

# The Forum Hoard and Beyond: Money, Gift and Religion in the Early Middle Ages

Rory Naismith\*

**Abstract:** The Forum hoard of Anglo-Saxon silver coins, deposited in Rome in the 940s, is remarkable for including a pair of fasteners inscribed with the name of the intended recipient, Pope Marinus II. This unique find prompts consideration of the material manifestation of early medieval gift-giving. Inscriptions placed on donated objects served an important function, commemorating the act and fixing its interpretation. This applied both to gifts which stood a good chance of being kept intact, and to ‘transitory’ gifts such as food and money, which were handed over in much the same setting but would soon be consumed or spent. The Forum hoard is a rare identifiable example of the latter. The final part of this article considers how such monetary gifts were understood in relation to contemporary thought on the interface between Christian religion and economy.

**Keywords:** Forum hoard, treasure, Anglo-Saxon England, Rome, papacy, material culture, gift-giving, money, economic thought, Christianity

On 8 November 1883, excavators working to uncover the House of the Vestal Virgins in the Roman Forum found a pot containing a heap of dirt-encrusted precious metal. Very soon this hoard was found to consist largely of tenth-century Anglo-Saxon pennies, together with seven Anglo-Viking pennies, five silver coins from elsewhere in western Europe, one Byzantine gold piece and two silver objects.<sup>1</sup> The idea of an early Englishman abroad, burying this treasure amid the storied ruins of the eternal city, piqued British public interest, and within two days of its discovery the London press began to carry news of this “most interesting” find and excited speculation as to its original context.<sup>2</sup> Thanks to the good offices of the head excavator, Rodolfo Lanciani, and his colleague Giovanni Battista De Rossi the contents of the pot were retrieved and preserved intact,<sup>3</sup> and subsequently passed to the museum at the Baths of Diocletian, later crossing the Piazza dei Cinquecento to enter the collection of the *Medagliere* of the Museo Nazionale Romano at the Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, where they remain to this day.

The Forum hoard (as it is generally known in English) is one of about seven largely or wholly Anglo-Saxon hoards from Rome and its environs.<sup>4</sup> It is unusual in a number of respects, however – not least in being by far the biggest and the best preserved, as well as the only one found in the course of an archaeological excavation. Most of the 817 or so English coins in the Forum hoard come from southern England, whereas the majority of tenth-century hoards from England itself are of northern or west midland origin. It is the largest single

---

\* Dept. of History, King’s College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK, [rory.naismith@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:rory.naismith@kcl.ac.uk). I am very grateful to Levi Roach and Francesca Tinti, and to *Viator*’s anonymous reviewers, for commenting on earlier drafts.

<sup>1</sup> Rodolfo Lanciani and Giovanni Battista de Rossi, “L’Atrio di Vesta,” *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (Rome 1883) 434–514; Christopher Evelyn Blunt, “The coinage of Athelstan, king of England 924–39,” *British Numismatic Journal* 42 (1974) 35–160, at 141–155. A new monograph-length study and catalogue of the hoard (the first to include complete illustrations) is Rory Naismith and Francesca Tinti, *The Forum Hoard of Anglo-Saxon Coins/Il ripostiglio anglosassone della Casa delle Vestali (Roma 1883)*, *Bollettino di numismatica* 55–6 (Rome 2016).

<sup>2</sup> *The Times* 10 November 1883, 5.

<sup>3</sup> The pot itself, unfortunately, was not preserved, or at least can no longer be identified.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Evelyn Blunt, “Anglo-Saxon coins found in Italy,” *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History: Essays in Memory of Michael Dolley*, ed. Mark Blackburn (Leicester 1986) 159–169; Rory Naismith, “Peter’s Pence and before: numismatic links between Anglo-Saxon England and Rome,” *England and Rome in the Early Middle Ages: Pilgrimage, Art and Politics*, ed. Francesca Tinti (Turnhout 2014) 217–253. One hoard beyond those listed in my previous article has since been recognised in a group of thirteen Anglo-Saxon fragments of the early tenth century, now also preserved in the Palazzo Massimo (Naismith and Tinti, *Forum Hoard* (n. 1 above) 41).

assemblage of coins of Æthelstan (924/5–939) from anywhere, and on the basis of the coins its date can be fixed with unusual precision to 944–946: the latest specimens belong to Æthelstan’s successor Edmund (939–946), and include one coin by a York moneyer which could only have been produced after Edmund secured control of York in 944.<sup>5</sup>

But without doubt the most exceptional element of the hoard is the pair of silver objects uncovered with the coins. These are round silver fasteners, each with a long protruding hook and two smaller lugs. An inscription is spread across the two, which were evidently intended to be used and viewed as a pair: DOMNO MA / RINO PAPA[e] (“for the Lord Pope Marinus”). The final A of the inscription has two cross-bars, probably representing a primitive form of *ae* ligature, which served to cast the inscription accurately into the dative case. Lanciani and de Rossi initially identified these as clips for a cloak worn by a papal functionary, but they have since been recognised as “hooked tags” – a widely used form of fastener for bags and clothing – of Anglo-Saxon workmanship.<sup>6</sup> They were presumably used to secure the container which carried the coins, a small piece of which still adhered to one of the coins after being dug up. The inscription (in the dative) names the recipient for whom the coins were destined: Pope Marinus II, whose pontificate (11 November 942–May 946) matches up perfectly with the date of the coins.

This is the only known case of an early medieval hoard from western Europe with a label of some sort which names the intended recipient and reveals that the assemblage was intended as a gift. It was only days after the discovery that a connection was made (by the London *Times*’s Rome correspondent, Shakespeare Wood) between this large Anglo-Saxon hoard from Rome and Peter’s Pence, an annual tribute from England to the papacy which grew out of occasional royal donations and was starting to emerge in a more regularised form in the mid-tenth century.<sup>7</sup> The Forum hoard may indeed represent a tranche of Peter’s Pence. But it is much smaller than the 299 marks (i.e. 47,840 pennies) paid in later times, and so would either be the remainder of a larger whole, or the contribution of a particular area, institution or individual. Other possibilities, or a blend of several motives, should also be considered, not least the well-attested offerings made by individual pilgrims or institutions on a more *ad hoc* basis. Many wealthy Anglo-Saxons made their way south with offerings for St Peter.<sup>8</sup> One of them could well have brought the Forum hoard, the surviving contents of which would have amounted to about £3 12s 11d in value;<sup>9</sup> no small sum, even if a long way short of 299 marks. It is even possible to make a guess at the identity of the wealthy English traveller who brought it to Rome: Theodred, bishop of London (d. 951×953),<sup>10</sup> whose will

---

<sup>5</sup> Various dimensions of the hoard’s evidence for tenth-century English currency are explored in Michael Metcalf, “The Rome (Forum) hoard of 1883,” *British Numismatic Journal* 62 (1992) 63–96.

<sup>6</sup> Lanciani and de Rossi, “L’Atrio di Vesta,” 487; James Graham-Campbell, Elizabeth Okasha and D. Michael Metcalf, “A pair of inscribed Anglo-Saxon hooked tags from the Rome (Forum) 1883 hoard,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991) 221–229; Naismith and Tinti, *Forum Hoard* (n. 1 above) 48–50 and 293.

<sup>7</sup> For the development of Peter’s Pence, see William E. Lunt, *Financial relations of the papacy with England to 1327* (Cambridge MA 1939) 1–30. Dr Tinti and I are also planning a dedicated article on the development of Peter’s Pence in the Anglo-Saxon period, beginning with the early royal donations of the seventh and eighth centuries. Wood’s identification of the hoard as a batch of Peter’s Pence came in the *The Times* article cited in n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> The points sketched here are further developed in Naismith and Tinti, *Forum Hoard* (n. 1 above) 38–41.

<sup>9</sup> The exact value of the hoard is difficult to pin down. 830 coins can be identified, one of them a Byzantine gold *solidus* typically valued at 30d in the early medieval West, bringing the likely value up to 859d. However, there are also 16 additional fragments that may have belonged to other coins now broken up. If each of these represented a separate coin, the total value would have therefore been 875d. There is also no way to be sure if the surviving deposit was once the entirety of what was brought from England, or if it represents part of a larger assemblage.

<sup>10</sup> Dorothy Whitelock, *Some Anglo-Saxon Bishops of London: the Chambers Memorial Lecture, Delivered 4 May 1975* (London 1975) 17–21.

includes the bequest of two chasubles which he bought in Pavia. The date of his visit to Italy is not given, but must have occurred before the composition of the will, which was written between 942 and Theodred's death in the early 950s – that is, within the time-frame of the Forum hoard.<sup>11</sup> Although it is not stated explicitly that Theodred went all the way to Rome, he very probably did so, having made it as far as Pavia on what seems to have been a similar route to that recorded for Archbishop Sigeric (990–994) some five decades later.<sup>12</sup> There is, moreover, evidence among the coins for a connection to London. It is the best represented single mint-place, above all in the most recent elements of the hoard. Several clusters of London coins struck from the exact same dies indicate that these had seen comparatively little circulation since their production, suggesting a prominent part for London in the background of the assemblage. In the late tenth and eleventh centuries massive expansion of output at London would have made its strong presence relatively unremarkable, but in the 940s London was by no means in such a dominant position: it was a significant mint, to be sure, but comparable in scale to several others including Canterbury, Chester, Winchester and York.<sup>13</sup> The prominence of London among the coins, along with the size and date of the deposit, combine to make a good case for Theodred being the original owner of the Forum hoard. Short of another spectacular find certainty is of course impossible; but for the sake of convenience Theodred will be referred to here as the owner of the hoard (with a “probable” always implied).

Theodred, or whoever brought the hoard to Rome, presumably did not anticipate his offering being concealed in the ground and forgotten. Early medieval Christians were mindful of scriptural commandments such as Matthew 6:19–21: “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth ... but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven ... For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also,”<sup>14</sup> or of the famous parable of the servant who hid the silver entrusted to him in the ground instead of using and multiplying it for his master's benefit (Luke 19:12–27 and Matthew 25:14–30). Hence the normal expectation was for donations such as the Forum hoard to be dispersed and spent or melted down by the recipient.<sup>15</sup> Something must have gone awry either immediately before or after the hoard was given, with the result that it ended up hidden beneath a small tenth-century building erected in the ruins of the Atrium Vestae.<sup>16</sup> Although Rome was riddled with violence and disorder for much of the tenth century, no specific battle, internal conflict or Magyar or Saracen raid can be pinpointed as a catalyst for the hoard's deposition; indeed, the 940s come across as a

---

<sup>11</sup> Peter H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography* (London 1968) no. 1526, ed. Dorothy Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge 1930) 2–5 (no. 1), ed. Susan Kelly, *Charters of St Paul's, London* (Oxford 2004) 225–228.

<sup>12</sup> Veronica Ortenberg, “Archbishop Sigeric's journey to Rome in 990,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 19 (1990) 197–246, at 236–238 (for Pavia's place in the list of stopping-places between Rome and England).

<sup>13</sup> Rory Naismith, “London and its mint c. 880–1066: a preliminary survey,” *British Numismatic Journal* 83 (2013) 44–74, at 51–53.

<sup>14</sup> “Nolite thesaurizare vobis thesauros in terra ... thesaurizate autem vobis thesauros in caelo ... ubi enim est thesaurus tuus ibi est et cor tuum.” All Latin biblical quotations come from the Vulgate, as printed in ed. Bonifatius Fischer, Roger Gryson *et al.*, *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart 2007); English translations are from the Douay-Rheims Bible.

<sup>15</sup> For almsgiving, see below n. 111. Grave-goods provide a partial exception to this rule in relation to buried treasures, but these were unusual in England and Italy by the tenth century, and in any case there is no indication that the Forum hoard accompanied a burial.

<sup>16</sup> For the archaeological and historical context of its find-spot, see Naismith and Tinti, *Forum Hoard* (n. 1 above) 4–13. However, the eagerness of the nineteenth-century excavators to uncover the classical remains of the Forum meant that medieval material was accorded only passing interest, and little detail about the Forum hoard's archaeological background is available.

time of relative peace under the unorthodox but firm rule of Alberic, *princeps* of Rome.<sup>17</sup> The exact story behind the hoard must therefore remain a mystery, but at least its preservation allows a unique glimpse of a monetary donation. Herein lies its greatest interest: a snapshot of a transitory monetary presentation which provides a rare opportunity to examine the nexus between accounts, images and actualities of gift-giving.

The starting point is that Theodred, having arrived at his destination, is unlikely simply to have thrust his offering into the pope's hands without preamble or fanfare. Although the one pitiful fragment of fabric which survived to modern times (itself now lost) leaves little to go on, the level of investment in the tags hints at considerable thought and expense being devoted to display and presentation. The silver in the tags (just under 14 grams) is the equivalent of eight or nine pennies, and the expertise and labor needed to turn the metal into hooked tags would have required additional expense. In modern terms it is the equivalent of a showy lock or clasp made of precious metal. The container the tags sealed may also have been a handsome and valuable affair, quite probably purpose-made for the occasion by the best craftsmen London (or indeed the English *borgo* in Rome) had to offer. In short, the hoard was put together with conspicuous presentation in mind: a handover that would make an impression on its recipient. There may even have been some attempt to make it appropriate for a pope. The formulation of the inscription is similar to that of the pope's title in documents and seals, while the primitive fleur-de-lis adorning the centre of each tag is vaguely reminiscent of the floral motifs seen on some tenth-century papal *bullae*.<sup>18</sup> By no means was it unrealistic for a visitor of Theodred's calibre to expect the opportunity to hand over a presentation such as this to the pope in person. Meetings with the leading figures of the city were the norm for high-ranking clerics visiting from far-off lands. The itinerary of Sigeric, archbishop-elect of Canterbury, mentions that in the course of a tour around Rome's churches in 990 he stopped at the Lateran to dine with Pope John XV (985–996),<sup>19</sup> and Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg (923–973) was personally welcomed to Rome on his various visits by Alberic and John XIII (965–72).<sup>20</sup>

Yet the actual practicalities of how gifts were given on such occasions remain evasive. Many scenes of giving are described in detail in medieval texts; a single example, similar in some respects to what might have taken place with the Forum hoard, must suffice.<sup>21</sup> The anonymous writer of the *Encomium Emmae reginae* described how he saw

---

<sup>17</sup> Chris Wickham, *Medieval Rome: Stability and Crisis of a City* (Oxford 2015) 23–25. See also Pierre Toubert, *Les structures du Latium médiéval: le Latium méridional et la Sabine du IXe siècle à la fin du XIIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Rome 1973) vol. 2, 974–98; Paolo Brezzi, *Roma e l'impero medioevale, 774–1252* (Bologna 1947) 115–126; Giorgio Falco, "Particolarismo e universalismo nella Roma del secolo X," *Studi romani* 2 (1954) 257–262, at 260–1; Girolamo Arnaldi, "Alberico di Roma," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, ed. Alberto M. Ghisalberti *et al.*, 79 vols. (Rome 1960–), vol. 1, 647–656.

<sup>18</sup> For surviving *bullae*, see especially Camillo Serafini, *Le monete e le bolle plumbee pontificie del Medagliere Vaticano, vol. 1: Adeodato (615–518)–Pio V (1566–1572)* (Milan 1910) 22 (Leo VIII no. 2). Papal documents of the tenth century have been fully published: those of Marinus II are *Papsturkunden 896–1046*, ed. Harald Zimmermann, 3 vols. (Vienna 1984–1989), vol. 1, 172–191 (nos. 98–108).

<sup>19</sup> Ortenberg, "Archbishop Sigeric's journey," (n. 12 above) 221–223.

<sup>20</sup> Gerhard of Augsburg, *Vita S. Uodalrici episcopi* I, 14 and 21, ed. and trans. Walter Berschin and Angelika Häse, *Vita Sancti Uodalrici: die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Ulrich* (Heidelberg 1993) 214–217 and 244–245.

<sup>21</sup> There was of course great variation in the medieval acts embraced by the modern category of gift-giving: for typology and vocabulary see Jürgen Hannig, "Ars donandi: zur Ökonomie des Schenkens im früheren Mittelalter," *Armut, Liebe, Ehre: Studien zur historischen Kulturforschung*, ed. Richard van Dülmen (Frankfurt 1988) 11–27; Bernhard Jussen, "Religious discourses of the gift in the Middle Ages: semantic evidences (second to twelfth centuries)," *Negotiating the Gift: Pre-Modern Figurations of Exchange*, ed. Gadi Algazi, Valentin Groebner and Bernhard Jussen (Göttingen 2003) 173–192; Chris Wickham, "Conclusion," *The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul J. Fouracre (Cambridge 2010) 238–261, at 242–254.

with his own eyes the events at Saint-Omer in early 1027, when King Cnut (1016–1035), by this stage lord of both sides of the North Sea, passed through Flanders *en route* to Rome and chose to exercise pious generosity in favor of the city’s monasteries. The church community received the king solemnly, and he then undertook a period of devoted and tearful prayer, after which Cnut motioned for one of his entourage to bring forth his gift. What this was is left unspecified, but it was large enough that the man had to carry it in a fold of his cloak. Cnut himself then placed the first gift on the altar, and repeated the process with gifts and kisses at other altars around the church. Finally, donations were given to a procession of *pauperes*.<sup>22</sup> A mixed and substantial audience can be inferred, including local clergy (among them the author) as well as the king’s own men, just one of whom brought forth the first gift. This account of the pomp and circumstance surrounding the king’s offerings serves as a particularly vivid illustration of the praiseworthy piety of Cnut, a central figure in the encomiast’s view of recent history. It and other written reports of gift-giving are constructions intended first and foremost to serve the writer’s narrative purposes.<sup>23</sup> Extracting specific details of how handovers were made is therefore problematic, although the meaning of the texts depended on the reader’s ability to grasp the significance of the words and gestures as described: the “rules of the game” (*Spielregeln*) of demonstrative interaction, so deeply explored by Gerd Althoff and others.<sup>24</sup> In other words, interpretation of ceremonies and other demonstrative actions in texts presupposed familiarity with them, from either reading or real-life experience.<sup>25</sup> What an author wrote represents just one perspective on what had taken place (or at least what he or she claimed to have taken place). Cnut’s gifts, for example, could have formed part of the offertory,<sup>26</sup> but the encomiast’s account focuses so closely on the king and his spontaneous piety that any liturgical setting is difficult to discern. Different viewers and participants might each take away a more or less separate reading of events depending on their own viewpoint and level of comprehension.<sup>27</sup> There is no way to be sure that the encomiast understood Cnut’s actions at Saint-Omer in the same way the king did, or deployed them in his text for the same range of reasons that Cnut undertook the actual donations, even if the author did observe the whole episode in person. Nonetheless, on a general level it is apparent that the staging of gift-giving, including the presence of an audience (even if solely a divine audience) to acknowledge it, was critical to achieving the desired reaction.<sup>28</sup> Gifts were very much in the giving.

---

<sup>22</sup> *Encomium Emmae reginae* II, 20, ed. and trans. James Campbell, with supplementary introduction by Simon Keynes, *Encomium Emmae reginae* (Cambridge 1998) 36–7. Cf. Elaine Treharne, “The performance of piety: Cnut, Rome, and England,” *England and Rome*, ed. Tinti (n. 4 above) 343–364, esp. 347–351; Elizabeth M. Tyler, “‘The eyes of the beholders were dazzled’: treasure and artifice in *Encomium Emmae reginae*,” *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999) 247–270.

<sup>23</sup> The central study is Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton 2001).

<sup>24</sup> Gerd Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikatio in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt 1997) and *Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt 2003) (*inter alia*). An important discussion from an Anglo-Saxon perspective, with extensive bibliography, can be found in Levi Roach, *Kingship and Consent in Anglo-Saxon England, 871–978: Assemblies and the State in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge 2013) esp. 161–211.

<sup>25</sup> Alexandra Walsham, “The dangers of ritual,” *Past & Present* 180 (2003) 277–87, esp. 280–281; Wickham, “Conclusion,” (n. 21 above) 241.

<sup>26</sup> David Ganz, “Giving to God in the mass: the experience of the offertory,” in *Languages of Gift*, ed. Davies and Fouracre (n. 21 above) 18–32.

<sup>27</sup> Christina Pössel, “The magic of early medieval ritual,” *Early Medieval Europe* 17 (2009) 111–125. A Carolingian case-study is developed in Simon MacLean, “Ritual, misunderstanding, and the contest for meaning: representations of the disrupted royal assembly at Frankfurt (873),” *Representations of Power in Medieval Germany, 800–1500*, ed. Björn K. U. Weiler and Simon MacLean (Turnhout 2006) 97–119.

<sup>28</sup> Hannig, “*Ars donandi*.”

In principle one might turn for further guidance to the numerous images of broadly contemporary gift-giving.<sup>29</sup> These underscore the pervasiveness of giving in early medieval society suggested by narrative accounts, and hint at a set of visual cues for gift-giving, potentially related to real-life donations. Text and picture could work together or separately: donation miniatures were familiar enough that they did not always need an accompanying inscription. The names and deeds of the donors were known unto God, and in the immediate context of donation would be common knowledge among recipients as well.<sup>30</sup> The matter of most immediate concern was to insert the donors and their act into the gift itself. They might be imagined making their offering in a great many postures and configurations, with or without the object or recipient being shown.<sup>31</sup> Transfers could take place either horizontally or vertically, emphasising association or differences in status respectively.<sup>32</sup> Early medieval western donation images inherited their repertoire from late antique and Byzantine precedents,<sup>33</sup> but representations of donations became especially popular in the Carolingian and post-Carolingian era.<sup>34</sup> Few (if any) were more elaborate than the set of donations depicted in the Hornbach Sacramentary, a gem of Ottonian-era manuscript art. It boasts no fewer than four donation scenes arranged in sequence at the beginning of the book. Each scene consists of an opening in the manuscript, with the left (verso) pages showing a donor handing a book – the very one on which the viewer gazed – to a recipient, while the right (recto) pages provided an explanatory inscription for each image, executed in gold leaf on a purple background. In the first of these four miniatures, a cleric (possibly the scribe himself) named Eburnant inclines slightly towards Abbot Adalbert (before 972–after 993) as he passes the book to him with both hands. The subsequent three images repeat the process with various participants, earthly and supernatural: Adalbert gives the book to St Pirmin,

---

<sup>29</sup> For the larger dimensions of artistic representations of donors and recipients (especially in a manuscript context) see Joachim Prochno, *Das Schreiber- und Dedikationsbild in der deutschen Buchmalerei, 800–1100* (Leipzig 1929); Klaus G. Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” *Die Ottonen: Kunst, Architektur, Geschichte*, ed. Klaus G. Beuckers, Johannes Cramer and Michael Imhof (Petersburg 2002) 63–102; see also Emmanuel Klinkenberg, *Compressed Meanings: the Donor’s Model in Medieval Art* (Turnhout 2009); Ludger Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade. Zu Kontext und Funktion sakraler Vorstellungen in Historiographie und Bildzeugnissen der ottonisch-frühsalischen Zeit* (Berlin 2001) 324–434.

<sup>30</sup> Corine Schleif, “Kneeling on the threshold: donors negotiating realms betwixt and between,” *Thresholds of Medieval Visual Culture: Liminal Spaces*, ed. Elina Gertsman and Jill Stevenson (Woodbridge 2012) 195–216, at 201–203.

<sup>31</sup> Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” (n. 29 above) 64–65 lays out a typology of four major groups in tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts, and discusses earlier taxonomies.

<sup>32</sup> Corine Schleif, “Gifts and givers that keep on giving: pictured presentations in early medieval manuscripts,” *Romance and Rhetoric: Essays in Honour of Dhira B. Mahoney*, ed. Georgiana Donavin and Anita Obermeier (Turnhout 2010) 51–74, at 66–67; Sean Gilsdorf, “Deësis deconstructed: imagining intercession in the medieval West,” *Viator* 43 (2012) 131–174, esp. 136–140. For larger dimensions of the social practice of intercession see Sean Gilsdorf, *The Favor of Friends: Intercession and Aristocratic Politics in Carolingian and Ottonian Europe* (Leiden and Boston 2014).

<sup>33</sup> Kurt Weitzmann, “Book illustration of the 4th century: tradition and innovation,” *Akten des VII. internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie. Trier 5–11 September 1965* (Vatican City 1969) 257–281, at 271–276; Leslie Brubaker, “Gifts and prayers: the visualization of gift giving in Byzantium and the mosaics at Hagia Sophia,” *Languages of Gift*, ed. Davies and Fouracre (n. 21 above) 33–61; Nancy Patterson Ševčenko, “The representation of donors and holy figures on four Byzantine icons,” *Deltion*, 4th ser., 17 (1994) 157–164.

<sup>34</sup> Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” (n. 29 above) esp. 70–71, 77 and 92. Beuckers particularly emphasises the impact that donation mosaics in Rome and other locations may have had on developing artistic traditions in northern Europe, on which see Erik Thunø, *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome: Time, Network, and Repetition* (Cambridge 2015); Caroline Goodson, *The Rome of Pope Paschal I: Papal Power, Urban Renovation, Church Rebuilding and Relic Translation, 817–824* (Cambridge 2010).

Hornbach's patron saint, who in turn gives it to St Peter in the third miniature. St Peter finally gives it to Christ in the fourth and final miniature.<sup>35</sup>

The physical acts represented in the Hornbach Sacramentary and elsewhere are not inherently unlikely, most revolving around a handover of the gift, or motion towards a gift, both carried out in full view of the audience, sometimes shown, or sometimes by implication to be identified with the reader him or herself. But there was manifestly more than worldly practicality at work in these images and the gestures they utilised. Some represent donations which there is no way the artist could possibly have seen or even known to have physically taken place, either because they involve supernatural figures like Christ, St Pirmin or St Peter, or individuals who had been dead for centuries. Images of the latter type enjoyed a certain amount of popularity in England in the decades around 1000: examples show St Aldhelm (d. 709/710) offering his newly written *De virginitate* to its female recipients, and Felix presenting his *Life* of St Guthlac to Ælfwald, king of the East Angles (713–749).<sup>36</sup> Depictions of gift-giving were thus above all an artistic construction; an idealised visual manifestation of what the donor(s) wished or later artists envisaged. They made up a coherent and recognisable visual language for expressing the relationships between producers, donors and recipients.<sup>37</sup> When information does survive about how a book or other item was given to a ruler or church (as is sometimes the case in the later Middle Ages), there was not necessarily much similarity with the carefully choreographed scene in a donation miniature.<sup>38</sup> There is every reason to believe that the elaborate, subtly arranged donation scenes of early medieval art likewise reflect an elevated ideal. Points of contact with real-world donations should not be ruled out – after all, the widespread use of images of gift-giving might have moulded the expectations of donors and recipients, or vice versa<sup>39</sup> – but they simply cannot be identified with any certainty, and probably relate to only a small part of the process.

The Forum hoard is able to cast a certain amount of light onto aspects of early medieval gift-giving left obscure or debatable by both written and visual accounts of donation.<sup>40</sup> It represents a stage in this process frozen in time: an assemblage of money as a

---

<sup>35</sup> Solothurn, Domschatz der St.-Ursen-Kathedrale, Cod. U 1 (Reichenau, s. x<sup>2</sup>) fols. 7v–11r. The sequence is discussed in Schleif, “Gifts and givers,” (n. 32 above) 59–63; see also Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” (n. 29 above) 74–76; Peter Bloch, *Das Hornbacher Sakramentar und seine Stellung innerhalb der frühen Reichenauer Buchmalerei* (Basel 1956).

<sup>36</sup> London, Lambeth Palace Library, 200 (St Augustine's, Canterbury, s. x<sup>2</sup>) fol. 68v; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 577 (Christ Church, Canterbury, s. x/xi) fol. 1v; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 389 (St Augustine's, Canterbury, s. x<sup>2</sup>) fol. 17v. See Gale Owen-Crocker, “Image-making: portraits of Anglo-Saxon Church leaders,” *Leaders of the Anglo-Saxon Church: from Bede to Stigand*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (Woodbridge 2012) 109–128, at 120; Richard Gameson, “Book decoration in England, c. 871–c. 1100,” *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Vol. I: c. 400–1100*, ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge 2012) 249–293, at 252.

<sup>37</sup> Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade* (n. 29 above) 392.

<sup>38</sup> Dhira B. Mahoney, “Courtly presentation and authorial self-fashioning: frontispiece miniatures in late medieval French and English manuscripts,” *Mediaevalia* 21 (1996) 97–160, at 100–104. Cf. Schleif, “Gifts and givers,” (n. 32 above) 58; Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” (n. 29 above) 64 and 94; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade* (n. 29 above) 408–434. On the difficulties posed by images and ritual more broadly, see Claus Ambos *et al.* (ed.), *Bild und Ritual: Visuelle Kulturen in historischer Perspektive* (Darmstadt 2010); Nils Holger Petersen *et al.* (ed.), *The Appearances of Medieval Rituals: the Play of Construction and Modification* (Turnhout 2004); Gerard Jaritz (ed.), *Ritual, Images and Daily Life: the Medieval Perspective* (Zurich and Münster 2012).

<sup>39</sup> Lawrence P. Morris, “Did Columba's tunic bring rain? Early medieval typological action and modern historical method,” *Quaestio Insularis* 1 (2000) 45–65 explores this issue with reference to early Insular saint's lives.

<sup>40</sup> For select examples of analysis of ritual beyond narratives, see Roach, *Kingship and Consent* (n. 24 above) 195–202 (using non-narrative texts and artistic representations); L. Kjær, “Matthew Paris and the royal Christmas: ritualised communication in text and practice,” *Thirteenth-Century England* 14 (2013) 141–154 (using royal account books).

gift, concealed and forgotten shortly before or after being handed over. Verbalisation and presentation, both highlighted by the fasteners found with the hoard, were central concerns, closely intertwined with one another. The donation inscription on the two tags, while brief, offers clues to the highly personal and situational nature of the gift which Theodred had brought for the pope. It is in the dative, with the actual object of the gift (i.e. the bag of money itself) left implied. Also notable for its absence is the name of the donor him or herself. This distinguishes the Forum inscription from most other early medieval donation inscriptions, which generally name the donor (often synonymous with the patron responsible for manufacture); indeed, it is easier to find inscriptions omitting the recipient than the donor among the many such inscriptions on objects and in books. To name just two examples, an ornate eleventh-century gold cross now preserved in Borghorst names and portrays its patron and donor, Abbess Bertha, but no specific recipient;<sup>41</sup> and a silver gilt reliquary from Rome carries an inscription naming its donor, Pope Gregory IV (827–844) and its purpose – the ornamentation of the head of St Sebastian – but again no recipient.<sup>42</sup> The most common practice was of course to name both parties, sometimes even a chain of donors and recipients ending with saintly or divine figures, as in the Hornbach Sacramentary.

The lack of reference to a donor on the Forum hoard fasteners might simply have been because the donor was present in person to make the handover; so too, of course, was the recipient, but if the Forum hoard was given to the pope by Bishop Theodred or someone of similar standing, there would have been a substantial discrepancy in status between the giver and receiver, and so emphasis on the recipient's name and position becomes more explicable.<sup>43</sup> During such a presentation, the inscription most likely also served another purpose: to signpost the nature of the parcel of money it was attached to. The identifying label of the Forum hoard finds numerous parallels among other gift-objects – books, metallic objects, even buildings – with the important difference that these were given with the expectation that they would be kept by the recipient. The aim of these inscriptions was to commemorate the act of donation and provide a lasting monument, thereby making the object into a tangible manifestation of the bond that joined the two parties.<sup>44</sup>

This opportunity to stamp an interpretation onto a gift, and by extension onto the relationship it implied, was invaluable. Gifts were tricky things: chances to assert power and status as well as friendship and solidarity, depending on how they were handled. Florin Curta has emphasised the competitive double-edged nature of early medieval gift-giving,<sup>45</sup> while Jacques Derrida went so far as to deny the possibility of a “true” gift, such was the permeation he saw of other motives encroaching on the modern ideal of the gift.<sup>46</sup> Exchanging gifts along with other words and interactions in the right setting, such as a shared meal, could help create the kind of amicable relationship the gifts were supposed to signify.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Mechthild Schulze-Dörrlamm, “Reliquienkreuz,” *Das Reich der Salier 1024–1125: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Landes Rheinland-Pfalz* (Sigmaringen 1992) 278–281.

<sup>42</sup> Gabriele Mietke, “Reliquiar für das Haupt des heiligen Sebastian,” *Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen. Katalog der Ausstellung Hildesheim 1993*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim and Mainz 1993) vol. 2, 128–130.

<sup>43</sup> William Ian Miller, *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking: Feud, Law, and Society in Saga Iceland* (Chicago 1990) 77–110 illustrates how the representation of gifts and other transactions depended on the social dynamics at work, in the case of saga-age Iceland. For the effects of status in gift-giving see also Hannig, “*Ars donandi*” (n. 21 above).

<sup>44</sup> Literature on commemoration is vast. See especially Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (ed.), *Memoria: der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter* (Munich 1984).

<sup>45</sup> Florin Curta, “Merovingian and Carolingian gift giving,” *Speculum* 81 (2006) 671–699, esp. 675–678.

<sup>46</sup> Jacques Derrida, *Given Time. I, Counterfeit Money*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (Chicago 1994).

<sup>47</sup> For a selection of helpful work on medieval friendship (another large topic), see Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge 2004) 67–90; Verena Epp, *Amicitia: zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher*



In some ways the link they created was like that between modern politicians or charities and major donors (or, in the parlance often used nowadays, “friends”), which was not necessarily founded on mutual and voluntary affection.<sup>48</sup> In the case of the Forum hoard, one doubts that there was much (if any) prior interaction between Marinus and Theodred: most likely, the bishop of London would have used the gift and the associated ceremonial interaction to create a bond with the pope, and by extension with St Peter. Its presentation could, to continue the analogy with modern politicians and donors, have been comparable to the photo opportunities donors expect to accompany a substantial grant: a demonstration of piety in just the right place, suggesting closeness and influence. Of course, Marinus may well have been eager to cultivate a wealthy bishop from England: Theodred’s visit helped burnish the prestige of the papal office, and the two clerics might even have become friends rather than “friends.” The underlying motives and sentiments of the two bishops remain opaque, and need not have been identical. There was some degree of shared etiquette regarding the practicalities of donation in the early Middle Ages,<sup>49</sup> but also a great deal of room for manoeuvre: as noted above, understandings of a donation were potentially as variable as the number of observers, and there was no guarantee that a single immutable meaning would be transmitted to posterity<sup>50</sup> – not, at least, without the helping hand of a fixed verbal account.<sup>51</sup> Directly anchoring the written word to a given object was an attempt to steal a march on this process, typically on the part of the donor him or herself. One particular view would thereby gain both prominence and precedence over others. Even a gift inscription was not a guarantee of immutability. Additional inscriptions might be added to reflect the regifting or repurposing of an item, as in the case of the famous star-cloak (*Sternenmantel*) of Emperor Henry II (1002–1024);<sup>52</sup> existing inscriptions might be erased or doctored, as with the dedicatory verses in the Codex Amiatinus.<sup>53</sup> But inscribing and identifying a gift was one of the best means available to channel its interpretation.

The details of each individual case are tied up in specific circumstances, but the majority of identifiable gift objects with an accompanying inscription belong to an

---

*Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1999) esp. 76–82; Rebecca Slitt, “Aristocratic male friendship in the Anglo-Norman world,” unpublished PhD dissertation, Fordham University (2008) 68–103; Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: the Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo 1988); also the papers in Julian P. Haseldine, ed., *Friendship in Medieval Europe* (Stroud 1999).

<sup>48</sup> See the example of three rival eleventh-century clerical “friends” in Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers* (n. 47 above) 78–9. Also instructive is the scholarship on “instrumental” gifts in modern China: Yunxiang Yan, “The gift and gift economy,” *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology*, ed. James G. Carrier, 2nd ed. (Cheltenham 2012) 275–290, at 285.

<sup>49</sup> Wickham, “Conclusion,” (n. 21 above) 249–250.

<sup>50</sup> Pössel, “Magic of early medieval ritual,” (n. 27 above) 118–122. See also Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers* (n. 47 above) 77 for an act read by one source as a diplomatic gift, and another as tribute.

<sup>51</sup> Philippe Buc, “Conversion of objects,” *Viator* 28 (1997) 99–143. Cf. Pössel, “Magic of early medieval ritual,” (n. 27 above) 118–119.

<sup>52</sup> Wilhelm Messerer, *Der Bamberger Domschatz in seinem Bestande bis zum Ende der Hohenstaufenzeit* (Munich 1952) 54–57; Renate Baumgärtel-Fleischmann, “Der Sternenmantel Kaiser Heinrichs II. und seine Inschriften,” *Epigraphik 1988. Referate und Rount-table-Gespräche. Fachtagung für Mittelalterliche und Neuzeitliche Epigraphik, Graz, 10.–14. Mai 1988*, ed. Walter Koch (Vienna 1990) 105–125; Gude Suckale-Redlfesen, “Sternenmantel Heinrichs II.,” *Kaiser Heinrich II. 1002–1024*, ed. Josef Kirmeier et al. (Stuttgart 2002) 383; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade* (n. 29 above) 404–407; David Ganz, “Pictorial textiles and their performance: the star mantle of Henry II,” *Dressing the Part: Textiles as Propaganda in the Middle Ages*, ed. Kate Dimitrova and Margaret Goehring (Turnhout 2014) 13–29, 167–170.

<sup>53</sup> Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1 (Wearmouth-Jarrow, before 716) fol. 1v. The key to the original form of the dedication is provided by their quotation in the anonymous *Vita Ceolfredi*, c. 37, ed. and trans. Christopher Grocock and I. N. Wood, *Abbots of Wearmouth and Jarrow* (Oxford 2013) 118–119. See also Rupert L. S. Bruce-Mitford, “The art of the Codex Amiatinus,” *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 3rd ser., vol. 32 (1969) 1–25.

ecclesiastical context. They represent the faithful offerings of wealthy laymen or clergy to a church. Consequently their inscriptions often identify not only the donor and recipient, but also the recompense expected for the gift: interpretation carried beyond the handover of the object itself, to the general and ongoing interaction between the parties involved – what Marcel Mauss famously referred to as a *prestation totale*.<sup>54</sup> This was very much a two-way process: ecclesiastical recipients in particular were called on to pray thereafter for the soul of the donor.<sup>55</sup> Gifts that were intended to be permanent stood the best chance of fulfilling this role. Land was a special case,<sup>56</sup> but precious crosses, books and reliquaries were not discarded or destroyed lightly. An ongoing stream of spiritual counter-gifts was the return donors expected, and in the case of a book or other object which was read regularly or used in the liturgy, this stream could in principle be long-lasting as generations of new viewers read the inscription and saw any associated images.<sup>57</sup> The donation inscriptions added to books given by King Æthelstan to various churches specifically requested that the recipient or reader offer prayers for the good of the king.<sup>58</sup> The Egmond Gospels made the equation of gift, prayer and supernatural intercession inescapable: a miniature of Theoderic II, count of Frisia (939–988), and his wife Hildegard placing the book on the altar of St Adalbert’s faced another miniature of the couple praying to the saint, who in turn looked to Christ enthroned on high; inscriptions on each page described the dedication of the aristocratic couple and the words of St Adalbert to Christ, respectively.<sup>59</sup>

The Forum inscription, however, is unusual in relating to a physically more transient gift. Its contents were not supposed to be kept and treasured by the pope, but rather distributed and used. The donor could have had specific applications in mind – lighting, for instance, is cited as the intended use of monetary donations from Offa of Mercia (757–796) and Æthelwulf (839–858)<sup>60</sup> – though a gift for the general use of the pope or a church was also entirely possible. Although the *Liber pontificalis* was no longer being maintained by the 940s, its picture of regular papal disbursement of largesse in the form of gold and silver to the numerous churches of Rome probably reflects the fate of most donations similar to the Forum

<sup>54</sup> Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: the Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. W. D. Halls, foreword by Mary Douglas (London 1990) 8 (the French is taken from Marcel Mauss, “Essai sur le don: forme et raison de l’échange dans les sociétés primitives,” *L’Année Sociologique* 2nd ser., vol. 1 (1925 for 1923–1924) 30–186, at 41).

<sup>55</sup> Beuckers, “Das ottonische Stifterbild,” (n. 29 above) 101–102.

<sup>56</sup> Classic studies on this principle include Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: the Social Meaning of Cluny’s Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca 1989); Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: the Laudatio Parentum in Western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill 1988); Ilana Friedrich Silber, “Gift-giving in the great traditions: monasteries in the medieval West,” *Archives européennes de sociologie* 36 (1995) 209–243.

<sup>57</sup> Eliza Garrison, *Ottoman Imperial Art and Portraiture: the Artistic Patronage of Otto III and Henry II* (Farnham 2012) 127 and 131; Körntgen, *Königsherrschaft und Gottes Gnade* (n. 29 above) 392–407; Catherine E. Karkov, *The Ruler Portraits of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge 2004) 53–63.

<sup>58</sup> Simon Keynes, “King Athelstan’s books,” *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge 1985) 143–201, esp. 149–150, 160, 165 and 197; also more generally David Pratt, “Kings and books in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 43 (2014) 297–377.

<sup>59</sup> The Hague, Royal Library, MS 76 F 1 (northern France, c. 900, with additions in Flanders, c. 975) fols. 214v and 215r. For discussion and context see Anne S. Korteweg, “Thierry II, count of Holland, and his wife Hildegard and their donations to Egmond Abbey,” *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century: Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, ed. Victoria D. van Aalst and K. N. Ciggaar (Hernen 1985) 146–164, esp. 147–156.

<sup>60</sup> Leo III, letter to Coenwulf, 798, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH Epistolae Karolini aevi 2/Epistolae 4* (Berlin 1895) 188–189 (no. 127); Asser, *De rebus gestis Ælfredi*, c. 16, ed. William Henry Stevenson, with preface by Dorothy Whitelock, *Asser’s Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser* (Oxford 1959) 14–16, trans. Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, *Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources* (Harmondsworth 1983) 72–73.

hoard:<sup>61</sup> to be melted down and turned into items of ecclesiastical finery.<sup>62</sup> For obvious reasons, it is enormously rare to find identifiable examples of physically transient gifts such as the Forum hoard. Yet they need to be borne in mind alongside the more celebrated inscribed treasures which fill church treasuries and, more recently, museums and exhibition catalogues across Europe. The fact that these more lasting and identifiable gifts include some of the most dazzling specimens of early medieval art should not create the impression that such donations were representative of gift-giving more widely. On the contrary, they probably represent the tip of an iceberg made up of donations often much more akin to the Forum hoard. Most of this potentially massive category of transitory gifts has perished without leaving any physical trace (or at least an identifiable trace), as contemporaries presumably expected. In the absence of a lasting tangible reminder, the emphasis instead fell on the presentational aspects of the act of giving itself. Publicity and ceremonial were very likely part and parcel of most medieval gifts, whether they were retained or otherwise. Theodred for one seems to have given thought to the physical presentation of the Forum hoard, based on no small material investment. The fabrication of valuable fasteners for the container (which itself may also have been a lavish and beautiful object) suggests an expectation that someone would see and appreciate the donation at some stage. If it was carried intact from England to Rome,<sup>63</sup> the whole journey would in a sense have been a long donative procession:<sup>64</sup> numerous onlookers who saw it *en route*, as well as in the churches of Rome itself, might have understood its significance. These viewers should not necessarily be imagined as demur and unengaged. The English bishop and his entourage could have been awed by the cities and ruins through which they passed, and eventually by the colossal churches in Rome. Their hosts might equally have been curious about these travellers from remote regions of the chilly north and the gifts they brought with them (though English pilgrims cannot have been an unusual sight in tenth-century Rome or on the road to it).<sup>65</sup> All, one imagines, would have been hushed, their attention rapt, as the parcel of money was handed to St Peter's heir – assuming, that is, that the hoard made it this far, which is by no means clear. Other gifts could have changed hands alongside the money, including from Marinus back to Theodred, as well as ceremonial words and gestures of friendship and affection.<sup>66</sup> The pope and his fellow Romans were adepts at ceremonial processes of this sort. Rome was a city of ritual, its civic life at this stage coming to revolve around cycles of liturgy and processions between churches.<sup>67</sup> Even watching this handover would have been to share in the spiritual glow it generated. Late antique and early medieval concepts of vision built on the idea that the eyes emanated rays of light, illuminating all before them and conveying what

---

<sup>61</sup> Ed. Louis Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886–1892); Paolo Delogu, “Oro e argento in Roma tra il VII e il IX secolo,” *Cultura e società nell'Italia medievale. Studi per P. Brezzi* (Rome 1988) 273–293.

<sup>62</sup> Rory Naismith, Peter Northover and Francesca Tinti, “The fineness of papal *antiquiores*,” *Numismatic Chronicle* 175 (2015) 195–203 shows how the local papal coinage (issued from the 770s until c. 980) was not receiving regular injections of silver from diverse sources elsewhere in Europe, implying that incoming silver coins and objects were not finding their way into the local currency.

<sup>63</sup> The tiny number of coins from outside England – and the fact that most come from sources distant from likely routes to Rome – suggests that the hoard probably did not mingle significantly with local currencies between England and Rome: Naismith and Tinti, *Forum Hoard* (n. 1 above) 44–47.

<sup>64</sup> This journey could have taken several routes, though all would have passed through towns and churches of importance where a visiting bishop might have expected to meet and consort with local elites. See Ortenberg, “Archbishop Sigeric's journey” (n. 12 above) esp. 228–244; David A. E. Pelteret, “Not all roads lead to Rome,” *England and Rome*, ed. Tinti (n. 4 above) 17–42.

<sup>65</sup> Pelteret, “Not all roads” (n. 64 above).

<sup>66</sup> See above, n. 47.

<sup>67</sup> John F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: the Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Rome 1987) 105–166, 253–268; John F. Romano, *Liturgy and Society in Early Medieval Rome* (Farnham 2014) 109–139; Wickham, *Medieval Rome* (n. 17 above) 321–348.

they touched directly into the viewer's soul: seeing something implied a degree of action and even participation.<sup>68</sup> The Forum hoard was hence at the same time a gift from one individual or institution for another individual, and also a means of embedding that act in the consciousness of all who saw or heard about it, to the greater spiritual benefit of the giver and the pope.

In its use during a ceremonial exchange such as this, the Forum hoard was far from exceptional, though it is a unique survivor. Similar means of enhancing the presentational form of money or other "transient" gifts can be found elsewhere if one looks for them. Wills provide one valuable source. Although there is no guarantee that their requests were followed to the letter, they nonetheless constitute some guide to how the testator wanted him or herself to be represented after death, including through specific instructions on how moveable goods should be presented in their absence.<sup>69</sup> The will of Bertram, bishop of Le Mans (d. 623), refers to bequests of gold coins being left in individual parcels, each labelled with the name of the intended recipient.<sup>70</sup> Another tenth-century will of an Anglo-Saxon noblewoman named Wynflæd mentions that half a pound of silver coins should be given to the recipient placed in a specific cup.<sup>71</sup> A uniquely personalised form of presentation was described by Wipo in his *Gesta Chuonradi imperatoris*. In 1026 Conrad II (1024–1039) and his army met resistance from the locals when they passed through Ravenna. In the aftermath, Conrad went to the bedside of a badly wounded German soldier, who had lost a foot and part of his lower leg in the fracas. The king (and soon-to-be emperor) commanded that a set of leather greaves be fetched, filled with coins, and placed on the soldier's stretcher. That is to say, Conrad provided a replacement leg made of cash, showing "great munificence in his customary way" (*maximam munificentiam ... more solito*).<sup>72</sup>

Gestures such as the Forum hoard's packaging or Conrad's silver-filled greaves are in a sense the ancestor of modern ways of making a demonstrative monetary donation. The whole point was to make a display to transform and individualise otherwise impersonal cash. In some early medieval sources there are traces of a concern with openness. A public,

---

<sup>68</sup> Margaret Miles, "Vision: the eye of the body and the eye of the mind in Saint Augustine's *De trinitate* and *Confessions*," *Journal of Religion* 63 (1983) 125–142; David C. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision from al-Kindi to Kepler* (Chicago and London 1976) esp. 1–17 and 87–90. The influence of these ideas on the Alfredian-period translation of Augustine's *Soliloquia* is discussed in Miranda Wilcox, "Alfred's epistemological metaphors: *eagan modes* and *scip modes*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 35 (2006) 179–217, at 202–205; for the importance of concepts of vision to the liturgy and other ritualised acts see Hans Henrik Lohfert Jørgensen, "Cultic vision – seeing as ritual: visual and liturgical experience in the early Christian and medieval Church," *Appearances of Medieval Rituals*, ed. Petersen *et al.* (n. 38 above) 173–197.

<sup>69</sup> Linda Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge 2011) 56–79, 198–202; Goswin Spreckelmeyer, "Zur rechtlichen Funktion frühmittelalterlicher Testamente," *Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter*, ed. Peter Classen (Sigmaringen 1977) 91–113, esp. 98–99, 105–107; Brigitte Kasten, "Erbrechtliche Verfügungen des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Organisation und zur Schriftlichkeit bei der Verwaltung adeliger Grundherrschaften am Beispiel des Grafen Heccard aus Burgund," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsheschichte: Germanische Abteilung* 107 (1990) 236–338; Christina La Rocca and Luigi Provero, "The dead and their gifts. The will of Eberhard, count of Friuli, and his wife Gisela, daughter of Louis the Pious (863–864)," *Rituals of Power: from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson (Leiden 2000) 225–280.

<sup>70</sup> *Das Testament des Bischofs Berthramn von Le Mans vom 27. März 616: Untersuchungen zu Besitz und Geschichte einer fränkischen Familie im 6. und 7. Jahrhundert*, ed. Margarete Weidemann (Mainz 1986) 45–46.

<sup>71</sup> Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (n. 11 above) no. 1539, ed. Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (n. 11 above) 10–15 (no. 3).

<sup>72</sup> Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi imperatoris*, c. 13, ed. Harry Bresslau, *Die Werke Wipos, MGH Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis recusi* 61 (Hanover 1915) 35. Cf. Herwig Wolfram, *Conrad II, 990–1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (University park 2006) 99–100.

witnessed handover was a gift; a hidden one an improper bribe.<sup>73</sup> One simply has to look in current newspapers or websites to be reminded that major charitable gifts are commonly made in the form of oversized cheques (printed with photo opportunities in mind), rather than as wads of used notes stuffed into a manila envelope. This highly demonstrative, ceremonial use of money for gifts is a deep-rooted phenomenon, yet it jars with modern sensitivities about the corrupting power of money. If all things can be made to dance to the chink of coins, then money threatens to undercut the very fabric of family, friendship and civil society.<sup>74</sup> Karl Marx called attention to this universalising quality of money in 1844, leaning on a passage of Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* about gold, the "yellow slave" who could "make black white, foul fair, wrong right, base noble, old young, coward valiant."<sup>75</sup> Broadly similar ideas have had a powerful influence on subsequent sociological and anthropological thought. Georg Simmel in *Philosophie des Geldes (The Philosophy of Money)* accepted money's erosion of traditional morality but emphasised its role in building networks and expanding social flexibility,<sup>76</sup> while Marcel Mauss construed the societies of ancient and distant lands, characterised by a strong element of giving, as a mirror to the over-rationalised and monetised society of early-twentieth-century Europe: "fortunately, everything is still not wholly categorised in terms of buying and selling ... it is our western societies which have recently made man an 'economic animal'".<sup>77</sup> On this basis, an influential set of articles in the 1950s by Paul Bohannan outlined the insidious effects the introduction of money had on traditional forms of exchange in Nigeria.<sup>78</sup> These views (characterised by Viviana Zelizer as "hostile worlds") effectively constitute the traditional reading of modern monetisation. Yet they are just one of many possible developments prompted by money. Zelizer herself has shown that even one of the most quintessentially capitalistic societies of modern times (the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) still made extensive use of specialised ways of storing, presenting and conceptualising money which undercut its supposedly corrosive power,<sup>79</sup> while Webb Keane has made an intriguing case that the abstracted view of money which gained currency in the writings of Marx, Simmel and Mauss was itself the product of a particular cultural complex, shaped by Protestant social morality.<sup>80</sup> He has also stressed that the cultural bouquet of money depended upon the soil in which it grew, and hence varied between individual societies.<sup>81</sup> There was no guarantee that it would come to overshadow everything.

<sup>73</sup> J. L. Nelson, "Munera," *Les élites et la richesse au haut Moyen Âge*, ed. Régine Le Jan, Laurent Feller and Jean-Pierre Devroey (Turnhout 2010) 383–401; Rory Naismith, "Payments for land and privilege in Anglo-Saxon England," *Anglo-Saxon England* 41 (2012) 277–342, at 299–301

<sup>74</sup> Webb Keane, "Market, materiality and moral metalanguage," *Anthropological Theory* 8 (2008) 27–42, at 28–30; Viviana Zelizer, *The Social Meaning of Money* (New York 1994) 6–12; Viviana Zelizer, *The Purchase of Intimacy* (Princeton 2005) 20–35.

<sup>75</sup> Karl Marx, "The power of money in bourgeois society," *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, trans. Martin Milligan (Moscow 1959) 165–169; William Shakespeare, *Timon of Athens*, Act IV, scene 3, lines 27–33.

<sup>76</sup> Georg Simmel, *The Philosophy of Money*, trans. Tom Bottomore, David Frisby and Kaethe Mengelberg (Boston and London 1978).

<sup>77</sup> "Heureusement, tout n'est pas encore classé exclusivement en termes d'achat et de vente ... Ce sont nos sociétés d'Occident qui ont, très récemment, fait de l'homme un 'animal économique'." Mauss, *Gift* (n. 54 above) 65, 76 (Mauss, "Essai sur le don" (n. 54 above) 160, 176).

<sup>78</sup> Paul Bohannan, "Some principles of exchange and investment among the Tiv," *American Anthropologist* 57 (1955) 60–69; Paul Bohannan, "The impact of money on an African subsistence economy," *Journal of Economic History* 19 (1959) 491–503.

<sup>79</sup> Zelizer, *Social Meaning* (n. 74 above). For elaboration of the principle in other areas, see her *Economic Lives: How Culture Shapes the Economy* (Princeton 2011).

<sup>80</sup> Keane, "Market, materiality" (n. 74 above) 37–38.

<sup>81</sup> Keane, "Market, materiality" (n. 74 above); Webb Keane, "Money is no object: materiality, desire, and modernity in an Indonesian society," *The Empire of Things: Regimes of Value and Material Culture*, ed. Fred R.

The crucial issue, therefore, is the role money played in the age of the Forum hoard. “Hostile worlds” are conspicuously absent from monetary exchanges in the early Middle Ages. Money appeared in all sorts of contexts, including payments of a highly personal or spiritual nature. It could reflect the bond between man and lord, as when a tenth-century English charter states that “I Edmund . . . have given 15 hides by free donation to a certain loyal thegn of mine named Wulfric, for his amiable obedience and for his pleasing payment which he gave to me out of the deference of his devotion.”<sup>82</sup> In the laws of post-Roman kingdoms, monetary compensation was central to maintenance of social order, with every part of the body from the toenail to the hair rated.<sup>83</sup> Monetary estimates of society extended beyond legal discourse: King Cnut, writing to his new kingdom in about 1020, addressed his bishops and earls as well as all “men of 1200-shilling wergild and 200-shilling wergild.”<sup>84</sup> Most relevant for present purposes is the deep penetration of money into religious exchanges. Kings might give land to a church “freely for the Lord,” but in the same breath “because [the bishop] also won me over with an appropriate price.”<sup>85</sup> Examples are legion, but one more illustrative case serves to demonstrate how thoroughly money permeated clerical as well as secular society. Aldred, provost of Chester-Le-Street in the mid-tenth century, felt no qualms about blending monetary and spiritual reasons for his work in glossing the Latin text of one of the most celebrated works of Anglo-Saxon manuscript art, the Lindisfarne Gospels. He added a colophon at the end of the scriptural text explaining why he had undertaken to add an Old English gloss, and divided his motivations into as many texts as he had worked on: he said he had glossed Matthew for God and for St Cuthbert and Mark for the bishop, but he glossed Luke for the community itself and for an advance of eight oras of silver with which to pay his entry fee (*to inlade*), and John for his own soul and for four oras of silver to give to God and St Cuthbert.<sup>86</sup>

Aldred’s casual references to monetary payments in return for scribal and devotional services find parallels as far back as the Bible itself.<sup>87</sup> Readers of the Bible encountered two

---

Myers (Santa Fe 2001) 65–90. See also Jonathan Parry and Maurice Bloch, eds., *Money and the Morality of Exchange* (Cambridge 1989); David Akin and Joel Robbins (ed.), *Money and Modernity: State and Local Currencies in Melanesia* (Pittsburgh 1999); another medieval case-study is Miller, *Bloodtaking and Peacemaking* (n. 43 above) 94–96.

<sup>82</sup> “Ego Eadmundus . . . cuidam fideli meo ministro uocitato nomine Wulfrico, pro eius amabili obedientia eiusque placabili pecunia quam mihi in sue deuotionis obsequio detulit, xv mansas libenter largiendo donauit”: Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (n. 11 above) no. 471; ed. Susan Kelly, *Charters of Abingdon Abbey*, 2 vols. (Oxford 2000–2001) no. 33. For context see Naismith, “Payments for land,” esp. 295–301; Rory Naismith, “The Economy of *Beowulf*,” *Old English Philology: Studies in Honor of R. D. Fulk*, ed. Leonard Neidorf, Rafael J. Pasqual and Tom Shippey (Woodbridge forthcoming).

<sup>83</sup> The logic of this system is elegantly explored in William Ian Miller, *Eye for an Eye* (Cambridge 2004).

<sup>84</sup> “Twelfhynd 7 twyhynde”: Cnut’s 1019–20 letter, c. 1, ed. Felix Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle 1903–1916) vol. 1, 273.

<sup>85</sup> “Libenter pro domino . . . eo quod ipse etiam pretio approbato a me conquirebat”: Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (n. 11 above) no. 54; ed. Walter de Grey Birch, *Cartularium Saxonum: a Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, 4 vols. (London 1883–1899) no. 116. The charter allegedly dates to 706, recording a grant by Æthelweard, *subregulus* of the Hwicce, to St Mary’s, Evesham. The text as it stands is not entirely an authentic document of the early eighth century, though draws on material of that period.

<sup>86</sup> London, British Library, Cotton MS Nero D.iv (Lindisfarne 687×689, with gloss of s. x<sup>3/4</sup>) fol. 259r. For text, translation and context see Michelle P. Brown, *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe* (London 2003) 92–104; further context includes Lawrence Nees, “Reading Aldred’s colophon for the Lindisfarne Gospels,” *Speculum* 78 (2003) 333–377; Jane Roberts, “Aldred signs off from glossing the Lindisfarne Gospels,” *Writing and Texts in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (Cambridge 2006) 28–43.

<sup>87</sup> Linda Georgianna, “Love so dearly bought: the terms of redemption in *The Canterbury Tales*,” *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 12 (1990) 85–116, at 87–93.

principal messages relating to the theme of giving.<sup>88</sup> One was that of selfless and unostentatious distribution of wealth – the model advocated in passages such as Matthew 6:4: “that thy alms may be in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret will repay thee.”<sup>89</sup> The other was the redemptive power of giving: the idea that each penny given was another penny added to the donor’s treasure in heaven (*thesaurus in caelo*, according to Matthew 6:20).<sup>90</sup> Theoretically these two ideas were not mutually exclusive. But the deeply embedded precedents of Greco-Roman donative traditions associated with patronage and euergetism fostered more demonstrative, public-oriented giving, with the result that early Christian society (and its medieval successor) placed more emphasis on redemptive, often public, donation rather than private gifts.<sup>91</sup> This aspect of Christian giving invited comparison with the back and forth of commercial life, intimately familiar to Jews, early Christians and pagans alike. In Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians, he famously told the Christians of the city that “you are bought with a great price.”<sup>92</sup> These words reverberated through subsequent centuries. Prosper of Aquitaine (d. c. 455) reminded his audience that “you have been bought, and you ought to pay the price of yourself, insofar as you can, so that by paying it you may become richer,”<sup>93</sup> and Pope Leo I (440–461) cast the almsgiver as a creditor to God: “long for the just profit of mercy, and pursue trade for a gain that lasts forever.”<sup>94</sup> When discussing in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos* a variant reading of Psalm 70:15 (*quoniam non cognovi negotiationes*),<sup>95</sup> St Augustine carefully explained that it was devotion to excessive profit and lying or blaspheming in aid of it which put the soul of the trader in danger, for “if I lie, I am the liar, not the trade ... if I am wicked, it is not trade that makes me so, but my own iniquity.”<sup>96</sup> The venerable Bede later likened a beloved female saint to a gold coin (*aureum ... nomisma*).<sup>97</sup> What St Augustine and various liturgical texts labelled “sacred commerce” (*commercium veneranda sanctorum*) or similar was thus hard-wired into Christianity from its earliest years,<sup>98</sup> and went hand-in-hand with Christian conceptions of giving.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>88</sup> These and their interplay are elaborated in Bronwen Neil, “Models of gift giving in the preaching of Leo the Great,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18 (2010) 225–259.

<sup>89</sup> “Ut sit elemosyna tua in abscondito et Pater tuus qui videt in abscondito reddet tibi.”

<sup>90</sup> See now the eloquent exposition of the subject in Peter Brown, *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity* (Cambridge MA 2015) 20–33.

<sup>91</sup> Neil, “Models of gift giving”. A major dimension of Greco-Roman giving (civic euergetism) is considered in Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, trans. Brian Pearce (London 1990).

<sup>92</sup> “Empti enim estis pro pretio magno”: I Cor. 6:20.

<sup>93</sup> “Emptus enim es pretiumque tui resolvere fas est, qua potes, ut solvens sis ditior”: Prosper of Aquitaine, *De providentia Dei*, lines 507–8, ed. Miroslav Marcovich, *Prosper of Aquitaine: De providentia Dei* (Leiden 1989) 36–37).

<sup>94</sup> “Concupisce iustum misericordiae lucrum, et aeterni quaestus sectare commercium”: Leo I, *Sermones* 17, 2, ed. Antoine Chavasse, *Sancti Leonis Magni Romani Pontificis Tractatus septem et nonaginta*, Corpus Christianorum series latina 138 (Turnhout 1973) 69. Cf. Neil, “Models of gift giving” (n. 88 above) 243.

<sup>95</sup> “Quoniam non cognovi litteraturas” is the reading now generally accepted (cf. ed. Weber *et al.*, *Biblia sacra* (n. 14 above) 856–857): Augustine himself noted that different copies of the Psalms varied on this reading, and offered comment on both.

<sup>96</sup> “Sed si mentior, ego mentior, non negotium ... si malus fuero, non negotiatio mihi facit, sed iniquitas mea”: Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 70, 17, ed. Eligius Dekkers and Johannes Fraipont, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 3 vols., Corpus Christianorum series Latina 38–40 (Turnhout 1956) vol. 2, 955.

<sup>97</sup> Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* III, 8, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford 1969) 238–239. Cf. Isabel Moreira, *Heaven’s Purgate: Purgatory in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 2010) 172.

<sup>98</sup> St Augustine, *Erfurt Sermon* 3, 3, ed. Isabella Schiller, Dorothea Weber and Clemens Weidmann, “Sechs neue Augustinus-Predigten. Teil 2 mit Edition dreier Sermones zum Thema Almosen,” *Wiener Studien* 122 (2009) 171–213, at 196. See also Ganz, “Giving to God” (n. 26 above) 25; Arnold Angenendt *et al.*, “Counting piety in the early and high Middle Ages,” *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, ed. Bernhard Jussen (Philadelphia 2001) 15–54, at 18–20; for larger

The place occupied by the language of commerce and exchange – including money – at the core of Christian belief is symptomatic of why early medieval Christians were so comfortable using money and monetary terminology for interpersonal and religious purposes. Accusations of simony could still arise when the influence of money was felt to loom inappropriately large,<sup>100</sup> as when the papacy charged newly elected Anglo-Saxon archbishops exorbitant sums for the *pallium* early in the eleventh century,<sup>101</sup> but on the whole there was a high degree of tolerance. Money was not vilified as a cancerous element which had to be staved off from proper expressions of faith and communal solidarity. If anything quite the opposite: calculative exchange, including use of money, was generally expected to march to the beat of what modern scholarship would identify as non-calculative, domestic or (in Weberian terms) substantive principles, intertwined with Christian teachings.<sup>102</sup> Buying and selling in the early Middle Ages were expected to follow social and moral as well as economic principles: choosing with whom and how to do business was governed as much by social obligation as who offered the best deal. In practice money and commerce still offered the potential for tension and exploitation, tempered by the general conditions of early medieval economic systems.<sup>103</sup> The bazaar economy studied by Clifford Geertz in twentieth-century north Africa offers certain points of comparison, in that stable clientship and customary patterns of buying and selling helped users navigate a complex system.<sup>104</sup> In much of earlier medieval Europe such mechanisms would often have been a matter of necessity due to the comparatively small scale of society, rather than a result of being spoiled for choice. Supply of coin varied dramatically between regions, but even in the most monetised areas, the monetary economy was at low ebb in the early Middle Ages compared to classical or later medieval conditions.<sup>105</sup> A large proportion of the population probably used coin sometimes, but far from frequently. Relative scarcity of cash is one factor which (in modern contexts) limits the impact of money on other aspects of society, and also contributes to its absorption into pre-existing social norms or *habitus*.<sup>106</sup> Prices, for example, were often seemingly established by custom and consensus. Two young monks in a mock colloquy from early

---

dimensions, Martin F. Herz, *Sacrum commercium: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der Römischen Liturgiesprache* (Munich 1958).

<sup>99</sup> Peter Brown, “From *patriae amator* to *amator pauperum* and back again: social imagination and social change in the West between Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, ca. 300–600,” *Cultures in Motion*, ed. Daniel T. Rodgers, Bhavani Raman and Helmut Reimitz (Princeton 2013) 87–106, 303–306, at 98–101; see also Brown, *Ransom of the Soul* (n. 90 above).

<sup>100</sup> Or rather, more correctly, of “simoniacal heresy” (*simoniaca haeresis*); simony (*simonia*) only emerged as a reified term in the eleventh century: Hans Meier-Welcker, “Die Simonie im frühen Mittelalter. Begriff und Erscheinung in ihrer Entwicklung von der Spätantike bis zum Investiturstreit,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 64 (1952–3) 61–93, esp. 64 and 73 on terminology; see also A. Leinz, *Die Simonie: eine kanonistische Studie* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1902).

<sup>101</sup> Francesca Tinti, “The archiepiscopal *pallium* in late Anglo-Saxon England,” *England and Rome*, ed. Tinti (n. 4 above) 307–342, at 329–330.

<sup>102</sup> Pierre Bourdieu, *Practical Reason: on the Theory of Action* (Cambridge 1998) 104–105; the medieval manifestation of this (and its transformation around the time of the French Revolution) is developed in Jacques Le Goff, *Money and the Middle Ages: an Essay in Historical Anthropology*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge 2012).

<sup>103</sup> See further Rory Naismith, “The social significance of monetization in the early Middle Ages,” *Past & Present* 223 (2014) 3–39, at 30–37.

<sup>104</sup> Clifford Geertz, “The bazaar economy: information and search in peasant marketing,” *American Economic Review* 68 (1978) 28–32; Clifford Geertz, “Suq: the bazaar economy in Sefrou,” *Meaning and Order in Moroccan Society: Three Essays in Cultural Analysis*, ed. Clifford Geertz and Lawrence Rosen (Cambridge 1979) 123–244.

<sup>105</sup> Rory Naismith, *Money and Power in Anglo-Saxon England: the Southern English Kingdoms 757–865* (Cambridge 2012) 252–292.

<sup>106</sup> Keane, “Money is No Object” (n. 81 above) 76–77. For larger dimensions of this problem in the early Middle Ages see Naismith, “Social significance,” (n. 103 above).



eleventh-century Canterbury haggled over the price of a book, one offering it for two pounds but eventually settling for 12 mancuses (i.e. 360d rather than 480d) because the buyer insisted that he wanted “to be careful and buy your book at the right price – at the price my friends will tell me its worth.”<sup>107</sup> Prices, even of basic commodities, hence often proved remarkably stable.<sup>108</sup> The ideal illustrated in religious *exempla* was one of stability and subordination of economic concerns to Christian morality, encapsulated effectively in a miracle story told by Peter Damian (d. 1072/3). The story praised a couple from Milan who at Lake Bolsena lost a purse of money needed to support a pilgrimage to Rome. They tightened their belts and persevered in the face of adversity. On their way back they stopped to buy a fish from a fisherman at the same lake, and the husband calmly accepted the fisherman’s request to pay 15 rather than 12 pence, without protracted haggling. At last God redressed their losses when the missing purse was found in the stomach of the fish they bought.<sup>109</sup> Thrift, patience and a reluctance to take advantage of others was what brought divine favor, itself in the form of a purse of coin.

Giving a gift in cash was in no way an exceptional, or exceptionable, act in the early Middle Ages. In fact, it offered certain advantages. Other items that were given as gifts and expected to be kept typically had to undergo a process of “conversion” as they moved from one owner and context to another.<sup>110</sup> In the course of this the donor’s wishes and the prior history of the object could easily become clouded. But “conversion” was inherent in money. If used for distribution to *pauperes* as alms, for instance,<sup>111</sup> a group of coins went from the realm of earthly treasure and commerce to that of heavenly treasure and commerce, redounding to the spiritual benefit of the donor as it did so – and in short order those alms would make the opposite transition as the recipients spent them.<sup>112</sup> Gifts of money represented a short-term material method of generating long-term spiritual gain.<sup>113</sup> Movement of money between different orders of exchange by means of some sort of sanitising process is a pattern that can be traced in societies early and modern across long stretches of time and

---

<sup>107</sup> “Cautus volo esse, et sic tuum librum emere sicut rectum est et sicut mei amici dicent mihi quanti pretii dignus sit”: Ælfric Bata, *Colloquia* 24, ed. Scott Gwara and trans. David W. Porter, *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: the Colloquies of Ælfric Bata* (Woodbridge 1997) 134–137.

<sup>108</sup> David L. Farmer, “Price and wages,” *The Agrarian History of England and Wales. Vol. 2: 1042–1350*, ed. H. E. Hallam (Cambridge 1988) 715–817, at 716–717. This stability might be argued to reflect similarly stable money supply, population and agricultural output (Edward Miller and John Hatcher, *Medieval England: Towns, Commerce and Crafts, 1086–1348* (London 1995) 141–143), as well as monetary conditions of traditional peasant societies (Mary Douglas, “Primitive rationing,” *Themes in Economic Anthropology*, ed. Raymond Firth (London 1967) 119–147, at 143–145).

<sup>109</sup> Peter Damian, *Epistolae* 169, ed. Kurt Reindel, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani* 4, MGH *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 4.4 (Munich 1993) 249.

<sup>110</sup> Buc, “Conversion of objects” (n. 51 above) 99–111.

<sup>111</sup> The literature on the evolution of almsgiving in this period is large: for a recent representative selection see Angenendt *et al.*, “Counting piety” (n. 98 above) 20–38; Gary A. Anderson, “Redeem your sins by the giving of alms: sin, debt, and the ‘treasury of merit’ in early Jewish and Christian tradition,” *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007) 39–69; Eric Shuler, “Caesarius of Arles and the development of the ecclesiastical tithe: from a theology of almsgiving to practical obligations,” *Traditio* 67 (2012) 43–69; Moreira, *Heaven’s Purge* (n. 97 above); Claire Sotinel, *Church and Society in Late Antique Italy and Beyond* (Farnham 2010); Richard Damian Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 2008); Thomas Sternberg, *Orientalium more secutus: Räume und Institutionen der Caritas des 5. bis 7. Jahrhunderts in Gallien* (Münster 1991).

<sup>112</sup> Brown, “From *amator patriae*” (n. 99 above) 99.

<sup>113</sup> The same was true of food, which was also often (indeed probably more frequently than coin) given out as alms to support the poor: Naismith, *Money and Power* (n. 105 above) 283–284. Tithes and other Church dues were often used for the support of the poor: in addition to the references at n. 109 above, see also Francesca Tinti, “The ‘costs’ of pastoral care: church dues in late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Francesca Tinti (Woodbridge 2005) 27–51.

distance.<sup>114</sup> Some coins were marked out specifically for such usages – both Anglo-Saxon and Frankish specimens inscribed as almspieces survive – though this was rare,<sup>115</sup> and usually parcels of regular currency were used, as the expectation was that the coins would soon be spent or melted down. As stressed above, the emphasis fell on the act of presentation itself and hence on elements of ceremonial and display. The specific circumstances of the Forum hoard may have made a cash gift particularly appropriate. Theodred was a visitor from afar, who probably did not anticipate making a return trip or building up a long-term relationship with the pope. Thus a gift which maximised the impact of his probably brief visit, with a strong emphasis on its presentational dimension, was eminently suitable.

We have ventured far from the Forum hoard itself, but returned to it in closing. This remarkable find stands in for a large, perhaps very large, dimension of gift-giving which has almost entirely perished physically, and can only be reconstructed from the echoes left in writing. The Forum hoard exemplifies how contemporaries would mark out gifts to emphasise their role in acts of donation; some items might be kept thereafter as a memento of the occasion, but not the Forum hoard. Consisting of cash, distribution soon after delivery was surely its intended fate. In this way the hoard bears witness to the flexible attitudes towards money current in late antique and early medieval Europe, which left no impediment to coin featuring in genuine and well-received gifts – even to the pope. There were of course limits to the reach of money. It was quite acceptable as the stuff of gift-giving as well as commerce, but there were areas where neither was welcome, such as (sometimes) the acquisition of clerical position: gifts, monetary or otherwise, in such settings verged on simony.<sup>116</sup> Signals of more serious and widespread hesitation about the place of money in the life of the Church came in the eleventh century, as simony became a central concern of the reforming papacy, and a flashpoint for conflicts with rulers and clergy elsewhere in Europe.<sup>117</sup> Hermits and monastic reformers of the same period also treated cash with caution, some going so far as to reject any and all contact with the taint of coin because of its association with earthly wealth.<sup>118</sup> One reason for the sharper concern with the role of money in the Church in these years was the growth in volume and use of coin across much of western Europe, but this was just one among several developments playing into polarisation of views on money. It is also important to stress that outlooks did not change overnight or at an even pace. The attitudes sketched here persisted into and long after the eleventh century. Even those at the heart of the renewed angst over simony still allowed that gifts to the Church could and should take place, though their return ought to take place in heaven rather than on earth.<sup>119</sup> Not all central medieval ecclesiastical institutions distanced themselves from money; neither did the flow of monetary gift-giving end completely, or the subordination of commercial exchange to religious and social morality. The early Middle Ages were not an

---

<sup>114</sup> Maurice Bloch and Jonathan Parry, “Introduction: money and the morality of exchange,” *Money and the Morality of Exchange*, ed. Parry and Bloch, (n. 81 above) 1–32, at 23–30.

<sup>115</sup> Michael Dolley, “The so-called piedforts of Alfred the Great,” *Numismatic Chronicle* 6th ser., vol. 14 (1954) 76–92; Karl F. Morrison and Henry Grunthal, *Carolingian Coinage* (New York 1967) no. 53.

<sup>116</sup> Wickham, “Conclusion” (n. 21 above) 252–254; Nelson, “*Munera*” (n. 73 above).

<sup>117</sup> Timothy Reuter, “Gifts and simony,” *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther Cohen and Mayke de Jong (Leiden 2000) 157–168; Paul Fouracre, “The use of the term *beneficium* in Frankish sources: a society based on favours?,” *Languages of Gift*, ed. Davies and Fouracre (n. 21 above) 62–88, at 84–88; Chris Wickham, “Compulsory gift exchange in Lombard Italy, 650–1150,” *Languages of Gift*, ed. Davies and Fouracre (n. 21 above) 193–216, at 213–215; Charles West, “Competing for the Holy Spirit: Humbert of Moyenmoutier and the question of simony,” *Compétition et sacré au haut Moyen Âge: entre médiation et exclusion*, ed. Philippe Depreux, François Bougard and Régine Le Jan (Turnhout 2015) 347–360.

<sup>118</sup> For more detail on these themes, see Rory Naismith, “Turpe lucrum? Wealth, money and coinage in the millennial Church,” *Money and the Church in Medieval Europe, 1000–1200: Practice, Morality and Thought*, ed. Svein H. Gullbekk and Giles E. M. Gasper (Farnham 2015) 17–37.

<sup>119</sup> Reuter, “Gifts and simony” (n. 117 above) 164–166.

exotic realm in which gift-giving compensated for economic backwardness.<sup>120</sup> Yet the age of greatest freedom and lavishness in mingling coin and devotion was beginning to give way.

---

<sup>120</sup> Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Francia and Polynesia: rethinking anthropological approaches," *Negotiating the Gift*, ed. Algazi, Groebner and Jussen (n. 21 above) 361–379; Wickham, "Conclusion" (n. 21 above) 259–260.