

SAL 30/2017

The Figurative
History of
Money: Cognitive
Foundations of
Money Names in
Anglo-Saxon

Received 12/2016

Accepted 05/2017

The Figurative History of Money: Cognitive Foundations of Money Names in Anglo-Saxon

Metaforinė pinigų istorija:
pinigų pavadinimų
kognityviniai pagrindai
senojoje anglų
(anglo-saksų) kalboje

SOCIOLINGUISTICS / SOCIOLINGVISTIKA

Natalya Davidko

Ph D, associated professor, lecturer of Moscow Institute Touro (MIT), Russia.

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.30.17311>

Money is a matter of functioning four, a medium, a measure, a standard, a store.
(Jingle)

Abstract

The current research is the first in a series of articles devoted to the study of money names in different periods of the English language history and is an attempt to reconstruct cognitive foundations for designating the concept of money in the Anglo-Saxon period (AD 410–1066) and look at how specific historical processes and human practices might have affected the naming. Money as an object of cognition has been the prerogative of economics, and as artifacts of numismatics. Linguistics has yet to contribute to the study of the phenomenon in question as its methods of semantic, etymological, and comparative analyses can help expose sociolinguistic forces at work in setting consistent patterns of denotation. In the history of concept formation figurative transfers played an important role in creating grounds for naming an object by the cognizing subject. Thus, onomasiology draws on cognitive schemes and image-schemata as its foundational elements. The aim of the current research is to study these elements. Diachronic cognitive onomasiology and social cognitive linguistics provide cross-disciplinary frameworks for the research.

KEYWORDS: Anglo-Saxon, cognitive foundations, image-schema, onomasiology, etymology, money names, social-cognitive linguistics.



Money as an object of cognition belongs in the first place to economics; however, other humanitarian sciences as well as literature and religion have been trying to get at the essence of money ever since its appearance. Deplorably, linguistics has so far had very little to say in this respect: money names have never been subjected to a detailed and extended analysis. All researches of monetary systems have had either a purely historical and cultural or numismatic bias (Turner, 1840; Dolley, 1961; Keary, 2005; Gil, Silva, 2015). This article is an attempt to research cognitive foundations for money names through the analysis of collective cognitive processes being at work in society and establishing recurrent figurative transfers and image patterns as a result thereof. The **aim** is to study ways of verbalization of money concepts at the earliest historical period with the purpose of getting an insight into fundamental deep-rooted venues of cognitive thinking underlying lexical nomination. The **objectives** are: 1) to inquire into the origin of the names of monetary units and their semantic structure; 2) to establish cognitive, sociocultural and linguistic mechanisms regulating designations in this category; 3) to reconstruct cognitive foundations that served as orienting models and determined onomasiological processes at earlier stages; 4) to analyze how these cognitive bases have been used to categorize new objects in after periods. We postulate that the integrated picture of the category of money can be achieved only as a result of the interaction of cognitive, linguistic and social approaches. Since money is a sophisticated, socially meaningful, culture-driven creation, language units denoting this phenomenon carry in their etymology and semantic structure clues to hidden and long-lost or severed links to protogenic cognitive foundations as well as changes in this linkage. The task of the linguist is to detect and interpret these clues and spot subtle shifts pointing to new evolutionary directions thus enhancing the plausibility of assumptions about language development in general.

The **methodology** applied in the current work is a combination of **diachronic cognitive onomasiology** whose aim is to discover the different lexical *pathways* through which a particular concept has been designated, i.e. “cognitively salient ways of conceptualization” (Blank, 2003, p.44) and **social cognitive linguistics** that “integrates linguistics into the study of cognitive processes in society [...] and grounds conceptualization and meaning in their social context” (Harder, 2010, p.5). Social cognitive linguistics theorizes the existence of a *social-cognitive world* and describes meaning as part of social reality. Onomasiological activities thus must be defined in terms of social collective practices because there is “an inherent link between the cohesion of the *langue* and the cohesion of the whole set of practices that constitute the society” (ibid., p.301). The process of designating new concepts and categories is a collective activity to a great extent derived from the cultural environment and social cognition.

Naming in a broad sense reveals specific ways of conceptualizing onomasiological targets. Throughout the history of any language and especially at the pre-linguistic stage associative imagery has been playing a vital role and has been subsequently incorporated into lexemes’ semantics. Metaphor and metonymy represent two modes of association: by similarity and by contiguity. Both are powerful cognitive tools for people’s appropriation of the world. Both are based on salient conceptual properties (Blank, 1999) and interrelation of concepts (McNamara, Miller, 1989), human experience and encyclopedic knowledge (Croft, 1993). In metaphorization, concepts are decomposed into properties (semantic elements) which are transferred from one concept to another on the basis of real or fictitious similarity. Metonymy is a “concatenation between signs along string of contiguity” (Ricoeur, 1978, p.147). As a result of abstract conceptualization, each language creates its own unique system of image schemata which are “cognitive constructs that capture the essential part of the mode of being” (Harder, 2010, p.31) and can be used for inferencing the latent primigenial processes of designation.

Introduction

Methodology, Methods and Material

We presume that re-creating image-schema attachment (in our case to money) helps expose cognitive foundations for naming. The following methods are employed to reconstruct image schemata: semantic (a study of the semantic structure of a word), etymological (inquiry into the origin of a word) and comparative analysis of meanings of cognate words in related and unrelated languages.

Ontologically, the category of money comprises multifarious members: generic names, *learned* words used in economic sciences, names for denominations of coins and banknotes, and a plethora of popular names for these coins and banknotes. It is sufficient to mention *buck* and *greenback* for the dollar, *quid* for the pound, *Big Ben* for ten pounds, *Lady Godiva* for five. The object of scientific scrutiny in the current article is money names in Old English. The **material** of the research is collected from various sources: dictionaries (Bosworth & Toller, 1898; Hall, 1916) numismatic catalogs (Humphreys, 1852; AMR Coins), chronicles (Chronicles, 1823), King's laws (Anglo-Saxon Laws), charters¹, and religious writings. These sources are substantiated by hoards of coins dug up all over modern Britain. They tell us a fascinating story about early money and help to discover recurrent schemes of designating the concept. Since Anglo-Saxon money names have never been analyzed from a cognitive angle, it seems appropriate at this point to specify the most important notion. The term **Cognitive foundations**, the focal point of our research, is used in many cognitive sciences from neuroscience to psycholinguistics to didactics. Inasmuch as we are concerned with the historical aspect of social cognition, we should delineate our understanding of the term and sort it out from what is currently accepted in studies of living languages. The most common approach today is the so called *user-based or user-driven* which hypothesizes that the underlying structure (cognitive foundations) is "intrasubjectively stable across time and intersubjectively similar across members of a speech community" (Schmid, 2010, p.2). Being concerned with the dead language and wishing to find those underlying structures that exerted a strong catalytic effect on the language enrichment, we look for social causality elsewhere and define cognitive foundations as *accumulated knowledge, lived experience and acquired habits and practices that serve as an orienting model between language and cognition*. Every new instance of naming is a cognitive representation of new contents by language means.

The linguistic **methods** used in the research are threefold. First, through etymological analysis we try to see how far back the word goes and whether we can get at its *original* meaning. If the word may be traced back to the Indo-European period, then we have every reason to assume that the oldest possible cognitive foundation for the name can be derived. If the word is traced back to the Germanic branch, then the cognitive base is much younger and is associated with later historical developments of human society. The analysis of cognates helps us to establish if there are recurrent models and similar cognitive-linguistic concepts in related languages. If enough linguistic evidence is available, we can go beyond related languages and look for similar or identical models in unrelated tongues, which may serve as proof that cognitive thinking runs the same channels even at different epochs when similar social circumstances arise. Finally, we resort to semantic analysis and examine semantic structures of the words under analysis whose combination of meanings and their succession (though we understand the potential limits) reflect the interaction of cognitive processes and shifts in lexical semantics as well as lexeme's re-orientation to new referents. However, in order to understand the entanglement between human cognition and language evolution linguistic data proper should be put in the broad social-historical context, which includes literary artifacts of the time, religious faith and pagan beliefs, the level of crafts and scientific development, current commercial practices.

¹ Anglo-Saxon documents which typically made a grant of land to the Church or people, or recorded a privilege.

It is not accidental that we start our research by going back to the *roots* of the linguistic history of money in English, the Anglo-Saxon period, with its rich written documentation and dictionaries that will hopefully help us discover the cognitive patterns underlying nomination. The Anglo-Saxon period lasted for 600 years from AD 410 to 1066. In the last years of the Roman governance of the British Isles two brothers from Continental Germanic tribes Hengest and Horsa were invited by the King of Britons to fight the pict². Then the tribes of Angles, Saxons and Jutes from Germany, and the Frisians from Denmark were making their way over to Britain and settling there. From the start, the tribes formed their own kingdoms (Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia and Wessex) with Kings (*cyning*) as rulers. The settlers brought with them their own culture and beliefs. And from the Continent came the monetary system, first through the Roman Empire and Byzantine, later from Continental Europe until eventually Anglo-Saxons worked out their own monetary device. Thus, money names bear traces of various cultures.

In the Anglo-Saxon period the following words were used to denote 1) money in general (generic names) and 2) coins differing in size, designs, value and metals they were made of: *feoh*, *solidus/ bezant*, *thrymsa*, *sceatta*,

styca, *scilling*, *pennig*, *mancus*, *pund*, *marc*, *ora*, *cæsaring*, *mynet*.

The coins in the table are units of payment which were used in everyday transactions. But there also existed units of account³, i. e. purely imaginary money, which served as denominations of large sums: the marc, the mancus, the scilling, the pund.

Feoh

The Old English *feoh* (Modern English *fee*), which was the generic name for money in Old English, goes back to the Indo-European *peku-, meaning *cattle* and to the Germanic form *fehu (OED). Cognates with identical meanings are found in other Germanic languages. In Old Norse, the word *fé* had the same three meanings – *cattle*, *property*, and *money* – as did Old Frisian *fia*, Old High German *fihu*, *fehu*, and Gothic *faihu* (OED). Old English *feoh* had three meanings: 1) cattle, livestock; 2) goods, possessions, movable property; 3) money (B–T). In King Alfred's laws (about AD 900), *feoh* was used in its original meaning *cattle owned*.

The same figurative transfer operated in the Roman branch: The Latin *pecu* meant *flock*, *herd*, or *cattle*. The value of a person's animal herds was his or her *pecunia* (wealth). In this way the Latin *pecus* (cattle) extended to *pecunia* "money". Compare the Modern English word *pecuniary relating to money*.

The semantic structure of the word *feoh* is based on the oldest cognitive foundation that is rooted in the social and economic history of our primeval ancestry and figurative (metonymic) extensions of the primary meaning in after years. The importance of livestock in the life of Proto-Indo-Europeans (PIE) is hard to overestimate⁴. They regarded cattle as their main wealth, used

2 A tribal confederation of peoples who lived in what is today Eastern and Northern Scotland.

3 A unit of account is currency in which prices are quoted and accounts are kept. During inflation, prices of goods may be quoted in dollars (a unit of account) but paid for in national currency (a means of payment).

4 Domestication of animals and the emergence of cattle-raising is a characteristic of the Neolithic Age (10.200 BC–2000 BC).

Anglo-Saxon Conception of Money

Table 1

Money coined by Anglo-Saxon kings (568–1066)

Kent	silver penny, silver sceatta, gold triens
Mercia	silver penny, gold Arabic mancus
East Angles	Skeattae
Northumberland	styca, silver skeattae, silver penny
West Saxons	penny, half-penny, gold penny

cows to measure it and raided their neighbors to seize their herds. In the Vedic culture there are such notions as *gavyánt* “desirous of cattle/ battle” and *gavy* “desire for cattle” (Kullanda, 2002, p.142). The cow was a chief unit of barter and a unit of value. The tradition was long-lived: even after the introduction of money in many countries the cow remained a measure of estimating the value of commodities. In the 19th century, peoples in the Caucasus and in Ireland still reckoned value in cows; in Siberia reindeer fulfilled this function; in the regions with the hunting form of existence the units of account were skins of fur-bearing animals. The early U.S. colonists used deer hides in trade instead of money, ergo the American English *bucks*.

Looking for written substantiation of this cognitive pattern, we deem it plausible to turn to Ancient Greece where oxen were also used to measure the value of commodities long before any coins appeared and later alongside with coins. In Homer’s *Iliad*⁵ we find the lines that serve as proof:

*“The long-haired Greeks bought wine from these vessels,
in exchange for bronze, glittering iron, cattle, hides, or slaves” (Homer, 1942, p.111).*

Elsewhere, Homer ridicules Glaucus⁶ who exchanged his gold armor for the bronze armor of Diomedes⁷, describing its worth in oxen.

“With these words they sprang from their chariots [...]. But the son of Cronus (Zeus) made Glaucus take leave of his wits, for he exchanged golden armor for bronze, the worth of a hundred head of cattle for the worth of nine” (ibid. p.93).

The researchers of Homeric Poems found in them only two units of value: the one is the cow (ox), the other is the *Talent* with the former prevailing. The *Talent* is used only with reference to gold. “We never find any other article expressed in Talents; all values are expressed in so many oxen” (Ridgeway, 1892, p.3).

In the Laws of Draco⁸, the same tendency is evident: fines and punishments are often prescribed to be paid in kine (Martin, 1996). In ceremonial practices, sacred festivals or religious rituals gifts were made in oxen, and prizes in races were awarded either in cows or in *Talents*. The cognitive model is seconded by artifacts found during excavations at the beginning of the 20th century. Two thousand years before Christ in the Mycenaean⁹ civilization copper ingots¹⁰ were made in a shape of an oxen hide stretched to dry (without head or tail). A very interesting interpretation is offered by N. Angell (1929), who suggested that it was a transition from the live ox unit to metals by way of a representation of the shape of the hide. Later, in Ancient Greece, the coin *didrachm* had a popular name an ox because, as Julius Pollux (2015) states in his *Onomasticon*,¹¹ an ox was stamped on it. Egyptian wall paintings depicting scenes of payment usually portray a weigh-master in front of scales on the one cup of which there are rings (early form of money) on the other stone or brass images of oxen or cows (Lepsius, 1849, p.331). It is noteworthy that weights were made in a shape of oxen: this fact “indicates

5 The oldest extant epic narrative of Western literature dated to the eighth century BC.

6 Glaucus is a mortal fisherman who was transformed into a sea-god after eating a magical herb.

7 Diomedes is a hero in Greek mythology known for his participation in the Trojan War.

8 Draco was the first legislator of Athens. In 622 BC, he replaced the system of oral law by a written code to be enforced only by a court. Draco’s written law became known for its harshness.

9 The period of Greek history from about 1600 BC to about 1100 BC is called Mycenaean.

10 A piece of metal that is cast into a shape suitable for further processing. In ancient times, precious metal ingots were used as currency.

11 The *Onomasticon* by Julius Pollux (Ὀνομαστικόν) is a Greek thesaurus of Attic synonyms and phrases, arranged not alphabetically but according to subject-matter in ten books (the 2nd century AD).

that in the mind of the first manufacturer of weights there was a distinct connection between the shape given to the weight and the object whose value in gold it expressed” (Ridgeway, 1892, p.243). All these facts prove that the cow “had a recognized traditional and conventional value as a monetary unit” (ibid., p.8) and that “all our monetary units are descended from the ox” (Angell, 1929, p.62).

The bull played an important role in different traditions, religions, and mythology. The Indian God Shiva had a steed Nandi, the Bull; Babylonian/ Assyrian Gods did not tread on the ground, but rode on special small vehicles (very much like modern skateboards) made in the shape of calves or horses; in Ancient Egypt the cult of the Apis, the embodiment of Ptah and Osiris¹², started at the beginning of the country’s history; in Greece, in the Minoan civilization, bulls were a major object of worshipping, the most famous character of the Minoan culture is no doubt the Minotaur, *part man part bull* and his labyrinth.

But the best known example of bull worshipping is no doubt the Golden calf of scripture. Putting aside religious connotations of false idols and unworthy aspirations that this episode purports, we may state that the story sealed forever the mental linkage between the bull and money. The semantic structure of the phrase is indicative of the link: 1) a golden idol set up by Aaron and worshiped by the Israelis; 2) money or material goods as an object of worship or pursuit (OED). Worshipping of the Golden calf since then has been interpreted as love of money. No wonder the bull is the symbol of Wall Street, and the stock market where money is plentiful is called the Bull market.

The relationship between livestock and money was so entrenched in human consciousness that the reverse process became possible. It is a rare case when metonymic transfers are a two-way process. The history of the word *cattle* is a vivid illustration. In Latin *capitale* meant *principal sum of money, property, and wealth*. In Old French it shortened to *captal* or *catel* (Old Northern French) and *chattel* (Parisian variant). During the Norman Conquest the word made its way to the Anglo-Norman legal language (litigation at that period was mainly in Latin or French) in the phrase *goods and chattels*, the latter meaning *movable property* which was mostly associated with *animals held in possession, livestock*. Thus money became cows: [capital → cattle]. The spelling was only changed in the 17th century (OED).

Analyzing metonymic transfers in the semantic structure of the word *feoh*, we can suggest the following scheme of semantic relationships. By the standard definition, wealth is the accumulation of valuable resources. Its structure is threefold: it includes real estate (property), movable assets of worth, and money. Thus money is part of wealth. It has been shown above that in Indo-European and later Germanic societies animal herds were esteemed as wealth. When an idea of money as a means of payment emerged, society found that cows and oxen had long been performing this function as proto-money. So the general term denoting *wealth* was applied to the emergent concept of money as it is part in the structure of wealth: FEOH [cattle → wealth → movable possessions → money].

In Modern English we have vestiges of this once potent model, mainly in vernacular English. *Bull’s eye* (five shillings) existed from the late 1600s to 1800s, and in the late 1700s was shortened to *bull*. After about 1910, *a bull* referred to counterfeit coins and *bull money* was a slang term for *money handed to a blackmailer, or a bribe given in return for silence*. *Cows* (a pound) appeared in the 1930s, from the rhyming slang *cow’s licker* is a nicker (*nicker* means a pound).

Solidus and Tremissis

When Julius Caesar invaded Britain (55 and 54 BC), he found the natives were already using coins. He writes, “They have great numbers of cattle, they use for money either bronze,

12 Supreme Egyptian deity.

or coins of gold, or rods of iron of a fixed standard of weight” (Ridgeway, 1892, p.94). When Britain became part of the Roman Empire, all local coinage was stopped. Coins were imported from the Continent until minting was resumed only in 155AD. The Roman Empire struck the gold *solidus* in considerable volume and it made its way to Continental Europe and Britain. In the early Anglo-Saxon period (5th and 6th centuries), an important development took place when Merovingian¹³ Franks adopted the gold *triens* or *tremissis* (one third of the value of the *solidus*), as their standard coin, which served as a source of coins for Anglo-Saxons. So in the sixth century, Britain was “sporadically importing (a) *solidi*, struck either in the Western or Byzantine empire and (b) Merovingian *trientes* struck from a variety of mints” (Sutherland, 1942, p.47). However, these two coins differed in their functions. The first use of *solidi* in the 6th century was as ornaments in-wrought in gold: their high value precluded their use in everyday transactions. In today’s terminology, we would say that the *solidi* functioned as a *store of value*. The function of a *medium of exchange* was assigned to the *tremissis*, which was amply used in trade with the Continental neighbors. In the end of the 6th century, the scarcity of coins necessitated the revival of Anglo-Saxon’s own mints. When Anglo-Saxon moneyers started their own mintage, the Merovingian Frankish currency served as the prototype for Anglo-Saxon gold coins. The tradition continued: coinage of *solidi* was limited and served ornamental and ceremonial purposes (Grierson, Blackburn, 1991, p.157), whereas the output of *tremissis* grew and its circulation increased as it functioned as a means of payment.

Etymologically, the name *solidus* comes from Late Latin word denoting an imperial Roman coin – *nummus solidus* (solid coin). It emphasizes the quality of the coin which was made of thick solid gold, not of thin plate. (In the 14th century the name was revived and applied to the English shilling). The Old English name for Merovingian *trientes* was *thrymsa* and represented the price of a cow or sheep. Other variants were *trimesia*/ *trimessa*/ *primes*/ *trymsa*. The history of this name is rather complicated and is based on erroneous interpretation of the morphological structure of the Latin word *sēmissis*/ *sēmī* (half) which served as a naming pattern for fractional money. *Sēmī* was a copper coin of Ancient Rome, the half of another copper coin – the *as*. The word *sēmissis* was falsely analyzed as *sē-* + *-missis*, though the root was *semi-*. Thus, a new suffix was erroneously formed *-missis*, so the Late Latin *trēmīssis* was formed with the root *trē(s)* + the suffix *-missis*. In Anglo-Saxon the Latin root was replaced with the OE *thrīe* (three).

The names of these two coins are illustrative of two onomasiological cognitive models: the first one may be described as the *qualitative model* based on the metonymic substitution of attributive quality for the object defined; the other may be called the *quantitative model* when the name denotes a fractional part of the related coin (literally, *one third*, or *one half*, or *one fourth*).

Cæsaring

The period of Roman dominance enriched Old English with two more money names – *cæsaring* and *mynet*. The word *cæsaring* set a novel mode of money naming and created a new onomasiological pattern of designating money by the persona imprinted on the coin (later banknote). There is no evidence that a specific coin by this name had ever existed nor that the image on the coin portrayed any specific emperor. The dictionary gives the following definition: *a coin with an emperor’s image, a coin* (B–T). The name is derived from the word *Cásere* (emperor). But there were no emperors in Anglo-Saxon England, the rulers were *cynings*.

13 The Merovingian dynasty owes its name to the semi-legendary Merovech, leader of the Franks, who defeated several Germanic tribes and established the basis of the Merovingian land. Before they started minting their own coins, they had been using Byzantine coinage. Merovingian own coinage started around 534; their coins were the *solidus*, *triens*, and later *denarius* (*denier*).

We have every reason to suggest that it was the first case of popular naming a coin in public culture. Though the pattern was new in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, it had been current in Ancient cultures. In Athens, for example, coins with the head of Pallas Athena were called *Owls* or *Maidens*¹⁴. On one of the Greek islands (Aegina, a rival of Athens) in the 7th–5th centuries BC coins carried images of the sea turtle, hence their name in folk parlance was *Tortoises*.

From the Bible we know the story about *Caesar's denarius*, a coin with an engraved image of an emperor. The entire episode acquired proverbial significance. When asked if Judea should pay a tax (tribute) to Rome, Jesus said:

"Bring me a penny, that I may see it. And they brought it. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Caesar's. And Jesus answering said unto them, Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (KJV).

The quotation is from King James translation of the Bible¹⁵ in which the coin is rendered as *penny*. In the New International Version, however, the names of the coin vary: Apostles Luke and Mark call the coin *a denarius*, whilst Matthews uses the word *penny*, and Thomas¹⁶ describes it simply as *a gold coin*. It is also noteworthy that Thomas does not mention the name of Caesar but writes, "Give the emperor what belongs to the emperor, give God what belongs to God, and give me what is mine" (Thomas, 100). He emphasizes the rank, not the name. Historians contend that in Jesus' lifetime *denarii* were not in common circulation in Judea (Lewis, Bolden, 2002, p.19). They lean to the opinion that it was a big coin like a *tetradrachm*¹⁷ (four drachmae). There is no unanimity what emperor was carved on the proverbial coin either: there are at least six candidates for the persona engraved (Marotta, 2001).

Whichever coin is featured in the Bible or whichever coin had currency in Anglo-Saxon Britain, the pattern it created has proved prodigious – to name the coin irrespective of its denomination after the persona engraved on it. In Northumbria, in the 9th century pennies with images of saints were struck; those of St. Peter were called *Peter pence* (Humphreys, 1853, p.419). In the Anglo-Norman period, the gold coin called the *noble* circulated under different names: During the reign of Henry VI (1421–1471) the coins minted were called the *Henrye*; coins which had a figure of St George killing the dragon were known as the *George*. The English gold *sovereign* of a later date is also a good example. First issued in 1489, the coin derives its name from the large size portrait of the monarch sitting full face on the throne. The word *sovereign* appeared in the English language in late 13th century from Old French *soverain* meaning *superior, ruler, master*. The coin was succeeded in the reign of James I (1566–1625) by a gold coin called a *Jacobus*, the Latin name of the King inscribed on the coin. Then came the *Carolus*, a gold coin minted in the reign of Charles I. In some cases the insignia of royalty formed the basis for naming: the *crown*, the *crown of the rose* (1526), the *laurel*¹⁸ (1619), the *British crown* (1701). Later, when paper money appeared, in the UK one pound note at one time was called *Sir Isaac* because it carried a picture of Sir Isaac Newton. In America, one-hundred-dollar bills are called *Benjamins*, in reference to the portrait of Benjamin Franklin printed on it. A collective name for US dollars is *Dead presidents* from the portraits of various former US presidents that usually distinguish bills of various denominations.

14 The virgin goddess of wisdom, courage, war, law and justice, knowledge and philosophy, often depicted with an owl perched on her hand or shoulder.

15 Published in 1612. The New Testament was translated from Greek.

16 Gospel of Thomas, discovered in Egypt in 1945, a non-canonical sayings book that sheds light on oral gospel traditions.

17 An ancient Greek coin minted during 525–510 BC, is believed to have replaced earlier 'owls'.

18 The king was portrayed with a laurel on his head like a Roman patrician.

Mynet

The other Latin word was *mynet* which comes from West Germanic **munita* and has cognates in Old Saxon (*munita*), Old Frisian (*menote*), Middle Dutch (*munte*), Old High German (*munizza*), German (*münze*). All the names are derived from Latin *moneta* a place for coining money, mint; coined money, money, coinage, which in its turn is derived from *Moneta*, a surname of the Roman goddess Juno, in whose temple money was coined. In the Anglo-Saxon period the word was used in two meanings: 1) a coin and 2) coinage, money. For example, *Ætgýwap mé ðæs gafoles mynyt*¹⁹ (Bring me that tribute coin) and *Ðæt án mynet sý ofer eall ðæs cynges onweald*²⁰ (That there be one coinage over all the King's dominion). It is significant that the Anglo-Saxon translator of the Bible uses an abstract name for the coin without mentioning its denomination. We have seen that is not the case in later translations.

The Latin word performed the function of the modern noun *coin*. The word *mynet* produced many derivatives in the language that proves the importance of the concept for society: *mynetcýpa* (money-dealer), *mynetere* (moneyer, money-changer, minter), *mynetian* (to mint), *mynetisen* (a die for stamping coins), *mynetslege* (striking, minting, coining), *mynet-smiððe* (a mint). In the 12th century, *Minter* combined the meanings of a *person who mints money* and a *place where money is minted*. The modern verb *to mint* and the noun *mint* appeared only in the 1540s.

Sceatta

Gold coins, however, were short-lived. They were first debased²¹ and eventually discontinued. Towards the close of the sixth century the transition from gold to silver was evident. The Franks introduced silver *deniers* (*denarii*). England followed suit and started minting silver *sceattas* which are believed to have replaced gold *thrymsas*. The word *sceat* occurs in the Laws of Ethelbert, King of Kent, around 601–604 AD and in Mercian Laws to express money in general or a small definite quantity of money, whereas in runic legends²² it is used in the sense of a coin-denomination. All evidence suggests that *sceattas* were produced during the seventh century and lasted into the eighth (Sutherland, 1942, pp.43–46). The *sceat*'s Germanic cognates are: Old High German *scaz* (*property, money*); Old Norse *skattr* (*tribute*); Gothic *skatts* (*coin*) Frisian *skat* (*money, cattle*), Middle Dutch *scoot*, Danish *skød*, Russian *скот* (*cattle*). All the words are derived from the Proto-Germanic **skautas* meaning *cattle, treasure*.

The semantic structure of the word *sceatta* is: 1) property, goods, wealth, treasure; 2) property which is paid as a price, gift, tax, bribe, tribute, goods, money; 3) a piece of money; 4) a coin; 5) the name of the English coin (B–T). The onomasiological model of the word *sceatta* is similar to that of FEOH, whose cognitive base is the primeval concept of cattle/ cow/ ox.

However, a careful analysis of semantic extensions of the original meaning reveals a more complex semantic picture. The third meaning of the word (a piece of money), is indicative of a later cognitive base superimposed on the ox-concept; this cognitive base is rooted in the old practice of reckoning the value of money by the metric measure of length that preceded the practice of valuing money by weight (which is better known) when money existed in the form of metal rods from which parts were cut off when needed. This system was current in many

19 The Old English version of Matthew's Gospel.

20 The Laws of Æthelberht, King of Kent, 560–616 A.D.

21 Debasement – reducing the proportion of precious metals in a coin.

22 Engravings on coins.

countries from Egypt, Greece and Rome to Ireland and Britain. King James Version of Genesis, describes money as pieces: “I have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver” (Genesis xx: 16); “They sold Joseph for twenty pieces of silver” (Genesis xxxvii: 28). In modern versions the word *pieces* is replaced with the word *shekel*. The Roman word *as* (foot) in the beginning designated a land measure equal to an acre, then a linear measure; when applied to money a copper rod was one foot in length; and only later did it start to denote the weight of the rod and then the coin. The English word *yard* in Anglo-Saxon times was a land measure, then became a linear measure; at one time the word was as well applied to weight (in Cambridge, the *yard* of butter was the same as the *pound* of butter). In modern British English the *Yard* is an informal name for a thousand million pounds; in the American variant, *Yards* denotes one hundred dollars.

Stycca

Sceattas gradually vanished from the scene. For some time they continued to be minted in Northumbria in debased silver and then in cheaper metals before disappearing altogether. These coins were no bigger than a fingernail and were called *stycas* – a copper coin of the lowest value (half a farthing). The semantic structure of the word is: 1) a piece, a bit; 2) a small piece of money.

The etymology of *stycca* is uncertain. One of possible explanations is that it is derived from the oriental word for a cutting instrument. The Indian *sicca*, Chinese *sycce*, Gothic *styca*, Frankish *saiga zicca* (Arabian), *sequin* (Venetian) all denoted a tool for clipping coins, and, by the metonymic transfer, a mint, a coin, etc. “In fact, most of the coins of this period were finished with the shears” (Del Mar, 1986, p.162). The name exemplifies the cognitive base related to the procedure of making coins, so it may be called *modus operandi*. In the case of *stycca*, the foundation for naming the coin may be the instrument with the help of which the coins were made. This is how Herodotus describes the mode of making money out of gold-dust:

“He (the King) melts it and pours it into earthenware jars, and when he has filled the vessels, he strips off the earthenware, and whenever he wants money, he cuts off as much as he needs on each occasion” (Herodotus, 1971, p.211).

The word *stycca* itself created a model for naming: small pieces → money of small denomination. In Modern English, coins of relatively low value are designated as *Bits*. It is believed that the word comes from thieves slang short for *a bit of money* (1609). In the US *bit* was recorded in 1683 referring to a small silver coin forming a fraction of the Spanish dollar which was current at that time.

Mancus

The name of money that is most often mentioned in the charters is the *mancus*. Opinions differ whether the coins ever existed or whether the name simply designated a unit of account (Craik, 1844, p.79). However, in charters and laws *mancus goldes* (gold mancus) are mentioned. There is no unanimity about the origin of the word either. It may be traced back to the Proto-Indo-European *man-ko (maimed in the hand), from *man- (hand). Cognates include Old Norse *mund* and Icelandic *mund* (hand). It might be a reference to the poor quality of gold coinage circulating on the continent. The commonly accepted etymology of *mancus* is the Latin *manu cusum* (struck with a hand) emphasizing the part of human body with the help of which the coin was produced. However, there is another interpretation of its origin that cannot be overlooked: *mancus* derives from the Arabic word *manqūsh* with the root *n-q-sh* meaning *to sculpt, engrave, inscribe, i.e. strike and engrave* (Del Mar, 1986, p.155; Grierson,

Blackburn, 1991, p.327). One more Arabian theory claims that the coin's denomination may go back to Arabic *manqush*, a unit of weight. According to this point of view, the mancus was a weight applied to express a certain quantity of money, coined or uncoined. We can see that the etymology of *mancus* revolves around the same cognitive patterns: *modus operandi* or *weight*

Marc and Ōra

There are two names of coins referring to the period of the Danish invasion of Britain. The *marc* introduced by the Danish settlers was first mentioned in the agreement between Alfred and Guthrun²³ in the ninth century (Craik, 1844, p.80). The other coin is the *ōra*.

The word *marc* meaning a *unit of money or weight* (chiefly for gold or silver) appeared in late Old English, probably from Old Norse *mörk* (unit of weight), cognate with the German *Mark* in the sense of *imprinted weight or coin*. The cognitive base for this name is the acquired practice of measuring money value by weight. The custom goes back to moneyless societies in which a medium of exchange, if it was used at all, was in the form of a given weight of metal. "Metals were handed about in ingots, and weighed at each transaction" (Wells, 1920, p.97).

But in Old English there had already existed a cognate of the Danish *marc* – the Anglo-Saxon word *mearc* meaning *landmark, a sign made upon a thing; an ensign; standard* from Proto-Germanic **marko* and Proto-Indo-European **merg-* (*edge, boundary, border*). The Anglo-Saxon word is older than the Danish borrowing. Its semantics preserves the older meanings and consequently reflects the older cognitive base – the use of *mark* as a land measure which we find also in other Germanic languages: Old Norse *merki*, Old Frisian *merke*, Gothic *marka*, Dutch *merk*, German *Mark* – all meaning (*boundary, boundary land, frontier, mark, sign*). It had parallels in other PIE branches: Latin *margo* (*margin*), Avestan *mareza-* (*border*), Old Irish *mruig* (*borderland*). In Germanic languages *Mark* also had designated a linear measure before the word was incorporated into the weight system: in old Norse and German cloth was measured in marks. Etymologists believe that semantically PIE primary sense *boundary* evolved into the Anglo-Saxon *sign* along the following route: *boundary* → *sign of a boundary* → *sign in general* → *impression or trace forming a sign*, the last one was registered in about 1200 (OED).

Having the same source but different venues and time of penetrating English, the two words are no doubt semantically related and reflect different cognitive bases for naming: the older related to linear and space measures, and a more recent that of weight. The *marc* was a chief unit of account with Anglo-Saxons until it was replaced by the *pound*. The *marc* generated a new style of payment – payment by tale, that is by literally counting out the coins, rather than by weighing because the weight was impressed on them. This was a new development in the history of money that gave birth to the semiotic model which in the future severed any link between the value of money and the value of the material it was made of – Money, is a sign, a token.

The other Danish money unit, the *ōra*, a species of money often mentioned in the Laws of the Northumbrian Priests, had a similar etymological history with the *marc*. Being of Germanic origin (Old Norse *aur-*, *eyrir* (*an ounce of silver*), Icel. *Yrir*, (*the eighth part of a mark*), it had an Old English cognate: *ōra* (*border, edge, margin*). Thus the *weight*-model and *sign*-model are interacting in this name too. However, these monies were short-lived.

23 Old English agreement between King Alfred of Wessex (871–899) and Guthrum, the Viking King of East Anglia, which spelled out the terms of peace and established the boundary between their Kingdoms.

Now we proceed to analyze the money-names which have the longest history in the English language and made up the modern monetary system of Great Britain up to the decimalization in 1970: *penny, shilling, pound, and farthing*.

Penny

The modern *penny* is among the earliest British coins. It was first minted in the 8th century AD by the Kings of Kent (Heaberht) and Mercia (Offa). However, it was not until Eadgar became King of all England in 959 that the silver penny became universal throughout the country (Del Mar, 1896).

The Old English *pening/ penig*, comes from Proto-Germanic **panningaz* of unknown origin. Its cognates are: Old Norse *penningr*, Swedish *pänning*, Danish *penge*, Old Frisian *panning*, Old Middle Dutch *pennic*, Dutch *penning*, Old High German *pfenning*, German *Pfennig*.

The origin of the *penny* is uncertain. Some historians believe that the coin was named after the Mercian King Penda²⁴, (compare Russian *керенки; катеринки*; French *Louis d'or*). Others believe that the penny, like its Germanic cognates, got its name from the pans which were used to melt silver before minting coins (West Germanic **panna* (pan). In Old Danish a small pan was called *penninge*, from which the word for *penge* (money) possibly originated. The German *Pfennig* might also come from *Pfanne*, the German for *pan* (OED). Another theory has it that *penning*, *Pfennig* and *penge* all come from West Germanic **panda* (*pawn pledge*). Some researchers derive it from the Latin word *pendo* (*to weigh*). Whichever the case, they all are indicative of very old metonymic transfers: personal name → name of an object; container → contents; action (pawning) → object (what is pawned). However, the instrumental model seems most believable since it rests on the old cognitive base *modus operandi*.

It is noteworthy that the meaning of weight is present in the semantic structure of the word: *pennyweight* (an ounce) (B–T). *Gif ða penegas teóp swíðor ðonne ðæt gold ðonne miswyrp ðam men hraðe* (if the pennies weigh a tenth more than the gold, then will it soon turn out badly for the man) (ibid). The very first penny-coins were struck on a weight standard.

Scilling

Another money name used by Anglo-Saxons was *scilling* (Modern *shilling*). It may be traced to Proto-Germanic *skillingoz-* and had cognates in other Germanic languages: Old Frisian *skilling*, Middle Dutch *schellingh*, Old High German *scilling*, Old Norse *skilling-r*, Gothic *skiliggs* (OED). There is no unanimity about the etymology of this word either. Some etymologists believe that it may be traced back to the root **skell* meaning *to resound, ring* (compare the Russian expression *звонкая монета* (coins clink). Others relate it to the root **skel* *to divide*. They think that the word originally denoted one of the segments of fixed weight into which a bracelet of gold or silver was divided, so that these pieces might be removed and used as money. The Russian *rouble* has a similar etymology. It is derived from the verb *рубить* which means *to cut, divide into pieces*. Some think the root might be from Proto-Germanic **skeldu-z.*, meaning *a shield, an article of defensive armour* (OED); the name is based on the similarity of form. Yet other researchers relate it to *sceale* (a scale). The semantic structure supports this idea as it includes a meaning *weight*. *Genim of ðysse wyrte petroselini swýðe smæl dust ánes scillinges gewihte* (Take a shilling weight of this parsley ground to fine dust) (B–T).

The story of the coin and the word is interesting. First came the word, and it was the denomination of value, not a coin (B–T). The coin was not minted until the sixteenth century; how-

24 Penda was a war-like King. He fought mercilessly and expanded Mercian territory at the expense of all the neighbouring Kingdoms.

ever, the value of a shilling had been used for accounting purposes since the Anglo-Saxon period. Originally, a shilling equated to the value of a cow in Kent or a sheep in other parts of the country. Researchers suppose that in the Anglo-Saxon period the word *scillinga* meant a certain quantity of uncoined silver. “The idea represented by the word is that so much silver cut off, and weighing so much” should be paid (Turner, 1840, p.311). In Kings’ Laws penalties were mainly prescribed in shillings. For example, in the Laws of Kent we read, “*If a man slay another in an eorl’s tun²⁵, let him make bot²⁶ with twelve shillings*” (Anglo-Saxon Dooms). That it was a unit of account is supported by the derivative *scillingrím* (reckoning by shillings). *Se mé beág forgeaf, on ðam siex hund wæs smætes goldes sceatta scillingrime* (He gave me that ring of the value of six hundred sceattas of pure gold reckoned in shillings). Thus we see that two cognitive foundations are interwoven in this name: that of *weight* and *modus operandi*. The word was also used to translate many foreign names of money: obol²⁷, stater²⁸, denarii²⁹, dragmam³⁰, argenteos³¹.

Feórðling

The word *feórpung/ feórþling* (modern *farthing*) appeared before the hard coin was minted in the 13th century. Ælfric explains its meaning as follows: “*Ðes feórþling oððe feórþa dæll þinges*” (It is a quarter or one fourth part of a thing) (B–T). Demand for small change at that time was easily met by simply cutting a penny coin, or any other coin for that matter, with a chisel into halves or quarters. The cross that was present on the reverse of many coins as a symbol of Christianity also served a practical purpose of cutting a coin into so many parts. That is why in many hoards archeologists find parts of coins. True, there was an attempt by Offa (King of Mercia) to mint round farthings, but they did not catch on. However, in the Bible we come across this word meaning some kind of coins. *Geseah he sume earme wudewan bringan twegen feórþlingas* (He saw a mournful widow bring two farthings). This is a sentence from a well-known Biblical story called *The Widow’s Offering*.

“As Jesus looked up, he saw the rich putting their gifts into the temple treasury. He also saw a poor widow put in two very small copper coins. ‘Truly I tell you,’ he said, ‘this poor widow has put in more than all the others. All these people gave their gifts out of their wealth; but she out of her poverty put in all she had to live on’” (NIV, Luke 21 1–4).

It could not have been farthings as positive coins because the first coins were struck of silver. The only copper coins of that time were styccas. The first copper farthings were issued during the reign of King James I; however, in the Bible of his time (supervised and sponsored by the King himself) the translator avoided mentioning the coin. The text reads: “And he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites” (KJV, Luke, 21–2) or “And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing” (ibid. Mark 12–43). It stresses a very low value of the coins. Thus, we can presume that *farthing* in Anglo-Saxon was a name of fractional money which was grounded in the practice of breaking down existing coins if need be. The practice is very old and is found in many Ancient cultures (Ridgeway, 1892). Old practices die hard; when comparable circumstances arise, people and govern-

25 manor, dwelling.

26 Remedy.

27 a form of Ancient Greek currency and weight.

28 literally *weigher* was an Ancient coin used in various regions of Greece and Ancient Europe.

29 a small Roman silver coin first minted about 211 BC.

30 The Greek *drachm*.

31 Silver pieces of money.

ments again resort to fractional money. When first settlers in America were faced with the scarcity of small change, they simply cut dollar bills into quarters or halves. During the Civil War the federal government issued perforated banknotes called postage currency to provide change (Mitchell, 1902, p.554).

Another interesting peculiarity in the semantic structure of the word is the presence of the meaning related to space measurements. “A division of land, probably originally a fourth of a hide (100 acres); later, a quarter of an acre.

Pund

In Anglo-Saxon the *pund* (pound) was understood as weight. No coin of any denomination existed by that name. Throughout the whole Saxon period the pound meant a weight of silver out of which 240 silver pennies could be coined. That the name of weight is later transferred to the name of money is not uncommon in other cultures: Greek *talanton*, Hebrew *sheqel*, German *Mark*; etc. are examples of the same pattern. The word *pound* is an early borrowing from Latin *pondo* (pound), originally in *libra pondo* (a pound by weight). Ælfric gives the following explanation, “*Libra is pund on Englisc*” (B–T). It had its cognates in Proto-Germanic: **punda* is a source of Gothic *pund*, Old High German *phunt*, Middle Dutch *pont*, Old Frisian and Old Norse *pund*.

The semantic structure of the word *pund* is indicative of the long and complicated way the system of weight standards had been made. We find the correlation of ancient cognitive bases: space, capacity and weight. It may mean in some cases *a pound weight of bread* and in other cases *one-and-a-half acres of land*. E.g., *Pund eles gewihþ .xii. penegum læsse ðonne pund wætres, and pund ealop gewihþ .vi. penegum máre ðonne pund wætres* (a pound of oil carries .xii pennies less than a pound of water, and a pound of ale bears .vi pennies more than a pound of water) (B–T). In addition, it reveals one more cognitive base – that of capacity: “a pound of water is a pint of water, and a pint of water is a pint for all liquids,” (B–T). In ancient times, weights were based on a certain capacity. For example, in Ancient Egypt the early units of weight equaled a portion of a cubic cubit³² of the Nile water (Ridgeway, 1892, p.242). Thus, in Anglo-Saxon the name of a weight did not yet mean a sum of money, which had relation to such weight. However, it established a lasting relationship between the pound and the metal it weighed – silver of the highest fineness (sterling/ iesterling), but this is a story of another epoch.

The analysis of money names in Anglo-Saxon reveals a complex picture. The money system was influenced by various cultures: Roman, Merovingian, Danish, and Arabian; this cultural diversity provided a variety of cognitive foundations.

One of the basic findings concerning this domain is that the level of societal development was fundamental for producing a name and onomasiology reflected what was salient to people at a certain point in history. At one time it was cattle, at another various metals. In addition, accepted practices of production and payment are reflected in the money names. Underlying much of designation is the semantic role of imagination. Figurative transfers are at the core of every word analyzed. Figurative thinking had its logic, and in this early period was based solely on metonymy involving various types of contiguity: personal name → name of an object; container → contents; action → object; shape → object; quality → object, instrument → object.³²

³² The cubit is an Ancient unit based on the forearm length from the middle finger tip to the elbow bottom.

Conclusions

The current research has brought to light cognitive foundations which were formed as a result of the interaction of social historical forces and productive imagination. 1) The oldest one is traced back to moneyless societies with *living* money (cattle). The image schema of *ox/ cow* was present in the Anglo-Saxon generic name for money *Feoh*. 2) Another foundation, which we call *modus operandi*, is related to the process of producing coins: *mancus* (made with a hand), *styca* (cut with shears). 3) One more cognitive foundation is related to weight standards and the practice of payment by weighing money. Many money names have a meaning *weight* in their semantic structure: *pund*, *penny*, *marc*. 4) The next is the *Quantitative model* which is the foundation for the names of fractional money *feórbung* and *thrymsa*. 5) A *Qualitative model* being a legacy of the Roman Empire was of minor importance and was the base for the name of one coin having limited currency – *solidus*. 6) However, the most important cognitive base that was taking substance at that time was the budding *semiotic model* – money as a sign expression of value, e.g. *marc* meant *imprinted weight*. 7) We also find examples of popular naming, though very few – a tradition that in consequent years generated an avalanche of names for coins and banknotes: *Peter penny* and *cæsaring*.

The analysis of semantics of money names allows of drawing some conclusions about changes taking place in cognitive foundations. Old, once potent cognitive foundations of *living* money were ceding place to a newer substratum for naming. In the period under consideration the cognitive base related to weight was gaining ground. The idea of weight is incorporated in the meaning of several money names, culminating in the word *pound* whose meaning is based entirely on weight. It is too early to speak about a *semiotic model* as a foundation for naming. The conception of sign came from land demarcation, and the idea of a sign representing the value of money was germinating within the weight system. But more drastic shifts were yet to come. 1066 marked a turning point not only in the history of Britain, but a shift in cognitive foundations for onomasiology. Pathetically, the last coin issued by the last Anglo-Saxon *cyning* carried an inscription PAX (peace) on its reverse.

References

- Blank, A., 2003. Words and Concepts in Time: towards Diachronic Cognitive Onomasiology. In: Trends in Linguistics. Words in Time. Diachronic Semantics from Different Points of View. Eckardt, R., Heusinger, K., & Schwarze, Ch. (eds.). The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, pp.37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110899979.37>
- Blank, A., 1999. Co-presence and Succession: A Cognitive Typology of Metonymy. In: Panther, K. & Radden, G. (eds.), Metonymy in Language and Thought. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp.169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.4.10bla>
- Craik, G., 1844. The History of British Commerce: From the Earliest Times, vol. 1. London: Charles Knight & Co, p.280.
- Croft, W., 1993. The Role of Domains in the Interpretation of Metaphors and Metonymies. In: Cognitive Linguistics, 4, pp.335–370. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1993.4.4.335>
- Del Mar, A., 1896 (2006). History of Monetary Systems. Honolulu: University Press of the Pacific, pp 444.
- Gil, I., Silva, H., 2015. The Cultural Life of Money. Berlin/ Boston: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 227.
- Grierson, Ph., Blackburn, M., 1991. Medieval European Coinage, volume 1. The Early Middle Ages (5th–10th centuries). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.675.
- Hall, G., 1916. A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. New York: The Macmillan Company, p.373.
- Harder, P., 2010. Meaning in Mind and Society: A Functional Contribution to the Social Turn in Cognitive Linguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p.515. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110216059>

10. Herodotus, 1971. *The Histories* (translated by Selincourt, A.). London: Penguin Books, p.716.
 11. Homer, 1942, *The Iliad* (translated by Butler, S.). New York: Waler J. Black- Roslyn, p.391.
 12. Humphreys, H. N., 1853. *The Coin Collector's Manual; or, Guide to the Numismatic Student in the Formation of a Cabinet of Coins*. London: H. G. Bohn, p.726.
 13. Keary, Ch., 2005. *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum*. London: Adamant Media Corporation, p.750.
 14. Kullanda, S., 2002. Indo-European "Kinship Terms" (revised). In: *Current Anthropology*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp.137–144. <https://doi.org/10.1086/324127>
 15. Lepsius, K., 1849. *Expedition auf Befehl Seiner Majestät*, 13 vols. Berlin: Nicolaische Buchhandlung, p.397.
 16. Lewis, P., Bolden, R., 2002. *The Pocket Guide to Saint Paul: Coins Encountered by the Apostle on His Travels*. Kent Town: Wakefield Press, p.292.
 17. Marotta, M., 2001. *Six Caesars of Tribute Penny* [online]. Available at: http://www.foundcollection.com/1_036d802f48b72a97_1.htm [Accessed 9 December 2016].
 18. Martin, Th., 1996. *Greece: From Prehistoric to Hellenist Times*. New Haven: The Yale University Press, p.261.
 19. McNamara, T. P, Miller, D. L., 1989. Attributes of Theories of Meaning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, pp.355–376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.3.355>
 20. Mitchell, W. C., 1902. The Circulating Medium during the Civil War. In: *Journal of Political Economy*. The University of Chicago Press. 10 (4), pp.537–574. <https://doi.org/10.1086/250880>
 21. Ricoeur, P., 1978. The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling. In: *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 5, no. 1. Special Issue on Metaphor, pp.143–159.
 22. Ridgeway, W., 1892. *The Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 417.
 23. Schmid H-J., Handl S., (eds.), 2010. *Cognitive Foundations of Linguistic Usage Patterns: Empirical Studies*. Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter, p.276.
 24. Sutherland, C., 1942. Anglo-Saxon Sceattas in England: Their Origin, Chronology, and Distribution. In: *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society* (sixth series), vol. 2, no. 1/ 4, pp.42–70.
 25. Turner, Sh., 1840. *The History of the Anglo-Saxons from the Earliest Period to the Norman Conquest*, vol. 2. Paris: Baudry's European Libarary, p.360.
 26. Wells, H. G., 1920. *Outline of History*. London: George Newnes, p.1190.
- ### Sources
1. AMR Coins [online]. Available at: <http://www.amrcoins.com/coins-for-sale/period/early-anglosaxon/> [Accessed 15 November 2016].
 2. Anglo-Saxon Coins. Studies Presented to Sir Frank Stenton on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday, 1961. Dolley, R. (ed). London: Methuen, pp. 296.
 3. The Anglo-Saxon Dooms [online], pp.560–975. Available at: <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/source/560-975dooms.asp>. [Accessed 2 April 2017].
 4. Bosworth, J., Toller, T., 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (B-T). Oxford: The Clarendon Press
 5. King James Version of the Holy Bible (KJV) [online]. Available at: <https://www.biblegateway.com/versions/King-James-Version-KJV-Bible> [Accessed 12 May 2017].
 6. *New International Version of the Holy Bible* (NIV), 1984. Colorado Springs: International Bible Society.
 7. *Online Etymology Dictionary* [online]. Available at: <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php> [Accessed 13 May 2017].
 8. *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), 1884. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 9. Pollux Grammaticus, 2015. *Onomasticon*. Charleston: Nabu Press.
 10. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (translated by Ingram, R. J.), 1823 (1912). London: Everyman Press.
 11. *The Gospel of Thomas* [online]. Available at: <http://gnosis.org/naghamm/gosthom.html> [Accessed 14 May 2017].

Santrauka

Natalya Davidko. Metaforinė pinigų istorija: pinigų pavadinimų kognityviniai pagrindai senojoje anglų (anglosaksų) kalboje

Šis mokslinis darbas yra pirmasis iš panašių darbų serijos, skirtas įvairių anglų kalbos istorijos laikotarpių pinigų pavadinimams tirti. Juo siekiama rekonstruoti kognityvinius pagrindus apibrėžiant pinigų sąvoką senosios anglų kalbos gyvavimo laikotarpiu (A. D. 410–1066) ir patyrinėti, kaip pinigų pavadinimus galėjo veikti konkretūs istorijos procesai ir žmogaus praktinė veikla. Pinigai, kaip pažinimo objektas, buvo ir tebėra ekonomikos mokslo prerogatyva ir numizmatikos artefaktas. Tačiau lingvistika taip pat turi prisidėti prie šio reiškinio tyrimo, nes jo semantikos, etimologijos ir lyginamosios analizės metodai gali pagelbėti atskleisti, kaip sociolingvistiniai veiksniai dėsningai įtvirtina pavadinimų modelius. Per visą sąvokos formavimosi istoriją metaforiniai perkėlimai vaidino svarbų vaidmenį pažinimo subjektui kuriant pagrindus objekto pavadinimui. Todėl onomasiologija (pavadinimų mokslas), kaip savo pagrindiniais elementais, remiasi kognityvinėmis schemomis ir įvaizdžių aprašymais. Diachroninė kognityvinė onomasiologija ir socialinė kognityvinė lingvistika yra tarpdisciplininis šio tyrimo pagrindas.

About the Author

Natalya Davidko

Ph D, associated professor, lecturer of Moscow Institute Touro (MIT).

Research Interests

Linguistics, cognitive linguistics, business English, sociolinguistics, diachronic onomasiology.

Address

20 Podsosensky Pereulok, Moscow, Russia.

E-mail:

Natalyadavidko@yandex.ru