The coinage of Tours in the Merovingian Period and the Pirenne Thesis

(Pl. IV-V)

The issue of the transition from the world of late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages belongs to the major historiographic debates of the twentieth century. After the series of studies by Henry Pirenne, the discussion of this issue has been constantly linked to the concept of this Belgian historian, which came to be known as the Pirenne thesis. The historiographic disputes in the six decades after Pirenne concentrated on either Merovingian trade or Merovingian numismatics in general. Yet the references to the latter have an ambiguous character since Merovingian coinage still presents more questions than clear answers to the scholars. Therefore, the case study of a particular Merovingian mint or region can bring new evidence into the contemporary debate. Although the narrow specter of the study may partly limit the verifiable value of the conclusions, such an approach can be as fruitful as general speculations about Merovingian numismatics. The coinage of Tours, together with related written sources, provides results which may be interesting for any student of the Pirenne thesis.

The history of Tours as a Roman town begins in the first century A.D. During the third and fourth centuries, it became one of the most important Christian centers of Gaul, especially through the missionary activity of Bishop Martin who was later acknowledged as the confessor of Gaul. His relics were kept in a basilica constructed in a suburb of Tours — at a distance less than a kilometer from the city — by the bishop of Tours, Perpetuus, and dedicated to Saint Martin in 471 (1). Even the cathedral of Tours, which came to be called Saint Maurice during seventh and eighth centuries due to translation there of the relics of the Holy Legion by Gregory of Tours in 589-590 (2), was overshadowed by the basilica. Holding the relics of Saint Martin, the basilica became the center of his cult and, consequently, a famous place of pilgrimage in Gaul in the

(*) Ildar H. Garipzanov, Fordham University. Dept. of History, 441 East Fordham Road, Bronx, NY 10458-9993, USA.

(1) For a detailed description of the basilica in the sixth century, see L. Piétri, La ville de Tours du IVe au VIe siècle: naissance d'une cité chrétienne (Collection de l'école française de Rome, 69), Rome, 1983, p. 372-405.

sixth to seventh centuries. Saint Martin created the image of the city in early medieval Gaul, and the prosperity of Tours was based on his cult.

In the time of Clovis I, at the beginning of the sixth century, this cult received royal protection. Thereafter, Saint Martin gradually became a royal patron, especially for the rulers of Austrasian subkingdom in the period 557-579. As a result of royal charity, Saint Martin became one of the richest monasteries of Frankish Gaul, and by the end of the eighth century, it was the owner of 20,000 serfs and 48 villas. Another source of the prosperity of the community around Saint-Martin's cult was the fiscal immunity given by Frankish kings Chlothar I and then Charibert to the civitas of Tours, including Saint-Martin, in the second half of the sixth century.

The wealth of Saint-Martin was not only the result of royal whims, but also the consequence of gifts from individuals. Gregory of Tours (the chief chronicler of the sixth century) mentions a rich noble Francilius and his wife Clara (divites valde in agris) who dedicated most of their lands to the basilica. Later, Gregory relates the case of Baudinus who presented 20,000 solidi to the basilica for distribution to the poor. As early as the sixth century, a religious community lived near the basilica caring for the tomb of the saint, performing the liturgy, and assisting pilgrims. There existed the basilica itself with the tomb and treasury (thesaurus basilicae sancti Martinii), a domus basilicae, a building for the abbot and monks, and a matricula for the poor and, perhaps, for pilgrims. Thus, the basilica of Saint-Martin had the main features characteristic of early monasticism throughout Western Europe. However, Saint-Martin received the official status of a monastery only with the adoption of the Rule of Columbanus at the middle of the seventh century. The establishment of the independence of the monastery from any interference by Tours' bishop continued gradually during the next hundred years, marked by two charters confirming the internal freedom and immunity of the monastery.


(4) Gregorius Turonensis, Libri historiarum decem, IV, 2, and IX, 30, describes two unsuccessful attempts to introduce taxation of the population of the civitas in the second half of the sixth century. See for details Pietri, La ville de Tours, p. 201-223.

(5) Libri historiarum decem, X, 31, 14 and 16.

A discussion of the role of the basilica of Saint-Martin in the history of Tours should not omit the coinage struck there. In its basic features, the coinage of Tours followed the development of Merovingian coinage in general, which can be divided into three main stages. First, there was pseudo-imperial coinage, which primarily imitated the contemporary gold Byzantine coinage (from the end of the fifth century to the 570s). Because of their imitative character, it is very difficult to attribute these coins to any Gallic mints, or in particular, to Tours. The second stage (the 580s-670s) is the national coinage. At that time, some coins were struck with the name of a king, but most of them have only the name of a mint and moneyer (monelarius). This is the reason why most of these Merovingian coins can be dated only approximately. If we add that there were more than 800 mints and several thousand moneyers, the obscurity of Merovingian coinage becomes more evident. In the 670s the debased gold Merovingian coinage was replaced by silver coinage, which became the main feature of the third and last period until the middle of the eighth century (7). These problems of Merovingian coinage hamper any general study of a period or region and make the study of the development of a particular coinage based on the written sources more productive.

There are 46 gold and 61 silver Merovingian coins known for Tours. They can be subdivided into two groups on the basis of their legends: the first one bears the name of the city on the obverse, Turonus or Turonus civitas and will be referred to as the urban or civic coinage; the second one identifies Saint-Martin and will be considered to be connected to the basilica. These appear to be separate issues and represent discrete minting authorities. The dating of these coins presents many difficulties, especially for the gold coinage, because there are only a few gold coins which can be dated on the basis of hoard analysis. Therefore, other techniques of dating such as specific gravity method and the stylistic comparison of the images and legends are very important.

(a) Gold coinage

Three of the gold coins of Tours can be dated easily due to the presence of a royal name on them. These comprise two coins of the moneyer Antimis, in the name of Childebert I, who obtained real control over Tours only in 592-595, and a coin of Gemellus in the name of Dagobert I, who was king of Neustria in 629-639. Therefore, these two moneyers create the starting framework for a numismatic chronology for Tours. As mentioned

earlier, hoard analysis can provide a few additions to this framework. There are four hoards of gold coins containing some coins of Tours.

1) The Lucy hoard (ar. Dieppe, c. Neufchâtel, dép. Seine-Maritime) was found in a tomb in 1851. This hoard contains 5 coins with the names of moneyers. Among them, there is a coin of Tours minted by Domnigisilus. This hoard is very difficult to date because of the absence of any royal coins in it. Jean Lafaurie, based on coin types, dated this hoard c.630 (8). Georges Depeyrot, having analyzed the development of the reverse types on Merovingian gold coinage, found that two coins from this hoard, those of Draveil and Bordeaux, belong typologically to the period c.620-c.640, while a coin of Gannat dated to 585-620. Due to this fact he dated the hoard to c.650 (9). However, on the basis of the existing evidence this hoard can hardly be dated so precisely. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the hoard was deposited between c.630-c.650. Because of its character as a funerary deposit, this hoard probably contains coins taken from circulation, and, therefore, all coins would be of more-or-less the same period. It means that the above-mentioned coin of Domnigisilus belongs to the period c.620-c.640.

2) The La Baugisière hoard (c. Saint-Michel-le-Clercq, dép. Vendée) was found about 1810. Most of the hoard was melted down, so we have only a general account of it. In particular, it is known that it contained a coin of the city of Tours and another one of Saint-Martin. The dating of the hoard relies only on the presence of a gold coin of Sigibert III (634-656). Consequently, this hoard could have been abandoned c.640-c.660 (10). Thus, the only positive information is that the urban coinage of Tours and that of Saint-Martin may have existed until c.660, but even this general conclusion might not be true.

3) The Saint-Aubin hoard (Sommières, c. Saint-Aubin-sur-Aire, dép. Meuse), consisting of 28 coins, was found in 1840. There is a coin of Charibert I (629-632) and two coins of Dagobert I (622-639) in the hoard. Therefore, this hoard was deposited not earlier than the 620s. To fix the terminus ante quem is more difficult because all the other coins have only names of moneyers and mint. Grierson argues that the absence of any obviously early coins suggests the 650s or 660s as the most possible date of the hoard (11). Jean Lafaurie and Alan Stahl prefer an earlier date between 630 and 640 for this hoard (12).

---

(10) Grierson and Blackburn, Medieval European Coinage (op. cit., n. 7), p. 126, dated the hoard by the end of the 630s, while J. Pilet-Lemièr, Monnaies mérovingiennes de Tours, in Tours: études numismatiques, BSFN 52, supplément, 1997, p. 44, dated it by c. 670.
(11) Grierson and Blackburn, Medieval European Coinage (op. cit., n. 7), p. 127.
The weight distribution supports the inference that the main part of the Saint-Aubin hoard consists of coins struck before the 640s-650s, as the weight standard between 1.24g and 1.28g was usual for the earlier period. These coins taken out of circulation were likely not the best ones, but rather were the result of a random selection since the two coins of Dagobert I have very different weights, 1.15g and 1.32g. Thus, it is reasonable to propose a date of c.640 for this hoard. It contains a coin of Saint-Martin struck by Gemellus and a coin of Moderatus for the mint of Baracillum. The latter coin is important for the dating of the moneyer Moderatus who is known to have struck coins for Saint-Martin as well.

Table 1. Coin weights in the Saint-Aubin hoard (13)

![Coin weights in the Saint-Aubin hoard](image)

4) The Bordeaux hoard was found in 1803 and contained over 184 Merovingian and Visigothic gold coins. Its dating is very obscure due to the fact that the content is not known properly, especially for its Visigothic component. It was probably deposited in the 670s (14), however, the dating of this hoard is not significant for understanding the coinage of Tours. The only coin of Tours in the hoard can be dated independently because it is the above-mentioned coin of Gemellus minted in the name of King Dagobert I. However, this coin of the 630s shows how wide the gap could be between the minting of a coin and the date of a hoard deposit.

Thus, the evidence of hoards is not enough to build up the basic chronology of the gold coinage of Tours. Therefore, it is necessary to turn to

(13) This table based on the description of the hoard by L. Maxe-Werly, Monnaies mérovingiennes, trouvaille de Saint-Aubin (Meuse), in RN, s. 3, 8, 1890, p. 12-53.
(14) For discussion and references, see Grierson and Blackburn, Medieval European Coinage (op. cit., n. 7), p. 127.
methodological considerations. The first of these rests on the observation of a progressive decline in the fineness of Merovingian coins (15). There are seven gold coins of Tours whose gold contents are known, all determined by specific gravity. First, there are three coins of moneyer Antimis that have gold contents characteristic of the last decades of the sixth century: 93.4%, 91.2%, and 90.5%. Thus, they have a range of difference 2.9%, which is less than the probable level of errors for the specific gravity method. Therefore, these coins were struck approximately at the same time. Due to the presence of two coins in the name of Childebert I among them we can date the urban coins of Antimis to the 590s.

The next three coins tested belong to the monetarius Gemellus. The coin of Gemellus in the name of Dagobert I has a gold content of 44.5%. Two others coins with the legend Sancti Martini have slightly higher gold contents of 55.5% and 61.5%, and they were probably issued earlier in the 620s or at the beginning of the 630s. The last coin whose gold content is known is in the collection of the American Numismatic Society and is important because it helps to fix the largest gold series of Tours, namely, the series Racio basilici Sancti Martini. Its gold content of 47.7% is lower than Saint-Martin's issue made by Gemellus. This number corresponds to the average gold content of Merovingian coins of the 640s. Therefore, one can propose that the series Racio basilici Sancti Martini replaced the series Gemellus-Sancti Martini in the 630s.

A small group of coins in Prou's catalogue of Merovingian coins in the Bibliothèque Nationale are indicated as 'pale' or 'white'. Some of these coins were analyzed by Oddy using specific gravity. His results show that coins characterized by Prou as 'pale' have gold content below 30%, and the 'white' coins have less gold content, below 20-25% and more often near 0%, while coins without these remarks have gold content above 25-30%. This evidence could provide a basis for dating because it is known that the level below 30% was characteristic of the last decades of Merovingian gold coinage, from the 650s. Relying on this, we can date a coin of the series Racio basilici Sancti Martini mentioned as pale to the 650s. The same could be said about 'pale' coins of Domnigisilus with the legend TVRONVS CIVE and of Moderatus minted in Baracillum. As to the 'white' coin of Fraternus with the legend Sancti Martini, it was probably struck in the 660s or even the 670s.

The next basis for dating provided is a consideration of the weights of the coins together with stylistic features of their types. Georges Depeyrot has proposed that before 560 the weight standard for a triens was 1.51g

corresponding to a solidus of 24 siliquas. In the period 560-585 the weight standard was 1.32g (solidus = 21 siliquas), and after 585, it was 1.26g (solidus = 20 siliquas) (16). Thus, the general tendency of that period was a decrease of coin weight. However, these weight debasements could have been later, and probably there was a further decrease of the coin weight in the first half of the seventh century. For instance, the coinage of Tours demonstrates that the transition from the solidus equal to 24 siliquas to the solidus equal to 21 siliquas occurred in the 590s.

The coinage of Tours was in effect at least by the 560s. There are two coins of the transitional period from the pseudo-imperial coinage to the national one (the 560s-570s), which could be attributed to Tours (17). They have a profile bust with 'boucle perdue' and the blundered mint legend Taronus civitas on the obverse, and the image of standing Victory holding wreath and cross on the reverse (nos 1-2), widespread in the period of the pseudo-imperial coinage and inherited from late Roman coins. One of them has a weight of 1.40g. The image of the Victory appears also on a coin of Chadomarus as the mint-and-minter type (no. 4). His other coin, with the weight 1.49g, has the cross pattée as a reverse type which is considered as the initial stage of the development of the cross on the reverse of Merovingian gold coins (no. 3). The replacement of the Victory by the cross on the Byzantine coins occurred during the reign of Tiberius II (578-582) (18). Therefore, the minting activity of Chadomarus can be defined as the 570s-580s. Narrative sources confirm the fact that there was a Toronensis monetarius in the 580s (19). Thus, by that time, there may have been a constant mint in Tours.

The coinage of Tours has a peculiar stylistic design on the coins of Antimis (nos. 5-8, Pl. IV, 2) in the 590s, most of which have an image rare in Merovingian coinage, the image of a beast looking backwards. The sources of inspiration for this image must be sought in German art; a depiction of the head of the similar beast looking backwards appears on bracteates made in northern Europe in the seventh and eighth centuries. Two coins of Antimis have weights corresponding to the solidus of 21 siliquas, 1.31g and 1.30g, while the other two have weights of 1.39g and 1.36g, higher than this standard, but less than the solidus of 24 siliquas. The possible explanation of this fact is that the transition from the 24 siliqua standard to 21 siliqua standard developed gradually and probably

(16) DEPEYROT, Le numéraire mérovingien (op. cit., n. 9), vol. 1, p. 22.
(17) J. LAFORIE and J. PILLET-LEMIÈRE, Réflexions sur les monnaies mérovingiennes de Tours, in BSFN, 52, 1997, p. 112, dated these coins to c. 558-561.
(18) DEPEYROT, Le numéraire mérovingien (op. cit., n. 9), vol. 1, p. 25.
(19) VITA ARIDII, 33, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Merovingiarum, vol. 3, ed. B. KRUSCH, Hanover, 1896, p. 591, narrates for the 580s: "Quaedam mulier Ricovera nomine, contiuna Tortonci monetaire, cum sancto viro medium ampullam cum deo benedicendi causa fideliter optulisset ..."
was not regulated by the central authorities. As a result, this transition developed over a few decades, in the 580s-590s.

The next moneyer whose coins can be dated on the basis of stylistic features is Maurus. One of his coins has a cross pattée, the earliest type of the cross on Merovingian gold coins. In addition, we have two coins of Maurus with a Greek cross on two steps or one step. On the basis of these features the coinage of Maurus can be dated to the 600s-620s. His coins have legends either TVRONAS (nos. 14-16, Pl. IV, 4) or Racio ecclesie (nos. 17-18, Pl. IV, 3 and 6). One of the coins with the latter legend has the letters I, P, T, and O around a cross. These letters could be interpreted as in pago Toronico, in which case the coins with the legend Racio ecclesie could have been struck outside Tours. The coin of Modestus (no. 19), with the legend Racio Sancti Mauricii and the abbreviation of the ECCLesia, was probably struck after this series of Maurus, in the c.630s due to the fact that its weight, 1.31g, would be unusual for a later period (20).

The same mint legend TVRONAS also appears on the coins of another moneyer of Tours, Laurufus (nos. 10-13, Pl. IV, 5). However, the types of crosses used on his coins, an anchored cross and a Latin cross on a globe, are very different from those of Maurus, while similar types of crosses appear on the coins of Gemellus dated by the 620s-630s (nos. 26-30). It is therefore possible to propose that the coins of Laurufus were struck after those of Maurus, and simultaneously with the coins of Gemellus with the legend Sancti Martini in the 620s-630s.

The last moneyer who struck gold coins for the city of Tours was probably Domnigisilus whose activity could be dated to the 630s-650s. His earlier coins have the mint legend TVRONVS (nos. 20-22), while later he used the legend TVRONVS CIVI (nos. 23-25) — one of the latter coins is mentioned as pale — repeated on the earliest silver coins of Tours in the 670s. The main reverse type used by him was the Latin cross, which had occurred on the coins of Laurufus. Domnigisilus also issued coins in other mints near Tours. A coin of Ballan (vicus Balaletonen), located 7km south of Tours, is known with his name (no. 25a). This coin has a weight (1.09g) very different from his coins struck in Tours, which have weights between 1.20g-1.24g.

The features of the bust on the obverse provide another basis for relative chronology. The comparison of the bust on the coin of Laurufus (no. 10) and that of Gemellus in the name of Dagobert I (no. 26) shows that the obverse dies for these coins were probably made by the same die-engraver. The same is true for the other coin of Gemellus made for Saint-Martin (no. 28), three coins of the series Racio basilici Sancti Martini (nos. 37-39), and the coin of Domnigisilus made for Ballan. They all

(20) The same dating is proposed by LAFaurie and PILET-LEMIÈRE, Réflexions (op. cit., n. 17), p. 113.
have busts with similar features to the previous pair, but, unlike them, they have the depiction of shoulders of the bust in form of the letter M. All these dies could have been made by the same die-engraver in the 620s-640s. Therefore, it is possible to argue that Domnigisilus issued coins for Ballan in the 630s-640s while he was moneyer of Tours.

The coinage in the name of Saint Martin after Gemellus did not include the name of a moneyer. The emergence of this series *Racio basilici Sancti Martini* happened probably in the 630s. Fourteen coins are known now, which are made from eight different obverse and reverse dies (nos 31-44, Pl. IV, 7-10). There are several die-links, which demonstrate that this series was continual during the course of several decades. This series departs slightly from the weight standard usual of the first third of the seventh century. The earlier coins of the series *Gemellus - Sancti Martini* have weights of 1.44g, 1.31g, 1.25g, and 1.15g, with the average weight being 1.29g. It is reasonable to suppose that they were probably minted on the standard of a 21 siliqua solidus.

Unlike the previous series, that of *Racio basilici* (table 2) were made on the standard of a 20 siliqua solidus, but even this standard was not maintained later, and the weight of this series in the 550s-560s was c.1.15g. Thus, the coinage of Saint-Martin demonstrates that this transition of the weight of the solidus from 21 to 20 siliquas occurred in the 620s-630s, not in 585 as Depeyrot argues. Let us take for comparison the coinage of Saint-Denis (21) produced most likely at the same time as the coinage of Saint-Martin. There are 19 coins known which were issued by moneyer Ebregisilus: nine of them have the name of the monastery of Saint-Denis, while the others were struck in the name of the village Catullacum located near the monastery. They all have a similar reverse, an anchored cross on a globe. However, their weights (table 3) explicitly show the difference between these two groups. The only possible interpretation is that the series *Catullaco* followed the series *Sancti Dionisii*, and the date of the latter series is c.620-the 630s, while the former one was later, that is, in the 630s-c.640.

The series *Ebregisilus-Sancii Dionisii* and *Gemellus-Sanci Martini* are very similar. They both have the weight standard around of 1.30g. They both have an anchored cross as a type of the reverse. Thus, they were struck probably at the same time, more likely in the 620s. However, in the 630s, these coinages of Saint-Martin and Saint-Denis diverged. The name of Saint-Denis disappeared from that series of coins, while the coins of Saint-Martin received the additional words *Racio basilici*. What was the reason for such different developments in the coinage of these two important religious centers of Merovingian Gaul?

(21) This analysis is made on the basis of the list of Saint-Denis' coins by DEPEYROT, *Le numéraire mérovingien* (op. cit., n. 9), vol. 2, p. 149. He attributes these coins on the basis of these stylistic features to the period c. 620-c. 640.
Table 2. Series Racio basilici Sancti Martini (22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight Range</th>
<th>Known only from Belfort</th>
<th>Real Coins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.09-1.13g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14-1.18g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19-1.23g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24-1.28g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29-1.33g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34-1.38g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The coins of Ebregisilus for Saint-Denis and Catullacum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight Range</th>
<th>Sancti Dionisii</th>
<th>Catullaco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.14-1.18g</td>
<td>1.18g</td>
<td>1.23g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19-1.23g</td>
<td>1.28g</td>
<td>1.33g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24-1.28g</td>
<td>1.38g</td>
<td>1.38g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29-1.33g</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34-1.38g</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(22) In addition to the weights of real coins which are in museum collections or appear in auction catalogues, the weights of coins from the catalogue by Belfort, the locations of which are not known now, have been included.

1) 1.10g.
2) 1.15g (g. c. below 30%), 1.15g, 1.15g, 1.15g, 1.17g, 1.17g, 1.18g.
3) 1.19g, 8 coins - 1.20g (1 coin has g. c. 47.7%), 1.23g.
4) 1.24g, 1.25g.
6) 1.35g.
In the 650s or in the 660s, the regular coinage of Saint-Martin was replaced by the occasional issues by traveling moneyers. One of them is that of Moderatus, who was a moneyer in Baracillum, in the province of Limoges, between the 630s and 660s. The other coin was struck by Fraternus who was a moneyer in Alingavias (Langeais), located 20 km to the west of Tours. This coin is white and has a weight of 0.98g. This indicates that it was minted in the 660s or even in the 670s. The existence of these traveling moneyers raises the question why they were invited to strike these coins, rather than a moneyer from Tours? The possible solution to this puzzle is that there was no moneyer in Tours in the 660s.

(b) Silver coinage

In the 670s the gold coinage of Tours and throughout Gaul as a whole was replaced by a silver one. The first urban coins were made by an unknown moneyer whose dies were of very good quality. It seems that the die-engraver was a very brilliant artifex, who explored various images for the reverse dies such as a standing Victory, copied from the earlier coins, a throne (Pl. V, 11), two figures with nimbus standing face to face (Pl. V, 12), and a figure with two swans (nos. 47-50). The latter two coins have the name of king Childericus on the obverse, which allow us date them to 673-675 (23). They all have the mint legend TVRONVS CIVI, which was that of the last issue of gold coins, those of Domnigisilus. These coins are quite rare, probably because the issues came from a single die pair, and are not found in any Merovingian hoard of silver coins.

The bulk of the silver coinage of Tours may be dated fairly on the basis of hoards and stylistic analysis. There are four hoards of Merovingian silver coins containing coins of Tours.

1) The Saint-Pierre-les-Étiex hoard (arr. Saint-Amand-Mont-Rhône, c. Charenton-sur-Cher, dép. Cher) was found in 1882. This pot-hoard has 103 silver coins and a gold triens of Banassac contemporary to or later than the reign of Sigibert III (634-656). This is the only silver hoard with a gold Merovingian coin, which, together with the weight standard of the silver coins of between 1.21-1.30g, allows us identify it as the earliest one. As this weight standard is lower than that of the coins of Tours datable to 673-675, the hoard must have been deposited a few decades after that date.

2) The Piassac hoard (arr. and c. Blaye, dép. Gironde) was discovered in 1850 and consists of 170 deniers (24). The peak of coin weights in this


(24) For these two hoards see J. Lafaurie, Monnaies d’argent mérovingiennes des VIIe et V VIIIe siècles: les trésors de Saint-Pierre-les-Étiex (Cher), Piassac (Gironde) et Nohant (Puy-de-Dôme), in RN, s. 6, 11, 1969, p. 98-219.
hoard is between 1.06g and 1.30g, which allows us to propose a dating for this hoard later than that of previous one.

3) The Bais hoard (dép. Ille-et-Vilaine) was found in 1904 \(^{(25)}\). This pot-hoard consisted of 407 deniers and many uncoined pieces of silver, so probably represents coins collected for further remelting. Therefore, the maker of this hoard appears to have accumulated heavier coins, so it does not represent the weight model of contemporary coins. The modal weight of coins of this hoard falls between 1.06-1.30g. Unlike the two previous hoards, that of Bais has a few deniers and flans of a rectangular form. This transition from circular flan to rectangular one took place at other Merovingian mints in the first half of the eighth century. Therefore, it is reasonable to propose that the Bais hoard was deposited soon after that of Piassac. All datable coins in this hoard belong to the 680s-690s. Thus, all the features of this hoard lead me to agree with the chronology proposed by Grierson, who also considered the dating of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian coins in these hoards \(^{(26)}\). Thus, the following dates can be used for these hoards: Saint-Pierre-les-Étueix - c.700, Piassac - c.705, and Bais - c.710.

4) The Savonnières hoard (dép. Indre-et-Loire), containing 45 coins, was discovered at a place 14 km to the west of Tours in 1865. Lafaurie was able to reconstruct almost the whole hoard (39 coins). This hoard consists mainly of coins from Tours so it cannot be dated on the basis of coins from other regions. This hoard does not have any coin known to us from other hoards, and as its average coin weight is about 1.00g, it was abandoned much later than the Bais hoard. There is, however, a stylistic connection between some coins of Tours known from the Bais hoard and four coins of Savonnières. While most of its coins are made of rectangular flan, a few of them have circular form. As there is no similarity to the coins of the Carolingian ruler Pepin the Short, struck in Tours in the 750s, this hoard can be seen as representing the development of the coinage of Tours in the 710s-730s. The silver content of one coin from this hoard (no. 89) is known. It is composed of c.94% silver and c.6% copper \(^{(27)}\), while the coins struck in 670s (no. 47) and the 700s (no. 66) contain about 90% silver and 10% copper \(^{(28)}\). An early Carolingian coin of Saint-Martin, minted in the 770s-780s, which was found in Dijon hoard, has a silver content of about 67% \(^{(29)}\). Therefore, the sil-


\(^{(26)}\) GRIERSON and BLACKBURN, Medieval European Coinage (op. cit., n. 7), p. 143-144.

\(^{(27)}\) LAFAURIE, Un nouveau denier de Childéric II (op. cit., n. 23), p. 423.


ver coin from Savonnières is closer, in its silver content, to the Merovingian silver coins minted at the last quarter of the seventh and at the very beginning of eighth century, than to the early Carolingian coin. Thus, all arguments are in favor of the date for Savonnières of c.740 proposed by Grierson, and an earlier date of c.735 could even be appropriate (30).

In addition to the hoards, the development of stylistic features on the silver coins of Tours is very useful for the creation of relative chronology (table 4). The first silver coins of Saint-Martin were struck by moneyer Leugaricus probably in the 670s (nos. 56-59). They have the legend Racio Sancti Martini, which had appeared on the gold coin of Moderatus. They also developed the reverse type of the cross chrismée of the latter by adding the second letter R on the left side of the cross. Another argument for this early dating is that one of them was found in Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux hoard. Thus, these coins probably followed the pattern set by the previous gold issues of the basilica.

As for urban coinage, the next moneyer after the unknown moneyer who produced the masterpieces in the 670s was Gandobertus (nos. 51-54). He used the same mint legend as his predecessor, TVRONVS CVI, and the same obverse type of a bust, but he invented a new type for the reverse, a monogram of Tours. The monogram was created originally from the letters T, V, N, and S, though, on one coin (no. 52), the letter E was added. The dating of his coins to the last decades of the seventh century is confirmed by their presence in the Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux, Piassac, and Bais hoards.

The next moneyer of Tours, replacing Gandobertus in the 690s, was Naudegisilus. His coins, found either in Piassac or in Bais, demonstrate three innovations. First, he developed the monogram of Tours by adding to it the letters R, O, and E. Thus, his monogram contains all the letters of the city name TVRONES. This use of the letter E at the end of the mint name was inherited by the Carolingian coins struck in Tours. Second, the monogram of Tours was surrounded by the legend Sancti Martini. This legend earlier was an attribute of the coinage of the basilica of Saint-Martin, which appears to have been interrupted after Leugaricus. Third, the complexity of the monogram resulted in a change whereby the corresponding die seems to have become the anvil die, while the die with the bust became the punch die. This supposition is based on the

(30) Lafaurie dated all these hoards to the 730s-740s. There is no argument in favor of this dating except his attempts to link them to the military expeditions of Charles Martel and Arabs at that time. However, the deposit of each hoard could have had other reasons, specific in every case, which are unknown to us. The dating of Savonnières to c. 750, proposed by Lafaurie, is especially unlikely, in light of the above-mentioning difference between the coins of this hoard and those of Pepin the Short. In his most recent article, written in cooperation with Pilet-Lemière in 1997, he adopted a chronology for the first three hoards proposed by Grierson, Lafaurie and Pilet-Lemière, Réflexions (op. cit., n. 17), p. 114.
observation that his four coins are made by means of three bust dies and only two dies with the monogram.

In the 700s, this development led to a logical result (nos. 64-69). The new series, found only in the later Bais hoard, keeps the monogram as an obverse type, but drops the reverse bust in favor of a barred S in a circle which developed into an S with two points on the sides. This reverse was used on four coins in the final hoard from Savonnières, which followed the previous series probably in c. 710. However, the monogram, blundered by that time (no. 70), was sacrificed in favor of two heads face to face, representing the same personages as an earlier silver coin with two figures, namely, Saint Martin and Saint Maurice (nos. 71-74).

The further development of the coinage of Tours can be reconstructed on the basis of a die-analysis of the coins of the Savonnières hoard, those of Unicter, Erloinus, and with the legend Sancti Martini instead of the name of a moneyer (table 5). The obverse die with a head and the legend Sancti Martin was used with four reverse dies with the name of Unicter (nos. 75-80) and five reverse dies with the same legend Sancti Martin (nos. 81-88, Pl. V, 13). This obverse die and one reverse die with the legend Sancti Martin also links the dies of Erloinus with the legends Erloinus (no. 97, Pl. V, 16) and Sancti Mauricio (no. 99, Pl. V, 15). The modal weight of these coins (nos. 99-107, Pl. V, 17) is about 1.00g. The second group of coins of Unicter have no die links to the first group (nos. 89-95). These coins have a different type of reverse and different average weight about 1.15g. The first series, with the legend Sancti Martin on both sides, is struck on circular flans, while the coins with the name of Unicter — especially his second group with the cross on the reverse — and with that of Erloinus have rectangular flans. This fact indicates that the series with Sancti Martin on both sides was the earliest one, and then it was replaced by the first group of Unicter. Later, this coinage was followed by that of Erloinus, while Unicter began to strike coins on a different standard with new dies and probably in a new place.

Thus, in the 710s, the obverse type with two heads developed into that of a single head, while the reverse type of S with two points on the sides continued with slight changes. This stage is represented by the coins with the legend Sancti Martin on both sides and the first group of Unicter. In the 720s, came the next stage, when the coins of Erloinus inherited the types of Unicter. Later Erloinus used two crossed letters S creating a swastika, while Unicter, working probably in another mint (possibly the basilica of Saint-Martin) returned to a type which had occurred on the last coins of Saint-Martin, struck by Leugaricus in the seventh century, namely: an equal-armed cross, which was to become so widespread in Carolingian times.

Thus, numismatic evidence shows that the activities of two mints of Tours, an urban one inside the city and that of the basilica of Saint-Martin, were different during the Merovingian period (table 6). The urban
mint struck gold at least from the second half of the sixth century until
the middle of the seventh century. It seems that in the 640s-660s the
production of the gold coin was curtailed within the city. The gold coin-
age of Saint-Martin, having emerged in the 620s-630s, flourished in the
630s-650s. Its stagnation occurred later than that of the urban coinage,
in the 660s-670s. In the 670s, with the transition of Merovingian coinage
from gold to silver, the urban coinage became significant again, while the
coins of Saint-Martin disappeared completely. As a result, by the end of
the seventh century, there was a single mint at Tours using the mono-
gram of the city and the legend Sancti Martin on its coins. This mint
followed the minting traditions of the previous urban one and was proba-
bly located inside the city. Only in the 720s-730s did the mint of Saint-
Martin begin to function again, forcing the urban mint to replace the
legend Sancti Martin by that of Sancti Mauricio. In addition, the findings
of the silver coins of Tours demonstrate that they had different circula-
tion pattern in comparison to the previous gold coins. While the gold
coins of Tours were scattered throughout Gaul, the finds of silver coins of
Tours are confined to the western regions of Gaul and the eastern coast
of Britain accessible for trade through river and sea routes.

How can we explain this development of the coinage of Tours? To
answer this question, one should turn to a problematic issue, namely,
the purpose and function of gold and silver coins in Merovingian Gaul.
Were they a real means of exchange or did they have strictly a redistrib-
utive role? Was the minting of gold coins somehow connected to the
fiscal system and taxation in the Merovingian kingdoms?

(c) The Pirenne thesis and Merovingian numismatics

Such questions are directly connected to the so-called Pirenne thesis
which originated between the two World Wars. After the publication of
The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, written by Ed-
ward Gibbon in the late eighteenth century, the historiography of late
Antiquity and the early Middle Ages was captivated, for a long time, by
the powerful influence of his thesis, that is the concept of an abrupt in-
terruption between the Roman civilization and Western European society
in the period of “the Dark Ages”. Consequently, in the nineteenth and
early twentieth centuries, there were discussions of particular reasons for
the fall of Rome, but all these discussions were firmly based on the
ground of the Gibbon thesis. This focus of early medieval historiography
was changed under the penetrating influence of Henry Pirenne’s works.

From the late 1910s to the mid-1930s, he wrote several works, which
formulated his famous concept. His thesis can be expressed by means of
his two main conclusions about the period. First, the Germanic invasion
did not destroy the Mediterranean civilization, which persisted up to the
eighth century. Second, the real break with classical tradition occurred in the eighth century, and the cause of that break was the rapid advance of Islam (31). The origins of the Pirenne thesis are already visible in his A History of Europe written between 1916 and 1918 after he was arrested and deported to Germany (32). In the 1920s, his thesis was elaborated by the addition of an economic argument. His famous article, published in those years, was "Mahomet et Charlemagne" (1922) (33). This article became the basis for his course of public lectures delivered in various universities, including several American ones. The latter were published in the United States under the title Medieval Cities. Referring to the works of contemporary French and German scholars, he explored Merovingian economic history as a decisive proof of his concept (34).

Merovingian numismatics became the crucial argument in his discourse. "In lack of other proofs, the monetary system of Frankish kings would alone establish this truth convincingly." The economic continuity with the Roman period is demonstrated by several features of Merovingian coinage: first, the adoption of Roman monetary system based on the solidus, the triens, and the denarius; second, the use of gold as the main metal; third, the imitation of Byzantine types on Merovingian coins. Pirenne argued that this imitation was due to intimate relations between Merovingian commerce and the Mediterranean (35). Completely relying on the conclusions of the main French authority in Merovingian numismatics, Maurice Prou (36), Pirenne thought that the silver denier replaced gold coinage only in the second half of the eighth century after the monetary reforms of Pepin the Short and Charlemagne. For him, the disappearance of gold coinage "had no other cause than the interruption of the commerce of the Mediterranean." In the ninth century the situation became even worse because "the State" lost the monopoly of minting. Pirenne considered this as another manifestation of economic decline: "History shows that the better commerce is sustained, the more monetary system is centralized and simplified" (37).

The final version of the Pirenne thesis is displayed in his last book Mahomet et Charlemagne, written in 1935. In this work, his treatment of Merovingian numismatics underwent profound changes due to more detailed acquaintance with the subject. He begins by repeating the argument that the imitative character of Merovingian coinage demonstrates the importance of Mediterranean trade for Frankish Gaul. At the same

(33) Id., Mahomet et Charlemagne, in RBPh, 1, 1922, p. 77-86.
(34) Id., Medieval Cities: Their Origin and the Revival of Trade, Princeton, 1925.
(35) Ibid., p. 15-16.
(37) Pirenne, Medieval Cities (op. cit., n. 34), p. 36-38.
time, the numismatic evidence undoubtedly pointed out that the organization of the Merovingian mints was decentralized. It made him repudiate the previous assumption that centralized minting was a sign of prosperous commerce. He followed the interpretation of the French numismatists, Arthur Engel and Raymond Serrure, that the diversity of Merovingian coinage resulted from the method of tax collection: the collector of a particular tax just reminted various coins and gold objects on the spot and put his own name as a guarantee of coin standard and value (38). Furthermore, Pirenne added the argumentation of Luschin that this minting of the gold, furnished by the tax, was a Roman custom (39). The constant supply of gold from outside was an essential condition of a functioning tax system. Pirenne asked what brought the gold, and answered — « obviously commerce » (40). The interruption of the Mediterranean trade in the eighth century because of the Islamic invasion produced the monetary crisis. This resulted in the substitution of gold coinage by silver one that « corresponded with the state of economic regression » (41). In his opinion, the disappearance of gold coinage happened at the same time as the disappearance of public taxation leading to the increasing weakness of the royal power and the final failure of the Merovingians (42). Thus, the final version of the Pirenne thesis on Merovingian numismatics linked Merovingian gold coinage to the Mediterranean trade and fiscal system, inherited from Roman times. This combination bore a contradiction in itself from the very beginning because Pirenne just tried to adjust new numismatic evidence to the old interpretation. If gold coinage was mainly connected to the fiscal system, then the trade probably did not play an important role for minting. The only function of commerce was, therefore, to supply gold to Gaul from the outside. Moreover, if the Carolingian silver denier was not connected to the fiscal system, it must have had another function. The only possible function is to be the means of exchange. The logical conclusion is quite opposite to the Pirenne thesis, i.e., that the transition from gold coinage to silver marks the shift from a tax-based economy to a trade-based economy.

The first reaction of historians to the Pirenne thesis and his interpretation of Merovingian numismatics concentrated exclusively on the connection between gold and trade. In 1943, Robert S. Lopez pointed out that the transition from gold coinage to silver one happened before the Islamic

(41) Ibid., p. 244-246.
(42) Ibid., p. 267.
invasion and was influenced by similar trends of Arab coinage in Spain (43). Five years later, Daniel C. Dennett, following the ideas of Marc Bloch, argued that the shift from gold to silver does not necessarily denote the transition from market economy to natural one. The disappearance of the gold was instead caused by draining gold out of Frankish Gaul (44). In the 1950-1960s, the scope of discussion was gradually expanding beyond the limits imposed by Pirenne. Sture Bolin added the northern world of the Vikings as an important factor for the trade model of the early Middle Ages (45). In 1959, Philip Grierson proposed another approach to the circulation of coins in Merovingian times, based on the works of M. Mauss and B. Malinowski. Grierson argued that 'gift exchange' and other alternatives to trade at that time were more important than trade itself and therefore one should be very cautious in the interpretation of archaeological evidence (46).

Archaeological excavations of the 1960s and 1970s, summarized by Richard Hodges and David Whitehouse, provided new evidence for the discussion of the Pirenne thesis. They demonstrated that the Roman trade model disappeared in the western Mediterranean by the end of the sixth century, long before the arrival of the Arabs. This effected the re-orientation of the Frankish economy to the north and, as a result, the introduction of silver coinage in the 670-680s. Thus, the shift from gold to silver marked a growing northern commerce and « the need for a smaller, serviceable currency ». However, they reformulated Grierson's concept of 'gift exchange' and argue that the new model was quite different from Roman trade. It was directed by the elite, namely, kings, the aristocracy, and the church. The final conclusion of Hodges and Whitehouse is that, in spite of some mistakes made by Pirenne, he was right in his outline of the transition from the Roman trade economy to the early medieval one (47).

Pirenne was not the only historian who 'fought' against the Gibbon thesis. Another important figure in the discussion of the transition from the Roman world to the Middle Ages was the Austrian historian Alfons Dopsch. Like Pirenne, he argued for the continuity of Roman structures after the disintegration of the West Roman Empire. However, Dopsch thought that this continuity could be traced through the Carolingian period up to the eleventh century. Thus, there is no break between Merovingian and Carolingian societies in his concept (48). Dopsch became the

(44) D.C. DENNETT, Pirenne and Muhammad, in Speculum, 23, 1948, p. 165-190.
founder of the second tradition, which can be considered as the main opponent of Pirenne's tradition at the present day (49).

The Dopschian tradition influenced the transition of the historiographical discussion from the analysis of trade to that of taxation, that is, to the second argument of Pirenne. The best-known contemporary supporter of this tradition is Walter Goffart who has analyzed the late Roman taxation and new trends appearing in Merovingian Gaul (50). He argues that the Roman fiscal system had two levels. A higher level belonged to state revenue and was imposed on the rich and resourceful possessors who were obliged to pay taxes in gold. A lower level of fiscal system was placed on the shoulders of dependant cultivators who paid renders in kind to their 'patrons', who were governmental or private proprietors. Merovingian kings, because of sixth-century protests made by the free Franks and the development of Roman temporary immunity into perpetual immunity, abandoned the higher level of the fiscal system, retaining, nevertheless, its lower level. This structural change in royal revenues, according to Goffart, took place between the 590s and the 630s (51).

Around the same time as this article was written by Goffart, Michael Hendy explored a similar topic (52). Based on the structural approach and the sociological concepts of Karl Polanyi and his school, Hendy studied the connection between Merovingian coinage and taxation. Seen from that point of view, the late Roman and Byzantine economy was dominated by 'special-purpose money' in cyclical and internal redistribution among government, army, and taxpayers. Therefore, in that world, 'reciprocity' and market-exchange played a secondary role, and coinage served the fiscal needs of state (53). Thus, unlike Grierson, Hodges, and Whitehouse, Hendy argued that late-Roman economy was not a market-based one. He postulated that late Roman coinage was mainly struck for fiscal purposes; i.e. taxpayers were forced to sell some of their products in order to pay taxes.

(49) B. Lyon, Henry Pirenne: A Biographical and Intellectual Study, Ghent, 1974, p. 448-449, defines these two traditions as the opposition between a moderate Romanist (Pirenne) and a more committed Romanist (Dopsch).

(50) W.A. Goffart, Barbarians and Romans, A.D. 418-584: The Technique of Accommodation, Princeton, 1980; Id., Old and New in Merovingian Taxation, in Rome's Fall and After, London, 1989, p. 213-231. For the historiography on the continuity of Roman taxation in Merovingian time, see ibid., p. 214.

(51) Ibid., p. 213-31.

(52) M.K. Hendy, From Public to Private: The Western Barbarian Coinages as a Mirror of the Disintegration of Late Roman State Structure, in Viator, 19, 1988, p. 29-78.

(53) Hendy writes: "The late Roman and early Byzantine coinage was primarily a fiscal instrument — that is, that it was primarily to do with the revenue and expenditure of the state, the principal source of revenue overwhelmingly being the land and (indirectly) its products, and the principal source of expenditure overwhelmingly being the administration and army," ibid., p. 29.
The Merovingians inherited that redistributive system in the late fifth century. According to Hendy, as soon as the Merovingian fiscal system and effective unitary rule collapsed by the 630s, Merovingian gold coinage experienced a similar fate because gold coins lost the main basis for their circulation. Merovingian trade, relying on the redistributive element « in the form of the sale of surplus to state organs in return for cash for taxation, collapsed also » (54). The silver coinage of the Arnulfings and Carolingians was more strongly connected to private trade and private interests, as well as less state-oriented. The final conclusion concerning taxation and coinage is that « one of the central tenets of what justifiably if loosely termed the « Pirenne Thesis » — that is, the crucial nature of the fate of late Roman structures — has been demonstrated as valid » (55).

The previous analysis proves that the Pirenne thesis in regard to Merovingian numismatics is still alive, even if it has been modified by his successors. However, the internal contradiction of Pirenne’s concept between the role of trade and that of taxation for functioning Merovingian coinage has forced scholars to choose between these two factors. For instance, Hodges and Whitehouse underline the connection between gold coinage and Mediterranean trade. According to this concept, the collapse of this Mediterranean market resulted in a new orientation of Merovingian trade towards northern Europe where the silver coin was used. The other Pirenian tradition, represented by Hendy, points out that all German kingdoms, and the Merovingian regnum in particular, inherited the late Roman system of provincial taxation and that late Roman and Merovingian gold coins were mainly struck for fiscal functions rather than for the needs of the market economy.

(d) The coinage of Tours

as a mirror of the changing role of coins in Merovingian Gaul

How do these theories relate to the coinage of Tours? A possible explanation is provided by a series of written sources, which relate to the financial obligations of the town and the monastery to the royal authority, and by grants of immunity, which made exemptions to these obligations. The basic relation of Merovingian coinage to royal taxation is illustrated by the royal fiscal levy of 632, described in the Vila Eligii. According to this source, personal taxes to the royal fisc (census publicus) were exacted once a year. They were collected in one place where a mo-

(54) Ibid., p. 72.
(55) Ibid., p. 75.
never under the control of a domesticus, the representative of king, remelted all gold and struck new coins with the place-name, to be carried then to the royal treasury. All this work could have lasted more than 3-4 days (56). Thus, in the first half of seventh century (and perhaps in the sixth century as well) taxes were brought to an appropriate place for minting, which had at least a hearth. The basilica of Saint-Martin could have had the necessary equipment for minting as could other Merovingian monasteries. A description of the monastery founded by Eligius near Solignac (Haute-Vienne) in 632 exists. Among other features of its prosperity, this description mentions the staff of experienced artifices (craftsmen) (57). The same could have been true for the wealthy basilica of Saint-Martin. In addition to this annual tax from any person excepting the clergy, there was the fretus, the fine due to the royal treasure. That fine to the royal fisc for a delict is included in many formulæ composed in the sixth and seventh century in Merovingian Gaul (58). Immunity, granted by royal authority, could include the release from both kinds of payments, as is demonstrated by the Marcufi Formuleae (59).

In the 630s, King Dagobert I gave fiscal immunity to Tours. The Vita Eligii, written between 657 and 675, states that, out of reverence for Saint Martin, King Dagobert transferred all taxation to the bishopric of Tours, and from that time, the fiscal right was in the hands of the bishop. That is why, even in the time when the Vita Eligii was written, the comes of the city used to be constituted through the charter of the bis-

---

(56) "Erat enim tempus, quo census publicus ex eodem pago [Lemovecino - I. G.] regis thesauro exincebatur inferendus, sed cum omni censo in unum collecto regi pararetur ferendum hac nelfel domesticus simil et monetarius adhuc aurum ipsum fornacis coctionem purgare, ut iuxta ritum purissimam ac rutilis aulae regis praesenteretur metallus, nesciebat enim praedium esse Eligio concessum - lolo nisi atque conatus per lvridium vel qualridium laboris insistentes, nulla poterant, Deo id praepediente, arte proficere usquequo ab Eligio praeveniens nuntius opus coepit intercerpal idemque eius dominio renovaret," Vita Eligii, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum, vol. 4, B. Krusch (ed.), Hanover, 1902, p. 681. The same procedure of the fiscal levy, once a year, is described by the Marcufi Formuleae, codified at the middle of the seventh century, in the charter addressing to duke, patricius, and count: "... el quicquid de ipsa accione in fisci dicitionibus speratuer, per vosmet ipsos annis singulis nostris aerarit inferatur. . . .," Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum Sectio V. Formuleae Merovingici et Carolini Aevi, ed. K. Zeumer, Hanover, 1886, p. 41.

(57) "Est aulem congregatio etiam nunc magna diversis gratiarum floribus ornata: habentur ibi et artifices plurimi diversis artibus periti, qui Christi timore perfecti semper at oboedientiam sunt parati," Vita Eligii, p. 682.

(58) For instance see the Formuleae of Angers, in Formuleae Merovingici et Carolini Aevi, 6, 7, 11, 13, 16, 17, and 18.

(59) The formula Cessio regis de hoc privilegium, referring to a monastery, mentions: "Sed sub omni eminuitate hoc ipse monasteriu vel congregatio sua sibimet omnes fretos concessus debeat possidere; et quicquid exinde fiscus noester forsitan de eorum hominebus aut de ingenuis aut servientes in eorum agros comanentes vel undique polerat sperare . . . pro mercedes compendium debeat cuncta proficire . . . ." ibid., p. 42-3.
hop (60). It meant that, after the death of Gregory of Tours in 592, who had stated unequivocally that his town was exempted from state revenues, Tours lost its immunity and paid all customary payments to the royal fisc until the 630s. This immunity, given in the period of Dagobert I, is also referred to in another later document, namely in the charter of Ibbo, the bishop of Tours, which granted full privileges to the monastery of Saint-Martin around 720. In addition, this charter tells us that the taxation and fealty of the basilica of Saint-Martin had been previously given to the city, that is, to its bishop (61). We can thus conclude on the basis of these written sources that, in the 630s, all payments from the ecclesiastic province of Tours to the royal treasure ceased, and the payments of Saint-Martin, formerly due to the king, went into the treasury of the bishop of Tours. Even in the 660s and in the first half of the 670s, the *ius fiscalis* was a prerogative of the bishop.

Thus, the decline of the urban coinage of Tours after the 630s can be seen to correlate to the immunity granted to it by Dagobert I. At the same time, the series, with the legend *Racio ecclesie*, which had originated at the beginning of the seventh century and reflected taxes paid by the bishopric to king, came to an end. The coinage of the basilica of Saint-Martin probably emerged in the 620s, after the death of Queen Brunhild who was known for her patronage of the cult of Saint Martin and had hardly imposed any fiscal burden on the landed property of the basilica. The first issues of *Gemellus-Sancti Martini* probably had the same character as the ones of Saint-Denis, *Ebrequisilus-Sancti Dionisii*, that is, they represented land taxes to the royal fisc. It is known that Dagobert I, unlike Brunhild, protected the cult of Saint Denis. He seemed to release

(60) "namque pro reverentia sancti confessoris Martini, Eligio regante, omnem censum, quod regi publicae sollevatur, ad integram Dagobertus rex eidem ecclesiae indulsit atque per cartam confirmavit. Adeo autem omnesibi ius fiscalis censurae ecclesiae vindicat, ut usque hodie ineadem urbe per pontifici litteras comis constitutator," Vita Eligii, p. 686.

Saint-Denis from payments to the royal treasury (62). As a result, the coinage with the legend Sancti Dionisii was replaced by the issues with the name Catullacum, the village near Saint-Denis. The coinage of Saint-Martin, transferred to the fiscal jurisdiction of the bishop, began to increase. Perhaps, this transformation was the reason for the use of the new legend Racio basilici Sancti Martini on the issues of the basilica. The term racio in this expression probably did not mean the property, but rather fiscal payments due to the city, that is, apparently to its bishop.

The next change was at the end of the 650s or at the beginning of the 660s when the community of Saint-Martin received privileges restraining the bishop from any interference in and exaction from the monastery (63). The nature of these privileges can be inferred from the immunity charter given by Clovis II to the monastery of Saint-Denis on 22 June 655 (64), which directly forbade the bishop to extort gold, silver and any thing made of them from the monastery treasury. As a result of this immunity, the coinage of Saint-Martin gradually disappeared after the 650s. The rare issues were occasionally minted by traveling moneyers such as Moderatus and Fraternus, who are known to have struck coins at other places. The term basilici was not used on their coins, probably a reflection of the change of the status of Saint-Martin from basilica to monastery. These small issues probably indicate that the bishop of Tours continued to have a reduced fiscal right over the monastery. In the 670s, these payments were still made in silver coins with the inscription Racio Sancti Martini.

(62) For instance, Gesta Dagoberii I regis Francorum, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores rerum Merovingiarum, vol. 2, ed. B. Krusch, Hanover, 1888, p. 414, narrates that in 635 he presented many villas to the monastery for nourishing monks, servants and matricularii, and added “nihil exinde ad suum opus retinere volens.” It was probably not the first gesture of royal benevolence toward the monastery.


(64) “... nullus episcoporum, nec praesentes nec qui futuri fuerint successores... possibilitique ordine de loco ipso alequid auferre aut alequaque postlata sibi in ipso monastirio vindicare vel alequid quas per commutacionis tutolum, abaque voluntae ipstus congregacionis vel nostrum permissum, minoere aut calices vel croces seu indumenta altaris vel sacros codices, argentum aurumve vel qualemquum speciem de quod ibidem conlatum fuit aut erit, auferre aut minoere vel at civilitate deferre non debet nec praesummat, Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Diplomata, vol. 1, H. Pestz (ed.), Hanover, 1872, p. 20. J. Nelson, Queens as Jezebels: Brunhild and Balfhild in Merovingian History, in Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe, London, 1986, p. 38-39, mentions that according to this charter the bishop of Paris lost, without any compensation, the rights to exact payments for liturgical purposes and to participate in sharing of monastic revenues.
Thus, the disappearance of gold coinage of Tours corresponds mainly to the gradual decay and final collapse of the taxation system in this region and to the grants of immunity received by the bishopric of Tours. However, the existence of gold coinage cannot be explained only in terms of its fiscal function. No doubt, it must have sustained trade exchanges as well. For instance, the Formulary of Marculfus, mirroring the usual practice in Merovingian Gaul in the sixth-seventh century, gives the models for the sales of property and serfs with the use of gold coins (65). The needs of such transactions explain the existence of reduced issues of gold coins in Tours even after the royal grant of immunity.

In 674, Pope Adeodatus confirmed the previous rights of this monastery and gave it exemption (66). Afterwards, even the silver coinage of Saint-Martin disappeared for a long time. At that time, the internal economic life of the monastery became primarily non-monetary-based. This conclusion is confirmed by the polyptych of Saint-Martin, written probably at the end of the seventh century (67). They show that all payments by tributaries were made to the monastery in kind rather than in coin. The usual title of these lists is Racio de agrario, which could be translated as payments in kind (68). It means that at that time the monastery did not use any money in relations with its coloni. These documents describe a large monastic estate with landed property in various villages of the province. There were 1,386 colones on its lands, making payments mainly in wheat, rye, barley, and oat (69). The main bulk of these products were probably consumed by the monks and monastic matricularii. Besides, a

(65) "... et accepi a vobis in pretio, iuxta quod mihi complacuit, auri solidos probus alque pensantes numero lanum...", Formulae Merovingici et Carolini Aevi, p. 90.

(66) PARDESSUS, Diplomata (op. cit., n. 61), vol. 2, p. 163-164.

(67) These documents (manuscript no. 88) were found in the monastery of Saint-Martin and are dated by the 21th, 22th, or 24th years of abbot Agyrí's ordination in the monastery, P. GASNAULT (ed.), Documents comptables de Saint-Martin de Tours à l'époque mérovingienne (Collection inédits sur l'histoire de France), Paris, 1975, p. 29, 37, 40, 42, and 45. This abbot is known from the 674 exemption charter of Pope Adeodatus. It is more likely that these documents were written after the trip of Agyrí to Rome. Cf. W.A. GOFFART, Merovingian Polyptychs: Reflections on Two Recent Publications, in Rome's Fall and After, London, 1989, p. 241-252. His hypothesis, that the expression in anno X ordenante domno Agyríco can refer to the "ordination" by Agyrí concerning the abbey's lands and tenants, is not plausible. That expression in ablative case usually refers to a year of "reign", as Gasnault translates it, or "ordination". The examples provided by Goffart do not have the verb ordinare in that specific context and can hardly be taken as a decisive argument, ibid., p. 242 and 250.

(68) GASNAULT (ed.), Documents comptables de Saint-Martin de Tours (op. cit., n. 67), p. 42 and 55. GOFFART, Merovingian Polyptychs (op. cit., n. 67), p. 240-241, argues that agrario is an informal term for "land tax". He thinks that the aforesaid lists present only a part of the peasant's obligations. However, the absence of the coinage of Saint-Martin in the late seventh century is an argument against that opinion.

portion of this produce should have been sold on local market in order to buy other goods necessary for the everyday life of the monastery.

About 720, the bishop of Tours, Ibbo gave to the monastery of Saint-Martin full privileges (ampla privilegia). There are two possible explanations for the issue of this charter, first, that the exemption given by Bishop Chrotopertus and Pope Adeodatus had not been fulfilled. The other explanation is that the privileges given to the monastery in 674 included freedom from payments and fines due to the treasury of the bishop but maintained other forms of dependence based on customs. The charter of 720 manumitted the monastery not only from census, servitutes, munera et cetera, but also from all secular customs (70). It is possible that one of these customs was the dependence of the monastery on the city for minting. This could explain why the silver coinage of the city used the legend Sancti Martin. This interpretation agrees with the reestablishment of a mint in Saint-Martin in the 720s when the moneyer Unicter left the urban mint and began to strike coins in the mint of the monastery.

At the beginning of the eighth century, the monastery gradually began to use the silver coinage in its economic activity. This practice was reflected in the Formulae Turonenses probably written in the monastery of Saint-Martin in the first half of the eighth century (71). A formula for a precaria charter and a formula for the letter of an abbot, granting this precaria, point out that the holder of the precaria had to pay the rent once a year in silver (72). The same process was probably characteristic of the regions around Tours. For instance, The Formulary of Angers, completed in 676 or even later, also gives the model of a payment in solidi, once a year, by a tenant to a monastery (73). The monastery used,

(70) "... praefatis ergo fratribus et abbati iura servantibus patrum cedimus, cessosque volumus ecclesiae census, servitutes, opera, mansiones, pastus, munera, frena, fisico, episcopo, indecesus, missis archidicaico, et omnes consuetudines saeculares ampulamus seu resecamus, et quicquid nobis vel eisdem servire dareve solemant." PARDESSUS, Diplomata (op. cit., n. 61), vol. 2, p. 320. About different kinds of immunity in Merovingian Gaul, see GOFFART, Old and New in Merovingian Taxation (op. cit., n. 50), p. 221-228.

(71) The dating of these formulae is based on the fact that they mention primarily silver for any kind of payments. The other argument is the similarity between the second formula Cessio a die presenti, Formulae Merovingici et Carolini Aevi, p. 160, and the real charter of land purchase by the monastery of Saint-Martin in 733, though, as P. GASNAULT, Actes privés de l'abbaye Saint-Martin de Tours du VIIIe au XlIe s., in Biblique, 52, 1954, p. 30, mentions, it is difficult to conclude which of these two documents was the prototype for the other.

(72) Precaria: "... unde censiti, me annis singulis ad festividadem ipsius sancti partibus vestris reddere argentum tantum." Epistola abbatis vel rectoris ipsius ecclesiae: "Unde censisti te a nobis annis singulis ad festividadem sancti illius in luminariibus ipsius sancti vel pro mersedis tuae augmentum argentum soledos tantos," Formulae Merovingici et Carolini Aevi, p. 139 and 160.

(73) "Domino venerabile et in Christo patri illo abbate vel omnis congregacio nostra et domni illius, hoc est locello cognomenante [illo] in pago illo, tam casis, campis, terris, mancipitis, acolabus, pratis, pascuis, aquis aquarumme decursibus, [absque] vestrum prelu-
perhaps, part of this income for the increase of its landed property. There is a charter of *vinditio* according to which the monastery bought lands in Alamania. According to this charter, the former holder of those lands, Gundoson, received 30 *solidi* from the treasury of the monastery (*n*). Thus, the restoration of the mint in Saint-Martin is correlated with the more active use of silver coins within the monastic economy and its commercial relations without. This transition from the administration of the monastery based on income in kind to the active use of silver coins probably occurred during the first quarter of the eighth century.

* * *

In conclusion, the development of the coinage of Tours in the Merovingian period supports Hendy's thesis that the gold coin struck at that time was mainly a fiscal instrument, and that the mints were primarily the places in which fiscal payments were collected for further transaction to the royal treasure, or as in the case of Tours to the authority that substituted for the royal fisc. The existence of an active mint in the sixth and seventh century was an explicit indicator of a fiscal burden for a given place. On the other hand, silver coins were primarily struck for the economic needs of the region in which a mint was located. From the late seventh century, the mint became a necessary element for the local economy and the right to mint became a very desirable aim for any city or monastery. Thus, the study of the coinage of Tours illustrates the twofold nature of Pirenne's heritage: on the one hand, he was wrong in thinking that coinage showed a more developed level of trade in the Merovingian period than in the Carolingian one; on the other hand, Pirenne is right in his overall assertion that a crucial shift away from late antique institutions to early medieval ones came late in the Merovingian period rather than at its onset. (*)

dicium et domni illius tenire et possedire debiai; et spondio vobis *annis singulis cinso sole-dos tantus* . . .," Ibid., p. 7.


(*) The research for this article could not have been carried out without the financial support of the Open Society Institute and the American Numismatic Society. I am grateful to Dr. Alan Stahl (New York) for his constant assistance, for reading the drafts of this article, and for his critical advice. In addition, I wish to thank Caroline Dunn (Fordham) for her help with my English. But any inaccuracies or ambiguities in argument or expression remain mine alone.
Table 4. The development of types on the silver coinage of Tours

The coinage of the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 670-c. 680</td>
<td>TVRONVS CIVI</td>
<td>Gandobertus</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux, Piassac, and Bais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 680-c. 700</td>
<td>Bust</td>
<td>Leugaricus</td>
<td>Racio Sancti Martini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux and Bais)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 690-c. 705</td>
<td>Bust</td>
<td>Naudegisilus</td>
<td>Monogram of Tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sancti Martini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Piassac and Bais)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown moneyer</td>
<td>Unknown moneyers</td>
<td>(Bais)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 700s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 710</td>
<td>Two heads</td>
<td>Unknown moneyers</td>
<td>(Savonnières)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c. 710-c. 720| Head                       | Unicter-Sancti Martini | Savonnières |}

The coinage of Saint Martin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Moneyer</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the 670s</td>
<td>TVRONVS CIVI</td>
<td>Gandobertus</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux, Piassac, and Bais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 700s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. The die-study of the coins of Unicler and Erloinus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Weights (g)</th>
<th>Average weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>1.16, 1.16, 1.15, 1.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD, OE</td>
<td>1.06, 1.05, 1.00, 0.98, 0.98, 0.95, 0.92, 0.91, 0.89, 0.87</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>1.12, 1.04, 1.08, 0.98, 0.95, 0.92, 0.91, 0.89, 0.87</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OB, OA: two obverse dies SCI MARTIN, head in profile, right.
RC: reverse dies VNICTER, type - cross.
RB: reverse dies VNICTER, type - S.
RA: reverse dies SCI MARTIN, type - S.
OD, OE: obverse dies SCE MAVRICIO, head in profile, right.
RD: reverse dies ERLOINVS, type - S.
RE: reverse dies ERLOINVS, type - S.
Table 6. The development of the coinage of Tours (75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>URBAN COINAGE</th>
<th>COINAGE OF SAINT-MARTIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOLD COINAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 560s-570s</td>
<td>The Victory type coinage - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 570s-580s</td>
<td>Chadomarus - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 590s</td>
<td>ANTIMIS - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 600s-620s</td>
<td>Maurus - 5</td>
<td>Gemellus - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown moneyer - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 620-630s</td>
<td>Laurufus - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modestus - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 630-650s</td>
<td>DOMNIGISILUS - 6</td>
<td>RACIO BASILICI - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 660-c. 675</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRATERNUS, Modestus - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SILVER COINAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 675-c. 680</td>
<td>UNKNOWN MONEYER - 4</td>
<td>Leugaricus - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown moneyer - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 680-c. 700</td>
<td>GANDOBERTUS - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown moneyer - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 690-c. 705</td>
<td>NAUDEGISILUS - 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 700s</td>
<td>UNKNOWN MONEYERS - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 710s-720s</td>
<td>UNICTER - 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the 720s-730s</td>
<td>ERLOINUS - 11</td>
<td>UNICTER - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agnus - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalogue of the coins of Tours

Abbreviations

ANS — American Numismatic Society, New York

(75) Those moneyers, who are indicated by bold capitals, are dated on the basis of hoards and/or specific gravity method. The other moneyers are dated due to the stylistic features and coin weights.


Lafaurie (1969) - J. Lafaurie, Monnaies d'argent mérovingiennes des VIIe et VIIIe siècles: les trésors de Saint-Pierre-les-Étancs (Cher), Plassac (Gironde) et Nohant (Puy-de-Dôme), in RN, s. 6, 11, 1969, p. 98-219.


La Neustrie - Patrick Périn and Laure-Charlotte Feffer, La Neustrie. Les pays du Nord de la Loire de Dagobert à Charles le Chauve (viiie-IXe siècles), Rouen, Musées et monuments départementaux de Seine-Maritime, 1985

Maxe-Werly (1890) - L. Maxe-Werly, Monnaies mérovingiennes, trouvaille de Saint-Aubin (Meuse), in RN, s. 3, 8, 1890, p. 12-53.

Obv. — obverse
P - M. Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, Paris, 1892.


Ref. — reference
Rev. — reverse


The gold coinage (the 550s-670s)

Early coinage (the 550s-570s)
1) 1.40g. Au.
Obv.: TVRONV ▼ AT. Bust in profile, right. Boucle perdue.
Rev.: TVNOSTVNE VIVE. Victoria facing, holding wreath and cross.
Ref.: B 4544 = P 20.

2) ?, Au.
Rev.: ... IV[IIV,V,V] ... Victoria facing, holding wreath and cross.
Ref.: Bank de France = Lafaurie (1997), 112.

Chadomarus (the 570s-590s)
3) 1.49g. Au.
Obv.: TVRONV+S CIVI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +CHADOMARI. Cross potencée, on the sides I-I.
Ref.: B 4521 = P 310.

4) 1.26g. Au.
Obv.: +TVRONVS CIVI... . Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: CHADOMALI M. Standing person.
Ref.: B 4520 = P 311.
Antimis (the 580s-590s)
5) 1.313g, Au 90.5%, 270° (Pl. IV, 2).
Obv.: +CHILDBERTI. Bust in profile, right. OD #T.
Rev.: +TORONI ANTIMI M. Beast looking back. RD #T.

6) 1.394g, Au 93.4%.
Obv.: +CHILDBERTI. Bust in profile, right. OD #T.
Rev.: +TORONI ANTIMI M. Beast looking back. RD #T.
Ref.: B4523 = P 304.

7) 1.30g, Au.
The same as the previous two coins.

8) 1.36g, Au 91.2%.
Obv.: +TVRONVS. Bust in profile, left.
Rev.: ANTIMI MON. Cross.
Ref.: B 4524 = P 312.

Unknown moneyer (c.590)
9) 1.04g, Au (Pl. IV, 1).
Obv.: TORHV CIVITCA. Bust in profile, right. Boucle perdue.
Rev.: ... INTMPFRVSE. Cross.
Ref.: Crédit de la Bourse, 12 June 1997, no. 288.

Laurufus (the 610s-630s)
10) 1.16g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: B 4540 = P 306.

11) 1.19g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: B 4537 = P 305.

12) 1.29g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Head in profile, left.
Ref.: B 4538, 4539 = P 307.

13) 1.19g, Au (Pl. IV, 5).
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +LAVRVFO Nl. Latin cross on a globe.

Maurus (the 600s-620s)
14) 1.18g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MAVRVS MON. Greek cross. External wreath.
Ref.: B 4529 = P 315.

15) 1.15g, Au (Pl. IV, 4).
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, left.
16) 1.20g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONAS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MAVRVS MON. Cross pattée.

17) 1.39g, Au (Pl. IV, 3).
Obv.: RACIO ECLSI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MAVRO MONE. Greek cross on 3 steps, surrounded by letters I-P/T-O.
Ref.: Münzen und Medaillen, 10 Dec. 1949, no. 314.

18) 1.26g, Au (Pl. IV, 6).
Obv.: RACIO ECCLESIE. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +MAVRO MONE. Greek cross.
Ref.: B 3705 = Burgan, 10 June 1994, no. 27.

Modestus (the 620s?)
19) 1.31g, Au.
Obv.: RACIO SCI MAVR. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MODESTO. At the center the contraction of ECCLesia.
Ref.: B 4546 = 6471 = P 323.

Domnigisilus (the 640s-660s)
20) 1.215g, Au.
Obv.: T+VRONVS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: DOMNIGISILO NO. Latin cross.
Ref.: Musée de Rouen, no. 696 = La Neustrie, 322, no. 1c. Lucy hoard.

21) 1.24g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONVS. Head in profile, right. External circle.
Ref.: B 4526 = P 314.

22) 1.20g, Au.
Obv.: +TVRONVS. Bust in profile, right. Small cross above the head.
Rev.: DOMNIGISILO. Cross.

23) 1.22g, Au, pale (probably below 30%).
Obv.: TVRONVS CIVI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: DOMNIGISILO M. Cross.
Ref.: B 4525 = P 313. Found in Mâcon.

24) ?, Au.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIVI. Head in profile, right.
Rev.: DOMNIGISILO. Cross.
Ref.: Musée Saint-Jean, Angers, no. 484. Found in Varades.

25) ?, Au.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIVI.?
Rev.: DOMNIGISILO M.?

25a) 1.09g, Au.
Obv.: DOMIGISILVS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +BALATETONEN VI. Cross on a step.
Ref.: P 363.
THE COINAGE OF TOURS IN THE MEROVINGIAN PERIOD

Gemellus (the 620s-630s)
26) 1.223g, Au 45.5%.
Obv.: GEMELLYS. Bust in profile, left.
Rev.: DOGBERTVS RE. Small Greek cross on a step. Two dots on the sides of the lower arm of the cross.
Ref.: B 4530 = P 303. Bordeaux hoard.

27) 1.44g, Au.
Obv.: MAR at the center. Below a small calice with two crosses on both sides. In exergue SC.
Rev.: GEMELLOS. Latin cross on two steps.

28) 1.25g, Au 61.3%.
Obv.: GEMELLYS. Bust in profile, right. External wreath.
Rev.: SCI MARTINI. Cross ancrée.
Ref.: B 4533 = P 321.

29) 1.15g, Au 55.5%.
Obv.: GEMELLYS. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: B 4532 = P 322. Discovered at Avoine (Indre-et-Loire).

30) 1.31, Au.
Obv.: GEMELLYS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: SH MA... Cross ancrée w. two dorts on the sides of the lower arm. External wreath.

Racio basilici (the 630s-650s)
31) 1.25g, Au.
Obv.: RACIO BASILICI. Bust in profile, right. OD #R1.
Rev.: ...CI MARTINI. Cross ancrée on two steps. RD #R1.
Ref.: B 806 = 4548 = P 2683.

32) 1.36g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. OD #R2.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Cross on three globes. External wreath. RD #R2.
Ref.: B 4562 = P 318.

33) 1.18g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. External wreath. OD #R3.
Ref.: B 4560 = P 317.

34) 1.19g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. External wreath. OD #R4.

35) 1.20 or 1.15g, Au (Pl. IV, 7).
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. External wreath. OD #R4.

36) 1.203g, Au 47.7 % (Pl. IV, 8).
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. External wreath. OD #R5.
Ref.: ANS.

37) 1.24g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Head in profile, left. OD #R6.
Ref.: Berlin = Franken, 1115, no. 32.

38) 1.17g, Au (Pl. IV, 10).
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. Letter M below head. OD #R7.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on globe. RD #R7.
Ref.: Bank de France = Peyret (1989), 75.

39) 1.15g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. Letter M below head. OD #R7.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on globe. RD #R7.
Ref.: B 4561 = P 316.

40) 1.17g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. Letter M below head. OD #R7.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on globe. RD #R7.

41) 1.20g, Au.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on globe. RD #R8.

42) 1.20 or 1.21g, Au (Pl. IV, 9).
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. Letter S below head. OD #R8.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on globe. RD #R8.

43) 1.15g, Au pale (probably below 30%).
Obv.: RA O BASILICI. Head in profile, right.
Rev.: SCI ...TIINI. Cross on three steps.
Ref.: Pilet-Lemière, 47. Found in Salon-de-Provence (Bouches-du-Rhône) in 1988.

44) 1.10g, Au.
Obv.: SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: RACIO BASILICI. Latin cross on a small step.
Ref.: Musée de l'Hôtel Gouin = Pilet-Lemière, 47.

Moderatus and Fraternus (c.660-c.670)

45) 1.17g, Au.
Obv.: RACIO S MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. External circle.
Ref.: B 4549 = P 320.

45a) Baracillum.?, Au.
Obv.: BARACILLO. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MODERATVS. Cross ancrée on two steps.
Ref.: Sotheby, 2 June 1924, no. 168.

45b) 1.15g, Au.
Obv.: +BARACILLO fl. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: P 2027.
45c) 0.93g, Au.
Obv.: +...RECILLO Fl. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: P 2028.

45d) 1.18g, Au.
Obv.: +BRICILLOO. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +MODERATVS. Cross.
Ref.: P 2028.

45e) 0.91g, Au pale (g. c. below 30%).
Obv.: +BRICILLOO. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +MODERATVS. Cross.
Ref.: P 2028.

45f) 1.274g, Au.
Obv.: +BARICILLO. Bust in profile, right.
Ref.: Musée de Bar-le-Duc = Maxe-Werly (1890), no. 22. Saint-Aubin-sur-Aire hoard.

45g) Brioude. 1.20g, Au.
Obv.: Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: MODERATV MN. At the center BRI/VAT.

46) 0.98g, Au white (below 25%).
Obv.: SCI MART. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +FRATERNO. Greek cross w. dot at 4 o'clock.
Ref.: B 6464 = P 324.

46a) Langeais. 1.09g, Au.
Obv.: ALINGAVIAS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: FRATERNO M. Greek cross.
Ref.: Münzen und Medaillen, 10 Dec. 1949, no. 380.

46b) Langeais, 1.33g, Au.
Obv.: ALINGAVIAS. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +FRATERNO M. Cross.
Ref.: P 346.

Silver Coinage (the 670s-740s)

Early silver coinage of Tours (673-675)
47) 1.033g, Ar 88%, Au 1.32%, Cu 10%, Pb 0.5%, traces of tin, zinc and iron (Pl. V, 12).
Obv.: TVRONVS CIVI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: CHILDERICO REGE. Two facing figures with nimbus.
Ref.: Lafaurie (BSFN, 1988), 422. Found in grave in Ramsgate (Kent, England).

48) 1.356g, Ar 99.59%, Cu 0.41%, Pb 0.3168%, Au 14 ppm, Sn 19.5 ppm (Pl. V, 11).
Obv.: TVRONVS CIVI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: CHILDERICO REGE. Throne.
Ref.: B 4463 = Lafaurie (BSFN, 1988), 422.

Unknown moneyer (the 670s-690s)
49) 1.05g, Ar.
Obv.: TV...S + CIVI. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: ... ARV M. Standing figure (Victory type).
Ref.: B 4552 = P 326.
50) 1.12, Ar.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIV. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: ... ODERTO MNTARI. Figure with two birds on the sides.
Ref.: B 4541 = P 325.

Gandobertus (the 580s-590s)
51) 1.12g, Ar.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIV. Bust in profile, right. OD #G1.

52) 1.09g, Ar.
Obv.: TV...N...S Cl.... Bust in profile, right. OD #G2.
Rev.: ...ANDOBE ...M. Monogram $\mathfrak{G}$. RD #G2.

53) ?, Ar.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIV. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: ...OBERTV .... Monogram $\mathfrak{G}$.

54) ?, Ar.
Obv.: TVRONVS CIV. Bust in profile, right. OD #G1.
Rev.: ...NDOBERTVS. Monogram $\mathfrak{G}$. RD #G1.
Ref.: Changanier coll (1934), picture in ANS.

Unknown moneyer (style of Gandobertus - the 580s-590s)
55) ?, Ar.
Obv.: ... CIVE. Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +MONGVL. R. Monogram $\mathfrak{G}$.

Early silver coinage of Saint-Martin
Leugariacos and unknown moneyers (the 670s-700s)
56) 1.335g, Ar.
Obv.: +RACIO SCI M... Cross $\mathfrak{P}$.
Rev.: +LEVGARIA.... Cross.

57) 0.98g, Ar.
Obv.: ...O SCI M... Cross $\mathfrak{P}$.
Rev.: ...ARIAC.... Cross with 4 dots in field.

58) ?, Ar.
Obv.: ...CIO SCI MAR... Cross $\mathfrak{P}$.
Rev.: L...CO M. Cross with 4 dots in field.

59) 1.25g, Ar.
Obv.: ... Bust in profile, right.
Rev.: +RACIO SCI MART. Cross potencée on a step.
Coinage of Tours and Saint-Martín

Naudegisilus (the 680s-700s)

60) 1.25g, Ar.
Obv.: DEGISELO. Monogram OD#N1.
Rev.: +SCI MARTINI. Bust in profile, right. RD#N1.

61) 1.28g, Ar.
Obv.: DELO. Monogram OD#N2.
Rev.: Bust in profile, right. RD #N2.

62) ?, Ar.
Obv.: DEGISELO. Monogram OD#N1.
Rev.: Bust in profile, right. RD #N3.

63) 1.32g, Ar.
Obv.: DEGISELO. Monogram OD#N1.
Rev.: +SCI MAR... NI Bust in profile, right. RD UNI.

Coins with monogram of Tours and barred S (the 700s)

64) 1.15g, Ar.
Obv.: Monogram of Tours.
Rev.: ..., around barred S in border - @.

65) 1.03g, Ar.
The same coin.

66) 0.98g, Ar 88.50%, Cu 9.29%, Au 0.60%, Pb 1.27%, Zn 0.27%, Bi 0.07%.
Obv.: Monogram of Tours.
Rev.: ... IVIVI..., around barred S in border.
Ref.: Ratto, 9 Dec. 1930, no. 2456 = Grierson 609.

67) 0.78g, Ar.
The same coin. Found in Septeuil (Yvelines) in 1983.

68) 0.96g, Ar.
Obv.: Monogram of Tours.
Rev.: ..., around barred S in border - @.

69) 0.87g, Ar.
Similar coin.

Later coinage of Tours and Saint-Martín

Transitional coinage from monogram type to S type (the 710s)

70) ?, Ar.
Obv.: Blundered monogram of Tours.
Rev.: Type @.
Ref.: Ratto, 9 Dec. 1930, no. 2459.
71) 1.10g, Ar.
Obv.: Two heads face to face.
Rev.: AG, IC. M. Type 5.
Ref.: B 4582 = P 342 = Lafaurie (1963), no. 33. Savonnières hoard.

72) 0.88g, Ar.
Obv.: Two heads face to face.
Rev.: A.M. Type #4.
Ref.: B 4583 = P 341 = Lafaurie (1963), no. 34. Savonnières hoard.

73) ?, Ar.
Obv.: Two heads face to face.
Rev.: A.M. Type 6.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 35. Savonnières hoard.

74) 0.85g, Ar.
Obv.: Two heads face to face.
Rev.: A.M. Type 6.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 36. Savonnières hoard.

Unicer-S (the 710s-730s)
75) 1.12g, Ar. ·2·.
Obv.: +SCI MARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #A.
Rev.: +YNICTER. Type. RD #B1.

76) 0.98g (worn), Ar.
Obv.: +SCI MARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #A.
Rev.: +YNICTER. Type ·2·. RD #B2.

77) 1.04g, Ar. ·2·.
Obv.: +SCI MARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #A.
Rev.: +YNICTER. Type ·2·. RD #B3.

78) ?, Ar.
The same coin. Type ·2·.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 7. Savonnières hoard.

79) ?, Ar.
The same coin. Type ·2·. OD #A, RD #B4.

80) ?, Ar.
The same coin. Type ·2·.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 10. Savonnières hoard.

Sancti Martini-Sancti Martini (the 710s-730s)
81) 0.95g, Ar.
Obv.: +SCI MARTINI. Head in profile, right. OD #A.
Rev.: +SCI MARTINI. Type ·2·. RD #A4.

82) 1.08g, Ar.
The same as the previous coin. OD #A. RD #A5.
Ref.: B 4576 = P 329 = Lafaurie (1963), no. 4. Savonnières hoard.

83) 0.98g, Ar.
The same as the previous coin. OD #A. RD #A1.
84) ?, Ar.
The same as the previous coin.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 3. Savonnieres hoard.

85) ?, Ar.
The same as the previous coin.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 5. Savonnieres hoard.

86) 0.89g, Ar (Pl. V, 13).
The same as the previous coin. OD #A. RD #A1.

87) 0.92g, Ar.
The same as the previous coin. Type ·S:. OD #A. RD #A2.
Ref.: Münzen und Medaillen, 10 Dec. 1949, no. 384.

88) 0.91g, Ar.
Obv.: +SCI MARTI.... Head in profile, right. OD #A.
Rev.: +SCI MARTIN. Type ·2·. RD #A3.

Unicter - Cross (the 710s-730s)
89) 1.10g, Ar. 92.78%, Cu 5.92%, Au 0.42%, Pb 0.59%, Sn 0.20%, 270°.
Obv.: +SCI MARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #B.
Rev.: +VNICTER. Small cross. RD #C1.

90) 1.16g, Ar (Pl. V, 14).
The same coin. OD #B, RD #C1.

91) 1.16g, Ar.
The same coin. OD #B, RD #C2.

92) 1.15g, Ar.
The same coin. OD #B, RD #C2.

93) ?, Ar.
The same coin.
Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 16. Savonnières hoard.

94) ?, Ar.
Obv.: +SCI MARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #B.
Rev.: +V...TER. Cross with four dorts in field. RD #C3.

95) ?, Ar.
The same coin.

Agnus (the 730s-740s)
96) 1.06g, Ar.
Obv.: +SCI M...TIN Head in profile, right.
Rev.: +AGNVS MVN. Greek cross on a step.
Ref.: B 4566 = P 344.
Erlöinus-Saint Martin (the 710s-730s)

97) 0.87g, Ar (Pl. V, 16).
   Obv.: +ARTIN. Head in profile, right. OD #A.
   Rev.: +ERLOINVS. Type ·S·. RD #D1.

98) ?, Ar.
   Obv.: Mirror image +SCI MARTINI. Head in profile, right.
   Rev.: ...SV I O (Erlöinus in mirror order). Cross 🅹.

99) 1.05g, Ar.
   Obv.: +S- E ...CIO. Head in profile, right. OD #D.
   Rev.: +SCI MARTIN. Type ·S·. RD #A5.
   Ref.: 8 4580 = P 335 = Lafaurie (1963), no. 22. Savonnières hoard.

Erlöinus-Sancti Mauricio (the 710s-730s)

100) 1.05g, Ar.
   Obv.: +S- E MA .. IO. Head in profile, right. OD #D.
   Rev.: +ERLOINVS. Type ·S·. RD #D2.

101) ?, Ar.
   Obv.: +S- E M .. CIO. Head in profile, right.
   Rev.: +ERLOINVS. Type 🅸.

102) 0.95g, Ar.
   Obv.: +S- E MAVR/CIO. Head in profile, right. OD #E.
   Rev.: +ERLOI...S. Type 🅸. RD #E1.
   Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 25. Savonnières hoard.

103) 0.97g, Ar.
   Obv.: Worn.
   Rev.: +ERLO... Type 🅸. RD #E2.

104) 0.92g, Ar (Pl. V, 17).
   Obv.: +S- E ...RICIO. Head in profile, right. OD #E.
   Rev.: +ERLOINVS. Type 🅸. RD #E2.
   Ref.: B 4569 = P 333 = Lafaurie (1963), no. 27. Savonnières hoard.

105) 1.00g, Ar.
   Obv.: +S- E ...IO. Head in profile, right. OD #E.
   Rev.: +ERLOINVS. Type 🅸. RD #E2.

106) ?, Ar.
   Obv.: Worn.
   Rev.: +E...NVS. Type 🅸.
   Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 29. Savonnières hoard.

107) ?, Ar.
   Obv.: ...E MAVRI... Head in profile, right.
   Rev.: +E...NVS. Type 🅸.
   Ref.: Lafaurie (1963), no. 30. Savonnières hoard.