

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft
Band: 88 (2009)

Artikel: Tradition and innovation in Carthaginian coinage during the Second Punic War
Autor: Visonà, Paolo
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-179781>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 04.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN CARTHAGINIAN
COINAGE DURING THE SECOND PUNIC WAR

PLATE 13

Despite being one of the largest coinages of antiquity before the Roman conquest, the coinage of Carthage used a relatively small number of coin types over the span of two and a half centuries¹. The horse and the palm tree, alone or associated with a divine female or male head², are the basic types found on Carthaginian issues in all metals since Carthage began to strike coins *c.* 410 BC. Yet, these did not become ‘types immobilisés’, like those on the royal coinage of Persia. Nor did their style remain unchanged over long periods of time. In fact, there is considerable variety and stylistic development on the coins minted at Carthage and its overseas territories in the 4th and throughout the 3rd century BC³. After the Carthaginians gradually introduced a coinage in different metals (silver, gold, bronze, and electrum) by

¹ An earlier version of this essay was presented at the conference on ‘La Monnaie, passerelle pour le dialogue entre les peuples et les cultures’ held at the Banque Centrale de Tunisie, Tunis, on June 20, 2009.

Silvia Hurter had a discerning eye for Carthaginian coins and a sense of humor for the idiosyncrasies of Punic style. She was a terrific editor, a unique mentor, and a dear friend; I owe her immense gratitude, and I will miss her.

² For recent studies on the identity of the obverse type on Carthaginian coins, cf. A. CUTRONI TUSA, *Interpretazione di un tipo monetale della Sicilia occidentale: maschile o femminile?*, in: *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII–III sec. a.C.). Arte, prassi e teoria della pace e della guerra*, vol. II (Pisa, 2006), pp. 675–679; E. ACQUARO, *Kore nella monetazione di Cartagine punica*, in: C.A. DI STEFANO (ed.), *Demetra. La divinità, i santuari, il culto, la leggenda. Atti del I Congresso Internazionale Enna, 1–4 luglio 2004* (Pisa – Roma, 2008), pp. 135–136. It is unlikely that the type of obverse head on the earliest Carthaginian coins had anything to do with the introduction of the cult of Demeter and Kore at Carthage in 396 BCE: cf. G. GARBATI, *Sul culto di Demetra nella Sardegna punica*, in: G. REGALZI (ed.), *Mutuare, interpretare, tradurre. Storie di culture a confronto, Atti del 2° Incontro “Orientalisti”* (Roma, 11–13 dicembre 2002) (Roma, 2006), pp. 136–137.

³ Abbreviations: BALDUS 1982 = H. R. BALDUS, *Unerkannte Reflexe der römischen Nordafrika-Expedition von 256/255 v. Chr. in der karthagischen Münzprägung*, *Chiron* 12, 1982, pp. 163–190; BURNETT 2000 = A. BURNETT, *The Silver Coinage of Italy and Sicily in the Second Punic War*, in: W. HOLLSTEIN (ed.), *Metallanalytische Untersuchungen an Münzen der Römischen Republik* (Berlin, 2000), JENKINS and LEWIS 1963 = G.K. JENKINS and R.B. LEWIS, *Carthaginian Gold and Electrum Coins* (London, 1963); SNG Cop. = G.K. JENKINS (ed.), *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Copenhagen*, fasc. 42, *North Africa: Syrtica – Mauretania* (Copenhagen, 1969); VISONÀ 1989 = P. VISONÀ, *Carthaginian Bronze Coinage in southern Italy and Sicily during the Second Punic War*, in: I.A. CARRADICE *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Numismatics*, London, September 1986 (Wetteren, 1989), VISONÀ 1998 = P. VISONÀ, *Carthaginian Coinage in Perspective*, *AJN* 10, 1998, pp. 1–27.

the second half of the 4th century, the consistent use of few coin types may have been intended to facilitate transactions within Punic territory, since the same issues circulated in North Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia, but generally had no value marks.⁴ We can assume that a Punic merchant at Tharros or Lilybaion would have known how many bronze units with a prancing horse similar to SNG Cop. 94 were equivalent to a gold or electrum denomination with a standing horse. The main users of these coins must have been politically subject to the authority of Carthage, or mercenaries serving in the Carthaginian army, but need not have been culturally Punic. The Greeks and the indigenous people living in the Punic zone in Sicily and Sardinia also used Carthaginian currency, as we know e.g. from the excavations at Iaitas, Segesta, and Selinus⁵, and at Tharros and Olbia and their hinterland⁶.

This pattern of circulation became increasingly regional in the period between the first two Punic wars, when coins were struck only in Zeugitania and in the areas of present-day Spain under Barcid control. Between c. 237 and 220 BC coins minted at Carthage circulated in or near North Africa, while Barcid issues generally did not travel outside the Iberian peninsula⁷. In contrast, the Second Punic War witnessed the activity of several Carthaginian mints outside North Africa. During this conflict Carthaginian armies fought simultaneously in different regions of the Mediterranean and interacted with the Romans as well as with other, culturally diverse populations, particularly in the Italian peninsula. At the same time, Carthaginian coinage underwent significant changes. While certain traditional coin types were retained, new coin types and styles were introduced by Carthage and other Punic mints in southern Italy and Sicily between 216 and 211 BC. Since some of these coins were meant to be used in both Punic and non-Punic cultural milieus, to

⁴ S. FREY-KUPPER, Coins and their use in the Punic Mediterranean. Case studies from Carthage to Italy (fourth to first century BC), in: J. QUINN and N. VELLA, Identifying the Punic Mediterranean. Proceedings of the conference, British School at Rome, 6–8 November 2008 (Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome) (London, forthcoming).

⁵ See S. FREY-KUPPER, Aspects de la production et de la circulation monétaires en Sicile (300–180 av. J.-C.): continuités et ruptures, *Pallas* 70, 2006, pp. 31–34 and 51, fig. 3; EAD., *supra*, note 4.

⁶ Cf. P. VISONÀ, Carthaginian Bronze Coinage in Sardinia, in: Numismatique et histoire économique phéniciennes et puniques. Actes du Colloque tenu à Louvain-la-Neuve, 13–16 Mai 1987 [Studia Phoenicia IX] (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1992), pp. 122–123, 129–131; F. GUIDO, Olbia. Su Cuguttu 1992: le monete, in: A. MASTINO and P. RUGGERI (eds.), Da Olbia ad Olbia. 2500 anni di storia di una città mediterranea. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Olbia, 12–14 Maggio 1994 (Sassari, 1996), pp. 441–446; L.-I. MANFREDI, Note storiche e archeometriche sull monete puniche da Tharros, in: E. ACQUARO *et al.* (eds.), Tharros Nomen (Monteriggioni 1999), pp. 181–186; EAD., Produzione e circolazione delle monete puniche nel sud dell'Italia e nelle isole del Mediterraneo Occidentale (Sicilia e Sardegna), in: M. P. GARCÍA-BELLIDO and L. CALLEGARIN (eds.), Los Cartagineses y la monetización del Mediterráneo occidental [Anejos de AespA 22] (Madrid, 2000), espec. pp. 16–22; M. Gharbi, Frontières et échanges en Sardaigne à l'époque punique, in: L'Africa romana XV (Roma, 2004), pp. 791–804; M. MADAU, Alla ricerca dell'identità perduta: il contributo dell'archeologia in Sardegna, *ibidem*, pp. 1087–1090; A. POLOSA, Appunti sulla circolazione monetaria in Sardegna fino all'età augustea, *AIIN* 52, 2006, pp. 130–133.

⁷ See VISONÀ 1998, p. 16, note 47; cf. S. FREY-KUPPER, Monete dal Tevere – I rinvenimenti “greci”, *BdN* 25, 1995, pp. 43–44 and p. 47, no. 1.

what extent was typological and stylistic innovation spurred by political expediency? Seven different groups of Carthaginian coins minted in Italy, Africa, and Sicily, will be briefly examined in an attempt to answer this question.

Special emphasis will be given to a bronze issue which has never been discussed.

Although some financial resources must have been available to Hannibal when he invaded the Italian peninsula⁸, the Carthaginians did not strike a large coinage in preparation for a second war against Rome, and there is no evidence that they sent money to Hannibal before his victory at Cannae in 216. The first group of Carthaginian issues minted for use in Italy consists of electrum 3/8 shekels, which imitate the types of the last series of Roman didrachms, the quadrigati⁹. The quadrigatus had been the main silver coin in the Italian peninsula for several years before the Second Punic War, and it would have been well known to Hannibal's troops after 218. But these small electrum fractions are not mere copies of Roman coins. The Punicized janiform female head wreathed with cornears that replaced the Roman male laureate on the obverse of the quadrigati may have alluded to the greatest victory of Carthage over Rome. Conversely, the lack of the ethnic **ROMA** below the quadriga on the reverse had equally strong ideological overtones. Whether this electrum was minted at Carthage or by Carthaginian moneyers in southern Italy (possibly with gold captured at Cannae)¹⁰, it represents the first example of a deliberate 'hybridization' of coin iconography and style by the Carthaginians during the war. Roman and Punic types were reinterpreted in a manner that gave them new meaning and hinted at freedom from Roman political domination. Such an unprecedented initiative should perhaps be attributed to Hannibal, who must have been familiar with the currency used in the Italian peninsula. It seems noteworthy that the ransom for the Roman soldiers who surrendered to the Carthaginians after the battle of Cannae was negotiated in quadrigati¹¹. The fact that electrum coins in general did not circulate in Italy indicates that the issue of 3/8 shekels with janiform head and quadriga was extraordinary. For the first time in the Italian campaign, Hannibal may have been able or have needed to make a cash payment to his troops. It is interesting that the few known proveniences of this electrum are concentrated in the Apulia region, where Roman quadrigati were minted: M.H. Crawford's suggestion 'that the issue was produced in (or for) South-East Italy' is quite plausible¹². As the minting of quadrigati was discontinued after c. 212 BC, the Carthaginian electrum could have been struck between 216 and 212.

⁸ Hannibal bribed the commander of Clastidium's garrison with 400 gold coins according to Livy 21.48.9, although Polybius (3.69.4) only states that Hannibal gave him great honors. Livy's story would suggest that Hannibal had some gold currency at his disposal in 218 BCE.

⁹ JENKINS and LEWIS 1963, pp. 48–50, 121 (Group XVI); *HN³ Italy*, p. 161, no. 2013.

¹⁰ M.H. CRAWFORD, Provenances, attributions and chronology of some early Italian coinages, in: A. MEADOWS and U. WARTENBERG, *Coin Hoards 9* (London, 2002), p. 274. Some quadrigati also travelled to North Africa: see M. FANTAR, *Kerkouane. Cité punique du Cap Bon (Tunisie)*, vol. III (Tunis, 1986), p. 539.

¹¹ Cf. Livy 22.52.3 and 22.58.4.

¹² CRAWFORD (*supra*, note 10), p. 274; cf. *HN³ Italy*, p. 50, nos. 334–335, and BURNETT 2000, pp. 102–105.

Two groups of silver half- and quarter-shekels were also issued in southern Italy by mints that have not yet been identified. Even though these coins bear overtly Carthaginian types, they would have been interchangeable with the coins of Hannibal's allies, some of which (Taras and Metapontum) minted silver half- and quarter-shekels¹³. Thus, for nearly a decade after 216, a silver currency based on the standard of the Carthaginian shekel circulated not only in North Africa and in the Iberian peninsula, but also across a large swath of southern Italy extending from Bruttium to Apulia. Even though the total output of these coinages may not have been substantial, it helped the Carthaginians to defray military expenses and it allowed them to engage in monetary transactions with the Greek and Oscan communities of southern Italy.

One group of Hannibalic silver (SNG Cop. 367–369) that was probably minted in Bruttium is known by numerous local hoards and site finds¹⁴. The style of the female head on the obverse lacks the traditional corn leaf and recalls that of the female head on the last silver series of Neapolis (c. 275–250 BC)¹⁵. Both the linear treatment of the coiffure and the rolled-up bands of hair on the forehead are distinctive. This interpretation of the Carthaginian obverse type could even be the work of a south Italian die cutter. Since a small *gamma* is sometimes found on the reverse of the half-shekels, which bear a horse standing before a palm tree, and the same letter is used as a control mark on several silver, gold, and bronze issues of the Brettians, Hannibal's main south Italian allies, this coinage may have been produced by a Brettian mint¹⁶. A series of bronze units and fractions in the style of the silver (SNG Cop. 370–376), some of which are overstruck upon Roman semilibral and quadrantal unciae, suggest that this group of issues was minted before 211 BC¹⁷.

¹³ Cf. *HN³ Italy*, nos. 1078–1083 and 1632–1636. The Lucanians probably did not mint half-shekels: a worn Lucanian coin similar to *HN³ Italy* no. 1449 (listed as an AR drachm / Punic half-shekel and dated c. 209–207 BC) comes from the Corfou hoard, which was concealed in the first quarter of the 3rd century: see K. PREKA and S. GJONGEČAJ, *Le trésor de Corfou*, 1997, in: G. MOUCHARTE *et al.* (eds.), *Liber amicorum Tony Hackens* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2007), pp. 368, 370 (no. 42), and 376. This issue may be dated to the time of Pyrrhus or even earlier.

¹⁴ P. VISONÀ, *Prolegomena to a Corpus of Carthaginian Bronze Coins*, *NACQT* 35, 2006, p. 247, Fig. 1. Add: R. AURIEMMA and A. DE GASPERI, Roca (LE), *Campagne di scavo 1987–1995: rinvenimenti monetali*, *Studi di Antichità* 11, 1998 [2003], pp. 92–93, nos. 16–17 and p. 120; E.A. ARSLAN, *Presenza e funzioni della moneta a Crotone e nella sua chora*, in: *Presenza e funzioni della moneta nelle choraì delle colonie greche dall'Iberia al Mar Nero. Atti del XII Convegno organizzato dall'Università "Federico II" e dal Centro Internazionale di Studi Numismatici*, Napoli 16–17 giugno 2000 (Roma, 2004), p. 241 (KR-CC 81–82).

¹⁵ See E. POZZI *et al.*, *La monetazione di Neapolis nel IV–III sec. a.C.*, in: *La monetazione di Neapolis nella Campania antica. Atti del VII Convegno del Centro Internazionale di Studi Numismatici*, Napoli 20–24 aprile 1980 (Napoli, 1986), pp. 111–115; cf. *HN³ Italy*, no. 586; *CNG Triton XII*, 6.1.2009, no. 21.

¹⁶ Cf. *HN³ Italy*, nos. 1941–1974.

¹⁷ VISONÀ 1989, pp. 85–86; ID., *La monetazione annibalica in bronzo nel Bruzio*, *Klearchos* 34, nos. 129–136, 1991–1992, [1994], pp. 155–157. An example overstruck upon a quadrantal uncia, found at Ascoli Satriano, is in the collection of the Soprintendenza Archeologica della Puglia at Taranto (diam. 19.25 – 20.75 mm; 5.5 g).

In contrast, a third group of Hannibalic coins consisting of half- and quarter-shekels (SNG Cop. 359–364) bears a completely different depiction of the female head on the obverse, and may have been struck at a mint located elsewhere in southern Italy. The more exuberant style of the obverse type resembles that of the silver quarter-shekels sent to Hannibal from Africa and of the heaviest bronzes minted at Carthage in the central years of the Second Punic War¹⁸, but finds no close parallels in North Africa. The voluminous hairdo arranged in a semicircular bun or braid on the back of the head, in particular, recalls that of the Carthaginian issues overstruck upon bronzes of Hieron II of Syracuse and of the Fifth Democracy brought to Africa in connection with Himilco's expedition to Sicily in 213–211 BC¹⁹.

On the whole, these two groups of silver and bronze coins minted by Hannibal in southern Italy bear standard Carthaginian types. But an additional group of Hannibalic bronzes with a head of Apollo and a horse walking or stepping with sundisk and uraei, and with a female head and a horse walking before a palm tree (cf. SNG Cop. 365–366 and 377), is unique²⁰. The obverse types portraying Apollo and a goddess (who could be identified as Demeter or even Hera) suggested that the Carthaginians honored the same deities worshiped by the different ethnicities of Magna Graecia. In combination with the Punic horse on the reverse, they implied that the Carthaginians and the peoples of southern Italy were united in the same struggle.

Throughout the war the Carthage mint issued a vast coinage in bronze based on a unit of c. 7–8 g (SNG Cop. 302–329)²¹, which circulated mainly in North Africa but also followed the movements of Carthaginian soldiers across the Mediterranean, as the pattern of finds from Spain to Sicily has revealed.²² A female head and a horse in a static pose remained the dominant coin types on

¹⁸ Cf. SNG Cop. 335–338, 340–344. H.R. BALDUS, *Zum hannibalzeitlichen punischen Großbronze-Typus SNG Cop 42, 340 ff.*, JNG 57, 2007, 83–90, has suggested that the large bronzes were minted in Italy primarily for internal use of the army. However, these coins have not yet been found in southern Italy and a die count indicates that they were struck in enormous quantity; their fabric and vertical die axes are consistent with North African minting practice. The provenance of seven examples in the collection of Naples' Museo Archeologico Nazionale is unknown: see M.R. VIOLA, *Catalogo*, in: E. ACQUARO (ed.), *Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale [BdN Monografia 6.3]* (Roma, 2002), pp. 77–78, nos. 386–392 (some of the die axes are questionable).

¹⁹ Cf. JENKINS and LEWIS 1963, p. 136 and pl. 28, 9; VISONÀ 1998, p. 17 and pl. 3, 48.

²⁰ Their weights and modules are consistent with those of Lucanian and Brettian bronze issues minted in the Second Punic War: cf. *HN⁸ Italy*, nos. 1450, 1454, 1975, 1987, 1992, 2000, and VISONÀ 1989, pp. 158–160.

²¹ Even though these coins have been described as 'shekels' because of their weight, it is doubtful that the same denomination was used for Punic coinage in precious metal and in bronze: cf. G.K. JENKINS, *Some coins of Hannibal's time*, in: *Studi per Laura Breglia [BdN 4 Suppl.]* (Roma 1987), pp. 216–217; J. ALEXANDROPOULOS, *Les monnaies de l'Afrique Antique 400 av. J.-C. – 40 ap. J.-C.* (Toulouse, 2000), pp. 113–115.

²² C. ALFARO ASINS, *Consideraciones sobre la moneda púnica foránea en la península ibérica y su entorno*, *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 18, 2000, p. 33; EAD., *La moneda púnica foránea en la península ibérica: nuevos datos*, in: A. GIAMMELLARO SPANÒ (ed.), *Atti del V Congresso Internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici* (Palermo, 2005), pp. 1346–1347; E.A. ARSLAN, *Archeologia urbana e moneta: il caso di Crotone*, in:

this group of issues. Although their chronological sequence is still uncertain, different, reverse dies featuring a motionless horse, or a horse in a pose of arrested movement may have been used concurrently by multiple workshops within the metropolitan mint. The existence of coins with a standing or a stepping horse overstruck upon Syracusan and Roman bronzes seized during the Sicilian expedition of 213–211 BC would support this hypothesis²³. Yet, only one issue within the same group bears a horse *prancing* left above a groundline on the reverse (SNG Cop. 330), and may have circulated exclusively in North Africa. At least six examples of this issue are among the contents of the largest assemblage of Carthaginian bronzes of the Second Punic War found at Bejaïa (Algeria)²⁴, and two come from Tunisia (see below).

The following specimens in good to poor condition in museum collections have an average weight of 7.46 g and were struck by five obverse and five reverse dies²⁵:

1. O1R1 Firenze, Museo Archeologico no. 35603
22 mm, 0°; 8.63 g (*Pl. 13*, 1)²⁶
2. O1aR1 Como, Museo Civico 'Paolo Giovio' no. 530
20 x 22.7 mm, 0°; 4.67 g (*Pl. 13*, 2)
3. O1bR? Tunis, Musée du Bardo no. 72.2.84
22 mm, 0°; 6.45 g (*Pl. 13*, 3)
4. O1cR2 Copenhagen, Danish National Museum (= SNG Cop. 330)
23 mm, 0°; 7.80 g (*Pl. 13*, 4)
5. O2R3 Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe (from Tunis)
23 mm, 0°; 6.944 g (*Pl. 13*, 5)
6. O2R4 Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale
(Santangelo collection, no. 8135)
23.2 mm, 0°; 9.36 g (*Pl. 13*, 6)²⁷
7. O2R5 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum
21.7 mm, 0°; 8.41 g (*Pl. 13*, 7)

R. BELLÌ PASQUA and R. SPADEA (eds.), *Kroton e il suo territorio tra VI e V secolo a.C. Aggiornamenti e nuove ricerche*, Atti del Convegno di Studi Crotone, 3–5 marzo 2000 (Crotone, 2005), p. 106; P. VISONÀ, in: T. BUTTREY *et al.*, *The Coins* [Morgantina Studies II] (Princeton 1989), p. 151, no. 443.

²³ Cf. SNG Cop. 323 and 325; VISONÀ 1998, pp. 17–18, note 52, and pl. 3, 46–47; Malter Galleries auction 12.11.2000, nos. 161–162.

²⁴ IGCH 2296. My examination of 2,671 coins and 231 coin fragments from this find in 1983 revealed two lots of coins in different condition and with different patinas (from two containers, or from two hoards?). About 130 specimens were seen by E.S.G. Robinson in 1935. For a preliminary catalogue (including 1 SNG Cop. 330 weighing 7.8 g), see A. SOLTANI, *A propos du trésor monétaire punique de Bougie (Algérie)*, in: *L'Africa romana XIII* (Roma, 2000), pp. 1779–1782. Cf. ALEXANDROPOULOS (*supra*, note 21), p. 114, note 55.

²⁵ These coins have open-cast flans (some with remains of prominent lugs) and were struck with fixed dies. Dies O1–O1c and R1 have a linear border; die O2 (and possibly R4?) has a dot border.

²⁶ F.M. VANNI PECCATORI, *Le monete puniche del Museo Archeologico di Firenze*, in: *Ricerche sui materiali e studi tipologici* [F. PANVINI ROSATI (ed.), *Quaderni di numismatica antica*] (Roma, 1996), p. 25, no. 56.

²⁷ VIOLA (*supra*, note 18), p. 72, no. 349.

While the style of the female head on the obverse of these bronzes is comparable to that of other Carthaginian issues minted in the central years of the war²⁸, the dynamic pose of the horse on the reverse is unusual. Since the prancing horse is one of the oldest Carthaginian coin types, going back to the first half of the 4th century BC²⁹, its reappearance in the bronze coinage of the Carthage mint cannot be regarded as an experimental feature. A very similar reverse type is found on a series of silver 6-shekels (or dodecadrachms) of Sicilian mintage struck c. 255 BC for military expenditure in North Africa following M. Atilius Regulus' invasion (*Pl. 13, 8*)³⁰. But a prancing horse is also on the reverse of a sixth group of silver half-, quarter-, and eighth-shekels, and of bronze coins minted by the Carthaginians in Sicily between 213–211 (possibly at Acragas)³¹, during Himilco's expedition in support of Syracuse (SNG Cop. 378–381). Therefore, it seems likely that this coin type had an ideological connection with Sicily dating back to the First Punic War. Its revival for a unique issue of Carthaginian bronze units may have been inspired by anti-Roman propaganda in the years of the Sicilian expedition in 213–211³². The additional presence of a wreath and of a palm branch ornamented with fillets on the Carthaginian silver and bronze coinage used in Sicily during the Second Punic War would have carried political overtones for the Sicilian Greeks as well, who had long been accustomed to similar coin types and symbols with implications of 'freedom' and 'victory'.

The identity of the divine male head wreathed with corn ears on the obverse of the Carthaginian fractions of the shekel is uncertain, despite the apparent relationship of this coin type with that found on earlier Carthaginian bronze coins similar to SNG Cop. 94–98 and 120–123. A thematic link between the silver and bronze minted by the Carthaginians in Sicily is provided by the veiled female head on the obverse of the bronzes (SNG Cop. 381), which seems to have been derived from the coinage of the Sikeliotai struck in 214/213³³. The Sicilian Greeks could have identified these coin types as the portraits of the hero Triptolemos and of Demeter or Persephone³⁴. Thus, both the revival and the adoption of coin types

²⁸ The obverse die of a coin in Glasgow similar to SNG Cop. 314 may be attributed to the same die cutter who made dies O1–O1c: cf. G. MACDONALD, *Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian Collection University of Glasgow*, vol. III (Glasgow, 1905), p. 595, no. 97, *pace* BALDUS 1982, p. 172, note 20.

²⁹ JENKINS and LEWIS 1963, pp. 18 and 76 (Groups I–II).

³⁰ G.K. JENKINS, *Coins of Punic Sicily Part IV*, SNR 57, 1978, pp. 36–38. For the dating of the 6-shekels see BALDUS 1982, pp. 181–188.

³¹ A. BURNETT, *The coinage of Punic Sicily during the Hannibalic war*, in: M. CACCAMO CALTABIANO (ed.), *La Sicilia tra l'Egitto e Roma. La monetazione siracusana dell'età di Ierone II* (Messina, 1995), pp. 383–386; ID. 2000, pp. 111–112; A. CUTRONI TUSA, *La zecca di Agrigento durante la seconda guerra punica*, *Scienze dell'antichità* 11, 2001–2003 [2005], pp. 312–315.

³² The Brettians also imitated a Pyrrhic coin type with anti-Roman implications: cf. E.A. ARSLAN, *Monetazione aurea ed argentea dei Brettii* (Milano, 1989), pp. 64–67 and *HN³ Italy*, p. 158, nos. 1946–1951.

³³ VISONÀ 1989, pp. 87–88; BURNETT 2000, pp. 112–113.

³⁴ See M. CACCAMO CALTABIANO, *Il 'ruolo' di Demetra nel documento monetale greco*, in: C.A. DI STEFANO, *Demetra* (*supra*, note 2), p. 129.

culturally related to Sicily also suggested that the Carthaginians shared the ‘values’ of their Sicilian allies and were fighting for a common cause against Rome.

However, the numismatic picture of this phase of the conflict is complicated by the presence of a seventh group of issues, which were used by the Carthaginians in Sicily between 231 and 211 BC, including a silver shekel and fractional denominations with a male head wearing a laurel wreath and a walking elephant (SNG Cop. 382–383). Whether these coins were struck at Carthage or by a Sicilian mint other than Acragas³⁵, their reverse type is evidently ‘foreign’ to Sicily and points unambiguously towards Africa. Nevertheless, it would not have been contradictory for the Carthaginians to hint at the ideological background and the political objective they shared with the Sicilians via the prancing horse coinage, and to advertise their military presence in Sicily via the elephant coinage. Since both the prancing horse issues and the elephant issues seem to have been relatively small, they may have been minted partly for symbolic and political purposes, as A. Burnett surmised³⁶.

One of the hallmarks of Carthaginian coinage in the Second Punic War is a versatile use of iconography and style. While traditional obverse and reverse types continued to be adopted for most coins struck for circulation in North Africa, and for the silver currency sent to Hannibal between 215 and 203 BC, new types and styles were introduced in response to the Carthaginians’ interaction with other ethnicities in different regions of the conflict. In contrast with the Romans, the Carthaginians occasionally exploited coin typology for political advantage, both by appropriating and redefining the coin types of their enemies, and by adopting ‘hybrid’ or cross-cultural types. They also reintroduced a Carthaginian coin type of the First Punic War, the prancing horse, seemingly because of its evocative association with Sicily. The style of Carthaginian coins minted between *c.* 216 and 211 is an important signifier. Some Hannibalic issues blended Punic, Greek, and Brettian features, possibly in order to reach out to different users in southern Italy, just as a series of silver and bronze issues struck for the Sicilian campaign of 213–211 may have been designed in part to appeal to the sensitivities of the Sicilian Greeks. Typological and stylistic innovation, and the revival of traditional coin iconography, appear to have been directly related to the changing political and military realities of the conflict.

³⁵ BURNETT 2000, pp. 111–112.

³⁶ BURNETT, *The coinage of Punic Sicily* (*supra*, note 31), p. 397.

Abstract

Carthaginian coinage minted during the Second Punic War exhibits both traditional and innovative features in iconography and style. Seven groups of Carthaginian coins struck between 216–211 BC show that the Carthaginians imitated foreign coin types, revived earlier Punic types, and introduced new types as they interacted with other ethnicities in southern Italy and Sicily. A rare bronze issue with a prancing horse struck at Carthage (SNG Cop. 330) may be linked to the Sicilian expedition of 213–211 BC.

Zusammenfassung

Punische Münzen aus der Zeit des Zweiten Punischen Krieges vereinigen sowohl herkömmliche als auch innovative Merkmale der Ikonographie und des Stils. Sieben Gruppen punischer Prägungen von 216–211 v. Chr. zeigen, dass die Punier fremde Münztypen nachahmten, auf ältere punische Münztypen zurückgriffen und im Umfeld anderer Volksgruppen in Süditalien und Sizilien auch neue Typen einführten. Eine seltene Bronzeprägung aus Karthago mit springendem Pferd (SNG Cop. 330) mag insbesondere mit der Sizilienexpedition von 213–211 v. Chr. in Beziehung stehen.

Paolo Visonà
Department of Art
University of Kentucky
207 Fine Arts Bldg.,
Lexington, KY 40506 USA
Paolo.Visona@uky.edu

Plate 13 (photos nos. 2–7 were taken from plaster casts):

Fig. 1 Firenze, Museo Archeologico, no. 35603; reproduced by permission.

Fig. 2 Como, Museo Civico ‘Paolo Giovio’, no. 530.

Fig. 3 Tunis, Musée du Bardo, no. 72.2.84.

Fig. 4 Copenhagen, Danish National Museum (= SNG Cop. 330).

Fig. 5 Badisches Landesmuseum Karlsruhe (from Tunis).

Fig. 6 Napoli, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (Santangelo collection, no. 8135).

Fig. 7 Oxford, Ashmolean Museum.

Fig. 8 Copenhagen, Danish National Museum (= SNG Cop. 179; ex G.K. JENKINS, *Coins of Punic Sicily Part IV*, SNR 57, 1978, p. 40, no. 422, Pl. 15).



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



Paolo Visonà
Tradition and innovation in Carthaginian coinage during the Second Punic War

