THE « PATRIMONIUM PETRI IN ILLIS PARTIBUS »
AND THE PSEUDO-IMPERIAL COINAGE
IN FRANKISH GAUL

I

The most puzzling single group of coins struck in Merovingian Gaul is that which was issued by a number of southern mints in the late sixth and early seventh centuries in the names of successive Byzantine emperors. The commonest coins, nearly two-thirds of the recorded total of about a hundred specimens, are those of Maurice (582-602), but the series begins in the reign of Justin II (565-578) and ends in that of Heraclius (610-641). The types are at first sight imperial, but on closer examination are found to differ in almost every detail from those of contemporary imperial issues. Their origin is a mystery. When the late Adrien Blanchet wrote « je ne me dissimule pas qu’il reste des points obscurs dans la question » (1), he was indulging in a masterly understatement. We know where the coins were struck and over what period, but by whom we have no idea. The coinage has been recently studied by Mr Rigold (2). On the purely numismatic side his article is extremely useful (3), but he gives no clear answer.

(3) Apart from a number of unprofitable speculations on points of detail, e. g. the meaning of CR (p. 114) and VF (p. 116) on coins of Maurice and Phocas,
to the fundamental question of who issued the coins. He believes in a revival of imperial influence in the western Mediterranean in the reign of Maurice and considers that this and the coinage are connected with one another, but he does not explain how such a connection is to be conceived. Coins are made by human agency, not by 'influence', and someone, even if someone of no greater consequence than a local moneyer, must have ordered them to be struck. Possibly the evidence at our disposal may not allow of his identification, but the scholar must at least assure himself that the attempt to trace him has been made.

The main elements of the problem can be briefly stated. The Franks, like most of the other invaders of the empire, modelled their earliest gold coinage on that which they found in circulation around them or on patterns which were at any rate of imperial origin. An attempt was sometimes made to keep up-to-date by imitating contemporary Byzantine or Italian (Ostrogothic) issues, but it was only half-hearted, and it is probable that the issue of such imitations always lagged some years behind that of their prototypes. Whether the minting of such pseudo-imperial coins was due to a combination of conservatism and indifference, or whether, as Byzantine self-esteem preferred to think, it involved an implicit recognition of imperial authority, is a question which need not here be discussed. The imitations became in time further and further removed from their originals, with legends blundered almost out of recognition and types transformed and barbarized into something new. Only the weight and fineness of the imperial solidi and tremisses were for a time retained (4), however ill these might be suited to the monetary systems which the invaders brought with them from their Germanic past.

This phase of imitative pseudo-imperial coinage ended at about the same time in Visigothic Spain and Frankish Gaul. In Spain, Leovigild (568-586) created a royal coinage bearing his own name and struck under his direction and control at some 20 separate mints throughout the country. In Gaul, where there was no uni-

---

and the supposed initial of a Jewish moneyer (p. 108). His dates are also much more precise than the evidence warrants.

(4) Though not without exceptions. The Burgundian code mentions a number of debased issues, and the common pseudo-imperial solidi of the second half of the 5th century with RA in the field are often of very poor gold.
fied monarchy and no feeling amongst the Franks that minting was a prerogative of sovereignty, the right of coining was exercised by any person or institution who was in a position to indulge in it and had the inclination to do so. Though the Frankish kings minted coins with their own names, they presumably did so as great landed proprietors, not as sovereigns, and their coinage was completely submerged in that of their subjects. The typical Frankish gold coin of the late sixth and seventh centuries was a tremissis bearing the name of a mint and a moneyer, and having on one face a cross and on the other a profile bust or some other design. No allusion to the monarch appeared on the coins at all and no control was exercised over the choice of type, though as a rule the smaller mints tended to imitate the coins of their more productive neighbours. This was in part due to the fact that in many regions of Gaul the dies were cut by itinerant workmen, who carried their type preferences and style from one locality to another. Almost the only general feature was a reduction in weight from c. 1.5 g to c. 1.3 g, i.e. from 8 carats to 20 grains, the Germanic barley grain instead of the Mediterranean carat (siliqua) being the unit of weight employed.

It is against this background that the emergence of the second series of pseudo-imperial coins — it would be better to call them quasi-imperial coins — must be viewed. At a time when most of the coinage of Gaul was developing on markedly local lines, these pseudo-imperial coins look like an attempt at putting back the clock. They start with tremisses in the name of Justin II (565-578) struck at Marseilles, Arles, Viviers, and Uzès. Rigold dates them towards the close of the reign, i.e. c. 575/8.

For the short reign of Tiberius II (578-582) there is a solidus of Arles, and

(5) The reduction in weight from 1.5 g to 1.3 g is an observed fact. I hope to show elsewhere that the explanation for it is that given in the text.
(6) What follows is mainly based on Rigold, art. cit., p. 123-33.
(7) The coin of Uzès was not known to Rigold. It made part of the Escharen hoard of 1897 and is now at the Hague; see C. Wilde and D. H. J. de Dome-Pierre de Chauffepié, La trouvaille d’Escharen, in Revue belge de numismatique, l.1v, 1898, p. 256, n° 7. The authenticity of the Escharen coins was unjustifiably attacked by R. Serrure, which led to their neglect by subsequent scholars. They have been independently examined within the last five years by M. J. Lafaurie and myself, and neither of us sees the slightest reason to question their genuineness.
for Maurice (582-602) there are solidi and tremisses of Marseilles, Arles and Viviers and tremisses of Uzès. There is also an anomalous group of tremisses from Vienne which combine the name of Maurice with that of a moneyer (De officina Laurenti). Phocas is recorded only for Marseilles (solidus) and Heraclius for Marseilles (solidus and tremissis) and Viviers (tremissis). In addition to the regular series there are a number of imitations with blundered legends, some probably contemporary and some perhaps representing, as Rigold suggests, a late revival at regular mints in the name of Maurice (8). Rigold dates the end of the series as between 615 and 620.

The solidi and tremisses are imperial in so far as they bear the name and title of the reigning emperor. They are not imperial in their types or their weight, or in the fact that they have on them the indication of the mint — MA or MAS (Massilia), AR (Arelate), VIVA (Vivarium), VC(etia), VIENNA — where they were struck. The solidi show either a facing armoured bust with transverse spear, a type discontinued by Justinian in 539, or a profile bust, which had not been used on imperial solidi at all during the preceding century. The reverse type of both solidus and tremissis is basically a cross, sometimes potent or fourcheé, above a globe; in later issues this is enclosed in a wreath within the surrounding legend (9). These types do not correspond to those of the contem-

(8) Some late coins of Valence with VA in the field — they have also been attributed to Gap (Vapincum) — can be written off as imitations which do not affect the main series. Coins with VE (perhaps Venasque, Vendesca) and DIA (Die, Dia Voconntorium) have no intelligible imperial name, and it is doubtful if they had any true quasi-imperial predecessors. See Rigold, art. cit., p. 103, 130. On the other hand, the Escharen hoard (art. cit., p. 256, n° 6) contained a coin with SE in the field and the name of Justin II which seems to have been contemporary or almost contemporary, and there is another coin of the same mint with blundered obverse type and legend but more normal reverse type in the author’s collection. SE can only be Saulieu (Côte d’or), as the name is spell out in full (Sedeloco) on a later coin (Prou, n° 149) of the same mint. This village in Burgundy, half-way between Autun and Sémur, is so remote from the south Gallic mints that one hesitates to class it with them, and I have not included it in my discussion in the text. Further research may well reverse my judgment on this point.

(9) The coins issued by Laurentius at Vienne differ from the others in having as reverse type a Christogram on a globe, while the mint-name is written in full in the legend instead of indicated by letters in the field. They are evidently quite distinct from the main issue.
porary imperial coinage, the nearest thing to them being a cross-on-globe introduced on imperial semisses under Tiberius II. The fact that the coins are light in weight is indicated by an XXI on the solidi and a VII on the tremisses, the weights of the corresponding imperial coins being 24 and 8 siliquae (carats) respectively \((10)\). This implies in grammes a reduction from 1.51 g to 1.32 g, the latter being an approximation, as nearly as it could be indicated in Roman siliquae, to the 20 grains \((1.30 \, \text{g})\) of the metrological system of the Germanic peoples \((11)\).

The coinage is therefore at once imperial and non-imperial: imperial in its clear recognition of at least some measure of imperial authority, non-imperial in its equally clear differentiation in weight and type from the authentic products of Byzantine mints. It likewise gives every appearance of having been, at least initially, organized by a single authority, though allowance has to be made for the existence of irregular issues and imitations. The difficulty in accounting for it arises in part out of the complex political history of Provence during the period in question, in part out of our knowledge of the relations between the Byzantines and the Frankish kingdom at the close of the sixth century.

II

It is difficult to give any account of Merovingian successions that will be both intelligible and brief. When Chlotar I died in 561 the Frankish kingdom was divided between his four sons. The cities where the pseudo-imperial coins were struck were divided between Sigebert I of Austrasia and Guntram of Burgundy. Sigebert held Uzès and probably Viviers, Guntram held Vienne and probably Arles, while Marseilles, or at least its customs revenue, was shared between them. When Sigebert died in 575 Guntram took advantage of the fact that Childebert II was a minor to seize part of his inheritance, but our information as to how much territory was involved and by what stages Childebert recovered it is extremely imperfect. When Guntram died in 593 Childebert

\[(10)\] The weights of the imperial issues are not indicated on the coins themselves, but are known to us from the written sources and confirmed by the actual weight of the coins.

\[(11)\] See above, n. 5.
became for three years sole ruler of the Midi. On his death in 596 it was divided between his sons Théodebert II and Theoderic II. The latter reunited the area in 612, and when he died a year later his grandmother Brunhild attempted to secure the inheritance for his son Sigebert II. Both were overthrown and put to death by Chlotar II, the surviving son of Chlotar I, who thus (613) became sole Frankish ruler as his father had been half a century before (12).

The history of the Midi during these years turned largely on the personality and policy of the *rector Provinciae* Dynamius, a person of considerable culture and attainments who managed the papal estates in Provence and was a friend and correspondent of Venantius Fortunatus (13). He figures much less prominently in the pages of Gregory of Tours than do such men as Guntram Boso and Mummolus, but his local importance was very great. Though he had been appointed by Childebert his personal inclinations were towards Guntram, and his uncertain loyalty makes it difficult to discern the precise pattern of authority at any given moment. His major quarrel was with Bishop Theodore of Marseilles (c. 565-c. 595), an adherent of Childebert, and in the prolonged disputes between them the *rector* could count on the support of at least a section of the clergy in the city. Between 581 and 583 the bishop was arrested on three separate occasions on a variety of charges, though on each occasion he was able eventually to secure his release (14). Two points at issue were the partition of


Marseilles, for Guntram had taken advantage of Sigebert's death in 575 to lay hands on his nephew's share of the city, and control of the bishopric of Uzès, which Dynamius gave in 581 to his own nominee without Childebert's consent (15).

A temporary peace concluded between Guntram and Childebert in 584 was apparently at Dynamius' expense, for Guntram gave up the disputed part of Marseilles (16). It was of short duration, and soon afterwards Childebert granted Uzès to the newly appointed Duke Nicetius of Auvergne (17), while Guntram for his part was in a position to nominate a military governor of Arles (18). In 587 Childebert made Nicetius rector of Marseilles and of the cities of those regions forming part of Childebert's kingdom (19). Later in the year, however, when the two kings concluded the peace of Andelot (28 November 597), Dynamius was taken back into favour by Childebert (20) and evidently recovered the rectorship, for he is entitled patricius Galliarum in papal correspondence of 593 (April) (21). Two years later he was out of office, for the office of manager of the papal estates was vacant in April 595 and there is an enigmatic allusion in a letter from Gregory to Childebert regarding Dynamius' inability to carry on his functions (22). Probably this was a consequence of Guntram's death.
on 28 March 593, but he seems to have suffered no fate worse than the loss of his rectorship, for his epitaph records his death after fifty years of married life.

These repeated shiftings of political boundaries and kaleidoscopic changes of allegiance leave no room for a unified coinage issued at the behest of any one of the regular political authorities in Gaul. The five cities involved were divided during much of the time between Guntram and Childebert II, while Dynamius, who for a time at least was master of Marseilles, Arles and Uzès, would as rector Provinciae have had no authority at all in Viviers, still less at Vienne. Nor can the situation be saved by attributing the coinage to Gundovald, as a number of scholars who discussed the coinage in the last century were disposed to do. This adventurer, who claimed to be a son of Chlotar I, returned to Gaul in 582 from an exile spent in part at Constantinople. His career as a pretender was a short one. His first attempt to seize power in Provence ended with his taking refuge on one of the islands off the coast in the spring of 583; his second began when he was raised on the shield at Brive in December 584 and ended when he was defeated and killed by Guntram at Comminges in March 585. Since it was widely believed by contemporaries that he was acting on behalf of Constantinople and was generously furnished with imperial gold, he might easily be supposed to have issued coin in the emperor's name. But the lack of correlation between his career and that of the history of the pseudo-imperial coinage renders such a solution impossible. In the first revolt we hear of him only in connection with Marseilles, through which he passed, and Avignon, where he spent some time but of which no pseudo-imperial coins exist. As for the second revolt, not a single one of the places involved — Brive, Angoulême, Périgueux, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Comminges — is connected with the coinage. In any case, a brief and unsuccessful revolt in Gaul in the early 580's cannot possibly account for a series of coins which began in the reign of Justin II and continued into that of Heraclius (23).

(23) The Gundovald thesis has long been abandoned by serious scholars. P. Goubert, who has examined in great detail the career of Gundovald and the relations between Byzantium and the Franks in the second volume of his Byzance avant l'Islam, Paris, 1955, makes no attempt to revive it; cf. his remarks on p. 67. He had been less prudent in three earlier articles published
Arguments of a more general economic or political character are equally unconvincing. It has been suggested that Marseilles, as the commercial entrepôt between east and west, might find it convenient to imitate the coinage of the empire, but we have seen already that this « imitation » was only very superficial; the types were not identical, and the difference in weight makes it clear that no attempt was being made to produce coins which would circulate on a par with the Byzantine solidus and tremissis. In any case, such an economic argument would not cover the coinage of such localities as Uzès and Viviers, cities of the interior of no commercial importance.

Mr Rigold has attempted to develop the political argument (24). All four sons of Chlotar I were in contact with the imperial court and in three cases these relations were of a most friendly character. Sigebert sent an embassy to Justin II pacem petens, whatever that may mean in this context, and Chilperic II one to Tiberius II; it was this which brought back the great imperial medallions weighing a pound of gold which were proudly shown by the king to Gregory of Tours. Frankish aid was required in Italy against the Lombards. Huge subsidies were sent to Childebert II ut Langobardos de Italia extruderet, and the collection known as the Epistolae Austrasicae contains a mass of correspondence relating to embassies between the two states during the reign of the Emperor Maurice (25). Without committing himself in so many words to such a proposition, Mr Rigold clearly intends to be understood that this coinage was either directly or indirectly an « imperial » one (26).

in the Échos d'Orient, XXXIX, 1941-2, p. 414-453, under the titles L'Aventure de Gondovald et les monnaies franques de l'empereur Maurice, Un second Gondovald : Syagrius and Note sur le triens viennois frappé au nom de Maurice.


(25) See especially GOUBERT, op. cit., p. 98 ff., and W. GOFFART, Byzantine policy in the west under Tiberius II and Maurice: the pretenders Hermenegild and Gondovald, in Traditio, XIII, 1957, p. 73-118. This last article includes a number of essential correctives to Goubert. The old study of G. REVERDY, Les relations de Childebert II et de Byzance, in Revue historique, CXIV, 1913, p. 61-86, is still of value.

(26) On p. 105 he allows the possibility of the first issue being authorized « directly or indirectly » from Constantinople; the later issues he ascribed
This reasoning seems to me based in part on a confusion between Roman survivals, which are undeniable and to be expected, and Byzantine contacts, which were much more limited in their objective than Mr Rigold believes them to have been (27). Though the Franks were, or at least pretended to be, apprehensive of Byzantine designs on Gaul, there is no reason to suppose that Maurice's ambitions went beyond that of obtaining effective aid against the Lombards. Even if they did, and the emperor hoped to create an enlarged "western empire" for his son Tiberius, it is impossible to argue that the emperor or his officials "ordered" the coinage; neither he nor they were in any position to do so, and it was in any case not "imperial" in content but adjusted to the coinage system of Frankish Gaul. It is equally impossible, to attribute it to Provençal officials like Dynamius and Nicetius, at least in their public capacities (28); it would have been too easily construed by their Frankish masters as treason (29), and the group of towns involved would be in large measure unintelligible. The same reasoning, with the added difficulty that the

to local officials or town magistrates with imperial sympathies. See below, n. 28. Goubert illustrates a plate of the pseudo-imperial coins under the title Monnaies de l'empereur Maurice, but nowhere amplifies this point of view in his text.

(27) Mr Rigold overstates his case in a number of ways. For example, the inscription of 587 (CIL, XII, 1045) dated both by the consulship and the regnal year of Childebert's reign, proves the opposite of what he says, for it employs the post-Basilian and not the imperial consular date: i.e. it is traditional-imperial, not contemporary-Byzantine. It seems to me pure fantasy to suggest that the sending of St Augustine to Britain should in some sense be credited to the Emperor Maurice. Mr. Goffart is fully justified in writing of the now long-discredited claim that Gundovald represented an imperial claim to recover Gaul (art. cit., p. 103, n. 133).

(28) Nothing can be directly adduced about the status of the moneyers, but the behaviour of the mints suggests that ... they were more than private entrepreneurs and to be connected with the remaining hierarchy of Roman-titled and Roman-named officials who could lend themselves to any partial reassertion of imperial prerogative (Rigold, p. 122).

(29) This seems to me a fundamental point. The fact that he had welcomed Gundovald was one of the main complaints against Bishop Theodore of Marseilles: "cur hominem extraneum intromississet in Gallias, voluisse Francorum regnum imperialibus per haec subdicer ditionibus" (Gregory, Historia, VI, 24; p. 264). The coinage must have been struck by someone against whom such an accusation could not reasonably be brought.
coinage itself seems in part to have been centrally organized, prevents us ascribing it to the magistrates of the towns themselves. We are back, in fact, where we started. Was there no authority in southern Gaul at this period which could issue from a number of centres a coinage at once imperial and Frankish, and do this without incurring the suspicion of treason?

Once the question is put in this form the answer is evident. The administrator of the papal estates in Gaul was precisely such a person, and it is to his activity that I believe the whole group of coins should be assigned.

III

Our knowledge of the Gallic portion of the Patrimonim Petri is confined to a period of little more than half a century, between 556 and 613. We first hear of it in two letters of Pope Pelagius I (555-60) to Sapaudus of Arles, though no doubt it had existed from much earlier times. Sapaudus is asked to ensure that his father, the patricius Placidus, collects and sends to Italy the pensiones of the possessions of the Roman Church, either in cash or in the form of warm clothes and cloaks which will be particularly acceptable to a population still suffering from the after-effects of the Gothic War. This was in a letter of 14 December 556, and the pope reverts to the same topic in a further letter of 13 April 557 (30). It is evident that Placidus, despite the fact he was a layman, was rector of the estates in question, while Sapaudus could intervene both in view of his personal relationship to Placidus and in his capacity of papal Vicar in Gaul.

There is then a gap in our knowledge till the time of Gregory the Great (590-604) (31). At the opening of the pontificate the

---

(30) M.G.H., Epistolae, III, 73, 77 (= Jaffe-Ewald, Regesta, n° 943, 947).
(31) The survival of a large part of Gregory's Registrum accounts for our wealth of information regarding the Patrimony at this period. See two articles by H. Grisar, Ein Rundgang durch die Patrimonien des heiligen Stuhles um das Jahr 600, in Zeitschrift f. katholische Theologie, I, 1877, p. 321-360 (esp. p. 353-354), and Verwaltung und Haushalt der päpstlichen Patrimonien um das Jahr 600, Ibid., p. 526-563; E. Spearing, The Patrimony of the Roman Church in the time of Gregory the Great, Cambridge, 1918; and the excellent summary in L. Breherier and R. Aigrain, Grégoire le Grand, les États barbares, et la conquête arabe (= vol. 5 of A. Fliche and V. Martin, Histoire de l'Église), Paris,
rector of part at least of the Patrimony was Dynamius patricius Galliarum, whom we have seen already as rector Provinciae, for Gregory wrote in April 593 congratulating him on his conscientious management of it and thanking him for 400 solidi Gallicani sent him by the hand of Hilary (32). Shortly afterwards, as we have seen, Dynamius fell into disgrace, and the pope seized the opportunity to replace a lay manager by a cleric. On 15 April 595 he wrote to the conductores of the papal estates in Gaul, saying he is busy making arrangements for the future but that for the moment they should obey the patricius Arigius and pay him the customary excepta, while they should choose one of their own number to collect the pensiones of the estates and hold them till his representative could arrive and take them over (33). This representative was a priest named Candidus, who was sent from Rome in September with a commendatory letter to Childebert II (34) and instructions not to send the revenues of the Patrimony in the form of cash, since Gallic coin was not acceptable at Rome, but either in the form of English slaves who might be trained in the monastic vocation or in that of clothing suitable for the poor (35).

The following summer (596) Gregory followed up the sending of Candidus with a spate of letters addressed to those likely to be affected by his activities and commending him to them. These letters were confided to Augustine, then setting out for England, and since they are also concerned to introduce Augustine they are less informative than they might have been, for we cannot be sure in every case whether the name of Candidus is thrown in as a matter of form or whether there were really any papal estates in the recipient's diocese or area of government. Such letters were sent to the kings Theoderic II and Theodebert II and their grandmother Brunhild, to Arigius patricius de Gallia, and to at least seven ecclesiastics: Serenus of Marseilles, Vergil of Arles, Protasius

1938, p. 543-553. From Gregory's letters it is apparent that the estates in southern Gaul were the only part of the Patrimony which the Papacy still retained outside the contracted imperial frontiers.


(33) Ibid., V, 31 (p. 311-312). The excepta were small payments in kind which formed part of the rector's perquisites.

(34) Registrum, VI, 6 (p. 385). It has been quoted above, n. 22.

(35) Ibid., VI, 10 (p. 388-389): «quatenus solidi Galliarum, qui in terra nostra expendi non possunt, apud locum proprium utiliter expendantur». 
of Aix-en-Provence, Desiderius of Vienne, Aetherius of Lyon, Syagrius of Autun, and Pelagius of Tours (36). There were probably other letters which have not survived, for the copy sent to Aetherius is preserved by Bede but is not in the Regestrum. Only in the case of Arles is there a clear reference to papal estates in the diocese, for there they had been managed many years by Vergil's predecessor Licerius and the revenues were still due. Vergil is instructed to pay them over to Candidus, and Protasius of Aix, who had formerly been an official in the diocese of Arles, is asked to use his influence with Vergil to ensure that this is done.

Candidus makes several further appearances in Gregory's correspondence. He received a letter from the pope in July 599 and he is mentioned in letters to Brunhild of September 597 and to Desiderius of Vienne in June 601 (37). That summer he visited Rome and returned with letters of commendation addressed to Asclepiodatus, who had succeeded Arigius as patricius Galliarum, and to another Arigius, bishop of Gap (38). He outlived Gregory, for he is mentioned in a letter of Boniface IV to Florianus of Arles of 23 August 613 (39). This letter, indeed, contains the last reference which we have to the papal patrimony in the country (40). Whether it was annexed by Chlotar II after his absorption of the Midi (41) or whether it gradually fell into the hands of local bishops and lay magnates we cannot tell. All we know is that it had disappeared without any trace by the time that the Liber Censuum came to be compiled, and that no allusions to its former existence occur in the correspondence between the Papacy and the Frankish monarchy of the Carolingian period (42).

(36) Regestrum, VI. 49-53, 56, 57 (p. 423-432). The letter to Aetherius of Lyon is in Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, I, 24, the date being 23 July 596. Bede mistakenly makes Aetherius bishop of Arles.


(38) Ibid., XI, 43, 44 (p. 316-317).


(40) *Practerea patrimoniolum ecclesiae nostrae in illis partibus constitutum, quemadmodum olim habuistis in omnibus commendatum, quacsu­mus, ut in eo se fraternitas vestra amplius debeat commodare*.

(41) The annexation of the Midi followed Chlothar's victory over Brunhild in 613, but its effective occupation may have been delayed by the conspiracy of the patrician Aletheus alluded to in Fredegarius, Chron., IV, 44 (M.G.H., Script. rer. Merov., II, 142-143).

(42) Papal memories were better in Italy, for we find John VII recovering
Little can be said regarding the geography or the size of the patrimony in Gaul. That it was concentrated in Provence is clear from Gregory's correspondence. The greater part of it was apparently in the dioceses of Marseilles and Arles: so much seems to emerge from the prominence of the three *rectores Provinciae* and the bishops of Arles in the correspondence. There is nothing to preclude further estates at Uzès and Viviers or as far afield as Vienne, but positive evidence is lacking. Gregory always describes it as «a small patrimony» (*patrimoniolum*), but this may be due to a mixture of prudence and literary affectation. It cannot have been quite as unimportant as he suggests if Dynamius could send him 400 solidi in the way of rent, particularly if this were only an instalment of one year's revenue \(^{(43)}\). Here we have little comparative material. Modern estimates of the size and income of the Patrimony as a whole are pure guesswork, and the 3500 lbs. of gold which Theophanes reckons as the annual income of the papal estates in Calabria and Sicily at the time of their confiscation by Leo the Isaurian may well be little more \(^{(44)}\). The papal estates at Picenum in the time of Pelagius I brought in an income of 500 solidi \(^{(45)}\), but these must have been very extensive, for under Gregory II the whole island of Capri was leased for 109 solidi and 100 *megarici* of wine \(^{(46)}\). A sum of 400 solidi amounted to what appears to have been a substantial part of the revenues of the see of Naples in the year 600 \(^{(47)}\). We can fairly conclude that the papal estates in Gaul must have been of quite respectable

\(^{(43)}\) Exactly what the sum represents is not clear, since despite Gregory's attempts to ensure annual payments and proper auditing the revenues of the Patrimony were often several years in arrear. The 400 solidi might therefore be more and not less than a year's income.

\(^{(44)}\) THEOPHANES, *Chronographia*, A. M. 6224 (Bonn edn., I, 631). 3500 lbs. of gold would be 25,200 solidi.


\(^{(47)}\) GREGORY, *Reg.*, X1, 22 (*Epist.* 11, 283).
dimensions, even if of only secondary importance when compared with the Patrimony in Campania or Sicily.

The probability that the pseudo-imperial coins are to be attributed to the rectors of the Patrimony in southern Gaul is based in part on the fairly close correspondence between the regions and periods involved, and in part on the fact that the rectors of the Patrimony would be the only persons in Gaul who could with propriety — and impunity — issue a coinage of such a nature. As papal representatives and as controllers of a wealthy complex of landed estates they must have been amongst the most prominent personages in Provence, even when they were not, as in the case of Candidus' predecessors, important secular or ecclesiastical officials as well. Their right to issue coin could scarcely have been gainsaid, and in view of the conditions of Frankish Gaul they would certainly have found it convenient to do so. The presence of mint letters on the coins implies only that the coins were issued in these localities, not that they were issued by them. Since papal property was not restricted to agricultural estates it may well be that the revenues of the rectors were augmented by rents and investments in such commercial centres as Arles and Marseilles, as were those of the see of Alexandria in the east (48).

Coins issued by the rectors of the Patrimony would naturally emanate from a number of centres. Since the pope was an imperial subject they would bear the emperor's name, but because the papal residence and centre of power was in Italy this circumstance would imply no disloyalty to Frankish sovereigns or invite their jealousy. At the same time, since the coinage was intended for circulation in Gaul it would conform to the systems of weight and value there employed. It is significant that special precautions were taken to ensure that the coins should not be confused with the products of imperial mints; the use of different coin types and the indication of a distinct weight standard would make it easy for the pope to defend himself against possible charges of counterfeiting being brought by officials of the fisc (49). There


(49) It is probably no more than a coincidence, though it is a noteworthy one, that our only literary references to solidi Gallicani and the fact that they could not be used in imperial territory occur in two letters of Gregory the
is even one striking coincidence of detail. The coins of Maurice fall into two distinct series, an early one without a wreath and a later one with a wreath on the reverse; the solidi of the first series also have a facing bust and those of the second class a profile one. The first series is the commoner of the two and there is much variety in the legends, suggestive of an absence or at least a weakness of central control; the second, concentrated mainly at Marseilles but including also Arles and Viviers, is extremely uniform and implies a reassertion of authority, probably emanating from Marseilles. The date of the replacement of the first type by the second is evidently sometime in the last decade of Maurice’s reign and Rigold suggests for it c. 596. No great stress can be laid on a date that in the nature of things can be only approximate, but it is significant that it was precisely in 595 that Candidus arrived in Gaul and set about the establishment of his authority in the Patrimony, particularly in that part of it which had been in the hands of the bishop of Arles and separated for some years from the rest.

None of these arguments can be regarded as proof, but they do on balance create a strong presumption that it is to the Patrimonium in illis partibus, as Gregory termed the Patrimony in Gaul, that the pseudo-imperial coins should be assigned. Such an hypothesis accounts for all the peculiarities of the series; the period of issue; the geographical distribution of mints; the revival of an imperial legend at so late a date; the toleration of this by Guntram and Sigebert and their successors; the care taken to differentiate the coins from those produced by the mints of the empire. Where the correspondence cannot be proved in detail, as in the precise list of mints, this may be only due to the inadequacy of our sources; certainly there is no contradiction between the literary and the numismatic evidence. This being the case, I believe that the views here put forward should be accepted as the most satisfactory explanation yet proposed for the coinage. One can only hope that further research may bring more evidence to light, and allow us definitely to assign to the popes a coinage.

Great. U. Monneret de Villard, in Rivista italiana di numismatica, XXXVI, 1923, p. 8, n. 3, has suggested that a reference to solidi franci in a formula published by Lindenbrog envisages these coins, but the better text of Mon. Germ. Hist., Formulae, p. 278, shows this to be a misreading for solidi tanti.
outside the empire which they could not as yet consider creating within its frontiers (50).

*Bruxelles-Cambridge.*

Philip GRIERSON.

---

(50) I should like to express my thanks to Prof. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, whose competence in the field of Merovingian history far exceeds my own, for reading and commenting on various points in this article.