WILLIAM the Conqueror is commonly said to have maintained, virtually unchanged, the minting arrangements of his Anglo-Saxon predecessors. The pattern of frequent renovatio monetae continued. The mint personnel remained Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian, with virtually no Norman admixture until the reign of Henry I. The bulk of the mints remained as before, even if a few old ones disappeared in the course of the reign and some new ones, though only ones of secondary importance, were opened. The one admitted novelty, the tax known as monetagium which is mentioned for the first time in Domesday Book, was short-lived, for it was regarded as an abuse and its abolition was one of the reforms conceded by Henry I's coronation charter in 1100. 'The monetagium commune, which was collected by the boroughs and the counties, and which did not exist in King Edward's day, this I utterly abolish from now on' (Monetagium commune, quod capiebatur per civitates et comitatus, quod non fuit tempore regis Eadwardi, hoc ne amodo sit omnino defendo).

This view is in one respect an oversimplification. The evidence of Domesday Book, if properly set out, shows that monetagium was not simply a new tax. Its introduction was accompanied by a reorganization of the system of accounting for the products of minting, and involved a substantial change in the relationship between the king on the one hand and the boroughs and moneyers on the other. Various small payments by the moneyers disappeared, their annual one being subsumed into a new geld de moneta paid by the boroughs and their occasional ones quando moneta vertebatur ('when the coinage was changed') replaced by a new monetagium tax. The geld de moneta presumably also absorbed such profit as the king had previously made through seignorage, and monetagium any additional ones accruing from such weight changes as might occur quando moneta vertebatur. The evidence is patchy and sometimes hard to interpret, but this is a consequence of the fact that mints were located in boroughs, so that information about them shares the general inadequacy of the returns on these institutions. The commissioners reporting on the boroughs had apparently no instructions with detailed lists of questions, such as we know from the Inquisitio Eliensis were used in rural areas, and the returns from London and Winchester were omitted, either because they were of such complexity that the scribes responsible for processing them abandoned their task in despair or because adequate information was available elsewhere. Some scholars have in fact argued that the borough returns originated in part from a distinct and earlier enquiry.

* This paper was read in a shortened form at the Tenth International Numismatic Congress in London in September 1986, and its argument, though without references, is incorporated in the 'Special Study 10: Currency, Minting, and the Monetary System' which I contributed to the Domesday Book 1986 Facsimile (London, 1986). I am grateful to Ian Stewart, Stewart Lyon, Henry Loyn and Mark Blackburn for reading it and for their many helpful comments.


The changes made by William can be most clearly demonstrated by setting out in tabular form all passages referring to minting places and moneyers, but distinguishing between those describing conditions in the time of Edward the Confessor, usually abbreviated in the text to TRE (tempore regis Edwardi), and those described as ‘now’ (modo or nunc), i.e. in 1086 when the enquiry was under way, but for comparative purposes most easily abbreviated, by analogy with TRE, as TRW. This need for comparing the two series of entries was overlooked by C. F. Keary and even by G. C. Brooke, who made extensive use of them in the introduction to his BMC Norman Kings and more systematically in his article on coin renovationes, presumably because the British Museum catalogues divided at 1066 and neither scholar was disposed to spend too much time on entries ‘outside’ his period. The references in Table 1 are to the standard edition by Abraham Farley and the Record Commissioners (1783–1816), which reproduce the foliation of the original, (DB) I being the fully processed Great Domesday, (DB) II the more detailed and undigested Little Domesday covering Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, and (DB) Exon referring to the copy of the circuit returns for the West Country in the so-called Exeter Domesday. The phrase quando moneta vertebatur has been abbreviated to QMV.

**TABLE 1**

*References to Mints and Moneyers in Domesday Book*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRE</th>
<th>TRW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BATH</td>
<td>Ibi erat unus monetarius reddens regi unam markam argenti et 20 solidos QMV. (I.75, from Exon. 11b)</td>
<td>Istud burgum . . . reddit 60 libras ad numerum et unam markam aur. Praeter hoc reddit moneta 100 solidos. (I.87, from Exon. 114b: Reddunt burgenses 100 solidos de moneta.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDPORT</td>
<td>T.R.E. erant in civitate 7 monetarii qui dabant 7 libras regi et comiti extra firmam QMV. (I.262b)</td>
<td>Praeter hoc reddunt burgenses de Colescra et de Melduna 20 libras pro moneta. Et hoc constituit Walramus et advocant regem ad turtorem quod condonavit illis 10 libras, et tenuit Walchelinus episcopus. Querit ab illis 40 lib. (II.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTER</td>
<td>De quibus (i.e., all the renders of the civitas) reddebant monetarii 4 libras TRE. (II.107)</td>
<td>De moneta vero habet rex 20 libras (I.162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLCHESTER</td>
<td>Ibi erant 2 monetarii quisque eorum reddens regi unam markam argenti, et 20 solidos QMV. (I.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORCHESTER</td>
<td>Septem monetarii erant ibi. Unus ex his erat monetarius episcopi. Quando moneta renovabatur dabat quisque eorum 18 solidos pro cuneis recipiendis; et ex eo die quo redibant usque ad unum mensem dabat quisque eorum regi 20 solidos. Et similiter habebat episcopus de suo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 * Quando moneta vertebatur: the change of coin-types in* BNJ 20 (1929–30), 105–16. Brooke inadvertently omitted the eleventh century; its bearing on mules and overstrikes*. Chester from his list.
HUNTINGDON
In hoc burgo fuerunt 3 monetarii redditentes 40 solidos inter regem et comitem sed modo non sunt. TRE reddabant 30 libras, modo similiter. (I.203)

IPSWICH
Monetarii reddabant per annum TRE 4 libras pro moneta. (II.290b)

LEICESTER

LEWES
Cum moneta renovatur dat (sic) 20 solidos unusquisque monetarius. De his omnibus erant (corrected from sunt) duae partes regis et tercia comitis. (I.26)

LINCOLN

MALDON

MALMESBURY

NORWICH

NOTTINGHAM
De duobus monetariis 40 solidos. (I.280)

OXFORD

PEVENSEY

RHUDDLAN

SHAFTESBURY
Ibi erant 3 monetarii. Quisque reddebat unam markam argenti et 20 solidos QMV. (I.75, from Exon. 11)

TRW

Huntedun burg defendebat se ad geldum regis pro quarta parte de Hyrstingestan [Hurstingstone] hundredi pro 50 hidis sed modo non geldat ita in illo hundredo postquam rex Willelmus geldum monetum posuit in burgo. (I.203)

Modo debent [monetari] reddere 20 libras sed de quatuor annis non reddiderunt nisi 27 libras. Et comes semper habet terciam partem. (II.290b)

Modo habet rex Willelmus . . . de monetariis 20 libris per annum de 20 in ora. De his 20 libris habet Hugo de Grentemainsil tercium denarium. (I.230)

De nova moneta 100 solidos et 12 de his omnibus habet Willelmus [de Warenne] medietatem et rex alteram. (I.26)

Aluredus nepos Turoldi habet 3 toftes de terra Sybi quem rex sibi dedit, in quibus habet omnes consuetudines praeter geldum regis de monedagio. . . Moneta vero reddit 75 libras. (I.336b)

See under COLCHESTER.

De moneta reddit ipsum burgum 100 solidos. (I.64b)

In hoc burgo si vult episcopus potest habere unum monetarium. (II.117b)

Modo reddet [Snotingham] . . . 10 libras de moneta. (I.280)


Moneta 20 solidos. (I.20b)

Rotbertus de Roelant tenuit de Hugone comite medi etatem ejusdem castelli et burgi in quo habet ipse Rotbertus 10 burgenses et medi etatem aecelesiae et monetae. (I.269)
Before looking at the record in detail there is one preliminary comment to be made. The returns are manifestly a very incomplete record, noting or allowing one to infer the existence of only thirteen mints TRE and twenty, for the most part different ones, TRW, while in both reigns the total known from the coins was in the region of seventy. The explanation may in some cases be differences in the ways the mints were organized and how they were farmed, but they in the main must derive from the nature of the returns. Information presented in some localities was in others not thought worth mentioning, and we have to use common sense in deciding where a given detail can be taken as an indication of a general practice and where it can not. We must also remember that Domesday grammar can be misleading – the text is extremely condensed – and that figures may sometimes be in error or pounds and shillings miscopied. It is impossible, in a detailed record of such gigantic dimensions, that things should be otherwise.

The most obvious distinction between the entries TRE and TRW is that they are not of the same kind and not strictly comparable with each other. The entries TRE, broadly speaking, record small payments made by the moneyers annually and QMV. The entries TRW record large annual payments made by the boroughs, not the moneyers. Monetagium has apparently taken the place of the fees formerly paid by the moneyers QMV, for the phrase quando moneta vertebatur is no longer used.

The TRE entries are in a little confusion, partly no doubt because of the carelessness of copyists but more often because information was incomplete. The normal fees due from each moneyer were a mark of silver (13s. 4d.) annually – the Ipswich entry specifies per annum, and it is implied elsewhere – and £1 quando moneta vertebatur. The two figures are given for the four Dorset mints: Bridport (one moneyer), Dorchester (two moneyers), Shaftesbury (three moneyers), and Wareham (two moneyers). At five mints – Chester (seven moneyers), Hereford (seven moneyers), Lewes (more than one moneyer), Shrewsbury (three moneyers), and Worcester (number omitted) – the payments of £1 per

---

5 Valuable discussion in Pamela Nightingale, 'Some English mints in the eleventh and twelfth centuries', NC 142 (1982), 34-50, esp. 43 ff.
head QMV are recorded, but the annual one of a mark per head is omitted. At Colchester, Ipswich and Nottingham a QMV phrase should probably accompany the totals, for the sums are expressed in pounds and not in marks and, while no figure for moneyers is given for Colchester or Ipswich, the £2 payment for Nottingham corresponds to the number of its moneyers. On the other hand they may be entries like that for Huntingdon, with marks converted into pounds and implying six moneyers for each mint. At Huntingdon the entry is anyway misleading. Three moneyers are recorded as paying £2, i.e. a mark each, which is what one would expect for the annual figure, and it is rightly noted that the payments have ceased (modo non sunt). There follow the words TRE redbebant 30 libras, modo similiter. Grammatically this ought to apply to the moneyers, but TRE and TRW payments by moneyers are never identical and even TRW a £30 payment is inconceivable, for Huntingdon was a small mint with usually no more than a single moneyer. The £30 must be the geld paid by the borough, which is not otherwise recorded and could perfectly well have been the same TRE and TRW. Presumably the word burgenses has dropped out after redbebant.

The QMV payments of £1, as Brooke recognized, were in the nature of fees, like the annual ones of a mark, the Worcester phrase pro cuneis monete accipiendis implying a payment ‘for receipt of dies’, not their actual cost. A figure of £1 for purchasing dies would be too high, for later medieval records show that dies cost no more than a few shillings, and the Hereford entry lists 18s. pro cuneis recipiendis as well as 20s. due to the king. (It is true the exposed position of Hereford on the Welsh border made it a special case in a number of respects, as the rest of the entry shows.) The moneyers were the king’s, as the Shrewsbury entry shows – Tres monetarios ibi habet rex – unless one or more of them belonged to a third party, usually a bishop. Domesday Book notes that this was the case at Hereford (TRE) and Norwich (TRW), and we know from other sources that some abbeys like St Augustine’s at Canterbury and Bury St Edmunds were equally privileged. It was even possible, at least earlier in the century, for a moneyer to be ‘owned’ by a private person, no doubt by royal grant, for in the reign of Cnut a moneyer at Stamford was included in various items of property presented to the abbey of Peterborough by a certain Thurkil Hoche. The phenomenon is one that has troubled commentators unnecessarily, for private persons were just as likely as churches to benefit from royal generosity. We hear less about such grants, however, because they would normally expire on the death of the recipient and knowledge of them could only survive if, as in Thurkil’s case, they passed by some subsequent act of generosity to an ecclesiastical institution capable of preserving a record of their existence.

Common to all the TRE entries in Domesday Book are the facts of the dues being paid by the moneyers – the boroughs are accorded no role at all – and their being small, fixed and recurrent, so that they have known totals that could be easily ascertained at a public enquiry. Brooke believed that these were the king’s sole revenue from the mints, but the size of the gelds de moneta paid subsequently by the boroughs supports the current view that over and above these would have been a share in the profits of the moneyers. If the very substantial levels of seignorage suggested by Petersson and Lyon for the late

6 The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, edited by W. T. Melloys (Oxford, 1949), p. 70, note 6; calendared with useful discussion by C. R. Hart, The Early Charters of Eastern England (Leicester, 1966), p. 245, no. 351. The grant – we only have its registration in the abbey cartulary, not the full text – is undated, but the donor witnessed a charter of Cnut in 1024. This renders unlikely his identification (by W. J. Andrew in NC 4th ser. 1 (1901), 362-3) with the Thurkil whom Cnut put in charge of East Anglia in 1017 but sent back to Denmark as regent in 1023 (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 1017, 1023).

Anglo-Saxon period really applied, it is inconceivable that the moneyers would have been allowed to keep the entire proceeds. How these were divided between the king and the moneyers is unknown to us and probably, since they would have been matters of arrangement, would often have been already undiscoverable in 1086, twenty years after the Conquest. Often they must have been farmed, the moneyer or some third party paying the king a fixed sum annually based on estimates of what they were likely to be.

The payments TRW, though equally fixed and recurrent, are otherwise quite different in character. They are normally large, or at least substantial, and are paid by the community, not by the moneyers, in return for having a mint (de moneta; in one case, pro moneta). Some of the Domesday references assert specifically that the payment is made by the burgenses collectively: the entry for Huntingdon speaks of the suppression of a local obligation postquam rex Willelmus geldum monete posuit in burgo. There are, it is true, two entries suggesting that the payment was made by the moneyers, but that at Ipswich continues one describing the moneyers’ obligations TRE and the compiler has failed to make the necessary verbal adjustment, while the de monetariis instead of de moneta at Leicester, if not simply a slip, must mean ‘in return for having moneys’. All the others either explicitly or by implication indicate that the borough or county – the latter is mentioned only for Oxford – is responsible for the payment.

The recorded sums, in descending order of magnitude, are set out in Table 2 in company with figures for the probable number of moneyers normally active in each mint in William’s later years – the figures in parentheses are the actual number of names recorded for his well documented type viii – and the number of coins of type viii in the huge and well mixed Beauworth (Beaworth) hoard buried in c. 1087.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mint</th>
<th>Geld de moneta</th>
<th>Probable number of moneyers</th>
<th>Coins of type viii in Beauworth hoard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester (plus Maldon)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 (4) + 1 (3)</td>
<td>96 + 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>10 + 20</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>5.12s</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>2.10s.</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey</td>
<td>1 +</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three figures in this table for the geld de moneta are obviously open to question or require explanation. One of them, the £1 due from Pevensey, is not a misplaced TRE entry, as one is tempted to surmise, for Pevensey had not been a mint in Edward’s day and the figure is embedded in a list of payments due to the count of Mortain; it is simply his share of some larger but unspecified sum. The other two apparently aberrant figures are those for Taunton and Lewes. That for Taunton is probably correct, for despite being below £5 it conforms to the general pattern of sums fixed in relation to this; the emendation of 50s. to 50 lib. would give an impossible figure for a one-moneyer mint. The Lewes figure
is most likely an error, for all others are round numbers and there was some carelessness over the TRE section in the Lewes entry, since the scribe first wrote sunt and corrected it to erant but failed at the same time to correct the dat in the preceding phrase to dabat. It seems most likely that the et xii de his is a misreading, but there is no obvious emendation to be made. There is also a verbal slip in the Ipswich TRW entry, which continues the TRE one without a change of subject and so implies that the £20 is due from the moneyers, not the burgesses.

The table in any case throws no clear light on how the figures for geld were determined. There is a rough correspondence between their size and the number of moneyers and, in so far as the numbers of coins in Beauworth are any guide, between them and the comparative mint output, but the correspondence is not at all close. (Beauworth is heavily weighted in favour of neighbouring mints, notably Winchester, but none of those in the table will be affected.) Leicester has one moneyer compared with two at Bath, but the geld paid by the first is four times that for the second. Oxford borough has twice as many moneyers as Nottingham, but each pays the same figure of £10. Nor is there any close proportionality with the number of coins in Beauworth, with Lewes represented by over three times as many coins in Leicester but paying a quarter its geld of £20 and Lincoln having only half as many coins again as Thetford but paying nearly twice its geld. Oxford cannot be easily compared with the others, for it is the only place where the geld payable by the county is recorded. If the figures for geld were determined by profitability, as seems most likely, this was not very closely related to the number of moneyers. Some mints may have had more moneyers than they really needed. Where total figures for geld are available, the share de moneta often accounts for a quarter or more of the whole sum due from a borough.

These new sums de moneta, payable by the boroughs in their corporate capacities, must be interpreted as involving a change in the organization of minting. The king will in future no longer have to deal with the moneyers individually, save insofar as they have to pay for their dies. The central government has simplified its conduct of business by passing this obligation on to the boroughs, or to those who at any given moment are farming them. This arrangement continued to operate in the next century, though with many complications created by the passage of time, with the burgesses sometimes paying the king directly for their privileges, sometimes doing so through the sheriff and the county administration, and always entitled to make deductions of £1 a head from their payments if the number of moneyers fell below the allotted number for each mint.8 It is clear from Domesday Book that this system went back to William the Conqueror, and that it was introduced at the same time as monetagium, the levy alluded to in the entry for Lincoln, which to all appearances took the place of the moneyers’ fees and any related payments formerly made ‘when the coinage was changed’.

That the two were different seems to be clear, and monetagium had a short life. The term is only twice used in English records so far as is known, once in the Domesday Book entry for Lincoln (spelled monedagium) and the other time in Henry I’s coronation charter. Since kings in the twelfth century were still receiving geld from the boroughs on behalf of their mints, despite the abolition of monetagium in 1100, the difference between the two payments is plain. The Oxford entry in Domesday Book indeed distinguishes between the £10 due from the borough de moneta and £20 due from the county, for Henry I’s charter speaks of monetagium as having been paid per comitatus as well as per civitates.

In determining the nature of monetagium in England the form of the word tells us little,

---

8 W. C. Wells, 'The Pipe Rolls and “Defalta Monetariorum”', NC 5th ser. 9 (1931), 261–90.
for it is simply *moneta* with the suffix *-age* widely used for abstract nouns, especially those derived from French (*OED*, s.v.). But it was a term widely used in western Europe for a tax, often triennial, paid by a ruler’s subjects in return for the abandonment of his right to change at will the intrinsic value of his coins, either by debasing them or by reducing their weight. Its best known occurrences are in Normandy and Aragon, where it led eventually in both cases to a complete abandonment of minting as unprofitable, and it has recently been made the subject of a thorough study by T. N. Bisson. Its classical formulation is that in the thirteenth-century *Summa de legibus Normanniae*, where the chapter *De monetagio* opens with the words ‘*monetagium* is a certain pecuniary aid to be paid to the duke of Normandy every third year so that he will not cause the nature of the coins circulating in Normandy to be changed for others’ (*Monetagium est quoddam auxilium pecuniale in tercio anno duci Normannie persolvendum, ne species monetarum in Normannia discurrencium in alias faciat permutari.*) The debasement of the Norman denier was in fact halted and its fineness and weight stabilized at a fineness of 6d (= 50 per cent silver) and a weight somewhat difficult to assess at some date late in the reign of William I (see below). In 1204, when Normandy was annexed to the Crown by Philip Augustus, *monetagium* there was levied at the rate of 12d a hearth (*foca*, ‘feu’, whence its alternative name of ‘fouage’), though there were plenty of exemptions for church property, property of favoured individuals, and so on. It continued in existence as late as the reign of Louis XVI.

*Monetagium* was thus in Normandy a public charge, not a payment with which individual moneyers had anything to do. The same arrangement is implicit in Domesday. The rate and the forms of the levy are nowhere stated, although the Lincoln entry implies a local property tax, perhaps a hearth tax, for a certain Alured has three tofts with all the ‘customs’ *praeter geldum regis de monedagio*. But if *monetagium* in Normandy was a tax compensating the ruler for the loss of such profits as he might have made by changing the weight or fineness of his coins, in England, if the word meant the same – as it surely did, for one country must have borrowed it from the other – the fineness of the coins was never altered and only changes in weight can have been involved. This means that a change in the weights of William’s coins should tell us when it was introduced.

This weight change is easily identified, though there is some doubt as to the exact figures involved. Types i–v (using Brooke’s numbering) of William I’s coins appear to have been struck at a weight of 21.5 grains (1.39g), like the last issue of Edward the Confessor before them and the sole coinage of Harold. With type vi the weight was raised to 22.5 grains (1.46g), a figure at which it was to remain for the next two centuries and which came to be regarded as the regular weight of the sterling penny. The precise figures are not quite certain – Lyon would prefer 21 grains for types i–v and 21.5 grains thereafter – for it is difficult to decide how much loss to allow for wear, and recent scholars have argued that the weights of each type in the late Anglo-Saxon series, and by implication the early issues of William, underwent some adjustment during their period of issue. For our purposes this

---


11 The figure is given as 8s (= 96 coins) to the helmarc, presumably a half-mark. Half a Troy mark would be 122.38g, but Norman deniers of the period fall far short of 1.34g. Possibly the correct figure should be 13s, reading *xii* for *viii*, for 0.78g would be about correct.


does not matter. It is sufficient to note that coins of type vi and its successors are consistently heavier than those of type v and its predecessor types i-iv.

The date of the end of type v and the introduction of type vi, however, is disputed. On the assumption of triennial renovationes it would have occurred in 1080. It would be easy to conceive of monetagium being established in this year, immediately after William returned from a three year stay in Normandy and with continental conditions fresh in his mind. He would, on this assumption, have ordered a change in the weight of the coins but given an undertaking, in return for an annual payment by the boroughs and counties, to make no further changes in the future. It is equally easy, however, to imagine the new arrangement postponed till three years later, with the king, about to make a further weight change to accompany the customary triennial renovatio, agreeing to forego it then and in the future in return for such a levy.

Unfortunately, while the sequence of William's coin types is certain, their dating is not. Brooke, who established the correct sequence but had no firm views on how long each lasted, attributed the first eight of the thirteen Willelinus types to William the Conqueror and the remaining five to William Rufus. But if the first seven of William I's types lasted three years each, reckoning from the death of Edward the Confessor and ignoring the coinage of Harold as illegitimate, type vii would have ended in 1086, leaving only a year (1086–87) or a little more – William I died on 9 September 1087, and the issue would have continued during the early months of his successor – for type viii. Even allowing for the distortion in our perspective caused by the huge Beauworth hoard of 1833, buried during the period of issue of type viii, this type seems too common to represent the coinage of a single year. It is the dating none the less which was given by North in the first edition of his standard work on English coins, and with some reservations it is still that accepted by many scholars today.14

Dolley, however, raised the possibility of assigning two-year periods to William's types i-iv, with three-year periods from type v onwards.15 This would take type vi back to 1077–80, type vii to 1080–83, and type viii to 1083–86, with what is usually regarded as William II's type i overlapping the two reigns as 1086–89. This would link type viii, the commonest of William I's coin types, with the heaviest of all his imposts, the six-shilling geld of 1083–84 levied in anticipation of the Danish invasion of England under Cnut. These revised dates, proposed in 1966, were accepted in two subsequent SCBI volumes containing coins of William I16 and in the second edition of North (1980). Either scheme would involve a renovatio in 1080, but the traditional arrangement would put the weight change in that year and the revised one would put it in 1077. Of course, if triennial renovationes are not sacrosanct the dates become little better than guesswork, more especially since the rarity of type v suggests a period of issue shorter than three years. There are two passages in Domesday Book, however, which show the introduction of the geld de moneta to have occurred in or before 1082, but probably not long before it, a fact which supports the customary dating if it happened at the beginning of type vi but that preferred by Dolley if it came at its end.

The Domesday passages are the entries regarding Colchester and Ipswich. The burgesses of Ipswich had been in arrears over the previous four years – only £27 had been

16 Dolley, The Norman Conquest, pp. 15–21.
paid instead of £80 – which shows that the new payments had been due since at least 1082 but leaves open the possibility of earlier ones that had been made in full. The year 1082 would therefore be the terminus ante quern for the introduction of the new geld de moneta. The same figure of four years is indicated by the Colchester and Maldon entry. The payment by these boroughs, we are told, was arranged by Waleran, who was presumably farming them at the time, and the burgesses call the king to witness that he had excused them half of the £20 due annually but that Bishop Walkelin, who is now farming the geld, claims £40 as still owing to him. The names of the persons concerned do not help over the date. Waleran had been a considerable landowner in East Anglia and seems at one time to have farmed Norwich, to the detriment of the burgesses (vastati . . . factum per Walerannum), but he had died before 1086, for in Domesday Book his lands are held by his nephew or grandson (nepos) John.\textsuperscript{18} Walkelin, who had a reputation for avarice\textsuperscript{19} – he is recorded as extracting £153 a year from Taunton, over three times the figure at which he had been granted it – was bishop of Winchester 1070–98. But the sum claimed by Walkelin was four times what the burgesses alleged had been excused them by the king, so once again the implication is that monetagium had been introduced at least four years before the Domesday inquest got under way.

There is no evidence from Normandy to help. Nineteenth-century students of Norman coinage were accustomed to cite an ordinance issued by Duke William at the Council of Lillebonne in June 1080, just prior to his return to England after three years’ absence, defining the weight and fineness of his deniers and limiting their striking to Rouen and Bayeux. If the date were correct it would advance the argument somewhat, for it would show that in the early 1080s the duke was concerned with mints and coin production, but unfortunately it is not.\textsuperscript{20} The Consuetudines et iusticie quas habet dux Normannie in eadem provincia, which include (cap. 13) the regulation in question, were added to the acts of Lillebonne by their first editor, Dom Martène. Although they follow the canons of Lillebonne in such MSS as contain them both, these canons are given in the official version (sealed by Henry I) and by Ordericus Vitalis without them. It is indeed plain from the opening words of the Consuetudines that these represent the conclusions of an inquest held by Robert Curthose and William Rufus and they are dated 18 July of a year that the known movements of the brothers show to have been 1091. They no doubt reproduce the terms of a monetary ordinance issued sometime during the Conqueror’s reign, but since we have no idea of its date it has nothing to contribute to our knowledge of the introduction of monetagium in England.

Nor do we know exactly when this practice was introduced in Normandy.\textsuperscript{21} There seems to have been no Norman tradition on the subject. It was certainly after 1066, for there are two eleventh-century Norman charters that refer to recent or anticipated coinage debasement.\textsuperscript{22} and one of them postdates this year. William must therefore still have had a free hand with his coinage during at least the first part of his reign. Recent scholars have been inclined to bring forward the introduction of monetagium to the very end of the

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. J. H. Round in \textit{VCH Essex}, I, 419. This Waleran must be distinguished from his contemporary Waleran fitz Ranulf, son of a prosperous Rouen moneyer, who became a substantial landowner in both Normandy and England (L. Musset, ‘À-t-il existé en Normandie au Xle siècle une aristocratie d’argent?’, \textit{Annales de Normandie} 9 (1959), 285–99, esp. 292–94).

\textsuperscript{19} Round, pp. 419–20.

\textsuperscript{20} For what follows see C. H. Haskins, \textit{Norman Institutions} (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), p. 277, his discussion being followed by the definitive edition of the Consuetudines (pp. 281–84).

\textsuperscript{21} Fullest discussion in Bisson, \textit{Conservation of Coinage}, pp. 14–28, though his conclusion is far from clear. The date 1097/1100 was favoured by Bridrey (above, note 12), though not all his reasoning will stand up to examination and he had overlooked the Domesday reference. It is accepted as correct by F. Dumas, \textit{Les monnaies normandes (XIe-XIIe siècles)}, RN 6th ser. 21 (1979), 84–140 at 95.

\textsuperscript{22} L. Musset, ‘Sur les mutations de la monnaie duecale normande au Xle siècle: deux documents inédits’, RN 6th ser. 11 (1969), 291–93; the second document is posterior to 1066.
century, when William Rufus was governing the duchy in 1096/1100 while his brother was absent on the First Crusade, and it has been argued that it must have occurred after 1091 since it is not referred to in the Consuetudines. But the Consuetudines expressly disclaim completeness in monetary or other matters (Remanet autem multum extra hoc scriptum de iusticia, moneta, et reliquis iusticiis Normannie), and the subsequent exemption of certain border regions from payment points to its introduction under William. It is also difficult to suppose that the duke would have set down the fineness and weight of his coins in a manner apparently intended to be permanent if he regarded himself as still free in the future to debase them when he chose. Cap. 13 of the Consuetudines seems therefore to imply the introduction of monetagium under Duke William, but gives no clue to when it occurred. There does seem a strong likelihood, however, that these closely related changes in minting arrangements took place at about the same time in Normandy and in England, and that it was in the early 1080s, possibly in 1082 but in any case between it and 1080, that the new geld de moneta began to be levied on the boroughs in England.