

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE



Tom XIII

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2018



Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Tłumaczenie tekstów oraz korekta językowa native speakerów tekstów
artykułów naukowych oraz recenzji naukowych w tomach XIII (2018) i XIV (2019)
finansowane w ramach umowy 790/P-DUN/2018 ze środków
Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego
przeznaczonych na działalność upowszechniającą naukę.

The translation and the proofreading by a native speaker of the texts
of academic articles and reviews in the volumes XIII (2018) and XIV (2019)
financed as part of the Agreement 790/P-DUN/2018 from the funds
of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education allocated for the purpose
of promoting and propagating science.

NOTAE NUMISMATICAE

ZAPISKI NUMIZMATYCZNE

Tom XIII

MUZEUM NARODOWE W KRAKOWIE
SEKCJA NUMIZMATYCZNA
KOMISJI ARCHEOLOGICZNEJ PAN
ODDZIAŁ W KRAKOWIE

Kraków 2018

Komitet naukowy / Scientific Committee:

Prof. Peter van Alfen, Prof. Michael Alram, Prof. Aleksander Bursche, Prof. François de Callataÿ, Dr Karsten Dahmen, Prof. Georges Depeyrot, Dr Haim Gitler, Zofia Gołubiew, Prof. Wiesław Kaczanowicz, Elżbieta Korczyńska, Prof. Katerini Liampi, Prof. Adam Małkiewicz, Prof. Andrew Meadows, Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek, Dr Jiří Militký, Prof. Janusz A. Ostrowski, Prof. Maciej Salamon, Prof. Bernhard Weisser

Redakcja / Editorial Board:

Redaktor / Editor in Chief – Jarosław Bodzek

Zastępca redaktora / Associate Editor – Mateusz Woźniak

Sekretarze / Secretaries – Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Bochnak, Barbara Zając

Redaktor tematyczny / Theme Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Redaktor językowy / Linguistic Editor:

Peter van Alfen

Recenzenci / Reviewers:

Prof. Katarzyna Balbuza, Dr hab. Tomasz Bochnak, Dr Dario Calomino, Dr Karsten Dahmen, Dr Oliver Hoover, Dr Witold Garbaczewski, Dr Adam Kędzierski, Dr hab. Agata Kluczek, Dr Kamil Kopij, Dr Julio M. del Hoyo-Meléndez, Dr Dubravka Ujes Morgan, Dr Kyrylo Myzgin, Dr Ulrike Peter, Dr Adrian Popescu, Prof. Stephen K. Scher, Dr Szymon Tracz, Dr David Wigg-Wolf, Prof. Michel Wiedemann

Redaktorzy prowadzący / Commissioning Editors:

Dorota Malarczyk, Anna Kowalczyk

Tłumaczenia / Translations:

David Daniel

Korekta / Proofreading:

David Daniel, Aedaan Shaw

Projekt graficzny i typografia / Graphic Design and Desk Top Publishing:

Luiza Berdak

Skład i łamanie / Typesetting and Page Layout:

Joanna Słomska

Adres redakcji / Address of the Editorial Office:

Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie

ul. Józefa Piłsudskiego 12, 31-109 Kraków

tel. (+48) 12 433 58 50

e-mail: notae@mnk.pl

<http://mnk.pl/notae-numismatiae-zapiski-numizmatyczne-1>

Wyłącznie odpowiedzialność za przestrzeganie praw autorskich dotyczących materiału ilustracyjnego ponoszą autorzy tekstów.
Authors of the texts bear the sole responsibility for observing the copyright illustrations.

Wersję pierwotną pisma *Notae Numismatiae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* jest wersja elektroniczna.

The electronic edition of the *Notae Numismatiae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne* is treated as its original version.

© Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie i Autorzy, 2018

ISSN 1426-5435

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS

- 9 Od redakcji
10 *From the Editors*

ARTYKUŁY / ARTICLES

- EMANUEL PETAC
13 About the Sarmizegetusa Hoard from 1998 and the Possible Chronology of Burebista's Campaign to the Black Sea Border
O skarbie z Sarmizegetusy z 1998 roku i przypuszczalnej chronologii kampanii Burebisty ku wybrzeżom Morza Czarnego
- HELLE W. HORSNÆS, MALENE REFSHAUGE BECK
37 A Hoard of Republican Denarii from Skellerup, Denmark – A Preliminary Report
Skarb denarów republikańskich ze Skellerup, Dania – uwagi wstępne
- JAROSŁAW BODZEK, RENATA MADYDA-LEGUTKO
53 Coins of the Rulers of Cimmerian Bosphorus Found in Poland
Znaleziska monet władców Bosporu Kimeryjskiego na ziemiach polskich
- EVGENI I. PAUNOV
93 The Start of the Coinage of Philippopolis under Domitian
Początki mennictwa Philippopolis za panowania Domicjana
- SZYMON JELLONEK
101 Roman Foundation Myths on Colonial Coinage
Rzymskie mity założycielskie na monetach kolonialnych
- ARKADIUSZ DYMOWSKI
127 Pseudo-Ancient Pseudo-Coins from Gdańsk. Remarks in the Margins of the Catalog of Finds of Ancient Coins in Medieval and Modern Contexts in Poland
Pseudoantyczne obiekty monetopodobne z Gdańska. Uwagi na marginesie katalogu znalezisk monet antycznych z kontekstów średniowiecznych i nowożytnych z terenu Polski
- BEATA MIAZGA, BORYS PASZKIEWICZ
137 The Metal Content of Selected Polish and Brandenburg Coins from the 14th and 15th Centuries
Metal wybranych monet polskich i brandenburskich z XIV–XV wieku
- HEINZ WINTER
171 Zu den Medaillen des Benvenuto Cellini – Der Bestand des Kunsthistorischen Museums Wien
The Medals of the Benvenuto Cellini in the Collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna
Medale Benvenuto Celliniego z kolekcji Kunsthistorisches Museum w Wiedniu

PAULINA TARADAJ

- 191 *Quo non augustior alter*. A Few Remarks on the Series of Small Medals Issued to Commemorate the Maneuvers of the Saxon Armies at Mühlberg in 1730
"Quo non augustior alter". Kilka uwag na temat serii małych medali wydanych z okazji kampamentu wojsk saskich pod Mühlbergiem w 1730 roku

ZNALAZISKA / FINDS

JAN BULAS, PIOTR N. KOTOWICZ

- 209 New Roman Coin Finds from the Upper San River Basin
Nowe znaleziska monet rzymskich z dorzecza Górnego Sanu

TOMASZ WAGNER, BARBARA ZAJĄC

- 225 New Roman Coin Finds from the Region of Częstochowa
Nowe znaleziska monet rzymskich z okolic Częstochowy

ANNA BOCHNAK, MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK

- 245 Fragment XVI-wiecznego skarbu z Zawiercia – Kromolowa ze zbiorów Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie
Part of a 16th-Century Hoard from Kromolów, Zawiercie, from the Collections of the National Museum in Krakow

VARIA

VIERA HUPALO

- 275 Ikonografia przedstawień na medalikach religijnych z grobów w kościele pobernardyńskim w Dubnie na Wołyniu (Ukraina)
The Iconography of Images on Religious Medallions from Graves in the Former Bernardine Church in Dubno, Volhynia (Ukraine)

RECENZJE / REVIEWS

BARBARA ZAJĄC

ARNAUD SUSPÈNE, VINCENT DROST, ANDREW BURNETT,
LAURENT BRICAULT

- 307 *Rome et les provinces. Monnayage et histoire. Mélanges offerts à Michel Amandry*. Numismatica Anatolica 7. Bordeaux: Ausonius éditions: avec le concours de Spink 2017, 463 pages; ISBN 978-2-35613-197-3

KRONIKA / CHRONICLE

MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK

- 315 Kronika Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie (2017)
322 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow* (2017)

JAROSŁAW BODZEK

331 Kronika Sekcji Numizmatycznej Komisji Archeologicznej Polskiej Akademii Nauk
Oddział w Krakowie (2017)

333 *The Chronicle of the Numismatic Section of the Commission on Archaeology of
the Polish Academy of Sciences (Krakow Branch of the Polish Academy of Sciences)*
(2017)

PAWEŁ GOŁYŹNIAK

335 Conference Report: *Coinage in Imperial Space. Continuity or Change from
the Achaemenid to Hellenistic Kingdoms?* Krakow, 28th June – 2nd July 2017

NEKROLOGI / OBITUARIES

JAROSŁAW BODZEK, MATEUSZ WOŹNIAK

345 Bogumiła Haczewska (4 maja 1943 – 31 grudnia 2017)

350 *Bogumiła Haczewska (4th May 1943 – 31st December 2017)*

357 Bibliografia prac Bogumiły Haczewskiej

Bibliography of Bogumiła Haczewska's Works

HENRYK WOŹNIAKOWSKI

361 Izabella Godlewska de Aranda (18 grudnia 1931 – 12 czerwca 2018)

363 *Izabella Godlewska de Aranda (18th December 1931 – 12th June 2018)*



Bogumiła Haczewska (1943–2017). Muzeum im. Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego, wrzesień 1995 r. Fot. I. Feldblum
Bogumiła Haczewska (1943–2017). Emeryk Hutten-Czapski Museum, September 1995. Photo: I. Feldblum

Szanowni Państwo,

oddajemy w Państwa ręce tom XIII *Notae Numismaticae – Zapisków Numizmatycznych*. Zgodnie z przyjętym zwyczajem teksty o tematyce międzynarodowej publikujemy w językach kongresowych, a teksty odnoszące się w większym stopniu do zainteresowań czytelnika polskiego w języku polskim. Wszelkie informacje dla autorów oraz archiwalne tomy naszego czasopisma dostępne są na stronie www.mnk.pl.

31 grudnia 2017 roku zmarła Bogumiła Haczewska (1943–2017), emerytowany, wieloletni pracownik i kierownik Gabinetu Numizmatycznego Muzeum Narodowego w Krakowie, znawczyni mennictwa średniowiecznego i gdańskiego, zastępca redaktora i członek komitetu redakcyjnego *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*. Była osobą mocno zaangażowaną w działalność społeczną: reaktywowała w 1989 roku w Muzeum Narodowym Związek Zawodowy „Solidarność”, działała w Towarzystwie Przyjaciół Muzeum im. Emeryka Hutten-Czapskiego, zakładała Stowarzyszenie Muzealników Polskich, najważniejszą dziś organizację skupiającą pracowników polskich muzeów. Niezwykle pracowita, świadoma odpowiedzialności wynikającej ze sprawowanych przez siebie funkcji, całą sobą oddana była Gabinetowi Numizmatycznemu.

Jej pamięci poświęcamy XIII tom *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*, nie mając wątpliwości, że czasopismo to nie powstałoby bez jej zaangażowania.

Redakcja

Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that we present to you Volume XIII of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*. In accordance with our customary practice, all the texts concerned with subjects of international interest or significance have been published in the conference languages, while those of more relevance to Polish readers – in Polish. Information for prospective authors as well as previously published volumes of our journal can be found at www.mnk.pl.

A worker of many years at the Numismatic Cabinet of the National Museum in Krakow and then the cabinet's director before she retired, Bogumiła Haczewska (1943–2017) passed away on December 31, 2017. An expert on medieval coinage and coinage from Gdańsk, Haczewska was deputy editor and a member of the editorial committee of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*. Whether she was reactivating the Solidarity labor union at the National Museum in 1989 or busy doing work for the Association of Benefactors of the Emeryk Hutten-Czapski Museum or else putting together the Association of Polish Museologists, the most important organization for employees at Polish museums, Haczewska was heavily engaged in doing social work. An exceptionally hard worker, Haczewska was conscious of the responsibility resulting from the offices she held, giving her whole self to the Numismatic Cabinet.

It is in memory of Bogumiła Haczewska that we dedicate the 13th volume of *Notae Numismaticae – Zapiski Numizmatyczne*, there being no doubt that the journal would never have been created without her full commitment.

The Editors

SZYMON JELLONEK
Jagiellonian University

Roman Foundation Myths on Colonial Coinage

ABSTRACT: Roman colonies minted coins that stood out among provincial coinage by way of their Latin legends and choice of iconographic motifs. The two main subjects that were used referred to the history of the colonies. The first was the foundation scene, in which the priest indicated the city's boundaries in imitation of Romulus, who indicated the boundaries of Rome with the help of two oxen and a plow. The second type that was popular referred to the colonists' military past, showing legionary emblems. Besides these motifs, other Roman myths also appeared, like the *Lupa Romana*, Aeneas with Anchises and Ascanius retreating from Troy, or Marsyas, who symbolized freedom. These motifs were dominant in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. Over time, local pre-Roman foundation myths began to appear on colonial coinage. Finally, in the 3rd century AD, as Roman and local elements became integrated, foundation myths of various origins were made use of and in certain situations even combined.

KEY WORDS: Roman colonies, Roman provincial coinage, cultural integration

ABSTRAKT: *Rzymskie mity założycielskie na monetach kolonialnych*

Rzymskie kolonie były monety wyróżniające się wśród mennictwa prowincjonalnego łacińskimi legendami oraz doбором motywów ikonograficznych. Dwa główne tematy odnosiły się do historii kolonii. Pierwszym była scena fundacyjna, podczas której kapłan wyznaczał granice miasta – na wzór Romulusa, który za pomocą pary wołów i pługa obrysował granice Rzymu. Drugi popularny typ odnosił się do militarnej przeszłości kolonistów i przedstawiał godła legionowe. Obok tych motywów pojawiały się również inne z rzymskich mitów, takie jak Wilczyca, Eneas z Anchizesem i Askaniuszem uciekający z Troi czy symbolizujący wolność Marsjasz. Motywy te przeważały w I i II wieku n.e. Z czasem na monetach kolonialnych zaczęły się pojawiać również lokalne, przedrzymskie mity fundacyjne. Wreszcie

w III wieku n.e., w miarę postępowania procesu integracji rzymskich i lokalnych elementów, wykorzystywano, a nawet w niektórych wypadkach łączono mity założycielskie różnego pochodzenia.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: rzymskie kolonie, rzymskie mennictwo prowincjonalne, integracja kulturowa

INTRODUCTION

The beginning of a city is one of the most important moments in its history. Even today, the people who live in cities are able to relate the legend associated with the beginning of their place of residence. It would seem that the situation was similar in antiquity. The cities of the Mediterranean already had a centuries-old history when they came under the authority of the Romans. Naturally, each had its own local tradition, and foundation myths were an important part of these traditions. On the other hand, Roman colonies appeared – mostly during the reign of Augustus and at the beginning of the 3rd century AD – that did not have their own foundation myths. This being the case, the colonists decided to draw such myths directly from the Roman tradition. The foundation ceremony of the Eternal City – performed, according to tradition, by Romulus – was repeated by the colonists and regarded as the birth of the colonies.¹ The myths of the she-wolf, of Romulus and Remus, and of Aeneas were also popular in the colonies. It was these motifs that were depicted on the colonial coinage struck from the 1st century BC to the declining years of provincial coinage in the 3rd century AD. These motifs were the allochtons' response to the local culture surrounding them. In this paper the iconographic aspects on colonial coins are reconsidered. The author focuses on the motives that are connected with the foundation myths, eponym heroes or inauguration rituals.

In Roman provincial coinage, we can see a perfect example of Fergus Millar's assertion that a city's coinage is one of the most significant symbols of its identity.² A city that was allowed to strike its own bronze coins not only included its *ethnikon* on these coins but also local deities. For example, it was natural for Rhodes to depict the head of Helios on its own issues (e.g. RPC III 2188). The temples of the most important deity were a popular motif – in Cyprus, for example, the temple of Aphrodite in Palaipaphos used to be usually depicted (RPC I 3906). Often, the cult statues themselves were enough, as in the case of Samos, where the Heraion of Samos was depicted (e.g. RPC I 2683), or that of Magnesia, where the statue of Artemis of Leukophrys was used (e.g. RPC I 2696). Sometimes a symbolic animal was used, as was the case in Ephesus, where Artemis' deer appeared more often

¹ KEEPIE 1983: 87–88.

² MILLAR 1993: 257.

than her cult statue itself (e.g. RPC I 2587). Nevertheless, in all of these cases it was local traditions that were being referred to, with mention sometimes being made of the eponym or foundation myth.

Although it is believed that the depiction of local foundation myths developed, above all, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries,³ Mount Argaeus was depicted with Helios in Caesarea in Cappadocia already as of the age of Tiberius (RPC I 3620). Cyzicus, on the other hand, depicted Cyzicus, its founder, already as of the age of Domitian (RPC II 886). The Cretan koinon depicted Gortyn – which, according to local legend, was founded by the hero Gortys – as of the age of Trajan (RPC III 55). Thus, it is not strange that Argos too vaunted its greatest hero, that is, Perseus, who is shown on coins from this city right after his fight with Medusa (RPC II 339). Also worth mentioning is Smyrna, which issued coins with Pelops and Hippodamia during the age of Antoninus Pius (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 237) and then, during the age of Marcus Aurelius, coins with the next founder, that is, Alexander (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 239). In Hierapolis, in the conventus of Cibyra, Apollo was depicted with the appellation APXHΓETHC, that is, founder (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 2052).⁴ All of these myths were well known by the local residents as of the times before the Roman conquest. However, the period of the so-called Greek renaissance, and so, the time of the “Second Sophistic”, which dates to the middle of the 2nd century AD,⁵ definitely had an impact on their restoration in the social consciousness, among other things, via their promotion in provincial coinage.

Initially, the positions taken up by the Roman colonies represented an alternative model in response to the local myths. It is quite obvious that these cities, which were mostly established towards the end of the Roman Republic or during the age of Augustus, could not have had legends of their own regarding their foundation. What these cities could do, however, was refer back to the pre-Roman tradition, for most of them were set up in places with a centuries-old history (among others, Berytus, Apamea, Lystra) and not on so-called virgin land.⁶ However, besides a few exceptions (including Corinth and Cassandreia), most of them opted for something else.

Whether local or Roman myths were used seems to be directly connected to the level of Romanization. Although the classic definition of the process is no longer in use and some alternatives have been recently proposed (globalization,⁷ creolization,⁸

³ HEUCHERT 2005: 51.

⁴ PRICE 2005: 118.

⁵ HOWGEGO 2005: 7.

⁶ RIZAKIS 1998: 599–617.

⁷ HINGLEY 2005.

⁸ WEBSTER 2001: 209–225.

Romanization 2.0⁹), the ongoing discussion about this topic indicates its sophisticated nature. Undoubtedly, the colonies set up by the Roman colonists in the age of the Roman Republic and that of Augustus were the centers of *Romanitas*. As miniatures of Rome, the colonies followed Roman law,¹⁰ urban design, and religion.¹¹ Despite the fact that archeological evidence can show, to some extent, the impact of Roman culture on the colonies (e.g. the numerous imports of Italian *sigillata* stamps in Knossos¹²), perceiving this as a conscious form of Romanization can be misleading. Another aspect of *Romanitas* is the language that was used in the colonies. We can see an expression of the linguistic situation in the inscriptions. The epigraphic sources can be divided into two groups: official and private. In the case of Asia Minor, the official inscriptions of the colonies were mostly in Latin, while private inscriptions were predominantly in Greek.¹³ Greek inscriptions eventually took the place of those in Latin in the 3rd century AD; however, in the case of Berytus the Latin inscription at the base of Flavius Domitius Leontius is dated back to AD 344.¹⁴ Furthermore, of great significance is the language used on the coins. In most cases, the coins were inscribed in Latin. However, the so-called titular colonies sometimes used Greek (Neapolis, Rhesaina, Edessa, Carrhae, Singara). It is important to highlight that the colonies mentioned here are distinguished by some scholars as ones that were never settled by Roman immigrants; these scholars treat the colonial status of these colonies as simply another granted title.¹⁵ So-called titular colonies were being established from the time of Septimius Severus as a gift for having taken his side during the civil war in 193–196.¹⁶ However, having analyzed the numismatic evidence, E. Dąbrowa argued that, to a limited degree, the Roman colonies of the 3rd century were real acts of settlement.¹⁷ Therefore, it is necessary to take into account the coins, and especially the iconographic presentations of foundation myths, when attempts are made to determine the civic identity of a given colony.

SULCUS PRIMIGENIUS

The so-called act of foundation was the most repeated subject on the reverses of colonial coinage. These reverses depicted a figure in a toga plowing a field, aided

⁹ WOOLF 2014: 45–50.

¹⁰ MILLAR 1992: 400.

¹¹ BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998: 333–334.

¹² BALDWIN-BOWSKY 2011: 117–119.

¹³ LEVICK 1967: 134–135.

¹⁴ MILLAR 2006: 172.

¹⁵ WATKINS 1983: 321; HOWGEGO 2005: 12; MILLAR 2006: 165; KATSARI and MITCHELL 2008: 242.

¹⁶ MILLAR 2006: 191.

¹⁷ DĄBROWA 2004c: 226.

by two oxen. Contrary to the speculations of some researchers,¹⁸ this was by no means a way of depicting the everyday life of the agricultural population. This scene alluded to the mythical founding of Rome by Romulus, who, aided by two oxen, marked the original furrow (*sulcus primigenius*), that is, the boundaries of the future city.¹⁹ A description of this event has been handed down to us by ancient historians such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus,²⁰ Plutarch,²¹ and Tacitus.²² This ritual ceremony (*aratum* – plow), included in *Etrusca disciplina*, was conducted whenever Rome was enlarged or whenever Roman colonies were established, which in turn is assured to us by Marcus Terentius Varro.²³ As cities modeled after the capital, Roman colonies took this ceremony as their symbolic beginning.²⁴ This being the case, it is not surprising that this ritual was often depicted at most of the centers.

The motive appeared for the first time in 81 BC on a *denarius serratus* (RRC 378/1c) struck by C. Marius. Next it was presented on a denarius struck in 28 BC (RIC² 272) under Octavianus. The solo-ruler who tried to legitimize his power eventually chose the title *Augustus* in 27 BC. However earlier he considered to become a new Romulus²⁵. This assumption known from historical sources can be supported by the symbolic foundation scene on his denarius emitted in 28 BC. Augustus had never ultimately accepted title of Romulus, however was perceived as the new founder of Rome or rather Roman State²⁶. Other emperors who presented themselves as founders were Vespasian (eg. RIC 943), Trajan (eg. RIC 567) and Commodus. The latter even decided to refound Rome as *Colonia Commodiana*²⁷. Reminiscence of that audacious act are series of coins where Commodus is ploughing with yoke of oxen (eg. RIC 560, 570). The issues obtained typical colonial legend: COL LAN COM.

It is worth adding here, however, that even though, in the overwhelming majority of cases, this type appeared on colonial coins, it was not exclusively reserved for them, for it appeared in at least two cities that were not colonies. Although we know that Tralles (RPC I 2649), for example, was settled by newcomers from Italy during the age of Augustus,²⁸ it never had the status of a colony. Regarding Assorus, Sicily

¹⁸ BLANCO-PEREZ 2015: 139.

¹⁹ ECKSTEIN 1979: 87–90; DĄBROWA 2004b: 399.

²⁰ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.88.

²¹ Plut. *Rom.* 11.

²² Tac. *Ann.* 12.24.

²³ Varro. *Ling.* 5.14.

²⁴ ECKSTEIN 1979: 93–94; SISANI 2014: 379.

²⁵ Suet. *Div. Aug.* 7; Cass. Dio. 53. 16.8.

²⁶ SCOTT 1925: 89–95.

²⁷ Cass. Dio. 73.15.2; SHA *Comm.* 8.

²⁸ MAGIE 1950: 469.

(RPC I 666), which may have been at most a *municipium*, the foundation scene is supposed to allude to the allotting of land to the Caesarian veterans,²⁹ or else it is simply supposed to symbolize – though this seems less likely – the fecundity of Sicily.³⁰ As a result, it can be concluded that if one did not interpret the priest with the oxen shown in these two instances as depicting the act of foundation, at least it would have indicated the fact that Italic newcomers had settled the territory in question.

Foundation coinage often appeared as the first issue of a newly established colony. The colony Lampsacus, which had barely been in existence for a decade, released, between 45 and 35 BC, two issues with the act of foundation (RPC I 2268–2269) (Pl. 1, Fig. 1). In Emerita, such a depiction was placed on the reverses of the asses (RPC I 5–7) (Pl. 1, Fig. 2) in the first issues during the age of Augustus. Much the same is true in Patras, where the only certain coin struck during the age of Augustus depicted oxen with a priest on the reverse (RPC I 1252) (Pl. 1, Fig. 3). Coins of this type were produced in Patras up until the age of Marcus Aurelius.³¹ M. Grant shows that foundation coinages were struck, in many cases, to commemorate round anniversaries.³² Among other things, Grant refers to the coin issue from Patras mentioned above, which was supposed to be struck to commemorate the colony's 25th anniversary.³³ In much the same way, B. Levick shows that coins from Cremna were struck during the ages of Marcus Aurelius and Aurelian to celebrate the 200th and 300th anniversary, respectively, of the city's foundation.³⁴ Although it is very tempting to combine all the issues with the foundation type with the successive anniversaries of a given colony's foundation, it does not seem possible to do this with regard to most of the issues. Attempts to do so can lead to significant overinterpretations, as in the case of the coins of Vespasian from Antioch. These coins are dated to AD 76, which according to B. Levick is supposed to indicate that this was the 100th anniversary of the colony's foundation, which as a result she set at 25 BC.³⁵ This, however, does not stand in accordance with A. Krzyżanowska's interpretation,³⁶ while P. A. Brunt has put in doubt the possibility of determining the foundation year at all.³⁷

The commemorative character of this scene is also evident on a few coins in which the priest is interpreted as the emperor who founded the colony in question. As of the age of Hadrian, Cremna struck coins on which it is Augustus who is behind

²⁹ GRANT 1946: 191.

³⁰ BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÉS 1992: 178.

³¹ PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 35.

³² GRANT 1946: 291.

³³ *Ibidem*: 265; PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 48.

³⁴ LEVICK 1967: 35–36.

³⁵ *Ibidem*: 34–35.

³⁶ KRZYŻANOWSKA 1970: 13–14.

³⁷ BRUNT 1971: 601.

the plough (RPC III 2805) (Pl. 1, Fig. 4). In Ptolemais, in turn, it was the founder Claudius who was depicted during the age of Nero (RPC I 4749) (Pl. 1, Fig. 5) and that of Hadrian (RPC III 3912). In both these cases, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the depicted figure, for the reverse is accompanied by the legend *DIVOS CLAVDIVS* or – in its abbreviated version – *DIVO CLAVD*.³⁸ In Aelia Capitolina, it is Hadrian who is standing behind the yoke (RPC III 3964).³⁹ It is likely that emperors were depicted in other instances on coins of this type; unfortunately, however, dies of weak artistic quality, the poor state of many of these coins, and the absence of inscriptions make it impossible to identify them.

It is worth noting that foundation coinages were often the largest and heaviest of all the coinages struck by a given mint, which no doubt bears testimony to their great importance. This was the case with regard to the above-mentioned coinages of Lampsacus and Emerita, but also to that of Berytus, where the foundation type was used on the largest coinages from Augustus (RPC I 4540) to Trajan (RPC III 3833). It was later replaced by newly introduced types with the temple of Astarte (RPC III 3840) and with Poseidon (RPC III 3847), in this way becoming the third denomination. In the case of Thracian Deultum, only one of seven dies presenting the priest with oxen was used for a small denomination.⁴⁰

An interesting situation took place in Antioch in Pisidia during the age of Augustus, where three issues were released. Whereas the largest had the foundation type (RPC I 3529), and the one in the middle, two legionary eagles (RPC I 3530), the smallest one depicted the founder with the oxen on the obverse, but like the middle issue it had, on the reverse, two legionary symbols (RPC I 3531) (Pl. 2, Fig. 13). This tradition was continued with regard to Antioch all the way to the 3rd century: among other things, the heaviest denomination during the age of Severus Alexander weighed about 23 g. The reverses of these denominations depicted the she-wolf, the emperor galloping, and also the foundation type analyzed above (RPC VI 6580). The entire iconographic program was closely tied to *Romanitas*, and it is worth noting here that the Roman-Italic element was exceptionally strong in Antioch.⁴¹

Other colonies with a significant Roman element were ones like Philippi,⁴² Cremna,⁴³ and Berytus.⁴⁴ However, in the case of these colonies, the foundation type went out of use much faster than was the case in Antioch. These coinages were

³⁸ MILLAR 2006: 184.

³⁹ BELAYCHE 2009: 174.

⁴⁰ DRAGANOV 2007: 101.

⁴¹ FILGES 2015: 43–44.

⁴² KREMYDI-SICILANOU 2005: 100.

⁴³ FILGES 2015: 45.

⁴⁴ JONES-HALL 2004: 251; MILLAR 2006: 165.

struck in Philippi during the Second Triumvirate (RPC I 1646); it may also be the case that they were struck during the ages of Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius, but the provenance of these coinages remains problematic.⁴⁵ During the 2nd century, it was mostly coinages depicting Julius Caesar and Augustus that were struck, while the last ones that were produced during the age of Gallienus showed Fortune.⁴⁶ With regards to Cremna, as has already been mentioned, the foundation type appeared on coinages to commemorate anniversaries during the age of Marcus Aurelius and Aurelian, but it also appeared during the ages of Hadrian, Septimius Severus, Philip the Arab, and Valerian.⁴⁷ The tradition of alluding to a city's foundation was supported by other motifs characteristic of Roman colonies, motifs like Marsyas (RPC III 2808), legionary emblems (RPC III 2806), or the genius of the colony (RPC III 2807). Moreover, as was the case in Antioch, reference was made directly to Rome through depictions of the she-wolf (RPC IX 971). Aspects of Roman culture, however, did not stop the local elite from simultaneously referring to local figures like Mida (the mother of King Midas) (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 7794) or Apollo Propylaeus (RPC VI 5925).

With regard to Berytus, it has already been noted that the foundation type was replaced at a certain moment as the heaviest denomination by new types with the temple of Astarte (RPC III 3845) (Pl. 1, Fig. 7) and with Poseidon (RPC III 3847). However, it was still minted in the age of Caracalla (Lindgren 2266) as the smallest coin. It was then supplanted by local motifs like Poseidon with Beroe (BMC 183) (Pl. 2, Fig. 8), Eshmun (BMC 202), or the Julian myth, that of Aeneas carrying Anchises.⁴⁸ On the basis of the two examples mentioned above, despite the strong Roman element that was present, one can see increasing integration with the local tradition.

On the other hand, there were colonies whose *Romanitas* was significantly weaker, and this is reflected in the coinage. These include the cities that did not at all produce foundation coinage (among others, Corinth, about which more will be said later) and those in which there were only a few such issues (these include Parium, Sinope, Alexandria Troas, Ninica, and Iconium). The amount and frequency of these issues varied greatly. In Sinope, the issues depicting founder with oxen were minted under Caligula (RPC I 2129) and probably under Domitian (RPC II 725). This motif appeared twice on coinage from Lystra: during the age of Augustus (RPC I 3539) (Pl. 2, Fig. 9) and during that of Marcus Aurelius (RPC IV (online

⁴⁵ GRANT 1946: 111–114; BURNETT, AMANDRY and RIPOLLÉS 1992: 309–310; PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 29.

⁴⁶ PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 42, 47.

⁴⁷ FILGES 2105: 81–82.

⁴⁸ JONES-HALL 2004: 120, 135.

temporary numbers) 7266). In Iconium, there were three issues: the first was in the age of Vespasian (RPC II 1609); the second, one-hundred-fifty years later, during the age of Gordian III; finally, the third was during the age of Valerian.⁴⁹ Compare this to Parium, in which production lasted from Augustus (RPC I 2261) all the way to Maximinus Thrax (RPC VI 3890). In Ninica, it lasted from Trajan (RPC III 3225) also to Maximinus Thrax (RPC VI 6910). As one can see from the information presented here, foundation coinages were struck at various stages over the course of the empire and at irregular intervals, which generally corresponds to the trends in the provinces.⁵⁰

Alexandria Troas which produced quite a numerous issues in the end of 2nd and 3rd centuries. The foundation type was presented only on two known emissions. First issue was struck under Antoninus Pius (RPC IV(online temporary numbers) 9187) and the other discovered recently by T. Lucchelli released under Commodus⁵¹. Despite the fact that Alexandria produced coins almost without a break until the Goths' invasion (the colony was plundered and coin dies, tools and mint workers were abducted⁵²), the foundation scene was never repeated on coins.

It is also worth mentioning the colonies founded as of the age of Septimius Severus, which for a long time were solely regarded as "titular" and which Italic colonists were never supposed to have settled.⁵³ Here, one can also find foundation coinages. In Tyre, such coins appeared as of the age in which colonies were established by Septimius, all the way to Elagabalus, at which point they completely disappeared.⁵⁴ In Rhesaina, in turn, coins with a priest and oxen supplant local motifs in the age of Trajan Decius; in addition, they also have Greek inscriptions (RPC IX 1576–1581) (Pl. 2, Fig. 10), but the abbreviation of legion is always presented in Latin: CЄΠ KOΛ PHCAINHCIΩN L III P⁵⁵. As has already been mentioned with regard to the centers that were not colonies (Tralles, Assorus) but where such coinages were struck, they were supposed to indicate that the settlers had come from Italy. Cities like Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, or Rhesaina were only supposed to receive the title COLONIA.⁵⁶ However, the depiction of the foundation ceremony, which was often combined, for example, with legionary emblems, could indicate that veterans did in fact settle in the cities mentioned.⁵⁷ In these cases, coinages with

⁴⁹ FILGES 2015: 76.

⁵⁰ HEUCHERT 2005: 32.

⁵¹ LUCHELLI 2017: 55–74.

⁵² BURSCHE, MYZGIN 2017: 250.

⁵³ MILLAR 2006: 164–165, 186, 198; KATSARI and MITCHELL 2008: 242.

⁵⁴ HIRT 2015: 194–196.

⁵⁵ CASTELIN 1946: 70–71.

⁵⁶ MILLAR 2006: 165; KATSARI and MITCHELL 2008: 242.

⁵⁷ DĄBROWA 2012: 33.

the *sulcus primigenius* naturally constitute a minority among coinages with a local character, but one cannot disregard their significance in the context of the colonists maintaining Roman traditions.

LUPA ROMANA

We have already made mention in a few places of the she-wolf (*Lupa Romana*), which should also be considered a foundation myth. Of course it is not directly tied to any given colony but refers to the beginnings of Rome, on which the colonies were modeled.⁵⁸ Just as the “foundation type” model remained practically unchanged throughout the entire period of provincial minting,⁵⁹ so too the *Lupa Romana* was depicted in one version.⁶⁰ Much like the founder with the oxen, the she-wolf was depicted above all on coins from the colonies or from places in which the Romans had relocated the population.⁶¹ Of course, the use of this motif symbolized the *Romanitas* of the inhabitants of the colony.⁶² It is worth noting, however, that this monetary type appeared more often on coins as of the middle of the 2nd century. With regard to earlier issues, one could mention the coins – struck during the age of Augustus – in Apamea (RPC I 2009) (Pl. 2, Fig. 11) and in Italica (RPC I 62). As of the age of Hadrian, the she-wolf appears on coins in Lystra (RPC III 2823) and in Sinope (RPC III 1228). We can see an interesting example in the colony that was established in Jerusalem just before the Bar-Kokhba revolt, that is, Aelia Capitolina. Here, from the very beginning, coins with an exceptionally Roman character were struck; as of the age of Antoninus Pius, the motif of the she-wolf was also used (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 6405).⁶³ In this case, it would seem that coins with iconography rooted in Rome were not only used to indicate the Roman descent of the colonists but also to remind the autochthonous population of the new political situation. Further issues with the *Lupa Romana* appeared in Patras (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 9473) and in Antioch in Pisidia (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 3971) as of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and in Ninica as of the reign of Commodus (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 9554). The she-wolf with twins was also juxtaposed with Tyche, the temples of Dea Syria, and Mount Gerizim on an issue of Neapolis (RPC IX 2171) (Pl. 2, Fig. 12).⁶⁴ This composition manifests the integration of Greco-Semitic origins and Roman influences.

⁵⁸ HOWGEGO 2005: 15.

⁵⁹ DĄBROWA 2012: 33.

⁶⁰ PARISI 2000: 30.

⁶¹ DĄBROWA 2004a: 479–483.

⁶² RISSANEN 2014: 340.

⁶³ KADMAN 1956: 54–55.

⁶⁴ BELAYCHE 2009: 172–173.

The she-wolf became a particularly popular motif as of the end of the 2nd century not only in the colonies but also in the provincial centers (Alexandria, Ilium, Ephesus), where this depiction was supposed to manifest loyalty towards Rome.⁶⁵

AENEAS MYTH

Besides these two foundation myths, a third also appeared, one taking us back to the origin of the Romans, that is, Aeneas' escape from Troy. The custom was to depict this scene at the moment when Aeneas is carrying his father, Anchises, on his back while at the same time holding his son, Ascanius, by the hand. This image was very popular as of the age of Augustus (Virgil described it in the *Aeneid*⁶⁶), who saw the beginnings of his family in the fruit of Anchises' relationship to Aphrodite, that is, in the person of Aeneas.⁶⁷ The statue of Aeneas carrying Anchises appeared in, among other places, the Forum of Augustus.⁶⁸ Of course the colonies that imitated Rome also made use of this scene; for example, it appeared on the altar from Carthage, which was rebuilt by Julius Caesar as *Colonia Iulia Concordia Karthago*.⁶⁹ Mention has already been made of the coin from Berytus depicting this scene; it was a singular issue struck during the age of Elagabalus (SNG Cop. 119) (Pl. 1, Fig. 6). Apamea also emphasized its ties to Rome by depicting this myth on its coinage during the age of Hadrian (RPC III 1032).⁷⁰ This motif also appeared later on the colonial coins in Corinth (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 5152) during the age of Marcus Aurelius, and during the age of Commodus they appeared in Patras (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 4623). It is worth emphasizing that coins with this scene were struck in the *municipium* Coela (RPC IX 165); unsurprisingly, they were also struck in Ilium (RPC III 1577) and in Dardanus (RPC III 1566). As Troy's heir, Ilium – as well as the neighboring cities of Dardanus and Coela – made use of this myth to indicate that the ancestor of the Roman emperors descended from their lands.⁷¹ However, with regard to the colonies, it can be seen that this legend was not only used by Berytus, which was strongly Romanized, but also by Corinth, which had a mixture of cultures. The scene of Aeneas carrying Anchises and leading Ascanius by the hand was significantly more popular in Roman art than the so-called foundation scene, as a result of which it cannot be regarded as being particular to the Roman colonies.

⁶⁵ RISSANEN 2014: 340.

⁶⁶ Verg. *Aen.* II 709–710.

⁶⁷ ZANKER 1991: 45; SQUIRE 2015: 163.

⁶⁸ BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998: 333; SQUIRE 2015: 162.

⁶⁹ BEARD, NORTH and PRICE 1998: 335.

⁷⁰ MAREK 2009: 43.

⁷¹ HOWGEGO 2005: 6.

OTHER ROMAN MOTIFS

Besides the three motifs on colonial coinage that have been discussed here, a few other motifs of a Roman character were also used. Of these, the most frequent were legionary emblems (the *vexilla* and the *aquillae*); sometimes they were depicted along with the legionary numbers. These include the Roman numeral III on coinage from Rhesaina (e.g. Castelin 9) (Pl. 2, Fig. 14), as a result of which we can be sure that it was veterans of the *legio III Parthica* who settled this colony.⁷² There are a few cases in which a *vexillum* appears on foundation-type issues; here, they constitute a kind of background for the ceremony already discussed, as on the coins from Tyre.⁷³ Legionary symbols commemorated the military past of the colonists. This memory had to be exceptionally strong since coins with these emblems were struck up until the final stages of provincial coinage.⁷⁴ In Berytus, the first coins of this type already appeared during the age of Augustus, and the last issues were struck during the age of Gordian III. In turn, in neighboring Heliopolis – which, as part of a punishment against Berytus for its having supported Pescennius Niger, was made an independent colony – reference was still being made to the same legions in the age of Philip the Arab.⁷⁵ In contrast to the foundation type or the she-wolf, legionary symbols cannot be combined with the mythological sphere but only with that of history; still, they too revealed the Roman nature. It should be added that in contrast to the symbolic depiction of the scene in which the city's boundaries were marked out, these coinages referred to the real founders of the colony.

The remaining motifs that appeared on coinages were the images of Marsyas, Roma, or the genius of the colony. Even though the Roman character of these images is not open to doubt, they cannot be understood as foundation myths. While it is true that statues of Marsyas were supposed to stand in the colonial forums and that they were supposed to be placed on coins as a sign of these colonies' freedom as well as the fact that they had *Ius Italicum*,⁷⁶ they are not tied directly to the foundation of these colonies. Still, Marsyas does emphasize once again the colonies' ties to the capital on which they were modeled, as Theodor Mommsen has already noted.⁷⁷

An extraordinary depiction appeared on the coins of Philippi as of Augustus (RPC I 1650) (Pl. 2, Fig. 15) to Commodus (RPC IV (online temporary numbers) 4259). The reverses show two figures placed on bases, indicating that what we are dealing

⁷² DĄBROWA 2004b: 402.

⁷³ HIRT 2015: 193.

⁷⁴ PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 36, 65.

⁷⁵ OKAMURA 1988: 128.

⁷⁶ KLIMOWSKY 1983: 94–95, 98–99; KATSARI and MITCHELL 2008: 231; PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI 2004: 51.

⁷⁷ MOMMSEN 1887: 809.

with here are statues.⁷⁸ A figure in a toga crowns the head of a figure in a cuirass. In order to identify these figures, the legends turn out to be invaluable: DIVO IVL(io) and AVG(usto) DIVI F(ilius) (RPC I 1650). Julius Caesar crowns his nephew. This depiction may refer to the famous battle that took place nearby in the year 42, when Caesar's murderers were supposed to be defeated by Marc Antony and the young Octavian.⁷⁹ Grateful to his heir for having taken vengeance on his enemies, Caesar thus crowns him.⁸⁰ This representation of course must be treated as a myth. While it is true that Octavian fought at Philippi, his troops lost the battle, and he himself is supposed to have taken refuge in a marsh while Marc Antony achieved ultimate victory.⁸¹ As we know, it was Caesar's heir who ultimately attained complete control, and because he could not allow for a situation in which his rival was regarded as the winner of the battle at Philippi, a legend was created according to which it was the appearance of the divine Julius that led to the defeat of the Republicans.⁸² As a result, it was this famous battle that became the foundation myth of the colony at Philippi, and the scene depicted on the coins was supposed to indicate the victors of the battle.

The motive of a Capricorn present on Parium coins from the age of Augustus (RPC I 2263) to that of Gallienus (SNG von Aulock 1346) is indirectly connected to the colonial foundation. The Sea-Goat was the chosen sign of Augustus.⁸³ Because the Capricorn referred to Divus Augustus, we know that it was he who established Parium as a colony; in this way the founder was commemorated.⁸⁴

LOCAL FOUNDATION MYTHS

On the other hand, there were colonies that concentrated on the pre-Roman local foundation myths, renouncing the foundation type that was typically used. I will discuss these local myths in chronological order. Although the introduction mentioned that foundation myths became more popular in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, I shall first consider the examples of Buthrotum and Corinth, where there was a focus on the local tradition from the beginning (the 1st century BC). I will then analyze the rivalry between the Syrian colonies at the beginning of the 3rd century. In addition, the example of Mallus will illustrate the integration of local elements with those of Rome. The final paragraph describes the case of Iconium, in which the assimilation of the local tradition took place.

⁷⁸ KOORTOBOJIAN 2013: 137, 228.

⁷⁹ JELLONEK 2017: 52.

⁸⁰ KOORTOBOJIAN 2013: 137–138.

⁸¹ SYME 2009: 207–208; Plut. *Vit. Brut.* 4.

⁸² Val. Max. 1.8.8.

⁸³ Suet. Aug 94.

⁸⁴ FILGES 2015: 260.

The story of the foundation of Buthrotum is a fine example of a pre-Roman myth that fits exceptionally well into Imperial propaganda. The Trojan refugee Helenus founded the city of Buthrotum, which was later visited by Aeneas.⁸⁵ The sacrificial bull swam across the channel between the planned city and the peninsula where the eventual settlement was set up.⁸⁶ As a result, the animal was frequently depicted on Buthrotum coinage (e.g. RPC I 1378) (Pl. 3, Fig. 16); once, it was even depicted swimming across the channel (RPC I 1399). Furthermore, Aeneas (or the genius of the city) is depicted with a Phrygian cap, raising a cup for a toast (RPC I 1380).⁸⁷

Corinth, which had a mixture of cultures, made use of its own rich mythology. Of course it is Bellerophon who takes the lead here. As the grandson of Sisyphus, the founder of Corinth, it was Bellerophon who played the role of the key hero in Corinthian iconography.⁸⁸ Bellerophon and Pegasus (RPC I 1116) (Pl. 3, Fig. 17) already appeared on coins during the classical age, and the colonists who came to Corinth at the emperor's wish placed this local hero with his winged horse on the reverse of their first coinage already in the year 44/43 BC.⁸⁹ As a result, it can be asserted that it was the aim of the colonists to continue the pre-Roman tradition as opposed to cutting themselves off from it, as was the case in other centers (in Berytus or in Antioch in Pisidia). In confirmation of this, it is worth adding that Corinth belonged to a Panhellenic union.⁹⁰ In later times, the reverses contained the whole gamut of local heroes, including Melicertes (RPC I 1162) or Isthmus (1164). However, dozens of demi-god heroes (including Opheltes and Hypsipyle (RPC III 130)) appear during the age of Hadrian on Corinth's copious issues, which just goes to prove the existence of a "Greek renaissance".

Local foundation myths also appeared in the so-called titular colonies in Phoenicia. Tyre, which received the status of a colony in AD 198, is the most significant example in which foundation myths were present on the coinage. From its very beginning, Tyre competed with the neighboring cities of Berytus and Sidon, making use of Cadmus.⁹¹ This son of Agenor, the king of Tyre, is supposed to have founded Thebes and given Europeans the alphabet.⁹² Dido was another founder – or rather, a foundress – associated with the founding of a city. On a coin of Julia Maesa, the queen of Carthage is depicted next to an altar; a city is in the process of being built in the background

⁸⁵ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.51; *Aen.* 3. 290–365.

⁸⁶ ABDY 2012: 91.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*: 92.

⁸⁸ AMANDRY 1988: 30.

⁸⁹ PAWLAK 2013: 149–150.

⁹⁰ SPRAWFORTH and WALKER 1985: 80.

⁹¹ HOWGEGO 2005: 6.

⁹² GRIMAL 1987: 172–173.

(Rouvier 2406) (Pl. 3, Fig. 18). The use of the images of these two founders of other splendid cities which have their origin in Tyre demonstrates the significance of this city against the background of its local competitors.⁹³ One should also add the myth about Europa, Cadmus' sister, who, abducted by Zeus and taken to Crete, gave birth to such dynasties as that of Rhadamanthus, Minos, and Sarpedon, becoming, as it were, the mother of Greek culture.⁹⁴ The myths of Dido (Rouvier 1602) (Pl. 3, Fig. 19), Cadmus (BMC236), and Europa (BMC 233) were also placed on the coins of Sidon – as mentioned above, Tyre's rival. The citizens of Tyre, however, did not stop there, striking, in addition, coins that referred to their own foundation. The ambrosial rocks, which were supposed to have been wandering around the world, were finally stabilized by Melqart, and it was on them that Tyre was supposed to have been founded – this was depicted on coins of Elagabalus (Rouvier 2411) (Pl. 3, Fig. 20) and Gordian III (Rouvier 2437). Furthermore another local hero Pygmalion was inscribed with Phoenician alphabet indicates on keeping local heritage⁹⁵. In this way, Tyre – as has already been mentioned – competed with its neighboring cities, emphasizing its eminent contribution to world history.⁹⁶ At the same time, as mentioned above, although *sulcus primigenius* only appeared sporadically, still, they were sometimes included on reverses, which demonstrates the capacity and desire to assimilate distant cultural memes. In effect, one can see the integration that was created between the colonists and the local population.

In times of Elagabalus Tyre temporarily lost the colonial status. Simultaneously Sidon became a colony⁹⁷. Abundant emissions were released under Elagabalus, presenting local heroes, which were connected also with Tyre. The rivalry between these cities are well documented and known e.g. from Bible, where Tyre is called as a daughter of Sidon⁹⁸. The Sidonians perceived themselves as the elder community than Tyre. The local tradition is juxtaposed with typical colonial issues (vexilla, Marsyas, *araturum* ritual) indicating on a recent colonial refoundation.

This integration is given testimony to by the issues struck in Mallus in Cilicia during the age of Severus Alexander (RPC VI 7157) (Pl. 3, Fig. 21) and that of Decius (RPC IX 1431–1433) in order to commemorate the city's attainment of the status of a colony.⁹⁹ The reverse depicts a scene in which the emperor, wearing a cuirass, gives a statuette of Marsyas to Tyche, who stands next to him. At the

⁹³ HIRT 2015: 196–197.

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*: 200.

⁹⁵ GITLER, BIJOVSKY 2002: 319–320.

⁹⁶ BUTCHER 2005: 152.

⁹⁷ HIRT 2015: 197.

⁹⁸ Isaiah 23.

⁹⁹ CALOMINO 2014: 204.

same time, the emperor holds the reins of two oxen. Amphilochus stands to the right and crowns the emperor with a laureate wreath. This scene no doubt refers to the colonial foundation in Mallus. The emperor symbolically guarantees freedom, by means of the statuette of Marsyas, to the city, which is represented by Tyche as the tutelary deity.¹⁰⁰ Amphilochus, who is the legendary founder of Mallus, crowns the emperor in a gesture of gratitude. The scene is completed by the oxen held by the ruler, for they bring to mind the foundation act. Thus, this depiction includes both motifs with a strictly Roman basis (the oxen, Marsyas) as well as ones from the local tradition (Amphilochus). In my opinion, the fact that they are combined in one syncretic scene shows the advanced degree to which both Roman and local elements had become integrated together.

A puzzling situation took place in Claudiconium (Iconium), which was inhabited by a double population¹⁰¹. During the age of Vespasian, the autochthons produced coins depicting the founder Perseus (RPC II 1608); the Greek legend on these coins read as follows: ΚΛΑΥΔΕΙΚΟΝΙΕΩΝ. At the same time, the colonists of Iconium struck Latin coins with the foundation scene (RPC II 1609); these were inscribed as follows: COL IVL AVG ICONI. The Greek issues never bore the foundation scene, though eventually, under Gallienus, the colonial coins intercepted the local tradition by presenting an effigy of Perseus on the reverse (SNG von Aulock 428) (Pl. 3, Fig. 22).¹⁰²

There are far away more local motives in colonial coinage (especially in 3rd century), however the author decided to present choice of types related anyhow to foundation myths. Therefore the local gods (eg. Diana Lucifera in Apamea, Iuno Pronuba in Comama) that are not directly connected with city's foundations are not mentioned here, still they play essential role in the identity of local and colonial communities and require further investigation that author plans to conduct.

CONCLUSIONS

The central themes of the coins of the Roman colonies referred to the three most important foundation myths of the Imperium Romanum. The first in the mythical chronology showed Aeneas together with his father and son leaving the walls of Troy. The next one illustrated the myth of the she-wolf, which fed Romulus and Remus. Finally, the third myth, the one that was most often placed on colonial coinages, depicted the foundation ceremony, referring to the foundation of Rome. It would appear that these motifs were supposed to indicate the cultural identity of the colonists and their future descendants while at the same time referring to

¹⁰⁰ BASSO, BUONOPANE 2010: 151.

¹⁰¹ MITCHELL 1979: 409–438.

¹⁰² FILGES 2015: 194.

their model, that is, Rome. These coins were struck throughout the entire period of provincial minting, that is, as of the late Republic to the middle of the 3rd century AD. However, as has been mentioned, coins with the “foundation ceremony” were most popular up to the middle of the 2nd century, while issues of the “she-wolf” or “Aeneas” type appeared more often as of the 2nd century. Naturally, these were not minted on a constant basis but only occasionally (as mentioned, sometimes an issue can be tied to the celebration of a colony’s birth). They were made use of as foundation myths, for besides Philippi as a place Octavianus victory, the remaining colonies could not allude to events to do with Rome which had taken place nearby. On the other hand, in some situations the pre-Roman tradition was alluded to, as was the case in Corinth or Tyre. In Berytus, as of the age of Trajan, Roman motifs accompany local ones, and during the age of Elagabalus the local foundation myth with Beroe and Poseidon also appeared (Pl. 2, Fig. 11). The commemorative issues from Mallus fully integrate Roman and regional elements.

It is important to highlight that besides the obvious differences between the Western colonies on the Iberian Peninsula (which stopped striking coins under Caligula) and the colonies of the Greek East, there are no essential discrepancies with regard to geography. Whether they were located in Macedonia or in Samaria, the processes by which the coinages evolved were similar, as mentioned above. In the 1st century, the colonies followed the colonial system, while in the 2nd century, probably under the influence of the Second Sophists and the “Greek Renaissance”, Hellenistic and local motives appeared. Eventually, in the 3rd century, the new colonies accepted some Roman foundation myths (*sulcus primigenius*, Aeneas, the she-wolf), at the same time accenting their own tradition.

We can see the discrepancies in the colonial types. Multicultural Corinth was totally different from Philippi, the coins of which maintained a strict Roman character. On one hand, the so-called titular colonies, which were established at the end of the 2nd century and in the 3rd century, used the Roman foundation types to show political loyalty and gratitude to the emperor. On the other hand, we can regard the depiction, with inscriptions in Latin, of the *aratum* ritual and legion standards as a clue that colonists truly did settle down in these colonies. The message from the coins seems to be insufficient to determine if the so-called titular colonies were in fact real settlements of Roman veterans.

The essential role in local identity plays also language. As it was mentioned a few times in the article the legends were commonly Latin, but there are at least ten exceptions where the legends were Greek¹⁰³. An unique case comes from Tyre,

¹⁰³ CASTELIN 1946: 47.

where Pygmalion used to be inscribed in Phoenician¹⁰⁴. Furthermore there are extraordinarily cases of bilingual legends. The abbreviation of *Legio III Parthica* was brought up in case of Rhesaena. In Mallus Greek obverse was juxtaposed with Latin reverse¹⁰⁵. However even in Latin inscriptions some Greek letters occurred. As an example, a coin of Sidon can be summoned with the reverse legend: COL AV[R PIA] METPO, CIA (BMC 255). The mistakes are frequent in the 3rd century and indicate on a poor level of engravers language skills.

As can be noted, reference was readily made in the Roman colonies to their Roman roots. The enduring memory of the past is striking. In a few cases, the descendants of the Roman colonists followed tradition even for almost three hundred years. However, as integration with the autochthonous population unavoidably proceeded, though the inhabitants of the colonies, to paraphrase the words of Greg Woolf,¹⁰⁶ remained Romans, for they continued to demonstrate their Roman descent, at the same time they became Greeks (as well as representatives of the local culture), adopting the local myths as their own.

ABBREVIATIONS

BMC = *British Museum Catalogue*.

Lindgren = KOVACS, F. 1985. *Ancient Bronze Coins of Asia Minor and the Levant from the Lindgren Collection*, Chrysopylon Publication.

RIC² = SUTHERLAND, C.H.V. 1984. *Roman Imperial Coinage* I, London.

Rouvier = ROUVIER, J. 1904. "Numismatique des Villes de la Phénicie: Tyre", *Journal International d'Archéologie Numismatique* 7: 65–108.

RPC I = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A., RIPOLLÉS P. 1992. *The Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. I. *From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC – AD 69)*, London/Paris.

RPC II = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A., CARRADICE, I. 1999. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. II. *From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69–96)*, London/Paris.

RPC III = AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. 2015. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. III. *Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian (AD 96–138)*, London/Paris.

RPC IV = HEUCHERT, V. and HOWGEGO, C. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. IV. *The Antonines*, Online Catalogue with temporary numbers.

RPC VI = CALOMINO, D., BURNETT, A. and MATTHIES, S. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. VI. *Elagabalus- Maximinus (AD 218–238)*, Online Catalogue with temporary numbers.

RPC IX = HOLSTEIN, A. and MAIRAT, J. 2016. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. IX. *Trajan Decius – Uranius Antoninus (AD 249–254)*, London/Paris.

SNG France = *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Cabinet des Médailles, Banque Nationale de Paris*, Paris.

SNG von Aulock = *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum Sammlung Hans von Aulock*, Berlin.

¹⁰⁴ GITLER, BIJOVSKY 2002: 317–324.

¹⁰⁵ CALOMINO 2014: 204.

¹⁰⁶ WOOLF 1994: 116–143.

REFERENCES

- ABDY, R. 2012. "Monuments, myth and small change in Buthrotum (Butrint) during the Early Empire". In: F. LOPEZ SANCHEZ (ed.), *The City and the Coin in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds*, BAR International Series, London: 91–101.
- AMANDRY, M. 1988. "Le Monnayage des duovirs corinthiens", *Suppléments au Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, vol. 15.
- AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. and RIPOLLÉS P. 1992. *The Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. I. *From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC–AD 69)*, London–Paris.
- AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. and CARRADICE I. 1999. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. II. *From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69–96)*, London–Paris.
- AMANDRY, M., BURNETT, A. 2015. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. III. *Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian (AD 96–138)*, London–Paris.
- BASSO P., BUONOPANE A. 2010. "Marsia nelle città del mondo romano", *Mediterraneo antico* 11: 139–159.
- BEARD, M., NORTH, J. and PRICE, S. 1998a. *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1. *A History*, Cambridge.
- BEARD, M., NORTH, J. and PRICE, S. 1998b. *Religions of Rome*, vol. 2. *A Source Book*, Cambridge.
- BELAYCHE, N. 2009. "Foundation myths in Roman Palestine. Traditions and reworkings". In: ROYMANS N., DERKS T. (eds.), *The role of Power and Tradition: Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity*, Amsterdam Archeological Studies 13: 167–188.
- BLANCO-PEREZ, A. 2015. "Colonia Iulia Concordia Apamea: Staying Roman, Becoming Greek", *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico*, vol. 111: 623–630.
- BRUNT, P. 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 BC – AD 14*, Oxford.
- BUSRCHÉ, A., MYZGIN, K. 2017. "Gold coins, Alexandria Troas and Goths", In: R. BLAND and D. CALOMINO (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Coinage in Honour of Andrew Burnett*. London: 232–258.
- BUTCHER, K. 2003. *Roman Syria and the Near East*, London.
- CALOMINO, D. 2014. "Bilingual Coins of Severus Alexander in the Eastern Provinces", *American Journal of Numismatics* 26: 199–222.
- CASTELIN, K. 1946. *The coinage of Rhessaena in Mesopotamia*, New York.
- DAȚBROWA, E. 2004a. "Lupa Romana sur les revers des monnaies des villes d'Asie Mineure (II–III s. après J.-C.)". In: W. HEFTNER and G. DOBESCH (eds.), *Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch*, Vienna: 479–483.
- DAȚBROWA, E. 2004b. "Le vexillum sur les monnaies coloniales (IIe–IIIe s. après J.-C.)", *Latomus* 63 (2): 394–405.
- DAȚBROWA, E. 2004c. "Roman Military Colonization in Anatolia and the Near East (2nd–3rd c. AD – The Numismatic Evidence)". In: G. SALIMERI, A. RAGGI and A. BARONI (eds.), *Coloniae Romane Nel Mondo Greco*, Roma: 211–231.
- DAȚBROWA, E. 2012. "Military Colonisation in the Near East and Mesopotamia under the Severi", *Acta Classica* 55: 31–42.
- DRAGANOV, D. 2007. *The Coinage of Deultum*, Sofia.
- ECKSTEIN, M. 1979. "The Foundation Day of Roman 'Coloniae'", *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 12: 85–97.
- FILGES, A. 2015. *Münzbild und Gemeinschaft: Die Prägungen der römischen Kolonien in Kleinasien*, Frankfurter Archäologische Schriften 29, Studien zu Münze und Geld in der griechisch-römischen Welt 2, Bonn.
- GOODMAN, M. 2005. "Coinage and Identity: The Jewish Evidence". In: C. HOWGEGO, V. HEUCHERT and A. BURNETT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford: 163–166.

- GITLER H., BIJOVSKY G. 2002. "The coins of Pygmalion from Tyre: A chronological sequence from Elagabal to Gallienus", *Numismatica e antichità classiche* 31: 317–324.
- GRANT, M. 1946. *From Imperium to Auctoritas*, London.
- GRIMAL, P. 1987. *Słownik mitologii greckiej i rzymskiej*, Wrocław.
- HINGLEY, R. 2005. *Globalizing Roman Culture*, London–New York.
- HIRT, A. 2015. "Beyond Greece and Rome: Foundation Myths on Tyrian Coinage in the Third". In: N. MAC SWEENEY (ed.), *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, Philadelphia: 190–226.
- HOLSTEIN, A. and MAIRAT, J. 2016. *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. IX, London–Paris.
- HOWGEGO, C., HEUCHERT, V. and BURNETT, A. (eds.) 2005. *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford.
- HOWGEGO, C. 2005. "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces". In: C. HOWGEGO, V. HEUCHERT, A. BURNETT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford: 1–17.
- JONES HALL, L. 2004. *Roman Berytus. Beirut in Late Antiquity*, Oxford.
- JELLONEK, S. 2017. "The Coins of Philippi: An example of Colonial Coinage". In: A. JURKIEWICZ, P. KOCZWARA, S. JELLONEK, and B. ZAJĄC (eds.), *Pecunia Omnes Vincit: The Coins as an evidence of Propaganda, Reorganization and Forgery*, Kraków: 51–61.
- KADMAN, L. 1956. *The Coins of Aelia Capitolina*, Michigan.
- KATSARI, C. and MITCHELL, S. 2008. "The Roman Colonies of Greece and Asia Minor. Questions of State and Civic Identity", *Athenaeum* 96: 221–249.
- KEPPIE, L. 1983. *Colonisation and Veterans Settlement in Italy 47–14 BC*, Rome.
- KINDLER, A. 1978. "Akko, A City of Many Names", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 231: 51–55.
- KLIMOWSKY, E. 1983. "The origin and meaning of Marsyas in the Greek Imperial Coinage", *Israel Numismatic Journal* 6: 88–101.
- KOORTOBOJIAN, M. 2013. *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications*, Cambridge.
- KREMYDI-SICILIANOU, S. 2005. "'Belonging' to Rome, 'Remaining' Greek: Roman Macedonia". In: C. HOWGEGO, V. HEUCHERT and A. BURNETT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford: 95–106.
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. 1959. "Monety Antiochii Pizydyjskiej", *Rocznik Muzeum Narodowego w Warszawie* 4: 239–280.
- KRZYŻANOWSKA, A. 1970. *Monnaies coloniales d'Antioche de Pisidie*, Warszawa.
- LUCHELLI, T. 2017. "Una nuova emissione di Commodo ad Alexandria Troas", *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica e Scienze Affini* 118: 55–75.
- LEVICK, B. 1967. *Roman Colonies in Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- MAC SWEENEY, N. 2015. *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, Philadelphia.
- MAGIE, D. 1950. *The Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton.
- MAREK, C. 2009. "Hellenisation and Romanisation in Pontos-Bithynia: An Overview". In: J. HØJTE (ed.), *Mithrydates VI and the Pontic Kingdom*, Aarhus: 35–46.
- MESHORER, Y. 1989. *The Coinage of Aelia Capitolina*, Jerusalem.
- MILLAR, F. 1993. *The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337*, Cambridge.
- MILLAR, F. 2006. *Rome, the Greek world, and the East III: The Greek world, the Jews, and the East*, Chapel Hill.
- MITCHELL, S. 1979. "Iconium and Ninica: Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 28: 409–438.
- MOMMSEN, T. 1887. *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. III. *Bürgerschaft und Senat*, Leipzig.

- OKAMURA, L. 1988. "Western Legions in Baalbek, Lebanon: Colonial Coins (A.D. 244–247) of the Philippi", *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 37: 126–128.
- PAWLAK, M. 2013. "Corinth after 44 BC: Ethnical and Cultural Changes", *Electrum* 20: 143–162.
- PARISI, C. 2000. *La Lupa Romana*, Rome.
- PAPAGEORGIADOU-BANI, H. 2004. *The Numismatic Iconography of the Roman Colonies in Greece and Local Spirit and the Expression of Imperial Policy*, Athens.
- PRICE, S. 2005. "Local Mythologies in the Greek East". In: C. HOWGEGO, V. HEUCHERT and A. BURNETT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford: 115–125.
- RISSANEN, M. 2014. "The *Lupa Romana* in the Roman Provinces", *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 65: 335–360.
- RIZAKIS, A. 1998. "Les colonies Romaines des côtes occidentales grecques. Population et territoires", *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 100: 599–617.
- RIZAKIS, A. 2009. "La Colonie de Patras en Achaïe Dans le Cadre de la Colonisation Augustéenne". In: E. GRECO (ed.), *Patrasso colonia di Augusto e le trasformazioni culturali, politiche ed economiche della Provincia di Acaia agli inizi dell'età imperiale romana. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Patrasso 23–24 marzo 2006*, Athens: 17–38.
- SCOTT, K. 1925. "The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus" *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56: 82–105.
- SISANI, S. 2014. "Qua aratrum ductum est. La colonizzazione romana come chiave interpretativa della Roma delle origini". In: J. PELGROM and D. STEK (eds.), *Roman Republican Colonization: new Perspectives from Archaeology and Ancient history: Papers of the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome* 62, Rome: 357–404.
- SPAWFORTH, A. and WALKER, S. 1985. "The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis", *The Journal of Roman Studies* 75: 78–104.
- SQUIRE, M. 2015. "Figuring Rome's Foundation on the Iliac Tablets". In: N. MAC SWEENEY (ed.), *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*, Philadelphia: 151–189.
- SYME, R. 2009. *Rewolucja Rzymska*, (trans. A. Baziór), Poznań.
- WEBSTER, J. 2001. "Creolizing the Roman Provinces", *American Journal of Archaeology* 105: 209–225.
- WEISS, P. 2005. "The Cities and Their Money". In: C. HOWGEGO, V. HEUCHERT and A. BURNETT (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Province*, Oxford: 57–69.
- WOOLF, G. 1994. "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40: 116–143.
- WOOLF, G. 2014. "Romanization 2.0 and its alternatives", *Archaeological Dialogues* 21: 45–50.
- ZANKER, P. 1991. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Michigan.

Author's address:

Szymon Jellonek
Institute of Archaeology, Jagiellonian University
11 Gołębia Street, 31–007 Krakow, Poland
e-mail: sjellonek@gmail.com

Translation: David Daniel

PLATE 1	Fig. 1. Caesar, Lampsacus, 45 BC, RPC I 2268; 22 mm, 7.8 g
	Fig. 2. Augustus, Emerita 27 BC – AD 14, RPC I 6; 29 mm, 13.5 g
	Fig. 3. Augustus, Patrae, AD 4–14, RPC I 1252; 20 mm, 6.5 g
	Fig. 4. Hadrian, Cremna, AD 117–138, RPC III 2805, 33 mm, 20 g
	Fig. 5. Nero, Ptolemais, AD 54–68, RPC I 4749, 25 mm, 12.8 g
	Fig. 6. Augustus, Pisidian Antioch, 27 BC – AD 14, RPC I 3531, 17 mm, 5.3 g
	Fig. 7. Trajan, Berytus, AD 98–117, RPC III 3845, 31 mm, 21 g
PLATE 2	Fig. 8. Elagabalus, Berytus, AD 218–222, BMC 184, 29 mm, 16.1 g
	Fig. 9. Augustus, Lystra, 25 BC – AD 14, RPC I 3539, 25 mm, 8.8 g
	Fig. 10. Trajan Decius, Rhesaena, AD 249–251, RPC IX 1579, 26 mm, 12.4 g
	Fig. 11. Augustus, Apamea, 27 BC – AD 14, RPC I 2009, 15 mm, 2.9 g
	Fig. 12. Trebonian Gallus, Neapolis, AD 251–253, RPC IX 2171, 27 mm, 12.7 g
	Fig. 13. Elagabalus, Berytus, AD 218–222, SNG Copenhagen 119, 25 mm, 10.4 g
	Fig. 14. Caracalla, Rhesaina, AD 211–217, Castelin 9, 20 mm, 4.5 g
PLATE 3	Fig. 15. Augustus, Philippi, 27 BC – AD 14, RPC I 1650, 26 mm, 9.9 g
	Fig. 16. Pseudo-autonomous, Buthrotum, 44–28 BC, RPC I 1378, 22 mm, 6.7 g
	Fig. 17. Caesar, Corinth, 44–43 BC, RPC I 1116, 23 mm, 9.2 g
	Fig. 18. Julia Maesa, Tyre, AD 218–222, Rouvier 2406, 29 mm, 13.2 g
	Fig. 19. Sever Alexander, Sidon, AD 222–235, Rouvier 1602, 26 mm, 12.8 g
	Fig. 20. Elagabalus, Tyre, AD 218–222, Rouvier 2411, 25 mm, 11.4 g
	Fig. 21. Severus Alexander, Mallus, AD 222–235, RPC VI 7157, 42 mm, 29.5 g
	Fig. 22. Gallienus, Iconium, AD 253–268, SNG von Aulock 428, 23 mm, 5.3 g

All illustrations from cngcoins.com.



1



2



3



4



5



6



7





8



9



10



11



12



13



14



15



16



17



18



19



20



21



22



