

STUDIES PRESENTED TO THE
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION
FOR THE HISTORY OF
REPRESENTATIVE AND
PARLIAMENTARY INSTITUTIONS

LXX

ÉTUDES PRÉSENTÉES À LA
COMMISSION INTERNATIONALE
POUR L'HISTOIRE DES
ASSEMBLÉES D'ÉTATS

70¹ Mb 5368

a 11844

1383.562

MEDIEVAL FRANCE AND HER
PYRENEAN NEIGHBOURS

STUDIES IN
EARLY INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

THOMAS N. BISSON

THE HAMBLEDON PRESS
LONDON AND RONCEVERTE

1989

Monetary ordinances for the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne in 1264. The page shows dense Latin text in a Gothic script, with some marginalia and a large initial letter 'D' at the top left.

A second page of the manuscript, also containing dense Latin text in Gothic script. It begins with a large initial 'D' and continues with several paragraphs of text.

Monetary ordinances for the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne in 1264.

Archives Municipales de Narbonne, AA 105, fol. 52v (See page 413)

COINAGES AND ROYAL MONETARY POLICY IN LANGUEDOC DURING THE REIGN OF SAINT LOUIS¹

At the accession of Louis IX in 1226 and the institution of royal government in Languedoc, the king's money was hardly known in those extended territories which lay between English and Imperial holdings in southern France. The inhabitants of that region, indeed, were still inclined to look upon France proper, to the north, as a foreign land. Half a century later, however, the royal penny had become a widely used currency in Languedoc. This development, with an accompaniment of definite royal policies toward the seigniorial coinages, is an important aspect of that process whereby the larger part of Languedoc, notably the county of Toulouse and its dependencies, became in fact as well as in right subject to the crown. The more interesting historical problems relate to the shifting fortunes of the feudal coinages, the nature of the changes effected by the king's administration, and the part played in this development by Alfonso of Poitiers, a "baron" of the blood royal.²

When it happened in 1212 that the elder Simon de Montfort, in consequence of his efforts and leadership in the early Albigeian campaigns, gained papal and royal recognition as count of Toulouse, the first step toward a new political order was accomplished in Languedoc. At the time of his ouster the hereditary count, Raymond VI, held titular control of the Quercy, the Rouergue, the Agenais, the Albigeois, the viscounty of Nîmes, and the marquisate of Provence, while the count of Foix, the viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne, and to a lesser degree the lord of Montpellier (the king of Aragon), recognized the overlordship of Toulouse. The failure of Amaury de Montfort to maintain his father's conquests and the suspect orthodoxy of the dispossessed but resourceful heir of Raymond VI led to the successful invasion of Languedoc by Louis VIII in 1226. The young Raymond VII, submissive by necessity, was permitted to retain his inheritance, but at the price of very considerable concessions to the king. By the terms of the treaty of 1229 the duchy of Narbonne,³ the viscounty of Nîmes, and that part of the Albigeois which lay to the south of the Tarn, were irrevocably united to the

¹ The writer wishes to acknowledge a grant by the American Numismatic Society, before whose summer seminar this paper, in its original form, was presented on 23 August 1955. He is indebted to Professors Joseph R. Strayer and T. E. Mommsen for suggestions and criticism; any errors that may be present are, of course, his own.

Note: Dates throughout are new style. Names for the coinages are anglicized or given in French or Latin according to the dictates of general usage.

² The technical difficulties, particularly regarding the derivation of coin types and standards of monetary weight and alloy, which beset the numismatist of feudal Languedoc cannot be considered here, aside from such general remarks as contribute to understanding the historical matters under discussion. See in general F. Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales de France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1866-69), II; A. Blanchet, A. Dieudonné, *Manuel de numismatique française*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1912-36), II, IV, 221-226, 234-247, and the works cited there.

³ Little more than a title; the viscounts and archbishops shared territorial rights in Narbonne.

royal domains. More important to the crown in the long run was the provision of the treaty by which Raymond VII pledged his remaining rights to his daughter, who was betrothed to Alfonse, the young king's brother;⁴ Alfonse was subsequently to become the last independent count of Toulouse. Royal government began at this time in two large administrative districts, the *sénéchaussées* of Beaucaire and Carcassonne. The senechals, military, judicial, and financial agents of the crown, with their subordinates, the vicars, supervised the royal mints in their districts and they were responsible for the enforcement of royal regulations relating to the coinages.

Of the two royal monetary systems in thirteenth-century France — the parisiens, confined mainly to the north and east, and the *tournois*, which was widely used in the west — only the latter was extended into Languedoc. Pennies, shillings, and pounds, as everywhere in the West, made up the system of account, but until 1266 silver pennies and half pennies (oboles, or *mailles*) were the only circulating specie. The well known *tournois* coins of Louis IX were in appearance virtually the same as those of his father. They bear the legends, obv. LVDOVICVS REX; rev., TVRONVS (variant, TVRONIS) CIVI, with a castle-like structure in the field. The *fleur de lys*, already the well recognized symbol of the monarchy, does not appear in the design, but is characteristic of the local types of Nîmes and Arras, and of the *gros tournois*.⁵ By the mediaeval reckoning of fine silver content in fractions of twelve (*deniers de loi*), the *tournois* were at a standard of three and three-quarters d. (or slightly less than 4/12 fine),⁶ which is to say that, like so many debased seigniorial coins of the period, they were a "black" money. They were cut at a ratio of 217 to the royal *marc* of Troyes,⁷ a relationship also expressed as 58 shillings-worth in fine silver. This standard was not markedly different from that of several contemporary seigniorial coinages, from which the royal money was distinct, however, in its characteristic design and in its more effective administrative control by the king.

In order to understand the background of royal monetary politics in Languedoc, it will be useful to consider in some detail the organization, minting, and distribution of the coinages with which the *tournois* were placed in competition. During the first half of the reign of Saint Louis some seventeen principalities in Languedoc enjoyed the regalian *jus monetæ*, which had passed by grant and by

⁴ For the most extensive text of the treaty see *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, edd. Teulet, Delaborde, Berger, Delaborde, 5 vols. (Paris, 1803-1909), II, 147b-162a.

⁵ Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, II, 227, figs. 70-71; G. Pierfitte, "Monnaies des comtes de Toulouse," *Revue Numismatique*, 4th ser., xxxviii (1935), 61. The Nîmes type is discussed below.

⁶ "Fine" silver in the case of royal coins usually was one twenty-fourth alloy, known as *argent-le-roi*. It is not always possible to tell whether pure silver or some such alloy is implied in texts referring to the fine content of coins; see Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, II, 34. In referring to the alloy of coins it is customary to give only the fractional numerator; thus, e.g., 4 d. = 4/12 fine silver.

⁷ On the problem of the *marc*, its origins, relationship with the Carolingian *livre*, and the technicalities of its weight and alterations, see P. Guilhermoz, "Note sur les poids du moyen âge," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, lxxvii (1906), 161-238; 402-450; A. Dieudonné, "Les poids du moyen âge et la numismatique d'après une étude publiée en 1906," *Le Moyen Âge*, 2d ser., xxii (1920), 157-173 (esp. 102 ff.). A fraction of the *livre* (one-half the so-called "strong *livre*"), the *marc* came into common use in France in the early twelfth century. See n. 28 below.

usurpation to the descendants of the local agents of Carolingian administration in the ninth and tenth centuries.⁸ The coinage of Toulouse was one of the leading currencies in Languedoc in this period and was in some respects typical of the others.

The coins struck at Toulouse by Raymond VII (1222-1249) cannot be distinguished from those of his father, and it is possible that the latest known type of these famous *tolzas* dates from the middle twelfth century. Characteristic of this type is the legend RAMON COMES, encircling a large cross; the reverses are commonly inscribed TOLOSA CIVI, around a field where appear enigmatic symbols most probably to be interpreted as spelling the word PAX.⁹ This word is clearly inscribed on certain Toulousan coins of the late eleventh century, undoubtedly in reference to the peace movement which, as one of its principles, encouraged the minting of good money.¹⁰ A half penny of Simon de Montfort, who occupied Toulouse for several months in 1215, is extant and bears the same inscription.¹¹ The cross, the abbreviated CIVITAS, and the reference to the peace, are clear evidence that the bishops of Toulouse had shared in the coinage. Their rights, however, were entirely lost by the early years of the thirteenth century.¹²

The coinage was long maintained at a relatively high weight and fineness. Known in the twelfth century as *moneta decena* (ten-twelfths fine), it became officially *septena* in 1178 by act of Raymond V. In the case of Toulouse these fractional designations appear to have described the weight of the coins as well as their fine silver content.¹³ The *septena* remained legally unchanged during a period

⁸ By the eleventh century the regal imprint on the coins had largely disappeared or been transformed. It is well understood, by the testimony of types, that numerous seigniorial coinages were derived from that of Toulouse; see Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, IV, 239, 243; Chalande, "Monnaies baronales & épiscopales de la province de Languedoc," in Claude de Vic, J. J. Vaissette, *Histoire générale de Languedoc* (hereinafter cited as *H.L.*), 16 vols. (Toulouse, 1872-1904), VII, 300-391. Royal charters of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, confirming seigniorial rights of coinage, were a mark of the completeness of the change, but also heralded a new period and the start of a reverse development.

⁹ See Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, II, pl. lxxxii, 4. But cf. the discussion by G. Pierfitte, "Monnaies," *Rev. Num.*, xxxviii, 48-49. Pierfitte seems to disregard the perhaps too ingenious explanation of Louis Blancard, "Nouveau classement des monnaies languedociennes," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences, Belles-Lettres, et Arts de Marseille*, 1888, pp. 99-105, who thinks the symbols have a double significance, relating not only to a personal name — perhaps VGO — but also to amounts of seigniorage.

¹⁰ A valuable suggestion by John H. Mundy, *Liberty and Political Power in Toulouse, 1050-1230* (New York, 1954), p. 28.

¹¹ Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, IV, 235.

¹² See texts of 1205 and 1222, *Cartulaire du Bourg*, in R. Limouzin-Lamothe, *La Commune de Toulouse et les Sources de son Histoire (1120-1249); Étude historique et critique suivie de l'édition du cartulaire du consulat* (Toulouse-Paris, 1932), pp. 403-404, 421-422. Faced by a strong, independent town organization and a powerful seigneur, the temporal authority of the bishop was very weak. See Mundy, *Liberty and Political Power in Toulouse*, pp. 80-82.

¹³ Professor Mundy, *ibid.*, p. 240, n. 73, doubts that the term *decena* expressed any notion more precise than one of fitness or suitability. This argument does not account for numerous, and parallel, references to coins *octena*, e.g., *H.L.*, V, 735 (1095), and *septena*, e.g., Limouzin-Lamothe, *Commune de Toulouse*, p. 403 (1207); see also P. Guilhermoz, "De la taille du denier dans le haut moyen âge," *B.E.C.*, lxxxiv (1929), 267. Mundy's citation from the *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Sernin de*

when the royal coinage of Tours was already at a standard of four-twelfths or three and three-quarters fine. Their *taille* to the *marc* was normally 28 shillings of Toulouse,¹⁴ and thus the Toulousan penny was worth approximately two pennies of Tours. In 1205 Raymond VI lost his right to change the coinage, promising the churches, consuls, and people of Toulouse not to alter the *septena*. His son made a similar promise in 1222, but in that troubled period he seems not to have had confidence in his ability to maintain a stable coinage.¹⁵ References to the later coinage of Raymond VII are vague, but there is some evidence for a change in standard about the year 1240.¹⁶ The one other coinage controlled directly by Raymond VII was that of the marquisate of Provence, which had its origin in the twelfth century.¹⁷ It was of little importance in the era of Louis IX. Both coinages were continued in new series by Alfonse, who reduced the alloy to the point of approximate equivalence with that of other seignorial and royal pennies.

From the vicecomital mints of Béziers and Carcassonne came pennies similar in types, weight, and fineness¹⁸ to those of Toulouse. It is not certain whether the bishops shared in the rights to these coinages. No coins later than the period of Raymond Roger (1194–1209) are known to numismatists. His successor, Raymond Trencavel II (1209–1247), fought a losing battle with the Montforts for control of Carcassonne and it is in this period that the end of the seignorial series must be placed.

The coinage of Albi was shared by the count of Toulouse, probably from the later twelfth century, with the bishop and viscount.¹⁹ The several varieties of "raymondins," as the pennies were called, cannot be assigned to specific dates or rulers before June 1248, when Count Raymond VII, Sicard Alaman, Raymond's chief minister, and the bishop of Albi divided among themselves the rights to the *moneta ramundensium Albiensis*. They stipulated that coins were to be struck, when needed, at Chateaufort de Bonafos, which Raymond had granted in fief to Sicard in 1241 on condition that he build a castle or town there.²⁰ The pennies minted under this arrangement can be easily identified.²¹ The "episcopal" cross

Toulouse, ed. C. Douais (Toulouse, 1887), which reads: "Hec moneta fuit decena in argento et pondere," was discussed by Guilhermoz in the article just cited, 267–268. His conclusion, namely, that the coinage so described was ten-twelfths that of a fictive, perhaps once real, coinage in weight as well as in alloy, appears reasonable. Cf. Pierfitte, "Monnaies," *Rev. Num.*, xxxviii, 59.

¹⁴ See *H.L.*, viii, 499, ii (1207), 797 (1224); *Layette*, ii, 136a (1227), 511a (1248). On the *marc* see n. 28 below.

¹⁵ Documents of 1224, 1227, and 1243, cited n. 14.

¹⁶ *Layette*, ii, 437b.

¹⁷ See Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 151, and fig. 86.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 239–240; Guilhermoz, "Taille du denier," *B.E.C.*, lxxxiv, 268–269; they were 8 d. fine in the twelfth century. See Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxiv, 11; lxxxv, 9–12, for reproductions of the later coins.

¹⁹ See Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 238.

²⁰ *H.L.*, viii, 1245–47; vi, 727; Clément Compayré, *Études historiques et Documents inédits sur l'Albigois, le Castrais et l'ancien diocèse de Lavaur* (Albi, 1841), pp. 312–313.

²¹ They were known as "raymondins of Bonafos" (*Ramondenz Bonafossenz*); see *Un Cartulaire et divers actes des Alaman, des de Lautrec et des de Lévis* . . . , edd. E. Cabié, L. Mazens (Toulouse, 1882), p. 96.

and the legend R BONAFOS are prominent features of their design. Degenerate letters in the obverse field, less legible than the corresponding symbols of Toulousan pennies, have, like the latter, been read as PAX.²² The raymondins were probably approximately equivalent to *tournois* in value.²³ Although the seignorial series continued through the reign of Louis IX, the mint of Albi-Bonafos was not very productive under the administration of Alfonse.²⁴

In the Agenais, a dowry which came with the English wife of Raymond VI, the count of Toulouse retained his suzerainty over a coinage which was exploited solely by the bishops of Agen in the thirteenth century. The coins were known as "arnaldins," after several of the bishops, and in the time of Alfonse they were slightly inferior in value to royal pennies.²⁵

The old seignorial mints of Melgueil and Narbonne continued in activity throughout the thirteenth century. In consequence of the Albigensian crusade the count of Melgueil in 1215 was dispossessed of his holdings, including mint rights, which were granted by Innocent III to the bishop of Maguelonne. As *seigneurial* the lord and consuls of Montpellier reserved a certain number of coins from each emission, but the bishop retained the greatest share throughout the century. There was no other coinage in Montpellier until 1273, when James I of Aragon instituted a *gros* money of fine silver. The coinage of Narbonne was originally the sole property of the viscount, but in 1215 the rights were divided by Aimery III, *intuitu pietatis*, with Archbishop Arnould Amaury.

Melgorian pennies, which were imitations of certain coins of Narbonne, bore the name Raymond, after an early viscount of Narbonne. The reverse type of the "melgorian," four ringlets with the name of Narbonne, was until 1215 characteristic of coins of the latter city. The distinguishing feature of the Melgorian penny was the peculiar disjointed cross in the obverse field.²⁶ After 1215 a key, symbolic of archiepiscopal authority, was represented on the coins of Narbonne.²⁷

²² Chalande, "Monnaies baronales," *H.L.*, vii, 415; Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 238. In contrast to the situation at Toulouse, the bishop of Albi was a powerful temporal lord.

²³ The texts are not informative on this point. However in 1278 raymondins were at an alloy of 8½, and 74½ shillings-worth to the *marc*; see P. Guilhermoz, "Avis sur la question monétaire donnée aux rois Philippe le Hardi, Philippe le Bel, Louis X et Charles le Bel," *Rev. Num.*, 4th ser., xxv (1922), 178, n. 1. In a charter granted by Sicard Alaman to the inhabitants of Chateaufort de Bonafos in 1256, they were termed *gros* with respect to pennies of Cahors, worth two of the latter (Compayré, *Albigois*, p. 320). In this period caorsins were approximately half the *tournois* in value; see Edgard Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse de Poitiers* . . . (Paris, 1870), p. 214.

²⁴ See *ibid.*, p. 215; between All Saints 1255 and the feast of St Michael 1259 only 39 *livres* were struck, and there was little subsequent activity.

²⁵ Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 221–222, and fig. 121; A. Vuitry, *Les Monnaies et le Régime monétaire de la monarchie féodale de Hugues-Capet à Philippe-le-Bel (987–1286)* . . . (Paris, 1876), p. 65, and n. 2.

²⁶ See in general, on the coinage of Melgueil, A. Germain, "Mémoire sur les anciennes monnaies seigneuriales de Melgueil et de Montpellier," *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Montpellier*, iii (1850–54), 133–255, also plate, 1–4; cf. Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxv, 14–20. The represented coins are undated; presumably designs changed little. See also G. Amardel, "Un denier inédit d'Aimeri III, vicomte de Narbonne," *Rev. Num.*, 4th ser., xxi (1917–18), 47.

²⁷ See Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 243; Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxii, 19, 21. In 1242 the archbishop complained that Viscount Amaury IV had forcibly seized the former's share of the rights; in 1266 the two lords were again contesting the *moneta* (*H.L.*, vi, 745, 897).

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries pennies of Melgueil were coined at a ratio of approximately 50 shillings-worth to the *marc* of Montpellier or Narbonne, a standard of monetary weight in very common use in Languedoc.³⁸ Early in the twelfth century they were eight d. fine and equivalent in value to pennies of Narbonne.³⁹ Subsequent mutations cut the value of both coinages approximately in half, that of Narbonne declining the more rapidly. In 1156 the penny of Narbonne was four-fifths the melgorian in value, a ratio which had decreased to three-fourths by the middle of the thirteenth century,⁴⁰ when melgorians were normally at a fineness of four d. or a little less. In weight and alloy, therefore, the Toulousan penny (26 s. to the *marc*; 7 d. fine, until 1249) was worth approximately two pennies of Melgueil, with respect to which it was, in fact, regarded as a *gros* coin.⁴¹ Principally because of a decline in weight the melgorian during the reign of Louis IX tended toward equality in standard with the royal penny of Tours (58 s. to the *marc*; 3½ d. fine). The alloy remained unchanged, at least *de jure*, but in 1261 the value of the Melgorian shilling relative to the *marc* fine was fixed at 60.⁴² Late in 1265 the viscount of Narbonne contracted for a coinage at a fineness of three and a half and, by weight, 25 s. 8 d. to the alloyed *marc* (or 88 s. to the *marc* fine).⁴³

The coins struck at Cahors and Rodez throughout the thirteenth century were somewhat similar in appearance.⁴⁴ This may be accounted for in part by the fact that at one time both counties had been connected with Toulouse. The bishop controlled the coinage of Cahors, but the *rodanois* was largely, if not en-

³⁸ The texts do not often specify which *marc* is meant; see, e.g., *ibid.*, viii, 460, i, 462, iv, 471, iii, relating to period 1199-1201, and indicating that little if any difference was recognized. See *Cartulaire de la seigneurie de Fontjoncouse*, ed. G. Mouynès (1876), pp. 13-14, for ratio of 48 s. Melgueil to the *marc* of Narbonne; *H.L.*, viii, 520, 50 s. Melgueil to the *marc* of Montpellier (1204). The *marc* of Millau was certainly identical with that of Montpellier (thirteenth century *coutumes*, M. A. F. de Gaujal, *Études historiques sur le Rouergue*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1868-69), i, 286), that of Béziers probably so (*Cartulaire de Béziers: Livre Noir de Béziers*, ed. J. Rouquette [Paris-Montpellier, 1918], p. 450). Documents of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries indicate a variation of 47½ to 52 s. Melgueil to the *marc*, the round number 50 being most common; see, e.g., *H.L.*, v, 1122; viii, 460, i, 462, iv, 580, i. The widely employed *marc* of Cologne also found its way into Languedoc, being utilized in the thirteenth century at Agen, Toulouse, Tournon, etc.; see Guilhermoz, "Remarques diverses sur les poids et mesures du moyen âge," *B.E.C.*, lxxx (1919), 77-78. Generalizations on the relative values of the different coinages in Languedoc are offered in this paper largely on the basis of the fact that there was little difference between the various *marcs*; according to the researches of Guilhermoz the *marc* of Montpellier bore to the *marc* of Troyes the relationship 85:87, while the ratio between the *marcs* of Cologne and Troyes was 15:16. See, on these points, his "Note sur les poids," *B.E.C.*, lxxvii, 187-189, 205, and n. 2; "Taille du denier," *ibid.*, lxxxix, 271.

³⁹ See *ibid.*, 260.

⁴⁰ *Inventaire-Sommaire des archives départementales...* (hereinafter cited as *I.S.A.D.*), *Aude*, Séries G-H (Carcassonne, 1900), G. 7, p. 14; *Inventaires des archives communales...* (hereinafter cited as *I.A.C.*), *Narbonne*, Annexes de la Série AA, ed. Mouynès (Narbonne, 1871), p. 60.

⁴¹ Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 243; see documents of 1207, 1224, 1227, 1243, cited above, n. 14.

⁴² The Melgorian obole was of lower silver content (3 d. fine). See Germain, "Mémoire," *Mém. Soc. Archéol. Montpel.*, iii, 189-190.

⁴³ *I.A.C.*, *Narbonne*, Annexes de la Série AA, p. 92.

⁴⁴ Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxvii, 8-11; lxxxvi, 19-23.

tirely, the possession of the count of Rodez.⁴⁵ The "caorsins" were the more important of the two monies. Of very low worth they were evaluated by Alfonso at one-half the pennies of Tours.⁴⁶ *Rodanois* were regarded in the later thirteenth century as a money equivalent, or alternative, to caorsins.⁴⁷

The mint of the small, related *seigneurs* of Anduze-Sauve and Roquefeuil was located at Sommières, on the river Vidourle. Their pennies, one-half the *tournois* in value,⁴⁸ were known as "bernardins" and "raymondins." Featured in their distinctive but not dissimilar designs were the large letters B and R.⁴⁹ These coins continued to be struck until about 1240.

Finally, five episcopal coinages, all in varying degree obscure during the reign of Louis IX, may be mentioned summarily. The powerful bishops of Mende, who were counts of the Gévaudan, maintained an independent coinage throughout the century. Their pennies bore the name of Saint Privatus, with mitred head and cross.⁴⁰ The bishops of Viviers had received their coinage originally by imperial concession. The thirteenth century, however, witnessed the gradual absorption of the diocese into the French sphere of influence. Although pennies of Viviers were apparently struck in the time of Louis IX, detailed knowledge of the seigneurial series is possible only from the reign of Philip the Fair.⁴¹ Royal charters regulated the episcopal coinages of Lodève (1210, 1285) and Uzès (1211, 1255), but no coins of more recent date than the first years of the thirteenth century are known from these mints.⁴²

Proverbially small in size and value, the pennies of Le Puy, or *pougeoises*, were by no means least in importance in Languedoc.⁴³ The mint rights were held in *paréage* by the viscounts of Polignac and the bishops of Le Puy from 1173 until 1248, when the viscount sold his share to the chapter. The legends and types of the surviving coins are in many instances undecipherable.⁴⁴ Until the last years of the reign of Louis IX, the *pougeoises* were of such low alloy as to be almost pure copper. They became synonymous throughout France with the quarter penny.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ The bishop of Rodez had certain rights in 1214, *H.L.*, viii, 655.

⁴⁶ Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonso*, p. 214.

⁴⁷ *Layettes*, iii, 518b; J. Malinowski, "Notice sur les monnaies des évêques et des consuls de Cahors frappées sous la troisième race des rois de France," *Revue de l'Agenais*, ii (1875), 206. For figures on the fluctuating weight and alloy of these coinages toward the close of the reign of St Louis, see *ibid.*, 271; Guilhermoz, "Question monétaire," *Rev. Num.*, xxv, 178, notes 2, 3.

⁴⁸ See below p. 402. They were equal in value and interchangeable; cf. *Querimoniae Aletensium, Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (hereinafter cited as *H.F.*), various edd., 24 vols. (Paris, 1788-1904), xxiv, ed. Delisle (1904), 401, d.

⁴⁹ Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxvi, 3-8.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, pl. lxxxvi, 16-18.

⁴¹ See Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 246, fig. 141; 247.

⁴² *I.S.A.D.*, *Gard*, Séries G-H, Suppl. (Nîmes, 1916), G. 1631, p. 89; see Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 240, 245; Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, ii, pl. lxxxvi, 9-11.

⁴³ See, in general, P. Olivier, "Les Monnaies féodales du Puy," *Rev. Num.*, 4th ser., xxx (1927), 170-217; xxxi (1928), 83-100, with plate. " *ibid.*, 193.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 203-204; according to a charter of Alfonso of 1253, four *pougeoises* were worth one toulousan. In a contract of 1269 *podenses nigri* were prescribed, at an alloy of 2½, 138½ shillings-worth in the *marc* of fine silver (their *taille* was 26 s. to the *marc*-weight of alloyed metal) (*ibid.*, xxxi, 86).

The patterns of distribution of these seigneurial coinages, or the particular regions of Languedoc in which they circulated, can be more clearly determined than the administration of the mints. Texts which refer to a particular kind of money are, of course, extremely numerous.⁴⁶ A brief analysis based upon a sampling of them will suffice for purposes of the present inquiry.

Until the middle of the thirteenth century no coinage was so widely used in Languedoc as the Melgorian. In Montpellier and its environs, from Béziers to the Vidourle, it was virtually unrivalled.⁴⁷ Payments for sales and services,⁴⁸ loans,⁴⁹ customary rents,⁵⁰ and seigneurial dues,⁵¹ were all made in money of Melgueil. The apparent quiescence of the nearby episcopal mint of Lodève in this period may have been due in part to this veritable flood of melgorians.

In the eastern parts of the *sénéchaussée* of Beaucaire, likewise, the values of rents and dues were frequently expressed in terms of money of Melgueil.⁵² In the region about Sommières, Nîmes, and Beaucaire, however, these coins were no longer in common use.⁵³ The principal circulating specie there were the raymondins and bernardins of Sommières, *pougeoises*, and the episcopal pennies of Mende and Vienne.⁵⁴ To judge from the record of the *enquêteurs* of 1247-1248, the raymondins were the most commonly used pennies in the *vigueries* of Nîmes, Beaucaire, and Sommières until about 1240,⁵⁵ whereas in the district of Alais the bernardins shared their supremacy.⁵⁶ Melgorians continued in use in Alais and farther to the north until late in the century.⁵⁷ The black pennies of Le Puy were

⁴⁶ There is no need for special citation of the host of surviving contracts, donations, recognitions of rents and revenues, etc., which specify that the coinage in question should also be "current" (*moneta currens, percurribilis*, etc.) in a particular area. In an age when transactions, as well as coinages, were relatively localized, there was no concept of widespread "legal-tender" to ensure acceptability of coins.

⁴⁷ There are rare references to money of Béziers, e.g., *H.L.*, v, 1449, clxxxv; *H.F.*, xxiv, 347, n, 1. With regard to the diocese of Agde, the agreement of 1150 between viscounts Raymond Trencavel and Bernard Atto (of Nîmes) that "nec aliam monetam ibi faciant, sed moneta Biterrensis currat pro totum Agathensem" remained a dead letter (*H.L.*, v, 1123; for use of melgorians there, see 1315-25). See generally *Querimonias Carcassoniensium, Biterrensiensium, 1247-1248*, *H.F.*, xxiv, 299-385, on the predominance of money of Melgueil in the whole area.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 364, n, 366, a, c, n-1, 375, a-b, 381, f.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 336, n-1, 361, g-n.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 354, k, 624, k.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 325, a, 326, a, 356, 1, 374, c, 644, 1, 645, a. For examples of customary *tailles* evaluated in money of Melgueil, see 369, b-c, 612, n-1.

⁵² For examples of 1248 and 1266 see *I.S.A.D., Gard*, Série G-H, Suppl., H. 788, pp. 59-60; H. 888, p. 218.

⁵³ Occasional mention of melgorians at Remoulins, Sommières, Nîmes, and Psalmody is cited in Robert Michel, *L'Administration royale dans la sénéchaussée de Beaucaire au temps de Saint Louis* (Paris, 1910), app. III, p. 326.

⁵⁴ On the latter coinage see Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manual*, iv, 161-164, and figs. 91-93.

⁵⁵ *H.F.*, xxiv, 420, b, f, 421, b, f, n, etc.; 444, a, 445, a, etc.; 430, n, 439, f. Note also 412, f, 427, a, 431, e, 439, a, where extortions by royal officials between 1226 and 1243 in shillings "raimundencium tunc currentium" are reported.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 393, f, n, j, 400, a, 395, f, 398, b, 401, d, etc.

⁵⁷ Michel, *Beaucaire*, p. 326; *I.S.A.D., Lozère*, Série G, II (Mende, 1890), G. 1035, p. 104.

more common in Alais than in the southern *vigueries*,⁵⁸ and were the predominant currency in the Velay, and possibly the Rouergue.⁵⁹ The *moneta viannensis* was widely used in the same regions. The *mendois* circulated in the Gévaudan,⁶⁰ where money of Le Puy must also have been very common.

The coins of Melgueil were not unknown in the Rouergue,⁶¹ and they were well recognized and "current" in the Albigeois. In August 1239 Philippe de Montfort, lord of Castres, promised the bishop and chapter of Albi to continue to pay a certain rent initiated by Simon de Montfort in 1212, amounting to twenty pounds of Melgueil.⁶² A house was sold at Castres in 1271 for 26 pounds in the same currency.⁶³ Only *malgoyrens* are mentioned in the monetary tariffs of the charter of *coutumes* granted by the viscount of Lautrec to the inhabitants of Paulin in 1253.⁶⁴ Raymondins of Albi also circulated extensively in the Albigeois, but not much more so than the melgorians.⁶⁵ According to the agreement of June 1248, between the count of Toulouse, the bishop of Albi, and Sicard Alaman, their coins were to circulate and to be accepted "comunitur ab omnibus" in the dioceses of Rodez and Cahors as well as in the Albigeois.⁶⁶ If there was a leading seigneurial penny in that region it was the caorsin. Rents, pecuniary amends, and sales were frequently stipulated in money of Cahors in such places as Albi, Cordes, Gaillac, Candeil, Villefranche, and Penne.⁶⁷ Pennies of Rodez, which circulated in the Rouergue with the *pougeoises*,⁶⁸ were also used in the Albigeois, probably more so in the later years of the period.⁶⁹

Seigneurial pennies of Toulouse were somewhat less common in the Albigeois,⁷⁰ but they were the leading currency in the valley of the Garonne, from Moissac

⁵⁸ *H.F.*, xxiv, 392, n-k, 397, j-k, 398, b-n, etc.; cf. 405, j.

⁵⁹ *Cartulaire des Templiers du Puy-en-Velay*, ed. A. Chassaing (Paris, 1882), pp. 28, 30, 35-36, 39-41, 44, 61; *I.S.A.D., Haute-Loire*, Série II, Suppl. (Le Puy, 1931), 1B. 282, pp. 50-51; 1B. 289, p. 54; 1B. 300, p. 58. See examples of its use in the Rouergue, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Bonneval en Rouergue*, edd. P. A. Verlaguet, J. L. Rigal (Rodez, 1938), pp. 126, 140, 168, 177, 198.

⁶⁰ Michel, *Beaucaire*, p. 326.

⁶¹ *Cartulaire . . . de Bonneval*, pp. 129, 137.

⁶² *H.L.*, vi, 646.

⁶³ *I.S.A.D., Tarn*, Série G-H (Albi, 1915), H. 419, p. 344.

⁶⁴ Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 341-342. See also *H.L.*, v, 1341, lxix, 1345, lxxxviii, etc.

⁶⁵ See, e.g., Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 398-399, 313-320, 160, vii; *H.L.*, v, 1344, lxxxv.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, viii, 1246.

⁶⁷ See, e.g., Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 337, 398-399, 406-407; *H.L.*, v, 1346, xciv; vi, 697; *I.S.A.D., Tarn*, Série G-H, G. 562, p. 173; H. 627, p. 422; *Correspondance administrative d'Alfonse de Poitiers*, (hereinafter cited as *C.A.*), ed. A. Molinier, 2 vols. (Paris, 1894-1900), II, No. 1859. The caorsin was unchallenged in the Quercy; see Malinowski, "Monnaies . . . de Cahors," *Rev. Agenais*, II, 268, 270.

⁶⁸ See *Cartulaire . . . de Bonneval*, pp. 134, 145, 170, etc.

⁶⁹ At Caylus one Bego de Maresta in November 1267 complained of spoliation by the count's bayle of 9 pounds "ructensium" (*C.A.*, I, No. 494). Alfonso complained in 1270 that money of Rodez and Cahors circulated in the Albigeois and elsewhere to his prejudice (*ibid.*, II, No. 1609).

⁷⁰ In the *coutumes* of Saint-Sulpice, 1247, fines and amends are in *tolzas* (Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 455-458); see also *coutumes* of Saint-Urcisse, 1256, in Élie Rossignol, *Monographies communales ou Etude statistique, historique et monumentale du département du Tarn*, 4 vols. (Toulouse, 1864-66), IV, 71-75; also *H.L.*, v, 1539, v.

to Comminges.⁷¹ Particularly in the western and southern sectors, however, the toulousans shared leadership, both as a coinage and as a money of account, with the *moneta morlanensis* of Béarn, in this period somewhat superior to *tournois* in intrinsic value.⁷² At Pamiers and Lézat payments for sales and rents were invariably in one or the other of these coinages.⁷³ The toulousans "invaded" the upper country of Comminges, particularly after 1240, where they long remained predominant.⁷⁴ Money of Morlaas was in use also in the Agenais, where the local arnaldins were the principal currency throughout the thirteenth century.⁷⁵

In the Lauragais and the regions bordering on the territory of the Haute-Garonne, the ubiquitous money of Melgueil was commonly used in sales, settlements, and loans.⁷⁶ Even in Narbonne it was the leading currency.⁷⁷ A council of Narbonne in 1246 ruled that Jewish families in the ecclesiastical province, extending to Perpignan, should pay six pennies of Melgueil to their local curate every Easter.⁷⁸ At Fontjoncouse melgorians were in common use until mid-century.⁷⁹

A few "foreign" coins, in addition to the monies of Morlaas and Vienne, circulated in Languedoc. They were principally Spanish pieces, introduced in the Midi in the period of Alfonse II of Aragon (1162-1196), who possessed Provence, Roussillon, and considerable domains in the Rouergue and Gévaudan. Among them were *gras* coins of gold, known variously as "alfonsins," "marabotins," and "crosats," which were evaluated in 1268 at 63½ to the *marc* of Troyes.⁸⁰ Sterling pennies of England, of considerably greater intrinsic value than most contemporary French coins, were common currency in Gascony, and were not unknown in Languedoc.⁸¹ Toward the east the Provençal *regales* of Marseille and the

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, viii, 752, iii (L'Isle Jourdain, 1228); v, 1024, lvii (Pamiers, 1272); vi, 879 (Mas-Grenier, 1265); see also viii, 1081-83, 1110-11, etc. Many thirteenth-century *coutumes* published by Ramière de Fortanier, *Chartes de Franchises du Lauragais* (Paris, 1839), give evidence of the prevalence of toulousans in the Lauragais; see, e.g., pp. 120-121, 132, 295, 607-610, 703, 705.

⁷² The mint was at Morlaas. On this coinage see Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 80-90, and fig. 43; also table below, p. 463. The money of Morlaas was quite as widely used in Gascony as was the Melgorian money in Languedoc.

⁷³ *H.L.*, v, 1619, xxxii, 1621, xlv, 1624, lvii, 1787, ccciv, 1797, cccclii, 1790, ccccxvii, ccccxxviii, ccccxx, etc.

⁷⁴ Charles Higounet, *Le Comté de Comminges de ses origines à son annexion à la Couronne*, 2 vols. (Toulouse, 1949), II, 489.

⁷⁵ See, e.g., *Archives municipales d'Agén, Chartes, Première Série (1189-1328)*, edd. A. Magen, G. Tholin (Villeneuve-sur-Lot, 1876), Nos. xxiv, xl, xlix; *C.A.*, I, No. 440; II, No. 1419; etc.

⁷⁶ E.g., at Montolieu, 1220-1260, *Cartulaire et Archives des communes de l'ancien diocèse et de l'arrondissement administratif de Carcassonne*, ed. A. J. Mahul, 7 vols. (Paris, 1857-82), I, 80-90, 92-93, 96; at Prouille, 1235, *I.S.A.D., Aude, Séries G-H*, II, 341, p. 331.

⁷⁷ For instances of its use at Narbonne, 1220-1275, see generally *H.L.*, v, 1605-08; cf. *I.A.C., Narbonne, Annexes de la Série AA*, pp. 49-58.

⁷⁸ C. J. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux*, tr. H. Leclercq, 11 vols. (Paris, 1907-52), v, II, 1698, ch. 42.

⁷⁹ *Cartulaire . . . de Fontjoncouse*, pp. 17-19, 65-66.

⁸⁰ Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 219. Certain fixed revenues were sometimes satisfied by the payment of one such coin. See, e.g., *Cartulaire . . . des Alaman*, p. 92; also Compayré, *Albigeois*, p. 383.

⁸¹ *C.A.*, I, Nos. 320, 323, 366; cf. Compayré, *Albigeois*, p. 180. See regarding literary references, Urban T. Holmes, Jr., "Coins of Old French Literature," *SPECULUM*, xxxi (1956), 316-318.

episcopal pennies of Valence, were probably in limited use.⁸²

By the middle years of the thirteenth century it is likely that, to some extent, several of the seignorial currencies are mentioned in the texts merely as monies of account. This point has been anticipated above with reference to the coinages of Toulouse and Morlaas; in Languedoc this was almost certainly true in the case of the money of Melgueil as well. Old seignorial dues and customary tariffs, mentioned or confirmed long after their institution, could be and undoubtedly were paid frequently in other coinages whose value in terms of Melgorian money would have been well known.⁸³ This was probably the situation in the *sénéchaussée* of Beaucaire and in the Albigeois, where equivalences between baronial coins were well established.⁸⁴ The money of Cahors was also in sufficiently wide use to be recognized very probably as constituting a system of account.

The distribution of these various seignorial pennies can be partially explained in terms of their values with respect to one another.⁸⁵ The tendency of coins of relatively low intrinsic value to change hands rapidly must have been a factor contributing to the widespread circulation of melgorians, *pougeoises*, and caorsins. Melgorians passed out of common circulation, however, in the *vigueries* of Sommières, Nîmes, and Beaucaire, where the local raymondins and bernardins were of considerably less value. In the same region the royal *enquêteurs* received numerous complaints of extortion by the king's officials of coins of Vienne, which were only slightly less valuable than *tournois*.⁸⁶

At a legal fineness of four d. melgorians were probably approximately equivalent in value to the raymondins of Albi, but it is notable that the caorsins, so widely used in the Albigeois, were only about one-half their value. Similarly the relatively high quality of toulousans may well have been a reason for their restricted use in the Albigeois.

Several reasons may be offered for the prevalence of toulousans in the Garonne valley. For one thing certain texts suggest that an effort was made to preserve a stable rate of exchange between Toulousan and Melgorian pennies.⁸⁷ With a fixed and accepted ratio the latter were less likely to drive the toulousans from the field. Secondly, the regular standard or "face value" of these coins, legally unchanged since 1178, was probably by the time of Louis IX in excess of their actual or intrinsic value. Mediaeval pennies had a tendency to decline from their

⁸² The seneschal of Carcassonne in 1264 evaluated them at ½ the *tournois*; see table below, p. 441.

⁸³ However the absence of the qualifying phrases "in pecunia numerata," e.g., *Cartulaire de Maguelone*, edd. J. Rouquette, A. Villemagne, 4 vols. (Montpellier, 1912-24), II, 618, or "in solidos denariorum," e.g., *H.F.*, xxiv, 378, J, can hardly be regarded as evidence that pennies of Melgueil are not intended.

⁸⁴ The references to *moneta biterrensis* cited above, n. 47, may well belong in this category. In June 1298 a rent of four pennies of Melgueil was included in the sale of a certain property near Cordière, in eastern Languedoc, price of which sale being 60 shillings *tournois*, *I.S.A.D., Gard, Série E* (Nîmes, 1894), E. 272, p. 212.

⁸⁵ Where possible fairly precise figures have been cited above for the standards of the coinages. No dogmatic or exact deductions can be made from them, of course.

⁸⁶ About mid-century they were ½ the pennies of Tours, in 1268, ½ (Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 169).

⁸⁷ The instruments cited above, n. 14, have in common the formula "solidos Tolosanones bonos vel Melgorienses duplos."

declared standards, and it is not easy to suppose that one of such relatively high value as the toulousan could be maintained without mutations over so long a period. However that may be, Alfonso, early in his administration of Toulouse, lowered the weight and alloy for his new series of seigniorial pennies. This may help to explain the extended use of toulousans in the county of Comminges in the second half of the thirteenth century. Just how long the old coinages of Carcassonne and Béziers continued at their originally high weight and alloy is not known, but it is certain that they were almost totally displaced from common circulation by the lower quality melgorians.

In the early years of royal administration, from 1226 to about 1240, the circulation of *tournois* money in Languedoc gradually increased. Philippe de Montfort and the bishop of Albi made a transaction in 1231 involving a sum of 200 pounds *tournois*.⁸⁸ In a charter granted to Lautrec by viscount Sicard de Lautrec in the following year payments and tariffs in *torneses* are specified; and in 1235 we find record of a sale made at Prouille for 41 shillings of Tours.⁸⁹ In 1247 the provincial chapter of the Dominicans required that the convents of Languedoc should support their students in *tournois*, an indication that the system, if not the coins themselves, was in general use in the Midi.⁹⁰

There was as yet, however, no determined royal policy that payments by and to royal officials should be made in the king's money. An annual *taille* of 200 pounds of Melgueil was imposed on the rebellious town of Limoux in 1226,⁹¹ and there are many other indications that before 1247 royal officials dealt in various ways in the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne in money of Melgueil.⁹² In fact the problem for the king in this period was to provide a sufficiency of royal specie to ensure its common use, and in order to accomplish this it was necessary to establish royal mints in Languedoc.

The yoke of the king's administration in Languedoc was a heavy one, as the *querimoniae* of 1247-48 reveal only too clearly. Trencavel's revolt in 1240 and Count Raymond's two years later found strong support in a subject population which knew few concessions for its loyalty. But the issue was decided in favor of the king, with similar consequences in both royal *sénéchaussées*. The viscounties of Carcassonne and Béziers passed to the direct control of the Crown in 1247; and Louis IX made a royal stronghold of the city of Carcassonne. The support tendered the revolt by the small but powerful baronage of eastern Languedoc

⁸⁸ *H.L.*, v, 1342, lxxii.

⁸⁹ Compayré, *Albigois*, p. 405; *I.S.A.D.*, *Aude*, Séries G-H, Add. (Carcassonne, 1926), H. 474, p. 102.

⁹⁰ *Acta Capitulum Provincialium Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum: Première Province de Provence, Province Romaine, Province d'Espagne (1239-1302)*, ed. C. Douais (Toulouse, 1894), p. 31; the injunction is repeated in many succeeding chapters; see, e.g., pp. 33, 40, 44-45, 48.

⁹¹ *H.L.*, viii, 1391-92.

⁹² *H.F.*, xxiv, 345, J, 366, E, 373, G, 382, H, I. There are many instances in the *querimoniae* of exactions in money of Melgueil. In one notable case it is clear that an alms in *tournois*, granted early in the reign to one Johannes de Burgis, had been regularly paid for 15 years in "melgorienses, et ita diminuitur helemosina domini regis per augmentum monetae, quod est de turonensi usque ad melgoriensem, . . ." (*ibid.*, 366, G-H).

led to the wholesale confiscation of their rights and properties by the king. Pierre Bermond VII of Sauve was forced to surrender Hierle, with its rich mines of copper and silver in 1243,⁹³ and five years later, in 1248, the barony and mint of Sommières, which he shared with Bernard of Anduze, was also ceded to Louis IX.⁹⁴

The king established two royal mints certainly, and probably a third, in this turbulent period. One was at Nîmes and commenced operations in 1239 or 1240,⁹⁵ while that of Sommières was active probably from the time of its cession to the king.⁹⁶ In both these mints the conventional and standard pennies of Tours seem to have been issued.⁹⁷ But it appears that a special penny of Nîmes, with a local type, was created. One such coin is known: obv., LVDOVICVS REX, with great *fleur de lys*; rev., NEMAUSI CIVI, with cross and two *fleurs de lys*. The French numismatist Lafaurie describes this as a *gros* coin, worth two pennies of Tours; in design it certainly seems to have been the model for the "*gros toulousan*" of Philip III.⁹⁸

The question arises whether coins of this type are to be identified with the *nemausenses* which were in common circulation in Nîmes and Beaucaire from about 1240 and which were so often mentioned in the *querimoniae*.⁹⁹ It has been supposed that the *nemausenses* were simply *tournois* minted at Nîmes,¹⁰⁰ and indeed there is evidence that, at least until 1253, Nîmes pennies were *tournois* in weight and alloy.¹⁰¹ But the description "Nîmes money" (*moneta nemausensis*) suggests that the king had a local type from the outset, perhaps not different

⁹³ In general, however, the mines of Languedoc do not appear to have been serious objects of royal policy in the reign of St Louis. Other important silver mines were located at Villemagne, diocese of Béziers, Largentière, in the Vivarais, and Orzals, in the Rouergue. As suzerain of the Rouergue Alfonso entered upon treaties to gain profits from Orzals (Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonso*, pp. 208-209).

⁹⁴ On these points see Michel, *Beaucaire*, pp. 124-125, 138-140.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 328, n. 2.

⁹⁶ Perhaps even earlier. The royal coinage at Sommières is first mentioned in 1264-65; see n. 163 below, and *Les Olim: Registres des arrêts rendus par la cour du Roi*, ed. A. Beugnot, 4 vols. (Paris, 1839-48), I, 602. But the remarkable increase in circulation of *tournois* in the *vigueries* of Alais, Beaucaire, and Sommières (*H.F.*, xxiv, 400, K, 401, E, 496, F, 499, E, 422, F, 440, A, etc.), combined with certain doubts whether conventional *tournois* were produced in quantity at Nîmes, suggest the early operation of the mint at Sommières. Detailed knowledge of this mint, important in the financial operations of Philip the Fair, seems to be available only from a period late in the century; see F. de Sauley, "Sur les ateliers monétaires royaux, qui ont fonctionné dans le Languedoc, depuis Philippe III jusqu'à François Ier inclusivement," *H.L.*, vii, 438.

⁹⁷ For evidence of a *tournois* coinage at Sommières, see n. 163 below; there is no mention of a local type.

⁹⁸ Jean Lafaurie, *Les Monnaies des rois de France* (Paris, 1951), pp. 25-26; cf. Blanchet, *Dieudonné, Manuel*, II, 229.

⁹⁹ *H.F.*, xxiv, 420, G, H, J, 423, B, I, 424, A, 454, D-F, etc.

¹⁰⁰ Michel, *Beaucaire*, p. 327, n. 8. He cites, p. 11, from the *Mémoire relatif au partage de 1307 conclu entre l'évêque Guillaume Durand II et le roi Philippe-le-Bel* (Société d'Agriculture, Sciences & Arts de la Lozère, I, Mende, 1896), p. 307, which refers to the bishop's attempt to prohibit the "cursum turonensium nemausensium et alterius monete regis per Gaballitanum." But cf. *ibid.*, pp. 354-355, where *turonenses* and *nemausenses* are certainly distinguished.

¹⁰¹ *Layette*, III, 188b.

from that of our surviving specimen.¹⁰² There are other indications that *tournois* and *nemausenses* were, at least in some respects, distinct from one another. A sale for "centum libras nemausensium" and a request for a payment of "viginti et quatuor libras turonensium" were mentioned in a single deposition in 1248.¹⁰³ In another case a lady named Beatrice complained to the royal *enquêteur* that one of the vicars of Nîmes had extorted fifteen shillings of Nîmes from her because she had required a payment from a certain man in money of Nîmes and had refused his proffered payment in *tournois*.¹⁰⁴ Possibly the *nemausenses* were (or were thought to be) of better weight and alloy,¹⁰⁵ but it is doubtful that true *gros* coins were struck so early. The best explanation would appear to be that, while ordinary pennies of Tours may have been minted at Nîmes, a new penny with a local type, but differing only slightly if at all in quality from *tournois*, was issued there and passed into circulation.

The establishment of these mints introduced the first concentrated effort on the part of the royal government to drive from circulation the seigneurial coinages of a particular locality. The raymondins, bernardins, *viennois*, etc., were much used until about 1240, the *tournois* relatively little. Within a decade this situation had been virtually reversed.¹⁰⁶ About the year 1245 it was publicly prohibited at Beaucaire to use any coinage there other than that of Nîmes.¹⁰⁷ Many complaints of monetary exactions after 1239 specify money of Tours or Nîmes.¹⁰⁸

Carcassonne became the third royal mint in Languedoc. It is first mentioned in an *arbitrage* of April 1253,¹⁰⁹ but like Sommières, probably began to operate almost from the time of its conquest. The earliest royal legislation relating to the coinages in the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne dates from July 1247.¹¹⁰ Its effect was to endorse vigorously the use of royal money in that district. The mint at Carcassonne was still active in 1265,¹¹¹ but meanwhile, about the year 1264, still another royal mint had been established at Saint-Antonin.¹¹² This strategically

¹⁰² *Nemausensis* implies a legend such as NEMAUSI, for *tournois*, raymondins, bernardins, etc., derived their names from characteristic legends and types.

¹⁰³ *H.F.*, xxiv, 502, G-H.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 419, H-I. From the judgment in the case (*H.L.*, vii, *Enquêteurs royaux*, 135) it seems that the issue concerned the relative, perhaps shifting, values of the coinages: "Injunctum fuit Ricardo notario, qui remanserat loco Michahelis de Castarii, nomine dicti Michahelis, quod reddat dicte Beatrici XV sol. Nem., secundum quod tunc valebant infra festum purificationis beate Marie." The vicariate of Michael de Castario is dated 1243-1248 (Michel, *Beaucaire*, app. v, p. 386).

¹⁰⁵ The texts just cited, n. 104, cannot be pressed too far in support of this view; there is little other evidence. However, at some time between April 1243, when Oudard de Villers became *senechal* (Michel, *Beaucaire*, p. 384), and 1247, when depositions were brought against him, 20 pounds of Nîmes were regarded as equivalent to 50 pounds of raymondins (*H.F.*, xxiv, 436, n). A normal exchange ratio of 2 to 1 was established in this period between raymondins and *tournois*.

¹⁰⁶ Relevant citations in n. 96 above.

¹⁰⁷ *H.F.*, xxiv, 508, I, J.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 304, B, 414, A, 419, G-I, 406, F, 499, E, etc.

¹⁰⁹ *H.L.*, viii, 1320.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1195, xv. This document is discussed in greater detail below, pp. 409-10.

¹¹¹ *Layettes*, iv, 90a.

¹¹² *H.L.*, viii, 1503. Boutaric (*Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 211, n. 3) thinks 1263; Molinier (*C.A.*, II,

located town, bordering on the Quercy and the Rouergue,¹¹³ was the seat of an old viscounty whose title had passed to the king in 1229. The inhabitants of the locality, a prey to the depredations of the count of Toulouse, aroused the attention of the government sufficiently for the king to order in May 1247 that it be administered henceforth as part of the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne.¹¹⁴ Regular *tournois* pennies were issued both at Carcassonne and at Saint-Antonin.¹¹⁵

Thus after the final setback of baronial opposition in the 1240's, and with the establishment of royal mints in the political centers of four conquered viscounties,¹¹⁶ the way was well prepared for the extensive circulation of the king's money in Languedoc. From this time forward royal officials themselves set an example for the governed, assigning rents and revenues, paying wages, and making payments for purchases of various kinds, in *tournois*.¹¹⁷ Crown politics in Languedoc received an additional impetus in this important decade when, on the decease of Raymond VII in 1249, Alfonse brought the county of Toulouse into the royal family. The administration of Alfonse, carried out in the reorganized comital *sénéchaussées* of Toulouse-Albigois, Agenais-Quercy, the Rouergue, and the *comtat* Venaissin,¹¹⁸ cleared the way for the extension of direct royal authority over Toulouse when he died in 1271.

Distinct royal policies toward the coinages featured the second half of Saint Louis' reign. Aside from the persistent promotion of the use of royal money, an effort which was made throughout the kingdom, three general rulings seem to have had particular importance in their application to Languedoc. First, the principle was laid down that royal coins should be current everywhere, while seigneurial coins should be restricted in circulation to their issuing principalities. Secondly, the government made an effort to establish fixed exchange rates between royal and seigneurial coinages. Thirdly, imitations of foreign, particularly Islamic, coins were prohibited. An important royal ordinance, rendered at Chartres in March 1263,¹¹⁹ officially inaugurated the first of these policies. It contained an important and relevant corollary, namely, the prohibition of seigneurial coins similar in appearance to those of the king. By this Louis recognized

No. 2034) says about 1264. The latter date is preferable, if a document dated 26 January 1264 is taken into account. In it are mentioned, with the omission of Saint-Antonin, the mints of the king, Alfonse, and Charles of Anjou in Languedoc and Provence (*Layettes*, iv, 90a.).

¹¹³ The Quercy had passed by treaty to the king of England in 1259 (*ibid.*, iii, 487a-489a).

¹¹⁴ *H.L.*, vi, 786, n. 2 (Molinier).

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, viii, 1503; *Layettes*, iii, 138b; there is no mention of a local type at either place.

¹¹⁶ Technically, Anduze-Sauve was a seigneurie, but had been quite as strong and independent as Carcassonne, probably more so than Nîmes and Saint-Antonin.

¹¹⁷ Michel, *Beaucaire, pièces justifiées*. No. 48, p. 451 (senechal of Beaucaire by royal order assigns bishop of Nîmes a revenue of 20 l. *tournois*, 1269); *H.L.*, v, 1468, liv (senechal of Carcassonne by royal order assigns a revenue of 10 l. *tournois* to chapter of Saint-Nazaire, 1248); *ibid.*, 1469, clv (senechal assigns a rent of 18 s. *tournois* to bishop of Carcassonne, 1257); *ibid.*, viii, 1362, xvii (wages to *soldaris* in the *castra*, *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne, being paid in *tournois*, 1255); *ibid.*, 1509-10 (sale to king by former viscount Trencavel of a castle in the Razès, for 610 l. *tournois*, 1263).

¹¹⁸ A. Molinier, "Étude sur l'administration de Louis IX & d'Alfonse de Poitiers (1226-1271)," *ibid.*, vii, 490-491; Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 142.

¹¹⁹ *Ordonnances des roys de France de la troisième race*, 21 vols. (Paris, 1723-1840), I, 93-94.

publicly that the confusion of a baronial with a royal penny would tend to favor and to extend the general circulation of the former, which was of course not at all his official intention. It may also be regarded as a contemporary indication of the generally recognized supremacy of the king's coinages. To appreciate the main reasons for this prohibition, however, we must refer to the Toulousan coinage of Alfonse.

Soon after succeeding to their domains and privileges, the king's brother initiated a seigneurial coinage wholly unlike the traditional and accepted *moneta septena* of the Raymonds. In design the new pennies were similar to Alfonse's Poitevin coinage, which was being altered in the same period in such a way as to resemble the *tournois* closely.¹²⁰ The first toulousans bore the types, obv., ANFOS COMES, with cross; rev., TOLOSA CIVI, in three lines.¹²¹ Soon there followed a significant change. Pennies and half pennies of the same design were issued, but with the addition of a decorative *fleur de lys* in the second segment of the field cut by the cross.¹²² Then, from 1251 to about 1262, Alfonse's mint at Toulouse issued toulousans which were in virtually all respects imitation *tournois*; the designs: obv., A. CO. FILIVS REG, with cross; rev., THOLOS A CIVI, with the characteristic "castle" of Tours.¹²³ It is not difficult to imagine how these features might easily have led the casual user to mistake such pennies, especially when blackened and battered, for *tournois*.

These different toulousans — certainly at least the latter variety — were *tournois* in standard as well as in design.¹²⁴ But it was their similarity in appearance to royal pennies which caused friction. Undoubtedly Louis IX had these coins in mind when he published the ordinance of 1263. The toulousans specifically, along with poitevins and certain coins of Provence, were termed "counterfeits" of royal pennies in 1265.¹²⁵ Probably because of their greater abundance, the king took a more drastic step with regard to the poitevins when in 1263 he ordered the mint at Montreuil-Bonnin to be closed altogether.¹²⁶ At Toulouse, in addition to the objectionable "tholosani simplices," *gros* pennies of Toulouse were being minted; presumably the ordinance did not apply to them.¹²⁷ The

¹²⁰ Notably by the addition of the "castle" design, and by the adoption of the *tournois* standards.

¹²¹ See Pierfitte, "Monnaies," *Rev. Num.*, xxxviii, 60-61, and pl. iv, 11-12.

¹²² *Ibid.*, pl. iv, 13-14.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, pl. iv, 15.

¹²⁴ *Layettes*, iii, 188ab.

¹²⁵ *Ord.*, i, 95.

¹²⁶ *C.A.*, ii, Nos. 1999-2001. From the royal letter of 21 June 1263 (No. 1999), it is apparent that there had been an earlier prohibition.

¹²⁷ Pierfitte, "Monnaies," *Rev. Num.*, xxxviii, pl. iv, 17-18. The type was taken from the design of Erbert of Mans. It included an inconspicuous *fleur de lys* but not the castle. The *grossi tholosani* were prescribed already in the contract of 24 July 1253 (*Layettes*, iii, 188ab) so they can hardly have been instituted in consequence of the prohibition of 1263 (Pierfitte, "Monnaies," *Rev. Num.*, xxxviii, 61). However there is extant a form letter of Alfonse, July 22 of an uncertain year, 1263-66, addressed to his seneschals, requiring that they take counsel "cum probis, sapientibus et discretis viris . . . ut melius poteritis . . . super grossis monetis novis eudendis in terris nostris, auri videlicet et argenti, . . ." ["Mandements inédits d'Alfonse de Poitiers, comte de Toulouse (1262-1270)," ed. A. Molinier, *Annales du Midi*, xii (1900), 319.] The piece is interesting as an indication of Alfonse's recognition of the efficacy of consultation with the community on matters of general concern; the new coinage, however, seems not to have materialized.

"castle" type was also characteristic of Alfonse's new coinage in the Venaissin (the old marquisate of Provence). It is perhaps not without significance that that mint does not appear to have been productive after 1263.¹²⁸

Alfonse wished to see his coins circulate generally with those of the king. Unwilling to be regarded as just "another baron," he looked upon his relationship to the king as reason for special privileges. On several occasions he refused to perform feudal homage for rights and properties which, as count of Toulouse, he held of ecclesiastical lords, regarding such an act as degrading for so great a *seigneur*.¹²⁹ In a charter granted to his minters at Toulouse in 1251, Alfonse's seneschal, in clear recognition of his master's purpose, promised among other things to exclude from circulation the old (*septena*) money of Toulouse, and all other coinages, except those of the count and the king.¹³⁰ Several years later Alfonse requested the seneschal of Carcassonne to promote the circulation of his Toulousan coins in royal territories, "just as he permitted those of the king to be current in his own lands."¹³¹

The pretensions of Alfonse notwithstanding, the ordinance of 1263 was directed as much to him as to any other baron. It made explicit for Languedoc what had been implied in the rulings of *circa* 1245 and 1247, mentioned above.¹³² The absolute prohibition of any but royal money in Beaucaire was possible because no seigneurial coinages remained legally existent in that locality. It may be that similar rulings were made at Nîmes and Sommières for the same reason.

In its positive aspect the royal injunction for the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne of July 1247 reflects in part the same principle: the king's money must circulate throughout the bailiwick. This brief but important document has been wrongly interpreted, however, as a prohibition of seigneurial coinages;¹³³ it reads as follows (*italics mine*):

Ludovicus, &c. J. de Cranis senescallo Carcassone . . . Mandamus vobis quatinus per totam balliviam vestram inhibeatiss frmiter, ne aliquis aliquam monetam quam nostram capiat, nisi pro quanto valebit.¹³⁴

¹²⁸ Poey d'Avant, *Monnaies féodales*, II, pl. lxxxi, 20-21. Information regarding the mint is not lacking (see, e.g., *Layettes*, iv, 89ab), but there is no evidence for a continued coinage; cf. Blanchet, Dieudonné, *Manuel*, iv, 151; Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, pp. 191, 206-208.

¹²⁹ The question arose with reference to the bishop of Albi and the abbot of Gaillac; see *H.L.*, vi, 909, n. 2 (Molinier); Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 382-383.

¹³⁰ *Layettes*, iii, 189a.

¹³¹ *H.L.*, vi, 352.

¹³² Maurice Prou, "Esquisse de la politique monétaire des rois de France du X^e au XIII^e siècle," *Entre Camarades* (Publié par la Société des Anciens Élèves de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris, Paris, 1901), p. 81, suggests that the principle dates from the reign of Philip Augustus. The confinement of a seigneurial coinage to its issuing principality was probably implied in royal charters such as that granted to the bishop of Lodève in 1210 (*italics mine*): "donavimus & concessimus . . . specialiter jus faciendi monetam regia autoritate, quae accipitur per totum episcopatum Lodovensem, . . ." (*Gallia Christiana* . . . , various editions, 16 vols. [Paris, 1715-1865], vi, *Instrumenta*, 284). Beugnot's contention, *Essai sur les Institutions de Saint-Louis* (Paris, 1821), p. 239, that this policy was initiated by Louis VIII in 1226 is unsupported. Cf. n. 144 below.

¹³³ By P. Guilhémous and A. Dieudonné, "Chronologie des documents monétaires de la numismatique royale des origines à 1330 et 1337," *Rev. Num.*, 4th ser., xxxii (1929), 218.

¹³⁴ *H.L.*, viii, 1196, xv.

This does not exclude the use of such recognized coinages as those of Narbonne and Rodez, either within or outside their seigneurial boundaries. It suggests that non-royal coins are to circulate, if at all, only at true exchange values, based on their intrinsic worth.¹³⁵ If such a regulation was sent also to the seneschal of Beaucaire, as Michel supposes,¹³⁶ it must have been similar in character, making allowance for the coinages of Melgueil, Mende, and Le Puy. The continued circulation of Melgorian money in the region of Lozère caused Louis IX to prohibit its use there in 1265.¹³⁷

Alfonse was not an obstreperous baron. In response to the king's order he had his offending coin types discontinued. If he promoted the use of his own coins, his administration served also to extend the circulation of royal money. Early in 1267 he received a complaint that his seneschal for the Rouergue had prohibited the use of any coinage but *tournois* in the town of Millau.¹³⁸ Learning that caorsins alone were circulating there, Alfonse himself directed that both his own and the king's coins should be used in Millau.¹³⁹ There had apparently been orders prior to 1265 to the effect that no money but the count's should circulate in Toulouse,¹⁴⁰ but it is unlikely that they were repeated afterward.

In this period the king's ruling was also being recognized in the more independent sections of coastal Languedoc. On behalf of the king, Pope Clement IV in 1266 confirmed the right of the bishop of Maguelonne to strike coins in his episcopal territories, provided that they should not circulate in the royal domain.¹⁴¹ Early in the next year the seneschal of Carcassonne accused the inhabitants of Narbonne of using coins prohibited by the latest royal ordinance, that is, coins other than local or royal.¹⁴² He was undoubtedly referring to melgorians.

The same principle was invoked in connection with the clarification of the king's status in Sommières, where Louis IX had replaced the local *seigneurs*. There he is expressly called "principalis dominus," a designation suggestive of that notion of regal overlordship which was being effectively urged by the crown in many parts of France in the later thirteenth century.¹⁴³ In 1265 a knight named Pierre du Cros, who had shared in the *seigneurriage* on the coinage of Anduze before 1248, sought the restoration of his rights on the new coinage. He argued that the king was the "successor" of Bernard of Anduze, but the *parle-*

¹³⁵ Precedents for this *nisi* clause may be found in Nicolas Brussel, *Nouvel Examen de l'usage général des feux en France, pendant les XIe, XIIe, XIIIe et XIVe siècles . . .*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1727), I, 198-199.

¹³⁶ *Beaucaire*, p. 328, n. 3.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

¹³⁸ *C.A.*, I, No. 181.

¹³⁹ Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonso*, p. 214; cf. *C.A.*, I, No. 187.

¹⁴⁰ *Articuli Civium*, ca 1265 (*ibid.*, II, No. 2058, p. 572).

¹⁴¹ Germain, "Mémoire," *Mém. Soc. Archéol. Montpel.*, III, 159.

¹⁴² *Olim*, I, 1012, n. 141. The ordinance was probably that of late 1264, *Ord.*, I, 94-95; cf. below n. 154.

¹⁴³ In reference to the king's suzerainty, the phrase came into use in Languedoc in the period of the crusade, with the submission of the feudatories; see, e.g., *H.L.*, VIII, 798, 822, iv.

ment denied his claim, referring to the king as "principalis dominus, non . . . successor ipsius Bernardi." The distinction is clearly demonstrated by the statement that the king's money should be current throughout the realm while Bernard's was restricted to his own lands.¹⁴⁴

Determined opposition to the increasing circulation of the king's currency and to the *supra-seigneurial* implications of royal overlordship was offered by the bishop of Mende in these years. By the treaty of Corbeil in 1258¹⁴⁵ title to the viscounty of Grèzes had passed from King James of Aragon to the king of France. The arrival of royal administrators in the Gévaudan led to friction between the crown and the bishop of Mende, who was still the most powerful *seigneur* in the region. A compromise was reached in 1266, but disputes continued on a number of points until the celebrated *paréage* of 1307.¹⁴⁶

The situation with regard to the coinages was a principal bone of contention. The seneschal of Beaucaire prior to 1266 had confiscated the episcopal *jus monetæ*, at the same time making efforts to extend the circulation of *tournois* into the bishop's domains.¹⁴⁷ Finding his title valid, the Pentecost *parlement* of 1266 restored to the bishop his right to strike coins which should circulate in his diocese.¹⁴⁸ But he was not satisfied with that privilege alone. We learn from the *Mémoire* relating to the *paréage* that the bishop, "ratione majoris dominationis et regalium," had prohibited the use of royal money in the Gévaudan.¹⁴⁹ This the crown was unwilling to accept. The bishop of Mende might have his own coinage, but by no appeal to regalian prerogative could he now assume a position in his own realm equivalent to that of the king in his.

To facilitate the wider circulation of royal money the king's administration, as a second general policy, tried to establish regular exchange rates between royal and seigneurial coinages. The importance, in this respect, of the royal directive of July 1247 has already been suggested. It takes on the appearance of a preliminary stratagem when read in the context of the crown's persistent campaign to promote royal currencies at the expense of seigneurial. Two considerations restrained the king from prohibiting absolutely, in a given area, the use of any but royal money. First, there was his policy, just discussed, of permitting certain *seigneurs* with traditional rights to have their *propre monoye*, which should circulate in their lands. Secondly, the king seems to have realized that the lack of royal specie made it sometimes impracticable to deny completely

¹⁴⁴ *Olim*, I, 602: "Rex . . . faciat ibi monetam suam Turonensem, cursualem per totum regnum et non monetam Renundinorum et Bernardinorum, que erat moneta ipsius Bernardi et habebat cursum suum tantummodo per terram suam." It is difficult to say whether this means that it was government policy prior to 1248 that raymondins and bernardins should circulate only in Bernard's lands, or whether that principle, made so explicit in 1263, was here being read back into the earlier situation.

¹⁴⁵ Printed in *Layettes*, III, 405b-408a.

¹⁴⁶ Jean Roucaute, *La Formation territoriale du domaine royal en Gévaudan (1161-1307)* (Paris, 1901), pp. 40-56.

¹⁴⁷ *Olim*, I, 232; *Mémoire relatif au paréage*, pp. 354-357.

¹⁴⁸ *Olim*, I, 232; cf. *Mémoire relatif au paréage*, pp. 15, 307.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 307, 354-357, 388. This fact takes on added interest in the light of arguments in the *Mémoire* to the effect that the bishop might be considered *rex in episcopatu suo*. See esp. p. 581.

the use of seigneurial coins. To understand how the king utilized exchange rates to further his purposes both these points must be kept in mind.

Royal money changers and *tabulas cambii* seem first to have been established in the district of Beaucaire in the 1240's.¹⁵⁰ The fact that from this time on no seigneurial coinages were existent or entitled to circulate there suggests why the prohibition of the use of such coins in Beaucaire of about 1245 was apparently unconditional.¹⁵¹ The activity of two new royal mints in this region, furthermore, is reason to think that there was enough royal specie to satisfy the normal conditions of commerce and local trade. The records show that exchange ratios were well established between the disappearing baronial coins and royal currencies.¹⁵² In 1254 the king's *enquêteurs* were evaluating the old bernardins and raymondins at just one-half the money of Tours.¹⁵³ It appears, therefore, that the royal money changers in the *sénéchaussée* of Beaucaire were, in effect, calling in the now unlawful seigneurial pennies. They were selling *tournois* and money of Nîmes for bernardins, raymondins, *pougeoises*, etc.

Late in 1264, about a year and a half after the legislation of Chartres, the king directed a second monetary ordinance to the whole kingdom.¹⁵⁴ It prescribed that no other coinages should henceforth be used except *tournois*, *parisis*, or *loevesiens*,¹⁵⁵ the latter worth half the pennies of Paris. Just as in the Carcassonne ruling of 1247, however, and probably for the same reason, a palliative qualification was added. In this case the king explicitly cited popular complaints that there was not enough circulating *tournois* and *parisis*. He therefore provided fixed exchange rates between *tournois* and four widely used currencies, the *nantois* of Brittany, angevins, *gros* pennies of Le Mans, and English sterling money. Why were these rates established? Clearly as a temporary concession to those who held, and were accustomed to dealing in, these baronial coinages, and in anticipation of a not-distant time when the growing supply of royal currencies would render the latter supreme. The setting of ratios between the permitted coinages and *tournois* specifically, rather than with other seigneurial monies, reveals that the purpose of the legislation was to publicize and encourage the use of royal money. It was not a question in this case of terminating once and for all the circulation of seigneurial coins. Not only was it explicitly stated that the four specified currencies should *circulate* at the fixed rates of exchange,¹⁵⁶ but the king provided as usual that seigneurial coins as well as royal were permissible within the domains of the issuing lords. Furthermore, a wholly different ordinance, enacted in the *parlement* of All Saints 1265, was required to prohibit

¹⁵⁰ See Michel, *Beaucaire*, p. 328, n. 1, and references there.

¹⁵¹ N. 107 above.

¹⁵² *H.F.*, xxiv, 391, 1, 397, F, 424, C, 436, H, etc.

¹⁵³ Michel, *Beaucaire*, *pièce justific*, No. 20, p. 411.

¹⁵⁴ *Ord.*, I, 94-95. It is there dated 1265, but is specifically referred to by the senechal of Carcassonne in an ordinance which was certainly drafted late in 1264; see n. 158.

¹⁵⁵ Episcopal half-pennies of Laon; see Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1840-50), *ad verb.* "moneta."

¹⁵⁶ "Et veut que icelles monoyes queurent ainsi par sa terre, par tel prix devant dit, tant comme il l'y plaira." (*Ord.*, I, 94.)

completely the circulation of sterling pennies, "save at the weight and value of the silver."¹⁵⁷

Lacking particular application to Languedoc, the royal ordinance of 1264 required implementation there. This was soon supplied by the senechal of Carcassonne in an important and detailed administrative ruling.¹⁵⁸ According to this, no person, from the Friday after the following Epiphany (1265, N.S.), was to buy or sell in any but *tournois* or other royal or permitted monies.¹⁵⁹ Trade for the king's currency was to take place at the royal exchange tables now established in the towns of each *viguerie*.

The senechal also reproduced the *modus cambiandi* from the royal ordinance just discussed. This was hardly a concession to the inhabitants of his district, however, for none of the four coinages permitted by the king was used to any appreciable extent in Languedoc. In addition, and on the basis of local inquiries, the senechal appended an elaborate schedule of exchange rates, designating most of the seigneurial coinages which might still be found in Languedoc. In every case the coinages were established in ratios with *tournois*, as is shown in the following table:

| | Seigneurial Pennies | Tournois |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|
| Melgueil | 14 | 12 |
| (in <i>grosso</i>) | (23 s.) | (20 s.) |
| Cahors | 25 | 12 |
| {Toulouse (<i>tholosani albi</i>) | 12 | 18 |
| {Morlaas | | |
| {Clermont | | |
| {Le Puy | 15½ | 12 |
| {Other coins circulating with latter | | |
| {Vienne | | |
| {Valence | 15 | 12 |
| {Marseille (<i>regales</i>) | | |

¹⁵⁷ "fors à pois & à la valte de l'argent." (*ibid.*, 95). Two considerations suggest that this saving clause, in appearance very like that of the Carcassonne ordinance of 1247, reflected a different policy: (1) This was a clearly defined prohibitive statute, referring specifically to one coinage previously admitted at fixed exchange rates. (2) There is no reference in the senechal's ordinance of 1264, about to be considered, to any previous prohibition of seigneurial coinages in the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne, where, as noted above, several coinages were entitled to circulate.

¹⁵⁸ The text is preserved only in an undependable contemporary copy, Municipal Archives of Narbonne, AA. 105, 5th *thal.*, fol. 52^v; it was published, not without errors, by Mouynès in *I.A.C.*, *Narbonne*, Annexes de la Série AA., pp. 91-92. Though undated, the ordinance can be assigned to November or December 1264, by reference to a royal mandate, also relating to the coinages, of 5 October 1264, a very bad copy of which appears on the same folio. The writer hopes to set forth the proof for this relationship, too long to be included here, in a separate study of the chronology and texts of several monetary documents of this period. Subsequent references to the ordinance are to the *MS*.

¹⁵⁹ The phrase occurs in two forms: (1) "nisi cum turonensibus vel pare monetam (*sic*)"; (2) "non habens turonenses vel parem." "Par moneta" should probably be translated "like money," in reference to local varieties such as that of Nîmes, or even perhaps to royal *parisis*. A misreading by the copyist of abbreviations for "parisiensibus" and "parisienses" is also possible; but if so the word "monetam" in the first phrase above would seem redundant.

This seems to have been the first official recognition that, although approximately equivalent to *tournois* in legal standard, the melgorians had declined in intrinsic worth.¹⁶⁰ The evaluation of the caorsins was almost precisely that which is found in the accounts of Alfonse, namely, two to one.¹⁶¹ The general term *tholosani albi* was certainly intended to include the new *gros toulousans*, and very likely the old *toulousans* of the Raymonds as well. The ratios here established may be regarded as a fair approximation of their contemporary value relative to *tournois*.¹⁶² Just which *pougeoises* could have been exchangeable at the rate of 15½ to 12 *tournois* is not clear, but they were certainly neither the old "black" pennies nor *gros* coins. This was a period of monetary experimentation at Le Puy, however, and it can only be conjectured that the ordinance referred to some relatively new episcopal coinage.

The senechal apparently did not intend that these coins should actually circulate in his district, in the same sense that the king, in his basic ordinance, allowed the use of certain non-royal coinages in the whole realm. At least he did not reproduce in his directive the royal provision to that effect. His object was to promulgate the king's policy and at the same time, taking account of local conditions, to carry it a step further. No claim is admitted, in his otherwise detailed ordinance, that there was an insufficiency of royal currency in the *sénéchaussée*. Three royal mints, including one at Carcassonne, had now operated in Languedoc for nearly twenty years, and it is likely that by this time *tournois* money was available in quantity.¹⁶³ In view of the royal principle that seigneurial coins should not circulate outside their issuing principalities, there may be some significance in the fact that none of the coinages included in the tariff of rates was admissible in the *sénéchaussée*. By the same token the money of Narbonne, which lay within the senechal's jurisdiction, was, possibly intentionally, omitted from the list. But the latter was an unimportant coinage of limited circulation; and in general there is insufficient evidence to insist on the point. However there is nothing in the ordinance to suggest continued toleration of the seigneurial coinages. The intended policy was evidently to drive the named coinages out of

¹⁶⁰ The *querimonia* of Johannes de Burgis, cited above, n. 92, suggests that this was the case even in the early years of the reign. What (little) we know of their standards (see p. 388 above) would seem to imply a reverse relationship between these coinages. Possibly the melgorians were minted *de facto* below their legal standard.

¹⁶¹ Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 214.

¹⁶² On the standard of the *gros toulousans* see *Layettes*, III, 188b. Mouynès, both in his edition (cited above, n. 158) and in *I.A.C., Narbonne, Série AA* (Narbonne, 1877), p. 102, interpreted the phrase "tholosani albi et morlani" to mean that coins of Albi, as well as toulousans and morlans, were included in the ratio. But (1) coins of Albi were never called *albi* or *albienses*, and (2) a ratio of 12 ordinary toulousans and raymondins of Albi to 18 *tournois* would have been impossible. The writer is indebted to Professor Philippe Wolff of Toulouse for the suggestion that "albi" should be read as an adjective, which solves the problem.

¹⁶³ The king apparently made this point in his directive to the senechal dated 5 October 1264 (see n. 158). The text is not clear, but the intent was apparently to discourage the use of Melgorian money; "et hoc publice in senescallia vestra preconizari faciat, cum nos monetam Turonensem apud Sumidrium eudi faciamus, quod vos credimus non latere."

circulation in the *sénéchaussée* of Carcassonne. The money changers were designed to function much as they had in Beaucaire some years earlier.

In its broad aspects the local ordinance hardly differed from that of the king. Both discouraged the use of non-royal coins but promised a fair rate of exchange. The general effect of the senechal's legislation was to publicize further the money of Tours and to enhance the prestige of the crown. The vicars were directed to promulgate the king's monetary ordinances before assemblies of townsmen in the centers of the *vigueries* and to inform the people where the exchange tables were to be located. The ordinance marked a real effort to standardize and unify monetary practices in a large sector of Languedoc. As for Alfonse, the fact that he never gave up using the *tournois* system in his domains¹⁶⁴ leads us to agree with Boutaric that his policy "resulted in facilitating transactions and creating new links between his subjects and those of the king of France."¹⁶⁵ It is easy to understand that Louis IX had no objection to his brother's use of the royal standards, a step toward monetary uniformity for the whole kingdom.

The third royal policy, that of prohibiting the use of foreign coins or their imitations, came to be applied particularly in consequence of some monetary activities of the bishop of Maguelonne. In 1263 the bishop ordered that certain coins called "millarets" should be minted.¹⁶⁶ Very like Islamic dirhems, in badly inscribed Arabic, these coins were undoubtedly intended to facilitate trade in the Mediterranean.¹⁶⁷

Saint Louis was unable to act directly in this matter because the county of Melgueil was still under the suzerainty of the pope. It is probable, however, that the pious, crusading king had the millarets in mind when he discussed the status of Melgueil with Clement IV in 1266. The latter at that time assured Louis that the papal overlordship was justified by tradition.¹⁶⁸ Late in 1266 a pontifical bull was addressed to Berengar of Fré dol, bishop of Maguelonne, ordering him to cease producing coins bearing the name of Muhammad. The prohibition was made in the name of God and the pope, but Clement implied also that if the bishop were having the coins struck on royal territory, he was acting in disobedience to the king.¹⁶⁹

Similar coins were circulating in neighboring areas. Saint Louis wrote to Alfonse about coins produced in the Venaissin on which appeared the name

¹⁶⁴ In addition to evidence cited above, see *C.A.*, I, Nos. 567, 574-575. In 1267 Alfonse's senechal for the Venaissin was ordered to contract for local *gros tournois*, each to be worth 12 pennies of the "parva moneta." See also Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 187.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹⁶⁶ See the instrument in Germain, "De la monnaie mahométane attribuée à un évêque de Maguelonne . . .," *Mém. Soc. Archéol. Montpel.*, III, 697-702.

¹⁶⁷ See L. Blancard, *Les Millares* (Marseille, 1876), pp. 24-26. Little is known about these coins, which by certain accounts seem to have been worth slightly more than three pennies of Melgueil (Germain, "Monnaie mahométane," *Mém. Soc. Archéol. Montpel.*, III, 691, n. 1).

¹⁶⁸ Germain, "Étude historique sur les comtes de Maguelonne, de Substantion et de Melgueil," *ibid.*, 601-604.

¹⁶⁹ Germain, "Mémoire," *ibid.*, 160; Germain also quotes part of the text, "Étude," *ibid.*, 605, n. 1.

"perfidi Machumeti," described as "propheta Dei."¹⁷⁰ In July 1267 Alfonse directed his seneschal for the Venaissin to prohibit the manufacture of "moneta Milliarrensis."¹⁷¹ Only the month before Alfonse had been informed that minters on the island of Oléron were striking "falsam monetam Sarracenorum," and had deputed his seneschal of Saintonge to put an end to the activity.¹⁷² Meanwhile royal officials were busy watching for the millarets. In 1269 the seneschal of Carcassonne confiscated "quamdam summam Milliarensium prohibitorum" from the lord of Mirepoix.¹⁷³ In its larger context this whole episode is illustrative of a conflict between the traditionalist idealism of a saintly king and pope and the economic expediency of nascent commercial interests in southern France.

In these various monetary policies Alfonse played a distinctive role, but one not always easy to interpret. As has been pointed out, Louis IX looked with disfavor on his brother's use of royal coin types, but this procedure was not intended by the count as an act of opposition. Its purpose was to advance his own prestige. This it had in common with his other policies, whose net effect appears to have been favorable to the crown. He adopted, and thus helped to extend, the royal *tournois* system in order to share some of the advantages which the king was deriving from it. Alfonse promoted the use of the king's money as well as his own. A close look at this phase of his monetary activity reveals no consistent policy however. In the administrative correspondence he is to be observed prescribing the payment of revenues and wages sometimes in toulousans,¹⁷⁴ more frequently in money of Tours.¹⁷⁵ Alfonse seems to have regarded his own money as *tournois*, at least in his earlier years as count of Toulouse, and it is likely that many sums expressed in shillings and pounds (money of account) of Tours were actually paid in pennies of Toulouse.

On the other hand the extensive correspondence relating to the *fouage* of 1267 "por le secours de la Terre seinte" pictures Alfonse as more interested in receiving an intrinsically valuable currency than in promoting his own coinages; here the effect was very favorable to the king's money. It is clear that by this time the toulousans had declined in value relative to *tournois*.¹⁷⁶ The royal money of Tours and Paris was invariably specified in the directions to the seneschals because there was general confidence in its uniformity and value. When payments were not obtainable in the royal coinages, the collectors were to receive other currencies, or even plate metal, at the most favorable exchange possible.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁰ Quoted in Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 217, n. 2.

¹⁷¹ *C.A.*, I, No. 556.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, No. 695.

¹⁷³ *Olim*, I, 316-317.

¹⁷⁴ *C.A.*, II, Nos. 2106-08.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, Nos. 1518, 1572-73, 1584, 2065, 2093.

¹⁷⁶ Money of Toulouse is generally prescribed only as an alternative currency in place of *tournois*; see, e.g., *ibid.*, I, Nos. 243, 323. In the first of these Alfonse tells the seneschal of Toulouse (May, 1267) that the *fouage* must be paid in *tournois* and exchange expenses must be borne by his subjects. A petition by the men of Montesquieu, dated 30 June 1267, requested "quod nos [Alfonse] ab ipsis pro dicto focagio monetam Tholosanam recipiamus, . . ." (*ibid.*, No. 280). See also *H.L.*, VIII, 1564-65.

Royal coins were circulating almost everywhere in Languedoc by 1270. For large scale external and royal transactions the *tournois* system was in use even in Montpellier, Narbonne, and other relatively independent areas.¹⁷⁸ In the *sénéchaussée* of Beaucaire the local coinages of Sommières had been effectively driven from circulation. Documents of this region dating from the later years of the reign reveal that *tournois* were used in transactions of all kinds.¹⁷⁹ Despite encroachments of royal officials on the seigneurial prerogatives of the defiant baronage farther to the north, however, there is no doubt that *mendois* and, particularly, *pougeoises* continued to circulate there in greater quantity than *tournois*.¹⁸⁰ But the influence of royal monetary policy is discernible even there, for the appearance of a beautiful *gros* penny at Le Puy followed closely Saint Louis' creation of the *gros tournois* in 1266.¹⁸¹

In the county of Melgueil, still independent of royal government, and in the regions about Montpellier, melgorians continued in common use.¹⁸² It is impossible now to estimate the effect of royal policies in eliminating this tenacious coinage from circulation in central and western Languedoc. The texts continue to refer to sums in melgorians (primarily rents and customary revenues) in Carcassonne, Béziers, Lagrasse, Narbonne, and Fontjoncouse, but *tournois* money was beginning to circulate there too.¹⁸³ Pennies of Narbonne continued in use in the Narbonnais, where no very extensive royal authority was exercised until late in the century.¹⁸⁴

In the Toulousan *Comminges tournois* came into use in external transactions and county finance from about mid-century, but, as in Toulouse and surrounding localities, did not completely replace *tolzas* and *morlans* in local exchange.¹⁸⁵ In

¹⁷⁷ *C.A.*, I, No. 323; cf. Nos. 243, 421. Alfonse felt that it was not unreasonable to require payment in *tournois* in view of the number and proximity of the king's mints: "Et semble que vos devriez trouver assez tornois, quar nostre sires li rois de France a fet forgier puis 11 anz en ca tornois à Borges, à Senz, à Tors, à Paris, à Saint Anthonnin et en la seneschauçie de Biaucaire . . . par quoi il est plus de tornois que il ne seut, et sont plus espanduz, et en doit l'en plus trover . . ." (No. 323).

¹⁷⁸ The inhabitants of Montpellier promised James of Aragon 60,000 s. *tournois*, in support of his trip to the Holy Land, in 1269 (*H.L.*, VI, 915); similarly, in April 1270, Louis IX acknowledged a gratuitous gift of 1000 l. *tournois* made by the inhabitants of Narbonne "pro subsidio . . . passagii transmarini." (*ibid.*, VIII, 1671, iv). See also *Cartulaire . . . de Bonneval*, pp. 180, 195.

¹⁷⁹ *I.S.A.D.*, Gard, Série E, E. 320, p. 243; E. 131, p. 118; E. 292, p. 223; Série G-H, H. 888, p. 218; Série H (Mende, 1877), H. 63, p. 19; *H.L.*, VI, 868, 837. Many other instances could be cited.

¹⁸⁰ *I.S.A.D.*, Lozère, Série G, II (Mende, 1890), G. 1890, p. 96; G. 1984, p. 115; G. 2030, p. 124; G. 2852, p. 292; Série H (Mende, 1904), H. 462, p. 186.

¹⁸¹ Olivier, "Monnaies . . . du Puy," *Rev. Num.*, xxx, 180.

¹⁸² See, in general, *Cartulaire de Maguelone*, II, III, for this period.

¹⁸³ *H.L.*, V, 1462-74, 1487-92, 1423-41; "Documents relatifs à la seigneurie de Boussagues (Hérault) de la fin du XIIe au milieu du XIVe siècle," ed. F. Pasquier, *Bulletin de la Société Archéologique, Scientifique, et Littéraire de Béziers*, 3d ser., III (1899), 259; *H.L.*, V, 1670, 1673-74; VIII, 252-254; *I.A.C.*, Narbonne, Série AA, AA. 103, p. 58; AA. 104, p. 90; AA. 2, p. 2; AA. 99, pp. 22, 32; AA. 104, p. 91.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, AA. 99, p. 32; AA. 103, pp. 56-57; *H.L.*, V, 42, 44; VIII, 218-219; see Richard W. Emery, *Heresy and the Inquisition in Narbonne* (New York, 1941), p. 108.

¹⁸⁵ Higounet, *Comminges*, II, 490-491; *I.S.A.D.*, Aude, Série G-H, H. 322, p. 297.

the Albigeois and Agenais *tournois* took its place as a standard medium of exchange alongside the seigneurial raymondins and arnaldins.¹⁸⁶ At the close of the reign, however, *tournois* were still running a poor third in the Rouergue, behind the pennies of Rodez and Le Puy.¹⁸⁷

The positive accomplishment of Louis IX was to introduce money of Tours into Languedoc and to lay a firm foundation for the supremacy of royal currencies there. After his death the course of monetary politics changed in one important respect, however, for King Philip III succeeded to the county of Toulouse. Thus the seigneurial coinage of Toulouse became a royal money, a fact which undoubtedly has much to do with the continued use of *tolas* in the fourteenth century.¹⁸⁸ Under Louis IX the greatest progress occurred in the central parts of the *sénéchaussées* of Carcassonne and Beaucaire. There four royal mints were established and the baronial coinages of Sommières, Béziers, and Carcassonne were terminated. Every sector of Languedoc, however, had in some degree felt the effect of royal monetary policy by the year 1270. In extending the currency of royal money while restricting that of seigneurial, and by demonstrating explicitly that he was no mere "successor" in principalities annexed by the crown, the king's administrators did much to further the process of centralization and the influence of regal authority. There can be no doubt that they recognized the value of a uniform royal coinage for impressing upon its users their common nationality.

It is particularly in this respect that royal monetary policy differed from that of the *seigneurs*, who were motivated primarily by local commercial needs and personal profits to strike and promote their coins. But we find something of his proverbial morality and a logical, traditionalist attitude toward the barony and regalian privileges in Saint Louis' administration of the coinages. This point will need little elaboration after what has been said above. The important ordinance of 1263 abolished no rights, being intended only to secure the general use of royal money, while restricting reasonably the circulation of entitled seigneurial coinages. Thus the bishop of Mende regained his confiscated coinage by decision of *parlement* in 1266. The prohibition of foreign coins followed rather from motives of piety and traditionalism than from the economic considerations which later induced Philip the Fair to take similar steps.¹⁸⁹ Even in this sphere baronial rights were respected. The Candlemas *parlement* of 1270 adjudged that the millarets seized by royal officials should be restored to the lord of Mirepoix, an inquest having determined that the *prise* occurred within his lands.¹⁹⁰ Had occasion arisen, we may be sure that Louis would have acted in Languedoc, as

¹⁸⁶ See Compayré, *Albigeois*, pp. 379-382; É. Rossignol, *Étude sur l'histoire des institutions seigneuriales et communales de l'arrondissement de Gaillac (Tarn)* (Toulouse, 1866), p. 52; *Archives Municipales d'Agen, Chartes*, No. xlviii; *C.A.*, I, Nos. 440, 446, 409; II, Nos. 1430, 1611.

¹⁸⁷ *Cartulaire . . . de Bonneval*, pp. 180, 195, 203; 208-210; 179, 198, 213; *I.S.A.D.*, *Aveyron*, Série G (Rodez, 1934), G. 10, p. 3; G. 501, pp. 208-209; G. 518, p. 218.

¹⁸⁸ See Philippe Wolff, *Commerces et Marchands de Toulouse (vers 1360-vers 1450)* (Paris, 1954), p. 324.

¹⁸⁹ A. Vuitry, *Les Monnaies sous Philippe le Bel et ses trois fils, 1285-1328* (Paris, 1879), pp. 10, 28.

¹⁹⁰ *Olim*, I, 816-817.

he did elsewhere, to prevent abuses of the seigneurial right to alter the coinage.¹⁹¹ In general it may be concluded that Saint Louis' monetary policies in Languedoc were timely and realistic. In this task as in others his was a clear step forward for the monarchy.

¹⁹¹ The bishop of Clermont, having debased his money and excommunicated those who refused to accept it, was in January 1270 rebuked by the king, who ordered the practice to cease, under threat of confiscation of the temporalities (Boutaric, *Saint Louis et Alfonse*, p. 428; see also p. 216, and n. 3). Louis VIII had established an important precedent for the crown against malpractices of this nature when, in 1225, he secured a guarantee from the bishop of Meaux that four months' notice should be given prior to any mutation of the coinage; see Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII (1187-1226)* (Paris, 1894), p. 380.

CORRIGENDUM

In Chapter 20, read Guilhiermoz (for Guilhermoz) and Nîmes (for Nimes) throughout.