

# STRANGERS IN A STRANGE LAND. THE IDENTITY OF GALATIAN RULERS IN THRACE AND ANATOLIA AT THE TURN OF THE 3<sup>RD</sup> TO THE 2<sup>ND</sup> CENTURY BC<sup>1</sup>

Julian Gieseke  
*Universität Bielefeld*  
Orcid: 0000-0002-1178-2277  
email: julian.gieseke@uni-bielefeld.de

## ABSTRACT:

The Gallic invasion of Greece in 280/279 BC left a deep mark in the collective memory of the Greeks. From then on, they represented the Celts as the stereotypical ‘barbarians’ – primitive, wild, violent and without any culture of their own. As the newcomers had established permanent kingdoms in Thrace and Phrygia, however, both sides had to learn how to deal with each other. The paper asks how the rulers of the Galatians on both sides of the Bosphorus handled this challenge and how this influenced their own identity. To go beyond existing research, the analysis draws both on the literary Greek sources and the coinage which the Eastern Celts started to produce in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. It will be shown that the Galatian elites quickly adapted to the political practices of the Hellenistic world and confidently asserted their own place within it, mixing their own customs with Greek and local (Thracian, Anatolian) elements to create a unique blend of identity.

**Keywords:** Celtic Coinage/Tylis/Galatia/Polybios/Identity

<sup>1</sup> This article is loosely based on a paper called *How Greek can it be? The identity and representation of Galatian rulers at the turn of the 3rd to the 2nd century BC* which I held at the conference *Definition and Redefinition of Celtic Identities in the Ancient World. An Interdisciplinary Approach* at the University of Edinburgh on 16 September 2022. My sincere thanks go to the organisers Giovanna Pasquariello (Edinburgh) and Andrea Pierozzi (Florence) and everyone who provided feedback during the session, but especially to Kevin Parachaud (Limoges), who also discussed the paper with me several times after the conference. The paper was later discussed under the title *Greek Style, Celtic Message? The representation of Eastern Celtic identity on their earliest coins at the turn of the 3rd to the 2nd century BC* during the conference *III Congreso Internacional de Arte y Arqueología del Mundo Antiguo. La Guerra* at the Universidad de Murcia (18–21 October 2023) and I am grateful to José Fenoll Cascales and Carlos Espí Forcén (both Murcia) for hosting the event as well as to everyone who participated in the discussions.

“They lived in unwalled villages, without any superfluous furniture; for as they slept on beds of leaves and fed on meat and were exclusively occupied with war and agriculture, their lives were very simple, and they had no knowledge whatsoever of any art or science. Their possessions consisted of cattle and gold, because these were the only things they could carry about with them everywhere according to circumstances and shift where they chose.”<sup>2</sup> (Polyb. 2.17.9–11)

This is the short ethnographic account of the inhabitants of Gallia Cisalpina in the *Histories* of Polybios of Megalopolis (ca. 200–118 BC). The Celts<sup>3</sup> appear as warlike, semi-nomadic ‘barbarians’ who lack every feature of Greek civilisation: Urban settlements, παιδεία, an appreciation of high culture, a sophisticated economy, political organisation. Elsewhere in the work, Polybios contradicts these statements, e.g. when distinguishing between the nomad Celts of the Alps and those settled in the Po valley<sup>4</sup> or when mentioning that the Celts had taken over the ‘civilised’ lands of the Etruscans<sup>5</sup> and that the Insubres had a capital city in Mediolanum/Melpum,<sup>6</sup> which even featured a gilded temple of Athena.<sup>7</sup> Despite better knowledge, then, Polybios sums up the Celtic lifestyle in the words quoted above. They serve as an introduction to his report on the war of the Insubres, Boii and Gaesati against Rome in the 220s BC. After a prolonged struggle, the Romans overcame these foes and captured Mediolanum.<sup>8</sup> Polybios concludes: “(...) not most steps but every single step that the Gauls took (...) (was) commended to them rather by the heat of passion than by cool calculation.”<sup>9</sup> As ‘barbarians’ who originally hailed from the cold and rough lands of the North – a topic Aristotle had already elaborated on<sup>10</sup> – the Celts were ruled by their θυμός, a stark contrast to the σωφροσύνη and νοῦς not only of the Greeks, but also of the Romans.<sup>11</sup> Undoubtedly, Polybios inserted these passages so that his readers could identify with the Roman side and see how similar Romans and Greeks were: after all, one of the goals of his *Histories* was to convince his Greek audience that further military resistance against Rome was futile and that they had to find ways to live with and under the Romans.<sup>12</sup> But it’s not just about Rome: Polybios’ Celts appear as the product of their environment. Hence, the inhabitants of the cold and snow-capped Alps are the wildest and least trustworthy of all Celts.<sup>13</sup> And even though the Gauls in the Po-valley now live in a region which Polybios calls very fertile,<sup>14</sup> they still largely stick to the old *nomoi* from the time they had lived in the North – as seen in the quote above.<sup>15</sup>

The same was true for the Celts of the East: Polybios compares the fate of Byzantion, which was under constant pressure from both Thracians and the Gauls of Tyllis, with the

2 ὄκουν δὲ κατὰ κόμας ἀτειχίστους, τῆς λοιπῆς κατασκευῆς ἄμοιροι καθεστῶτες. [10] διὰ γὰρ τὸ στιβαδοκοτεῖν καὶ κρεαφαγεῖν, ἔτι δὲ μηδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν τὰ πολεμικὰ καὶ τὰ κατὰ γεωργίαν: ἀσκεῖν ἀπλοῦς εἶχον τοὺς βίους, οὐτ’ ἐπιστήμης ἄλλης οὔτε τέχνης παρ’ αὐτοῖς τὸ παράπαν γινωσκομένης. [11] ὑπαρξίς γε μὴν ἐκάστοις ἦν θρέμματα καὶ χρυσὸς διὰ τὸ μόνον ταῦτα κατὰ τὰς περιστάσεις ῥαδίως δύνασθαι πανταχὴ περιγαγεῖν καὶ μεθιστάναι κατὰ τὰς αὐτῶν προαιρέσεις. Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2010. This is followed by a more neutral comment on the structure of Gallic society in 2.17.12.

3 In antiquity, the various terms for the Celts were used with differing meanings by different authors, but could all potentially refer to the majority or all of these peoples, and therefore *Celts*, *Galatians* and *Gauls* will be used interchangeably in this paper, but the Celtic peoples in Phrygia will always be called *Galatians*, in line with common practice.

4 Polyb. 2.19.1–4.

5 Polyb. 2.17.1–3. Archaeology shows that many settlement patterns continued after the Gallic conquest, though often on a smaller scale than before: cf., e.g., Frey, 1995: 524–528; Vitali, 2006: passim for the area of Monte Bibele near Bologna under the Boii.

6 Polyb. II.34.10–14; cf. Williams, 2001: 80–81.

7 Polyb. 2.32.6.

8 Polyb. II.34.10–14.

9 Polyb. 2.35.3. [...] διὰ τὸ μὴ τὸ πλεῖον ἀλλὰ συλλήβδην ἅπαν τὸ γινόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν θυμῷ μᾶλλον ἢ λογισμῷ βραβεύεσθαι. Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2010.

10 Aristot. Eth. Nic. 1336a; Pol. 1327b.24–34; Probl. 14.8.909b 9–10; 15.910a.26–27; 16, 910a.38–39; cf. Kochanek, 2004: 225.

11 For his views on the Romans cf. Gieseke, 2023: 60–122.

12 The military superiority of the Romans could only lead to defeat: he had experienced this with his very own Achaian League and could thus put the blame of the war only on their leaders, who should have known that they could not defeat Rome. This was also true for other Greek statesmen who fought the Romans after the Third Roman-Macedonian War: cf. Walbank, 1972: 176–179; Erskine, 2013a: 241–243. For Polybios’ motivation in this regard see Gieseke, 2023: 124–126.

13 Polyb. 3.52 (especially treacherous character); 3.54–55 (weather and climatic conditions in the Alps). Cf. Urban 1991, 143; Foulon, 2001: 61.

14 Polyb.2.15.1–6.

15 For the gradual differences between the Alpine and the Cisalpine Celts in the *Histories* see Gieseke, 2023: 137–157.

torment of Tantalos: In the same way that Tantalos could only ever see the water and food he desired in front of him without actually reaching it, the Byzantines cultivated their fruitful land every year only to see the crops stolen by their ‘barbarian’ neighbours at harvest.<sup>16</sup> Further to the East, the Galatians were “(...) the most formidable and warlike nation in Asia Minor (...)” and Attalos I therefore deserved immense praise for stopping them and protecting the Greek cities.<sup>17</sup>

The image of the Celts in the *Histories*, then, is predominantly negative: They are characterised as savage ‘barbarians’ who threaten the Mediterranean world and cannot be integrated into ‘civilisation’: Contrary to what the archaeological record shows us, Polybios claims the Romans had evicted all Celts from Gallia Cisalpina after conquering the area.<sup>18</sup> For him, there was no place for Celts in the ‘civilised’ world.<sup>19</sup>

And of course, Polybios is no exception. In poetry, Kallimachos portrayed the Celts as wild and dangerous, and as numerous as snowflakes or as the stars in the sky.<sup>20</sup> His descriptions, too, had a concrete purpose: He probably wrote the lines in the wake of a mutiny of Galatian mercenaries against Ptolemy II, who subsequently isolated and killed the Celts on an island in the Nile.<sup>21</sup> Kallimachos shared the popular conception that the Celts came from the far West, which was at the same time increasingly combined with the idea of the cold North.<sup>22</sup>

We find very similar depictions of the Celts in other media: In inscriptions from Asia Minor they are often portrayed as the common enemies of all. One text of the 270s, from Priene, singles out their *παρανομία*, a lawlessness that knew no respect for either humans or gods.<sup>23</sup> Meanwhile, the Aitolian League, which had greatly contributed to the Greek defence of Delphi against the Celts of Brennos in 279 BC, established a *σωτήρια* festival for Apollo soon after. In 245 BC, the *κοινόν* changed the narrative to portray itself as the sole saviour of the sanctuary. The move served not least to justify the Aitolian seizure of Delphi and their expansion into neighbouring regions in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC.<sup>24</sup>

Meanwhile, the image of the defeated Celt became a popular motif on grave stelae in Bithynia and was used to underline personal glory: Even one Menas from Nikaia, whose epitaph informs us that he killed a Mysian and a Thracian in battle, depicted a Celt as his enemy in the illustration!<sup>25</sup> The most prominent example of the Gauls as defeated ‘barbarians’, however, comes from the well-known works of the Attalids. Their victory monuments in Athens, Delphi, Delos and Pergamon show the Galatians as heroic and brave warriors whose attributes and looks resemble the *topoi* of Greek literature.<sup>26</sup> Though there is some ambivalence in the artistic representation, they ultimately share the fate of all Celts in the Greek imagination: They had followed their *θυμός* and lacked ‘civilised’ organisation, so they could only end up on the losing side and often chose suicide – a move that stood in strong opposition to the values of the *polis*.<sup>27</sup>

None of this is a surprise. Most Greeks of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC only knew *Κελτοί* and *Γαλάται* as enemies: They had seemingly arrived from the Northwest with the sole aim to plunder Greek towns and attack Greek civilisation, and though they often served as mercenaries in Hellenistic

16 Polyb. IV, 45, 1–8; cf. Hom. Od. 11.582–592. There is indeed good evidence that Byzantion, Chalkedon, Kallatis, Mesembria, Odesos and Kabyle all paid tributes to the Tylian Celts in the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. See Price, 1991: 173–174 (West Pontic cities), Marinescu, 1996: 403–406 (cities on the Bosphorus), Diedrich, 2022: 55 (Kabyle).

17 Polyb. 18.41.7: [...] ὁ βαρύτερον καὶ μαχιμώτατον ἔθνος ἦν τότε κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν [...]. Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2012. Cf. all of 18.41 for the encomium on the Pergamene king.

18 Polyb. 2.35.4; Williams, 2001: 213–214.

19 Cf. the discussion of the idea of fringe peoples outside the common history of the Mediterranean as connected by the *συμπλοκή* in Quinn, 2013: 341–342.

20 Callim. H. 4.171–188.

21 Cf. Kistler, 2009: 213–218.

22 Herodotos had already located the Celts in the far West: Hdt. 2.33.3; 4.49.3. And Thuc. 6.2.1 had placed the Cyclopes on Sicily: Similar monsters were thus found on the Western and Northern fringes of the *ecumene*.

23 OGIS 765 (= I. Priene 17 = Burstein 1985) l. 7–13; 17–19.

24 For this phenomenon cf., e.g., Champion, 1996: 317–318; Paus. 10.19.4–23.13; E.M. 7400 = IGII/IG III<sup>2</sup>, 680 = Syll. <sup>3</sup> 408/Delph. Inv. 2275 = IG IX, I<sup>2</sup>, 194b = FD III, 3, 215 = Syll. <sup>3</sup> 402; Chaniotis, 2015: 25.

25 Istanbul Archaeological Museum Inv. 1176, l. 1–8; Kistler, 2009: 53–65 & 54 on Menas.

26 Cf. Fless, 2002 *passim*.

27 Similar: Zanker, 2000: 412–413. On the suicide: Lampinen, 2018: 290–291.

armies, these posed a constant danger both for the employers (as seen by the case of Ptolemy II) and the – usually also Greek – enemies of the respective army (such as Priene or Pergamon). Yet, the Galatians had established permanent kingdoms in Thrace and Phrygia, concluded treaties with Greek states, acted as arbitrators in conflicts,<sup>28</sup> supplied mercenaries in accordance with international contracts<sup>29</sup> and begun to mint Hellenic style coins. Moreover, it had been the Greek ‘Northern League’ which had brought them over to Asia in the first place.<sup>30</sup> This raises the question if the Greek image of the eastern Celts changed during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, and if the Galatians themselves – on both sides of the Bosphorus – were striving for acceptance in the Greek world they had found themselves in. Finally, we have to wonder how this affected their identity. In answering these questions, the paper will bring together the scholarly debates about Greek views on the Celtic ‘barbarians’ and the analysis of the *Histories* of Polybios with the research into Celtic material evidence, most importantly their coins. These disciplines usually remain separate, but if taken together they can further our understanding of the Eastern Celts, their culture, policies and identity in the early Hellenistic period.<sup>31</sup>

A closer look shows that, in a few isolated cases, even Polybios could praise Gallic individuals. The most prominent examples are Ortiagon, tetrarch of the Galatian Tolistobogioi, and his wife Chiomara. Ortiagon and his people had supported Antiochos III in his war against Rome and, in the aftermath of the Seleucid defeat at Magnesia-on-Sipylos in 189 BC, became the target of a campaign of the consul Gnaeus Manlius Vulso.<sup>32</sup> The Galatians chose fortified positions on the Asiatic Olympos and another mountain called Magaba, but were eventually overcome.<sup>33</sup> Despite their victory, the Romans left the Galatian states intact to ensure they could continue to exert pressure on other actors in the region.<sup>34</sup> In the course of the 180s, Ortiagon grasped this opportunity to unite most of Galatia under his single rule.<sup>35</sup> After what we have seen, one may expect that Polybios demonised such a person, but the opposite is the case:

“Ortiagon, one of the Galatian princes, formed the project of subjecting the whole of Galatia to his dominion; and for this purpose, he possessed many advantages both natural and acquired. For he was munificent and magnanimous, his conversation was both charming and intelligent, and, what is most important among Galatians, he was brave and skilled in the art of war.”<sup>36</sup>

Ortiagon’s most important attribute is his bravery (ἀνδρεία; here ἀνδρώδης), typical of a Celt and northern ‘barbarian’, as Polybios makes clear. Yet, he is also given more Greek characteristics: Munificent (εὐεργετικός), magnanimous (μεγαλόψυχος), charming (εὐχαρῖς) and even intelligent or wise (συνετός). These traits are evocative not of a savage ‘barbarian’, but of a Hellenistic king. Polybios thus acknowledges the legitimation of his rule and treats him like a Greek. Though he points out that Ortiagon’s courage and dexterity in battle are most appreciated by the Gauls, these skills would have equally won the appraisal of Greek readers, especially if they were military men like Polybios himself. Yet, the statement shows

28 In Polyb. IV, 52, 1–5 we hear how Kauaros of Tyllis brokered a peace treaty to end the war of Rhodes and Bithynia against Byzantium in 220 BC. See on this p. 12 below.

29 Cf. Maier, 2000: 58 for the Ptolemies and Tyllis.

30 Cf. Memnon of Herakleia, Frg. 11. It consisted of Byzantium, Herakleia Pontike, the kingdom of Bithynia, Chalkedon, Tieion and Kios and/or Kieros. Cf. Kaye, 2023: 188 for Kios, Saprykin, 2020: 227 for the possible inclusion of the kingdom of Pontos and the history of the Northern League in general.

31 Most authors working on Polybios’ views of the Celts have concentrated on the West and almost never considered the numismatic evidence for comparisons: cf. Urban, 1991, Berger, 1995, Foulon, 2001, Williams, 2001. Kistler, 2009, has much to say about the representation of the Eastern Celts on graves and monuments, but far less on the coinage, and he only treats Polybios in passing. The latest numismatic approach to the topic by Diedrich, 2022 gives considerable room to Polybios, but does not investigate the ethnographic characterisations in the *Histories*. Most papers on Eastern Celtic and Thracian coinage, meanwhile, – among them Draganov, 2005c, Anastassov, 2011 or Damyanov/Manov, 2013 – are focussed on their specialist issues and do not make much use of the literary sources.

32 Polyb. 21.33–39; Liv.38.12–27.

33 Liv. 38.19; 26–27.

34 Strobel, 1991: 131–132.

35 Cf. Arslan, 2004a: 99.

36 Polyb. 22.21. ὅτι Οἰτιάγων ὁ Γαλάτης, τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ βασιλευῶν, ἐπεβάλετο τὴν ἀπάντων τῶν Γαλατῶν δυναστείαν εἰς αὐτὸν μεταστῆσαι, [2] καὶ πολλὰ πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἐφόδια προσεφέρετο καὶ φύσει καὶ τριβῇ. [3] καὶ γὰρ εὐεργετικός ἦν καὶ μεγαλόψυχος καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἐντεύξεις εὐχαρῖς καὶ συνετός, [4] τὸ δὲ συνέχον παρὰ Γαλάταις, ἀνδρώδης ἦν καὶ δυναμικός πρὸς τὰς πολεμικὰς χρείας. Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2012.

that Polybios does not regard the Galatian people to be of the same character as Ortiagon: They apparently only admire his martial qualities but fail to recognise the virtue of his character – revealing their own lack of culture. Behind Polybios’ portrayal of Ortiagon we may suspect a conscious policy of self-representation by the ruler and euergetism in the style of a Hellenistic βασιλεύς, but our evidence for this is patchy at best.<sup>37</sup> Another reason for Polybios’ appreciation of the Tolistobogian may be that he had personally met his wife Chiomara, if we can believe the testimony of Plutarch.<sup>38</sup> After the defeat of the Galatians at the hands of Vulso, she had been taken captive and raped by a Roman centurio.<sup>39</sup> However, Ortiagon managed to negotiate her release and Polybios (as quoted by Livy and Plutarch) describes the scene:<sup>40</sup>

“When the Gauls crossed and after handing him (the centurio) the money were taking possession of Chiomara, she signalled to one of them to strike the man as he was taking an affectionate leave of her. The man (the Galatian) obeyed and cut off his head, which she took up and wrapped in the folds of her dress, and then drove off. When she came into the presence of her husband and threw the head at his feet, he was astonished and said, “Ah! My wife, it is good to keep faith.” “Yes,” she replied, “but it is better still that only one man who has lain with me should remain alive.”<sup>41</sup>

Plutarch (and Livy) cited the anecdote as a moral exemplum. It is not unlike the story of the 7<sup>th</sup> century Lydian king Gyges in Herodotos’ *Histories*. Gyges had once been the commander of the bodyguard under the previous king, Kandaules, but when he saw Kandaules’ wife naked, the queen forced Gyges to either kill her husband or himself: In Lydia, no woman could live with the shame to have been seen in nude state by two different men.<sup>42</sup> Polybios will have been familiar with Herodotos’ work<sup>43</sup> and the parallels in the story would imply a moral critique of Ortiagon: He had allowed his wife to be captured by the Romans and was thus responsible for what she had to go through.<sup>44</sup> And he does not even avenge her – instead, she has to take care of restoring her reputation herself. Additionally, Plutarch and Livy likely emphasised the killing of the centurio in typical Celtic fashion to show their readers that even an intelligent and hellenised Galatian princess like Chiomara remained a barbarian at heart. Despite being on the ‘right’ side of the story, the moral superiority of Ortiagon and Chiomara is thereby restricted because they remain ‘barbarians’.

But was this Polybios’ original intention? If he did indeed meet her, he may have been told about these events by herself or at least by someone with a Galatian background. Plutarch adds that Polybios admired Chiomara’s “(..) high spirit (φρόνημα) and intelligence” (σύνεσις), while he had described the centurio as an ignorant brute who lacked any self-control whatsoever.<sup>45</sup> That both Ortiagon and Chiomara are συνετός (intelligent/wise) and that she is also said to possess φρόνημα (good sense/reason) presents a complete role reversal: Kallimachos calls the Galatians ἄφρων<sup>46</sup> and Polybios usually criticises the Galatians for their θυμός, while emphasising the rationality of the Romans.<sup>47</sup> Yet, in this comparison a Galatian

37 On the uber-Greek name of his son see p. 10 below. Ortiagon also seems to have been an ally of the Bithynian king Prusias, as Péré-Noguès, 2013: 166 rightly underlines, and Liv. 38.26.4 mentions the kingdoms of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia as supporters of the Galatians, demonstrating that the Anatolian kingdoms acknowledged the Galatians as valuable allies at this point. This is no surprise, however, considering that the so called ‘Northern League’ brought the Galatians over to Asia in the first place; see p. 8 above.

38 Plut. Mor. 258 F = de mul. virt. 22 = Polyb. 21.38.7.

39 Plut. Mor. /258E = de mul. virt. 22 = Polyb. 21.38.1–2.

40 Cf. Liv. 38.24.

41 Polyb. 21.38.4–6. ὡς δὲ διαβάντες οἱ Γαλάται τὸ χρυσοῖον ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ καὶ παρελάμβανον τὴν Χιομάρην, ἢ μὲν ἀπὸ νεύματος προσέταξεν ἐνὶ παισὶ τὸν Ῥωμαῖον ἀσπαζόμενον αὐτὴν καὶ φιλοφρονούμενον, [5] ἐκείνου δὲ πεισθέντος καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκόψαντος, ἀραμένη καὶ περιστείλασα τοῖς κόλποις ἀπὶ γλαυνοῦ. [6] ὡς δ’ ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρα καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῷ προύβαλεν, ἐκείνου θαυμάσαντος καὶ εἰπόντος «ὦ γύναι, καλὸν ἢ πίστις» «ναί», εἶπεν «ἀλλὰ κάλλιον ἕνα μόνον ζῆν ἐμοὶ συγγεγενημένον». Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2012.

42 Hdt. I. 8–12.

43 On this and Herodotos as a role model for Polybios’ passages on foreign peoples see Gieseke, 2023: 62, 66–68.

44 Andrew Erskine (Edinburgh) was so kind as to point out the parallel between the two stories to me.

45 Plut. De Mul. Virtut. 22/258E = Polyb. 21.38.3 (centurio); Plut. Mor. 258F = de mul. virt. 22 = Polyb. 21.38.7 (Chiomara’s intelligence). Translation from Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2011.

46 Callim. H. 4. 184.

47 See above p. 6.

princess appears as more reasonable than and morally superior to a male Roman officer. As a historian of the Hellenistic age, Polybios was very much interested in moral lessons and he uses the fate of Chiomara to illustrate that even ‘barbarians’ and their women could be wronged by the representatives of ‘civilised’ peoples.<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, this would have been a mirror for his Roman audience to not take their moral pre-eminence for granted.<sup>49</sup> Maybe it also corresponded to his idea of the *τύχη* as a force behind all history that punished those – in this case, the centurio – who did not show the necessary humility in success.<sup>50</sup>

To go further, we could possibly speculate that Chiomara or another Galatian intentionally told the Greek historian the story to spread a positive, moralising image of the Galatian ruling pair. Chiomara appears as an immaculate heroine who demonstrates the bravery both her people and Greek soldiers like Polybios admired so much. Since Polybios does not shy away from criticising the Romans in other passages of the *Histories* either,<sup>51</sup> he did indeed insert the story and thus cast Vulso’s campaign against the Galatians in a critical light. It is impossible to say if the Galatian source would have hoped Polybios could exert any political influence in the favour of Ortiagon. In any case, it is conspicuous that the beheading of the Roman officer, Chiomara’s personal enemy, fits to the traditions of headhunt among the Celts which was reported by many ancient authors.<sup>52</sup> The phenomenon certainly existed among various La Tene peoples, but so far, the very fragment discussed here is almost the only evidence for its existence among the Anatolian Celts.<sup>53</sup> Hence, it is unlikely that the beheading of the centurio actually took place and Polybios – or Plutarch – probably modified the story to meet the expectations of the audience. The mention of the headhunting highlights the ‘civilisational’ gap between the Galatians and Romans and it would thus not have been in the interest of Chiomara or any other Galatian to include this aspect. According to the *Suda*, Ortiagon (and Chiomara?) had a son called Paidopolites (either “the one who educates citizens”, or “educated to become a citizen”), an overly Greek name which is otherwise unattested.<sup>54</sup> If accurate, this would attest to a desire of ‘catching up’ with the Greeks and Romans and with the anecdote they would have accordingly demonstrated that, at least on the moral level, the Galatians could be the equals of their neighbours. Since we lack any direct Galatian perspective, we can currently only assume that Ortiagon and Chiomara had represented themselves as a Hellenistic ruler couple – in control of all of Galatia – that enacted euergetism to win over the hearts and minds of the Greeks and Anatolians without foregoing their Celtic traditions – but we cannot prove this.<sup>55</sup> What we do know is that there was no happy end: In 184/183 BC, Ortiagon was captured and executed by Eumenes II of Pergamon.<sup>56</sup>

48 For his moral interests cf. Hau, 2016: 23–71.

49 For his (limited) Roman audience cf. Polyb. 31. 22.8 with Walbank, 1972: 4.

50 On Polybios’ views of the *Tyche*, its role in his conception of history and the vagaries of life see Maier, 2012.

51 He can criticise both their behaviour as ruthless conquerors (e.g., the sack of Syracuse: Polyb. 9.10) and some of their equally ruthless *nomoi* (e.g., fathers sometimes have to execute their own sons: Polyb. 6.54.5). This topic is explored in some detail by Erskine, 2013b.

52 E.g., by Posidonius in Strab. 4.4.5C198 = FGrHist 87 F55 = F 274 EK = F 34 Theiler or by Trogus in Iust. 24.5. Cf. Armit 2012, 24, tab. 2.1 for an overview of all literary sources on Celtic headhunt in antiquity BC; Polybios himself (2.28.10 & 3.67.3) mentions it among the cisalpine Gauls.

53 Armit, 2012: 24, tab. 2.1 lists no other literary description and I could find no archaeological proof for headhunting in Galatian Anatolia. For the second ancient story mentioning it see p. 11. However, Iust. 24.5 tells us that the Celts of Brennus cut off the head of Ptolemy Keraunos, and the Galatians would later break off from this group, so it could be argued there is some evidence here – if Justin/Trogus did not simply make up the story to entertain his readers. The headhunt certainly featured in the European Keltiké: For instance, many Gallic rulers depicted severed heads on their coins – as late as the 50s BC. Gruel/Popovitch, 2007: 166 Cat. No. 19, 2; Colbert de Beaulieu/Fischer, 1998: 238–239, Cat. No. 142. Cf. Armit, 2012: 18–44 for an analysis of the phenomenon of Celtic headhunt within its wider Indo-European context. Armit concludes that there was some truth in the story, but that sometimes the depiction of severed heads may have been just that – it was not always an allusion to headhunting. Lately, the skeleton finds at ancient Gordion have been interpreted as evidence for human sacrifice by the Galatians: Voigt, 2012. However, this interpretation has been challenged by Parachaud, 2019: 57–60 and Polybios does not mention the practice for the Galatians either. In Diod. 31 Fr.13 – based on Polybios?–, however, we hear that an army of Galatians that had defeated Eumenes II in 168 BC celebrated the victory by sacrificing young men. Again, it remains unclear if this is just a *topos* or relates to an actual event. In any case, human sacrifice has to be separated from the headhunt, which is usually portrayed as happening during a battle, while the captives are sacrificed after the fighting and there is no indication their heads were necessarily severed.

54 Suid. s.v. Ὀρτιάγωντος.

55 A similar interpretation is implied by Arslan 2004a, 98. A new inscription due to be published by the *Istanbul Mitteilungen*, which mentions Ortiagon as tetrarch of the Tolistobogioi, can hopefully shed new light on the matter. It was already announced by Vardar, 2006: 80.

56 Iust. pr. 32.

A set of further stories preserved by Greek authors can possibly help us to illuminate the actions of Ortiagion and Chiomara. According to Plutarch and Polyainos, Celtic women had fulfilled the roles of bards and druids who mediated between the noblemen and warriors in a long distant past before the first migrations. Traces of this tradition were found in a treaty the Cisalpine Gauls signed with Hannibal and according to which Celtic (noble) women should preside as judges over any complaints filed against the Celts by the Carthaginians.<sup>57</sup> Though this tale, if true at all, refers to the West, there are two corresponding episodes which fit the context of Tylis and Galatia: In the work of an unknown Greek author, we hear that the Galatians are advised by their women in matters of war and politics, but if their counsel turns out to have been poor, they pay with their lives – fittingly, their heads are cut off.<sup>58</sup> Péré-Noguès has convincingly dated the story to the early 3rd century BC, when women are said to have accompanied and sometimes fought with their men in the invasions of Greece, Thrace and Phrygia.<sup>59</sup> It is impossible to decide if these examples were simply part of a literary tradition around certain *topoi* or based on actual observation of Celtic society, but a final, more concrete fragment in the *tractatus de mulieribus claris in bello*, possibly written by Pamphile of Epidauros, the first known female Greek historian (fl. mid-1st century AD), may lend weight to the idea that we are faced with genuine Galatian *nomoi*.<sup>60</sup> In this case, a Celtic people was suffering from hunger and subsequently decided to sally forth and find a new and better home for themselves. Yet, none of their noblemen was brave enough to take on the responsibilities of a leader, and so a woman called Onomaris took it on herself to head the expedition. Eventually, they crossed the Istros (Danube) river, defeated the indigenous inhabitants and established a kingdom – or, better, queendom, for Onomaris was confirmed as the queen of the new entity.<sup>61</sup> Since the Celts cross the Istros in this story, Péré-Noguès has suggested connecting it with the history of the Scordisci, who formed one or several kingdoms on the Balkans in the early 3rd century BC and took part in the Celtic invasion of Greece.<sup>62</sup>

As the Tylian Celts stem from the same invasion army, it is possible that they already had significant female leadership in the 270s BC, too. In any case, it is astonishing that Onomaris is not only a queen, but a female *oikistes*, a founding heroine, and in difference to other famous women mentioned in ancient sources – like Chiomara – her prominence is not due to her father, husband, brother or son.<sup>63</sup> In fact, the opposite is the case: She was braver than all men in her ethnos. Though the author of the passage may have been a woman in Pamphile, she would still have written for a predominantly male audience and it is hard to explain the autonomous and crucial role given to Onomaris if there was not some truth to it. From the patchy evidence, we may thus conclude that women could attain pivotal roles in Celtic societies at least in times of crisis.<sup>64</sup> Later examples of influential Galatian women such as Adobogonia II, daughter of the Roman ‘client’ king Deiotaros in the first century BC,<sup>65</sup> may imply that the repeated, long distance migrations had led to a shake-up of Galatian traditions which allowed women to claim a more important place than in other ancient societies, or to retain such a position, if we are to believe the anecdote about their past role as religiously legitimated mediators. We could then see Chiomara and Ortiagon as a strong ruling couple that embraced Hellenistic ruling practices, while at the same time representing a Galatian identity which heavily drew on the ethnos’ former migrations and the consequences of those.

To the great disappointment of the modern-day historian, the couple minted no coins and there is little material evidence that could be securely connected with them. We will therefore

57 Plut. Mor. 246B–D = De mul. virt. 6; Polyain. 7.50. Cf. Péré-Noguès, 2013: 160–161 for the interpretation.

58 Paradoxographus Vaticanus Rohdii apud Keller, 1877: 112 n. 48.

59 Péré-Noguès, 2013: 163.

60 On the argument for Pamphile as the author instead of an unknown, likely male composer around 100 BC see Gera, 1997: 60–61.

61 *Tractatus de mulieribus claris in bello* 14, Péré-Noguès, 2013: 164.

62 Iust. 32.3.6 attests their presence in the invasion army and Strab. 7.5.12 C318 claims they once lived along the Istros, but that part of the Scordisci which had took part in the expedition may have afterwards settled further south than their relatives. However, this question is still hotly debated, for which see Drnić, 2020.

63 Péré-Noguès, 2013: 164.

64 Péré-Noguès, 2013: 165.

65 On her, see Péré-Noguès, 2013: 173 and p. 22 below.

turn to another, very similar case next: Tylis, the small Celtic kingdom in Thrace,<sup>66</sup> one of which rulers also found the appraisal of Polybios. This is Kauaros, the last king of Tylis. Following the comparison between the fate of neighbouring Byzantion and Tantalos mentioned above,<sup>67</sup> Polybios describes the so-called Monopoly War between Byzantion and Rhodes in 220 BC: Hard pressed by the Tylians, who demanded an annual tribute of eighty talents,<sup>68</sup> the Byzantines started to exact high duties from all ships crossing the Bosphorus. Even though Polybios could have easily blamed Kauaros for the outbreak of the war, he only speaks of the desperate situation of Byzantion<sup>69</sup> and later emphasises the role of the Tylian king as a successful mediator after Byzantion had been attacked by Rhodes and Bithynia.<sup>70</sup> Kauaros' own realm was overrun by Thracians shortly after 220 BC<sup>71</sup> and yet, he earned the respect of Polybios:

“Kauaros, king of the Gauls in Thracia, being naturally kingly and high-minded, afforded great security to traders sailing to the Pontos, and rendered great services to the Byzantines in their wars with the Thracians and Bithynians. This Kauaros, so excellent in other respects, was corrupted by the flatterer Sostratos a native of Chalkedon...”<sup>72</sup>

Once more, Polybios describes a Galatian ruler akin to a Hellenistic king: Kauaros is “kingly” (βασιλικός) and “high-minded” (μεγαλόφρων), which probably means that Polybios thought him to be a good king according to his circle of constitutions (ἀνακύκλωσις) where μοναρχία designated the good form of kingship, one where the monarch rules in the interest of his people.<sup>73</sup> Overall, Kauaros was ἀγαθός in character, while his advisor Sostratos of Chalkedon, a Greek, is introduced as an immoral person. This comparison finds a parallel elsewhere in the *Histories* when Polybios contrasts the advisors of Philip V of Macedon, the virtuous Aratos of Sikyon and the selfish Demetrios of Pharos.<sup>74</sup> However, in this case, the ‘barbarian’, Demetrios the Illyrian, is cast in the role of the villain while the Achaian Greek Aratos is the (tragic) hero. This makes the praise for Kauaros even more remarkable. His mediation between Byzantion and its enemies was rated very highly by Polybios: In fact, he once remarks that the Byzantines deserved every praise for always keeping the Bosphorus open and thus allowing the trade between the Mediterranean and Black Sea go smoothly,<sup>75</sup> and he must have felt the grain supply of the Aegean in particular would have been under threat had king Prusias I of Bithynia brought the strait under his control.<sup>76</sup> Kauaros was the only person who had been in a position to prevent this scenario from becoming reality, and for that, the Greek world had to thank him. It is conceivable that the Celtic king wanted to achieve just that so that he would be acknowledged as a ruler in the Hellenistic style and accepted by his Greek neighbours, just as we have assumed for Ortiagon and Chiomara above. We are lucky that, in difference to Ortiagon, he minted his own coins, and these can tell us more about his self-definition and aims.<sup>77</sup> His coinage has to be examined in a larger context: Most Celtic issues of

66 Scholarship generally agrees that the area it ruled directly was rather small, though its exact location remains hotly contested; cf. Diedrich, 2022: 30–31 (size), 31–33, 36–37 (location) with an up-to-date overview of the debates. Discussing these questions here would lead too far away from the question of identity posed above, but the author certainly agrees that Tylis should be seen as a smaller, regional power with a few dependent allies, not a large empire on the Balkans. Diedrich, 2022: 61–62 emphasises that the distribution of the bronze coins of Kauaros supports this idea.

67 P. 7. Polyb. 4.45.1–8.

68 Polyb. 4.46.4.

69 Polyb. 4.46.5–6.

70 Polyb. 4.52.1–2.

71 Polyb. 4.46.4. For the date cf. Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 11.

72 Polyb. 8.22.1–3. ὅτι Καυάρως ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ Γαλατῶν βασιλικὸς ὑπάρχων τῇ φύσει καὶ μεγαλόφρων, πολλὴν μὲν ἀσφάλειαν παρεσκεύαζε τοῖς προσπλέουσι τῶν ἐμπορῶν εἰς τὸν Πόντον, [2] μεγάλας δὲ παρείχετο χρεῖας τοῖς Βυζαντίοις ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς Θράκας καὶ Βιθυνοὺς πολέμοις. Πολύβιος [3] ἐν ὀγδῇ ἱστορίῳ, Καυάρως, φησὶν, ὁ Γαλάτης, ὡν τὰλλα ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, ὑπὸ Σωστράτου τοῦ κόλακος διεστρέφετο, ὃς ἦν Χαλκιδόνιος γένος. Transl. by Habicht/Paton/Walbank, 2011.

73 Polyb. 6.7.3–5. His characterisation of kings as moderate and living a simple life is an idealisation that hardly fits the realities of the Hellenistic world, but Polybios was probably aware of that.

74 This can be best seen in Polyb. 7.12–14.

75 Polyb. 4.38.1–10.

76 For instance, he says Prusias minded that Byzantion tried to negotiate a peace treaty between Attalos I and the Seleucid usurper and at that point *de facto* king of Asia Minor, Achaïos; Polyb. 4.49.2.

77 Besides coins, the torques of Gorni Tsibar, remains of a chariot, fibulae, rings, knives, swords, helmets, shield buckles and chain-mail have been found as markers of Celtic presence in Thrace, cf. Anastassov, 2011 for an overview.



the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC are straight copies of Greek types, reflecting the fact that most Celts did not know any other forms of money.

Accordingly, they started using those Hellenic coins which were accepted by everyone in the area.<sup>78</sup> This is true, e.g., for the Scordisci on the Balkans, who minted staters in the style of Philip II of Macedon, which is obvious when we compare some of their staters, roughly dated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC (FIG.1), with a posthumous issue of Philip II from his Amphipolis mint (FIG. 2).<sup>79</sup> The obverse of all of these coins shows a bearded Zeus, though the Celtic design is clearly different. On the reverse, we spot a rider wearing a laurel branch on the Macedonian coin, while the Scordiscian examples sport a horse under a wheel. If we add a third Scordisci issue dated, once more, to 300–100 BC, the evolution of the coinage becomes clear:<sup>80</sup> Here, we see Zeus on the obverse and a rider on the reverse who is holding some kind of branch in his hand, just like the Macedonian horseman on the Philip coin. We may thus assume that this was the first copy of the Argead model, with only minor changes, before the horseman was replaced with a horse under a wheel, which is associated with the Celtic god Taranis, whose dominion, like that of Zeus, was the sky.<sup>81</sup> If true, the Scordisci thus equated their own gods with Greek gods to make the religious connotations understandable for the audience: The *interpretatio Graeca* was therefore not just a one-sided operation, but rather found its equivalent in an *interpretatio Celtica*.



Figure. 1 Silver stater of the Scordisci, head of Zeus (o)/horse under wheel (r), Syrmia?<sup>82</sup>, 300–100 BC. Göbl, 1973: 188 2–3, Kostial, 2003: no. 459, Dembski, 1998: 1110–1, Popović, : pl. 8, 12–pl. 9, 10. Nomos AG, Numista: <https://en.numista.com/catalogue/pieces190832.html> (last view 21/11/2023).



Figure. 2. Posthumous silver stater of Philip II, head of Philip II as Zeus (o)/rider with laurel branch (r), Amphipolis, 340–320 BC. Le Rider, 1977: 442, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin Inv. 18238516, picture: Reinhard Saczewski.

78 Hooker, 2006: 461–462.

79 Göbl, 1973: 188 2–3, Kostial, 2003: no. 459, 300–100 BC; Kostial, 2003: no. 460, Göbl, 1973: Pl. 16, 18, 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC; Posthumous issue of Philip II, Amphipolis mint, Le Rider, 1977: 442, here Münzkabinett Berlin Inv. 18238516. In fact, Göbl/Pink, 1974a: 19 argued that the Scordisci were the first Celts to mint copies of the Philip staters.

80 Dembski, 1998: 110, 1350; Göbl, 1973: pl. 12, 129.5; Kostial, 2003, 82, 418, 3<sup>rd</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC. Unfortunately, all available copies of this type seem to have been sold and their images removed from public access so that no figure could be included here.

81 Melrose, 2016: 78–80. Like other researchers, Melrose is cautious in equating Zeus and Taranis, but the Scordiscian coins certainly back up this claim.

82 This was suggested by Göbl/Pink, 1974a: 99, but cannot be proven and is still uncertain.

Next, we need to look at the Thraco-Macedonian kingdom of Kabyle in northern Thrace: According to Strabo, Philip II had settled villagers from his vast kingdom here,<sup>83</sup> and, expectedly, the mints of Kabyle follow the role models of Philip, Alexander and Lysimachos, who had all ruled Thrace: On bronze coins from the time 297–281 BC, but possibly only dating to around 270 BC, we can see Apollo with a laurel wreath on the obverse and a rider on the reverse, with the legend ΣΚΟΣΤΟΚΟΥ (FIG. 3).<sup>84</sup> The name of this ruler appears again on a bronze emission from 260–245 BC, with similar motifs (FIG. 4).<sup>85</sup> The horseman wears a helmet and wields a lance overhand, thus resembling the *xystophoroi* of the Macedonian army.<sup>86</sup> Two more bronze issue possibly depict Skostokos himself and the rider, this time in greeting pose, respectively Artemis Phosphoros, the chief deity of Kabyle, on the reverse.<sup>87</sup> The tetradrachms, meanwhile, copy those of Lysimachos instead, depicting Alexander with the horns of Ammon on the obverse and a seated, armed Athena with Nike in her right hand on the reverse.<sup>88</sup> Skostokos thus followed standard Macedonian imagery, but at the same time emphasised his dynasty's Macedonian connections – his father (?) Spartokos, who also minted coins,<sup>89</sup> or his grandfather may have been given the fiefdom by Philip II – in order to legitimate his rule over Kabyle and the surrounding area.<sup>90</sup> That Apollo was chosen instead of Zeus was probably due to a local sanctuary and thus reflects a certain individual identity.<sup>91</sup> And once again, the image of the cavalryman is retained, emphasising military prowess, though of course this, too, may simply be an imitation of the Argead kings.



Figure. 3 Bronze coin of Skostokos of Kabyle, head of Apollo (o)/armed rider (r), Kabyle?, 297–ca. 270 BC. CN type 11198, Peter, 1997: 219, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Monnaies, médailles et antiques Inv. Fonds général 59 (M 5008). Cf. Corpus Nummorum, [https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/cn.skostococ\\_i\\_thrace.1\\_ed.3](https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/cn.skostococ_i_thrace.1_ed.3) [last view: 21/11/2023].

83 Strab. 7.6.2.C320.

84 CN type 11198, 297–281 BC, Peter, 1997: 219. For the later date(s) Peter, 1997: 222–227, cf. Diedrich, 2022: 54 with the various proposals made by Dimitar Draganov. Since the coins of Skostokos' father Spartakos are from the early 3rd century BC, it seems more likely that his son only produced his own emissions after the former's death. Fischer-Bossert, 2005: 61–63 argued for the earlier date, based on the appearance and type of the tetradrachms. The name Skostokos is Thracian or Celtic; cf. Fischer-Bossert, 2005: 54, n. 29.

85 CN Type 5192; 260–245 BC, Peter, 1997: 219. Also very similar is SNG Stancomb 301, Peter, 1997: 219, Draganov, Cabyle type 1, HGCC 3.2, 1475 and SNG Stancomb 300.

86 Cf. Head, 1982: 104.

87 Peter, 1997: 219, from the private collection of R. Rusev (rider), Peter, 1997: 220, from the private collection of M. Mindov (Artemis). CN Type 11759 again has Apollo on the obverse and Artemis Phosphoros on the reverse.

88 SNGCop 1171 = SNG Ashmolean 3779 = Youroukova, 1976: 103, 277–260 BC, Peter, 1997: 218. For a complete overview of all known tetradrachms see Fischer-Bossert, 2005: 63–74 & pl. I–VIII. They are marked with something that looks like a small herm. On this and other questions regarding the production and origin of the Skostokos silver coins see Fischer-Bossert, 2005: passim.

89 Cf. Peter, 1997: 203–215 on the coinage of Spartokos, id. 218–235 for Skostokos. Spartokos is also mentioned in IGBulg. III 2, 1731 as a powerful ruler who seems to have held some influence in neighbouring Seuthopolis, the capital of the Odrysian kingdom.

90 Nankov, 2015: 402–403. For the discussion if there was a multitude of rulers with the name Skostokos see the overview in Diedrich, 2022: 53.

91 Rabadjiev, 2020: 445. Apollo already appears on at least one coin of Lysimachos, however: Thompson 3; Mionnet I, 121 (306–301 BC).



Figure. 4 Bronze coin of Skostokos of Kabyle, head of Apollo (o)/armed rider (r), Kabyle?, 260–245 BC. CN type 5192, Peter, 1997: 219, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin Inv. 18210566, picture: Lutz-Jürgen Lübke.

With this context in mind, we can now turn towards the coinage of Tylis. Three very small series are known from the period preceding Kauaros, one bearing the name of a ruler called Kersibaulos, the second being identified as that of Orsoaltios, while the description ΛΙΛΑΡΚΙΙ on the last may be a Celtic or damaged version of ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ.<sup>92</sup> At least the first two can be seen as Tylian rulers after Komontorios, the founder of the kingdom in (ca.) 277 BC, and before Kauaros.<sup>93</sup> The respective tetradrachms are very similar to the only specimen minted by the Galatians of Phrygia in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC that I am aware of:<sup>94</sup> All four types show Alexander as Herakles wearing the lion skin on the obverse and a seated Zeus holding an eagle and a sceptre on the reverse.<sup>95</sup> The Celtic coins are modelled on the coins of Alexander from his Lampsakos and Amhipolis mints (fig. 5).<sup>96</sup>

In general, the western half of the Eastern Celts, including the Scordisci, generally imitated the staters of Philip II while those in Thrace and Asia preferred the Attic tetradrachms of Alexander the Great.<sup>97</sup> Since either type was accepted everywhere in the Hellenistic world, they could be used and were needed for international trade, the payment and hiring of mercenaries or craftsmen from abroad or for treaties with Greek cities and kingdoms. Yet, there are some differences between the early Tylian and Galatian coins: On the reverse of the Lilarkii tetradrachm (FIG. 6), we find a figure to the left of the inscription and under the throne that seems to be Artemis holding two torches in her hand. We can identify her with Artemis Phosphoros, the main goddess of Kabyle,<sup>98</sup> where this coin may have been minted.<sup>99</sup> On the reverse of Kersibaulos' tetradrachm (FIG. 7), meanwhile, a Celtic *thyreos* shield can be found beneath Zeus' eagle. The inclusion of the *thyreos* clearly sets the series

92 Kersibaulos: Cn type 5203, SNG BM 308, mid-3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, and Münzkabinett Berlin, Inv. 18210197, cf. Peter, 1997: 250, Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 15. Orsoaltios: Cn type 5205, Peter, 1997: 249, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Monnaies, médailles et antiques Inv. Fonds général 22. Cf. Corpus Nummorum, <https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/5202?l-g=de> [last view: 22/11/2023]. Lilarkii: AR Tetradrachm, 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, wildwinds.com, ex CNG auction 61, Sept. 2002: <https://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/thrace/kings/lilarkii/tetradrachm.jpg> (last view 18/11/2023), Diedrich, 2022: fig. 3 (44). For the meaning of Lilarkii: Diedrich, 2022: 44. Manov, 2018: 561–563 proposed that there was also a ruler called Eutydas, but this theory is based on a single, badly damaged coin, cf. Diedrich, 2022: 42 n. 79.

93 Cf. Tomaschitz, 2002: 140, Diedrich, 2022: 41–42 on the foundation of the kingdom. Diedrich, 2022: 45 notes that only Kersibaulos' coins allow us to safely identify him as a Celtic ruler, but he does not doubt in principle that Orsoaltios (and a theoretical Lilarkii) may have been dynasts of Tylis. Fischer-Bossert, 2005: 59 calls both Orsoaltios and Lilarkii Thracian rulers, but thereby acknowledges Lilarkii as a personal name. The question cannot definitely be answered here, but even if they were Thracians, they would have ruled territory in the vicinity of Tylis and thus also influenced Kauaros.

94 This coin, AR drachm, 3<sup>rd</sup> century, 3.45g, 18mm, seems to be unpublished but for a preview (Price 1373), but images and info can also be found online on Tom Vossen's VCoins: [https://www.vcoins.com/de/stores/tom\\_vossen/165/product/galatia\\_3rd\\_century\\_bc\\_ar\\_drachm\\_345\\_gm\\_18mm\\_imitating\\_lampsakos\\_mint\\_issue\\_of\\_alexander\\_iii\\_of\\_macedon\\_cf\\_price\\_1373/807181/Default.aspx](https://www.vcoins.com/de/stores/tom_vossen/165/product/galatia_3rd_century_bc_ar_drachm_345_gm_18mm_imitating_lampsakos_mint_issue_of_alexander_iii_of_macedon_cf_price_1373/807181/Default.aspx) (last view 22/11/2023).

95 For the lion skin: Peter, 1997: 249 (Orsoaltios), 250 (Kersibaulos).

96 E.g. drachm ADM II series 2, Müller Alexander 397; Demanhur 1689–1747. Here Price, 1991: 96 no. 78, Münzkabinett Staatliche Museen zu Berlin inv. 18214359.

97 Göbl/Pink, 1974: 31.

98 See above p. 14.

99 Currently p. 15 below.

apart from the other issues and marks a crucial difference to the Graeco-Macedonian role model: By adding a typical part of the equipment of the Eastern Celts, the ruler underlines his identity: He may be using Hellenic style coinage, but he is still a potent Gallic war leader. The Orsoaltios tetradrachm (FIG. 8), however, is an almost perfect copy of the Alexander coins with no obvious differences aside from the label [B]ΑΣΙΛΕΩ[Σ] ΟΡΣΟΑΛΤΙΟΥ. Finally, on the Galatian coin (FIG. 9), an S-like symbol appears in the same position as the *thyreos* on the Tylian tetradrachm, unlikely to be the abstract illustration of another shield, but possibly the depiction of a snake.<sup>100</sup> Conspicuously, the Thracian (and Asiatic?) Celts were compared to a snake in the so-called “oracle of Phaennis”, which was allegedly contemporary.<sup>101</sup> In Celtic religion, the snake was a regular companion of warrior deities.<sup>102</sup> If the symbol is to be identified with a snake, the Galatian mint probably included it to underline military strength and divine support. With the limited information we have it is impossible to decide whether the Galatians were familiar with the prophecy comparing them to a snake, but had they known it, they may have tried to re-interpret the sign, or even reaffirm the Greek view that the Celtic newcomers should be feared. However, since neither the provenance of the coin nor the date of the prophecy or the identification of the s-like icon as a serpent are safely attested, more than speculation is not possible at this point. The S could as well be a production fault, the initial of the die-caster or, quite probably, a buckle, as suggested by Price, who interpreted it as the copy of an early Diadochi coin based on Alexander’s Lampsakos type which bears a very similar mark that does indeed look more like a buckle than a snake.<sup>103</sup>



Figure. 5 Tetradrachm of Alexander III the Great of Macedon, head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/ Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Amphipolis, 336–323 BC. Price, 1991: 96 no. 78, Münzkabinett Staatliche Museen zu Berlin Inv. 18214359, picture: Reinhard Saczewski.



Figure. 6 Tetradrachm of Lilarkii (?), head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/seated Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Tylis?, 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. With permission of wildwinds.com, ex CNG auction 61, Sept. 2002: <https://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/thrace/kings/lilarkii/tetradrachm.jpg> (last view 18/11/2023).

100 I am thanking Giuliana Calcani (Roma Tre) for this idea.

101 Zosim. 2.37.1 with Gabelko, 2002: 220 (translation as snake), 224/225, 228.

102 Monaghan, 2004: 415.

103 Price, 1991: no. 1369, Price, 1991: no. 1373.



Figure. 7 Tetradrachm of Kersibaul(os), head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/seated Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Tylis?, mid-3rd century BC. Cn type 5203, Peter, 1997: 250, Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 15, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Inv. 18210197, picture: Lutz-Jürgen Lübke.



Figure. 8 Tetradrachm of Orsoaltios of Tylis, head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/seated Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Tylis?, 299–201 BC. Cn type 5205, Peter, 1997: 249, Bibliothèque nationale de France, département des Monnaies, médailles et antiques Inv. Fonds général 22. Cf. Corpus Nummorum, <https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/5202?lg=de> [last view: 22/11/2023].



Figure. 9 Drachm of the Galatians (?), head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/seated Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Galatia?, 3rd century BC. Prototype Price, 1991: 1373, otherwise unpublished, accessible online on Tom Vossen's Vcoins: [https://www.vcoins.com/de/stores/tom\\_vossen/165/product/galatia\\_3rd\\_century\\_bc\\_ar\\_drachm\\_345\\_gm\\_18mm\\_imitating\\_lampsakos\\_mint\\_issue\\_of\\_alexander\\_iii\\_of\\_macedon\\_cf\\_price\\_1373/807181/Default.aspx](https://www.vcoins.com/de/stores/tom_vossen/165/product/galatia_3rd_century_bc_ar_drachm_345_gm_18mm_imitating_lampsakos_mint_issue_of_alexander_iii_of_macedon_cf_price_1373/807181/Default.aspx) (last view 16/11/2023).

We shall now turn towards the coinage of Kauaros himself. Overall, six types survive, two of tetradrachms, four of bronze.<sup>104</sup> While the silver coinage was distributed 'internationally' for trade, the bronzes were only produced for internal use by the kings' subjects.<sup>105</sup> In fact, their find spots are largely restricted to north eastern Bulgaria, a likely location of the realm.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Diedrich, 2022: 47–50 for the typology and illustrations.

<sup>105</sup> Diedrich, 2022: 47.

<sup>106</sup> Anastassov, 2011: fig.2 (228), Diedrich, 2022: 61–62.

Like most of the other Thracian and Celtic rulers we have seen, Kauaros minted tetradrachms in the style of Alexander, with the earlier ones sporting the text KAYAPOY and the latter ones ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ, probably since the coins with his own name had not been readily accepted.<sup>107</sup> The silver and most of the bronze money was probably cut by Greeks from Mesembria and other West Pontic cities, who had been forced to pay tributes to Kauaros and probably coerced into sending the qualified personnel.<sup>108</sup> The first bronze issue, minted at Apros, a Thracian city on the Propontis,<sup>109</sup> depicts the head of Apollo in various forms – some with a more Celtic than Greek looking haircut<sup>110</sup> – on the obverse and a crowning Nike with a laurel wreath in her hand on the reverse (FIG. 10).<sup>111</sup> Apollo was apparently the protector god of Apros,<sup>112</sup> while Nike with the laurel wreath symbolised military success on various coins all across the Greek speaking world. We may thus simply attribute her appearance to the fashion of the day, but it could also be explained by a more specific desire of Kauaros to remind his subjects of the many military victories of the Tylian kings and the Galatians in general.

The second, slightly smaller bronze series features a laureate head of Zeus on the obverse and a cornucopia on the reverse (FIG. 11).<sup>113</sup> This pattern was probably inspired by Ptolemaic coins used in Thrace during the Second Syrian War (260–253 BC), which include an issue that depicts Apollo and a cornucopia.<sup>114</sup> Furthermore, Tylian Celts often served as mercenaries in the Ptolemaic army and were thus generally familiar with the motif of the cornucopia on coin reverses.<sup>115</sup> The laureate head of Zeus, meanwhile, corresponds to the standard coinage of Philip II once again.

A third type of bronze coins bears Hermes with a typical Petasos hat on the obverse and his winged kerykeion staff on the reverse (FIG. 12).<sup>116</sup> The issue seems to copy the style of the coinage of the Greek city Ainos in Thrace.<sup>117</sup> Ainos was under Ptolemaic rule at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century,<sup>118</sup> but it was not far from one possible location of Tylis<sup>119</sup> and one of the Kabylian tetradrachms was apparently minted there in the 270s or 260s BC.<sup>120</sup> Therefore, it may have also been in dependent relationships with Kabyle and Tylis at different points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC.<sup>121</sup>

Last, but not least, more recently, a fourth bronze issue of Kauaros has been found which was exclusively minted at Apros in the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC (FIG. 13). Their obverse depicts Apollo, the chief god of the city, once again, but the reverse bears an image of a Celtic *thyreos* shield.<sup>122</sup> Immediately behind the legend Β]ΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ [Κ]ΑΥΑΡΟΥ, we can spot a small lyre on some of these coins. The lyre must be associated with the head of Apollo on the obverse and allows us to identify the Apollo of Apros as Apollo Kitharoidos, the kithara player.

<sup>107</sup> Diedrich, 2022: 57.

<sup>108</sup> Price, 1991: 173 (tributes), Diedrich, 2022: 58, 62–63 (coin cutters).

<sup>109</sup> Possibly identical with Tylis, as Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 16/17 suggest, but see p. 12 n. 66 above: this topic can not be discussed in depth in this paper. Diedrich, 2022: 63–64 points out that the coins from Apros were produced last and that the city may only provisionally have been controlled by the Tylian Celts before they emigrated to Anatolia for good. When combined with the observation that the bronze coins of Kauaros are virtually restricted to northeastern Bulgaria as mentioned above (p. 12 n. 66), Diedrich's hypothesis is the more convincing one.

<sup>110</sup> E.g., on AE 19 SH 2733.

<sup>111</sup> AE 19 SH 266; AE 18 SH 729; AE 18 SHH 784; AE 19 SHH 2269; AE 19 SHH 2270; AE18 SHH 2268; AE 19 SHH 2732–2739 = Moushmov, 1912: no. 5759; Youroukova, 1976: 108, BMC Greek (Tauric Chersonese) p207.1, SNG BM Black Sea IX, 1, 194, here British Museum HPB,p34.1.C.

<sup>112</sup> Koychev/Mutafov/Peev/Topalov, 2004: 78.

<sup>113</sup> AE 16 SHH 678; AE 17 SHH 1152; AE 15 SHH 2407; AE 16 SHH 2775; AE 16cSHH 3711; AE 15 SHH 3843 = Moushmov, 1912: no. 5760; Youroukova, 1976: 109, here Berlin, Münzkabinett der Staatlichen Museen, Inv. 18210570.

<sup>114</sup> See Psoma, 2008 in detail.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Maier, 2000: 58.

<sup>116</sup> AE 12 SHH 2391; SH 6915 = Moushmov, 1912, no. 5761, SNG BM Black Sea IX, 1, 199, here British Museum 1929,1013.256.

<sup>117</sup> E.g., AR Diobol May 34 (A19/P-); Grose, 1926: no. 3810.

<sup>118</sup> Polyb. 5.34.9.

<sup>119</sup> At or near Apros, see p. 18, n. 109 above.

<sup>120</sup> SNGCop 1171.

<sup>121</sup> Peter, 1997: 227–229 shows that Skostokos of Kabyle probably forced Ainos to mint coins for him.

<sup>122</sup> Cn type 2218, Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 17 tab. 2, fig. 1+1a, Draganov, 2005c: 339, fig. 1–3, Hoover, 2017: 60, 1352, here Numismatik Naumann (formerly Gitbud & Naumann) eA 104 (04.07.2021) lot 91. Cf. id.: 17 for the current location and identification of the coins. An older coin in the British Museum is very similar: compare British Museum 1957,0111.1 and Damyanov/Manov, 2013: fig. 3–6 = Diedrich, 2022: 49 type IV.

The style shows an unfamiliarity of the coiner with Greek letters and thus confirms that he was Celtic, in difference to those of most of the other coins.<sup>123</sup> The most important element, however, is the Celtic shield: It has been suggested that this was meant as a reminder of the Celtic invasion of Greece,<sup>124</sup> but we will come back to this point to discuss it in more detail.



Figure. 10 Bronze coin of Kauaros of Tylis, head of Apollo (o)/crowning Nike (r), Apros, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. BMC Greek (Tauric Chersonese) p207.1, SNG BM Black Sea IX, 1, 194, British Museum HPB,p34.1.C. © The Trustees of the British Museum. Shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) licence.



Figure. 11 Bronze coin of Kauaros of Tylis, head of Zeus (o)/cornucopia (r), Tylis (?), 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. Münzkabinett Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Inv. 18210570, picture: Lutz-Jürgen Lübke.



Figure. 12 Bronze coin of Kauaros of Tylis, head of Hermes (o)/Kerykeion (r), Ainos, 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. SNG BM Black Sea IX, 1, 199, British Museum 1929,1013.256. © The Trustees of the British Museum. Shared under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) licence.

<sup>123</sup> Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 14. If the assumptions in n. 108 are correct, the Celtic coiner may only have resided in the city for a short time while they controlled it.

<sup>124</sup> Koychev/Mutafov/Peev/Topalov, 2004: 83–84.



Figure. 13 Bronze coin of Kauaros of Tyllis, head of Apollo (o), thyreos shield (r), Apros, second half of 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. Cn type 2218, Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 17 tab. 2, fig. 1+1a, Draganov, 2005c: 339, fig. 1–3, Hoover, 2017: 60, no. 1352, Numismatik Naumann (formerly Gitbud & Naumann) eA 104 (04.07.2021) lot 91, Corpus Nummorum, [https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/cn.apros.1\\_ed.2](https://www.corpus-nummorum.eu/types/cn.apros.1_ed.2) [last view: 2023/11/16].

Now, Damyanov and Manov identified some of the late 3<sup>rd</sup> century coinage from Kabyle as having been minted for Kauaros:<sup>125</sup> Maybe the kingdom had been conquered by the Celts, presumably after the death of Skostokos, or it had been forced into a similar status of dependence as Byzantion.<sup>126</sup>

One of the tetradrachms is identical to the so-called autonomous coinage of Kabyle in the late 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC<sup>127</sup> and copies the popular Alexander coins, adding Artemis Phosphoros, the main goddess of the city, to the left of the seated Zeus with eagle and sceptre on the reverse (FIG. 14).<sup>128</sup> The bronze coins from Kabyle, meanwhile, depict the head of Apollo and a crowning Nike with wings, just like the coins minted in Apros.<sup>129</sup> While the Tylian coins thus follow widespread Greek imagery, just like other non-Greek coinage on the southern Balkans, they certainly emphasise a distinct element by using other combinations of deities and by featuring the Celtic oval shield. The *thyreos* was one of the most iconic markers of Gallic warriors in Greek art, where they were usually degraded as naked savages, as we have seen above. Yet, its common depiction reflected the realities in so far that it was indeed the most widespread type of shield among Celtic warriors.<sup>130</sup> Were the Celts aware of how they were depicted in Hellenistic imagery? With the sheer number of coins, monuments, statues, or stelae featuring the stereotypical Celtic ‘barbarian’ that have survived until the present day, it seems impossible that they were not. If they were aware that the image of the *thyreos* on their coinage would have been instantly recognised by both Celts and Greeks as a symbol both of Gallic military might and its demotion in Hellenic art, its inclusion must have been an intentional decision. We may suspect that the Tylian kings purposefully put it on their coins to remind the Greeks of Gallic military glory and challenge Hellenic connotations of the *thyreos*. It showed: We exist here, among the Greeks, and our kings can both oppress and save mighty Greek cities such as Byzantion.<sup>131</sup>

<sup>125</sup> Damyanov/Manov, 2013: 15–17. They expanded the work of Gerassimov 1959. This includes the tetradrachms, cf. Diedrich, 2022: 51.

<sup>126</sup> This may be supported by the inscription Historical Museum Jambol Inb. No I-1068 = Emilov, 2005 Appendix, which is, however, very fragmentary. Emilov suggests that it may have recorded the payment of tribute from Kabyle to Tyllis: Emilov, 2005: 328–329. Fittingly, Draganov, 1983a: 114 observed that Kabyle’s trade relations with the Aegean significantly decreased in the period 280–200 BC. This evidence speaks against the idea of Gerassimov 1958, 275 that the relations between Tyllis and Kabyle were of an exclusively friendly nature.

<sup>127</sup> Diedrich, 2022: 65 claims that both the so-called autonomous coinage and that of Kauaros was minted by order of the dynast, but that Kabyle as a city remained autonomous, though as a dependency of Tyllis. His arguments are certainly compelling, but the question cannot be treated in more detail here.

<sup>128</sup> Damyanov/Manov, 2013: pl. 9 = Tetradrachm AR 28 SHH 5162 = Draganov 874/883 (autonomous coin); Damyanov/Manov, 2013: pl. 10 = Tetradrachm AR 28 SHH 2018 = Moushmov, 1912: no. 5758; Youroukova, 1976: 107 (Kauaros coin). Fig.13 provided here is the slightly different Price, 1991: 8882, Draganov, 1993b: 158, 845–885, tab. 40–44, CN type 10004, but the iconography is identical.

<sup>129</sup> Damyanov/Manov, 2013: pl. 11 = ANS 1956.36.1.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Ritchie/Ritchie, 1995: 48–49. For more details on Celtic self-representation of their armament and archaeological excavations see the contributions to Girard 2013. The extensive analysis of Kistler 2009 also shows the centrality of the *thyreos* shield, so that I would disagree with Draganov, 2005c: 341 that it may actually represent Thracians or Greeks in Apros: an order by Kauaros seems plausible. I do not dispute his claim that Apros was not necessarily occupied by Celts, though; see p. 18, n. 109 (Diedrich 63–64) above. It is further true that the *thyreos* was widely adopted by Greek and Thracian soldiers by the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, so the messages on Kauaros’ coins may have been less powerful than those of Kersibaulos decades earlier. But, again, the *thyreos* remained the marker of Celts in Greek art well into the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC and beyond (e.g., Kistler, 2009: 226–230) and Kauaros cannot have missed that.

<sup>131</sup> A parallel to the hypothetical Galatian snake, see p. 16 above.





Figure. 14 Tetradrachm of Kauaros of Tyllis, head of Alexander as Heracles with lion skin (o)/seated Zeus Aëtophoros (r), Kabyle, late 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. Price, 1991: 8882, Draganov, 1993b: 158, 845–885, tab. 40–44, CN type 10004, Münzkabinett Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Inv. 18250350, picture: Lutz-Jürgen Lübke.

Kauaros would thus have sent a clear message of military prowess to everyone under his rule, who used these bronze coins. This included Greek settlers in Thrace, Hellenic mercenaries in Tylian service, Greek merchants who visited his realm and the largely Hellenic die-casters in the *poleis* themselves as well as the people associated with them. That he attempted to also widely distribute tetradrachms with his name on them testifies his ambitions beyond his own realm. The production and imagery of the coins thus fits the role of Kauaros in Polybios' *Histories*, where he appears to be keen to achieve some kind of 'international' recognition by mediating between Byzantion and its foes, even though he had brought about the war in the first place. In his personal characterisation of Kauaros, Polybios emphasises that the monarch further assisted Byzantion in otherwise unknown wars with "the Thracians".<sup>132</sup> These may have been the same Thracians who later destroyed the kingdom of Tyllis, and/or they were the Kabylions who had apparently suffered under the Celtic rulers of Thrace. It seems as if Kauaros was well aware that the (Greek) cities tributary to him were his source of power and therefore he did not intend to destroy them, but only wanted to keep them weak.

By mediating in conflicts between other states, he could hope that his informal rule over the West Pontic cities, Byzantion, Kabyle, Ainos and Apros would be recognised by these powers. This is an obvious parallel to the actions of Ortiagon and Chiomara, who likewise aspired to be taken seriously by their Greek, Anatolian and Roman neighbours. The adoption of elements typical for Hellenistic kingship helped to cement their status both internally and externally. And yet, their position rested on military power: As soon as Kauaros and Ortiagon appeared vulnerable, the Thracians respectively Attalids struck and destroyed the new powers.

Yet, the Celtic populations remained, and there is little doubt that their Hellenisation was well underway at this stage.<sup>133</sup> Discerning the identity of the Tylians, Galatians and other Eastern Celts at the turn of the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century presents a formidable challenge, however.<sup>134</sup> The analysis has shown that it is highly likely that Celtic rulers intentionally copied Hellenistic kings in their policies, emphasising not only their military virtues, but also their euergetism, diplomatic skills and just character. The coins suggest that this was a fusion of Celtic and Greek elements, which took different forms: The prominence of Celtic names in the Galatian elite of Anatolia, the continued usage of traditional art and jewellery like torques as well as the fact that most Galatians chose to settle outside the existing cities confirm that

<sup>132</sup> Polyb. 8.22.2.

<sup>133</sup> Hellenisation shall here be understood as the processual distribution of the elements of Greek culture in an originally non-Greek context, such as the myths, religion, language and writing, knowledge of central texts, architecture, political institutions of the *polis*, military tactics and equipment, administrative practices etc. It is important to note, as all recent scholarship has emphasised, that this was always a mutual process that often led to the birth of unique, local amalgams of cultures. Cf. Kuhrt & Sherwin-White, 1993: 141–149, Cartledge, 1997: 1–15, Chrubasik & King, 2017.

<sup>134</sup> On the fall of Tyllis and the continued existence of Celtic groups in Thrace see Diedrich, 2022: 45–47.

many elements of the European La Tène-culture were retained.<sup>135</sup> In Thrace, meanwhile, the Celts seem to have intermarried with Thracians from early on and several ancient authors attest to a blend of both cultures.<sup>136</sup> Thracian and Greek influences can be found in the design of the Celtic necropoleis in Thrace, while the structure of the tombs at Kalново follows Scythian practices.<sup>137</sup> To this mix of cultures we can add more: Livy likens the Galatian soldiers at the Battle of Magnesia to those of the Cappadocians, an Iranian kingdom,<sup>138</sup> and there are two terracotta figurines of Galatian mercenaries from Myrina in Aiolia dated to 130–60 BC who are armed like the *thorakitai*, a heavy infantry unit in the Seleucid and Achaian armies, but additionally wear Iranian face masks.<sup>139</sup> The evidence attests a complex mix of cultures, especially in the ever important area of the military, where Roman and Italic elements have to be added in the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC:

Deiotaros, king of a greater Galatia under Augustus, had two full legions under his command, whose survivors seamlessly integrated into the Roman army after the annexation of Galatia in 25 BC.<sup>140</sup> Yet, he resided in a royal palace built in the style of ancient Phrygian architecture,<sup>141</sup> and had two Greek wives, Stratonike and Berenike, and a Greek concubine called Elektra who bore most of his children.<sup>142</sup> Even in the generation before him, some Galatians may already have worshipped Greek deities.<sup>143</sup> And finally, we have a bust of Deiotaros' daughter Adobogiona II, wife of the tetrarch of the Trokmoi, Brogitaros, which was placed in the temple of Hera in Pergamon. She is wearing Greek clothes and sports a Greek haircut, but her physiognomy is clearly Celtic: The plastic thus underlines the distinct identity of the Galatians.<sup>144</sup> And though there were some regional differences between Tylians and Anatolian Galatians, they remained closely linked, which is attested not least by the coinage: Most of Kauaros' tetradrachms were found in or near Galatia.<sup>145</sup>

Furthermore, it is now generally accepted that, after the death of Kauaros, many Tylian Celts left Thrace forever and joined their cousins in Asia.<sup>146</sup> It is hence plausible that Ortiagon and Chiomara followed the role model of Kauaros in their attempt to become a powerful ruler pair in the mould of Hellenistic kings and queens.

Ortiagon's premature death possibly prevented them from minting their own coins and it would thus take until the first century BC for Galatian kings to resume the designs of Kauaros in full.<sup>147</sup>

To conclude: The Celts in Asia and on the southern Balkans preserved their Celtic identity in the Hellenistic period, but selectively adopted Greek (and Thracian) customs that furthered their aims, such as coinage, an equation of their deities with the Olympian gods and goddesses (as depicted on the coins) and the political as well as diplomatic practices of Hellenistic kings and queens. On the coins and through (monumental and sepulchral) architecture, they represented the (identity) policies they pursued as rulers. In the military

135 Bittel, 1974: 241–246, cf. Coşkun: 2012 for the names – Celtic names only disappeared in the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD.

136 Anastassov, 2011: 234, 236–238 and, e.g., Strab. 7.1.1, C289, 3.2C296.

137 Anastassov, 2011: 234–236 with fig. 24–26.

138 Liv. 37, 40.4; 9; 12. On the question which of these are foot soldiers and which are horsemen: Müller/Weissenborn, 1906: 70, n.5.

139 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, (cf. Burr, Myrina 1934: 112) and Louvre, Paris, Cat. II pl. 151b&d. Polybios mentions *thorakitai* in the Seleucid army in, e.g., 10.29.6, and in the Achaian army in, e.g., 11.11.4–5.

140 The Legio XXII Deiotariana; cf. Grainger, 2020: 215. Cic. ad. Att. 6.1.4 mentions Deiotaros having 30 cohorts of 400 men each in Roman equipment, for which cf. D'Amato, 2009: 44. Cic. Phil. 11.33 and Bell. Alex. 34.4 confirm the Roman armament and training of the Galatian foot soldiers.

141 Near Karalar, 40km northwest of Ankara; Bittel, 1974: 246. His tomb complex, meanwhile, followed a model popular in Macedon, Thrace, Bithynia and Mysia; id.: 247.

142 Berenike is mentioned in an inscription (Mitchell, 1993: 28 (n. 8)), Stratonike and Elektra are known from Plutarch (Plut. Mor. 258D = de mul. virt. 21). Péré-Noguès, 2013: 172 assumes Galatian kings may have had several wives or concubines, but it is of course also possible that Berenike and Stratonike are the same person, with the name having been corrupted over time.

143 In the story of Kamma, lover of the tetrarch Sinat and victim of his rival Sinorix, the father of Deiotaros, the young woman is a priestess of Artemis; cf. Plut. Moral. 257E–258C; similarly in Plut. Amat. 22 and Polyæn. VIII, 39. Though this may be an *interpretatio Graeca*, the fact that Plutarch uses genuine Celtic names in the tale and the increasing Hellenisation of Galatian society make it plausible that they would also rever Greek gods and goddesses, especially those connected with prowess in war, like Artemis.

144 Cf. Strobel, 1991: 130 and n. 194–196.

145 Diedrich, 2022: 57.

146 Diedrich, 2022, 63–64.

147 For this coinage see Arslan, 2004b.

area in particular, Anatolian, Iranian and Romano-Italic influences also shaped Galatian culture and self-definition. These developments find many parallels in other states which were formed in the vicinity of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires and later fell into the sphere of the Imperium Romanum: The Hasmoneans of Judaea and the Nabataeans both adopted Hellenistic legitimization strategies and made Greek their official language while preserving local cultural and religious traditions, and the three different dynasties of the Ituraians in greater Syria all hellenised to various degrees so that each of them could present itself differently and thus justify its existence.<sup>148</sup> In Thrace itself, meanwhile, the later Roman client kings<sup>149</sup> readily adopted Greek and Roman weaponry and used their networks in the neighbouring empires to obtain luxury goods from Central Asia.<sup>150</sup> And yet, the Thracian and Anatolian Celts stand out: Unlike all of these other peoples, they were complete newcomers in the Eastern Mediterranean and thus faced a much greater challenge in trying to secure their survival and finding acceptance on the ‘international’ level without completely giving up their traditions. They thus created a unique blend of cultures, religions and policies while retaining and even expanding their military strength. Far from being simple, savage ‘barbarians’, they quickly understood the rules of the game and established themselves as a firm part of the Hellenistic world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anastassov, J. (2011). The Celtic presence in Thrace during the 3rd century BC in the light of new archaeological data. In Guštin, M., Jevtić, M. (eds.). *The Eastern Celts. The Communities between the Alps and the Black Sea*. Koper-Beograd: Anales-Mediterranei, 227–239.
- Armit, I. (2012). *Headhunting and the Body in Iron Age Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arslan, M. (2004a). *Galater. Die vergessenen Kelten*. Scheidegg im Allgäu: Via Verbis.
- Arslan, M. (2004b). *The Coins of Galatian Kingdom and the Roman coinage of Ancyra in Galatia*. Ankara: Ankara Ticaret Odası.
- Berger, P. (1995). La Xénophobie de Polybe. *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 97. 3–4, 517–525.
- Bittel, K. (1974). Die Galater in Kleinasien, archäologisch gesehen. In *Assimilation et résistance à la culture Gréco-Romaine dans le monde ancien. Travaux du VIe Congrès International d’Etudes Classiques – Madrid, Septembre 1974*. Bucharest/Paris 1974: Editura Academiei. Les Belles Lettres, 241–249.
- Burr, D. (1934). *Terracottas from Myrina in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*. Vienna: Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger.
- Cartledge, P. (1997). Introduction. In Id./Garnsey, Peter/Gruen, Erich (eds.). *Hellenistic Constructs. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*. Berkeley et al.: University of California Press, 1–19.
- Champion, C. (1996). Polybius, Aetolia and the Gallic Attack on Delphi (279 BC). *Historia*, 45.3, 315–328.
- Chaniotis, A. (2015). *War in the Hellenistic World. A Social and Cultural History*. Malden (MA)/Oxford/Carlton (VIC): Blackwell Publishing.
- Chrubasik, B., King, D. (2017). Introduction. In Idd. (eds.). *Hellenism and the Local Communities of the Eastern Mediterranean. 400 BCE–250 CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coşkun, A. (2012). Intercultural anthropology in Hellenistic and Roman Galatia - with maps drafted by Michael Grün and April Ross. *Gephyra* 9, 51–68.
- Damyanov, V., Manov, M. (2013). The First Mint of Cavarus, the last King of the Celtic Kingdom in Thrace. *American Journal of Numismatics* 25, 11–19.
- De Beaulieu, J.B. C., Fischer, B. (1998). *Recueil des Inscriptions gauloises (RIG), Nr. IV. Les*

<sup>148</sup> See Hoffmann-Salz, 2022: 343–371 for these comparisons.

<sup>149</sup> For these Thracian kings as actual Roman client kings who were closely bound to the emperors see Ish-Shalom, 2021: 154.

<sup>150</sup> Konrad, 2014: 70–71.

- légendes monétaires*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Dembski, G. (1998). *Münzen der Kelten. Sammlungskataloge des Kunsthistorischen Museums*, 2. Vol. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum.
  - D'Amato, R. (2009). *Arms and Armour of the Imperial Roman Soldier*. London: Pen & Sword Books.
  - Diedrich, B. (2022). Das Keltische Tyllis in Thrakien und die Münzprägung des Kauaros. *Orbis Terrarum* 20, 29–72.
  - Draganov, D. (2005c). Coins of the Unknown Mint of Apros in Thrace. In Alfaro Asíns, C., Marcos Alonso, C., Otero Morán, P. (eds.). *XIII Congreso Internacional de Numismática Madrid 2003*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura, 339–343.
  - Draganov, D. (1993b). *The Coinage of Cabyle*. Sofia: Self-Published.
  - Draganov, D. (1983a). Zu den Handelsbeziehungen der thrakischen Stadt Kabyle vom 5. bis 3. Jahrhundert v. u. Z. *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte/Economic History Yearbook* 24.2, 111–118.
  - Drnić, I. (2020). The Scordisci: a story from the verge of the La Tène world. In Fichtl, S., Kysela, J., Pierrelvein, G. (eds.). *Unité et diversité du monde celtique. Actes du 42e colloque international de l'Association française pour l'étude de l'âge du Fer (Prague, 10–13 mai 2018)*. Paris: Collection Afeaf.
  - Emilov, J. (2005). The Galatians and Cabyle. A fragmentary inscription and its context. In *Studia Archaeologica Universitatis Serdicensis Suppl. IV*, 324–332.
  - Erskine, A. (2013a). How to Rule the World: Polybius Book 6 Reconsidered. In Gibson, B., Harrison, T. (eds.). *Polybius and his world. Essays in memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 231–246.
  - Erskine, A. (2013b). Making Sense of the Romans. Polybius and the Greek Perspective. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 9, 115–129.
  - Fischer-Bossert, W. (2005). Die Lysimacheier des Thrakers Skostokos. *Revue Belge de Numismatique* 151, 49–74.
  - Fless, F. (2002). Zur Konstruktion antiker Feindbilder – Das Beispiel der „Großen Gallier“. In *Die Religion der Kelten: Fromm, Fremd, Barbarisch (Exhibition Catalogue, Leipzig)*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 59–70.
  - Foulon, E. (2001). Polybes et les Celtes (II). *Les Études Classiques* 69, 35–64.
  - Frey, O.H. (1995). The Celts in Italy. In Green, M. J. *The Celtic World*. London/New York: Routledge, 515–532.
  - Gabelko, O.L. (2002). „Phaennis' Oracle“ (Zosim. II. 36–37) and Galatians' Passage to Asia Minor. In Olshausen, E., Sonnabend, H. (eds.). *„Troianer sind wir gewesen“ – Migrationen in der antiken Welt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 8*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 211–228.
  - Gera, D. (1997). Warrior Women. *The anonymous Tractatus de mulieribus claris in bello*. Leiden: Brill.
  - Gerassimov, T. (1959b). Quelle est la ville où les tétradrachmes de Kauaros, roi celtique ont été frappées. *Bulletin de l'Institut d'archéologie* 22, 111–118.
  - Gerassimov, T. (1958a). The Alexandrine Tétradrachms of Cabyle in Thrace. In Ingholt, H. (ed.). *Centennial Publication of the American Numismatic Society*. New York: American Numismatic Society, 273–277.
  - Gieseke, J. (2023). *Vom äußersten Westen der Welt. Die Griechische Ethnographie und die Völker Iberiens und der Keltiké im Schatten der römischen Expansion (2. Jahrhundert v. Chr. – 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
  - Girard, B. (ed.) (2013). *Au fil de l'épée. Armes et guerriers en pays celte méditerranéen*. Nîmes: École Antique de Nîmes.
  - Grose, S.W. (1926). *Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Greek Coins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  - Göbl, R. (ed.) (1974b). Pink, K. *Die Münzprägung der Ostkelten und ihrer Nachbarn* (2nd, revised edition). Braunschweig: Klinkhardt & Biermann.
  - Göbl, R. (ed.) (1974c). Pink, K. *Einführung in die keltische Münzkunde mit besonderer*

- Berücksichtigung des österreichischen Raumes* (3rd, revised edition). Vienna: Franz Deuticke.
- Göbl, R. (1973a). *Ostkeltischer Typenatlas*. Braunschweig: Klinkhardt und Biermann.
  - Grainger, J.D. (2020). *The Galatians. Celtic Invaders of Greece and Asia Minor*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword History.
  - Gruel, K., Popovitch, L. (2007). *Les monnaies gauloises et romaines de l'oppidum de Bibracte*. Glux-en-Glenne: Collection Bibracte.
  - Hau, L. I. (2016). *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
  - Head, D. (1982). *Armies of the Macedonian and Punic Wars 359 BC to 146 BC. Organisation, Tactics, Dress and Weapons*. Cambridge: Wargames Research Group.
  - Hoffmann-Salz, J. (2022). *Im Land der räuberischen Nomaden? Die Eigenherrschaften der Ituraier und Emesener zwischen Seleukiden und Römern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
  - Hooker, J. (2006). S.v. Celtic coinage. In Koch, J. T. (ed.). *Celtic Culture. A Historical Encyclopedia*, Vol. I Celtomania–Fulup. Santa Barbara: Bloomsbury Academic, 461–464.
  - Hoover, O.D. (2017). *Handbook of Coins of Macedon and its Neighbours. Part II: Thrace, Skythia, and Taurike. Sixth to First Centuries BC*. Lancaster: Classical Numismatic Group.
  - Ish-Shalom, T.A. (2021). Provincial Monarchs as an Eastern *Arcaenum Imperii*: 'Client Kingship', the Augustan Revolution and the Flavians. *Journal of Roman Studies* 111, 153–177.
  - Kaye, N. (2023). *The Attalids of Pergamon and Anatolia. Money, Culture, and State Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  - Keller, O. (ed.). (1877). *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores* Vol. I. Leipzig: Teubner.
  - Kistler, E. (2009). *Funktionalisierte Keltenbilder. Die Indienstnahme der Kelten zur Vermittlung von Normen und Werten in der Hellenistischen Welt*. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
  - Kochanek, P. (2004). *Die Vorstellung vom Norden und der Eurozentrismus. Eine Auswertung der patristischen und mittelalterlichen Literatur*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
  - Konrad, M. (2014). *Emesa zwischen Klientelreich und Provinz. Identität und Identitätswandel einer lokalen Fürstendynastie im Spiegel der archäologischen Quellen*. Rahden (Westfalen): VML Verlag Marie Leidorf.
  - Kostial, M. (2003). *Kelten im Osten. Gold und Silber der Kelten in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Sammlung Lanz. Munich: Staatliche Münzsammlung München.
  - Koychev, A., Mutafov, V., Peev, I., Topalov, S. (2004). New contribution to the study of Aprocity coinage, situated in the interior of Thrace during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC. *Anali* 1–4, 75–86.
  - Kuhrt, A., Sherwin-White, S. (1993). *From Samarkhand to Sardis. A new approach to the Seleucid Empire*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
  - Lampinen, A. (2018). Against Hope? The Untimely 'Elpis' of Northern Barbarians. In Kazantzidis, G., Spatharas, D. (eds.). *Hope in Ancient Literature, History and Art (Ancient Emotions I)*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 275–295.
  - Maier, B. (2000). *Die Kelten. Ihre Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
  - Maier, F.K. (2012). „Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen“. *Die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios*. Munich: C.H. Beck.
  - Manov, M. (2018). A Unique Bronze Coin of an Unknown Ruler of the Celtic Kingdom in Thrace. *Pontica* 18, 553–570.
  - Marinescu, C.A. (1996). *Making and spending money along the Bosphorus. The Lysimachi Coinages minted by Byzantium and Chalcedon and their socio-cultural Context*. New York: PhD Thesis, Columbia University.
  - Melrose, R. (2016). *Religion in Britain from the Megaliths to Arthur. An Archaeological and Mythological Exploration*. Jefferson (NC): McFarland Books.
  - Monaghan, P. (2004). *The Encyclopedia of Celtic Mythology and Folklore*. New York: Facts on File.
  - Moushmov, N.A. (1912). *Ancient Coins of the Balkan Peninsula*. Sofia: Pechatnitsa na Grigor. Iv. Gavazov.
  - Nankov, E. (2015). Urbanization. In Id., Grainger, D., Valeva, J. (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*. Hoboken (NJ): Wiley, 399–411.
  - Parachaud, K. (2019). La rencontre de l'histoire et de l'archéologie, un risque de biais méthodologique? In Perret, A., Sompayrac, L. (eds.). *Questionner la rencontre en sciences*

- humaines et sociales, actes des Journées Thématiques 2019 de l'École Doctorale 612 des Universités de Limoges et de Poitiers*. Limoges: Universités de Limoges et de Poitiers, 49–61.
- Péré-Noguès, S. (2013). Chiomara, Camma, et autres princesses... Une histoire des femmes dans les sociétés "celtiques" est-elle possible? *Pallas. Revue d'études antiques* 90, 159–176.
  - Peter, U. (1997). *Die Münzen der thrakischen Dynasten (5.–3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.) Hintergründe ihrer Prägung*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
  - Popović, I. (1993). *Les Bijoux Monétaires de Serbie*. Belgrade: National Museum Belgrade. Serbian Numismatic Society.
  - Price, M. J. (1991). *The Coinage in the Name of Alexander the Great and Philip Arrhidaeus. A British Museum Catalogue* (2 vls.). London/Zurich: The British Museum/Swiss Numismatic Society.
  - Psoma, S. (2008). Numismatic Evidence on the Ptolemaic Involvement in Thrace During the Second Syrian War. *American Journal of Numismatics*, 20, 257–263.
  - Quinn, J.C. (2013). Imagining the Imperial Mediterranean. In Gibson, B., Harrison, T. (eds.). *Polybius and his world. Essays in memory of F.W. Walbank*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 337–352.
  - Rabadžiev, K. (2020). Religion. In Grainger, D., Nankov, E., Valeva, J. (eds.). *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Hoboken (NJ): Wiley, 443–456.
  - Le Rider, G. (1977). Le monnayage d'argent et d'or de Philippe II frappé en Macédoine de 359 à 294. Paris: E. Bourgey.
  - Ritchie, J. N.G., Ritchie, W.F. (1995). The army, weapons and fighting. In Green, M. (ed.). *The Celtic World*. London/New York: Routledge, 37–58.
  - Saprykin, S. (2020). The Pontic Kingdom and the Seleucids. In Oetjen, R. (ed.). *New Perspectives in Seleucid History, Archaeology and Numismatics. Studies in Honor of Getzel M. Cohen*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 225–239.
  - Strobel, K. (1991). Die Galater im hellenistischen Kleinasien: Historische Aspekte einer keltischen Staatenbildung. In Seibert, J. (ed.). *Hellenistische Studien. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Bengtson*. Munich: Editio Maris, 101–134.
  - Tomaschitz, K. (2002). *Die Wanderungen der Kelten in der antiken literarischen Überlieferung*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften:
  - Urban, R. (1991). Die Kelten in Italien und in Gallien bei Polybios. In Seibert, J. (ed.). *Hellenistische Studien. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Bengtson*. Munich: Editio Maris, 135–158.
  - Vardar, L.E. (2006). Galatia Bölgesi kaleleri/yerleşmeleri yüzey araştırması: Ankara İli 2005. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 24.2, 79–100.
  - Vitali, D. (2006). S.v. Bononia/Bologna. In Koch, J.T. (ed.), *Celtic Culture. A Historical Encyclopedia, Vol. I A–Celtic*. Santa Barbara: Bloomsbury Academic, 226–228.
  - Voigt, M. (2012). Human and Animal Sacrifice at Galatian Gordion. The Uses of Ritual in a Multiethnic Community. In Porter, A., Schwarz, G.M. (eds.). *Sacred Killing. The Archaeology of Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. University Park (PA): Eisenbrauns, 237–290.
  - Walbank, F.W. (1972). *Polybius*. Berkeley (et al.): University of California Press.
  - Williams, J.H.C. (2001). *Beyond the Rubicon. Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
  - Youroukova, Y. (1976). *Coins of the Ancient Thracians*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
  - Zanker, P. (2000). Die Gegenwart der Barbaren und die Überhöhung der häuslichen Lebenswelt. Überlegungen zum System der kaiserzeitlichen Bilderwelt. In Hölscher, T. (ed.). *Gegenwelten zu den Kulturen Griechenlands und Roms in der Antike*. Leipzig/Munich: K G Sauer, 409–434.

## EDITIONS

- Livius, Titus, *Ab Urbe Condita*. ed. and trans. by Müller, H.J., Weissenborn, W. (1906). Vol. 8 (Book XXXV–XXXVII), Berlin/Leipzig: Teubner.
- Polybius. *The Histories*, 6 vol. Translated by Paton, W.R., revised by Walbank, F.W., Habicht, C. (2010–2012). Cambridge, MA: Loeb Classical Library.