

**‘New Work on Hellenistic and Roman Galatia’**

***Terror Gallicus, Keltensieg, and Conflicting Perceptions of the Galatians*<sup>1</sup>**

**I. Traditional Views of the Galatians and Their History**

As compared to the rest of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, we are relatively well informed about the Celtic migration to the East. Driven by overpopulation and hunger, but also by lust for booty, Celtic bands seized the opportunity to attack Macedon, when Lysimachus had to confront Seleucus I near Corupedium in Western Asia Minor in 281 BC. The death of both kings encouraged further invasions. In his attempt to stop them, Ptolemy Ceraunus, the new ruler of Macedon, was killed in 279 BC. Immediately, the warlord Brennus gathered more than 200,000 warriors to intrude into central Greece. Their bloody traces can be followed all the way down to the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, where, under the lead of the Aetolians, the Greeks inflicted a terrible defeat upon them. In 278 BC, some splinter groups of the Celts crossed over to Asia Minor as allies of King Nicomedes I of Bithynia. After securing the throne to him, they oppressed the rich coastal cities for another couple of years.<sup>2</sup>

And as the prevailing (modern) narrative wishes us to believe, King Antiochus I eventually crushed the invaders in the so-called ‘Elephant Victory’ and settled them in the remote and arid hinterland of Phrygia. The Galatians remained ‘uncultivated barbarians’ for the next two and a half centuries, being little affected by the spread of Hellenic language or urban culture among their direct neighbours. Admittedly, they were hired time and again as mercenaries, but even as such they conspicuously remained in their tribal units, for they would do most efficiently by displaying their fear-inspiring wildness rather than by trying to fight in a disciplined phalanx.<sup>3</sup>

A vivid impression of their appearance and manners is conveyed by the 1<sup>st</sup>-century BC historian Diodorus.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Federico Santangelo for kindly inviting me to give this talk in the Lampeter research seminar (12/3/2009) and for making this preliminary version accessible for discussion to a broader audience. The paper strongly draws on two forthcoming conference papers (Seleukid Dissolution, Exeter, July 2008; Hellenistic Workshop: Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World, Waterloo, On., August 2008) and on some further work on Antiochus I Soter, which I have been conducting as a Feodor Lynen Visiting Scholar at the University of Exeter. Moreover, I have made use of my yet unpublished *Habilitationsschrift* on Galatian history (3<sup>rd</sup> century BC to AD 2<sup>nd</sup> century), which was accepted by the University of Trier in 2007.

<sup>2</sup> On the Celtic migration from the Balkans to Asia Minor, cf. Liv. 38.16; Memn. FGRIH 434 F 11 = Phot. 4.227b–228a (Henry pp. 63f.); Iust. 24.7f.; 25.2; Pausan. 1.4.5; 10.18.7; 10.19.4–12; Strab. geogr. 12.5.1. For a discussion of these sources, cf. Nachtergaele 1977; Tomaschitz 2002. Historical maps of Celtic movements and Asia Minor/Galatia are to be found in Belke 1984; Mitchell 1993; Strobel 1999; Koch 2007; Coşkun 2008a and 2008b (online).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. especially Stähelin 1907; Moraux 1957; Mitchell I 1993, 13–20; Tomaschitz 2002; Strootman 2005, 104–15. Different in many regards are the views of Strobel 1996, 1999 and 2002, on which see below.

<sup>4</sup> Diod. 5.29 (Translation: Loeb Library).

*“Some of them despise death to such a degree that they enter the perils of battle without protective armour and with no more than a girdle about their loins ... And when any man accepts the challenge to battle, they then break forth into a song in praise of the valiant deeds of their ancestors and in boast of their own high achievements, reviling all the while and belittling their opponent, and trying ... to strip him of his bold spirit before the combat. When their enemies fall, they cut off their heads and fasten them about the necks of their horses ... ”*

According to Sir William Ramsay, for long the most prominent scholar of the Galatians, they still earned their living as cattle-breeders, slave traders, and mercenaries, when Augustus decided to transform central Anatolia into a Roman province in 25 BC. The emperor’s noble aim allegedly was to civilize these barbarians, or, in Ramsay’s terminology, to “de-Gallicize” them. He had still experienced the British Empire on its height, and for him, a cultural mission of the Romans was so apparent that he thought his claim did not require confirmation by sources.<sup>5</sup> Although serious scholars nowadays tend to withhold from too outspokenly racist statements, Galatian historiography has ever been flourishing in continuing ancient common places of ‘the Barbarian’. Thus still in 1975, Ronald Mellors called the inhabitants of the *provincia Galatia* „little more than savages“.<sup>6</sup>

However, Stephen Mitchell, to whom we owe the completest account of Galatian history, has yielded much less to widespread bias and paid more respect to the multifarious sources. Avoiding moralistic judgements, he rather describes the conditions of migration and settlement as well as the development of social and political relations. But still, as long as ancient or modern authorities remain in unison, he tends to follow traditional views. In this, the approach of Karl Strobel differs radically.

## **II. *Terror Gallicus*, the Ideology of *Keltensieg*, and Karl Strobel’s Galatians**

Strobel claims that most ancient sources and modern accounts are seriously distorted by anti-Celtic bias. Notwithstanding a Hellenic disposition to denigrate non-Greeks, the conception of Celts as barbarians *par excellence* ultimately roots in the propaganda of their defeat: these instrumentalised their victories to enhance the legitimacy of their rule. After the

---

<sup>5</sup> Ramsay 1939, 202 and idem 1922, 176: „It was a means of unifying Galatia by hellenizing the province, and de-gallicizing the three tribes“. Cf. also idem 1900, 79–85 on barbarism, nomadism, and demography; and Stähelin 1907, 71, 103, according to whom the Galatians “nach alter grausamer Barbarensitte“ gemeuchelt hätten”, so that their defeat by Attalus I soon after 240 BC was a “Triumph der hellenistischen Kultur über die Barbaren”.

<sup>6</sup> Mellor 1975, 89.

triumph of the Aetolian League at Delphi in 279 BC, Hellenistic kings likewise styled themselves as ‘saviours’ of the civilized world, independent of how glorious their fight against the Celts had been. Their *Keltensieg* was then immortalised on coin imagery, in panegyric poetry, through sculptures exhibited in the most distinguished sanctuaries of the Greek world, and by means of cult rituals for the saviour-kings. These ancient ‘mass media’ not only brought the divine achievements to public awareness, but also shaped the contemporary and future imagination of the evil and mad nature of the Celts.

Most prominent are the monuments that the Attalids erected in their royal residence Pergamum and sponsored in Delphi, Athens, and Delos from the later 3<sup>rd</sup> to the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC.<sup>7</sup> Attalus I, after refusing to pay tributes to the Tolistobogii and defeating them repeatedly since 240 BC, assimilated his deeds to the mythical defeat of the Titans and Giants. Most famous is the Roman copy of the ‘Dying Galatian’.<sup>8</sup> Characteristic features are the golden torc, the moustache, and the shaggy hair dress, all of which are described in an ethnographic digression on the Celts by Diodorus. Art historians would also call attention to the pointed physiognomy of the face. But beyond these ethnic features, with his athletic body, the Galatian appears in heroic nakedness.

Probably to the same iconographic programme belonged the ‘Galatian Killing His Wife and Himself’, again preserved only as a Roman marble copy.<sup>9</sup> The very first – romantic – impression one may have is certainly misleading: the warrior is not suiciding himself, because he has found his wife death, but it has been himself who killed her by stabbing through her armpit – you see the blood stilling out of her right sleeve. Two alternative interpretations have been offered: Either the battle against Attalus was lost, and the Galatian wanted to save himself and his wife from slavery. Or we have before us another variation of the topic of Galatian lethal madness. The most impressive version of this kind is told by Justin. It is fitted into the context of a battle with Antigonos Gonatas which the Celts were facing.<sup>10</sup>

*“And when also the Gauls prepared themselves for the battle, they slaughtered cattle for the auspices; since their veils predicted heavy defeat and deletion, they were not seized by fear, but by madness, and hoping to expiate the threats of the gods by the*

<sup>7</sup> On their identification and interpretation, cf. now Schmidt-Dounas 2001, esp. 232–242 and 293–312.

<sup>8</sup> Museo Capitolino inv. no. 747. To my knowledge, the best photo is in Andreae 2001, pl. 47. It is accessible online in Coşkun 2006a, p. 5.

<sup>9</sup> The so-called ‘Ludovisi Group’. Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps inv. no. 8608. To my knowledge, the best photo is in Andreae 2001, pl. 46. It is accessible online in Coşkun 2006a, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Iust. 26.2.2: *Galli, cum et ipsi se proelio pararent, in auspicia pugnae hostias caedunt, quarum extis cum magna caedes interitusque omnium praediceretur, non in timorem, sed in furorem versi sperantesque deorum minas expiari caede suorum posse, coniuges et liberos suos trucidant, auspicia belli a parricidio incipientes.*

*slaughter of their kin, they butchered their wives and children, thus initiating the war with the murder of their kin.”*

At any rate, these Attalid Galatians were understood as despisers of death and masters of cruelty, though without vilifying them: in their heroic postures, they inspire fear and veneration at the same time. Their conqueror, in turn, deserved the highest praise. How importantly the Galatian victories figured in Pergamene propaganda, is also made clear in Polybius' necrologus on Attalus I.<sup>11</sup>

*„It is therefore appropriate to admire the magnanimity of the aforesaid, for he invested his means for nothing else than to achieve kingship; there is nothing greater or more beautiful which could be mentioned. / In the beginning, he not only strived for the abovementioned aim by benefits and favours towards friends, but also through deeds in war. / Namely, after defeating the Galatians, who then were the most cruel and belligerent people in Asia, he then declared himself king for the first time.“*

This way, the ideology of *Keltensieg* merged the Galatian and the barbarian into a single nature of savagery, thereby coining the imagination of generations to come. Such stereotypes were absorbed by the Romans, while fighting fiercely against the Gauls in Cisalpina until the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century. But their city had been sacked by Gauls already in 387 BC. The chieftain of the latter was allegedly called *Brennus*, as was the leader of the attack on Delphi. Later on, Caesar revived anti-Celtic prejudice in his *Commentarii de bello Gallico*.

In the face of such a powerful *Keltensieg* tradition, Strobel claims that the whole of Galatian history has been distorted and needs to be re-written. In his counter design, the Galatians were welcome within the Hellenistic World and struggled under the same conditions as other major players. Instead of booty, they primarily longed for new arable land; instead of driving off the indigenous people from their soil, they included them socially and culturally; after the “Galatization” of these Phrygians, the Galatians even became the promoters of Hellenization in Central Anatolia. And while Livy reports that the poleis and kings paid taxes to the Galatians, though so few in number, but horrifying the whole of Asia Minor, Strobel speaks of remuneration of services or gift exchange.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Polyb. 18,41,5–7: διὸ καὶ τοῦ προειρημένου ἄξιον ἀγασθῆναι τὴν μεγαλοψυχίαν, ὅτι πρὸς οὐδὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἐπεβάλετο χρῆσασθαι τοῖς χορηγίοις, ἀλλὰ πρὸς βασιλείας κατὰκτησιν, οὐ μείζον ἢ κάλλιον οὐδὲν οἶόν τ' ἐστὶν οὐδ' εἰπεῖν. / ὃς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐνεστήσατο τῆς προειρημένης ἐπιβολῆς οὐ μόνον διὰ τῆς εἰς τοὺς φίλους εὐεργεσίας καὶ χάριτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον ἔργων. / νικήσας γὰρ μάχῃ Γαλάτας, ὃ βαρύντατον καὶ μαχμώτατον ἔθνος ἦν τότε κατὰ Ἀσίαν, καὶ τότε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἔδειξε βασιλεύειν.

<sup>12</sup> Strobel 1994, 67–96; 1996, 10 (summary); 55–115; 263f.

Strobel's fresh (though partly cynical) approach combines a painstaking description of the Galatian landscape and archaeological fieldwork in Eastern Galatia with Celtic and Anthropological studies. It has indeed highly stimulated my own research. Consequences pertain to nearly every period and aspect of Galatian history – in many regards not even foreseen by Strobel himself. But it is apparent that the latter's contentions are repeatedly too sweeping, and they finally add up to a tendentious image of the Galatians. Hence, a critical re-examination not only of ancient and modern explicit statements, but also of their underlying premises is highly promising.

### III. Unity versus Diversity among Celts and Galatians

Complementary to the aforementioned discourses of the Galatians' position within Hellenistic Asia Minor, the notion of Celtic and more particularly Galatian identity has to be addressed as another key to a better understanding of Galatian history. The scope of this paper does not allow to enter into the heated debates of 'Celtoscepticists and Celtomaniacs'.<sup>13</sup> In this regard, I simply confine myself to disclaiming that linguistic criteria are still the safest to decide on a tribe's Celticity. I further mention only in passing that, on the one hand, we are mainly depending on Greek and Roman sources for the whole of Antiquity. On the other hand, tribal names are linguistically Celtic and thus at least partly transport in-group perspectives.<sup>14</sup>

For our concern, however, it is more important to confront ancient and modern terminology. The label *Celti* / *Keltoi* in its strict sense was limited to the Gauls in modern France, but was also applied more generally as a collective term for Northern barbarians including Germanic and even Scythian peoples.<sup>15</sup> Closer to the modern usage of 'Celts' was the Greek *Galatai* and the Latin *Galli* respectively: thus were called not only the Celts of Western and central Europe, but also the ones in Southern and Eastern Europe, whom the invaders of Asia Minor hailed from.

In contrast, modern accounts tend to limit the term 'Galatians' to 'Celts of Asia Minor' as an acknowledgement of a distinctive historical development. Myself, I even go one step further. I normally limit this ethnic to the Celts that occupied the region on both sides of the middle Sangarius bow and the middle Halys, or in other words within a circle of up to 200 km around Ancyra in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. While my narrow definition also includes their

---

<sup>13</sup> For a summary of the debate, cf. Koch 2007, 1–17.

<sup>14</sup> But it is difficult to decide in how far in- and out-group views coincide, mix up, or influence each other.

<sup>15</sup> Conspicuously, the term was not applied to the peoples of Britannia and Scotia (i.e. modern Ireland), whereas the Celtic-speaking inhabitants of the Iberian peninsula were called *Keliberioi*. Cf., e.g., Freeman 2001, 5–7; Koch 2007, 2–4.

descendants, I am more hesitant with other Celts attested elsewhere in Hellenistic Anatolia, as long as no direct links to the core of Galatia can be established. I thus exclude the Aegosages whom Attalus I had recruited as mercenaries in Eastern Europe, and likewise the Rhigosages who served Antiochus III. The three most important tribes which alone maintained their political autonomy down into the Roman Empire, are the Tolistobogii in the West, the Tectosages in the centre, and the Trocmi in the East. Other Galatian tribes had either been absorbed by their neighbours or got extinguished over time.

Next, ancient and modern accounts predominantly use the generic terms *Galli* / *Galatai* instead of the individual tribal names. Frequently, this was – or still is – due to ignorance of the appropriate names. But ideological motivations will also have played their rôles in distorting the representation of Celts. For to enhance the prestige of one's victory, claiming the defeat of '(the) Galatians' was more likely to inspire admiration among contemporaries than, e.g., that of '(the) Trocmi', since most individual tribal names would simply have meant little or nothing to a Hellenised or Roman audience.

The impact of such terminological imprecision is significant. For the lack of distinction – combined with the persistent cultivation of barbarian stereotypes – has repeatedly induced non-Celts to assume a cultural homogeneity among those 'barbarians'. Moreover, it is normally supposed that neighbouring Galatian tribes used to concert their military and diplomatic actions. While frequent cooperation among some Galatian tribes should not be denied, there is actually no unquestionable evidence for any action uniting all Galatians politically before the days of King Deiotarus in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC. But even for this later period, the testimony to a fragmentation of Galatian politics is much stronger.

#### IV. Deconstructing Strabo's History of the Galatians

My 'analytical' approach to 'the Galatians' has still to be confronted with the clear-cut description in Strabo's *Geography*, which forms the basis for nearly all modern views on the subject. Among other things, we learn about the closeness of the Galatian territories, the identity of language and customs, and their common origin: allegedly the Gaulish tribe of the (Volcae) Tectosages. Their political unity is illustrated more precisely by their subdivision into twelve identical subtribes plus a common assembly in the so-called 'Oak-Wood' (*Drynemeton*).<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Strab. geogr. 12.5.1–3 (566–568 C). – The notion of their unity seems also to be the explanation for the fact the believe that the Galatians "split up" into three tribes after their settlement in Asia Minor; cf., e.g., the Loeb translation of Liv. 38.16.4 (despite the original *cum tres essent gentes*); Maier 2000, 101 ("zerfielen die

Some of these assertions, however, appear to result from speculations on the onomastic material rather than being source-based facts. A closer analysis of Strabo's presentation will even demonstrate the deliberate schematism which he imposes on Galatian society and history. Inconsistencies not only arise by adducing independent authorities such as Memnon of Heraclea, who speaks of 17 tribal units and two supreme commanders for the year 278 BC, and Livy, who names four *reguli* and construes a geographical landscape different from Strabo's for 189 BC. But discrepancies also occur within the *Geography* itself.<sup>17</sup>

E.g., in his earlier treatment of Southern Gaul, Strabo has not yet mentioned the theory that all of the Eastern Galatians had derived from the Tectosages; instead, he supposed that the Tolistobogii and Trocmi stemmed from homonymous Gaulish tribes, which at the time of writing were extinct though. While neither of the explanations is likely to be true,<sup>18</sup> it is noteworthy that, in his Galatian chapter, the author has opted for a version that implies a higher degree of uniformity. This observation is closely linked with another deliberate choice: For the sake of insinuating homogeneity, Strabo only mentions the name of Leonnorius and suppresses the independent actions of Lutarius. But he must have known the latter from the same sources as the former. Instead, the reader is misled to deduce *\*Tolistobogius* and *\*Trokmus* as the names of Leonnorius' subordinate companions.

Most important for the assumption of a federal state with a common foreign policy is the geographer's description of the threefold tetrarchical constitution.<sup>19</sup>

*"The three tribes spoke the same language and differed from each other in no respect; and each was divided into four portions which were called tetrarchies, each tetrarchy having its own tetrarch, and also one judge and one military commander, both subject to the tetrarch, and two subordinate commanders. The council of the twelve tetrarchs consisted of three hundred men, who assembled at Drynemetum, as it was called. Now the Council passed judgment upon murder cases, but the tetrarchs and the judges upon all others. Such, then, was the organisation of Galatia long ago, but in my time the power has passed to three rulers, then to two, and then to one, Deiotaros ..."*

---

Kelten Kleinasien in die drei Stämme").

<sup>17</sup> Memn. FGrH 434 F 11.3 = Phot. 4.227b (Henry IV p. 64) = Tomaschitz 2002, T 50.3. And Liv. 38.18.3 on the Tectosages (conflicting with 38.15.15 and Polyb. 21.37.2 on the Tolistobogii); 38.19–23 on the Trocmi.

<sup>18</sup> The ethnogenesis of the Galatian tribes will probably always remain controversial. For different approaches, cf. Strobel 1996, 2002, and 2007; Darbyshire/Mitchell/Vardar 2000; Coşkun 2006a and 2006b.

<sup>19</sup> Strab. geogr. 12,5,1 (567 C): *τριῶν δὲ ὄντων ἐθνῶν ὁμογλώττων καὶ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐξηλλαγμένων, ἕκαστον διελόντες εἰς τέτταρας μερίδας τετραρχίαν ἐκάσθην ἐκάλεσαν, τετράρχην ἔχουσιν ἴδιον καὶ δικαστὴν ἓνα καὶ στρατοφύλακα ἓνα ὑπὸ τῷ τετράρχῃ τεταγμένους ὑποστρατοφύλακας δὲ δύο. ἢ δὲ τῶν δώδεκα τετραρχῶν βουλὴ ἄνδρες ἦσαν τριακόσιοι, συνήγοντο δὲ εἰς τὸν καλούμενον Δρυνέμετον. τὰ μὲν οὖν φονικά ἢ βουλὴ ἔκρινε, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα οἱ τετράρχαι καὶ δικασταί. πάλαι μὲν οὖν ἦν τοιαύτη τις ἢ διάταξις, καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ εἰς τρεῖς, εἴτ' εἰς δύο ἡγεμόνας, εἴτα εἰς ἓνα ἦκεν ἢ δυναστεία, εἰς Δηϊόταρον.* (Translation: Loeb Library)

This constitution is said to go back to the times prior to the migration. Even if we neglect the complete isolation of this allegation among the ancient sources, and likewise avoid general concerns about the stability of the posited system,<sup>20</sup> it is, again, Strabo himself who causes suspicion: he seems to presuppose the existence of only a single ruler of the whole Tolistobogii in a previous chapter. And only the latter view finds support in epigraphic documents.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the entire evidence outside the *Geography* suggests that the tribes were ruled monarchically throughout the Hellenistic period. Accordingly, the elite is designated as *basileis* in Greek or *reguli* in Latin texts related to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC, thus coming close to the Celtic *riges* (i.e. ‘chieftains’) well known from Europe but indirectly attested in Galatian onomastics as well.<sup>22</sup>

In contrast, the title of *tetrarchēs* lacks any relevant parallel in the Celtic world, despite repeated claims to the opposite.<sup>23</sup> In Anatolia, it appears no earlier than around 100 BC, but even then it does not imply a limitation of the ruler’s power by any other Galatian official or institution. Most probably, it was Mithridates VI Eupator of Pontus who bestowed this label on four (not twelve) rulers of four (not three or twelve) thitherto autonomous Galatian tribal units.<sup>24</sup> Designed as a means to control central Anatolia, the title outlived its creator after the downfall of Pontus. Its survival was owing to its confirmation by the Romans. And only in the 40s BC, it emancipated itself from its etymological reference to four territories, whereupon the Romans declared ‘tetrarchs’ also non-Galatian Eastern dynasts.

## V. Three intermediate conclusions

1) Whether or not one is prepared to follow my alternative view of Galatian constitutional history, Strabo’s sketch may at best have been close to reality for a very limited period. It can no longer be regarded as the institutional background to assumed common activities of the Galatians throughout the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries BC – even less so, since the geographer himself

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Coşkun 2004, although I withdraw my previous view that the Galatian tetrarchy was introduced by Pompey, see below.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. in particular RECAM II 188. – Beyond this, note that Strabo assigns his constitutional sketch to a vague past: *πάλαι μὲν οὖν ἦν τοιαύτη τις ἡ διάταξις ...*

<sup>22</sup> For names like *Aioiorix*, *Gaizatorix*, *Sinorix*, cf. Freeman 2007.

<sup>23</sup> Scholars as Mommsen 1884, 316, 319f.; Birkhan 1997, 141; Strobel 1999, 335f. and idem 2002, 273–278 refer to a few Celtic polities structured in four units. However, these examples are purely coincidental, for examples of a two-, three-, or fivefold structure could easily be adduced. But what is more, there is no evidence that the rulers of such subunits bore titles explicitly referring to the fourth part of any whole. As appears from his longish rejection of my ideas (Coşkun 2004), Strobel 2007, 391–396 (followed by Radt 2008, 415 without discussion) has not even understood the point of this and of other arguments. – Strabo’s description is generally accepted; cf. also, e.g., Maier 2000, 101; Bringmann 2002; Meid 2007, 52.

<sup>24</sup> He was in the position to do so upon occupying their territories in 107/102 BC. Cf. Iust. 37,4,6: *nec territus minis Galatiam quoque occupat*.



attributes only juridical powers to the council of the Drynemeton.

2) We should allow for much more autonomy and diversity of diplomatic affiliations among the Eastern Celts in general, and the Galatians in particular. If, over time, they did develop a sort of common identity, that was surely less to their common language and the likeness of other cultural features rather than to massive military and political pressures.

3) Whenever we thus read ‘(the) Galatians’ in ancient and (most) modern accounts on Anatolia, we are well advised to translate into “(members of) one or more of the Celtic or Galatian peoples living in Asia Minor”.

Up until now, we have prepared the ground to address several other historical problems. I shall now choose three examples – relevant not only to current Galatian disputes, but also to more complex issues of the Graeco-Roman World.

## VI. Antiochus I and His ‘Elephant Victory’

The so-called ‘Elephant Victory’ that Antiochus I reportedly inflicted on the Galatians has already been mentioned in the introduction. Mid-20<sup>th</sup>-century scholarship mostly dated the battle prior to the First Syrian War, i.e. to 276, 275, or 274 BC.<sup>25</sup> This view was strongly supported by the bulk of the inscriptions attesting Galatian oppression in Western Asia Minor between 277 and 75 BC. Beyond this, there are indications that Antiochus, after coping with the Syrian upheaval in the early 270s, took swift action against the Galatians.

In 1971, however, an inscription was found in Laodicea on the Lycus which attests an ongoing or at least very recent “Galatian war” (*polemon ton Galatikon*) as late as January 267 BC. In this conflict, peasants had been kidnapped and ransomed later on. The majority of scholars now follow Michael Woerrle in dating the ‘Elephant Victory’ to 269 or 68 BC.<sup>26</sup> Wörrle’s complex argument depends on the following explicit or implicit premises: 1) that the Galatians were united in their fight against Antiochus – which is doubtful; 2) that he inflicted a crushing defeat on them – the evidence for which is weak (see below); 3) that the same ‘victorious’ king had remained inactive or completely failed on the Western battlefields for around a decade – which is questionable; 4) that, after his victory, he was mainly responsible

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf., e.g., Tarn 1926, 157 and idem 1930, 451; Otto 1928, 22ff.; Moraux 1957, 73 n. 47; Habicht 1970, 84 n. 3; Bengtson 1977, 403. Cf. already Wellmann 1894, 2453 (278/75 BC), and still Strootman 2005, 116 (though referring to Wörrle in n. 58); Maier 2000, 102; Meid 2007, 49. Others, as Stähelin 1907, 12–14, dated to around 270 BC.

<sup>26</sup> Wörrle 1975, 59–72, esp. 65–69. He is followed, e.g., by Heinen 1984, 423; Mitchell I 1993, 18; Ma 1999/2002, 34 (although he regards a first phase of havoc finished by 275 BC); Tomaschitz 2002, 166; Ameling 2002, 762. Strobel 1996, 257f. insists in summer or autumn 268 BC.

for the eventual assignations of their remote dwelling places – which is contradicted by the entire evidence; 5) that the same battle entailed their long-lasting obedience to the Seleucids – which, again, is neither attested nor plausible.<sup>27</sup>

But to Woerrle, his chronology seemed to be further corroborated by the cults established by some Ionian cities individually as well as collectively by their *koinon*, whereby his argument strongly depends on Christian Habicht's famous *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*. All of the cults are believed to have been dedicated in or after 268 BC to Antiochus I Soter, the 'Saviour', as he was also titled in the Seleucid dynastic cult.<sup>28</sup> But, again, most of the implications are at least difficult, if not implausible or simply wrong: 6) that the cult of the *koinon* was in fact to a Soter, which is possible, but nowhere attested; 7) that the divine honours were related to a Galatian victory, which is not even hinted at in the inaugural decree that has been preserved; 8) that the cults for an Antiochus Soter in Smyrna and Bargylia as well as for a King Antiochus in Teos and Erythrai were related to the one and same Antiochus I; and 9) that all four instances had been motivated by the 'Elephant Victory'.<sup>29</sup>

Re-Visiting the evidence for the Ionian cities, I have come to the firm conclusion that the cults in Smyrna and Bargylia were demonstrably dedicated to Antiochus II (who enjoyed several civic cults in Asia Minor), that the reference in Teos was in all likelihood to the *koinon* cult of Antiochus I, and that the document from Erythrai attests sacrifices to Antiochus III in the 190s BC. Hence there is no evidence for a local cult to Antiochus I in Ionia, while his divine *epiklēsis* of the *koinon* seems to have been *Basileus Antiochus*.<sup>30</sup>

Despite the authorities of Habicht and Woerrle, it appears that we have to do with an enormous accumulation of weak hypotheses. But I would like to stress that they are rooted in two widespread misconceptions: the unitarian view of the Galatians and the failure to understand the deep impact of the *Keltensieg* ideology on our sources.

The former has not only to be questioned on the basis of my general objections outlined above in sections III–IV. There are further indications that the Tectosages remained independent from the Tolistobogii and Trocmi, if not hostile to them. Moreover, they are attested to have oppressed in-land Anatolia, which Laodicea forms part of, whereas the

<sup>27</sup> For a more detailed discussion on the relationship between the Galatians and the Seleucids, cf. my forthcoming paper (as above, n. 1).

<sup>28</sup> The date of the establishment of the dynastic cult is highly controversial. Scholarly opinion varies between the aftermath of the 'Elephant Victory' and the 190s BC. This dispute cannot and need not be discussed here. Cf. the latest study by van Nuffelen 2004, who opts for 209/204 BC. But, as has been kindly indicated to me by Kyle Erickson, numismatic evidence may seem to imply its first inauguration by the time of Seleucus II at the latest.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. OGIS I 229 = I.Smyrna II 1.573 = Austin<sup>2</sup> no. 174, esp. l. 100.; Syll.<sup>3</sup> I 426, ll. 20–22 = I.Bargylia (=I.Iasos II) 608; CIG 3075 (Teos); IGR IV 1539 + 1759 = I.Erythrai II 207 (cf. also I.Erythrai I 31 = Welles RC 15 = Austin<sup>2</sup> no. 170); OGIS I 222 = I.Klazomenai (=I.Erythrai II) 504 = Austin<sup>2</sup> no. 169 (*koinon* decree). With Habicht 1970, 85–105 and Woerrle 1975, 70–72, followed, e.g., by Strobel 1996, 260f.

<sup>30</sup> For in-depth discussion on the cult history, cf. my forthcoming paper (as above, n. 1).

Tolistobogii raided the coast of Ionia and Aeolia. Beyond this, nothing hints at any hostile act by the Galatians between 274 and 269, although Antiochus and his cities were most vulnerable during the so-called First Syrian War (274–271 BC). To insist in the unity of the ‘Galatian war’ under these circumstances lacks any plausibility.

As to the latter, no less than premises 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 have been influenced by the Seleucid propaganda of a *Keltensieg*. After all, our notion of Antiochus’ victory mainly depends on two AD 2<sup>nd</sup>-century authorities: Lucian and Appian. The sophist of Samosata offers the most prolific, but highly phantastic description of the battle: Antiochus is said to have confronted a phalanx of 40,000 Galatians with only a small fraction of this number, and that even rashly recruited, but he won thanks to sixteen elephants.<sup>31</sup> The historian from Alexandria only offers a single summary statement. He claims that the king gained the title of *Sōtēr* (‘Saviour’) “by expelling the Galatians that had set over to Asia from Europe”: while the elephants remain unmentioned, the completeness of the victory is indicated by the expulsion of the invaders. The enemies do not appear to have been driven off from Western Asia Minor to central Anatolia, as scholars tend to harmonise the allegation with the conflicting facts, but from the Asian continent as a whole – which is blunder.<sup>32</sup>

Thanks to the Byzantine encyclopedia of Suidas, we are in the position to name the poet Simonides of Magnesia as one of the spin-doctors of the panegyric tradition exalting Antiochus.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, one particular detail reported by Lucian, the construction of an elephant-shaped tropaeum, gains credence through a few terracotta figurines. The most prominent example found in Myrina shows an elephant trampling down a warrior clearly styled as Celt by his oval shield with a cross-formed boss and through his nakedness.<sup>34</sup>

In the end, the evidence seems to warrant the following: Antiochus personally conducted a battle against (some) Galatians, in which elephants were employed, and brought (some) relief to the Greek cities of Asia Minor, though rather thanks to costly diplomacy than to a skirmish. Antiochus thence was more effective in deploying his propaganda of victoriousness. To a Western audience, the king conveyed the additional message that he could always draw on the resources of his Eastern realm to re-establish his superiority. But when the First Syrian War broke out, a Syrian or Ptolemaic audience was meant to understand: beware that not even the

<sup>31</sup> *Zeuxis* 8–11. Cf. also the passing remark in his *Pro lapsu in salutando* 9. Cf. also the diverging commentaries by Mitchell I 1993, 18 n. 67 (“clearly largely phantastic”); Strobel 1996, 259 and Tomaschitz 2002, 165 on the value of this testimony; also Wörrle 1975, 71 n. 56.

<sup>32</sup> *Syriaka* 65.343: ὅς καὶ Σωτὴρ ἐκκλήθη, Γαλατὰς ἐκ Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐσβαλόντας ἐξελάσας. While this exaggeration has been explained with the later meaning of Asia, i.e. the Roman province of Asia, and this terminological ambiguity may in fact have contributed to Appian’s claim, it should not be overlooked that, by juxtaposing Europe and Asia, Appian actually insinuates that Anatolia was completely freed of the invaders.

<sup>33</sup> Suid. s.v. *Simonides of Magnesia*; cf. FGrH 183 F 1.

<sup>34</sup> Still the best picture known to me is to be found in Pottier/Reinach 1888, pl. X. It is accessible online in Coşkun 2006b, 4. For further figurines, cf. Mitchell I 1993, 18 n. 69; Strootman 2005, 117 n. 65.

most barbarious enemies on the outskirts of the Empire can withstand Antiochus!

## VII. *Amicitia populi Romani*: Rhetorical Façade or Reality? The Example of King Deiotarus Philorhomaesus

The next spotlight takes us down to the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC, and it provides me with an opportunity to mention the actual starting point of my Galatian studies: a Trier-based research project on Roman foreign relations, in particular on the notion of friendship within Roman diplomacy.

Classical scholarship has traditionally viewed *amicitia populi Romani* either in terms of *Völkerrecht* as a type of inter-state contract, or as a euphemistic label for crude hegemony. On the one hand, however, the Romans did not generally shrink from openly naming hierarchies; and, on the other hand, they insisted in calling their diplomatic partners – whether kings, cities, or other distinguished persons – ‘friends’. This observation led us to hypothesise that the choice of words would have had some impact on those relations. Without ignoring the asymmetric nature of such ‘friendships’, we still supposed that these would normally imply mutual benefits and encourage affectionate relations on a personal level, unless these very links had rather been the stimulus for establishing inter-state friendship.<sup>35</sup>

The Tolistobogian tetrarch Deiotarus has been a rewarding test case. Already in the 90s BC, he supported Sulla’s war against Cappadocia, and in the subsequent decades, he was Rome’s staunchest ally in the wars against Mithridates Eupator of Pontus. Nearly all of the Roman generals who fought in the East made friends with him, many lauded him before the Roman senate or on public assemblies. In 64 BC, Pompey raised him to kingship and presented him large parts of the former Pontic realm. With these resources, he was able to defend Asia Minor against further attacks from the Black Sea region or the Parthians. Inevitably, he got involved in the Roman Civil War, in which he sided with his most important benefactor Pompey. After the latter’s death, he had to make peace with Caesar, who renewed his older friendship bonds with the king, but stripped him of half of his realm nevertheless. Their relationship remained difficult. In 45 BC, Tectosagen rivals of the king hoped to get rid of him by accusing him of having plotted against Caesar.<sup>36</sup>

To a modern audience, Deiotarus is mainly known thanks to the speech that Cicero held in his defence. It is not only full of praise for the ally, but also expresses the latter’s deep

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf., e.g., Coşkun 2005 and 2008a; also Braund 1984; Burton 2003.

<sup>36</sup> The evidence is collected by Syme 1995, 127–136 and Coşkun 2005, 127–154.

affection for the Roman people and Pompey in particular. Among other things, Cicero explains:<sup>37</sup>

*“as the closest friend of this empire he was worried about the safety (or existence) of the Roman people, in which he saw included even his own”* (vir huic imperio amicissimus de salute populi Romani extimescebat, in qua etiam suam esse inclusam videbat).

Most modern judgements differ significantly from Cicero's. Marcel Lob, a French editor of the apology, characterises him as “sultan mi-grec, mi-barbare, intelligent sans doute, actif, courageux au combat, mais cupide, ambitieux, rusé, sans dignité, toujours aux côtés du plus fort, cruel jusqu'à la férocité et vindicatif au bord même de la tombe”. And further down: “de ce sultan mi-grec ... Cicéron a fait un vieillard doux et grave, noble, généreux, fidèle à l'amitié, même dans le malheur, et dévoué de toute son âme – on se demande pourquoi – aux seuls intérêts de Rome. César ... dut écouter sans rire ce panégyrique d'une outrance toute professionnelle”. Arnold Jones comments: “The history of Galatia for the twenty years which succeeded Pompey's settlement consists largely in the intrigues and murders of Deiotarus, who had set his heart upon ruling the whole country”. H. Willrich claims: „daß ... unter dem hellenistischen Firnis unverfälschtes, rohes Barbarentum lag“. Denis Saddington finds Deiotarus „certainly not a sympathetic character, nor could he be plausibly credited with laudable qualities“. Up until now, only Sir Ronald Syme has assessed the king worthy of a biography, which is limited to 10 pp. though. In the face of Deiotarus' deeds, the Australian scholar cannot but acknowledge some of his achievements and even his loyalty to Pompey, but on the whole, the view of a violent and unpredictable tyrant shines through repeatedly.<sup>38</sup>

Such judgements are, again, based on diffuse anti-Celtic resentments rather than on relevant sources. For even if one discards the above-quoted apology as tendentious, one can adduce many other testimonies. E.g., Cicero, as proconsul of Cilicia in 51 BC, was happy to send his son and nephew to the king's court into summer holidays.<sup>39</sup> And in a letter to the Roman senate, he praised the Tolistobogian as the single reliable ally of the Romans at the critical times of the Parthian threat.<sup>40</sup> Brutus is reported to have made a surprisingly

<sup>37</sup> Cic. Deiot. 11.

<sup>38</sup> Lob 1967, 95; Jones 1971, 118; Willrich 1944, 224; Saddington 1993, 92; Syme 1995, 127–36.

<sup>39</sup> Cic. Att. 5.17.3 (110 SB): *Cicerones nostros Deiotarus filius* (i.e. the son of Deiotarus Philorhomaeus), *qui rex a senatu appellatus est, secum in regnum; dum in aestivis nos essemus, illum pueris locum esse bellissimum duximus*; also Cic. 5.18.4 (111 SB) and Att. 5.20.9 (113 SB).

<sup>40</sup> Cic. fam. 15.2.2 (105 SB): *... ut Artavasdes, rex Armenius, quocumque animo esset, sciret non procul a suis finibus exercitum populi Romani esse, et Deiotarum, fidelissimum regem atque amicissimum rei publicae nostrae, maxime coniunctum haberem, cuius et consilio et opibus adiuvari posset res publica*; 15.4.5 (110 SB): *interea in hoc tanto motu tantaque exspectatione maximi belli rex Deiotarus, cui non sine causa*

emotional speech on behalf of his friend in 47 BC. A century later, Lucanus, in his epic *Pharsalia*, styles Deiotarus as the personification of friendship and loyalty, contrasting him with many others who had left Pompey after Caesar's victory in 48 BC. Interestingly, Plutarch, in the later 1<sup>st</sup> and early 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries AD, understands 'Galatian' as synonymous to 'barbarian', but whenever he speaks of Deiotarus, one has the impression that he regarded him as a wise and honourable man.<sup>41</sup>

But, gradually, the memory of the king's achievements for Rome vanished. Deiotarus somehow became the personification of pre-Roman Galatia, whereas the name of the country 'naturally' implied a hostile attitude towards the civilized world. This way, the anti-Celtic resentments returned into the narrative. E.g., in the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD, the Byzantine chronicler John Malalas describes the provincialisation of Galatia as a result of a war that Augustus fought against Deiotarus. And, in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, John Tzetzes writes: "This Ancyra that I am speaking of was, as I have discovered, founded by the Roman Octavius Caesar after killing Deitarus, the tetrarch of Galatia."<sup>42</sup>

These quotations nicely link up to our next spotlight:

### VIII. The 'Soft' Provincialisation of Galatia

With Amyntas, the last king of Galatia died in 25 BC. Instead of appointing a successor, Augustus imposed his rule on the whole realm which extended as far Southwards as the Pamphylian coast. In the next decades, other smaller territories which had been ruled by independent Galatian princes were attached to the province. My research in the latter's history has been motivated by the question why the first emperor did not continue the successful tradition of *reges amici populi Romani*. When I did not find a clear answer, I at least wanted to understand better what it actually meant in this specific case: to be transformed into a province.<sup>43</sup>

Recent scholarship has abandoned euphemistic ideas of civilizing missions. But they continue to assume an active policy of urbanisation, if only to facilitate the political control and the economic exploitation of a country. In the case of central Galatia, most historians see

---

*plurimum semper et meo et tuo et senatus iudicio tributum est, vir cum benevolentia et fide erga populum Romanum singulari, tum praestanti magnitudine et animi et consili, legatos ad me misit se cum omnibus suis copiis in mea castra esse venturum.* Also Cic. fam. 15.1.5f. (104 SB); Cic. Att. 5,18,2 (111 SB). On the critical situation, cf. further Cic. fam. 3.3.1; 8.5.1; 8.10.1; 15.1f. (66, 83, 87, 104f. SB); Cic. Att. 5.15.1; 5.18.1 (108, 111 SB).

<sup>41</sup> Plut. Brut. 4,3f.; Lucan. 8.202–43; Plut., esp. mor. 257e–258f. and Crass. 17.2 (not mor. 1049c).

<sup>42</sup> Ioh. Mal. Chron. 9,13 (Dindorf S. 221f. = Thurn S. 168 = Bosch 1967, no. 47); Ioh. Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 1.139 (Bosch 1967, no. 48).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Coşkun 2008a, 133–164; on the development of imperial Galatia, also idem 2008b, 2009a, 2009b.

the particular need to foster urban development, since the inhabitants are mostly considered to have conducted a nomadic lifestyle still in the late 1<sup>st</sup> century BC, if not well into the Christian era (though with the distinct exception of Strobel). Accordingly, common opinion holds that the Tolistobogii received Pessinus as their urban centre, the Trocmi Tavium, and the Tectosages Ancyra. The latter is also believed to have been raised to metropolitan status, hosting the residence of the *legatus Augusti pro praetore*. Further ‘essentials’ of provincial rule such as is the imposition of Roman tax or jurisdiction have likewise been taken for granted.<sup>44</sup>

In addition, several historians still favour the view that, from Augustus onwards, the establishment of a central cult for the Goddess Roma and the God Sebastos (i.e. Augustus) coincided. In fact, the Ancyran temple for these two divine powers appears to be the most impressive of all in-land Anatolia.<sup>45</sup> And the devotion of the Galatians to these is not only attested by a flow of inscriptions and coin imagery down until the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, but also by the honorific title the three tribes chose: with (or soon after) the inauguration of the cult, they obtained the privilege to call themselves ‘Sebastēnoi Tolistobogii’, ‘Sebastēnoi Tectosages’, and ‘Sebastēnoi Trocmoi’, the apposition meaning ‘Augustan’ or even ‘Devoted to Augustus’.<sup>46</sup>

Unfortunately, a closer look at the evidence once more drives me into ‘heresy’. A new analysis of the famous priest list inscribed on the left antae of the temple seems to enable us to date the inauguration of the cult exactly to 4 BC, the beginning of the construction of the temple to 2 BC, and the inauguration of the temple to AD 14.<sup>47</sup> For the time being, I am happy to draw on the authority of Stephen Mitchell: he formerly argued for the initiation of the cult under the first Roman governor and for the inauguration of the temple in 19 BC, but he is now considering to accept my suggestions with only minor changes. At any rate, this new chronology separates the inauguration of the cult from the provincialisation by 21 years and thus clearly speaks against any functional connection.

I was even more surprised to see that there is no trace of a noticeable urban development before the mid-1<sup>st</sup> century AD, when civic architecture and epigraphy came into broader use. Likewise missing is any reference to a governor’s acting or even residing in Ancyra before the reign of Hadrian, when the city’s title *metropolis* is attested for the first time. Moreover, the evidence for the merging of the Phrygian temple state of Pessinus and the Tolistobogian

<sup>44</sup> On the province of Galatia, cf., e.g., Ramsay 1900 and 1939; Bosch 1967; Halfmann 1986; Mitchell 1993, 2007, and forthcoming; French 2003; Strubbe 2005; Strobel 2007.

<sup>45</sup> Among the references in the previous note, cf. esp. Mitchell 2007. Still the best documentation of the temple is Krencker/Schede 1936.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. esp. the numismatic evidence which starts in or soon after AD 68: RPC I 3568–3570; II 1620–1622, 1624–1626.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Coşkun 2009a and 2009b.

tribe stretches from the late Augustan until the Trajanic period, thus mirroring a slow development rather than a clear-cut Roman policy.<sup>48</sup>

As it seems, urbanisation mostly resulted from the practical needs of the Parthian war, which was constantly fought or at least feared since the era of Nero: the movement of the legions to the Eastern frontiers encouraged road engineering through central Galatia and intensified agricultural production. This way, the growth of the focal point Ancyra as well as the foundation of several smaller towns throughout central Anatolia were fostered. And it was during the Parthian war of Trajan when the provincial boundaries were deeply re-shaped and perhaps other reforms – such as the imposition of a regular tax – were put into practice. Beforehand, the Galatians contributed to the empire by serving as a rich reservoir of soldiers.

As it seems, Augustus did not pursue a master-plan to civilise the Galatians or to interfere seriously with their traditional life styles, which had in fact been beneficial for the empire. I thus tentatively suggest to speak of an example of ‘soft’ provincialisation, though only for core-Galatia, while other parts of Amyntas’s realm, especially Pisidia, had to accept thousands of Roman veteran colonists.

## IX. Instead of a Summary: Re-Constructing the Galatian Past in the 4th-Century AD

I want to conclude this paper with another late antique retrospective on the Galatians: In AD 383, the philosopher Themistius had to address the emperor Theodosius on behalf of the Senate of Constantinople. The main difficulty was to gloss over the weakness the emperor had shown by paying a high price to pacify the Goths. The orator therefore praises the mildness and prudence of Theodosius for finishing a deleterious war. Instead of replenishing Thrace with even more dead bodies, he had won new colonists to cultivate the soil.<sup>49</sup>

Next, Themistius continues with a historical example:<sup>50</sup>

*“Just look at the Galatians at the Pontus! They carried over to Asia under the law of war and, having driven away everything west of the Halys, they stayed in this land which they now inhabit. And neither Pompey nor Lucullus annihilated them, although*

<sup>48</sup> For the evidence, cf. – beside the references in nn. 43f. – esp. Devreker 1984; Belke 1984; Bennett 2003; Arslan 2004.

<sup>49</sup> For Themistius and the historical context, cf. Vanderspoel 1995, esp. 204–208.

<sup>50</sup> Themistius, *Oratio* 16, § 19 (211c-d): ἀλλ' ὁρᾶτε τουτουσὶ Γαλάτας τοὺς ἐπὶ Πόντῳ. οὗτοι μέντοι πολέμου νόμῳ διαβάαντες εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐντὸς Ἰλίου ἀναστήσαντες ἐγκατέμειναν ταύτῃ τῇ χώρῃ, ἣν νῦν κατοικοῦσι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξέτριψεν αὐτοὺς Πομπήιος οὐδὲ Λούκουλλος, λίαν ἐξόν, οὐδὲ ὁ Σεβαστὸς οὐδὲ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν αὐτοκράτορες, ἀλλὰ ἀφέντες τὰ ἀδικήματα ἐν μέρει τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐποιήσαντο. καὶ νῦν οὐκέτι βαρβάρους Γαλάτας ἂν τις προσείποι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ Ῥωμαίους· τοῦνομα γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ πάλαι παραμεμένηκεν, ὁ βίος δὲ σύμφυλος ἤδη. καὶ εἰσφέρουσιν ὥς ἡμεῖς εἰσφοράς καὶ στρατεύονται ὥς ἡμεῖς στρατείας καὶ ἄρχοντας δέχονται ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ νόμοις τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὑπακούουσιν. οὕτω καὶ Σκύθας ὀφόμεθα ὀλίγου χρόνου.



*this would have been possible easily, nor Augustus or any of the Emperors after him, but, instead, they dispensed with their atrocities and made them a part of their empire. And no-one still addresses the Galatians as barbarians nowadays, but even as genuine Romans. Although their old name remained with them, their way of life already is akin (to ours). Like us they pay taxes and like us they serve in the army, like all the others they receive magistrates and obey the same laws. Thus we shall soon see also the Scythians.”*

To draw on Lucullus, Pompey, or Augustus as examples for mercy is a-historical, because they had not fought against the Galatians but rather owed them their military success to a significant extent. Moreover, it is anachronistic sweepingly to purport that provincial rule was welcomed as a benefit already in the days of Augustus. Apparently, the previous misdeeds of the Eastern Celts had occupied a more prominent position in the collective memory of the Hellenised world than the later services of the Galatians as friends and allies of the Roman people and as loyal subjects to the emperor respectively.

This retrospective not only marks the beginning and the end of my studies on the Galatians, i.e. their violent intrusion into Asia Minor, their inclusion into the Hellenistic power games, their incorporation into the Roman Empire, and the final normalisation of their provincial status. The same passage nicely exemplifies the persistence of anti-Celtic resentments and their flexible instrumentalisation in political propaganda. And last not least, this Themistian version of the Galatian past once more illustrates how useful Galatian histories may be to teach students a basic but never trivial lesson: that all history is construction.

### **Select Bibliography**

- Ameling, Walter: Antiochus [2.] I. Soter; Antiochus [3.] II. Theos, Brill's New Pauly I, 2002, 762.  
Andrae, Bernard: Skulptur des Hellenismus. Aufnahmen A. Hirmer / I. Ernstmeier-Hirmer, München 2001.  
Arslan, Melih: The Coinage of Ancyra, Ankara 2004.  
Belke, Klaus: Tabula Imperii Byzantini, Bd. 4: Galatien und Lykaonien. Mit Beiträgen von Marcell Restle, hg. von Herbert Hunger, Wien 1984. (TIB IV)  
Bengtson, Hermann: Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit, Munich <sup>5</sup>1977.  
Bennett, Julian: Ancyra, *Metropolis Provinciae Galatiae*, in: Pete R. Wilson/ John S. Wachter (eds.): The Archaeology of Roman Towns, Oxford 2003, 1–12.  
Birkhan, Helmut: Kelten. Versuch einer Gesamtdarstellung ihrer Kultur, Wien <sup>2</sup>1997.  
Bosch, E.: Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum, Ankara 1967.  
Braund, David: Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of the Client Kingship, London 1984.  
Bringmann, Klaus: Tetrarches, Tetrarchia (I./III.), DNP 12.1, 2002, 196–199.  
Burton, Paul J.: *Clientela* or *Amicitia*? Modeling Roman International Behavior in the Middle Republic (264–146 B.C.), Klio 85.2, 2003, 333–69.  
Coşkun, Altay: Die tetrarchische Verfassung der Galater und die Neuordnung des Ostens durch Pompeius (Strab. geogr. 12,5,1 / App. Mithr. 560), in: Herbert Heftner/ Kurt Tomaschitz (eds.): *Ad fontes!* FS für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004b, Wien 2004, 687–711.

- idem (ed.): Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat, Göttingen 2005, esp. idem: *Amicitiae* und politische Ambitionen im Kontext der *causa Deiotariana*, pp. 127–54.
- idem (2006a): Das antike Galatien und die prägende Kraft der Bilder. Presentation on the *Habilitandenforum* of the 46th *Deutscher Historikertag*, Konstanz, 20.09.2006. URL: <http://www.uni-konstanz.de/historikertag/download/habilitandenforum-coskun.pdf>.
- idem (2006b): Intercultural Onomastics and Some Patterns of Socio-Political Inclusion in the Roman World. The Example of Galatia in Asia Minor, NIO-Ga-Ro 2006.1: <http://www.uni-trier.de/index.php?id=21749>.
- idem (ed.) (2008a): Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer (2. Jh. v.Chr.–1. Jh. n.Chr.), Frankfurt a.M. 2008, esp. idem: Das Ende der ‚romfreundlichen‘ Herrschaft in Galatien und das Beispiel einer ‚sanften‘ Provinzialisierung in Zentralanatolien, pp. 133–164 (with maps 3–4).
- idem (2008b): Interkulturelle Ortsnamen in Zentralkleinasien und Galatische Geschichte, in: NIO-GaRo 2008.1: [http://www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb3/AGY/NIO-GaRo\\_2008.1.pdf](http://www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb3/AGY/NIO-GaRo_2008.1.pdf).
- idem (2009a): Der Ankyraner Kaiserkult und die Transformation galatischer und phrygisch-galatischer Identitäten in Zentralanatolien im Spiegel der Münzquellen, soon in: idem/ Heinz Heinen/ Stefan Pfeiffer (eds.): Reprä-sentation von Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt, Frankfurt a.M. 2009.
- idem (2009b): Das Edikt des Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus und die Fasten der Statthalter Galatiens in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit, forthcoming in Gephyra, ca. 2009.
- Darbyshire, Gareth/ Mitchell, Stephen/ Vardar, Levent: The Galatian Settlement in Asia Minor, AS 50, 2000, 75–97.
- Devreker, John: Les monnaies de Pessinonte, in: idem/Waelkens vol. I 1984, 173–215, with vol. II 142–57 pl. 254–269.
- Devreker, John/ Waelkens, Marc: Les Fouilles de la Rijksuniversiteit te Gent a Pessinonte, 1967–1973. Hommage à Pieter Lambrechts, 2 vols., Brussels 1984.
- Freeman, Philip: The Galatian Language. A Comprehensive Survey of the Language of the Ancient Celts in Greco-Roman Asia Minor, Lewiston/NY 2001.
- French, David: Roman, Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions of Ankara, Ankara 2003.
- Habicht, Christian: Gottmenschtum und griechische Städte, Munich <sup>2</sup>1970.
- Halfmann, Helmut: Zur Datierung und Deutung der Priesterliste am Augustus-Roma-Tempel in Ankara, Chiron 16, 1986, 35–42.
- Heinen, Heinz: The Syrian-Egyptian Wars and the New Kingdoms of Asia Minor, CAH VII<sup>2</sup> 1, 1984, 412–445.
- Jones, A.H.M.: The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, Oxford <sup>1</sup>1937, <sup>2</sup>1971.
- Koch, John T.: An Atlas for Celtic Studies: Archaeology and Names in Ancient Europe and Early Medieval Ireland, Britain, and Brittany, Oxford 2007.
- Krencker, Daniel/ Schede, Martin: Der Tempel in Ankara, Berlin 1936.
- Lob, Marcel: Cicéron, Discours, vol. 18, Paris 1968. (includes Cic. Deiot.)
- Ma, John: Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor, Oxford 1999, repr. 2002.
- Maier, Bernhard: Die Kelten. Ihre Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, München 2000.
- Meid, Wolfgang: Die Kelten, Stuttgart 2007.
- Mellor, Ronald: ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World, Göttingen 1975.
- Mitchell, Stephen: Galatia under Tiberius, Chiron 16, 1986, 17–33.
- idem: Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor, vol. 1: The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule; vol. 2: The Rise of the Church, Oxford 1993.
- idem: Römische Macht im frühkaiserzeitlichen Ankara – Verwaltung oder Herrschaft?, in: Rudolf Haensch/ Johannes Heinrichs (eds.): Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit, Köln 2007, 366–77 mit Taf. XXII–XXIV.
- idem: The Imperial Cult in Galatia from Claudius to Trajan, forthcoming in FS Elmar Schwertheim (Ms. 2007).
- Mommsen, Theodor: Die keltischen Pagi (Nachtrag zu Bd. XVI S. 449f.), Hermes 19, 1884, 316–21. (= Ges. Schr. V.2, 1908, 438–43)
- Nachtergaele, George: Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes. Recherche d’histoire et d’épigraphie hellénistiques, Brussels 1977.
- Otto, Walter: Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte des 3. Jh. v.Chr., Abh. Akad. München, Phil.-hist. Kl. 34,1, 1928.
- Pottier, Edmond/ Reinach, Salomon: La nécropole de Myrina. Recherches archéologiques exécutées au nom et au frais de l’École Française d’Athènes, 2 vols., Paris 1888.
- Radt, Stefan: Strabons Geographika, vol. VII, Göttingen 2008.
- Ramsay, William M.: Historical Commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians, London <sup>2</sup>1900.
- idem: Studies in the Roman Province of Galatia. III., JRS 12, 1922, 147–86.
- idem: Early History of the Province Galatia, in: Anatolian Studies William Buckler, Manchester 1939, 201–25.
- Saddington, D.B.: Preparing to Become Roman. The ‘Romanisation’ of Deiotarus in Cicero, in: U. Vogel-Weidmann (ed.): Charistion C.P.T. Naudé, Pretoria 1993, 87–96.
- Schmidt-Dounas, Barbara: Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft. Politik und Selbstdarstellung im Spiegel der Monumente, Berlin 2000.
- Stähelin, Felix: Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater, <sup>2</sup>1907, Nd. Osnabrück 1973.

- Strobel, Karl: Galatien und seine Grenzregionen; and: Keltensieg und Galatersieger, in: Elmar Schwertheim (Hg.): *Forschungen in Galatien*, Bonn 1994, 29–65 and 67–96.
- idem: *Die Galater*, Bd. 1: *Geschichte und Eigenart der keltischen Staatenbildung auf dem Boden des hellenistischen Kleinasien*, Berlin 1996.
- idem: *Kelten [III.]*: *Kelten im Osten*, DNP 6, 1999, 393–400.
- idem: *Die Staatenbildung bei den kleinasiatischen Galatern. Politisch-historische und kulturelle Prozesse im hellenistischen Zentralanatolien*, in: Hartmut Blum et al. (eds.): *Brückenland Anatolien? Ursachen, Extensität und Modi des Kulturaustausches zwischen Anatolien und seinen Nachbarn*, Tübingen 2002, 231–93. (cf.: *State Formation by the Galatians of Asia Minor. Politico-Historical and Cultural Processes in Hellenistic Central Anatolia*, *Anatolica* 28, 2002, 1–44.)
- idem: *State Formation by the Galatians of Asia Minor. Politico-Historical and Cultural Processes in Hellenistic Central Anatolia*, *Anatolica* 28, 2002, 1–44.
- idem: *Die Galater und Galatien: Historische Identität und ethnische Tradition im Imperium Romanum*, *Klio* 89.2, 2007, 356–402.
- Strootman, Rolf: *Kings against Celts. Deliverance from Barbarians as a Theme in Hellenistic Royal Propaganda*, in: Karl A.E. Enenkel/ Ilja L. Pfeijffer (eds.): *The Manipulative Mode*, Leiden 2005, 101–41.
- Strubbe, Johan: *The Inscriptions of Pessinous*, Bonn 2005 (IGSK 66).
- Syme, Ronald: *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo*, hg. von Anthony Birley, Oxford 1995.
- Tarn, W.W.: *The First Syrian War*, *JHS* 46, 1926, 155–62.
- Tarn, W.W.: *The Date of Milet I*, iii, No. 139, *Hermes* 65, 1930, 446–454.
- Tomaschitz, Kurt: *Die Wanderungen der Kelten in der antiken literarischen Überlieferung*, Wien 2002.
- van Nuffelen, Peter: *Le culte de l'empire des Séleucides: une réinterprétation*, *Historia* 52, 2004, 278–301.
- Vanderspoel, John: *Themistius and the Imperial Court. Oratory, Civic Duty, and Paideia from Constantius to Theodosius*, Ann Arbor 1995.
- von Sallet, A.: *Beiträge zur antiken Münzkunde*, *ZfN* 12, 1885, 358–86 (pp. 371f.: Deiotarus).
- Wellmann, M.: *Antiochos I. Soter*, *RE* I.2, 1894, 2450–55.
- Willrich, H.: *Cicero und Caesar*, Göttingen 1944, 224.