

Money, accounting and trust beyond personal relationships

Juan Seguro

Core question

How did units of account, transferable value and coinage allow obligations to be compared and settled beyond face-to-face relationships?

Historical and evolutionary context

Money did not appear in a single moment, and coinage was not the beginning of quantified exchange. Mesopotamian administrations used weighed silver, grain and other commodities as units of account long before minted coins. Written accounts could express debts and equivalences without a coin changing hands. Coinage, emerging in western Anatolia and the Greek world in the first millennium BCE, later created a portable object whose weight and authority were publicly signalled.

The historical transition therefore has several layers: accounting units, denominated obligations, weighed media, institutional guarantees and eventually coined money. Different regions combined these elements differently.

Coinage itself also has more than one history. Struck coin traditions developed in the eastern Mediterranean, while coin traditions also emerged independently in China; for South Asia, the degree of independence from Achaemenid and Greek influences remains debated. A global history of money therefore has to distinguish the invention of particular coin technologies from the much older and wider problem of representing obligations, value and trust.

What could communities know before this transition?

Reciprocity, barter, tribute and debt could coordinate exchange. Yet value was often embedded in relationships and local conventions. Comparing unlike obligations across strangers, institutions and long distances was harder.

What changed?

Units of account created a common numerical language for obligations. Coinage added a compact, transferable object authorised by a political community. Accounting records made balances inspectable across time. Together these practices allowed value claims to circulate beyond personal memory and immediate trust.

Why could this capability emerge?

Large administrations, taxes, military pay, markets and legal institutions created recurring problems of equivalence. Standard weights and writing were important preconditions, but the development of money was not a simple technological consequence of either.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Monetised accounting supported taxation, commercial calculation, credit and eventually more abstract financial instruments. It also encouraged new forms of quantitative comparison between heterogeneous goods and services.

New limits and risks

A numerical price can look more objective than the institutions that create it. Monetisation can widen exchange while also deepening debt dependence, inequality and fiscal control. Coin finds are also an uneven proxy for the full monetary economy.

What changed in the architecture of human knowledge?

Societies gained a **portable calculus of obligation**. Value could be recorded, transferred and compared using conventions shared by people who did not know one another personally.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

The word “money” covers historically different arrangements. It is misleading to say that Greeks simply invented money, or that coinage replaced all earlier forms. The better historical question is which monetary functions were bundled together in each society.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-014 Cuneiform accounting, writing and external memory
- INDIRECT ← PIO-012 Wheel, axle and transport
- DIRECT ← PIO-015 Weights, measures and standards
- INDIRECT ← PIO-016 Laws, contracts and institutional memory
- INDIRECT ← PIO-021 Roads, logistics and organised information
- INDIRECT → PIO-056 Probability, censuses and error: Pascal to Quetelet

References

1. Schaps, D. M. *The Invention of Coinage and the Monetization of Ancient Greece*. University of Michigan Press (2003). <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17760>
2. Peacock, M. S. Accounting for money: the legal presuppositions of money and accounting in ancient Greece. *Business History* 55, 280–301 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2012.704513>
3. Hudson, M. The archaeology of money: debt versus barter theories of money's origins. In Wray, L. R. (ed.), *Credit and State Theories of Money*. Edward Elgar (2004).