The History of Selling Silver: How the Metal Was Weighed, Tested, Priced, Traded, and Sold for 5,000 Years

A global history of silver markets, from weighed bullion and stamped coin to hallmarks, futures, ETFs, and online dealers

AllMetalPrices.com

August 23, 2026

Abstract

Silver has been sold for thousands of years, but never as one uniform product. Ancient merchants traded weighed fragments; mints turned refined metal into countable coins; assay offices certified plate and jewelry; colonial states taxed bars and coin; industrial buyers purchased silver for its physical properties; and modern investors trade futures or shares whose value refers to metal held elsewhere. This paper follows the commercial problem running through those changes: how a seller proved what the silver was, how much fine metal it contained, who had authority to certify it, and which price applied. Its central argument is that the history of selling silver is a succession of verification systems. Scales, mint marks, touchstones, hallmarks, assays, warehouse warrants, benchmark auctions, exchange rules, and vault records each made a different form of silver legible to buyers. Those systems widened markets, but they also redistributed power among miners, states, merchants, refiners, guilds, banks, and exchanges. The result is not a straight path from barter to a single global spot price. It is a five-thousand-year history of competing products, prices, and institutions built around the same difficult metal.

Direct answer. People have sold silver for at least five millennia. At first it changed hands mainly by weight. Coinage made selected pieces countable; hallmarks made finished objects easier to trust; imperial mints and long-distance merchants connected regional markets; and modern benchmarks, futures, bullion banking, and exchange-traded products made the *price exposure* to silver easier to sell than the metal itself. Across every period, the decisive commercial question remained the same: **what exactly is being sold, and who will stand behind that description?**

Key findings

1. **Silver did not begin as a coin.** In early Near Eastern economies it could be a unit of account, a debt obligation, or weighed metal in rings, coils, ingots, and fragments (Powell 1996; Grierson 1977).
2. **Coinage reduced verification costs without abolishing assay.** A trustworthy stamp allowed accepted pieces to pass by count, but worn, foreign, clipped, or suspicious coins still returned to the scale and test (Bresson 2016; Burnett 1987).
3. **Worked silver required a different market.** A cup or spoon combined recoverable metal, workmanship, fashion, provenance, and legal marks. Hallmarking attached responsibility to makers and assay offices, improving consumer protection while also regulating entry into the trade (Goldsmiths' Company 2026; British Hallmarking Council 2022).
4. **The early modern silver trade was global but not governed by one world price.** Merchants earned money from differences among regional exchange rates, mint rules, tax systems, transport costs, and purchasing power (Flynn 2015; Irigoin 2020).
5. **Demonetization changed what miners were selling.** Once states no longer promised unlimited conversion of bullion into full legal-tender coin, silver producers faced a commodity market more exposed to industrial demand, investor appetite, and public policy (Friedman 1992; Silber 2019).
6. **A modern "silver price" is only a reference point.** A wholesale bar, a futures contract, a retail coin, a sterling fork, a rare dollar, and a bag of photographic scrap can all contain silver while selling at materially different prices.

A five-thousand-year timeline of selling silver

Period	Common saleable form	How buyers checked it	Typical basis of price
Fourth–third millennia BCE	Rings, coils, ingots, fragments, worked objects	Balance scales, weights, visual inspection, counterparty reputation	Weight units; local accounting conventions
Seventh–sixth centuries BCE	Stamped electrum, gold, and silver coins	Mint type, weight, sound, test cuts, occasional assay	Denomination plus confidence in the issuing authority
Fifth–fourth centuries BCE	Athenian and other civic silver coinages	Familiar designs, weight standards, money changers	Count for accepted coin; weight or discount for doubtful coin

Period	Common saleable form	How buyers checked it	Typical basis of price
Roman Republic and Empire	Denarii, provincial coin, plate, bullion	Imperial image, denomination, weight, fineness, exchange practice	Face value within fiscal systems; bullion value at edges
Seventh–tenth centuries CE	Islamic dirhams, ingots, ornaments, hacksilver	Scales, cuts, pecks, coin type, fineness knowledge	Count and weight used side by side
High and late Middle Ages	Pennies, gros, florins, plate, bullion	Money changers, mint standards, assays, merchant reputation	Local money of account, exchange rates, metal content
From 1300 in England	Hallmarked silverware	Maker or sponsor mark, assay-office mark, fineness standard	Metal, labor, design, retail margin, tax
Sixteenth–eighteenth centuries	Mine output, tax bars, Spanish American pesos, Japanese silver	Colonial assays, mint marks, weight, fineness, merchant networks	Mint price, exchange rate, freight, tax, regional purchasing power
Nineteenth century	Coin, bullion, plate, industrial feedstock	National mints, refiners, assay offices, commercial banks	Legal monetary ratios increasingly replaced by commodity prices
1897 onward	London wholesale bullion	Broker benchmark, approved bars, vault and clearing practices	London benchmark plus location, credit, and delivery terms
Twentieth century	Futures, industrial contracts, bullion coins, scrap	Exchange specifications, laboratory assay, brand, chain of custody	Spot/futures references plus fabrication or refining adjustments
Twenty-first century	Bars, coins, scrap, online listings, ETP shares	XRF and fire assay, serials, dealer reputation, platform records, vault lists	Reference price plus premium, spread, fees, condition, and liquidity

Introduction: Silver Has Never Had Only One Market

A seller entering a modern precious-metals shop may bring a tray of flatware, a one-kilogram bar, a bag of old coins, and a bracelet stamped “925.” All four lots contain silver. They are not the same commercial product. The bar can be quoted against a bullion reference price. The flatware must be sorted by fineness and weighed without knives or other components that may contain steel. The coins may be worth more as collectibles—or less, if damaged—than their metal content suggests. The bracelet has a stated standard, but the buyer still has to decide whether the mark is genuine and how much non-silver material is present. A single spot-price number does not answer those questions.

The same difficulty appears throughout silver’s history. A miner sold ore or concentrate, not immediately usable bullion. A refiner sold an assay and a bar as much as metal. A mint accepted

bullion under rules governing fineness, charges, and legal-tender status. A money changer valued coins whose official denominations did not always match their metallic content. A silversmith sold design and labor attached to recoverable metal. A merchant shipping pesos across an ocean sold at a price shaped by freight, credit, war risk, exchange rates, and the demand for Asian goods. A twentieth-century manufacturer bought conductivity, reflectivity, photosensitivity, or antimicrobial properties. An investor buying an exchange-traded share acquires a security interest whose economic behavior refers to silver but whose possession, fees, and redemption mechanics differ from holding a bar.

That variety explains why “the history of the silver price” and “the history of selling silver” are related but not identical subjects. A price series selects a unit—often a currency amount per troy ounce—and attempts to compare values over time. A commercial history asks what qualified for that quote, who could trade at it, where delivery occurred, how purity was known, and what deductions separated the reference price from cash in the seller’s hand. For long stretches of history, there was no continuously published spot price. There were local mint prices, coin tariffs, money-of-account conventions, gold–silver ratios, exchange rates, wholesale bargains, and retail prices for objects. Even when numbers can be reconstructed, they should not be mistaken for one frictionless world market.

This paper uses **saleability** as its organizing idea. Silver becomes saleable when a buyer can identify the product well enough to quote it. Four facts usually need to be made credible: weight, fineness, ownership, and deliverability. A fifth fact—historical or artistic identity—matters when the object may be worth more than melt. Different institutions made those facts legible in different ways. Scales converted irregular pieces into weight. Mints placed a public claim on coins. Test cuts, touchstones, cupellation, and later laboratory instruments challenged that claim. Hallmarks linked a manufactured object to a maker and assay office. Colonial bureaucracies created tax stamps and mint records. Approved-refiner lists, warehouse warrants, futures rules, benchmark procedures, and vault reports perform analogous work in modern wholesale markets.

Calling these arrangements **verification systems** does not mean that they were impartial. A mint could debase coin. A hallmarking regime could protect buyers while reinforcing guild privilege. Colonial assays could make bullion trustworthy for imperial commerce while sitting atop forced labor and mercury pollution. An exchange could improve standardization while excluding material that fell outside approved brands, locations, or contract sizes. Trust lowered transaction costs, but the authority to define trustworthy silver was itself valuable.

The result was neither a steady march toward efficiency nor a simple replacement of old practices. Ancient weighing survives in every scrap counter. Coin types remain decisive in numismatic trade. Medieval habits of accepting foreign coin by weight recur whenever official money crosses a boundary. Hallmarks still matter to auction houses and households. The modern wholesale market continues to rely on bars that are physically weighed, sampled, marked, stored, and transferred. Digital screens have accelerated quotation; they have not abolished metal.

1. Before Coinage: Silver by Weight, Contract, and Reputation

No surviving document records the first sale of silver. Archaeology instead reveals a long transition in which silver objects, fragments, and accounting units became embedded in exchange. In Mesopotamia, obligations could be denominated in silver even when settlement occurred in barley, wool, labor, or another good. The shekel was a weight before it was the name of a coin. Silver therefore operated in

more than one register: an actual substance, a standard used to express value, and a future obligation written into a contract (Powell 1996).

When metal changed hands, shape did not guarantee value. Silver might appear as a ring, coil, lump, ingot, vessel, or clipped fragment. The transaction required a scale, a set of accepted weights, and confidence that the object was substantially what it appeared to be. If alloy or surface treatment was suspected, the seller faced a discount or a more invasive test. The repeated need to weigh made exchange slower than counting standardized pieces, but it also made the system adaptable. Almost any form could be converted into a commercial quantity if the parties agreed on weight and quality.

Credit complicated the picture in a productive way. A merchant did not always need silver in hand to conduct a transaction denominated in it. Written obligations allowed the metal to function as a measure across time. That arrangement widened trade, but it shifted verification from the object to the contract and the solvency of the debtor. A promised shekel was not identical to a weighed shekel, just as a modern unallocated bullion balance is not identical to a bar in the owner's possession. Both depend on an institution or counterparty performing later.

Silver's position also varied sharply by region. In ancient Egypt it was often scarcer than gold and carried elite, ritual, and ornamental importance. Vessels, jewelry, mirrors, and amulets could be prized for workmanship and symbolism as much as weight (Schorsch 2018; Ross and Bettenay 2024). Recycling obscures the evidence: silver was readily melted and remade, so the archaeological record systematically loses objects that remained commercially useful. A thin surviving record may reflect high recoverability rather than low value.

The seller in a pre-coinage market thus offered one of two broad things. The first was **metal content**, in which case weight and purity dominated. The second was a **made object**, in which case form, workmanship, use, and social meaning entered the price. That division remains recognizable. A refinery values recoverable ounces; an auction house may value the maker, age, rarity, and condition before calculating melt. The oldest silver market is not gone. It survives beneath every later layer.

2. Coinage: When a Stamp Made Silver Countable

Coinage changed silver commerce because it moved part of the verification process ahead of the sale. Early coins in western Anatolia were struck in electrum, a natural or deliberately made gold–silver alloy. By the sixth century BCE, separate gold and silver coinages had developed in Lydia and the Greek world. A recognized design asserted that a piece belonged to a known standard. When buyers trusted that assertion, they could accept coins by count—"by tale"—instead of negotiating every fragment by weight (Grierson 1977; Bresson 2016).

The innovation is sometimes described as if stamping created money from inert metal. Commercially, the subtler change was that a mint **branded bullion**. The stamp condensed information about expected weight, fineness, origin, and issuing authority into a portable sign. It reduced the cost of making small and repeated transactions. It also created a new source of value: a coin could trade above the worth of its silver because users valued its denomination, familiarity, and acceptability in taxes or payments.

Athens provides the classic example. Silver from the Laurion mining district fed an economy in which mine leases, ore processing, cupellation, minting, state finance, naval power, and trade reinforced one another. The Athenian "owl" tetradrachm became recognizable well beyond Attica. Its types did not make every specimen identical, nor did they guarantee acceptance everywhere, but they gave distant

users a common starting point (Kallet and Kroll 2020). An owl was easier to sell than an anonymous lump of comparable mass because generations of handling had built knowledge around it.

That liquidity rested on labor that older celebratory histories often pushed to the margin. Mining and processing at Laurion depended heavily on enslaved workers operating in dangerous conditions. The coin's convenience at market cannot be separated from the coercion embedded in its production. The same problem will recur at Potosí: highly saleable silver could be produced through systems that made human lives brutally expendable.

Coinage did not end weighing. A merchant receiving an unfamiliar issue might put it on a scale, make a test cut, compare its ring, inspect wear, or consult a money changer. Coins lost metal through abrasion and clipping. Forgers plated base-metal cores. States altered standards. Foreign pieces might be accepted only at a discount or as bullion. Hoards preserve countermarks, cuts, and pecks that record practical skepticism. A coin was a claim, not proof beyond challenge.

Nor did official denomination erase commodity value. If a coin contained more silver than its face value justified, it could disappear into hoards, export, or the melting pot. If it contained less, users might reject it or pass it only where law and habit supported the official value. This tension between **tale** and **weight**—between what a coin said it was and what its metal could fetch—became one of the enduring forces in monetary history.

For sellers, coinage opened a ladder of markets. Newly refined bullion could be sold to a mint. Coins could be spent at face value, exchanged into another currency, exported to a place where their silver bought more, or melted into plate. Money changers earned margins by sorting those possibilities. The more currencies circulated together, the more valuable specialized knowledge became. Coinage simplified the ordinary transaction while creating a sophisticated trade in the differences among coins.

3. Rome: A Vast Currency Area and the Cost of Changing Standards

Roman silver circulated across an unusually large political and fiscal space. The denarius and its successors paid soldiers, collected taxes, settled contracts, and moved through provincial trade. Imperial portraits and official legends turned coins into statements of authority, while the state's demand for its own money helped make the pieces marketable. Within that system, a seller often dealt in denominated coin rather than naked bullion (Burnett 1987).

Yet Roman coin was not static. Metallurgical study shows changes in fineness that were sometimes too subtle for ordinary users to measure directly. Reduction in silver content allowed the state to stretch metal supplies and meet expenditure, but repeated changes could alter confidence and prices (Butcher and Ponting 2014). The commercial consequence was not necessarily an immediate collapse each time the standard moved. People could continue accepting a coin because taxes, wages, habit, and law supported it. Over time, however, deteriorating standards encouraged sorting, hoarding of better issues, price adjustment, and a return to weight in some settings.

The Roman case exposes a limit of the "coin as guaranteed bullion" model. A successful currency can trade because the issuer creates a network in which the token is useful, even when metal value diverges from face value. Silver remains present, but it is only one part of the product. The seller of a denarius may be transferring a tax instrument, a wage unit, and a piece of precious metal at once.

At the edges of the empire—or after political authority fractured—the hierarchy could reverse. Roman coins moved into regions where imperial denomination carried less force. There they might be valued for silver content, ornament, or prestige. Old pieces could remain in circulation, be cut, pierced,

mounted, or melted. Political borders did not stop silver; they changed the questions buyers asked. A coin leaving its home currency area often became bullion again.

This pattern matters far beyond Rome. Modern bullion coins also have face values, but investors ordinarily buy them for metal and recognizability rather than for spending. Conversely, a circulating coin can be worth far more by law than its metal. The Roman experience shows that “silver coin” describes a hybrid. Its sale price may be governed by state authority, fine-metal content, scarcity, or some combination that shifts with place and time.

4. Medieval Eurasia: Coins, Ingots, and Hacksilver in the Same Economy

The end of Roman political unity did not produce a continent without money. It produced more fragmented and overlapping monetary zones. In western Europe, local and regional coinages multiplied. In the Islamic world, silver dirhams circulated across immense distances. In northern and eastern Europe, imported coins often entered economies where weighing remained central. The resulting systems were not simply “coin economies” or “bullion economies.” They could be both at once (Spufford 1988; Kuroda 2009).

Silver hoards from Viking-age and early medieval contexts illustrate the mixture. They contain complete coins, cut coins, ingots, jewelry, and chopped objects—materials commonly grouped under the term **hacksilver**. A fragment of arm-ring could be weighed beside a dirham. A coin’s design might identify a source or suggest fineness, while the scale established the quantity offered. In parts of the Danelaw, archaeological evidence supports a dual-currency environment in which coin and bullion practices overlapped rather than succeeding one another neatly (Kershaw 2017).

Cutting was not necessarily vandalism. It could create change, reveal the interior of a suspect piece, or convert an ornament into a weight suitable for payment. Small pecks and nicks on coins may likewise record testing. These marks are the physical traces of buyer caution. They show that users did not passively accept official images; they produced their own evidence.

Islamic dirhams became especially influential because large quantities of relatively fine silver moved through trade routes linking mining regions, mints, the caliphates, the steppe, eastern Europe, Scandinavia, and the Baltic. Lead-isotope analysis now adds information about metal sources, although recycling and mixing make provenance difficult to reconstruct with certainty (Merkel, Oravisjärvi, and Kershaw 2023). For the medieval seller, source mattered less than acceptance. A familiar fine coin could command confidence, but once cut or carried into another accounting system, its usefulness might again rest on weight.

Money changers became indispensable in urban and fair-based commerce. They assessed coins, quoted exchange rates, supplied local currency, and helped merchants move among money-of-account systems. A merchant contract might be written in one unit and paid in another. The changer’s table converted political diversity into a service—and a spread. The profession thrived because silver was never perfectly uniform.

Mints also used periodic recoinage. Authorities could call in old pieces and issue new ones, sometimes collecting fees or seigniorage. For holders, recoinage imposed a decision: present metal to the mint, seek a market elsewhere, or hide it. For rulers, control of coin standards created revenue and political visibility. Selling bullion to a mint was therefore not a neutral refinery transaction. It took place inside a legal arrangement that determined who could coin, what charge applied, and whether old currency remained valid.

The medieval evidence corrects a common story in which coinage steadily replaces barter and raw bullion. Sophisticated commerce often used several monetary forms together. Merchants chose among them according to scale, location, law, and trust. The lesson for silver history is plain: standardization expands a market, but diversity does not disappear. It migrates into exchange rates, discounts, assays, and professional intermediation.

5. Hallmarks and the Retail Sale of Worked Silver

A bullion bar advertises interchangeability. A silver ewer advertises difference. Its price may reflect the silversmith, design, fashion, engraving, provenance, condition, and retail setting, as well as recoverable metal. That makes worked silver harder to compare than coin or bullion. It also creates a strong incentive to use less precious metal than the buyer expects.

Hallmarking addressed that problem by attaching a chain of responsibility to the object. In England, a statute of 1300 required defined standards and empowered guardians of the craft to test and mark precious-metal work. The Goldsmiths' Company traces the London hallmarking system to that measure and the leopard's-head mark (Goldsmiths' Company 2026). Later systems added combinations of maker or sponsor marks, assay-office symbols, fineness marks, and date letters. The details changed over time, but the commercial purpose remained recognizable: a buyer did not have to destroy a finished object to obtain some assurance about its metal.

The English word **hallmark** itself reflects testing associated with Goldsmiths' Hall. Similar practices developed in other European jurisdictions, though symbols, standards, and enforcement differed. Modern British law still treats hallmarking as consumer protection for precious-metal articles above specified exemption weights (British Hallmarking Council 2022). "Sterling" denotes 925 parts silver per thousand in the modern British system, but a stamped 925 alone should not be confused with a complete British hallmark.

A mark did more than state fineness. It made responsibility traceable. If an article failed, authorities could identify the sponsor or maker and the office that tested it. That traceability increased retail trust, supported credit, and helped silver objects travel beyond the immediate reputation of a workshop. A customer could buy from a dealer who had not personally made the item because the object carried institutional memory.

The system also created costs and exclusions. Assay fees, registration, delays, and guild rules raised barriers to entry. Regulators could protect established producers as well as consumers. Enforcement was uneven, and forged or transposed marks existed. Hallmarks must therefore be read as evidence, not magic. Specialists inspect the sequence, shape, wear, and compatibility of marks with an object's style and construction.

For the seller, hallmarking divided value into layers. A common damaged spoon might be bought close to melt after deductions. A coherent service by a known maker could sell for many times its silver content. An altered piece, mismatched set, or object with suspicious marks might lose the premium. The hallmark helps answer **what** the object claims to be; the market still decides whether anyone values that identity.

Silver plate also became an emergency reserve. Households, churches, and states could melt vessels when cash was needed. During political or fiscal crises, elaborate objects returned to bullion. This reversibility made silverware financially useful but historically vulnerable. Museum collections

represent only a fraction of production because generations of owners repeatedly chose metal value over survival of the object (Metropolitan Museum of Art 2003a, 2004).

Hallmarking is one of the clearest examples of how verification can create a retail market. It does not make every article equal. It allows differences—maker, date, object type, and condition—to be priced on top of a credible claim about material.

6. The Mining Revolution: Potosí, Mexico, Japan, and the Cost of Abundance

The sixteenth century changed silver's commercial scale. European conquest in the Americas brought vast ore bodies under Spanish rule, while improvements in extraction and refining made lower-grade ores profitable. The most famous center was Cerro Rico at Potosí, in present-day Bolivia. Silver had been mined in the Andes before the Spaniards arrived, but the boom that followed the mountain's exploitation after 1545 created a city, an industrial complex, and a fiscal machine of exceptional reach (Lane 2019; UNESCO World Heritage Centre n.d.).

A mine did not produce a market-ready peso. Ore had to be broken, sorted, milled, concentrated, refined, assayed, taxed, transported, and often coined. Each stage created a distinct sale and a new opportunity for loss, fraud, finance, or control. Mine owners needed labor, tools, animals, timber, food, mercury, and credit before receiving revenue. Refiners had to estimate recovery rates. Royal officials claimed taxes and supervised assay. Merchants advanced supplies against future output. The famous flow of American silver was therefore built from contracts and deductions, not a simple stream of treasure.

Mercury amalgamation expanded what could be processed. The patio process and related techniques allowed refiners to recover silver from ores that were not economical by smelting alone. In the Andes, supplies from Huancavelica became strategically important. The technology increased output, but mercury poisoning and environmental contamination were not incidental side effects. They were part of the operating cost displaced onto workers and landscapes (Robins 2011).

Labor coercion was equally central. At Potosí, the colonial **mita** drafted Indigenous communities into rotational labor. Working conditions, altitude, dust, accidents, mercury exposure, and disruption of community life made the system devastating, even though labor arrangements and individual experiences varied over time. Highly standardized coin and bullion at the end of the chain rested on violently unequal control at its beginning. A commercial history that celebrates liquidity while hiding labor reproduces the accounting of the beneficiaries.

New Spain developed a different but equally important mining geography. Zacatecas, Guanajuato, and other districts expanded through combinations of wage labor, coerced labor, merchant credit, and refining networks. Output patterns in Mexico and Peru did not move in lockstep; ore quality, mercury access, technology, taxation, war, drainage, and local institutions produced distinct cycles (Bakewell 1971; Brading and Cross 1972; Garner 1988). "Spanish American silver" is a useful aggregate only if those differences remain visible.

Japan added another major source. Iwami Ginzan grew into one of the important silver-producing regions of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Its mines, settlements, roads, ports, and refining sites reveal how production depended on an entire landscape rather than a hole in the ground (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2007). Japanese silver entered regional trade at a moment when

Chinese demand and European maritime expansion were reshaping exchange across East and Southeast Asia.

The state's role began before export. Colonial mints and assay offices turned variable output into forms accepted for tax and trade. Spanish American pesos carried mint identifiers, assayer marks, denominations, and types. Those features did not eliminate irregularity, especially in hand-struck coin, but they gave merchants evidence to inspect. A well-known coin could cross more borders than an unmarked bar because information traveled with it.

The Spanish crown also tried to keep part of the value through taxation and monopoly. The royal fifth and later changing tax rates, mercury controls, mint charges, customs, and convoy systems shaped the seller's net return. Smuggling flourished where official rules created a profitable gap. Recorded output therefore understates some production and movement, while official coin totals cannot be treated as a complete measure of silver extracted.

Abundance did not mean a uniform fall in price everywhere. New supply entered monetary systems, paid debts, financed war, purchased imports, and moved toward regions where silver commanded greater purchasing power. Effects depended on route and institution. The mining revolution increased the quantity available for sale; the more consequential change was that it produced standardized flows large enough to link distant markets repeatedly.

7. The First Global Silver Trade—Without a Single Global Price

Between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, silver connected the Americas, Europe, Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, China, and Japan more persistently than any earlier commodity of comparable value. The Spanish American peso—often called the piece of eight or Spanish dollar—became one of the trade's principal instruments. It was divisible, recognizable, and sufficiently consistent to function in places far beyond the sovereignty of the king named on it. Its descendants shaped later dollar currencies, including that of the United States (U.S. Mint 2026b).

One route ran east across the Atlantic through Seville and later Cádiz. Silver paid royal obligations, serviced debt, supported armies, and purchased European goods. Much of it did not remain in Spain. Merchants and states moved the metal onward to commercial centers where it could settle balances or buy imports. Another route crossed the Pacific. The Manila galleons carried American silver from Acapulco to the Philippines and returned with Chinese silk and porcelain, spices, ivory, and other Asian goods (Metropolitan Museum of Art 2003b). Silver also moved through Indian Ocean networks and overland routes that predated Iberian arrival.

China's place in this system was decisive but should not be reduced to the slogan that China "only wanted silver." Chinese fiscal and commercial changes increased the importance of silver in taxation and large transactions, while copper cash remained important for everyday exchange. Regional monetary practices varied, and the relationship between silver units and cash was not fixed (Glahn 1996, 2016). Demand for silver was intertwined with the enormous supply of Chinese goods that foreign merchants wanted to buy.

The trade worked because silver's purchasing power differed from place to place. A merchant did not need a modern screen displaying a universal ounce price. Profit could arise from the exchange ratio between gold and silver, the silver price of silk, the local value assigned to a particular coin, or the discount applied to a bar. Freight, insurance, taxes, credit terms, time at sea, piracy, war, and mortality

had to be added. The famous arbitrage between relatively silver-rich Atlantic markets and silver-demanding Asian markets was real, but ratios were neither timeless nor uniform (Flynn 2015).

This distinction changes the meaning of "global market." The early modern silver economy was not global because every buyer paid the same price. It was global because price differences created routes, and flows along those routes altered conditions elsewhere. If silver became more expensive in one destination, ships, bills, and merchant decisions responded. Integration consisted of repeated adjustment, not instantaneous convergence.

Manila, formally established as a Spanish colonial city in 1571, occupies a prominent place in debates over when world trade became truly global. Dennis Flynn and Arturo Giráldez argued that sustained exchange linking the Americas with Asia through Manila marked a critical threshold (Flynn and Giráldez 1995). Other scholarship stresses older interregional networks and warns against turning one date into a creation story. The stronger claim is narrower: Manila made American silver a regular component of trans-Pacific trade, and that connection changed the scale at which commercial events could reverberate.

South Asian merchants were not passive intermediaries. Indian textiles, money markets, shipping, and merchant communities shaped the routes by which silver moved and the goods it purchased. European companies frequently needed bullion because their exports to Asia did not cover the value of imports. Company records make this visible, but they should not be mistaken for the whole market. Armenian, Gujarati, Tamil, Chinese, Malay, Arab, Persian, and other merchants operated through networks that did not depend on European command (Prakash 1998).

The peso's success depended on verification. Buyers learned mint types and marks. Merchants weighed bags, sampled coins, and distinguished trusted issues from clipped, debased, counterfeit, or unfamiliar pieces. In China, foreign coins could receive chopmarks from merchants who tested and endorsed them. The additional marks sometimes damaged numismatic appearance, but commercially they built a chain of private validation. A piece's surface became a record of previous scrutiny.

Coins also changed identity during transit. In a Spanish colony a peso might be legal tender; in another jurisdiction it might be foreign coin admitted at a tariff; elsewhere it might be valued by weight; in a silversmith's shop it became feedstock. One object moved among categories without changing its atoms. Its price changed because the applicable institution changed.

Credit accompanied the metal. Bills of exchange were powerful within European commercial networks, yet they did not circulate everywhere as if law and trust were universal. Long-distance traders often preferred recognized precious metal where claims on distant debtors were difficult to enforce (Irigoin 2025). Silver's physicality was burdensome—it had to be guarded and transported—but it made settlement possible across political systems that did not share courts, banks, or accounting conventions.

That advantage carried social costs. Convoys, forts, customs houses, plantations producing export goods, mines, and coerced labor all belonged to the same world. Silver linked markets partly because empires organized violence at scale. The neutrality of the coin in a distant hand can obscure the unequal conditions of extraction and trade.

By 1800, silver had become a global commercial language without becoming a single commodity in the modern exchange sense. The language had dialects: pesos, sycee, taels, rupees, dollars, local moneys of account, and differing fineness standards. Merchants made money by translating among them.

8. How Silver Was Priced Before “Spot Price”

Modern market pages encourage a simple mental model: silver has a spot price quoted per troy ounce, and every object can be valued by multiplying weight, fineness, and price. That calculation is useful for estimating melt value. It is not a description of most historical transactions, and even today it is rarely the seller’s final cash price.

Before electronic quotation, silver prices were embedded in institutions. A mint might announce terms for receiving bullion and returning coin. A government might define a legal relationship between gold and silver. Merchants quoted exchange rates among currencies. Money changers published or memorized tariffs for foreign coin. Refiners paid according to assay after deducting charges and losses. Silversmiths bought material and sold fabricated goods. None of these prices was automatically identical.

Weight and fineness came first

A gross ounce of alloy is not a fine ounce of silver. The basic bullion calculation is:

fine silver = **gross weight** × **fineness**

A 1,000-gram bar marked 999 contains a stated 999 grams of fine silver; a 1,000-gram sterling object at 925 contains 925 grams before allowing for solder, weighted components, or an inaccurate mark. Historically, units themselves varied. A “mark,” “pound,” “tael,” or “ounce” could differ by jurisdiction. Comparing quotations requires knowing both the accounting unit and the physical standard behind it.

The troy system later became entrenched in precious-metals trade. In the United States, precious metals sold by weight are commonly expressed in troy units or SI mass units; the troy ounce is larger than the everyday avoirdupois ounce (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2026). Unit confusion remains a source of retail error. Twelve troy ounces make a troy pound, while sixteen avoirdupois ounces make an avoirdupois pound.

Mint price was a legal offer, not a universal market fact

Under free-coinage arrangements, a mint’s terms created an outlet for bullion. A holder could deliver metal and receive coin after charges and delay, subject to standard. That right placed a floor or anchor under some transactions, but access, transportation, assay, seigniorage, and legal restrictions mattered. A mint price was a promise made by an authority at a place—not a price available to every seller everywhere.

Bimetallic systems added a legally defined gold–silver ratio. If law valued one metal differently from the commercial market, people had an incentive to pay with the legally overvalued metal and export, melt, or hoard the undervalued one. This is the mechanism commonly summarized by “bad money drives out good,” though the actual outcomes depended on transaction costs and enforcement. The U.S. Coinage Act of 1792 set a 15-to-1 ratio; differences from international valuations contributed to the export or disappearance of some coins (U.S. Mint 2026b).

Coin tariffs and exchange rates converted political standards

Foreign coin did not enter a market with a self-executing value. Authorities and merchants assigned rates based on expected content, condition, demand, and policy. A trusted Spanish dollar might pass readily; a worn or obscure issue might be weighed or discounted. Exchange rates also contained information about credit and settlement, not only metal.

Location and time were part of the price

Silver in a mining district, at a mint, in a port, aboard a ship, and in a consuming market was not equivalent. Freight, security, financing, insurance, and delay separated those locations. A merchant who shipped silver to obtain a higher nominal price tied up capital and accepted the possibility that the price, exchange rate, or political situation would change before arrival.

Workmanship could dominate melt

The metal-content formula is least informative when a buyer values an object. A celebrated silversmith, rare coin variety, intact historical service, or documented provenance may create a price many times melt. Conversely, monograms, repairs, missing pieces, or unfashionable forms can reduce demand even when silver content is unchanged. The correct market is part of the valuation. Sending a rare coin to a refinery efficiently destroys the information that made it rare.

A historically responsible price comparison therefore asks five questions: **which unit, which fineness, which location, which legal status, and which type of buyer?** Without those answers, a long-run chart can create false precision.

9. Demonetization: When Silver Lost Its Guaranteed Monetary Buyer

During the nineteenth century, major monetary systems moved toward gold or token coinage, while silver output expanded. The transition was uneven and politically explosive. It changed silver selling because it weakened or removed a privileged outlet: the right to bring bullion to a mint and receive full legal-tender coin under established terms.

“Demonetization” can sound as if a government declared silver worthless. That is not what happened. Silver remained valuable as bullion, subsidiary coin, plate, jewelry, industrial material, and reserve asset. The change concerned monetary status. When a mint closed to unlimited coinage or a state limited the legal-tender power of silver coins, bullion had to find buyers at a market price rather than rely on a standing conversion rule.

The United States provides the best-known controversy. The Coinage Act of 1873 reorganized the mint system and omitted the standard silver dollar from the list of coins authorized for ordinary production. As silver prices later fell, advocates labeled the law the “Crime of 1873,” arguing that ending free coinage harmed debtors and producers (U.S. Mint 2017). The slogan compressed a complicated statute and chronology into a political weapon, but it captured a genuine distributional conflict. A higher monetary valuation of silver could benefit miners and some debtors; creditors and defenders of gold-standard stability feared inflation and exchange disruption.

Congress later required government purchases through measures including the Bland–Allison Act of 1878 and the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890. These laws made the state a large buyer and supported coinage or silver-backed notes without fully restoring the old bimetallic system. The market learned a lesson that remains relevant: public procurement can become a demand category in its own right. Miners sold not only to manufacturers and private investors but to policy.

International changes compounded the pressure. Germany’s move toward gold after unification, adjustments within European monetary arrangements, and India’s closure of its mints to free silver coinage in 1893 altered demand and expectations. China retained a silver-based monetary order longer, so falling silver could affect its exchange rate and external purchasing power differently from

gold-standard countries. The monetary geography of silver had not vanished; it had become more divided.

The conflict continued into the twentieth century. U.S. silver-purchase policy in the 1930s raised the price and redirected flows, with significant effects on China. Milton Friedman argued that American policy contributed to monetary contraction and instability there, though the magnitude and interpretation remain debated (Friedman 1992). The episode demonstrates why the phrase “market price” can be misleading when a state purchases large quantities under legislation.

For producers, demonetization demanded a commercial reinvention. Mining companies and political allies promoted new monetary purchases, investment products, and industrial uses. Silver was increasingly sold as a commodity whose price could fall relative to gold, rather than as metal convertible into money at a legal ratio. That distinction exposed mines to cycles of closure and reopening.

For households, old coin became a two-way option. As long as face value exceeded metal value, coins circulated. If bullion value rose above face value, they were hoarded or melted despite legal restrictions. The same economic logic that had moved ancient coins across borders now emptied modern cash drawers.

Demonetization did not end silver money in one stroke. It created layered systems in which silver survived as subsidiary coin, national reserve, trade coin, and political symbol. What ended gradually was the expectation that the state would absorb unlimited bullion at a fixed full-money valuation. Once that buyer withdrew, silver sellers had to live more fully in the commodity market.

10. From Monetary Metal to Industrial Input

Silver entered the industrial age with an unusual commercial advantage: it already had deep mining, refining, monetary, and recycling infrastructures. Manufacturers could draw on established supplies while exploiting physical properties that had little to do with coinage. Silver is highly conductive, reflective, workable, and chemically useful. Those qualities turned the metal into photographic material, electrical contacts, brazing alloys, catalysts, mirrors, medical products, and later electronic and photovoltaic components (U.S. Geological Survey 2026).

Photography became one of the most important twentieth-century demand categories. Light-sensitive silver halides made film and photographic paper possible. The business model differed sharply from selling coin. Manufacturers required controlled chemical forms and consistent purity, while laboratories generated silver-bearing waste that could be recovered. A circular market grew around film, fixer solutions, x-ray material, and processing residues. Silver was sold into industry, used in minute dispersions, collected where economical, and refined back into saleable metal.

Industrial demand changed the seller’s product. A fabricator did not merely want “an ounce of silver.” It might require grain, powder, paste, sheet, wire, alloy, or a compound with precise tolerances. Fabrication charges, quality assurance, delivery schedules, technical support, and credit terms became part of the price. The reference value of fine silver remained relevant, but it was only the raw-material layer.

Recycling became equally specialized. High-grade manufacturing scrap could be returned through a documented loop with predictable recovery. Low-grade waste required sampling and processing. Household silver, electronics, catalysts, and photographic material each needed different treatment. Refiners typically settled after assay, paying for recovered metal minus treatment, refining, and

sometimes environmental charges. The seller therefore faced **assay risk**: a provisional estimate could differ from final settlement.

The transition from circulating silver coin accelerated when bullion values and coin demand collided. In the United States, the Coinage Act of 1965 removed silver from dimes and quarters and reduced the silver content of half dollars; later halves became base-metal clad. The law responded to coin shortages and the growing gap between monetary use and metal economics (U.S. Mint 2026a). Older silver coins were rapidly sorted from circulation. A familiar retail category emerged: bags of "junk silver," a trade term for common, worn coins valued primarily for bullion rather than rarity.

Governments also cultivated a separate bullion-coin market. Such coins combine standardized weight and fineness with a sovereign mint's design and legal-tender denomination. The face value is usually far below the bullion sale price, so monetary status functions mainly as authentication and branding. This is coinage returning to one of its earliest commercial roles: a public stamp makes a piece of precious metal easier for strangers to recognize.

Industrialization did not make ornamental or monetary demand obsolete. It stacked new markets on old ones. A rise in photographic use could compete with coin fabrication; a wave of household selling could add scrap supply; a monetary scare could increase retail investment demand. Because much silver is produced as a by-product of mining lead, zinc, copper, or gold, supply does not respond only to the silver price. The modern market became more complex precisely because silver served so many buyers.

11. The Modern Wholesale Market: Benchmarks, Good-Delivery Bars, and Futures

A modern silver quote appears instantaneous, but the infrastructure behind it is physical and legal. Wholesale markets need a standard unit, approved quality, a delivery location, credit arrangements, and procedures for transferring title. The screen price is the visible edge of those rules.

The London benchmark

London's silver benchmark traces its institutional history to 1897, when brokers began agreeing and announcing a price for wholesale business. The historic fixing procedure changed over time and was replaced in 2014 by the LBMA Silver Price, an electronic auction administered under a newer governance structure (London Bullion Market Association n.d.). The benchmark gives market participants a reference for contracts and valuation. It does not mean every bar or retail coin changes hands at that number.

The "loco London" market is largely over the counter: parties deal directly rather than sending every transaction through a single exchange. Standardization makes that decentralized structure workable. Creditworthy counterparties can trade balances and allocate bars through clearing and vault systems. Location matters; silver in another country or warehouse may require transport, insurance, taxes, and conversion before it is equivalent to London metal.

Good Delivery turns a bar into an acceptable wholesale unit

The London Bullion Market Association's Good Delivery system defines acceptable refiners, markings, fineness, weight, dimensions, and quality. Current technical specifications call for silver bars around 1,000 troy ounces, with a permitted tolerance, and minimum fineness of 999.0 parts per thousand

(London Bullion Market Association 2026). A roughly 32-kilogram bar is not retail-friendly. Its purpose is efficient wholesale settlement.

The list does not say that silver from an unlisted refiner has no value. It says that the bar is not interchangeable in the same delivery chain without additional handling or verification. An off-list bar may need melting, sampling, or re-refining. The resulting discount is an example of **form risk**: chemically similar metal can be worth less at a specific trading point because it is packaged outside the accepted standard.

Good Delivery also illustrates how reputation becomes infrastructure. Refiners earn acceptance through technical competence and ongoing compliance. Vaults and weighers follow procedures. Marks and weight lists connect a physical bar to records. The market saves time by relying on a chain of accredited actors rather than re-assaying every bar at every transfer.

Futures separate price risk from immediate metal ownership

Exchange-traded futures add another layer. The standard COMEX silver futures contract is quoted in U.S. dollars per troy ounce and has a 5,000-troy-ounce contract unit (CME Group 2026). Buyers and sellers can take price positions or hedge future needs without moving physical silver each time the contract changes hands. Most positions are offset before delivery, while the possibility and rules of delivery help connect the contract to deliverable metal.

For a mine, refiner, fabricator, or dealer, futures can reduce uncertainty. A producer expecting output may sell futures to lock in a price; a manufacturer may buy to protect against a rise. The hedge is rarely perfect. Quantity, timing, location, fineness, financing, and the relationship between the company's physical price and the futures price can create **basis risk**.

Futures also permit leverage. Traders post margin rather than the full notional value, so gains and losses can be large relative to cash committed. That feature supports liquidity and risk transfer but can force liquidation when prices move sharply. Exchange rules on margin, position limits, and delivery are therefore part of silver's price history, not administrative footnotes.

The 1979–1980 Hunt episode made this visible. Large purchases of physical silver and futures by interests associated with Nelson Bunker Hunt and William Herbert Hunt contributed to an extraordinary price rise. Exchange rule changes, higher margin requirements, tightening credit, and forced liquidation were followed by a collapse. The CFTC later treated concentration and market integrity as central lessons (Commodity Futures Trading Commission 1985; Berkovitz 2010). Whatever narrative is preferred about motives, the event showed that a seller's ability to exit depends on market structure as well as quoted price.

Bullion banking and unallocated claims

Wholesale participants often trade **unallocated** metal: a contractual claim on a provider rather than title to specified bar numbers. Unallocated trading is operationally efficient because balances can be credited and debited without moving individual bars. It also introduces counterparty exposure. **Allocated** metal, by contrast, is tied to identified bars held for an owner, though custody agreements, fees, jurisdiction, and access still matter.

The distinction echoes ancient credit. A written silver obligation can circulate more easily than the metal, but its value depends on performance. Modern documentation is more elaborate; the underlying commercial problem is familiar.

12. ETFs, Bullion Coins, Scrap Counters, and Online Dealers

The late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries widened retail access to silver. A household can now sell physical metal locally, ship it to a national dealer, list it on a marketplace, consign it to auction, or sell a security through a brokerage account. Each outlet solves one problem and creates another.

Exchange-traded silver

The iShares Silver Trust, formed in 2006, issues shares representing fractional beneficial interests in a trust whose assets consist primarily of silver held by a custodian. Its stated objective is for share value to reflect the price of owned silver, less expenses and liabilities (iShares Silver Trust 2006). The product made silver exposure tradable through ordinary securities accounts without requiring most investors to arrange assay, transport, insurance, or storage.

A share is not a small bar in a brokerage envelope. Retail holders generally trade shares rather than redeeming individual coins or bars. Fees and expenses reduce the amount of silver represented over time, and market price can differ from net asset value. The seller is disposing of a security in a regulated market, not delivering metal to a refiner. This is perhaps the clearest case in which the history of selling silver becomes the history of selling a legally defined claim.

Bullion dealers and sovereign coins

Physical investors usually encounter a two-sided dealer market. Dealers post an **ask** at which they sell and a **bid** at which they buy. The difference covers operating costs, inventory risk, hedging, fraud losses, payment processing, shipping, and profit. Highly recognizable coins and bars often receive stronger bids because they can be resold with less explanation. Obscure rounds, damaged packaging, or questionable brands may be discounted even if their stated fineness is the same.

Retail premiums expand and contract with demand and supply-chain capacity. During a rush to buy small products, the premium on a one-ounce coin can rise even if the wholesale silver price is flat. Mints and fabricators cannot instantly convert 1,000-ounce bars into unlimited retail units. A shortage of convenient form is not necessarily a shortage of all silver.

Scrap and refinery settlement

Scrap dealers buy a recoverable yield. They must sort fineness, remove stones and nonmetal components, test suspicious pieces, aggregate lots, and send material for refining. The quoted percentage of “spot” is only meaningful if the weight basis, assumed fineness, fees, and settlement timing are clear.

Testing methods range from magnets, dimensions, density, and acid tests to X-ray fluorescence and fire assay. Each has limits. XRF reads near-surface composition and can be misled by plating or an unusual core if used carelessly. Fire assay is destructive but remains a reference method for many settlement contexts. Large or heterogeneous lots require representative sampling; a precise test of an unrepresentative sample gives a precise wrong answer.

A professional seller keeps categories separate. Sterling, coin silver, 800-fine continental ware, plated material, weighted candlesticks, knives with non-silver blades, jewelry, and coins should not be thrown into one gross-weight total. Documentation of origin and previous assays can improve confidence, though buyers will apply their own procedures.

Auctions and numismatic markets

An auction house is appropriate when identity may matter more than melt: rare coins, important makers, old services, historically documented objects, or strong design. Expertise can unlock value, but cataloging, photography, commissions, insurance, and time reduce the net proceeds. The headline hammer price is not the seller's check.

Cleaning can destroy value. Abrasive polishing alters coin surfaces; removing patina or marks from old silver can impair evidence and collector appeal. A seller who treats every object as bullion may lose the exact premium that justifies an auction.

Online marketplaces

Online selling enlarges the buyer pool and makes price comparison easier. It also shifts verification into photographs, seller history, payment rules, shipping, platform dispute systems, and third-party grading or authentication. The seller may achieve a higher gross price but spend more on fees, insured delivery, returns, and fraud prevention.

Reputation has returned in digital form. Ancient merchants relied on known counterparties; online buyers rely on feedback, account age, transaction records, clear photographs, and enforceable platform policies. The technology is new. The commercial function is not.

13. Why There Is Never Just One Silver Price

A live silver price is useful, but it is not a promise to buy every silver object at that amount. The number usually refers to a market convention for fine metal at a specified place and time. A seller's proceeds are built from—or diverge from—that reference through several layers.

Price layer	What it means	Why it differs from a headline quote
Benchmark or spot reference	A wholesale indication for fine silver under defined market conventions	Not necessarily an executable retail bid; location and timing matter
Futures price	Price for a standardized contract and delivery month	Includes time, financing, storage expectations, and contract rules
Melt value	Fine-silver content multiplied by a reference price	Assumes stated weight and fineness; ignores costs and premiums
Refinery settlement	Payment after assay and deductions	Reflects recovery, treatment, sampling, fees, and settlement delay
Dealer buyback price	Immediate bid for a recognized retail product	Reflects resale demand, inventory, hedging, authentication, and margin
Retail ask	Price charged for a coin or bar	Adds fabrication, mint or brand premium, distribution, and dealer spread

Price layer	What it means	Why it differs from a headline quote
Numismatic or antique value	Price for rarity, maker, history, condition, and demand	Metal may be a small part of total value
Net seller proceeds	Cash remaining after all costs	Subtracts commission, shipping, insurance, payment fees, taxes, and time

The distinction between **melt value** and **buyback price** causes many disputes. Melt is a calculation, not a guaranteed offer. A dealer who pays exactly theoretical melt before verifying an item would absorb all testing, refining, market-movement, and fraud risk without compensation. Competitive bids can approach the reference for desirable material, exceed it for scarce products, or fall well below it for difficult scrap.

Fineness errors compound quickly. A sterling object is not .999 bullion. A plated object may contain little recoverable silver. “German silver” and “nickel silver” traditionally describe copper-based alloys containing no silver. Weighted hollowware may contain cement or other filling. A credible price starts with correct identification.

Time also matters. A quoted bid may be locked when the seller accepts, when the dealer receives the parcel, or after assay. During volatile markets, those moments can produce different outcomes. Good terms state the pricing point in advance.

The best outlet depends on the product, not on a universal ranking of buyers. Standard bullion favors a competitive bullion dealer. Heterogeneous industrial material may belong with a specialist refiner. Rare coins require numismatic expertise. Important silverware may deserve an auction. A seller needing immediate cash may rationally accept a lower price for speed and certainty. “Highest price” is incomplete unless costs, probability of sale, delay, and risk are included.

Common Myths About the Silver Trade

Myth 1: Silver became money only after coins were invented

Silver served as a unit of account and weighed means of payment long before coinage. Coins standardized selected pieces; they did not create silver’s monetary role (Powell 1996).

Myth 2: A stamped coin always traded at face value

Acceptance depended on place, condition, law, and trust. Foreign or worn coins could be weighed, discounted, countermarked, cut, or melted. Even within one state, metallic and face values could diverge.

Myth 3: Early global trade had one world silver price

Merchants profited precisely because prices and exchange relationships differed. Integration linked those differences; it did not erase them (Irigoin 2020).

Myth 4: Hallmarks prove age, maker, and value beyond doubt

Marks are evidence that must be read in context. They can be forged, altered, or misinterpreted. They do not guarantee artistic importance or a price above melt.

Myth 5: “Spot” is what every seller should receive

Spot is a reference for a defined wholesale market. Retail buybacks, refinery settlements, and auction proceeds include different costs and risks.

Myth 6: Any old silver coin is valuable because it is old

Age alone does not create rarity. Mintage, survival, condition, variety, demand, and authenticity matter. Some old coins trade mainly for bullion; others are worth far more.

Myth 7: Online trading removed the need for trust

It relocated trust to custody agreements, platform rules, serial numbers, insured shipping, reviews, audits, and legal claims.

Frequently Asked Questions

When did people first sell silver?

There is no datable “first sale,” but silver objects, accounting, and weighed exchange are documented in ancient Near Eastern societies thousands of years before the common era. By the third millennium BCE, silver could denominate obligations and change hands by weight (Powell 1996).

What was the first silver coin?

The earliest coinage emerged in western Anatolia in the late seventh century BCE and was initially associated with electrum. Distinct silver coinages developed in Lydia and Greek cities during the sixth century BCE. Because definitions and chronologies vary by find and authority, naming one undisputed “first silver coin” is less reliable than describing that transition (Grierson 1977; Bresson 2016).

Why did coinage make silver easier to sell?

A recognized mint stamp bundled information about expected weight, fineness, and issuer. Trusted coins could pass by count, reducing the need to negotiate every piece. Doubtful coins still had to be weighed or tested.

Why was the Spanish dollar accepted so widely?

Its recognizable design, large silver content, mint and assayer information, and repeated use in international trade made it familiar. Political reach and merchant practice reinforced that familiarity. It was not accepted everywhere at one fixed rate, but it was easier to identify than anonymous bullion.

Why did so much American silver go to Asia?

Asian goods were in high demand, European merchants often lacked equally desired exports, and silver could buy more in some Asian markets than in Europe or the Americas. Chinese fiscal and monetary use of silver added demand, while Manila and Indian Ocean routes made repeated movement possible (Metropolitan Museum of Art 2003b; Flynn 2015).

What does sterling silver mean?

In modern British hallmarking, sterling silver is 925 parts silver per thousand. A bare “925” stamp is a fineness claim; it is not automatically the same as a complete legally recognized hallmark. Standards and marking systems vary by country and period (British Hallmarking Council 2022).

When did silver stop being money?

It did not stop everywhere at once. Major nineteenth-century economies restricted free coinage or shifted toward gold, while silver coin and silver-based systems persisted. The United States removed silver from circulating dimes and quarters in 1965, but silver bullion coins and legal-tender commemoratives still exist (U.S. Mint 2026a).

When did modern silver price benchmarking begin?

The institutional history of the London silver benchmark dates to 1897. The traditional fixing was replaced in 2014 by the LBMA Silver Price electronic auction (London Bullion Market Association n.d.). Futures and other markets provide additional price references.

What is the difference between spot price and melt value?

Spot is a wholesale reference under specified conventions. Melt value is an estimate obtained by multiplying an item's fine-silver content by a chosen reference price. Neither equals the seller's guaranteed proceeds after testing, refining, commissions, shipping, or dealer spread.

Why can a silver coin sell above spot?

A coin may carry fabrication, mint, brand, scarcity, condition, or collector premiums. In a retail shortage, demand for small recognizable units can rise faster than the supply of fabricated products even when wholesale bars remain available.

How is silver purity tested today?

Methods include visual and dimensional checks, density, magnets, electrical instruments, acid testing, X-ray fluorescence, ultrasonic testing, and destructive assay. No single method is ideal for every object. Large heterogeneous lots require representative sampling, and surface-only tests can miss plated or filled material.

Where should someone sell silver?

The outlet should match the object. Standard bars and common bullion coins suit competitive bullion dealers; mixed scrap suits a refiner or specialist buyer; rare coins require a numismatist; important silverware may merit auction. Compare **net proceeds and terms**, not only the advertised percentage of spot.

Glossary of Silver-Market Terms

Allocated silver. Metal held for a specific owner and identified by particular bars or other records. Allocation reduces some credit exposure, but custody terms, fees, jurisdiction, insurance, and access still matter.

Assay. A test used to estimate the composition or fineness of metal. Methods range from touchstone comparison and cupellation to fire assay and X-ray fluorescence. The reliability of a settlement depends on both the method and the representativeness of the sample.

Bullion. Precious metal valued primarily for its recoverable content rather than for a coin denomination, artistic workmanship, or historical rarity. Bullion can appear as bars, ingots, grain, rounds, or recognized investment coins.

Fineness. The proportion of precious metal in an alloy, commonly stated in parts per thousand. Sterling silver is 925 fine; a wholesale bar meeting a 999.0 minimum contains at least 999 parts silver per thousand by mass.

Hallmark. An official mark or group of marks indicating that a precious-metal object was submitted for assay and met a stated standard. A hallmark can also identify the responsible maker or sponsor and the assay office; it does not by itself establish market value or prove every attribution.

Legal tender. Money that the law recognizes for settling qualifying debts. Legal-tender status can give a silver coin uses beyond its melt value, but the exact rules, limits, and practical acceptance vary by jurisdiction and period.

Melt value. An estimate of the value of an item's fine-silver content, calculated from weight, fineness, and a chosen reference price. It is not the same as a guaranteed payout because testing, refining, fees, spreads, shipping, and non-silver components affect net proceeds.

Money of account. A unit used to state prices, debts, or records even when payment is made in another coin, metal, or commodity. Historical account units often survived changes in the physical money used for settlement.

Premium and spread. A premium is the amount paid above a reference metal price for fabrication, brand, scarcity, convenience, or collectibility. The spread is the difference between a buyer's bid and seller's ask; it helps cover operating costs, risk, and profit.

Seigniorage. Revenue or a charge associated with converting bullion into coin. The term can refer to a mint fee or, more broadly, to the gain an issuer obtains from creating money whose face value exceeds production and metal costs.

Spot or benchmark price. A reference for fine silver under defined market conventions at a specified time and location. It is a starting point for valuation, not an automatic cash offer for every coin, object, bar, or scrap lot.

Troy ounce. The precious-metals weight unit equal to 31.1034768 grams. It differs from the more familiar avoirdupois ounce used for many household goods. Historical ounces and local weights were not always identical to the modern troy standard.

Unallocated silver. A contractual claim against a bullion provider rather than title to specified bars. It is operationally efficient for wholesale transfers, but the holder depends on the provider's ability to perform and on the governing account terms.

Conclusion: The Price of Trust

The history of selling silver is not a side story to the history of money. It explains how silver became usable across strangers, borders, and centuries. Early merchants relied on weights, contracts, and reputation. Mints compressed expected weight and fineness into a stamp. Money changers translated among political standards. Hallmarks made the claims attached to finished objects traceable. Colonial assay and mint systems converted ore extracted under coercive regimes into internationally recognized coin. Benchmark administrators, exchanges, refiners, vaults, and securities law later made wholesale bars and financial claims tradeable at enormous scale.

None of those systems removed uncertainty. They selected which uncertainties a buyer could tolerate and who would bear the rest. A mint accepted responsibility for a standard but could change it. An assay office tested fineness but did not determine artistic value. A futures exchange standardized a

contract but not every mine's output. A bullion trust reduced the burden of storage for shareholders while replacing possession with legal and custodial claims. Each innovation made one form of silver easier to sell by defining it more narrowly.

That is why silver still has many prices. The same metal can be ore, an industrial input, a monetary token, a branded bar, a collectible, a family object, scrap, collateral, a futures delivery unit, or the asset behind a security. The headline ounce price becomes relevant only after the product has been identified.

The deepest continuity is physical. Silver survives melting and remaking. A Roman coin can become plate; plate can become bullion; bullion can become film or an electrical contact; scrap can return to a refinery. Every transformation erases some information and creates another commercial identity. The seller's task is to know which identity the next buyer values—and to preserve the evidence needed to prove it.

Sources and Method

This paper synthesizes scholarship in economic history, monetary history, archaeology, mining history, and material culture with institutional documentation from assay, mint, exchange, regulatory, museum, and heritage bodies. It distinguishes directly documented institutional rules from broader historical interpretation. Dates attached to continuing market rules were checked against sources available on August 23, 2026.

The paper does not present a continuous historical silver-price series. Such a series would require explicit choices about currencies, weight units, fineness, inflation adjustment, exchange rates, and location. Treating those choices as invisible would create more precision than the evidence supports. The commercial categories used here—bullion, coin, worked silver, scrap, contract, and security—are analytical tools; historical actors did not always draw the boundaries in the same way.

This is historical and educational material, not an appraisal or a recommendation to buy, hold, or sell silver.

References

Bakewell, Peter J. 1971. *Silver Mining and Society in Colonial Mexico: Zacatecas, 1546–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berkovitz, Dan. 2010. "Testimony Before the CFTC on Position Limits for Metals." U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Brading, D. A., and Harry E. Cross. 1972. "Colonial Silver Mining: Mexico and Peru." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 52 (4): 545–79.

Bresson, Alain. 2016. *The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy: Institutions, Markets, and Growth in the City-States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

British Hallmarking Council. 2022. "Hallmarking: Practical Guidance—Summary." GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hallmarking-guidance-notes/hallmarking-is-the-law-guidance-summary.

Burnett, Andrew. 1987. *Coinage in the Roman World*. London: Seaby.

Butcher, Kevin, and Matthew Ponting. 2014. *The Metallurgy of Roman Silver Coinage: From the Reform of Nero to the Reform of Trajan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CME Group. 2026. "Silver Futures Overview." https://www.cmegroup.com/markets/metals/precious/silver.html.

Commodity Futures Trading Commission. 1985. "CFTC History in the 1980s." https://www.cftc.gov/About/HistoryoftheCFTC/history_1980s.html.

Flynn, Dennis O. 2015. “Silver in a Global Context, 1400–1800.” In *The Cambridge World History, Volume 6: The Construction of a Global World, 1400–1800 CE, Part 2: Patterns of Change*, edited by Jerry H. Bentley, Sanjay Subrahmanyam, and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, 213–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139022460.010.

Flynn, Dennis O., and Arturo Giráldez. 1995. “Born with a ‘Silver Spoon’: The Origin of World Trade in 1571.” *Journal of World History* 6 (2): 201–21.

Friedman, Milton. 1992. “Franklin d. Roosevelt, Silver, and China.” *Journal of Political Economy* 100 (1): 62–83. https://doi.org/10.1086/261807.

Garner, Richard L. 1988. “Long-Term Silver Mining Trends in Spanish America: A Comparative Analysis of Peru and Mexico.” *American Historical Review* 93 (4): 898–935.

Glahn, Richard von. 1996. *Fountain of Fortune: Money and Monetary Policy in China, 1000–1700*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2016. *The Economic History of China: From Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldsmiths’ Company. 2026. “The History of Hallmarking.” https://www.thegoldsmiths.co.uk/hallmarking-stories/the-history-of-hallmarking.

Grierson, Philip. 1977. *The Origins of Money*. London: Athlone Press.

Irigoin, Alejandra. 2020. “The Rise and Demise of the Global Silver Standard.” In *Handbook of the History of Money and Currency*, edited by Stefano Battilossi, Youssef Cassis, and Kazuhiko Yago, 383–410. Singapore: Springer.

———. 2025. “Foreign Monies and Exchange Risk in Pre-Modern Maritime Private Trade, or Why Did European Bills Not Circulate Outside Europe?” *Revista de Historia Económica / Journal of Iberian and Latin American Economic History*.

iShares Silver Trust. 2006. “Prospectus and Depositary Trust Agreement.” U.S. Securities; Exchange Commission. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1330568/000119312506205546/d424b3.htm.

Kallet, Lisa, and John H. Kroll. 2020. *The Athenian Empire: Using Coins as Sources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kershaw, Jane. 2017. “An Early Medieval Dual-Currency Economy: Bullion and Coin in the Danelaw.” *Antiquity* 91 (355): 173–90.

Kuroda, Akinobu. 2009. “The Eurasian Silver Century, 1276–1359: Commensurability and Multiplicity.” *Journal of Global History* 4 (2): 245–69. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022809003143.

Lane, Kris. 2019. *Potosí: The Silver City That Changed the World*. Oakland: University of California Press.

London Bullion Market Association. 2026. “Good Delivery Rules: Technical Specifications for Silver Bars.” https://www.lbma.org.uk/publications/good-delivery-rules/technical-specifications.

———. n.d. “Precious Metal Benchmarks.” https://www.lbma.org.uk/publications/the-otc-guide/precious-metal-benchmarks.

Merkel, Stephen W., Jani Oravisjärvi, and Jane Kershaw. 2023. “Sources of Early Islamic Silver: Lead Isotope Analysis of Dirhams.” *Antiquity* 97 (396): 1564–80. https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2023.165.

Metropolitan Museum of Art. 2003a. “French Silver in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.” Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/fsil/hd_fsil.htm.

———. 2003b. “The Manila Galleon Trade (1565–1815).” Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. https://www.metmuseum.org/essays/the-manila-galleon-trade-1565-1815.

———. 2004. “Nineteenth-Century English Silver.” Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/ensl/hd_ensl.htm.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2026. “Precious Metals Conversion Information.” NIST. https://www.nist.gov/pml/owm/metric-si/unit-conversion/precious-metals-conversion-information.

Powell, Marvin A. 1996. “Money in Mesopotamia.” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 39 (3): 224–42. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568520962601225.

Prakash, Om. 1998. *European Commercial Enterprise in Pre-Colonial India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robins, Nicholas A. 2011. *Mercury, Mining, and Empire: The Human and Ecological Cost of Colonial Silver Mining in the Andes*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ross, James, and Leigh Bettenay. 2024. “Gold and Silver: Relative Values in the Ancient Past.” *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 34 (3): 403–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774323000355.

Schorsch, Deborah. 2018. “Silver in Ancient Egypt.” Metropolitan Museum of Art, Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History. https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/egsl/hd_egsl.htm.

Silber, William L. 2019. *The Story of Silver: How the White Metal Shaped America and the Modern World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Spufford, Peter. 1988. *Money and Its Use in Medieval Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. 2007. “Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and Its Cultural Landscape.” https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1246/.

———. n.d. “City of Potosí.” https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/420/.

U.S. Geological Survey. 2026. “Silver Statistics and Information.” https://www.usgs.gov/centers/national-minerals-information-center/silver-statistics-and-information.

U.S. Mint. 2017. “U.s. Mint History: The ‘Crime of 1873’.” https://www.usmint.gov/news/inside-the-mint/mint-history-crime-of-1873.

———. 2026a. “Historical Timeline of the u.s. Mint.” https://www.usmint.gov/learn/history/timeline.

———. 2026b. “History of u.s. Circulating Coins.” https://www.usmint.gov/learn/history/us-circulating-coins.