
660 For Ennodius’ second removal see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 9.7, p. 420. For his prosecution of Egidius see Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.19, p. 510.
661 If Gregory and Ennodius did get along then this could have alleviated some of the stress that Gregory encountered when navigating the judicial boundaries that existed between his authority and that of the count’s in local politics. It might also have enabled him to be slightly more liberal in his writings, since he would no longer have to worry about the count making accusations that could get him removed from his post. Egidius’ trial, conviction, and subsequent dismissal from his post had the potential to cause issues for Gregory’s own reputation and authority, since he had received his episcopal title at Egidius’ hands. Yet this is purely conjectural. Gregory never implies that his authority suffers as a result of Egidius’ deposition and he never indicates that his professional relationship with Ennodius was soured as a result.
662 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 7.33, pp. 353-354.
663 This does not necessarily imply that Gregory intended that the kings would read his work or that he wrote it for them to read. For a discussion on the issues surrounding Gregory’s portrayal of Guntram after Chilperic’s death see Halsall, ‘Nero and Herod?’ 337-350. An alternative view is found in Wood, ‘Secret Histories,’ 253-270.
Of further and final note is Gregory’s declaration concerning the lack of the fear of God in *Histories* 6.5. This also reveals that Gregory perceived the fear of God to be connected with self-control and its absence with the loss of such mastery. In *Histories* 6.5, Gregory narrates his debate with Chilperic and a Jew on the issue of whether God came down to earth to save mankind. When the Jew inquires as to whether God could simply have sent a prophet or an apostle to save the human race, rather than undertaking the task Himself, Gregory replies that it had been necessary for God to save mankind because:

‘From the beginning the human race has always forsaken [Him] of whom it was not terrified, nor [was it terrified by] the submerging of the Flood, the burning of Sodom, the plagues of Egypt, the miracle of the sea and the division of Jordan; it always resisted the commandment of God, it did not believe the prophets, and, not only did it not believe, it also killed those proclaimers of repentance.’

Aside from being an example of Gregory using the fear of God in rhetorical discourse, Gregory’s response to the Jew illustrates that he perceived the lack of the fear of God to be the reason why it had to be God who saved humankind. The connection that Gregory forges between the lack of the human race’s fear of God and God’s need to come to earth Himself, suggests that he might have considered that God came down to earth to instil His fear into mankind as part of his task of accomplishing its redemption. Gregory’s notion has theological precedent both in Scripture and the works of Prosper of Aquitaine, who devoted much energy to reminding his readers that the fear of God was God’s gift to mankind in *The Call of All Nations*. Gregory’s passage demonstrates that he regarded the fear of God to be part of Christ’s gift of redemption, which He re-kindled while on earth. But upon closer inspection, Gregory’s words also show him subtly conveying his perception that the lack of the fear of God in people was indicative of their lack of self-control.

---

665 “A principio genus semper diliquit humanum, quem numquam terruit nec submersio diluvii nec incendium Sodomae nec plagae Aegypti nec miraculum maris Jordaniaque divisi; qui semper legi Dei restitit, prophetis non crededit, et non solum non crededit, verum etiam ipsos praedictores paenitentiae interemit.” Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 6.5, pp. 270-271 (17-18, 1-3).
Gregory’s debate with the Jew has already been recognised by Martin Heinzelmann to have constituted an opportunity for Gregory to expand and clarify his Christological views. What Heinzelmann seems not to have recognised however, is that this speech also reflects Gregory’s eschatological perspectives and views about the theological issue of self-control and paideia. In the passage above, Gregory holds that it had to be Christ who underwent the Passion because mankind was so steeped in sin and so without the fear of God that only God Himself could put them back on the right path. Mankind is portrayed by Gregory to have lost total control over itself; neither the Flood, Plagues of Egypt, nor Burning of Sodom was enough to cause it to remember what it owed to God. Effectively, mankind had become an unruly child. No longer fearing or respecting its parent, it had lost its ability to discern right from wrong, moral from immoral.

When Christ came to earth, according to Gregory, He seems to have done two things. Firstly, He absolved mankind from its past sins by suffering the Passion. Secondly, He re-ignited the fear of God in certain people who then spread that fear around the world. He accomplished this using two means. One was the performance of miraculous cures, which included restoring the sight of the blind and resurrecting the dead. Such miracles made God’s power manifest to those around Him and they are often said to

667 Heinzelmann, Gregory, 155.


669 See also, Gregory of Tours, DLH, 1.3-4, p. 6; 1.12, p. 13; 1.14-16, pp. 14-15.

670 As with Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory’s works show that he also perceived the relationship between God and mankind to be one of a parent and child in Roman culture. In Gregory’s writings, kings are persuaded by examples and words to remember their fear of God e.g. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, pp. 219-220 and Gregory of Tours, VP, 17.2, p. 279. While the miracle narratives depict people of all social ranks being coerced by debilitating illnesses to remember their fear of God, there is only one case in which a priest receives a beating by Christ to bring about this result: Gregory of Tours, GM, 22, p. 51. Even then, the blows ( Verae) are only administered after Basileus initially fails to heed Christ’s request to cover His nakedness in a painting. Following Saller’s analysis of the use of the whip in Roman family culture, this would imply that Gregory saw the relationship of mankind to God as akin to a parent and child, rather than a slave and master. Although certain punishments inflicted on wrongdoers in Gregory’s works are akin to corporal punishments in Roman law, words not punishments are used most often to inspire the fear of God. The whip, the punishment of a master to a slave, is the last resort. Saller, Patriarchy, 133-139 and 141-145.

671 This is the very crux of Gregory’s response to the Jew’s question of why it had to be Christ who underwent the Passion.

672 This is a task of the apostles, one of which was Andrew whom Gregory wrote a condensed book of miracles about. Gregory of Tours, M/A, 1-38, pp. 378-396.
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spark fear in the Bible.674 Gregory would continue this tradition in his own miracle stories.675 The second method was by the preaching of God’s Word.676 This served to remind mankind of the fear it owed to God and it was transmitted across the world by the apostles and believers in Christ after the Ascension. If one examines Gregory’s edition of The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew, it is notable that Andrew is shown to continue Christ’s work by performing miracles and by spreading the Word and fear of God to the people he interacts with.677 Gregory’s adaptation of this text means he would have firmly identified Christ’s miracles and bringing of the Word of God as being the two main gifts which helped to spread the fear of God amongst humans once more.

Thus, Gregory’s opinion seems to have been that when Christ came to earth, He redeemed mankind by reinstating the possibility of salvation and by leaving them with the means by which they could reach that salvation: the fear of God. This fear brought control and order to the chaotic mess in which mankind previously existed. Without the fear of God, humans would return to an undisciplined, uncontrolled state; a scenario that would prompt Christ’s Second Coming and, in accordance with the Gospel of Matthew and the Book of Revelation, the Apocalypse.678 Gregory’s debate with Chilperic and the Jew thus shows that he perceived the fear of God to be a gift rekindled in humans by Christ for the purposes of restoring wider order through the maintenance of self-control. The lack of this fear equated with the loss of such discipline and would result in chaos until after the events of the Apocalypse.

An analysis of the depictions of the fear of God and the lack of this fear that appear in Gregory of Tours’ Ten Books of Histories, Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers thus reveals that he equated the presence of this fear with discipline and self-mastery, and the lack of this fear with an absence of such control. The fear of God and its connection to discipline make it a central component of Gregory’s views of good Christian behaviour on everything from the individual level to the wider society. The fear of God keeps the Christian individual, wider society, and world in order. Without discipline there is no fear of God,679 but without the

---

674 For example, Vulgate, Luk., 7:15-16.
676 Christ preaches the fear of God in Vulgate, Matt., 10:28.
677 This is the underlying theme of every story in Gregory of Tours, MA, 1-38, pp. 378-396.
678 Vulgate, Rev., 14:1 and Matt., 24:30.
fear of God there is also no discipline. The two concepts are inseparably intertwined. They are central to Gregory’s view of how an individual, society, and the wider world operate within the order instituted by God. It is for this reason that the fear of God is so important to Gregory and why it is so prominent in all his works.

2.3. Gregory, the Fear of God, and Self-Control in Merovingian Realpolitik

Having argued that Gregory used the fear of God in his texts to express his ideas about notions of self-control and what made the good Christian, this section takes Gregory’s record of the trial of Praetextatus and explores how he utilised the connection to navigate the turmoil that littered the Merovingian political sphere in the first decade of his episcopacy. The decision to use Praetextatus’ trial was made primarily because this is the only trial in the Histories in which Gregory can be seen to be explicitly depicting himself using the fear of God to navigate a political, legal, and religious issue. It thus provides an invaluable opportunity for historians to examine how Gregory thought that the fear of God could and should be used in a practical political situation, not just theological and ideological discourse. Gregory’s account of the trial of Praetextatus of Rouen has already attracted much attention in Gregorian scholarship.680 Most recently, Helmut Reimitz has suggested that Gregory used the trial as a way ‘to discuss fundamental questions regarding the limits and legitimation of secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to assert the responsibility of the ruler and the bishops to orient themselves to divine law.’681 Reimitz is not wrong in his interpretation, but, in what follows, I suggest that Gregory might be doing more in this narrative than conveying his views on the boundaries between ecclesiastical and secular justice.682 I argue that Gregory’s use of the fear of God in this trial demonstrates two things: firstly, that he equated this fear with self-control and good Christian behaviour and secondly, that in keeping with the Graeco-Roman tradition of placing self-control as the key


to wielding public power, Gregory perceived that it was the connection between the fear of God and self-mastery which rendered this fear a potent and useful tool for negotiating power relationships.

Praetextatus’ trial took place at the Synod at Paris in 577. He was accused of breaking the Canons, by permitting the incestuous marriage of King Chilperic’s son, Merovech, to his aunt and King Sigibert’s widow, Queen Brunhild, and with committing treason, by inciting people to support Merovech against Chilperic. Gregory’s account of the three-day trial is extensive, but it can be summarised thus:

Day 1: Chilperic accuses Praetextatus of marrying Merovech to Queen Brunhild and with conspiring to bring about his death. He presents witnesses carrying gifts which Praetextatus had given them as proof but Praetextatus defends himself by declaring that he had been acting within the parameters of gift-exchange. After Chilperic withdraws, Aëtius, the Archdeacon of Paris, warns that if the other bishops did not support Praetextatus they would be perceived as cowards by God and men alike. Gregory, after delivering two rhetorical speeches which also urged the bishops to support Praetextatus, is summoned to meet with Chilperic and the two discuss the matter. That evening he is visited by the servants of Chilperic’s wife, Queen Fredegund, who attempt to bribe him to speak out against Praetextatus. Gregory replies that he would act in accordance with the Canons.

Day 2: Chilperic attempts to bring charges of larceny against Praetextatus who successfully deflects them and forces Chilperic to withdraw again. Back at his lodgings, Chilperic concocts a plan to ensnare Praetextatus.

---

683 Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, 3-44.
685 The idea that one who receives a gift must then repay the gesture with another gift of similar stature after an appropriate length of time has passed. For more on this see Florin Curta, ‘Merovingian and Carolingian Gift Giving,’ *Speculum* 81, no. 3 (2006): 671-699 and V. Alice Tyrrell, *Merovingian Letters and Letter Writers* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2019), 177-195. Also see the collective essays in Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre, *The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), esp. 1-32, 62-88.
Day 3: After initially parrying the charge that he had been seeking men who would make friends with Merovech, Praetextatus suddenly confesses to having plotted to overthrow Chilperic. The king, having returned to his lodgings, sends a copy of the Canons to the bishops presiding over the trial. This copy contains a new four-page insert on the Apostolic Canons which declare that any bishop guilty of murder, perjury, or adultery was to be removed from his office. Praetextatus realises too late that he has been tricked and while Gregory tries to defend him, he is unsuccessful. Praetextatus is first jailed and then exiled to an island off Coutances after Chilperic demanded him to be stripped of his episcopal tunic and excommunicated.

To explore Gregory’s use of the fear of God in his narration of Praetextatus’ trial, I decided to transform Gregory’s narrative into a script and format this in a similar way to that of a stage performance or film script. Each scene, of which there are nine in total, has settings, characters, dialogue, and ‘scene’ sections which describe the visual aspects or actions of the characters as told by Gregory. The foundations and analyses which follow are derived from this script. The motivations for this methodology are twofold. Gregory’s record of the trial is situated in the middle of his Ten Books of Histories which are, in the most basic sense, a story. One of the most informative ways for a historian to access emotions within Gregory’s stories, to see not only where they occur but what part they play within the events narrated, is to perform or act out his narratives. This not only has the effect of enlivening the dialogue and actions in the historian’s mind, it also aligns with the reading practices of the period.

Throughout late antiquity and the early middle ages it was common practice to read texts using an active form of reading known as lectio divina.686 Lectio divina is considered an ‘active’ method of reading because its three stages - oral recitation, repetition, and memorisation - forced the reader to actively engage with the words written.687 Texts read using lectio divina were normally performed aloud, but silent personal reading in certain cases was also encouraged.688 Although lectio divina was a reading practice that was largely

---

686 For a comprehensive analysis of lectio divina in late antiquity and the early middle ages see Robertson, Lectio Divina. Also, Riché, Education and Culture, 117-121.
687 Robertson, Lectio Divina, xiv. Riché highlights a few cases in which silent reading was encouraged. Riché, Education and Culture, 117.
688 Robertson, Lectio Divina, xiv.
associated with studying Scripture or exegesis for spiritual contemplation by the sixth century, the practice of reading texts aloud extended beyond the reserve of the purely religious text. \(^{689}\) Acknowledging the type of reading practice that surrounds Gregory’s works is important because these reading practices would have influenced the methods that late antique authors, like Gregory, used to construct their works. Most texts would have been written with the knowledge that they would be recited aloud or performed to an audience. Gregory likely bore this in mind when dictating, or perhaps even writing, the events of Praetextatus’ trial.

Transforming Gregory’s narrative of the trial of Praetextatus into a performable script elevates his words and gestures from passive text to the active performance it was designed to be. It is thus a useful way for the historian to analyse how Gregory utilises the fear of God in this event. Turning Gregory’s prose into a script, allows the historian to position themselves as an onlooker of the events as they unfold. It enables them, to some extent, to access the experiential aspect of Gregory’s works, ‘visualising’ the characters, ‘hearing’ the words they speak, and ‘glimpsing’ the wider range of emotional inflections and interactions that occur between the characters that a passive reading of the text, even if read aloud as it is written on the page, simply does not permit.

In basing the following analyses on the performable script of Praetextatus’ trial which I created, I acknowledge that my methodology adds another layer of interpretation which distances the analyses that follow from the original event, already separated by a minimum of five layers of interpretation,\(^{690}\) even further. While the issues that inevitably accompany any further re-interpretation of a historical narrative cannot be completely avoided, in order to try to lessen the impact of these issues I have ensured firstly that the script created derives from Krusch’s Latin, thus reducing one extra layer of interpretation that Thorpe or Dalton’s English translations would bring. Secondly, I have included nothing that is not recorded in that Latin. Thus, while the script does reformat Gregory’s narrative, it does not insert or remove anything from the account of Praetextatus’ trial that he provided.


\(^{690}\) The five layers are: Interpretation and use of emotions by the characters during the event → Gregory’s interpretation of this event when translated from his recollection into writing → reinterpretation by scribal copiers in subsequent MSS → Krusch’s editorial reinterpretations → my translation from his edition to English.
An initial assessment of this script indicates that there are two points at which the fear of God appears in Praetextatus’ trial.691 The first is when Gregory attempts to appeal to his fellow-bishops’ fear of God’s punishment, which he does with the intent of undermining Chilperic’s desire to have Praetextatus removed from office.

The setting for Gregory’s address to the bishops is the sacristy of Saint Peter’s church in Paris. Here all the bishops who are attending the trial are convened and discussing the morning’s proceedings. As they talk, Aëtius, the Archdeacon of Paris who has arrived late to the trial, salutes the bishops and delivers a speech in which he warns them that they will be seen by God and men as cowards if they do not support Praetextatus.692 No one responds to Aëtius’ words and it is at this point that Gregory recalls his observation that the bishops appeared to be afraid of incurring the wrath of the queen at whose instigation these things had been done: ‘Timebant enim regine fururem, cauis instinctu hacce aegerabant.”693

The term regine merits a brief note here. Regine, an abbreviation of regina, is the singular feminine genitive which signifies that the anger belongs to Chilperic’s queen, Fredegund, rather than the king himself.694 The decision by Arndt and Krusch to opt for the term reginæ is interesting given that their critical apparatus shows that four of the B family manuscripts, on which they heavily relied, used masculine variants.

---

691 Thorpe’s translation would suggest there is a third when Chilperic asks his supporters to tell Praetextatus that he was a ‘God-fearing man,’ but the Latin simply says pius. Compare Gregory of Tours, History of the Franks, trans. Lewis Thorpe (London: Penguin Books, 1974), 5.18, p. 280 with Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 222 (10). *Thorpe’s version is hereafter referred to as History.
692 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 217 (17-20).
693 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 217 (21-22).
which assign the anger to Chilperic. In Arndt’s critical notes he states that B 1 and 2 (also 1 and 2 in Krusch’s stemma) use *regemne* while B 4 and 5 (B 3 and 5 in Krusch’s stemma) use *regem*. Krusch, who developed Arndt’s manuscript tree when he revised his mentor’s first critical edition of Gregory’s *Histories*, also acknowledges that B 1, 2, 3, and 5 use *regem*. Four of the six manuscripts, which constituted both editors’ preferred siglum, relate the anger to Chilperic. To further the confusion, in 1974 Lewis Thorpe, who utilised the French translation of Henri Omont and Gaston Collon (1886-1893, reprinted 1913) to create his English translation, wrote that the bishops: ‘were afraid of the king who had raged at them’.

Although this inconsistency appears problematic, it is worth noting firstly that while B 1, 2, 3, and 5 use terminology which links the anger discussed to Chilperic, they are the only four manuscripts, out of a total of six manuscript classes and fifty-six manuscripts or manuscript fragments, to do this. Furthermore in 1932, Krusch convincingly demonstrated that the B siglum of *Histories* manuscripts, despite being the oldest, were not representative of Gregory’s full and original work as had previously been thought. Thus, not only are the oldest manuscripts which reference the anger as Chilperic’s outnumbered by the rest of the manuscripts in the surviving stemma, the earliest surviving version is also the work of seventh-century scribes who, as Helmut Reimitz argues, selectively edited Gregory’s *Histories* to make them more appealing and relevant to the seventh-century reader. One of the more interesting changes made by the scribes, as Reimitz highlights, is their replacement of Gregory’s reference to Saint Martin with Saint Germanus of Auxerre in his address to the bishops convened at Praetextatus’ trial. The six-book-version copiers’ apparent willingness to alter, not just cut, parts of Gregory’s original narratives, raises the question of whether *regina* was the original term which the B siglum scribes changed, or whether Gregory had originally associated the anger with the king which was initially honoured by the B siglum scribes and later changed by the others.

---

696 Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 5.18, p. 217 ref. r.
697 It should be noted that Krusch added another manuscript to the B siglum in his revised edition meaning that there are six manuscripts, not five as Arndt had thought, that make up this family.
698 Gregory of Tours (tr. Thorpe), *History*, 5.18, p. 276.
699 For a complete list of the six classes and manuscripts of the *Histories* see Krusch and Levison, ‘Praefatio,’ xxiii-xxv.
702 Reimitz, ‘Early Medieval Editions,’ 538.
Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

Gregory’s systematic layout of the events of Praetextatus’ trial means that the association of the anger with Chilperic by the B siglum scribes is not unreasonable. Yet there are features later in Gregory’s story which firmly indicate that the bishop might have originally associated the anger with the queen.

At the end of the first day of Praetextatus’ trial, Gregory reports that in the evening he was visited by Queen Fredegund’s servants who offered him a bribe of two hundred pounds of silver to speak out against Praetextatus.703 Fredegund’s actions would have explicitly alerted Gregory, if he did not already suspect, to the queen’s involvement in this affair and desire to have Praetextatus removed. Moving forward to Gregory’s account of the second day of the trial, he states that after Praetextatus managed to withstand another baiting by Chilperic, the king retired to his hunting lodge and said these words: “I confess myself conquered by the words of the bishop and I know that he tells the truth, now what should I do in order that the wishes of the queen are fulfilled?”704 Here, Gregory shifts part of the responsibility for the trial from Chilperic to Fredegund. It is she who encourages Chilperic’s persecution of Praetextatus. Later, in Histories 8.31, Gregory also portrays her as having an implicit part in Praetextatus’ assassination.705 He clearly thought that it was primarily Fredegund’s anger to which Praetextatus was being subjected.

Pascale Bourgain has noted that Gregory’s original spelling is now lost to us,706 largely because the archetype manuscript of the Histories has not survived. Although this means we can never be certain as to whether Gregory used regem, as the B siglum scribes thought, or regina (the term preferred by later scribes), his narrative certainly permits the reading that he perceived his colleagues to be afraid of incurring Fredegund’s ire. In all probability, Gregory was unlikely to have been present during Chilperic’s declaration about his wife’s wishes. The dialogue he ascribes to the king was either reported to him, created by him, or possibly a bit of both. In any case, the dialogue itself is situated within a narrative that was certainly created after the trial had taken place. Gregory had the benefit of hindsight. With this in mind, I would argue that Gregory might have wished to portray the bishops as being afraid, not of Chilperic’s wrath, but of Queen Fredegund’s.707

---

703 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (13-17).
704 “Victum me verbis episcopi fater et vera esse quod dicit scio; quid nunc faciam, ut reginae de eo voluntas adimpleatur?” Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 222 (7-8).
705 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.31, pp. 397-399.
707 There is not the space for a detailed discussion of the implications that this has on both Gregory’s and our views on the exercise of female power in the Merovingian kingdoms, though future research on Queenship and the exercise of female power in this region should consider this more closely. There is an interesting, more immediate implication
Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

Having suggested that Gregory regarded the bishops present at the trial as fearing the wrath of the Neustrian queen, it is time to return to examining his use of the fear of God in his narrative of Praetextatus’ trial. Seeing that none of the bishops present have responded to Aëtius’ declaration, Gregory stands and speaks out himself.

“Be attentive to my words, I beg you, O most holy priests of God, and particularly you, who are seen to be more familiar with the king; you should give to him holy and priestly advice, lest by his rage against the servant of God he might perish with his kingdom and his glory.”

Gregory’s rhetorical style in this first speech is moderate. Although his use of the subjunctive pererat (‘he might perish’) is grammatically necessary to the result clause, Gregory’s decision to say that the king might perish, rather than he will perish, suggests that he might be trying both to escape any accusation of treason, which could be levelled if he directly prophesied the king’s demise, and to gently but firmly remind the bishops present to prioritise their fear of God destroying the king and kingdom over their fear of the queen and king. The bishops present, Gregory included, would have known that if the king and kingdom perished as a result of God’s displeasure, then they, as those whom God would hold accountable for the actions of the king and people, would also be punished. In his first speech, Gregory is calling to the bishops’ fear of God’s punishment, but he is not actively trying to inspire that fear within them at this stage.

After his first declaration, Gregory pauses. He looks around but sees that the bishops are continuing to sit in silence. His first speech has not convinced them and so he tries again:

“‘Remember, my priests of the Lord, the words of the prophet who said: ‘If the watchman see the iniquitous man and says nothing, he is answerable for the destruction of the soul.’ Therefore do not be silent, but preach and lay before the eyes of the king his sins, lest...”

for Gregory’s use of the fear of God in this episode. The ascription of the other bishops’ fear to being of Fredegund’s power, not just Chilperic’s, implies that Gregory thought that the fear of God should be prioritised over the worldly fears of powerful women not just men. Implicitly, he could be seen to be commenting that the self-control brought about by the fear of God was something that powerful woman and powerful men should adhere to.

708 “Adtenti estote, quaeso, sermonibus meis, O sanctissimi sacerdotes Dei, et praesertim vos, qui familiariores esse regi vidimini; adhibite ei consilium sanctum atque sacerdotalem, ne ecardiscens in ministrum Dei pererat ab ira eius et regnum perdat et gloriam.” Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 218 (1-4).
something bad should take hold of him and you be responsible for the condition of his soul. Or are you ignorant of those deeds that occurred recently? In what manner did Chlodomer take hold of Sigismund and thrust him into jail, and Avitus the priest of God said to him: “Do not lay a hand on him and when you march to Burgundy you will obtain victory.” Truly he [Chlodomer] rejected that which the priest had said to him, he went forth and had him [Sigismund] with his wife and sons killed. He marched to Burgundy where he was crushed by the army and killed. What of Maximus the Emperor? When he compelled the blessed Martin\textsuperscript{709} to accept communion with a bishop who had committed murder, he [Martin] agreed to the impiety of the Emperor so that he might liberate [many] from death without difficulty. Maximus, pursued by the judgement of the eternal king, was deposed from imperial rule and condemned to the worst death.’’\textsuperscript{710}

In this speech, Gregory begins by imploring the bishops to lay the king’s sins before his eyes because they are responsible for the condition of his soul. He plays on their fears of being judged by God and buttresses this by narrating two examples of recent rulers who did suffer as a result of ignoring their churchmen: King Chlodomer, who ignored the advice of Abbot Avitus of Saint-Mesmin-de-Micy and was killed as a result, and the Emperor Maximus, who was deposed and killed, at least in Gregory’s declaration, because he inconvenienced the saintly bishop Martin. In this speech, Gregory has switched his rhetorical style. He has moved from the moderate style of his previous plea, to the grand or high style. This is signified by his use of rhetorical questions and personification; techniques that were often employed in grand rhetoric to evoke an emotive reaction from the audience.\textsuperscript{711}

When Gregory stands and reels off the examples of Chlodomer and Maximus, he is impressing on the bishops present that God’s judgement against Chilperic will be meted out because it has already been

\textsuperscript{709} This is where the scribe of the six-book version changed Martin to Germanus of Auxerre. Reimitz, ‘Early Medieval Editions,’ 538.

\textsuperscript{710} ‘Hicis vero silentibus, adieci: “Memento, domini mi sacerdotes, verbi prophetici, quo ait; si videtis speculatur iniquitatem hominis et non disceret, reus evert animae pervertes. Ergo nolite siere sed praedicete et ponite ante oculus regis pecata eius, ne forte ei aliud multi contingat et vos rei sitis pro anima eius. An ignoratis, quid novum gestum fuerit tempore? Quomodo adpraehensum Sigismundum Chlodomeris retruxit in carcerem, dictique ei Avitus Dei sacerdus: “Ne initias manus in eo, et cum Burgundiam petieris, victorieam obtenebis.” Illa vero aminuens quae ei a sacerdote dicta fuerant, abitit ipsamque cum auctor et filius interemit petitique Burgundiam, ibique oblatusse an exercitu, interemptus est. Quis Maximus imperator? Cum beatum Martinum compulisset communicare cudiadum homicide episcopo, et ille, quo faciliss immessa morte liberaret, regi impio consensisset, prosequente Regis aeterni judici, ab imperio depulsus Maximus morte pessima condemnatus est.”’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 218 (5-16).

shown to have been dispensed to other powerful rulers.\footnote{160} In doing this, Gregory depicts himself as pressing his fellow bishops to overcome, or at least put aside, their fear of incurring royal anger in favour of fearing God’s wrath instead. For Gregory, the bishops should let their fear of God, not their fear of earthly monarchs, guide their judgement.

Gregory’s emphasis on God over earthly ruler is significant because it indicates that he associated the fear of God with the maintenance of self-control. In Gregory’s eyes, the bishops present are permitting their worldly fears of incurring punishment at the king’s or queen’s hands override their sense of loyalty and duty to God. Their fear of ending up in a similar position to Praetextatus has caused them to lose control over their voices which they should be using to correct the king. Gregory quite clearly equates the bishops’ submission to the fear of the king and queen with the loss of self-control. By actively reminding and invoking the fear of God’s punishment in his fellow bishops, Gregory thus depicts himself as exhorting them to regain control of themselves and displays himself as an example of someone who has not lost control by succumbing to worldly fear. He wants the bishops, in this order, to put aside their corporeal fears, remember their fear of incurring God’s wrath, regain their self-control, and assert the wisdom that comes with such self-mastery in order to protect Praetextatus, the king, and the kingdom.

Returning to the narrative, we see that after Gregory has spoken silence descends. Thorpe’s translation reads that the bishops ‘sat there as if stunned and petrified’: the Latin simply says stupentes.\footnote{713} The stunned reaction is significant. It demonstrates that at this precise moment the atmosphere is one of uncertainty. The bishops are caught between their immediate fear of Fredegund, Chilperic, or both and the fear of God which Gregory has invoked with his speech. No one moves and for a moment it appears as if Gregory’s appeals might have rendered him victorious. The moment is then broken as a member of the king’s entourage enters and announces that Chilperic has requested that Gregory present himself before him.

\footnote{712} One might argue this is also the case with Chilperic’s brother, Sigibert who committed the sin of civil war and paid the price for it. Halsall, ‘The Preface to Book V,’ 307-312, and for Chilperic himself, if Gregory’s record of King Guntram’s vision of what happened to Chilperic after his death is accurate. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.5, p. 374.

\footnote{713} Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 218 (17).
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The second place where Gregory deploys the fear of God is in his confrontation with Chilperic. This scene immediately follows his addresses to the bishops in the narrative. Neither Gregory’s journey to this meeting, nor any other smaller details, such as whether he and the messenger conversed or whether the messenger accompanied him as a guide or guard, are given. In the scene that unfolds, Gregory, whose words have been reported to Chilperic by bishops Ragnemod and Bertram, presents himself before the king.714 Arriving at the king’s tent near some trees, Gregory sees Chilperic standing with Bertram to his right and Ragnemod to his left.715 In front of them, he notes, there is a bench with an array of bread and drink upon it.716 The atmosphere going into the dialogue which follows appears to be one of a mixture of tension and curiosity. This is first time that Gregory has met Chilperic face to face. Prior to this, the king’s only contact with Gregory has been through a series of letters in which the bishop refused to accede to the king’s demand to expel Merovech, Chilperic’s overly-ambitious son, from Tours.717 This event is recorded in Histories 5.14 and it is worth noting that Gregory, in the same chapter, also stated that Ragnemod, the Bishop of Paris who had betrayed Gregory’s words to Chilperic, had been with Gregory when he allowed Merovech to receive Communion after the prince threatened to kill members of the congregation if he was refused.718 While Gregory does say that he administered the Communion with Ragnemod’s support, he also noted that his actions were done out of a fear to protect his congregation and that his surrender was questionable according to Canon law.719 Soon after this, Chilperic’s letter demanding Merovech’s expulsion from Tours arrived. In this light, Ragnemod’s betrayal of Gregory’s words in the sacristy to Chilperic begs the question of whether he had acted as Chilperic’s spy, perhaps under the mask of negotiation, back in the events of Histories 5.14. If that were the case, then it is likely that Chilperic already saw Gregory as a trouble-maker when he met him for the first time at this point in Praetextatus’ trial.

The exchange that follows between the two men is heated. Chilperic begins by accusing Gregory of choosing to remain loyal to Praetextatus over him using the proverb: ‘a crow does not pluck out the eye of

714 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 219 (1-3).
715 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 219 (4-5).
716 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 219 (5-6).
717 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.14, pp. 208-209 (15-17, 1-2).
718 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.14, p. 208 (4-5).
719 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.14, p. 208 (6-8).
another crow.’ The proverb is significant. Effectively it means that one does not betray another of its own kind. Wallace-Hadrill has noted that it was Chilperic’s lack of confidence in Praetextatus over a particular vendetta which caused him to instigate the trial in the first place. In this light, Chilperic’s use of the proverb of a crow supporting another crow adopts a deeper meaning. By using it, the king subtly accuses Gregory of the same charge for which he had arraigned Praetextatus: loyalty to Merovech over him. Gregory, in Chilperic’s eyes, would not support him over Praetextatus because, like Praetextatus, he had chosen Merovech instead. Given the events in Histories 5.14, Chilperic’s remark is not surprising. Nevertheless, it is a critical one because it would have warned Gregory that he was also ‘on trial’ during this meeting. Gregory would have known that his response to Chilperic would make or break the relationship between them.

He responds by challenging the king:

“If anyone of us, O king, has wished to overstep the path of justice, you can reprove him: [but] if you should depart [from the path of justice] who will reprove you? For we speak to you, and if you wish, you listen, but if you do not, who will condemn you, if not He who declares himself to be justice?”

Gregory’s reaction to the king’s indictment against him is to call on the fear of God. He implicitly reminds Chilperic to think on this fear because it is God who will mete out eternal justice. Importantly, Gregory’s tone in this speech is still submissive. The words: ‘and if you wish, you listen,’ suggest that he is trying to appear calm and amiable while reminding Chilperic that he ought to maintain self-control and follow the path of justice to ensure he avoids God’s ire. By retaining an outwardly amicable appearance, Gregory could demonstrate to Chilperic, and omnipresent God, that he could show respect before his superiors. At the same time, he also provided Chilperic with a visible display of how a man with the fear of God should behave; calm and in control. Thus, not only does Gregory visibly show Chilperic how a person with the fear of God should behave, he also gives the king a chance to take the hint and quietly warns him of the

---

720 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 219 (8-9).
721 Wallace-Hadrill, Frankish Church, 43-44.
722 Ad haec ego: ‘Si quis de nobis, O rex, iustitiae tramitem transcendere voluerit, a te corrigi potest; si vero tu excesseris, quis te corripiet? Loquimur enim tibi; sed si volueris, audia; si autem volueris, quis te condemnavit, nisi is qui te pronuntiavit esse institiam?’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 219 (9-12).
consequences of not doing so. Chilperic, however, either ignores or discards Gregory’s display. He complains at the bishop’s obstinacy and then moves to taunt him by threatening to have the people of Tours shout insulting slogans about him.

“…But I know what I will do so that you might be marked by the people and your injustice become revealed to all. I will assemble the people of Tours and say to them: “You can shout against Gregory that he is unjust and dispenses justice to no man.” As they shout this I will also reply: “If I who am king am not able to find justice with him, how do you lesser [people think] you will find it?”’’

Gregory’s description of Chilperic’s language suggests that he might have wanted the king to appear somewhat theatrical at this point. It is easy to imagine Chilperic performing while he speaks, maybe gesturing like a Roman orator or ribbing Ragnemod or Bertram as he continues. Given that Gregory tells us that Chilperic invested a lot in providing spectacles of drama and entertainment for the people, it not unreasonable to suggest that he might have wanted to portray the king as someone who was not above using theatrics to mock, rile, and deliberately incite a bishop to lose his self-control. The king’s slogan: “that he [Gregory] is unjust, and discharges justice to no man”, is not the worst insult ever spoken. But with Chilperic’s endorsement this statement would have had the potential to be damaging to Gregory’s reputation and, in the worst-case scenario, to spark rebellion against him in Tours. Bishops were, after all, supposed to be figures from which the people could seek God’s true justice. Chilperic uses this knowledge to bait Gregory and play on his insecurities. In doing so, he aligns with Roman tradition which declared that those who interceded on the behalf of traitors would be given an infamous reputation and permitted those who wielded legal authority to cause a ‘healthy terror’ in people to uphold the law. It is worth remembering that the date of Praetextatus’ trial is 577. Gregory had only been Bishop of Tours for four years and three years later he would find himself on trial at Berny-Rivière. He was not yet secure in his
post and Chilperic’s threats, regardless of the tone of delivery, would have had the potential to damage Gregory’s reputation and security. Chilperic’s response to Gregory’s initial reminder of God’s judgement is to play on the bishop’s own insecurities. He is testing his own ability to wield fear and to see whether he can use this to unhinge Gregory.

Gregory responds thus:

“That I am unjust, you are not to know. For my conscience is known to Him, to whom the eyes of the heart are manifest. Those insults the people shout with a truly false clamour is nothing, because all will know that they hurl these things from you. Therefore, it is not I but you, who will be marked by the exclamation. But what does it matter? You have the law and the canons, it behoves you to study these diligently, and then if you do not observe that which they instruct, you should know that the judgement of God hangs over you.”

In this speech Gregory’s mood is undiscernible. He could have been angry, snappish, and vitriolic, or calm, composed, and governed by the fear of God. Given the lack of emotional descriptors concerning the feelings that accompanied these words, it is perhaps unwise to speculate one way or the other. Both readings are possible. Gregory might want us to think he is calm and collected, effectively saying: ‘Do your worst for it is nothing to me’. His actions and appearance in his previous speeches are those of a self-controlled bishop not in fear of his king or queen, and they contrast with Chilperic’s ire and irritation. What is marked is that Gregory has moved from his earlier, subtler warnings to openly threatening Chilperic with God’s unfavourable judgement. He alludes to the king’s own destruction while standing in front of him. Having realized that the king has simply dismissed his earlier advice to fear God’s judgement and display of how a man in the fear of God should act, Gregory now seeks to actively instil this fear into the king by explicitly declaring that God’s judgement will be meted out to him if he does not do as Gregory advises.

Chapter 2: Gregory of Tours and the Fear of God

Silence ensues. We are left with the picture of Gregory facing the king and the two bishops flanking him. Notably, Chilperic’s expressive reaction to Gregory’s outburst is not recorded. He could have been stunned, angry, thoughtful, or perhaps a combination of all three. Whatever emotions flitted across the king’s mind and face in the moments after Gregory’s lambasting, when he next speaks it is to offer Gregory a bowl of chicken and pea soup. This offer marks Chilperic’s final attempt at baiting Gregory, who remarks that he saw through this attempt to soften him. Had Gregory accepted the soup he would have accepted Chilperic’s hospitality thereby rendering him beholden to the king and queen’s future demands. Chilperic might not have offered the soup to Gregory with the sincere expectation that he would take it, but rather he offered it as a final attempt to make Gregory beholden to him.

From here on, the exchange between the king and bishop loses the tension which had built up earlier. At the end of their first meeting, both Chilperic and Gregory manage to reach an accord in which Chilperic pledged to follow the Canons and Gregory accepted a little bread and some wine in return. Notably, this particular part of the event has been interpreted by Yitzhak Hen as the point at which trust and friendship was confirmed between the two men. He perceived Gregory’s willingness to drink to be a symbolic act of trust and friendship with Chilperic. Yet if the reader remembers that Gregory rejected the soup even after reaching an accord with Chilperic, Hen’s interpretation becomes debatable. Gregory’s acceptance of the wine and bread was possibly done out of basic necessity and politeness since the two men had now reached an accord, or at least they appeared to have (it is worth noting that Gregory does not include the dialogue by which he and Chilperic finally reached that accord). In light of this agreement it would have been impolite for Gregory to reject all of Chilperic’s offerings of hospitality. His choice to reject the soup but accept some of the bread and wine, both religiously symbolic and appropriate for episcopal consumption, indicates that Gregory still did not entirely trust the king. The two might have reached an accord but they were not friends.

729 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (5-6).
730 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (3-6).
731 In swerving the king’s final snare, it is possible that Gregory might have unwittingly sparked Fredegund’s decision to send her servants to him and the other bishops that night. Gregory had successfully navigated Chilperic’s attempts to get him on side in this verbal sparring match and so Fredegund had to interfere more directly herself later that evening.
732 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (9-12).
733 Hen, Culture and Religion, 242.
Gregory’s appeals to and use of the fear of God in his account of Praetextatus’ trial demonstrates that he equated the fear of God with self-control and that he also viewed it as a tool which bishops could and should use to negotiate power relationships. His second address to the bishops, exhorting them to put their fear of God above the fear of the king and queen, indicates that Gregory associated the fear of God with self-control and the fear of royal punishment with the loss of such mastery. Gregory’s text shows that his speech seems to have struck a chord, as Fredegund’s servants, who were sent to bribe him to stop supporting Praetextatus that evening, state that they had managed to secure promises of support from the other bishops attending the trial.734 Gregory’s earlier efforts had clearly rendered some of his colleagues uncertain as to whether they would side with Chilperic or Praetextatus. If Gregory’s speech had been wholly unsuccessful, Fredegund would probably not have felt the need to exact such promises because none of the other bishops would have regained enough self-mastery to put aside their fear of her and Chilperic’s reprisal.

Furthermore, Gregory appears to have succeeded in using his fear of God and the self-mastery which that enabled, to assert his own strength of mind before Chilperic. His attempts to inspire the fear of God in Chilperic does, at least, make the king shift away from throwing insults and towards promising that he would uphold Canon law. When Gregory parried Chilperic’s threats to ridicule and possibly destabilise him by reminding him of God’s inescapable judgement, an event which was intended to invoke fear in the king and persuade him to show some restraint, he demonstrated to Chilperic that he was also familiar with the value of wielding fear in the establishment and negotiation of power relationships. He showed the king that he was familiar with the idea of utilising fear as a weapon to combat someone in power by effectively employing the fear of God to show Chilperic that he would not be bullied. That Chilperic and Gregory are subsequently shown to be on the same side when trying to persuade a Jew to give up his faith in Histories 6.5,735 suggests that Gregory had won some ground through his boldness and decision to use the fear of God’s judgement to stand up to Chilperic. That being said, none of Gregory’s appeals to this fear carried enough weight to secure the acquittal of Praetextatus, who was tricked into making a confession on the

734 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 220 (15-18).
735 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.5, pp. 268-272.
third day. Nor were they able to protect Merovech, whom Danuta Shanzer perceives, perhaps correctly, to be the primary reason why Gregory spoke out for Praetextatus in the first place. At the end of Gregory's narration of this event, it is the king's power and influence which triumphed over Gregory and the fear of God.

Although the fear of God had not “set itself above all else” in terms of Merovingian Realpolitik, Gregory clearly equated this theological fear with self-control and considered it to be a useful tool for a bishop navigating a complex political, legal, and religious issue. His addresses to the bishops and discourse with Chilperic demonstrate that he regarded the fear of God as a rhetorical device which could be usefully deployed in episcopal addresses to kings and bishops alike. In constantly repeating the message that the fear of God was tied to self-control in his discourse to Chilperic and his episcopal peers, Gregory can be seen to be following the traditional Roman technique of using repetition in discourse to negotiate his own status. As bishop of the metropolitan diocese of Tours, Gregory could be expected to have prized the fear of God as a theologically important fear. But the trial of Praetextatus shows that Gregory was also willing to use this fear and what it symbolised, beyond the altar. The theological connotations of the fear of God with self-control enabled this fear, in Gregory's eyes, to be a potent and useful fear for negotiating power relationships in the worldly political landscape that surrounded him. In perceiving and recording this, Gregory preserved the Graeco-Roman social and cultural tradition which set self-control at the heart of a man's right to wield civic power. Through its connection with self-mastery, the fear of God could be, should be, and was a means of navigating the political and social world for Gregory of Tours.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that Gregory of Tours' texts show that he associated the fear of God with the acquiescence and maintenance of self-mastery. For him, the fear of God was the facilitator and indicator of discipline and self-discipline (enkrateia in Classical terminology). Gregory, like his predecessors (Plotinus,
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736 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 5.18, p. 222 (19-21).
739 This technique is highlighted in Cooper, The Virgin and the Bride, 14-16.
740 Cooper, The Virgin and the Bride, 5-44 and Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 152-153.
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Porphyry, Plato, Origen, Augustine, Cassian, and Aristotle, was interested in questions of the formation of the self and how one could attain self-awareness and spiritual salvation. His repetitive use of the fear of God to signify self-control throughout his writings, illustrates that he used these texts to continue the Graeco-Roman and early Christian tradition of writing discourse on matters of the self and self-control. Gregory used examples of those who had the fear of God together with those who either lacked or had lost this fear, to convey his own views on how the good Christian of late sixth-century Gaul was supposed to behave and live. From the trial of Praetextatus, in which Gregory depicted himself as a model who tried to show Chilperic how the good Christian with the fear of God was supposed to behave, to his stories of saintly figures like Saint Salvius and Abbot Maxentius, Gregory consistently assimilates the fear of God with self-control and self-mastery.

The knowledge that Gregory equated the fear of God with the training of the self, and that he used this fear to write discourse on the self across all his works, constitutes something new in our knowledge of Gregory of Tours’ worldview and writing tactics. It provides Gregory-scholars with a different lens by which to read the bishop’s works; one which sees Gregory’s use of fear and other emotions in his works as valuable keys with which to continue unlocking more of the messages, lessons, and glimpses of his world that he might have wished to convey but knew would be lost in a mire of translation and interpretation. By uncovering Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God, this chapter shows that Gregory’s works are a useful but thus far unexplored source for historians seeking to explore more about Merovingian attitudes towards the self and how they transformed Classical concepts of paideia and enkrateia. The analyses above have shown that while some of Gregory’s uses of fear and the fear of God have clear roots in Roman culture and legal tradition (e.g. the emphasising of Helarius and his wife’s chastity and Chilperic’s threat to ruin Gregory’s reputation for his defence of Praetextatus), others can be illustrative of opinions more personal to Gregory (e.g. Gregory’s views on the fear of God and the Second Coming of Christ). But this is only one half of the equation. With this knowledge in mind, it is time to move forward to begin exploring Gregory and his contemporaries’ perceptions of fear, the Devil, and his demons.

742 Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride*, 3-12 and Cooper, ‘Womanly Influence,’ 152-162.
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Introduction

Before this research can analyse Gregory of Tours’ use and understanding of demonically-inspired fear, it must first establish the late antique Gallic perspectives of the Devil, his demons, and the relationship that exists between demonic figures and fear. As with his comprehension and use of the fear of God, Gregory’s descriptions of fear instigated by demonic beings cannot be understood without reference to the intellectual, theological, and demonological context that enabled him to view and use the relationship between fear, the Devil, and his demons in the ways that he did.

The purposes of this chapter are twofold. Its main role is to provide the contextual backdrop for the final chapter of this thesis, which investigates Gregory’s attitude towards demonically-inspired fear in his works. Its second purpose is to bring balance to the overall structure of this dissertation. This chapter is the mirror of chapter one which examined the Gallic perception of the fear of God in late antiquity. It ensures that the analyses of Gregory of Tours’ views of the Devil, his demons, and fear, are given the same in depth grounding in the wider Gallic attitudes to these topics that his views on the fear of God were given in the first half of this thesis.

Next to God and His holy society, the other prominent figures in late antique Christian theology are the Devil and his demons. In this chapter I argue two things. First, that the works of Gregory’s theologically-minded predecessors show that they considered fear to be used by the Devil and his demons to cause people to lose their self-control and thus drive them away from God. Second, that the concept of the relationship between the Devil, demons, and fear in late antique Gaul, develops along a different trajectory to the fear of God; a point which, to the best of my knowledge, historical scholarship has not yet realised.

The exact nature of the relationship which exists between the fear of God and the fears associated with demonic beings specifically within the Gallic theological tradition has not had much exploration. Peter Brown’s *The Ransom of the Soul*, in which he suggests that there was a wider ecclesiastical campaign in Gaul

---

743 The Archangels, Angels, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs, and Confessors.
which sought to instil the fear of God’s judgement into people and increase their fear of facing demonic beings in the fifth and early sixth century,\textsuperscript{744} constitutes, as far as I am aware, the most recent discussion on the topic. By exploring how the perception of demonically-inspired fear develops in Gaul, and how it came to interact with their concept of the fear of God in detail, this chapter contributes to the scholastic discussion on Gallic Christianity, theology, and demonology. Piece by piece it uncovers the story behind the Gallic association of demonic beings with fear and the development of the notion of demonically-inspired fear which would come to be known by Gregory of Tours. It also puts Peter Brown’s theory to the test, using a range of sources from a variety of authors who influenced theological thinking in Gaul.

3.1. Methodology

The methodological approach used to construct this chapter is, in many ways, like that used to create chapter one. The selection of authors and sources remain the same. Likewise, each of the sections below only offer the reader a synthesis of the findings that emerged from the in-depth analyses of how demonic fear, its workings, and its role in Christianity, were envisaged by each individual author and the Vulgate (the closest historians can currently get to the version of Scripture known to Gregory of Tours). Furthermore, this chapter also adopts the same temporal structure as that used in chapter one. This allows it to highlight the key points about demonic fear developed by each author and enables it to closely mirror its counterpart.

While the overarching methodological approach is largely identical to that used in chapter one, this chapter differs from the first in two subtle but distinct ways. Firstly, occasional reference is made to Evagrius of Antioch’s translation of Athanasius’ \textit{The Life of Antony} in the footnotes. Neither Evagrius nor Athanasius were themselves Gallic writers, though it should be noted that the views and actions of the latter were severely criticised by Hilary of Poitiers who also witnessed the events of the Trinitarian Controversy.\textsuperscript{745} Nevertheless, Athanasius and his work on Antony are occasionally included in this chapter for two reasons.

Firstly while \textit{The Life of Antony} constitutes the second example of a saint’s \textit{Life} to be created,\textsuperscript{746} it is the first to show a saint, rather than Christ or one of His apostles, actively interacting with the Devil and

\textsuperscript{744} Brown, \textit{Ransom of the Soul}, 115-138.
\textsuperscript{745} See Hil., of Poit., \textit{Collect.}, CSEL, Vol. 65, Series A, 4.6-24, pp. 53-63; ‘Against Valens,’ 1.6-24, pp. 24-33.
\textsuperscript{746} \textit{The Life of Cyprian} is regarded as the first Christian biography written c.258. Clare Stancliffe, \textit{St. Martin and his Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 91.
demons.\textsuperscript{747} It is thus an archetypal text, alongside the books of the New Testament, from which all subsequent demonic interactions described in saints’ \textit{Lives}, including those written by Gregory, derive. Secondly, owing to its popularity, \textit{The Life of Antony} became the prototype from which subsequent saintly \textit{Lives} were created. It was this \textit{Life}’s extreme popularity which led Jerome, the translator of many of the Old Testament texts into vulgar Latin, and Sulpicius Severus, the author of \textit{The Life of Saint Martin}, to create their own hagiographies.\textsuperscript{748} Although both men sought to challenge rather than copy the model Athanasius presented with Antony, \textit{The Life of Antony} remained a popular text throughout the Christian East and West.\textsuperscript{749} By shaping the views and writings of Jerome, Sulpicius, Paulinus of Périgueux, and Gregory’s close friend, Venantius Fortunatus,\textsuperscript{750} Athanasius’ \textit{The Life of Antony} may have also indirectly impacted on Gregory of Tours’ thoughts and works, particularly \textit{The Life of the Fathers}. Although this thesis lacks the space available for an analysis of demonically-inspired fear in \textit{The Life of Antony}, it does highlight those cases in which the authors who feature in this chapter can be seen to draw upon this source when discussing demonic fear.

Besides the inclusion of Athanasius’ \textit{The Life of Antony}, this chapter also differs methodologically from the first chapter in one other way. The following sections not only discuss each author’s views on demonic figures and fear, they also situate those views within a recreated and highly synthesised portrait of the author’s concept of the Devil and his demons. The reason for this is that, as will be shown, demonically-inspired fear and the human fear of demons lacks the same biblical foundations in either the New and Old Testaments that the fear of God has. Although both Testaments provide foundational knowledge about Satan and demons which subsequent theologians could build upon, they do not provide much groundwork regarding the relationship between the Devil, demons, and fear. Dale Martin and Valerie Flint have quite convincingly shown that the demonological tradition that came to be so popular in the late antique west


\textsuperscript{748} Rousseau, \textit{Ascetics}, 133-151. Also, Stancilffe, \textit{St. Martin}, 64-65, 91-93.

\textsuperscript{749} For more on this see Rousseau, \textit{Ascetics}, 133-151.
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was predominantly developed by Christian writers of the second to sixth centuries.\textsuperscript{751} The Bible did not provide early Christian theologians with the same level of foundational knowledge about demonic fear as it did for the fear of God. The demonological tradition that would come to be known by Gregory of Tours, thus resulted more from a gradual development in the notions of the Devil and his demons that occurred in over four centuries’ worth of theological commentary, exegesis, poetry, and hagiography, than it did from the knowledge found in Scripture.

The realisation that the late antique perception of the relationship that exists between demonic beings and fear lacks the same comprehensive foundations that the fear of God possesses in the Bible, means that this chapter has had to approach the question of how each author envisaged, used, and understood fear in relation to the Devil and his demons in a slightly different way to that which was used for the fear of God. This chapter must situate each author’s perception of fear and demonic figures within their basic concept of who the Devil and his demons were and what their role was in Christianity. These views fluctuate from author to author in a way that does not necessarily apply to their perception of God.\textsuperscript{752} Each author has his own demonology and concept of the Devil. Some of their perspectives are rooted in the views of their predecessors. Others, for example those of Augustine, change and mature during their careers. This last point is especially important because it raises the possibility that as each author’s concept of the Devil and his demons matured, their views on these figures and fear might also change to reflect this. Since each theologian’s perspective on the Devil, demons, and fear was determined by their wider concept of these demonic figures, it has been necessary to devote some space to illustrating each author’s concept of these beings in order to better understand their perspectives on demonic fear.

3.2. The Foundation Stone? The Devil, his Demons, and Fear in the Vulgate


\textsuperscript{752} Although Trinitarian debates continued to take place between Christianity and the other religious branches such as Arianism from the fourth century onwards, most of the Gallic authors cited in this chapter seem to align with the Nicene outlook that God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are consubstantial. The notable exception to this is Augustine, who was not baptised as a Christian until April 387, aged 33. On the date of Augustine’s conversion and baptism see Henry Chadwick, Augustine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 25-27; Peter Brown, Augustine of Hippo: A Biography, a revised edition (London: Faber & Faber, 2000), 64. Citations here refer to the Faber & Faber 2000 edition; Gary Wills, Augustine’s “Confessions”: A Biography (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 58-97 and Robin Lane Fox, Augustine Conversions and Confessions (London: Penguin, 2015), 342-352.
In this section, I argue that despite containing very little demonically-associated fear, the scripts of the *Vetus Latina* and the *Vulgate* might have provided Gregory and some of his theological predecessors with the foundational knowledge that demons could fear God and that humans might fear the Devil because of his connection with death.

Chapter one illustrates that the fear of God has solid foundations in the New and Old Testaments. It is the most frequently cited fear in the Bible. Yet the same cannot be said for fear associated with demonic beings. References to fear in connection with the Devil or his demons, contrary to expectation, are virtually non-existent in the Bible. While the *Vulgate* translations of Jerome, as the first chapter has shown, might have been the version of Scripture known to Gregory of Tours, having been used in combination with *Vetus Latina* scripts by theologians like Augustine to develop their notions of Christianity and build the Church of which Gregory would come to be a part, it is very unlikely that the rich image of the Devil, his demons, and their use of fear which Gregory creates in his *Miracles, Histories, and The Life of the Fathers*, was garnered from the *Vulgate*. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, historians cannot be certain that Gregory's biblical knowledge stemmed solely from the *Vulgate*. Secondly, there is the problem that demonically-inspired fear never explicitly appears anywhere in the Old or New Testaments. Indeed Hebrews 2:14-15 is the only case where it might be possible to infer that the author perceived humankind to have a fear of the Devil. No other biblical humans are ever explicitly described as being afraid of demons. Moreover, there is only one case, that of James 2:19, which gave Augustine and successive theologians the means to portray demons as beings capable of experiencing fear. Despite the lack of references to demons or the Devil using fear in the Bible, Hebrews 2:14-15 and James 2:19 do indicate that Scripture did supply
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753 Chapter 1, section 1.2: *The Foundation Stone: The Fear of God in the Vulgate.*

754 Although Jerome’s translation was in wide circulation by Gregory’s time, the formation process which resulted in the *Vulgate* becoming the ‘standard edition’ of the Bible did not begin until the sixth century and was not completed before the ninth. It is possible that some scripts of the *Vetus Latina* were still in circulation in Gregory's age and that some of his biblical knowledge might have been based on those older Latin versions. On the history of the *Vulgate* see Kelly, *Jerome*, 162. Chapter 1, section 1.2: *The Foundation Stone: The Fear of God in the Vulgate.* On Gregory's extensive knowledge of the Bible see: Appendix 5: Table 6: A list of the biblical texts that are cited in Gregory of Tours’ Ten Books of Histories and Table 7: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses biblical texts in his Ten Books of Histories and Appendix 6: Table 8: A list of the biblical texts Gregory uses in his books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers and Table 9: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses various biblical texts in his books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers.


756 See Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 388 and 392-393.
Gregory’s theological predecessors with the knowledge that demons could fear God and that humans might fear the Devil because of his connection with death.

The notion that humans might fear the Devil is only implicitly alluded to once in the New Testament. Hebrews 2:14-15 states:

“Therefore since the sons were receivers of blood and flesh, He [Christ] similarly participated in that, so that, through death, He might destroy him who would have the empire of death, that is the Devil, and that He might liberate them who through their fear of death were subject to servitude throughout their life.”

Here, the sons, who are mankind, are explicitly said to fear death not the Devil. Yet the author of Hebrews creates an explicit link between the Devil and death by declaring the Devil to be the one who has the ‘empire of death.’ In this passage the Devil is not death itself, but he is its ruler. Though connected, death and the Devil are still independent of one another to some extent. In this light, it is possible to make the inference that the Hebrews author, whom Jerome and Augustine perceived to be Saint Paul, contextualized the fear of death with the fear of the Devil or, at least, a fear of becoming a part of his empire. Paul states that Christ became human and underwent the Passion, facing death in order to destroy the Devil and liberate those held captive by their fear of joining his empire. This suggests that Paul clearly perceived that the fear of being subject to the Devil through death was something that Christ intended to remove from humankind.

James 2:19 contains what could be classed as the sole reference to the demonic fear of God in the New Testament: ‘Thou believest that there is one God. Thou dost well; the demons believe and tremble.’

The Latin term used in the Vulgate is ‘contremescunt’. Although tremesco and contremisco do not explicitly denote fear in the same way that terms such as timor or formido do, most modern dictionaries including the Thesaurus


\[758\] The Pauline authorship of Hebrews is now disputed and was even by Eusebius and Origen. However, because Augustine and Jerome believed that Paul was the author of this biblical book, Paul will be referred to as the author of Hebrews in what follows.

Linguae Latinae acknowledge that they can signify trembling from a sense of dread or fear. In the case of James 2:19 it is likely that 'contremescunt' signifies that the demons were perceived to believe in and, specifically, to tremble from a fear of God.

Significantly, it was Augustine’s interpretation of the epistle of James that gave rise to the late antique concept of demons having non-salvific faith. In ‘Reading James 2:18-20’, Kenneth Wilson highlights that Augustine’s inability to read Greek left him reliant on a Vetus Latina version of this epistle. Unfortunately this particular script was unusual in that it omitted the interlocutors present in the Greek script; a detail which led Augustine to interpret the views in James as being those of the apostle directly. To navigate the conundrum that arose with explaining why James would declare that demons were afraid of God in the context of humans also needing to perform good works, Augustine used this passage as part of his anti-Donatist polemic to preach the notion of non-salvific faith. Since James highlighted that demons could not be saved, despite their belief in and fear of God, but that the twelve tribes could be if they feared God and did good works, Augustine interpreted this to mean that good works were the essential factor that barred demons from salvation. The Donatists, who also did not consider good works to be an essential facet of the good Christian, were thus comparable with demons. Augustine’s interpretation of this passage and dissemination of its message through his sermons in 404 and 411, had a significant impact on fifth-century theories regarding demons and the importance of good works in Christian practice. Yet because the Christian demonological tradition was never fully developed in either the Old or New Testaments, the need for Augustine to unravel where fear sits in relation to the figures of demons and the Devil in Scripture
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761 The exact translation and interpretation of James 2:19 is ultimately up to the individual. Tremesco and contremisco can simply refer to ‘trembling’ or ‘quaking’ and a person or demon could tremble for different reasons than fear. Fevers, anger, or simply being cold are other possibilities.

762 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 385-393.

763 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 388.

764 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 385-388. Pierre Petitmengin has also highlighted that considerable variations existed in the presentation and typology of the Vetus Latina and Vulgate manuscripts from the second to the sixth centuries. These variations as Wilson shows can have a detrimental impact on exegetical commentary and Christian theological beliefs as a result. See Pierre Petitmengin, ‘Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine,’ in Le Monde Latin Antique et la Bible, ed. Jacques Fontaine and Charles Pietri (Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), 89 and 91-117.

765 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 389-393.

766 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 405-407.

767 Martin, ‘When Did Angels Become Demons?’ 657.
is not surprising. Although the Synoptic Gospels do feature demons,\footnote{Vulgata, Matt. 9:32, 8:28-33 and 12:22; Mrk., 5:8-14; Luk., 8:29-34.} their full nature, beyond their subservience to Christ, is never fully expounded upon. Nevertheless, despite the lack of demonically-associated fear being present in early Latin Scripture, Hebrews 2:14-15 and James 2:19 do suggest that while Gregory of Tours’ concept of demonically-inspired fear might not be directly locatable in the Bible, Scripture did provide him and his theologically-minded predecessors with the foundational knowledge that demons could fear God and that humans might fear the Devil through his connection to death.

3.3. The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul during the Middle of the Fourth Century

Having established that Scripture set a precedent for the idea that demons could fear God and that humans could fear the Devil through his connection to death, this section will now show how these roots were developed in the theological literature of early Christian Gaul. In that which follows, I argue that the writings of Hilary of Poitiers show that a link between the fears associated with demonic beings and the loss or lack of self-discipline was starting to emerge in the theological discourse of late antique Gaul.

The surviving works of Hilary of Poitiers, primarily discussing the ‘Arian’ or ‘Trinitarian’ Controversy which unfolded alongside the political crises that plagued the late Roman Empire in the fourth century, do not contain many references to the Devil or his demons. The Trinity (c.356-360), Against Valens and Ursacius (356-360, completed before 366),\footnote{Wickham dates the first book of ‘Against Valens and Ursacius’ to 356, the second book to 359/360 and third book to 367. D. H. Williams does not date each book but states that they were completed before 366. Compare D. H. Williams, ‘Introduction,’ in Commentary on Matthew, trans. Daniel H. Williams (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 8 and 10 with Wickham, ‘Introduction,’ 1, 7, and 12.} Letter to Constantius (359), and Commentary on Matthew (written before 353),\footnote{Williams, ‘Introduction,’ 23.} contain no references to the idea that humans should fear the Devil or his demons. Preoccupied with political intrigue and religious debate over the exact nature of the relationship between God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,\footnote{As noted in Chapter 1, section 1.3: The Fear of God in Gaul during the Middle of the Fourth Century, this was just one of the fundamental markers of Christian doctrine that was debated in this period. Constantine’s conversion ignited a fire amongst Christian theologians who had to work out precisely what ‘Christianity’ was as a religion and, at the same time, how to make this attractive and workable as the belief system for the vast Roman Empire. Complex but thorough outlines and discussions of the religious turmoil in this period can be found in Hanson, Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. Also, Ayers, Nicaea and its Legacy, 1-259. Refined introductions can be found in Rousseau, Early Christian, 215-234. Also, Wickham, ‘Introduction,’ xv-xii.} Hilary appears unconcerned with discussing either the role of the Devil and
his demons within Christian doctrine, or the ‘emotions’ that humans should, would, or might experience in relation to these figures. Although Hilary’s works remain silent about humans fearing demonic beings, his Commentary on Matthew shows that he interpreted Matthew 4:1-11 to reveal that the Devil experienced a fear of losing the opportunity to test Christ. It also suggests that he might have implicitly used this knowledge to express the idea that the Devil was the embodiment of irrationality and that uncontrolled fear was linked with the loss of self-control.

In chapter three of his Commentary, Hilary provides his own interpretation of the temptation of Christ as retold in Matthew 4:1-11:

‘That He [Christ] was led into the desert, signified the freedom of the Holy Spirit to present His humanity to the Devil, permitting Himself to be tempted and providing the tempter with an opportunity that he would not have had unless it had been given to him. Therefore, the devil had a suspicion driven from fear, not derived from insight.’

Hilary’s commentary has several significant points. The first is that it situates God as being the One in total control. Hilary specifies that the Devil only gets to tempt Christ when and because the Holy Spirit permitted it. Indeed he only receives his chance when the Holy Spirit, whom Hilary perceived to be consubstantial with God, reveals to him that God had assumed human form. Throughout this situation, God, in the form of Christ and the Holy Spirit, is the one in control. The Devil never moves from beyond a position of submission. It is only once the Devil is able to recognise Christ for who He really is, that he becomes aware that God has taken human form and is struck with fear. Yet the Devil, rather significantly, is not afflicted with a direct fear of Christ. Hilary is more specific:

---


‘but because the devil was afraid of losing the opportunity of tempting him whom he regarded as man, he acted rashly.’

The Devil does not fear Christ, he fears losing the chance to tempt Christ and of losing the possibility of scoring a victory against God Himself. Upon recognising Christ for who He truly was, Hilary has the Devil wrongly assume that God, by adopting a human form, had opened a part of Himself up to temptation. Accordingly, the Devil immediately began to assess the human side of Christ for any weaknesses that would leave Him open to deception as Adam had been. Hilary is explicit in that the Devil is driven by his fear of losing the opportunity to use his suspicions of what Christ’s human weaknesses might be to test Him. The Devil does not actually experience a fear of Christ, either for who He is or what He might do to him. He does not even fear losing the test of temptation as the following chapter will show him doing in Gregory’s works. Hilary’s view of the fear the Devil experiences in connection with God, is subtly different to Gregory of Tours’.

Hilary’s view that God had opened Himself up to the possibility of being tempted, and thus ensnared by the Devil by embracing a human form, is connected to the ‘Ransom Theory of Atonement’. Although the exact nature of this theory changes throughout the middle ages, and seemingly from theologian to theologian, the general notion is that the Devil received a price, which was paid by God in Christ’s form, for the liberation of humankind from his clutches. The exact nature of the price and who paid it was, like everything else, continually subject to debate. Celia Chazelle has stated that the Greek school of thought maintained that God had to ‘buy back’ humankind which He lost to the Devil through Original Sin. The authors of the Latin west maintained a slightly different perspective. Augustine, for example, perceived that the Devil received Christ’s blood which Christ willingly ‘paid’, despite being under no obligation to pay any
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775 Igitur istius temporis metu in temptando eo quem hominem contuebatur, sumpsit temeritatem. ’ Hil., of Poit., Comm., Matt., ILTA, SChr 254, cap. 3, par. 1, lin. 15, pag. 112; Commentary on Matthew, 3.1, p. 54.
776 Hil., of Poit., Comm., Matt., ILTA, SChr 254, cap. 3, par. 1, lin. 17, pag. 112; Commentary on Matthew, 3.1, p. 54.
777 Chapter 4, section 4.4: Gregory, the Fear experienced by Demonic Figures, and Self-Control.
779 Chazelle, ‘To Whom Did Christ Pay the Price?’ 43 and 52.
tribute to any power including the Devil.\textsuperscript{780} Accordingly the Devil was overcome by Christ’s death because he had unjustly accepted Christ’s blood, just as he had wrongfully obtained control of humanity.\textsuperscript{781} Although Hilary does not explicitly discuss the ‘Ransom Theory of Atonement’ in his commentary on Matthew 4:1-11, his perception that the Devil thought that God would grant him an opportunity to tempt and trap Him, by assuming a human form which could be more easily deceived, points to an awareness of this theory. The Devil, upon realising who Christ truly was, immediately acted rashly, fearing that he would lose the opportunity to unjustly ensnare God which he thought had been granted to him. In reality, God was always in control, but Hilary’s Devil cannot see this and the fear which Hilary interprets him to experience reflects this.

In revealing more about his views of both the Devil and uncontrolled fear, Hilary’s perception of the specific type of fear which the Devil experiences in relation to Christ becomes highly valuable. For Hilary, the Devil is not only a figure who acts rashly (tenteritatem),\textsuperscript{782} he is a figure who literally embodies irrationality and the loss of self-control to the point that even the fears which he experiences, and which drive his actions, signify this.

It is interesting that in Hilary’s perspective the Devil displays neither a logical fear of Christ nor a fear of what Christ could do to him in consequence for daring to go up against Him a second time.\textsuperscript{783} The type of fear the Devil experiences in relation to Christ is indicative and borne of the fact that he is the figure who embodies irrationality and the lack of discipline. In his Commentary therefore, Hilary can be seen using the fear which the Devil experiences when faced with God, to characterise the Devil as the embodiment of irrationality and show that he considered irrational fear to be a sign of either a lack or loss of self-control. His work thus illustrates that a link between the fear associated with demonic figures and the loss or lack of self-control was starting to emerge in the theological discourse of fourth-century Gaul.


\textsuperscript{781} Chazelle, ‘To Whom Did Christ Pay the Price?’ 52.

\textsuperscript{782} Hil., of Poit., Comm., Matt., LLTA, SChr 254, cap. 3, par. 1, lin. 15, pag. 112; Commentary on Matthew, 3.1, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{783} The Devil went against God for the first time when he placed his love for himself over that of God who had created him, but this might not have been a direct confrontation. God is never shown to interact with Lucifer Himself before He casts him down. This time however the Devil and God, in the form of Christ, lock horns face to face. This is a direct challenge to God right in front of Him which involves conversation.
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3.4. The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century

The previous section highlighted that the notion of the Devil as a figure connected with fear and the loss of self-control had begun to emerge in the theological literature of late antique Gaul. This section explores how the relationship between demonic figures and fear advances using a selection of texts from authors who lived, or influenced contemporary thinking, in Gaul from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century. Here I argue that the writings of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Prosper of Aquitaine, John Cassian, and Sulpicius Severus, suggest two things. First, that both the concept of the human fear of demonic figures, and the contemporary understanding of the relationship which existed between demons and fear, began to develop and mature in the theological discourse of this period. Second, that these theologians, whose literature influenced the Gallic theological outlook in this period, were beginning to perceive demonically-inspired fear as a sign of the loss or lack of discipline and a threat to the attainment of the good Christian life.

Augustine’s On the Divination of Demons, The City of God, The Trinity, On Christian Doctrine, On Order, On Admonition and Grace, On the Literal Meaning of Genesis, On Genesis Against the Manichees, and The Christian Combat, have been used in this chapter because they had a substantial impact on theological thinking in the late antique west. They all show that Augustine was interested in developing the concept of the Devil, his demons, and their role in the Christian life, within his wider discussions on Christian doctrine and theology. They also demonstrate that the notions that humans should fear demons and that demons experienced fear, were becoming topics of discussion in works that would almost immediately begin to influence Gallic views on Christianity.

Much progress charting the trajectory of development of Augustine’s views on the demonic in his various works has already been made by scholars such as David Wiebe. Combined, Augustine’s texts show that over several years the bishop developed a consistent and highly complex understanding of the nature of

demons and their role in the Christian life. The City of God suggests that he thought demons could experience a variety of passions including fear. As former angels, demons had rational souls and, as a result of their fall, demons also had bodies that were formed of sublunary, rather than superlunary ether.\(^{785}\) The aerial nature of their bodies gave demons particular skills such as being able to move with great speed across time and space;\(^{786}\) the ability to read the natural atmosphere around them and use that knowledge to make predictions with which to deceive people;\(^{787}\) the ability to mutate into different beings, becoming invisible or visible at will;\(^{788}\) and an uncanny ability to command and understand the passions which constantly perturbed and reshaped their bodies.\(^{789}\) Augustine’s belief that demons had a rational soul, a lingering virtue of their angelic heritage, is important because it means that demons, in accordance with Aristotelian logic, were not just passively torn about by the passions. Like the pagan gods, demons were subject to and able to be moved by ‘emotions’ such as anger, envy, jealousy, and fear.\(^{790}\)

Augustine’s perception that demons could experience ‘emotions’ by virtue or curse of their nature, caused him to declare in The City of God 9.21 that the demons in Matthew 8:29 ‘feared’ (formidabant) Christ’s power to punish them.\(^{791}\) This declaration is interesting since Scripture ascribes no emotions to either the demons or the two men whom they possessed.\(^{792}\) The lack of biblical precedent for the fear experienced by the demons in this scenario, means that while Augustine might not have been the first to interpret the


\(^{786}\) Aug., De Div., Daem., LLTA, cap. 3, par. 7, pag. 603, lin. 15.

\(^{787}\) Augustine explains this in more detail across chapters three to five of Aug., De Div., Daem., LLTA, cap. 3-6, par. 7-10, pag. 603-609, lin. 15-13.

\(^{788}\) Aug., De Div., Daem., LLTA, cap. 4, par. 8, pag. 606, lin. 12 and cap. 5, par. 9, pag. 607, lin. 6.

\(^{789}\) Aug., De Civ., LLTA, SL 47, lib. 8, cap. 17, lin. 1; lib. 9, cap. 3, lin. 5-17, lib. 9, cap. 3, lin. 22 and lib. 9, cap. 6, lin. 11; ‘City of God,’ 8.17, p. 156, 9.3, p. 167 and 9.6, p. 169.

\(^{790}\) Also, Wiebe, ‘The Politics of Possession,’ 36.


\(^{792}\) ‘Et ecce clamaverunt, dicentes: Quid nobis et tibi, Jesus fili Dei? Venisti huc ante tempus torquere nos?’ This translates as: ‘And behold they cried out, saying: What have we to do with you, Jesus Son of God? Have you come hither to torment us before the time?’ Vulgate, Matt., 8:29.
demons in Matthew 8:29 as fearing God, he did consider demons to retain a fear of being punished by God.

Notably, and perhaps unlike Gregory of Tours, Augustine also expands the demons’ fear of Christ’s power to punish to encompass a fear of God’s angels. Discussing angels in the same chapter, Augustine describes them as beings ‘of good and sanctity [and], in this way, [the angels] dreadfully terrified the unclean spirits.’ In Augustine’s eyes, demons not only feared God’s power to punish them, they also feared the goodness and sanctity of His holy angels.

Besides writing on the ability of demons to experience fear, Augustine also expounds on the human fear of demons in his *On Order*, *On Christian Doctrine*, and *On the Divination of Demons*. Discussing the divine part of authority in *On Order*, Augustine states:

> ‘The wonderous deceptions of the aerial spirits, who perceive through divinations those things pertaining to the corporeal, are to be feared. By some powers they [the aerial spirits] are readily accustomed to ensnare the souls of those doomed to perish through curious misfortunes, desire of fragile powers, or fright of empty miracles.’

In the above Augustine declares that humans ought to fear the powers of deception gifted to the aerial spirits. Although he does not use the term for demons, preferring the label ‘aerial spirits’, his use of the term ‘deceptions’ (*fallacia*) signifies that he is referring to demons and not God’s true angels. He stresses that people ought to fear demons because they can divine things according to corporeal matters; a point

---


794 ‘…boni utique et sancti ut per hoc spiritibus immundis metuendi et tremendi,’ Aug., *De Civ.*, II.TA, SL 47, lib. 9, cap. 21, lin. 23; ‘City of God,’ 9.21, p. 177.

795 ‘In qua metuenda est aeriorum animalium mira fallacia, quae per rerum ad istos sensus corporis pertinentium quasdam divinationes nonnullasque potentias, decepte animas facilime concuerunt, aut perituarum fortunarum curiosas, aut fragilium cupidas potestatum, aut inanum formidolosam miraculorum.’ St. Augustine, *On Order* [De Ordine], trans. Silvano Borruso (Indiana: St. Augustine’s Press, 2007), 2.9.27. *Note that the translation above is my own and that the citation provides book, chapter, and section number in order.
which he explains in more detail in *On Christian Doctrine*. Discussing the dangers of divination in his second book of this work, Augustine explains that engaging in divination is tantamount to entering into a contract with demons who controlled the properties of omens.\(^{796}\) In divination it is the demon, not the human, who decides whether particular signs are omens and how certain those omens are.\(^{797}\) As the master of the sign and the one who turns into an omen based on what it perceives the human to already be suspicious of, the demon is the one in control.\(^{798}\) The ease with which Augustine perceives demons to be capable of deceiving someone to believe what they create, leads him to declare:

"Therefore, in all these teachings the society of demons, which with its leader the Devil seeks nothing other than to bar and close our return [to God], is to be feared and shunned."\(^{799}\)

In this passage Augustine declares that humans should not only fear the demons' powers of deception, they should also fear the possibility of becoming trapped in demonic society, the consequence for practising divination and entering into a contract with a demon. Becoming a part of the Devil's society and metaphysical body is such a fearful prospect for Augustine because that person could only be freed if God deigned to intervene.\(^{800}\) Augustine's concept of why humans should fear practising divination is thus connected to his fear that a person trapped by a demon would almost irrevocably lose their ability to break free from the Devil's society and damnation. Divination, a form of demonic power, was to be feared because it involved surrendering control of the soul to the Devil.

A final, noteworthy aspect of Augustine's perception of the human fear of demons is made in *On the Divination of Demons*. Here Augustine states that men inexperienced in guarding against demons ought to be

---


\(^{797}\) Aug., *De Doc.*, LLTA, lib. 2, cap. 24, lin. 1; 'On Christian Instruction,' 2.24.37, p. 94.


\(^{799}\) 'In omnibus ergo etsi doctrinis societas daemonum formidanda atque vitanda est, qui nihil cum principe suo diablo nisi reditum nostrum claudere atque obserare consentur.' Aug., *De Doc.*, LLTA, lib. 2, cap. 33, lin. 36; 'On Christian Instruction,' 2.23.36, p. 94.

afraid of encountering them.\textsuperscript{801} He ties the notion that one should fear demons to the issue of experience and vulnerability. Those inexperienced in guarding against a demonic attack ought to be more fearful of meeting a demon because their lack of training made them more appealing for demons hunting easy prey. Crucially, Augustine never expands his declaration to state that those with experience of demons should no longer fear encountering them. He does not, at least explicitly, equate prior experience of demonic attacks with a ‘get out jail free card’ when it comes to experiencing a fear of demons. He only maintains that those without experience guarding against demons should fear them.

Augustine’s commentary on this matter is significant because it suggests that he connected the human fear of demons to ascetic training on a certain level. His silence on whether experience with demonic attacks would mean that a person may not fear subsequent demonic encounters makes it difficult to judge whether Augustine regarded the role which the fear of demons played in the ascetic life in the same light that Cassian did. Nevertheless, Augustine can at least be seen to equate the fear of demons with ascetic training.

Augustine’s writings show that the bishop was interested in developing the theological concept of the Devil, his demons, and their role in the Christian life, within the wider contextual development of Christian doctrine in the period. Yet he was not the only theologian to maintain a deep interest in demonology in this period.

\textit{The Conferences} of John Cassian are perhaps the most detailed and most important source for navigating Gallic perceptions of the nature and roles of the Devil and his demons in this period. Cassian’s seventh and eighth conferences with \textit{abba} Serenus are the primary texts in which he transmits his views on the hierarchy

\textsuperscript{801} ‘…cum eas homo vic experiendo cavere didicerit et multa innocia, quod sint incepta, formidet.’ Aug., \textit{De Div., Daem.}, LLTA, cap. 3, pars 7, pag. 604, lin. 10.
of demons, their strengths and powers, and their various methods of attack. They also contain Cassian’s perspectives on the Devil as the twice-fallen angel. Conferences seven and eight show that Cassian, like Sulpicius Severus, considered demons to be beings which would actively inspire fear in people to try and make them lose their focus on God.

Cassian’s eighth Conference reveals that he saw demons as creatures which caused fear in humans through their appearance. In Conferences 8.12, Cassian, through abba Serenus, states that all wicked spirits inhabit a realm of air which is spread between heaven and earth. This realm is filled with spirits who do not fly either quietly or aimlessly.

Divine providence has, however, deigned to protect mankind from visibly seeing this because:

’ve men would be terrified with intolerable fear and falter from the terror of the mob [of wicked spirits] or rather the horror of their faces, which they transform and convert through their will when it has pleased them [to do so].'
For Cassian, the ever-changing countenances of demons were a danger to humans because they had the power to strike a fear into men and remove their focus on God. As shapeshifters, demons were figures to be feared because they could manipulate their appearance into forms which would incite people to fear them and thereby falter in their pursuit of God.

Cassian’s *Conferences* are further notable because they show that his attitude on the acceptability and role of the human fear of demons in the monastic life changed subject to how far the monk had progressed along their path to spiritual purity. Conferences seven and sixteen provide the reader with alternative views on the role and mitigation of the human fear of demons in the life of the desert ascetic. In his seventh Conference on the changeableness of the soul and wicked spirits, Cassian creates a dialogue between himself, Germanus, and *abba* Serenus which discusses the battles that all monks, as aspiring centurions of God, must undertake against the forces of evil. In this dialogue, Serenus states that demons, or wicked spirits, all have the power to assail humans who have the freedom to accept or reject those efforts.810 Yet, he continues, ‘if we fear greatly their [the wicked spirits’] powers and attacks, we might gather together against them, with the protection and help of God.’811

Serenus’ statement is important because it shows that the powers and attacks of demons were thought to inspire the fear of demons in desert ascetics and because it shows that Cassian did not consider the human fear of demons to be an unreasonable fear for a desert monk to experience. In the speech above, Cassian, through Serenus, neither upbraids nor judges monks for fearing the powers and attacks of wicked spirits. The fear of demons is a permissible part of the ascetic experience but, as the declaration that the monks should gather together against the spirits with the aid and protection of God shows, it was also not a fear by which monks should become consumed. In Conference seven, Cassian’s readers learn that humans would and were permitted to fear the powers and attacks of wicked spirits, so long as they remembered that they should stand against it with God’s help and protection.

Cassian’s declarations on the human fear of demons in his seventh Conference do not, however, mark the end of the reader’s education on the subject. The human fear of demons arises once again in

---

811 ‘…quorum tamen potentiam et inpugnationes si pertimescimus, etiam protectiones atque adiutoria dei e contrario conferamus,’ Cass., *Collat.*, CSEL, Vol. 13, VII.VIII.2, p. 190 (5-7); *Conf.*, 7.8.2, p. 254.
Conference sixteen where Cassian discusses the topic of friendship. Interestingly, the views on the fear of demons, which Cassian puts forward through the mouthpiece of abba Joseph, contrast with those stated in Conference seven. Discussing the illusions of the Devil, abba Joseph tells the reader: ‘truly all the traps of our adversary the devil and the snares of his illusions are not to be feared.’ Here Cassian explicitly says that the desert monk should not fear the Devil and his traps.

The views that Cassian maintains about the ascetic fear of demons in Conference sixteen need to be contextualised within the overall point of the Conference to be fully understood. The two main focuses of this Conference are friendship, its role and value in the strivings of a desert monk, and how one should live in a monastic community. A crucial part of friendship, according to Cassian, is the willingness of someone to exchange and receive advice from other friends. Through this a monk demonstrated that he did not consider himself so proud and intelligent as to not need the advice of others. The openness to receiving advice was, for Cassian, tantamount to a display of humility not just friendship. As long as the monk persisted in humility, they would not need to fear the Devil’s snare of pride. Humility was the way to avoid experiencing a fear of demons.

Cassian’s views in his sixteenth Conference contrast with those he put forward in Conference seven in a subtle but crucial way. In Conference sixteen, the human fear of demons is something which monks should not experience because their adherence to the monastic quality of humility in friendship should prevent it. The fear of demons should be curtailed by ascetic rigour before it was experienced. Yet in Conference seven, Cassian recognises that fearing demons is a part of monastic experience even if it should be managed by recourse to God’s aid. The human fear of demons is an inescapable part of ascetic life and something which must be managed when experienced. The difference in Cassian’s attitude towards the fear of the demons between the two Conferences is striking. One possible explanation for this is that Cassian might simply have wanted to convey the different attitudes that existed amongst the desert fathers when it came to deciding what was and what was not considered to be correct ascetic orthopraxy. The other,
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perhaps more plausible explanation is that Cassian might have used different perspectives to try to indicate the progress that the monk should have made between Conferences seven and sixteen.

In Authority and Asceticism, Conrad Leyser identifies that the Institutes and Conferences present a regime for the monk to follow. The Institutes train the monk to handle the bodily requirements of the ascetic life while The Conferences handle the mental side. According to Leyser, Cassian maintained a systematic approach to achieving spiritual purity, and this is clearly displayed by his hierarchical structure of the vices in The Institutes and his discussion of the various stages of perfection that the monk has to pass through in Conference eleven. In this context, the polarised attitudes Cassian maintains on the issue of whether the fear of demons was an permissible part of monastic orthopraxy is less surprising. What he considered to be acceptable for a monk in Conference seven, which lies in the first part of The Conferences, would be considerably less so by time the monk reached Conference sixteen, the penultimate stage of the second part. In declaring that the fear of demons was an acceptable part of ascetic life in Conference seven but that it was no longer permissible by Conference sixteen, Cassian might be inexplicitly trying to convey the progress that the monk should have made, following his systematic approach towards achieving spiritual purity, to the reader.

The Conferences show that Cassian was interested in expanding the wider Gallic comprehension of the nature of the relationship between demons and fear, as seen by the emergence of the idea that demons actively used their appearance to inspire fear in humans to make them falter in their pursuit of Christian perfection. They also show that Cassian was interested in using the notion of the ascetic’s fear of demons to put forward his views about the progression of the Christian towards spiritual purity. By introducing the detailed and complex demonologies of the desert fathers into Gaul, Cassian’s Conferences constituted a significant step in the development and consolidation of the Gallic concept of demons. The centrality and primacy of his works to the maturation of Christian demonology in the west should never be underestimated.

---

816 Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 38.
817 Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 47, 50-51.
818 Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 49.
819 Cass., Instit., CSEL, Vol.17, 2-5, pp. 78-231; Institutes, 5-12, pp. 113-274. For Cassian’s discussion of the stages of perfection see Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, XLII.1, p. 326 (15-17) and XLII.5, p. 327 (16-23); Conf., 11.12.1. p. 418 and 11.12.5. p. 418. Discussed in Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.
Nevertheless, as Valerie Flint’s *The Rise of Magic* shows, Cassian’s contribution to late antique demonology should also be contextualised alongside the contributions of other writers including Augustine, something which Robert Wiśniewski fails to consider in his declaration that if the writings of Cassian and Sulpicius Severus are set aside, demons did not have an important role in Latin monastic literature.820

It is debatable whether Cassian knew of, and might have drawn ideas from, Sulpicius’ *The Life of Saint Martin*. The text was completed and in circulation by 397 and was immediately popular.821 Both these factors mean that it is possible that Cassian might have encountered this work after his arrival at Marseilles around 415.822 The difficulty lies in proving that any of the knowledge put forward in Cassian’s own *Conferences* was drawn from or influenced by any other source outside of John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, Augustine, and the desert fathers he spoke to on his travels.823 Cassian, following the habit of most late antique writers, rarely cites his theological sources. While Rousseau believes that Cassian, having been encouraged by the successors of Martin and Sulpicius to share his knowledge, created his works to educate people on how to follow the ascetic life that was pioneered with Sulpicius’ depiction of Martin,824 it is not possible to conclusively determine that Cassian’s writings were influenced by the theological perspectives of Sulpicius or Martin. Although Cassian and Sulpicius maintained similar outlooks on how demons ensnared people - for example both men thought that demons used their countenances to incite people to fear them825 - it is possible that these similarities resulted from the fact that both men sourced most of their knowledge from eastern theologians; Athanasius in Sulpicius’ case,826 John Chrysostom and Origen (through Evagrius...

---


821 On the date of Sulpicius’ *Life* see Stancliffe, *St. Martin*, 71.


823 Leyser identifies John Chrysostom and Evagrius as the main fountains of inspiration for Cassian’s works. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 35. Also, Markus, *End of Ancient Christianity*, 185.


826 The influence of Athanasius’ *The Life of Antony* on the structure of Sulpicius’ *The Life of Saint Martin* is discussed in Rousseau, *Ascetics*, 133-139.
Indeed it is worth noting that Sulpicius’ Devil and demons are strikingly similar to their counterparts in Athanasius’ *Life of Antony*. Both sets of figures are depicted as the testers of the holy hero and users of fear to entrap their prey. Although Sulpicius’ *Life of Saint Martin* gave Gaul its own popular ascetic model comparable to Antony, and set a precedent for the role of the Devil and his demons in the testing of ascetic sanctity in Gallic theological literature, the question of whether he directly influenced the demonological views of Cassian remains an open one. With all this in mind, it is time to examine what Sulpicius Severus’ writings, which considerably influenced the perception of the relationship between demons and fear that would come to be known by Gregory of Tours, reveal about the contemporary attitudes to demonically-inspired fear and the wider relationship which existed between demonic beings and fear.

Sulpicius’ *The Life of Saint Martin, Letters,* and *Dialogues* demonstrate that the Gallic comprehension of the nature of the relationship between demons and fear was expanding at the end of the fourth century. They also show that there was an interest in discussing the role that demonically-inspired fear played in the Christian life. *The Life of Saint Martin* especially, reveals that Sulpicius, like Cassian, thought that the Devil and his demons would intentionally incite fear in people in order to distract them from their fear of God and draw them away from salvation. In chapter eighteen, Sulpicius describes how a rumour that Tours was about to be attacked by barbarians caused uproar amongst the citizens. In response to these rumours, Martin, who was then the Bishop of Tours, ordered a person possessed by a demon to tell the truth about what was happening. The demon, lurking within the possessed person, confessed that there were ten demons who:

---

‘had scatted this rumour around the people in order that Martin, at least, would flee from the city.’

Sulpicius’ text clearly depicts the demons as figures who had deliberately incited a fear of a barbarian attack in the citizens of Tours in order to dislodge Martin from the city. It is interesting that the fear which Sulpicius’ demons incite is not a fear of demons but a fear of being attacked by barbarians. In playing on this fear, Sulpicius’ demons can be seen to be trying to achieve two goals with one method. On the one hand, by spreading the rumour of an imminent attack through the city, the demons inspired fear and tumult amidst the people; causing them to become distracted and rendering them easy prey for the demons. On the other hand, the demons also appear to hope that either the confused tumult of the terrified people or Martin’s own fear of a barbarian assault, would induce the bishop to abandon his see. The primary aim of Sulpicius’ demons is to dislodge Martin from Tours and their preferred method of achieving that goal is to use fear to incite commotion. Sulpicius’ view that demons would use fear to try and distract and dislodge bishops and holy people is something that Gregory of Tours would later expound upon in his books of Histories, Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers.

The Life of Saint Martin also shows that Sulpicius thought that the Devil, like his demons, used fear to distract and ensnare people. In the sixth chapter of Martin’s Life, Sulpicius outlines how the Devil appeared to Martin in the guise of a human. He struck up a conversation with Martin, inquiring as to where he was travelling and Martin answered that he would go wherever God demanded him to. The Devil replied that

---


834 This is another point in which Sulpicius and Cassian align. Cassian also stated that demons worked by stripping people of their focus on the fear of God. See Cass., Collat., CSEL, Vol. 13, VII.XXIII, p. 203 (5-9); Conf., 7.24, p. 264.

835 For in-depth discussion of examples of this see Chapter 4, section 4.3: Gregory, Demonically-inspired Fear, and the Loss or Lack of Self-Control.


he would resist Martin wherever he went and in whatever he did. But Martin’s reply: ‘The Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man can do unto me’, caused him to promptly vanish.

Martin’s reply to the Devil in this first encounter, is a direct quotation from Psalms 117:6. On a basic level Martin’s recitation of this verse illustrates that Sulpicius perceived that one way to defeat the Devil was to recite the words of the Gospel. On a deeper level, Sulpicius or Martin’s choice of quote is itself revealing of their views on the way that the Devil worked. By declaring: ‘I will not fear what man can do unto me’, Sulpicius implicitly demonstrates that he perceives the Devil to work by inspiring fear in people and that the way to thwart him in this was to acknowledge that this fear had no effect. While Sulpicius is clear that the verse: ‘I will not fear what man can do unto me’ is spoken to a man, that man is inhabited by the Devil. Thus, while Martin explicitly says that he does not fear what the man can do to him, he also implicitly declares that he does not fear what the Devil might do to him. Martin does not display a fear of either the man or the Devil and makes this lack of fear explicit through his words. Sulpicius shows his audience that the Devil traps people by inciting them to fear, but that he will vanish if he realises that the person is not distracted by the fear of either man or him.

Sulpicius’ Life of Saint Martin evidences an increasing interest amongst Gallic theologians in discussing the role which demonically-inspired fear had in the Christian life. It shows that Sulpicius regarded the Devil and his demons as beings who used fear as means of trying to remove people away from God; either by using fear to replace their thoughts about God with other more worldly-orientated fears, or by using fear to try and move those who represented God, and had power as a result of His favour, away from those they protected. In revealing this, Sulpicius’ Life of Saint Martin also shows that the Gallic perception of the nature of the relationship between demons and fear was maturing at the very end of the fourth century. The Devil and his demons were now portrayed as masters of fear, figures who could prey upon people’s fear and use it for their own ends.

The works of Prosper of Aquitaine do not contain many references to demons or the Devil. Indeed, Prosper never explicitly refers to the human fear of demons or the possibility that demonic figures could experience fear in either *The Call of All Nations*, letters to Rufinus and Augustine, *Answers to the Extracts of the Genoese, Answers to the Objections of the Gauls*, *Answers to the Vincentian Articles*, or the *Official Pronouncements of the Apostolic See on Divine Grace and Free Will*. The only text of Prosper to openly refer to the human fear of the Devil is his *Against Cassian the Conferencer*. Here Prosper shows that he perceived that the fear of the Devil’s ability to tempt people was not something that humans were either supposed to experience or, at the very least, that the human will was able to escape by its own strength.

Prosper’s references to the Devil are sparse. Yet they do collectively indicate that he perceived the Devil to be a figure who sought to use external and physical objects to persuade the already-perverted human will to transgress even further against God.\(^{841}\) Although the Devil could not control free will, which Christ had liberated through the Crucifixion, he was able to manipulate people as a result of Adam’s sin.\(^{842}\) Yet the Devil’s ability to test people was limited by God who determined how far a person’s loyalty to Him may be tested subject to the level of divine grace He had bestowed on them.\(^{843}\) The concept of the Devil as figure whose power is limited by God is crucial for understanding Prosper’s perspectives on the human fear of the Devil.

In *Against Cassian*, Prosper states:

> ‘But after that, he [Cassian] inserted a testimony of no authority from that discussion in *The Book of the Shepherd*. From this he wished to show that everyman, placed between the contrary influences of the good and the bad angel, is left to his natural judgement and own discretion in such a way that there is no more help for him from God than there is danger from the Devil.’\(^{844}\)

---

\(^{841}\) Prosp., of Aquit., *De Voc.*, PL, Vol. 51, I.VIII. col. 0654C; *Call of All Nations*, 1.8, pp. 35-36.

\(^{842}\) Prosp., of Aquit., *De Voc.*, PL, Vol. 51, I.VIII. col. 0654C; *Call of All Nations*, 1.8, pp. 35-36.


\(^{844}\) ‘Post illud autem nullius auctoritatis testimonium quod disputationi suae de libello Pastoris insenuit, ex quo ostendere voluit, inter boni et mali angeli contrarias suasiones, ita onem bonum naturali judicio et propriae discretionis esse commissum, ut ei non plus a Deo praeediti, quam a diabolo sit periculi;’ Prosp., of Aquit., *Contra Coll.*, PL, Vol. 51, XIII.6, col. 0250C-0251A; ‘Against Cassian,’ 13.6, p. 108.
In his translation, P. De Letter would interpret *periculi* to mean fear.\(^{845}\) Yet danger does not always denote the presence of fear and Prosper’s Latin does not contain any explicit fear terminology. Only when the passage is contextualised does it demonstrate that Prosper might have thought that the humans were not supposed to fear the Devil, or that this fear was not something which the strength of the human will would be able to overcome.

The quotation above constitutes the opening to Prosper’s criticisms of Cassian’s commentary of a passage from *The Book of the Shepherd*, known more commonly as *The Shepherd* or *The Shepherd of Hermas*. Prosper’s central issue with the passage is that Cassian uses it to declare that a person, when faced with the test of good and evil, was left to rely on the strength of their will to such an extent that there was no need to rely on help from God or think that the Devil presented any danger. This is what Prosper interprets the passage to mean and it is also what he thought Cassian interpreted it to mean, owing to the latter’s which stated that mankind always kept its free will and could neglect or delight in the grace of God as it chose.\(^{846}\) In Prosper’s eyes, Cassian thought that the human will was free to act as it wished; a point which he vehemently criticised because it attributed the reception of grace entirely to the human will thus aligning too closely with the fabricated doctrine falsely-attributed to Pelagius.\(^{847}\)

Already judging Cassian to have attributed too much power to the human will, Prosper, commenting on Cassian’s use of Job, stated that God did not leave Job to face the Devil’s trials without the aid of divine grace.\(^{848}\) He corrects Cassian, stating that instead of saying: “since God allowed the tempter no more power than He knew Job was strong enough to withstand,” it would have been better to say: since God allowed the tempter ‘no more power than He knew He had given Job strength to withstand’.\(^{849}\) God, in Prosper’s

---

\(^{845}\) See P. De Letter’s ‘Against Cassian,’ 13.6, p. 108. The *T.L.L.* shows that if *periculosus*, is combined with another fearing term such as *metus* then it can mean fear. On its own however *periculosus*, meaning danger, does not always imply that fear is present. Though Prosper is referring to the Devil as a threat in this context, a person does not have to respond to a threat with fear. See *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, *Vol. 10.1* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1992-2010), s.v. ‘*periculosus*’ col. 1452-1457 and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, *Vol. 8*, s.v. ‘*metus*’ col. 911.


understanding, was not simply a spectator who watched Job to see if his will was strong enough to withstand the trials of the Devil. He was the determiner of the strength of divine grace Job received, the limiter of the Devil’s tests, and the One who sent the Holy Spirit to guide and strengthen the human will.

Prosper’s argument on God as the origin of the strength of the human will is not only important for discerning his stance on ‘Pelagian’ doctrine at this point in his theological career, it is also vital for understanding his implicit views on the fear of the Devil. Prosper’s stance implies that he either thought that the human will should not fear the Devil or his trials, or that the will could not, of its own accord, become strong enough to face a test of good and evil without needing God’s help or fearing the Devil’s deeds. If Prosper had read the anonymous *Shepherd of Hermas,* beyond what he had derived from Cassian, it is quite possible that he would not have thought that the human will should experience any fear of the Devil. The Angel of Repentance, educating Hermas in the Twelve Commandments of God, warned the pastor: “But fear not the Devil; for by fearing the Lord thou shalt overcome the Devil…Fear the acts of the Devil, because they are evil”. Later he also stated: “The Devil creates fear, but his fear is empty; therefore do not fear him, and he will fly from you.” According to the mandates in *The Shepherd,* the Devil was not to be feared but his deeds were.

---

850 Bonner has debunked ‘Pelagianism’ as a fabricated myth that did not represent the reality of Pelagius’ views or the nature of the doctrinal controversy. Bonner, *Myth of Pelagianism,* x-xvii and 1-287. Hwang demonstrates that this position matures as Prosper does. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover,* 1-9 and 37-239.

851 Charles Hoole speculated that the author was possibly the Hermas to whom the Apostle Paul sent greetings in the epistle, Romans. But he also notes that the Ethiopic version of the text labelled Paul as the author and that it is possible that an anonymous author might used ‘Hermas’ as a pseudonym owing to its popularity in the early Church through the apostolic Hermas and the brother of Pius I who was also called Hermas. Charles Holland Hoole, ‘Introduction,’ in *The Shepherd of Hermas,* trans. Charles Holland Hoole (Oxford: Rivingtons, 1870), vii-x.


853 ‘Diabolus autem timorem factit, sed timor illius vanus est. Nolite ergo timere eum, et fugiet a vobis.’ Herm., *Herm.,* mand., 12, cap. 4, pag. 67, lin. 8-9; *The Shepherd,* 2.12.4, p. 76.
Unfortunately, establishing that Prosper read *The Shepherd* is not a straightforward task. Beyond his criticism of Cassian’s work, Prosper never references this text in any of his other writings. Although, as Alexander Hwang also points out, Prosper does state that *The Shepherd* was a book of no significance, it is difficult to know for certain whether this was a judgement derived from his own reading of the text or whether it stemmed from his dislike of the way Cassian had used it.

At the start of his thirteenth chapter of *Against Cassian*, Prosper seemingly describes the contents of *The Shepherd* in greater detail. He quotes the part about mankind being able to freely choose as it pleases and describes the two angels, one good and one bad, that appear in the sixth Commandment recited by the Angel. While this could indicate that Prosper had read the text himself, a cursory glance at Cassian’s thirteenth Conference reveals that Prosper has copied Cassian almost *verbatim*. Since Cassian, in a rare occurrence, explicitly cites *The Shepherd* as his source, this is one of the few occasions in which it is possible to state that Prosper would have been able secondary reference *The Shepherd* without having any prior knowledge of it. Cassian’s explicit reference to *The Shepherd* as his authority means that the in-depth knowledge that Prosper provides about *The Shepherd* can be determined to have come from Cassian and not from his own study.

In the absence of an explicit declaration about his views of the human fear of the Devil, it is perhaps best to remain open minded about Prosper’s thoughts on the matter. He might have perceived that the human will could not grow strong enough to become resistant to the fear of the Devil, or his trials, by its own merit. Alternatively, he might have thought that the human fear of the Devil was not something which humans should experience at all. This would align with the views presented in *The Shepherd*, though there is no surviving textual evidence to suggest that Prosper knew more than what Cassian had quoted.

Before drawing this section to a close, it is tempting to suggest that while Prosper might have maintained that the human will could not become resistant to the fear of the Devil by its own merit, he might...
have thought that it could become resistant to this fear with the aid of God’s grace. Unfortunately Prosper never explicitly claims this. Indeed he stated that the passage which Cassian quoted was ‘of no value’ and then devoted the next two chapters to debunking the idea that the human will could ever truly be independent of God’s help. Both these points are important. They indicate that Prosper might have thought that the human will could never reach the stage at which it was free to not fear the danger which the Devil posed. If Prosper rejected Pelagius’ supposed idea that human will was truly free in its choice to accept or neglect divine grace, then it follows that he might also have rejected the perception that the human will could ever be free of fearing the Devil. Nevertheless this must remain circumspect. Prosper never conveys his exact stance on the matter. It is only through contextualising Prosper’s quote on the danger posed by the Devil that it is possible to discern that, at the time when he composed Against Cassian, Prosper did not think that the human will could become strong enough on its own to face the trials of good and evil without fearing the danger that was the Devil. Whether he thought that the human will could become strong enough to be permanently free of the fear of the Devil if it was gifted with God’s divine grace, will never be known.

Combined, the individual analyses of Prosper, Augustine, Cassian, and Sulpicius’ writings demonstrate that the concept of the Christian fear of demonic beings, and the contemporary understanding of the relationship which existed between demons and fear, had begun to mature in the theological literature of the period. More importantly, they also show that contemporaries were beginning to regard demonically-inspired fear as a sign of the loss or lack of discipline and a threat to the attainment of the good Christian life. Within the wider development of Christian doctrine, theology, and orthopraxy that was conducted in the works of these four men, the notions that demons used fear to distract humans from God and that humans should fear demonic beings because of this, started to acquire a more established role in the theological discourse of late antique Gaul. The writings of Augustine, Sulpicius, Prosper, and Cassian show that there is consensus between these authors regarding the idea that the Devil and his demons could and would actively cause fear in humans for the purposes of testing their adherence to God and His laws. Where

they all differ is in how they perceive Christians should react to demonically-inspired fear and how this reaction might change as they progress along the path pursuing Christian perfection. The differences in the views of the four men needs to be stressed because they indicate that the notion that demonically-inspired fear signified or led to a loss or lack of self-control was still in its infancy in this period. Its role was not yet fully expounded or universally established in Christian theology.

3.5. The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century

Having uncovered that the writings of Augustine, Cassian, Prosper, and Sulpicius show that demonically-inspired fear was increasingly being perceived as a sign of the loss or lack of discipline and a threat to the attainment of the good Christian life, this section explores how this notion matured in the century that followed. In that which follows, I argue that the writings of Paulinus of Périgueux, Julianus Pomerius, Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, and Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, show that there was an intensification of the presence of demonically-inspired fear in the theological literature of Gaul from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century. I also argue that the works of these men show that contemporaries were growing increasingly interested in reinforcing the message that demonically-inspired fear could lead to the loss of the fear of God and self-discipline.

Chapter one, drawing on the views of Danuta Shanzer and Ian Wood,860 suggested that in the period spanning from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century, the Gallic theological tradition shifted away from widespread debate to develop a tradition in which discussion, while still encouraged, operated within much tighter constraints.861 This transition resulted from the desire of the clergy in Gaul to establish firmer stances on various theological matters like the role of grace, free will, and the attainment of perfection.862 Yet the more recent work of Peter Brown suggests that there was more to this transition than Shanzer and Wood have pointed out.

In The Ransom of the Soul, Peter Brown argues that another ecclesiastical movement gathered momentum during the fifth century: one in which the Christian clergy of southern Gaul began trying to

---

861 Chapter 1, section 1.5: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century.
862 Chapter 1, section 1.5: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fifth to the Middle of the Sixth Century.
persuade the wealthy to donate increased sums of money and land to the Church.\textsuperscript{863} Employing a wide range of contemporary literature, from Salvian of Marseille’s *Open Letter to the Church* to Julianus Pomerius’ *On the Contemplative Life* and Faustus of Riez’s *On Grace and its Place in the History of Theology*, Brown claims that these three men, alongside the three bishops of Arles (Honoratus, Hilary, and Caesarius), were part of a wider re-imagining of the connection which existed between wealth, the process of what happened to the soul after bodily death, and repentance.\textsuperscript{864} Salvian, who was influenced by the Egyptian literature which he had read at Lérins, urged his readers to think on the dreadful recompenses that awaited those who, having not atoned for their sins by donating to the Church, had fallen into the hands of the Devil’s angels.\textsuperscript{865} He played, Brown thinks, on the people’s already growing fears of encountering and falling prey to the demonic forces that would appear to the soul immediately or soon after death.\textsuperscript{866} Brown perceives the evidence for this fear to lie in the increasing practice of people burying their loved ones beside saints. This was done to ensure that the deceased had a holy figure to guide them through the Last Judgement and help them pass more immediately through the ranks of demons who would try to claim them after their death.\textsuperscript{867} Here Brown enters dangerous territory. Despite declaring that there was an increasing practice of this type of burial, Brown only provides one example of a notable burial: Flora’s son, Cynegius, who was buried beside Felix of Nola.\textsuperscript{868} He then relies on Maximus of Turin’s writings to support his argument that Salvian played on the fears of ‘innumerable men and women, all over the Christian world at the prospect of death’.\textsuperscript{869} While Brown does provide evidence to support his claims, a wider corpus of burial examples and textual evidence beyond Maximus would have lent greater support to his view that a widespread fear of falling into the hands of demons after bodily death existed in this period.\textsuperscript{870}

\textsuperscript{863} Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 115-147.
\textsuperscript{865} Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 119-124.
\textsuperscript{866} Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 122-124. Allen Jones also highlights that Gregory of Tours adheres to this view as well see Jones, *Death and Afterlife*, 147-148.
\textsuperscript{868} Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 77-79 and 122.
\textsuperscript{869} Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 124.
Despite Brown’s under-supported notion about the prominence of the fear of encountering demons after death, his use of the works of Salvian, Faustus, Hilary, and Caesarius convincingly supports his broader argument that contemporaries in the fifth and sixth centuries were invested in creating ‘an undercurrent of fear’ of God’s final judgement, Hell, and encountering demonic figures.\(^\text{871}\) It is interesting that Brown perceives there to have been a wider ecclesiastical campaign which sought to instil the fear of God’s judgement into people while increasing their fear of facing demonic beings at the same time.\(^\text{872}\) His theory suggests that encouraging people to maintain a constant fear of demonic figures was at an all-time high by the time that Julianus Pomerius and Caesarius of Arles were writing. But do the works of these men, along with those of Avitus of Vienne and Paulinus of Périgueux, support this?

An analysis of writings of Paulinus of Périgueux, Julianus Pomerius, Avitus of Vienne, and Caesarius of Arles, suggests that the Gallic Church was growing increasingly concerned with forging and developing a relationship between the human fear of demonic figures and the fear of God, one in which the human fear of the Devil and his demons was grounded in and tied to the fear of either being punished by God or losing the love of God. It also shows that these four men were actively invested in promoting the idea that there was a connection between demonically-inspired fear and the loss of self-control to their audiences, by giving the Devil, his demons, and the fears that they incited in people a more established role in Christian paideia.

Paulinus of Périgueux’s *The Life of Saint Martin* lends support to Brown’s theory of an increasing concern with demonic fear in this period. It is the only work of those cited in this thesis before those of Gregory of Tours, to contain cases of demons inspiring fears in humans, humans fearing demonic figures, and demons experiencing fear themselves. Overall, Paulinus’ six book versification and expansion of Sulpicius’ *Life of Saint Martin* and *Dialogues*,\(^\text{873}\) contains more explicit references to demonic fear than Sulpicius’ original. This

---


872 Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 115-138. Brown’s ultimate focus is on the Church’s acquisition of wealth. Though not directly concerned with commenting on the clerical use of fear in this period, Brown discusses it nevertheless because he regards it as the means by which the Southern Gallic Church was able to garner its wealth.

suggests that Paulinus, and possibly his patron, Bishop Perpetuus of Tours, were more concerned with integrating demons and fear into the narrative than Sulpicius had been. One example of this appears in Paulinus’ second book of metric verse, in which he versifies the seventeenth chapter of Sulpicius’ Life of Saint Martin. Describing how Martin cured a possessed person, Paulinus writes:

‘For by chance entering the threshold of a neighbouring dwelling he [Martin] exclaims that he could distinguish in the gates a foul and horrible shadow with the appearance of a furious demon. Without delay the enemy came forth, [and] having seized the cook, he began to cause commotion in the interior of the house with his malicious gnashing of teeth, laying bare the threatening teeth of the captive mouth, cultivating inborn rage with foreign biting. The possessed body shakes with the confused insanity of the demon, so that madness rages from the human mouth, provoked to foreign frenzy by its own teeth. Frightened they [the household] scatter, no one daring to stand against [it] and these events kindle extreme fears.’

Determining the extent of Perpetuus’ influence on Paulinus’ work is difficult. Historians agree that Perpetuus sent copies of Sulpicius’ writings, which he had overseen the editing of, to Paulinus. But they disagree on the texts that were sent. Alston Chase has suggested, not implausibly, that the Turonian version of Martin’s Life, which Perpetuus sent to Paulinus, was a newly edited copy of Sulpicius’ original, which Perpetuus designed and sent to Paulinus so that Paulinus could help him further his goal of cultivating greater interest in the cult of Saint Martin. Chase, ‘metrical Lives,’ 56. Raymond Van Dam has a different view. He argues that Paulinus, as an act of gratitude for Martin’s cure of his eye ailment, had already versified Martin’s Life when Perpetuus got in contact. Perpetuus sent Paulinus a new copy of Sulpicius’ Dialogues and later a list of posthumous miracles but did not impact on Paulinus’ versification of Sulpicius’ Life. Van Dam, Saints and Their Miracles, 19. Paulinus himself provides little help on the matter. He confirms that he worked from a ‘splendid history’ of Perpetuus in his Prologue but does not specify further. Paul., of Péri., Vit., Sanct., Mart., CSEL, Vol. 16, Pro., p. 17 (11-12). Establishing which texts Perpetuus sent Paulinus is crucial to establishing which of his poetical books present Paulinus’ views before Perpetuus became involved. Unfortunately, none of the copies of the work that Perpetuus sent to Paulinus appear to have survived. Charting exactly whether the changes Paulinus’ Life makes to Sulpicius’ original were his own or the result of Perpetuus’ influence is thus currently impossible.

‘Nam forte ingrediens vicini limina tecti exclaimat tetram foribus se cernere in ipsis horribilem et visu furiosi daemonis umbra. Nec mora continuo coepit iam proditus hostis arrepto saevire coco, miscere tumultum interiortas donus penetralia, fremere mali, captivique oris dentes nudare minaces, ingentiam exercens alienis moribus iram, dum antiqui obsesso permixta insanias corpus daemonis, ut rabies humana saevit ore armata ad propriis alieno dente furoros. Diffugiant trepidi nec quiquam obstire contra andet et extrema acertum exempla timores.’

In Paulinus’ dactylic hexameter, the demon is shown to inspire fear in people when it possesses a cook and causes everyone in the household to scatter with fright. What makes Paulinus’ versification of this story so striking is that his version explicitly incorporates fear into the story. Sulpicius states that the demon caused uproar in: ‘the household population and the violently confused family turned in flight’, but he never says that the demon evoked fear in the household. Paulinus’ version specifies that the demon drives everyone in the household into a state of chaos by inspiring ‘fright’ (timores), thus emphasising the role of fear in a place where Sulpicius’ account had not.

Paulinus’ *Life of Saint Martin* not only contains additional and more explicit references to demonically-inspired fear than Sulpicius’ original, it also modifies the reason why demons use fear. For example, in his versification of Sulpicius’ account of the demons who sparked rumours of a barbarian invasion at Tours, Paulinus states:

‘Suddenly everything between the city walls was thrown into disordered panic. A report alleged that the vile barbarians moved to make war, scattering fear through credulous hearts.

And nor would the messenger of these rumours come forth so that the faithful might openly bring [him] forth with manifest authority.

Therefore, where he [Martin] saw fire to have been agitated by doubtful things and the people to be seized by terror from uncertainty,

---

876 Paulinus’ poem mostly appears to be composed of standard dactylic hexameter, rather than leonine, triperit tripartite, adonic or versus citocadi hexameter. Nevertheless, there are evident signs of an intermittent and inconsistent use of different rhyming schemes in Paulinus’ work. The scheme used most often is the rhyming couplet AA, but Paulinus also seems to deploy other rhyming schemes such as a monorhyme of AAAAA as well as other unclassified schemes; ABCABC, ABCA, ABCDA, AABCA.


877 ‘...commota domus, familia turbata, populus in fugam versus’ Sulp., Sev., *Vita Sancti Mart.*, CSEL, Vol. 1, 17.5, p. 127; ‘Life of Saint Martin,’ 17, p. 12. Sulpicius’ uses ‘fugam’, meaning to flee, but this does not necessarily signify the presence of fear. Sulpicius depicts the family as violently confused (Commota...familia turbata) not afraid.
he commanded that the demon, trapped in the body from whom the new rumours had been scattered, be uncovered.

At once, having been compelled by verbal torture to confess, he cries out that he himself was cause and leader of the wicked rumour: the lies were sown by himself with masked companions, so that the people might be overwhelmed with restless fear. Therefore, with this confession, he [Martin] released the sorrowful minds from the torture of the deceptive demon. 878

In a similar fashion to his version of the demon who possessed the cook, Paulinus makes three important changes to Sulpicius’ original narrative. Unlike Sulpicius, Paulinus does not specify the exact number of demons who are said to spread rumours in the city. 879 He also changes the cause of the demon’s confession, attributing it to verbal torture which never appears in Sulpicius’ text. 880 Yet his most important alteration concerns his description of why the demons sought to inspire fear in the city. Paulinus states that the demon confessed that it, and its compatriots, aimed to plant lies in people’s minds so that they would become afraid. 881 But he crucially omits the declaration that the plot was enacted with the intent to drive Martin out of Tours. 882 Paulinus’ demons are shown to deliberately want to incite fear in the citizens but are no longer

---


879 Sulpicius clearly specifies that ten demons were involved in this charade. ‘Tum confessus est decem daemonas secum fuisse, qui rumorem hunc per populum dispersissent,’ Sulp., Sev., Vita Sancti Mart., CSEL, Vol. 1, 18.2, p. 127; ‘Life of Saint Martin,’ 18, p. 12.


882 Paulinus’ demons are shown to deliberately want to incite fear in the citizens but are no longer
interested in dislodging Martin. The omission of this point is important because it suggests that while Paulinus, and maybe Perpetuus, recognised that demons worked by inciting people to fear worldly attack rather than focus on God, they did not perceive that the demons would use this method to try and remove the holy bishop from his see. Martin, despite the fact that his mere presence is no longer enough to compel the demon to confess, seems to have been regarded as being beyond such a plot.

Interestingly, even though Paulinus changes the intentions of Sulpicius’ demons concerning Martin, he retains the original notion that the demons incited a fear of a barbarian attack in order to move the citizens to frenzy and disorder. The relationship between demonically-inspired worldly fear and disorder remains intact. Furthermore, it is possible that Paulinus might have deliberately edited Sulpicius’ account in order to bring this relationship to the foreground of the story. By omitting the part about the ploy being enacted to remove Martin from Tours, Paulinus removed the distracting notion that the demons could have acted for any other reason besides wanting to inspire chaos in the city. Paulinus prioritises the message that demons inspire fear in people in order to create chaos and shortens the path by which the reader comes to this realisation.

In book five of his Life of Saint Martin, Paulinus refers to the idea that demons could experience fear, making him the first author of those discussed in this thesis to refer to this concept since Augustine. Versifying Sulpicius’ story of Martin’s confrontation with Avitianus and the demon curled around the back of his chair, Paulinus writes that:

‘…with the breath of the blessed mouth having been conducted towards it [the demon] from afar, it fled with terror of the word.’

In Paulinus’ story the demon becomes terrified enough to flee when Martin breathes and speaks to it. Although Paulinus does not specify what Martin said to the demon, the use of ‘the word’ (verbi) potentially implies that Martin spoke Scripture to it. Since the Gospel of John stated that the Word was God, it is

---

883 See above n. 880.
884 ‘Quam procul ut flatu benedicti contigit oris sanctus et ad moto verbi terrore fugavit;’
not unreasonable to suggest that Paulinus is not only explicitly showing a demon experiencing fear of Saint Martin in this story, but also a fear of God and His Word.

It is notable that this example lies in Paulinus’ fifth book of poetry. Books five and four versify the tales of Martin which Sulpicius recorded in his *Dialogues*. While Alston Hurd Chase and Raymond Van Dam disagree on whether the earlier books of Paulinus’ *Life* would have been shaped by the texts sent to him by Perpetuus, they concur that Paulinus could have worked from Perpetuus’ revised edition of the *Dialogues*. Consequently, it is important to recognise the potential contribution of Perpetuus to Paulinus’ account of Avitianus and the demon, not least because it allows for the possibility that Paulinus’ view that demons could experience the fear of God might have been shaped by the revisions made by the-then Bishop of Tours. Although this can only ever remain speculative, since the exact editions Perpetuus sent to Paulinus do not survive, the possibility that Paulinus’ ideas about what types of fears a demon might experience were influenced by another Gallic bishop is intriguing. It would suggest that the concern to make the fear experienced by demons more explicit in religious literature was more widespread and already an interest of the bishops of Tours by the late fifth century. Even if it is later proved that Perpetuus had no influence on Paulinus’ views in this scenario, the poem alone still demonstrates that Paulinus himself was interested in presenting demons as fear-experiencing figures in his literature.

The writings of Julianus Pomerius, the African-born rhetor who moved to Gaul and later became the tutor to Caesarius of Arles, do not contain any explicit references to the human fear of demons. As such they initially seem incongruous with the argument that ecclesiastical thinkers in fifth-century Gaul were increasingly urging people to maintain a fear of being ensnared by demons alongside the fear of God. Nevertheless, while Julianus does not mention any aspect of demonic fear in his *On the Contemplative Life*, he does expound upon the nature of the Devil and his demons in detail. His characterisation of the Devil and his demons, coupled with his interpretation of the judgement which they received and that which

---

awaited all people, might have been included with the implicit intention of encouraging the reader to fear following in the footsteps which the Devil and his angels had trodden.

In *On the Contemplative Life* 1.3, Julianus directly opposes the unclean spirits with their good angel counterparts. For him, unclean spirits were the angels who were cast down from the heavens after being corrupted by deadly pride. They were transformed into spirits that were not only prohibited from being reinstated to heaven but were also deprived of any desire for such redemption. The lack of desire for redemption is particularly notable because it emphasises the baseness to which the Devil and his unclean spirits have sunk. They have become so thoroughly corrupt that they cannot even desire salvation anymore.

The judgement handed down to the unclean spirits, as Julianus’ work makes apparent, is partly the result of their own corruption through pride and partly God’s decision. It was God who meted out this punishment to the sinful angels and, as Julianus carefully observes, it would be God who would conduct this judgement again on the sinners of the world. The idea that humans would face the judgement meted out to the corrupt angels, informs the reader that if they do not adhere to the good Christian lifestyle, they will be reduced to the very state in which the Devil and his unclean spirits persist. Whereas the just, by persevering in God and pursuing the active and contemplative aspects of the Christian lifestyle, would join the good angels in heaven, the sinners would be transformed into spirits so base that they would not only be barred from redemption, they would no longer be able to desire it either. They would become alike with the same spirits who desired to throw them off course with waves of temptation as they pursued the active Christian lifestyle. Consequently, while Julianus’ *On the Contemplative Life* is more concerned with
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888 Pom., *Vita Contemplat.*, PL, Vol. 59, lib.1, cap. 3.2, col. 0420C-0421C; *Contemplative Life*, 1.3.2, p. 20.
889 Pom., *Vita Contemplat.*, PL, Vol. 59, lib.1, cap. 3.2, col. 0420C-0421C; *Contemplative Life*, 1.3.2, pp. 20-21.
890 The exact quotation reads: ‘This judgement, which we say will take place between the just men and the unjust, we believe was made between the holy angels and the unclean.’ *Hoc judicium, quod inter justos homines injustosque futurum dicimus, inter sanctos angelos et immundos cedimus factum.* Pom., *Vita Contemplat.*, PL, Vol. 59, lib.1, cap. 3.2, col. 0420C; *Contemplative Life*, 1.3.2, p. 20.

892 Julianus specifies that the Devil and his unclean angels only attack those pursuing the active lifestyle. Those who have moved on to pursue the contemplative life, striving for perfection, are no longer pursued. Pom., *Vita Contemplat.*, PL, Vol. 59, lib.1, cap. 12.1-2, col. 0427D-0429A; *Contemplative Life*, 1.12.2, pp. 32-33. For unclean angels throwing
encouraging the reader to maintain a fear of God, in keeping with its overall aim of creating a moral language that ascetics in positions of power could use. Julianus’ declaration that humans who lost control would be judged just like the evil angels, must surely have been intended to encourage the reader to fear following the example of the Devil and his demons.

Caesarius of Arles’ Sermons suggest, on a broader scale, that there was a growing concern amongst the bishops of the Gallic Church to encourage the people of late fifth and early sixth-century Gaul to maintain a fear of demons. In sermon eighty-one Caesarius declares:

“For if, having been emptied from all evil through baptism, we wish to be idle and lazy, I fear lest what is written in Scripture might be fulfilled in us: when an unclean spirit has departed from a man, he proceeds rapidly through the dry places searching for rest and does not find it. If, after returning, he shall find the home [host] vacant, he fetches seven other vile spirits and the subsequent state of that man shall be rendered worse than the first.”

His declaration draws on Christ’s speech in Matthew 12:43-45:

“And when an unclean spirit has departed from a man, he walks through dry places, seeking rest, and finds none. Then he says: “I will return into my house from whence I came out.” And coming he finds it empty, swept clean, and ornamented. Then he goes, and obtains seven other wicked spirits himself, and entering they live there: and the new state of that man is made worse than the first.”

people off course with waves of temptation see Pom., Vita Contemplat., PL, Vol. 59, lib.1, cap. 16, col. 0431C-0432B; Contemplative Life, 1.16, p. 38.

984 ‘Nam si per baptismum malis omnibus vacuati desiderantes esse volumus et ignavi, timeo ne impleatur in nobis illud quod in evangeliis scriptum est: cum excidisset immundus spiritus ab homine, vadit per loca arida, et quaerit requiem, et non inventit; postea reversus si invenit domum vacuam, adducit se cum alios sepem spiritus nequiores se, et erunt hominis illius posteriora peiora prioribus.’ Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 81.2, p. 334; Sermons, 2, 81.2, p. 4.

In the *Vulgate*, Christ never explicitly mentions that the Pharisees, the people to whom this passage was addressed, ought to be afraid of this scenario. Indeed, he speaks without any prescribed emotion at all. The lack of fear in Christ’s declaration contrasts with Caesarius’ use of the first person singular, ‘*timeo*’ or ‘I fear’, which he applies, perhaps for rhetorical flair, to this passage. Although Caesarius’ statement explicitly shows him telling his audience to be wary of being sinful or lazy in following good Christian precepts, it also implies that he was encouraging his listeners to maintain a fear of demons because of the eventuality outlined by Christ. Demons, as Caesarius comprehended them, ought to be feared for at least two reasons: their ability to repossess someone who returned to sin after baptism and their persistency in seeking to possess people. Summarising Christ’s words, Caesarius reminds his audience that demons could and would repossess a person if that person’s soul was found to be empty of virtues after their baptism. He seems to have understood Christ’s declaration on unclean spirits to mean that the risk of being possessed or even repossessed was constant threat for a sinful or unvirtuous person. Demons would, as Christ declared, always return to the person from whom they had been driven after failing to find rest elsewhere. Sermon eighty-one thus suggests that while Caesarius was undoubtedly more concerned with encouraging his audience to avoid sin, he might have tried to do this by encouraging his audience to maintain a fear of the demons who would always return to a sinful person.

Caesarius’ eighty-first sermon also indicates that he might have wanted his listeners to maintain a fear of being ensnared by demons for more self-centred reasons. Any person who ended up being repossessed by demons as a result of returning to idleness, would pose a serious problem for Caesarius on a professional and personal level. As the Bishop of Arles, Caesarius was not only responsible, as Peter Brown put it, for perpetuating a fear of encountering demons in his works, he was also responsible for the souls of his flock. This knowledge, along with the rhetorical and monastic training needed to make him an excellent

---

896 Whether this would have been the same in the *Vetus Latina* scripts, and whether Caesarius would have used this version is difficult to know without either extant copies of the biblical books Caesarius’ used or a complete edition of the *Vetus Latina* itself.

897 ‘*Cum autem immundus spiritus exierit ab homine, ambulat per loca arida, quaerens requiem, et non invenit. Tunae dicit: Revertar in domum meam, unde exivi.*’ *Vulgate*, Matt., 12:43-44.


ascetic in power, had been expertly taught to him by Julianus Pomerius. His sermon for the ordination of a new bishop shows clearly that Caesarius knew that he would be held accountable for the souls he lost to the Devil when he faced God’s judgement. It is here that Caesarius’ views on why members of his flock ought to fear being ensnared by demons converge with his own fear of God’s judgement. By preaching the knowledge that people risked being possessed and possibly repossessed by wicked demons if they did not discipline themselves, Caesarius might have hoped that the members of his congregation would behave more virtuously, give alms to atone for past sins, and reduce the penalties that both they and he would have to face when brought before God. By encouraging his congregation to discipline themselves, while remembering to retain a fear of both God and demons, Caesarius was not just putting the power of his tutor’s moral language into practice, he was trying to save his own soul. Self-discipline, the fear of God, and a healthy fear of being ensnared by demonic beings, were crucial aspects of the good Christian life for Caesarius.

The letters of Avitus of Vienne do not contain any references to the human fear of demons. Indeed the Devil and his minions are virtually absent from these texts. Yet his poem On Original Sin is notable for its in-depth focus on the Devil and the emotions which Avitus perceived him to experience in the moments after his fall; the same emotions that led him to corrupt Adam and Eve. Avitus’ poem implicitly shows that he was also part of the ecclesiastical movement that sought to encourage the people of Gaul to maintain a fear of the Devil and his demons because of the threat they presented to self-control and salvation. While Avitus’ poem neither depicts Adam and Eve as being afraid of the Devil nor states that the Devil is a creature to be feared, the notion that the Devil ought to be feared because he was a threat to self-control can be seen to be cleverly woven into the persona of the Devil which Avitus creates.

---

900 Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 80.
901 Caesarius notes that this is eventuality that all bishops will face in his sermon to be read at the consecration of a new bishop. Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIV, 230.2 and 230.6, pp. 911-912 and 913-914; Sermons, 3, 230.3 and 6, pp. 180 and 182-183.
902 On the giving of alms to avoid post-death torment see especially Caes., of Arl., Serm., CCSL, Vol. CIII, 32.1-4, pp. 139-142, and Vol. CIV, 158.2, and 4-6, pp. 646-648; 179.2, 4, and 6-9, pp. 724-729; Sermons, 1, 32.1-4, pp. 158-162, and Sermons, 2, 158.2, and 4-6, pp. 360-363; 179.2, 4, and 6-9, pp. 450, 452-456.
903 For more on Julianus creating a moral language see Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 72-77.
Avitus’ characterisation of the Devil in *On Original Sin* is remarkable. It gives the Devil a personality, transforming him into a figure with thoughts, actions, motives, dialogue, and feelings. Indeed Avitus creates perhaps the best and most detailed portrait of the Devil in the period. A ‘deceitful enemy’ from the offset, Avitus’ Devil is referred to as an angel who, after being burned with pride, denied his Creator and was cast down from heaven into Paradise as a result. Retaining his angelic form, the former lord of light remained able to read the future and transmogrify into a range of disguises from piles of gold and silver to holy figures. Having been cast down from heaven into Paradise, he sees Adam and Eve and is moved to speak about the range of emotions which he experiences such as jealousy, shame, bitterness, and grief. It is these volatile feelings which, according to Avitus, motivate his subsequent decision to turn himself into a snake.

‘the serpent was the highest of all the animals in cunning, callous with its chest sly from envy.

This, of all animals, the transgressor chose to assume the form of, he surrounded his airy body with skin, [and] stretching himself out, he suddenly changed into the serpent: he became a long-necked dragon, depicting his resplendent neck with spots and he made rough the smooth folds of his back and armed it with rigid scales...

…the terrible form has a frightening beauty: the eyes flash dreadfully: then the joyful vision becomes accustomed to the sun with the keen light it once wished to know.’

---

904 ‘Angelus hic dudum fuerat, sed crimine postquam succensus proprio tumidos exarsit in ausus, se semet fecisse putans, suas ipsa creator ut fuerit, rabido concepit corde furorem autore miseri negans:’


906 The monologue Avitus creates is very long, but it merits closer study because it best illustrates Avitus’ originality and views about what motivated the Devil to instigate the Fall of Man and ruin himself completely in the process.

907 ‘Forte fuit cunctis animantibus alior astus, aemulius arguto callet qui pectore, serpens: buius transgressor de cunctis sumere formam eligit aeternum circumdans tegmine corpus inque repentinum mutatus tenditur anquem: fit longa cervice dracon, splendida colla depingit maculis territique volumina dorsi asperat et squamis per terga rigentibus armat. …perfert terribilis metendium forma decorum:’
Avitus’ passage provides a glimpse into his views on what humans ought to fear about the Devil and why. In the verse, it is the physical appearance which the angel chooses to adopt which is both beautiful and ‘terrible’ (terribilis). The beauty of the Devil’s snake-like form is something which Avitus perceives to be frightening (metuendum) because, as he goes on to show, it distracts and captivates people. The serpent’s physical appearance, especially when combined with the cunning characteristics that were already inherent in the creature of the snake that God had created, present a dangerous distraction to a person, captivating their attention and removing their focus from the fear and love of God. Eve becomes Avitus’ case in point for this.

After the angel, now disguised as the serpent, approaches Eve, he beguiles her, first by appealing to her beauty and then by discussing her power over the earth. He inquires why she does not eat the fruit of the forbidden tree and Eve replies that she and Adam had complied with God’s command partly because they had no need to eat from the tree, Paradise provided all the sustenance they needed, and partly because God had promised that they would suffer death if they disobeyed the accepted law. The serpent responds:

“Woman, you fear the empty name of terror.
No rapid sentence of death will come to you:
but the hateful Father has not conveyed an equal lot
and nor has He allowed you to know this…”

Here, Avitus demonstrates that the fallen angel has developed an awareness of what it means to fear God. Although his reply is in response to Eve’s query about the nature of death, which she is still ignorant about at this point, it is not the fear of death to which Avitus has the serpent refer. Instead he has the serpent sense that Eve holds to God’s request because she fears Him. The fallen angel, previously without the fear
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of God, now realises what it is and that it plays an important role in the link which binds humans to God. He discerns that the way to scupper God’s plan to elevate mankind to the rank which he had formerly occupied, is to try to replace Eve's fear of God with a desire for power. This becomes apparent in Avitus’ description of Eve after she took hold of the fruit:

‘opposites seized the mind,
love from here, fear thereafter: her pride pushed against the law
and sometimes, indeed, the law prevailed.’

Eve is torn between her love of God and her fear of disobeying Him. Although Eve still has the perfect, if wavering, love of God and the fear of losing that love, which Cassian and Augustine identified as the second type of the fear of God, she has become divided of heart after the fallen angel’s intervention. Avitus portrays her as being engaged in a battle with the self, a battle between her self-control, defended by her love of God and the fear of losing that love, and the loss of that self-control, championed by her desire for power equal to God’s. Avitus’ fallen angel, who will become the Devil after God’s judgement is thrown down upon him for the second time, is shown to be undermining the fear of God and humanity’s self-mastery through seductive appearance and words. This, for Avitus, constitutes both what humans should fear about the Devil, namely his alluring appearance and honeyed words, and the reason why they should fear the Devil, because he could use these abilities to break them from God. Avitus’ On Original Sin thus demonstrates that by the early sixth century, Gallic bishops were increasingly interested in promoting the idea that people ought to fear the Devil and his demons because they had the ability to undermine a person’s fear and love of God, and that they ought to maintain this fear of being beguiled by demonic beings alongside their fear of God.

912 The other parts of the link are ignorance and the love of God.
913 ‘rapiunt contraria mentem
binc amor, inde metus: pulsat iactantia legem
interdumque etiam lex subvenit.’
914 Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.
915 ‘aestuat anceps dividui cordis dura inter proelia fluctus.’
Combined, the writings of Paulinus, Julianus, Caesarius, and Avitus suggest that there was an intensification of the presence of demonically-inspired fear in the theological literature of Gaul composed from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century. They also show that contemporaries had become increasingly interested both in reinforcing the message that demonically-inspired fear could lead to the loss of the fear of God and the self-discipline that stemmed from that, and establishing that demonically-inspired fear and the fear of God each had important roles to play in Christian paideia and the making of the good Christian self. The literature discussed above shows that Avitus and Caesarius were interested in promoting the idea that people ought to maintain a fear of being tempted and ensnared by the Devil and his demons, alongside their fear of God. They should fear the Devil and his demons because of their abilities to distract a person from their focus on God, thus undermining their self-discipline and leaving them open to being attacked. This notion was also present in Paulinus’ The Life of Saint Martin. Paulinus not only added more cases of demons explicitly instigating fear in people into his versified life of Martin, he brought Sulpicius’ notion that demons would use fear to instigate chaos in people to the fore by editing the original narrative to make this the focal message. Collectively, Avitus, Paulinus, and Caesarius’ works demonstrate that the Gallic clergy were focused on urging people to fear the Devil and his demons because they presented a threat to a person’s self-control and could lead them to act in manner that would later see them removed from and punished by God. Their works, along with Julianus’ On the Contemplative Life, stress that the clergy in Gaul now perceived a relationship to exist between the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear. The fear of God almost becomes the prerequisite for the existence of the fear of the Devil and his demons. If you have one you should also have the other. In stressing this, these men can be seen to support Peter Brown’s broader argument that there was, in this period, a wider ecclesiastical campaign that wanted to inspire a fear of God’s judgement into people and increase their fear of encountering demonic beings.916

3.6. The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gregory’s Gaul

The previous section suggested that by the middle of the sixth century, the notion that the Devil and his demons actively instigated fear in humans in order to make them lose their focus on fearing God and maintaining their self-control had acquired a more firmly established position in the theological literature

916 Brown, Ransom of the Soul, 115-147.
of Gaul. In the final section of this chapter, I argue that the writings of Gregory’s close friend, Venantius Fortunatus, demonstrate that the Christian writers of late sixth-century Gaul continued to use their literature to emphasise that the fear of God and the capacity of demonic beings to experience fear both played important roles in the making of a good Christian.

Although Fortunatus’ poems do shed light on the poet’s understanding of the Devil, his demons, and their nature, they reveal nothing about his perceptions of the human fear of demons or the fears experienced and used by the Devil and his demons. Yet Fortunatus’ views on these elements can be discerned in his *Life of Saint Radegund*. It is here that Fortunatus shows his readers how the fear of God and the capacity of demons to experience fear are both important aspects which help to make the good Christian and the saint.

In chapter thirteen of Radegund’s *Life*, Fortunatus records the case of a possessed woman who was brought before the holy woman:

“When a certain woman struggled severely with an invasion of the enemy, they had been scarcely able to lead the rebellious foe to the holy woman. She [Radegund] commanded the enemy to prostrate itself on the pavement in fear. Soon, at the word of the blessed woman, it prostrated itself on the ground [and] that which had been feared was [now] greatly afraid. When the holy woman, full with faith, had trampled the enemy on the neck, it exited through a flux of the stomach.”

---

917 Poem 5.6 illustrates that Fortunatus connected the Devil with the serpent of Genesis and that he perceived the Devil to experience other emotions like jealousy. Ven., Fort., *Carm.*, MGH: AA, 4.1, 5.6, p. 117 (10-15); *Poems*, 5.6a, pp. 322-323. The prologue to *Carmina* book ten, highlights Fortunatus’ view of the Devil as the deceiver whose traps had to be defeated. Ven., Fort., *Carm.*, MGH: AA, 4.1, 10.1 (22), pp. 223-224 (37, 1-4); *Poems*, 10.1, pp. 616-617. Poem 8.3 shows Fortunatus’ view that demons tested good Christian traits by adopting guises of different types of serpents. Ven., Fort., *Carm.*, MGH: AA, 4.1, 8.3, p. 186 (193-196) *Poems*, 8.3, pp. 510-511. Note that the diverse types of serpents that Fortunatus lists here might indicate that the poet knew about the typology of diverse demons that Cassian wrote about in Cass., *Collat.*, CSEL, Vol. 13, VII.XXXII.1-4, pp. 211-212 (20-25, 1-25 and 1-11); *Conf.*, 7.32.1-4, pp. 269-271. Poem 1.9 offers an insight into the most perplexing element of Fortunatus’ demonology; whether demons are able to experience emotion or whether they are being made up of emotion. Ven., Fort., *Carm.*, MGH: AA, 4.1, 1.9, p. 12 (15-16); *Poems*, 1.9, pp. 28-29. The question arises from Fortunatus’ specification that it was the rage of a demon that fled which in turn allowed the possessed man to be free. It was not the demon that flees but its rage.
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Here, the enemy, or demon, who has taken hold of the woman is portrayed as experiencing fear. When Radegund orders the demon to throw itself on the floor in fear, it obeys her.919

Interestingly Radegund’s next actions in Fortunatus’ story directly mirror God’s declaration to the serpent after Eve blames it for seducing her in Genesis 3.15:

“I will put enmities between you and the woman, and your seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel.”920

God implicitly tells the Devil that it will be Eve’s descendants who surmount him. In Fortunatus’ narrative, Radegund is depicted as one of those descendants when she tramples on the neck of the woman possessed by a demon. In this light the demon could be interpreted as fearing being crushed by Radegund, who was effectively fulfilling God’s punishment, and fearing God, whose word and power Radegund had used to subdue it. Explicitly, the demon fears Radegund who, as a descendant of Eve, has the power to crush it underfoot. Implicitly, the demon also has a fear of God, whose power buttresses and supplies Radegund’s own.

In his Life of Saint Radegund, Fortunatus, like Augustine, Paulinus, and Gregory of Tours can thus be seen to be continuing the hagiographical tradition established by Athanasius in which the deeds of demonic figures are undone, and the demons themselves banished, through the fear of God and His power.921 He shows his audience that they could play on demonic figures’ fear of God in order to drive both them and the loss of self-mastery, which they sought to instigate, away. His prose writings testify that some of the Christian writers who lived in Gregory’s Gaul had remained interested in using their literature to educate their readers that the fear of God and the capacity of demonic beings to experience this fear, had important roles to play in allowing a person to progress along the path of Christian paideia to become a good Christian.

Conclusion

The collective writings of the theologians used in this chapter show that they considered fear to be a means by which the Devil and his demons could ensnare people, causing them to lose their discipline and self-control. Additionally, these works also show that the broader concept of the relationship which was thought to exist between the Devil, demons, and fear acquired an established role in Christian theology much later than the fear of God; something which historical scholarship has not yet realised. The works of Augustine, Cassian, and Sulpicius reveal that that contemporaries during the late fourth and early fifth centuries were beginning to perceive demonically-inspired fear as a sign of the loss or lack of discipline and a threat to the attainment of the good Christian life. The texts of these men, which were hugely influential on wider contextual development of Christian doctrine, theology, demonology, and orthopraxy in Gaul, began to give the notions that demons used fear to distract humans from God and that humans should fear demons for this ability, a more established role in the theological literature of the region. Their ideas were adopted and emphasised by some of their successors including Paulinus of Périgueux, Avitus of Vienne, and Caesarius of Arles, whose writings reveal that the Gallic clergy of the fifth and early-sixth century were collectively interested in promoting the knowledge that the Devil and his demons would use fear to instigate a loss of self-control and drive people away from God. Paulinus, Avitus, and Caesarius gave greater prominence to the views of Cassian, Augustine, and Sulpicius in their writings. Their works thus lend greater support to Peter Brown’s notion that there was wider ecclesiastical campaign which aimed to increase people’s fear of encountering demonic figures in this period.922

---

922 Brown, Ransom of the Soul, 115-147.
Chapter 4: Gregory of Tours, the Devil, Demons, and Fear

**Introduction**

Scholars including Guy Halsall, Peter Brown, and Giselle de Nie, have already produced a substantial volume of scholarship analysing Gregory’s use of the demonic in his texts. But there is little scholarship, as far as I am aware, which specifically examines the relationship that Gregory portrays between demonic beings and fear. Having examined the views of Gregory’s Gallic predecessors on the Devil, his demons, and fear in the previous chapter, it is now time to analyse Gregory’s perspectives on this.

Gregory’s notion of the relationship which exists between demonic beings and fear has three aspects:

1. fear *experienced by* demonic beings;
2. fear *caused by* demonic beings; and
3. fear *of* these beings in humans.

In the first part of this chapter, I explore the second and third elements in detail, arguing that Gregory used demonically-inspired fear in his writings to express his ideas about the loss or lack of self-control, sanctity, and the Christian life. For him the world and the individual were torn between two types of fears: the fear of God and those instigated by the Devil and his demons. The former, as a technique of self-mastery, represented control and order. It marked out the good Christian and served as key to the attainment of sanctity. The latter, as this chapter demonstrates, would prompt the lack of or loss of this self-control. Fear inspired by demons was synonymous with the chaotic nature that the Devil and his demons embodied, a test of temptation, and a trial of sanctity, which could only be passed through recourse to the fear of God. Furthermore, the human fear of demons sat at the opposite end of the spectrum to the fear of God: a spectrum that, in Gregory’s eyes, existed inside the Christian individual’s soul and, on a much larger scale, also gave structure to the world.

---


Chapter 4: Gregory of Tours, The Devil, Demons, and Fear

The originality and significance of this chapter lies in its demonstration that Gregory’s notion that demonically-inspired fear exists in connection with - while simultaneously being the counterpart to - his concept of the fear of God. This is significant because it explicitly shows that Gregory’s works, which are foundational to our knowledge of the sixth-century world, are an excellent, yet unrealised, source for early Christian attitudes about the self, its formation, and the place of the self within the order of the world and divine cosmos. In continuing and preserving the Classical tradition of writing discourse on the self, Gregory’s works give historians new opportunities to study Merovingian notions of the self, the formation of the good Christian, and how the Merovingians developed Roman paideia.

4.1. Demons and Notions of Self-Control in the Late Antique Christian World

To understand where Gregory and his peers’ connection between demonically-inspired fear and the loss or lack of self-control originates and why these authors would have perceived the two to be inextricably linked, we must first briefly outline the wider Christian attitudes to the relationship which exists between demons and self-control.927 Once again it should be noted that while it is essential to build up a background on the views that might have influenced Gregory’s own creative perspectives of the world, the bishop’s own views ought not to be hammered to fit those perspectives maintained by his contemporaries.

The notion of the loss or lack of self-control (akrasia in Ancient Greek and incontentia or intemperantia in Latin) is intricately bound up with its conceptual opposite, self-control. The Classical concept akrasia was formed from the principles which contemporaries such as Aristotle believed to denote an unvirtuous person from a virtuous one.928 An akratic person was someone who had either lost control of themselves,

---


928 See Aristotle, ‘Magna Moralia,’ 2.6, 1200b-1204a; Aristotle, ‘Nicomachian Ethics,’ 7.2-10, 1145b-1152a; Aristotle, ‘Eudemian Ethics,’ 2.7, 1223b, and Aristotle, ‘On Virtues and Vices, 5, 1250b, 6, 1251a. Also, Jaeger, Paideia, 54.
particularly with regard to letting their passions remain unbridled, or someone who simply did not have the capacity to control themselves.\textsuperscript{929}

With the emergence and spread of Christianity, the Classical notion of the loss or lack of self-discipline continued to remain an important point of discussion. From the fourth century onwards much of this discussion was conducted with recourse to the Devil and his demons, two very different and complex types of being. The Devil, in particular, has a very intricate history.\textsuperscript{930} Biblically, he only becomes identified as a fallen servant of God in the New Testament, specifically Luke 10:18, wherein Christ declares that he had seen Satan fall from the sky.\textsuperscript{931} Here the Devil is portrayed as the leader or prince of demons and a separate being from them.\textsuperscript{932} He is the powerful antithesis of Christ; a fallen angel who retains his spiritual form and is at war with the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{933}

The New Testament character differs somewhat from that provided in the Old. Here Satan is depicted as the dark side of Yahweh, the One God, and appears more as a servant to His bidding rather than a separate being devoted to undermining Him.\textsuperscript{934} Sydney Page has charted that the concept of Satan as an ‘evil’ figure is something which emerges gradually over the course of the biblical books that make up the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{935} The original ‘satan’ is not a figure but a noun which alludes to a prosecutor of mankind at the bidding of God.\textsuperscript{936} Satan only emerges as the figure who encourages mankind to sin in 1 Chronicles.\textsuperscript{937}

Of the two biblical depictions of Satan, it is the one provided in the New Testament which became dominant in Latin Christianity. The Devil came to be perceived as a figure that did not fit within God’s order and thus represented chaos and the unredeemed state of humankind.\textsuperscript{938} As contemporary perceptions of him expanded during the second to fifth centuries, the Devil became intertwined with the Fall of Man.

\textsuperscript{929} Foucault, \textit{The Use of Pleasure}, 65.
\textsuperscript{930} For a good illustration of this see Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 55-249.
\textsuperscript{931} ‘Et ait illis: Videbam Satanam sicut fulgor de caelo cadentem.’ \textit{Vulgate}, Luk., 10:18.
\textsuperscript{932} Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 228 and 252. Also, Kingston, ‘The Devil and Demons,’ 15.
\textsuperscript{933} Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 228-229.
\textsuperscript{934} \textit{Vulgate}, Job 1:6-10. Also, Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 178-191.
\textsuperscript{935} Page, \textit{Powers of Evil}, 11-37.
and shifted to become the primary enemy of both God and mankind due to his enmity with God and ‘jealousy’ of humanity’s capacity to be redeemed.\textsuperscript{939}

Demons, the Devil’s minions, also boast a highly complex history. In the pagan perspective demons were perceived to be either the souls of the deceased, spirits of nature, or Olympian Gods.\textsuperscript{940} In the Old Testament, demons are largely peripheral to the plot. Divine in origin, they appear as rebellious angels whose power to rebel remains under divine command.\textsuperscript{941} An example of their rebellious nature lies in Genesis 6:1-4. Here the “sons of God”, a phrase used to denote angels in the Old Testament, fell into sin after they turned away from their task of instructing mankind in the ways of God in order to marry their daughters.\textsuperscript{942}

In the New Testament, the figure of the demon is developed further. Here demons become central to the core narrative that is God versus the Devil.\textsuperscript{943} They are the legions of the angels who fall with the Devil and turn into wicked spirits under his command.\textsuperscript{944} Christ describes them as being part of a hierarchy and a coordinated group of beings who seek the downfall of humankind; a shift from the Old Testament figures who worked more or less as individual divine beings under Yahweh’s (God’s) control.\textsuperscript{945}

The portrayal of demons in the New Testament seems to have been the one that shaped early Christian attitudes to demons the most. It was adopted by Origen in book one of his treatise \textit{On First Principle}\textsuperscript{946} and maintained by Augustine, who stressed that the bad angels had fallen due to their sin of pride.\textsuperscript{947} In his tract devoted specifically to demonology, \textit{On the Divination of Demons}, Augustine described these angels as beings constituted of darkness rather than light.\textsuperscript{948} As formerly divine beings, demons were associated with the element of air and were spiritual in form; a nature that enabled them to have abilities

\textsuperscript{939} Kingston, ‘The Devil and Demons,’ 17-18.
\textsuperscript{941} Page, \textit{Powers of Evil}, 54-77.
\textsuperscript{943} Page, \textit{Powers of Evil}, 87.
\textsuperscript{944} Vulgate, Rev. 12:7-10 and 12:12. Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 237.
\textsuperscript{945} Page, \textit{Powers of Evil}, 102-103.
\textsuperscript{947} Aug., \textit{De Civ.}, LLTA, SL 48, lib. 11, cap. 33, lin. 1 and lib. 12, cap. 6, lin. 1-9.
\textsuperscript{948} Aug., \textit{De Civ.}, LLTA, SL 48, lib. 11, cap. 9, lin. 64 and cap. 33, lin. 14-47.
such as garnering incredible volumes of knowledge and moving at rapid speeds. In his seventh Conference, Cassian characterised demons as wicked but nonetheless wise and subtle spirits that preyed on the human predisposition to vice. He perceived several wicked spirits to exist for every vice and that each spirit would inflict unequal amounts of wickedness subject to the strength of the person’s will and the surrounding circumstances. In the wider early Christian monastic and ascetic spectrum, demons were conceptualised as invisible beings that bore a likeness to the human spiritual essence, until bodily sin made them visible.

Building on this, the late antique ascetic perspective maintained that the ability to battle successfully against demonic figures, who sought to distract a person from their pursuit of God, was a central requirement of the struggle to avoid losing control of the self. The Devil and his demons were the embodiment of all the various vices and sins that could dislodge a person from the path to God. They strove to incite, and were themselves representations of, a loss of self-control. Notably, most of the vices and sins that ascetic writers like Cassian associated with breaking from the Christian path of self-discipline all resemble the traits that akratic people, who forsook their restraint to indulge their desires even when knowing them to be wrong, were thought to have in Greek philosophy. These included: pride, lust, desire, avarice, and gluttony for example. It is through their development and use of demonic figures in their literature that Christian writers can be seen to continue the Classical debates concerning what made virtuous and unvirtuous people, reframing them within Christian parameters.

---

Chapter two of this thesis identifies that Gregory’s concept of the fear of God is inextricably linked with the acquiescence and maintenance of self-discipline. This connection between the fear of God and self-control in Gregory’s works means it is very plausible that he would also have equated anything which sought to undermine this fear and its effects with the lack of self-control. In what follows, I shall demonstrate how Gregory of Tours’ tales of the Devil, his demons, and fear show that he connected demonically-inspired fear with the loss and lack of self-control.

4.2. The Presence of Fear and Demonic Figures in the works of Gregory of Tours: The Raw Data

The raw data on Gregory’s references to fear and demonic beings imparts a very basic sense of the similarities and differences which Gregory perceives to exist between the fear of God and the fears associated with demons. It is for this reason that such data is important, and it is why this section has been devoted to outlining the basic details on Gregory’s references to the Devil, demons, and fear in his texts.

Across Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories, Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers, there are twenty cases in which the Devil or his demons appear in conjunction with fear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLH 8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM 1.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM 2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSM 2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These two are cases of fear instigated or experienced by storms in which Gregory perceived there to be underlying demonic agency. See de Nie, *Views From A Many-Windowed Tower*, 91-96 and 101-107. Also, Giselle de Nie, ‘History and Miracle: Gregory’s Use of Metaphor,’ in *The World of Gregory of Tours*, ed. Kathleen Mitchell and Ian Wood (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 272.
The distribution of demonic fear cases in Gregory’s texts is striking. The Life of the Fathers is the work which has the highest proportion of demonically-associated fear cases. Since the tradition of testing self-mastery by encountering and battling demonic forces was well-established in the literature which discussed holy lives and miracles by Gregory’s time, it is interesting if unsurprising that the highest proportion of demonic encounters and cases which include fear that is attributable to demonic beings in some way, exists in the book in which Gregory primarily sought to define the characteristics of the holy lifestyle.

What is interesting is that the table above shows that references to demons and fear do not permeate Gregory’s textual corpus to the same extent that the fear of God does. Statistically, the fear of God appears roughly five times more than demonically-associated fear in Gregory’s writings. While it is tempting to use these statistics to support the claim that Gregory considered demonically-associated and demonically-inspired fear to be less important than the fear of God, or that he thought it was less prevalent in society, caution is advised. Firstly, it is important to remember that, when it comes to emotions, quantity, or the frequency of their use within a text, does not necessarily reflect perceived importance. Secondly, the question of whether the frequency of demonically-associated and demonically-inspired fear in Gregory’s texts reflects his perception of the prominence of this fear in society is tied to complex issues of reality

---

957 The phrase ‘demonically-associated fear’ in this chapter refers to all cases in which fear is connected with demons and the Devil, including those cases in which demonic beings experience fear. ‘Demonically-inspired fear’, specifically refers to the fears that demons instigate in humans.


959 Gregory distinguished The Life of the Fathers from his books of Miracles in his Histories because of this focus. Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.31, p. 535 (20).

960 See criticism on Delumeau’s adoption of the quantitative method back in Literature Review, section 7.1: Histories of Fear.
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versus Gregory’s literary reality. It is thus both a deeply problematic and largely irrelevant question, since it is how Gregory uses a fear that determines its importance and prominence, not how many times he uses it.

In the cases tabled above, Gregory deploys a range of fearing vocabulary when referring to demonically-associated and demonically-inspired fear. The primary word he uses is *timor* and its derivatives. The term appears in conjunction with fear and demonic beings thirteen times, closely followed by *terror*, *pavor*, *metus*, *formido*, and *horror*. Similarly, Gregory’s habit of using more than one fearing term per case and fearing compounds like *metu exterriti* and *timore perterritus* means that the total number of terms Gregory uses to signify demonically-inspired fear outnumbers the total cases thirty to twenty.

The figures above are compelling because they show that Gregory’s preferential fearing-term when discussing fear related to demonic figures is the same as that which he used for the fear of God. Indeed the order of most used fearing-terms also correlates with that used for the fear of God. For both the fear of God and the fear associated with demons, *timor* is the most frequently used word followed by *terror*, *pavor*, and *metus*. This correlation in Gregory’s fear-vocabulary is striking because it suggests that Gregory did not necessarily associate a specific fearing-term with a specific type of fear. *Timor* appears to be the standard term for Gregory’s descriptions and discussions about the fear of God and those inspired by demons.

The final aspect of the raw data that merits note relates to who experiences demonically-inspired fear. In the cases above, the Devil, demons, holy men, boys, soldiers, kings, bishops, high-status women, and non-royal men and women are all connected with demonically-inspired fear. This diversity of figures demonstrates that there exists some similarity between Gregory’s notion of demonically-

---

962 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 11.1, p. 260 (5-6).
963 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 1.1, p. 214 (14, 20, 21); 5.3, p. 229 (12, 18); 11.1, p. 260 (5-6).
965 Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 8.34, p. 403 (25). Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 1.1, p. 214 (14, 20, 21); 5.3, p. 229 (12, 18); 10.2, p. 257 (19, 23); 11.1, pp. 259-60 (27, 5-6).
967 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 5.2, p. 228 (34).
969 Gregory of Tours, *VSM*, 2.25, p. 168 (3).
inspired fear and the fear of God in terms of who experiences or is connected with it. Both the fears instigated by demons and the fear of God are shown to be connected with a wide variety of beings and people of different sex, age, and vocational backgrounds. As with the fear of God, the only beings that are not shown in connection with demonically-inspired fear in Gregory’s narratives are God and His angels.\footnote{This is not necessarily to say that Gregory did not perceive that angels might have been affected by demonically-associated fear, only that his works shed no light on the matter.} This is notable because it suggests that Gregory perceived the only beings to be beyond the reach of the most crucial fears in his works are God and His angels.\footnote{Again, Gregory never explicitly declares whether angels have the fear of God. He might have perceived them to have the second strand of it (the fear of losing the love of God) and thought the fact too obvious to mention. His silence on this matter sadly prevents an analysis of whether Gregory considered there to be a duplex fear of God in the same manner as Cassian and Augustine, and it also hinders a comparative study of demonic and angelic fear in Gregory’s works.}

4.3. \textit{Gregory, Demonically-inspired Fear, and the Loss or Lack of Self-Control}

Having assessed what conclusions the raw data collected on demonic beings and fear in Gregory’s collected writings illustrate, it is now time to analyse what Gregory’s narratives reveal about his understanding of demonically-inspired fear. In what follows, I analyse Gregory’s use of the Devil, demons, and fear in his stories concerning Anatolius of Bordeaux, Caluppa the Recluse, Portianus the Abbot, Nicetius, Bishop of Trier, the two boys of Voultegon, and Gregory himself.

4.3.1. \textit{Anatolius of Bordeaux}

Demonically-inspired fear and the fear of demonic beings are connected with the loss of self-control throughout Gregory's works. In the entirety of Gregory’s \textit{Histories} there is only one case of demonically-inspired fear. It appears in \textit{Histories} 8.34, a chapter which comprises of two stories on the temptations of Winnoch the Breton and Anatolius of Bordeaux. Gregory’s use of fear within this chapter, I argue, demonstrates that he perceived demons to act against mankind by using fear and that he considers the fear inspired by demons to result in a loss of self-control and sanctity.

In the second half of \textit{Histories} 8.34, Gregory introduces Anatolius of Bordeaux who, at twelve years of age, sought to leave the service of his merchant master in order to lead the life of a recluse.\footnote{Gregory of Tours, \textit{DLH}, 8.34, p. 403 (17-18).} Initially the
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merchant refused the request, believing that the boy did not have the stamina to maintain his desired occupation.975 When he eventually relented, Anatolius took up residence in a crypt with a vaulted ceiling and a cell just big enough for a man to stand.976 There he remained for eight years surviving off very little and spending most of his time in prayer.977 He is shown by Gregory to have set himself on the journey towards spiritual perfection, the path of paideia. To reach the heights of Christian paideia, in accordance with the views outlined by authorities like John Cassian, Anatolius would have had to acquire self-mastery; something which Gregory depicts him as actively seeking to do by his adherence to rigorous prayer and fasting.978 In his pursuit of Christian perfection Anatolius appears to have been provisionally successful, but after eight years something happened which drastically threw him off course.

‘After this, he [Anatolius] endured from a great fear, he began to shout [that] he was being internally tortured. Whence I believe it happened that, with a division of the devil’s soldiers helping him, he moved the enclosure which had held him with square blocks. Then he started hitting a wall in the earth, clapping his hands and shouting that he was being burned up by the saints of God. When he was held fast for the longest time in this insanity, and since he would frequently disclose the name of Saint Martin saying that his power to torture him was greater than that of the other saints, he was led to Tours. But the malignant spirit, I believe, was controlled by the virtue and greatness of the saint, for he silenced the man. After spending a year in that place, he suffered from no further evil and returned [to his cell]. But the attack, from which he had been free, returned.’979

Gregory’s passage is notable because it shows that he perceived demons to act against mankind by using fear to deprive people of their self-control and sanctity.

973 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.34, p. 403 (19-20).
974 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.34, p. 403 (20-23).
975 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.34, p. 403 (23-25).
976 Leyser identifies this as the backbone of Cassian’s ascetic approach. Leyser, Authority and Asceticism, 51-52.
977 ‘Post haec pavore validum perpessus, clamare coepit, intrinsecus se torqueri. Unde factum est, ut, adiuvante ei, ut credo, diabolicæ partis militia, amotis quadris quibus conclusus tenebatur, elideretur parietem in terram, conlidentis palmas et clamans, se a sanctis Dei peruriri. Cumque diutissime in hac insanias tenetur et sancti Martini creribus confiteretur nomen ac diceret, se potius ab eo quam a sanctis alius cruciare, Thoronus adducitur. Sed malus spiritus, credo, ob virtutem adique magnitudinem sancti contrapes, nequiquam hominem materialem. Nam in loco ipso per anni curriculum degens, cum nihil male pateteret, regressus est, sed eius quae carverat incurrerit.’ Gregory of Tours, DLH, 8.34, pp. 403-404.

While Gregory does not explicitly say that Anatolius was possessed by a demon, the point at which a person starts shouting in his miracle narratives usually indicates that they have become possessed by that point. Apostrophising is not an uncommon technique in Gregory’s works.
In the passage quoted above, it is noticeable that Anatolius is first said to have endured a great fear. Prior to this he had managed to spend eight years in a state of prayer and abstinence without ever breaking from his ascetic vocation. Gregory’s portrayal of Anatolius’ fear thus merits especial interest. It is, I believe, a case of demonically-inspired fear.

The focal message of Histories 8.34 derives originally from Virgil and might possibly have come to Gregory’s attention either through the works of Augustine or from Caesarius of Arles who, when referring to the Devil in his fiftieth sermon, stated: ‘he has a thousand ways of harming us, and he uses them all for the deception of mankind’. Gregory’s opening sentence to Histories 8.34 mimics this when he states that: ‘the prince of darkness has a thousand skills to inflict harm’. He also devotes the first half of the chapter to retelling the downfall of Winnoch the Breton, the would-be ascetic who fell into a state of complete mental and physical lack of self-control as a result of his excessive drinking. Inebriation was a pet hate of Caesarius’ and a vice that both he and Gregory regarded as a snare of the Devil. Set within the context of Gregory’s explicit aim in this chapter, the fear with which Anatolius is struck appears in a new light.

In the context of illustrating the various ways in which the Devil aims to harm people, it is very possible that Gregory thought that either the Devil or one of his demons, having seen Anatolius proving himself to be steadfastly moving along the path to Christian perfection (paideia) through his eight years of fasting and prayer, decided to test the strength of his self-control by inciting him to fear. This would explain why the ‘great fear’ seems to appear from nowhere and has no specific cause in Gregory’s narrative. When Anatolius fails this test by succumbing to the fear, the demon which inspired it was then able to possess him. Anatolius’ loss of self-control results from his succumbing to the fear instigated by the demon and failing the test of the fear of God; a test which had been important in Prosper and Cassian’s discussions on the good Christian life.
which allows him to be possessed. Consequently, when more demons arrive to join the fight, they are able
to successfully overpower him, make him break from his cell and the path to perfection simultaneously.
For Gregory, Anatolius, having lost his self-control, became a vessel in which a tug-of-war was fought
between the demons who represented the loss of self-control and the saints who embodied such mastery.
Here, Gregory might be seen to be indirectly, and perhaps unintentionally, drawing on the apocryphal but
nevertheless well-known *Vision of Paul*: a text used by Caesarius of Arles\(^{985}\) which preached that each soul
would be contested over by the good and bad angels immediately after bodily death.\(^{986}\) While Anatolius is
very much alive in Gregory’s narrative, his soul is portrayed to be a site of confrontation between the
demons, who had possessed him, and the saints, who were tormenting but trying to free him.\(^{987}\) The idea
that there is battle for control of Anatolius’ soul here is not too dissimilar from the *Vision of Paul*’s notion
that the souls of the dying would be contested for by the good and bad angels. Gregory’s knowledge of
apocryphal literature aside, the important message that he seems to want his narrative to convey is that the
‘great fear’ which Anatolius experiences and that was plausibly incited by a wandering demon, leads to a
loss of self-control.

In showing that Anatolius’ failure of the test of fear leads to possession and a loss of his self-
discipline, Gregory draws on the precedents set by Prosper and Cassian. Chapter one establishes that both
Prosper and Cassian perceived the fear of God to be a fear which was tested by fear.\(^{988}\) For them, the fear
of God was tested by the rejection of vice and the fears of death and pain.\(^{989}\) Of the two men, Gregory
follows Cassian more closely in his story of Anatolius. He never specifies that Anatolius succumbs to a
particular vice or the fear of death and pain, but he does show that Anatolius’ asceticism was specifically
tested by demons which is a focal point in Cassian’s *Conferences*. Thus, while Gregory can be seen to align
with Cassian and Prosper in perceiving that Anatolius’ fear of God and asceticism were tested by fear, he
sways more towards Cassian in acknowledging that it is the demons who use fear to perform the test.

---

\(^{985}\) Brown, *Ransom of the Soul*, 139-141.


\(^{987}\) Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, 8.34, p. 404 (1-5).

\(^{988}\) Chapter 1, section 1:4: *The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.*

It is notable in Gregory’s story that Anatolius is said to have only ever been held in check, rather than being cured, by Saint Martin when he was brought before his tomb.\(^990\) The moment Anatolius returned to his cell he began to suffer from his torments once again.\(^991\) It appears that once Anatolius had lost his self-control to the demons he was never strong enough to recover it. In this case study, the fear experienced by Anatolius, and which was plausibly instigated by a demon, undermined his ability to maintain his self-mastery and remain on the path of paideia. The demonically-inspired fear is linked with the loss of self-control.

4.3.2. Caluppa

The *Life of the Fathers* can be considered perhaps the most insightful of the Gregory’s works for the historian attempting to decipher his views on demonology and sanctity. The Devil and his demons appear in all but three of the twenty saints’ *Lives* which make up this work.\(^992\) The eleventh *Life* in this collection - the *Life of the holy recluse Caluppa* - is a particularly useful text for showing that Gregory equated demonically-inspired fear with the loss of self-control.

The opening preface to the *Life of Caluppa* immediately connects the recluse with the theme of poverty which Gregory regarded as one of the ways by which a person could prepare themselves to enter heaven.\(^993\) He then introduces Caluppa the hermit (*reclusus*), who opted to pursue the anchoritic life of solitude after finding that the coenobitic way of life did not agree with him. According to Gregory, Caluppa had initially resided at the monastery at Méallat, but he departed after his excessive abstinence left him too weak to work and caused his brethren to view him with disdain.\(^994\) Burning under their reproach, Caluppa fled to a cave in a rock which had a small stream bathing it at the bottom.\(^995\) Here he built a small oratory in which, as he tearfully recalled to Gregory, ‘serpents often fell on his head and, winding themselves around his neck,
brought no small amount of horror to him."\textsuperscript{996} Gregory followed this up with his own declaration: ‘But because the devil has the appearance of a cunning serpent, there is no doubt that this ambush was of his making.’\textsuperscript{997}

Gregory’s comment here is striking because it connects the serpents which fell on Caluppa’s head with the treacheries of the Devil. Caluppa’s fear is of the small serpents. It is Gregory who, by referring to the Devil and his guise as a serpent, makes the serpents into creatures who act at the behest of the Devil. His words transform the serpents into the figures of demons.

Interestingly, Gregory also refers to this incident as a ‘snare’ (\textit{insidia}), indicating that he perceived these demons to have been deliberately sent by the Devil to trick Caluppa into abandoning his oratory, meditation, and focus on God. The demons use fear as a means to achieve their aim. In Gregory’s text the demons are shown to play on Caluppa’s fear of snakes, adopting the illusion of their form and using the hermit’s fear of this to try to dislodge him from his cell, moving his focus away from prayer, monastic rigour, and pursuit of the path to God. In short, they use fear to try to undermine Caluppa’s self-mastery.

The demons, however, are not successful. According to Gregory, Caluppa remained steadfast in his cell, unmoved by the bites of the small snakes.\textsuperscript{998} Consequently:

‘…on a certain day two enormous dragons (\textit{dracones}) of an immense size came to him and stood at a distance; one of these, that I believe to be the leader of temptation himself, was taller than the other. Having lifted its chest, it raised its mouth to that of the blessed man as if to whisper something. To which [Caluppa] terrified with fear, stood very stiff as if [made of] bronze. He was completely unable to move his limbs or lift a hand so that he might evoke the sign of the blessed cross.’\textsuperscript{999}

\textsuperscript{996} ‘\textit{In hoc loco oratoriolum parvulum quodam modo fecit, cui oranti, ut ipsi nobis cum lacrimis referre erat solitus, serpentis super caput eius suaviter decidiebat, et involventes se circa collum eius, non minimum ei inferebant horrorem.’ \textit{Gregory of Tours, VP}, 11.1, p. 259 (25-27).

\textsuperscript{997} ‘\textit{Sed quia diabolus ad speciem callidi serpentis habitur, non ambiguitur, eius hanc fuisse insissionis insidiam.’ \textit{Gregory of Tours, VP}, 11.1, p. 260 (1-2).

\textsuperscript{998} \textit{Gregory of Tours, VP}, 11.1, p. 260 (2-3).

\textsuperscript{999} ‘\textit{Quadam die duo dracones inmensae magnitudinis ad eum ingressi, adsteterunt procul; quorum unus, ut abitror ipse duc temptacionis, validior altero erat, qui, erecto pector, os suum contra os beati quasi aliquid mustataurus erexit. Ad ille timore perterritus, tamquam aeneus valde diriguit, nullumque penitus membrum movere potens neque manum elevare, ut signam beatae crucis obponeret.’ \textit{Gregory of Tours, VP}, 11.1, p. 260 (3-7).
In this passage, Caluppa, having beaten the initial round of demonic attacks, is now confronted by two dragons, the first of which Gregory interprets as the leader of temptation. This dragon is shown to raise itself to match Caluppa in height and in doing so sparks a powerful fear in the recluse which paralyses his limbs. If Gregory’s interpretation of this dragon as the leader of temptation is taken to imply that this dragon is the Devil himself, then this becomes an example in which the Devil is actively shown to use Caluppa’s fear of snakes/dragons to deprive him of the ability to control his physical body.

In his chapter “Divine Power Flowed From this Book”, Conrad Leyser notes that Gregory had good knowledge of Cassian’s works and the ascetic model he proffers within them. Indeed in his Life of Leobardus, Gregory acknowledges that he gave a copy of Cassian’s Institutes to the erring recluse. Yet Leyser’s view does not appear to be widely held. Martin Heinzelmann, in his most recent article on the works known to and used by Gregory of Tours for example, does not include Cassian in his syllabus. Yet the Life of Caluppa confirms Leyser’s view. It shows that Gregory followed and utilised the demonic typology and model of ascetic spiritual progress which Cassian had outlined in his Conferences.

Within his seventh and eighth Conferences, Cassian sets out a hierarchy of demons based on that of Evagrius of Pontus. In this hierarchy, the types of demons range from the moderately irritating to the ‘principal’ demonic leaders. The aspiring ascetic battles against an increasingly more powerful demon the further along the path to spiritual purity he progresses. Cassian is clear that a desert monk should expect to be confronted first by a lesser more irritating demon and then, assuming he overcame this test, he ought to expect a confrontation with a stronger demon, one with powers that would prey specifically upon the weaker points in his self-control.

If we return to Gregory’s Life of Caluppa, this is the exact system which Caluppa progresses through. First, he confronts the lesser snakes (serpentes and minorum anguium) which, through Gregory’s declaration
that they were part of a trap created by the Devil, can be assimilated with the lesser, more irritating demons in Cassian’s hierarchy. This battle with the smaller snakes forms the prelude to Caluppa’s next test. Having withstood the fear engendered by the snakes or lesser demons, Caluppa then faces the more powerful dragons, in this case the Devil and one of his more potent minions, who continue to prey on his fear of snakes and temptation by adopting the guise of two dragons (dracones).

The Latin terminology Gregory uses is worth paying attention too. Draco, here translated as dragon, refers either to a much bigger serpent or a different creature entirely. In both biblical and contemporary literature, there appears to be a notable distinction between a serpens or anguis and a draco. The Greek drakon or Latin draco, are different from standard serpents owing to their enormous sizes and supernatural qualities. The dragon, despite being a subgroup of the serpent species, is widely regarded as a different, more dangerous creature. Gregory’s commentary on dracones, across his works in general, shows that he knew that a draco was a supernatural type of serpent. In Histories 10.1 for example, Gregory distinguishes the great dragon (magnus draco) from the smaller water serpents (serpentes) whose drowning in the Tiber sparked the great plague that saw Gregory the Great elected to the papacy in Rome. The dragon is different from the serpents (serpentes) because it is much ‘bigger’ (magnus) than them. Likewise in the Life of Caluppa, it is the immense size of the two dracones which differentiates them from their smaller counterparts who had attacked the holy man earlier in the story. Gregory seems to have used his terminology very carefully in his texts, using serpentes and anguium to refer to lesser demons who adopted a snake-like form and using draco and hydram (a water serpent) to refer to the Devil or more powerful demons in serpent-shape. His use of snake-terminology in the Life of Caluppa signifies the holy recluse’s ascetic progress through the different levels of the demonic hierarchy as outlined by Cassian.

Within this context, Caluppa’s initial fear of the snakes and his terror of the first dragon now become comfortably associable with demonically-inspired fear. In Gregory’s narrative, Caluppa fears both the

1007 Ogden, Drakón, 4.
1008 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.1, p. 477 (7-9).
1009 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 10.1, p. 477 (7).
1010 Gregory of Tours, VP, 11.1, p. 260 (3).
smaller snakes, which Gregory portrays as lesser demons, and the two larger dragons, who represent the Devil and one of his minions. The Devil and his demons play on Caluppa’s fear of snakes by adopting fear-inspiring forms with the aim of striking fear into the recluse and dislodging him from both his self-mastery and holy path to God (Christian paideia).

Returning to the narrative, Gregory initially makes it seem like the Devil has succeeded in his mission. Caluppa’s terror of the dragons, a terror which the Devil had incited, has brought the recluse into a state of physical paralysis, a partial loss of self-control. He cannot move his lips, limbs, or use his hand to make the sign of the cross and free himself. Yet all is not lost as Gregory follows this with the declaration that:

“When they had remained in this silence for the longest time, it came into the mind of the saint, through the Holy Spirit, that he might cry out the prayer of the Lord in his heart since he was not able to move his lips. While he spoke silently, he felt his limbs, having been bound by the arts of the enemy, gradually begin to be loosened. Feeling that his right hand was now freed, he made the sign of the blessed cross before the mouth [either his own or the dragon’s].”

The means by which Caluppa triumphs over his fear of the dragon and regains his self-control are notable for our knowledge of how Gregory understands demonically-inspired fear in relation to the fear of God. Gregory states that while Caluppa was physically paralysed, the Holy Spirit was still able to enter his mind and remind him to cite the Lord’s prayer. Caluppa cannot move his lips, but he quickly realises that even if he cannot vocally project the words aloud, he can speak them with his heart. His heart (cor) and mind (mens) are not paralysed with and by the demonically-inspired fear.

Here there is an interesting parallel to be made between the tales of Caluppa and that of Aquilinus in The Miracles of Saint Martin. In this story, Gregory describes how Aquilinus incurred an overpowering fear (pavorem pessimum), a heart tremor, and then lost his senses while out hunting with his father. Upon realising that their son’s suffering was instigated by the Devil, Aquilinus’ parents initially sought the aid of

---

1011 Gregory of Tours, V/P, 11.1, p. 260 (6-7).
1012 “Cumque ambo duissime in silention constisset, venit in mentem sancto per spiritum, ut orationem dominicam, etsi labia movere non poterat, vel corde clamaret. Quam dum tacitus loquitur, coeperunt paulatin membra eius, quae inimici fuerunt arte revincta, dissolvi, et sentiens, se manum dextram habere iam liberam, orbignum beatae crucis imponit;” Gregory of Tours, V/P, 11.1, p. 260 (7-11).
1013 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (13-14).
soothsayers and healers. After this predictably failed, the parents sought the aid of Saint Martin. Although Aquilinus eventually regained his senses, Gregory is clear that this did not happen until he had spent a long time following the faith.

Gregory’s use of demonically-instigated fear in this story is interesting when compared with the tale of Caluppa. In the latter, the fear employed by the demons and the Devil does not seem to infiltrate the recluse’s heart or mind. But in Gregory’s narrative on Aquilinus, the fear which is instigated by the Devil leaves Aquilinus with a tremor of the heart and also makes him lose all his self-control: both physical and mental. Caluppa, on the other hand, only loses his physical mastery. Why does Gregory show a difference in the affective powers of the fear employed by the Devil between these two figures?

In the late antique perspective, the heart and mind were widely considered to be the primary organs through which the soul moved the body, the will, and the passions. The mind could influence the heart and vice versa, but late antique Gallic theologians, like Prosper of Aquitaine, also considered the heart to be the seat of the fear of God. If the Devil was able to make his fear affect either the heart, the seat of the fear of God, or the mind, the seat of the will and influencer of the heart, then, logically, this would mean that the person’s fear of God was either not strong enough to combat the Devil or that it was absent altogether.

A comparison of the stories of Caluppa and Aquilinus seems to confirm this view. In Gregory’s works, Caluppa is a holy recluse, one who has tried to spend much of his time dedicated to prayer. He has experience with both the coenobitic and anchoritic lifestyles and is actively preoccupied in pursuing the path of Christian paideia towards perfection and salvation. In accordance with the standard outlined in Cassian’s Conferences, Caluppa is a model monk and it is highly likely that God, and the fear of God, actively

---

1014 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (15-17).
1015 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (17-19).
1016 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (21-23).
1017 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (13-16).
1019 This view was maintained in the Vulgate as well the works of Prosper, Cassian, and Augustine. See Chapter 1, section 1.2: The Foundation Stone: The Fear of God in the Vulgate and section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.
1020 Gregory of Tours, VP, 11.1, p. 259 (25-26).
Chapter 4: Gregory of Tours, The Devil, Demons, and Fear

occupied both his heart and mind. Aquilinus on the other hand is neither a holy man nor actively concerned with God when he is ambushed by the Devil. Instead he is focused on the hunt with his father. Neither his heart nor his mind are fixated on the fear of God. Nor are they trained in monastic rigour and directed towards self-mastery. When the Devil and his demons use fear to try to convince Caluppa to part with the self-control that he had garnered from his training, their fear is unable to pierce the recluse’s heart or mind because these are full of faith and the fear of God. Yet when the Devil uses fear against Aquilinus, his fear is able to take hold and drag the boy into a state of complete loss of self-control because neither the boy’s heart nor mind are defended by the fear of God. For Gregory, the heart and mind could have one of two states. They were either occupied with the fear of God, a means of gaining and a form of Christian self-mastery, or they were open to being destabilised by demonically-inspired fear resulting in the loss of self-control. The fear of God equates with and enables a person to retain self-mastery; giving in to the fear instigated by demons is linked with and causes the loss of this mastery.

4.3.3. Portianus

Alongside the *Life of Caluppa*, the *Life of the holy abbot Portianus* also shows that Gregory associated demonically-inspired fear with the loss of self-control. In his preface to this text, Gregory introduces Portianus as one of the few whom God had chosen to lift to His heavenly empire. Originally a slave, Portianus kept fleeing from a certain barbarian, taking shelter with an abbot at a monastery. After a miraculous blinding freed Portianus from the clutches of his master, he became a cleric and succeeded the abbot upon the latter’s death. Gregory’s description of Portianus emphasizes the man’s saintly rigour. The abbot chewed salt to moisten his dry gums and master his bodily needs when fasting, testing his ability to withstand the need to drink. He also passed his first test against the wiles of the Devil. In this test, Portianus visited the camp of Theuderic with the intention of preventing the king from

---

1021 Gregory acknowledges that the maintenance of the fear of God is connected to discipline when he states: *Disciplina ergo haec timorem Domini facit*, Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 12.Pref., p. 261 (22-23).

1022 The fear of God had to precede the introduction of faith in the theological discourse of late antique Gaul. See Chapter 1, section 1.4: *The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century*. Gregory also acknowledges this in Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 12.Pref., p. 261 (22-24).


1025 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 5.1, p. 228 (2-12).

1026 Gregory of Tours, *VP*, 5.1, p. 228 (12-17).
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laying waste to the village of Artonne.\textsuperscript{1027} After being conducted to the tent of the king’s first man Sigivald, Portianus was pushed to wash his hands and partake of some unmixed wine.\textsuperscript{1028} Portianus protested on the basis that he had neither seen the king nor, more importantly, sung the Psalms.\textsuperscript{1029} Despite his protestations, Sigivald ordered the wine to be brought and commanded Portianus to bless it.\textsuperscript{1030} Upon raising his right hand and making the sign of the cross, the vessel split in half spilling the contents and a huge serpent (\textit{inmenso serpente}) onto the ground.\textsuperscript{1031}

The presence of the huge serpent within the vessel, and Gregory’s portrayal of its exposure as a miracle, indicates that the wine had been a test of temptation which Portianus successfully passed. Gregory signifies that the wine is a test of the Devil by his specification that it is unmixed (\textit{merum}) or undiluted. This wine would have contained a stronger alcoholic content and thus the test presented to Portianus was one of gluttony and inebriation. Portianus’ earlier protestations and refusal to accept the wine when it was initially offered, because it was offered before he had sung the Psalms, demonstrates his refusal to bend to this temptation and mastery over his desires. His display of self-control and rejection of temptation gives him both the power to reveal the serpent hidden in the vessel and the ability to strike the fear of God into the surrounding soldiers through this act. God, as Gregory states, rewarded Portianus for his self-control by saving him from death by serpent and with the release of some prisoners by the king.\textsuperscript{1032}

After Portianus passed his first test of self-mastery, Gregory states that the Devil continued his machinations against the abbot by attacking him in ways that he could see.\textsuperscript{1033} It is in the second test that the Devil seeks to undermine Portianus’ self-mastery with fear.

‘For a certain night, when he [Portianus] had given himself to sleep, he was suddenly awakened and saw that the cell seemed to be consumed with flames. Jumping up, terrified, he tried to make for the door. But when he was unable to open it, he prostrated himself in prayer and made the sign of the cross around himself. The

\textsuperscript{1027} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 228 (20-21).
\textsuperscript{1028} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 228 (21-26).
\textsuperscript{1029} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 228 (27-30).
\textsuperscript{1030} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 228 (30-31).
\textsuperscript{1031} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 228 (31-33).
\textsuperscript{1032} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.2, p. 229 (6-7).
\textsuperscript{1033} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VP}, 5.3, p. 229 (9-10).
phantom flames that had appeared, vanished and he knew that this had been a deception of the devil.\textsuperscript{1034}

Here the Devil is shown to use fire to inspire fear in Portianus. The abbot’s terror is not of the Devil because he does not realize that the Devil is the one who has sparked the flames until after he extinguishes them using the sign of the cross. Instead what Gregory shows is the Devil sparking the fear of being burnt to death in Portianus. He wants Portianus to flee from the cell, lose his self-control, and surrender his mental mastery to him. In Gregory’s narrative, Portianus is notably unable to find the door to leave the cell. This is important because it indicates that Devil did not want Portianus to physically leave the cell so much as he wanted him to give up his mental strength and discipline. The Devil uses fear to try to and force Portianus to lose his self-control which shows, in turn, that Gregory associated demonically-inspired fear with the loss of self-mastery.

4.3.4. Nicetius of Trier

The example of Nicetius of Trier demonstrates that Gregory equates demonically-inspired fear with the loss and lack of self-control. In this tale, Gregory declares that King Theudebert became terrified after a demon, who had possessed a boy, stood up and started shouting that the king was an adulterer, vain, and without the fear of God.\textsuperscript{1035} The terror that Gregory wants to portray Theudebert experiencing here is likely to have been the fear of God, since this was the fear that the demon explicitly reminded the king that he was lacking. Although this case is principally an example of the human fear of God being incited by a demon, it is also possible that Theudebert might have simultaneously experienced a fear of the demon which shouted those things and rekindled his fear of God. The demon had, after all, possessed a boy, created quite a spectacle in the church, and publicly slandered the king in front of the entire congregation. It is not implausible that a fear of the demon would have been sparked in the king in this scenario. If Theudebert

\textsuperscript{1034} ‘Nam nocte quadam, dum se sopori dedisset, subito exergyfactus, vidit cellulam suam quasi incendio concræmari; eaeurgensque perterritus, ostium petiit. Quem cum reserare nequiret, in oratione prosternitur, ac signum salutare corum se et circa se faciens, protinus phantasia flammarum quaæ apparerent evanuit, cognorique, hoc diaboli fuisse fallatiam.’ Gregory of Tours, I/P, 5.3, p. 229 (11-15).

\textsuperscript{1035} Gregory of Tours, I/P, 17.2, p. 279 (26-28).
can be interpreted to experience both the fear of God and a fear of the demon in this narrative, then this would suggest that Gregory thought it was possible for a person to experience both fears simultaneously.

Interestingly, the king does not appear to lose control when he becomes terrified in Gregory’s text. If anything, he seems to remain completely in control of his will, reacting to the declaration by demanding that Nicetius expel the demon from the church.1036 But even if the king can be argued to have experienced a fear of the demon alongside his fear of God, this example still suggests that Gregory assimilates giving into the fear inspired by a demonic being with the lack of self-control. The demon’s description of the king as the one who was adulterous, vain, and without the fear of God, makes him appear to be the one who has lost control of himself. Nicetius, the one who was chaste, humble, and very much in the fear of God, experiences no terror at the sight of the demon. He retains perfect control of himself, thus allowing him to pass the test of being tempted into vainglory through praise speech as highlighted by Halsall.1037 The king, the one whose actions enabled him to be accused of being in a state in which he lacks self-control, is the one who ends up terrified, both of the demon and of God as a result of the demon’s speech. Consequently, it is possible to argue that the tale of Nicetius of Trier not only shows that Gregory associated demonically-inspired fear with the loss of self-control, but that he also saw demons as testers of faith and the fear of God.

4.3.5. The Two Boys of Voultcgon

Demonic appearances litter The Miracles of Saint Martin. In total, Gregory explicitly describes thirty-seven demonic cases across the four books.1038 The story of the two boys from the village of Voultcgon in the territory of Poitiers, forms another example which shows that Gregory equated fear caused by demonic beings with the loss of self-mastery. In this story, Gregory describes how two boys, who had been sharing a bed on Sunday night, awoke upon hearing what they thought was the bell calling people to matins.1039 Yet upon entering the church forecourt they found a group of women singing there instead.1040

1036 Gregory of Tours, VTP, 17.2, p. 279 (28-29).
1038 This number does not include those cases in which demonic agency could be inferred, i.e. the sudden gusts of wind and impromptu storms. For the connection between storms and the demonic see de Nie, Views From A Many-Windiwed Tower, 91-107 and de Nie, ‘History and Miracle,’ 272.
1039 Gregory of Tours, TSM, 2.45, p. 175 (11-13).
1040 Gregory of Tours, TSM, 2.45, p. 175 (14).
'And being greatly terrified, knowing them to be a mob of demons, they fell to the ground. As they did not make the sign of salvation, because they were young, one was punished [with the loss of] the light [of his eyes], and the other was punished with the [loss of the] light [of his eyes] and capacity to walk.'

In this slightly odd tale, the demons, who are either disguised as a group of singing women or have possessed a group of women and are singing through them, are shown to ensnare the two boys by striking a great terror in them. This terror causes the boys to become physically incapacitated and fall to the ground, thus implying that it has deprived them of their physical self-control.

Interestingly, it is not the boys' lack of the fear of God which fails to protect them from the demonically-inspired fear but their youthful inexperience (aetatis infirmitas). Gregory never specifies the age of the boys or anything about them beyond the fact that they shared the same bed. Nevertheless, he does imply that they were old enough to have acquired some level of Christian training, as he notes that they were able to recognise that the women were in fact a mob of demons. Unfortunately, the boys do not appear to have been old enough to have the mental mastery necessary to withstand the terror which the demons incite. As such this terror is able to ensnare them, leaving them physically incapacitated. The boys are then subsequently punished, either by God or by the demons, one with blindness and the other with blindness and debilitation.

It is briefly worth noting that in both this story and the one about Aquilinus, Gregory might be seen to be following Augustine's notion that those who had no past experience dealing with demons ought to retain a fear of encountering them. Both Heinzelmann and Halsall have already argued in favour of the idea that Gregory knew of Augustine's works. Gregory's narratives of Aquilinus and the boys of Voultegon may lend further support to this. It is notable that Gregory depicts the boys as being neither

---

1041 ‘Exterritique valde, cognoscentes catervam esse daemoniorum, dum ad terram corrunt nec se, ut esset aetatis infirmitas, signo salutare praemonunt, unus lumine, alius et lumine et gressu multatur.’ Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.45, p. 175 (15-17). De Nie uses ‘est’ instead of ‘esse’ and ‘aetatis’ instead of ‘aetatis.’ Gregory of Tours, Lives and Miracles, trans. Giselle de Nie (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2015), p. 628. The only other options that Krusch identifies are eras in MS 1a and nec saevem aetatis in MS 2. Gregory of Tours, VSM, p. 175, ref. e.

1042 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.45, p. 175 (15-17).

1043 ‘…cum eas homo visu esperando caverdi didicerit et multa inoexperta, formidet.’ Aug., De Div., Daem., LLTA, cap. 3, pars 7, pag. 604, lin. 10. Chapter 3, section: 3.4: The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century.

wary of encountering demons nor old enough to have the required training in faith and the fear of God to protect them. Likewise, Aquilinus, as noted above, was not trained in the fear of God or focused on it when he was attacked by the Devil. The results are catastrophic. Though the boys of Voultegon eventually receive healing, Gregory is clear that this does not happen for many years (multorum annorum). For one of the boys, the path to healing is also a longer two-stage process. The boy who was blinded and debilitated, despite receiving an initial cure for his blindness, had to wait longer and visit the cell at Candes on his way home from the Basilica of Saint Martin to recover his movement. In his story on Aquilinus, Gregory also notes rather strikingly that Aquilinus had to spend a long time following the faith at the basilica (cumque in hac fide diutius commorasset) before the Devil’s fear left him and his senses returned. This suggests that Gregory, perhaps building on a knowledge of Augustine’s warning that those without experience of demons ought to fearing meeting them, might have thought that it would take an extended period of time for someone to garner the spiritual training necessary to make them worthy of redemption. In certain cases, like that of Aquilinus and the two boys of Voultegon, a person who had been punished particularly severely for falling into a trap of fear laid by demons might have to wait a long time to merit a full recovery. In this narrative, Gregory can thus be seen to equate demonically-inspired terror with the lack of mastery over the self. He can also be shown to have thought that while achieving redemption was possible, for a person who had not guarded against demonically-inspired fear, this process would take a long time.

4.3.6. Gregory of Tours

A final, thought-provoking example which demonstrates that Gregory linked demonically-inspired fear with the loss of self-control is found in the second book of The Miracles of Saint Martin. What makes this case more intriguing is that it is one in which Gregory recalls his own experience of fear. This makes the story potentially more personal than those which do not directly concern Gregory and thus the fear within it also has the capacity to reflect Gregory’s own views on fear more clearly.

1045 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.45, p. 175 (17).
1046 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.45, p. 175 (17-25).
1047 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 1.26, p. 151 (21-23).
In The Miracles of Saint Martin 2.25, Gregory recalls a Christmas Eve when he and his congregation set out on a procession to the Basilica of Saint Martin from the Cathedral Church of Tours. As they processed:

‘...one of the possessed, who was more atrocious than the others, began to rave excessively. Grabbing and striking himself, he was shouting: “You approach the threshold of Martin in error! For naught do you come to this house, since, for your multiple crimes, he has left you! Behold, abhorring you, he performs miracles in Rome! There he pours light into the eyes of the blind, restores the walking of the paralytics, and puts an end to other illnesses with his power!” From this speech of the devil, all the people were disturbed (exturbatur), and not only were the lesser hearts overwhelmed, but we ourselves indeed were struck by fear (pavore).’

In this passage, Gregory depicts a demon, which had possessed a person in his congregation, blatantly using fear to attempt to break the bishop and his flock away from the literal and figurative path to Saint Martin.

By decrying that their collective attempt to cultivate Martin’s favour was useless, because the saint had left due to their many sins, the demon actively sought, and initially succeeded, in inspiring a fear amongst Gregory and his congregation that Martin had abandoned both Tours and its bishop.

Gregory’s perception of demons as, amongst other things, testers of the faith and faithful means it is likely that he wanted to make the demon’s use of fear in this story appear as a test for him. This is not to say that Gregory might not have also wanted the reader to realise that the demon was inciting fear in the congregation to draw as many people away from the path to Saint Martin and God as it could. The demon does, after all, use fear in a similar way to the demons who incite commotion throughout Tours in Sulpicius and Paulinus’ Lives of Saint Martin. Yet Gregory’s principal objective is to show how he responds to
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1048 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, p. 167 (32-33).
1049 *...quidam ex inerguminis atrocior ceteris coepit nimium debachare, et decerpens se atque conlidens clamabat: Frustra Martini limina petitis, casso eius aedem aditis, qui vos propver multis criminibus dereliquit, et ecce vos abhorrens, Romae mirabilia facit Cæcorum oculis lumen infundit, iti paralyticorum gressus diregit; sed et alius quoque morbis sua virtute imponit.’ Ad hunc diaboli vocem omnis populus exturbatur, et non solum bruta minorum corda, sed etiam nos ipsi pavore concutimur.’ Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, pp. 167-168 (33-36, 1-3). De Nie changes a number of the Latin terms in her edition: exturbatur→exturbabatur, bruta→obruta, et→en, and imponit→imponit. Gregory, Lives and Miracles, p. 582.
1050 See the case of Nicetius above as an example. Also, Halsall, ‘The Critique of Diabolical Reason,’ 3-4.
demonically-inspired fear. By stating that the demon had specifically incited a fear in him that Martin had abandoned Tours, Gregory depicts the demon to be a tester of his steadfastness of faith, his rejection of any vanity that could come from being the presiding bishop of Martin’s see (note that Gregory like Nicetius does not immediately respond and decry the demon’s claims), and his control over both himself and his flock as their pastoral shepherd. The demon incites fear in Gregory with the intention of making him panic and lose control of both himself and his flock. Gregory thus connects submitting to demonically-inspired fear with the loss of mastery.

Interestingly, Gregory’s opening sentence characterises this tale as one in which ‘an immense burden of grief, revealed great joy to us.’ His introduction does not explicitly characterise this story as one in which fear turns to joy, but one in which grief, or sorrow, turns to joy. Despite the fact that Gregory describes the citizens of Tours, including himself, to have spent the night on the floor of the saint’s cell ‘with great weeping’, he also very clearly states that he was ‘struck with fear’ upon hearing the demon’s words. There is little doubt that this is a story of overcoming demonically-inspired fear, so what does Gregory’s characterisation of it as one of overcoming sorrow suggest about his understanding of demonically-instigated fear?

To answer this question, it is necessary to look at how Gregory depicts fear interacting with other ‘emotions’ like grief. Chapter two established that Gregory regarded the fear of God as a fear which was able to restore a person’s self-control when they were afflicted with anger, grief, or other worldly fears. In the tale of Monegundis for example, her fear of offending Christ led her to surmount the overwhelming grief she experienced following the death of her two daughters. In the exordium to his first book of The Miracles of Saint Martin, Gregory also revealed that his own sorrows and worldly fears about the critical reception his work might face were overcome by his fear of God. While sorrow is triumphed over by the fear of God
in both these stories, it is depicted by Gregory to be a crucial cause of uncertainty and, certainly in Monegundis’ case, the immediate cause of the loss of self-mastery.

Returning to The Miracles of Saint Martin 2.25, it becomes apparent that Gregory thought that grief which emerged from the fear instigated by the demon would also aid the demon in its quest to make Gregory and his congregation lose their self-control. In the opening paragraph, Gregory describes this story as one in which immense grief (immensum maeroris) turned to joy (gaudium).1058 Immediately after the demon decries that Martin has abandoned both the people and the Bishop of Tours, Gregory states that the people became agitated and that he was ‘struck with fear.’1059 The demon is shown to have caused fear with the intent of testing Gregory and his flock’s confidence in their security and self-control. Continuing on, Gregory recalls that ‘with us having entered the basilica with great weeping, we all fell to the floor praying, that we might merit the presence of the holy man.’1060 Here the demonically-inspired fear is shown to have morphed into lamentation or a passionate display of grief as signified by the great weeping. This is the sorrow that Gregory had used to characterise the story in its opening lines and it endures for a short time afterwards as Gregory and his congregation wait for a sign of Martin’s presence. This period of time is one of uncertainty which the demonically-inspired fear-cum-lamentation serves to perpetuate and intensify. But while the demon has succeeded in inspiring fear and distress in Gregory and the people, it has not yet managed to bring its aim of inducing both Gregory and his flock to forsake their self-discipline to fruition. Instead of surrendering total control, Gregory continues with the procession, celebrates the holy solemnities, and does not permit his fear-cum-sorrow to drive him to give up hope in Martin.1061

Although the demonically-instigated fear fails to induce Gregory and his flock to lose their self-mastery, the lamentation into which it morphs continues to overshadow the celebrations. It serves to aid the demon’s cause as it literally clouds Gregory’s eyes with tears, blocking out the light. Only after Bonulf receives a healing miracle is Gregory, his ‘eyes [lights] still wet with tears’, able to stand up and announce to the congregation:

1058 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, p. 167 (30).
1059 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, p. 168 (3).
1060 ‘Ingredientibus autem nobis cum fletu magno basilicam, omnes pavimento prosternimur, orantes, ut sancti viri praesentiam mereamur.’ Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, p. 168 (3-5).
1061 Gregory of Tours, VSM, 2.25, p. 168 (14-15).
‘Let all the fear depart from your hearts because the blessed confessor lives with us! Do not believe anything [declared] by the devil, who has never disclosed the truth. “He was deceitful from the beginning and stands in no truth.” As I said this, all grief turned to joy… and all were thus wrested from the fear of the enemy and strengthened through Christ’s presence.’

In this quotation, Gregory uses Scripture to tell his congregation to let all the demonically-inspired fear (timor) depart from their hearts. Describing the congregation’s subsequent response to his speech, Gregory then states that all their grief (luctus) turned to joy (gaudium). In swapping fear for grief here, Gregory re-enforces the relationship that he had established between demonically-inspired fear and sorrow as the demon’s tools in this story. He then ends by declaring that everyone triumphed over the demonically-inspired fear. In closing this story by saying that everyone overcame the demonically-inspired fear, Gregory might be seen to be indicating that, while both the demonically-caused fear and lamentation served the demon’s desire to test Gregory and his flock’s self-control, in the end it was only by not submitting to the demonically-inspired fear that Gregory and his congregation were rendered worthy to receive a demonstration of Martin and God’s grace. Submitting to demonically-inspired fear is still linked with the loss of self-control.

The analysis of Gregory’s portrayal of demonically-inspired fear in his collected writings shows that he firmly equated demonically-inspired fears with the loss or lack of self-control. In Gregory’s worldview, both the individual and the world were torn between the fear of God, which could enable self-control, and the fears incited by and sometimes of demonic figures which could instigate a loss of self-mastery.

A wider, more significant conclusion of this chapter is that Gregory thought that the Devil and his demons’ ability to successfully use fear to ensnare someone was subject to the abilities of the person to use his or her fear of God to overcome those fears. In the Histories, the tale of Anatolius, who loses and never regains either his self-control or sanctity after being possessed by a demon, shows that demonically-inspired

1062 *Quod videns ego, Deo omnipotenti gratias agens, lumina fletibus madesfacta, in hac ad populum voce prorupi: ‘Timor a cordibus vestris omnis abscedat, quia beatus confessor nobiscum inhabitat, nec omnia crede diabolo, qui nihil unquam prodit verum. “Ille ab initio mendax est et in veritate non stetit.”’...Et sic a timore inimici omnes crepeti, Christi praeaddio roborati sunt.* Gregory of Tours, V3M, 2.25, p. 168 (17-20, 25-26).
fear could triumph in its goal to move a person into a state in which they surrendered their mental and physical self-mastery. Yet the story of Caluppa illustrates that while demonically-instigated fear could inspire a loss of physical control, a person who had sufficient training in both coenobitic and anchoritic monastic rigour would be able to use their fear of God to regain mastery over themselves. The notion that rigorous training in self-mastery was essential to supplanting the intended effects of demonically-inspired fear was also shown in Gregory’s *Life of Portianus*, tale of Aquilinus, and story of the two boys of Voultegon. Portianus, who was repeatedly victimised by the Devil, barely had enough self-mastery to be able to fend off the effects of the Devil’s fear. Had he not decided to pray when he could not break down the door of his burning cell, the Devil would have succeeded in his attempt at ensnaring the abbot despite his ascetic training and past triumphs over him. The boys of Voultegon, who did not have sufficient training in self-discipline and the fear of God due to their young age, lost their physical control and the ability to protect themselves upon seeing a mob of demons. Aquilinus, who had no monastic training in the rigours of Christian self-control whatsoever, became easy prey for the Devil who used fear to rob him of his mental senses and leave him with a heart tremor. In each of these cases Gregory shows that giving in to demonically-inspired fear equates with losing self-control. Whether the person forfeited their mastery over their body, mind, or both, depended on how much ascetic training they had. Their ability to regain control over themselves was subject not just to the amount of ascetic training and fear of God they had but how much they continued to maintain those. For Gregory himself, as his own experience in *The Miracles of Saint Martin* 2.25 shows, demonically-inspired fear is firmly linked with the demon’s aim to instigate chaos and the loss of self-control. Throughout his works, Gregory’s Devil and demons deliberately incite fear in people in order to distract them from their self-mastery and test their steadfastness in sanctity. Demonically-inspired fear in Gregory’s writings therefore, represents the other side of his notion of Christian self-mastery.

4.4. *Gregory, the Fear experienced by Demonic Figures, and Self-Control*

Having argued that Gregory firmly equated demonically-inspired fear with the loss or lack of self-control, it is now time to explore the final aspect of his notion of demonic fear: the fear experienced by demonic beings. For Gregory, the submission to fear which had been instigated by demons resulted in a person
becoming uncontrolled and incontinent, the Christian equivalent of the Ancient Greek concept of *akrasia*. The role of demonically-inspired fear in God's scheme for the world was to test the steadfastness, sanctity, and self-mastery of a Christian. It was the counter to the fear of God and everything which that fear brought about. But what about the fears that Gregory's Devil and demons experience? Where do they sit in this equation? In the final part of this chapter, I argue that in Gregory's writings the Devil and his demons had to be capable of experiencing fear, specifically a fear of God, for two reasons. Firstly, it was a logical means by which humans could foil the trickery which demonic figures tried to inflict. Secondly, it was another way for Gregory to clearly convey the message that demons had no self-control and that the fear of God was a tool of self-mastery.

### 4.4.1. The Devil and the Fear of God

Gregory’s *Life of Lupicinus and Romanus* shows that the Bishop of Tours thought that the Devil experienced a particular fear of humans rising to God's side through their faith. Describing the reception that awaited Lupicinus and Romanus when both men were driven by violent hostilities to abandon their ascetic life and return to the village, Gregory says that they were upbraided by a poor woman in whose house they had sought shelter:

“It had been necessary, O men of God, [for] you to fight manfully against the tricks of the devil and not to fear the hostilities of him who has often been overcome by the friends of God. For he is envious of sanctity and fears lest the human race, that had fallen through his perfidy, might rise ennobled by faith.”

Within the bounds of the main argument of this chapter on Gregory and demonically-inspired fear, the passage above is a further case which shows that Gregory equated submission to demonically-inspired fear with one's loss of self-mastery and removal from the path towards Christian perfection. Nevertheless, there

---

1063 “Oportuerat vos, O viri Dei, contra insidias diaboli viriliter dimicare, nec formidare eius inimicitias, qui saepius ab amicis Dei superatus occubit. Aemulus est enim sanctitati, dum metuit, ne, unde ille perfidia vilis corruit genus humanum fide nobilitatum ascendat.”


*Aemulus* could be translated as either envious or jealous. I have chosen envious here because sanctity, which *aemulus* governs in the sentence structure, is something that the devil desires but is perceived to be incapable of obtaining. On this see Aug., *De Civ.*, LLTA, SL 48, lib. 11, cap. 13, lin. 20. Nevertheless, *aemulus* could be translated as jealous in the sense that the devil fears to lose something, namely he fears to lose to God.
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is also another fear present in this story: the fear experienced by the Devil. In the dialogue which he ascribes to the woman, Gregory states that the Devil is envious (aemulus) of sanctity and fears (metuit) that humans would rise to God through their faith.

Notably, although the Devil does not fear being punished or judged by God, his fear is still connected to God. Explicitly, Gregory’s Devil fears that humans will rise to God’s side, but there are more layers to this if the historian asks why Gregory’s Devil fears this rather than being punished by God. In fearing that people will rise from their fallen state to God’s side, the Devil fears that he will lose control over people whom he had dragged down with him into sin. The more people who ascend, or try to ascend, from the state of Original Sin to God, the weaker the Devil becomes in his war against God. Gregory’s Devil thus retains a different type of the fear of God; one which stems from his fallen state and jealousy of the human race’s opportunities to escape the same fate. It is not the human fear of being punished and judged by God; it is the fear of losing control of the people he had brought into a state of sin to God’s holy ways.

Gregory’s portrayal of the Devil as a figure who fears losing his hold over humankind to God can be seen to have roots in the Bible as well as the works of Hilary of Poitiers and Avitus of Vienne. In the monologue which Avitus affords the Devil in his On Original Sin, the fallen angel, who eventually becomes the Devil, explicitly reveals that he is both jealous (zeli) of Adam and Eve’s bliss and pained (dolor) by the thought that they will rise to take his place in heaven. This pain causes him to instigate the Fall of Man. In book two of the Histories, Gregory reveals that he knew and had copies of Avitus writings. With this knowledge in mind, he could be seen to have adopted the notion that the Devil was concerned about losing the control he had wrought over mankind from the character of the Devil in Avitus’ poem. The pain that Avitus’ Devil felt at being replaced drove him to drag mankind away from God into his control. That he would then retain a fear of losing this control would not be an illogical leap for Gregory to make.

Gregory's idea that the Devil could experience a different fear of God to that experienced by humans could also have been sourced from Hilary of Poitier’s Commentary on Matthew. Here, as chapter three established, Hilary explicitly states that the Devil feared (metu) losing the opportunity to test Christ when
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1066 Gregory says that he still has Avitus’ letters in Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.34, p. 82 (21) and his description of the portents that afflict Vienne during Mamertus’ episcopacy very closely mirrors that of Avitus’. Compare Gregory of Tours, DLH, 2.34, p. 83 with Avitus of Vienne, Hom., MGH: AA, Vol. 6.2, pp. 109-110; ‘On Rogations’, p. 382-383.
he realised that He was God in human form.\textsuperscript{1067} The Devil did not fear being punished or judged by God; he only feared losing the chance to test Him.\textsuperscript{1068} The idea that the Devil could experience a different fear of God to that of humans has precedent in the Bishop of Poitiers' works.

Finally, the notion that the Devil would fear becoming weaker in his war against God as a result of more people rising through their faith to join God aligns closely with the New Testament depiction of the Devil as the fallen servant who was at war with God and the enemy of mankind.\textsuperscript{1069} Gregory's depiction of the fear which the Devil is said to experience in the \textit{Life of Lupicinus and Romanus}, can consequently be seen to have potentially derived from his cumulative knowledge of the writings of his Gallic predecessors and the New Testament.

4.4.2. Demons and the Fear of God

Like the Devil, demons are also shown to experience the fear of God in Gregory's works. In \textit{The Miracles of Saint Martin} 2.18, Gregory describes how the demons that had infested a poor man named Landulf fled ‘terrified (\textit{terribiliter}) through the air’ when Landulf made the sign of the cross.\textsuperscript{1070} In this story, the demons tormenting Landulf are characterised by Gregory to fear the sign of the cross. Yet this is used by Landulf to invoke God's protection against the demons. Explicitly, the demons fear the physical sign of the cross. Implicitly, they also display a fear of God, whose protection was called upon by Landulf.

Another example which shows demons fearing God is located in Gregory's synthesised version of \textit{The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew}.\textsuperscript{1071} In chapter seventeen, Gregory states that a demon, who had possessed a certain youth, overheard the boy's father asking a friend to summon Andrew so that his son could be cured.\textsuperscript{1072} When Andrew appeared, the demon deliberately sought to attract his attention by asking him if he had come to “drive us out of our homes?”\textsuperscript{1073} Upon being prompted by Andrew to answer why it wished, but was seemingly unable, to leave the boy until he was present, the demon replied that it feared

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1067} Hil., of Poit., \textit{Comm.}, \textit{Matt.}, LITA, SChr 254, cap. 3, par. 1, lin. 15, pag. 112; \textit{Commentary on Matthew}, 3.1, p. 54.
\item \textsuperscript{1068} Chapter 3, section 3.3: \textit{The Devil, Demons, and Fear in Gaul during the Middle of the Fourth Century}.
\item \textsuperscript{1069} Vulgate, Luk., 10:18; Russel, \textit{The Devil}, 228-229, and Kingston, ‘The Devil and Demons,’ 17-18.
\item \textsuperscript{1070} '\textit{Sed ille ad haec fidenter immobilis signum crucis opponens, terribiliter eos per aera tenerum effugabat.}' Gregory of Tours, \textit{VSM}, 2.18, p. 165 (15-17).
\item \textsuperscript{1071} Gregory openly states that he had shortened the version he worked from because he felt the original was too verbose in his prologue. Gregory of Tours, \textit{M/A}, Pro., p. 375 (15-17).
\item \textsuperscript{1072} Gregory of Tours, \textit{M/A}, 17, p. 385 (20-22).
\item \textsuperscript{1073} ‘\textit{Venisti, ut nos a propriis sedibus exturbaris?}’ Gregory of Tours, \textit{M/A}, 17, p. 385 (17-18).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
(timent) the tortures (cruciato) that the apostle would inflict. Explicitly, the demon displays a fear of being punished by Andrew. Implicitly, it can also be interpreted to display a fear being punished by Christ; the One who had given Andrew and the other apostles the authority and power to spread His word and drive away His enemies.

In using the miracles narratives of The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew to talk about Gregory’s view on the fears experienced by demons, it should be noted that while the stories within this work are not original to Gregory, the Bishop of Tours did not cut out these particular aspects of the version that he synthesised. If Gregory bore any disagreement with the concept that demons would fear the infliction of God’s punishment through His servants, he could have cut this from the narrative. He chose not to, suggesting that he at least thought that such an eventuality was possible.

4.4.3. The Fear of God as the Foil of the Devil and his Demons

Having shown that both the Devil and his demons can be interpreted to experience a fear of God in Gregory’s writings, this section explores why Gregory portrays them to have this fear. In the tales of Landulf and the possessed boy in The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew, the demons’ indirect fear of God, as evoked by the sign of the cross or presence of an apostle, serves to liberate the ones they torment from the demons’ power. The demons’ fear of God exists as a foil to their tricks and it allows Gregory to highlight the difference that exist between those who can use the fear of God to regain their self-control and those who cannot.

In his article on ‘Reading James 2:18-20’, Kenneth Wilson argues that Augustine’s desire to interpret and use this biblical passage to ‘demonize’ Donatists resulted in him needing to address the issue of why demons could have faith and yet not be saved. If Gregory’s tales of Landulf and the possessed boy in The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew are analysed, then it becomes apparent that while Gregory also uses the demonic experience of the fear of God to comment on why the Devil and his demons could not be saved, he does
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1074 “Nunc autem timens cruciatos quos nobis inferis, veni, ut egrediatur ab eo coram te.” Gregory of Tours, M/A, p. 385 (22-23).
1075 Christ grants the power and authority over demons to the apostles in Vulgate, Luk., 9:1.
1076 Gregory of Tours, M/A, Pro., p. 377 (15-20).
1077 Wilson, ‘Reading James 2:18-20,’ 385.
so for different reasons. The tale of Landulf shows pertinently that demons and their deceptions are only able to be foiled because they have a form of the fear of God. The demons who attack Landulf with daggers, turn and flee when Landulf makes the sign of the cross before them.\textsuperscript{1078} The symbolism evoked by the sign of the cross, coupled with Landulf’s fear of God, faith, and physical presence in the Basilica of Saint Martin, combine to make the demons flee. Formed from pneuma, demons, as figures of chaos and embodiments of the complete loss of self-control, were logically incompatible with and unable to use the fear of God to master themselves as Landulf is shown to do.\textsuperscript{1079} In juxtaposing the reaction of the demons and Landulf to the fear of God, Gregory is able to highlight that demons, as figures with no self-control, are not able to use this fear to gain mastery over themselves. The demons, unlike Landulf, are driven to flee when they experience the fear of God because they can never gain mastery over themselves.

The same conclusion can be drawn from the narrative of the demon who flees from the possessed boy in \textit{The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew}. Upon hearing Andrew’s name being mentioned by the boy’s father, the demon realises that it needs to escape if it wishes to avoid being subjected to torment by someone with permission to wield God’s power. Its fear of Andrew’s power to punish it, a power bestowed by Christ,\textsuperscript{1080} actively makes it declare itself to the apostle in the hope that it can avoid such torment. The demon’s fear of God foils its original intent to keep the boy’s soul in the Devil’s servitude.

Curiously, the demons which feature in Gregory’s work on Andrew are significantly more powerful than most of those which appear in the bishop’s original works. This is evidenced by the difference in the scale of damage which the demons in Andrew’s time can inflict compared to those in Gregory’s other works. Most of the demons that Andrew encounters do not just deceive or seek to move a person to lose their self-control; they actively aim to kill or have already killed someone by the time Andrew arrives.\textsuperscript{1081} This difference in the exercise of power is potentially explained by the temporal and contextual differences which

\textsuperscript{1078} Gregory of Tours, \textit{VSM}, 2.18, p. 165 (15-17).


\textsuperscript{1080} \textit{Vulgate}, Luk., 9:1.

\textsuperscript{1081} See Gregory of Tours, \textit{MA}, 6, p. 380; 7, p. 381; 14, p. 384, and 18, p. 386.
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existed between the worlds inhabited by Andrew and Gregory. Andrew, who lived in the first century AD, moved in a world that was largely not Christian. Indeed, Gregory’s story of Andrew is one of an apostle who spent most of his time traversing the territories of the eastern parts of the Roman Empire, converting people to Christianity. In sixth-century Gaul, the scene was very different. Most of the Merovingian territories Gregory knew of were Catholic Christian. Although other regions like Visigothic Iberia were more invested in variant branches of Christianity such as Arianism, most of the places external to Gaul that Gregory would have known about had at least heard of Christ and God by this point.

That Christ was much more widely known in Gregory’s world than Andrew’s is significant because it explains why the demonic beings that Andrew encounters are much more powerful than those which appear in Gregory’s original stories. In the parts of the world traversed by Andrew, the Word and name of God had not yet taken hold. As discussed in chapter two, Gregory’s Histories show that he believed that Christ came down to a world that did not have any fear of God.1082 According to him, the world was so steeped in sin that only God could begin its redemption via the Crucifixion and by re-igniting people’s fear of God.1083 But in those parts of the world that remained without this fear and the Word, the parts Andrew travelled to after Christ’s Ascension, demons had the upper hand. The levels of sin in those regions, caused by the lack of the fear of God and thus the lack of self-control, would have made it possible for the more powerful demons to move unchecked. But in Gregory’s time, the human fear of God was much more widespread with more people using it as a technique to discipline themselves, combat demonic attacks, and pursue the Christian path of paideia. The scales of Godly and demonic power in the world had tipped back in favour of the former. Gregory’s world had more fear of God, meaning that the more powerful demons, like the ones Andrew encountered, would have found it harder to move freely and ensnare prey. Instead the lesser demons of Cassian’s hierarchy,1084 the ones who would use deception and fear to test sanctity and self-mastery, would have been much more prevalent. For Gregory, the only times in which the Devil or his more powerful demons appear are cases like that of Caluppa, in which a stronger test of faith is required.

1082 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.5, pp. 270-271 (17-18, 1-3). Discussed in Chapter 2, section 2.2.3: The Lack of the Fear of God.
1083 Gregory of Tours, DLH, 6.5, p. 271 (3-4).
Gregory’s demons thus experience the fear of God because it is only through having this fear that the chaos which they embody, represent, and seek to instil, can be defeated by humans. The fear of God that Gregory's Devil has is more unusual because it is not a fear of being punished or judged. Yet Gregory can still be seen to be using it as another way to comment on the idea of self-control and its role in the good Christian life. Gregory’s Devil fears that mankind will rise from the state of sin which he had instigated to God’s side through sanctity. He fears losing his control of the human race to God and becoming weaker in his eternal war against Him. There is something of paradox which exists between Gregory’s human fear of God, which enables people to acquire self-mastery and regain any control that they might have lost from being distracted by demonically-inspired fear, and the Devil’s fear of God, which is rooted in his fear of losing control of the human race to God. Gregory's Devil cannot respond to the fear of God in the same way that humans can or should. In showing that the Devil’s fear of God is linked to his fear of losing control, even if it is losing control of mankind and not of himself, Gregory demonstrates to his audience how they should not respond to this fear. Unlike the Devil, good Christians should use the fear of God to do what the Devil cannot: attain or regain their self-control.

**Conclusion**

Gregory’s understanding of demonically-inspired fear is inextricably tied to his understanding of the fear of God and the issues of self-control, sanctity, and the good Christian life. Gregory equated surrendering to demonically-inspired fear with the lack or losing of self-mastery. For him, the Devil and his demons used fear as weapon to try to make someone panic and remove their focus away from God.

In using demonically-inspired fear to talk about the loss or lack of self-control, Gregory continues the Classical and earlier Christian tradition of debating the notions of the self and paideia; what they were and how one achieved them. Previous Gregory-scholarship, especially that of Martin Heinzelmann and Walter Goffart, has already argued that Gregory created his works didactically, using them to define and show how a model Christian society could be achieved. Conrad Leyser has also argued that The Life of the Fathers were partly created by Gregory to be a means by which he could express his literary ambitions
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and ascetic knowledge.\textsuperscript{1086} The conclusions of this chapter, and its counterpart on Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God, support both conclusions to a certain extent. They demonstrate that the Bishop of Tours was at least using the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear to record his own personal views on the challenges that the Christian life entailed and how one could successfully overcome them. Gregory weaves the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear throughout his works, using them as vessels through which he can discuss his views about the roles that different fears had in the Christian life and how the Classical notions of \textit{paideia}, self-mastery, and the loss or lack of this, operated in Merovingian Gaul. His use of these fears to ensure that his writings continued and preserved the Classical tradition of debating the nature of the soul and self means that all of his works, not just \textit{The Life of the Fathers}, provide historians with the foundations to begin exploring newer aspects of Gregory’s world. While it would be inadvisable to take Gregory’s writings as fully representative of Merovingian society’s wider concept of the self, the good Christian, and how they transformed Roman notions of \textit{paideia} before a future comparative study of the views of other Merovingian authors not included in this thesis can be conducted, the keys to studying these issues are all present in Gregory’s writings.

\textsuperscript{1086} Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From this Book”, 281-294.
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In his introduction to *Humour, History and Politics*, Guy Halsall remarks that in finding the key to understanding late antique and early medieval attitudes to humour, the historian can discern more about the wider social and cultural attitudes of the time.\(^{1087}\) This thesis shows that the same is true for Gregory of Tours’ attitude to fear. By uncovering and analysing Gregory and his Gallic contemporaries’ attitudes to the fear of God and those connected with demonic figures, the historian can reveal more about the notion of the Christian self and handling of Classical topics like *paideia* in late antiquity. Gregory was part of a long line of late antique theologians who sought to preserve the Graeco-Roman tradition of debating about the formation of the good self,\(^{1088}\) re-appropriating it to suit the needs of the Gallic Christian Church of which he was a part. His use of, and attitudes towards, fear throughout his texts, especially the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear, show that he participated in theological discourse which contributed to the wider transformations that occurred in the contemporary attitude towards the self and the formation of the good Christian self in the late and post-Roman world.

Throughout this thesis, I have attempted to show that Gregory used the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear to consistently express his views on what made the good or bad Christian. Ron Newbold has already highlighted that the fear of God was ‘a highly desirable attitude’ for Gregory of Tours in his article ‘Secondary Responses to Fear and Grief’.\(^{1089}\) But chapter two has shown that Newbold’s statement needs to be expanded. The fear of God was not just ‘a highly desirable attitude’ to Gregory; it was the most important fear for the Christian formation of the virtuous self. Without this fear, a person could not acquire or maintain self-discipline over their minds or their bodily needs. In his stories about Helarius and his wife, Abbot Maxentius, and Salvius, Bishop of Albi, Gregory always depicts the fear of God as being a characteristic that enables these people to become the models of the type of Christian lifestyle they
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\(^{1087}\) Halsall, “Don’t Worry I’ve Got the Key,” 3-21.


\(^{1089}\) Newbold, ‘Secondary Responses,’ 2-3.
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represented. Helarius and his wife were the model married couple who were chaste, loyal, and always in the fear of God. Salvius was John Cassian and Julianus Pomerius’ model ascetic brought to life; a man who having been led by the fear of God to perfect the active monastic life then progressed to the contemplative, anchoritic lifestyle, before being rewarded with a glimpse of heaven and his appointment to the episcopal see of Albi. In each of these cases, Gregory portrays the fear of God as being the thing which guides these people to self-mastery and keeps them in that state.

In using the fear of God this way, Gregory shows that he adopted and engaged with the contemporary attitudes to the role that this fear played in forming the good Christian self that had been emerging in the discussions on the structure and purposes of early Christian theology and asceticism in Gaul for the previous two centuries. He also integrated the late Roman tradition that the key to power lay in the display of self-control into his writings1090 and, rather crucially, developed this by highlighting that the key to attaining self-mastery and thus social power, was the fear of God. In his tales of Salvius and Caluppa, Gregory shows that he approved of the views of Augustine of Hippo, Julianus Pomerius, Caesarius of Arles, and especially John Cassian. Past scholarship on Gregory, with the exception of Conrad Leyser’s work, has largely neglected to identify Cassian as one of Gregory's primary influencers.1091 Even though Leyser has noted that The Life of the Fathers shows that Gregory was very aware of Cassian’s ascetic model,1092 chapters two and four of this thesis show that this is the case for all Gregory’s works not just The Life of the Fathers. Gregory borrowed more extensively from Cassian’s ascetic model than scholars, including Leyser, have previously suspected. Both Gregory’s description of Salvius in Histories 7.1 and his Life of Caluppa collectively show that the bishop was intimately familiar with the ascetic model that Cassian put forward in The Institutes and The Conferences. Salvius, as just noted, was Cassian’s ideal ascetic embodied and Gregory’s tale of the tests of the serpents which Caluppa undergoes in his pursuit of Christian perfection indicates that he was intimately familiar with the workings of Cassian’s demonological hierarchy.

Gregory’s Life of Caluppa, along with his other tales of demonically-inspired fear, further reveal that he continued the wider ecclesiastical movement of the Gallic Church traced by Peter Brown, which tried
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1092 Leyser, “Divine Power Flowed From This Book”, 290-291.
to increase people’s fear of God and of encountering demonic beings. Gregory’s narratives show that he perceived that a person who submitted to demonically-inspired fear risked losing varying degrees of their physical and mental self-mastery. The degree of mastery lost was subject to the ascetic training which a person had and continued to follow. In the story of the two boys of Voultegon their youthful age limited the amount of ascetic training they had. This led them to submit to the terror inspired by a group of demons in the church forecourt and resulted in them being physically blinded, with one also being made lame. In the case of Aquilinus who was out hunting with his father, his complete lack of ascetic training, coupled with the fact that neither his heart nor his mind were focused on the fear of God, led him to become easy prey for the Devil who gave him a heart tremor and robbed him of his senses. Aquilinus lost both his mental and physical self-mastery because of his lack of ascetic training and fear of God. Caluppa on the other hand, only lost his ability to control his body when afflicted with a demonically-inspired fear of serpents. Because his heart and mind were in the fear of God, Caluppa was able to use the mental freedom, which this fear afforded him, to free himself from the Devil’s clutches. In each of these stories, Gregory reminds any potential readers that there are two key points. Firstly, that the Devil and his demons were creatures that people should fear to encounter because they threatened to disrupt a person’s self-mastery and their path to Christian perfection and secondly, that the fear of God was the key to their rescue against demonically-inspired fear.

Moreover, by showing that the Devil and his demons would flee before a person with the fear of God and self-control, and that they themselves could not use this fear to acquire any self-mastery, Gregory demonstrated that these demonic figures were creatures who had no self-control. He presented the Devil and his demons as beings that the good Christian should be wary of encountering and used them to comment on how the good Christian should and should not pursue the path of Christian paideia. The attitude to the fear of God and those connected with demonic figures which Gregory puts forward in his writings, would have educated anyone who did read these texts to remember the value of retaining a fear of God and a wariness of encountering demonic figures. By integrating these points into his texts, Gregory followed the footsteps of some of his predecessors including Augustine, Caesarius, Avitus of Vienne, and Paulinus of Périgueux.

1093 Brown, Ransom of the Soul, 115-147.
This brings us neatly to the broader implications that the analyses in chapters one and three reveal about how contemporaries assimilated and transformed Classical precepts of *paideia* and the formation of the self in the two centuries prior to Gregory of Tours. Current scholarship on late antique theology and education has recognised that the various social and cultural aspects which made up *enkyklios paideia* were slowly translated and turned into Christian *paideia* in different ways by different groups across the first four centuries of Christianity. A chronological approach, such as that used by Meghan Henning, allows the historian to pick up on the nuances of how each biblical author and early Church Father created their own ethical and educational curricula by incorporating certain elements of Classical *paideia* into their tracts while rejecting or transforming others. It also allows the historian to identify where broader shifts occur in early Christian attitudes towards theologically and philosophically important matters such as the notion of how a virtuous or unvirtuous person is formed and why this was such an important concern. An examination of how contemporary attitudes towards the fear of God and demonically-associated fear changes in the theological literature that shaped Christian Gaul in the fourth to sixth centuries, provides another key to unlocking how attitudes towards the formation of the good Christian matured in late antique Gaul.

In the case of the Gallic perception on the fear of God, I have attempted to show both that attitudes towards this fear transitioned in line with the wider priorities of the Church in Gaul and that there was no single, universal attitude on the nature and role of this fear in Christianity during this period. From the late fourth century to the middle of the fifth, the nature and purpose of the fear of God in Christian doctrine and life were widely discussed topics. Authors like Cassian, Prosper, and Augustine, expounded on their views of the fear of God in detail. They described it as a ‘duplex fear’ which had two parts - the fear of God's punishment and the fear of losing goodness and the love of God - that matched its two purposes: to bring a person onto the path towards spiritual purity and keep them there. Both fears of God were intricately bound up with Christian *paideia* and the path to perfection. Together they brought and kept a person in a state of self-control and discipline; qualities that had been essential for someone pursuing Classical *paideia* and had evidently continued to be so in Christian *paideia*.
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But while these men influenced each other and maintained similar perspectives on certain aspects of the fear of God, their views on this fear also differed subject to their stances on much larger theological matters including the role of prevenient grace and the attainability of perfection. An analysis of the contemporary attitude towards the fear of God which exists in the theological discourse that influenced the wider Gallic attitude from the fourth to middle of the fifth centuries is significant, because it highlights that historians can no longer regard the theological history of the late antique world as having either a predetermined course of development or a universally held philosophy. Signs of consensus did begin to emerge amongst the most influential thinkers of the period, but they continued and were free to disagree with one another. In ignoring these differences or disregarding them in favour of highlighting elements of consensus, historians miss the richness that the sources of this period depict Christianity, and the wider cultural and intellectual milieu of the late Roman world, to have had.

Whereas the pre fifth-century theological discourse that influenced contemporary attitudes towards the fear of God in Gaul seems to have been characterised by expansion and development, the theological literature from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the sixth centuries illustrates that some of the more complex notions about the fear of God, like the ‘duplex fear of God theory’, were preserved but synthesised by the authors in this period. This seems to have happened as part of the wider shift in the goal of the Gallic clergy towards creating a consolidated Christian doctrine that has been traced by Ian Wood and Danuta Shanzer. Avitus of Vienne, Caesarius of Arles, Julianus Pomerius, and Paulinus of Périgueux’s various writings all show an awareness of the complicated theological attitudes towards the fear of God that their predecessors had maintained. But they also show that none of these men sought to expand upon or continue debating these notions, preferring instead to synthesise the more complex aspects into theories that could be more easily preached or conveyed to their audience. Despite this, Paulinus, Avitus, Caesarius, and Julianus all continued to uphold the view that the fear of God was an essential part of Christian paideia because of its connection with self-mastery. The wider attitude on why the fear of God was important in Christian paideia did not change. The perception of how the fear of God made the good Christian, did.

The same cannot be said for demonically-inspired fear. Unlike the fear of God, contemporary attitudes towards fear connected with demonic beings continued to mature right up to the time of Gregory of Tours. Authors of the late fourth and fifth centuries began to perceive demonically-inspired fear as a sign which indicated the loss or lack of self-control. The works of Augustine, Cassian, and Sulpicius show that the Devil and his demons had many ways of inciting people to fear through their appearance and deeds. Submitting to this fear removed a person from their focus on God and thus the path of Christian paideia. This notion was subsequently emphasised and expanded upon by writers of the late fifth and early sixth centuries such as Avitus, Paulinus, and Caesarius. Their growing desire to encourage people to fear God and fear encountering demons seems to have had some influence on Gregory of Tours whose writings strongly indicate that he associated a person’s surrender to the fears inspired by demonic beings with the loss of self-control and bad Christian behaviour. An analysis of the wider Gallic attitudes towards the fear of God and those connected with demons is thus useful, partly because it enables historians to identify much larger shifts in the contemporary perception of paideia in late antique Gaul, and partly because it also reveals that Gregory was part of this trend of preserving the Roman cultural and philosophical tradition of writing discourse on the formation of the virtuous self.

In highlighting that an in depth study of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear in Gregory’s world is important because it reveals how the ancient philosophical and political discourse on self-control was transformed in the late and post-Roman Christian west, the significance of this thesis lies most immediately in its contribution to the theological and intellectual history of the late antique world, the studies of Gregory of Tours, and those on Merovingian Gaul. Astute readers might notice that there has been limited discussion of the wider social and cultural implications that these changes to the ancient theory of self-control would have wrought. This is partly because the spatial, temporal, and financial restraints placed upon this project have meant that these questions cannot be investigated here. But it is also a consequence of this thesis’ need to fulfil its aim of demonstrating why fear is an important historical topic and why it needs to be picked apart rather than glossed over by late antique scholars. This dissertation has had to perform a close analysis and systematic breakdown of Gregory and his contemporaries use of fear in their writings in order to show the value of studying fear to late antique studies. This has come at the expense of
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a detailed commentary of the broader social, political, and cultural ramifications that Gregory and his contemporaries’ use of fear points towards. Nevertheless, the prioritisation of the detail enhances rather than damages the contribution of this thesis to Gregory-scholarship. Only by doing this has this study been able to demonstrate that Gregory and his contemporaries’ use of fear is a valuable key to advancing our knowledge of how the Classical philosophical and political traditions of power and self-control were transformed with the growth of Christianity and gradual decline of the Roman Empire.

There is still much more to be studied on Gregory’s and his contemporaries use of fear the fear of God. Future studies might investigate how the agency of a saint wielding God’s power added another dimension to the fear of God. They might also ask whether the fear of death or of being killed - the second most prominent fear in Gregory’s writings – is also connected to the fear of being punished by God? How far did the fear that was used in Roman law and ancient political theory shape the early Christian concept of the fear of God and the late Roman attitude towards fear more generally? How do the writings of those authors who were not able to be included in this thesis (e.g. Sidonius Apollinaris and Gregory the Great) contribute to the development of the theological concept of the fear of God in Gaul and the wider late antique world? And what are the implications for our reading of Gregory’s writings in light of the knowledge that he was also fluent in late Roman philosophical tradition?

More than 1400 years stand between us and the person that was Gregory, Bishop of Tours. Yet the works of this man remain the most important textual sources for our understanding of the Merovingian world. The Ten Books of Histories, books of Miracles, and The Life of the Fathers continue to tantalize, educate, and provide food for thought for twenty-first century historians, just as they have done for our predecessors and are likely to do for our successors. In Gregory’s writings, historians have an excellent, if as of yet unrealised, medium through which to pursue new avenues of study such as the Merovingian attitude to the

1096 Death and the fear Gregory associated with it is highlighted by Jones in his study of death in Gregory’s writings. A future study specifically focusing on Gregory’s use of fear in relation to death in his writings is needed to build on this. See Jones, Death and Afterlife, 29-32 and 35.

1097 This is hinted at in Chapter 1, section 1.4: The Fear of God in Gaul from the Middle of the Fourth to the Middle of the Fifth Century and Chapter 2, section 2.3: Gregory, the Fear of God, and Self-Control in Merovingian Realpolitik. Measuring how far and where ancient political and legal uses of fear might have influenced the late antique concepts of fear of God and those associated with demons needs much deeper exploration in a future study.
formation of the self, the good Christian, and how they transformed Classical notions of paideia and its constituent elements. This thesis not only shows that Gregory’s works are invaluable sources for his attitudes to the formation of the good Christian self, it also gives scholars of the late Roman and early Merovingian world the key to unlocking the full potential that Gregory and his contemporaries’ texts have to show us how Merovingian and other late antique Christian authors transformed Classical attitudes about the self. The notion that transformations were taking place in the mental attitude of people in the post-Justinianic world has already been touched upon by Robert Markus in his *The End of Ancient Christianity*. Yet Markus never expounds on this in relation to Gregory of Tours. In revealing that Gregory’s understanding of the fear of God and demonically-inspired fear was inextricably bound up with his attitudes on how the good Christian self was formed or lost, this thesis highlights that the key to exploring the wider Merovingian and late antique views on the formation of the self, the good Christian, and the role that paideia played within these, lies in examining the contemporary attitude towards emotions like fear. The importance of fear to Merovingian history lies in what the study of contemporary attitudes towards it can reveal about how the Classical perspectives on the self and the formation of the virtuous and unvirtuous person were changed with the emergence of Christianity and the transformation of the Roman world.

---

Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s *Ten Books of Histories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of fear</th>
<th>Person(s) afflicted</th>
<th>Cause(s) of fear or lack of</th>
<th>Word(s) used in L. Thorpe’s translation</th>
<th>Word(s) used in B. Krusch’s MGH</th>
<th>Location in L. Thorpe’s translation</th>
<th>Location in B. Krusch’s MGH</th>
<th>Total no. of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ten Books of Histories</em></td>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>People of the world</td>
<td>God’s anger.</td>
<td>• awe</td>
<td>• terrae</td>
<td>1.4, p. 70</td>
<td>1.4, p. 6 (21)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of exile</td>
<td>Soul of a sinner (in Gregory’s opinion)</td>
<td>Biblical knowledge that the sinner is sent to Hell, exiled from God.</td>
<td>• fearful</td>
<td>• horribiliter</td>
<td>1.15, p. 79</td>
<td>1.15, p. 15 (6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (one fear)</td>
<td>Everyone (implied)</td>
<td>God’s power.</td>
<td>• feared</td>
<td>• timore metuendus</td>
<td>2.3, p. 112</td>
<td>2.3, p. 44 (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of the loss of power</td>
<td>Herod</td>
<td>Birth of Christ.</td>
<td>• feared</td>
<td>• zelo</td>
<td>1.19, p. 81</td>
<td>1.19, p. 17 (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of an angel</td>
<td>Guards</td>
<td>Vision of an angel.</td>
<td>• terrified</td>
<td>• territis</td>
<td>1.21, p. 82</td>
<td>1.21, p. 18 (3)</td>
<td>3 (4 incl., Thorpe’s translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of the Day of Judgement</td>
<td>People of Carthage (implied)</td>
<td>The events that will happen at the Day of Judgement.</td>
<td>• fearful</td>
<td>• tremendum • terribiliter</td>
<td>2.3, p. 109</td>
<td>2.3, p. 41 (10, 11)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of the death of the soul</td>
<td>People of Carthage (implied)</td>
<td>Scripture (Matt., 10:28).</td>
<td>• fear not • fear him</td>
<td>• nolite timere • timete</td>
<td>2.3, p. 110</td>
<td>2.3, pp. 41-42 (28, 1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>Everyone (implied)</td>
<td>Blindness of avaricious heretic.</td>
<td>• feared • fear</td>
<td>• timore metuendus (ref. l) temore</td>
<td>2.3, p. 112</td>
<td>2.3, p. 44 (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being caught in the Church after hours</td>
<td>A poor man</td>
<td>Shining lamps.</td>
<td>dazzled</td>
<td>favore territus</td>
<td>2.7, p. 117</td>
<td>2.7, p. 49 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearless</td>
<td>Aetius</td>
<td>Ability to stand up to danger.</td>
<td>scorned</td>
<td>inpavidus</td>
<td>2.8, p. 119</td>
<td>2.8, p. 52 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Emperor Valentinian</td>
<td>Aetius' quest for power.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>2.8, p. 119</td>
<td>2.8, p. 52 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Emperor Valentinian</td>
<td>Aetius' quest for power.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>metum</td>
<td>2.9, p. 120</td>
<td>2.9, p. 52 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Townsfolk of Cologne</td>
<td>The attacks and slaughters caused by the Franks.</td>
<td>panic</td>
<td>metu</td>
<td>2.9, p. 120</td>
<td>2.9, p. 53 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Romans (feigned)</td>
<td>Frankish troops under Quintinus</td>
<td>A lack of fearful news from Italy.</td>
<td>nothing to disturb</td>
<td>nullo...metu</td>
<td>2.9, p. 123</td>
<td>2.9, p. 56 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Emperor Constantine</td>
<td>News that Gerontius had proclaimed Maximus as Emperor.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>exterreti</td>
<td>2.9, p. 124</td>
<td>2.9, p. 56 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being deposed</td>
<td>Constans and Prefect Decimus Rusticus</td>
<td>The voice of God.</td>
<td>awe-inspiring</td>
<td>terribilis</td>
<td>2.10, p. 125</td>
<td>2.10, p. 59 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God (lack of)</td>
<td>The Franks</td>
<td>Declaration by God.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>adorabis</td>
<td>2.10, p. 126</td>
<td>2.10, p. 59 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Duke Victorius</td>
<td>The architecture/atmosphere of the church of Clermont.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>2.16, p. 131</td>
<td>2.16, p. 64 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Duke Victorius</td>
<td>His lifestyle.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>vereritur</td>
<td>2.20, p. 133</td>
<td>2.20, p. 66 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Duke Victorius</td>
<td>His lifestyle.</td>
<td>timorem</td>
<td>2.23, p. 136</td>
<td>2.23, p. 68 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Lord's name</td>
<td>People of Clermont</td>
<td>The lack of having someone to inspire the fear of God after Sidonius' death.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timorem</td>
<td>2.23, p. 136</td>
<td>2.23, p. 68 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Person/Event</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Line Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being sent to give counsel</td>
<td>Cup-bearer</td>
<td>Vision in which an evil priest was held to account.</td>
<td>2.23, p. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>2.23, p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ne</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the judge’s splendour and dignity</td>
<td>Cup-bearer</td>
<td>Vision of the judge.</td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• panic</td>
<td>2.23, p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• metu</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Cup-bearer</td>
<td>Vision in which the judge orders the cup-bearer not to be afraid.</td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• do not be afraid</td>
<td>2.23, p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ne timeas</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Cup-bearer</td>
<td>Vision in which the judge informs the cup-bearer that he will suffer a bad death if he says nothing.</td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• frightful</td>
<td>2.23, p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• pessima</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of cup-bearer’s statement</td>
<td>Evil priest</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Cup-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the approaching Franks</td>
<td>People of Clermont</td>
<td>Rumours of the Franks’ approach.</td>
<td>2.23, p. 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• great excitement</td>
<td>2.23, p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• terror</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of incurring the Franks’ wrath</td>
<td>Syagrius, King of the Romans</td>
<td>Clovis.</td>
<td>2.27, p. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• not afraid</td>
<td>2.27, p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• nec...metuit</td>
<td>(15-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Alaric II, King of Toulouse</td>
<td>Explicit threat of attack by Clovis.</td>
<td>2.27, p. 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>2.27, p. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• metuens</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of King’s wrath</td>
<td>Soldiers of Clovis</td>
<td>Clovis had killed a soldier who had destroyed a ewer of his earlier that year.</td>
<td>2.27, p. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• dread</td>
<td>2.27, p. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• timorem</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of refusing Clovis’ military might</td>
<td>Clovis’ reputation</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>Metuens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Clovis’ military might</td>
<td>King Gundobad</td>
<td>Besieged at Avignon by Clovis.</td>
<td>Panic-stricken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>King Gundobad</td>
<td>Besieged by his brother, Gundobad at Vienne that led to a food shortage.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>King Gundobad</td>
<td>Besieged by his brother, Gundobad at Vienne that led to a food shortage.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Godigesl</td>
<td>Besieged by his brother, Gundobad at Vienne that led to a food shortage.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Godigesl</td>
<td>Besieged by his brother, Gundobad at Vienne that led to a food shortage.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of famine</td>
<td>Godigesl</td>
<td>Besieged by his brother, Gundobad at Vienne that led to a food shortage.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Gundobad</td>
<td>He dallied in openly professing that he had converted to the Catholic faith.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the people</td>
<td>King Gundobad</td>
<td>He dallied in openly professing that he had converted to the Catholic faith.</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of portents</td>
<td>People of Vienne</td>
<td>Earthquakes as well as wolves and stags entering the city.</td>
<td>Terrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of fire</td>
<td>People of Vienne</td>
<td>The king’s palace was set ablaze by fire sent from God.</td>
<td>Panic-stricken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of terror</td>
<td>People of Vienne</td>
<td>Easter.</td>
<td>Terror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of fire</td>
<td>People of Vienne</td>
<td>The king’s palace was set ablaze by fire sent from God.</td>
<td>Panic-stricken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Abbot Maxentius</td>
<td>Holy man</td>
<td>God-fearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Abbot Maxentius</td>
<td>Holy man</td>
<td>God-fearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of soldiers</td>
<td>Monks at Maxentius’ monastery</td>
<td>Approaching soldiers of Clovis’ army.</td>
<td>Frightened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Scene Details</th>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fear of soldiers</td>
<td>Abbot Maxentius</td>
<td>Holy man.</td>
<td>no fear</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.37, p. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Holy man’s power, Clovis’ reputation.</td>
<td>great consternation</td>
<td>timore maximo</td>
<td>2.37, p. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Clovis’ reputation for killing disobedient soldiers who harm the Church or clergy.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timentus</td>
<td>2.37, p. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Clovis’ reputation for killing disobedient soldiers who harm the Church or clergy.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timentus</td>
<td>2.37, p. 87 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Clovis’ reputation for killing disobedient soldiers who harm the Church or clergy.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timentus</td>
<td>2.37, p. 87 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the blessing of the Holy Trinity</td>
<td>People of Israel</td>
<td>Scriptures, Exodus.</td>
<td>trembled</td>
<td>pavisct</td>
<td>3.14, pp. 174-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Munderic</td>
<td>He was reassured by Aregisel.</td>
<td>don’t be afraid</td>
<td>noli timere</td>
<td>3.14, p. 111 (18-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the reinstatement of Chlodomer’s sons to the royal succession</td>
<td>King Childebert I</td>
<td>Queen Clotild favoured the two sons and was highly affectionate to them.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>3.18, p. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of grandchildren’s death</td>
<td>Queen Clotild</td>
<td>An ultimatum in which she was forced to choose between watching the princes be tonsured or killed.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>exerrita</td>
<td>3.18, p. 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Younger son of Chlodomer</td>
<td>Watched his brother being murdered and was about to be killed himself.</td>
<td>lest</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>3.18, p. 119 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being supplanted by daughter</td>
<td>Deuteria</td>
<td>Her daughter reached maturity.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>3.26, p. 123 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Reference 1</th>
<th>Reference 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being hit by lightning</td>
<td>King Theudebert, King Childebert I, and their armies</td>
<td>Violent hailstorm.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>3.28, p. 186</td>
<td>3.28, p. 125 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of storm</td>
<td>Troops of Chlotar I and Childebert I</td>
<td>The ones they were besieging were marching behind a banner of St. Vincent and imploring God for help.</td>
<td>scared</td>
<td>3.29, p. 187</td>
<td>3.29, p. 126 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>King Theudat</td>
<td>Childebert I, Chlotar I and Theudebert threatened to kill him if he did not compensate Amalasuntha’s murder.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>3.31, p. 188</td>
<td>3.31, p. 127 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Secundius</td>
<td>Asteriols’ son reached maturity.</td>
<td>panic-stricken</td>
<td>3.33, p. 190</td>
<td>3.33, p. 129 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Saint Gallus</td>
<td>Warning from an angel of the Lord.</td>
<td>no need to be afraid</td>
<td>4.5, p. 200</td>
<td>4.5, p. 138 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Saint Gallus</td>
<td>Warning from an angel of the Lord.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>4.5, p. 200</td>
<td>4.5, p. 138 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of fable</td>
<td>A man/accused thief</td>
<td>Fable of gluttony-driven snake is told by Theudebal.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>4.9, p. 203</td>
<td>4.9, p. 140 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being suffocated</td>
<td>Freeman/priest Anastasius</td>
<td>Had to use his cloak to block his nostrils from the odours of the dead man with whom he had been entombed. This cut off his air supply.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>4.12, p. 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| Fear of being attacked | King Chramn threatened him and he knew the people disliked him. | Bishop Cautinus | 4.13, p. 208 | 4.13, p. 144 (16) |
| Fear of death | | | | |
| Fear of pain | • afraid | • metuens | |
| Fear of being attacked | • fear | • metuens | 4.13, p. 208 |
| Fear of death | • anxiety | • timentes | 4.16, p. 212 | 4.16, p. 149 (9) |
| Fear of being killed | • no compunction | • nec...timuit | 4.20, p. 216 | 4.20, p. 153 (7) |
| Fear of the death of their father | • terrified | • terruerunt | 4.31, p. 225 | 4.31, p. 164 (19) |
| Fear of prodigies | Three or four suns, a comet, and a crested lark which extinguished all the church lamps. | People of the Auvergne | 4.31, p. 226 | 4.31, p. 166 (5) |
| Fear of the plague | Plague. | Bishop Cautinus | 4.34, p. 229 | 4.34, p. 167 (21) |
| Fear of death | His praying resulted in the corn being protected by a miracle. | Monk in charge of corn | 4.36, p. 231 | 4.36, p. 169 (4) |
| Fear of God | • fear | • timore | 4.39, p. 234 | 4.39, p. 171 (4) |
| Fear of death | • tremble | • tremens | 4.39, p. 234 | 4.39, p. 171 (4) |
| Fear of being killed | Romanus’ rumour said that Sigibert wanted Palladius killed. | Palladius, Count of Javols | 4.39, p. 234 | 4.39, p. 171 (4) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of death</th>
<th>The Saxons</th>
<th>Mummolus threatened greater destruction unless the Saxons paid recompense for pillaging.</th>
<th>terrified</th>
<th>timetus valde</th>
<th>4.42, p. 238</th>
<th>4.42, p. 177 (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Amo (Longobard leader) and his troops</td>
<td>Mummolus' reputation in battle and his approach.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>exteriti</td>
<td>4.44, p. 241</td>
<td>4.44, p. 180 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Ursus</td>
<td>Ursus’ loyal servants had burnt Andarchius alive.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>4.46, p. 243</td>
<td>4.46, p. 183 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Some of the hostile troops</td>
<td>The monks barred them from the monastery.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timore</td>
<td>4.48, p. 245</td>
<td>4.48, p. 185 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of God</td>
<td>Twenty of the hostile troops</td>
<td>They are godless in Gregory’s narrative.</td>
<td>did not fear</td>
<td>non metuebant</td>
<td>4.48, p. 245</td>
<td>4.48, p. 185 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being attacked</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>Sigibert threatened to turn his troops on him.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>4.49, p. 246</td>
<td>4.49, p. 185 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being attacked</td>
<td>King Chilperic</td>
<td>Knew his own army was unable to defeat those of Guntram and Sigibert.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>4.49, p. 246</td>
<td>4.49, p. 186 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Book 5**

<p>| Fear of their kings' power (?) | The Franks | Gregory believes that this fear could happen if the Frankish kings stopped their civil wars. |  | conterritae | 5.Pro., p. 253 | 5.Pro., p. 193 (9) |
| Fear of St. Martin's power | Roccolet | Urged by Gregory of Tours to shake in fear of St. Martin and to not attack the Church. | fear | metueretque | 5.4, p. 258 | 5.4, p. 199 (7) |
| Fear of being thought of as arrogant as | Gregory of Tours | Gregory considered Felix to be arrogant and resented him for | fear | ne | 5.5, p. 259 | 5.5, p. 200 (15) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Event/Reason</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Note 1</th>
<th>Note 2</th>
<th>Note 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Felix of Nantes</td>
<td>Fear for reputation</td>
<td>Bringing up the murder of Gregory's own brother, Peter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of causing death</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours Merovech declared he would kill Gregory’s congregation if he was refused Communion.</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>• veritus</td>
<td>5.14, p. 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of appearing to be fearful</td>
<td>Guntram Boso and Prince Merovech Need to maintain their reputations (?), prowess (?)</td>
<td>• timid</td>
<td>• timidi (ref. d) timedi</td>
<td>5.14, p. 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No fear of God</td>
<td>King Chilperic Sacked Tours.</td>
<td>• no fear of God</td>
<td>• sine…timorem</td>
<td>5.14, p. 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Queen Fredegund/Chilperic</td>
<td>Bishop’s at Praetextatus’ trial</td>
<td>Fredegund’s ire would result in their own trials.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timebant</td>
<td>5.18, p. 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>King Chilperic</td>
<td>King Chilperic uses this as part of his ploy to get Praetextatus to fall into his trap.</td>
<td>god-fearing</td>
<td>pius</td>
<td>5.18, p. 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being maltreated</td>
<td>Prince Merovech</td>
<td>His father, Chilperic and his armies were mustering.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>5.18, p. 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>People in King Chilperic’s kingdom</td>
<td>They had burned the tax collector’s books to ashes.</td>
<td>terrible</td>
<td>conternit</td>
<td>5.29, p. 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Tiberius the Caesar</td>
<td>He had placed his trust in God.</td>
<td>no reason to fear</td>
<td>5.30, p. 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of unspecified remarks</td>
<td>Queen Fredegund</td>
<td>Prince Clovis, Chilperic’s son, made inconsolable remarks against her.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>pavore nimio terrebatur</td>
<td>5.39, p. 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of meeting a treacherous death</td>
<td>Queen Fredegund</td>
<td>She was threatened that she would meet her demise with her sons now dead.</td>
<td>greatly frightened</td>
<td>timore perterritus</td>
<td>5.39, p. 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Christ, God the Son</td>
<td>Biblical teachings, Mrk., 14:33.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timor</td>
<td>5.43, p. 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful oaths</td>
<td>King Chilperic (implied)</td>
<td>Terrible oaths were exacted from Chilperic</td>
<td>awful</td>
<td>terribilis</td>
<td>5.46, p. 313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear that King Sigibert would retake Tours as part of his kingdom</td>
<td>Leudast, Count of Tours</td>
<td>He suspected Sigibert would find a replacement for his position as Count of Tours if he ever wrested control of the land from his brother Chilperic.</td>
<td>• dreaded</td>
<td>5.48, p. 315</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of deposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.48, p. 258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of enemies</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours (implied)</td>
<td>Biblical teaching, Ps., 78 and 53.</td>
<td>• feared not</td>
<td>5.49, p. 317</td>
<td>(2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of something untoward</td>
<td>No-one specific</td>
<td>Duke Berulf and Count Eunomius had spread rumours that King Guntram was planning to capture Tours.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>5.49, p. 318</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of God</td>
<td>Humankind</td>
<td>Too steeped in sin.</td>
<td>• did not fear</td>
<td>6.5, p. 332</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Monks of Hospicius the recluse</td>
<td>The Longobards were approaching and Hospicius told his monks to flee and not fear for him.</td>
<td>• have no fear</td>
<td>6.6, p. 334</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of rebellion, Fear of being killed, Fear of death</td>
<td>Unnamed, Count of Angoulême</td>
<td>The people started a riot when a monk pleaded the Count to spare the life of a criminal.</td>
<td>• timens</td>
<td>6.8, p. 278</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of St. Martin’s power</td>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>6.10, p. 280</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightful justice</td>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>They would become an example of St. Martin’s justice.</td>
<td>• terrible</td>
<td>6.10, p. 340</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Book 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Line No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fear of God</td>
<td>Humankind</td>
<td>Too steeped in sin.</td>
<td>• did not fear</td>
<td>6.5, p. 332</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Monks of Hospicius the recluse</td>
<td>The Longobards were approaching and Hospicius told his monks to flee and not fear for him.</td>
<td>• have no fear</td>
<td>6.6, p. 334</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of rebellion, Fear of being killed, Fear of death</td>
<td>Unnamed, Count of Angoulême</td>
<td>The people started a riot when a monk pleaded the Count to spare the life of a criminal.</td>
<td>• timens</td>
<td>6.8, p. 278</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of St. Martin’s power</td>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>6.10, p. 280</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightful justice</td>
<td>Thieves</td>
<td>They would become an example of St. Martin’s justice.</td>
<td>• terrible</td>
<td>6.10, p. 340</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of thieves’ execution</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Worrying that King Chilperic would execute the thieves thus meaning that Gregory would not be following Martin’s example of intercession.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>6.10, p. 341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of not serving St. Martin properly</td>
<td>Duke Gundulf</td>
<td>Worried that King Guntram would block all his roads as he and Childebert II disputed over land.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>non audebat</td>
<td>6.11, p. 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being blocked in King Guntram’s kingdom</td>
<td>Dynamius</td>
<td>He was unprotected after being separated from his men.</td>
<td>fiercely assailed</td>
<td>terribiliter</td>
<td>6.11, p. 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear provoked by attack</td>
<td>Ambrosius, brother of Lupus, citizen of Tours</td>
<td>Lupus wanted to join the Church.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>6.13, p. 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the loss of goods</td>
<td>The household in which Lupus and Ambrosius stayed</td>
<td>Ambrosius had been murdered, Lupus was fatally wounded.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>stupebant</td>
<td>6.13, p. 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of murder</td>
<td>People of Paris</td>
<td>A cloud had rained real blood.</td>
<td>horror</td>
<td>borrenes, (ref. s) ortrenes, borrenis</td>
<td>6.14, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of blood falling from the sky</td>
<td>Unnamed man in Senlis</td>
<td>Awoke to find his house covered in blood.</td>
<td></td>
<td>terreturio, (ref. s) terreturio, territurio</td>
<td>6.14, p. 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Niece of Bishop Felix</td>
<td>The king's consent allowed her to marry Pappolen without fearing parental backlash.</td>
<td></td>
<td>timere...distulit</td>
<td>6.16, p. 286 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Wolves that had entered Bordeaux</td>
<td>Uncertain.</td>
<td>no fear</td>
<td>noquaquam...metuens, (ref. s) non metuens</td>
<td>6.21, p. 350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fear</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of brightness</td>
<td>Count guarding Bishop Theodore</td>
<td>A bright light appeared in the bishop’s cell late at night.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>6.24, p. 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Guntram Boso</td>
<td>Mummolus made false reassurances.</td>
<td>nothing to be afraid of</td>
<td>6.26, p. 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ne times</td>
<td>6.26, p. 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Egidius, Bishop of Rheims</td>
<td>King Childerbert II’s army mutinied against him.</td>
<td>panic</td>
<td>6.31, p. 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Gregory was uncertain as to whether Queen Fredegund would try to kill Leudast.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>6.32, p. 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Leudast’s murder</td>
<td>Unnamed cleric</td>
<td>Bishop Aetherius caught and asked the cleric why he was following the bishop with an axe.</td>
<td>lost his nerve</td>
<td>6.36, p. 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Bishop Aetherius</td>
<td>Conspirators against him, including his archdeacon, told King Childebert II that he had fled to King Guntram’s kingdom in fear for his life.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>6.36, p. 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of son being harmed and killed</td>
<td>King Chilperic</td>
<td>King Chilperic suspected his son might come to harm if presented before the public.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>6.41, p. 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Longobards</td>
<td>King Childerbert II’s armies had marched into Italy.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>6.42, p. 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Families of Paris</td>
<td>King Chilperic had ordered them to be rounded up and sent</td>
<td>dreading</td>
<td>6.44, p. 377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fearful Action</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being sent abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off to Spain with Rigunth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Saint Salvius</td>
<td>Holy lifestyle.</td>
<td>7.1, p. 323 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear that the story might sound incredu</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Rhetorical style, needed an excuse to include a quote from Sa</td>
<td>7.1, p. 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losus to implicitly demonstrate knowle</td>
<td></td>
<td>dge.</td>
<td>7.1, p. 326 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of King Chilperic</td>
<td>Ragoonvald’s wife</td>
<td>Duke Ragoonvald had been beaten by Duke Desiderius. His wife</td>
<td>7.10, p. 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fled to sanctuary back in 6.12.</td>
<td>7.10, p. 332 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should have fear of God)</td>
<td>Queen Redegund</td>
<td>She had punished and mutilated several men while residing in</td>
<td>7.15, p. 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the church of Paris.</td>
<td>7.15, p. 337 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>A poor man warned him that King Chilperic’s chamberlain Far</td>
<td>7.18, pp. 400-401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faraulf was seeking to kill him.</td>
<td>7.18, p. 338 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of King Guntram</td>
<td>Treasurer Eberulf</td>
<td>King Guntram sent men to kill him.</td>
<td>7.22, p. 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.22, p. 341 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear from a vision</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Vision in which Gregory tried 'manfully' to protect Eberulf</td>
<td>7.22, p. 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of King Guntram</td>
<td></td>
<td>from King Guntram’s clutches.</td>
<td>7.22, p. 342 (14-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should have the fear of God)</td>
<td>Treasurer Eberulf</td>
<td>Eberulf threatened to kill him if King</td>
<td>7.22, p. 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.22, pp. 342-343 (22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Afraid</th>
<th>Timore</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fear to move to Poitiers</td>
<td>Gundovald</td>
<td>Heard rumour that an army was being raised against him.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timorem</td>
<td>7.26, p. 407</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of being killed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of St. Martin’s power</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>He planned to kill Eberulf while in the vestibule of the church</td>
<td>feared</td>
<td>metuebat</td>
<td>7.29, p. 411</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of St. Martin’s power</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>He killed Eberulf within the church.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>timore perterritus</td>
<td>7.29, p. 411</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of St. Martin’s power</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>He killed Eberulf within the church.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ref. s) precerti tus, pererti tus</td>
<td>7.29, p. 411</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of heights (?)</td>
<td>Unnamed deacon</td>
<td>Was forced to ascend a ladder to retrieve a casket of holy relics</td>
<td>tremblish</td>
<td>tremor</td>
<td>7.31, p. 414</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of unspecified consequences</td>
<td>Bishop Bertram, Metropolitan</td>
<td>Gundovald ordered King Chilperic’s decree that Count Nicetius become bishop to be overruled in favour of his own candidate.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>cavenes</td>
<td>7.31, p. 414</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>Bishop Bertram, Metropolitan</td>
<td>Gundovald ordered King Chilperic’s decree that Count Nicetius become bishop to be overruled in favour of his own candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of specified consequences</td>
<td>Bishop Bertram, Metropolitan</td>
<td>Gundovald ordered King Chilperic’s decree that Count Nicetius become bishop to be overruled in favour of his own candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>Bishop Bertram, Metropolitan</td>
<td>Gundovald ordered King Chilperic’s decree that Count Nicetius become bishop to be overruled in favour of his own candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of being ousted as traitors</td>
<td>Some of King Childebert II’s principal men</td>
<td>King Guntram had summoned King Childebert II to discuss Gundovald.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timuerunt</td>
<td>7.33, p. 416</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of Guntram’s wrath</td>
<td>Some of King Childebert II’s principal men</td>
<td>King Guntram had summoned King Childebert II to discuss Gundovald.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>King Guntram’s troops</td>
<td>God exacted vengeance on them.</td>
<td>fright</td>
<td>conterruit</td>
<td>7.35, p. 418</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of death</td>
<td>King Guntram’s troops</td>
<td>God exacted vengeance on them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ref. g) conterruit</td>
<td>7.35, p. 418</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Fear to attack</th>
<th>King Guntram’s troops</th>
<th>Part of God’s vengeance.</th>
<th>• fear</th>
<th>• metu</th>
<th>7.35, p. 419</th>
<th>7.35, p. 356 (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No fear</td>
<td>Gundovald</td>
<td>King Guntram’s troops were trying to encourage Gundovald to reveal who had invited him to Gaul.</td>
<td>• don’t be afraid</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>7.35, p. 419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of being captured</td>
<td>Bladast</td>
<td>He thought that Leudegisel would capture the city.</td>
<td>• very frightened</td>
<td>• metuens</td>
<td>7.37, p. 421</td>
<td>7.37, p. 359 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of death</td>
<td>Bishop Sagittarius</td>
<td>He realised that all Gundovald’s supporters, who had received security, had been killed and knew he would be next.</td>
<td>• terrified</td>
<td>• timore consternatus pavoret</td>
<td>7.39, p. 424</td>
<td>7.39, p. 362 (17-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of losing more sons of the Church</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>The fight between Sichar and Austregesil had already resulted in the murder of the third party Auno and his family.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• metuemus</td>
<td>7.47, p. 429</td>
<td>7.47, p. 367 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Book 8**

| • Fear that enemy would receive honourable burial | Queen Fredegund | She had, had Prince Clovis murdered after he threatened her back in 5.39. | • afraid | • metuens | 8.10, p. 441 | 8.10, p. 377 (5) |
| • Frightful oaths | Saint Vulfoliac | Gregory adjured him with frightful or terrible oaths to tell him how he had entered the Church. | • terrible | • terribilibus | 8.15, p. 445 | 8.15, p. 380 (20) |
| • Fear of weather | Gregory of Tours | He saw blood-red clouds in the sky, | • foreboding | • metum | 8.17, p. 449 | 8.17, p. 384 (17) |
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### Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Character/Event</th>
<th>Description/Context</th>
<th>Fear Term(s)</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of heavenly plague</td>
<td>Flashing as if filled with lightning and rays of light shining from all corners of the earth.</td>
<td>• fearing • time Niger</td>
<td>8.21, p. 453</td>
<td>8.21, p. 388 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of being caught thieving</td>
<td>Guntram Boso’s pueri</td>
<td>They had despoiled and looted the body of one of Boso’s wife’s relatives.</td>
<td>non…ansi</td>
<td>8.21, p. 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of corporeal punishment</td>
<td>Guntram Boso’s pueri</td>
<td>After looting the body they had been unable to successfully flee.</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>8.29, p. 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of death (should have no fear of death)</td>
<td>Two clerics</td>
<td>Queen Fredegund told them to cast all fear of death aside, if they were killed pursuing their task their families would be richly rewarded.</td>
<td>• fear and dread • timore • (ref. q) timore, trepidation • (ref. s) trepitatio</td>
<td>8.30, p. 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Horror of another people</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>He was ashamed that the territory of the Goths extended into Gaul and viewed these people as horrible.</td>
<td>• horrible • horrendorum • (ref. k) orrend, horned</td>
<td>8.30, p. 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of death</td>
<td>King Guntram’s army</td>
<td>Terentilus, Count of Limoges was killed and had his head taken back into the town they were trying to attack.</td>
<td>• stricken with panic • timore perterritus • (ref. r) perteritus, p-territus</td>
<td>8.30, p. 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No fear of God (should fear of God)</td>
<td>King Guntram and his people</td>
<td>Loss of victory.</td>
<td>• not fear • non metuemus • (ref. b) metuimus</td>
<td>8.30, p. 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>The leaders of Guntram’s army wish to placate him.</td>
<td>• fear • timor</td>
<td>8.30, p. 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No fear of king (should fear the king)</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td>The leaders try to deflect their own failings onto the people.</td>
<td>• no man fears • nullus…metuit</td>
<td>8.30, p. 461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Latin Term</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horror at death</td>
<td>Those who challenged Queen Fredegund over Praetextatus’ death</td>
<td>Queen Fredegund had poisoned one of the men who warned the others to flee.</td>
<td>horror</td>
<td>malum</td>
<td>8.31, p. 461</td>
<td>8.31, p. 399 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror at a monarch’s actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonic fear</td>
<td>Anatolius of Bordeaux</td>
<td>Possession.</td>
<td>great panic</td>
<td>pavore validum</td>
<td>8.34, p. 468</td>
<td>8.34, p. 403 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of torment</td>
<td>Pelagius of Tours</td>
<td>Not a good man.</td>
<td>revered</td>
<td>nullum...metuens</td>
<td>8.40, p. 471</td>
<td>8.40, p. 406 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of judge (should fear judge)</td>
<td>Domigisel and everyone in Angers (implied)</td>
<td>Duke Beppolen had badly treated the people and property in Angers.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metum</td>
<td>8.42, p. 473</td>
<td>8.42, p. 408 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of superior</td>
<td>Son of Bishop Nonnichius</td>
<td>Antestius accused him of being involved in Domnola’s death.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>territus</td>
<td>8.43, p. 474</td>
<td>8.43, p. 409 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being hurt</td>
<td>Bishop Palladius</td>
<td>Antestius threatened him with exile unless he surrendered his house in Bourges.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metuit</td>
<td>8.43, p. 475</td>
<td>8.43, p. 410 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing property</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>A drunk man, who was asleep in the corner of an oratory, startled the king to declare that it was not right for a man to sleep like that in the horror of the night.</td>
<td>dread horror</td>
<td>horror</td>
<td>8.44, p. 475</td>
<td>8.44, p. 410 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death (?)</td>
<td>Duke Desiderius</td>
<td>King Guntram had restored Alli to King Childebert II whose father, King Sigibert,</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>8.45, p. 476</td>
<td>8.45, p. 411 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of accusations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death/exile (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of revenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being stripped of possessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of being killed (?)</th>
<th>was defeated by Desiderius.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 or 17</td>
<td>9.10, p. 492</td>
<td>9.10, p. 425 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Book 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of being killed</th>
<th>Bishop Magneric of Verdun</th>
<th>Guntram Boso had drawn his sword in a desperate act to get Bishop Magneric to save him from death.</th>
<th>terrified</th>
<th>turbatus</th>
<th>9.10, p. 492</th>
<th>9.10, p. 425 (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Bishop Magneric</td>
<td>King Childebert II threatened to kill him instead if Berthefried escaped.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>9.12, p. 495</td>
<td>9.12, p. 427 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Bishop Magneric</td>
<td>King Childebert II threatened to kill him instead if Berthefried escaped.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>9.12, p. 495</td>
<td>9.12, p. 427 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of King</td>
<td>Several people/magnates</td>
<td>Unspecified but the deaths of Guntram Boso, Ursio, Rauching and Berthefried at the king’s command are the likely cause.</td>
<td>greatly afraid</td>
<td>pertimisentes</td>
<td>(ref. c) pertimescentes</td>
<td>9.12, p. 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childebert II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Bretons in Nantes</td>
<td>King Guntram threatened to kill them all if they did not pay recompense for the damage they caused.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>timentes</td>
<td>9.18, p. 500</td>
<td>9.18, p. 431 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Day of</td>
<td>Everyone bound by the</td>
<td>Fear of the Day of Judgement used to ensure the terms of the treaty would be adhered too.</td>
<td>awful</td>
<td>tremendum</td>
<td>9.20, p. 507</td>
<td>9.20, p. 439 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>treaty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>widow of King Charibert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of St. Martin</td>
<td>King Chlotar I</td>
<td>St. Martin’s power made King Chlotar I burn the tax books.</td>
<td>overawed</td>
<td>timorem</td>
<td>9.30, p. 516</td>
<td>9.30, p. 448 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of St. Martin</td>
<td>King Charibert</td>
<td>King Charibert followed in his father, Chlotar’s footsteps in</td>
<td>feared</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>9.30, p. 516</td>
<td>9.30, p. 449 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Person/Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fearful Word(s)</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fearing Martin and not taxing Tours.</td>
<td>Berthegund</td>
<td>She abandoned her husband believing no married person could enter heaven. Gregory then spoke to her of the Nicene Creed which declared that a woman who abandoned her husband would never enter heaven.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>9.33, p. 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being excommunicated</td>
<td>Berthegund</td>
<td></td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>9.33, p. 452 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being sent to Hell</td>
<td>Berthegund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33, p. 452 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being excommunicated</td>
<td>Son of Waddo</td>
<td>His father was determined to do battle.</td>
<td>coward</td>
<td>9.35, p. 522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of fighting</td>
<td>Son of Waddo</td>
<td></td>
<td>timidum</td>
<td>9.35, p. 456 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing a parent</td>
<td>Son of Waddo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.35, p. 456 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Sunnegesil, Count of the Stables and Gallomagnus, Referendary</td>
<td>They were discovered embroiled in a plot to kill King Childebert II and depose his mother Queen Brunhild and wife Queen Faileuba.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38, p. 459 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened conscience</td>
<td>Sunnegesil, Count of the Stables and Gallomagnus, Referendary</td>
<td>Knowledge that the King would punish them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38, p. 459 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Sunnegesil, Count of the Stables and Gallomagnus, Referendary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38, p. 459 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Sunnegesil, Count of the Stables and Gallomagnus, Referendary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.38, p. 459 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear that Clotild will be excommunicated</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Clotild rejected his advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.39, p. 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frightened conscience</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.39, p. 460 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.39, p. 460 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being killed</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.39, p. 460 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of anathema</td>
<td>Any nun who tries to leave St. Radegund’s monastery</td>
<td>The precepts established by Bishops Eufronius, Praetextatus, Germanus, Felix, Domitians, Victorius and Domnolus.</td>
<td>awful</td>
<td>9.39, p. 529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of excommunication</td>
<td>Any nun who tries to leave St. Radegund’s monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td>diri</td>
<td>9.39, p. 463 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s Ten Books of Histories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of violence</strong></td>
<td>The clergy who had attended Saint Hilary's church to sort out the nun's revolt</td>
<td>The Devil’s interference had resulted in the clergy, who had been sent to investigate the actions of the nuns of Poitiers, being badly injured by the nuns.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>pavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of receiving the same punishment as Ananias and Sapphira</strong></td>
<td>Nuns under St. Radegund of Poitiers</td>
<td>Religious devotion.</td>
<td>awful</td>
<td>tremendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of death</strong></td>
<td>St. Radegund of Poitiers</td>
<td>Religious devotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of God</strong></td>
<td>The people of Rome</td>
<td>A plague struck the city of Rome and Pope Gregory exhorted the people on it.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>metuere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>terrify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of the Day of Judgement</strong></td>
<td>The people of Rome (implied)</td>
<td>The desire to be faithful to God.</td>
<td>anguish</td>
<td>tremore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ref. l) tremor, timori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of death</strong></td>
<td>Bodegisil, son of Mummolus, Evantius, son of Dynamius and Grippo a Frank</td>
<td>The Prefect of Carthage had assembled a group of men outside their home after one of the servants had murdered a merchant.</td>
<td>thunder-struck</td>
<td>timore perturriti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of being attacked</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ref. d) timorem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of being killed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of united strength</strong></td>
<td>The enemies of Burgundy and the Longobards</td>
<td>Aptachar, King of the Longobards, proposed an alliance to King Guntram so that their enemies would fear at seeing them united.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>terrantur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book 10

<p>| 17 or 16 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of being attacked</th>
<th>Virus, nephew of Eulalius</th>
<th>He had fallen in love with Eulalius’ neglected wife, Tetradia.</th>
<th>afraid</th>
<th>timens</th>
<th>10.8, p. 555</th>
<th>10.8, p. 490 (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being attacked</td>
<td>Ebrachar’s army</td>
<td>They realised they had to return via the same route which they had pillaged and looted.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>metuens</td>
<td>10.9, p. 558</td>
<td>10.9, p. 493 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Resurrection</td>
<td>Sinners</td>
<td>Their guilt and sins.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>metuntas</td>
<td>10.13, p. 565</td>
<td>10.13, p. 499 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should fear what God said to the Apostles)</td>
<td>One of Gregory’s priests</td>
<td>Sadducean belief.</td>
<td>not fear</td>
<td>non formidas</td>
<td>10.13, p. 565</td>
<td>10.13, p. 499 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being harmed by plaster</td>
<td>Abbess Radegund</td>
<td>The plaster in the new lavatory was still fresh. Radegund worried that the smell would damage the nuns’ health.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>10.16, p. 572</td>
<td>10.16, p. 506 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of more evil being done in the monastery</td>
<td>Abbess Leubovera of the monastery at Poitiers</td>
<td>The actions of Clotild, Basina and other nuns.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>10.16, p. 575</td>
<td>10.16, p. 506 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror/fear of punishment</td>
<td>Unnamed assassin</td>
<td>Unspecified, but possibly his conscience or knowledge that God would punish those who committed murder.</td>
<td>absolutely terrified</td>
<td>timore perterritus</td>
<td>10.18, p. 576</td>
<td>10.18, p. 509 (16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of corporeal torture</td>
<td>Those apprehended for trying to kill King Childebert II</td>
<td>Torture.</td>
<td>could not face</td>
<td>metuentes</td>
<td>10.18, p. 576</td>
<td>10.18, p. 509 (20-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of men in white robes</td>
<td>Unnamed man from Antioch</td>
<td>Outside the city gates he saw a man in white robe standing with two other men.</td>
<td>awe</td>
<td>terrae</td>
<td>10.24, p. 583</td>
<td>10.24, p. 516 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Frightening Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frightful oaths</td>
<td>Man in white robes</td>
<td>Was sworn by his two companions not to destroy the second half of Antioch.</td>
<td>terrible</td>
<td>terribilbus</td>
<td>10.24, p. 583 10.24, p. 517 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Unnamed man from Antioch</td>
<td>His wife, house and children had been saved by his charity and prayer.</td>
<td>no reason to fear</td>
<td>ne timeas</td>
<td>10.24, p. 584 10.24, p. 517 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of Christ (should fear Christ)</td>
<td>A man from Bourges</td>
<td>Believed himself to be religious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.25, p. 517 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of divine anger</td>
<td>King Guntram</td>
<td>Needed to placate King Childebert II in order to hold his other nephew, Clothar II over the baptismal font.</td>
<td>tremble</td>
<td>formido</td>
<td>10.28, p. 588 10.28, p. 521 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Bishop Gatianus, first bishop of Tours</td>
<td>Religious zeal and disposition.</td>
<td>god-fearing</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>10.31, p. 593 10.31, p. 526 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of enemies</td>
<td>Bishop Martin, third bishop of Tours</td>
<td>Religious zeal and disposition.</td>
<td>courage</td>
<td>intrepidus</td>
<td>10.31, p. 594 10.31, p. 527 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Bishop Eustochius, fifth bishop of Tours</td>
<td>Religious zeal and disposition.</td>
<td>god-fearing</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>10.31, p. 595 10.31, p. 529 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall total 180
### Appendix 2: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory’s hagiographical corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type of Fear</th>
<th>Person(s) afflicted</th>
<th>Cause(s) of fear or lack of</th>
<th>Words used in R. Van Dam trans.,</th>
<th>Words used in E. James trans.,</th>
<th>Words used in G. de Nie trans.,</th>
<th>Words used in my trans.,</th>
<th>Word(s) used in B. Krusch’s MGH</th>
<th>Locati on in R. Van Dam trans.,</th>
<th>Locati on in E. James trans.,</th>
<th>Locati on in G. de Nie trans.,</th>
<th>Locati on in B. Krusch’s MGH</th>
<th>Tot al no. of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GM</strong></td>
<td>• Fear of divine judgement</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Biblical knowledge.</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• metuens</td>
<td>Intro., p. 2</td>
<td>Intro., p. 2</td>
<td>Intro., p. 2</td>
<td>Intro., p. 2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of eternal death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td>Death of someone who had tampered with relics.</td>
<td>• great fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• timor magnus</td>
<td>13, pp. 15-16</td>
<td>13, pp. 15-16</td>
<td>13, p. 48 (6)</td>
<td>13, p. 48 (6)</td>
<td>13, p. 48 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td>Priest Basileus</td>
<td>Vision, Christ.</td>
<td>• terrifyin g person</td>
<td>• very afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• persona terribilis</td>
<td>22, pp. 20-21</td>
<td>22, pp. 20-21</td>
<td>22, p. 51 (23, 29)</td>
<td>22, p. 51 (23, 29)</td>
<td>22, p. 51 (23, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>A poor man</td>
<td>Presence of relics in his house and human intuition.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• timore</td>
<td>47, pp. 46-47</td>
<td>47, pp. 46-47</td>
<td>47, p. 70 (15)</td>
<td>47, p. 70 (15)</td>
<td>47, p. 70 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of huge serpent</td>
<td>Unnamed boy</td>
<td>A serpent wrapped around a candle.</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• timens</td>
<td>50, p. 49</td>
<td>50, p. 49</td>
<td>50, p. 72 (27)</td>
<td>50, p. 72 (27)</td>
<td>50, p. 72 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Type</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Event Details</td>
<td>Fear Words</td>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Britto (servant of Count Waroch)</td>
<td>Britto’s greed outweighed his fear, his death sparks fear in Waroch.</td>
<td>• Britto – had no fear • Waroch – shaken with fear</td>
<td>60, pp. 58-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent fear of the power of the martyrs</td>
<td>Count Waroch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60, pp. 79-80 (24, 25, 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should fear the power of the martyrs and divine punishment)</td>
<td>Unnamed man</td>
<td>Greed.</td>
<td>• unafraid</td>
<td>71, p. 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• non metuens</td>
<td>71, p. 86 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of causing death</td>
<td>Unnamed priest and unnamed judge</td>
<td>Priest’s accusations led a thief to be sentenced to the gallows, the judge was terrified when the accused man fell to the ground without being hung.</td>
<td>• feared • terrified</td>
<td>72, p. 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(thus incurring) fear of divine judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• metuens • (ref. m) intuens • timor perterritus</td>
<td>72, pp. 86-87 (20, 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a martyr’s power</td>
<td>Duke Ara</td>
<td>Threats in a vision, the truth of which were later confirmed.</td>
<td>• petrified with fear • terrified</td>
<td>77, pp. 72-73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consternatus que metu • timor perterritus</td>
<td>77, p. 90 (14, 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of divine judgement</td>
<td>Unnamed husband</td>
<td>Death of a heretical priest at a feast table after eating food.</td>
<td>• frighten ed</td>
<td>79, p. 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• perterritus</td>
<td>79, p. 92 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory's hagiographical corpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of consequences for being a heretic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest Epachius (Eparchius)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck down with illness after being drunk at Christmas Eve vigils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• feeling fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• frightened conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• non sine metu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• terrente conscientia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, p. 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, p. 96 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of personal embarrassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of damage to family reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caught napping three times during the Christmas Eve celebrations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• thoroughly frightened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pavore perterritus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, p. 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86, p. 96 (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of the consequences for acknowledging illegitimate children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of community punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed woman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water of the Jordan river receded away from her thus confirming her guilt of infanticide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• feared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• metu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87, p. 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87, p. 97 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of literary criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The aura of Christ, a lack of confidence in the reception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• timeo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• amor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• timorque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro., pp. 16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro., pp. 297-298 (24, 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Character/Event</td>
<td>Fear Description</td>
<td>Greek Word(s)</td>
<td>Page References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Confessor’s power</td>
<td>The Goths The death of the man who tried to kill Abbot Leovigild.</td>
<td>terrified with fear</td>
<td>timor perterrita</td>
<td>12, p. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td>A brave man Bishop Eufronius Trust in the heart outweighs the brave man’s fear. Visions cause fear for both men.</td>
<td>did not fear terrified afraid</td>
<td>non metuit territus vereor</td>
<td>18, pp. 32-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a flash of fire</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours, everyone incl., clerics, deacons, rich and poor Fearsome fireball or flash or bright light.</td>
<td>fearsome frightening fear afraid</td>
<td>terribilis terribilis timor metum pavore nolite timere timor</td>
<td>20, pp. 34-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the unknown</td>
<td>No-one specific Christian belief.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timentibus</td>
<td>30, p. 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Helarius (Hiliarius) and his wife Christian belief.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timor</td>
<td>41, p. 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Christ (?)</td>
<td>Wife of bishop (Victarius of Rennes?) Vision of a white lamb upon the bishop’s breast and his refusal to</td>
<td>terrified with fear</td>
<td>timor perterrita</td>
<td>77, p. 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Fear of being found in bed with her husband/bishop | share his bed with his wife. |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|  |  |  |
| Fear of the plague | People of Rheims Plague | Plague | terrified | terrerentur |
| Fear of divine power exuded by relics | | | did not dare | |
| People of Rheims Plague | | |  |  |
| Fear of the plague | Plague | |  |  |
| People of Rheims Plague | | |  |  |
| Fear of the plague | Unnamed man Caught stealing by Eusicius. | | terrified | perterritus |
| Fear of divine punishment (divine and corporeal) for stealing | | |  |  |
| unnamed | | |  |  |
| Fear of punishment | King Guntram Three of his prisoners were released by the power of St. Sequanus. | | terrified | exterritus |
| Fear of Confessor's power | | |  |  |
| King Guntram | | |  |  |
| Fear of Confessor's power | Bishop Germanus of Paris Vibrations at the holy tomb, or an earthquake. | | terrified with fear | pavore perterritus |
| Fear of divine punishment | | |  |  |
| Bishop Germanus of Paris | | |  |  |
| Fear of divine punishment | Archdeacon of Trier Struck with fever upon approaching the tomb of St. Maximus. | | dare not | non audens |
| Fear of being caught committing perjury | | |  |  |
| Archdeacon of Trier | | |  |  |
| Fear of divine punishment | | |  |  |
| Archdeacon of Trier | | |  |  |

| Appendix 2: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory's hagiographical corpus |  |  |  |  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fear Type</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Jews</td>
<td>Unnamed man</td>
<td>Unspecified.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>95, p. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of divine punishment</td>
<td>Unnamed hoeing man</td>
<td>Struck down with a twisted neck while hoeing when he should have been celebrating St. Avitus' ascension.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>97, p. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of community retribution (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97, p. 361 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of death</td>
<td>St. Julian</td>
<td>Religious devotion.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>1, p. 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being prevented from martyrdom by his parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feared</td>
<td>1, p. 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing the crown of glory if he did not fight for Christ properly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feared</td>
<td>1, p. 114 (5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should fear divine punishment)</td>
<td>People at the meal where Ingenuus died</td>
<td>Ingenuus was struck with a flaming spear and consumed by fire after</td>
<td>did not hesitate</td>
<td>15, pp. 173-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>did not hesitate</td>
<td>15, pp. 339-341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>did not hesitate</td>
<td>15, pp. 120-121 (29, 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VSJ: VSJ
| Fear of being burned alive and in death | Fear of death | Fear of divine punishment | stealing from Julian’s lands. | afraid | fearing | timensque | 18, p. 176 | 18, p. 349 | 18, p. 122 (26) |
| Fear of being discovered as a horse thief | Fear of corporeal punishment | Unnamed man | Found himself surrounded by villagers of Brioude with a stolen horse. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fear of storms (particularly thunder) | Fear of fire | Everyone in Brioude | Violent and destructive lightning storm. | terrifyin g | terrifying | terribiliter | 27, p. 181 | 27, p. 369 | 27, p. 125 (31-32) |
| Fear of disappointing the Abbot or St. Julian if he did not visit the tomb |  | A cleric of Abbot Aredius of Limoges | A vision. | terrified with fear | terrified | metu territus | 28, p. 182 | 28, pp. 371-373 | 28, p. 126 (12-13) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of God</th>
<th>Everyone (implied)</th>
<th>Illness and death of a servant who did not display an appropriate amount of the fear of God.</th>
<th>fears</th>
<th>fears</th>
<th>timentem</th>
<th>46a, p. 192</th>
<th>45, pp. 407-409</th>
<th>46a, p. 132 (19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of writing Martin’s miracles</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Lack of confidence in peers (not necessarily himself), belief in the importance of saintly intercession.</td>
<td>do not dare</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>non audeam</td>
<td>terroris</td>
<td>1.Pro., pp. 200-201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of earthly and divine receptions and criticism</td>
<td>Bishop Perpetuus, abbots, clerics and those who had gathered to move Martin’s casket</td>
<td>They were unable to move St. Martin’s casket even after three days of fasting and praying.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>severely frightened</td>
<td>exterriti</td>
<td>pavore omnes exterriti</td>
<td>1.6, p. 208</td>
<td>1.6, p. 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of humiliation</td>
<td>Everyone in the boat carrying Bishop Baudinus</td>
<td>Violent storm.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timore</td>
<td>1.9, p. 210</td>
<td>1.9, p. 457</td>
<td>1.9, p. 144 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Guards at Tours’ jail</td>
<td>Prison break. The transferral of St. Martin’s relics to Galicia. St. Martin’s power.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>exterritusque</td>
<td>1.11, p. 212</td>
<td>1.11, p. 465</td>
<td>1.11, p. 145 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpowering fear</td>
<td>Aquilinus</td>
<td>Heart tremor. Treacheries of the enemy.</td>
<td>trembling</td>
<td>overpowering fear</td>
<td>pavorem pessimum pavore</td>
<td>1.26, pp. 219-220</td>
<td>1.26, p. 497</td>
<td>1.26, p. 151 (14, 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of punishment for stealing and perjury</td>
<td>A custodian at St. Martin’s</td>
<td>Divine vengeance. Guilty conscience. Punishment given by his brothers.</td>
<td>did not fear</td>
<td>not afraid</td>
<td>non metuit</td>
<td>1.31, p. 222</td>
<td>1.31, p. 509</td>
<td>1.31, p. 153 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of accusations</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours and those friends travelling with him</td>
<td>Threat of being sent to Hell.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>metuendum</td>
<td>1.32, p. 224</td>
<td>1.32, p. 513</td>
<td>1.32, p. 154 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of saintly power</td>
<td>A hailstorm</td>
<td>A holy candle that Gregory of Tours placed in a vineyard tree on his estate.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>1.34, p. 225</td>
<td>1.34, p. 519</td>
<td>1.34, p. 155 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of a saint’s appearance</td>
<td>Bandits who attacked Gregory never the Bebre river</td>
<td>St. Martin.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>panic</td>
<td>conter(r)uit</td>
<td>1.36, p. 226</td>
<td>1.36, p. 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of episcopal power</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Lack of confidence in own abilities (?). Demonstratio n of rhetorical abilities.</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>vereor</td>
<td>2.3, p. 230</td>
<td>2.3, p. 539</td>
<td>2.3, p. 160 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being unable to move</td>
<td>Mummola</td>
<td>A malady resulted in the loss of ability to use one foot.</td>
<td>terrified with fear</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>conterrita a favore</td>
<td>2.11, p. 233</td>
<td>2.11, p. 553</td>
<td>2.11, p. 162 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Everyone except Guntram Boso</td>
<td>Storm which resulted in sinking boats.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>do not be afraid</td>
<td>exterritus</td>
<td>2.17, p. 236</td>
<td>2.17, pp. 565-567</td>
<td>2.17, p. 164 (28, 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of no fear</td>
<td>Demons</td>
<td>Sign of the cross.</td>
<td>fearfully</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>terribiliter</td>
<td>2.18, p. 237</td>
<td>2.18, p. 569</td>
<td>2.18, p. 165 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fear</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Equivalent Terms</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of literary reception</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Gregory had decided not to use fuller discourse to record the miracles which left him open to criticism.</td>
<td>trepidation, fear</td>
<td>2.19, p. 238, 2.19, p. 571, 2.19, p. 165 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being abandoned by patron saint</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours and everyone at the vigil</td>
<td>A demon possessing a man had declared that St. Martin had abandoned Tours in favour of Rome.</td>
<td>fear, fear, fear, fear</td>
<td>2.25, pp. 240-241, 2.25, pp. 583-587, 2.25, p. 168 (3, 18, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of having episcopal authority undermined</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours and everyone at the vigil</td>
<td>A demon possessing a man had declared that St. Martin had abandoned Tours in favour of Rome.</td>
<td>fear, fear, fear, fear</td>
<td>2.25, pp. 240-241, 2.25, pp. 583-587, 2.25, p. 168 (3, 18, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing control of himself and others</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours and everyone at the vigil</td>
<td>A demon possessing a man had declared that St. Martin had abandoned Tours in favour of Rome.</td>
<td>fear, fear, fear, fear</td>
<td>2.25, pp. 240-241, 2.25, pp. 583-587, 2.25, p. 168 (3, 18, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Devil</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours and everyone at the vigil</td>
<td>A demon possessing a man had declared that St. Martin had abandoned Tours in favour of Rome.</td>
<td>fear, fear, fear, fear</td>
<td>2.25, pp. 240-241, 2.25, pp. 583-587, 2.25, p. 168 (3, 18, 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>Debilitated woman</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>fear, terror</td>
<td>2.31, p. 244, 2.31, p. 599, 2.31, p. 170 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrible fear</td>
<td>Allomer</td>
<td>Divine grace (?)</td>
<td>terror, fearful, horrified, terrible fear</td>
<td>2.33, p. 246, 2.33, p. 605, 2.33, p. 171 (30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No fear</th>
<th>Mother of a mute girl</th>
<th>Religious faith</th>
<th>without fear</th>
<th>without fear</th>
<th>intrepidus</th>
<th>2.38, p. 247</th>
<th>2.38, p. 613</th>
<th>2.38, p. 172 (33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of demons</td>
<td>Two boys</td>
<td>They snuck out of bed and found a group of women/demons singing in the church courtyard.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>exterritique valde</td>
<td>2.45, p. 252</td>
<td>2.45, p. 629</td>
<td>2.45, p. 175 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Christians in general</td>
<td>Religious faith</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>timetis timor</td>
<td>2.46, p. 252</td>
<td>2.46, p. 631</td>
<td>2.46, p. 175 (32, 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being labelled a deceiver</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Worry that St. Martin would stop favouring him if he acted ‘injuriously’ towards the saint’s name and reputation.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>timeo</td>
<td>3.Pro., p. 260</td>
<td>3.Pro., p. 663</td>
<td>3.Pro., p. 182 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>A miller</td>
<td>Desire/need to work outweighs fear to uphold holy day.</td>
<td>neither feared</td>
<td></td>
<td>non metuens</td>
<td>3.3, p. 669</td>
<td>3.3, p. 183 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of pestilence</td>
<td>Unspecified People of Tours (?)</td>
<td>Cattle killing disease.</td>
<td>feared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.18, p. 695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Fear of starvation</th>
<th>• Fear of death</th>
<th>• overcame by terror</th>
<th>• pavore perterritus</th>
<th>3.23, p. 269</th>
<th>3.23, p. 703</th>
<th>3.23, p. 188 (27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of bright light</td>
<td>• Reverential fear</td>
<td>• terrified with fear</td>
<td>• terribiliter</td>
<td>3.42, p. 276</td>
<td>3.42, p. 733</td>
<td>3.42, p. 192 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of divine admonition</td>
<td>• Monk of Marmoutier</td>
<td>• upset him deeply</td>
<td>• shook him terribly</td>
<td>• pavor exterritusque trepidus</td>
<td>3.54, p. 280</td>
<td>3.54, p. 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear connected to illness</td>
<td>• Man from Montlouis</td>
<td>• frightened</td>
<td>• fright</td>
<td>• timentes</td>
<td>4.Pro., p. 284</td>
<td>4.Pro., p. 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of illness</td>
<td>• Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>• fearing</td>
<td>• metuens</td>
<td>3.60, p. 283</td>
<td>3.60, p. 765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bk 4</th>
<th>• Fear of God</th>
<th>• Biblical fear</th>
<th>• No-one specific</th>
<th>• Bible Ps., 15:4</th>
<th>• fear</th>
<th>• fear</th>
<th>• timentes</th>
<th>4.Pro., p. 284</th>
<th>4.Pro., p. 771</th>
<th>4.Pro., p. 199 (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illness fear</td>
<td>• Fear of illness</td>
<td>• Silluvius of Bayeux</td>
<td>• Unspecified illness or injury.</td>
<td>• struck with fear</td>
<td>• struck with terror</td>
<td>• pavore perculsus tremere</td>
<td>4.22, p. 294</td>
<td>4.22, p. 811</td>
<td>4.22, p. 205 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fear of loss of hay</td>
<td>• Fear of loss of</td>
<td>• Leodulf of Bourges</td>
<td>• Rain.</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>• afraid</td>
<td>• metuens</td>
<td>4.45, p. 302</td>
<td>4.45, p. 851</td>
<td>4.45, p. 210 (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 not incl. cattle case
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>income/support</th>
<th>• Fear of starvation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of being maimed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fear of being killed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fear of the Enemy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fear that man will rise to God's side through faith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupicinus and Romanus</td>
<td><strong>Fear of Romanus and Lupicinus fear being stoned when praying.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Devil</td>
<td><strong>The Devil fears losing to God.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of an earthquake</strong></td>
<td><strong>King Chilperic of Burgundy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of being attacked</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trembling chair.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessors of Christ</td>
<td><strong>Biblical teaching Ps., 119:120.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Christ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of divine judgement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of son's death</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mother of Illidius' great, great grandson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of son's death</strong></td>
<td><strong>Her son was afflicted with</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Christ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Confessors of Christ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of divine judgement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Biblical teaching Ps., 119:120.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of son's death</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mother of Illidius' great, great grandson</strong></td>
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<td><strong>Mother of Illidius' great, great grandson</strong></td>
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<tr>
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<td><strong>Her son was afflicted with</strong></td>
</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrible fright</strong></td>
<td>King Theodoric/Theuderic</td>
<td>Not specified, possibly a nightmare, illness or threat.</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>terrible fright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of punishment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of death</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of divine power</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of episcopal power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers Count Hortensius</td>
<td>The soldiers’ feared being punished by Hortensius if they freed their charge.</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>feared</td>
<td>fearing</td>
<td>timentes</td>
<td>timens</td>
<td>4.3, p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No fear of a powerful person</strong></td>
<td>Bishop Quintianus</td>
<td>Divine grace and security in his power.</td>
<td>never feared</td>
<td>nor did he fear</td>
<td>nec metuit</td>
<td>4.5, p. 27</td>
<td>4.5, p. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of serpents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of being caught as a poisoner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of God</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fear of a holy man’s power</strong></td>
<td>A serpent in a jug of wine.</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>metu exterriti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of fire</strong></td>
<td>Abbot Portianus</td>
<td>A fire in his cell.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>perterritus nihil...pavescere</td>
<td>5.3, pp. 30-31</td>
<td>5.3, pp. 65-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of plague</td>
<td>Bishop Gallus</td>
<td>Inguinal plague.</td>
<td>• trembled</td>
<td>• feared</td>
<td>• trepidus</td>
<td>6.6, p. 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the death of those entrusted to your responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• do not fear</td>
<td>• do not fear</td>
<td>• ne timeas</td>
<td>6.6, p. 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no fear (should have)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• don't be afraid</td>
<td>• don't be afraid</td>
<td>• noli metuere</td>
<td>6.6, p. 234 (17, 21, 23, 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of child’s death</td>
<td>Mother of Nicetius, Bishop of Lyon</td>
<td>Illness afflicted her son. St. Martin’s power healed him.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• metumque</td>
<td>8.1, pp. 50-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• do not fear</td>
<td>• don’t be afraid</td>
<td>• ne timeas</td>
<td>8.1, p. 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1, pp. 241-242 (3, 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of humiliation</td>
<td>Gregory of Tours</td>
<td>Bishop Nicetius ordered him to plead for a priest’s pardon when he publicly failed to persuade any of the other priests present to do it.</td>
<td>• trembling</td>
<td>• trembling</td>
<td>• trepidatione</td>
<td>8.3, p. 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3, p. 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3, p. 244 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear (should fear using false witnesses)</td>
<td>Those seeking to undermine the Church</td>
<td>Divine and episcopal punishment.</td>
<td>• do not even fear</td>
<td>• unafraid</td>
<td>• non metuunt</td>
<td>8.3, p. 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3, p. 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3, p. 244 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Type</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Fear Type 1</td>
<td>Fear Type 2</td>
<td>Reference 1</td>
<td>Reference 2</td>
<td>Reference 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear</td>
<td>Unnamed man</td>
<td>He was released by Bishop Nicetius’ power.</td>
<td>undaunted</td>
<td>fearlessly</td>
<td>8.7, p. 58</td>
<td>8.7, p. 127</td>
<td>8.7, p. 247 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>Dado a peasant</td>
<td>A vision and threats of death.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>8.11, p. 62</td>
<td>8.11, pp. 135-137</td>
<td>8.11, pp. 250-251 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of not being chosen by God</td>
<td>Friardus and Secundellus (Friardus’ companion)</td>
<td>Friardus fears Secundellus’ bragging about his healing powers, Secundellus fears that he has been tricked by the Devil.</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>10.2, p. 74</td>
<td>10.2, p. 161</td>
<td>10.2, p. 257 (19, 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of snakes</td>
<td>Caluppa</td>
<td>Snakes and two large dragons.</td>
<td>terror</td>
<td>great fear</td>
<td>11.1, pp. 77-78</td>
<td>11.1, pp. 169-170</td>
<td>11.1, pp. 259-260 (27, 5-6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory's hagiographical corpus
<p>| No fear of being punished by Sigivald | Boar Brachio, hunting master of Sigivald of Clermont | Confidence in the protection of the holy man displaces the boar’s fear. Brachio fears punishment by Sigivald if he publicly becomes a cleric. | fearless | fearless | nihil...formi dante (ref. n) intrepidus, non audiebat (ref. y) audiebat | 12.2, pp. 82-83 | 12.2, pp. 181-183 | 12.2, pp. 262-263 (24, 5, 5, 18) |
| No fear of terror or pain | Athletes of Christ | The desire to be with God overwhelms fear in Gregory’s interpretation. | not frightened by any fear | fears no terror | metu non territur | 13.Pro., p. 86 | 13.Pro., p. 189 | 13.Pro., p. 265 (15) |
| No fear (should fear God) Fear of punishment for thievery | An impudent man | The need for food outweighs his initial fear but he becomes afraid of being caught stealing when he cannot find his way out of the garden. | without fear double fear do not fear | without fear terrified don’t be afraid | sine timore Dei terretur ne timeas | 14.2, p. 92 | 14.2, pp. 203-205 | 14.2, p. 269 (9, 15, 28) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear of</th>
<th>Gregory of Tours</th>
<th>Lack of confidence in how people will receive his narrative of Bishop Nicetius of Trier.</th>
<th>• fear</th>
<th>• fear</th>
<th>• vereor</th>
<th>17.Pro., p. 104</th>
<th>17.Pro., p. 235</th>
<th>17.Pro., p. 277 (21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God</td>
<td>Nicetius, Bishop of Trier</td>
<td>Religious devotion.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• feared</td>
<td>• metuebat</td>
<td>17.1, p. 107</td>
<td>17.1, p. 241</td>
<td>17.1, p. 279 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of publicly ruined reputation</td>
<td>King Theodebert/Theudebert</td>
<td>A possessed boy shouted that the king was proud, an adulterer and that he would be destroyed.</td>
<td>• frightened</td>
<td>• terrified</td>
<td>• timore</td>
<td>17.2, p. 108</td>
<td>17.2, p. 243</td>
<td>17.2, p. 279 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fear of threats</td>
<td>Nicetius, Bishop of Trier</td>
<td>Confident in his own power and God's security.</td>
<td>• without fearing</td>
<td>• did not fear</td>
<td>• nec... timuit</td>
<td>17.3, p. 109</td>
<td>17.3, p. 247</td>
<td>17.3, p. 280 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of death</td>
<td>People of Trier</td>
<td>Thunderclap and a plague of the groin.</td>
<td>• terror</td>
<td>• terrified</td>
<td>• exterritus</td>
<td>17.4, p. 110</td>
<td>17.4, pp. 250-251</td>
<td>17.4, p. 281 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2: A Catalogue of Fear in Gregory's hagiographical corpus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear of Christ’s name</strong></td>
<td>Monegundis Everyone holy (implied)</td>
<td>Religious teaching.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• timentes</td>
<td>19.3, p. 123</td>
<td>19.3, p. 279</td>
<td>19.3, p. 289 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of Christ’s name</td>
<td>No-one specific</td>
<td>Biblical teaching.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• timentibus</td>
<td>19.4, p. 125</td>
<td>19.4, p. 285</td>
<td>19.4, p. 291 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>Clerics</td>
<td>Religious devotion.</td>
<td>• god-fearing</td>
<td>• feared</td>
<td>• timentibus</td>
<td>20.3, p. 128</td>
<td>20.3, pp. 293-294</td>
<td>20.3, p. 293 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA</strong></td>
<td>• Fear of God</td>
<td>Inhabitants of Mermidona (Achaea Pththiosis)</td>
<td>God, at Andrew’s bequest and prayer.</td>
<td>• great fear</td>
<td>• timor magus</td>
<td>1, p. 378 (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No fear (should fear losing her son and soul)</td>
<td>Mother of Sostratus</td>
<td>Inflamed lust.</td>
<td>• do not fear</td>
<td>• non metuas</td>
<td>4, p. 379 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear</td>
<td>Parents of a dead male</td>
<td>Uncertain, possibly they feared gossip or being attacked themselves as their son had been.</td>
<td>• fear</td>
<td>• timore</td>
<td>7, p. 381 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of demons (?)</td>
<td>• Fear of being attacked (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of Apostolic power</td>
<td>Demon</td>
<td>The demon heard that he was to be brought before the Apostle.</td>
<td>• fearing</td>
<td>• timens</td>
<td>17, p. 385 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Andrew’s shining countenance</td>
<td>Guards sent by Proconsul Virinus</td>
<td>The excessive brightness of Andrew’s countenance.</td>
<td>thoroug hly terrified by fear</td>
<td>timor perterriti</td>
<td>18, p. 385 (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of serpent</td>
<td>Everyone (implied)</td>
<td>A giant serpent, fifty cubits in length.</td>
<td>terrified with fear</td>
<td>metu terrentur</td>
<td>19, p. 387 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the Devil</td>
<td>Calista, wide of the Proconsul Lisbius</td>
<td>Andrew reassured her that Trofima would not take revenge for what had been done to her.</td>
<td>do not be afraid</td>
<td>nolite timere</td>
<td>23, p. 390 (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the future Judgement</td>
<td>Calista, wife of the Proconsul Lisbius</td>
<td>She converted to Christianity after Andrew revived her.</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>times</td>
<td>23, p. 390 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of God’s power (?)</td>
<td>Demon</td>
<td>Andrew had approached a pool where an old demon and a young demon had been bathing.</td>
<td>trembling</td>
<td>trementes</td>
<td>27, p. 392 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of demons (implied)</td>
<td>People accompanying Andrew to the baths</td>
<td>Andrew said that the people should not fear demons but believe in Christ.</td>
<td>do not be afraid</td>
<td>nolite timere</td>
<td>27, p. 392 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of an attack by a vigorous enemy</td>
<td>Maximilla, wife of the Proconsul Egeas and his household</td>
<td>Andrew's Christian teachings; Egeas was persecuting Andrew because his wife spent all her time with Andrew and not with him.</td>
<td>fearing</td>
<td>timentes</td>
<td>35, p. 395 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: A table illustrating the range of fear vocabulary used by each of the authors cited in this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulgate</th>
<th>Hilary of Poitiers</th>
<th>Augustine of Hippo</th>
<th>John Cassian</th>
<th>Prosper of Aquitaine</th>
<th>Sulpicius Severus</th>
<th>Paulinus of Périgueux</th>
<th>Julianus Pomerius</th>
<th>Avitus of Vienne</th>
<th>Caesarius of Arles</th>
<th>Venantius Fortunatus</th>
<th>Gregory of Tours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornido</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terror</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepidus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereor</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: A table illustrating the range of fear vocabulary used by each of the authors cited in this thesis.
Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Fearing constructions</th>
<th>Number of times used</th>
<th>Construction used</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>terrore perterriti</td>
<td>Gen., 45:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pavore perterritus</td>
<td>Gen., 41:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timore perterritus</td>
<td>Deu., 20:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Par., 10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Par., 21:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Par., 20:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers</td>
<td>Collectanea Antiariana Parisina</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>terrore perterritus</td>
<td>1 Kings., 13:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oratio Synodi Sardicensis ad Constantium Imperatorem</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>timore exterriti</td>
<td>Mrk., 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libri tres adversum Valentem et Ursacium</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>timore perterranta</td>
<td>Gen., 18:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine of Hippo</td>
<td>De Agone Christiano</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>timor exterrens</td>
<td>(CPL 0313), LLTA, SL 48, lib. 14, cap. 9, lin. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Civitate Dei</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>timore timeret</td>
<td>(CPL 0313), LLTA, SL 48, lib. 18, cap. 35, lin. 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Timeus</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Divinatione Daemonum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Doctrina Christiana</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Fide et Operibus</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Ordine</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cassian</td>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CPL 0313), LLTA, SL 48, lib. 18, cap. 35, lin. 46

(CPL 0313), LLTA, SL 47, lib. 9, cap. 4, lin. 54

De Ordine, trans. Silvano Borruso (Indiana: St. Augustine's Press, 2007), 1.11.32.


Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Sources</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Use of Fear Construction</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Incartione Domini Contra Nestorum</td>
<td>Collationes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulpicius Severus</td>
<td>Dialogorum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vita Sancti Martini</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistolorum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liber Contra Collaratorem</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulinus of Périgueux</td>
<td>De Vita Sancti Martini</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homiliae</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarius of Arles</td>
<td>Sermones</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>perterriti metu, (CPL 1008), LLTA, SL 103, serm., 116, cap. 1, lin. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tremore timentur, (CPL 1008), LLTA, SL 103, serm., 79, cap. 1, lin. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timebis terorem, (CPL 1008), LLTA, SL 103, serm., 105, cap. 6, lin. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tremore metuerent, (CPL 1008), LLTA, SL 103, serm., 43, cap. 6, lin. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tremorem escavescant, (CPL 1008), LLTA, SL 103, serm., 47, cap. 4, lin. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expositio in Apocalypsim</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tremore timeamus, (CPL 1016), LLTA, par. 3, pag. 218, lin. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Sources</th>
<th>Fear Construction</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venantius Fortunatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carmina</em></td>
<td>N</td>
<td><strong>terribiliter formidanda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vita Sancti Hilarii</em></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MGH, AA, Vol. 4.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 7, p. 9 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liber de Virtutibus Sancti Hilarii</em></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vita Sanctae Radegundis</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><strong>timebatur extimuit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vita Sancti Marcelli</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MGH, AA Vol. 4.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 30, p. 46 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gregory of Tours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Deem Libri Historiarum</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td><strong>timore metuendus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pavore territus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>pavore perterritus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.1, ed. Bruno Krusch (1951), 2.32, p. 79 (6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>timore perterritus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Fear Construction</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liber in Gloria Confessorum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>timore perterriti</td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 12, p. 305 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timore perterrita</td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 77, p. 344 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pavore conterritus</td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 60, p. 80 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timore perterritus</td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 72, p. 87 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber in Gloria Martyrum</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>pavore perterritus</td>
<td>MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 72, p. 87 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>metu territus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liber de Passione et Virtutibus Sancti Juliani Martyris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber Vitae Patrum</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>pavore perterritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metu ex territi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metu per territus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timore per territus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber de Miraculis Beati Andreae Apostoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>timore per territus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>metu terrentur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (1885), 3.23, p. 188 (27)
MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Max Bonnet (1885), 18, p. 385 (35)
MGH, SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. Max Bonnet (1885), 19, p. 387 (10)

Table 5: A table showing how each of the authors and sources used in this thesis employ fear constructions
## Appendix 5: A list of biblical texts that are cited in Gregory of Tours’ Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book 1</th>
<th>Book 2</th>
<th>Book 3</th>
<th>Book 4</th>
<th>Book 5</th>
<th>Book 6</th>
<th>Book 7</th>
<th>Book 8</th>
<th>Book 9</th>
<th>Book 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>2 Esdras</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Jeremias</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>2 Peter</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>2 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Judges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5: Biblical texts in Gregory of Tours' Ten Books of Histories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proverbs</th>
<th>Wisdom</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colossians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: A list of biblical texts that are cited in Gregory of Tours' Ten Books of Histories.\[1099\]
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Appendix 5: A table showing the Frequency with which Gregory uses Biblical texts in his *Ten Books of Histories*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book 1</th>
<th>Book 2</th>
<th>Book 3</th>
<th>Book 4</th>
<th>Book 5</th>
<th>Book 6</th>
<th>Book 7</th>
<th>Book 8</th>
<th>Book 9</th>
<th>Book 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>10 Psalms</td>
<td>12 Exodus</td>
<td>5 Judith</td>
<td>2 John</td>
<td>14 Matthew</td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>5 Psalms</td>
<td>1 Matthew</td>
<td>3 Psalms 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>7 Isaiah</td>
<td>10 Genesis</td>
<td>3 1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>2 Matthew</td>
<td>9 John</td>
<td>7 2 Kings</td>
<td>4 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>3 Acts</td>
<td>1 Matthew 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>5 John</td>
<td>7 Numbers</td>
<td>2 Acts</td>
<td>2 Psalms</td>
<td>6 Psalms</td>
<td>6 Apocalypse</td>
<td>4 2 Kings</td>
<td>2 2 Kings</td>
<td>2 2 Kings 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>3 Genesis</td>
<td>5 Josue</td>
<td>2 Matthew</td>
<td>2 2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3 1 Corinthians</td>
<td>4 Psalms</td>
<td>3 4 Kings</td>
<td>1 4 Kings</td>
<td>1 John 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>3 Jeremiah</td>
<td>3 Daniel</td>
<td>2 Isaiah</td>
<td>2 Proverbs</td>
<td>3 Romans</td>
<td>3 John</td>
<td>2 1 Kings</td>
<td>1 2 Esdras</td>
<td>1 Luke 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>2 4 Kings</td>
<td>3 2 Maccabees</td>
<td>2 Exodus 1</td>
<td>1 Isaiah</td>
<td>2 Acts</td>
<td>3 1 Timothy</td>
<td>2 Matthew</td>
<td>1 Proverbs</td>
<td>1 Ezekiel 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>2 1 Kings</td>
<td>2 Judges</td>
<td>2 Josue</td>
<td>1 1 Corinthians</td>
<td>2 1 Kings</td>
<td>2 Josue</td>
<td>2 James</td>
<td>1 1 Kings</td>
<td>1 Genesis 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>2 3 Kings</td>
<td>2 1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1 Ephesians</td>
<td>1 Luke</td>
<td>2 Joel</td>
<td>2 Acts</td>
<td>2 Daniel</td>
<td>1 Genesis</td>
<td>1 Jeremiah 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>2 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>2 Leviticus</td>
<td>1 1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1 Job</td>
<td>2 Philippians</td>
<td>2 Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1 Mark</td>
<td>1 Exodus</td>
<td>1 Luke 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>1 Exodus</td>
<td>2 Mark</td>
<td>1 2 Timothy</td>
<td>1 Galatians</td>
<td>1 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1 Tobit</td>
<td>1 Ezekiel</td>
<td>1 Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1 2 Corinthians 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>1 Galatians</td>
<td>2 4 Kings</td>
<td>1 Genesis</td>
<td>1 Genesis</td>
<td>1 Jeremiah</td>
<td>1 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1 Luke</td>
<td>1 2 Timothy</td>
<td>1 Isaiah 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1 Romans</td>
<td>2 2 Kings</td>
<td>1 Leviticus</td>
<td>1 Leviticus</td>
<td>1 Baruch</td>
<td>1 Daniel</td>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>1 1 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 1 Thessalonians 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>1 1 Peter</td>
<td>1 Acts</td>
<td>1 2 Kings</td>
<td>1 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1 Luke</td>
<td>1 Exodus</td>
<td>1 Numbers</td>
<td>1 1 Timothy</td>
<td>1 4 Kings 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>1 Philippians</td>
<td>1 Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1 Jonas</td>
<td>1 Exodus</td>
<td>1 James</td>
<td>1 Matthew</td>
<td>1 Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1 James</td>
<td>1 Apocalypse 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>1 2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1 Ephesians</td>
<td>1 Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1 Mark</td>
<td>1 2 Peter</td>
<td>1 Exodus</td>
<td>1 Romans</td>
<td>1 1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>2 318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5: Biblical texts in Gregory of Tours’ Ten Books of Histories

### Table 7: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses biblical texts in his Ten Books of Histories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Kings</th>
<th>1 James</th>
<th>1 Romans</th>
<th>1 Proverbs</th>
<th>1 Paralipomenon</th>
<th>1 2 Kings</th>
<th>1 Proverbs</th>
<th>1 2 Peter</th>
<th>1 Job</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Paralipomenon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maccabees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses biblical texts in his *Ten Books of Histories*.100

100 Columns list biblical text in order of frequency, the highest first. Quantitative figures are at the end of each cell. They are based solely on the references identified by Krusch and collected from: *MGH: SRM*, Vol. 1.1, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hannover: Impensis Bibliopoli Hahniani, 1951).
Appendix 6: A list of the biblical texts Gregory uses in his books of *Miracles* and *The Life of the Fathers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Glory of the Martyrs</th>
<th>The Glory of the Confessors</th>
<th>Miracles of the Blessed Martyr Julian</th>
<th>The Miracles of the Holy Bishop Martin</th>
<th>The Life of the Fathers</th>
<th>The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>4 Kings</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micheas</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>1 John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremias</td>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>Josue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Kings</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Paralipomenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses various biblical texts in his books of *Miracles* and *The Life of the Fathers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ezekiel</th>
<th>Tobit</th>
<th>Isaiah</th>
<th>Wisdom</th>
<th>2 Thessalonians</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Proverbs</th>
<th>Exodus</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 8: A list of the biblical texts Gregory uses in his books of *Miracles* and *The Life of the Fathers*.\(^{100}\)

---

\(^{100}\) This data is collected from: *MGH: SRM*, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusche (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885).
## Appendix 6: Biblical texts in Gregory of Tours' books of Miracles and The Life of the Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Glory of the Martyrs</th>
<th>The Glory of the Confessors</th>
<th>Miracles of the Blessed Martyr Julian</th>
<th>Miracles of the Holy Bishop Martin</th>
<th>The Life of the Fathers</th>
<th>The Miracles of the Blessed Apostle Andrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Matthew 8</td>
<td>Psalms 2</td>
<td>Matthew 4</td>
<td>Matthew 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>John 3</td>
<td>Matthew 2</td>
<td>John 2</td>
<td>Acts 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mark 2</td>
<td>Luke 2</td>
<td>Genesis 1</td>
<td>John 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Numbers 1</td>
<td>Exodus 1</td>
<td>Mark 1</td>
<td>Mark 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proverbs 1</td>
<td>Wisdom 1</td>
<td>4 Kings 1</td>
<td>1 Corinthians 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Galatians 1</td>
<td>4 Kings 1</td>
<td>Acts 1</td>
<td>Romans 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micheas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hebrews 1</td>
<td>Genesis 1</td>
<td>Ephesians 1</td>
<td>1 John 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus 1</td>
<td>Genesis 1</td>
<td>Galatians 1</td>
<td>Exodus 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apocalypse 1</td>
<td>Luke 2</td>
<td>Jeremias 2</td>
<td>1 Timothy 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecclesiastes 2</td>
<td>1 Peter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Corinthians 1</td>
<td>Josue 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Kings 1</td>
<td>Psalms 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Timothy 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Paralipomenon 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuteronomy 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kings 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebrews 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses various biblical texts in his books of *Miracles* and *The Life of the Fathers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Text</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaias</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: A table showing the frequency with which Gregory uses various biblical texts in his books of *Miracles* and *The Life of the Fathers*.\(^{1002}\)

---

\(^{1002}\) Each column is ordered by the number of references each biblical texts has within each of Gregory’s hagiographical corpora. This list is not an exhaustive list of all Gregory’s biblical references. Gregory often uses biblical allusions or quotes biblical phrases from memory which are not cited by Krusch, an example would be: ‘*Vade retro, Satanas*’ in VP, 11. 1, p. 260 (lin. 25). This data is collected from: *MGH: SRM*, Vol. 1.2, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885).
Appendix 7: A table showing which of the authors discussed in the thesis cite each of the three different branches of demonic fear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Human fear of the demonic</th>
<th>Fear caused by demons and/or the Devil</th>
<th>Fear experienced by demons and/or the Devil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine of Hippo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cassian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulpicius Severus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosper of Aquitaine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulinus of Périgueux</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianus Pomerius</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avitus of Vienne</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarius of Arles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venantius Fortunatus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: A table showing which of the authors discussed in the thesis cite each of the three different branches of demonic fear.
**Abbreviations**

**Series:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td><em>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td><em>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH: AA</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH: SRM</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH: Conc.</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Concilia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td><em>Patrologia Latina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLTA</td>
<td><em>Library of Latin Texts, Series A</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Location</th>
<th>Title/Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug., De Agon., Christ.</td>
<td><em>De Agone Christiano</em> (CPL 0296). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug., De Doc.</td>
<td><em>De Doctrina Christiana</em> (CPL 0263). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug., De Civ.</td>
<td><em>De Civitate Dei</em> (CPL 0313). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug., De Gen., Lit.</td>
<td><em>De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim</em> (CPL 0266). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug., De Trinit.</td>
<td><em>De Trinitate</em> (CPL 0329). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instit.</strong></td>
<td>Gregory of Tours, ‘De Cursu Stellarum Ratio, Qualiter ad Officium Impendendum Debeat Observari,’ in MGH: SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. B. Krusch (1885).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Cursu.</strong></td>
<td>Gregory of Tours, ‘De Cursu Stellarum Ratio, Qualiter ad Officium Impendendum Debeat Observari,’ in MGH: SRM, Vol. 1.2, ed. B. Krusch (1885).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herm.,</strong></td>
<td>Hermas, <em>Pastor Hermae (versio Vulgata)</em> (CPL 0093 b (A), LLA 471.7). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comm., Matt.</strong></td>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers, <em>Commentarius in Matthaeum</em> (CPL 0430, LLA 582.a.1). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Trin.</strong></td>
<td>Hilary of Poitiers, <em>De Trinitate</em> (CPL 0433). LLTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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