

NETWORKS OF RECIPROCATION IN LATE ANTIQUE EPISCOPATE. THE CASE OF MARTIN OF TOURS

DAMIÁN FERNÁNDEZ

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER
damianf@interchange.ubc.ca

En la Galia tardoantigua, en el tiempo que separa las consecuencias de las políticas de Constantino hacia la Iglesia y los procesos que tuvieron lugar a partir del siglo quinto, existe un lapso de tiempo de al menos 50 años en el cual se produjo la consolidación del poder episcopal. Este período ha recibido menos atención que otros, aunque se verificaron en él importantes desarrollos en la estructura eclesiástica. Esta monografía analizará evidencia al respecto a partir de la información biográfica de Martín de Tours provista por Sulpicio Severo, discutiendo un aspecto del surgimiento del poder episcopal: la manipulación de relaciones sociales verticales y horizontales.

Martin de Tours | Sulpicio Severo | Galia | obispos | poder

In Late Roman Gaul, between the aftermath of Constantine's policies towards the Church and the developments that occurred from the fifth century onwards, stands a gap of at least fifty years during which the bishop's power began to consolidate its basis. This period has received less attention than the others, although important processes took place within the ecclesiastic structure. This paper will analyze some evidence from the biographical information about Martin of Tours provided by Sulpicius Severus and discuss one aspect of the rise of episcopal power –the exploitation of both vertical and horizontal social relationships.

Martin of Tours | Sulpicius Severus | Gaul | bishops | power

Almost eight decades ago, Samuel Dill, in a book published posthumously, observed that “in the early times of the Frank monarchy they [the bishops] were generally men of a Gallo-Roman stock, sprung from old senatorial families with a long tradition of social dignity. As time went on, many of them [...] had held office at court [...] and had acquired a knowledge of administration and the habit of command. In his official career the future bishop had formed many powerful friendships, which would secure influence and support for the interests of the

Church".¹ This image became accepted by the years and dominated any description of the socio-political landscape of early medieval Gaul. However, this situation was a result of a complex process, whose "prehistory" may be traced back, for some aspects, to the fourth century. We will see how some of the aspects mentioned by Samuel Dill were carefully and gradually assembled by a bishop in the end of the fourth century, when both the social and political situations were diverse from those of the Frank kingdom.

The present paper is a proposed reading of two pieces by Sulpicius Severus. These are the *Life of Martin* and the *Dialogues*.² Modern scholarship has emphasized two dimensions of these writings: the literary structure and influences and the construction of the portrayal of Martin of Tours as a holy man and wonder-maker.³ Although these approaches have brought fruitful outcomes, we want to suggest a possible third line of analysis. It is the hypothesis of this paper that both the *Life* and the *Dialogues* are valid sources for studying a particular social phenomenon in late fourth century which influenced the emergence of episcopal power.

Certainly, we do not claim originality when suggesting this approach. The figure of the bishop and the conscious construction of his power in late antiquity are issues that have been extensively addressed by modern scholars. Indeed, it is possible to affirm that the problem of the episcopate and its relationship with power, charity, emperors or municipal structures has been a constant and omnipresent *topos* in historiography.

Therefore, the modest aim of this work is to take advantage of this impressive historiographical production for analyzing Sulpicius' writings for the light they shed on the social strategies of Martin of Tours.⁴ We will

¹ DILL (1970:479).

² We have used the following editions for the primary sources: *Vita Martini*, Paris, 1967 (ed. Jacques Fontaine) and *Dialogi*, Palermo, 1969 (ed. Giuseppe Augello).

³ STANCLIFFE (1983). Also Fontaine has been considered an authority on Sulpicius' writings. Most of his arguments are summed up in his commentary on the *Life*. In general, current literary studies applied to the case of Martin take for granted that one has to make a difference between Martin's and Sulpicius' agenda.

⁴ Probably the first of the most recent works that truly stressed Martin's social relationships as a central issue for the understanding of his career has been John Matthews' *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court* (1975:154-160). This work sharply contrasts with Stancliffe's analysis, published eight years later but without any reference to the problem of Martin's contacts with local aristocrats. However, Matthews has primarily emphasized the role of evangelization in the figure of Martin. VAN DAM (1985:121-128) has

look at these sources in search of some elements regarding two major themes. These are the uses of vertical and horizontal social relationships as a mechanism for the reinforcement of bishops' power. The aim may sound excessively ambitious. Yet, what we will show is only how these primary sources highlight the accuracy of some recent works on strategies of social power. It is beyond the intention of this paper to provide a comprehensive summary of problems. However, it does suggest that an interesting point of comparison can be found with certain figures of episcopal power in the Latin west, like Ambrose, Augustine or Gregory of Tours.

1. AMICITIA AND HORIZONTALITY

The triumph of Constantine and his political project grounded in the support of the Christian church had an immediate effect on legislation. As it is known, Christian institutions and particularly bishops received benefits and privileges from the imperial court. This practice was followed by Constantine's successors and has been presumed to have had lasting political effects. It has been assumed that after the reign of Constantine not only did the empire become "Christian", but also the episcopate consolidated its position as an all-powerful institution within the cities.⁵

Modern scholarship, however, has attacked both of these assumptions.⁶ The debates on Christianization have led us to look at the issue in

also worked on the problem of evangelization, suggesting another dimension of the figure of Martin, namely the discourse of authority he developed in order to gain the support of his community.

⁵ For an example in recent historiography, see DRAKE (2000:393-402). However, this book works primarily with eastern sources. There is no mention of Martin in the whole book, not even in the sections dedicated to the consequences of Constantine's policy (even if the figure of Martin confirmed some of Drake's hypothesis). This raises the question of a difference of *tempo* in this development in both parts of the empire, an issue impossible to be dealt here.

⁶ BROWN (1992:89) has held that the "privileges lavished on the Christian church by Constantine and Constantius II constituted a grandiose overture to the later position of the churches", but this was not sufficient to secure this position". His recent works have been dedicated to some extent to demonstrating how the episcopate that dominated the political panorama of the fifth century was a result, among other factors, of a constant struggle during the previous century (see REBILLARD, 1999:813-823, particularly the organization of the historiographical debate that he proposes between Brown's arguments and Pietri's thesis).

a more critical way. It is not the aim of this paper to deal with these problems. Several scholars have pointed out how the idea of the triumph of Christianity more accurately reflects the optimistic and programmatic view of some intellectuals rather than actual social reality.⁷

Also, in recent years, some theorists have stressed the political weakness of some bishops. In the case of Late Antique Gaul, Brigitte Beaujard has offered a depiction of the fragile situation of the episcopate at the beginning of the fifth century.⁸ According to her, the bishops had a modest place in the city since they were just one among a range of notables. The episcopate had a fairly small place in the city with authority over the local church, which represented a minority. Also, she pointed out that the bishop was not integrated within the municipal institutions and, in consequence, lacked an important source of political power. This situation shifted by the beginning of the fifth century, and finally consolidated in the sixth century. The contrast with the all-powerful bishop in the early Merovingian France may lead to an inaccurate assessment of the actual extent of power of the Gaul episcopate at the end of the fourth century. Nevertheless, it is clear from Beaujard's study that Christian leaders only gradually became one of the central figures in the political life of the city. By the end of the sixth century, the Gallic episcopate consisted almost exclusively of highly educated men of aristocratic origins who held immense political power within the city. This analysis of the process in Gaul is popular among many historians from different historiographical perspectives.⁹ Many historians also emphasize how the social landscape changed from the times of Martin. Thus, we will look at how unique (or not) Martin was in the creation of social networks.

⁷ The bibliography on "Christianization" is abundant and well known. A brief state of the question may be found in REBILLARD (1999). As an example of the triumph of Christianity as an intellectual trend both in a programmatic and apologetic sense, see CAMERON (1997:145-174). This program entered in crisis at the times of Sulpicius, and this crisis was certainly perceived by some of the actors. See MARKUS (1990) particularly his treatment of the Pelagian controversy as a symptom of this process.

⁸ BEAUJARD (1996:127-145).

⁹ VAN DAM (1985:153-156). PÉREZ SÁNCHEZ (1995:209-222). Pérez Sánchez essentially follows Van Dam's arguments but from a Marxist point of view. Also MARKUS (1990:199-211), for the cultural connotations. In the German historiography, the problem has been seen from the perspective of the "Bischofsherrschaft" and was one of the premises in Beaujard's analysis (HEINZELMANN, 1976). The process has also been studied from the perspective of the urban landscape (HARRIES, 1992:77-98). As we have said, an analysis *a posteriori*, that is, from a Merovingian perspective may lead to undervaluing the situation of bishops in fourth century. Even from a "Frankish" view, the fifth century can be seen as a "Gallo-Roman Prelude" (WALLACE-HADRILL, 1983:1-16).

Bishops in Gaul as in any other part of the Roman empire needed more than imperial protection from afar to support their struggle for a new urban leadership.¹⁰ One of the strategies employed by the episcopate to gain power was the use of alliances with a usually (though not always) Christian aristocracy.¹¹ In order to gain allies for his own cause, a bishop in late antiquity employed some of the same social strategies as his lay contemporaries. We refer here to the links between "peers" or equals. This relationship was characterized by a reciprocation of favors and gifts according to a well established etiquette.¹² This protocol had a particular name in Latin sources: *amicitia*. Although this term was also used to label (mainly in Republican times) a relationship between unequals, as a euphemism to designate a patronage bond, the *amicitia* was a convention that regulated moral conduct and behavior between people of high status. This mode of social behavior was described by late fourth-century men such as Symmachus as "the careful observation of established rules of courtesy, the preservation of all due social rankings, and an attitude of earnest devotion".¹³

¹⁰ Concept taken from BROWN (1992:77).

¹¹ This is a phenomenon particularly well studied and documented. CRACCO RUGGINI (1997:168-174) made an interesting approach towards the "clientelistic spaces" of Rome for the case of the election of Damasus at Rome. Cfr. MATTHEWS (1975:146-172).

¹² The interchange of gifts is a phenomenon widely studied in pre-capitalistic and pre-state societies. This was an essential component of such societies as a mechanism of integration between different groups or individuals, and included not only "monetary" gifts. As MAUSS (1967:11-12) recognized in his classic study on the gift "food, women, children, possessions, charms, land, labour, services religious offices, rank - everything is stuff to be given away and repaid. In perpetual interchange of what we may call spiritual matter, comprising men and things, these elements pass and repass between clans and individuals, ranks, sexes and generations". We will see later that this wide categorization provides a better understanding of gifts in Martin's social relationships. Many works have been dedicated to this issue after Mauss' book. For an evolution of the theoretical debate and a new approach toward the issue, see GODELIER (1999:10-107). Godelier proposes a re-thinking of Mauss' theory, claiming a distinction between agonistic and non-agonistic gifts. Some of the characteristics of the non-agonistic gift are present in the exchange of presents analyzed here, although we left aside this problem for the sake of the limited purposes of this paper. For the characterization of non-agonistic gifts, see GODELIER (1999:48).

¹³ MATTHEWS (1975:5). The relationship between the senator and the bishop Ambrose has been thoroughly explained from Ambrose's side by MCLYNN (1994:263-275). In his study, MCLYNN (1994:275) emphasizes the political aspects of the relationship, stating that "*amicitia* should not be confused with friendship [...] The relationship between Symmachus and Ambrose was the fruit of necessity, imposed upon them in their common struggle to perform the favours and services upon which their reputations rested

Furthermore, this *amicitia* had a concrete ground, the exchange of favors and gifts in a reciprocal way – a concept extensively studied by modern anthropology. Reciprocation, in Polanyi's analysis, was considered as a system of economic integration between symmetrical groups.¹⁴ Of course, we are not saying that the Roman economy was fully integrated by mechanisms of reciprocity. Indeed, Polanyi made an intuitive leap that was later validated by Chris Wickham. He saw the Later Roman empire as an economy integrated by redistribution.¹⁵ Beyond the different lines of interpretation, we want to make use of this concept to understand the establishment of social relationships by means of reciprocation of gifts of favors between *equals*. Although he was from humble origins, Martin became a notable due to the status of his office.¹⁶ Subsequently, the social status of his position allowed him to be considered as an "equal" by notables in the provincial society of northern Gaul.¹⁷

When looking at the actual situation in which Martin exercised his episcopal office, we might expect that he, being one of the figures of prominence in his setting, fostered the relationships with other local notables to assert his position. Martin did not have strong consistent support in Tours, or at least Sulpicius' account does not mention any such support. With membership in a monastic "brotherhood", Hilary's support in the previous years or his own fame could have helped him in becoming bishop. Yet, these facts are complemented by a series of social relationships with local aristocrats, in the establishment of a sort of "alliance".¹⁸ Otherwise, he would have not been able to overcome the blatant hostility of the local Gallic episcopate. The scene of his nomination presents Martin being acclaimed by the people.¹⁹ Although this was a common *topos* in this literature, one might suspect that they acted

and from which they derived their political influence". This will be a valuable observation when we see Martin's acquaintance with Avitianus.

¹⁴ POLANYI (1967:250-253).

¹⁵ POLANYI (1967:256). Cf. WICKHAM (1984:3-36).

¹⁶ Bishops belonged to a privileged status equal to the highest magistracies due to the office itself (DI BERNARDINO, 1998:35-48).

¹⁷ The importance of the acquisition of status once he obtained the position of bishop can be seen by the different treatment he received from his fellows in the episcopate. Before the consecration, the bishops (or at least some of them) were reluctant to consider him worthy of the position (*Life* 9.3). Once in the chair, and even when he faced a strong opposition from the Gallic episcopate, his presence in some public occasions was required by the other bishops (*Dialogues* 3.11-13).

¹⁸ MATTHEWS (1975:156).

¹⁹ *Life* 9.1-3.

with, at least, a tacit approval of local officers and notables. The late fourth century was a period in which the formalization and control of the *plebs* at the moment of the election was not completely achieved by the church.²⁰ It is possible to conceive that the people were mobilized by "extra-clerical" means. Unfortunately, Sulpicius is reluctant to offer more details about the subject that could prove this point.²¹

This is a common problem with these types of sources. As many other holy men, Martin was not presented by Sulpicius as a "receiver" of gifts in his intercourse with wealthy people.²² Yet, by closely examining both the *Life* and the *Dialogues* it is possible to obtain some conclusions from them. Thus, let us briefly review the contacts that Martin had with prominent persons, according to Sulpicius.

Before Martin became a bishop, the *Life* mentions that he had resurrected a slave.²³ Sulpicius does not mention the name of this slave, but he pays particular attention to his owner, a certain Lupicinus. Neverthe-

²⁰ PIETRI et al. (1992:390-391).

²¹ Despite his silence, Sulpicius mentions that some people came from neighbouring cities for the acclamation of Martin, which may be a clue for the dimension of the networks that Martin used: "mirum in modum incredibilis multitudo non solum ex illo oppido, sed etiam ex uicinis urbibus ad suffragia ferenda conuenerat" (*Life* 9.2). From the literary point of view, the narrative of the election is consistent with the main themes of Christian literature: unanimity in the election ("una omnium uoluntas") and refusal of the office demonstrated by the device that the people needed to accomplish in order to take Martin out of the monastery (*Life* 9.1). See PIETRI et al. (1992:379-380). LIZZI 1998:81-104) has paid particular attention to the codification of procedures and gestures in the determination of episcopal models. The behavior at the moment of the election was a fundamental hallmark of the episcopal role from the second half of the fourth century. The treatment of this moment had, according to her, an important effect in the "sacralization" of the power and in the dealing with the *potentes*. As we will later see, most of the points in the new moral code designed by Christian writers for the episcopal role were present in Sulpicius' portrayal of Martin: asceticism, domination of the passions of mind, exaltation of contemplative life, etc. This will be fundamental in the relationship between episcopate and secular powers in an ideological plane.

²² It must be kept in mind the idea that Martin was a bishop but a peculiar one: a monk-bishop. ROUSSEAU (1978:148-149) has stressed the episcopal dimensions of Martin (dimensions that we consider central for the present analysis), although the chief aim of Sulpicius was to portray Martin as a wonder-maker. In a recent reconsideration of his classic article of 1971 on the holy man, BROWN (1995:63) has recognized one shortcoming of his study by means of a new interpretation of the sources. "The *Lives* achieved their effect through censoring one side of the gift exchange that had taken place around the figure of the holy man – the steady, often disquieting flow of gifts and favours from the outside world that gave the holy man's activities an appropriate degree of splendour and public recognition".

²³ *Life* 8.1-3.

less, the narrative specifies that Martin “gave” something to a man distinguished according to the *saeculum* and landowner.²⁴ Lupicinus did not play any role in the drama. Martin was asked by a crowd, which, at the same time, was the public for the event. The emphasis that Sulpicius puts in the name of the owner of the slave could be with the intention of giving the history an aura of veracity. Moreover, it suggests one of the ways that Martin may have used to gain access to local notables. Some of them (*nobiles*) joined him in his a monastic retirement in his first years of episcopate and later, according to Sulpicius, became bishops as well.²⁵ They put themselves under the protection of a prominent leader, adhering to his religious practices and affiliation, i.e., the “ascetic mood” – as Martin had done some years before when taking Hilary’s side in the episcopate’s factional struggle in the 350’s and 360’s.

Later on in the narrative, Martin is said to have cured a slave of another potentate, Tetradius, a *uir proconsularis*.²⁶ In this case, the notable begged Martin personally to help his slave, and after the miraculous cure, Tetradius converted to Christianity and “always cultivated an extraordinary affection for Martin, the author of his salvation”.²⁷

These examples do not demonstrate any kind of reciprocation, although it could be implied by the reader. Nevertheless, the episode that involved Arborius, a prominent former officer, a *uir praefectorius*, is less ambiguous. In this case, the thaumaturgical power of the holy man saved the daughter of this potentate from an illness. As a form of acknowledgement (or due to the vivid impression that the miracles caused in Arborius, according to Sulpicius) the father of the healed youth offered her as a virgin.²⁸

²⁴ “Nec multo post, dum agrum Lupicini cuiusdam, honorati secundum saeculum uiri, praeterire” (*Life* 8.1).

²⁵ “Quod eo magis sit mirum necesse est, quod multi inter eos nobiles habebantur, qui longe aliter educati ad hanc se humilitatem et patientiam coegerant; pluresque ex eis postea episcopus uidimus” (*Life* 10.8). This is all of what Sulpicius says about these young gentlemen. One might expect that the patronage of a holy man was reciprocated by some kind of support by their families.

²⁶ *Life* 17.1.

²⁷ “Semperque Martinum salutis suae auctorem miro coluit affectu” (*Life* 17.4).

²⁸ “Arborius autem, uir praefectorius sancti admodum et filelis ingenii, cum filia eius grauissimis quartanae febribus ureretur, epistulam Martini, quae casu ad eum delata fuerat, pectori puellae in ipso accentu ardoris inseruit, statimque fugata febris est [...] Profectusque ad Martinum, puellam ei, praesens uirtutum eius testimonium, quae per absentem licet curata esset, obtulit, neque ab alio eam quam a Martino habitu uirginitatis inposito passus est consecrari”. (*Life* 19.1-2).

Nonetheless, not only people and reputation contributed to Martin's power, but also wealth in the concrete sense of money. Christian leaders tried to drain resources otherwise distributed by rich families under the form of private patronage (either Christian charity or traditional "pagan"-civic *euergesia*).²⁹ The *Life* does not mention any reciprocation of "ideological" gifts by wealth but the *Dialogues* certainly do. A former *uicarius*, Lycontius, wrote to Martin asking him to heal his servants from a plague. After Martin's prayers and fastening, the house became free from danger. In order to thank Martin, Lycontius decided to give him one hundred silver Roman pounds that was used by the bishop to liberate the slaves healed.³⁰ So, the pattern is the same one as in the other occasions, but in this case with the actual mention of the gift given in return. It can be argued that this was the sole occurrence of an explicit mention of a real act of reciprocation and, therefore, it cannot be extended to all the relationships with other notables.

However, we want to suggest that the occasion narrated by Sulpicius was the common pattern in all Martin's relationships and some hints point toward this conclusion. First, the mention of other forms of reciprocation (such as the consecration of a virgin) insinuates that the gifts from wealthy families came into the hands of the bishop in different ways. Money, sons as monks, daughters as virgins or other favors are different ways of reciprocating Martin's initiatives. Also, the episode of reciprocity in the *Dialogues* does not include any indication that this was the only occasion in which Martin received money. Sulpicius mentions the gift by Lycontius in a context in which he was settling the "rules" for the life in a monastic community (among which, the use of the money was one of them). Although biographical and anecdotal, the order imparted by Martin has an echo of guiding principles preceding the first monastic rules in the West.³¹ Therefore, Sulpicius is explicitly mentioning the gift in this episode for a particular purpose.³² The silence in other

²⁹ A brief synthesis of the state of the question in HUNT (1998:257-262).

³⁰ "Mox ad eum Lycontius diuina expertus beneficia peruolauit, nuntians simul et agens gratias, domum suam omni periculo liberatam. Centum etiam argenti libras obtulit, quas uir beatus nec respuit nec recepit, sed priusquam pondus illud monasterii limen adtingeret, redimendis id captiuis continuo deputauit" (*Dialogues* 3.14).

³¹ "Nos, inquit, ecclesia et pascat et uestiat, dum nihil deesse uestiat, dum nihil usibus quaessise uideamur" (*Dialogues* 3.14). Even first monastic rules did not have a normative aim in legal modern terms, but an intention of offering *exempla* for the individual monastic practices (PRICOCO, 1998:18).

³² Also, this anecdote might be considered as a deliberate opposition to Briccius' attitude described in the following chapter, where Martin criticized his successor for having en-

episodes might be related to its lack of relevance to Sulpicius' purposes. And this attitude reflects the aforesaid interest of the hagiographical writers to silence any (material) gift received by holy men in reciprocity for their deeds.

These deeds were not only prayers. There is an episode in the *Dialogues* that refers to an incipient phenomenon: the traffic of relics. In this case, the good that Martin gave was not exactly a relic, but something similar. A vessel of oil blessed by Martin was requested by the wife of a *comes*, Avitianus, to apply it in the cure of illnesses. This does not seem to be an isolated episode, since Sulpicius himself recognizes that this was "according to the custom".³³ This is reflecting the establishment of a relationship that appears later in the narrative reciprocated by Avitianus. Martin will be later a privileged speaker in the presence of the *comes*.³⁴ It must be patent that we are not suggesting here that Avitianus behaved in a particular way due to the oil that Martin had sent to his wife. Neither that the relationship between them was one of strict horizontality. Indeed, despite the efforts of Sulpicius to present the episodes as a triumph of Martin with a halo of moral superiority (as the relationship between Ambrose and Theodosius was presented),³⁵ the actual rapport might have been quite different.³⁶

Martin is said to have interceded on behalf of some prisoners, but this was not probably the only business that he dealt with Avitianus. Unfortunately, Sulpicius does not specify any other affair, but he does describe an atmosphere of familiarity between the two notables, and more than one contact with the *comes*. He claims also that the influence of Martin appeased the natural cruelty of Avitianus.³⁷ The officer recognized

riched himself after becoming priest: "qui nihil umquam ante clericatum quippe qui in monasterio ab ipso Martino nutritus habuisset, equos aleret, mancipia conpararet" (*Dialogues* 3.15).

³³ "Auitiani comitis uxorem misisse Martino oleum, quod ad diuersas morborum causas necessarium, sicut est consuetudo, benediceret" (*Dialogues* 3.3). Sulpicius presents the oil as an element that, once blessed by Martin, holds his same sainthood and operates miracles in itself. In the same chapter, the vessel that contained the liquid survived an accident during which it should have to be broken. According to Sulpicius, this was due to Martin's power ("quae res non potius ad casum quam ad Martini est referenda uirtutem, cuius benedictione perire non potuit", *Dialogues* 3.3)

³⁴ *Dialogues* 3.4.

³⁵ BROWN (1992:103-117).

³⁶ LIZZI (1998:98-99).

³⁷ "Qui cum omnibus locis cunctisque in urbis ederet crudelitatis suae infanda monumenta, Turonis tantum innocens erat: et illa bestia, quae humano sanguine et infelicium mortibus aiebatur, mitem se adque tranquillum beato uiro praesente praestabat". (*Dialogues* 3.8).

in Martin a *uir sanctus*, an acknowledgement of his status of bishop necessary to a relationship of reciprocatation between equals.³⁸

In addition to relics, prayers and symbols of prestige, Martin offered the important access to high spheres of influence due to his episcopal status. A passage in the *Dialogues* offers an illustration: in the middle of the Priscillianist conflict, he presented to Maximus a more secular petition than those on behalf of the prosecuted monks and bishops. He asked mercy for a *comes* and a *praeses* that had eagerly supported Gratian.³⁹ As in the case of Ambrose, "*amicitia* imposed various obligations, among them the performance of commissions at second hand, on behalf of the friends of friends".⁴⁰

Two conclusions can be drawn from these incidents. First, the imperial policy toward Christian leaders, that has been pointed out by Peter Brown, is reproduced here in a smaller scale.⁴¹ The imperial authority (through his representative in this case) chose which faction will help it in the task of controlling the cities. The second one is that, at the same time, Martin and Avitianus were creating relationships of reciprocity. The actual link between both *potentes* should have been more complex than an exchange of oil and good manners, being these affairs perhaps only hints of a closer collaboration.⁴²

Therefore, the biographical information provided by Sulpicius confirms how Martin, an outsider at Tours, created and built up his position by means of bonds of reciprocatation with local notables and other potentates throughout the region. Although the biographer is eager to present

³⁸ *Dialogues* 3.8. The term *uir sanctus* is clearly differentiated from the term used for the monks, *uiri Dei*. CRACCO RUGGINI (1999:175-186) insisted that the association between both terms is a late fourth century phenomenon, beginning with the biography of Ambrose by Paulinus. Therefore, Sulpicius is stressing in this encounter the episcopal dimension of Martin, as a church dignitary, rather than his ascetic side. So it was under this title that Martin confronted and negotiated with Avitianus.

³⁹ "Has principales petitiones habebat: pro Narsete comite et Leucadio praeside, quorum ambo Gratiani partium fuerant" (*Dialogues* 3.11).

⁴⁰ MCLYNN (1994:261).

⁴¹ BROWN (1992:103-117), for the case of Theodosius and Ambrose.

⁴² The *Dialogues* try to exonerate Avitianus from his cruelty and notorious fame, suggesting that he was not the person that was doing what he actually did. Sulpicius says that the behaviour of the *comes* changed after Martin cast out a demon that was either counselling Avitianus or directly possessing him. Soon afterwards, he became a better person ("Cassit diabolus et reliquit familiare subsellium: satisque constat post illum diem Avitianum mitiorem fuisse, seu quod intellexerit egisset se semper adsidentis sibi diaboli uoluntatem, seu quod inmundus spiritus ad illius consessu per Martinum fugatus priuatus est potestate grassandi", *Dialogues* 3.8).

the relationship in terms of Martin as a patron-protector, who “gives” magical powers or “access to the divine”, he offers traces of a different sort of social intercourse. The reciprocation between persons of the same status (or, at least, similar) appears in the actual behavior behind the narrative. And the “equals”, according to Martin’s status, were a series of characters depicted in the sources: landowners, former functionaries or imperial officers. Sulpicius fails to mention alliances between Martin and other bishops, although we may expect that he had some *amici* among the episcopate.⁴³

The friends of Martin were determined by the distinctiveness of Gaul as a society extremely influenced by the presence of the emperor.⁴⁴ In different parts of the empire, bishops may have had different allies, as at Rome, where the senatorial families were likely to be the “natural” friends of the bishops.⁴⁵ The sources here analyzed give the impression that Martin was not supported by a “party” or faction of local notables. On the one hand, there were defenders of Gratian and officers of Maximus among his *amici*; on the other hand, he defended Priscillian’s supporters but he never broke totally with the Ithacian faction.⁴⁶ Therefore, the links that he created were based on personal contacts and bonds of reciprocity rather than on an organized faction. This networking gave the political alliances of bishops a heterogeneous and flexible space for maneuvers and the possibility of incorporating a complete social and political spectrum of contact.⁴⁷

In order to be considering as a *potens* and, consequently, be able to establish relationships of horizontality between other *potentes*, Martin needed to utilize, at the same time, links of verticality. That means he

⁴³ The *Dialogues* have an example of two bishops sympathetic with Martin – and Martin being sympathetic with them: “Ille cedens episcopis, qui tum forte latus illius ambient. Valentino adque Victricio, inparem se esse tantae moli, sed illis quasi sanctoribus nihil impossibile fatebatur” (*Dialogues* 3.2). Cfr. *Life* 16. See STANCLIFFE (1983:168) for a comparison of both accounts. For Martin’s possible connections with other bishops, particularly Ambrose, MATHISEN (1989:13-17).

⁴⁴ According to VAN DAM (1985:20-34), the presence of the emperor was a disturbing presence in Gaul over a long-time established hierarchy of aristocratic personal relationships. These aristocrats provided a lasting exercise of power regardless of the political vicissitudes of late antique Gaul.

⁴⁵ CRACCO RUGGINI (1997:176-177).

⁴⁶ Sulpicius tells that Martin avoided contacts with the Ithacian faction (“Itaque ab illo tempore satis cauit cum illa Ithacianae partis communione misceri”) but he attended the consecration of Felix, and Sulpicius himself has kind words for him: “sanctissimi sane uiri et uere digni, qui meliore tempore sacerdos fieret” (*Dialogues* 3.13).

⁴⁷ PIETRI (1975:283-305).

had to be able to mobilize and control "his people" or to contribute to the rule of other notables' subordinates. In the late Roman world this was achieved by means of patronage, a machinery well-rooted in the Mediterranean world.

2. PATRONAGE AND VERTICALITY

Patronage is usually considered one of the central aspects of Roman social history.⁴⁸ Its vocabulary merged sometimes with that of *amicitia*, which would seem strange since the natures of both relationships are distinguished by one based on horizontality and the other based on verticality.⁴⁹ However, both interactions share a common background: reciprocity. Yet, in the case of patronage, this mechanism acted upon individuals of different social status and/or economic position.⁵⁰ And when this happens, the action of giving has particular social implications for

⁴⁸ Even Marxist historians, generally concerned with issues of class' relationships, have recognized the centrality of such a system. For instance, DE SAINTÉ-CROIX (1981:364) has argued that "the exercise of patronage by the great men (by no means limited to their *clientes*) was a major factor in political and social life – and incidentally much more pervasive and effective even in the judicial system than has been generally realised". This social mechanism was so fundamental in the Roman world that it has been suggested that rather than being considered as a social relationship, it must be seen as a social system, that is, a system in which the "access to resources is predominantly mediated by such personalized relationships". (JOHNSON-DANDEKER, 1989:226). However, as it was said, this claim is not unanimous. It has been suggested that the Roman state's redistributive system was the key element in late Roman social configuration. However, from the mid third century, this system increasingly competed against private patronage, or a "proto-feudalism" (WICKHAM, 1984:22-26).

⁴⁹ The term *amicitia* was sometimes employed to designate a client-patron relationship and, in imperial Rome, this was particularly used in the case of the *amici* of the emperor. However, both relationships were clearly distinguished and *amicitia* (as during the republic) was used in the context of patronage with the purpose of flattering the client (ROULAND, 1979:575-577 and HELLEGOUARICH, 1963:54-56). The term *amicus* was also applied to clientelistic relationships in early middle ages (EPP, 1999:130-139).

⁵⁰ "Patronage is defined [...] as an enduring bond between two persons of unequal social and economic status, which implies and is maintained by periodic exchanges of goods and services, and also has social and affective dimensions" (GARNSEY-WOOLF, 1989: 153-154). JOHNSON-DANDEKER (1989:224) sum up the main feature of the patronage relation in modern scholarship: "1) a reciprocal exchange of goods and services, 2) a personal relationship of some duration, 3) two parties of unequal status offering different kinds of goods and services in exchange. The definition of the elementary patron-client relation is extended by several other authors to include 4) the principle of voluntarism".

reinforcement of one side's higher position.⁵¹ Like the seventeenth-century Italian village of Santena, reciprocity may occur between individuals or groupings of different social or economic power, and then, the exchange favors the side with a better position.⁵²

Episcopal patronage presented two different aspects in fourth century. The first one is a traditional patronage of the city in the context of imperial politics. With a municipal life regulated by itself, the bishop acted as a liaison between his city and a distant central power.⁵³ This corporate patronage was complemented by a second type that united the bishop with the people that formally fell outside traditional patronage. This grouping consisted of the outsider to the community, the stranger and, more importantly, the poor.⁵⁴

The "care of the poor" is, perhaps surprisingly, not a main concern in Sulpicius' narratives. As in the case of the alliances with local notables or representatives of the imperial power, we must once again reconstruct the actual functions of Martin by indirect means. The *Dialogues* mention one occasion in which the use of wealth coming from the richest families is used for charity.⁵⁵ Yet, Sulpicius does not offer any other direct reference to them, although he does give us indirect hints.

Two episodes are designed to make a representation of the poor. The first one is the well-known affair with the poor man in Amiens, with whom Martin shared his cloak, as a result of seeing Jesus in a dream identifying himself with the *pauper*.⁵⁶ Martin was representing the charity *par excellence* in a time when the church began to stress the role of the

⁵¹ "Giving thus seems to establish a difference and an inequality of status between donor and recipient, which can in certain instances become a hierarchy: if this hierarchy already exists, then the gift expresses and legitimizes it." (GODELIER, 1999:12).

⁵² LEVI (1988:87-99).

⁵³ CRACCO RUGGINI (1999:175-177).

⁵⁴ BROWN (1992:81-86), for the definition of the traditional clientele in the cities that purposely excluded the "poor". Brown's category of poor stresses social characterization rather than economic (BROWN, 2000:45-50). In this recent publication, Brown has pointed out the different socio-economic backgrounds of people taken under the care of bishops, against the use of modern economic category of poor. Cfr. PLATAGEAN (1986:120-121), although this study is centrally concerned with eastern sources. Occasionally, the "poor" were also used by traditional senatorial aristocracy to manipulate *clientelae* (CRACCO RUGGINI, 1997:185-186).

⁵⁵ This is the aforementioned episode of Lycontius (*Dialogues* 3.14).

⁵⁶ "Audit [Martin] lesum clara uoce dicentem: Martinus adhuc catechumenus hac me ueste contextit" (*Life* 3). In a more didactic way, *Dialogues* 10: "quem recens tonsam forte conspexerat, euangelicum, inquit, mandatum ista compleuit: duas habuit tunicas, unam earum largita est non habenti: ita ergo et uos facere debetis".

poor as a common *topos* in its literature.⁵⁷ The second one is a description of a miser swineherd as Adam thrown away from paradise.⁵⁸ In this case, the emphasis is put on a rural poor, which is unusual for Christian sources usually concerned with the urban poor.⁵⁹

As it can be appreciated, the evidence is not copious, but it is possible to envisage a self-portrait of Martin as a "lover of the poor" through the use of Christian charity – a way to assert a new form of patronage in other parts of the Mediterranean world.⁶⁰ By means of comparative studies it is possible to reach this conclusion, since many studies have been produced in recent years in this direction.⁶¹

Charity was not the sole way in which Martin acted as a *patronus*. He also represented his city, or at least a grouping of its dwellers. Both the *Life* and the *Dialogues* offer episodes in which Sulpicius claims that Martin acted as a representative of the city. One of these incidents was his asking Avitianus for the release of some prisoners.⁶² Although the intervention of Martin benefited only a small group of people, the narration pointed toward a civic interpretation of the event. With his persuading Avitianus, Martin liberated the *civitas*.⁶³ Likewise, the *Life* reports an incident that occurred after the rumor of a barbarian incursion, when city was freed from fear once Martin showed that the rumor was provoked by a plotting of some daemons.⁶⁴

⁵⁷ PIETRI (1983:279). The examples given by the author are taken from fourth century Italy such as Ambrose or Maximus of Turin, although he worked with some examples from the Gaul such as Hilary of Arles. Cfr. BROWN (2000) esp. chapter I, where he emphasizes the construction of the idea of poor and its political use by late antique bishops.

⁵⁸ "Item cum subuculum algentem ac paene nudum in pelliccia ueste uidisset, en, inquit, Adam eiectus de paradiso in ueste pellicea sues pascit" (*Dialogues* 2.10).

⁵⁹ BROWN (2000:51).

⁶⁰ PLATAGEAN (1986:73-82). BROWN (1992:89-103).

⁶¹ The most recent. BROWN (2000). Although a comparative study between Martin and other bishops of his time is possibly the only methodology available to reconstruct his use of charity, this line has its shortcomings since the most documented episcopal sees are also the major ones, where larger amounts of wealth were controlled by the bishop. In this sense, one might expect that the case of Tours was much more modest than, for example, Rome (see CRACCO RUGGINI, 1997).

⁶² *Dialogues* 4.

⁶³ The whole section is impregnated by the lexicon of the "city": "Hic [Avitianus] rabido spiritu ingressus Turonum ciuitatem [...] disponit postero die adtonita ciuitate ad opus triste procedere". After Martin's intervention, "ita fugato Auitiano laetata est ciuitas et liberata" (*Dialogues* 4).

⁶⁴ *Life* 18. The literary construction of the passage points towards an identification of Martin as the "patron" of the city. It begins with the fear of the city's dwellers: "Interea cum de motu impetu barbarorum subita ciuitatem fama turbasset, daemonicum ad se

The representation on behalf of his community, his city or some groupings within them was extended beyond the boundaries of Tours. If we believe Sulpicius, Martin was a well-known character at the imperial court. He visited at least two emperors; Valentinian, soon after his election as bishop,⁶⁵ and Maximus, probably in 386.⁶⁶ In the first case, there is no indication of what Martin intended to ask of the emperor. What is clear is that he went to the court with the intentions of soliciting things that Sulpicius chooses not to mention.⁶⁷

The relationships with Maximus are described in more detail. The *Life* relates the famous event of the cup in a dinner at the court.⁶⁸ However, it does not say much about the actual motive for Martin being at Trier. Conversely, the *Dialogues* bring up some allusions to the affairs that Martin carried out at court. He talked with the emperor "about the present things, future things, the glory of the faithful ones and the eternity of the saints".⁶⁹ These "present things" about which Martin talked with the emperor, in Sulpicius' report, could have been the mission to release prisoners, to end some people's exile and to restore goods, all

exhiberi iubet". And, after the intervention of Martin ordering the possessed to tell him the truth, "metu turbatione praesenti ciuitas liberata est". A similar structure to the *Dialogues* 4 section is found here and we suggest that it sums up the role of the bishop as patron of the city. The inhabitants of the city asked his patron for solving their concerns and Sulpicius stresses the effectiveness of the intervention. Note that the word *ciuitas* is used in a sense that goes beyond the mere physical setting and includes the dwellers as a corporate body. When Sulpicius wants to refer to the city as a physical place, he uses both *ciuitas* (cfr. *Life* 18.3) and, in this section, *oppidum* ("ut hoc saltim metu ex illo Martinus oppido fugaretur").

⁶⁵ "Eo fere tempore, quo primum episcopus datus est, fuit ei necessitas adire comitatum. Valentinianus tum maior rerum potiebatur" (*Dialogues* 2.5).

⁶⁶ *Life* 20 and *Dialogues* 2.6-7. Stancliffe does not deal in her work with the problem of the social and political functions of Martin's visits to the court, since she is more concerned about the literary portrayal of the character by Sulpicius. However, her analysis has settled the grounds for avoiding any distortion of the actual influence of Martin at the court. Sulpicius' uttermost aim was to present Martin as a holder of an exceptional power, even in his relationships with imperial figures. See STANCLIFFE (1983:156-158). Therefore, we have to be cautious when evaluating the real achievements of Martin as a patron in the emperor's presence. For the date of the visit, see STANCLIFFE (1983:113).

⁶⁷ "Hic cum Martinum ea petere cognouisset, quae praestare nolebat [...] Nec expectatis Martini precibus prius omnia praestitit quam rogaretur" (*Dialogues* 2.5). It is interesting the way in which Sulpicius suggests the intention of the emperor of establishing a closer relationship with Martin by means of several gifts, *multa munera*.

⁶⁸ *Life* 20.4.

⁶⁹ "Totus illi cum eo sermo de praesentibus, de futuris, de fidelium gloria, de aeternitate sanctorum" (*Dialogues* 2.6).

events mentioned in the *Dialogues*.⁷⁰ This evidence is probably related to the Priscillianist affair, and Martin may have been talking on behalf of this group or, maybe, mediating between Maximus and Gratian's supporters. However, the episode reveals the possibility of Martin acting as a representative of one group patronized by him, at the very center of the political system. Also, this may have been the occasion for reciprocating favors from higher officers or local notables, such as the intercessions on behalf of two former partisans of Gratian aforementioned. Indeed, the emperor was not the only acquaintance that Martin made at court. Sulpicius, for particular reasons, carefully reports that "the highest and distinguished men" shared the table with the bishop. He identifies them as the prefect and consul Evodius, two *comites*, the brother and the uncle of the emperor and the emperor himself.⁷¹

Therefore, the emperor and the bishop talking *de praesentibus*, was one of the ways that Martin used to strengthen his position. The possibility of being an effective mediator between his community and the imperial court or imperial officers would have reinforced his legitimacy. At the same time, the possibility of getting access to higher spheres of power depended on the actual power that Martin was representing, as a member of one or several ecclesiastical factions and as a person acquainted with other notables.

Although it will be not treated in this work, there is another dimension that deserves to be acknowledged. Martin, in his dealing with the emperor (and maybe with some high officers as well) was himself within a relationship of patronage, despite Sulpicius' efforts to present the issue in a perspective favorable to the episcopal status.⁷² Yet, Sulpicius reveals

⁷⁰ "Ut clausos carcere liberaret. exiliis datos restitueret. bona adempta rehiberet" (*Dialogues* 2.7).

⁷¹ "Coniuae autem aderant. uelut ad diem festum euocati, summi atque illustres uiri, praefectus idemque consul Euodius, uir quo nihil unquam iustius fuit, comites duo summa potestate praediti, frater regis et patruus" (*Life* 20.4). For the comment on Evodius, we can suspect who was Martin's closest ally at that dinner. The mention of these figures is intended to accentuate the humiliation that Maximus suffered in that occasion when Martin offered the cup to a priest before passing it to the rest of the attendants. However, it reveals the possible magnitude of contacts to which Martin had access.

⁷² He uses the language of patronage to describe the relationships of the Ithacian faction at court: "Plures ex diuersis orbis partibus episcopi conuenissent et foeda circa principem omnium adulatio notaretur seque degenerare inscontantia regiae clientelae sacerdotalis subdidissent" (*Life* 20.1). Note that the accusation against these bishops was their *adulatio* like this of the *clientes*. Probably, the "politically correct" way to mention a relationship of patronage would be *amicitia*.

two occasions in which Martin acted as a client of the *emperor* Julian on the one hand⁷³ and of the *bishop* Hilary of Poitiers on the other.⁷⁴ As we can appreciate, the vertical relationships of reciprocation permeated Martin's life, either when he was an eager client of a famous bishop or when he openly was a local *patronus* – and, possibly, secretly a client.

3. CONCLUSIONS

When Sulpicius wrote his works, he did not intend to describe the social relationships of Martin. He only wanted to establish a model of sainthood, ascetic and miraculous, rooted in the Gallic reality. Therefore, the social intercourse of Martin, his activities as patron or his bonds of reciprocation are part of an implicit background.

This has a negative and a positive effect. The negative is the difficulty of reconstructing the actual social configuration due to the lack of evidence. The positive is that Sulpicius presents these issues in an unconscious way, as a fact of reality, probably with fewer distortions than a premeditated treatment would have presented. As has been proven by recent research, the power of the bishop was not what the Christian sources wished to imply. Even when Sulpicius wants to portray a relationship between Maximus and Martin (favorable to the second), he evidently appeals to complex literary strategies to obtain it, since the actual rapport surely was of a different nature. We must consider that the times when Sulpicius released his books (particularly the *Dialogues*) witnessed

⁷³ "Iulianus Caesar [...] donatium coepit erogare militibus, et, ut est consuetudinis, singuli citabantur, donec a Martinum uentum est" (*Life* 4.1). This episode shares common characteristics with traditional patronage. The *donatium* was not a regular salary but a gift in an extraordinary circumstance. Also, Martin belonged to the imperial guard, the *scholae*, a group under the direct command of the emperor or the *magister militum* (JONES, 1964:613). Although Martin did not accept a conventional reward he asked for a favour (being released from the army).

⁷⁴ Although this episode is not unanimously accepted as veridical, the relationship described is also based on reciprocation between unequals. Hilary gave Martin an office whereas Martin became a supporter of Hilary's ecclesiastical faction. According to Sulpicius' theatrical description, Hilary "tempted" Martin with a *deaconate* (*diaconatus officio*) that he rejected. Besides the meaning of 'office', *officium* was also a traditional term in the vocabulary of *amicitia* (See HELLEGOUARCH, 1963:152-163). Finally he "accepted" a charge of exorcist (*Life* 5.1-3). Martin will prove to be an ardent partisan of the faction of his "patron" and he will follow the bishop of Poitiers when he came back from his exile. Again, Martin will be a *protégé* in his monastic foundation near Poitiers (*Life* 6.4-7.1).

the emergence of a new episcopal model, both in theory and practice that was increasingly turning into the paradigm of the fifth and sixth century bishop.

We consider that modern historiography has correctly stressed the differences between the two periods, particularly in the case of Gaul. However, when we look at the archetype described by Dill and Beaujard with which we started this paper, it will appear that most, if not all, of the characteristics of the power of later bishops were present to some extent in the social relationships of Martin, though on a smaller scale. This raises the question, then, of what was the change that allowed the spread and reinforcement of episcopal power within existing social practices.

Like the local *Juntas* that emerged in the Americas with the fall of the Spanish empire after Napoleon's invasion in 1808, the Gallic local notables (among whom were bishops) assumed the government after the fall of the central imperial government with the "tools" that they had developed. As we saw, most of Martin's peers were imperial officers or people that owed part of their position to imperial patronage. If the fall of the Roman Empire did have an impact in the West (a fact that is starting to be considered as more important after years of historiographical banishment),⁷⁵ we may assume that one consequence was the realignment in the exercise of local power, a matter that is beyond the scope of this paper.

The central purpose of this work was to show how vertical and horizontal social relationships functioned in the second half of the fourth century in Gaul through the implications in Sulpicius' writings. Eventually, this analysis can become the prolegomenon for a wider understanding of how local power functioned once the central government became a distant memory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEAUJARD, B. (1996) "L'évêque dans la cité en Gaule aux ve. et vie. siècles" in LEPELLEY, C. (ed.) *La fin de la cité antique et le début de la cité médiévale*, Bari, pp. 127-145.

BROWN, P. (1992) *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire*, Madison.

——— (1995) *Authority and the Sacred*, Cambridge.

⁷⁵ See GIARDINA (1999:172-177).

- (2000) *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, Hanover.
- CAMERON, A. (1997) "Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of Constantine" in EDWARDS, M. – SWAIN, S. (eds) *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, pp. 245-274.
- CRACCO RUGGINI, L. (1997) "Spazi urbani clientelari e caritativi" in *La Rome impériale. Démographie et Logistique*, Rome, pp. 157-191.
- (1999) "Prête et fonctionnaire: l'essor d'un modèle épiscopal aux IV^e-V^e siècles", *Antiquité Tardive*, 7, pp. 175-186.
- DE SAINTE CROIX, G. E. M. (1981) *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, New York.
- DI BERNARDINO, A. (1998) "L'immagine del vescovo attraverso i suoi titoli nel codice teodosiano", in REBILLARD, E. – SOTINEL, C. (eds) *L'évêque dans la cite du IV^e au VI^e siècle. Image et Autorité*, Rome.
- DILL, S. (1970) *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age*, New York.
- DRAKE, H (2000) *Constantine and the Bishops. The Politics of Intolerance*, Baltimore.
- EPP, V. (1999) *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, Stuttgart.
- GARNSEY, P. – WOOLF, G. (1989) "Patronage of the rural poor in the Roman World" in WALLACE-HADRILL, A. (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London, pp. 153-170.
- GIARDINA, A. (1999) "Esplosione di tardoantico", *Studi Storici*, 40, pp. 157-180.
- GODELIER, M. (1999) *The Enigma of the Gift*, Cambridge.
- HARRIES, J. (1992) "Christianity and the city in the Late Roman Gaul" in RICH, J. (ed.) *The City in Late Antiquity*, London and New York, pp. 77-98.
- HEINZELMANN, M. (1976) *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien: zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert*, München.
- HELLEGOUARC'H, J. (1963) *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des parties politiques sous la République*, Paris.
- HUNT, D. (1998) "The Church as a Public Institution" in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 13, Cambridge, pp. 238-276.
- JOHNSON, T. – DANDEKER, CH. (1989) "Patronage: relation and system" in WALLACE-HADRILL, A. (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London, pp. 219-242.

- JONES, A. H. M. (1964) *The Later Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- LEVI, G. (1988) *Inheriting Power. The Story of an Exorcist*, Chicago.
- LIZZI, R. (1998) "I verscovi e i potentes della terra: definizione e limite del ruolo episcopale nelle due *partes imperii* fra IV e V secolo D.C." in REBILLARD, E. – SOTINEL, C. (eds) *L'évêque dans la cite du IVe au VIe siècle. Image et Autorité*, Rome, pp. 81-104.
- MARKUS, R. (1990) *The End of Ancient Christianity*, Cambridge.
- MATHISEN, R. (1989) *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*, Washington.
- MATTHEWS, J. (1975) *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court*, Oxford.
- MAUSS, M. (1967) *The Gift. Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, New York.
- MCLYNN (1994) *Ambrose of Milan. Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Berkeley.
- PLATAGEAN, E. (1986) *Povert  ed emarginazione a Bisanzio*. Bari.
- P RIZ S NCHIZ, D. (1995) "Ideolog a cristiana y sociedad en la Galia del siglo V", *Gerion*, 13, pp. 209-222.
- PIETRI, CH. (1975) "L'aristocratie chr tienne entre Jean de Constantinople et Augustine d'Hippone" in *Saint Jean et Saint Augustin*, Paris, pp. 283-305.
- (1983) "Les pauvres et la pauvret  dans l'Italie de l'Empire Chr tien (IVe si cle)" in *Miscellanea historiae ecclesiasticae*, Bruxelles, pp. 789-811.
- PIETRI, L. ET AL. (1992) "Peuple Chr tien ou Plebs: le r le des la cs dans les  lections eccl siastiques en occident" in *Actes de la table ronde autour de l'oeuvre d'Andre Chastagnol*, Rome, pp. 373-395.
- POLANYI, K. (1967) *Trade and Markets in the Early Empires*, Glencoe.
- PRICOCO, S. (1998) *La Regola di San Benedetto e le Regole dei Padri*, Verona.
- REBILLARD,  . (1999) "La conversion de l'Empire Romain selon Peter Brown", *Annales HSS*, 4, pp. 813-823.
- ROULAND, N. (1979) *Pouvoir politique et dependance personnelle dans l'Antiquit  romaine*, Bruxelles.
- ROUSSEAU, PH. (1978) *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church*, Oxford.
- STANCLIFFE, C. (1983) *Saint Martin and His Hagiographer*, Oxford.
- VAN DAM, R. (1985) *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*, Berkeley.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, J. (1983) *The Frankish Church*, Oxford.
- WICKHAM, CH. (1984) "The Other Transition: from the Ancient World to Feudalism", *Past and Present*, 103, pp. 3-36.

