Coşkun, A. (ed.): *Galatian Victories and Other Studies into the Agency and Identity of the Galatians in the Hellenistic and Early Roman Period*. Leuven: Peeters. Colloquia Antiqua – Supplements to the Journal *Ancient West & East*. 2022. xix + 394 pp. ISBN 978-90-429-4608-8. Price: 95 €.

This eagerly awaited volume, edited by one of the greatest authorities on ancient Anatolian Galatae, brings together a well-thought-through and thematically varied selection of chapters originally stemming from workshops and collaborations taking place in the 2010s. It is difficult to envision anybody better qualified to edit such a collection than Altay Coşkun, who in addition to his meticulous and tremendously valuable Introduction contributes to the book two chapters on different aspects of Galatian studies. This just underlines the breadth and quality of Coşkun's own research record: complementing his narrower specialisation in Galatian matters is his position as one of the leading scholars on Seleucid history.

The need to cast new light into the study of Galatia has been fairly pressing for some time. The studies of Karl Strobel in the 1990s and the early 2000s, as well as Stephen Mitchell's numerous contributions over much of the same time period, laid a very solid basis for the better understanding of this still rather understudied Anatolian region and its history.[1] Mitchell's *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor* (1993; see pp. 8–9 in Coşkun's introductory chapter in this volume) remained for many decades the definitive work on Anatolian history from the Hellenistic to the Early Byzantine period. Generally, Mitchell – who sadly died in January 2024 – sought to foreground local agency in the processes of Romanization and cultural integration in the Galatian area; in so doing, he paid close attention to local inscriptions and settlements, though he may have occasionally overstated the 'Celtic' character of some local artefact assemblages and material evidence. Strobel's work, on the other hand, leaned rather heavily in terms of the identity and ethnicity of the Galatians on the 'ethnogenesis' framework (especially in Strobel 1991, 1994 and 1996), preferring to see an overarching ethnic identity coalescing around a combined nucleus of Celtic elements and local Anatolian traditions from rather early on in the Hellenistic era. Strobel also very valuably drew the attention to the preconceived, rhetorical and stereotype-laden way in which the ancient sources wrote about Galatians, and the influence that the broader Hellenistic polities had on the Galatian groups. To a degree, neither of these great scholars put much emphasis on the agency of the Galatians themselves.

1 Strobel 1991; 1994; 1996; 2002; 2006; 2009; Mitchell 1982; 1993; 2000; 2003.

Antti Lampinen, Nordic Library at Athens
Studia Celtica Fennica XX (2024), 67–82, eISSN 2242-4261 © 2024 Lampinen
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of a Creative Commons License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

In the years since Strobel's and Mitchell's main publications, not only have research paradigms and outlooks kept evolving, but several fieldwork projects have accrued a multi-faceted trove of finds from some very important sites. The publication of inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Roman eras has also taken noticeable steps forward. What has also become clear is the need for a truly cross- and interdisciplinary angle into Galatian Studies – one that relies on experts in such vastly differing fields as archaeology, ancient history, philology and linguistics (in classical, Celtic, and Anatolian languages alike), epigraphy (with a similarly broad range of scripts and traditions), comparative religion, and biblical exegetics. That the volume currently under review cannot cast new light on all these various aspects of Galatian studies, is neither a surprise nor a rebuke. What it offers is an inspiring selection of carefully argued case studies that frequently engage in conversation with each other in a genuinely valuable way. Taken together, the chapters highlight the great advances that Galatian studies have seen in the past few decades, as well as the points that still offer space for debate. As a whole, the volume does manage to go a long way towards what the – now very sadly deceased – series editor Gocha Tsetskhladze, who directed the Pessinus excavations for many years, calls in his prefatory words (vii) a 'New History of Galatia'.

Coşkun's introductory chapter ('A Survey of Recent Research on Ancient Galatia (1993–2019)', pp. 3–94) offers an almost encyclopaedic overview of the publications and research trends from 1993 to 2019, arranged in a broadly thematical and occasionally topographical fashion (Gordion, Pessinus, Ankyra, etc.). This structural choice introduces slight repetition here and there, but the benefits of the chapter for any scholar on Galatia and the Galatians are obvious and difficult to overstate. Carefully scrutinising sites and topics that come up time and time again in connection with the possibly 'Celtic' aspects of Galatian culture and identity, Coşkun not only offers an excellent state-of-the-art summary of each topic, but also frequently suggests to the reader the likeliest interpretations on some specific questions. This is the case, for instance, with the possible remains of human sacrifice uncovered at a necropolis in Gordion and at Kaman Kalehöyük (12–13). He also devotes space to evaluating the previous interpretations by both Strobel and Mitchell that put much value on the supposed 'Celtic' character of a select few material finds from Phrygia and Galatia. Throughout, Coşkun is careful to demonstrate the importance of new excavation reports and epigraphic publications for our understanding of the Galatian society and its integration into the wider Hellenistic world. He does, for instance, note the resurgence, or even a revival, in the use of the traditional tribal names of the Tectosages, Trocmi and Tolistobogii from the late 1st to the mid-3rd centuries CE (pp. 19–20), a development which tallies well with other local identity-tags in the Greek East and does not need to imply an unbroken tradition from the Hellenistic Galatae (cf. p. 37). Coşkun also discusses very valuably the notion of the 'soft

provincialisation' of Galatia (pp. 44–51), which may well have been supported in an important way by the imperial cult centred on Ankyra (modern Ankara). This is in a way comparable with role of the imperial cult in the Gallic provinces under the Julio-Claudians, acting as a focal point around which a new Galatian-provincial identity was built.

In the second chapter of the volume, 'Beating the Galatians: Ideologies, Analogies and Allegories in Hellenistic Literature and Art' (pp. 97–144), Thomas J. Nelson explores the range of ways in which the Hellenistic monarchs' victories over the Galatians were portrayed in literature and art. The propagandistic importance of the Celtic and Galatian adversaries for the monarchies and the *koina* of the Hellenistic world alike has been recognised for a long time.[2] What Nelson's chapter does very well is to assess in a sober fashion the common assumptions that previous scholarship has sometimes taken too easily for granted regarding these representations. The (primarily literary) analogies between the earlier Persian Wars and the Hellenistic struggles against the Galatae form one such theme, even if after a thorough study Nelson finds plenty of reasons to confirm that these analogies were long-standing, formulated already in the Classical era and creatively reapplied in the later Hellenistic context.[3] A similar analogy between the Gigantomachic and Galatomachic pictorial depictions is even more frequently being floated with very little in-depth discussion, and Nelson duly investigates how iconographic gestures applicable to both Celts and Giants, such as the very well-known ones at the Great Altar of Pergamon, were employed to reinforce Greek cultural superiority and to legitimize the power of Hellenistic rulers as chaos-combating defenders of civilization (e.g. p. 107, 109).

The chapter also devotes a great deal of attention to Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos*, which ranks among the earliest Greek reactions to the Galatian attack against Delphi in the early third century BCE, as well as the complexities of Lucian's second-century CE literary vignette about the so-called 'Elephant Battle' between king Antiochus and Galatae.[4] Occasionally, the chapter's length and the variety of its contents could have warranted clearer signposting. Nelson's chapter is particularly strong in showing how the earlier symbolic and mythohistorical ways of negotiating the dichotomy of chaos and order wielded a strong formative influence over the Hellenistic stories about the Galatae, communicated through a range of literary genres. One aspect that could perhaps have been discussed in more detail is the middle-Hellenistic political context; this was not limited just to the Athenian-Aetolian and Aetolian-Macedonian one-upmanship in Delphi, but also

2 E.g. Nachtergael 1977; Champion 1995; Barbantani 2001; Strootman 2005; Queyrel 2017; Battistoni 2020; Couvenhes 2022; on the later Roman reception of this, see Roy 2024.

3 Cf. now also Lampinen 2024.

4 On which see Coşkun 2012.

includes the anti-Macedonian alliance between Pergamon and Athens. This would no doubt have emphasised the future-oriented aspect of such monumental depictions as the so-called 'Attalid Dedication' of Attalus I on the Athenian Acropolis.[5]

Taking further the study of the impact of the Galatians' original arrival on the scene of Hellenistic Anatolia, William D. Burghart argues in his chapter ('When Galatians Attack: A Re-Evaluation of the Impact of the Galatians on the International Affairs of 3rd-Century Hellenistic Asia Minor', pp. 145–162) that the Galatians played a more independent and influential role in the political dynamics of third-century Asia Minor than previously thought. This is a refreshing take along the lines already approached by Coşkun,[6] but updates and takes further the argument that seeks to – paraphrasing Aristarchus of Samothrace – Γαλάτας ἐκ Γαλατῶν σαφηνίζειν. Burghart attacks with particular vigour the old stereotype of Galatians as 'mere mercenaries' who were only spared from destruction at the hands of their more powerful Hellenistic neighbours through a combination of luck and their own usefulness as, in turn, allies and convenient enemies over whom a ruler could also claim to have scored civilization-saving victories.[7] Burghart does a good job in distinguishing the credible evidence for Galatian's soldierly pursuits from the old stereotype (often adopted due to an overly high reliance on the Greek accounts) of them as despoilers, brigands and robbers.[8]

Particularly useful is Burghart's idea that the Galatian independence was not merely the result of a convenience from the point of view of the Hellenistic monarchs (especially the Seleucids and the Attalids of Pergamon), but that the continuous conflicts between these rulers enabled the Gauls to maintain a high degree of agency. Perhaps the argument could have been pushed even further. If the Celtic Galatians had social and cultural structures and institutions that were comparable to the better-documented ones in Continental Europe, they would have been able to benefit from the dissension of the surrounding state structures, as well as the continuous flow of mercenary wages, booty and tribute. In some ways, they could even be seen to have created the environment for their own thriving: by actively facilitating and participating in the aggressive relations between Anatolian kingdoms and cities, the Galatae ensured not only their own survival, but the sort of conditions that their society was well-placed to take advantage of. Burghart's foregrounding of the Galatian volition does, however, sometimes make him de-emphasise certain aspects of the Greek imagination that have shaped the Hellenistic sources. For instance, in discussing how the Galatae in the 270s BCE

5 On the politics, see Habicht 1990; Gruen 2000; Champion 2005; Gondat 2018; on the dedication at Akropolis, see Stewart 2004; Osborne 2017.

6 Coşkun 2011, who positioned himself against Strobel 1994 and Michell 2003.

7 On the Galatian mercenary pursuits, see now Baray 2017; also on the dichotomy see Savalli-Lestrade 2020.

8 The motif was subsequently adopted into literary creations: Parth. *Narr.* 8, the story of Herippe of Miletus: see Battistoni 2020, 219.

demonstrated a prior desire to cross from Europe to Anatolia – instead of having just been passively ferried across by king Nicomedes of Bithynia – he relies on the narrative of Memnon of Heraclea. This text, which we know only through a paraphrase, may have shown the same tendency as Callimachus' *Hymn to Delos* in imagining the Galatae/Celts purposefully heading from their far-away homelands to vex and plunder the Greeks. In Callimachus' case, the attackers head right from the outset towards Delphi, 'rushing from the furthest west like snowflakes' (Call. *Hymn.* 4.171ff.). It is useful to emphasise the Galatian agency and volition in our readings of the Hellenistic events, but the Greek sources do not necessarily reflect these in a limpid way.[9]

Elizabeth Kosmetatou's chapter 'The Eunuch Philetairos: Pergamene Founding Father and Galatian-Slayer' (pp. 163–191), for its part, strongly foregrounds the Asiatic Greek imagination and propagandistic narratives. Dovetailing very well with Nelson's chapter, Kosmetatou's investigation looks at the way in which the Pergamene 'galatomachic' propaganda was back-projected to the eunuch Philetaerus, the founder of the dynasty (through his brother's descendants), whose actual exploits against the Galatae would have been very meagre or even non-existent. Kosmetatou is a seasoned scholar of Attalid Anatolia, and operates confidently in the web of Hellenistic political posturing and scantily documented or only partially surviving religious dedications.[10] The chapter takes as its starting point the relatively lowly origins of the Attalid dynasty, and it also serves as an introduction to what is known about Philetaerus himself, but the principal focus settles on how Attalus I (241–197 BCE), in particular, retroactively ascribed military victories over the Galatians to Philetaerus to bolster the legitimacy of his upstart dynasty. Kosmetatou argues, very reasonably, that this narrative was largely a fiction used by Attalus to emphasize his own victories over the Galatae and to create a heroic foundation story for his family that had by c. 200 BCE been thrusted into the forefront of Hellenistic politics. Kosmetatou also documents many interesting subsidiary points, such as the artists involved in the Attalid propaganda push, as well as the dynasty's focus on the holy island of Delos. This focalization ties Attalid 'galatomachy' to the broader narratives of Delphi's defence, with Apollo's help, against the northern invaders, but also responded to the Antigonid (i.e. Macedonian) posturing that made use of their own victories over Celts. Through his deft manipulation of Homeric language and mythistorical exemplars, Attalus was able not only to insinuate that Philetaerus had basically been already a king (a title which only Attalus himself had adopted after defeating the Galatae), but had also been divinized.

9 See also Gabelko 2021; more generally on the settlement of the Galatae in Anatolia, see Darbyshire, Mitchell & Vardar 2000.

10 The lack of reference to Savalli-Lestrade 2020 may have been due to the long production-process of the volume overall.

Back-projections are also very central to Germain Payen's chapter 'When Galatians Unite? A Geopolitical Evaluation of the Impact of the Alleged Galatian Unity in the 2nd Century BC' (pp. 193–212). The chapter argues against the occasional assumption in the scholarship that the Galatians ever formed a unified political or military entity in the 2nd century BCE. It also offers a very meticulous account of the Galatian history between Manlius Vulso's campaign in 189 BCE and the proclamation of the Galatian autonomy by the Romans in 166 BCE. Payen emphasizes that, despite references to 'Galatian unity' in a number of ancient texts, the different tribes often acted independently of each other or diverged in their alignments with opposing Hellenistic rulers. Through his detailed analysis of the geopolitical landscape and a series of well-contextualised readings of writers like Diodorus Siculus, Livy and Strabo, Payen reminds us of the fluid and decentralized nature of Galatian leadership during this period. Not even the main tribes would have been always unified under a single leader (p. 195) – to say nothing about the smaller, less well-attested groups such as the Tosiopoi, who remained allied to Pergamon even in 189 BCE when the Galatians had to deal with Vulso's campaign. Tracking the separate trajectories of the individual groups and their known leaders is one of the contributions of the chapter that will benefit a broad range of scholars.

Payen quite sensibly notes that even if our historical sources do sometimes offer credible reports of one or two different Galatian groups unifying for a limited time in pursuit of a common strategy or aims, this does not mean that this state of affairs should be thought to characterise the entirety of Galatian 'Celtic' societies. The main sources to the second century (and earlier) Galatian history all wrote between Julius Caesar and the principate of Tiberius, which certainly coloured their understanding of the Galatian cohesion. The unity that rulers such as Deiotarus and Amyntas had – with the support of the Romans – established over the Galatian lands was thus easy to project back into the earlier history. One example, briefly mentioned by Payen (p. 198) but left perhaps under-contextualised, is the way in which Livy's description of Manlius' exploitation of the divisions between different Galatian groups is strongly based on assumptions popularised by Caesar's narrative of his own Gallic campaign in the *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*.

In his chapter 'Pessinus, Kleonnaeion and Attalid Administration in Eastern Phrygia in Light of a Recently-Found Royal Letter from Ballıhisar' (pp. 213–232), Altay Coşkun examines an inscribed letter found in 2003 from Ballıhisar and subsequently interpreted in various ways. Unlike some of the previous interpretations, in his view the letter should be dissociated from the so-called 'secret correspondence' between the Attalids and the Pessinuntine high priest of Kybele known by the title of Attis.[11] The chapter does, however, also debate

11 See also Avram & Tsetskhladze 2014; Thonemann 2015; Savalli-Lestrade 2020, 178–80.

this longer-known piece of Attalid correspondence with their subalterns. The dating of the different parts of the 'secret correspondence' is still a somewhat open question, but Coşkun aims to dismantle the scholarly myth that there was anything 'treasonous' in the exchange between the Attalids and the priests at Pessinus, recorded on stone much later, possibly in the Augustan or Tiberian era (p. 218). Coşkun disputes the idea that Pessinus had been subjected to, or at least under the influence of, the Galatian Tolistobogii in the third or second centuries BCE, as well as the view that it enjoyed autonomy in the second quarter of the second century BCE; he argues instead for its integration into Attalid governance as early as 188/85 BCE.

What is at stake with the more recently found inscription from Ballıhisar is not only the length (or existence) of direct Pergamene rule over the temple-state of Pessinus, famous for its cult of Kybele, but also the question of the location and identity of the military settlement of Kleonnaeion. If this letter – sent from a Pergamene prince Attalus (who later ruled as Attalus II) to his officials – is to be dated to the 188/185 BCE as Coşkun suggests, it cannot tell us anything about tensions between the Galatians and Attalids, but stands instead out as an important document for the administrative reforms that the Pergamenes implemented in the early phase of their rule. The letter is a response to a petition by a certain Aribazos, the '*hegemon* of the Galatians from Kleonnaeion and the settlers from Amorium' (p. 220), who had not only asked for the confirmation of his earlier landed property, but for privileges that were typically granted to a *strategos*. Notable is Aribazos's Persian name: considering the multilingualism of Galatian onomastics (see below), this does not need to exclude a 'Celtic' ethnicity (whatever we might mean by that term in this context), but conclusions are difficult to draw. As Coşkun points out, the fact that the letter was later inscribed on stone indicates that this petition was very probably successful. As to where to fix the location of (K)leonnaeion, the chapter challenges the assumption that this place name, which sees its first-ever mention in this letter, was identical to Pessinus.

The Anatolian patchwork of peoples, languages, and religious and cultural traditions forms a fascinating background for Wojciech Sowa's chapter 'Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Relations in and around Galatia (3rd Century BC – 3rd Century AD)' (pp. 235–256). Perhaps the best-known literary testimony to the endurance of the Celtic-speaking communities in Galatia is the comment by Jerome, in his *Commentary on Galatians* 2.3 on how *Galatae* have, besides the Greek language, a *propria lingua* that is very close to that of the Treveri in the Lower Moselle valley.[12] Overall, however, the study of many of the languages of Anatolia is hamstrung by their status as 'fragmentarily attested languages' (p. 237), which despite having been in full use in the period from which they are

12 Leading, quite understandably, to explorations of this connection in earlier periods: Macro 2019.

documented, are attested in forms that are insufficient for reconstructing a lexicon or grammar. Many Anatolian communities in the Classical and Hellenistic period had rather undeveloped epigraphic habits, and by the time inscriptions become more common, many of the local languages, such as Phrygian, were moribund or already gone. This is true with Galatian language, too: no inscription in a Celtic language has been found from Galatia – no doubt because the speakers of Celtic did not have a similar epigraphic habit as the Greek-speakers. An inscription was something you commissioned to be made in Greek, not Celtic.

Since no text in a Celtic language survives from Galatia, the study of linguistic developments must rely on less direct evidence. After discussing very usefully the criteria which we should use to judge a language 'Celtic' (p. 238–39), Sowa explores linguistic and cultural interactions between the Phrygian, Greek, and Galatian populations in central Anatolia, and even entertains the possibility of finding Celtic forms borrowed into Armenian. Overall, the strength of the chapter lies in its tracing of the possible substratic and superstratic interactions in the linguistic Anatolian melting-pot, and suggests by way of examples how they may have influenced the development of a hybrid linguistic landscape in Galatia, particularly as Greek became the dominant language during the Roman period. Throughout, the author emphasizes how the blending of languages could well help us trace broader socio-cultural exchanges, with the section on 'intercultural onomastics' (pp. 250–252) being particularly interesting. This all helps Sowa's contribution dovetail well with Coşkun's call in the Introduction (p. 17) for Galatian onomastic studies (including both anthroponymy, theonymy and toponymy) that would take a flexible and nuanced approach towards multilingual contexts.

Christian Wallner's contribution to the volume reflects the results of the Tavium International Research Project (1997–2009, under Karl Strobel's direction), which discovered around 400 individual finds with inscriptions from the area of the tribal centre of the Trocmi. These inscriptions, predominantly tombstones (70% of the finds), milestones, and honorary texts, date from the Roman and Byzantine periods, with the largest number of epitaphs datable to the Early Byzantine period. In his 'Inscriptions in the Tavium Area' (pp. 257–275), Wallner discusses five monuments from the Tavium area, chosen as a representative sample of the whole corpus of finds, part of which is still waiting for publication: we have four funerary inscriptions and an honorary one. Through its focus on these, Wallner' chapter is able to offer new insights into the aristocracy, road systems, and personal names in the Tavium area – until recently much less well-understood in epigraphic terms than the areas around Ankyra and Pessinus – as well as giving a good indication of the typical features of the local epigraphic habit. Out of Wallner's chosen inscriptions, the late-first or early-second century CE funerary stelae of Bellōn and Grimitalos are without doubt the most interesting ones for Celtologists. The epigram for Bellōn gives

us a lovely indication of the way in which the Galatian onomastic traditions incorporated fluctuation from one generation to the next.[13] The grandfather is called Goutoumaros, a Celtic name suggested to mean something like 'big voice' or 'important speaker' (p. 265). The deceased himself had a difficult-to-place name Bellōn, which may well have had both a Celtic and a local Anatolian significance, while also conforming to a very common Greek type of a name. This offers us an excellent example of polysemic 'intercultural anthroponymy'. The sons of Bellōn, who set up the stele to their father, bear the respectively Greek and Celtic names of Andromachos and Grimitalos. Additionally, Strobel's project was lucky enough to uncover a stele of 'Grimitalos son of Bellōn', which Wallner – very plausibly – interprets as commemorating the son of the previous stele's subject (p. 268). As Wallner notes, such varying onomastics find good *comparanda* from other Galatian stelae, such as the one of Amyntas son of Saton, set up by Athenaïs and her husband Deiotaros (Mitchell 1982, no. 498).

Hale Güney explores local theonyms in her chapter, 'The Imperial Estate *Choria Considiana* and 'Zeus of the Seven Villages' in North-West Galatia' (pp. 277–291), which serves further to highlight the tremendous variety of Anatolian religious traditions and identities, as well as the effects that Roman foundations and patterns of provincial administration had on the local religious scene. The starting point in this case, too, is a new inscription, found in 2019 from Ağaçhisar and including a previously unknown epithet for Zeus, 'Ordobanenos'. Güney connects this new epithet with the cult of Zeus Heptakomeiton (or Heptakomikos), that is 'Zeus of the Seven Villages', known from the area of the imperial estate of *Choria Considiana*. In a region like Anatolia, characterised already in the Bronze Age as the 'Land of a Thousand Gods' (Marek 2016, 79), tracking local religious traditions is complex detective work. As with the local divine epithets – some of which have been demonstrated to contain Celtic elements, such as Bussurigios, Bussumaros and Suolibrogenos – the patchy epigraphic record has also hindered the interpretation and identification of other Anatolian divine manifestations. Güney's chapter does a great deal to reconstruct the religious landscape of the area of Choria Considiana, northeast of the modern Eskişehir (ancient Dorylaeum), which comprised of the seven villages that formed a common cultic identity under the worship of Zeus as well as a 'Mother of the Seven Villages'. Both Zeus and Meter were most commonly addressed through epithets derived from toponyms: 'Ilarenos', 'Eissindene', 'Ordobanenos', etc. Local evidence has to be supplemented by inscriptions from further afield, such as an altar from the Roșia Montană area in modern-day Romania, which may reflect a cult epithet 'Heptakomikos' (p. 278f.). Güney goes on to suggest some identifications for the 'Seven Villages' (pp. 281–83).

13 Cf. the cases noted in Battistoni 2020, 226.

The volume is brought to a close by a pair of lengthy chapters delving in great detail into a question that has been a source of heated debate among New Testament scholars, with knock-on effects in the field of Anatolian religious studies and Galatian studies alike. Like Brigitte Kahl, one may wonder whether the question, debated with 'almost ceremonial zeal', can ever really be resolved unless dramatic new evidence comes to light.[14] In the case of this controversy between 'South' and 'North' Galatian hypotheses the volume, exceptionally, is not able to present new primary evidence. Felix John's and Altay Coşkun's chapters defend these two diametrically opposite interpretations regarding the location of Paul's newly-founded Christian communities – and the identity of the addressees of his *Epistle to the Galatians*. What is at stake is not only the exact nature of the 'Galatian Crisis' among the early adherents of the Jesus movement, but also the extent to which local traditions (or the imperial cult) may have interfered with early Christian practices. The fundamental disagreement between the adherents of the 'South' and 'North' Galatian Hypotheses is whether the Pauline mission could have found enough of a receptive demographic in the old heartland of Galatia, where the Celtic groups had once settled, or whether the – perhaps relatively more prosperous – centres of the region that had only later become attached to Galatia form a more natural context for Paul's activities. It is clear that the meaning of the regional term *Galatia* fluctuated over time, and while some ancient writers observe the administrative terminology, others doubtless reflect the more commonsense perceptions of their day.[15] One should not expect the ancient usages to be consistent. What is clear is that areas that historically had not seen much (or any) Galatian settlements – for example, Phrygia Paroreia and Pisidia, with such important cities as Iconium and Laodicea-the-Burned – could frequently be subsumed under the term *Galatia*.

John's defence of the South Galatian Hypothesis ('Pauline Churches in South Galatia', pp. 293–322) asserts that Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians* was directed to churches in the southern part of the Roman province of Galatia, particularly in cities like Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. John argues that these urban centres were more likely targets for Paul's missions due to their developed infrastructure, economic significance, and the presence of Roman veterans. In John's view the infrastructure and urban development in South Galatia were much more suitable for evangelization than the heartlands of the older Galatian areas. Correlating Paul's journeys in *Acts* with his missionary work in South Galatia, John emphasizes that Paul's visits to cities in the southern part of the province fit the timeline and geographical progression of his journeys. He notes the role of Pisidian Antioch as a likely base for Paul's mission, and flirts with the idea that the Hispanian connections of some of the elite families in the Pisidian Antioch

14 Kahl 2010, 34.

15 On 'common sense geography', see Dan, Geus & Guckelsberger 2014.

might explain Paul's otherwise strange desire to take his mission all the way to the Spanish provinces of the Empire.

John also stresses that Paul's use of the term "Galatia" aligns with the Roman administrative understanding, referring to the provincial territory rather than strictly the ethnic regions of the Galatians. John argues that terms like "Galatia" and "Galatians" could encompass non-Celtic populations living in the Roman province, and hence, it is plausible that Paul was addressing Roman colonists or Hellenized populations in the south. What this reviewer finds particularly appealing as an argument is John's point about the way in which Paul's famous exclamation 'oh you senseless Galatians' (ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, *Gal.* 3:1) draws its rhetorical force from the negative stereotypical connotations of the ethnicised reference, which John contextualises well (pp. 303-304). Though evidence from later eras should not necessarily be ascribed too much importance, one could also have pointed out Lucian's exclamation about 'that stupid Celt' when he narrates the blind belief of the Aquitanian-born governor Sedatius Severianus towards a pseudo-oracle that predicted success for his foray into Armenia.[16] When Paul calls the recipients 'Galatians', they were supposed to feel stung and ashamed by this wielding of the ethnic label, even if (and perhaps *especially* if) it was only based on provincial terminology.

True to its title, Coşkun's 'Pauline Churches in the *Galatike Chora*: A New Plea for Their Location in North Galatia' (pp. 323–364) defends the North Galatian Hypothesis, formerly influential especially in the German-speaking academia. In short, this hypothesis espouses the idea that Paul's addressees were 'ethnic Galatians' (a problematic term which both John and Coşkun use) residing in the northern parts of the province, particularly in the formerly Celtic territories like Ankyra, Pessinus, or Tavium. Coşkun critiques the assumption that Paul's missionary work was limited to the southern cities and suggests that Paul's reference to 'Galatians' would apply most naturally to the 'ethnic Galatians' in the north of the region, though he does not fully address John's most substantial argument about the stereotype-buttressed rhetorical force of Pauls' use of the ethnic tag 'Galatians' (cf. p. 335). As the editor of the volume, Coşkun has had the benefit of being able to give the last word on the North/South Galatian hypotheses, and he structures his chapter occasionally as a respectful point-to-point response to John's chapter. In particular, he seeks to emphasise that if Paul had meant to address non-Galatians, his use of ethnic and geographical terms would have been more precise. He further argues that the assumption of southern addressees loses sight of how ancient audiences would have understood the ethnic distinctions in the text. Coşkun rebuts John's reliance on the *Acts of the Apostles* as a source, arguing that the text of *Acts* is not conclusive proof for Paul's focus on South Galatia. He also puts much stock on evidence suggesting that Paul had a chance

16 Lucian, *Alex.* 26–27.

to proselytize to the Galatian communities in the north of the region, particularly during his second missionary journey when he was delayed due to illness.

The two concluding chapters base their arguments on different interpretations of ancient terminology, geography, and Paul's missionary strategy. While both John and Coşkun agree regarding the need to combine various fields of expertise in order to make any headway in the matter of the Galatian Hypotheses – a useful example of the broader need for the same in Galatian Studies overall – in some ways the two chapters reflect the different emphases on divergent and not wholly conversant groups of evidence that in the past have been preferred and prioritised by New Testament scholars or ancient historians contributing to the discussion. Regarded as a pair, the two chapters manage to tone down some of the main sticking points; even so, neither necessarily manages to convince the reader to pick a side in the dispute. Both have their weaknesses: John does not provide strong counterarguments against the possibility that Paul's audience included ethnic Galatians in the north, while Coşkun, on the other hand, does not fully refute John's argument that Roman infrastructure and urban centres in the south would have been more practical for Paul's missions. Nor does Coşkun explain why Paul would have bypassed these larger and more accessible cities if his primary goal was to spread the gospel efficiently, and while he seeks to revise our understanding of the North Galatian urbanisation, this leads to what seem like internal inconsistencies. On the one hand, North Galatian urbanism is envisioned to have started earlier than usually thought, but on the other hand Coşkun does not present concomitant evidence for any coaeval elaboration of infrastructure in the same region (cf. p. 330). Both John and Coşkun agree that the troublemakers among the recipients of Paul's letter did not in all likelihood stem from the Roman imperial cult in the region, nor from the influence of any local religious traditions (Celtic or Anatolian): Jewish-Christian conservatives either from the province's established synagogues or from Judaea itself seem like better candidates for the identity of Paul's adversaries. In terms of the two Galatian Hypotheses, it is more difficult to square the implications of Coşkun's argument with this identity: established Jewish communities in the North Galatian area are not as solidly attested in this era, and for Judaean anti-Pauline agitators to head to Northern Galatian communities in the wake of Paul's somewhat unplanned *ad hoc* evangelization in the area seems to bypass many cities where resistance to the lifeways of the new Christ-believers' movement would be more expected.

The field of Galatian studies takes in a huge range of historical, cultural and religious topics and influences all over the central Anatolian heartland, and the coverage of this book's chapters must, of course, remain uneven. For example, one topic that could very well have been included in a more comprehensive collection would have been the relationship between the Anatolian and Thracian Galatae. In some ways, scholarship from recent years has remedied this blind spot to a degree, especially through shorter articles and contributions, but much remains

still to be said.[17] Yet another highly interesting topic, deserving of a chapter of its own, would have been the way in which the Anatolian – or more specifically Pergamene – experience of the Galatians was received, adapted and transformed in the society and culture of Rome, the most important ally of Pergamon; a Pergamon-centric reading of the *translatio* of Kybele/Magna Mater to Rome still remains to be written. Topics such as these would also have made the volume even more useful for scholars in the field of the Celtic Studies, although it certainly constitutes a formidable contribution even in its current shape and scope. From a purely editorial point of view, the publication still has some infelicities and typographical errors that could have been easily ironed out with one more round of proof-reading.[18] Some of the tables and maps taken from Coşkun's earlier publications are somewhat smudgily rendered and thus may cause a few legibility issues (e.g. figures 1, 3, 5). This does little, however, to detract from the collection's overall high quality of scholarship and highly inspiring range of topics. One feels privileged to have learnt so much from a single volume.

List of References

Avram, A. & G. Tsetskhladze. 2014. 'A New Attalid Letter from Pessinus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 191, 151–81.

Baray, L. 2017, *Celtes, Galates et Gaulois, mercenaires de l'Antiquité: representation, recrutement, organization*. Picard, Paris.

Barbantani, S. 2001. *Φάτις νικηφόρος: frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle guerre galatiche: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 969*. Milano; Vita e pensiero.

Battistoni, F. 2020. 'Aspetti culturali della presenza galata in Asia Minore'. In C. Bearzot, F. Landucci & G. Zecchini (eds.). *I Celti e il Mediterraneo: impatto e trasformazioni*. Milano; Vita e pensiero, 217–236.

Champion, C. B. 1995. 'The Soteria at Delphi: Aetolian Propaganda in the Epigraphical Record', *The American Journal of Philology* 116, 213–220.

Champion, C. B. 2005. 'In Defense of Hellas: The Antigonid *Soteria* and *Paneia* at Delos and the Aetolian *Soteria* at Delphi', *American Journal of Ancient History* 3–4 n. s. (2004–2005), 72–88.

Coşkun, A. 2011. 'Galatians and Seleucids: A century of conflict and cooperation'. In K. Erickson & G. Ramsey (eds.) *Seleucid Dissolution: The Sinking of the Anchor*. Harassowitz, Wiesbaden, 85–106.

Coşkun, A. 2012. 'Deconstructing a myth of Seleucid history: The so-called "Elephant Victory" over the Galatians revisited', *Phoenix* 66, 57–73.

Couvenhes, J.-C. 2022. 'La violence impose aux Galates vaincus: le récit des grandes et petites offrandes attalides dans le seconde moitié du IIIe siècle avant J.-C.'.

17 For some highly interesting contributions, see Sîrbu & Vaida (eds.) 2006; also Dimitrov 2010; Emilov 2010.

18 One erroneous source reference struck this reviewer as particularly glaring: p. 303 fn. 56 should have 'Themistius *Oratio* 16.19', not 'Themistokles'.

In P. Cosme, J.-C. Couvenhes & S. Janniard (eds.). *Le récit de guerre comme source d'histoire, de l'Antiquité à nos jours*. Besançon ; Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 29–56.

Dan, A., K. Geus & K. Guckelsberger. 2014. 'What is Common Sense Geography? Some Preliminary Thoughts from a Historical Perspective'. In K. Geus & M. Thiering (eds.). *Features of Common Sense Geography: Implicit Knowledge Structures in Ancient Geographical Texts*. Zürich, Münster & Vienna; LIT Verlag, 17–38.

Darbyshire, G., S. Mitchell & L. Vardar. 2000. 'The Galatian Settlement in Asia Minor', *Anatolian Studies* 50, 75–97.

Dimitrov, K. 2010. 'Celts, Greeks and Thracians in Thrace during the Third Century BC. Interactions in History and Culture'. In L. F. Vagalinski (ed.). *In Search of Celtic Tylis in Thrace (III c. BC): Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary Colloquium, Sofia 8 May 2010*. Sofia; Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 51–66.

Emilov, J. 2010. 'Ancient Texts on the Galatian Royal Residence of Tylis and the Context of La Tène Finds in Southern Thrace. A Reappraisal'. In L. F. Vagalinski (ed.) *In Search of Celtic Tylis in Thrace (III c. BC): Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary Colloquium, Sofia 8 May 2010*. Sofia; Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 67–88.

Gabelko, O. 2021. 'Paus. X. 23. 14 on the Galatians' Passage to Asia: lost in translation', *Colonial Geopolitics and Local Cultures in the Hellenistic and Roman East (3rd century BC – 3rd century AD)*. In H. Bru, A. G. Dumitru & N. Sekunda (eds.). Oxford; Archaeopress, 148–151.

Gondat, J. 2018. 'Φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι: les relations entre les Attalides et les Étoliens au IIIe et au IIe siècle avant J.-C.', *Revue des Études Grecques* 131, 97–122.

Gruen, E. S. 2000. 'Culture as Policy: The Attalids of Pergamon', *From Pergamon to Sperlonga: Sculpture and Context*. In N. T. de Grummond & B. S. Ridgway (eds.). Hellenistic Culture and Society 34. Berkeley; University of California Press, 17–31.

Habicht, C. 1990. 'Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century B.C.', *Hesperia* 59, 561–77.

Kahl, B. 2010.*Galatians Re-imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished*. Minneapolis; Fortress Press.

Lampinen, A. 2024. 'Galatae between Northern and Eastern Stereotypes. Methods, Motives and Motifs of 'Orientalisation'', *Oriental Mirages. Stereotypes and Identity Creation in the Ancient World*. In B. Forsén & A. Lampinen (eds.). Stuttgart; Franz Steiner Verlag, 197–231.

Macro, A. D. 2019. 'Galatian Connections with the Celtic West in the Hellenistic Era', *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. In H. Elton & G. Reger (eds.). Pessac; Ausonius Éditions, 169–177.

Marek, C. 2016. *In the Land of a Thousand Gods: A History of Asia Minor in the Ancient World*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Mitchell, S. 1982. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor: II, The Ankara District – The Inscriptions of North Galatia*. Oxford; British Archaeological Reports Publishing.

Mitchell, S. 1993. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Vol. 1, The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman rule*. Oxford; Clarendon Press.

Mitchell, S. 2000. 'Ethnicity, Acculturation and Empire in Roman and Late Asia Minor', *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*. In S. Mitchell & G. Greatrex (eds.). London; Duckworth & The Classical Press of Wales, 117–150.

Mitchell, S. 2003. 'The Galatians: Representation and Reality'. In A. Erskine (ed.). *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Blackwell, Oxford, 280–93.

Nachtergael, G. 1977. *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôteria de Delphes: recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*. Palais des académies, Bruxelles.

Osborne, R. 2017. 'How the Gauls Broke the Frame. The Political and Theological Impact of Taking Battle Scenes off Greek Temples'. In V. Platt & M. Squire (eds.). *The Frame in Classical Art. A Cultural History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 425–56.

Queyrel, F. 2017. 'Les Galates comme nouveaux Géants? De la métaphore au glissement interprétatif'. In F.-H. Massa-Pairault & C. Pouzadoux (eds.). *Géants et gigantomachies entre orient et occident*. Naples; Centre Jean Bérard, 203–215.

Roy, A. 2024. *Empire of Images. Visualizing the Conquered in the Roman Republic*. Berlin; De Gruyter.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 2020. 'I Galati e gli Attalidi, tra esclusione e integrazione'. In C. Bearzot, F. Landucci & G. Zecchini (eds.). *I Celti e il Mediterraneo: impatto e trasformazioni*. Milano; Vita e pensiero, 167–195.

Sîrbu, V. & D. L. Vaida (eds.) 2006. *Thracians and Celts:Proceedings of the International Colloquium from Bistrița, 18-20 May 2006*. Cluj-Napoca; Editura Mega.

Stewart, A. 2004. *Attalos, Athens, and the Acropolis: The Pergamene "Little Barbarians" and Their Roman and Renaissance Legacy*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Strobel, K. 1991. 'Die Galater im hellenistischen Kleinasien: historische Aspekte einer keltischen Staatenbildung'. In J. Seibert (ed.). *Hellenistische Studien: Gedenkschrift für Hermann Bengtson*. Münchner Arbeiten zur Alte Geschichte 5. Munich; Institute für Alte Geschichte, 101–34.

Strobel, K. 1994. 'Keltensieg und Galatersieger. Die Funktionalisierung eines historischen Phänomens als politischer Mythos der hellenistischen Welt'. In E. Schwertheim (ed.). *Forschungen in Galatien*. Bonn; R. Habelt, 67–96.

Strobel, K. 1996. *Die Galater: Geschichte und Eigenart der keltischen Staatenbildung auf dem Boden des hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*. Berlin; Akademie-Verlag.

Strobel, K. 2002. 'State Formation by the Galatians of Asia Minor', *Anatolica* 28, 1–44.

Strobel, K. 2006. 'Galatien, die Galater und die Poleis der Galater: historische Identität und ethnische Tradition', *Eirene: Studia Graeca et Latina* 42, 89–123.

Strobel, K. 2009. 'The Galatians in the Roman empire. Historical Tradition and Ethnic Identity in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor'. In T. Derks & N. Roymans (eds.). *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*. Amsterdam; Amsterdam University Press, 117–144.

Strootman, R. 2005. ‘Kings Against Celts. Deliverance from Barbarians as a Theme in Hellenistic Royal Propaganda’. In K. A. E. Enenkel & I. L. Pfeijffer (eds.). *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity*. Leiden; Brill, 101–41.
Thonemann, P. 2015. ‘Pessinous and the Attalids: A New Royal Letter’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 193, 117–28.

Antti Lampinen
Nordic Library at Athens