



## THE GALATIAN SHIELD IN EGYPT

Matthew Coleman  
The University of Arizona

### ABSTRACT

*In the Hellenistic world Galatian mercenaries were extremely popular in the armies of the successor kingdoms. They were a non-aligned ethnic mercenary element which would be loyal to its employer, the king, rather than the local community. The Ptolemaic kingdom was no exception, hiring many of these mercenaries and settling them in Egypt. Once the Galatians arrived in Egypt, an effort was made to preserve the uniqueness of these “barbarian” troops among the rest of the population. Nowhere is this distinction clearer than in the symbols used to identify Galatians in art. The most prevalent of these symbols is the shield. With its distinctive boss and horizontal handle, the Celtic shield used by the Galatians has an appearance that conveys an ethnic attachment. Greek and Egyptian shields are smaller with a different boss and handle combination that would have made the distinction clear for a person living in Egypt at the time. In Ptolemaic Egypt the Galatian shield became an identifying symbol of the Galatian mercenaries living in the kingdom, a symbol reinforced by their Greek neighbors.*

### INTRODUCTION

The difference between Galatian and Ptolemaic armament and the use of the term “Celtic” must be briefly explored before the central point of this paper is addressed. The shield of the Ptolemaic infantryman was the smaller shield used by the solider in the typical Macedonian phalanx.<sup>1</sup> This shield was small and round with a vertical handle and strap combination. A perfect example of this type of shield is found on the fragments of the relief of Aemilius Paullus at Delphi.<sup>2</sup> It was meant for easy use with a two-handed spear and required a limited sized shield and specific straps. The type of shield most commonly used by the Galatians was a larger, flat shield with a large boss covered in iron and a horizontal handle.<sup>3</sup> The shape of the shield varied but generally followed a vertical eye shape with the ends occasionally cut off. Greek audiences would have considered these types of flat, tall shields with long protruding bosses as foreign and unlike even the larger shields used by their peltasts. Peltast shields were also large with long bosses but were generally curved and wider in shape.<sup>4</sup> Even if the Greeks had adopted these types of shield, there would still be a recognizable difference between the Galatian shield and those of the shields used in the Ptolemaic army.

One must proceed with caution when labeling a culture “Celtic” as there is debate regarding the veracity of such designation.<sup>5</sup> A better approach is to consider the designation “Celtic” as merely a term used to describe a linguistic and material culture grouping.<sup>6</sup> There was no unified culture of the Celts. However, the term is useful for identifying the La Tène material cultures which spread throughout the European continent during the fifth to second centuries BCE.<sup>7</sup> It was linguistic and material-cultural uniqueness that differentiated the Galatians from their Greek and Egyptian neighbors that the Greeks displayed in many depictions of the Galatians. Yet even if this more moderate approach to the term “Celtic” is applied to Ptolemaic Egypt, the cultural distinction still remains as there is a definite difference between the La Tène culture and the Greek or Egyptian cultures, in terms of material artifacts and language. This difference was used to distinguish the Galatians from their neighbors in Egypt and it was symbolized in their shield. Karl Strobel makes the best use of the term when he defines the term “Celt” as denoting a specific linguistic group without any true unity of tribes or single entity.<sup>8</sup> However, to deny similar approaches to identity, even if they are not exactly the same is difficult to accept as there are certain cultural traits, like reliance on druids, which are similar between regional groupings.<sup>9</sup>

Regardless, the Greco-Macedonian world clearly identified the Galatians as a foreign element and they are categorized as such in visual representation. The famous statues of the Pergamum victory monument depict the Galatians with mustaches, torcs and spiked or swept back hair: precisely the Greek stereotype of the Celt.<sup>10</sup> In sum it is simpler to give depictions of the Galatians a label rather than debate over the modern controversy concerning the label of “Celt”.

### GALATIAN MERCENARIES IN EGYPT

There has been little scholarly work focused on the Galatian mercenaries who settled in Egypt, mainly due to lack of evidence.<sup>11</sup> This article, therefore, will necessarily draw upon studies which focus on the main Galatian settlements in Asia Minor. Through excavations of the fortresses of King Deiotarus I at Blucium and Peium Galatian ethnic symbols and a distinctive non-Hellenistic identity have been analyzed.<sup>12</sup> Traditional Celtic symbols of power have been discovered throughout Galatia, indicating the Celtic identity of the elite and the acceptance of these Celtic symbols by those that were used by them.<sup>13</sup> Even the enduring quality of the Galatian language has been discussed by Philip Freeman, who shows that the language remained mainly a Celtic dialect in Hellenized Asia Minor.<sup>14</sup> These cultural elements traveled to Egypt with the Galatian mercenaries who settled there. As for the shield, a number of scholars have accepted it as an identifying mark of the Galatian mercenaries. Barry Cunliffe, for example, sees the Celtic shield as part of a larger ethnic material culture which can enable archaeologists to discern Celts from other cultural groups.<sup>15</sup> Yet he does not use the shield alone as a source of evidence and does not consider the role of Greeks in the production of these depictions.<sup>16</sup> Mark Shchukin notes the prevalence of the Celtic shield in depictions of Galatians among the Greek communities of the Black Sea region but also comes to the conclusion that the shield was merely an observation of Galatian material culture by the Greeks rather than an ethnic identifier which the Greeks imposed upon the Galatians.<sup>17</sup>

Greek artisans had always composed caricatures of outside ethnic groups.<sup>18</sup> In the eyes of a Greek audience, these imagined traits were common to all members of the depicted group.<sup>19</sup> Greek stereo typical depictions generally depicted Persians wearing britches, native Africans with certain facial features and amazons dressed for war in Scythian gear.<sup>20</sup> The shield of the Galatians fits this paradigm well. It was a symbol with distinctive characteristics that could easily be interpreted by a Greek audience. A large shield of foreign make was a perfect symbol to use to depict an ethnic group that was known to utilize it as a main form of defense. It also fits into the pattern of easily recognizable symbols of identification of outside ethnicities created by the Greeks.<sup>21</sup> Another important distinction made by

the Greeks was that between the barbarian and the civilized “Other”. The Egyptians, for one, were viewed as a civilized “Other” in comparison with the warlike Galatians.<sup>22</sup> Neither the Greeks nor the Egyptians fought in the same manner as the Galatians, and the fierce reputation of these Celtic speakers gave them a warrior ethos in the eyes of the Ptolemaic kings who employed them. Thus the martial symbol of the shield would have fit the Galatians well and been easily understood by those who had witnessed these men fight.

The use of the shield to delineate “Celtic” peoples was not new to Hellenistic discourse. After the Aetolian victory after the sack of Delphi in 279 BCE, Gaulish shields were placed on a victory monument to celebrate the destruction of these foreign invaders.<sup>23</sup> The tradition of identifying these people through their shield was already a recognized discourse in the Hellenistic world at this time. Similar terracotta figurines as those that will be discussed in this paper, were found in a variety of Hellenistic areas from Pergamum to Italy, all carrying the same Gaulish type shield.<sup>24</sup> Again a widespread acceptance of the shield in identifying a Celt was found throughout the Hellenistic world. This trend also fits in the discourse of controlling or opposing the Galatians and Gauls. Hellenistic kings made themselves appear as the saviors of the Greek world by defeating Galatians in battle; however they also took pains to show their ability to control Galatians serving in their armies.<sup>25</sup> Kistler brings this comparison to Egypt in his analysis of the integration of the Galatian mercenaries in Ptolemaic Egypt, and shows the Ptolemaic system of symbolic identification used to maintain Galatian identity by the kings.<sup>26</sup> Even though the symbol of the shield is repeatedly found in the material evidence, this discussion does not include the prime role of the Galatian shield in the imposed symbol of these mercenaries. The Ptolemaic kings desired to maintain this identity for a distinction with a people who would eventually Hellenize and not remain easily distinguishable from other cleruchs.

Galatian mercenaries had a long history in Ptolemaic Egypt. Ptolemy II Philadelphos was the first to invite the Galatians into Egypt as mercenaries, mainly to help combat his Seleucid rivals Antiochus I and Antiochus II.<sup>27</sup> This first group eventually rebelled and was trapped on the Elephantine Island on the Nile where they starved to death.<sup>28</sup> However, Ptolemy II soon hired more mercenaries, who settled as cleruchs in main population centers. After this, no more were hired.<sup>29</sup> Thus in the remaining periods when Galatian mercenaries were used by the Ptolemies, the sources such as Plutarch and Polybius refer to these settled Galatians who had maintained a Galatian label imposed by the Ptolemaic kings. During the war with Antiochus III in 217 BCE, Ptolemy IV used Galatian mercenaries, who had settled as cleruchs, to secure his victory at the battle of Raphia.<sup>30</sup> In the early second century BCE these mercenaries were used to suppress a native revolt in Thebes.<sup>31</sup> Cleopatra VII, in the first

century BCE, is described as having been escorted by a Galatian bodyguard.<sup>32</sup> There is thus a long tradition of service to the Ptolemaic kings throughout which the Galatians were given enough of a separate identity by the Ptolemaic kings as for it to be recorded by the ancient sources. Although these sources are sparse, they occur over two centuries and reveal a tradition of labeling these cleruchs in Egypt.

### GALATIAN IDENTITY IN EGYPT

The actual presence and long term use of Galatian mercenaries in Egypt has never been in question. However, no one has attempted to address the cultural complexity created by having foreign Celtic mercenaries serving a Hellenistic king in Egypt. Galatian ethnic distinctions appear to have been very strong and were seemingly important not only to the Galatians themselves but also to outside observers of their culture.<sup>33</sup> Additionally, Hellenistic kings tended to settle foreign mercenaries in a segregated fashion to reduce tensions and ensure the reliance of the mercenary community on the king.<sup>34</sup> As stated earlier, the persistence of Galatian culture even when surrounded by Greek neighbors is confirmed in many parts of the Mediterranean basin. This might suggest that Galatian self-identity was so strong that the Greeks came to understand and accept the Galatians as a distinct cultural group. A Greek inscription from Thebes dating to the second century BCE gives the names of four men who identify themselves as Galatians.<sup>35</sup> While the inscription is in Greek, and the names are Greek, the men make a point of identifying themselves as Galatians. On a vase found at Hadra near Alexandria the name *Ἀλδωριγος* is inscribed. Freeman identifies this as a name “with the common Celtic stem *-ριγ*.”<sup>36</sup> The inscription is thus an example of the continued use of the Galatian language in Egypt: even up to the Roman annexation of Egypt as a province the Galatians were a distinct group in Egypt by the definition of the kings who maintained the label. As stated above, Josephus mentions that Cleopatra VII had a personal guard of Galatian mercenaries.<sup>37</sup> Her use of these mercenaries in a parade setting reinforces the idea that these men were a symbol of the prestige of Cleopatra.<sup>38</sup> Stephen Mitchell does state, with excellent evidence, that this form of mercenary prestige display was common in the Hellenistic world.<sup>39</sup> In every piece of evidence for Galatians in Egypt, one thing remains consistently clear: that the Galatians were considered distinct from the ruling Greek population of Egypt for generations.<sup>40</sup>

Ethnic separation, therefore, is not in doubt; but just who enforced the separation is. Perhaps surprisingly, the impetus to draw a sharp distinction does not appear to have originated from the Galatians themselves. Instead, the symbolic ethnic identity of Galatian appears to have been conceived of by their Greek neighbors. This imposition of identity appears in the form of the

Celtic shield. The Celtic shield has a number of distinctive characteristics that are easily identifiable, which would have made it a good symbol to use. Made of interlaced wooden strips with a wooden midrib covered in iron, the front face of the Celtic shield had a distinctive long vertical shield boss.<sup>41</sup> The handle underneath the shield boss was horizontal, rather than the typical Greek vertical configuration, and would have given the warrior holding the shield a distinct profile.<sup>42</sup> A shield found at Kasr El-Harit in the Fayum has precisely these characteristics.<sup>43</sup> Although some believe that this shield, dated to 160 BCE, is a Roman *scutum*, most scholars argue that the shield is Celtic especially since the shield is dated to 160 BCE which predates any significant Roman presence in Egypt.<sup>44</sup> If so then it is a physical example of a likely symbolic identifier. Greeks and Egyptians would have seen Galatians favoring this type of shield and may have adopted it as a signpost to easily identify this foreign group of mercenaries in artistic representations.

Evidence of just this kind of symbolism is found in many artistic depictions of Galatians from Egypt. A terracotta warrior from the third century BCE, now at the British Museum, which was part of a larger collection of different ethnic mercenaries under the employ of the Ptolemaic kings, is depicted in the stereotypical fashion: he is naked with swept back hair, a drooping mustache, a sword and a Celtic shield.<sup>45</sup> The shield on this figurine is the characteristic Celtic shield. It is also the most prominent piece of equipment on the figurine. Another figurine from Naucratis in the Nile Delta, dating between the third and second centuries BCE, only has the shield remaining, but the shield is the same type as the one found on the full figurine.<sup>46</sup> Both pieces have a shield with the vertical shield boss and oblong shape typical of the Celtic shield.<sup>47</sup> Anyone who viewed these figurines in Egypt during the Ptolemaic period would immediately have identified the soldier's and their equipment as Galatian. The two shields of these different figurines only differ in a few superficial decorations. The shield of the complete warrior is relatively undecorated while the incomplete shield has a cress bar at the middle boss section of the shield.<sup>48</sup> Similarity in design, especially when it comes to identifying symbols, indicate a method of distinction to an audience that might not be literate. The complete terracotta figurine is usually paired with a figurine of an African mercenary since they are believed to be part of a larger set that no longer exists.<sup>49</sup> Just as with the Galatian mercenary, the African mercenary is depicted with certain stereotypical identifying marks: he has a distinctive hairstyle, equipment and dress. He is being ethnically identified by distinctive markings just as the Galatian is being identified.

Coinage also shows the use of the ethnic symbolic identifiers by Greeks. A series of coins issued by Ptolemy II Philadelphos in the Third century BCE features an eagle standing over a Galatian shield (Figure 1).<sup>50</sup> The message of such a symbolic statement here might be the control of the Ptolemaic monarch over his



Figure 1: Ptolemaic Coins Containing Galatian Shields, J.N. Svoronos, *Ta Nomismata tou Kratous ton Ptolemaion* (Athens: Sakellarios, 1904), Plate XII.

Galatian mercenaries, especially after the rebellion of the first group of mercenaries hired starting in 274 BCE.<sup>51</sup> The coin would thus act as a message to his other subjects, Greeks and Egyptians, in particular stating his power and prestige.<sup>52</sup> Although the minter of the coins is in doubt, the ethnic image is not.<sup>53</sup> Either of the two possible minters would assume that his audience would understand the ethnic relation of the shield to the Galatians. Coinage, with its heavily symbolic message, needs simple and easily interpreted images to successfully rely its message. The Galatian shield must be one of those images. A wide audience of traders, mercenaries, tax collectors and ambassadors would view these coins and need to understand the imagery for the propaganda to be successful. There must be a universal understanding that is assumed by the minter of the coins. Ptolemy controls the Galatians and controls the violence that the Galatians can unleash. A threat of state controlled physical

damage was implied in this coin and the threat was only successful if the symbol of the Galatian shield was linked to the military use of a people who did not have local cultural ties to the native population. The foreignness of the Galatians was crucial for the success of the message as well as the violence connected with Galatian identity. Both themes are contained in the symbol of the shield and the violence connected to this symbol.

There are some examples of Galatian self-representation in Egypt. These provide varied depictions of Galatians which differ from those created by Greeks and others. The necropolis at Hadra near Alexandria contains three examples of Galatian funeral stelae dated to the later third century BCE. All three monuments clearly state that the men depicted are Galatians and all three men wear blue cloaks.<sup>54</sup> Only one of these men carries weapons, including a shield.<sup>55</sup> The other two monuments show scenes of the men with their children and wives.<sup>56</sup> Of Special

interest here is the blue cloak, which is not found in any other depiction of Galatians in Egypt. In the initial analysis of these monuments, it was assumed that the blue cloak was another ethnic signifier for Galatians.<sup>57</sup> Since no other image of the blue cloak remains it is hard to judge how widespread this symbol was, but it does appear to have been the case that in Habra, at least, the blue cloak was used by Galatians to distinguish themselves from their neighbors. Additionally, it is important to remember that these stelae are Galatian self-representations and not Greek or Egyptian. It could be that the blue cloak represents an attempt by Galatians to exert their own symbolic alongside the shield used by their Greek and Egyptian neighbors to identify them. As it happens, the most distinctive item in these monuments is the large shield of Galatian type. Even after generations in Egypt the shield was still part of the ethnic identity of the Galatian mercenaries. It is perhaps not so odd; therefore that just as in the inscription at Thebes, the language on the stelae at Habra is Greek and not a Celtic dialect.<sup>58</sup> Also as in the inscription at Thebes, the men who commissioned the Habra stelae took pains to state that they were Galatian.<sup>59</sup> It appears that, although these settled mercenaries adopted had the Greek language, they still identified themselves as Galatians. In so doing, they effectively conformed to the separation imposed by the Greeks via the shield symbol.

The possibility that the Galatian shield coinage was widely used implies the possibility that its symbols were interpreted and understood over a broad geographic area. Ian Morris has argued for an interconnected Mediterranean throughout out the Hellenistic and Roman period in which, despite the prevalence of a “Mediterranean” culture, broadly defined, local institutions continued to matter.<sup>60</sup> Symbolic identities could travel in this interconnected world and often did so reinforced by the agendas of the Hellenistic states. Thus Greek stereotypes about the Galatians could have not only been maintained but also expanded in scope.<sup>61</sup> As it happens, Galatian symbols outside of Egypt conform to a general Celtic pattern of elite warrior identity. The sword, torc and horse are the most important symbols of a Celtic warrior. In the tomb of Deiotarus II built around 43-41 BC in Galatia various prestige goods were excavated including a golden torc.<sup>62</sup> No shield or image of a shield was discovered at the site. Deiotarus II was a king, a leader of warriors in Celtic society, the fact that the shield does not appear as a symbol of his power or identity is significant.<sup>63</sup> In her excellent survey of Celtic symbols, Miranda Green states that the main imagery in use by the Celtic elite warriors was the torc and horse.<sup>64</sup> For his part, Radomir Pleiner emphasizes the role of the sword in Celtic iconography.<sup>65</sup> The sword and its production defined the elite warrior and separated him from other members of Celtic society.<sup>66</sup> The care of construction and the importance for the elite made this a more palatable native ethnic symbol than the shield. The precious metal included in the making of the

sword as well as fine decoration makes it stand out as a prestige item. The sword, not the shield, was privileged as an elite item and great attention was given to its proper use and display. The Galatians followed this use of imagery common to other Celtic groups. At the tombs in Trocmian territory, in north central Anatolia, there are traditional Celtic versions of fibulae, spear tips and swords and the inhumation style of burial is similar to that in the La Tène burials on the European continent.<sup>67</sup> The traditional burials in parts of Galatia also point to the use of traditional Celtic symbols, which again do not include the shield.

To be fair, there are instances in Celtic iconography where shields are employed in warrior-related symbols, but these are always employed as parts of an elite military assemblage. From the early La Tène site at Glauberg there are statues of elite warriors holding shields.<sup>68</sup> The shields are part of an assemblage of elite objects in each case. Each statue at Glauberg holding a shield also has a torc with pendants attached, arm and wrist bracelets, a cuirass and what appears to be a leaf crown.<sup>69</sup> Clearly, many components made up the arraignment of an elite warrior and the shield was only a part, unlike the sword or torc which carried more prestige as individual items.<sup>70</sup> It seems clear that the shield was not any ethnic identifier created by a Celtic group to serve as a general statement about ethnic identity manner. One might suggest that a shield is a degradable item and thus Celtic shields would have left less of an archaeological footprint than other grave goods. However, many Celtic shield bosses have been recovered and there are a number of depictions of shields in Celtic art.<sup>71</sup> In most of these cases the shield is inconsistent in representation and employment.<sup>72</sup> This inconsistency, coupled with the various other elements Celtic ethnic expression on view in the material cultural remains, further suggests that the Galatian shield in Egypt was an imposed ethnic symbol created by a people who wanted to view the Galatian mercenaries as Celtic warriors.

One final example will further bear this out. In Camarina, Sicily, a stone relief of a Celtic shield was discovered suggesting the presence of Galatian mercenaries who lived as soldiers in the Greek colony.<sup>73</sup> Camarina was not a part of the Ptolemaic kingdom, but as in Hellenistic Egypt, the Galatians of Camarina were living amongst a non-Celtic majority and were thus identified by that majority in a manner chosen by that majority: the shield. The relief from Camarina could indicate use of the shield as a symbol over a broad geographic expanse, but unfortunately there is little evidence upon which to base such an argument. Notably, André Rapin states that the shield also appears at Entremont and in the Ligurian areas of southern France and northern Italy, but these additional attestations do not necessarily indicate a wide use of the symbol.<sup>74</sup> It is important to note, however, that Entremont and the Ligurian areas were locations of Celtic interaction with other cultures. There is thus the possibility that in these areas we find another instance of

## Matthew Coleman | The Galatian Shield in Egypt

imposed symbolism, but again, there is little evidence to support such a claim. Only in Egypt does enough evidence exist to support the concept of imposed identity.

### CONCLUSION

In Egypt we see clear symbolic identification of Galatian mercenaries by their Greek and Egyptian neighbors. The Celtic shield was used to symbolically identify this warrior people. Whether such a system of imposed identification was ever

employed outside of Egypt to designate Galatians is unclear; any further study should naturally remain focused on areas which the Galatians were known to inhabit. The case of symbolically enforcing ethnic identification in Ptolemaic Egypt was an interesting visual method of demographic enforcement. Galatians were important for the prestige of the Ptolemaic king, therefore their uniqueness needed to be maintained. Use of the Galatian shield was a good means of achieving this goal and continuing the separation of the royal family's specialized warriors.

### Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 54.
- <sup>2</sup> Minor Markle, "A Shield Monument from Veria and the Chronology of Macedonian Shield Types," *Hesperia* 68 (1999): 246.
- <sup>3</sup> André Rapin, "Weaponry," in *The Celts* ed. V. Kruta et al (New York:Rizzoli, 1991), 323-4.
- <sup>4</sup> Rapin, 1991, 323.
- <sup>5</sup> John Collis, *The Celts: Origins, Myths & Inventions* (Wiltshire: Tempus Publishing Ltd., 2003).
- <sup>6</sup> Timothy Bridgeman, "Keltoi, Galatai, Galli: Were They All One People?" *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 24/25 (2004/2005): 155-62.
- <sup>7</sup> Even though the identity of the Celts is controversial and some state that there was no larger common connection between different "Celtic" groups, see John Collis, *The Celts: Origins, Myths & Inventions* (Wiltshire: Tempus Publishing Ltd., 2003) and Peter Wells, *Beyond Celts, Germans, Scythians: Archaeology and Identity in Iron Age Europe* (New York: Duckworth Publishers, 2001). This paper follows the logic of other scholars who state that the current definition of Celt might be too strict, but an understanding of regional differences does no subtract from the common social attributes and closely related languages that make the term "Celt" still applicable for modern use, see Timothy Bridgman, 155-162 and Raimund Karl, "The Celts from Everywhere and Nowhere: A Re-evaluation of the origins of the Celts and the Emergence of Celtic Cultures," 39-64.
- <sup>8</sup> Karl Strobel, "State Formation by the Galatians of Asia Minor," *Anatolica* 28 (2002): 2.
- <sup>9</sup> Strobel argues against the interpretation of Darbyshire and Mitchell, claiming language does not have an important role in identity formation. I disagree with Strobel and suggest that the use of language along with other institutions is important for identity especially if it is linked with other important signifiers, such as cult practice and identifiers of rank.
- <sup>10</sup> Bernard Andreae, "The Image of the Celts in Etruscan, Greek and Roman Art," in *The Celts* ed. V. Kruta et al (New York: Rizzoli, 1991), 64-6.
- <sup>11</sup> There have been some publications on the Galatian soldiers in Egypt including , Adolphe J.-Reinach, "Les Gaulois en Égypte," *REA* 13 (1911): 33-74 and Altay Coşkun, "Galatische Legionäre in Ägypten: die Konstituierung der legio XXII Deiotariana in der frühen Kaiserzeit," *Tyche* 23 (2008): 21-46 who discusses the use of the transformed army of created by Deiotarus into a legion and stationed in Egypt for a period of time. Additionally, there is a good analysis of use of mercenaries in Hellenistic armies in Angelos Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
- <sup>12</sup> Stephen Mitchell, "Blucium and Peium: The Galatian Forts of King Deiotarus," *Anatolian Studies* 24 (1974): 61-75.
- <sup>13</sup> Gareth Darbyshire, Stephen Mitchell, and Levent Vardar, "The Galatian Settlement in Asia Minor," *Anatolian Studies* 50 (2000): 75-97. In two tumuli found at Bolu traditional elite objects such as torcs and jewelry were found, see Nezih Firatli, "Two Galatian tumuli in the vicinity of Bolu," *AJA* 69 (1965), 365-67.
- <sup>14</sup> Philip Freeman, *The Galatian Language: A Comprehensive Survey of the Language of the Ancient Celts in Greco-Roman Asia Minor* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2001).
- <sup>15</sup> Barry Cunliffe, *The Oxford Illustrated History of Prehistoric Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 365-9.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* 365-369.
- <sup>17</sup> Mark Shchukin, "The Celts in Eastern Europe," *OJ* 14 (1995): 218.
- <sup>18</sup> Brian Sparkes, "Some Greek Images of Others," in *The Cultural Life of Images: Visual Representations in Archaeology* ed. Brian Leigh Molyneux (New York: Routledge, 1997), 136.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 135.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* 142-4 (Persians), 144-54 (native Africans). The Amazons are analyzed in Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks: A*

- Portrait of Self and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) 39-41.
- <sup>21</sup> Cartledge, 54.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid. 71-4.
- <sup>23</sup> Craige Champion, "The Soteria at Delphi: Aetolian Propaganda in the Epigraphical Record," *AJP* 116 (1995): 215.
- <sup>24</sup> Pierre Bieñowski, *Les Celtes Dans Les Arts Mineurs Gréco-Romains* (Krakow :Cracovie, Impr. de l'Université des Jagellons, 1928), 127, 139.
- <sup>25</sup> Rolf Strootman, "Kings against Celts. Deliverance from Barbarians as a Theme in Hellenistic Royal Propaganda", in *The Manipulative Mode. Political Propaganda in Antiquity. A Collection of Case Studies* eds. Karl A.E. Enekel and Ilja Leonard Pfeijffer (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 101-41.
- <sup>26</sup> Erich Kistler, *Funktionalisierte Keltenbilder: Die Indienstname der Kelten zur Vermittlung von Normen und Werten in der hellenistischen Welt* (Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2009), 351-72.
- <sup>27</sup> Pausanias, 1.7.2.
- <sup>28</sup> Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos*, 185-188. Callimachus was commissioned to write a victory poem regarding the slaughter of these Galatians and was close to the event.
- <sup>29</sup> Pausanias, 1.7.2.
- <sup>30</sup> Polybius *Histories*, 5.65, 82. There was a tradition of Gauls and Galatians taking their families with them when they served in Hellenistic armies, which could be part of a colonizing practice of the king as discussed by Pasi Loman, "Mercenaries, Their Women, and Colonization," *Klio* 87 (2005): 363. However, there is no little evidence of this occurring in Egypt, although the presence of women would fit the general model.
- <sup>31</sup> Dittenberger, OGIS 757.
- <sup>32</sup> Josephus *The Jewish Wars*, 1.397: *Jewish Antiquities*, 15.217.
- <sup>33</sup> Karl Strobel, "Die Galater und Galatien: Historische Identität und ethnische Tradition im Imperium Romamum," *Klio* 89 (2007): 356-402. Altay Coşkun, *Art. Adobogiona*, in *Amici Populi Romani* 04, 2010, <http://apr.uwaterloo.ca> disputes the claim by Strobel but the conflict between the two focuses on Asia Minor and the imposition of identity by the king on the Galatian cleruchs was probably the dominant trend in Egypt.
- <sup>35</sup> Freeman, 9.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid. 27.
- <sup>37</sup> Josephus, *The Jewish Wars*, 1.397.
- <sup>38</sup> Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 15.217.
- <sup>39</sup> Stephen Mitchell, "The Galatians: Representation and Reality," in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* ed. Andrew Erskine (New York: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 288-290.
- <sup>40</sup> There is little to no evidence for the daily lives or family composition of the Galatian cleruchs. It is reasonable to infer that they embedded themselves into the communities where they settled and married locally. Galatian women are not

- mentioned in any ancient texts nor is there any archaeological evidence for them.
- <sup>41</sup> J.N.G. and W.F. Ritchie, "The Army, Weapons and Fighting," in *The Celtic World* ed. Miranda Green (New York: Routledge, 1995), 48, 50.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid. 48.
- <sup>43</sup> Wolfgang Kimmig, "Ein Keltenschild aus Aegypten," *Germania* 24 (1940): 106-11.
- <sup>44</sup> Such as argument has been made by a number of scholars including Wolfgang Kimmig and Philip Freeman, *The Philosopher and the Druids* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 47, T.G.E. Powell, *The Celts* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1980), 127-8, John Haywood, *The Historical Atlas of the Celtic World* (New York, Thames & Hudson, 2001), 36-7.
- <sup>45</sup> British Museum No. 1994,1001.2.
- <sup>46</sup> British Museum No. 1886, 0401.1574.
- <sup>47</sup> When compared, the two shields only have minor differences, but the shape and shield boss remain the same. To look at more shield comparisons see Par André Rapin, "Un bouclier celtique dans la colonie grecque de Camarina," *Germania* 79 No. 2 (2001): 277, 281, 283.
- <sup>48</sup> Neither figurine has any surviving paint so it is unclear whether the full figurine ever had decorations on the shield when painted.
- <sup>49</sup> British Museum No. 1994,1001.2.
- <sup>50</sup> Svoronos No. 603-625. Barclay Head, *Historia Numorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911), 851.
- <sup>51</sup> Pausanias, 1.7.2.
- <sup>52</sup> Svoronos No. 603-625. Head, 851.
- <sup>53</sup> A few of the coins have been assumed to be minted in Syracuse by Daniel Wolf and Catharine Lorber. *Syracusan Imitations of the Bronze Diobols of Ptolemy II Philadelphus* (2007). <http://www.mcgagcm.com/ancient/paper.html> (accessed March 16-May 3, 2011), but not all are counterfeit and most are truly Ptolemaic.
- <sup>54</sup> "Funerary slab with soldier and two girls [Greek; from the Soldier's Tomb, Ibrahimieh necropolis, Alexandria, excavated 1884] (04.17.4, 04.17.5, 04.17.6)". In *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000-. <http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/04.17.4> (April 2007).
- <sup>55</sup> The Metropolitan museum of Art, 04.17.5.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., 04.17.4, 04.17.6.
- <sup>57</sup> A.C. Merriam, "Painted Sepulchral Stelai from Alexandria," *AJA* 3 (1887): 262-3.
- <sup>58</sup> Freeman, 32, 52, 57-8.
- <sup>59</sup> All three stelae from the Metropolitan Museum of Art have the inscribed identification "ΤΑΛΛΑΤΗΣ".
- <sup>60</sup> Ian Morris, "Mediterraneanization," *MHR* 18 (2003): 51.
- <sup>61</sup> Jimmy Sanders, "Ethnic Boundaries and Identity in Plural Societies," *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (2002): 328.
- <sup>62</sup> Stephen Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 57.

## Matthew Coleman | The Galatian Shield in Egypt

<sup>63</sup> Darbyshire et al, 83-84.

<sup>64</sup> Miranda Green, *Symbol & Image in Celtic Religious Art* (New York: Routledge, 1989) 74-130.

<sup>65</sup> Radomir Pleiner, *The Celtic Sword* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 12.

<sup>66</sup> Pleiner, 165-9.

<sup>67</sup> Darbyshire et al., 87. Mithradates VI did recruit eastern Gauls as mercenaries in his army as discussed in Altay Coşkun, "Galatians and Seleukids: a Century of Conflict and Cooperation," in *Seleukid Dissolution: Fragmentation and Transformation of Empire* eds. Kyle Erickson and Gillian Ramsey (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011) *Philippika* 50, 85-106. However, there is little indication that these new mercenaries settled in Galatian areas, especially since Deiotarus I drove out the armies of Mithridates.

<sup>68</sup> Otto-Herman Frey, "A New Approach to Early Celtic Art," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature* 104C (2004): 108.

<sup>69</sup> Frey, 108.

<sup>70</sup> See above.

<sup>71</sup> Rapin, 1991, 320-31.

<sup>72</sup> Rapin, 1991, 320, 330.

<sup>73</sup> Rapin, 2001, 273-96.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.