

A Preliminary Examination of the *Leeuwengroot* as Mentioned in Medieval Accounts Part Two: Heynric de Rode

by Paul A. Torongo

© 2020

Part of our ongoing investigation into the *leeuwengroot* (*gros au lion*, *gros compaignon*, *gezel*, *socius*) of all regions involves studying the accounting records made in the Middle Ages that pertain to this coin type. This is the second in a series of reports on that subject.

The *leeuwengroot* (*gros au lion*, *gros compaignon*, *socius*, *gezel*) was a (nominally) silver coin, struck in the 14th century in Western Europe, in particular, in the Low Countries. The type was first minted in Flanders (or perhaps in Brabant) in 1337, in response to the devaluation of silver coins in France earlier that same year. The type was quickly imitated in the regions around Flanders, sometimes as a “coin of convention” mandated by agreements between these regions.



leeuwengroot of Flanders
Louis of Nevers (1322-1346)
Elsen 132-523 / 3.46 g.
shown actual size

Minting of this type ended in Flanders in 1364, and the imitations in other regions ceased as well. Minting of the *plak* series of lion-with-helm coins began in 1365 in Flanders, and was widely imitated in other places as the *leeuwengroot* had been before it. A short resurgence of *leeuwengroten* occurred in Brabant 1381-1383, with a few imitations in small regions such as Mezen and Batenburg.

Our interest therefore lies in medieval records dating c. 1337 - c. 1364, while also keeping an eye out for records from c. 1381-1383 (especially those from Brabant).

This is Part Two of our report on the *leeuwengroot* as found in medieval documents. It is assumed that the reader has read (and understood) Part One (the accounts of Jan Meester Lams Zoon, ref. 68); we will not be repeating the basic information regarding medieval bookkeeping as given in previous reports.

It is important to note that medieval accounting was only consistent within a very specific framework. The manner in which the books were kept in one place was not necessarily the same manner used in another place. The manner in which the books were kept by one clerk was not necessarily the same manner used by another clerk (in the same place, at a different time), *et cetera*.

As it turns out, this will cause us quite a bit of trouble when attempting to study the medieval accounts relevant to the study of the *leeuwengroot*, but we are getting ahead of ourselves.

It is the inspection of coins and the study of their detailed characteristics that is our forté, not the study of medieval documents. To be perfectly frank, we are “in over our heads” when we attempt to decipher some of the medieval accounts. In effect, what we are trying is akin to trying to read *The Odyssey* in the original Greek, armed with nothing more than a meager knowledge of the language, and an Ancient Greek-English dictionary.

We are therefore highly dependent upon the works of previous researchers to aid us. Financial (and other) constraints also limit us to what we can find on the Internet; we have only seen facsimiles of any of the documents, none of the originals, and even some of the modern transcriptions were unavailable to us. Fortunately, new old things keep turning up on the Net every day, so in time, more medieval records are sure to become available to researchers.

THE ACCOUNTS OF HEYNRIC DE RODE

We are going to continue our investigation into 14th century documents with another “easy” one: the accounts of Heynric de Rode, which include 2 entries recording transactions involving clear indications of *leeuwengroot* coins. (In fact, the joke was on us because the “easy” calculations turned out to be anything but).

We have taken these accounts from Hamaker, whose transcriptions are the only version available (as far as we know), without tracking down and inspecting the original, medieval documents. We are therefore relying on Hamaker’s transcriptions to be accurate. We are unaware of any subsequent literature having been published regarding these particular accounts.

The accounts of Heynric de Rode, (August 24, 1343 - 10 January, 1346), *rentmeester* of Kennemerland & West Friesland, can be found on pp. 222-558 of the second volume of Hamaker’s Holland transcription (ref. 2).

On pp. 252, 341 and 497, the name is given as: *Heynric den Rode*. The first line gives his name as *Heynric die Rode* (p. 252) or as *Henric die Rode* (pp. 341 & 497). On pp. 253 and 279, we find: *Heyne Rode*, and at various other points he refers to himself simply as *Henric*.

The accounts are full of entries for various costs and money paid out, for innumerable things such as maintenance of the count's residences, dike repair and maintenance, building supplies (nails, ironwork, lumber), building costs (carpenters, bricklayers etc.) food supplies (cows, pigs, eels, haring, cod, wine, beer etc.). There are entries for money paid out for various things that washed up on the beaches, including wood, fish, and chests full of clothing or money. Various other costs arise, costs paid for horses and cows, costs and labor involved in collecting and burning shells for lime, etc. There are expenses for clothing for various servants of the count, and for messengers tasked with carrying the many letters sent by the count as by his wife. Etc. etc.

There are, of course, many posts for money **received**, most of which involve "taxes" or rents for land, or repayments of loans made by the count. The details of the accounts receivable are fairly complicated, involving many different aspects of medieval fiefdom and land use. These details lie far outside the scope of our own *leeuwengroot* coin investigation.

Gezellen (Coins)

By the time that Heynric de Rode was *rentmeester*, the first two waves of *leeuwengroot* production (in Flanders, Brabant, Holland, Hainaut and elsewhere) were as good as finished. In about October, 1343, production of *leeuwengroten* ceased in all regions; no more *leeuwengroten* were minted until the restart of late 1345 or early 1346 (Flanders, Brabant, etc.)

It is therefore not all that surprising that there are so few references to the *gezel* in the Heynric de Rode accounts. They only come up twice, both times in what seem to be exchanges of "old" coins for new. Before and after these *socius* posts in the accounts come other exchanges of "old" or "foreign" money (see below).

Rekenpond

At the beginning of the Heynric de Rode accounts, it is not immediately clear which *rekenpond* is being employed. Most of the entries give only sum totals, and do not involve any conversions. Eventually the word *holland* appears after the total, an indication that the amounts are being recorded in *pond holland*.

Errors in the Accounts

We have not seen the original Heynric de Rode accounts (nor any facsimiles thereof), but they were almost certainly written using Roman numerals, as was usual at the time. If someone, the clerk or Hamaker, misread or left out even a single digit here or there, everything could go off by fairly large amounts of money. The difference between vij (7) and viij (8), for example, might in fact become fairly significant in the calculations if mistranscribed (by the clerk or by Hamaker).

In the accounts for Zeeland (ref. 4), we have noticed a number of mistakes in the accounting, some of them small, some of them involving rather large amounts of money; in several cases, the items listed do not add up to the total given. We are unable to say if these errors are in the

original accounting, or in Hamaker's transcription, but either way, the math does not work out properly. Hamaker makes no note of any of these errors.

In the transcription of the accounts of Heynric de Rode, as well as the accounts of Gheret Heinen (also found in Hamaker's second Holland volume), Hamaker has pointed out (and corrected) a number of errors in the medieval accounts. He seems to have been double-checking the arithmetic and the (Holland) accounts in general for accuracy (including spelling and grammar). Either Hamaker was less careful when it came to the Zeeland accounts, and simply did not see the errors, or we can infer that the errors that we found are in fact Hamaker's. (More on this in our upcoming reports on the Zeeland accounts, to be published.)

It appears, however, that there are other errors in the Heynric de Rode accounts that either went unnoticed by Hamaker, or were errors made by Hamaker himself in his transcriptions (it is impossible to determine which). Let us take a look at the sales of some swans...

VERKOOP VAN ZWANEN.

Item ontfaen van vercoften zwanen in Vrieslant van den jare 48 vorseit.

Eirst in Utender coghe bi Wouter Pieter Bennen s. van 465 zwanen, thondert 6 ⷀ, f. 28 ⷀ 4 sc.

Item bi den zelven van 125 zwanen, thondert 7½ ⷀ, f. 9 ⷀ 7 sc. 6 d.

Item bi Abbe Gheytiens s. van zwanen in den Middelen coghe bi der zuder zide, eirst van 680 (*lees 530*) zwanen, thondert 6 ⷀ, f. 31 ⷀ 16 sc.

Item bi den zelven van 85 zwanen, thondert 8 ⷀ, f. 6 ⷀ 14 sc.

Item bi den zelven van 50 zwanen, thondert 8½ ⷀ, f. 4 ⷀ 5 sc.

Item bi Rippaert Ymmen s. van zwanen in Hogoutwouder ambocht, van 705 zwanen, thondert 6 ⷀ, f. 42 ⷀ 6 sc.

Item bi Hayken van Opdam van 380 zwanen, thondert 6 ⷀ, f. 22 ⷀ 16 sc.

Item bi den zelven 56 zwanen, van den stic 14 d., f. 3 ⷀ 5 sc. 4 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 274^[2]

Note that Hamaker has corrected an error in the original accounts in the third post (Abbe Gheytiens). But the first entry (Wouter Bennen) does not add up correctly either:

Wouter Pieter Bennen

$$[465 \text{ swans} \div 100 = 4.65] \times 6 \text{ £} = 27.9 \text{ £} = 6,696 \text{ d} = 27 \text{ £ } 18 \text{ β} *$$

$$28 \text{ £ } 4 \text{ β} = 6,768 \text{ d} = 470 \text{ swans}$$

= a difference of 72 d too much paid for 465 swans

Wouter Pieter Bennen

$$\underline{125 \text{ swans @ } 7.5 \text{ £ per hundred}} = 2,250 \text{ d} = \underline{9 \text{ £ } 7 \text{ β } 6 \text{ d}} \quad (\text{correct})$$

Abbe Gheytaens

$$\underline{630 \text{ swans } \{sic\} @ 6 \text{ £ per hundred}} = 9,072 \text{ d} = 37 \text{ £ } 16 \text{ β}$$

$$\underline{31 \text{ £ } 16 \text{ β}} = 7,632 \text{ d} = 530 \text{ swans @ } \underline{6 \text{ £ per hundred}}$$

Why did Hamaker correct the Abbe Gheytaens entry, but not the Wouter Pieter Bennen entry? **Either Hamaker's transcription is wrong, or the entry is wrong.** The amount to be paid could have been miscalculated (Wouter paid for 5 swans that he did not actually receive), or the correct amount was paid but then mis-entered in the books, or the entry should have read "470 swans".

Abbe Gheytaens also paid for:

$$\underline{85 \text{ swans @ } 8 \text{ £ per hundred}} = 1,632 \text{ d} = 6 \text{ £ } 16 \text{ β} *$$

$$\underline{85 \text{ swans @ } 8 \text{ £ per hundred}} = 1,608 \text{ d} = \underline{6 \text{ £ } 14 \text{ β}}$$

= a difference of 24 d too little paid for 85 swans

So Abbe paid 24 d too little... **or the entry is wrong, or Hamaker's transcription is wrong.**

Abbe Gheytaens also paid for:

$$\underline{50 \text{ swans @ } 8.5 \text{ £ per hundred}} = 1,020 \text{ d} = 4 \text{ £ } 5 \text{ β}$$

This one is correct.

So what, exactly, is going on here? Either the clerk or Hamaker were not very good at his job. Either Hamaker was making errors in his transcription, or the clerk is making errors in his arithmetic and Hamaker was not checking every single post for accuracy. Without seeing the original documents (or facsimiles thereof), we cannot answer these questions.

The rest of the swan sale entries on this (Hamaker) page are all correct:

$$\underline{705 \text{ swans}} = 10,152 \text{ d} = \underline{42 \text{ £ } 6 \text{ β}}$$

Rippaert Ymmen

$$\underline{380 \text{ swans}} = 5,472 \text{ d} = \underline{22 \text{ £ } 16 \text{ β}}$$

Hayken van Opdam

$$\underline{56 \text{ swans}} = 784 \text{ d} = \underline{3 \text{ £ } 5 \text{ β } 4 \text{ d}}$$

Hayken van Opdam

In theory, all of these numbers would have been checked by another clerk or clerks at the *verantwoording*, where Heynric de Rode would have been made to account for his bookkeeping before the count of Holland (Hainaut, Zeeland & “Friesland”). Does this imply that the errors are Hamaker’s?

We should also point out that Hamaker’s correction of 630 swans to 530 swans, which makes the math work out correctly, was, technically, his own assumption that it was the number of swans that was the incorrect number, and not the final total of 31 £, which if “corrected” to 37 £, makes the math work out correctly for 630 swans. While Hamaker’s “correction” might be a logical assumption, it is one that we ourselves cannot make in such a situation, without having the original documents at our disposal. Without these documents, it is not possible to determine exactly where the errors lie: with Hamaker’s transcription, with the original transaction, or with some aspect of the account entry (number of swans or the total amount paid).

Hamaker has already translated the Roman numerals into Hindu-Arabic numerals for us.

31 = xxxvj lb.

37 = xxxvij lb.

630 = dcxxx *zwanen* ?

530 = dxxx *zwanen* ?

Redaction of the Accounts

At several points in his transcriptions, Hamaker decided to leave out what he considered to be “repetitive” information. While we are not convinced that this was a good idea (in general), it does not seem to have affected anything relevant to our *leeuwengroot* study, insofar as the Heynric de Rode accounts are concerned. (More on this in our upcoming reports on the Zeeland accounts, to be published.)

Hamaker

Ref. 2

We pored through all of the HdR account entries, looking for the word *socio*, *socios*, *socius*, *socii*, *sociorum*, *soc.*, and/or anything else similar, as well as the word *gezel*, *ghezelle*, *gheselle*, *ghez.*, etc. In addition, we looked over the entries in general, looking for references to other coin types or anything else interesting of whatever nature.

Bear in mind the previously mentioned difference between *gezellen* **coins** and *gezellen* **human companions** (ref. 68, p. 4).

In this report:

Amounts that are underlined are taken *verbatim* from the original documents, while those that are not, are the calculations performed by ourselves and/or the medieval clerk(s), and the corresponding results.

Words in [square brackets] are absent from the original text, but have been inserted by us in order to clarify the text.

Words in **red** indicate something that is incorrect or suspect.

VIII.
DRIE REKENINGEN
VAN
HEYNRIC DEN RODE,
RENTMEESTER VAN KENEMERLAND
EN VAN WESTVRIESLAND.

EERSTE REKENING.

1343, Aug. 24 — 1344, Aug. 16.

ONTVANGSTEN.

Dit es dat Heynric die Rode ontfanghen heift van der rentemeesterscip van Kenemerlant ende van Vrieslant zeder die tijt, dat hem die rentemeesterscip bevolen wart, dat was tot Dordrecht op sente Baerthelmeis dach int jair 43 tote des manendaghes na onser vrouwen daghe toe assumptio int jair 44, dat es 1 jaer, 9 daghe min.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 222 ^[2]

Dordrecht, St. Bartholomew's Day, 1343 – The Monday after Assumption of the Virgin Mary, 1344
1 year, 9 days

To understand what is going on with the entries involving the *socius* coins, we will begin with a different entry involving *brabantini* and “other old money”, received by Henric de Rode:

Item ontfaen an ouden holls. ende an brabantische ende an anders ouden ghelde 18 ⷈ, dair Henric of ontfaen heift op elken scilt 2 d. (*te baten*), van 30 scilden f. 5 sc.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 364 ^[2]

The conversion from *brabantini* and “other old money” to {new} *deniers holland* was done “invisibly” by the clerk. The subsequent math works out properly:

$$18 \text{ ⷈ [holland]} = 4,320 \text{ ⷈ holland}$$

$$4,320 \text{ ⷈ holland} \div 30 \text{ écu} = 144 \text{ ⷈ holland per écu}$$

$$2 \text{ ⷈ [holland]} \times 30 \text{ écu} = 60 \text{ ⷈ [holland]} = 5 \text{ ⷈ [holland]}$$

1 gold *écu* is worth 144 ⷈ *holland*.

The way that the **first post including *socius* coins** is written, we will need the value of the *écu (scilde)*, in order to do the necessary calculations. We are told “{received} each *gezel* for 6 ⷈ [holland]”:

Item in ghesellen ontfaen 21 ⷈ 2½ sc., elken gheselle voir 6 d., ende weder wtghegheven voir 7 d., dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. op elken scilt 8 d., f. 23 sc. 4 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 273 ^[2]

$$21 \text{ £ } 2.5 \text{ β [holland]} = 5,070 \text{ đ holland}$$

$$\div 6 \text{ đ holland} = \mathbf{845 \text{ socius coins}}$$

$$\times 7 \text{ đ holland} = 5,915 \text{ đ holland}$$

(“...elken gheselle...weder wtghegeven voir 7 đ...”)

A difference of, of course, 845 đ *holland*.

In this post we are not told how many *écu* this 5,070 đ *holland* would be, but:

$$5,070 \text{ đ holland} \div 144 \text{ đ holland (value of 1 écu)} = 35.2083333333 \text{ écu}$$

$$\underline{\times 8 \text{ đ [holland]}} = 281.66666666 \text{ đ holland} = + 1 \frac{2}{3} \text{ đ holland} *$$

$$= \mathbf{23 \text{ β } 4 \text{ đ [holland]}} = \mathbf{280 \text{ đ holland}}$$

The total given is $1 \frac{2}{3}$ đ *holland* too low, but close enough.

What we cannot explain is the seeming incongruity between the statement that the *socius* were “taken in” at 6 đ [*holland*] and “given out” at 7 đ [*holland*] (= 845 đ), and the statement that this meant 8 đ per *écu* (= c. 280 đ). The final total given seems to be based upon the latter statement, but the origin of this “8 đ per *écu*” is not at all clear to us. (Again: medieval bookkeeping is not at all our area of expertise.)

The entry tells us that the value of the *écu* is 18 *groot*, which gives us the value of 1 *groot* in *denier holland*:

$$1 \text{ écu} = 18 \text{ groot}$$

$$144 \text{ đ holland} \div 18 \text{ groot} = 8 \text{ đ holland per groot}$$

The notation that the *écu* was worth 18 *groot* was, of course, relevant to the clerk, because at other times, the *écu* was listed as being worth 20 *groot*.

Note that if we divide the total *denier holland* by 18 *groot* (the value of 1 *écu*):

$$5,070 \text{ đ holland} \div 18 \text{ groot} = 281.66666666 \text{ đ holland}$$

we get the same total.

Item ontfaen an ghesellen 7 ~~œ~~ 18 sc., den gheselle vor
6 d. ende weder wtghegheven vor 7 d. dat beloipt te baten
boven den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilt 8 d., f. 8 sc. 10 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, pp. 364 ^[2]

This is the second post regarding the *socius* coin.

$$7 \text{ £ } 18 \text{ } \beta \text{ [holland]} = 1,896 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland} = 316 \text{ } \text{socius coins}$$

$$\div 144 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland (value of 1 } \text{é} \text{cu)} = 13.166666 \text{ } \text{é} \text{cu}$$

$$\times 8 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ [holland]} = 105.3333333 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland} = - \frac{2}{3} \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland} *$$

(This $105 \frac{1}{3} \text{ } \text{d}$ is the same total one would get by dividing $1,896 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland}$ by 18 *groot* as with the previous *socius* post.)

$$8 \text{ } \beta \text{ } 10 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ [holland]} = 106 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland}$$

The final total given is $\frac{2}{3} \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland}$ too high, but close enough.

We are told that the value of the gold *écu* is $12 \text{ } \beta \text{ [holland]}$, which is the same $144 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland}$ value for the *écu* that we obtained from the *brabantini* and “old money” entry given above (Hamaker, p. 364).

$$1 \text{ } \text{é} \text{cu} = 12 \text{ } \beta \text{ [holland]}$$

$$1 \text{ } \text{é} \text{cu} = 18 \text{ } \text{“groot of } 8 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland”}$$

$$1 \text{ } \text{é} \text{cu} = 144 \text{ } \text{d} \text{ holland}$$

We could find no other references to *socius* (*gezel*) coins in the accounts of Heynric de Rode. We took a quick look at some of the other transactions involving specific coins types as well. Some of them did not work out too well, so we simply abandoned our efforts. (For example, the final post, involving bishop’s head *grotten*, which seems to be missing some information as to how much was “*te baten boven*” the *écu* of 18 *groot*, as given in every other post. The *f. of facit* is also missing.)

Item so heift Henric ontfaen an zilveren ghelde, an bisscops groten ende an gansen, den bisscops grote voir 7 d. ende den ganse voir 7 d., daer die somme of biloept 97 fl 13 sc. 11 d., ende weder wtghegreven voir 8 d., dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. op elken scilt 4 d., f. 54 sc. 2 d.

Item in ghesellen ontfaen 21 fl 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ sc., elken gheselle voir 6 d., ende weder wtghegreven voir 7 d., dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. op elken scilt 8 d., f. 23 sc. 4 d.

Item in ghelres penninghen 5 fl 14 sc. ontfaen ende tatie voir 2 miten, dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. op elken scilt 7 gr., f. 44 sc. 4 d.

Item in ghelres brabantischen ontfaen 8 fl 6 sc. 6 d. ende tatie voir 3 halven, ende wtghegreven voir 2 d., dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. op elken scilt 4 gr., f. 14 sc. 8 d.

Item ontfaen an bisscops groten van 10 d. 51 stic, ende tatie voir 8 d., dat biloept te baten boven den scilde te 18 gr. 4 sc. 5 d.

Summa, 7 fl 11 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, pp. 273-274 ^[2]

These pages contain (among other things) various entries involving receipt of different sorts of silver money, along with the values, presumably expressed in money of Holland. One of these transactions involved *socius* coins (discussed here above). The value given for the *écu* is 18 *groot (holland)*, which equals 144 *den* *holland* (the *groot* having a value of 8 *den* *holland*).

Other coins are the bishop's head *groten* (presumably from Utrecht or Cologne), *gansen* (presumably *grand blanc* $\frac{1}{2}$ *groten* from Flanders *et al*), and *penningen* and *brabantini* from Guelders.

Item ontfaen an ghelres brabantſchen 4 ~~fl~~ 17 ſc. 9 d.,
 ele ſtie vor 1½ d. ende wtghegheven vor 2 d., dat beloipt
 te baten boven den ſilde vor 12 ſc. op elken ſcilt 4 grote,
 maict .. 21 ſc. 7 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 364^[2]
detail

ghelres brabantſchen

$$4 \text{ fl } 17 \text{ } \beta \text{ } 9 \text{ d} = 1,173 \text{ d}$$

$$1,173 \text{ d} \div 144 \text{ d } \textit{holland} = 8.14583333333333 \text{ } \textit{écu}$$

$$\times 4 \text{ } \textit{groot per } \textit{écu} = 32.58333333 \text{ } \textit{groot} *$$

$$259 \text{ d } \textit{holland} \div 32.58333333 \text{ } \textit{groot}$$

$$= 7.94885 \text{ d } \textit{holland per } \textit{groot}, \text{ or c. } 8 \text{ d } \textit{holland}$$

$$32.58333333 \text{ } \textit{groot} \times 8 \text{ d } \textit{holland per } \textit{groot} = 260.66666 \text{ d } \textit{holland} *$$

$$\underline{21 \text{ } \beta \text{ } 7 \text{ d } [\textit{holland}]} = 259 \text{ d } \textit{holland}$$

$$259 \text{ d } \textit{holland} \div 8 \text{ d } \textit{holland per } \textit{groot} = 32.375 \text{ } \textit{groot}$$

The totals are close, but not perfect. They work out much better if they are simply rounded off:

$$260 \text{ d } \textit{holland} \div 32.5 \text{ } \textit{groot} = 8 \text{ d } \textit{holland per } \textit{groot}$$

$$= 21 \text{ } \beta \text{ } 8 \text{ d } [\textit{holland}]$$

Item so heift Henric ontfaen an selveren, an biscops
groten van 10 d., die hi ontffing vor 8 d., 28 fl 9 sc. 4 d.
ende weder wtghegheven vor 10 d. Dit beloipt te baten
boven den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilde 18 d., f.

3 fl 11 sc. 2 d.

Item an biscops groten van 8 d., ontfaen vor 6 d.,
3 fl 9 sc. ende weder wtghegheven vor 8 d., dat beloipt
te baten boven den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilt 4 gr.,
f. 15 sc. 4 d.

Item ontfaen an ghesellen 7 fl 18 sc., den gheselle vor
6 d. ende weder wtghegheven vor 7 d. dat beloipt te baten
boven den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilt 8 d., f. 8 sc. 10 d.

Item ontfaen an gansen 6 fl 14 sc., 2 gansen vor 7 d.,
ende wtghegheven vor 8 d., dat beloipt te baten boven
den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilt 4 d., f. 3 sc. 10 d.

Item ontfaen an ghelres brabantischen 4 fl 17 sc. 9 d.,
ele stie vor 1½ d. ende wtghegheven vor 2 d., dat beloipt
te baten boven den scilde vor 12 sc. op elken scilt 4 grote,
maict 21 sc. 7 d.

Item ontfaen an holls. 57 sc. 6 d. tatie vor 2 miten
ende wtghegheven vor 1 d., dat beloipt te baten boven
den scilde te 18 groten op elken scilt te baten 7 gr., f.
22 sc. 4 d.

Item ontfaen an ouden holls. ende an brabantische ende
an anders ouden ghelde 18 fl , dair Henric of ontfaen
heift op elken scilt 2 d. (*te baten*), van 30 scilden f. 5 sc.

Item bi Martijn den Buser van bate van ghelde, dat hi
ontfaen hadde van den voederpenning ende van der vroe-
nescout in Kenemaerlant boven den scilde vor 12 sc., 20 sc.

Item bi den zelve alse van den ghelde, dair hi turf
mede cofte tot Ailsmair ende dair omtrent, dair die cale
of ghebarnt wart, dair hi te baten of reket boven den
scilde te 20 gr. ende den gulden halling vor 15 grote,
6 fl 19 sc. 8 d.

Item bi Gherairt Brechten s. alse van ghelde, dair hi
turf ende scilpen mede cofte, dair hi te baten of reket
boven den scilde te 20 groten ende den halling vor 15
groten, 5 fl 6 sc. 6 d.

Hamaker (Holland) II, pp. 363-364 ^[2]

These pages contain (among other things) the second group of entries involving receipt of different sorts of silver money, along with the values, expressed in money of Holland. One of these transactions involved *socius* coins (discussed here above)..

The entries repeat the previously determined values for the *écu* of 18 *groot* = 12 β *holland* (= 144 d *holland*). That is, until the final two posts, where the values given are:

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{écu} &= 20 \textit{groot} \\ \textit{halling} &= 15 \textit{groot} \end{aligned}$$

Presumably, at this ratio between the two coins, when the *écu* was worth 18 *groot*, the *halling* would have been worth 13.5 *groot*, i.e.

$$(18 \textit{groot per écu} \div 20 \textit{groot per écu}) \times 15 \textit{groot per halling} = 13.5 \textit{groot per halling}$$

From one post to the next, the value of the *écu* changed from 18 *groot* (144 d *holland*) to 20 *groot* (160 d *holland*).

Beach Finds

Eirst in enghelschen penninghen, die in enen scriene
ghevonden waren, dat an quam ter Wijc op die zee
4 £ 16 sc.
Item in den zelven scriene 11 scilde, 3 gulden hal-
linghe, f. 7 £ 19 sc.

Hamaker (Holland) II, p. 275 ^[2]

$$\underline{11 \textit{écu} + 3 \textit{halling} = 7 \textit{£} 19 \textit{β} [\textit{holland}] = 1,908 \textit{d} [\textit{holland}]}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \textit{écu} &= 12 \textit{β} \textit{holland} = 144 \textit{d} \textit{holland} \\ \times 11 &= 1,584 \textit{d} \textit{holland} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \textit{halling} &= 324 \textit{d} \textit{holland} \\ 1 \textit{halling} &= 108 \textit{d} \textit{holland} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the 108 d *holland* value for the gold *halling* would be equal to 13.5 *groot*, as discussed here above, so everything is working out correctly.

The Groot of 8 ð Holland

What is this *groot* = 8 ð *holland*? In theory, it cannot be a *groot holland*, because, by definition, 1 *groot holland* should equal 12 ð *holland*, in the same way the 1 *groot gezel* always = 12 ð *gezel* (even though there were no physical “*denier gezel*” coins).

Let us take a look at some previous literature, in this case **Sassen** (ref. 5, pp. 123-124):

Bijdrage tot de muntgeschiedenis van Holland.

FRANS VAN MIERIS heeft bij de samenstelling van zijn *Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland, van Zeeland en Heeren van Vriesland* gebruik gemaakt van de thans in het Rijksdepot te 's-Gravenhage bewaard wordende *Archieven van de Leen- en Registerkamer der grafelijkheid van Holland* en heeft daaruit verschillende muntordonnantiën overgenomen. De geleerde VAN DER CHIJS heeft in zijn bekend werk *De munten der voormalige graafschappen van Holland en Zeeland* de muntordonnantiën uit het Charterboek van VAN MIERIS overgenomen onder meer de muntevaluatie van Graaf WILLEM IV, deel uitmakende van het op 16 December 1342 door dezen vorst uitgevaardigd *Gebod*, dat, — ontleend aan het Register EL 32, (f^o. 90) der voorbedoelde archieven —, in zijn geheel is afgedrukt op blz. 671 in het tweede deel van het gezegd Charterboek. Uit eene vergelijking van het door VAN MIERIS gebruikte handschrift met zijn zoo juist aangeduiden afdruk, bleek mij, dat hij zich op meer dan een plaats heeft vergist en eene in het handschrift voorkomende verkorting niet heeft kunnen of durven aanvullen. Zoo heeft de in de *Archieven van de Leen- en Registerkamer* voorkomende minuut de waarde der gouden munten uitgedrukt in *schellingen Hollandsch* terwijl VAN MIERIS er *groten Hollandsch* van heeft gemaakt, b.v. *een scilt voir twaelj groten Holl.* De minuut heeft in plaats van grooten eene S met een verkortingsstreepje er boven. Dit teeken kan wel niets anders dan het woord *solidus* uitdrukken. Dat *solidus* = schelling bedoeld is, blijkt, onder meer, uit de rekening van den grafelijken rentmeester van

Zeeland, BOLDIJN JANSZON over het tijdvak 16 Aug 1342–14 Sept 1343 1) Deze rentmeester toch deed rekening en verantwoording op 16 September 1343 toen de op 16 December bevorens geboden evaluatie geldend was en gebruikte daarbij volgens zijne verklaring „*parment den scilt 18 ð gr gherekent*” Een groot is gelijk aan 8 ð Holl Achttien groot alzoo = 18×8 of 144 ð Holl = $\frac{144}{12}$ of TWAALF SCHELLINGEN HOLL en niet groten Holl, gelijk VAN MIERIS verkeerdelyk las, daargelaten of grooten Holl wel oot hebben bestaan 2)

2) Ze bestonden toen ter tijd niet

Sassen, pp. 123-124 ^[5]

What Sassen is basically saying is that van Mieris incorrectly transcribed β (or $\bar{\text{S}}$) as *groot* instead of the correct *schelling*. More important for our purposes at the moment, is Sassen's statement: "*Een groot is gelijk aan 8 d holland*". He then uses this to show that $18 \textit{ groot} = 12 \beta \textit{ holland}$ (and not $12 \textit{ groten holland}$). Sassen does not give this *groot* a name, but instead seems to say that they should **not** be referred to as *groot holland*, which, he says, did not exist at the time.

Sassen states, with no further edification, that $1 \textit{ groot} = 8 \textit{ d holland}$, period. As we have seen, at some times, the gold *écu* was worth $18 \textit{ groot}$ ($144 \textit{ d holland}$), at other times the *écu* was worth $20 \textit{ groot}$ ($160 \textit{ d holland}$).

Since the accounts under discussion appear to have been kept in *d holland*, with no conversion to *d tournois*, we have little choice other than to refer to this "*groot*" simply as the "*groot of 8 d holland*". It is possible, perhaps even likely, that this is the same "*groot of 16 d tournois*" that we encounter in so many other accounts. If so, then $2 \textit{ d holland}$ was equal to $1 \textit{ d tournois}$, and one *écu* worth $288 \textit{ d tournois}$ when it was worth $18 \textit{ "groot of 8 d holland" / 12 } \beta \textit{ holland}$.

This would mean that the fluctuating values of the *socius* coin would be:

$6 \textit{ d holland}$	$12 \textit{ d tournois}$	
$7 \textit{ d holland}$	$14 \textit{ d tournois}$	
$7.5 \textit{ d holland}$	$15 \textit{ d tournois}$	
$8 \textit{ d holland}$	$16 \textit{ d tournois}$	$1 \textit{ groot of 8 d holland}$

Note that the *socius* rarely, if ever, reached a value of $8 \textit{ d holland}$ or $16 \textit{ d tournois}$ (we have yet to do a complete charting of the values of the *socius* over time). Note as well that this particular table is only valid as long as the ratio between *denier tournois* and *holland* was 1:2 (which was almost certainly not always the case).

CONCLUSION

It is impossible to know where the problems with the accounts that we have noticed originate, whether with Hamaker's transcriptions or with the original documents.

Assuming for the sake of argument that Hamaker's transcriptions are correct (for the most part), then the clerk Heynric de Rode seems to have gone about his work in a fairly slipshod manner, at times losing or gaining a *denier* or two here or there, but at other times bungling rather sizeable amounts of $24 \textit{ d}$ or $72 \textit{ d}$ (etc.). But for all we know at this point, some or all of the errors could be Hamaker's.

The *socius* is only mentioned twice in the accounts, both times with an "incoming" value of $6 \textit{ d holland}$ and an "outgoing" value of $7 \textit{ d holland}$, with the *écu* worth $18 \textit{ "groot of 8 d holland" / 12 } \beta \textit{ holland}$ at the time (i.e. $144 \textit{ d holland}$).

LITERATURE

[1]

***De rekeningen der grafelijkheid van Holland onder het Henegouwsche Huis
Deel 1***

Hendrik G. Hamaker

Werken van het Historisch Genootchap te Utrecht, n° 21

Kemink & Zoon

Utrecht, 1875

[2]

***De rekeningen der grafelijkheid van Holland onder het Henegouwsche Huis
Deel 2***

Hendrik G. Hamaker

Werken van het Historisch Genootchap te Utrecht, n° 24

Kemink & Zoon

Utrecht, 1876

[3]

***De rekeningen der grafelijkheid van Holland onder het Henegouwsche Huis
Deel 3***

Hendrik G. Hamaker

Werken van het Historisch Genootchap te Utrecht, n° 26

Kemink & Zoon

Utrecht, 1878

[4]

***De rekeningen der grafelijkheid van Zeeland onder het Henegouwsche Huis
Deel 2***

H.G. Hamaker

Werken van het Historisch Genootchap te Utrecht, n° 30

Kemink & Zoon

Utrecht, 1880

[5]

Bijdrage tot de muntgeschiedenis van Holland

August Sassen

in *JMP*, 1909

pp. 123-125

[6]

The Coins of the Dokkum (Klaarkamp) Hoard (1932)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2014

Academia.edu

[7]

The Coins of the Dokkum (Klaarkamp) Hoard (1932): Addenda & Errata

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2014

Academia.edu

[8]

The Coins of the Flanders Hoard (1914-1918)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[9]

The Coins of the Staple Hoard (2015)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[10]

The Coins of The Delft Hoard (2004)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[11]

A Preliminary Look at the Leeuwengroten of Louis of Mâle (1346-1384): Issues IV and V

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[12]

The Leeuwengroten of the Rotterdam (“Vlaardingen”) Hoard (2005)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[13]

The Leeuwengroten of the Amersfoort Find (1991)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[14]

Catalog of the Sneek Coin Hoard (1955) Leeuwengroten

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2015

Academia.edu

[15]

The Leeuwengroten of the Zutphen Hoard (1958)

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2016

Academia.edu

(in 4 parts)

[16]

The Elusive Gros au Lion of Bergerac, Elias 138 b

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2016

Academia.edu

[17]

The Zutphen Hoard (1958) Addenda: DNB Coins

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2016

Academia.edu

[18]

Leeuwengroten in the Collection of the Museum Rotterdam

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2016

Academia.edu

[19]

A Preliminary Look at the Leeuwengroten of the County of Holland Including the Fractional Coins

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2016

Academia.edu

[20]

The Leeuwengroten Types of Louis of Nevers, Count of Flanders (1322-1346): A Preliminary Overview

Paul Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout
Rotterdam, 2016
Academia.edu

[21]

A Previously Unpublished Leeuwengroot of the Lordship of Rummen

Paul Torongo
Rotterdam, 2016
Academia.edu

[22]

A Preliminary Look at the Leeuwengroten of Louis of Mâle : Issues I, II, III and IV

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout
Rotterdam, 2016
Academia.edu

[23]

The Leeuwengroten of Louis of Mâle (1346-1384), Issues I, II, {III and IV} Addenda: The CdMA Group Coins

Paul Torongo
Rotterdam, 2016
Academia.edu

[24]

A Preliminary Look at the Gros au Lion of Brittany

Paul Torongo
Rotterdam, 2017
Academia.edu

[25]

A Preliminary Look at the Leeuwengroten of Louis of Mâle (1346-1384): Issues VI – VIII

Paul Torongo
Rotterdam, 2017
Academia.edu

[26]

A Previously Unknown and Unpublished Leeuwengroot Type [MONETA LIRAN]

Paul A. Torongo
Rotterdam, 2017
Academia.edu

[27]

An Extremely Rare, Previously Unknown and Unpublished Leeuwengroot Type Struck for Louis of Nevers, Count of Flanders (1322-1346)

Paul A. Torongo

in *Bulletin de Cercle d'études numismatiques*, 55/1, 2018, p. 32-33.

[28]

The Turch Hoard (1911): A Numismatic Tragedy Revisited

Paul Torongo & Aimé Haeck

Rotterdam, 2017

Academia.edu

[29]

A Previously Unknown and Unpublished Leeuwengroot Type: MONETA FCADB

Paul Torongo

Rotterdam, 2017

Academia.edu

[30]

The Leeuwengroten of the County of Rethel: An Initial Overview (revised version)

Paul A. Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2017

Academia.edu

[31]

The Leeuwengroten of the Hollandsche Rading Find (2016)

Paul Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[32]

A Preliminary Look at the Rare Leeuwengroot of Groningen (REVISED)

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[33]

The Leeuwengroten of the Wittmund Hoard (1858)

Paul A. Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[34]

A Previously Unpublished Half Leeuwengroot of the County of Holland

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[35]

A Preliminary Look at the Tiers de Gros au Lion of Flanders

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[36]

A Preliminary Look at the Tiers de Gros au Lion of Flanders: ADDENDA

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[37]

A Preliminary Look at the Enigmatic NNANE Leeuwengroten

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[38]

The Coins of the Amsterdam Hoard (1897)

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[39]

A Preliminary Overview of the Leeuwengroten of Brabant Part One: Brussels

Paul A. Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[40]

Another Previously Unpublished Flanders-Brabant “Coin of Convention” Counterfeit

Leeuwengroot

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2018

Academia.edu

[41]

A Preliminary Look at the Fractional Leeuwengroten of The Lordship of Megen

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[42]

MONETA AGEN: The Gros au Lion No One Has Ever Seen

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[43]

The Leeuwengroten of Arnold of Oreye, Lord of Rummen: A Preliminary Overview

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[44]

Five Extremely Important Leeuwengroten You Have Never Seen Before: Coevorden, Rekem, Namur and Guelders

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[45]

The Leeuwengroten of the Arnhem Coin Hoard (1957) Part One

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[46]

A Preliminary Look at the Leeuwengroten of the County of Holland Including the Fractional Coins: ERRATA

Paul A. Torongo & Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[47]

The Extremely Important Leeuwengroten of the Schoo Hoard (1927)

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[48]

The Leeuwengroten of the Lordship of Horne: A Preliminary Overview

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[49]

The Leeuwengroten of the Lordship of Horne: A Preliminary Overview: ERRATA

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[50]

Some Unusual Leeuwengroten from the County of Holland

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[51]

A Preliminary Overview of the Leeuwengroten of Brabant Part II: MONETA BRABAN

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[52]

A Previously Unpublished Fractional Leeuwengroot of Otto of Cuijk (1319-1350)

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[53]

A Unique, Unpublished Leeuwengroot Struck For the Bishop of Utrecht

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[54]

Previously Unpublished Fractional Leeuwengroten of John II of Kuinre (1337 -c. 1360

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout

Rotterdam, 2019

Academia.edu

[55]

Previously Unpublished Fractional Leeuwengroten Struck For the Bishop of Utrecht at Vollenhove (and Zwolle ?)

Paul A. Torongo with Raymond van Oosterhout
Rotterdam, 2019
Academia.edu

[56]

The Anglo-Gallic Gros au Lion: A Preliminary Examination

Paul A. Torongo
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[57]

The Malines Coin Hoard (1847)

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[58]

The Leeuwengroten of the Byvanck (Beek) Hoard (c. 1835?)

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[59]

A Strange and Unusual “Deceptive Imitation” Flemish Leeuwengroot, Previously Unknown and Unpublished

Paul A. Torongo
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[60]

The Leeuwengroten of the County of Namur: A Preliminary Overview (Revised Version)

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[61]

The Leeuwengroten of the County of Hainaut: A Preliminary Overview

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)
Rotterdam, 2020
Academia.edu

[62]

A Preliminary Look at the Rare Leeuwengroten of Valkenburg (Fauquemont)

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[63]

The Leeuwengroten of the Diocese of Cambrai: A Preliminary Overview

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[64]

The Leeuwengroten of the Diocese of Cambrai: A Preliminary Overview: ERRATA

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[65]

Another Impressive “Deceptive Imitation” Flemish Leeuwengroot, Previously Unknown and Unpublished

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[66]

Errata: Lodewijk van Nevers, Graaf van Vlaanderen. Historische en numismatische studie van de muntslag in Aalst en Gent by Jean-Claude Martiny & Paul A. Torongo (2016)

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[67]

The Unique Leeuwengroot of Pietersheim (Revised Version)

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[68]

A Preliminary Examination of the Leeuwengroot as Mentioned in Medieval Accounts Part One: Jan Meester Lams Zoon

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[69]

The Unique (But Missing) Leeuwengroot of Élincourt

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[70]

The Leeuwengroten of the Duchy of Guelders: A Preliminary Overview

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[71]

Previously Unpublished Leeuwengroten of Brabant

Paul A. Torongo (with Raymond van Oosterhout)

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu

[72]

The Malines (“Ghent”) Hoard (1891): Another Numismatic Tragedy

Paul A. Torongo

Rotterdam, 2020

Academia.edu