

Zeitschrift: Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft
Band: 53 (1974)

Artikel: Coins of punic sicily. Part 2, Carthage Series I
Autor: Jenkins, G. Kenneth.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-174152>

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: 17.09.2025

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

G. KENNETH JENKINS

COINS OF PUNIC SICILY

Part 2

CARTHAGE SERIES I

Introduction

This instalment of the publication started in SNR 50, 1971, 25 ff. will cover only the first series of the regular issues of Carthage. It is a small and compact series which stands somewhat apart from the rest of the coinage both typologically and otherwise, and it can therefore conveniently be treated in isolation. Some of the questions which it raises can however only be considered finally in connexion with the continuation of the series, to which further instalments of this publication will be devoted – notably the question of the mint location. For the present, the main point to be established, in the light of new evidence, is the date at which Carthage first began to mint coins.

In part 1¹ it was considered that Lilybaion would probably be the minting place for the regular Carthage tetradrachm series, and a Sicilian origin for the Carthage tetradrachms was clearly envisaged also in Jenkins-Lewis, p. 22 f. Specimens of the first series here under discussion were present in two hoards, that of Contessa² in western Sicily and of Vito Superiore³ from the area of Reggio Calabria. The representation of the series in these hoards was as follows: Contessa, nos. 14, 15, 18, 23, 25, 30, 35, 36, 43, 44, 46, 47; Vito, nos. 17, 24, 26, 41, 42, 45, 46. Both hoards give a comprehensive coverage of the series, apart from its first issues, and both were buried probably during the decade 390/380 B.C. For the terminal date of the series, the Vito hoard is specially important, since it was almost certainly buried at the time of Dionysios' attack on Rhegion, 387 B.C. Clearly all the issues of Carthage series I had by then been issued, on the showing of these hoards, and it seems quite probable that this coinage came to an end at the peace which followed Mago's expedition to Messina in 393 B.C.

What was hitherto lacking however was any firm indication as to the date at which the first Carthage series began. In part 1 the tacit assumption was that it probably began only after the destruction of Motya (397 B.C.) and the establishment of a new city as its replacement at Lilybaion. An important new piece of evidence has now come to light, and previous assumptions as to the opening date can no

¹ SNR 50, 1971, p. 55 ff.

² Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards 2119.

³ Ibid. 1910.

longer be maintained. This evidence consists of an overstruck coin of Akragas which appeared in the Leu sale no. 2, 1972, lot 69 (here Plate 6 and 7). This coin was correctly noted in the catalogue as being overstruck, but the original type was not identified. The original was in fact a specimen of Carthage series 1. In the centre of the Akragas reverse with the two eagles there is clearly to be seen the neck, mane and part of the bridle from a Carthage horse, and even the horse's topknot by the eagle's throat. Below there are further traces of the lower outline of the horse forepart, and above is a fairly clear outline of the Nike. The Carthage die is in fact O 3, and from the precise form of the bridle as we see it in the overstrike we can even be sure that it was of this die in its original state, and not the remodelled O 3'. Then on the Akragas obverse across the bodies of the horses can be seen traces of the trunk of the palm tree and the bunch of dates hanging to the left, together with a little of the branch just beyond the date bunch. These traces are insufficient to afford an identification of the Carthage reverse die, though the obverse is certain.

The main conclusion to be drawn from this important overstrike will be evident enough. The coinage of Akragas belongs to the last decade or so of that city's existence before being destroyed by the prolonged Carthaginian assault in 406 B.C. At present it would be premature to try to give an exact date for the Akragas coin which was struck over the Carthage; it is in fact a specimen of the first issue in the Akragas series as proposed by Seltman⁴, and was dated by him to 413 B.C., but Seltman's sequence is not necessarily the only possible one and the whole question of the Akragas sequence is being studied afresh. At all events the evidence is clear that, whatever the precise date of the Akragas coin in question, the Carthage was overstruck by a coin minted before 406 B.C. The Carthage series had therefore already started before the destruction of Akragas, and so more than a decade earlier than I had previously supposed.

Looking at the events of the years preceding 406 B.C., what is the most likely occasion for the beginning of a Carthaginian coinage? During most of the fifth century since 480 B.C. Carthage had kept studiously aloof from Sicilian affairs. As late as 416 when the conflict between Segesta and Selinus broke out we learn from Diodoros⁵ that Segesta made an appeal for help to Carthage, which was not answered, so that as a result Segesta appealed instead to Athens. Among the ambitions of Alkibiades was noted the design of reducing both Sicily and Carthage, as mentioned by Thucydides⁶, but this hardly signifies much, and Carthage seems to have continued quiescent. Only in 410 B.C. when a further conflict came about between Segesta and Selinus, and as a result of a further appeal from Segesta, did Carthage take any action. This time, Segesta was offering to acknowledge Carthaginian suzerainty; this was a proposition tempting in itself, and especially to the influential

⁴ Charles Seltman, *The engravers of the Akragantine decadrachms*, NC 1948, 1 ff.

⁵ XII. 82.

⁶ VI. 15.

suffete Hannibal son of Gisgo there was added the personal motive of revenge for the death of his grandfather Hamilcar killed at Himera in 480 B.C.

But even now the intervention was on a restricted scale. Hannibal took over to Sicily a force of only 5000 Libyans and on arrival collected some 800 Campanians who had been at large in Sicily since 413; but he succeeded in driving back the Selinuntines to their own territory⁷. In the following year⁸ however he returned with an army of up to 50 000 and there followed the siege and destruction of Selinus and Himera. As is generally agreed by historians, the small scale of the first expedition in 410 is clear proof that, until that moment, Carthage had no plans for intervening in Sicily. That being so, it is difficult to see why Carthage should have needed to strike coins at any earlier date. For it is abundantly clear that this was a purely military coinage; it had, at least initially, nothing to do with the needs of commerce⁹, and the coins are labelled in the most explicit way as being for military use. The legend MHNT = the camp, viz. the military headquarters, appears from the beginning, though it is lacking on some issues, and of course is almost constant on the subsequent Carthage series which will be covered by later instalments of this publication.

Thus it seems distinctly possible, and indeed probable, that the decision to intervene on behalf of Segesta in 410 B.C. carried with it the decision to strike coins for the first time. It is worth noting that the Carthaginians promised «high pay» to the Campanians employed in 410¹⁰, although of course this could if necessary have been paid with the help of other existing coins. But the preparation of the large army which took the field in 409 must certainly have made the need for coinage more urgent.

So much then for the starting date which we are now led to propose for the Carthage series, in all probability 410 B.C. But this conclusion naturally leads to the further question, where was the mint established? On the assumptions previously made, it would have been in Sicily, and the name of Carthage which appears on the coins could in that case have a certain ambiguity either signifying Carthage in the sense of the «Carthaginian state» or even as suggested in part I referring to the «new city» just established at Lilybaion¹¹. But of course in 410 B.C. Lilybaion did not exist, and the other Punic mints of Sicily, Motya and Panormos, were fully occupied with the production of quite different series of coins¹². It seems difficult

⁷ Diod. Sic. XIII. 44.

⁸ Diod. Sic. XIII. 54.

⁹ For comments on this point compare the remarks of J. Maynard Keynes, *Treatise on Money* (Cambridge 1930), i, 12. I owe this interesting reference to the kindness of Prof. Philip Grierson.

¹⁰ Diod. Sic. XIII. 44. — I am most grateful to Dr. C. M. Kraay for helpful discussion of this whole question.

¹¹ SNR 50, 1971, p. 55.

¹² SNR 50, 1971, pp. 27 ff. *passim*.

in these circumstances to envisage that the first series of Carthage could have been minted at either of those cities. Equally difficult is it to envisage at this date any other centre in Sicily at which the first Carthage series could have been minted. It now seems therefore, with the starting date firmly placed about 410 B.C., that we are driven after all to the conclusion that the QRTHDST legend must be read in a perfectly literal sense, that is that the mint, as well as the minting authority, for the first tetradrachm series was at Carthage itself.

Further than this we cannot go for the moment. If as suggested here the first series with the name of Carthage was probably minted there, this should not preclude the possibility that at some later stage the mint for the tetradrachms may yet have been moved to Sicily, and if so probably to Lilybaion (and it remains just possible that perhaps the last issue of the first series, nos. 38–48 where the free horse type replaces the horse forepart, might signify a move of the mint to Sicily). The subsequent series introducing the «Tanit» head seems to come only after an appreciable interval, and only the first issue (e.g. Plate 6 B) bears the name of Carthage, which never again appears. Only from about the middle of the fourth century apparently, when Carthage was again involved in a series of wars against the Greeks in Sicily, was the need for a new silver coinage felt. This is indicated by the evidence of hoards such as those from Nissoria and Gibil Gabib which by c. 330 B.C.¹³ still show only a limited part of the «Tanit»/Horse and palm tree series. This being so, it seems possible that the tetradrachm mint when it restarted may have done so at Lilybaion, coincidentally with the new issue of gold at Carthage itself, which must be of a different mint from the tetradrachms as there is no sign of any significant relation between them¹⁴.

The series covered in this article represents only a small part of the whole Carthage tetradrachm series and was struck from a comparatively limited number of dies, totalling twelve obverse and forty-two reverse. The remaining series to be published in further instalments will account for the use of over a hundred further obverse dies. Nevertheless the size and scope of the first series is not to be underestimated, especially as it was produced in a fairly short time, c. 410–392 B.C. It is characteristic of these series that there is almost no die-linking: the only obverses which share reverse dies are the group O 8–O 9–O 10. Otherwise each obverse has its own group of reverse dies, which vary considerably in number. The average proportion of 42 reverses to 12 obverses is not remarkable but there are some obverses which have an unusually high number of reverse dies, notably O 3 which has eleven, and O 12 which has seven. Such proportions can only be paralleled in

¹³ Cf. SNR 50, 1971, p. 56 f.; Nissoria = *Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards* 2133 (s. v. Leonforte), Gibil Gabib = *ibid.* 2132.

¹⁴ Cf. Jenkins-Lewis, pp. 22 ff.

Sicily in certain issues of Himera and Akragas¹⁵. On the whole we have an impression of an intensive though spasmodic minting. The fact that no less than five of the 12 obverse dies were during their working life recut or remodelled strongly suggests that they were used to the limit.

The series presents two of the basic types of the Carthaginian coinage, the horse and the palm tree. Among the various interpretations hitherto offered, the horse has sometimes been connected with the foundation legend of Carthage, or alternatively regarded as a religious emblem relating to the war-god or the sun-god¹⁶. The latter theory, associating the horse with the sun-god, mentioned by Jenkins-Lewis¹⁷, has received strong independent support recently in an article by Ferron¹⁸. He rightly notes a variety of solar symbols which from time to time accompany the horse on Carthaginian coins; he goes on to stress the fact that the sun-god is, at least in later times, equated with Ba'al Hammon. The horse should therefore be regarded as the emblem of this deity, the chief of the Punic pantheon. If so, the palm tree, as an ancient and recognised fertility emblem in itself, can be seen as completing and complementing the symbol of the sun-god (and in this connexion, as Ferron says, we have the same association in Greek terms of the palm tree with Apollo). An explanation on these lines seems more acceptable than the old and rather over-ingenious suggestion of the palm tree as a *type parlant* (= Φοίνιξ) which as Robinson has pointed out¹⁹ would imply that the Carthaginians were bilingual in Greek and were thinking of the palm tree in purely Greek terms²⁰. As a fertility emblem, on the other hand, the palm tree is readily intelligible and is in line with some of the other symbolism associated with the horse on Carthaginian coins (Ferron notes the occurrence of a corn ear on some later tetradrachms) and in the first series here discussed there is nearly always a corn grain, doubtless adapted from Sicilian models, where it is common enough but where it must have in any case a similar meaning.

¹⁵ Himera: Jenkins, in *La monetazione arcaica di Himera fino al 472 a.c.* (supplemento al volume 15-16 degli *Annali*) 1971, pp. 31 ff. — Akragas: information from Ulla Westermark.

¹⁶ It may be noted that the horse on the Carthaginian coins cannot in any case have been copied from Syracuse where it first appears on small gold coins (e.g. Kraay-Hirmer 126); these latter now seem to be of the fourth century. The horse as a Syracusan emblem is also known from other monuments such as the stele mentioned by Jenkins-Lewis p. 12, n. 2, and from the fact that the mark of a horse was a state emblem which was branded on the foreheads of Athenian prisoners who were to be sold as slaves in 413 B.C. (Plutarch, *Nikias* xxix. 1). Moreover the derivation of the Carthaginian half-horse from a gold coin of Gela, as suggested by Evans (Jenkins-Lewis p. 12, n. 1) is now quite ruled out by the new chronology of the Carthage coins, beginning in c. 410 B.C.; the gold of Gela belongs to 406-405 B.C. (Jenkins, *Gela*, p. 99 f.).

¹⁷ Jenkins-Lewis, p. 12.

¹⁸ J. Ferron, *Le caractère solaire du dieu de Carthage* (*Africa* I, 1966, pp. 41 ff.).

¹⁹ NC 1963, pp. 285 ff. (review of Jenkins-Lewis).

²⁰ The only occurrences of this type of palm tree on Sicilian coins are at Motya (SNR 1971, pl. 23.4) and Panormos (*ibid.* pl. 7.1-3), both roughly contemporary with the present Carthage series.

Commentary

Nos. 1-4 (Plate 1)

That these issues may form the earliest phase is perhaps indicated by their comparative simplicity and lack of elaboration – also perhaps by their absence from the Vito and Contessa hoards. There is a certain unity in this group, inasmuch as the reverses R 1, 3 and 4 are quite similar, though R 2 is unique in showing the whole trunk of the palm tree tapering towards the top. Obverse O 1 is of a peculiar style unlike any other in the series, and shows a horse with a body-harness for which some parallels can be found for instance at Syracuse and Gela²¹; it is a feature that does not recur in the Carthage series. Then obverse O 2 shows a horse of a more compact and typical style, with a bridle; and here for the first time is added a corn grain symbol which remains a constant feature down to no. 37.

Nos. 5-15 (Plates 1-2)

With this group, all struck from a single obverse die, the coins begin to be a little more elaborate, with the addition of a fine and prominent Nike flying above. In her hands she holds not only the normal wreath, as on countless Sicilian tetradrachms, but with the wreath also a caduceus which is not often clearly visible but is plain enough on the enlarged specimen of no. 6 (Plate 7). The caduceus is of course a normal enough attribute for Nike and finds parallels at Kamarina²² and at Terina²³. But there seems to be no analogy for a caduceus held with the wreath in this way among the many flying Nikai on Sicilian coins. The numerous palm tree reverses which go with O 3 are of a very homogeneous style, quite distinct from those of nos. 1-4. The remodelling of the obverse die took place before the striking of no. 12. – As stated above (p. 24) it was a coin of this group, with the original version of the obverse, which was overstruck at Akragas and which proves that the Carthage coinage must have begun before 406 B.C.

Nos. 16-19 (Plates 2-3)

Here the obverse die O 4 is rather similar to O 3 of the previous group, but the horse is of slighter build and has no bridle. Nike again here holds a caduceus with the wreath as on O 3, but the caduceus is less well depicted and seems to terminate in

²¹ Syracuse: Boehringer, Syrakus no. 380, etc.; Gela: Jenkins, Gela no. 104 etc.

²² Rizzo, pl. VIII. 6.

²³ Regling, Terina *passim*.

a mere blob. Perhaps the engraver did not fully understand this detail. The reverse shows a more angular type of palm tree and the legend MHNT is omitted. — No. 19 is of quite distinct character and stands alone, but seems as well placed here as anywhere else in the series. On the obverse Nike no longer has a caduceus but only a wreath, and the horse forepart, now with a bridle, is so positioned as to give generous space for the legend which is written exceptionally large. The reverse likewise is of a very individual style, and again omits the MHNT legend. In fact the MHNT legend does not reappear until no. 34; but it seems unlikely that its omission can have any serious significance and there is no reason to suppose that the nature and purpose of the coinage had changed since the first issues.

Nos. 20–29 (Plates 3–4)

This group is characterised by the omission of the legend MHNT, as in the immediately preceding issues, and more particularly by the appearance of the QRTHDST legend on the reverse. Both obverses come in for some degree of remodelling (as O 6' and O 7' respectively) but otherwise have little in common stylistically. The reverses which go with O 6 are generally somewhat similar to those of the group with O 3; those which go with O 7 are quite distinct.

Nos. 30–37 (Plate 4)

In this group there are three obverse dies which, uniquely in the first Carthage series, are interlinked by their reverses. O 8 is linked to O 9 by means of R 30, and O 8–9–10 are all three linked by means of R 31'. The chief feature of this group is however that the horse forepart is here turned to the left, though with Nike and corn grain in the same relative positions as before. The legend QRTHDST continues at first on the reverse as in the previous group. Then with no. 34 the legend MHNT reappears with, between the letters, objects that have been identified previously only as «vases»²⁴ of an unspecified nature. They certainly do not resemble any known type of Greek pottery, and their true identification has been kindly pointed out to me by Dr. D. B. Harden. The objects represent incense-burners or «Brûle-parfums» as they are generally referred to in the French archaeological literature; they are a common type of Punic pottery, and many of them are illustrated by Cintas²⁵. Such common objects are they indeed from Punic sites that in broken form

²⁴ E.g. Grose, McClean catalogue «two vases on pedestals»; Salinas, Contessa hoard (NSc 1888, pp. 320 ff.) «coppe con piede»; similarly Müller (Carthage, no. 4), J. Hirsch 19, 636.

²⁵ P. Cintas, *Ceramique punique* (Publications de l'Institut des Hautes Études de Tunis, vol. III, Tunis 1950), esp. pl. L and p. 489. Dr Harden has now kindly indicated to me a bronze version of the same type of object, illustrated in *Guia del Puig des Molins, Ibiza*, by Maria Jose Almagro Gorbea (Madrid 1969), pl. XXVIa.

they were often used as lids for amphoras. But their meaning as part of the coin type remains to find a convincing explanation. I understand that although they are clearly cult objects they are not confined to the use of any one particular cult rather than another. It might be that their presence here at least serves to emphasise the religious nature of the horse which as we have seen is, according to Ferron, the emblem of Ba'al Hammon. O 9 (no. 34) has the incense-burners with the legend MHNT; O 10 (no. 36) has the same objects between the letters of QRTHDST. On no. 36 the MHNT legend is once more placed on the reverse, but the use of R 31' also in combination with O 10 (at no. 37) results in the unique occurrence of QRTHDST on both sides of the coin.

Nos. 38-48 (Plate 5)

Here occurs the only significant change of type in the whole of the first series – the entire horse replacing the forepart. It is a free horse without bridle and is still as before accompanied by Nike flying above but without any other additions. Legends occur only with the horse to left (nos. 38-40); on the exergual line of O 11 is found QRTHDST in minute and sketchy letters, though on no. 40 what seems to be the same obverse die with slight alterations there seem to be no traces of the legend at all. MHNT still appears on the reverses of these. Then on nos. 41-48 there are no legends on either side. O 12 has no less than seven reverses with it, and the sequence of these can be fairly well determined from the progressive wear and eventual remodelling of this obverse. The change in type seems underlined by a change of style; the horse here seems more assured and expert, and the palm tree is rendered in a more complex and sophisticated manner with much crossing of the branches, as well as being enclosed in a dotted border (for the first time, if we except no. 19 that seems to have no natural place in the series as remarked above). Clearly new engravers are involved in this group, but more than that would be hard to say. If, as suggested above, the mint originally set up at Carthage was at some stage moved over to Lilybaion, it could be considered whether the change already took place with the appearance of this group, but it would be a tenuous indication.

Typologically, it is natural to associate with this last group of tetradrachms (nos. 38-48) the gold shekel published by Jenkins-Lewis no. 1 (here Plate 6 D). However it cannot be taken as certain that this is necessarily the right place for the gold coin in the Carthage series. It would be possible to stress the differences as well as the similarities. On the gold, the horse has a somewhat cramped appearance within its border and there is no exergual line; the style has little enough in common with the rather particularly «Greek» style of the tetradrachms. The palm tree too is very different from those of the tetradrachms, and seems in a way closer to the later and more stylised type of palm tree which occurs for instance in the gold quarter-staters Jenkins-Lewis no. 115. Viewed thus, the precise relationship of this

unique gold shekel to the silver is perhaps more problematic than it seems at first sight, or than was assumed by Jenkins-Lewis, and it should at least be considered whether the gold may not be rather later than the present group of tetradrachms. The problem of the possible gold/silver ratio has been discussed again by Robinson²⁶, who advocates the gold shekel as the equivalent of 24 drs. silver (rather than 25, as Jenkins-Lewis) which would give a ratio of about 13.5:1. The high ratio apparently still operative in Sicily in the early fourth century admittedly produces difficult equivalences, and might be another argument for placing this gold coin further into the fourth century.

Another observation should be made regarding the silver litrai of the type here shown on Plate 6 C. No doubt on account of the types, these have often been placed in catalogues²⁷ as part of the first tetradrachm series. But not only is the palm tree here apparently the obverse, but the type of palm tree shown on these litrai bears no visible relation to that on any of the tetradrachms. It is in fact much closer to the later palm tree type on the smaller gold coins such as Jenkins-Lewis no. 115 (quarter-stater) or nos. 136 ff. (tenth-stater). In fact the silver litrai could be as late as any of these or even later. A hoard found at Selinunte²⁸ consisted entirely of a large number of the silver litrai together with a single hemidrachm of another type which has been dated to the late 3rd century; the latter however, to judge by the illustration given by Tusa Cutroni²⁹, is not at all typical of the hemidrachms minted during the second Punic war³⁰ and by its style might well be of the earlier 3rd century. In any case the Selinunte hoard, whatever its true date, strongly suggests that the silver litrai in question cannot be of the early fourth century. That being so, there are no fractional coins corresponding to the first tetradrachm series³¹.

²⁶ NC 1963, 285 ff.

²⁷ E.g. SNG II (Lloyd), SNG Copenhagen, part 42.

²⁸ Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards 2247.

²⁹ Kokalos 7-8, 1961/62, tav. XX.

³⁰ E.g. SNG Copenhagen (part 42), 335-339.

³¹ An interesting note explaining the false litra by Becker (e.g. SNG Copenhagen, part 42, 73) by E. Gandolphe, BSFN 1971, pp. 42 f.

Catalogue³²

Summary of Types and Legends

Q = QRTĤDŠT; M = MHNT

Obverse Types			Legends
<i>Horse forepart to right</i>			
1-2	Body harness		Q / M
3-4	Bridle	Corn grain	Q / M
5-15	Bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath, caduceus)	Q / M
16-18	No bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath, caduceus)	Q / nil
19-24	Bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath)	Q / nil (19) nil / Q (20-24)
25-29	No bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath)	nil / Q
<i>Horse forepart to left</i>			
30-33	No bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath)	nil / Q
34-37	Bridle	Corn grain Nike (wreath) Incense burners	M / Q (34-35) Q / M (36) Q / Q (37)
<i>Free horse to left</i>			
38-40		Nike (wreath)	Q / M
41-48		Nike (wreath)	nil / nil

³² *Abbreviations used in catalogue*

Salinas = NSc 1888, 302 ff. (Contessa hoard, cf. n. 2 above)

Procopio = Rendiconti, Accad. di Archeologia Lettere e Belle Arti, Naples 1953, 3 ff. (Vito Superiore hoard, cf. n. 3 above)

Legends

QRTḤDŠT

1 (O 1)	አሠ ፬፻፲፩ ጥ	24 (R 24)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ . .
3 (O 2)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	25 (R 25)	ከ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
5 (O 3)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	26 (R 26)	. . . ስ ጥ
12 (O 3')	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	27 (R 27)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
16 (O 4)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	30 (R 29)	፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
	፩	31 (R 30)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
	፩	32 (R 31)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
19 (O 5)	፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	33 (R 31')	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
20 (R 20)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	36 (O 10)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
21 (R 21)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ	38 (O 11)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ
22 (R 22)	ከሠ ፩፻፱ ስ ጥ		

MHNT

1 (R 1)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	11 (R 11)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
2 (R 2)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	12 (R 12)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
3 (R 3)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	13 (R 13)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
4 (R 4)	𐎧𐎥 . .	14 (R 14)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
5 (R 5)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	15 (R 15)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
6 (R 6)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	34 (O 9)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
7 (R 7)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	36 (R 32)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
8 (R 8)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	38 (R 33)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
9 (R 9)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥	39 (R 34)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢𐎥
10 (R 10)	𐎧𐎥 𐎢	40 (R 35)	𐎧𐎥 .

Plate 1

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---------|---|
| 1 | O 1 | Forepart of horse r. with body-harness; legend QRTHDST | 17.45 | Brussels |
| | R 1 | Palm tree with level branches, date bunches protruding; legend MHNT | 16.78 | Brussels de Hirsch 827 |
| | | 17.12 Cambridge McClean 3031 | 16.85 | Cambridge McClean 3032 |
| | | 16.07 * London (Salinas) | 17.01 * | Jameson 907 = Niggeler I 538 (obv. Plate 6 and enlarged Plate 7) |
| | | | 16.72 | Leu-Hess 1956, 227 |
| 2 | O 1 | Die somewhat worn | 7 | O 3 |
| | R 2 | Similar, tree trunk emphasised; MHNT | | R 7 |
| | | 16.86 * London (Cracherode) | | Similar, MHNT |
| | | 16.98 Niggeler I 537 | | 17.15 * Schlessinger 26. 11. 1934, 373 |
| 3 | O 2 | Forepart of horse without harness, but with bridle; above in field corn grain; legend QRTHDST | 8 | O 3 |
| | R 3 | Similar to R 1; MHNT | | R 8 |
| | | 16.89 * London (RPK) | | Similar, MHNT |
| | | 17.00 * Paris Luynes 1431 | | 16.83 * Hague = Rosenberg 1914, 162 = Hess 27. 10. 1902, 727 |
| | | — Private collection Y | | 16.97 * London, Lloyd SNG II 1609 = Hirsch 26, 117 |
| 4 | O 2 | | 9 | O 3 |
| | R 4 | Similar, MHNT | | R 9 |
| | | 17.07 * London (Cracherode) | | Similar, MHNT |
| | | | | 16.64 * Lewis = Ratto 8. 11. 1928, 820 = Platt coll. «A» 809 |
| 5 | O 3 | Forepart of bridled horse; corn grain in r. field, Nike flying above holding wreath and caduceus over horses's head; legend QRTHDST | | — Myers Sept. 1971, 30 |
| | | The die progressively deteriorates from no. 8 onwards and at no. 12 is partly recut. | | — Palermo |
| | R 5 | Palm tree taller with thick trunk, drooping branches and large date bunches hanging close to trunk; legend MHNT | 10 | O 3 |
| | | 17.20 * Berlin | | R 10 |
| | | 16.75 Merzbacher 1910, 890 = Hess 27. 10. 1902, 726 | | Similar, MHNT |
| | | 16.95 Paris 2382 | | 18.12 ANS = Bourgey 29. 5. 1911, 47 = do. 14. 4. 1910, 228 |
| | | 17.34 Paris Vogué 647 | | 16.68 * Hamburger 98, 221 = Schulmann 16. 12. 1926, 209 = do. 7. 6. 1937, 148 = Cumberland Clark 354 = Luneau (Platt 26. 3. 1922) 935 (Plate 2) |
| 6 | O 3 | | | 17.17 Hirsch 14, 592 |
| | R 6 | Similar, MHNT | | 17.43 * London (RPK) (Plate 1) |
| | | 16.69 AC 14, 149 | | — Paris, Smith-Lesouef 18 |
| | | 16.69 Berlin | | 16.79 Sotheby 15. 11. 1927, 85 = MMAG list 351 (1973) 1 |

- 11 O₃
R 11 Similar, MHNT
16.83 * Aberdeen, SNG I 97
— Syracuse
- 12 O₃' Same die with much of the roughened surface remaining from before; type largely recut and enlarged; horse's mane and bridle altered, front paws nearer border; also altered, Nike's wing and hands holding wreath. Legend altered and enlarged, especially letters *resh* and *dalet* with longer tails (flaw on *dalet* probably remaining from previous state!).
No. 15 shows further deterioration of the die and blurring of the legend.
R 12 Similar, MHNT
17.26 * Copenhagen
(SNG part 42) 72
- 13 O₃'
R 13 Similar, MHNT
16.78 ANS
16.80 * Naville 4, 996 = Benson
792 = Hirsch 30, 619 =
Platt 3. 4. 1933, 221
— * Private collection Y
— Syracuse
- 14 O₃'
R 14 Similar, but date bunches more protruding; MHNT
17.24 * AC 13, 379 = Montagu
807 = Hirsch 15, 1343
16.95 Cahn 68, 1759
16.50 London
17.69 MMAG 43, 12 = Car-
frae 7
— Palermo, Contessa hoard
- (not illustrated by
Salinas)
17.05 Paris Luynes 1430
- 15 O₃'
R 15 Similar to R 5, etc.; MHNT
17.47 Cambridge SNG IV 1474
17.32 Hess 208, 802
17.35 Leu-Hess 1964, 92
17.00 * London
— Palermo, Contessa hoard
(Salinas pl. xviii. 28)
17.25 Paris Luynes 1429
17.48 * Private collection X
- 16 O₄ Similar, but horse without bridle;
corn grain in field, Nike above
holding wreath and caduceus (?);
legend QRTHDST (fully visible
only on Reggio specimen of no. 17)
R 16 Palm tree with drooping branches,
thinner and more tapering trunk,
smaller date bunches; no legend
17.18 * Berlin
- 17 O₄
R 17
16.94 AC 16, 919 = Naville 12,
1058 = Egger 46, 2769 =
Hess 18. 3. 1918, 750
16.95 ANS = Cahn 35, 223
— Collignon 147
— * Private collection Y
— Ratto 4. 4. 1927, 445
17.09 * Reggio, Vito Superiore
hoard 116 (Procopio
pl. iii. 7)
- 18 O₄
R 18
— Palermo
— * Palermo, Contessa hoard
(Salinas pl. xviii. 27)

- 19 O 5 Forepart of bridled horse r., small corn grain in field, Nike above holding wreath only; legend QRTHDST
- R 19 Palm tree with frizzy branches and small date bunches; no legend; dotted border!
- 16.91 * Brussels de Hirsch 828
- 15.20 London = Pozzi 3295
- 16.57 * Leu-Hess 1968, 116
- 20 O 6 Forepart of bridled horse r., corn grain in r. field, Nike above holding wreath only; linear border; no legend
- Flaws above and below horse's nose. From no. 23 the die is partly remodelled.
- R 20 Palm tree with drooping branches, small date bunches; legend QRTHDST
- 17.58 * Copenhagen (SNG part 42) 71
- 15.35 Hague = Hess 18.3.1918, 751 = Naville 12, 1059
- 17.00 Hirsch 21, 4665 = Schulman 21.10.1935, 234 = do. 26.11.1913, 3034
- 17.46 * London
- 16.00 Paris, Delepierre
- 21 O 6
- R 21 Similar, but larger date bunches; QRTHDST
- 16.91 * AC 14, 147
- Berlin
- Palermo
- 22 O 6
- R 22 Similar, QRTHDST
- 17.10 Cahn 66, 479 = Rosenberg 72, 802
- 16.35 * Hague
- 23 O 6' Same die, but remodelled; previous flaws removed; type enlarged especially horse's head and mane, bridle and corn grain recut, truncation also. Nike however seems worn in die and not recut.
- Fresh flaws between bridle and leg, also above and below truncation.
- R 23 Similar, QRTHDST
- 17.41 * ANS
- Palermo, Contessa hoard (Salinas pl. xviii. 26)
- Palermo, Contessa hoard (not illustrated by Salinas)
- 24 O 6'
- R 24 Similar, QRTHDST
- 15.72 * Paris Vogué 648
- Pennisi
- 17.37 * Reggio, Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio 115); photo slightly small
- (Note: These specimens probably though not certainly from the same rev. die)
- 25 O 7 Forepart of horse without bridle r., corn grain in r. field, large Nike above holding wreath only; no legend
- R 25 Palm tree with drooping, wavy branches, trunk thick at base; legend QRTHDST
- Berlin
- 16.59 * Private collection Y = Leu-Hess 1966, 175 = Sandeman 263
- Palermo, Contessa hoard (Salinas pl. xviii. 29)
- 26 O 7
- R 26 Similar, QRTHDST
- 16.92 * Reggio, Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio 114); photo slightly small
- 27 O 7
- R 27 Similar, QRTHDST
- 16.45 Hess 202, 2676
- 17.18 * London Lloyd SNG II 1608 = Naville 6, 577 = Hirsch 32, 610
- 17.24 Stockholm

Plate 4

- 28 O 7
R 28 Similar, QRTHDST (tops of letters only visible)
17.46 * London = Prowe 1910, 1788
- 29 O 7' Same die, but partly recut – horse's neck and mane straighter and closer to Nike (but Nike and horse's head unchanged)
R 28
16.85 * Private collection X = Hess 194, 164 = Hess, Lucerne 7. 3. 1935, 283
- 30 O 8 Forepart of horse without bridle l., corn grain in l. field; Nike above holding wreath only; no legend
R 29 Palm tree with drooping branches; legend QRTHDST
17.50 Bunbury I 541 = Allotte de la Fuye 1730
16.85 * London Lloyd SNG II 1607 = Naville 6, 576 = Sotheby 5. 7. 1910, 89
– Palermo, Contessa hoard (not illustrated by Salinas)
- 31 O 8
R 30 Palm tree with sparser branches drooping; legend QRTHDST
– Berlin
17.08 Copenhagen (SNG part 42) 70
16.78 Hunter 6
17.12 * London
16.99 Münzhandlung Basel 4, 1156 = Hamburger 27. 5. 1929, 170
16.52 Naville 5, 2981 = AC 14, 148
– Palermo
17.10 Paris 2384
– Uncertain, cast in B. M.
- 32 O 8
R 31 Similar, QRTHDST
16.64 Cambridge SNG IV 1473
17.14 * Paris Luynes 1432
- 33 O 8
R 31' Same die slightly remodelled – trunk of tree thicker, some branches thickened, root of branches altered; legend altered.
16.88 * Naville 5, 2980
16.40 Vienna
Note: The following specimens may be either of no. 32 or no. 33:
16.85 Hague
– Palermo
– Paris Chandon de Briailles
- 34 O 9 Forepart of bridled horse l., corn grain in l. field, Nike above holding wreath; below, two incense-burners interposed in the legend; legend M / HN / T
R 31'
17.17 * Paris Vogué 646
- 35 O 9
R 30 Die of no. 31
– * Palermo, Contessa hoard (Salinas pl. xviii. 31)
- 36 O 10 Similar to O 9, bridled horse to l. with corn grain and Nike; below two incense-burners interposed in the legend; legend QRT / H / DST
R 32 Similar, but legend MHNT
– Berlin
17.01 Cambridge McClean 3033
17.00 * London
– * Munich
– Palermo, Contessa hoard (Salinas pl. xviii. 30)
– Palermo, Contessa hoard (not illustrated by Salinas)
– Paris 2386
- 37 O 10 Signs of wear, e.g. bridle, nose, l. leg, truncation.
R 31'
17.49 * London = Hirsch 19, 636

Plate 5

- 38 O 11 Free horse prancing l., Nike above holding wreath. Triple ex. line, on central line of which legend in small sketchy characters QRTHDST
R 33 Palm tree with curling and intertwined branches; legend MHNT; dotted border
17.38 Brussels de Hirsch 829
16.80 * London (PCG III. C. 40)
— Private collection Y = Zeno 4361
- 39 O 11
R 34 Similar, MHNT; dotted border
16.31 * Jameson 908 = Leu-Hess 1957, 138
- 40 O 11' Apparently the same die, but with signs of wear and alteration — Nike's head and wing smaller, r. arm not visible, skirt apparently longer; horse's hind legs thicker, tail higher. Legend worn away and not visible. See also false tetradrachms F 5, below p. 40.
R 35 Similar, MHNT; dotted border
16.90 * Berlin (Holm taf. viii. 2)
- 41 O 12 Free horse prancing r., Nike above holding wreath; double ex. line; no legend; flaw by Nike's waist
R 36 Palm tree similar with intertwining but less drooping branches; no legend; dotted border
16.82 * Cambridge McClean 3034 = Benson 793 = Bunbury 542
Paris 2364
16.72 Reggio, Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio 118)
- 42 O 12
R 37 Similar
— * Reggio Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio 119 or 120)
- 43 O 12 Additional flaw by horse's nose
R 38 Similar, flaw at top left of tree
16.81 Hess 207, 222
— * Palermo, Contessa hoard (Salinas pl. xviii. 32)
- 44 O 12
R 39 Similar
— Berlin
16.70 Hague
17.31 Jameson 909 = Hirsch 15, 1347 = Archaeologist and Traveller 115 = Sotheby 2. 5. 1905, 190 = Niggeler I 539
17.16 * London (RPK)
— Palermo, Contessa hoard (not illustrated by Salinas)
17.10 Paris Luynes 1447
- 45 O 12 Additional flaw on wreath
R 40 Similar
17.45 ANS
17.37 Lewis = Lloyd SNG II 1610 = Naville 6, 575 = Sandeman 262 = Hirsch 31, 650
17.20 * Lockett SNG III 1032 = Weber 1771 = Locker-Lampson 114
17.17 London
— MMAG 43, 13 = Carfrae 351 = Wigan Bompois 362
— Munich
— Reggio, Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio 117; this rev. die?, surface of coin not well preserved)
- 46 O 12 Apart from flaws already noted, the surface of the die now begins to become rough. Additional flaw below horse's belly
R 41 Similar
— * Berlin
— Palermo, Contessa hoard (not illustrated by Salinas)
— * Private collection Y
— Reggio, Vito Superiore hoard (Procopio pl. iii. 8)
17.80 Vienna
- 47 O 12
R 42 Similar

17.25 * London
 — Palermo, Contessa hoard
 (not illustrated by Salinas)

hooves altered. Flaw below horse's
 belly (no. 46) nevertheless remains!

R 42

- 48 O 12' Same die, but the surface smoothed
 and the type recut — Nike altered
 and enlarged, horse's front legs and

17.11 * Oxford, SNG 2150

False tetradrachms (F 2, F 3 — plate 6)



F 1



F 4



- F 1 Crude copy of nos. 1–2.
 16.99 London (falsa)
- F 2 Copy of no. 5, by Becker (Hill, Becker 132). The design of the obverse seems rather reduced in scale and the legend rather weak. The reverse is not taken in detail from any of the genuine dies, but the boss-like feature on the trunk at the base of the branches suggests the patch of wear visible on R 5.
 14.40 * Hess 207, 221
 14.64 Weber 1772
- F 3 Copy of similar type but perhaps derived from nos. 12–15. The legend is over-large, copying that of O 3' and exaggerating the die-flaw on the letter *dalet*, while the *sin* is given a wrong and untypical form; few of the letters are close to the original. The reverse might be considered a copy of any of those represented in nos. 12–15, but in the legend the letter which should be *beth* is wrongly rendered. The tree trunk is peculiar.
 16.76 * Hague = Naville 12, 1057
 — Laval, Glendining 1955, 228
- F 4 Copy of no. 38. Obverse shows discrepancies in Nike, horse's mane, tail and hind legs; reverse, palm tree much changed in detail especially the branches, now rendered with exaggerated «barbs», and the legend altered.
 16.82 Seen in London 1967
- F 5 See no. 40. The Berlin specimen had already been included in the series before doubts arose owing to the recent discovery among the B. M. falsa of a specimen apparently from the same dies. The «alteration» of the obverse die O 11 and especially the disappearance of the legend, as noted above at no. 40, could then find a different explanation. It seems possible that no. 40 is after all merely a falsification made after no. 39. On the B. M. specimen the border of the obverse fades out above the Nike in a most unconvincing manner. On the other hand the reverse though similar to that of no. 39 (R 34) is by no means an exact copy of it as might be expected if no. 40 is indeed false. For the present the problem can only be indicated.

Key to plates

Plate 1	1	London	31	London
	2	London	32	Paris
	3 P	Paris	33	Naville 5
	3 L	London	34	Paris
	4	London	35	Palermo
	5	Berlin	36 L	London
	6	Jameson-Niggeler	36 M	Munich
	7	Schlessinger 1934	37	London
	8 L	London		
	8 H	Hague		
Plate 2	9	Lewis	Plate 5	38 London
	10 L	London		39 Jameson
				40 Berlin
				41 Cambridge
	10 H	Hamburger 98		42 Reggio
	11	Aberdeen		43 Palermo
	12	Copenhagen		44 London
	13 N	Naville 4		45 Lockett
	13 Y	Private collection Y		46 B Berlin
	14	Ars Classica 13		46 Y Private collection Y
Plate 3	15 L	London		47 London
	15 X	Private collection X		48 Oxford
	16	Berlin		
	17 R	Reggio	Plate 6	O 10 (no. 37) – London, enlarged 2 x
	17 Y	Private collection Y		A After R. P. Delattre, Carthage, la nécropole punique (Paris 1899), p. 9, fig. 13
	18	Palermo		B Carthage, tetradrachm. Pen-nisi (photo slightly large)
				C Carthage, litra. London, Lloyd SNG 11, 1612
	19 Br	Brussels		D Carthage, gold shekel. Berlin, Jenkins-Lewis no. 1
	19 LH	Leu-Hess 1968		E Akragas, tetradrachm. Leu 2, 1972, 69
	20 C	Copenhagen		O 3 (no. 6) Jameson-Niggeler
Plate 4	20 L	London		F 2 Hess 207, 221
	21	Ars Classica 14		F 3 Hague = Naville 12, 1057
	22	Hague		
	23	ANS	Plate 7	Akragas, tetradrachm reverse, Leu 2, 1972, 69, enlarged 3 x
	24 P	Paris		Carthage O 3 (no. 6) Jameson-Niggeler, enlarged 3 x
	24 R	Reggio		
	25	Private collection Y		
	26	Reggio		
	27	London		

PLATE I



PLATE 2



10 H



11



12



13 N



10



11



12



13



13 Y



14



15 L



15 X



13



14



15



15



16



17 R




17 Y



18



16



17



17



18

PLATE 3



19 Br



19 LH



20 C



20 L



19



19



20



20



21



22



23



24 P



21



22



23



24



24 R



25



26



27



24



25



26



27

PLATE 4



28




29




30



31




28



28



29



30



32



33



34



35




31



31'



31'



30



36 L



36 M



37



32



32



31'

PLATE 5



38



39



40



41



33



34



35



36



42




43



44



45



37



38



39



40



46 B



46 Y



47




48



41



41



42



43



O 10 (no. 37)



A



B



C



D



E



O 3 (no. 6)



F 2



F 3



