**Galatian Studies – Publication Abstracts**

Also see the relevant entries in [*Amici Populi Romani*](http://www.altaycoskun.com/apr), which are frequently updated.

**A. Articles**

**41) Altay Coşkun: Deiotaros of Galatia. Forthcoming in: Blackwell-Wiley’s Encyclopaedia of Ancient History (EAH). Revised Online Edition, Oxford, ca. 2020. (First version: 2012).**

This article summarizes the biography of the most famous Galatian ruler (ca. 120–40 BC), with a particular emphasis on his cooperation with the Romans, his ascent to royalty in ca. 64 BC and his impact on Galatia tribes and other areas in Asia Minor.

**40) Altay Coskun: The Cult of Theos Sebastos in Galatia: a Mystery Cult? In preparation.**

The priest titles *hiero-phantai* (< *hieros* = sacred, *phainein* = to show), also known from Eleusis (cf. Strab. geogr. 10.3.10), and *sebasto-phantai* (< *Theos Sebastos* = *Deus/Divus Augustus*), are repeatedly attested in Roman Asia Minor. (1) Most scholars (esp. Ramsey, Robert, Price, Pleket, Brent) now agree that the Imperial cult was often or always shaped as a mystery cult, including secret rites and theology. In contrast, fomerly the idea prevailed that the political nature of the cult required its public celebration, with *sebastophantai* having similar functions as imperial high priests (*archiereis*): to sponsor public games & feasts (thus still Strubbe). Others advocate various compromises (e.g., Chaniotis), admitting some mystic elements, but denying either initiation rites or any deeper meaning attached to it. However, Harland and Frija point out the connections to traditional mysteries, emphasizing the latter’s model functions for the Imperial mysteries at Ephesos and Pergamon. But their origins, organizational structure and theological contents still remain uncertain. Following the paths of Harland & Frija, the present paper will give due consideration to the highly diverse nature of ancient cults, including the Imperial. But in contrast to previous studies, mystery features within the Imperial cult will be explained by the thorough permeation of any pre-existing cultic landscape by the cult of Augustus and his successors. A precise chronology of the establishment of new priesthoods within the imperial cult of the Galatians in Ankyra and Pessinous will not only give strong support to this view, but also recommend it as a model to explain the evidence, e.g., for Ephesos and Nikomedia.

**39) Altay Coskun: A Survey of Recent Research on Ancient Galatia (1993–2019). To be included in A.C. (ed.): Galatian Victories and Other Studies into the Agency and Identity of the Galatians in the Hellenistic and Early-Roman Periods (ca. 2021).**

Once poorly neglected by scholars of the Classical world, Galatia in the heartland of Anatolia has developed into one of the most productive areas of Ancient History, Graeco-Roman epigraphy, and Classical Archaeology in the course of the last few decades. Given the wealth and diversity of recent contributions and ongoing research activities, it is timely to present a concise overview that not only provides readers with easy access to at times remote publications, but also summarizes and contextualizes major recent results. Likewise, various new problems and re-opened questions deserve scholarly attention. The debt that the scholarly community owes to Stephen Mitchell is outstanding: His two-volume work on the history, society and geography of ancient Galatian (1993) covers a full millennium from the early-Hellenistic to the early-Byzantine period and continues to be the most authoritative point of reference. It serves as the starting point of my research survey. Its first version (in German, published in Anatolica 39, 2013) ended to include the monumental Inscriptions of Ankara I, which Mitchell produced together with David French (2012). The present second version presents a revised, translated, and substantially extended text and bibliography, framed by yet another landmark publication by the aforementioned scholars, the second volume of the Ankara corpus, released in 2019. This year may well be seen as transformative for our field, since it also converges with the release of the long-expected volume of the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (LGPN V.C), which covers in-land Anatolia, and further of the most substantial conference on ancient Phrygia (held in Eskişehir 2015). This, in turn, closely follows the first two volumes reporting on the Pessinus Excavations, directed and edited respectively by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (Colloquia Antiqua (21, 22, 24, published in 2018–2019).

**38) Altay Coskun: Pauline Churches in the *Galatike chora*: A New Plea for the North-Galatian Hypothesis. To be included in A.C. (ed.): Galatian Victories and Other Studies into the Agency and Identity of the Galatians in the Hellenistic and Early-Roman Periods (ca. 2021).**

Although Paul’s Letter to the Galatians has been enjoying intensive scholarly attention since antiquity, the identification of its addressees – whether ethnic Galatians in the north of the Roman province or non-Celtic inhabitants of the cities in its south – has been driven more by preconceived assumptions than by an impartial assessment of the evidence. The present study will engage with the arguments of the South-Galatian hypothesis as presented by Felix John. After identifying much common ground concerning the religious context of the ‘Galatian crisis’ to which Paul responds, I shall revisit John’s terminological discussion. While our assessments of the details differ in some regards, our overall conclusions concur in that a location of the ‘Churches of Galatia’ (Gal 1. 2) and of the ‘foolish Galatians’ (Gal 3. 1) cannot be based on those two verses alone. I shall then proceed to re-examine the most relevant sections of Galatians and the Acts to find out how their authors encountered or envisaged the historical space of Asia Minor. The first mission of the apostle (AD 49) was confined to the southern districts of the province Galatia, which are subsumed under Kilikia in Gal 1. 21 and Acta 15. 23, 41; 16. 1–4. On his second mission (AD 50–51/52), Paul marched from Lystra through the ‘Galatian countryside’ (Acta 16. 6) to the Troas, deliberately avoiding all bigger cities (after Ikonion in Phrygia). And yet, he was delayed by illness on his way (Gal 4. 13–14). This provided him with the unexpected opportunity to evangelize in the southern territory of the Galatian Tektosages or Tolistobogians. He wrote his Letter to the Galatians in Ephesos early during his third mission (AD 53/54), before he initiated the large-scale collection for Jerusalem (AD 54–56).

**37) Altay Coskun: Pessinus, Kleonnaeion and Attalid Administration in Eastern Phrygia in the Aftermath of the Peace of Apameia (188 BC) – Reflections on a Recently-Found Royal Letter from Ballıhisar. To be included in A.C. (ed.): Galatian Victories and Other Studies into the Agency and Identity of the Galatians in the Hellenistic and Early-Roman Periods (ca. 2021).**

The so-called ‘secret correspondence’ from Pessinus, i.e. seven fragmentary letters authored at the Attalid court, is normally dated to the mid-2nd century BC and read as revealing treacherous exchanges with the High Priest Attis. An eighth letter has recently been found in Ballıhisar. In this, Attalos orders his officials Sosthenes and Heroïdes to take action to satisfy the request by the military official Aribazos, leader of military settlers in Amorion and Kleonnaeion. A. Avram & G. Tsetskhladze, who published the *editio princeps* (*ZPE* 191, 2014, 151–181), date it to ca. 160/59 BC, and thus assign it to the same historical context as the other royal letters. But P. Thonemann (*ZPE* 193, 117–128) now argues for a date around 183 BC. The difference is significant in that Pessinus and Galatia are normally regarded as subjected to Pergamon from 188 or 183 to 166 BC. Thonemann thus views the new letter as reflecting administrative measures affecting Pessinus directly during its short dependency from Pergamon. Moreover, he claims that the military settlement Kleonnaeion was located in or perhaps merged with Pessinus, and at some point even enjoyed polis status. Most recent research on Hellenistic Galatia, however, has seriously questioned an important premise for the study of the royal correspondence: there is no evidence that Pessinus had ever been subjected to the Galatians in the 3rd or 2nd century BC. As a result, Pessinus was most likely ceded to Eumenes together with Eastern Phrygia in 188 BC. The royal letters addressing Attis should no longer be interpreted as secretive, but as correspondence between the high priest and his king. The new letter, in fact, attests to Pessinus’ subjection to Attalid administration, and probably dates as early as 188/85 BC. And, finally, there is no evidence to warrant the identification of the cult site in the Gallos valley with Kleonnaeion.

**36) Altay Coskun: Über den Hintergrund der Verbreitung des Kybele-Kultes im Westen des Mittelmeerraumes – Neue Forschungen zum phrygisch-hellenistischen Pessinus (‘On the Background of the Dissemination of the Cult for Cybele in the Western Mediterranean – New Research on Phrygian and Hellenistic Pessinous’).**  
a) Prepublication in the Preliminary Publication of the Conference Proceedings ‘Contact Zones of Europe from the 3rd mill. BC to the 1st mill. AD. International Scientific Conference (Humboldt Kolleg), Moscow, 1-4 October, 2017, 13-18.   
b) Extended and Illustrated version submitted to Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia.

Die literarische Quellenlage zur Überführung der Magna Mater (in Form eines Meteoriten) von Pessinus nach Rom im Jahr 205 v.Chr. sowie zur mythischen Aitiologie und institutionellen Ausprägung des Kultes ist relativ reichhaltig. Aber tatsächliche oder auch nur vermeintliche Widersprüche in den Schriftzeugnissen sowie das mittlerweile beklemmende Ausbleiben entsprechender archäologischer Funde haben zu einer großen Skepsis gegenüber unserer Hauptquelle (Livius 29,10,4–29,11,8 & 29,14,5–14) geführt. Der vorliegende Beitrag beleuchtet zahlreiche rezente, zum Teil noch nicht erschienene Publikationen, welche einerseits die livianische Tradition im Wesentlichen bestätigen, andererseits vor allem die *agency* Attalos’ I. neu beleuchten. Die Hinweise verdichten sich, dass er nicht nur Mittler zwischen Rom und Pessinus, sondern vielmehr Schöpfer des Kybele-und-Attis-Kultes sowohl im Gallos-Tal als auch am Tiber war.

**35) Altay Coskun: The Course of Pharnakes II’s Pontic and Bosporan Campaigns in 48/47 BC. Forthcoming in Phoenix ca. 2020.**

Appian’s account of Pharnakes’ Pontic campaign (*Mithr*. 120.590–595) conveys the impression that the king of the Bosporos started his attack on Asia Minor by attacking Sinope from the sea. The end of the narrative, however, raises some doubts as to whether the king had a fleet at his disposition. It is therefore a plausible hypothesis that Pharnakes’ land forces had marched through Kolchis to invade Asia Minor. The *Bellum Alexandrinum* (34–78) and Cassius Dio (42.45–47) confirm this view and allow us to complete the picture. Seeming contradictions disappear, once we concede that Armenia (Minor) denoted the entire former Mithradatic territory in Anatolia east of the river Halys, or at least east of the river Iris. Pharnakes progressed along the south-eastern coast of the Black Sea, much of which was then ruled by the Galatian King Deiotaros, before turning south at the mouth of the Iris. This way, he reached northern Kappadokia, but withdrew to Pontic Armenia after the diplomatic intervention of the proconsul Cn. Domitius Calvinus. When negotiations failed, Pharnakes defeated the Romans and their Galatian and Kappadokian allies at Nikopolis, whence he expanded further west into Paphlagonian Pontos. News of Asandros’ revolt in the Bosporos caused his army to march back east, but the unexpected arrival of Caesar induced him to turn back once more. In the meantime, he ordered allied forces to gather on the Taman peninsula, while Asandros was extending his control over the European parts of the kingdom. Beaten by Caesar at Zela, Pharnakes fled to Sinope, and was so desperate to escape Calvinus that he killed the last 1,000 horses, to evacuate their riders by sea on randomly confiscated ships. Together with his allies, he was able to retake Theodosia and Pantikapaion, but was defeated regardless by Asandros no later than early September 47 BC. Appian’s account thus emerges as largely reliable regarding facts, whereas distortions are due to his arbitrary selection of details and skewed causalities. These are best explained with the literary design of his narrative and its underlying moral lesson.

**34) Altay Coskun: Mithridates Eupator: Retter, Hegemon, Feind und Opfer der Galater (Mithridates Eupator, Saviour, Hegemon, Enemy, and Victim of the Galatians). Forthcoming in: David Braund & Anca Dan (eds.): Mithridates and the Pontic Kingdom (Collection Varia Anatolica, ed. by the French Institute of Anatolian Studies, Istanbul), Paris: de Boccard, ca. 2020.**

The Pontic Kingdom and the Galatian tribal states share the fate that their histories have to be, for the most part, reconstructed on the basis of a very fragmentary literary tradition, which rarely ever aims at completeness. Most pieces of information that have come down to us either relate to the generation of the founders in the earlier 3rd century BC or have been drawn from narratives dedicated to conflict or cooperation with the Romans. It is owing to the latter, however, that our documentation is relatively rich for Mithradates Eupator, yet his role as archrival of the Romans has frequently narrowed down or distorted the perspective on him. The present paper seeks to study Galatian-Pontic relations based on such marginal notes, anecdotes and historical conjecture. First, the developments of the early Hellenistic period will be rehearsed, before the occupation of Galatia by Mithradates towards the end of the 2nd century BC is studied in more detail. This intervention resulted in the demotion of the four tribal kings to tetrarchs. Relations remained very close with the Trocmi under Brogitarus, whereas the Tolistobogii soon evaded Pontic influence under the leadership of Deiotarus. Based on the resources of his own territory, but also on his easier access to allies in the West, the latter gradually grew in importance before his close friendship with Rome effectively allowed him to inherit the Mithradatic dynasty as the leading force of Asia Minor. Although Mithradates ultimately failed in his subjection of Anatolia, his relation to the Galatians appear to be quite ambivalent: prior to the brutal conflict that erupted in 86, the king had been able to maintain close supervision of the leading dynasties with minimal deployment of force, and it appears that the Trocmi remaind loyal to him even for several years after that pivotal year.

**33) Altay Coskun: Keltische Personennamen und keltische Personennamentraditionen im römischen Galatien. Mit einer Fallstudie zu den Namen der Mitglieder des galatischen Koinons unter Nerva (I.Ankara I 8, 98 n.Chr.) (Celtic Personal Names and Celtic Personal Naming Traditions in Roman Galatia. With a Case Study on the Names of the Members of the Galatian Koinon under Nerva [I.Ankara I 8, 98 BCE). Forthcoming in George Broderick, Paul Schwind & Lothar Willms (eds.): Akten der Konferenz: Celts, Romans, Greeks – Language and Cultural Contacts in the Roman Empire and Associated Areas. Heidelberg, 18–21 Sept. 2014, ca. 2020.**

The variety of personal names in Celtic-speaking areas shows a tremendous diversity and creativity. According phenomena are not confined to Celtic names themselves, but also extend to names adapted to their Greek or Latin environment. The basic principles of how onomastic traditions are carried over from one language into another are a) transliteration, b) assonance (e.g., *Dubius* < *Dubno*-), c) translation (e.g., *Ursus* < *Artos*), and d) hybridisation (e.g., *Iul-iccus*). After giving some examples from the Gallo-Roman world, for which the principles of intercultural onomastics are widely established, the focus shifts eastwards to the Galatians in Asia Minor. Their names began to be collected more than a century ago, but they have become the object of intercultural name studies only recently, and much more work needs to be done to further our understanding of the cultural and socio-political history of the area. A short overview delineates the major stages of Galatian History from the 3rd century BC to the 4th century AD, as reflected in their personal names: starting with the Anatolian-Phrygian layer and indications of early Hellenization under Alexander the Great (†323 BC), the Celtic impact on the area after the invasion of Galatian tribes into north-western and central Anatolia as of 278 BC is explained. Greek and Roman influence became noticeable in the 1st century BC, gradually beginning to supersede epichoric traditions in the High Empire; with the emergence of Christian names in the later 3rd century AD, Celtic names evaporate from our record. A case study on the list of members of the Galatian koinon (*I.Ankara* I 8) allows us to exemplify the problems of classifying names according to intercultural parameters. Quantifying the results generates data for linguistic and historical comparison. The core of this paper consists of an onomastic commentary to the transmitted 95 persons or 196 individual names respectively of the aforementioned inscription. The data not only conveys nuanced insights into intercultural naming practices, and more specifically into the ways names of Roman emperors and provincial governors affected local naming patterns, but as a whole it also lends strong support to identifying the date of the inscription: this can now be established as AD 98 (rather than AD 145/61, which has so far been the prevailing view. The article concludes with a revised list of all known governors of Galatia from Augustus to the death of Trajan (25 BC–AD 117).

**32) Altay Coskun: The ‘Temple State’ of Phrygian Pessinus in the Context of Seleucid, Attalid, Galatian and Roman Hegemonial Politics (3rd-1st Centuries BC). In: Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (ed.): Phrygia in Antiquity: From the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period. Proceedings of the International Conference ‘The Phrygian Lands over Time (from Prehistory to the Middle of the 1st Millennium AD)’, held at Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2nd–8th November, 2015 (Colloquia Antiqua 24), Leuven 2019, 607-648.**

The affluent and exotic ‘temple state’ of Cybele rendered Pessinus the most famous Phrygian cult site in the Graeco-Roman world. No other Phrygian cult or location is mentioned as often in Classical literature, and, likewise, the epigraphic and material evidence for the Roman city stands out amongst its peers in Asia Minor. In contrast, the primary record that predates the 3rd century BC is absent or minimal. Based on this lack of evidence, a recent study has tried to demonstrate that Pessinus as a super-regional sanctuary of the Great Mother should be understood as a creation by king Attalos I. The current article intends to specify the political relations of the priest elite of this newly created sanctuary with its neighbours, the Attalid kingdom to the west and the Galatian tribal states to the east and north, besides their connections with the court of the Seleucids and the Roman superpower respectively. The evidence for the mid- and late Hellenistic period continues to remain highly lacunose and controversial. But recent work on the political divisions and dynamic territorial changes among the Galatians suggests some modification to the currently prevailing view: Pessinus was not part of Galatia (however defined), but rather part of the Attalid kingdom, first from 207 BC to about 200/197, and then again from 188 BC until the dissolution of the kingdom (133/129 BC). Then it seems to have been controlled first by the Tektosages, a generation later by the Trokmoi and since the time of the Mithradatic Wars by the Tolistobogioi. Hence it developed into the urban centre of the Tolistobogioi under Augustus.

**31) Altay Coskun: Galat Krallıkları / The Galatian Kingdoms. In: Oğuz Tekin (ed.): Hellenistik ve Roma İmparatorluğu dönemlerinde Anadolu – Anatolia in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Periods (English, with Turkish translation by İnci Türkoğlu), Istanbul: Yapı Kredi, 146-163.**

Entering Asia Minor as allies of the Bithynian king in 278 BC, the -Galatian Tolistobogii established a powerful kingdom along the bend of the river Sangarios in-between Bithynia and Pessinus. The Tectosages were settled in eastern Phrygia in the environs of Ankyra by the Mithradatids of Pontos. Together with the Trocmi, they were often in a position to exact taxes from the Greek cities. The Seleukids never fully subjected then, but rather had to pay for their alliance. After the Romans established hegemony over Asia Minor by 188 BC, the Tolistobogii refused to accept the lead of the Attalids as commanded by the Romans, and resisted first together with Bithynia, then with Pontos and finally on their own. After the provincialization of Pergamum, Pontos emerged as the most aggressive power in Anatolia, allying in particular with the Trocmi, who were settled east of the Halys bow by Mithradates VI Eupator. Fierce resistance to him allowed the Tolistobogian tetrarch Deiotaros to become the most trusted friend of the Romans and most powerful king of Asia Minor after the death of Mithradates VI Eupator (63 BC), inheriting about half of his territories in Pontic Armenia. At the end of his life (ca. 41 BC), he united the Galatian tribes. His successor Amyntas extended Galatian rule into Lykaonia and Pisidia, before Augustus established the province of Galatia in 25 BC.

**30) Altay Coskun: The War of Brothers, the Third Syrian War, and the Battle of Ankyra (246-241 BC): a Re-Appraisal. In: Kyle Erickson (ed.): The Seleukid Empire, 281–222 BC. War within the Family, Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2018, 197-252 + 275-308 (bibliography).**

The Third Syrian War (246-241 BC) is normally viewed as an indirect result of the peace agreement following the Second Syrian War (260-253). This was sealed with a marriage between Antiochos II and Berenike, daughter of Ptolemy II Philadelphos. For when Antiochos died, his first wife Laodike supposedly murdered the rival queen and her infant child, which in turn provoked the invasion of Berenike’s brother Ptolemy III Euergetes (246). According to Justin (27.1-3), the tensions between Seleukos II (246-225) and his younger brother Antiochos Hierax escalated just when their cooperation had caused Euergetes to sue for peace – Porphyry of Tyre (FGrH 260 F 32.8) dates this to 241. More convincingly, Porphyry synchronizes the beginning of the War of Brothers with to the outbreak of the Third Syrian War: Ephesos had already been lost to Ptolemy when Seleukos was confronting his brother in Ionia, but it was only after Seleukos’ defeat at Ankyra that Euergetes invaded Syria and Mesopotamia in the latter half of 246. Hierax’ control of the Seleukid possessions in Asia Minor finally consolidated when Seleukos conceded this to him together with the royal title in ca. 242. A closer look at Justin (27.2.6-7) reveals that the chronology of the two wars had been changed for the sake of rendering the moralizing messages more clear-cut: Seleukos is the villain of the first chapter, Hierax of the second, both suffering divine punishment for wronging a brother. A revision of the chronology also helps us better understand the roles of the many parties involved: the Tolistobogian and Tectosagen Galatians, the Prusiads, the Mithridatids, Ariarathids, and the Attalids, all of whom pursued agendas of their own. As a result, the history of the empire needs to be rewritten for the entire rule of Seleukos (246-225).

**29) Altay Coskun: Brogitaros and the Pessinus-Affair. Some Considerations on the Galatian Background of Cicero’s Lampoon against Clodius in 56 BC (Harusp. Resp. 27–29). In: Gephyra 15, 2018, 117-131.**

All of our extant literary sources on the history of Pessinus in the Hellenistic age involve Roman agency. For the most part, they are strongly shaped by a specifically Roman perspective that focuses on Roman political or economic interests, and in a way that significantly limits, if not distorts, the information on the sanctuary itself. A telling example is a section from Cicero’s fervent lampoon against Publius Clodius, *De haruspicum responsis* 27–29. This is our main source for the law that granted the control of Pessinus to the Trokmian Brogitaros at the cost of the Tolistobogian Deiotaros. Cicero’s rhetoric has encouraged modern scholars to contextualize this incident within Roman Republican strives – which is indeed pertinent –, but, at the same time, discouraged attempts to better understand specifically Galatian agency behind the conflict. However, a subtle analysis of Ciceronian polemics, especially a reflection on what Cicero does *not* say, will allow us to put forward some plausible hypotheses about the otherwise poorly attested history of Pessinus after the end of the Attalid Kingdom in 133/129 BC. By doing so, we shall gain further arguments for the view that Tolistobogian interest in Pessinus was very late, and that the development of its emporion to the urban center of the Tolistobogians may well have started as late as around 60 BC.

**28) Altay Coskun: The Temple State of Kybele in Phrygian and Early Hellenistic Pessinus: a Phantom? In: Gocha R. Tsetskhladze (ed.): Pessinus and Its Regional Setting, vol. 1 (Colloquia Antiqua 21), Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2018, 205-243.**

Common opinion has it that the ‘temple state’ of Pessinus was founded in the Phrygian period, maintained its status under the Lydians, Achaimenids, the Seleukids (or Galatians), to flourish under the Attalids, before gradually declining under Roman rule. However, the material evidence that has so far come to light from the Gallos Valley only confirms the presence of the cult of Kybele through the ages, though without supporting yet the existence of any sanctuary run continuously from the Phrygian to the Roman periods. Traces of monumental residences appropriate for priestly dynasts are so far absent. The assumption of a pre-Hellenistic temple state is ultimately based mainly on legendary references to King Midas as the founder of the cult, and on Strabo’s mention of those priestly dynasts in an unspecified past. A careful reading of the Geographer’s report suggest that the past he envisaged was the blossom of Attalid rule, and this in combination with the Romans’ interest in the sacred meteorite in 205 BCE. Against this background, most recent research on the diplomacy and propaganda of Attalos I is surveyed, to support the hypothesis that it was this king of Pergamon who skilfully diverted the Roman quest for their ‘Idaean Mother’, as prophecized by the Sibylline Oracles, from the Troad into the Anatolian hinterland. Next the reasons are explained that made an insignificant Phrygian village with a local sanctuary an attractive choice for Attalos and a credible home of the Idaean Mother in the eyes of the Romans. In conclusion, a highly contingent, though no less effective convergence of Roman interests and Attalid diplomatic skills, combined with substantial sponsorship, dragged the Pessinuntian sanctuary out of the shades of insignificance that are so typical for most inner-Anatolian settlements and sanctuaries in pre-Roman times.

**27) Altay Coskun: ‘Warlordism’ in Later Hellenistic Asia Minor. In: Fernando López-Sánchez & Toni Ñaco del Hoyo (eds.): War, Warlords, and Interstate Relations in the Ancient Mediterranean, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2018 (Dec. 2017), 205-230.**

The study of ‘warlordism’ in antiquity, if ever such a thing existed, faces the difficulty that its modern implications, especially the context of the nation state, cannot be applied to the Graeco-Roman world. If filtered out, an ‘ancient warlord’ would have been a ruler *who drew on military force with a deficient legitimacy*; his contemporaries might have called him *tyrannos*, *pirata* or *lēstēs*. However, the definition is too broad to serve as an analytical category, for it likewise fits very different types of rulers, such as Antipatros of Derbe, the Galatian Amyntas, Mithradates Eupator of Pontos or the latest Seleukids; several Roman generals such as Sulla or Mark Antony fulfill these criteria as well. Moreover, none of the aforementioned labels is an objective category, but they appear to be derogative terms imposed by enemies. Against this background, it is suggested that further studies may concentrate on the rhetoric that seeks to establish, deny or negotiate legitimacy of kings, petty rulers and military leaders.

**26) Altay Coskun: Attalos I and the Conquest of Pessinus. *I.Pessinus* 1 Reconsidered. In: Philia 2, 2016, 53-62.**

Very few sanctuaries of the ancient world can boast such a broad and diverse literary, epigraphic and numismatic tradition as the temple state of Kybele Agdistis in Pessinus. And yet, inconsistencies or lacunae in the sources have resulted in countless controversies on the history of the cult place. In particular, the most detailed account of the Roman quest for the sacred meteorite of the goddess in 205/4 BC (Livy 29.10.4–29.11.8; 29.14.5–14) has often been rejected as later fabrication. An important argument is that King Attalos I of Pergamon, the guide of the Roman embassy according to Livy, did not yet have access to Eastern Phrygia at the time. The close relation between the Attalid kings and the sanctuary is attested by Strabo (12.5.3), who remains unspecific in chronological terms, and through a number of royal letters addressing Attis, the ruling priest of Pessinus, which have traditionally been dated to 163/156 BC. However, Christian Mileta (2010) has convincingly shown that *I.Pessinus* 1 should rather be identified as a letter by King Attalos I to one of his own military officials, providing instructions for the conquest of “Pessongoi” in 207 BC. All attempts at not identifying this place with Pessinus have failed, and Mileta’s argument for the high date can be further enhanced by a closer study of the letter and its addressee. This way, we shall be in a much better position to understand what happened in the Gallos Valley at the end of the 3rd century BC.

**25) Altay Coskun: Die Tetrarchie als hellenistisch-römisches Herrschaftsinstrument. Mit einer Untersuchung der Titulatur der Dynasten von Ituräa (‘The Tetrarchy as a Hellenistic and Roman Instrument of Imperial Rule. With a Study of the Titulature of the Dynasts of Ituraea’). In Ernst Baltrusch / Julia Wilker (eds.): Amici –Socii – Clientes. Abhängige Herrschaft im Imperium Romanum. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 30, Berlin 2015, 161-197.**

Scholars are divided as to whether the tetrarchy originated from Gaul or Macedon, or was a mix of both traditions. However, a systematic study of the evidence suggests that, for the first time, Mithridates VI bestowed the tetrarchic title on four (not twelve) Galatian kinglets around 100 BC. Due to inner-Galatian rivalries, the term lost its etymological relation to a four-fold structure, and could be imposed on rulers not deemed worthy of the diadem. Such a practice is attested for Mark Antony after Philippi. He granted the title to the sons of the Idumaean strategos Antipater in return for his merits, whereas the King of the Ituraeans Ptolemy, son of Mennaios, was demoted to the rank of a tetrarch and high priest as a punishment. His son Lysanias usurped the royal title when enjoying the protection of the Parthians, but was executed by Antony in return. His grandson Lysanias of Abilene was among the last tetrarchs of Rome’s grace.

**24) Altay Coskun: Latène-Artefakte im hellenistischen Kleinasien: ein problematisches Kriterium für die Bestimmung der ethnischen Identität(en) der Galater (Latène Artefacts in Hellenistic Asia Minor: a Difficult Criterion for the Definition of the Ethnic Identity (Identities) of the Galatians). In IstMitt 64, 2014 (2015), 129-162.**

This paper seeks to revisit the significance of Latène artefacts in determining the ethnic identity of 3rd-century BC Galatian immigrants to Anatolia as well as of their descendants. Although only few such objects have so far been found in Asia Minor, they have commonly been understood as indicative of Galatian presence in central Anatolia, and at times even of continued cultural exchange with the Celts from Europe. However, a closer look at the evidence speaks against this view. First, the term ‘Galatian Ceramics’ is misleading, since this ware does not show any traces of Latène culture, so that it should better be labelled ‘Pontic-Hellenistic Ceramics’, according to its main production area. Second, not a single Latène fibula can be attributed to an individual bearer from among the three major Galatian tribes; geographical and chronological implications rather point to mercenaries recruited from eastern Europe by Attalus I (ca. 240–197) or later Hellenistic kings. Third, the architecture of Galatian tumuli stands in an Anatolian-Phrygian tradition, and while Latène-style burial gifts are entirely absent from among the Trocmi and Tectosages, alleged attributions of such objects to Tolistobogian tombs could not yet be substantiated. In conclusion, none of the three Galatian tribes seems to have been regular users, let alone producers, of Latène objects. If this is true, we also have to reconsider the origin of the Galatian iconography of the famous victory monuments of Pergamum.

**23) Altay Coskun: Neue Forschungen zum Kaiserkult in Galatien. Edition der Priester-Inschriften des Ankyraner Sebasteions (Dittenberger II 1903/70, 533 = Bosch 51) und Revision der frühen Provinzialgeschichte (‘New Research on the Imperial Cult in Galatia. Edition of the Priest-Inscriptions of the Ancyran Sebasteion [OGIS II 533 = Bosch 51] and Revision of the Early Provincial History’). In: Joseph Fischer (ed.): Der Beitrag Kleinasiens zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Antike, Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, Wien, 3.-5. November 2010 (Österr. Ak. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 469), Vienna 2014, 35-73.**

This article presents an in-depth study of the famous priest inscriptions carved into the left anta of the Temple for Theos Sebastos (i.e. the God Augustus) and Thea Rhome (i.e. the Goddess Rome) in Galatian Ancyra. Under the names of the according provincial governors, 23 annual priests of the aforesaid divinities are listed together with the lavish donations they offered to the gods and their worshippers. Although the inscriptions were known for centuries, new readings of some letters, a scrutiny of the various layers of the inscriptions as well as a better understanding of the political framework allow us to improve the interpretation of the text and its historical evaluation. For the first time, we are in the position to date precisely the establishment of the cult in Ancyra (5 BC), the start of the temple construction (3 BC) and the inauguration of the completed building (AD 14). In contrast, previous studies had variously dated the beginning of the cult to sometime between the 20s BC and even after AD 14. The list of the provincial governors mentioned was formerly understood to cover most if not all of the rule of the Emperors Tiberius (AD 14–37) and Claudius (AD 37–41), whereas the list could be demonstrated to have preserved the magistrates of the years from 5 BC to ca. AD 18/19. Following an introduction to the archaeological setting of the temple and the inscriptions, a critical edition of the text is presented together with a new German translation. On this basis, a detailed commentary as well as further historical appendices discuss several difficulties, solidly establish the new chronology and explore the far-reaching consequences for the history of the province of Galatia and the Roman imperial rule in the east. Even before its publication by the Austrian Academy, the results of this study were received and fully acknowledged by M. Kadıoğlu et al.: *Roman Ancyra* (Istanbul 2011) and S. Mitchell and D. French, *I.Ankara* I (Munich 2012), no. 2.

**22) Altay Coskun: Vier Gesandte des Königs Deiotaros in Rom (45 v.Chr.). Einblicke in den galatischen Hof der späthellenistischen Zeit auf onomastischer Grundlage. In Philia 1, 2014 (2015), 1-13.**

Having sided with Pompey at the Battle of Pharsalos (48), the Tolistobogian King Deiotaros not only had to pay heavy indemnities to Caesar, but was also stripped of Armenia Minor and the Trokmian tetrarchy (47). The latter was given to Mithradates of Pergamon, who, however, died soon thereafter in his attempt to conquer the Bosporan Kingdom (46). Since Caesar’s regime remained under pressure through republican rebels in Syria (46-43), Africa (49-46) and Spain (45), Deiotaros seized his opportunity to ask the dictator to return him the Trokmian territory. To this end, he sent out two ambassadors, *Blesamios* and *Artignos* (not *Antigonos*, as is commonly held) (46). The king’s Tektosagen rivals tried to thwart his plan albeit; they dispatched prince Kastor to accuse Deiotaros of attempted murder of Caesar and conspiracy with Caecilius Bassus, the rebel in Syria. The Tolistobogian responded with sending out a second embassy, which consisted of his friends *Hieras* and *Dorylaos*. Our main source for these events is Cicero’s speech in defence of the king, held in Nov. 45 before the dictator. The present paper focuses on the four envoys of Deiotaros: the pieces of information provided by Cicero, including the implications of their Celtic or intercultural names, allows us to throw unique glimpses into the Tolistobogian court of the mid-1st century BC.

**21) Altay Coskun: War der Galaterkönig Deiotaros ein Städtegründer? Neue Vorschläge zu einigen kleinasiatischen Toponymen auf *Sin-/Syn*- (‘Was Deiotaros, the King of the Galatians, a Founder of Cities? New Suggestions as to Some Toponyms from Asia Minor which begin with *Sin*-/*Syn*-’). In: Gephyra 10, 2013, 152-162.**

After the arrival of the Galatians in central Anatolia, Phrygian cities such as Gordion and Ankyra continued to exist, but the little interest the new rulers took in them became apparent when those cities were not re-founded after the Romans had sacked them in 189 BC. Neither historiographic nor geographical sources provide any evidence for a city built by the Galatians, and the lack of archaeological remains appears to concur with this negative assessment. The same even seems to hold true for King Deiotaros. Although he was most closely connected with Roman senators, he occasionally acted as a benefactor in the Greek world, and effectively succeeded to the throne of Pontus. So, as a (late) Hellenistic king, some interest in constructing, fostering or at least the dynastic naming of cities would fit his role well. But only one isolated reference in Plutarch’s *Life of Crassus* (17.1) credits the king with the foundation of a city (54 BC). However, so far it has been impossible to identify any Galatian site with this city. It is therefore suggested that we might have to look for it in Armenia Minor near the Euphrates, for there was a settlement with the Celtic name *Sintoion* which Stephanos of Byzantion explicitly attests as a Galatian foundation. Even more interesting is the case of *Synhorion*, originally a frontier fort established by Mithradates VI Eupator: in all likelihood, this was renamed or rather reinterpreted as *Sinorix Phrourion* (App. Mithr. 101.463; 107.503) or \**Sinorigia* by Deiotaros, son of Sinorix, which yielded the later form *Sinoria* (Strab. geogr. 12.3.37). Here the dynastic naming pattern – so widespread among Hellenistic kings, and so often applied by Mithradates – is manifest. One may thus go on and venture the hypothesis that this was also the city Deiotaros was building when Crassus came along on his ill-fated Parthian campaign.

**20)** **Altay Coskun: Von *Anatolia* bis *Inscriptions of Ankara*: Zwanzig Jahre Forschungen zum antiken Galatien (1993-2012) (‘From *Anatolia* to *Inscriptions of Ankara*: Twenty Years of Research on Ancient Galatia’). In: Anatolica 39, 2013, 69-95.**

Once poorly neglected by scholars of the Classical world, Galatia in the heartland of Anatolia has developed into one of the most productive areas of Ancient History, Graeco-Roman epigraphy, and Classical Archaeology in the course of the last few decades. Given the wealth and diversity of recent contributions and ongoing research activities, it is timely to present a concise overview that not only provides readers with easy access to at times remote publications, but also summarizes and contextualizes major results. This will allow us to point out some converging discoveries or insights as well as old and new views that may conflict with documentary evidence that has been recently found or better understood. Likewise, various new problems and re-opened questions that deserve scholarly attention in the future will be put forward. The debt that the scholarly community owes to Stephen Mitchell is outstanding, as the author of the most comprehensive study of roughly one millennium of Galatian history (1993) as well as the co-editor of the monumental Inscriptions of Ankara I, which he has produced together with David French (2012). These milestones of Galatian Studies will serve as a framework for this report.

**19) Altay Coskun: *Histoire par les noms* in the Heartland of Galatia (3rd Century BC–AD 3rd Century). In: Robert Parker (ed.): Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia, Oxford 2013 (Proceedings of the British Academy 191), 79-106.**

For the two centuries following the Galatian occupation of central Anatolia after 278 BC, only a few nearly exclusively Celtic names of tribal or mercenary leaders have been transmitted. In the 1st century BC, the first examples of Anatolian names re-emerge in our evidence, and a few Greco-Macedonian ones alongside with them. By the beginning of the 2nd century AD, Roman names prevailed among Galatian aristocrats. Complementary to these general trends, this study also looks at the Phrygian and Celtic traditions that were sometimes hidden behind Greek or Roman facades: the extent of such complex naming practices reveals the compatibility of embracing Hellenism or Romanness with an awareness of the Galatian or Phrygian cultural heritage still in the 2nd century. Such local peculiarities faded away in the 3rd century with the completion of Roman franchise and the spread of Christian names.

**18) Altay Coskun:** **Belonging and Isolation in Central Anatolia: the Galatians in the Graeco-Roman World. In: Sheila Ager/Riemer Faber (eds.): Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World (Waterloo, August 2008), Toronto 2013, 73-95.**

This article surveys the distorted representation of Galatians in ancient writing and modern scholarship. It draws on a number of preliminary studies (nos. 16, 8, 5, 3).

**17) Altay Coskun: Romanisierung und keltisches Substrat im hadrianischen Ankyra im Spiegel der Gedenkinschrift für Lateinia Kleopatra (Bosch 117 = Mitchell/French, I.Ankara I 81) (Romanization and Celtic Substratum in Ancyra under Hadrian, as Mirrored in the Commemorative Inscription for Latinia Cleopatra). In: ZPE 183, 2013, 171-184.**

Die systematische Untersuchung zu den Namen der Gedenkinschrift für Lateinia Kleopatra hat in verschiedener Weise zur Präzisierung unserer Kenntnisse von der Entwicklung des kaiserzeitlichen Ankyra geführt. Zunächst wurden die letzten Jahre der Herrschaft Hadrians als wahrscheinliches Datum für den Ehrenbeschluss ermittelt (ca. 135/138 n.Chr.). Sodann konnte gezeigt werden, wie sich das in der galatischen Aristokratie des 2. Jahrhunderts weit verbreitete Bedürfnis, auf königliche Vorfahren hinzuweisen, in ihrem Namengut spiegelt, wobei die Namen *Kleopatra* und *Alexandros* sowohl thematische als auch genealogische Verbindungslinien zum tosiopischen Tetrarchengeschlecht nahelegen. Ferner hat eine Schichtung der Namen der Phylarchen, welche die Ehrung vorgenommen hatten, nicht nur einen Einblick in die (überraschend weite) Verbreitung des römischen Bürgerrechts in der Ankyraner Mittelschicht gestattet, sondern zugleich auch den hohen Anteil keltischer sowie ‚verdeckt‘ epichorischer Namen kenntlich gemacht. Durch Vergleiche mit den Namen von Sebastos-Priestern und Buleuten des Koinons der Galater konnten weitere Besonderheiten erstens der Metropolis Ankyra gegenüber anderen Gebieten Kerngalatiens sowie zweitens der Mittelschicht jener Stadt gegenüber dem engeren Zirkel der aristokratischen Führungselite hervorgehoben werden. Hierbei verdient besonders die augenfällige Dominanz des keltischen Elementes noch im mittleren 2. Jh. n.Chr. betont zu werden. Die grundsätzliche Gefahr der Verzerrung des Eindrucks angesichts der geringen Zahl von Namen wird durch mehrere Umstände verringert: erstens durch die relativ gleichmäßige Rekrutierung der zwölf Phylarchen aus der Ankyraner Mittelschicht; zweitens durch die ergänzende Untersuchung der ‚verdeckten‘ Namentraditionen; drittens durch mehrere Vergleiche mit anderen Namenlisten Kerngalatiens, welche eine recht genaue Datierung und soziale Einordnung erlauben; und viertens durch die plausible Kontextualisierung der Befunde im weiteren Rahmen der Geschichte Galatiens.

**16) Altay Coskun: Deconstructing a Myth of Seleucid History: the So-Called ‘Elephant Victory’ over the Galatians Revisited. In: Phoenix 66.1-2, 2012, 57-73.**

Common opinion has it that Antiochus the Great pacified central and western Asia Minor by defeating the Galatians in a glorious battle, mainly relying on his war elephants. As a result, the Galatians are said to have been settled in the remote hinterland of Anatolia, remaining loyal vassals of the Seleucids for the ensuing century. Scholarship has until now only been divided as to dating this ‘Elephant Victory’: while ca. 276/74 has traditionally been the date mostly accepted, more recently 270/68 BC has been prevailing. In this article, it is firstly argued that Antiochus must have reacted to the invasion of the Galatians by 274. Secondly, a revision of the ancient sources reveals that the subject of the ‘Elephant Victory’ was absent from Hellenistic historiography. It was rooted in Seleucid propaganda (cf. Suda s.v. *Simonides of Magnesia*) rather than in the political realities of the 3rd century. Little was known about it when Lucian composed his *Zeuxis or Antiochus* in the 2nd century AD, which allowed the sophist to make the story fit his own rhetorical needs. The deconstruction of this myth of modern historiography has a far-reaching impact on the political history of Asia Minor as well as of the reconstruction of the early Seleucid ruler cult.

**15) Altay Coskun: Bibliographische Nachträge zu den Fasten der Provinz Galatien in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit (‘Bibliobliographic Addenda to the Fasti of the Province of Galatia under Augustus and Tiberius’). In: Gephyra 9, 2012, 124-127.**

After briefly introducing into the revised *fasti* of the early governors of the province Galatia, a survey of the most recent publications in the field is given. Most importantly, the new chronology of the *legati Augusti pro praetore* as deployed in Gephyra 6 (2009) has been accepted in the recent corpus of inscriptions of Roman Ancyra (edd. Mitchell / French 2012), even though it has been argued convincingly there that the main source, the priest list on the left anta of the Sebasteion (I.Ankara I 2), started in 5 (and not 4) BC. Moreover, the discussion of three inscriptions relating to the repair of a road connecting Attaleia and Perge further corroborates a late Augustan and early Tiberian date for the governor T. Helvius Fronto.

**14) Altay Coskun: Intercultural Anthroponomy in Hellenistic and Roman Galatia. With Maps Drawn by Michael Grün and April Ross. In: Gephyra 9, 2012, 51-68.**

From 278 BC, Celtic mercenaries started to be involved in the dynastic wars of Asia Minor and began to settle in eastern Phrygia as ‘Galatians’. From there they ruled substantial parts of central and western Anatolia until the creation of the Roman province of Galatia in 25 BC. Despite their historical importance, little is known about their cultural identity, so that a closer look at their personal names helps to fill some of the gaps in our knowledge. After a general introduction to the onomastic resources for central Anatolia, it is pointed out that Celtic compound names dominated among the aristocracy of Hellenistic Galatia. Proso­po­graphical information is then employed to explain that the rare use of foreign names in the course of the 1st century BC was mainly due to intermarriage with the nobility of neighbouring territories. Despite the growing impact of Hellenization and Romanization in the same period, Greek and Roman personal names became more popular than Celtic names only in the latter half of the 1stcentury AD, though Celtic names only disappear in the course of the 3rd century. Surprising is the resurgence of Phrygian names in imperial inscriptions, which may at least partly be explained by the amalgamation of the priestly elite of Pessinus and the Tolistobogian nobility. But in some places, there seems to have been a continuity of Phrygian settlement that may go back to the early Hellenistic period if not beyond. This appears to be implied in rural naming patterns, where a high degree of homogeneity as to the use of either Phrygian or Celtic names is attested in the epigraphic record. The evidence becomes even more striking if the implications of intercultural naming practices are also considered. The assumption of an early ‘Galatization’ of central Anatolia, soon followed by its ‘Hellenization’, is thereforein need of modification.

**13) Altay Coskun: Galatians and Seleucids: a Century of Conflict and Cooperation. In: Kyle Erickson/Gillian Ramsey (eds.): Seleucid Dissolution: Fragmentation and Transformation of Empire (Exeter, July 2008), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011 (Philippika 50), 85-106.**

Most ancient sources and no less modern accounts ignore the political independence of the eastern Celtic, especially Galatian, peoples that settled in the centre of Asia Minor or operated as federates or mercenaries in the whole of the Hellenistic world. However, a fresh analysis of the literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence enables us to differentiate much more clearly between those political entities. This way, new light may also be shed on their highly dynamic and complex relations with the Seleucids during the first century of their presence in Anatolia. It will be suggested that the Elephant Battle won by Antiochus I in ca. 270 has as much been overestimated as the victories that Attalus I achieved at the sources of the Caïcus and at the walls of Pergamum. Even under Antiochus III, when Seleucid rule over Asia Minor reached its pinnacle, it is unlikely that the Galatians considered themselves or were treated as his subjects: while the tribe of Eposognatus (which has hitherto not been identified) remained loyal to Eumenes II of Pergamum, the remaining Galatian tribes seem to have been allies of Antiochus, though at least the Tolistobogii and the Tectosages seem to have been bound by individual treaties. Besides, there is manifold evidence for additional mercenary units probably hired from the failed Celtic kingdom of Tyle in eastern Thrace. The close relationships between Antiochus and the Celts living north-west to the mountain chain of the Taurus was shattered only by the campaign of Manlius Vulso in 189. No further contacts between the Galatians of central Anatolia and the Seleucids can be traced after the Romans had installed their 'peace and friendship' on Antiochus in Apameia the same year.

**12) Altay Coskun: Annäherungen an die galatische Elite der hellenistischen Zeit (‘Approaching the Galatian Elite in the Hellenistic Period’). In: Boris Dreyer/Peter F. Mittag (eds.): Lokale Eliten und hellenistische Könige. Zwischen Kooperation und Konfrontation (Oikumene 8), Berlin 2011, 80-104.**

Während für Galatien im 3. und 2. Jh. lediglich vage Indizien vorliegen, belegen die Quellen zum 1. Jh. v.Chr. erstens die monarchische Herrschaft der Stammesfürsten und zweitens die starke Bedeutung sowohl einer dynastischen als auch einer meritokratischen Legitimation. In allen Fällen vor der Herrschaftsausdehnung des Deiotaros über sämtliche galatische Stämme liegen eine Herkunft des *regulus* bzw. Tetrarchen aus dem jeweiligen Stamm oder doch wenigstens ein genealogisch bedingter Erbanspruch vor. Dies schließt freilich nicht aus, dass kleinere Sippschaften nach und nach in die vier oder später drei Großstämme integriert und damit gewissermaßen vorübergehend einer Fremdherrschaft unterworfen wurden. Das große Bestreben der Galater nach Autonomie ging ganz ohne Probleme mit dem Versuch einher, Herrschaft über fremde Territorien zu gewinnen. Hier zeigte sich ein starkes Nachwirken der gewaltsamen Landnahme in den 270er Jahren, aber auch eine Begleiterscheinung der nomadischen Lebensweise, die in größerem Maße als sesshafte Gesellschaften auf militärische Selbstbehauptung angewiesen ist. Daher musste sich ihre Elite kontinuierlich in der Kriegführung bewähren, konnte aber auf eine große Bereitschaft der Stammes­genossen zur Gefolgschaft zählen. Auch im Heeresdienst unter hellenistischen Königen oder römischen Proconsuln verblieben galatische Einheiten im ethnischen Verband, der von ihren eigenen Fürsten kommandiert wurde. Ähnlich wie viele griechische Poleis, aber zum Teil mit größerem Erfolg, changierten auch die galatischen Stämme zwischen voller Autonomie, hegemonialer Beeinflussung und vorübergehender Besetzung seitens einer hellenistischen Großmacht. Im Verlauf des 1. Jhs. lehnten sie sich indes immer stärker an Rom an. Für die meisten Tetrarchen zahlte sich diese politische Ausrichtung durchaus aus, da ihnen Pompeius nicht nur ihre Stellung garantierte, sondern Deiotaros und Brogitaros nachweislich sowie vielleicht auch Kastor Tarkondarios und Domnekleios zusätzliche Territorien aus dem untergegangenen pontischen Reich schenkte. Andererseits vermochte Deiotaros durch seine Begünstigung seitens der Römer derart umfangreiche Ressourcen anzuhäufen, dass er bis zu seinem Lebensende eine Herrschaft über Gesamtgalatien errichtete. Die damit verbundenen gewaltsamen und für die lokalen Fürstenhäuser zum Teil tödlichen Konflikte stellten eine wichtige Voraussetzung dafür dar, dass die Provinzialisierung unter Augustus friedlich verlief und sich die Eliten an eine Fremdherrschaft gewöhnt hatten.

**11) Altay Coskun: Das Edikt des Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus und die Fasten der Statthalter Galatiens in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit (‘The Edict of Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus and the Fasti of the Governors of Galatia under Augustus and Tiberius’). In: Gephyra 6, 2009 (2010), 159-164.**

Die galatische Statthalterschaft des Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus ist allein durch eine im h. Burdur bei Sagalassos in Pisidien gefundene, erstmals von Stephen Mitchell herausgegebene Inschrift bezeugt: Es handelt sich um ein Edikt, welches die Mißstände in der Nutzung des öffentlichen Transportwesens zu beheben sucht. Unstrittig ist, daß das Edikt unter der Herrschaft des Tiberius abgefaßt wurde, da sich der Statthalter im Präskript *legatus Ti. Caesaris Augusti pro pr(aetore)* (Z. 1f.) nennt. Verwiesen wird aber auch auf frühere, dasselbe Problem betreffende Anordnungen des Augustus (Z. 3), welche wiederholt mißachtet worden seien. Aus der Formulierung schließt die bisherige Forschung weit mehrheitlich, daß der römische Beamte von Augustus eingesetzt worden und nach dessen Tod in seiner Position verblieben sei. Doch ist dies durch Inschrift von Sagalassos keineswegs belegt und zudem durch die Dokumente für die Statthalterschaft des T. Helvius Basila ausgeschlossen. Diese Beobachtungen führen zu einer umfassenden Revision der galatischen Fasten unter Augustus und Tiberius: M. Lollius (Curio?) 25–22/21 v.Chr.; L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex ca. 14–ca. 13 v.Chr.; Cornutus (Arruntius?) Aquila bis So(mmer) 6 v.Chr.; P. Sulpicius Quirinius So. 6–So. 2 v.Chr.; Metilius (erster Statthaltername im überlieferten Teil der Ankyraner Priesterinschrift) So. 2 v.–So. 4 n.Chr.; Fronto So. 4–Sept. 7/So. 8 n.Chr.; M. Plautius Silvanus Okt. 7/So. 8–So. 12 n.Chr.; T. Helvius Basila (letzter Statthaltername in der Ankyraner Priesterinschrift) So. 12–ca. 15/17 n.Chr.; Priscus ca. 18/19 n.Chr.; Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus ca. 20/37 n.Chr.

**10) Altay Coskun: Der Ankyraner Kaiserkult und die Transformation galatischer und phrygisch-galatischer Identitäten in Zentralanatolien im Spiegel der Münzquellen (‘The Emperor Cult of Ancyra and the Transformation of Galatian and Phrygio-Galatian Identities in Central Anatolia According to the Numismatic Evidence’). In: idem, Heinz Heinen & Stefan Pfeiffer (eds.): Repräsentation von Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt, Frankfurt/M. 2009 (2010), 173-211.** [PDF Download](http://www.altaycoskun.com/s/Coskun-2009-Ankyraner-Kaiserkult-Muenzquellen.pdf).

Die Erforschung des Ankyraner Kultes für den Theos Sebastos und die Thea Rhome kann sich mit dem zu großen Teilen erhaltenen Tempel einschließlich der auf diesem befindlichen Inschriften sowie mit den relevanten epigraphischen und numismatischen Zeugnissen auf eine breite Quellenbasis stützen. Nach einer je kurzen Einführung in den historischen Raum Galatien, die Entwicklung der Städte Ankyra, Pessinus und Tavion sowie die Etablierung des dort praktizierten Kaiserkultes soll die Bedeutung des letzteren für das Selbstverständnis der Galater herausgearbeitet werden. Dies spiegelt sich nicht nur in ihrer Beibenennung als *Sebastenoi* wider. Die Wahl der Münzmotive erlaubt zudem Blicke auf die kultbezogene Selbstrepräsentation seit der spätaugusteischen Zeit. Dabei sind zu ihrer Auswertung die –höchst kontroverse – Datierung der Münzen, Identifizierung der Abbildungen und Zuordnung der Prägeautorität von großer Bedeutung. Die Grundlage des Beitrags bildet die umfassend revidierte Chronologie der frühen Provinz Galatia, die im Rahmen einer jüngst abgeschlossenen Habilitationsschrift erarbeitet worden ist. Dieselbe erlaubt neue Perspektiven auf die Prozesse der Provinzialisierung bzw. Herausbildung neuer politisch-sozialer und ethnisch-kultureller Identitäten im Herzen Kleinasiens.

**9) Altay Coskun: Galatische Legionäre in Ägypten: die Konstituierung der *legio XXII Deiotariana* in der frühen Kaiserzeit. Bärbel Kramer zum Geburtstag gewidmet (‘Galatian *legionarii* in Egypt: the Constitution of the *legio XXII Deiotariana* in the Early Empire’). In: Tyche 23, 2008 [Nov. 2009], 21-46.**

Die Waffenhilfe galatischer ‘Freunde und Verbündete’ für die römische Hegemonialmacht ist seit dem späteren 2. Jh. v.Chr. bezeugt und wurde in den Tagen des Deiotaros Philorhomaios (ca. 120–41/40 v.Chr.) zu einer Selbstverständlichkeit römischer Kriegführung im Orient. Dass die Reichszentrale auch nach der Provinzialisierung Galatiens im Jahr 25 v.Chr. nicht auf diese Unterstützung verzichten wollten, geht nicht zuletzt aus der massiven Präsenz galatischer Legionäre besonders im frühkaiserzeitlichen Ägypten hervor. Der vorliegende Beitrag unterbreitet neue Vorschläge für die Ankunft und die Organisationsform von Galatern im Land des Nils: Es scheint, dass erst Germanicus die *legio (vernacula) Deiotariana* von Kleinasien aus nach Ägypten brachte und mit diesen dort die *legiones III* und *XXII Cyrenaicae* verstärkte; seitdem wurden diese Verbände als *legio III Cyrenaica* und *legio* *XXII Deiotariana* geführt, ohne dass sich fortan weitere regelmäßige Rekrutierungen aus Kleinasien nachweisen lassen.

**8) Altay Coskun: ‘New Work on Hellenistic and Roman Galatia’: *Terror Gallicus*, *Keltensieg*, and Conflicting Perceptions of the Galatians. In: University of Wales, Lampeter – Research Institute of Classics, Working Papers, March 2009.** Offline since ca. 2011. [PDF Download](http://www.altaycoskun.com/s/Coskun-2009-Lampeter-Working-Paper-New-Work-on-Hellenistic-and-Roman-Galatia-re-ed.pdf).

This is an introduction into the history of Hellenistic and Roman Galatia and the major debates in current scholarship. To a large extend, it overlaps with the articles ‘Belonging and Isolation in Central Anatolia: the Galatians in the Graeco-Roman World’, in: Sheila Ager/Riemer Faber (eds.): Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World (Waterloo, August 2008), Toronto 2013, 73-95, and, to a minor extent, also with the article ‘Deconstructing a Myth of Seleucid History: the So-Called ‘Elephant Victory’ over the Galatians Revisited’, in: Phoenix 66.1-2, 2012, 57-73. On these see below, III 67 and 65.

**7) Altay Coskun: Interkulturelle Ortsnamen in Zentralkleinasien und Galatische Geschichte (‘Intercultural Place Names in Central Asia Minor and Galatian History’). In: Wolfgang Ahrens/Sheila Embleton/André Lapierre (eds.): Names in Multi-Lingual, Multi-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic Contact. Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS XXIII), August 17-22, York University, Toronto 2009, 243-253.** Download of earlier draft: Netzwerk Interferenzonomastik, Gallorömische Abteilung (NIO-GaRo) 2008.1 (2009): http://www.uni-trier.de/fileadmin/fb3/AGY/NIO-GaRo\_2008.1.pdf. (14 pp.)

While toponomastic research on Galatia in Asia Minor has made significant progress in the last years, the enormity of the primary and secondary Celtic impacts in central Anatolia still have not been fully accounted for: far too often, indigenous (Old Anatolian, Phrygian) etymologies are determined and Celtic derivatives, hybridizations or homonyms are not considered at all. While the newest scholarship counts only between 9 and 16 (possibly) Celtic place names out of the approximately 75 known for the Galatian heartland (ethnonyms remain unconsidered here), I count 24 (probably) Celtic names and 25 further cases with several possible etymologies, of which Celtic is an option. Furthermore, the count of (possibly) Celtic or Celtic-influenced place names outside of the Galatian heartland seems not to amount to between 2 and 10, as has been accepted up until now, but rather at least 34. Thus on the one hand a new methodical starting point for the toponomastics of central Asia Minor is given, and on the other hand the cultural history and historical geography of central Asia Minor can be placed on a new basis as well.

**6) Altay Coskun: Das Ende der ‚romfreundlichen‘ Herrschaft in Galatien und das Beispiel einer ,sanften‘ Provinzialisierung in Zentralanatolien (‘The End of the ‘Philo-Roman’ Rule in Galatia and the Example of a ‘Soft’ Provincialisation in Central Anatolia’). In: idem (ed.): Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer (2. Jh. v.Chr. – 1. Jh. n.Chr.), Frankfurt/M. 2008, 133-164 (with maps 3-4).** [PDF Download](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/553e6ebae4b06fb7f1cd64df/t/5ce04ca2ad659800019ecccf/1558203558590/Coskun+2008+Sanfte+Provinzialisierung%2C+in+InEx+9.pdf).

Als mit Amyntas der letzte König der Galater 26/25 v. Chr. unerwartet starb, übernahm Augustus die direkte Herrschaft über dessen Reich. Im Laufe der folgenden Jahrzehnte sollten weitere benachbarte, ebenfalls un-ter galatischen Dynasten stehende Territorien der neuen Provinz zugeschlagen werden. Ein Grund für diese Maßnahmen wird in den Quellen nicht genannt. Auch in der Forschung haben die Motive des Kaisers bisher ein eher geringes Interesse gefunden. Aber gerade mit Blick auf die Loyalität, welche die galatischen Machthaber dem römischen Kaiser erwiesen hatten, sowie auf den Umstand, dass Amyntas mehrere erwachsene Söhne zurückließ, ist die Erklärungsnot für diesen Entschluss nicht gering. Der Aufsatz geht systematisch der Frage nach, warum damals mit der bewährten Tradition gebrochen wurde, das kaum durch Städte und Straßen erschlossene anatolische Hochland ›romfreundlichen‹ Monarchen zu unterstellen. So wird einerseits erörtert, welche Aufgaben Augustus den von ihm eingesetzten bzw. bestätigten Königen zuwies und welche Verpflichtung er gegenüber den *reges amici populi Romani* einging. Zum anderen werden die möglichen Gründe für die Provinzialisierung Galatiens diskutiert, wobei insbesondere auf den Bedarf an Siedlungsland für die Bürgerkriegsveteranen zu denken ist, die sich vor allem in Pisidien niederließen. Kerngalatien blieb demgegenüber vorerst weitgehend unberührt vom Ende des Königtums, bis 20 Jahre später der Kaiserkult in Ankara gestiftet wurde; Anzeichen für Besteuerung oder direkte Machtausübung durch römische Statthalter sind dort vorerst nicht zu erkennen. Die Urbanisierung Ankyras und weiterer Orte Zentralgalatiens nahm erst durch den flavischen Straßenbau an Fahrt auf. Zur Metropolis der Provinz wurde Ankyra erst gegen Ende der Herrschaftszeit Trajans.

5) Altay Coskun: Das antike Galatien und die prägende Kraft der Bilder (‘Ancient Galatia and the Impact of Images’). Presentation on the *Habilitandenforum* of the *46th Deutscher Historikertag*, Konstanz, 20.09.2006. Offline since ca. 2011. [PDF Download](http://www.altaycoskun.com/s/Coskun-2006-Habilforum-Konstanz-Das-antike-Galatien-und-die-pragende-Kraft-der-Bilder-re-ed.pdf).

Seit 278 v.Chr. wurden Galater zur Waffenhilfe nach Kleinasien gerufen und vielfach in Zentralanatolien angesiedelt. Sie waren begehrte Verbündete, gefürchtete Feinde und bald auch Räuber auf eigene Rechnung, bevor sie im 2. Jh. in umfassendere Friedensordnungen einbezogen wurden. Dem Tetrarchen Deiotaros gelang im 1. Jh. durch seine unbedingte Treue zu Rom und seine Freundschaft zu einflußreichen Imperatoren sogar die Gründung eines Königreichs im Zentrum und Nordosten Kleinasiens. Als Galatien 25 v.Chr. römische Provinz wurde, hielten ihre Führer dem Kaiser die Treue, was sich nicht nur in der Fortsetzung des Heeresdienstes für die Supermacht, sondern auch im Ankyraner Augustus-Kult spiegelt. Trotzdem galten die Galater als Inbegriff des Barbarischen: Ihr negatives Bild wurde schon im 3. Jh. v.Chr. im Kontext königlicher Legitimation entworfen. Eine große Wirkung entfaltete besonders die Visualisierung der Galater als gewalttätige Gegner der Zivilisation in Pergamener Siegesmonumenten. Damit wurde die Vorstellungswelt – oftmals kontrafaktisch – über die römische Kaiserzeit hinaus noch bis in die moderne Literatur hinein geprägt. Nicht minder problematisch ist aber der jüngste Gegenentwurf, nach dem die Galater früh hellenisierte Ackerbauern gewesen seien. Wer nach der Ethnogenese der galatischen Stämme, dem Schicksal der phygischen Vorbevölkerung, der politischen Organisation und kulturellen Entwicklung Galatiens, dem Charakter des von Rom etablierten Königtums sowie den Umständen und Folgen der Provinzialisierung fragt, tut gut daran, mit einer Kritik der Galaterbilder zu beginnen. Eng damit verbunden ist die Notwendigkeit, die Reichweite und Spielarten der *amicitia populi Romani* angemessener berücksichtigen. Eine Relecture literarischer Quellen, aber auch die systematische Untersuchung von Personen-, Stammes- und Ortsnamen soll die Grundlage für eine überzeugendere Geschichte der Galater legen. Diese ließe sich auf die kurze Formel ‘Von der *Geißel Asiens* zur *romfreundlichen Ordnungsmacht*’ bringen.

4) Altay Coskun: Intercultural Onomastics and Some Patterns of Socio-Political Inclusion in the Roman World. The Example of Galatia in Asia Minor. In: Netzwerk Interferenzonomastik, Gallorömische Abteilung (NIO-Ga-Ro) 2006.1. URL: <http://www.nio-online.net/galatIcos.pdf> and <http://www.uni-trier.de/index.php?id=21749>.

The Galatians originated from those Celts who had moved East to the Balkans by the early 3rd century BC. In the 270s, some of them got involved in the dynastic wars of Asia Minor. Soon afterwards, they settled in central Anatolia, which they ruled until the creation of the Roman province of *Galatia* in 25 BC. Since only little is known about their cultural identity, a closer look at their personal names shall help to fill some of the gaps. The first analysis starts from the clear dominance of Celtic in the onomastic thesaurus of the last three centuries BC. Prosopographical information is employed to explain that the rare use of foreign names since the late 2nd or early 1st centuries BC was mainly due to intermarriage with the Galatian aristocracy. From this, however, native Phrygians seem to have been mostly excluded. Since the mid-1st century, the new quality of international relations established by king Deiotarus I brought a variety of new (mainly Greek) personal names into the Galatian elite. The second focus is on inscriptions dating to the first three centuries AD. Although Greek and Roman names were then popular throughout Galatia, many villages still show a surprisingly high degree of homogeneity as to the use of either Phrygian or Celtic names. The evidence becomes even clearer, if the implications of intercultural naming practices are also considered. This way, the assumption of an early ‘Galatization’ of central Anatolia soon followed by its ‘Hellenization’ is seriously questioned. Further analyses may help to describe more precisely both the modes of ethnic and cultural interbreeding and the extent to which distinctiveness persisted in certain areas.

**3) Altay Coskun: *Amicitiae* und politische Ambitionen im Kontext der *causa Deiotariana* (‘Friendship Relations and Political Ambitions in the Context of the Case of Deiotarus’). In: Altay Coskun (ed.): Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat, Göttingen 2005, 127-154.**

Rund ein halbes Jahrhundert bewahrte sich der Galaterkönig Deiotaros Philorhomaios (†41/40 v.Chr.) die Achtung und Protektion einflußreicher Römer. Während er ihnen schlagkräftige militärische Dienste leistete, förderten diese den Ausbau seiner Machtstellung entweder aktiv oder gewährten ihm in Zeiten bedrohlicher Anfechtun­gen wirksamen Schutz. Auf diesen war er besonders angewiesen, nachdem er im Bürgerkrieg auf der Seite des Pompeius gekämpft hatte. Caesar bestrafte ihn zwar durch den Entzug umfangreicher Territorien; jedoch sicherte das weitgespannte Netz seiner Kontakte sein politisches Überleben. Im Jahr 45 beschuldigte ihn ein innerga­latischer Rivale, Attentate gegen Caesar geplant und mit dem Rebellen Caecilius Bassus konspiriert zu haben. Cicero übernahm die Verteidigung eines Freundes, dem er als ehemaliger Statthalter Kilikiens zu großem Dank verpflichtet war. Die Apolo­gie ist eine wahre Fundgrube freundschaftlicher Semantiken, der Streitfall selbst ein komplexes Beispiel dafür, wie interpersonale Nahverhältnisse die Grenzen Roms überbrückten und wie tiefgreifend sie auf die Ereignisse im Zentrum und in der Peri­pherie des Reiches einwirken konnten. Allerdings gilt Ciceros Plädoyer in der jüngsten Forschung als Protestschrei gegen den ‘Tyrannen’ Caesar, wobei der Red­ner konkrete Nachteile für seinen angeblich ‘barbarischen’ Mandanten in Kauf ge­nommen und überhaupt mit fiktiven Elementen gearbeitet habe. Solcherlei Ansichten werden durch eine Analyse des Streitfalls und der Verteidigungsstrategie widerlegt. Zugleich lassen sich Interaktionen zwischen römischen Senatoren und dem *amicis­simus nostrae rei publicae* (Cic. Deiot. 3) herausarbeiten.

**2) Altay Coskun: Inklusion und Exklusion von Fremden in den Gerichtsreden Ciceros. Zugleich ein Einblick in das Projekt ‘Roms auswärtige Freunde’ (‘Inclusion and Exclusion of Foreigners in the Forensic Speeches of Cicero. At the Same Time, Introduction to the Project ‘The Foreign Friends of Rome’’). In: Sabine Harwardt/Johannes Schwind (eds.): *Corona Coronaria*. Festschrift für Hans-Otto Kröner zum 75. Geburtstag, Hildesheim 2005, 77-98.**

Auf eine kurze Vorstellung des SFB 600 ‘Fremheit und Armut’ werden die Zielsetzungen und Methoden des Teilprojekts ‘Roms auswärtige Freunde’ exemplarisch an wenigen Ausschnitten aus drei Verteidigungsreden Ciceros verdeutlicht. An *Pro Fonteio* läßt sich zeigen, wie auswärtige bzw. römische Freunde im Dienst einer Anklage oder Verteidigung vor Gericht mobilisiert werden konnten; zudem wird der diskriminierende Einsatz der in Rom verbreiteten Barbarentopik behandelt. In der *Pro rege Deiotaro oratio* setzt sich Cicero für den um Rom hochverdienten Galaterkönig ein, für den er die gleiche Rechtssicherheit wie für einen *civis Romanus* und die gleiche Nachsicht seitens des Bürgerkriegssiegers Caesar wie gegenüber den unterlegenen römischen Anhängern des Pompeius fordert. In der Verteidigung *Pro Archia poeta* verwendet der Anwalt den Großteil seiner Energie darauf, aus der Nützlichkeit des hochtalentierten griechischen Gelehrten seinen Anspruch auf das römische Bürgerrecht herzuleiten. Cicero erweist sich in allen Fällen als Meister inkludierender und exkludierender Strategien, die er hemmungslos und in allen erdenklichen Nuancen anwendet. Die Untersuchung ist zugleich eine Mahnung, keinen Diskurs über In- bzw. Exklusion losgelöst von zugrundeliegenden Motiven der Akteure zu betrachten. Darüber hinaus kommt die katalysierende Wirkung gesellschaftsinterner Konflikte für den Ein- bzw. Ausschluß von Fremden zur Sprache.

**1) Altay Coskun: Die tetrarchische Verfassung der Galater und die Neuordnung des Ostens durch Pompeius (Strab. geogr. 12,5,1 / App. Mithr. 560) (‘The Tetrarchic Constitution of the Galatians and the Restructuring of the East by Pompey’). In: Herbert Heftner/Kurt Tomaschitz (eds.): *Ad fontes!* Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004, dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden, Wien 2004, 687-711.**

Die in der Forschung vielfach beschriebene, auf der Skizze Strabons fußende tetrarchische Ordnung der Galater ist von verschiedener Seite in Frage zu stellen. So überhaupt jemals galatische Viertelherrschaften in hellenistischer Zeit bestanden haben, sprechen die Rivalitäten und die Uneinigkeit in der Führungsschicht gegen ihre Bestandsfähigkeit. Zudem läßt sich die Annahme eines symmetrischen, stabilen Staatswesens dieses Volkes nicht auf die wenigen Zahlen stützen, die außerhalb der *Erdbeschreibung* überliefert sind. Auch die angeblich keltischen Traditionen oder hellenistischen Einflüsse sind nicht hinreichend zu belegen, während sich für abwechselnde Machtstrukturen zahlreiche Parallelen in Caesars *Commentarii de bello Gallico* finden. Wahrscheinlich ist also das Bild, das Strabon von der Tetrarchie zeichnet, etymologisch inspiriert. Tatsächlich dürfte es in Galatien jedoch – entsprechend den Mitteilungen Appians –erstmals unter Pompeius genau vier von Rom anerkannte Herrscher gegeben haben, denen 62 v.Chr. erstmals der Tetrarchentitel verliehen wurde. Zwar erodierte diese politische Konstruktion schon wenige Jahre später, aber, obwohl sich Deiotaras bis a. 42/41 die Alleinherrschaft gesichert hatte, blieb er – der König mehrerer kleinasiatischer Territorien – ebenso wie seine Nachfolger „Tetrarch der Galater“. Mithin war die Bindung des Begriffs an die Vierzahl, nicht aber an den Status eines Klientelfürsten, aufgegeben, als M. Antonius ab a. 41 die Landkarte des Ostens erneut tiefgreifend veränderte. So konnten in der Folgezeit viele mittelgroße und kleinere romfreundliche Monarchien in Anatolien und der Levante als Tetrarchien bezeichnet werden, die erst im Verlauf des 1. Jhs. n.Chr. dem Ausgreifen der Provinzialisierung durch Rom wichen.

[Note: in an improved argument, I ascribe the introduction of the tetrarchical system in Galatia to Mithradates VI Eupator, see no. 25 (2015).]

**B. Books**

**2) Altay Coskun: Galatian Victories and Other Studies into the Agency and Identity of the Galatians in the Hellenistic and Early-Roman Periods. In preparation for the series Colloquia Antiqua (series editor: Gocha Tsetskhladze).**

About a quarter-century ago, S. Mitchell presented an exhaustive synthesis of Galatian History (Oxford 1993), which was shortly followed by the workshop *Forschungen in Galatien* in Münster (published by E. Schwerdtheim, Bonn 1994) and a most detailed reappraisal of the migration period of the early-3rd century BC by K. Strobel (Berlin 1996). A workshop held at Waterloo in 2014 was designed to offer a new synthesis of more recent and ongoing research projects dwelling on the historical landscape of Galatia, the intercultural processes that took place among the Celtic invaders and the Phrygian inhabitants in the broader contexts of the power games of Hellenistic kings and the expanding Roman Empire. Substantial progress has further been made in recent years owing to excavations (including Pessinus, Gordion, and Ankyra), field surveys (such as in Tavion or the Konya province) as well as the publication of epigraphic and numismatic corpora (most prominently, *I.Ankyra* I). No less important are the several attempts at reconsidering who the Galatians or the inhabitants of Galatia were and how they interacted with their environment politically, socially and culturally. The study of the broader Hellenistic and Roman contexts not only supports the interpretation of the (still lacunose) evidence for Galatia, but, at the same time, the available information on the Galatians has much to offer to enhance our understanding of the conditions under which royal and imperial rules were established, legitimized, challenged and redefined.

**1) Altay Coskun: Von der ‘Geißel Asiens’ zu ‘kaiserfrommen Reichsbewohnern’. Sudien zur Geschichte der Galater unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der *amicitia populi Romani* und der göttlichen Verehrung des Augustus, 3. Jh. v.-2. Jh. n.Chr. (‘From the ‘Scourge of Asia’ to ‘Emperor-Venerating Provincials’. Studies in the History of the Galatians with Special Foci on the ‘Friendship of the Roman People’ and the Divine Cult of Augustus, 3rd Century BC to AD 2nd Century’). Unpublished Habilitation Thesis, University of Trier 2007. xiii + 533 pp.**

The Galatians in central Anatolia were amongst the most active players in the political power games of the Hellenistic world, and their involvement in neighbouring conflicts is attested or at least alluded to in dozens of instances, though most often in fragments and with utter distortion. Moreover, little is known about their internal organization and socio-political structure or the first two centuries of their settlement in central Anatolia. This thesis tries to shed more light not only on the most ill-reputed people of the Hellenistic age, but also on the landscape onto which they left only few physical imprints over the first three centuries due to their nomadic life style. Even so, if the literary, archaeological, numismatic, epigraphic and onomastic evidence of late Hellenistic and mainly Imperial date is adduced with caution, we can deepen our understanding of the ethnogenesis and development of the Galatian tribes, their diplomatic affiliations as well as their development under Roman Imperial rule. The past decades have seen substantial progress (cf. my bibliographical survey in Anatolica 39, 2013, 69-95), but much research is still ongoing. Most importantly, the publication of epigraphic corpora as well as of the excavations in Pessinus, Tavion and Gordion are expected to shed new light on the history of Galatia. I have therefore postponed my plan to revise my 2007 Habilitation thesis into a comprehensive monograph.