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## G. KENNETH JENKINS

# COINS OF PUNIC SICILY* 

Part $4{ }^{* *}$<br>CARTHAGE SERIES 5-6

## Introduction

As already stated in part 3 it seems clear from the evidence of hoards that Carthage series 5, Melqart head/horse head, should be roughly of the same phase as the Syracusan coins of Agathokles with Kore head/Nike and trophy, minted most probably after Agathokles' return from Africa and in fact between the years 305 and 295 B.C. For a summary of early third century hoards containing Carthage series 5 coins, see the table of hoards at the end of this instalment. It is evident enough that Carthage series 5 and the Agathokles «Nike» type tend to coincide. This conclusion is set off by a very slightly earlier hoard, Pachino 1957 (IGCH 215I), of the late fourth century, which contains neither the Agathokles Kore/Nike type nor the Melqart head/Horse head, but only the preceding phase of each mint - from Syracuse the quadriga tetradrachms of Agathokles and from Carthage series 3 Kore head/Horse head. On these general reckonings we may assume that Carthage series 5 should start about 300 B.C.

There is no easy way of deciding how long a series is involved; if it is accepted as will presently be argued - that Carthage series 5 is to be envisaged as a parallel production by two separate mints, this will in any case tend to telescope the possible duration of the series. Provisionally we may think of a period of about a decade for the whole series, in which case it would come to an end by about the time of Agathokles' death (289 B.C.). Third century hoards containing series 5 do not, apparently, include any Sicilian coins later than Agathokles.

That in broad terms series 5 must be defined as two parallel series seems virtually inevitable. In the first place we have a definition by legends. Series 5 a is the mint of the army signed 'MMHNT or 'MHMHNT (People of the Camp). Series 5b is the mint of the «quaestors» signed MHSBM. The only complication is that a few issues from the mhsbm mint are signed 'mmhnt instead but these as we shall see are clearly exceptional and in fact form an integral part of the mhsbm mint series.

The relative representation of the two series in hoards gives little indication as to the relation between the two series. In the Cefalú hoard there are five specimens of each; in the Megara Hyblaia 1967 hoard there are eight ' mmhnt and 14 mhsbm speci-

[^0]mens; in the 197I hoard there are four 'mmhnt and 12 mhsbm . From these samples there is no significant difference of wear between one series and the other, and so far as quantities go the presence of more mhsbm pieces in two of the hoards may simply reflect the fact that the latter was probably minted in greater quantity. While the figures for obverse dies are about equal, the reverse dies are twice as numerous for the mhsbm mint. Series 5 a-Obv. 20 Rev. 39. Series 5 b-Obv. 21 Rev. 8i.

The division into two series seems further emphasized by a sharp distinction of both style and fabric. The flans of series 5 b are noticeably more compact than those of 5 a . The stylistic difference is most obvious from the reverse type. In series 5 a some horse heads here placed at the beginning as untypical have some connexion with a type which occurs briefly in series 3 a nos. 176 etc. where similarly the horse's shaggy mane is parted into two lines. But the dominant style of 5 a is a horse head set on a rather long neck with curving outlines, the throat bulging out and the truncation usually deeply curved in to balance. The forceful and swaggering character of this horse head bears a relation to a type of head which had already appeared sporadically in some issues of series 3 (nos. 215-216) as there remarked. This style becomes the normal one of series 5 a , with many interesting variants. The contrast with series 5 b could not be more extreme. In 5 b the horse head has a much simpler and more austere aspect, the neck is short and has none of the curvaceous character of 5 a, the throat does not bulge out and the truncation though varying in shape from die to die is often a quite shallow curve. Moreover the head typical of $5 b$ has no resemblance whatever to any style known in the previous series 3 .

The distinction between series 5 a and 5 b is finally completely confirmed by the different styles of the Melqart-Herakles heads. In neither series is the head of so entirely homogeneous a style as the reverse, but on the whole it is clear that series 5 a has all of the more exuberant and lively examples, matching the style of the horses, while the heads of series 5 b are quieter and more restrained. All this goes to show that we have the work of two quite separate groups of engravers. Obviously enough, for the Melqart-Herakles heads they were drawing largely on prototypes from the coinage of Alexander the Great though without slavish imitation. The difference in the taste of the two groups of engravers may of course simply reflect the chance of which types of Alexander coins happened to come into their hands. In series 5 a the models tend to be those of eastern Alexander mints - Tarsus, Alexandria, Sidon, at all of which before Alexander's death a rather rich style developed; there is also some influence from Babylon. This contrasts strongly with the rather plainer style of Alexander's early Macedonian issues (also at first widely copied in the near east); Carthage series 5 b however shows more traces of these Macedonian styles, also with the addition of some elements from Babylon.

The clear differences between series 5 a and 5 b seem to speak for themselves. While there exists the bare possibility that the two series might be successive rather than parallel there is no indication as to how a transition could be made from one to the other. On the whole it seems much better to think of a parallel issue and of a
mint for the army and another for the quaestors (even allowing for the few exceptions mentioned).

As regards the legends, series 5 a has exclusively 'MMHNT/MHMHNT. This legend first appeared in series 3 and thus, as was shown in part 3 of this publication, at c. 320 B.C. Series I during the late fifth to early fourth century had by contrast only the simple MHNT. 'MMHNT «people of the army» is an expression involving the term $M$ (people) used in the same way as it is in Phoenician inscriptions to denote the population of a named city; examples can be cited for Tyre, Sidon, Carthage, Gaulos, Ebusus, Lepcis, Caralis, Sulcis, Bithia, Lixus ${ }^{1}$. In one inscription it is a term used not for a city but for a temple, the people of the temple of Melqart at Carthage ${ }^{2}$. Acquaro ${ }^{3}$ has lucidly distinguished between the significance of the term ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{M}$ as in ${ }^{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{M}$ QRTHDST, and the term $B^{\prime} L$ as in the legend $B^{\prime} L S ̣ Y S ̣$ (and perhaps $B^{\prime} L$ 'GDR etc.) ${ }^{4}$. ' M conveys the sense of the people in its capacity as a popular assembly; B ' L on the other hand should signify the individual citizen with full rights. Thus in the case of 'MMHNT we gain the impression that the army in Sicily appears to have been constituted at this period somewhat on the lines of a city or republic with a popular assembly, almost a separate entity within the Carthaginian territory ${ }^{5}$.

In series 5 b by contrast we have the first and indeed the only use on coins of the rerm MHSBM. How is it to be interpreted? That it means basically «financial controllers» is not now in doubt ${ }^{6}$. But are these officials purely and simply the «paymasters of the army» ${ }^{7}$ ? - if so it seems strange that the army is not mentioned; and although there is the brief interpolation of a few 'MMHNT issues in the series (nos. 360, 370-374) otherwise exclusively signed MHSBM, this hardly seems a conclusive reason to determine our reading of the legend MHSBM as such. The word MHSBM was not attested otherwise than on the coins until the discovery in 1966 of

[^1]a new inscription at Carthage, dating probably to the early second century B.C. ${ }^{8}$; this inscription records the opening of a new street in the city, mentions the collaboration of diverse classes of the people, and imposes fines for damage to the inscription which would be payable to «our MHSBM». The latter are clearly officials charged with the public finances, on the general analogy of Roman quaestors, as DupontSommer remarks. It is known from Livy that there were at Carthage magistrates to whom he refers precisely as «quaestors» and whose importance in the state was such that they had the right of automatic entry on expiry of office to the all-powerful ordo iudicum ${ }^{9}$. Were the MHSBM of our coins these same «quaestors» or were they some purely local officials?

It is of course known that most of the Phoenician cities in the west had similar constitutional features and that for instance there were suffetes (shofetim) not only at Carthage but at Gades and elsewhere, including many smaller towns in Africa; there is also mention of a «quaestor» at Gades ${ }^{10}$. Likely enough the Punic cities in Sicily had similar institutions. However there is no indication from the coins that the MHSBM we are concerned with were any kind of local magistrates, and it seems unavoidable to reflect that the coins are those of the Carthaginian state and not of any local city. Should it not therefore follow that the MHSBM on the coins are indeed the «quaestors» of the Carthaginian state? No doubt it fell within their scope to provide pay for the army, inter alia, but there seems little indication that they were merely «army paymasters» and they must surely have had wider responsibilities as civil magistrates also. If it were otherwise, there seems little point in the distinction of the two kinds of legend on the coins.

While a coinage in the name of the «people of the army» still went on (series 5 a), it is perhaps relevant to observe that it was at precisely this time, c. 300 B.C., that the civic coinages of SYS and RSMLQRT had apparently come to an end. At the same date we have the appearance of the Carthaginian coins signed MHSBM. We can only speculate whether these events were at all connected - as if the «quaestors» of the Carthaginian state were in a general financial sense somehow filling the place left by civic authorities which had ceased to emit coins? If so, it may be a sign of some closer and more direct control of the Sicilian territory by the Carthaginian state.

## Types

There is little need to discuss again here the type of the horse's head the main and most consistent type of the present and preceding series (ser. 3). In part 2 it was mentioned that, following Ferron and others, the horse's head is to be regarded as an

[^2]emblem connected with Ba'al Hammon ${ }^{11}$; in part 3 reference was made to a more recent discussion by C. Picard where it was argued that the possible connection with Ba'al Hammon does not of course exclude the connection with Tanit-Juno as indicated by Vergil ${ }^{12}$. So far as concerns series 5, we now find the horse head coupled with the head of Melqart, with whom it has no direct connection. This underlines the fact that we must evidently regard the horse head as it appears on the coins as an element of symbolism which is used independently and by no means as intimately linked with the corresponding obverse type, such as the Kore of series $2-3$. The horse is not a representation often found on Punic stelai, though there are a few examples from El Hofra; the commentary on those stresses the solar nature of the horse ${ }^{13}$, also mentioning its relevance to Hadad (Ares).

As regards the head of Melqart-Herakles which dominates series 5, there is at least no problem. It is well known that Melqart, the chief god of Tyre, was assimilated by the Greeks to Herakles, and there are plenty of subsequent examples of a purely Greek Herakles serving as equivalent for Melqart. The present coin series must be the first example of this. It seems doubtful however whether we can see any specific historical or cult reasons for the adoption of the Herakles type - from the coinage of Alexander, as mentioned above. It seems unlikely that historical developments at Carthage at the end of the fourth century which could help us to account for the Melqart type; there appears to have been some political change after the defeat of Bomilcar's attempt at tyranny ( 308 B.C.), which resulted in the supersession of the kingship and brought in the heyday of oligarchic power which made Carthage «a sort of Venice of the ancients, an aristocratic republic» ${ }^{14}$. But it seems difficult to use this as any kind of explanation for the production of coins with the new type in Sicily, especially as at Carthage itself the coinage continued to make use of the Kore type as before.

The cult of Melqart had always been followed at Carthage as at other Phoenician cities in the west, notably Gades ${ }^{15}$. Although the bulk of our evidence on the cults of Carthage is that derived from the tophet stelai mainly concerned with Tanit and Ba'al Hammon, this may give a one-sided view when considering the importance of other cults, among which that of Melqart certainly held an important place. The temple of Melqart is mentioned in one inscription ${ }^{16}$, and personal names which are compounds of Melqart are very frequent at Carthage (Abdmelqart, servant of Melqart - whence Hamilcar; Bodmelqart, in the hand of Melqart, whence Bomilcar) ${ }^{17}$. Each year the Carthaginians sent offerings to the temple of Melqart at Tyre; a special

[^3]offering was sent in 310 after Agathokles' landing in Africa as in the panic of the moment the Carthaginians feared they had neglected the cult ${ }^{18}$. It seems likely, as Picard thinks, that the Melqart cult attained a special importance at a later period and especially under the Barcids in Spain. However none of this suggests any special reason why the Herakles-Melqart head should suddenly appear on Punic coins minted in Sicily around 300 B.C.

Since in fact it is beyond question that the type of the coins was adapted from the coinage of Alexander (and not from any other Greek prototype) the explanation is probably quite a simple and practical one. Earlier Carthaginian coins (series 2-3) were largely modelled on the prototypes provided by the coins of Syracuse, the great western power. Before the end of the fourth century, the impact of Alexander's conquests had changed the world and his coinage quickly came to dominate Greece and the near-east. Carthage remained in close touch with her metropolis Tyre - where a Carthaginian embassy was present at the time of Alexander's siege ${ }^{19}$ - and must have been fully cognisant of the new developments. Possibly too the fall of Tyre gave the Carthaginians some impulse towards regarding themselves as now in a sense filling the vacant place as leader of the Phoenician nation. At all events they seem at this period to have had a wider vision of themselves as a Mediterranean «great power» dominating the west, complemented in the early third century by an alliance with Ptolemy in the east ${ }^{20}$. In the circumstances, what could be more logical for Carthage than to use for their own coinage the new model of «great power» coinage, that of Alexander himself?

The new prototype coins were not hard to seek in any case, as a number of Sicilian hoards of the period contain specimens, showing that the Alexander coins were reaching Sicily as well as other regions of the mediterranean. In view of Carthage's wide commercial connections, not least with Phoenicia, where several mints had been pouring out Alexander tetradrachms for some time, it is not a little tempting to think that Carthaginian trade may have done much to bring such coins to the west. Sicilian hoards of our period containing some Alexanders are:
IGCH 215I Pachino 1957 (3 Amphipolis; 3 Babylon, two of which are after 317 B.C.; Myriandros; Arados)
IGCH 2154 Cefalú (Amphipolis c. 318)
IGCH 2180 Megara Hyblaia 1966 (Babylon; Lycia-Pamphylia)
IGCH 2183 Capo Soprano (Myriandros)
IGCH 219I Syracuse 1927 (Amphipolis; Tarsos)
Other hoards containing Alexander tetradrachms, of which we do not have details, are:
IGCH 2159 Buccheri 2160 Aidone 2186 Pachino 1921

[^4]In addition to these, a new hoard has been reported («Sicily 1976/77), which contained a number of Carthage series 3 and 5, Agathokles quadriga tetradrachms, Athens IV c tetradrachms, but most of all a large number ( $« 300+»$ ) of Alexander retradrachms, among which the Alexandria «rose» issue (Demanhur 46ıo) was said to be very prominent, though there is reason to believe that numerous other varieties of Alexander coins were probably included also. This new hoard of which few details are yet known is of special interest simply on account of its profusion of Alexander coins, never before met with in a Sicilian hoard. Another new hoard («S. E. Sicily» 1977) also contained many Alexanders of a variety of mints, and at least one Alexander came in a very recent hoard (《S. Sicily 1978»). From the information we have so far, then, it is clear that there was an abundance of possible prototypes from numerous Alexander mints for the engravers of Carthagel series 5 to draw on.

## Commentary

Series 5 a (Plates I-6)
Nos. 273-275
It is not easy to find any plausible position for this short sequence and it is here given at the beginning of series 5 a largely for convenience. The die-linkages are as follows:

| O 86 | O 87 | O 87 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R 227 | R 227 | R 228 |

The Herakles head of O 86-87 are not particularly close to any others of series 5 a although it would be clear from the style alone that it is to this series that they must belong. The peculiar rendering of the horse's mane on R 227 with a parting is a feature that recalls the horse head of 176,178 in series 3 , though without any close stylistic resemblance apart from that. The sudden contrast with the «curvaceous» horse of R 228 is very striking. The latter, anticipated in series 3 (R. 187) is the typical rendering in series 5 a . The general shape of the horse head, also the palm tree with raised branches, recall perhaps those of 224 (series 3).

The die-links of this group are as follows:

| O 88 | O89 O90 |
| :---: | :---: |
| R 229 (fulmen) | (caduceus) |
| R 230 (triangle of dots) | R 230 |
| R 231 (triangle of dots) | R 23 I - R 23 I |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { R } 232 \\ & \text { (triangle of dots) } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { -R } 232$ |

In this die-linked group two of the reverses ( R 229-230) are of the normal style of series 5 a . The other two are totally different ( $\mathrm{R} 23 \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{R} 232$ ); their appearance is rather like that of 267,268 in series 3 d . There as in the present case, the confident sculptural modelling of the normal type is absent and the effect is flat and scrappy. Again like 268 of series 3 our R 23I changes direction to the right. On both R 23 I and 232 it is characteristic that the hair on the horse's forehead is shown parted to left and right below the rising tuft on top of the head; this arrangement is strongly reminiscent of the treatment found in many of the series 3 dies of various styles (e.g. 148,254 ) but one which is never seen with the curvaceous style either in series 3 (216) or in series 5. The stylistic diversity of R 229, 230 as against R 23I-232 is further emphasised by the comparable difference in the style of the epigraphy, the neat lettering of the former and the rather sprawling letters of the latter in both of which the final tau overlaps on the horse's truncation.

With the reverses appear marks in the field. On R 229 is a fulmen symbol, never found elsewhere on Carthaginian coinage, nor in Carthaginian material of any other kind ${ }^{21}$. This was doubtless copied from Greek coinage such as the pegasi of Ambrakia, Corinth and Syracuse, but is of a distinct form ${ }^{22}$. On the other three dies of this group we have in the field a triangle of dots, such as that which was typical of the gold coins minted at Carthage in the middle and later fourth century. Such a mark does not remain exclusive to the gold however and was also used on bronze coins minted in Sicily during the early third century ${ }^{23}$. Outside the sphere of Carthaginian coins it is difficult to cite the use of such marks except from certain of the eastern mints of Alexander - Tarsus (Demanhur 1974, 2187 etc.), Amathus (Demanhur

[^5]2708, 2710) Damascus (Demanhur 2904) and Aradus (Demanhur 3460 etc.). The triangle of dots as we have it on the tetradrachms (277) cannot in fact form any significant link with the gold minted at Carthage (Jenkins-Lewis group III) and which according to the dates adopted by Jenkins-Lewis ( $350 / 320$ B.C.) was abandoned after group III for other forms of marking by the time this tetradrachm was minted.

With O 89 the caduceus symbol makes its only appearance in this series below the Herakles head, though it is prominent in series 5 b as a symbol on the reverse. The importance of the caduceus as a Punic religious symbol has been commented on in part 3, relating to this symbol as it comes in series $2 / 3$. In series 5 , as will be discussed below, the symbols which occur seem more probably related to the symbols which are typical of Greek coinage practise than of Punic religion, and this may be the case here. At all events there is no obvious connection of the caduceus with the cult of Melqart.

The style of O 89 seems strongly influenced by the Alexander coins of e.g. Alexandria and Sidon of a generation earlier. Note the shape of the lion's mouth as it curves around Herakles' ear, and projecting forward on to the cheek, a central feature of many of the eastern mints of Alexander. Around the lion's mouth is a stylised «frill» of loose flesh; this corresponds to a real feature of the lion's mouth in nature, visible when a lion's mouth is open as a frill of dark flesh contrasting with the lighter colour of the fur; it is feature well noticed by Greek artists and emphasised e.g. in the lion-head spouts from Himera and elsewhere ${ }^{24}$, on the lion-head coins of Leontinoi ${ }^{25}$ and elsewhere, also on the lion-skin worn by Herakles at Kamarina ${ }^{26}$. This «frill» is much emphasised in the dies of series 5 a but is by contrast a rarity in series 5 b where different Alexander prototypes are being followed.

O 89 is followed by O 90 , closely derivative from it, and by $\mathrm{O} 9 \mathrm{I}, 93$ where the general pattern is remarkably similar.

Nos. 284-295
The die-links are as follows:

| $\mathrm{O}_{91} \mathrm{O}_{92}$ | O 93 | O94 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { R } 235 \\ & \text { club } \end{aligned}$ |  | R 242 |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { R } 236-\text { R } 236 \\ & \text { corn ear } \end{aligned}$ | R 240 R 24I corn ear | R 243 double corn ear |
| R 237 corn ear |  |  |
| ${ }^{24}$ Langlotz-Hirmer, Art of Magna Graecia pl. 76-80. <br> ${ }^{25}$ Kraay-Hirmer, Greek Coins, 16. <br> ${ }^{26}$ Westermark-Jenkins, Coinage of Kamarina, esp. pl. 12-1 |  |  |

In this group the majority of the reverses are marked by symbols. The club on R 235 here makes its only appearance in series 5 a whereas it is typical of many dies in series 5 b (nos. 326-346). The club would be apt enough in connexion with Herakles-Melqart but perhaps essentially as an attribute belonging to his Greek iconography. But the predominant symbol in the present group is the corn ear ${ }^{27}$, usually standing up prominently in the left field, though once very unobtrusive (29r) and once in the form of a double corn ear on a reverse which is also unusual in that the horse head faces right and is of divergent style (295). Another exceptional detail is one die where the extra foliage is placed around the trunk of the palm tree (294).

The Herakles heads $\mathrm{O}_{91}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{93}$ as mentioned already follow closely the pattern of $89-90$ with its «Alexandrian» influence pl. $14, \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}$ ). O94 has some resemblance to certain late Babylon issues e.g. Oxford I406 A.

Nos. 296-324
Summary of die-links:


In this phase of series 5 a there are no symbols. The legend is normally 'mhmhnt varied only once to 'mmhnt (nos. 310-31I). It is not easy to find plausible Alexander prototypes for the obverses of this group. In $\mathrm{O} 95-97$ we find a rather heavy-featured fleshy style that really has no close parallels in the Alexander coinage: it has something, but not much, in common with some late examples from Sidon of the years 311 , 3 Io B.C. ${ }^{28}$. $\mathrm{O}_{98}$ is almost certainly nothing else than $\mathrm{O}_{97}$ with a number of details re-engraved. With it is linked a strange die, O 99 , which is exceptional in representing the lion scalp in a pattern where the row of tufts protrudes from a scalp cut off in a vertical straight line instead of in the usual curved form; this may reflect the characteristics of certain Phoenician mints of Alexander such as Aradus and Carne (pl. 14.E), though the scheme is one which, as initially at many other eastern mints, derives ultimately from the early issues of Macedonia (pl. 14.A). Quite another style appears at

[^6]O ioo; here the smooth part of the lion's scalp surface from which the tufts depend has more prominence than on most previous dies. O iol and O IO2 are again different, the arrangement of the lion scalp is less rigid but has a restrained array of tufts, O IOI having a rather small face and weak nose, whereas $\mathrm{O}_{102}$ is far more powerful and expressive. These obverses are linked to the foregoing «heavy» group by means of R 253 and $\mathrm{R}_{258}$. Finally there is the work of $\mathrm{O}_{103}-105$ which is far more exuberant; in $\mathrm{O}_{103}-104$ the curls above the forehead as well as the tufts of the lion-skin have a certain abandon. To these $\mathrm{O}_{105}$ is closely related though the facial forms and expression come close to those of O 102. In none of these is it really useful to try to seek parallels from the Alexander coinage, and one can only point to the later issues of Babylon for something of a general analogy (e.g. Copenhagen SNG Macedonia, pl. 22).

The style of the reverses, including their epigraphy, remains comparatively regular apart from variations which merely facilitate the distinction of individual dies.

## Series 5 b - MHSBM (Plates 6-14)

Nos. 325-375
Summary:


| Nos. 376-42 I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| O II7 | O in 8 | Oil9 Oi20 | O 12 I | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{O}_{122} & \text { O }_{123} \\ \mathrm{R}_{330}-\mathrm{R}_{330} \end{array}$ | O 124 | O 125 | O I26 |
|  |  | R 317 -R 317 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | R 319-319 |  |  | R 335 | R 335 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | R 342 | -R 342 |  |

Series 5 b falls into two distinct phases. The first is marked by the occurrence of a number of symbols and other marks on the reverse - club, pellet, caduceus, astragalos, poppy (recut as astragalos), astragalos and pellet. The legend in series 5 b is always MHSBM except that towards the end of the first phases come a few intrusive issues marked 'MMHNT. The second phase has no symbols or other marks, but continues to bear the legend MHSBM without exception. In principle there is nothing that enables us to decide whether this second phase might not in fact precede the first phase as we have arranged it. However the arrangement as given seems plausible; it seems natural to place near to the abnormal 'MMHNT issues an obverse $\mathrm{O}_{\text {II }} 6$ which is coupled with a reverse 'MMHNT reverting to MHSBM and next to $\mathrm{O}_{\text {I }} 6$ has been placed a very similar obverse which has only MHSBM with the remaining no symbol issues following this.

The first phase, whith symbols, is fairly well die-linked. First are placed three obverse $\mathrm{O}_{\text {IO6-10 }}$ where the reverse in most cases carries the club symbol. There is no die-link from this to the next group but there the club symbol continues with the first three obverses O io9-III. At O in i there begin a number of issues with either the caduceus or astragalos symbol. One reverse first marked by a poppy ( R 298 ) was recut to make an astragalos ( $\mathrm{R} 298^{\prime}$ ), others have astragalos with a pellet halfconcealed behind the horse's mane in a manner reminiscent of other Carthaginian coins. The general sequence is attested by the history of R 282 which appears more worn with Oifi than with Oiri, ond R 293 which is more worn with Oilf than with $\mathrm{O}_{\text {II3. }} \mathrm{OII4}$ is an isolated obverse with its own single reverse bearing a caduceus and is to be placed in the same general context though not die-linked.

The abnormal 'MMHNT of R 293 is used first with O II3 then after transferred to OII5 which then used three other 'MMHNT dies (R 301-303), while Oir3 finished its career by reverring to MHSBM issues. The abnormality of those 'MMHNT issues in series 5 b is to be emphasised; only some five dies in all have this legend (R 293, 301, 302, 303, 304), and the last of them precedes a MHSBM die with Oir6. This is a minute proportion out of a total of some eighty reverse dies used for series 5 b as a whole, all the remainder of which are signed MHSBM. The exceptional 'MMHNT dies (nos. 360, 370-374) were certainly made in the same workshop as the great mass of the MHSBM dies; the style of the horse head is in every way characteristic of the mint of series 5 b . The temporary change of control of the mint which seems to be attested by the way in which the long series of MHSBM is interrupted by a handful of 'MMHNT dies must presumably be allowed the mean some-
thing - possibly suggesting that for a moment the «civil» mint was required to produce coins for and the name of the army. It is of course quite impossible to guess why or in what circumstances any of this could have taken place.

In any case the two series 5 a and 5 b are clearly defined and distinct, and any notion of trying to arrange the whole of series 5 so as produce a first series with MHNT followed by a second group with MHSBM, in a simple succession, is quickly doomed.

The occurrence of the symbols on series 5 b in the main serves to add one more factor to the distinct character of the two series. In two cases it is true we find an occurrence of the same symbol in each series; there is a club in 5 a but only once (286) and there in a way that distinguishes it from the numerous club dies of 5 b , being shown with the handle downwards whereas on 5 b it is always upwards. Also the caduceus, common in 5 b occurs once in 5 a on O 89 . For the rest the symbols in 5 b are distinct. By contrast with earlier series where symbols occur which seem to have a relation to Punic religion, those which are found in series 5 a and 5 b seem to be of another kind. The caduceus, as remarked above, is an important symbol in Punic religion and could so be regarded in series $2 / 3^{30}$, but here it is merely one of other symbols, all of which are known in the repertoire of Greek coins but have no specific Punic connotation. Thus the corn ear and astragalos can be found at Gela, the latter also at Abdera; the club, cornear and astragalos at Ainos; the astragalos, club, cornear, fulmen and caduceus on various Corinthian coinage ${ }^{31}$. It seems that in series 5 we should regard the symbols as evidence of the adoption of Greek mint practice in line with the adoption of the Greek Herakles type from the Alexander coins to stand for Melqart. This fits well at a period when hellenisation was specially strong in Punic life and culture generally.

The distinction made above between two mints is born out by the fact that, as mentioned above, the Herakles heads in series 5 b differ widely from those of 5 a . On the whole the style of the MHSBM mint is simpler and less elaborate. The heads are smaller, the lion-skin is treated differently in several respects. For instance the mouth of the lion where it encircles the ear is not adorned with the stylised «frill» of flesh which is always prominent in 5 a , but is simply a plain edge - the single exception is $\mathrm{O}_{115}$. Also it is quite usual in 5 b for the part of the lion-skin where it is cut off behind Herakles' neck to be depicted with emphasis and shown with folds as if of drapery, making the head almost into a draped bust - this neckpiece is specially noticeable on O Io8 and also on O 109, 112, 115 , 118, 121, 123. Even where it is not so clear this neckpiece still seems usually to be present, and it is a treatment quite distinct from that of series 5 a where there is simply an abrupt cutoff of the lion-skin with little attempt to make it into a drapery-like feature. (In this the only exception is $\mathrm{O}_{95}$ of 5 a , which is indeed closer to the 5 b model). It is hardly

[^7]possible to comment on the treatment of the lion's paws as a criterion as this feature is often enough not complete on the flan, but in general we see only the nearer paw the other being indicated very sketchily if at all (e.g. 357, 367); whereas the opposite was the tendency (by no means regular) in 5 a (e.g. 28r). The general difference in character, the treatment of the lion's tufts and the modelling of the Herakles face, are sufficiently different to call for little comment.

The treatment of the lion-skin in series 5 b is best exemplified by O 108 (334); it seems to suggest that coins of this type were influenced by prototypes from the early Macedonian mints of Alexander (notably Amphipolis, pl. 14 A). If so, the engravers of these Punic coins were simply making their own adaptation and the result is distinct enough from the Amphipolis coins in any case. Another prototype which seems to have had some influence on series 5 b would be the mint of Babylon, where in its earlier phase (to 317 B.C.) the typical treatment of the lion's mane is in a long swag curving downwards (pl. 14F); and we see something like this on O IIo, II6, 117. Then in the later (post 317) phases at Babylon there were quite other styles prevalent (pl. 14 G) which perhaps influenced Punic dies such as O 124, 125. Apart from these examples, it is not easy to find Alexander coins which are similar enough to our series to be worth mentioning. In series 5 b , only O II5 has some affinity to the «Alexandrian» model of series 5 a (e.g. O 91, 93).
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Series 5 a

273 O 86 Head of Melqart-Herakles in lionskin with thick shaggy mane; dotted border. Long break across die.
R 227 Horse's head to left, with mane parted into two lines; on the right, palm tree with ascending branches; linear border. Legend 'mmhnt. Die break on neck.
16.78* Glasgow Hunter II

274 O 87 Head more compact, tufts of lion's mane parted.
R 227 Die of 273. Die break extended. 17.25 * Paris 2325

275 O 87 Die of 274.
R 228 Horse's head of different style with bulging throat, neat mane and more curving truncation; palm tree with compact bush of branches; dotted border. Legend 'mmhnt.
16.76 * MMAG * 43, 36

- Syracuse

276 O 88 Head of refined style, tufts of lion's mane falling in a thick mass.
R 229 Similar, palm tree smaller; in left field, thunderbolt. Legend 'mhmhnt (partly off-flan).
16.88 * London $=$ Sotheby
2. 5. 1905, I95

277 O 88 Die of 276.
R 230 Similar; three pellets in left field.
Legend 'mhmhnt.
15.35 * Paris Luynes 1448

- Paris Vogué 650
- Platt collection A, 1930, 810

278 O 88 Die of 276.
R 23I Horse's head to right, flat sketchy style, very shallow truncation; palm
tree on left; three pellets in right field. Legend 'mhmhnt.

- ${ }^{*}$ Palermo

279 O 89 Similar, slightly smaller, tight curls on forehead, neck more exposed. Below lion's paws, caduceus.
Bar-shaped die break at 2 o'clock.
R 230 Die of 277.
I6.96 * Gustav VI Adolf, late King of Sweden, SNG $46=$ Sotheby
6. 7. $192 \mathrm{I}, 222$
16.32 * London

- Priv. coll. Y
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

280 O 89 Die of 279.
R 231 Die of 278. 16.43 * Paris Luynes 145 I

281 O 89 Die of 279.
R 232 Horse's head of sketchy style to left, locks parted on forehead, shallow curved truncation; on right palm tree; three pellets in left field. Linear border. Legend 'mhmhnt

- $\quad$ * Palermo

282 O 90 Closely similar to O 89 but tufts of lion's mane straighter; caduceus below?
R 231 Die of 278, 280. 16.66 Lewis (Jenkins-Lewis pl. 26, 10 )
16.82 * London

283 O 90 Die of 282.
R 232 Die of 281 .
17.30 Allotte de le Fuye 1925, 135
16.80 * ANS
16.82 ANS
17.12 Nav. 10, 353

- Priv. coll. Y
- Spink 1968
* MMAG $=$ Münzen und Medaillen AG.

284 O 91 Similar to O 89-90, slightly larger, lion's mane with thicker tufts. No border.
R 233 Horse's head to left, similar to R 229-230, truncation pointed in front. Dotted border.
Legend 'mhmhnt? (incomplete)
16.51 * Priv. coll. Y = AC 12, 1075
17.00 SC 1927, 1160
$285 \mathrm{O}_{91}$ Die of 284. Breaks around neck.
R 234 Horse's head smaller, truncation deeply arched. Legend 'mhmhnt 16.96 AC 12, 1074
16.37 Auctiones 5, 1975, 244

-     * Berlin
- Philadelphia
17.28* Priv. coll. X

286 O 91 Die of 284. More worn.
R 235 Similar, truncation is smooth shallow curve; club in left field. Legend 'mhmhnt

-     * Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

287 O 91 Die of 284.
R 236 Similar, palm tree larger; corn ear in left field. Legend 'mhmhnt - Berlin
16.60 * Lockett SNG $1055=$ Nav. 10, 354
16.76 London

- Paris 2328
16.78 Pennisi

288 O 92 More expressive face, lion's mane in long vertical tufts. No border.
R 236 Die of 287.
16.82 * Boston 499
16.34 London Lloyd SNG 1654 (NC 1925 pl . VII), Cefalú hoard

289 O 92 Die of 288.
R 237 Similar, horse's throat more prominent, palm tree closer; corn ear in left field. Legend 'mhmhnt

-     * Burlington Fine Arts 20I, 207
16.65 Glasgow Hunter 13
- MMAG list 326, 15, 1971 hoard
16.73 MMAG 43, 37
16.78 Naples 4817
17.30 Schlessinger 26. 2. 1934, 375

290 O 93 Cloșely similar to O 91, lion's mane with thick short tufts downwards. Dotted border.
R 238 Horse's head massive, thick tufts on top, truncation in regular curve.
Legend 'mhmhnt

- $\quad$ Berlin
17.02 Cambridge McC 3047
17.08 Hamburger 29. 5. 1929, 497
$16.76 \mathrm{LH}^{*}$ 1958, $116=$ Morgan 194
16.72 London
- Martinetti 805
14.30 (sic) Naples 4808
17.40 Pennisi
17.35 * seen 1977

291 O 93 Die of 290.
R 239 Closely similar, at front tip of truncation close to border, small corn ear. Legend 'mhmhnt 16.90 Cahn 68, 1763 16.38 Cambridge SNG 1495
16.13 London Lloyd SNG 1655
17.05 Münzh. Basel 8, 187
16.45 MMAG, 1971 hoard
17.29 * Nav. 6, $578=$ Benson 800
17.15 Priv. coll. X
17.20 Schulman 30.3. 1936, 48

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
16.00 Yale $=$ Ciani 17. 12. 1921. 99

292 O 93 Die of 290.
R 240 Similar, throat more bulging, palm tree taller; in left field large corn ear upright. Legend 'mhmhnt 17.12 * ANS

293 O 93 Die of 290.
R 24 I Similar, tufts of mane longer; in left field corn ear slightly slanting. Legend 'mhmhnt

294 O 94 Compact head with tufts of lion's mane thick and short. Dotted border.
R 242 Strongly bulging throat and curvaceous truncation, tall palm tree with extra foliage around trunk; in left field large corn ear.
Legend 'mmhnt
$1742^{*}$ London
16.92 Nav.5, 2985

- Paris 2329

295 O 94 Die of 294.
R 243 Horse's head to right, angular truncation; palm tree on left; double corn ear in right field.
Legend 'mmhnt (?)
16.53* Naples 48ı8
16.59 Nav. 5, 2986

296 O 95 Larger head; jaw of lion's mane with wide frill, compact row of tufts. Dotted border.
R 244 Head to left; shallow arched truncation, long mane; palm tree very close. Legend 'mhmhnt
17.12 Cambridge SNG 1497
16.86 Feuardent I6. II. 1937, 140
16.54 Galerie Monnaies de Genève, New York, 1976, 702

- Hamburger in. 6. 1930, 653
16.48 London Lloyd SNG I647, Cefalú hoard
16.70* Naples 4807
- $\quad$ * Private collection Y
16.50 SC 1927, II 55
* $\mathrm{LH}=$ Leu-Hess.
* $\mathrm{SC}=$ Sambon-Canessa.

297 O 95 Die of 296
R 245 Similar slightly larger, dense mane, taller palm tree.
Legend 'mhmhnt
17.10 Glendining-Seaby III, 1185
17.29 * Lewis CCCC SNG 428
17.00 SC* 1927, 1161

- Syracuse Gagliardi iooi


## Plate 3

- $\quad$ *Glendining 24. I I. 1950, 1538

298 O 96 Closely similar, smaller eye, lion's jaw closer to ear.
R 246 Similar, bulging throat, truncation more concave. Legend 'mhmhnt
16.52 AC 12, 1060
17.09 ANS
16.49 Boston 498
16.77 Copenhagen 90

- Hamburger 20. 2. 1928, 210
17.20 Hess 226, 164
- Hindamian 293
16.83* Naples 4806
16.93 Naples S 8087

I6.70 Paris Luynes 1452

- Paris 2326
- Platt I92I, 122

299 O 96 Die of 298
R 247 Similar, palm tree lower.
Legend 'mhmhnt
16.80 Baranowsky 1929, $1565=$ Brandis 38 I

- $\quad$ * Bourgey 20. 12. 1921, 64
17.16 London

300 O 96 Die of 298
R 248 Similar, bulging throat, shallow truncation, palm tree not so close.
Legend 'mhmhnt
16.20 Cambridge SNG 1494
17.28* London

- Myers
16.85 Naples S 8088
- $\quad$ Syracuse 24742, Mineo hoard
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

301 O96 Die of 298
R 249 Similar; legend ends beyond truncation. Legend 'mhmhnt

- $\quad$ Berlin
- Berlin
16.95 Princeton, Firestone

302 O 96 Die of 298
R 250 Similar, truncation in regular curve, legend ending beyond.
Legend 'mhmhnt
16.33 Cambridge SNG 1493
16.67 * Private collection X
16.50 * Private collection X

Plate 4

303 O 96 Die of 298
R 25 I Similar, truncation in shallower curve, taller palm tree.
Legend 'mhmhnt
16.99 * Stockholm SNG 662

- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

304 O 96 Die of 298
R 252 Slightly smaller, truncation with deeper curve, shorter palm tree. Legend 'mhmhnt 16.66 Nav. 5, 2987 I 5.90 * Private collection X

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

305 O 97 Head with larger features, especially the eye; tufts of lion skin backwardturning.
R 253 Head long-nosed, broad neck with truncation strongly curved; tall palm tree. Legend 'mhmhnt
16.83 Naples 4804
16.88 * Private collection X

306 O 97 Die of 305
R 254 Compact shallow truncation, long mane tufts. Legend 'mhmhnt 17.70 Hamburger 27. 5. 1929, $178=$ Kondylis 207
17.I I * London Lloyd SNG 1643
16.34 London formerly (rev. die break on palm tree)
16.28 MMAG i97I hoard
16.80 Vienna

307 O 97 Die of 305
R 255 Long-tufted mane, broad-topped palm tree. Legend ?

- $\quad$ ANS

308 O 97 Die of 305. Breaks on eye (Hunter)
R 256 Similar to R 249 but legend within truncation. Legend 'mhmhnt. Diebreaks by mouth.

- Berlin
16.77 * Glasgow Hunter 12

Paris Smith-Lesouef 20
309 O 97 Die of 305
R 252 Die of 304. Flaw in field low left.
17.09 ANS
16.70 Cambridge SNG 1496
$16.53^{*}$ Gustav VI Adolf, late King of Sweden, SNG 47
16.99 Hague = Nav. 10, $352=$ Nav. 5, 2984
17.10 Hess 194, 166

- Nobleman 232
16.29 Naples 4809
- Paris 2327
16.50 Ratto 8. II. 1928, 2926

310 O 98 Probably originally the same as O 97 but reworked, notably the details of the lion's jaw.
R 257 Horse head upright, truncation curves to right.
Legend 'mmhnt 16.39 * Nav. 5, 2982

3 II O 99 Lion's jaw has large smooth area, behind which straight tufts; large eye.
R 257 Die of 310

-     * ANS

312 O 100 Smaller features, especially the eye, tufts of lion skin attached to broad smooth band behind ear. No border.
R 253 Die of 310. 16.79 ANS

- Collignon 156
16.77 * Nav. 5, 2983

313 O 100 Die of 312
R 258 Similar to R 253 but head slightly higher, shallower truncation.
Legend 'mhmhnt
15.97* Glasgow Coats 3457

314 O ror Head smaller, wide open eye, lion skin more compact. Dotted border.
R 258 Die of 313. 16.04 * London Lloyd SNG 1645 , Cefalú hoard

## Plate 5

315 O ion Die of 314
R 259 Similar to R 256, legend ends beyond truncation.
Legend 'mhmhnt
17.00 Brandis 379
15.43 * Naples 4799

316 O ioi Die of 314
R 260 Similar to R 258 but larger.
Legend 'mhmhnt

-     * Private collection Y

317 O ror Die of 314
R 261 Similar to R 259 but smaller and truncation less arched, palm tree taller. Legend 'mhmhnt
16.75 Brandis 380
16.44 Copenhagen 89

- Glendining-Seaby II $253=$

Helbing 8. II. 1928, 3719
17.14 LH 1956, 241
16.22 London
16.76 Naples 4802
16.90 Paris Luynes 1449
16.8I * Pennisi

318 O 102 Larger than $\mathrm{O}_{\text {IoI, tufts }}$ of lion skin more spread. Dotted border.
R 261 Die of 317 . Flaw on lower neck. 16.84* London Lloyd SNG I642, Cefalú hoard

319 O 103 Finer and richer in detail, especially curls above brow and tufts of lion's mane protruding sharply behind.

R 262 Large horse's head similar to R. 258 less bulging throat and truncation more curved. Legend 'mhmhnt

- ${ }^{*}$ Brussels
16.65 Cahn 84,470 $=$ Hamburger 29. 5. 1929, 496
16.96 Hess 1954, 208
16.78 Hirsch $20,446=$ do. 14 , 599
16.97 LH 1960, 107
16.74 London Lloyd SNG 1644 , Cefalú hoard
16.65 * Naples 4805
16.93 Oxford SNG 2165
16.95 Rosenberg 8.9. 1924, 229
16.89 Ward 361

320 O 103 Die of 319
R 263 Similar but more bulging throat and mane longer.
Legend 'mhmhnt

- Palermo

32 O IO4 Larger head, bolder details throughout.
R 263 Die of 320

- Bourgey 5. 12. 1932, 290
- Feuardent 9.6.1913, IO7
16.46 Delbeke 243
16.81 Gulbenkian $375=$ Jameson $916=$ Hirsch 19,637
16.84 Hirsch 29, 870
17.19* MMAG 43, 35
16.84 Nav. I, $3303=$ Carfrae 357
$=\mathrm{AC}$ 13, 304

322 O 104 Die of 321
R 264 More compact, truncation more regular curve. Legend 'mhmhnt
16.77 * ANS
16.2I * Naples 8084

323 O ios Similar, heavy face, lion's skin all denser and more compact. Dotted border.
R 264 Die of 322.
17.00 London $=$ Glendining
23. II. 1928, 184
17.17 Montagu I 809
16.04 Oxford SNG 2162
16.75 SC 1927, I 156
16. 10 * Vatican 936

324 O 105 Die of 323
R 265 Horse's head taller and nose held lower, steeply arched truncation, long tufts. Legend 'mhmhnt

- Berlin

Plate 6

Series 5 b
325 O ro6 Head of Melqart-Herakles in lion skin, which has regular radiating tufts, jaw without frill and flat neckpiece.
R 266 Compact horse's head with shallowcurved truncation; palm tree on right; in left field, club sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm 16.80 * Paris Vogué 649

326 O 106 Die of 325
R 267 Similar, truncation more concave; in left small club sloping inwards. Legend mhsbm 16.29 * Paris 2340

327 O 106 Die of 325
R 268 Similar; in left field, club sloping inwards. Legend mhsbm

- $\quad$ Berlin
17.14 Egger 46, $2771=$ Merzbacher 1910, 893
16.67 London
- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

328 O 106 Die of 325
R 269 Similar; in left field, short club sloping inwards. Legend mhsbm - Glendining-Seaby III II86 16.95 * Pennisi

329 O 107 Similar to O 106, face slightly taller, tufts of lion's mane stop short of neck in line with lion's paw.
R 269 Die of 328 I6.6I * Naples 48 I5

330 O 107 Die of 329
R 270 Smaller, front of truncation lower; in left field, club sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm

> 16.74 * London Lloyd SNG 1651 , Cefalú hoard

331 O 107 Die of 329
R 27 I Normal size; in left field, club rupright. Legend mhsbm

- Berlin
16.43 Cambridge SNG 149 I
16.46 * MMAG, 197 I hoard
16.49 Ratto 1934, $262=A C_{12}$, 1061

332 O 107 Die of 329
R 272 Large head, long nose raised, thick palm tree; in left field, large club sloping inwards. Legend mhsbm 16.50 * Cambridge SNG $1492=$ Nav. r, 3305
16.75 Copenhagen 92

333 O 108 Very compact head and lion skin with short tufts and neckpiece in folds.
R 272 Die of 332
16.82 Hamburger 27. 5. 1929, 179
16.57* Naples S 8086

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

334 O ro8 Die of 333
R 273 Small head, short palm tree; in left field, small club sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm 15.64* London Lloyd SNG 1650, Cefalú hoard

335 O 108 Die of 333
R 274 Similar, club touching horse's neck. Legend mhsbm
16.60 * ANS = Sambon I9. I2. 1907, 520
16.10 Baranowsky VI 513

## Plate 7

336 O ro9 Similar but lion skin tufts longer, neckpiece less visible.
R 275 Truncation very shallow; club sloping inwards. Legend mhsbm 16.26 Cambridge SNG 1490
17.17 Glasgow Coats 3458
16.67 * Naples 4816

337 O Io9 Die of 336
R 276 Larger, no symbol. Legend mhsbm 16.78 * Egger 40, 1270

338 O ro9 Die of 336
R 277 Similar, head up more than R 276. Legend mhsbm 16.70 * Schulman 30. 3. 1936, 208

339 O ro9 Die of 336
R 278 Similar, head less raised than R 277; in left field, club near horse's nose. Legend mhsbm
15.96 * MMAG, 197 I hoard $=$ Genève 10. 10. 1977, 127

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967 (rev. flaw across club)

340 O ro9 Die of 336
R 279 Similar but no symbol, truncation down in front. Legend mhsbm 17.16 * MMAG, 197 I hoard

341 O i io Broader head, tufts of lion skin cascading downwards, flat neckpiece, lion's jaw with frill.
R 279 Die of 340

- Baranowsky 1934, 4674
- Engel-Gros Paris 1921, 23
16.30 * Naples 4800
- Peus 280, 1972, $66=$ Baranowsky VI 512

342 O IIo Die of 341
R 280 Similar, truncation straighter.
Legend mhsbm
16.68 London
16.00 * MMAG, I97 I hoard
16.99 Pennisi

343 O ino Die of 341
R 281 Similar, truncation more curved; in left field pellet. Legend mhsbm - * Private collection Y

344 O iro Die of 341
R 282 Head held lower, palm tree close; in left field long club sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm 16.42 * MMAG list 326, 16, 197 I hoard

- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

345 O II I Similar to O iog but tufts of lion skin reach to neck touching paw, jaw without frill.
R 282 Die of 344 . Signs of wear below truncation.
16.56 * London

346 O III Die of 345
R 283 Similar, smaller especially horse's nose, truncation straighter; in field left, caduceus. Legend mhsbm 16.74 * Paris Luynes 1455

Plate 8

347 O IIf Die of 345
R 284 Head of normal size, curved truncation; in left field, astragalos. Legend mhsbm 17.20* Pennisi

348 O in 2 Head broader, face more ample, lion skin tufts denser, neckpiece with folds.
R 284 Die of 347

- Berlin
- $\quad$ Hartwig i910, 687
17.17 * London Lloyd SNG 1653
17.40 MMAG list 351, 6
16.97 Naples 48ir

349 O II2 Die of 348
R 283 Die of 346

- $\quad$ Helbing 8.9. 1928,3718
16.57 Hess 202, 2682
16.84* MMAG list 326, 14, 1971 hoard
16.89 Naples 4813
16.42 Naples 4814

350 O 112 Die of 348
R 285 Horse with more protrusive throat; in left field, caduceus.
Legend mhsbm
16.92 * Paris Luynes 1456
16.70 Vienna

351 O 112 Die of 348
R 286 Truncation low in front, restless mane; in left field, astragalos. Legend mhsbm
16.60 * Hague
17.09 Pennisi
16.69 Pennisi

352 O 112 Die of 348
R 287 Similar, nose lower, neater mane; in left field, astragalos.
Legend mhsbm 17.10 * Private collection X := Hamburger 98, 458

353 O 112 Die of 348
R 288 Similar to R 288 but truncation in smoother curve; in left field astragalos. Legend mhsbm

- ANS
17.29 * Nap'es 48 Io

354 O II 3 Similar but more compact and finer style, lion's mane with fewer short tufts, neckpiece flat.
R 285 Die of 351
15.9I * London Lloyd SNG 1652, Cefalú hoard

355 O II3 Die of 354
R 289 Truncation sharply indented; in left field, caduceus.
Legend mhsbm
17.39 * ANS

356 O II3 Die of 354
R 290 Similar, truncation shallower; in left field, caduceus. Legend mhsbm 16.37 Naples 48I2

- $\quad$ * Private collection Y

357 O II3 Die of 354
R 29I Truncation more angular; in left field caduceus, not so close. Legend mhsbm 16.67 * Paris 2341

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

358 O 113 Die of 354
R 288 Die of 353
17.30 * Bourgey 14. 12. 1911, 48 $=$ Sandeman 265

Plate 9
36I O II3 Die of 354 (Signs of wear arnund nose, mouth and chin).
R 294 Normal type with curved truncation; in left field caduceus sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm 17.41* London

362 O 113 Die of 354, worn.
R 295 Similar, truncation low in front; in left field, caduceus upright.
Legend mhsbm
16.41 * London

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

363 O II3 Die of 354, worn.
R 296 Truncation in shallow curve; in left field caduceus upright, not so close. Legend mhsbm

- $\quad$ * Paris 2342

364 O II4 Compact head of beautiful style, lion skin tufts in restless mass, neckpiece with folds.
R 297 Similar but smaller; caduceus short, sloping outwards. Legend mhsbm 16.13 * Lewis

365 O IIs Broad head with refined features, small eye and mouth, lion skin rich in detail, thick interweaving tufts, jaw with frill, neckpiece with fo!ds partly revealed.
R 298 Small head with narrow neck, S-curved truncation; in left field poppy. Legend mhsbm 17.04 * London Lloyd SNG $1649=$ Feuardent 19. 12. 1921, 67

- $\quad$ Syracuse Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967 (rev. doublestruck)

366 O 115 Die of 365
R 298' Die of 365 but poppy recut as astragalos.
16.72 * ANS $=$ Benson 802
16.55 Brandis 377

-     * Private collection Y
16.60 Schlessinger 26. 2. 1934, 376
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

367 O IIs Die of 365
R 299 Similar, truncation low in front; $=$ in left field, astragalos; between horse's mane and palm tree, pellet. Legend mhsbm 16.8I * Paris 2343

368 O 115 Die of 365
R 300 Horse's neck shorter; astragalos and pellet as R 299. Legend mhsbm 16.27 * London

369 O 115 Die of 365
R 288 Die of 353,358
16.78* Münzh. Basel ıо, $148=$ Hess 207, 223

## Plate io

370 O IIs Die of 365 , signs of wear.
R 293 Die of 360 (legend 'mmhnt), more worn - breaks around horse's nose and throat (Hindamian).
17.40 HL 1960, 108

- $\quad$ Hindamian $290=$ Luneau 940
- Mionnet cast (uncertain original)
$16.37^{*}$ MMAG 197 I hoard
- Paris 2354
16.64* Sambon 19. 12. 1907, 522 $=$ Schulman 16. 12. 1926, 212

371 O 115 Die of 365
R 301 Similar to R 293
Legend 'mmhnt
16.69* London (PCG IV. C. 19)

372 O 115 Die of 365
R 302 Similar. Legend 'mmhnt
16.52 ANS
16.66 * Hess 209, $47=$ Rosenberg 72, 803

373 O 115 Die of 365
R 303 Similar, mane more restless.
Legend 'mmhnt

- $\quad$ * Castro Maya 1957, 37

374 O in6 Very small head, lion skin has dense mass of tufts curving down to the neck and paws. Dotted border.
R 304 Compact horse head; die-flaw across neck gives the impression that horse is tethered to tree. Legend 'mhmhnt

- *Boudin 15.4. 1912, 329
16.62 * Paris Luynes 1450

375 O in6 Die of 374 . Signs of wear on the face.
R 305 Similar, head held lower.
Legend mhsbm
16.42 Egger 45, 839
17.10 * Hess 194, 168

376 O 117 Closely similar to O II6, slimmer face, lion skin tufts finish closer to neck.
R 306 Similar but a little larger, same shallow S-curve truncation, smaller tree. Legend mhsbm
17.59 Benson $803=$ Morgan 195

- $\quad$ Naples 4803
17.20 Paris Luynes 1453
$377 \mathrm{O}_{117}$ Die of 376 . Wear on face and in front.
R 307 Similar, truncation down more in front. Legend ? (small traces visible)
16.8I * Glendining 18.4. 1955, 233
$=$ Sotheby 9.3.1936, 149
$=$ Helbing 8. II. 1928, $3720=$ Nav. I, 3304

378 O II7 Die of 376 . Cracks also above and behind.
R 308 Strongly curved truncation.
No legend
16.45 Copenhagen 93
16.65 * London $=$ Münzh. Basel 4, II57
16.98 London (formerly)
15.94 MMAG, 197 I hoard

379 O 117 Die of 376
R 309 Similar, truncation less curved.
Legend mhsbm

-     * Private collection Y
16.79 H. Weber $1776=$ Nav. 4, 1008


## Plate II

380 O II 8 Face similar to O in6 but different lion skin neckpiece with prominent folds and tufts in looser arrangement.
R 310 Truncation almost straight.
Legend mhsbm
17.13 * Lewis CCCC SNG 429

381 O II8 Die of 380 . Flaw in front.
R 3II Small short-nosed horse, larger palm tree, S-curve truncation.
Legend mhsbm

- Berlin (Regling MaK 836)
16.79 * Paris 2351

382 O II8 Die of 380 . More worn in front.
R 312 Similar, truncation straighter.
Legend mhsbm
16.07 Ahlström 6, 1974, 88
17.01 * Stockholm SNG 66I

383 O II8 Die of 380 . Heavily worn in front.
R 313 Similar, palm tree taller.
Legend mhsbm
17.26 Glasgow Hunter 15
16.95* London

384 O if9 Broader head, regular curls on forehead; lion skin with thick tufts, mouth plain, neckpiece with fold.
R 314 Similar, truncation with a different
shallow curve. Legend mhsbm
16.76 * Ciani 20. 11. 1935, $87=$ Allotte de la Fuye 134
16.65 Copenhagen 91
17.4 I HL 1957, 144
16.58 Lewis = Glendining 19. 7. 1950, 62

-     * Private collection Y
16.5 I Schweiz. Bankverein Zürich 2, 1977, 280
16.63 Vatican

385 O II9 Die of 384
R 315 Similar but narrow neck, truncation down in front.
Legend mhsbm

| 17.44 | Cahn $71,699=$ Cahn 66, |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 483 |
| 16.95 | Hess 194, 167 |
| - | Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia |
|  | hoard 1967 |
| - | Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia |
| hoard 1967 |  |

17.44 * Cahn 71, $699=$ Cahn 66, 483
16.95 Hess 194, I 67

- Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967 hoard 1967

386 O 119 Die of 384. Break on nose.
R 316 Horse with normal wide neck, truncation low in front.
Legend mhsbm

- Guadan
- Mionnet cast (uncertain original)
16.86 MMAG 197I hoard $=$ Münzschätze 5 (Bayer. Vereinsbank 1977), 78
16.48 Naples S 8085
16.91 * Pennisi
16.90 SC 1927, 1158

387 O in9 Die of 384
R 317 More compact, shallow truncation.
Legend mhsbm
16.42 ANS

- Berlin
16.99 Cancio
16.84 * London Lloyd SNG 1646

Cefalú hoard
16.68 London

388 O il9 Die of 384
R 318 Horse's head lower, mouth open, truncationn more curved. Die
break across mane and palm trunk.
Legend mhsbm (partly visible)

-     * Syracuse Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

389 O ri9 Die 384
R 319 Similar to R 316.
Legend mhsbm
16.46 ANS

- Bourgey 3. 12. 1928, 128
17.13 Cahn 66, 484
- $\quad$ Canessa 12.6.1928, 728
- $\quad$ Ratto 4. 4. 1927, 2927
- Syracuse Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967
16.70 Vienna

390 O 120 Flaw on eye. Closely similar to O ing, face larger, lion skin tufts looser.
R 317 Die of 387

- $\quad$ Luneau 939
16.30 Riechmann 1921, 1120
- St. Louis, Washington University, Wulfing coll.
-     * Syracuse 25286, Mineo hoard

391 O i20 Die of 390
R 319 Die of 389
17.2 I * Hague
17.33 Headlam 82
16.75 London $=$ GlendiningSeaby III II87

392 O 120 Die of 390
R 320 Similar to R. 319 but truncation in shallower curve. Legend mhsbm 16.47 Hamburger 98, 456 17.12 * Lewis

- Ratto 8. II. 1928 (Paris), 823

393 O 120 Die of 390
R 32 I Similar to last. Legend mhsbm 17.44 * Private collection Sicily

394 O 120 Die of 390
R 322 Similar to R 315 (385), small
differences in palm tree and truncation

- Numismatica Toderi 4, 1973, 148

395 O 12 I Closely similar to O II9-120 but altogether larger, tufts of lion's mane long and loose, neckpiece with folds more prominent, lion's mouth very wide open with thin edge.
R 323 Horse head small, truncation shallow. Legend hardly visible (offflan).

- $\quad$ * Feuardent I8.6. 1924, 54

396 O I21 Die of 395 . Signs of wear in front on some specimens.
R 324 Horse head larger. Legend mhsbm 16.97 AC 16, 929

- Brussels
16.90 Glasgow Hunter 14
- Grabow 9.6.1930, $607 \quad 15.90$ Helbing 24. 10. 1927, 3171
16.70 London Lloyd SNG I648,
16.94 Naples 480 Cefalú hoard
16.28 * MMAG 1971 hoard
16.54 MMAG 197 I hoard

397 O 121 Die of 395
R 325 Horse head smaller than last, palm tree larger. Legend mhsbm 16.36* Private collection X

398 O r2r Die of 395 . Breaks in front of face.
R 326 Similar, truncation more curved and palm tree closer. Legend mhsbm - Berlin
16.35* MMAG 1971 hoard
17.29 MMAG 1971 hoard
16.84 Oxford SNG 2164

400 O 121" Same die further recut - inlet below lion's jaw wider. Breaks in front.
R 328 Similar but horse's neck narrower, base of palm tree closer to mane. Legend mhsbm

- $\quad$ * Palermo

401 O 122 Different style; face with short nose and bulging brow; lion skin has mouth in broad band, tufts fewer but thicker, plain neckpiece, second paw not shown.
R 329 Similar, straight shallow truncation.
Legend mhsbm
16.75 * Paris Luynes 1454
16.82 Paris Delepierre

399 O 12 I' Die of 395 , now partly recut, especially the eye, brow and nose.
R 327 Truncation more deeply curved in front, palm tree tall.
Legend mhsbm
17.14 * AC 16, 928

- Ahlström 14. 1977,655

402 O 122 Die of 401
R 330 Truncation more concave.
Legend mhsbm
17.10 * Paris Luynes 1457
16.95 Syracuse 13206, Scoglitti hoard

Plate 13

403 O 122 Die of 401
R 331 Similar, truncation more curved, mane more curly. Legend mhsbm 17.25* Hague

404 O 122 Die of 401 . Heavy flaw on cheek.
R 332 Similar, details and legend not visible.

* Naples S 8089

405 O 122 Die of 401
R 333 Smaller, truncation shallow.
Legend mhsbm

- $\quad{ }^{*}$ Ciani 14.6. 1934, 88
-     * Syracuse 25287, Mineo hoard

406 O 123 Small compact head, lion skin with short snaky tufts and very prominent neckpiece with foids.
R 330 Die of 402
17.05 Glendining 21.6.1972, 108
15.76 London
16.70 * MMAG list 396, 12

407 O 123 Die of 406. Break across chin.
R 334 Similar to R 331. Legend mhsbm

-     * ANS
- $\quad$ Sambon 19.2.1907, 521
- Santamaria 1934, I60

408 O I24 Closely similar to style of O 122 but more compact; lion skin has neckpiece with folds, single paw. Die flaw across head.
R 335 Horse's neck rather narrow, shallow truncation. Legend mhsbm 16.93 * London

- Munich

409 O 124 Die of 408
R 336 Similar, more curved truncation. Legend mhsbm

- $\quad$ Delmonte I8. I I. 1933, 207

Guadan
16.60 Helbing 70, 536
17.36 * Pennisi

410 O 124 Die of 408, neck narrow.
R 337 Horse's nose up, truncation very shallow. Legend mhsbm

-     * Syracuse 25288, Mineo hoard

4II O 124 Die of 408
R 338 Horse's head not raised, neck wider, fairly shallow truncation.
Legend mhsbm

-     * Syracuse 48. 326, Camarina hoard 1928

412 O 124 Die of 408. Die-break worse.
R 339 Similar, horse wide-necked.
Legend mhsbm

- Grabow 9.6.1930, 606
16.90 Helbing 1911, 796
17.14 Lockett SNG 1056
16.48 * MMAG 1971 hoard
16.85 SC 1927, $1157=$ Rosenberg 64, $1504=$ Brandis 378
- $\quad$ Syracuse Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967

413 O 124 Die of 408. Additional breaks in front of mouth.
R 340 Similar, horse's neck not so wide.
Legend mhsbm
16.18* London
16.95 Oxford, Miss., USA

```
Plate 14
```

414 O 124 Die of 408
R 34 I Similar to R 338. Legend mhsbm 17.06 * Allotte de la Fuye 136

415 O 124 Die of 408
R 342 Similar, truncation down in front. Legend mhsbm

- $\quad$ * ANS
16.87 Oxford SNG 2163

416 O $_{125}$ Similar style to $\mathrm{O}_{124}$, lion skin has fewer but thicker tufts, plain neckpiece and single large paw.
R 335 Die of 409 16.23 * Schweiz. Bankverein Zürich 2, 1977, 281

417 O 125 Die of 416
R 342 Die of 415 16.38* London

418 O 125 Die of 4 16 . Vertical flaws across middle and on right.

R 343 Similar to R 339 but less wide.
Legend mhsbm
16.63 ANS $=7.3 .1935,284$
16.33 * Pennisi

419 O 125 Die of 416
R 344 Similar to R 340, truncation more concave. Legend mhsbm - $\quad$ * de Nicola, March 1972, 192

420 O 126 Closely similar to O I24 but the face quite different and neckpiece of lion skin smooth and without folds.
R 345 Very shallow truncation.
Legend mhsbm
16.72 * London

42 I O 126 Die of 420
R 346 Closely similar to R 345 .
Legend mhsbm ? (little visible)

- $\quad$ Helbing 8. ri. 1928, 3722

Series 6
(Plates I5-20)
The following group of coins belongs to a later period than any of those previously discussed, and is included here on account of the apparent connexion with Sicily. One important element is the issue of electrum triple-shekels of low gold content which formed group VIII in Jenkins-Lewis and which are here re-listed with some revision and additions. The remaining coins are large silver denominations, a small issue of 6 -shekels and 3 -shekels, with another and larger issue of 5 -shekels; a I-shekel of the same types as the 6 -shekel is also included on the assumption of being genuine. What may have been a half-shekel of the same types as the 3 -shekel coins is noted by Müller ${ }^{32}$ from an older publication but the specimen has not come to light since and nothing can be said about it. The group as a whole has a certain stylistic homogeneity; its approximate date can only be deduced from a comparison with other Carthaginian coins, and there are no finds to give an association with other coins of known date.

At first sight there seems to be a division into two groups, first the 6 -shekel and 3 -shekel without legend, and second the 5 -shekel and the electrum (Jenkins-Lewis group VIII ${ }^{*}$ ) which both have the legend B'RSTT. However the division is not so clear stylistically. Of the large silver, the 6 -shekel has a head which is close to that of the Carthage shekels ( pl .16 E ) in its rather plain aspect as in the general arrangement of the hair though lacking the curl on top behind the corn ears, and having a triple not single earring and a plain not pendant necklace; the truncation is however more or less S-shaped like the shekels. The 3 -shekel coins seem to be by another hand and are closely related to the group VIII electrum, with a rich treatment of the curls above the forehead and behind the ear, a top curl (but no top spray as on the electrum), triple earring, pendant necklace and S-shaped truncation (the latter also similar to the Carthage shekels). The 5 -shekel coins may be said to be linked to the Carthage shekels by having a single earring and a top curl (but no top spray) but the neck and truncation are markedly different as on the 5 -shekels there is really no necklace and the truncation is mostly indeterminate (where visible), running into the dotted border and once (on $\mathrm{O}_{4}$ ) making a shallow S-curve; the 5 -shekels thus stand rather apart from the rest. However it remains true that the whole group seems to hang loosely together and that the only points of contact with other coins are formed by the Carthage shekels and the electrum staters of JenkinsLewis group VII; the latter have a general similarity to the coins we are concerned with though differing markedly in the form of the pendant necklace and truncation which remains convex as on previous gold and electrum issues. The Carthage shekels are not closely datable except to the earlier third century, the Group VII electrum

[^8]staters should be of about 270 . For what this indication is worth, it should suggest that the group of large silver and electrum coins belongs to about the early years of the first Punic war ( $\pm 264$ B.C.).

The legend B'RSTT on the decadrachms and electrum tristaters has been discussed many times. Older references are given by Müller and Gsell. One theory is that this legend somehow corresponds to Byrsa, the name of the citadel of Carthage or at least that part of the city including the citadel. The name is known only from classical sources in its Greek form $\beta$ v́go $\alpha$ ( $=$ ox-hide), on the basis of which the story went that Dido-Elissa when founding the African colony was to claim such territory as could be covered by an ox-hide; however by cleverly cutting the ox-hide into small strips she was able to measure out a sizeable area of ground. It is uncertain whether there is any real significance in the «ox-hide» name or whether it is, as has been suggested, an attempt to turn into Greek a semitic word meaning a «fortified space», on the analogy of the Hebrew BṢRH (with an interchange of the middle letters) ${ }^{33}$ - a similar root which is behind the name of e.g. ancient Bostra.

The connection between the coin legend B'RSTT and the Byrsa of Carthage has most recently been accepted again by Cintas ${ }^{34}$, but most opinion in recent times has preferred the interpretation as «in the land» ${ }^{35}$. This interpretation is unexceptionable, on the basis of the word 'RS or 'RSTT plus the prefix B (= «in»), a word familiar from the phrase «Eretz Israel». 'RS is a term attested from a North African inscription from the area of Maktar mentioning 'RST TSK'T. the territory of Tusca corresponding to what was later called «Pagus Tuscae» as an administrative division in Roman Africa ${ }^{36}$. The Greek equivalent of 'RS is, as Picard has pointed out, $\chi \omega \varrho \alpha$. The Carthaginian domain in Africa appears to have been made up of seven or eight quite large 'RSTT each under a prefect, the whole under the command of a Boetharch ${ }^{37}$.

How far this throws any direct light on the coin legend b'rṣt is not certain. It was argued in Jenkins-Lewis that if the correct general sense of the legend is «in the land» then it should at least imply that the mint in question was not at Carthage. Bisi considers that the implication of 'RS is such as to mean not only «territory» but «national territory» and that this indicates that the coins were for circulation in the area surrounding Carthage ${ }^{38}$. However it can hardly have been necessary for coins to be so designated as all Carthaginian coins could have circulated in the whole area in any case (though these apparently did not - see below). If the coins are to be thought of as having an intimate connection with the African 'RSTT it might be

[^9]necessary to suppose the existence of another mint in Africa, which must surely have been quite superfluous and makes little sense.

In fact I still think that the solution is more probably the one indicated by the find spots of the coins; and this clearly suggests Sicily rather than Africa. It is true that apart from the finds the indications might be held to be equivocal. The weight standard now used both for the silver and the electrum denominations is no longer the Attic standard as had been previously used in Sicily, but the Punic shekel standard, hitherto only used at the mint of Carthage. But this is hardly a cogent objection against Sicily as possible mint at the date in question, for in Greek Sicily too since the latter days of Agathokles the Attic standard had been abandoned ${ }^{39}$, and was not resumed except briefly by Hieronymos, for the minting of silver, though it was retained for gold. Another factor is the style of the B'RSTT group of coins; it is not entirely uniform, but can hardly be called specifically Sicilian since all the close parallels are typical of styles which were or had been current at the mint of Carthage. On the other hand, there is the question of the die-axis, and this criterion does really seem to distinguish the coins apart from those of the Carthage mint. At Carthage the regular upright axis $\uparrow \uparrow$ had come in with the electrum issue of c. $320 / 310$ B.C. ${ }^{40}$ and thence remained constantly in use there until the last days of Carthage, as opposed to an irregular axis still found in other issues, e.g. of bronze, in Sardinia and Sicily (the regular axis being otherwise found very rarely and notably in Barcid Spain). There is a slight degree of variation in the regular axis of for instance the silver shekels of Carthage J-L pl.26. I4 but less than that shown by the silver of the B'RSTT group. Above all, the electrum coins of the B'RSTT group have a decidedly irregular axis. This supports the deduction made in Jenkins-Lewis that the group of coins in question should have been minted elsewhere than at Carthage, as indeed is implied by the legend.

In fact the finds known are exclusively from Sicily. Isolated specimens of the electrum were recorded as found near or at Palermo (J-L 368 and 372.5) which is also the case for the silver 3 -shekel Jameson 2349 . Then a number of other electrum pieces, together with specimens of the various large silver denominations, came from a hoard discovered in 1896/97, allegedly at Porto Empedocle near Agrigento (IGCH 2207; J-L hoard XVI). Finally as many as fifty to eigthy of the silver 5 -shekel coins (decadrachms) came from a hoard found at or near Palermo in 1958 (IGCH 2208; possibly from Termini Imerese). As against this, no specimen of any of these coins has ever, it seems, been reported from Africa.

Naturally it is impossible always to be sure that find spots give an exclusive indication for place of mintage - it is only necessary to think of the great finds of Carthaginian gold and electrum staters found in Sardinia but certainly minted at Carthage. However the possible Sicilian origin of the B'RSTT coins must be taken seriously, in view of the find evidence. If so, what can be the significance of the

[^10]legend B'RSTT? Having in mind the circumstances of the early third century and the probability that Carthage was viewing herself at the time as more or less the «great power» of the western mediterranean, it seems reasonable to wonder: does B'RṢT here apply specifically to the Sicilian province and if so does it mean that the latter was regarded at this period as an integral part of the Carthaginian state in the same way as the several 'RST of Africa? The question may be raised, but hardly answered, for lack of any direct evidence ${ }^{41}$.

[^11]
## Catalogue

Plate 15

6-shekels (dodecadrachm)
Obv. Female head with two corn-ears and leaf in hair, triple earring, plain necklace, indented truncation; dotted border.
Rev. Prancing horse.

```
4 2 2 ~ O ~ I ~
    R I
        \uparrow45.61 ANS = Nav. 5, 3025
\uparrow45.34 * Copenhagen 179
\uparrow45.36 London PCG pl. 38.30
\44.25 Naples 4848
\uparrow44.64 Naples 4849
    44.27 Naville 6,603
423 O I
    R 2
\begin{tabular}{rl}
\(\uparrow 45.37^{*}\) & Berlin \\
44.35 & MMAG 43,5 = Jameson \\
& \(925=\) Hirsch 19,660
\end{tabular}
\uparrow45.37* Berlin
                925 = Hirsch 19,660
```

R 3
/ $45.52{ }^{*}$ Hunter Glasgow pl. xciii. 24

```
425 O 3
```

R 4
44.15 Sartiges $390=$ Hirsch 21 , 4684

- Hirsch If, 106
-     * Private collection Y
$426 \mathrm{O}_{4}$
R 5
$\uparrow 45.30^{*}$ Vienna
I-shekel (didrachm)
Obv. and rev.-types same as 6-shekels
$\begin{array}{cl}6.52 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Shown at B. M. } 1968 \\ \text { (genuine?) }\end{array}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{cl}6.52 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Shown at B. M. I968 } \\ \text { (genuine?) }\end{array}\end{array}$

Plate 16
3-shekels
Obv.Similar to the 6-shekel type but the hair more elaborate and restless; curl on top behind corn-ears; pendant necklace.
Rev. Horse's head.
428 O I
R I

| $20.65^{*}$ London PCG pl.38.3I $=$ | $430 \mathrm{O}_{3}$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| AC 13.39 I | R $_{2}$ |

Plates 17-20

5-shekels (decadrachms)
Obv. Female head with two corn-ears and leaf in hair, single drop earring, no necklace; truncation where visible seems to merge into dotted border. ( $\mathrm{O}_{4}$-truncation ends in sharply indented concavity outside dotted border.)

Rev. Pegasos flying right; leading edge of wing has rounded corner overlapping horse's neck with strongly curved indentation below; on lower part of the wing, normally two main rows of short feathers, but on $\mathrm{RII}, \mathrm{I} 2$ three rows of feathers.
$429 \mathrm{O}_{2}$
R 2
† 20.64 Gulbenkian $379=$ Jameson 2439
$\uparrow$ 21.99 * Private collection $\mathrm{Y}=$ Lockett $1065=$ Nav. ı. 373 = Nav. 4. IOI9
\22.15 Paris Luynes 3780
$\uparrow 21.44^{*}$ Berlin

Below between front and back hooves of pegasos, legend B'RST
$B^{\prime} R S T$

## trapg

There is little variation in the letter forms between one version and another; the letter alef alone shows slight variants.


## Plate 17



Plate 18


Plate 19
$442 \mathrm{O}_{3}$ Flaws on chin and in field
R II
$\checkmark 36.98$ Boston 506
〕 36.49 London RPK = PCG V C
21
$\nearrow 37.69$ MMAG 19, 1959, 601
36.09 Glasgow Coats 346I

```
\34.99 Munich = Carfrae 14
\(\uparrow\) - \(\quad\) * Palermo hoard 1958
\(\nearrow\) - Palermo hoard 1958
\(443 \mathrm{O}_{3}\)
    \uparrow - * Palermo hoard 1958
    \nearrow- Palermo hoard 1958
R
    R I2
                                    \ 37.9I Leu 7, 1973 107
                                    * Palermo hoard 1958
```

$444 \mathrm{O}_{3}$ The face heavily remodelled （on the coin？）
R 13
36．54＊Bunbury 547
$445 \mathrm{O}_{4}$ R 14
$\uparrow 36.48$ Berlin
† 37.44 Cambridge SNG $1512=$ Benson 806
－Hamburger 29． 5.29 （these dies？）
35.60 Hirsch 3 I． $655=$ Hirsch 33． 995
† 35.70 London Lloyd SNG 1665 36.74 O＇Hagan 807

र－Palermo hoard 1958
35．57 Paris Vogué 664
† 36．58＊Private collection Y＝ LH 1956248
$446 \mathrm{O}_{4}$
R 15
＊Private collection Y （rev．Giacosa，Uomo e cavallo pl．lxxxviii）
$447 \mathrm{O}_{4}$
R 16
〕 37.88 ＊Hirmer $211=$ Leu－Hess 1959， 125
フ－Palermo hoard 1958

Plate 20
$448 \mathrm{O}_{4}$
R 17
r－＊Palermo hoard 1958
$449 \mathrm{O}_{4}{ }^{\prime}$
R 18
\ 37．05＊London（Cracherode）
\ 36.80 Vienna
450 O 4 ＇
R 19
$\nearrow 37.77^{*}$ Leu 28，1965， 120
$45 \mathrm{IO}_{5}$
R 20
＞ 37.58 Brussels de Hirsch 1866
$\nearrow 38.01{ }^{*}$ Leu 15，1976， $151=$ LH 1962， $137=$ Palermo hoard 1958
$\nearrow 37.8 \mathrm{I}$ LH 31，1966， $182=$ LH 45， 1970， 85
Palermo hoard 1958
$\nearrow 37.20$ Private collection X
〒 31.50 Stockholm SNG 663
$452 \mathrm{O}_{5}$ R 21

37．77 Harmer－Rook 19．I．1978， 121
$\uparrow$－＊Palermo hoard 1958

F I-4 See part 2.
F 5 See part 2; London ex Blacas 1867, 17.31.
F 6 Copy of 49-52; details weak, scrappy fragments of legend incorrect. Specimen seen in 1967 (weight?).
$\mathrm{F}_{7}$ Copy of the type of $6 \mathrm{I}-67$. A strange and disturbing item, not least on account of its provenance, the Megara Hyblaia 1949 hoard (!), in spite of which it seems impossible to regard it as genuine. The harsh forms of the head are quite at variance with O 16-17-18 and the letter mem behind the neck is unsatisfactory; likewise the palm-tree, whose branches and bunches are utterly feeble and whose trunk disintegrates into a mass of separate dots in a quite uncharacteristic manner. Conceivably this should be regarded, on account of its provenance, as an ancient forgery rather than a modern one; if so it is the only known example of the kind.
Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia 1949 hoard (inv. no. 55850), 16.05.
F 8 A crude copy of the types 88-90 which would deceive nobody. Specimen from Malta, cast in London 1931, 15.96 ; another 1937.
F 9 A bizarre combination of a reverse copied from series I (no. 27) with a head from series 2 b (no. 12I); the head is not so bad, but the reverse is weak and the legend peters out lacking the last letter of QRTHDST. Specimen seen in 1965, 16.87 .
Fio Copy of 92: apparently a plated coin, ancient forgery (?). Copenhagen SNG 43, 80, 15.53 g .
Fil-Fi2 These two both derive from the same obverse die ( $\mathrm{O}_{4} 6$ ) which is the one that joins series 2 d to series 3 a . The reverse of $\mathrm{F}_{\text {II }}$ is close to that of 136 though altered a little in detail; that of $\mathrm{F}_{12}$ is close to the reverse of 143 . In both cases the fine quality of the original work has been lost; a close comparison, especially of the heads, with the originals reveals that the actual dimensions have shrunk by a small but perceptible amount. Thus it is clear that casting was employed at some stage in the production of these forgeries.
Fill specimen seen in 1962, 16.96 ; another $1965,16.84$.
F 12 - specimen seen in 1956; another 1965, 17.88 (sic).
F $_{13}$ Copy of 189; small difference and a certain hardening in detail throughout. Specimen seen 1971 , 17.28.
F14 Difficult to find an exact prototype for this; a very problematic item. Though at first sight rather good, doubts supervene; many of the details have a fussy and scrappy look; a dot in front of the front dolphin. The horse's head has a strange expression quite uncharacteristic of this series. What finally settles it is surely the legend, with its scrappy disjointed and inaccurate letters.
MMAG 43, 26.
Fis A peculiar and rather crude copy; since there is an attempted shell below the chin it must be the obverse O 49 which is copied. Very scrappy throughout, legend hopeless.
London 14.6r; another in Prado, Madrid.
Fisa Types of series 3 a e.g. 148. Becker 13 r.
F 16 An inferior copy of 270; loss of quality and detail evident at every point. Cast in London, 1962, 16.83 .
F 17 A more serious copy of 270 . Obverse: many small discrepancies especially the far-side tiara flap, the locks of hair protruding behind, the exaggerated and hardened outlines of the tiara, the space between truncation and tiara side-flap and the border, which space does not exist in the original. Reverse: Numerous discrepancies especially the trunk
of the palm-tree disintegrating; legend sketchy. Casts in London, 1939 (16.38) and 1949 (i6.80). Cf. Ravel, Falsifications pl. IX. 40.
Fi8 Very inferior version, seen 1964.
Fi9 Apparently a mechanical reproduction of 27 I, somewhat shrunk from the original and weaker in every detail. Palm tree branches narrowed; front paw of lion wrong; shin of legend wrong.
Specimen seen in 1974, 16.85 (bad patina); another 1965, 16.95.
F 20 Copy of 272. At first sight plausible and close to the original; but the discrepancies are there and soon become apparent with close examination. Obverse: weak points - the ear, earring, edge of tiara behind the ear; bottom edge of back tiara flap acut off» and wavy strand of hair above it very feeble. Modelling of the tiara itself very weak, the pleats too much separated. The lock of hair and tiara flap in front of the neck wrong. Reverse: the whole body and paws of the lion weak, the bristling mane full of small discrepancies, palm-tree very poor. Legend hardly corresponds on detail to the original (itself marred by numerous die-flaws, see catalogue).
Naples 4280.
F 21 A self-evident absurdity, modelled loosely and crudely on 272 but with a Greek legend $\Lambda$ EONTINON replacing the Punic inscription.

## London.

F 22 Types of series 5 but rev. horse's head adapted from a reverse of series 3 e.g. 183, 184 with legend 'mmhnt and in front triangle of dots suggested by 277 etc. Seen in 1969. 16.39 g .
F 23 Types of series 5, very broad obv. head, rev. horse's head similar to 294, cornear symbol, legend 'MMHNT, peculiar lettering.
Becker 130: specimens - including Brussels Hirsch 840; Egger 40.1269; Nobleman 234; MMAG list 351, 7; commerce 1968. Same obv. used for Becker's forgery 47 (Alexander) here pl. 22.
F 24 Types of electrum tristater Jenkins-Lewis group VIII but in silver. 1959; 37.94 g. 1965; 38.00 g .

F 25 Types of 6-shekels, crude version of 422. Seen 1976; 42.24 g.
F 26 Obv. of 6-shekel type as F 24 combined with rev. 5-shekel type. Made at Cefalú 1975.
F $27 \quad$ Obv. type of 5-shekels combined with rev. type of 6-shekels. 1969; 39.28.
F 28 5-shekels type, Becker 134; obv. based on $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ with wrong truncation, rev. based on R 9 but with too many feathers.
Cf. Kress Nov. 1953, 126.
F 29 5-shekels type, based on 442. 1969; 37.84.
F $30 \quad 5$-shekel type based on 448 ; Milan (cast) 29.42 g. - Dr. Arslan confirms that this specimen is now regarded as a forgery.

## Key to Plates

| Plate I | 273 | Glasgow |  | 313 | Glasgow |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 274 | Paris |  | 314 | London |
|  | 275 | MMAG 43 |  |  |  |
|  | 276 | London | Plate 5 | 315 | Naples |
|  | 277 | Paris |  | 316 | Private collection Y |
|  | 278 | Palermo |  | 317 | Pennisi |
|  | 279 S | King of Sweden |  | 318 | London |
|  | 279 L | London |  | 319 N | Naples |
|  | 280 | Paris |  | 319 B | Brussels |
|  | 281 | Palermo |  | 320 | Palermo |
|  | 282 | London |  | 321 | MMAG 43 |
|  | 283 | ANS |  | 322 A | ANS |
|  |  |  |  | 322 N | Naples |
| Plate 2 | 284 | Private collection Y |  | 323 | Vatican |
|  | 285 X | Private collection X |  | 324 | Berlin |
|  | 285 B | Berlin |  |  |  |
|  | 286 | Syracuse | Plate 6 | 325 | Paris |
|  | 287 | Lockett |  | 326 | Paris |
|  | 288 | Boston |  | 327 | Berlin |
|  | 289 | Burlington Fine Arts |  | 328 | Pennisi |
|  | 290 L | seen 1977 |  | 329 | Naples |
|  | 290 B | Berlin |  | 330 | London |
|  | 291 | Naville 6 |  | 331 | MMAG 1971 |
|  | 292 | ANS |  | 332 | Cambridge |
|  | 293 | Lewis CCCC |  | 333 | Naples |
|  |  |  |  | 334 | London |
| Plate 3 | 294 | London |  | 335 | ANS |
|  | 295 | Naples |  |  |  |
|  | 296 N | Naples | Plate 7 | 336 | Naples |
|  | 296 Y | Private collection Y |  | 337 | Egger 40 |
|  | 297 | Glendining 1950 |  | 338 | Schulman 1936 |
|  | 298 | Naples |  | 339 | MMAG 1971 |
|  | 299 | Bourgey 192I |  | 340 | MMAG ${ }_{\text {I97 }}$ I |
|  | 300 | London |  | 34 I | Naples |
|  | 301 | Berlin |  | 342 | MMAG 197I |
|  | 302 | Private collection X |  | 343 | Private collection Y |
|  | 302 | Private collection $\mathbf{X}$ |  | 344 | MMAG 1971 |
|  |  |  |  | 345 | London |
| Plate 4 | 303 | Stockholm |  | 346 | Paris |
|  | 304 | Private collection X |  |  |  |
|  | 305 | Private collection X | Plate 8 | 347 | Pennisi |
|  | 306 | London |  | 348 | London |
|  | 307 | ANS |  | 349 | MMAG 1971 |
|  | 308 | Glasgow |  | 350 | Paris |
|  | 309 | King of Sweden |  | 351 | Hague |
|  | 310 | Naville 5 |  | 352 | Private collection X |
|  | 311 | ANS |  | 353 | Naples |
|  | 312 | Naville 5 |  | 354 | London |


|  | 355 | ANS |  | 397 | Private collection X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 356 | Private collection Y |  | 398 | MMAG 1971 |
|  | 357 | Paris |  | 399 | Ars Classica 16 |
|  | 358 | Bourgey 1911 |  | 400 | Palermo |
|  |  |  |  | 401 | Paris |
| Plate 9 | 359 | MMAG 1971 |  | 402 | Paris |
|  | 360 | Hamburger 98 |  |  |  |
|  | 361 | London | Plate 13 | 403 | Hague |
|  | 362 | London |  | 404 | Naples |
|  | 363 | Paris |  | 405 C | Ciani 1934 |
|  | 364 | Lewis |  | 405 S | Syracuse |
|  | 365 | London |  | 406 | MMAG list 396 |
|  | 366 Y | Private collection Y |  | 407 | ANS |
|  | 366 A | ANS |  | 408 | London |
|  | 367 | Paris |  | 409 | Pennisi |
|  | 368 | London |  | 410 | Syracuse |
|  | 369 | Münzh. Basel 10 |  | 411 | Syracuse |
|  |  |  |  | 412 | MMAG 1971 |
| Plate Io | 370 M | MMAG 1971 |  | 413 | MMAG 1971 |
|  | 370 S | Sambon 1907 |  |  |  |
|  | 375 | London | Plate 14 | 414 | Allotte de la Fuye |
|  | 372 | Hess 209 |  | 415 | ANS |
|  | 373 | Castro Maya |  | 416 | Schweiz. Bankverein 1977 |
|  | 374 P | Paris |  | 417 | London |
|  | 374 B | Boudin 1912 |  | 418 | Pennisi |
|  | 375 | Hess 194 |  | 419 | de Nicola 1972 |
|  | 376 | Naples |  | 420 | London |
|  | 377 | Naville I |  | 42 I | Helbing 1928 |
|  | 378 | London |  | A-G | Alexander obverses (London) |
|  | 379 | Private collection Y |  | A | Amphipolis |
|  |  |  |  | B | Alexandria |
| Plate II | 380 | Lewis CCCC |  | C | Alexandria |
|  | 381 | Paris |  | D | Sidon |
|  | 382 | Stockholm |  | E | Carne |
|  | 383 | London |  | F | Babylon |
|  | 384 Y | Private collection Y |  | G | Babylon |
|  | 384 C | Ciani 1935 |  |  |  |
|  | 385 | Cahn 71 | Plate 15 | 422 | Copenhagen |
|  | 386 | Pennisi |  | 423 | Berlin |
|  | 387 | London |  | 424 | Glasgow |
|  | 388 | Syracuse |  | 425 | Private collection Y |
|  | 389 | Ratto 1927 |  | 426 | Vienna |
|  | 390 | Syracuse |  | 427 | seen in 1968 |
| Plate 12 | 391 | Hague | Plate 16 | 428 | London |
|  | 392 | Lewis |  | 429 | Private collection Y |
|  | 393 | Private collection Sicily |  | 430 | Berlin |
|  | 394 | Numismatica Toderi |  | A | Electrum, Brussels |
|  | 395 | Feuardent 1924 |  | B | Electrum, London |
|  | 396 | MMAG 1971 |  | C | Electrum, London |
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## Appendices

## Ṣ Y Ṣ - Panormos

Evidently doubt is still felt in some quarters as to the interpretation of the word SYS as a place-name of Panormos, for which cf. part I of this publication. The appearance of an interesting article by E . Lo Cascio «La leggenda sys delle monete siculo-puniche e il concetto politico dell'epikrateia» (Parola del Passato 1975, 153 ff .) affords the opportunity for a few further comments. There is no new evidence, so far as I am aware. Lo Cascio seeks to argue towards the conclusion that the appearance of the word sys - which he does not believe to be the name of Panormos - in some way attests a new organisation of the Carthaginian province in Sicily. Admitting that sys should have a geographical significance of some kind, he adopts from Holm the suggestion that it stands for a Punic transliteration of the Greek $\Sigma \iota x \varepsilon \lambda \iota \alpha$, abbreviated. It cannot be said that this article carries conviction, either numismatically or linguistically.

Natural there is no literary evidence as to the equivalence sys - Panormos; indeed if there were, the argument would not arise. There is however no reason at all why it should not have been so in spite of the fact that the name Panormos proved to be the enduring one. In the same way the name $k f r^{\prime}$ at Solus did not displace the name Solus. It is in any case hard to see why the word sys could be thought to have some more generai application to the Carthaginian province of Sicily, when in fact during the early phases (late fifth century) we find coins marked sys being minted concurrently with others marked $m t v^{\prime}$ for Motya and $k f r^{\prime}$ for Solus; and later after 350 B.C. we find the series of sys coins still continuing concurrently with those signed rsmlqrt. Moreover to assert, as Lo Cascio does, that the sys coins account for the greater part of those issued in Punic Sicily is in any case not true. In the late fifth century, the Panormos - sys coins are less numerous than those of Motya, while in the latter part of the fourth century the $s y s$ ršmlqrt: tetradrachms of sys for the whole period from 405 to $310 / 300$ B.C. account for the use of 22 obverse and 70 reverse dies, whereas at $r$ rsmlqrt there were used no less than 26 obverse and 55 reverse dies for the much shorter period c. 350/310 B.C. Also, Lo Cascio seems to take little account of the fact that there existed in Sicily from 410-390, and again c. 350/340 until the early third century, a real official coinage of the Carthaginian state, namely the coins dealt with in parts $2 / 3 / 4$ of this publi-
cation. Of these there are, down to 300 B.C. alone, 82 obverse and 223 reverse dies clearly a considerable issue which forms the real Carthaginian coinage of Sicily, and beside which the series marked sys is of much more restricted quantity and indeed of more local scope. In these circumstances, it really seems beside the point to assert some general or «provincial» significance for the sys coins.

Lo Cascio also repeats the argument that there are so many different types copied from Greek mints in Sicily appearing with the legend $s y s$ and that these could not all have occurred at one place, but this was merely what Lloyd had argued in 1925, and this has been sufficiently discussed already in part $\mathrm{I}, 29 \mathrm{f}$.

To recapitulate a little the details of the coinage at the early appearance of the $s y s$ legend: it will be recalled that in order to explain the didrachms with the legend sys numbered $\mathrm{Z} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{I}-2-3}$ and the die-links between these and the coins of Motya and Segesta, we had to envisage a transfer of certain dies from one mint to another, a process for which there are many parallels in the ancient world ${ }^{42}$. It is clear that obverse die $\mathrm{O}_{9}$ came from Segesta (part I plate 2 A ) and that it was subsequently used for $\mathrm{Z}_{3}$ in combination with the unfinished Segestan die bb (on which traces of a Segestan legend remain between the letters of the sys legend). At the same time another die of Segestan character, and presumably also of Segestan make, O 8, was brought into use with reverse bb to make $\mathrm{Z}_{2}$, the same obverse being used to make $Z_{I}$ in combination with another reverse of Segestan style, aa. Die aa has the sys legend done in the same large handwriting as that of bb and the same Segestan engraver could have made both these reverse dies. So far one could say that the sys coins $Z_{1-2-3}$ might as well simply have been produced at Segesta. However at this same juncture we find the obverse O 8 being used in combination with Motya reverses R 6-7-8. There would have been little point in bringing Motyan dies to Segesta, and even less in taking Segestan dies to Motya. But there would have been some point in taking dies from either one or both these mints to a place where no regular mint existed at that moment - namely Panormos. I believe this is what happened, and that it gives a straight forward explanation of the complex die-linked material involved, without having to fall back on elaborate and mysterious hypotheses regarding the word $s y s$. It is hardly necessary to add once again, that the only direct evidence for the significance of $s y s s$. remains, as it was, the bilingual litra (here plate 24) with obverse sys and reverse Пavo@uos.

For the rest, there seems little to be gained by the attempt to place the coins $Z_{\text {I-2-3 }}$ after, instead of before, the Panormos didrachms with Greek legend, in order to make a once-for-all change from Greek to Punic; it does not really follow

[^12]from the numismatic evidence (see the table p.51), and some alternation at thisperiod is hardly surprising in view of the already mentioned bilingual litra which has both Greek and Punic. As for the chronology of the Greek didrachm phase at Motya and Panormos, viz. c. 425-410 B.C., this seems confirmed by the showing of a new hoard reported from western Sicily and evidently buried c. 409 B.C., in which a specimen of the Panormos didrachm no. 7 was included.

Finally as regards the meaning of the word $s y s$ it is really necessary to take issue with Lo Cascio over the interpretation as SIK(elia). It is not difficult to condemn this at once as philologically absurd, since it is inconceivable that both the first and the third letters of «Sikelia»should both the represented in Punic lettering by one and the same letter, sade. Nor is it possible that anyone in Sicily who knew the Punic language could have been expected to understand sys in such an unexpected sense, for the word has perfectly good semitic roots ${ }^{43}$. Indeed there is an example of its use as place-name, in the Old Testament: $s y s$ is the name of a place in the southeastern desert of Judaea near which Jehoshaphat defeated the Moabites and Ammonites (II Chron. 20. 16). Which of the possible meanings of the word is to be judged most appropriate in the case of Panormos is naturally not a matter for dogmatism, but the meaning «blossom, flower» is by no means inappropriate on the analogy of Florence or Florentia, the ancient Granada ( $=$ Iliberris). In any case the important point is that since sys does possess semitic meanings it is highly unreasonable to try to make it into something quite different.

[^13]
## Motya - Panormos - Summary



410-405

Motya II (B)
dog didrachms
26-30
mtv

405-397
Motya III
tetradrachms, didrachms
37-50
405-late IV century
Panormos tetradrachms
II-2I fast quadriga
sys
shell added (O4)
22-24 crayfish, column (O 5)
maeander (O 6)
26-34 hippocamp ( $\mathrm{O}_{7}, 8$ )

35-41 ketos ( $\mathrm{O}_{9}$ ) no legend swan (O ro) no legend Tanit sign (O ro') no legend sys legend (O Ir)

| Panormos | Panormos |
| :--- | :--- |
| dog didrachms | tetradrachms |
| $9-\mathrm{II}$ | 10 $s y s$ |
| ṣys | ṣs |

405-late IV century
Panormos
tetradrachms
II-83
Eumenes style (e.g. R 10)
Eukleidas style (R I3)
Large head as Tudeer 38 (R 14)

- fish instead of dolphin (R 17, 19)
- corngrain instead of dolphin (R 21)
Eukleidas head, corn ears (R 22)
Kimon-derived head (R 23)
Kimonian head (R 28)

Contessa hoard (to 34)
c. $390 / 380$ B.C.

Kimon-Phrygillos style
R 30
R 30 (new die-link) R 33
R 33 (new die-link)

42-5I walking quadriga ( $\mathrm{O}_{\text {I2 }}$ )
fast quadriga
dolphin in ex (o 13 )

52-61 dolphin ( $\mathrm{O}_{14}$ ) no symbol ( $\mathrm{O}_{15}$ )
two dolphins ( O I6)
62-70 thick ex. line ( $\mathrm{O}_{17}, \mathrm{I} 8$ )
thick ex. line (O 19)
$7 \mathrm{I}-83$ star, dolphins ( $\mathrm{O}_{20}$ )
no star, dolphins ( $\mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{I}$ )
details?( $\mathrm{O}_{22}$ )

Kimon-ish head ( $\mathrm{R}_{3} 6$ )

- corngrain added (R36')

Kimonian head (no. 43 a)
Eukleidas-like head (R 37)
Kimon-derived (?) head ( $\mathrm{R}_{38}$ etc.)

- corn grain (R40)

Hoard G (to 50)
$\longrightarrow$ c. 330 B.C.
indeterminate style (R4I etc.)
Megara Hyblaia hoard
1949 (to 50)
c. $330 / 320$ B.C.
inferior Euainetos style (R48)
good Euainetos style (R 50)

- pellet (R 56)
- swastika (R 57)
S. Sicily hoard 1978 (to 70 a) late IVc. B.C.
Agathoklean heads R 58 etc.)


## Rslmqrt tetradrachms - summary

I-4 tast quadriga left

- caduceus (O i)

5-10 quadriga right

1 1-22 quadriga left
21-30 quadriga right ( O Io)
quadriga left ( $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{II}}^{\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{I} 2 \text { ) }}$

- caduceus ( $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{II}}$ )

Melqart head (R I)
female head, dolphins ( $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ etc.)

- corn grain (R 2')
female head in sphendone
- without sphendone ( $\mathrm{R}_{7}$ )
large head, no wreath or sphendone ( $\mathrm{R} 9, \mathrm{II}, \mathrm{I} 3$ )
Eukleidan head (R 10, I5)
large head
- corn grain R 14

Nissoria, Gibil Gabib
hoards (to I8)
c. 330 B.C.
large head

- corn grain R 18
- fish instead of dolphin (R 2 I')

Euainetos type head with corn ears ( $\mathrm{R} 22,23$ )
Hoard G (to 29)
c. 330 B.C.

Euainetos type adaptations (R 24 etc.) good and poor (e.g. R 45, 48) style
quadriga right
horse and palm tree R 55
Pachino (to 64)
305 B.C.

## Carthage Electrum triple-staters

Jenkins-Lewis group VIII, revised list

```
JL 368 O I
            R I \nearrow21.78 Private collection (formerly Palermo)
JL 369 O I
                R }
(JL) 369 A O I
                R }
                    \uparrow 22.78 Brussels. Plate I6 A
JL 370 O I
                    R 4 ¢ 22.65 Paris Beistegui 54= Hirsch 16,700= Hirsch 15, 1357
JL 371 O I
                                    R 5 \nearrow 22.68 Gulbenkian 377 = Warren 1370=AC 13. 393 = Sotheby
                                    2.5.1905, 183
JL 372 O I
            R 6 \ 22.75 Gulbenkian 378=Walcher de Molthein 456, from Palermo 1870
                    (not Porto Empedocle)
                22.78 Jameson }92
            \leftarrow 2 2 . 5 5 ~ B e r l i n
            \uparrow 22.8I Lockett IO63
                            \22.64 London PCG V.C. }2
JL 373 O I
                    R 7 22.82 Engel-Gros 69 = Prowe 1904, 1784 = Hindamian 302
JL }37
                            R 7 \22.53 Boston 505
JL 375 O O
    R 6 \leftarrow22.46 Lewis = Lucerne 1953, 210 = Sartiges 387 = Hirsch 21, 4675
            \leftarrow22.50 Paris Armand-Valton 590 (not Porto Empedocle)
JL 376 O O
    R 8
    \22.58 Paris I58 (not Porto Empedocle)
```

| Summary of Hoards |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 㫐 } \\ & \text { E} \\ & \text { M } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \&o } \\ & \text { 毕 } \\ & \text { U゙ } \end{aligned}$ | Syracuse | Corinth | Others |
| Series I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 390／380 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ognina（2120） | 21 ？ | － |  | － | tetradrachms | some | Sicil． |
| Contessa（2119） | 34 | － |  | 47 | decad．tetr． | － | Sicil． |
| Giarre Riposto（2115） | 34 | － |  | － | － | － | Naxos |
| Vito Superiore（1910） | 30 | － |  | 46 | tetradrachms | some | Sicil． |
| Series 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 330 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hoard G（IGCH－） | 50 | 29 | 4 | 74 | decad．tetr． pegasi | E | Sicil． |
| Leonforte（2133） | － | 18 |  | 75 | decad．tetr． pegasi | E，N | 1 Ath． |
| Gibil Gabib（2132） | － | 18 | I | 74 | decad．tetr． | N |  |
| 330／320 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Megara Hyblaia 1949$(2135)$（ $50-129 \quad$ tetr．pegasi |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Series 3 （4） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 320／310 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hoard X（IGCH－） | － | － | － | 206 （271／2） | － | A II AP | － |
| 305／300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pachino 1957（2151） | － | 64 | － | 242 （272） | Agath．quad． pegasi | all except AO | 8 Alex． <br> I Ath． |
| 300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S．Sicily 1978 | 70a | IIa | I $a$ | 246 | decadrachms <br> Agath．quad． | many | I Ath． many Ath． |
| Palermo 1933 | － | 47 | － | 265 | Agath．quad． |  | － |
| S．E．Sicily 1977 | － | 47 | － | － | Agath．quad． Agath．Nike |  | many Alex． many Ath． |
|  |  |  |  | Series 5 |  |  |  |
| Early III c ． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sicily 1976／77 | － | － | － | some | Agath．quad． | － | many Alex． many Ath． |
| Camarina－Scoglitti（2185） | － | － | － | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \mathrm{II} \\ & (+ \text { EL gp.V }) \end{aligned}$ | Agath．Nike <br> Agath．gold EL | many | I Ath． |
| Cammarata（2182） | － | － | － | some | Agath．Nike | many | Selinus etc． |
| Cefalú（2154） | － | 66 | － | 396 | Agath．Nike | － | I Alex． |
| 1971 hoard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Megara Hyblaia 1967 (2180) | － | － | － | 412 | Agath．Nike pegasi | － | 2 Alex． <br> 2 Ath． |


|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { जू } \\ & \text { g } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ |  | Syracuse | Corinth | Others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mineo (2184) | - | - | 410 | Agath. Nike | - | 4 Ath. |
| Palma Montechiaro (2153) - | - | - | some $(+\mathrm{EL})$ | - | many | Locri |
| Selinunte 1877 (2178) | 39 | - | some <br> ( + shekel as J-L 26. 14) | Agath. quad. | - | - |
| Sicily 1837 (2144) | - | - | some | pegasi | many | - |
| Other III c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Syracuse 1927 (2191) | - | - | 148 | - | - | 2 Alex. |
| Syracuse 1955 (2179) | - | - | 194 | Agath. Nike <br> Agath. pegasi | incl. | 4 Ath. <br> I Alex. |
|  |  |  | 257 | Agath. Nike | many | y Alex. |
| Capo Soprano, Gela (2183) - | - | - |  |  |  | y Alex. |
| Capo Soprano, Gela (2183) - | - | - | 257 | Agath. Nike | many |  |
| Pachino (2186) | - | - | series 3 $(+\mathrm{EL} ?)$ | Agath. Nike <br> Agath. reduced pegasi | - |  |
|  |  |  |  | Agath. gold |  |  |
| Palazzolo Acreide (218I) | -- | - | series 3 | Agath. Nike | many | - |

## Addenda

Plate 24 - Part IV
PT 38 a Panormos: O io'-R 30, combination not recorded, but cf. SNR 1971 Panormos 36 (plate io) for Or ro-R 30. O io' has the "sign of Tanit" added; R 30 now shows die-flaws not apparent on Panormos 36.
Schulman 264, 2976, 5047
PT 39 a Panormos: O II-R 33, combination not recorded, cf. SNR 1971
Panormos 40-4I for the obverse, 39 for the reverse.
Schulman 264, 1976, 5048
Leu 20, 1978, 37
This variety is important for providing a connexion between the «swan» group (Panormos $35-38$ ) and the sys group (Panormos 40-4I), which was hitherto lacking. The attribution of the «swan» group to Kamarina, as suggested by Lederer (ZfN i924, I84 ff.), is hereby decisively ruled out.

PT 43 a Panormos $\mathrm{O}_{12}-\mathrm{R}$ new; the reverse die is clearly distinct from that of SNR 197 I plate I I 42-43 (R 36, 36').
Alex. G. Malloy, S. Salem, New York, 28. 2. 1972
PT 70 a Panormos $\mathrm{O}_{19}$-R new; the reverse similar to R 57 is clearly a distinct die.
S. Sicilian hoard 1978

R il a Rsmlqrt O 8-R 9, combination not recorded in SNR 1971 .
S. Sicilian hoard 1978

R 26 Rsmlqrt 26 (SNR 197I plate 17); this specimen is clearly overstruck with traces of a previous type visible in the ex. of the obverse, and on the reverse the outlines of a previous head which appears to be a male head to right. The original head must have been one of Melqart, as on Rsmlqrt I (SNR 1971 plate 15), but probably not from the same die as Rsmlqrt x . The traces of the original obverse show the beginning of the legend, evidently of the same die as Rsmlqrt O . Apart from confirming satisfactorily that the Melqart head must come at the beginning of the Rsmlqrt series, the specimen arouses curiosity as to why the Melqart head was first used then superseded.
Hoard G
Th I a Thermai: O I-R new though of similar style to those of SNR 197 I plate 22, $1-3$.
S. Sicilian hoard 1978

C 28 a Carthage: O 7-R new, but similar to those of SNR 1974 plate 4, 25-28.
Schweizerischer Bankverein 27. II. 1977, 265.
A, B Same specimens as SNR 1971 plate 2, X, Y
C Obv. Head of Pan r. Rev. Three pellets; above + ; to 1. ivy-leaf; to r. horn. Mini coll. 0.17 g
It seems possible, though less than certain, that this small silver fraction may pertain to Panormos; the shortened legend recalls that of SNR 197 I plate 24, I.
D Variant of the small silver type SNR 197I plate 24, 7; here the obverse has bearded head to left, and on the reverse in the segments of the wheel appear to be dolphin (bottom r.) followed clockwise by Punic letters ṣys.
Mini coll. 0.26 g

E, F Obv. female head 1. without wreath or leaves; Rev. Horse's head r.
(F) Auctiones AG 8, 1978, 411.0 .58 g
(F) London, acquired 1848.0 .62 g

This type is mentioned by Müller (IV no. I29 a), citing only the London specimen. A third specimen is known from the Mongo hoard (IGCH 2312).
The head seems to resemble that of Rsmlqrt 26 ; if this is significant in such a way as to associate it with the Rsmlqrt series, it would provide a small denomination of that mint, hitherto lacking, and thus the possibility that future find spots might yet help to determine the location of the mint.

## Index of specimens

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Abbreviations } & \mathbf{M}=\text { Motya } \\
& \text { PD }=\text { Panormos didrachms } \\
& \text { PT }=\text { Panormos tetradrachms } \\
\mathbf{R}=\text { Rsmlqrt } \\
& \text { Th }=\text { Thermai } \\
\mathbf{C}=\text { Carthage }
\end{array}
$$

Aberdeen (SNG I): C ir 90 163
AC (Ars Classica)
 284285298

- 13: PD I2 Ci4 126 145 16I 162321428
- 14: M46 PT 35 R $14 \quad$ C6 20 31 71 127142242
- 15: PT 36 R 66 C 99 100 111 125 1321421581801881992121242


- 17: M47 PD 5 PT 28 R 43 C 257

Ahlström 6, 1974: C 257382 - 14, 1977: C 399
Allotte de la Fuye (Florange-Ciani 1925): R 63 C $\begin{array}{lllllllll}30 & 55 & 215 & 227 & 241 & 283 & 384 & 414\end{array}$


 229232237253258267272283292298307309311312322335353355366372 387389407415418422
Archaeologist and Traveller (Sotheby 20. I. 1898): PT 32 C 44144
Ashburnham (Sotheby 1895): C 158438
Auctiones AG 5: C 250 285-6: 192
Balmanno (Sotheby 1898): R 56 C 188
Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University: C 92 105 176178234263
Baranowsky 1929 (Milan): R 19 - IV: PT 32 R 70 C irs - VI: C 172336342 - 1934: R 38 C 143217 341 360
 376
Berlin, Staatliche Museen: M I 3 IO II 12 I3 15



 266268269271272285287290301308324327332348381387398423430438441 445
Bourgey 7.6. 1909: R 38 C 149 - 15. 10. 1909: $C_{70} 198$ - 23. 5. 1910: R 38 - 29. 5. 1911: R 48 71 C 1094 - 14. 12. 1911: C 358 - 1913: R 55 - 20.12. 1921: C 299 - 3. 12. 1928: C 389 - 5. 12. 1932: R 37 C159 321-255.5.1950: Cio5
Bordonaro: PT 2


Brandis (Canessa 1922): R 35 C 686222247299315317368412


Bunbury (Sotheby 1896): M 9 PT 32 R 70 C 3041153
Burlington Fine Arts 202: C 289
Butler (Sotheby i9II): C i7I
Cahn (Frankfurt)
35: C 17 I86
60: R 2566 C 194262
6i: C 200
65: R 38
66: R $2247 \quad$ C 22 186 194231385389
68: R44 C14 143237 291
7I: PT 2I R 20 C 200385
75: R 14
80: PT 2I R 20 C 88148200
84: PT 52 R 38 C 153189320
Cahn (Basel) 1950: C 188


 331332336445
Cancio, L., Washington: C 2 II 248387
Canessa - de Nicola 1950: R 64
Canessa 12.6. 1928: C 389
Carfrae (Sotheby 1894): R 43 C 1445121136322445
Castro Maya (Drouot 1957): C 134 I9I 373
Cefalù, Museo Mandralisca: M 40
Ciani
1929: PT2I R9 C218
1921: C 259 291
1934: R 56 C 405
1935: C 263384
1955: R 39 C 65
Cleveland, Ohio, Art Museum: $\mathrm{C}_{70}$
Collignon (Feuardent 1919): PT 3I C 17312437
Courtauld (University of Rhodesia): C 158
Copenhagen, National Museum: M 5 is 16 18 1946 PD 3 PT 39 (addendum $=$ SNG «Camarina» 171) 40 C 1220315464798587115129132157163193208231 $\begin{array}{lllllll}298 & 317 & 332 & 378 & 384 & 422 & 437\end{array}$
Copenhagen, Thorwaldsen Museum: R 73
Cumberland Clark (Sotheby 1914): PT 80 C io 83186
Davis, N., Seattle: C 436
Delbeke (Sotheby 1907): C 124132188 321
Delmonte 1933: C 181 409
Egger
40: C 90
4I: R I6 3I
45: PD I2 PTin $193031 \quad$ C 4988 I86 375
46: M5 3I R 47 CI7 113 327
28. II. I904: R $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & 38\end{aligned} 48 \quad C_{28} \quad 65242$

```
    10. 12. 1906: R 21 67 C 89 r6r I86 189 249 266
    7. I. 1908: M 14 17 23 32 PT 12 18 20 25 27 28 31 34 41
    26.1I. 1909: M47 R I7 69 C 5I }25
Engel-Gros: PT 78 C r93 34I
Feuardent
```

    9. 5. 1910: R 63
    26. 5. 1914: R 374060 C 215
6. 6. I9I3: C 322
1. I2. I92 : C 365
2. 6. 1924: C 395
1. II. i937: R 38 C 298

Florange-Ciani 1924: C 260 - 1925: C 187
Fuller 1966: C 266
Galerie des Monnaies de Genève, New York 1976: C 299
Geneva 1o. 10. 1977: C 339
Glasgow-Coats: R 47 C 313336442
 308383396424
Glendining
14. 6. 1915: C 144
23. II. 1928: С 323
3. 12. 1929: R 31
9. 6. 1930: С 70 153
9. 3. 193I: Сiio
28. 6. 1938: PT 53
24. II. I950: C 176297
19. 7. 1950: C 384
31. I. 195I: R 14 C 99242

1953: C 168
1955: R 47 C96 168377
13. in. 1957: R 46
23. I. 1963: C 439
13. 12. 1963: PT 12 C 248
21. 6. 1972: C 406

Hall: R 69
Glendining-Seaby I: C 156 - II: R 4449 C 237259317 - III: R 46 C 180 187 194293 328 391
Grabow 1930: C 396412
Guadan, A. M., Madrid: C 49 ror 386409

Gustav VI Adolf, late King of Sweden: C 218250279309

 309351 391 403
Hamburger


1894: PT 29
20. 2. 1928: C 298
29. 5. 1929: PD 13 C 31 8I 95103158240249250290306319333445

## 11. 6. 1930: C 296

Harmer-Rook, New York: C 45 I
Hart, Blackburn: C 133
Hartford, Conn. USA: C 130
Hartwig (Santamaria 1910): R 37 C 348
Helbing
70: C $88 \quad 148 \quad 163179409$
19. II. 1912: R 62

1911: C412
1927: PT 49 R 1338 Th I $\quad$ C 180398
1928: PT 12 R 3I C 182/3I8 349377 42I/I86
Headlam (Sotheby 1916): R 56 C 198 391
Hess

```
27. 10. 1902: PT 60 C 58146 16I
    18. 3. 1918: PT 12 R \(3134 \quad\) C \(1720 \quad 96129186\)
    Vogel 1929: R 55
    18. I2. 1933: C 151
    15. 2. 1934: PT 29
    7. 3. 1935: C 2989147418
    28. 4. 1938: R 31
    194: R \(38 \quad\) C 29309375385
    202: R \(3955 \quad\) C 27 181 231349
    207: R \(48 \quad\) C 4399 10I 179369
    208: R 56 C 15 162
    209: R 55 C 372
    224: C 194
    226: C 301
    1949: C 163
    1953: R 55
    1954: R 37 C 129319
```

Hess/Leu see Leu/Hess
Hindamian (Paris 1956): PT 72 R 5570 C 138 191 298370
Hirsch, J., Munich
8: PT $7 \quad$ C 94
11: C 425
12: C 166
13: PT 3I C $7095129 \quad 159$ 191 422

15: M 19 PT 3276 R 47 C 144488 IoI 120140145
16: R 33 C 9599186431
18: PT 4

190216238321423
20: R 3143 C 95126129159211319
21: R 1о 31 $69 \quad$ C $2053 \quad 96176425436$
26: R 43 C 894139153
29: PT $70 \quad$ R 2066 C 94 IOI 139142149156179238321

31: R 47 Th 2 C 4572123445


34: PT 3I R $28 \quad 335566$ Th $4 \quad$ C 94156171
Hirsch (Ciccio): M 4245
Hoffmann: C 272


Kondylis (Sotheby 1924): C 141306
Kricheldorf XI 1962: C 440
Lanz 5 1975: C 192264266
Lewis (CCC Cambridge) SNG VI: C 138200270293380


Lempertz 1926 (Köln): $\mathrm{P}_{71} \quad$ C 197
Lloyd SNG II (specimens not in London): C $\begin{array}{lllllll}45 & 52 & 92 & 129 & 148 & 172 & 270\end{array}$
Leu-Hess/Hess-Leu $=$ LH/HL
 187218227272317445
1957: PT $7254450 \quad R_{17} 2848$ Th $2 \quad$ C 3977 IOI III 119155384
1958: PT $3 \mathrm{I} \quad$ R 204748 C 139227242272290
1959: R 52266 C 141164184215447
1960: PT 14 R 1043 C 153188192319370
1962: M 820 PT 18 R 50 C 88 100 112116125164272450
1964: Z $2{ }_{2} \quad \mathrm{M}_{4} 6 \quad \mathrm{PD} 5 \quad \mathrm{PT} 29 \quad \mathrm{C}$ 15 89156
1965: PT2I 50 R $5165 \quad$ C 449

1968: PT 79 R 37 C19 98 101 157
1970: C 450
1971: C 433
Leu
7, 1973: C 443
15, 1976: C 450
Sicilia: M 27 PT $5967 \begin{array}{lllll} & \text { R } 39 & \text { C } 99\end{array}$
Llano de la Consolacion: PT 39
Löbbecke (Hess 1926): C 189


Locker-Lampson: PD $2 R_{25}$ C 45136188




 454749525363667071788486899092949899 100 101 102 113 115 116


 $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllll}287 & 288 & 290 & 291 & 294 & 296 & 299 & 300 & 306 & 314 & 317 & 319 & 323 & 327 & 330 & 334 & 342 & 345 & 348\end{array}$
 445448
London, Victoria and Albert Museum (Salton): C 117154

Luneau (Platt 1922): PT 53 R $7 \quad 69 \quad$ C 1099390
Maddalena (Sambon 1903): C 157 101
Mann (Sotheby 1917): C 186
Martinetti-Nervegna (Sambon 1907): R 69 C I6I 227238290
Merzbacher

19Io: R 2548 C 588 II6 138 I47 184327
Montagu (Sotheby 1896): R 4I C $14 \begin{array}{llllllll}53 & 113 & 133 & 189 & 242 & 323 & 434\end{array}$
Morgan, J. P.: C 52 188 199377
Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung: M 3946 PT 38 R 3046
Münzhandlung Basel


Naville



 99 IOI I3I I40 184 207215224242249256257269294295309310312422
 8388929499 IoI 105 127 130 132 164 186 223 241 291 422437
 287429
«Naville 12»- see AC 12
Nervegna 1907: C 148
de Nicola 1972: C 419

Niggeler (Leu-MMAG 1965): C 264493123129138144182431
Nobleman (Glendining 1955): C 224309
Numismatic Fine Arts 1975: C 175 - $1976:$ C 145164271
O'Hagan (Sotheby 1908): R 2348 C 445

Oxford Ashmolean Museum, SNG V: Z 2 M 27 3I 46 PD | 3 |
| :--- |


Oxford, Miss., USA: C 413
Palermo, Museo Nazionale: M 10 22374245464748 Panormos drachm A PD 567






 237241242243249254256257266270271272274277280287294298308309


 418
Peus 280: C 342
Philadelphia Museum: C 161285
Platt

```
1921: C 206299
1930 (coll. A): C 998230277
3.4. 1933: R 2267 C 1353132183201
```

Polese-Canessa 1928: R 5564
Princeton, Firestone: C 304
Private collection Catania: C 143
Private collection R: C 187
Private collection Sicily: C 393

 $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllll}262 & 263 & 264 & 266 & 285 & 291 & 302 & 304 & 305 & 352 & 397 & 450\end{array}$


 $\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllll}256 & 279 & 283 & 284 & 296 & 316 & 343 & 357 & 366 & 379 & 384 & 425 & 429 & 434 & 445\end{array}$
Proschowsky: R 34
Prowe see Egger 28. I. 1904

## Ratto

26. 4. 1909 (Froehner): R 4466 C 89 180 249
1. 4. 1927: С 1789 184 389399
1. II. 1928: C9 168309392
2. 10. 1934: C 213237263 33I

Ready (Paris 8.7. 1919): Th I C 153

Riechmann 192I: C 390
Rollin 1908: C 164

## Rosenberg

9.3. 1914: C 8 I59
8. 2. 1924: R 31 C 319

64, 1928: C 412 R 38
72, 1932: PT 2I R 1244 C 22 189 200
Ryan (Glendining 1950): R 47
Salton, M., New York: PT 5I R i3 16 C 88 I64 191
Sambon
24. 3. 1902: C 87205 A
19. 12. 1906: R 8
6. 7. 1921: C 67
26. 4. 1925: R 46

Sambon-Canessa $=\mathrm{SC}$
22. 6. 1906: R 69 C 189229

Ci21 154 178 181 188 198 223335370407

412
Sandeman (Sotheby 1911): R $47 \quad$ C $2545 \quad 188 \quad 358$
Sangiorgi 1907: C 227
Santamaria 1934: C 407
Sartiges: PT 2325 3I R 3748 C 24243 I
Schlessinger 26. 2. 1934: C 7177366
Schulman
2. 5. 1905: C 44

2I. IO. 1912: R 2063
26. II. 1913: PT 53 C 20
16. 12. 1926: R 21223844 C 10 104189230370
6. 6. 1930: R 50
8. 6. 193I: PT 71

2I. 10. 1935: C 20 191 263
7. 6. 1937: PT 71 R 2037 C 10 116 158 189
30. 3. 1936: C 291338
31. 5. 1938: R 55 C 183257

264, 1976: C 5771
265, 1977: C 152
1976 (not sale): C 74
«I»: C 168
Schweizerischer Bankverein 1975: C 206 233-1977: C 384 416
Sellwood, D., London: C 165
Silla, Alicante: PT 33
Sotheby
11. 7. 1899: C 145
2. 5. 1905: C i61 276
6. 12. 1907: R 56
II. 12. 1907: C 138
19. 12. 1907: C 9294 ror 105 123126130133255
21. 4. 1909: R $25 \mathrm{C}_{147}$
5. 7. 1910: C 30174
26. 7. 1920: C 119

```
    6. 7. 192I: R 38 48 C }27
    1924: C I30
    25. 5. 1925: C 146
    15.11. 1927: C IO
    21. 2. 1929: C 99 137
    I. 5. 1929: C 266
    25. 3. 1935: C I42
    9.3. 1936: PT }6
    17. 7. 1939: R }3
Spink 1968: C 283 289
Stiavelli (Santamaria 1908): PT 80 R 25 55
St. Iouis, Washington, USA: C 39I
Stockholm, K. Myntkabinettet: R 47 69 Clllllllllll
Strozzi (Sangiorgi 1907): PD 5 C }22
Syracuse, Museo Nazionale: M 2 PT 17 43 50 52 56 82 (lllllllllllllll
    5564 69 Th I C C Ir 13 70 74 75 81 88 90 91 94 106 116 119 124 126 129 136
    142 146 148 157 176 178 186 188 189 194 204 205 206 237 242 255 256 257 267 271
    272 275 279 286 29 293 300 303 304 327 333 339 344 357 362 365 366 385 386 389
    390402 405 4IO 4II 4I2
Vatican: C 89 18I 197 266 323 385
```



```
    306 350 389 426 435
Vinchon 3. 3. 1975: C 8I
Walcher Moltheim: M I2 26 PD I2 PT 60 R 66 C 156
Ward, J.: M 30 40 PT 20 29 7I R 57 C C 122 188 197 319
Warren, E. P.: M M2 PT 70 R }4
Weber, H.: M I2 3I 46 48 PD P2 PT 33 39 44 R R 32 38 44 Cllllllllll
Weber, E. F.: C 436
White-King (Sotheby 1909): PT 69 R 71 C 142
Whitehead (Sotheby 1898): C I6I
Woodward, W. H.: M }9\mathrm{ PT }3
Wotoch (Sambon-Canessa 1901): PT 80
Yale University: C 180 291
Zeno, Apostolo: C 39
```

Hoards:
Camarina-Scoglitti (2185): C 402 4II
Capo Soprano, Gela (2183): C 257
 $\begin{array}{lllllll}319 & 330 & 334 & 354 & 387 & 396\end{array}$
 4647
Ciarre Riposto (2115): PT 2734 (N. B. 27 not noted as such in catalogue, but see IGCH 2115; further specimens possibly from this hoard in Egger 7. I. 1908 and Hirsch 19, II. II. 1907)
Gibil Gabib (2132): R 18 Th I $\mathrm{C}_{70} 74$
Leonforte (=Nissoria, 2133): R 18 C 75
Megara Hyblaia 1949 (2135): PT 43 50 C 9194 106 116 124129
Megara Hyblaia 1966 (2180): R 5369 C 90 126 136176204205237255256279286 291 300303304327333339344357362365366385388
Mineo (2184): C 391405410

Ognina (2120): PT 21 (?)
Pachino 1957 (215I): R4I 474864 C 8I 142157188189206237242271272
Palermo 1933/ «Palermo hoard 1936" (IGCH not): R 47 C 89 I32 139170186209223 224227230248
Palermo 1958 (2208): C 432433435436439440442443445446447450451
Syracuse 1927 (2191): C 148
Syracuse 1955 (2179): C 146194
Vito Superiore (1910): PT if $28 \quad 29 \quad 30$ C 17242641424546
1971 hoard (IGCH not): C 289306331340342344349359378388396398412
Hoard G (IGCH not: SNR 1977, 12 note 26): M 47 PT 2023273738 38a 39a 444648 $50 \quad \mathrm{R}_{2} 6{ }_{27} 29$ Th 34 C $17 \begin{array}{llll}57 & 71 & 74\end{array}$
Hoard X (IGCH not: SNR 1977, 24 note 68): C 139206271
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G. K. Jenkins Coins of Punic Sicily


[^0]:    * Final instalment of the publication stated in SNR 50, 197r, 25 ff . (part i) and continued in SNR 53, 1974, 23 ff. (part 2) and SNR 56 (1977), 5 ff. (part 3).
    ** Veröffentlicht mit Unterstützung des Schweizerischen Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung. - Publié avec l'aide du Fonds National Suisse de la Recherche scientifique.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cooke, Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions no. 9, ro; Moscati, Riv. Studi Orientali 43, 1968, 1-4; Fantar, Antas, Les inscriptions p. 58 ff.; Acquaro RIN 1974, 77-8i.
    ${ }^{2}$ CIS 264. ' $M$ is also used more generally for «people of the land» (' M 'RS)) in the rather older Yehawmilk inscription from Byblus, Cooke Textbook no. 3 (V-IV century B.C.).

    3 Acquaro RIN 76, 1974, Note di epagrafia punica I pp. 77-82. For $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{L}=$ citizen(s) cf. CIS 120 (a citizeness of Byzantium); Cooke Textbook no. Io (citizens of Hammon), no. 54 (a citizen of Maktar); also RES $163-164$, 505, 679, 942. - Moscati, Riv. Studi Orientali 43, 1968, p. 2, points out the distinction between an élite (viz. a senate) and people clearly shown in inscriptions from Lepcis (Levi della Vida, Rend. Lincei 1955, 550-561).
    ${ }^{4}$ However the term often read as $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{L}$ on coins of Gades, Sexsi, Lixus, Tingis, is interpreted by Solá Solé as P'L («obra, obra acunada» thus $=$ mint or coinage), cf. Sefarad XXVII 1967, r6 ff. and Numisma VIII 35, 1958, 17.

    5 Acquaro RIN 1974 p. 80 note 20 notes as a parallel a resolution by the army in an African inscription (Fevrier, Cahiers de Byrsa 6, 1956, 22. 25).
    ${ }^{6}$ Bisi, Annali 16-17, 1969-1970, 95 note 96, citing the derivation of the word, which incidentally was not given by Müller.

    7 Bisi op. cit. 93 says «mhsbm - magistrati incaricati della paga alle truppe simili ai quaestores romani»; but it is difficult to see why they have to be military.

[^2]:    8 Dupont-Sommer, CRAI 1968, II6-132; the date of the inscription is suggested in a final note by Carcopino.
    ${ }^{9}$ Gsell II, 201, 275.
    10 Gsell II, 193 ff.

[^3]:    11 SNR 1974, 27.
    12 Karthago, XVII, i976, 104.
    13 El Hofra 197 ff.
    14 Picard 1968, 125.
    15 Gsell IV, 301 ff .
    16 CIS 264.
    17 Halff, Karthago XII, 1963-1964, 130 ('bdmlqrt); do., 95 (bdmlqrt).

[^4]:    18 Diod. Sic. XX. I4.
    19 Picard 1968, 167.
    20 Picard 17 Iff .

[^5]:    21 It is apparently unknown on the stelai. - If the fulmen had any connexion with Punic religion, it could be related either to Baal Shamin or to Resef (cf. Gsell IV 294, 326-327) whose very name signifies the "flame» or "lightning-flash» and who was incidentally identified with the Greek Apollo (especially in Cyprus, cf. CIS 89, trilingual inscription from Idalion).
    ${ }_{22}$ Cf. Cammann, ANS NNM 53, no. 47.
    23 Jenkins-Lewis group III, also (bronze) appendix 3.

[^6]:    27 The corn ear though rare is not entirely unknown on Punic stelai, C. Picard, Karthago XVII, 1976, I09 s. v. épis (examples of III/II c. B.C.).

    28 Newell, Dated Alexander Coinage of Sidon and Ake, pl. IV. 16, 18.
    29 E.g. Jennkins-Lewis group X b, with dot on leaf..

[^7]:    30 Cf. SNR 1977, 16.
    31 Jenkins, Gela, no. 205 etc., 541 etc.; May, Abdera group CXV; May, Ainos, no. 8, 125, 325, 442; Cammann ANS NNM 53, no. 12, 23, 26, 47, 67.

[^8]:    32 Müller II p. 92 note 2 «D'après Bull. Sardo IV p. 68 no. 3 il semble qu'il existe aussi une drachme aux mêmes types.»

    * For a revised list see Appendices.

[^9]:    33 Cf. R. E. io. 2, col. 2205 f.
    ${ }^{34}$ Cintas Manuel I, 172 f.
    35 Bisi, Annali 16-17, 1969-1970, 103 ff .
    36 G. C. Picard, Mélanges Piganiol III, 1966, 1257 ff.
    37 Cf. Gsell II, 302.
    38 Bisi cf. note 34 above.

[^10]:    39 Cf. Essays Robinson, 153.
    40 Jenkins-Lewis group IV.

[^11]:    ${ }^{41}$ It is true that in their treaties with Rome the Carthaginians did not treat Sicily as a forbidden zone in the same way as Sardinia or Africa; but it seems uncertain how much we could deduce from this in respect of their precise relation with Sicily, since, like Sicily, Carthage itself was not a forbidden zone. On the Carthaginian attitude to Sicily in 24r B.C., see recently F. Decret, Carthage ou l'empire de la mer (Paris 1977), 167 f .

[^12]:    42 To the instances listed in part I, p. 28 may be added: common die between Paphos and Citium in the late Ptolemaic period (Nikolaou-Mørkholm, Paphos I, 73) and common dies between Pergamon, Sardes and Synnada in the cistophoric coinage (Kleiner, The early Cistophoric coinage, 80). Of these, the first is almost certainly a transferred die, the second may be a case rather of centralised mintage (Kleiner).

[^13]:    43 Schmoll, Die vorgriechischen Sprachen Siziliens, 49, sys $=$ *wing», translating Lybian afr, and so obtaining the sense «African, i.e. Carthaginian territory». - Bisi Annali 16-17, 1969-1970, $84-85$ mentions $s y s=$ «fiore», nel senso di "la più bella», "la splendida»; but also mentions the possibility of a meaning «ramo, rampollo». This latter («offshoot») might, she remarks, refer to coins derivative from those of the main mint, and thus help to explain the variety of typology which makes it difficult to think of all the sys coins being minted at a single centre (a difficulty, if it is one, which we have referred to above, and in part I p. 30); but here it is hard to see the same term would apply to the coins of the main sys series of tetradrachms which can hardly be «derivative» and must be of the principal mint itself.

