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## Ršmlqrt - R'šmlqrt

The entire coinage of this mint seems to belong to the second half of the fourth century. This is indicated by the occurrence of early specimens (no. 18) in the Nissoria and Gibil Gabib hoards (seebelow, p. 56-57) and by the numerous specimens of the later groups buried in hoards during the time of Agathokles (below, p. 59); it seems unlikely that the coinage continued later than c. 305-300 however, as virtually all the coins are accounted for by the date of the Pachino hoard (cf. p. 59).

The question of where this mint was situated is a very difficult and indeed for the present insoluble problem. The main difficulty to be faced is, that the series consists of nothing but tetradrachms, and there are no smaller coins or bronze coins which might, from the evidence of local finds, help to locate the mint. The coins occur in a number of hoards from almost every part of Sicily though few are from the western part of the island; in any case there are no indications to be obtained from any local predominance in one area rather than another. The meaning of the name Ršmlqrt = Cape of Melqart is not decisive as there are many possible capes, and different places associated with Melqart-Herakles; and little reason to prefer one to another. The favourite proposals have usually been either Kephaloidion (Cefalú) or Herakleia Minoa, but neither of these is convincing.

Cefalu has the merit of an excellent cape or headland, one of the most impressive and well known in Sicily. But it was a Sikel town and not Punic, though friendly with Carthage, and in 396 made a treaty with Himilco; after this it was captured by Dionysios and there is no evidence that it ever returned to the Carthaginian side. The fact that it was captured by Agathokles in 307 proves almost nothing about the situation there in the intervening period. It must be emphasised at once, that the presence of specimens in the Cefalú hoard published by Lloyd in NC 1925 is merely typical of the distribution in several other hoards of this period, and proves nothing about the location of the mint, as Lloyd thought; the coins are in fact equally represented in the 1957 hoard from Pachino.

The earlier phase of Cefalú is illustrated by the coins inscribed «Herakleiotan ek Kephaloidiou», which have been discussed by Consolo Langher in Kokalos 7-8, 1961-1962, 166 ff . That these coins are undoubtedly coins of Cefalú, and not, as has been supposed by others, of refugees from Cefalú settled at Herakleia Minoa, is I think amply demonstrated by Mrs. Langher. Her conclusion is further reinforced by the existence of an unpublished coin in the Pennisi collection ${ }^{23}$, inscribed «Kephaloiditan» (Plate 21 C). However the Pennisi coin seems to be appreciably later in style than the «Herakleiotan» coins, and I would think it likely that the «Kepha-

[^0]loiditan» coin should be of the second half of the fourth century, without attempting to suggest too precise a date. If this is correct, it would certainly diminish the possibility of Cefalú being under Punic control at the period when the Ršmlqrt tetradrachms were being minted.

The other current favourite for Ršmlqrt, Herakleia Minoa, is likewise not without difficulties. The earlier settlement seems to have been destroyed in 409 B.C. but was restored by Timoleon in 345. At this period it seems to have flourished, as is attested by the recent excavations and discoveries on the site - from all of which one would not get the impression that Herakleia - with its notable Greek theatre - was anything but a Greek city at the time. However as has been remarked above, the coins inscribed «Herakleiotan ek Kephaloidiou» must no longer be reckoned as part of the evidence. In other respects, however, it seems to me perfectly reasonable to follow the opinion of De Miro in Kokalos 4, 69-8I, that Herakleia was in fact in the Greek zone, since it lies on the east side of the river Halykos which formed the boundary between Greek and Punic Sicily. The coins found at Herakleia are admittedly mostly Punic ${ }^{24}$, but this, it seems to me, is readily explained by the proximity of the city to the Punic zone, and such coins do form quite an element in the finds even from Greek sites much further east, such as Gela.

Of other possible sites for Ršmlqrt, we must, I think rule out cities which, though within the Punic zone and having associations with Herakles, have other coinages already assigned to them - Solus, Thermai; Eryx too has some Punic coins of the period with the legen 'rk (e.g. Plate 24, 23-24). As for Trapani (Drepana), the harbour of Eryx, there seems little if any reason for thinking of an important mint there in the fourth century. But another place which was securely in the Punic zone, and also has the association with Herakles, is Selinus ${ }^{25}$; the Greek city was destroyed in 409 B.C., but in the reconstruction which took place in the fourth century Punic elements seem to have assumed great importance ${ }^{26}$. In this connexion it may be worth making the bare suggestion that Selinus could be considered as a possible site for the Rssmlqrt mint. It must be admitted that there is nothing in the copious finds of coins (mainly Punic) from the site ${ }^{27}$ which could directly support this hypothesis (a single tetradrachm was included in a hoard from Selinunte in 1877, cf. Kokalos 7, tav. XX, 2), though this, for reasons already outlined above, namely the non-existence of bronze coins of the mint, will be a difficulty whatever site we choose. In the meantime, and merely by a process of elimination, Selinus seems to me to have a certain attraction and although the Akropolis of Selinunte may seem an insignificant feature of the landscape when compared with the mighty rock of Cefalú, it does nevertheless form a small promontory which could conceivably have attracted the name of Ršmlqrt.

[^1]It must be added that Lilybaion (Marsala) would have been a possible candidate for Ršmlqrt except that it is, in my opinion at least, needed as the most probable site for the main Sicilian «Carthage» series. The fact that the earlier coins of that series are inscribed qrthdšt does not necessarily or even probably mean Carthage itself, or if so only by extension as implying the «Carthaginian state». In any case the «Carthage» series is of undoubted Sicilian mintage and as such seems to be most appropriate to the city which became, after the destruction of Motya, the chief Carthaginian base in the island. The legend qrthdšt is accordingly susceptible of another shade of meaning, and «new city» may aptly be thought to refer to the new foundation at Lilybaion which replaced Motya. There is good analogy for such a usage, and from quite another context, that of Cyprus in the eighth to seventh century B.C., where in some inscriptions the expression qrthdšt refers to a city of Cyprus, probably Kition ${ }^{28}$. Possibly the legend on the «Carthage» coins of Sicily may contain some degree of ambiguity and refer at once to the new city of Lilybaion as well as to the Carthaginian state. At all events, it seems to me that this was the likeliest mint for the «Carthage» series, thus ruling out any chance of putting R šmlqrt there.

> Ršmlqrt
> I-4 (Plate 15)

This rather heterogeneous group is placed at the beginning of the series largely because there is no other obvious place for it. Nike does not appear on the obverses as she does everywhere else in the series, and the first die $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{I}}$ has instead a caduceus above in the field. The caduceus symbol occurs again at no. 23, and also in the «Carthage» series (e.g. SNG II 1620, McClean 3045), as one of the symbols associated with Tanit, by analogy with its occurrence on many Punic stelai (for which see Anna Maria Bisi, Le stele puniche, Rome 1967).

The most interesting coin of this first group is undoubtedly no. I, where instead of the expected female head on the reverse there is a bearded head of Melqart, wearing a wreath and an earring (cf. Plate 21). The earring is paralleled by a coin of Solus (Plate 23, 21) and by the Siculo-Punic bronzes, SNG Cop. 94, also at Motya (Plate 23, I3). So far as I can trace, this coin with the Melqart head is unpublished although it has been in the B. M. since 1874. The other two reverses of this group are the usual female head with dolphins, and on $\mathrm{R}_{2}$ (no.3) a corn grain is added to the die, as in the case of Panormos no. 24, 43 .

[^2]Three obverse dies $\mathrm{O}_{4-6}$ occur in this group, and each has the regular Nike above. $\mathrm{O}_{4}$ is not linked, but $\mathrm{O}_{5}$ and O 6 are linked by R 6 . The group has a certain homogeneity on account of the style of $\mathrm{R} 4,5,8$ (nos. 5, 6, 10 respectively) which all follow an identical prototype with sphendone and stars. However the treatment of R 6 (no. 7-8) is interesting, with the hair rendered in a knobbly pattern, which has a considerable affinity to certain dies of Thermai (Plate 22, 4, 5, 6): these must be contemporary with R 6 and thus give a date in the third quarter of the century (see below 70 ) ${ }^{29}$, No. 9 ( $\mathrm{R}_{7}$ ) has another hair rendering but the face is similar to that of R 6. In the obverses of this group we see a style that is very typical for this mint, with its exaggerated upward surge of the horses, which is to be seen again at no. 21 (Plate 16) and no. 31 (Plate 17).

$$
\text { II-25 (Plates } 16-17)
$$

This group contains five obverses, four of which are linked in the manner indicated in the following diagram.

| O8 | O9 | Oıо | Oif |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R ıо---R 10 |  |  |  |
| R 12---------- R 12 |  |  |  |
| R I4----------------- R 14 |  |  |  |

The obverses are of quite disparate character and only O io shows the really typical upward surge of the horses. On O ir the caduceus symbol appears in front of the horses, as has been mentioned above (cf.Oi). The most typical style of reverse is that of R 9, II, I3, a rather large and exuberant development of a basically Euainetan style, though without the wreath. There is no direct prototype or close parallel to be found in the «Carthage» series. The type of R 9 (no. II) is adapted with a greater degree of stylisation when it comes to nos. 15-17, 21, 23-25. A corn grain appears on nos. 17, 23-25 replacing the dolphin behind the head. A quite different style is seen in R io (nos. 12, 20) and R 15 (no. 18), based on the model of Eukleidas' head with the five-fold earring (Tudeer rev. 35), a prototype which also seems to have pleased the engravers of the sys series (nos. 14-15, Plate 8) at a much earlier date.

This varied but closely-linked group is important for the chronology of the mint owing to the presence of specimens of no. 18 in two hoards, those of Nissoria and Gibil Gabib. The date of the Nissoria hoard has been set, on other grounds, at abour

[^3]330 B.C. ${ }^{30}$; that of Gibil Gabib (in Syracuse museum) must be the same, as it has the same latest coins, the N -series of Corinth and the «Carthage» series as far as the type represented by Jenkins-Lewis, pl. 26, 4. Thus the two hoards agree in essentials and give a good indication for the chronology of the R šmlqrt mint, which can only have begun to operate in the second half of the fourth century; and this is further in agreement with the indirect indication already derived from our comparison of Ršmlqrt no. 7-8 (R 6) with Thermai nos. 3-5, specimens of which were also contained in the Gibil Gabib hoard.

## 26-30 (Plate 17)

In this short group a single obverse is coupled with four reverses. Of these, R 20-2I are of a rather hard and stylised aspect; noteworthy is the replacement in the die of the dolphin behind the head by a large fish, recalling another fish on sys nos. 19-20 ${ }^{31}$. R $22-23$ are quite different and more like the regular Greek-Carthage style; here for the only time in this series is there a wreath with corn ears, so characteristic of «Carthage» as e.g. SNG III 1048, Jenkins-Lewis, pl. 26, 2-6.

$$
\text { 3I-68 (Plates } 17-21)
$$

This large group comprises almost all the rest of this mint's output, with no less than eleven obverse dies; of these, only one, $\mathrm{O}_{17}$ (no. 48), has so far not appeared in a definite linkage of dies, but there is no doubt that it too is embedded in this group by the style of its reverse, and it is therefore provisionally placed next to no. 47 whose reverse is closely similar (Plate 19). The scheme of the linkages is as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{llllllllll}
\mathrm{O}_{13} & \mathrm{O}_{14} & \mathrm{O}_{15} & \mathrm{O}_{16} & \mathrm{O}_{18} & \mathrm{O}_{19} & \mathrm{O}_{20} & \mathrm{O}_{21} & \mathrm{O}_{22} & \mathrm{O}_{23}
\end{array} \\
& \text { R26--R } 26 \text { R } 32-\text { R } 32 \text { R } 39-\text { - R } 39 \\
& \text { R } 27 \text {--R } 27 \text { R } 45 \text {------- R } 45 \text { R 5I-- R } 51 \\
& \text { R31-------R3I--R3I R } 46-\text { R } 46 \text { R } 49 \text { - - R } 49
\end{aligned}
$$

On the whole the obverse dies display the rather wildly upward-rearing horses so typical for this mint, though the style is far from even as between $\mathrm{O}_{13}, 15,17,18$, 22, 23 (nos. 31, 41, 48, 49, 65, 68). As against these, $\mathrm{O}_{14}$, 16 (nos. 35, 42) are more restrained and placid, as is $\mathrm{O}_{20}$ (no.61). O i9 (no.54) is another variant, harking back to the early style of Eumenes at Syracuse; while O 2 I (no. 62), with its sagging horses, is also remarkable for having the legend reversed (viz. reading from left to right).

[^4]The reverses likewise offer a great variety of style and treatment. The predominant style of head, equipped with a wreath but without corn ears, derives ultimately from the Euainetos model, but only at some removes; in fact, the pure Euainetos style, which appears sometimes at Panormos (e.g. Plate 13, 69) and also at the «Carthage» mint, is never found at Rs mlqrt , for whose typical styles much closer parallels can be seen in some of the characteristically Punic styles of the «Carthage» mint.

Of the various stylistic groups represented here, we may first distinguish R 24, 26, 27 (nos. 3I, 33, 34), slightly astringent and stylised, with which may be compared «Carthage» dies such as Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26, 5; reverses 28, 29 (nos. 37-38) have a somewhat gentler aspect, leading into $\mathrm{R}_{31}$ (nos. 40, 45, 49); the latter in turn has further affinites with $\mathrm{R} 38,39,40,43$ (nos. $50,51,52,56$ ). Here there is a likeness to «Carthage» Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26,7. Another grouping consists of $R_{32}, 33,34,35,36,37$ (nos. 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48) all of which have in one way or another much in common with «Carthage» dies exemplified by Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26, 7 and here Plate 2I B, both representing a rather bold and important development of the Euainetos type; the corkscrew curls on Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26, 7 are also an important element on Ršmlqrt R 36,37 (nos. 47, 48) and even R 5 I (no. 67), and the rather stylised sweep of the back hair on $\mathrm{R} 33,35$ (nos. 43, 46) is close to that of «Carthage» Plate 2I B. A more compact style is shown at R 4I, 42, 44,46 (nos. $53,55,57,59$ ) for which it is difficult to cite any precise parallels; the presence of a corn ear on R 44 (no. 57) is to be remarked. Several other styles are represented, of which R 45 , 48 (nos. 58, 63) have become so far removed from any Greek or even Punic prototype as to have an almost Celtic aspect ${ }^{32}$. It is equally difficult to find any close analogy for R 47 (no. 60) or R 49 (no.64). On the other hand R 50 (no. 66) goes back to a rare «Carthage» die here shown on Plate 21 A , which would be nearly contemporary with Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26, 5, 7, and these latter have already been mentioned as analogies for other dies of the Ršmlqrt group with which we are concerned.

Clearly, the discussion of the style of these coins cannot be taken any further for the moment and without having the complete series of «Carthage» coins for comparison; it is hoped to present the latter series in further articles. For the present it should be remarked only that the parallels from «Carthage» which have been cited here all come from the third and last quarters of the fourth century - that is, assuming that the group with Horse and palm (as e.g. Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26, 2-8) covers approximately $350-325$ B.C. and the group with Horse's head (as Jenkins-Lewis, plate 26,9 ) approximately $325-305$. In any case it is clear that the R s smlqrt mint seems to have depended largely - and to a greater extent than ssys Panormos - on prototypes from the «Carthage» mint, though at the same time adding its own characteristic touches.

32 SNG II 164I could perhaps be cited in this connexion, but it is not close.

This small group, consisting of only a single obverse die and two reverses, poses something of a problem, for its place in the series is far from clear. Obviously it must be put either before or after the large group nos. $3 \mathrm{I}-68$. The style of the heads R 52,53 is at first sight much more Greek than most of those in the preceding series, though this fact gives little indication of the true position. The obverse has a quadriga which is not so typical for this mint, and the wide exergual line recalls some of the later s y s dies, e.g. O I8, 19 on Plate 13 ; for this reason, at least nos. 69-70 may plausibly be placed towards the end of the series. A rather fresh specimen in the Megara Hyblaia hoard 1967 might confirm this.

The occurrences of specimens of the last two groups (nos. 31-68, 69-70) in various hoards are reasonably frequent; the hoards in question are invariably from the period of Agathokles ${ }^{33}$ and clearly confirm that the bulk of the Rsmlqrt coinage must belong to the last quarter of the fourth century. In fact the series seems to extend about as far as the «Carthage» Tanit/horse's head and the Agathokles quadriga types, both present in the Pachino hoard 1957 . This hoard ${ }^{33 a}$ did not include the subsequent «Carthage» Melqart head/horse's head nor the Agathokles Nike with trophy types, and in fact seems to have buried about 305 B.C. It did contain specimens of the following numbers of the R šmlqrt mint - 37, 4r, 47, 48, 64. A similar but less well recorded hoard from Palermo 1936, of which some information is preserved in the B. M., likewise contained a specimen of no. 47 .

The other hoards relevant for the mint represent a slightly later phase in the reign of Agathokles, containing both the Carthage Melqart head / horse's head type and also the Agathokles Nike with trophy type. The presence of these would indicate, I think, a date of burial early in the third century. The hoards in question are those of Cefalú, Megara Hyblaea 1967, Selinunte 1877 and Cammarata. The Cefalú hoard, published by Lloyd in NC 1925, included specimens of our nos. $17,39,48,53,64,66$. That of Megara Hyblaea 1967, not yet published but which I am grateful to the authorities of the Syracuse museum for allowing me to study, contained specimens of no. 53 and 69 . The Selinunte 1877 hoard ${ }^{34}$ contained a single specimen, of no. 39 . Finally the Cammarata hoard ${ }^{35}$ appears to have included the same main elements, among them some specimens of the R šmlqrt mint, but we have no details.

Putting together the indications derived from the various hoards of the Agathoklean period for the lower end of the series and of the Nissoria and Gibil Gabib hoards for the earlier section, it seems justified to estimate the duration of the mint as covering roughly the second half of the fourth century (cf. above, p. 56-57).

[^5]This is a strange group which stands quite apart from the main series of the mint and cannot be accomodated within the regular sequence. It seems doubtful if it can be a regular issue of the mint, though it could be later than the regular series. Here, the head is transferred to the obverse and the quadriga placed on a deeply concave reverse. Both for this reason, and because of the style of the head O 25 , we find a strong reminder of the Agathokles quadriga coins at Syracuse ${ }^{36}$; the latter had also influenced the style of the latest groups of the s ys mint (cf. above, p. 44). It is noteworthy that the legend, here of course on the reverse R 54, takes the form r'smlqrt, and in this respect resembles that of $\mathrm{O} 8,9, \mathrm{II}$ and 24 .

It is difficult to find any explanation for the linkage of the same quadriga R 54 with a quite different head O 26 (no.72), a head which is further linked with a stepping horse and palm tree reverse ( R 55 ) at no. 73, This unexpected linkage might at first sight be thought to afford some positive connexion with the «Carthage» series where the types of no. 73 occur, but in fact the head bears little resemblance to any of the other dies present in the regular «Carthage» series, and the same may be said of the reverse with its two Punic letters below the horse. Since no. 73 will not fit into the «Carthage» series, it seems inevitable to regard it as something quite irregular, and the apparent linkage between the types of Ršmlqrt and «Carthage» cannot be looked on as significant either for dating or for place of mintage.

[^6]| ${ }^{(01)}$ |  |  | カ98ちサいの |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{(102)}$ | 「9¢L4ma | ${ }_{42}(1060)$ |  |
| den | 9pbuma | ${ }_{48}^{8(0) 7)}$ | 198ちyma |
| $5(04)$ | 可から449 |  | 9pS449 |
| 6 （0） |  | （099） | 十冖¢く449 |
| ${ }^{(06)}$ | tapluma |  | क huma |
| e | 5ym9 |  | prr）ppt |
|  |  |  | ト9¢ $\mathrm{F}_{\text {¢ }}$ |
| 8 （0） |  |  | T945444 |
|  | 9\＄ら4449 | （024） |  |
| incompec | 90くりいキ9 | $\mathrm{R}_{59}$ | t99ヶ44＊ |
| 25（ori） | 9やイッツ女の |  | ヘ0 |
|  | カッチイッツの |  |  |

## Plate 15

I O I Fast quadriga 1．；double ex．line， legend in ex．Above，caduceus （but no Nike）
R I Head of Melqart bearded，r． with wreath and earring． 16．32＊London 1874 （Castellani） Enlarged x 2：plate 21
$2 \mathrm{O}_{2}$ Similar，no Nike，nothing in field above；double ex．line and legend in ex．
R 2 Female head r．，with single－drop earring；three（？）dolphins
16．3I＊Lockett SNG III $740=$ Priv．coll．Y
$3 \quad \mathrm{O}_{2}$
R 2＇Same die with addition of corn grain behind head
16．77＊Leu 1965
$4 \mathrm{O}_{3}$ Similar to $\mathrm{O}_{2}$
R 3 Similar head，with ampyx，single－ drop earring；at least four dolphins， possibly a fifth behind head
－$\quad$＊Uncertain sale cat．
（no．III）
$5 \mathrm{O}_{4}$ Quadriga r．with rearing horses， Nike above．Legend in ex．
(5) R 4 Female head r. with sphendone ampyx, triple earring; three dolphins 16.77 * Boston add. 24 = HessLeu 1959, $115=$ Jameson 1903

6 O 5 Similar, but horses lower and charioteer more forward. Legend in ex.
R 5 Similar to R 4, three dolphins 17.01 * ANS
$7 \mathrm{O}_{5}$
R 6 Larger head r., with sphendone and ampyx, hair knobbly, triple earring; three dolphins 16.20 Paris Luynes 922

- Luneau 220
16.76 * London Lloyd $1598=$ Nav. 6, 36 I

806 Similar, horses very large and charioteer very high. Legend in ex.
(8) R 6
17.05 * Sambon 19.12. 1906,494

- Syracuse, Mineo hoard 25284
906
R 7 Large head r., slightly untidy hair, triple earring; two dolphins
16.97 * Lockett SNG III $737=$ Nav. 12, 708
16.6I London $1939=$ Ciani 1929, 50
- Pennisi

06
R 8 Head with sphendone and ampyx similar to R 4-5, triple earring; four dolphins
17.02 * Cambridge McC $2487=$ Hirsch 21, 592
17.24 Hess-Leu 1960, 102

I6.72 Priv. coll. X

- Palermo

Plate 16

II $\mathrm{O}_{7}$ Quadriga l., horses in close formation; Nike above (?); double ex. line, legend in ex.
R 9 Large head with waved hair, tripie earring; two dolphins visible in front 16.82 * Hirsch I9, 16 I

I2 O 8 Similar, horses more level; single ex. line. Legend in ex.
R io Head with sphendone (decorated with stars) and ampyx, earring with five pendants; three dolphins 16.56 * London 1929

I7.01 Nav. 5, 873
16.90 Rosenberg 72, 175

I3 O8
R II Similar to R 9; two dolphins visible in front
$16.87^{*}$ London $1938=$ Helbing 12.4. 1927, I658
16.75 Paris Luynes 924

- Berlin
- Salton

14 O 8
R II' Same die, but worn and partly altered (nose, mouth and hair)
(I4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
16.45 * & \text { AC } 14,90=\text { Helbing } \\
& 1930,108=\text { Cahn } 75, \\
& 228=\text { Glendining } \\
& \text { 31. 1. 1951, } 58
\end{aligned}
$$

1508
R 12 Large head with rolled hair, ampyx, single-drop earring; two dolphins 17.15 * Paris 946

1608
R I3 Head similar to R 9, R II, triple
earring; three dolphins
I6.65 Nav. 5, 87 I
16.40 Egger 4I, 12 I
16.97 Hunter xvi, 5
16.52 MMAG 1951, 219
17.07 London BMC I9

-     * Pennisi
16.65 Hague
17.00 Berlin
- Salton
$17 \quad 08$
R 14 Similar to R I3, etc., but with ampyx, triple earring; two dolphins in front, corn grain behind 16.61 * London Lloyd I597, Cefalú hoard
(I7) 16.56 Egger 26.II. 1909, 195 I
16.90 Priv. coll. Y = Lockett

SNG III 739
17.00 Hirsch $30,350=$ Sambon 19. 12. 1907, 500
17.32 Hess-Leu 1957132
16.94 Berlin

I8 O 9 Quadrigal., horses regular and low to groundline; double ex. line, legend r'smlqrt
R I5 Head with sphendone (decorated with stars) and ampyx, earring with five pendants; three dolphins 16.66 ANS $=$ Nav. 5, $874=$ Luneau 222
16.47 Paris Luynes 927
17.3I Nav. 4, 283
16.90 Hague
17.02 * London BMC 2

- Syracuse, Nissoria 54542

I7.00 Syracuse, Gibil Gabib 48296
$19 \mathrm{O}_{9}$
R 16 Head r., triple earring; no dolphins; in front, crescent? 16.88 * London Lloyd 1596

- Pennisi
- Baranowsky 1929, 1554a
$20 \mathrm{O}_{9}$
R ıo Die more worn
16.81 Jameson 596
r6.96 Cambridge McC 3053
16.32 AC 16, 486
(20) $\quad$ 16.4I Oxford $2148=$ Hirsch $29,83=$ do. $19,160=$ Schulman 21. 10. 1912, $\mathrm{I}_{9}=$ do. 7.6. 1937, 96
16.29 ANS = Münzh. Basel 4, 561 = Cahn 7I, 205 = Cahn 8o, II3
17.08 * Priv. coll. $Y=$ Lockett SNG III $738=$ Nav. 4, 232
16.82 Hess-Leu 1958, I I I

2 I O Io Quadriga with horses very high similar to O 6
R 12
16.75 Nav. 6, $367=$ Schulman 16. 12. 1926, III
16.95 AC 16, 49I

I6.68 Priv. coll. $Y=$ Jameson $600=$ Eggerio. 12. 1906, 87
17.10 * London BMC 20

O 10
R 17 Similar to R I2; two dolphins
17.13 * Cambridge McC 3052 = Sambon 19. 12. 1907, 493
16.60 Cahn 66, $145=\mathrm{MM}$ AG 1951, 218
17.17 Hess-Leu 1959, I 14
16.85 ANS

I7.05 Nav. 6, $366=$ Platt 3. 4. 1933, $68=$ Schulman 16. 12. 1926, IIO

Plate 17

23 Oir Quadriga 1., horses low and regular, charioteer amidships, double ex. line, legend in ex. On 1. caduceus
R 14
16.71 O'Hagan 124
17.04 * London BMC 21
16.90 Paris Luynes 923

24 OiI
R 18 Similar to R 14
16.99 * AC 16, 492
16.65 SC 1927, 1148

25 O II
R 19 Similar to R 18
17.25 * Stiavelli $158=$ Merzbacher 1910, $218=$ Sotheby 21.4. 1909, 85
17.14 ANS = Locker-Lampson $65=$ Cahn $60,188=$ Nav. 12, 709
26 O i2 Quadriga 1. with horses low regular and compact, charioteer in normal position and leaning forward. Double ex. line. Legend in ex.
(26) R 20 Head l., hair wavy and neatly rolled, triple earring; three dolphins
16.70 Hamb. 98, 226

-     * ANS

27 O I2
R 21 Similar; three dolphins
16.81 * London BMC 18

28 O I2
R 2 I' Same die, but dolphin behind head changed into fish
16.55 Hirsch 34, $155=$ Jameson 1895
16.69 * London RPK
17.09 Hess-Leu $1957=$ Priv. coll. Y

- Palermo

29 O I2
R 22 Head l. with corn ear wreath, triple earring; three dolphins
16.52 * London BMC 5

- ANS
16.60 Paris Delepierre
$30 \quad$ O I2
R 23 Head r. with corn ear wreath, triple earring; two dolphins
16.75 Priv. coll. X
16.9I Munich
16.95 Berlin
17.23 * Nav. 6, 362

3 I ${ }^{13}$ Quadriga r., horses rearing up but regular; single ex. line
R 24 Head r. with leaf wreath, triple
earring; three dolphins
16.88 Egger 4I, $120=$ Hess 28.4. 1938, 523
17.30 * London Lloyd 1604
(3I)
17.30

Glend. 3. 12. 1929, 704
$=$ Rosenberg 8. 2. 1924, 84

- Paris A-V 273
16.53 Hirsch 21, 589
17.15 Hess 18.3 . 1918, $188=$ Egger 28. II. 1904, 197 $=$ Helbing 2. 3. 1928, $123=$ Hirsch 20, 121
- Helbing 8. II. 1928, 37 I6
17.28 Oxford $2147=$ Lockett SNG III $743=$ Nav. , 426
16.82 Hague
$32 \quad \mathrm{O}$ I3
R 25 Head l. with leaf wreath, etc.;
two dolphins visible in front
16.98 * London $1919=$ Weber 1477

33 O I3
R 26 Similar to R 24
17.00 Hirsch 14, 172
17.06 * Hirsch I6, 232
17.04 Oxford 2149

34 O I3
R 27 Similar to R 24 and R 26
16.96 Hirsch 19, I58
17.12 * Nav. IO, I93 = Nav. 4, $23 \mathrm{I}=$ Merzbacher 2. II. 1909, 2490
16.72 Hirsch 34, I 54
17.22 Hague

- Proschowsky 362
$17.00 \quad$ Nav. 12, $703=$ Hess 18.3. 1918, $187=$ SC 1927, II43

Plate 18

35 O I4 Similar to $\mathrm{O}_{13}$, but horses lower and charioteer taller
R 26

$$
\text { I6.74 * Hague }=\text { Brandis, }
$$ Canessa 1922, 389

36 O 14
R 27
17.30* Hirsch 33, 342

- Syracuse
$37 \quad \mathrm{O}$ I4
R 28 Head similar, but hair more curly and wreath has extra leaves; three dolphins
16.77 * London $1939=$ Nav. 4 , $230=$ Soth. 17.7.1939, 16 $=$ Hirsch 32, $60=$ Bourgey 5. 12. 1932, 70
17.16 Brussels
(37)
- 

Feuardent 26. 5. 1914, 158
16.40 Hartwig $682=$ Hamb. 98, 224
17.27 Hess-Leu 1968, II4
17.00 Hirsch 32, 59
17.04 Jameson 597
17.08 Nav. 4, 229
17.22 Nav. 6, 363
17.36 Paris Luynes 920

- Pennisi
17.20 Sambon 19. 12. 1907, 490
17.18 Sartiges $453=$ Sambon 19. 12. $1907,489=$ Hess I954, 50
17.21 Schulman 7.6.1937,97

I6.94 Syracuse, Pachino 22
17.07 MMAG 43, I970, 57
$38 \quad \mathrm{OI} 4$
R 29 Similar to R 28, but hair wavy instead of curled; three dolphins
17.58 * ANS
17.17 ANS $=$ Bourgey 23.5. 1910,30 = do.7.6. 1909, I33
17.00 Cahn 65, $66=$ Egger 28. II I 1904, 22I $=$ Hess I94, I32
17.16 Nav. 6, $364=$ Cahn 84, $184=$ Schulman 16 . 12. 1926, 107

- Baranowsky 1934,4647
17.20 Helbing I2.4. 1927, 1656
17.30 Hirsch 33, 344
17.10 Hirsch 33, 343
16.63 London 1918
- Paris 2388
- Paris Vogué 656
17.08 Lewis $=$ Hess-Leu 1956, 88
17.04 Weber $1297=$ Feuardent I6. II. 1937, 48
17.20 Rosenberg 64, 139 I
- Soth.6.7.192I, 201

O 14
R 30 Head 1., leaf wreath, triple earring; three dolphins
I7.I8 Boston 270

- Berlin
17.07 Benson 189
16.66 Cambridge SNG IV 972
- Ciani 7.5. I955, I90
16.90 Hess 202, 2269

I5.13 London 1928
16.72 * London Lloyd I605, Cefalú hoard
17.19 Paris Luynes 921
16.90 Paris 2389
16.90 Leu Sicilia $142=$ Priv. coll. Y
17.23 MMAG 43, 1970, 58

- Palermo, Selinunte hoard I877
(Kokalos VII, tav. xx, 2)
$40 \quad \mathrm{O}_{14}$
R 31 Head r., similar to R 28, R 29; three dolphins
$16.97^{*}$ Hirsch 14,173
- ANS
- Feuardent 26. 5. 1914, I 56

O Is Quadriga r., horses rearing up, charioteer leaning forward
R 32 Head r., similar; four dolphins
I7.16 Brussels H822
17.23 Cambridge SNG IV 970 $=$ Montagu I Ior
17.24 * London BMC 7
16.76 Hess-Leu 1956, 87

- Priv. coll. Y
17.16 Priv. coll. X
17.10 Lewis
17.17 Nav. IO, I95
17.03 Syracuse, Pachino 21

42 O i6 Similar, horses more compact, charioteer leaning forward
R 32

| 17.13 * | London BMC 6 |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | Paris A-V 274 |
| I7.20 | Paris Luynes 917 |

O 16
R 33 Similar; earring larger, dolphin behind head turns inwards
16.75 Berlin
17.18 Boston = Warren 419
16.95 Cambridge McC $3051=$ Carfrae 48
16.96 Cambridge SNG IV 969
17.13 AC 17, 142

I6.94 Hague
(43)

| 16.75 | Hirsch 20, 120 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 16.87 | Hirsch 26,72 |
| 17.08 | Hess-Leu 1960, IOI |
| $16.75 *$ | Lockett SNG III 744 |
| 17.03 | Paris Luynes 916 |
| - | Paris 376 |
| 17.17 | Priv. coll. Y |

44 O ェ6
R 34 Similar to R 33 , but earring swings forward
17.34 ANS
17.03 ANS
17.16 Cahn 68, $1153=$ Schulman 16. I2. 1926, 109
17.05 Glend.-Seaby II, $186=$ Münzh. Basel IV 562
17.10 * Paris Vogué

- Pennisi
17.20 Ratto 26.4.1909, 1175
17.35 Rosenberg 72, 174
17.10 Weber 1296
16.52 SC 1927, I 145
- Syracuse, Gagliardi 1002

45 O 16
R 31
17.04 * Bompois, Holm Gesch. Siz. III, viii, 9
$46 \quad$ O I6
R 35 Closely similar to R 34 , but earring more vertical
16.91 Hunter Syracuse 56
17.05 * London BMC 12

- Berlin
- Glend. I3. II. 1957, 29
16.68 Munich
16.85 Nav. 5, 864
17.22 Nav. 5, 868
16.75 Nav. 5, $865=$ Glend.-

Seaby III, II98

- Paris 375
- Sambon 26.4. 1925, 157 $=$ do. 19. 12. 1907, 492
- Palermo


## Plate 19

$47 \quad$ O 16
R 36 Similar to R 35
17.26 Cahn 66, I46
17.23 Hess-Leu I958, 89

-     * Glasgow, Coats 2892
- ANS
17.10 Hirsch 31, $558=$ do. 15, I 008
I7.12 Jameson 598
17.07 Lewis
17.15 London Lloyd 1600

I7.09 Münzh. Basel 8, I84
16.64 Nav. I2, 705

- Glend. 1955 Laval, 227
17.25 Paris Luynes 919

I7.10 Sandeman 29
17.07 Stockholm KMK = Nav. Io, I94

- Ryan 1495
17.20 Sambon I9. I2. 1907,49I
- Palermo hoard 1936
17.00 Syracuse, Pachino I9
- Syracuse, Gagliardi 1003

O 17 Quadriga r., horses rearing up, charioteer high and leaning far forward
R 37 Similar, larger head
16.44 AC I6, 489
17.01 Berlin
16.95 Egger 46, $78=$ Soth.
6. 7. 192I, 202
17.50 Hess-Leu 1957, I3 I
16.36 London Lloyd I599, Cefalú hoard
17.05 Münzh. Basel 10 , 146
17.06 * Nav. 5, $863=$ Hess 207, $134=$ Merzbacher 1910, $216=$ Hess-Leu 1958,
ııо $=$ Egger 28. 1 I.
1904, 224
17.04 O'Hagan $125=$ Bourgey
29.5. I9II, 40

- Priv. coll. Y
- Sartiges 97
17.14 Syracuse Pachino 20 (Annali 5-6, tav. viii, I)

O 18 Quadriga r., horses very large and spread out, charioteer more upright
R 3 I
17.13 * London BMC 15

- ANS
- Berlin
- Glend.-Seaby II 1929, 187
O 18
R 38 Similar to R 3I; dolphin behind head turns towards head
16.82 * Hess-Leu 1962, 125
17.23 Schulman 6.6.1930, 28
- Naples Santangelo 7750

O 18
R 39 Similar to $\mathrm{R}_{31}$, earring more forward
16.90 London Lloyd 1603 (rev. tooled; earring removed)
17.23 * Leu 1965

O 18
R 40 Similar to R 39, slightly larger
16.7I * Boston 269
17.35 * London 1918
16.96 Paris Delepierre

- Palermo
17.17 Munich
17.43 Münzh. Basel 4, 560

O 18
R 4 I Similar, more compact head
16.50 SC 1927, 1146
17.00 * London Lloyd 1601, Cefalú hoard
16.82 Priv. coll. X

- Syracuse, Megara

Hyblaea 1967
Or9 Quadriga 1., horses in fan-like formation; double ex. line
R 39
16.77 * ANS $=$ Merzbacher 2. II. 1909, 2493

55 O 19
R 42 Head 1., compact; wreath earring dolphins normal 16.80 AC I6, 487
16.66 Hague
12.17 Hague
17.24 Hirsch 32, $58=$ Hindamian 176
16.92 Hirsch 34, $152=$ Bourgey 1913, $18=$ Sambon 19. 12. 1907, $488=$ HessVogel 1929, $131=$ Hess 202, 2268 = Hess 209, $15=$ Hess 7.3.1935, 251
17.15 Lewis
17.18 London BMC 16
17.05 * Lockett SNG III 742
16.85 MMAG 43, 1970, 60
17.04 Nav. 5, 870
17.16 Nav. 12, 706
17.00 Priv. coll. X

- $\quad$ Polese, Canessa 719
16.78 Schulman 31. 5. 1938, 75
- Stiavelli 156
- Syracuse

56 O I9
R 43 Similar to R 39, earring larger

- Berlin
16.32 * AC 16, $488=$ Headlam $180=$ Ciani 14.6. 1934, 13
16.87 Hess 208, 105
17.17 Merzbacher 2. I. 1909, $2492=$ Balmanno $42=$ Soth. 6. 12. 1907, 30

57
O 19
R 44 Similar to R 42; corn ear below 16.69 New York Met., Ward 359
16.95 * London 1968

58 O I9
R 45 Head r., rather stylised; triple earring, three dolphins

- $\quad$ * Priv. coll. Y
- Pennisi

59 O I9
R 46 Head 1., similar to R 42; four dolphins
16.55 * London 1938
17.15 Cambridge SNG IV 973
$60 \quad \mathrm{O}$ I9
R 47 Head r., peculiar shape, wreath and earring normal; four dolphins 16.84 * London BMC 14

- Berlin
- Feuardent 26.5.1914, 157
17.05 Nav. 5, 869

6I O 20 Quadriga r., very compact; double ex. line
R 46
16.59 * Lockett SNG III 741 $=$ Priv. coll. Y

62 O 2 I Quadriga r., long sagging horses; double ex. line; legend reversed
R $45^{\circ}$
17.23 * Helbing I9. II. I912, I55

63 O 21
R 48 Head r., very stylised; three dolphins
17.04 * London BMC I3
15.10 Allotte de la Fuye 1925, 124
17.24 Nav. 6,365 = Feuardent 9.5.1910, $245=$ Schulman 2I. Io. 1912, 18 Paris 2387
$64 \quad \mathrm{O}_{21}$
R 49 Head l., wreath, triple earring; four dolphins 16.87 Hamb. 98, $225=$ SC 1927 $1147=$ Polese, Canessa 1928, 720 720
16.88 Hess-Leu 1966, 171
16.85 * London Lloyd 1606 , Cefalú hoard
(64)
16.88 London 1938
17.20 Paris Luynes 926
16.62 Priv. coll. X
16.78 Priv. coll. Y
$16.80 \quad$ Vienna
17.19 Syracuse, Pachino 23

- Palermo
- Burel ro6
- Canessa-de Nicola I950, II2
65 O 22 Quadriga r., rearing horses, charioteer high and leaning forward; single ex. line, legend normal
R 49
16.79 Baranowsky 4,319 = Ratto 24.6.1929, 108
- $\quad$ * Leu 1965

66 O 22
R 50 Large head $r$.; four dolphins
$17.27^{*}$ Boston add. 23 = HessLeu 1959, II3
16.27 London Lloyd 1602, Cefalú hoard
17.33 London BMC 10
17.06 Nav. 5, 866
17.10 AC I5, $284=$ Ratto 26.4. 1909, $1176=$ Cahn 60, $189=$ Hirsch 34, I53

- Paris 377
17.35 Walcher Molthein $420=$ Hirsch 29, 82 = MMAG 43, 1970, 59
$67 \quad O_{22}$
R 5 I Head r., similar to R 32; four dolphins
16.65 London 1969
17.12 * Nav. Io, $192=$ Nav. 1 , $425=$ Egger IO; 12. 1906, 86
- Platt 3.4. 1933, 67
$68 \mathrm{O}_{23}$ Similar to O 22, but horses lower and charioteer leans further forward
R 5 I
17.20 * London BMC 8

I7.16 Nav. 5, 867
17.50 Paris Luynes 918

69 O 24 Quadriga 1., horses low on ground, thick ex. line
R 52 Head r., compact style, wreath and triple earring; three dolphins
15.60 Brussels H 82 I
17.31 * London 1938 (BMQ 1938, xlix, 2)
17.28 London BMC 4
17.00 Nav. 12, 707
16.82 Paris Luynes 925
16.62 Priv. coll. X
16.44 Ratto 24.6. 1929, 107
16.76 Stockholm KMK = Nav. 10, $196=$ Hirsch 21,590 $=$ Luneau 22 I

- Martinetti Nervegna 793
16.85 Egger 26.11. 1909, 149
16.91 Lewis $=$ Glend. Hall 1950, 6I
- Palermo
- Priv. coll. Y
- Sambon-Canessa 22.6. 1906, 175
- $\quad$ Syracuse, Megara Hyblaea 1967

O 24
R 53 Similar to R 52, earring larger
17.04

AC 16,490
16.95 Cambridge SNG IV 971
= Bunbury 527
(70)
16.50 Hague
16.76 Hirsch 32, $62=$ Hindamian 178
16.61 Jameson 599
16.77 Lewis
16.68 * London BMC 3
15.56 * Lockett SNG III 745
(rev. extensive break below the ear)
16.75 Priv. coll. X
16.30 Priv. coll. Y
$7 \mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{O} 25$ Head r., wreath and earring; three dolphins
R 54 Quadriga r., double ex. line;
legend r'šmlqrt
15.55 Berlin

- Berlin
16.58 * ANS = White King 55
= Bourgey 29. 5. 191I, 39
O 26 Head 1.; two dolphins visible in front
R 54
$16.37^{*}$ London BMC 17
$\mathrm{O}_{2} 6$
R 55 Walking horse r ., palmtree behind; below letters ayin and gimel 16.50 * Copenhagen, Thorwaldsen
- Priv. coll. Y


[^0]:    23 After a photo which the late Barone Agostino Pennisi gave me some years ago. Unfortunately I do not have any note of the weight. As reproduced here the photo is about twice natural size.

[^1]:    ${ }^{24}$ NSc 1958 and Annali 5/6, pp. 296 ff.
    ${ }^{25}$ On Herakles at Selinus, cf. L. Lacroix, Monnaies et colonisation, pp. 34 ff .
    ${ }^{26}$ A. di Vita, Archaeologia Classica V, pp. 39-47.
    27 Annali 5/6, pp. 306 ff.

[^2]:    ${ }^{28}$ S. Moscati, World of the Phoenicians (London 1968), pp. 104-105 and references on pp. 259260.
    G. Cavallaro, Panormos pre-romana (Palermo 1950), p. IO9ff., however, equates qrthdšt with Panormos; if we accept the syṣ coin series for Panormos, as I do, then this must surely exclude the possibility suggested by Cavallaro.

[^3]:    ${ }^{29}$ A specimen of no. 8 comes from the Mineo hoard (Noe ${ }^{2}$ 697) whose burial date however should be early in the third century B.C., so that this is not indicative for the early part of the series.

[^4]:    ${ }^{30}$ ANS Centennial Publication, pp. 372-374.
    ${ }^{31}$ The same or similar fish on the coins of Akragas (Rizzo i, 16) has been discussed by the late Prof. F. E. Zeuner in Numismatic Circular 1963, pp. 142-143, concluding that it is probably a species of the giant sea-perch known as the mero.

[^5]:    ${ }^{33}$ On hoards of the time of Agathokles, cf. Essays Robinson, p. 15 I.
    ${ }^{33 a}$ A. Di Vita, Annali 5/6, 1958/59, 125 ff.
    ${ }^{34}$ Noe ${ }^{2}$ 946, NSc 1877, also Kokalos VII, tav. $20,2$.
    ${ }^{35}$ Noe ${ }^{2} 193$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{36}$ Cf. SNG II 1476-1480.

