

**Zeitschrift:** Schweizerische numismatische Rundschau = Revue suisse de numismatique = Rivista svizzera di numismatica  
**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Numismatische Gesellschaft  
**Band:** 56 (1977)

**Artikel:** Coins of punic Sicily. Part 3, Carthage Series 2-4  
**Autor:** Jenkins, G. Kenneth  
**Kapitel:** Legends and mint  
**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-174317>

### **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:** 16.04.2026

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

emphasis is given to the corn-ears of the wreath; and this makes the point very clear, especially by contrast with the rarity of this feature at Syracuse whence most of the prototypes are derived<sup>7</sup>. The same head with corn-ears dominates the important gold coinage which started at the Carthage mint in the mid-fourth century and continued to be the exclusive form of the deity on all subsequent Carthaginian coinage<sup>8</sup>.

As regards Kore-Persephone, it is further to be recalled that these deities were worshipped at Carthage after 396 B.C., presumably in their Greek cult<sup>9</sup>. If Persephone was given a Punic name, we do not apparently know it; on the well-known stele from Carthage showing a figure of Persephone in Hellenistic style, dedicated by Milkyaton the suffete, the goddess is identified purely by the cornucopiae which she carries, and is not named in the accompanying inscription<sup>10</sup>. We lack evidence apparently as to which precise Punic deity would have been regarded as the nearest equivalent to Persephone. Tanit herself included a definite element of the fertility goddess and to that extent might conceivably be represented in Greek terms as Kore. But evidence is lacking.

A further point is that in the coin series here covered many of the most typical heads are evidently not of Kore after all, being imitations of the Syracusan Arethusa type in very varying degrees of faithfulness. It is possible to wonder whether these can necessarily be deemed to signify much more, intrinsically, than for instance the Athena heads on coins of the Himyarites<sup>11</sup>, namely the continuance of a customary coin design simply as such.

The types of series 4 will be discussed separately below (p. 25).

### *Legends and mint*

Before considering the question of the mint, it is necessary to summarise the occurrence of the legends on the coins. First comes an issue inscribed QRTHDST (series 2a, 49–60). Next is an issue bearing only the single letter *mem* (series 2a, 60–67). After this there is no legend for the rest of series 2 (the only exceptions being the unique *btw'l* on series 2a, 85, and the pair of letters *beth beth* on series 2c, 91–100; all of these are most probably abbreviations of personal names). In series 3a there is the regular legend 'MMHNT' («people of the camp»), varied only on 176 and 187–189 to S'MMHNT; series 3b has M M (*mem mem*); series 3c is a single issue with the letter '*ayin*'; and then series 3c has the single letter *mem*. Series 4 has once again the S'MMHNT legend found on series 3a with which, as will be shown below, it is in any case closely associated.

<sup>7</sup> Tudeer 46, 47, 66 are the only heads with corn-ears in the Syracuse series.

<sup>8</sup> Jenkins-Lewis group 2 and especially group 3 onwards.

<sup>9</sup> Harden 81.

<sup>10</sup> Harden pl. 45; CIS I. i, 176.

<sup>11</sup> BMC Arabia etc. pl. VII.

The legend QRTHDST had been fairly regular in series 1 (for which see Part 2 of this publication) but now appears only at the very beginning of series 2 and then never again in the entire Carthaginian coinage. The legend MHNT (= «camp») was likewise common in series 1: the form 'MMHNT' (= «people of the camp») <sup>11a</sup> now dominates series 3 which is thus clearly designated, as was series 1, as the mint of the «camp», that is of the army. It seems highly probable that this designation belongs by extension to the rest of the coinage, even where, as in series 2 largely, there is no legend of any kind. The continuity of the mint at least is sufficiently assured by the die-link which joins series 2d to series 3a (O46) and again the link from series 3a with 'MMHNT' to series 3b with M M (O63). Moreover it seems overwhelmingly probable, in default of any other plausible suggestion, that the single letter M in series 2a and in 3d should also stand for the word MHNT. The letters M M of series 3b are not at first sight quite so simple to explain; Müller suggests that these stand for *mbnt* and *mbsbm* respectively <sup>12</sup>, but this seems unconvincing, and I understand that there is little reason why the first *mem* should not be regarded as a prefix to the word *mbnt* for which the second *mem* could be the initial letter, thus *mm(bnt)* <sup>13</sup>.

It seems clear enough that the mint is that of the «camp» throughout. A coinage so specifically named as a military issue is something virtually unique in the ancient world. Of course there must have been many other coinages at various times and places which were in fact military issues, without this being expressly stated <sup>14</sup>. For instance it is virtually certain that a number of military coinages were issued under the Roman Republic, though none of them is labelled as such in so many words <sup>15</sup>. There is one possible analogy, from Parthian coins of the first century B.C. attributed to Gotarzes I (c. 90–80 B.C.) <sup>16</sup> which carry a supplementary legend ΚΑΤΑΣΤΡΑΤΕΙΑ – an otherwise unattested word but one which conveys a clear suggestion of a «camp mint», even if it should be the name of a town so named after the royal camp.

To find perfectly explicit and unquestionable parallels for the Carthaginian MHNT however, it is necessary to go to the later Islamic world. There coins bearing the formula «darb urdu», viz. the Royal Camp Mint, is to be found on coins of the

<sup>11a</sup> Acquaro in RIN 1974, 79 f., discusses the distinction between 'M («popolo») as in 'MMHNT and B'L (cittadino») as in B'L SYS etc.

<sup>12</sup> Müller II p. 21; *mbsbm* (= quaestores) does not occur except in series 5, the Melqart head/horse head coinage (Fig. 1), to be dealt with in the subsequent instalment of this publication.

<sup>13</sup> Advice from L. Mildenberg; cf. Friedrich, Phönizische Grammatik, p. 198–200.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Kraay ACGC 280–281 for issues by Persian satraps one of which with the type of a hoplite comes close to being an explicit military issue. Naturally the coinages associated with Hannibal in Italy, though less explicit, can be regarded in the same light (for these, cf. Robinson, NC 1964, 37 ff.). Another coinage of a military nature was that of the «Libyans», associated with the revolt of the mercenaries (241–238 B.C.); on some of those the letter *mem* appears, which it has been suggested may stand for MHNT (Robinson NC 1953, 30).

<sup>15</sup> Crawford RRC 604 etc.; the phrase «moneta castrensium» belongs solely to literature (Lucan), cf. Babelon, Traité I, i 850.

<sup>16</sup> Sellwood Parthia, type 30/12 (p. 79).

Mongol Great Khans in the thirteenth century, on coins of Shah Isma'il the first Safavid monarch of Iran (1502–1524) and further on coins of the Mogul Empire<sup>17</sup>. Something of an analogous mint organisation is also to be found in the later Roman empire, where after 368 the coinage of gold was carried out not by the regular local mints of the empire but was concentrated on the imperial *comitatus*. In these circumstances the mint would not have had a permanent fixed location but would have moved about with the imperial court<sup>18</sup>. This would of course apply equally to the Camp mint in the Islamic instances cited.

Naturally these later parallels, interesting as they are, come from quite other times places and circumstances from those which concern us in the case of the Punic coins. If they have any relevance, it must be simply by suggesting that a military mint is not by definition one which has a permanent fixed location, serving a particular locality for general purposes, in the way that a city mint was designed to do. This need not necessarily imply that the Carthaginian camp mint was forever on the move and indeed it is much more probable in the historical circumstances that it would normally have resided at Lilybaion, the main Carthaginian base in Sicily. However it seems useful to keep in mind the notion that the camp mint was not of its nature tied to a particular place, and this helps to envisage the possibility, mentioned in Part 2, that it may originally have been set up at Carthage itself and only later transferred to Sicily. If so, the question at what point the move occurred is still an open one. In Part 2 it was suggested that the move could have occurred in the course of series 1 and thus before c. 390 B.C. On the other hand such a move may only have effectively taken place when the mint resumed operations at about 350/340 B.C. with series 2 and the introduction of the «Kore» head. The legend QRTHDST which there appears need be no argument to the contrary, since the name, denoting «New city»<sup>19</sup>, most obviously and basically can be taken to describe the authority under which the coins were struck without necessarily implying anything as to the place of mintage. It is also possible that «New city» may be an expression of some ambivalence conveying not exclusively the notion of «Carthage» but that of Lilybaion, the new city founded after the destruction of Motya in 397 B.C.

In fact, if it is correct to suppose that the prolific gold coinage of the Carthage mint was likewise being started at about the same period as our series 2, c. 350/340

<sup>17</sup> For this information and references I thank my colleague Nicholas Lowick: Mongols – C. J. Rodgers, Catalogue of the Indian Museum Calcutta, part IV, 1896, no. 9759; Iran – twelve-tankah piece, B. M. Yearbook 1975 (forthcoming); Moguls – Whitehead, Punjab Museum Catalogue II, p. xxxviii.

<sup>18</sup> J. P. C. Kent in Essays Harold Mattingly 190 ff. – I thank him for information and discussion of this point.

<sup>19</sup> Originally the «new city» in Africa as the name of Carthage, founded 814 B.C., as contrasted with the «old city» (TYQH) as the name of Utica, founded in 1110 B.C.; cf. Albert Dietrich, Phönizische Ortsnamen in Spanien, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Leipzig 1936, 31 citing Movers etc.

B.C.<sup>20</sup>, it becomes at once clearer that the latter must have been minted in Sicily and not at Carthage, if only because of the total disparity in style and in every way between the gold issues and the silver coinage here discussed.

It seems on the whole most probable then that the Camp mint was, at least for the period here under discussion, operating in Sicily and in practice this should mean normally at Lilybaion. It was argued in Part I that this should exclude the possibility of another mint, which would be that of the city, having been in operation also at Lilybaion. It seems difficult to prove anything about this one way or the other, but it is appropriate to mention here the suggestion, made recently by Robinson<sup>21</sup>, that perhaps the mint named RSMLQRT, often in the past attributed to Herakleia Minoa or to Kephalaion, might in fact be of Lilybaion. The question of its location remains a difficult one and evidence is still lacking. It need only be remarked further that the die-link between a coin of the Carthaginian type (Part I plate 21.73) and the Rsmqlrt series can prove nothing to the point; the «Carthaginian» type in question, with a walking horse and palm-tree on the reverse, is such that it will not fit at all into the Carthage series 2 and seems unlikely even to belong to the same period. It must be regarded as something quite irregular.

### *Commentary*

#### Series 2a (49–85) Plates 1–4

This sequence as here arranged begins with a «Kore» head, equipped with prominent corn-ears, though from 77 onwards this is replaced by an Arethusa head of the Syracusan type. The first «Kore» heads may be thought to reflect somewhat the style of the Kimon decadrachms, at some remove; and a similar style is found on gold coins (whose date as given by Jenkins-Lewis may need to be a little lowered if the dating of the present silver series is acceptable<sup>22</sup>). After the first dies O 13–O 15 appears a head of much more «punic» style (O 16 etc.); then O 21–22 are again more Greek. With O 24 we have a fairly close derivative of the Euainetos Arethusa type, followed by other versions of the same; O 24 itself gives much the same sort of relation to the Euainetos original that we find in the fourth century in mainland Greece as at Phe-neus, Messene or the Locrians of Opus<sup>23</sup>, a relatively faithful copy of the prototype but reinterpreted in typically fourth century style.

The internal sequence of this series is not much attested by die-links and could in principle be varied if there seemed any particular reason to do so. The placing first of O 13 etc. is in accord with the fact that these are the only coins (49–60) of series 2 –

<sup>20</sup> Jenkins-Lewis group 3, and p. 22 ff.

<sup>21</sup> Robinson, *Gulbenkian Catalogue* (Lisbon 1971) p. 70.

<sup>22</sup> Jenkins-Lewis group 2 «375/360».

<sup>23</sup> Kraay *ACGC* 321–322, 406.