



CARIA

CARIA, Achaemenid satrapy in the area of southwestern Turkey. Caria was under Achaemenid rule first as a part of the satrapy of Sparda (Lydia; 540s-390s B.C.), then as a separate satrapy (390s-30s B.C.) under the Hecatomnid family.

The study of Achaemenid Caria offers a cautionary example to those examining less well-documented areas of the empire, where the apparent absence of Susa's influence on material remains has been taken to indicate weak Achaemenid control (this problem has been discussed recently in the case of the satrapy of Bactria and its environs; Briant, 1984). Thus, while the material remains of Caria display little Iranian influence, written records (discarding the pro-Hellenic bias of Greek historians and orators) reveal that this area functioned as a satrapy controlled by loyal and competent administrators. Caria and its satraps played a significant role in the Achaemenid empire, which was a multi-ethnic land-based power. As such, its successful administration depended upon a policy of utilizing local native administrators and tolerating local, non-Iranian, cultures. Moreover, the far-western portions of the empire were open to raiding by unfriendly powers with a more ready access to naval power, but when the Achaemenid central government at Susa entrusted Caria to the Hecatomnids, a family of local Carian dynasts, the region developed into a new center of Achaemenid power, with its own administrators and fleet, controlled by the satraps. The fleet, as well as Hellenic cultural forms, was used as a means of projecting Achaemenid power and influence into the Aegean Sea, thereby helping to neutralize



potential sea-borne threats to the Anatolian mainland.

Landscape and resources. Caria cannot be described as a particularly wealthy portion of the empire. The Maeander and Indos river valleys and the fields around Caunus were noted for fertility (figs, olives, wine, cypress, and wood; cf. Strabo, *Geography* 14.651). Mylasa, the first satrapal capital, provided marble (Strabo, 14.658). The rough terrain of the province was unsuitable for horses (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.4.12) or for the types of estates found in greater numbers in the satrapies north and east of Caria (some did exist, cf. *ibid.*, 3.2.12, and below). Anecdotes about the wealth of the satrapal family suggest a successful exploitation of resources during the fourth century b.c. (Isocrates, 5.103; Theopompus, historian, no. 115, in Müller, *Fragmente*, no. 299). No sure data exists for the type or amount of tribute paid to Susa; Herodotus (3.90.1) has Caria contribute to the 400 talents of silver paid by the first *nomos* in his satrapy list, but this *nomos* is only a reflection of the areas on the Anatolian coast which 5th-century Greeks could hope to loot (cf. Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1.4.9; *Inscriptiones Graecae* I, 2nd ed., nos. 192.12, 205.76, for coined or weighed silver handed over to Greeks). The anecdotes about Mausolus's subordinate Condalus, who is seen collecting fruits and livestock (Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348a, 11.18-34), are probably more to the point.

Sources. Though Caria, like other Persian satrapies in the west, was viewed and recorded primarily from the outside, fortunately the satrapal family's prominence and self-promotion created a number of mostly Greek epigraphic documents detailing the Hecatomnid development of 4th-century Caria and the local attitudes towards these Achaemenid administrators.

Greco-Roman writers, such as Herodotus, Xenophon, Diodorus, and the Alexander historians, most often noted Caria and its personnel only in the context of clashes between Achaemenid and alien troops. Thus, two narratives of Hecatomnid family history are given in the context of the Macedonian invasion (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.23; Strabo, 14.656-57, his only detailed discussion of Achaemenid Caria in his account of Caria, 14.632ff.). The prominence of Hellenic cultural forms in Hecatomnid Caria (the region was long exposed to Greek culture) attracted western attention but created the erroneous expectation that the satraps would act against the king. Hence the orator Isocrates and the historian Diodorus make constant reference to secret satrapal disloyalty (e.g., Isocrates, 4.162, 5.103-04; Diodorus, 15.2.3). Most of the anecdotal reports about Achaemenid Caria concern the activities of the Hecatomnids (e.g., Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348a, 11.4-10, 18-34, on financial



matters).

Material remains include coins, inscriptions, and archeological remains. 5th-century B.C. local Carian dynasts were responsible for sporadic issuing of silver coinage (e.g., Tymnes of Termera, the family of Pigres at Syangela). The 4th-century Hecatomnid satraps, unlike their Iranian counterparts in Sardis and [Dascylium](#), issued a regular satrapal silver coinage, which in turn influenced local coinage struck on Greek islands. A local Carian deity, Zeus of Labraunda (who to Iranians may have seemed to be the Carian equivalent of Ahura Mazdā), and the satrap's name in Greek letters were found on the reverse, on the obverse usually the Hellenic deity Apollo. The Hellenized appearance of the coinage helped assure its circulation in commercial centers on the Aegean, while the coinage itself served as a ready reminder of Achaemenid power. Epigraphical evidence, most of which derives from the 4th century b.c., reports the activities of the satrapal government and subordinate organizations. Such data are provided by the Carian sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, which like its counterparts in Greek cities served as a repository for public documents. Attitudes towards the satrapal government are seen in documents from cities under its control: Mylasa's account of how it punished plotters against Mausolus (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 167), Erythraea's honors for the satrapal family (e.g., *ibid.*, no. 168, cf. below), statues of the satrapal family set up at Delphi by the Milesians (*ibid.*, no. 225). Physical remains from sanctuaries (Sinuri's near Mylasa, Artemis's at Amyzon, Zeus's at Labraunda) point to active building programs under the Hecatomnid satraps.

Caria as a portion of the satrapy of Sparda (Lydia), 540s-390s. Following the fall of the kingdom of King [Croesus](#) of Lydia, Caria and its inhabitants became part of an Achaemenid satrapy; the name Karka appears in royal lists of peoples (Herodotus, 1.28, 171, 174; Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 7.4.1ff., at best reflects the continued presence of native Carian dynasts). The satrap at Sardis, who exercised control over Caria, held property there (Tissaphernes' estate, *oikos*: Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.2.12, cf. 3.1.8-10; the possible existence of an estate belonging to his predecessor, the rebel Pissouthnes, may help explain the son Amorges' ability to hold out as a rebel in Caria, Thucydides, 8.5.28). Subordinate to the satrap were lesser officers, principally Iranian or Iranized nobles with property and personal followings on the model found elsewhere in Sparda, Dascylium and Cappadocia, as well as native Carian dynasts. Scanty documentation permits only one of the first group to be identified for certain,

the Artaphernes active in 396/5 b.c. around Caunus (Diodorus, 14.79; *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* 9.3., Diogenes Laertius, 2.79). Of the second group a fuller list can be drawn up. They intermarried with other Anatolian nobility (Herodotus, 5.118, 7.99; cf. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 45.14ff., for a Carian with an Iranian name serving as a political officer in 5th-century Halicarnassus), and participated in the Achaemenid military operations recorded by Hellenic sources (e.g., Herodotus, 5.37, 7.98, 195, 8.68). Apparently Achaemenid authorities could identify a particular family of notables upon whom to rely for support in each Carian center. Some of these families held power for a number of generations (the family of Artemisia at Halicarnassus is well documented: Herodotus, 7.99, 8.68; *Suda*, s.v. Herodotus; *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 45). Occasionally political tension within such families could create problems for Achaemenid officials: At Mylasa the sons of the dynast Ibanollis split in allegiance, with Oliatus loyal (Herodotus, 5.37) but Heracleides a traitor (5.121). Local dynasts continued to exist into the later 5th century B.C. when Caria was under pressure from Hellenic raids (Diodorus, 11.60.4; Thucydides, 2.69, 3.19, 8.102; Pactyes of Idyma and Pigres of Syangela paid tribute to the Athenians, *Inscriptiones Graecae* I, 2nd ed., nos. 192, 205). There is sporadic reference to Achaemenid strongholds and bases (Diodorus, 11.60.4, 14.79; *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* 19). The interactions between the various elements of Achaemenid government in Caria remain obscure. It would be in the interest of the satrap at Sardis to maintain Caria sufficiently pacified to permit him to collect revenue and raise troops for military campaigns. During the troubles of the 490s, some Carians operated against Achaemenid forces (Herodotus, 5.103, 117-122; 6.20, 25). By 480 the region was pacified enough for Carian dynasts to provide 70 ships (Herodotus, 7.93) and military forces to Xerxes. One may also note here the explorations carried out for Darius by Carian Scylax of Caryanda (Herodotus, 4.44), and the presence of Carian settlements in Mesopotamia (noted only in the 330s, when their inhabitants fought the Macedonian invaders: Arrian, *Anabasis* 3.8.11; Diodorus, 17.110, 19.12).

Caria as a separate satrapy under the Hecatomnid family, 390s-30s. During this period the Carian Hecatomnid family ruled the satrapy (Table 46). The capital was first at their hometown, Mylasa; later it shifted to Halicarnassus. The Hecatomnid regnal years are as follows (cf. Hornblower, *Mausolus* xxvi; Strabo, 14.656-657; Diodorus, 16.36, 42, 45, 69, 74; Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.23):

Hyssaldomus active in 330s perhaps satrap



Hecatomnus	ca. 392/1-d. 377/6	
Mausolus	377/6-d. 353/2	
Artemisia	353/2-d. 351/0	
Idrieus	351/0-d. 344/3	
Ada	344/3-341/0	Macedonian appointee 334-?
Pixodarus	341/0-d. 336/5	
Orontopates	336/5	fights at Gaugamela in 331

While his father, Hyssaldomus, is known from epigraphic documents only (Hornblower, pp. 36 and notes 5-6 for discussion and texts), Hecatomnus himself appears in the historical record as prominent and loyal enough for Artaxerxes II (405-359) to assign to him the task of subduing the rebel Euagoras from Salamis in Cyprus (Diodorus, 14.98, 15.2; Theopompus, historian, no. 115, in Müller, *Fragmente*, no. 103). The king's decision suggests that in 390 the family was influential enough to gather and command troops from the interior in addition to naval forces and that Caria was stable enough under Hecatomnid control for influential administrators to leave their home sectors.

It is best to regard the Hecatomnid family before the creation of the satrapy as local native dynasts, much the same as the 5th-century b.c. family of Ibanollis, also from Mylasa. Ties to the earlier homonymous family members of the dynasts of Cindya (Herodotus, 5.118) and to the semi-religious office of king of the Carians (better attested in the Hellenic period) are most uncertain, in spite of a popular trend among modern scholars to regard them as the reasons for the rise of the Hecatomnids. Greater weight in explaining the family's rise to prominence and attracting Susa's notice should be placed on Hecatomnid activities, unfortunately unattested, during such crises in Caria as the rebellions of Amorges and Cyrus and on their relations with Tissaphernes, the last satrap at Sardis to control Caria. One should take note of the flexibility in Hecatomnid administration: Artaxerxes, when he removed native loyalty from the position of satrap in Cilicia (the Syennesis), at the same time selected native nobles to provide satraps for Caria, a region which also possessed Iranian or Iranized nobility (cf. Artaphernes, above; Bagadates and Ariaramnes in Robert, 1983, for a later period). The decision to create a separate satrapy of Caria can be explained in part by Susa's desire to assign a more manageable sector to the new satrap at Sardis and avoid the problems of Tissaphernes' tenure.

The long tenure of the satrapal family can best be compared in Anatolia to that of the satrapal house of Pharnaces in Dascylium to the north. Although regnal years for each family member are given in the sources (see above), all the members were active in governing Caria during the reign of the father and brothers, a practice common in Achaemenid Anatolia (*Suda*, s.v, Dexippus; Polyaeus, 7.23.2). No extant document labels the Hecatomnid women as satraps although one earlier lesser officer, Mania, widow of Zenis in Dascylium, was so styled by Xenophon (*Hellenica* 3.1.11-12). It is reasonable to assume that Susa tended to view husband and wife as a sort of local royal family, in which power could pass to the competent widow of a competent satrap (so Pharnabazus decided in Mania's case). Mausolus presented Artemisia and himself at least once as a royal couple (Crampa, no. 40). That this occurred with some frequency is evidenced by the local perception of the satrap and his wife as a royal couple (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., nos. 168, 225; Robert, 1945, no. 73).

The brother-sister marriages which characterized the surviving children of Hecatomnus (Strabo, 14.656; Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.23) may have been arranged in part in imitation of Achaemenid royal practice, but more probably were political moves by the satrap to solidify and maintain power within his own family, a move made in the realization that other local natives might try to raise future claims that they were better suited to be satrap. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., nos. 167, 169, show that some enemies of the Hecatomnids were wealthy enough for civic officials to have taken pains in publicly disposing of their seized property—perhaps as a measure of the guilty persons' prominence. Hecatomnus was moderately successful in solidifying his family's power: the evidence for family infighting remains puzzling (Aristotle, *Rhetorica* 3.1406b26), being the result of source bias (Strabo and Arrian, loc. cit., discredit Ada's immediate predecessors when discussing her appointment by Alexander) or the result of modern interpretation (the French dating of the Xanthus trilingual to the reign of Artaxerxes III [359-38], thereby having Mausolus temporarily replaced by his youngest brother in the aftermath of supposed satrapal disloyalty).

The stemma (Table 46) points to an unfortunate shallowness in the Hecatomnid family. Only Pixodarus is known to have had heirs. Mausolus died childless (Strabo, 14.656; Ariarames, son of a Mausolus, Crampa, no. 28, is indicative of Carian-Iranian intermarriage). No heirs are attested for Idrieus and Ada (her *oikeioi* in Strabo, 14.657, are Orontopates and Ada the younger).



There is no way at the present time (1988) to identify any other attested Carian as a member of the extended Hecatomnid family. The dangers posed by a satrapal family so limited in extent were no doubt offset by the presence of other Carian and Iranian nobility in the province.

Lesser officers. The identity of subordinate officers, whether royally or satrapally appointed or local Carian and Greek civic officials, as well as their interaction with each other remained for the most part obscure. Only Mausolus' and Pixodarus' own subordinates are known by name (e.g., Condalus: Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348.a18-34; Aegyptus: Polyaeus 6.8; Artemelis: the Xanthus trilingual). Carian nobility may lie behind the "very wealthy" and Mausolus's friends in Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348.a4ff., and Polyaeus, 7.23.1. The Ariarames mentioned above, who set up a life-size statue (of Zeus?) in a prominent location in the sanctuary at Labraunda, may have belonged to such a family. Ironically, since Hecatomnid Caria was secure from Hellenic depredation, Greek sources did not preserve the names of local officers who would have defended the satrapy (cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis* 7.8.7ff.: Xenophon's account of his own mischief in Lydia preserves information about the otherwise unattested estate owner Asidates and his colleagues). Arrian and the other Alexander historians (e.g., Curtius and Diodorus) do not identify clearly those lesser officers of Caria who defended their satrapy in the 330s.

It is possible to delineate broad classes of lesser officers, all of whom, in political reality, would be subordinate to the satrap (made clear in the Xanthus trilingual); some overlap: satrapally-appointed staff; garrison and citadel commanders (cf. Diodorus, 15.90.3); landed nobility (local nobles, some pre-dating the Hecatomnid rise); officers appointed to supervise cities (e.g., Artemelis for Xanthus); native civic officers; officers in charge of sanctuaries.

Native Carian organizations. The epigraphic record identifies a number of local Carian political organizations and provides information concerning their relations with the satraps, whose control they did not challenge. Some of these groups survived into the Hellenistic age.

At Mylasa there existed forms of civic government (an assembly, a citizen body organized into tribes, a body of ancestral laws; see *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 167, cf. 2nd ed., no. 573, for Tralles' civic government). A number of groups not associated with larger urban centers are known from surviving copies of their decrees: the *Koroandeis* (ibid., no. 311, cf. Hornblower, pp. 368, no. M 12), the *Plataseis* (Crampa, no. 42), the *syngeneia*,



or tribal subdivision, of Pelekos (Robert, 1945, nos. 73, 75). The activities recorded involve local, internal affairs and do not circumscribe satrapal authority.

It is often argued by modern scholars that there existed a larger civic organization, the *koinon*, or league, of the Carians, which posed a potential challenge to satrapal control, but the Achaemenid-era evidence cited for this organization is most defective; in fact, these passages, Herodotus (5.117-121), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (III, no. 167), and Diodorus (17.24.2), make no mention of it at all (for a fragmentary 4th-century B.C. inscription sometimes cited, see Hornblower, Mausolus, pp. 55-56 n. 28).

Excavations at a number of Carian sanctuaries reveal the Hecatomnids as important patrons: Their names were prominently displayed on buildings they dedicated (e.g., Crampa, nos. 13-19). Mausolus altered religious procedure at Labraunda (nos. 53-54; Droaphernes at Sardis provides a parallel, see bibliography). Such activities served to remind Carians of satrapal control, under which one would anticipate the province's highest officer to look out for the religious well-being of his subjects (cf. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 22, for Darius' anger when this was not done by a subordinate).

Economic development. Successful satrapal administration meant the regular dispatch of tribute to Susa. There are hints as to the types of revenue collected: Crampa, no. 42, and Robert, 1945, no. 73, draw distinctions between local taxes and those destined for the crown, for which the satrap was ultimately responsible (see, e.g., Polyaeus, 7.23.1). While some of the results of the economic success of the Hecatomnids are visible, the processes leading to their success are obscure. There are a few anecdotes relating to Mausolus' economic activity (e.g., Theopompus, historian, no. 115, in Jacoby, *Fragmenta*, no. 299), but overall it is difficult to determine how many of the physical remains of the 4th century which point to the satrapy's development are due to direct satrapal participation—as in the Carian sanctuaries—or to the more general stability created by competent administration.

While other Achaemenid authorities expended efforts on estates (cf. Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 4.20, and *Hellenica* 4.1.15ff.) the Hecatomnids seem to have been more interested in urbanization. Relocation to more defensible sites by the citizens of Erythrae, Heraclea on Latmus, and Priene in the 4th century may have been a satrapal impetus (so too, perhaps, Cnidus' shift to a site offering a better command of the sea).



The best known of the Hecatomnid urbanization programs was the one carried out at the newly expanded and rebuilt Halicarnassus (Diodorus, 15.90.3; Strabo, 13.611, 14.656-657; Pliny, 5.107; Vitruvius, 2.8.10ff.), which became an expression of satrapal wealth and power. The new capital, replacing Mylasa, was a natural fortress, well-walled, with two harbors (one “concealed”: Vitruvius), a satrapal palace, public buildings, and the Mausoleum (Pliny, 36.30-31; Vitruvius, preface to bk. 7, secs. 12-13). The Mausoleum, a monumental tomb roughly pyramidal in form, was planned by Mausolus, who left room in the city plan for it, and was influenced by Iranian, Lycian, and Egyptian architectural forms. Although adorned by Greek artists, the monument’s sculptural decoration served to promote the Hecatomnid family as a whole (cf. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 3rd ed., no. 167, for a statue of Hecatomnus and the mention of *progonoi*, ancestors, who would be represented on the tomb). The shift of the capital from inland Mylasa to coastal Halicarnassus was significant for the far-western parts of the Achaemenid empire: by shifting the seat of his power to the coast Mausolus, unlike his Iranian colleagues to the north, facilitated the ability to reach and strike out at potential threats sailing in from the west. His capital remained a valuable economic and military center for the rest of the Achaemenid period.

Little is known about the development of agricultural regions and the road network needed to facilitate the exchange of goods other than from anecdotes, such as those concerning Mausolus’ subordinate Condalus (Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348a18-34) which presuppose both the ability to raise crops and livestock in peace and the existence of roads nominally under satrapal control (*hodoi basilikai*: produce hanging above them or falling on them is Condalus’ to deal with).

Satrapal history. Hecatomnid tolerance of local Carian groups and the family’s self-promotion through dedications and building activities bore fruit when the Carian satraps were able to use their province’s resources in defense of the empire. Satrapal activity possessed the following interrelated characteristics: a lack of tension between the satrapies Caria and Lydia, the successful use of sea power (the Hecatomnid fleet possessed at least a hundred ships; Xenophon, *Agesilaus* 2.26), the extension of Achaemenid control and influence across the Aegean, particularly at the expense of Athens, and the improvement of the quality of Achaemenid control in Anatolia.

The first major campaign to which Hecatomnid Caria contributed troops was



waged against Euagoras in 390 B.C. (cf. above). Hecatomnus was able to raise troops from both the interior and the coast (the reference in Diodorus, 14.98.3, to the upper satrapies, normally used of Central Asia, is explained by a comparison with 14.80.5, where the same phrase obviously refers to the interior of Turkey). He also cooperated with Autophradates, who was to hold Sparda as satrap while Mausolus ruled Caria. The good relations between Caria and Lydia should be traced to this operation, in which Mausolus probably participated.

In the 360s Mausolus and Autophradates joined forces in operations against [Ariobarzanes](#), then satrap at Dascylium and believed rebellious. Mausolus, in charge of the fleet, fought at Assus at southern Troad in northwest Turkey and at Sestus in Europe (Xenophon, *Agesilaus* 2.26). A similar use of the Hecatomnid fleet is found in the mid-340s when Idrieus (Diodorus, 16.42) operated against the Cypriote rebel Pnytagoras of Salamis. That fleet also enabled Achaemenid authorities to carry out two simultaneous campaigns requiring naval forces, one against Cyprus, and another against rebel Egypt, in which Lydia's satrap and forces took part (Diodorus, 16.47).

The Hecatomnids also campaigned closer to Caria to subdue recalcitrant peoples: Carians (*Suda*, s.v. Dexippos), the disaffected at Ephesus (Polyaenus, 7.27.2, 7.23.2: further cooperation between Sparda and Caria), and the rebels at Heraclea (Polyaenus, 7.23.2, 8.53.4) and Miletus (Polyaenus, 6.8).

In the region of Lycia east of Caria along the southern Turkish coast it is possible to observe a transformation from rule by warring dynasts to relatively stable control exercised by satraps of Caria. This process is difficult to trace because of the scanty literary documentation, the inability to fully understand Lycian inscriptions, and the difficulty in interpreting the coinage, which documents a variety of contemporary local political figures more or less subordinate to Achaemenid authority.

Like Caria, Lycia was originally supervised by the satrap at Sardis, and local documents contain references to officers from Sardis, for instance Tissaphernes, active in the area. By the time of Mausolus Hecatomnid administration was in place (Aristotle, *Oeconomica* 2.1348a18-34, on Condalus; *Tituli Asiae Minoris* II/3, no. 113, on Phaselis under Mausolus' control). Evidence from the time of Pixodarus places Lycia firmly under Caria's control



(*Tituli Asiae Minoris* I, no. 45; Xanthus trilingual). Achaemenid control collapsed only under the weight of a Macedonian invasion (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.24).

The Hecatomnid extension of Achaemenid influence westward is characteristic of overall local Achaemenid activity in the far west after Artaxerxes II imposed peace on the European Greeks in 387. The [King's Peace](#) forbade Greek interference in Anatolia but did not contain restrictions on satrapal efforts to extend the empire's influence and control over the areas surrounding the Aegean, like Sardis, which sought to control the island of Samos, and Dascylium, which controlled the European, as well as the Asian, side of the Hellespont, i.e., the Dardanelles.

Epigraphic and literary evidence points to a growing Hecatomnid influence over Greek city states in Ionia, including some that were normally supervised from Sardis in the 5th century (cf. Lucian, *Dialogi mortuorum* 24, on Mausolus' sphere; and Strabo, 14.647, 651, 659, for areas of mixed Lydian/Carian settlement). Steps taken to assure these cities' pro-Achaemenid stance are customarily labeled by modern scholars as the institution of oligarchies, a negative political term in Greek writing.

Two undated but related inscriptions from Erythrae honor Mausolus, Artemisia, and Idrieus (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 3rd ed., no. 168; Varinlioğlu). The civic officers tried to define the satrapal family in Greek political terms (e.g., Mausolus and Idrieus are called citizens of Mylasa, but no mention is made of their Achaemenid positions), and Idrieus was offered citizenship in Erythrae if he wished it. Both inscriptions prefigure later attempts in the Hellenistic period by cities to deal with rulers in a fashion that preserved at least a semblance of the city's independence and an absence of subservience. If one compares the Erythrae decrees with Crampa, no. 40 (from Mausolus' chancery) and no. 42 (which preserves the decision of a local Carian group) and Robert, 1945, no. 73, one can observe how completely the Hecatomnid satraps and subordinate political organizations in their satrapy could immerse themselves in the language and form of Hellenic diplomacy when necessary. Such use of Hellenic forms facilitated the extension of satrapal influence westward.

Sardis and Halicarnassus cooperated to keep Ephesus under Achaemenid control. This city had been used as early as the 5th century b.c. as a base for Achaemenid officers (see, e.g., Plutarch, *Lysander* 3), and during the 4th

century paid revenues to such authorities (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.17). Miletus, temporarily in disorder (Polyaenus, 6.8), was pro-Hecatomnid from at least the 350s (cf. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 3rd ed., no. 225: statues of the satrapal family; Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.19, on the family of Glaucippus). Tralles dated its documents by regnal years of Artaxerxes and a mention of who was satrap at Halicarnassus.

The Hecatomnid fleet assisted in the extension of influence into the Aegean islands, where satrapal hands were seen in the dismembering during the 350s of an alliance Athens had built up (Demosthenes, speech 15 and the ancient introduction [*hypothesis*] to speech 24; Diodorus, 16.7, 77). Chios, Cos, and Rhodes stand out as pro-Achaemenid. On Crete, the major city Cnossus enjoyed favorable relations with Halicarnassus (Crampa, no. 40).

Influence was sought in mainland Greece. During the 370s or early 360s Mausolus had made a guest-friendship (*xenia*) with the Spartan king Agesilas (Xenophon, *Agesilaus* 2.27; cf. Plutarch, *Agesilaus* 13, for Spartan ties with Idrieus), a practice attested for other satraps (e.g., Xenophon, *Hellenica* 5.1.28) and one which might lead to Mausolus' hiring Spartans as mercenaries (the indigent Spartans and their king instead served rebel Egypt). In 337/6 Pixodarus sought to blunt Macedonian hostility towards the empire by arranging a marriage between one of his daughters and Phillip's son Arrhidaeus (Plutarch, *Alexander* 10). Dynastic strife in the Macedonian royal family terminated the effort.

Fall of Achaemenid Caria, 334-33 b.c. The task of defending the satrapy and the Achaemenid west against foreign royal invasion fell to Orontopates, son-in-law of Pixodarus (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.20-23, 2.1-2, 5, 13), and Hecatomnid naval forces made up a portion of the fleet operating off the Ionian coast (Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.18-19). Halicarnassus and its environs did not fall until the end of 333, Orontopates fleeing east to fight at [Gaugamela](#) (Arrian, *Anabasis* 3.8.5, 3.11.5). The Macedonian conquerors succeeded in only damaging the satrapy; to rule it they first used an aged Hecatomnid (Ada) and then Macedonian officers presiding over a satrapal administration that displayed continuity with the Achaemenid era (see, e.g., Robert, 1983, no. 2, in form and content; Crampa, no. 42).

Studies. For general accounts of Achaemenid Caria see Hornblower, who



assembles most data on Caria, cites texts of inscriptions, though muster and display of data are at the expense of analysis; Judeich contains a well-reasoned, but outdated, account of Hecatomnid Caria; Weiskopf gives an analysis of Caria as satrapy and attempts to identify what is due to pro-Hellenic bias in the sources. Studies of value on particular points: Bosworth gives a valuable analysis of Arrian passages and problems they raise; Briant (1985) discusses administrative continuities; Cargill discusses Achaemenid activities in the Aegean; Childs collects evidence, some relating to Hecatomnid inscriptions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient sources: For the following authors any current edition (Teubner, Oxford, Loeb, etc.) may be used: Aristotle, Arrian, Curtius, Demosthenes, Diodorus Siculus, Diogenes Laërtius, *Hellenica Oxyrrhynchia*, Herodotus, Isocrates, Lucian, Pliny, Plutarch, Polyaeus, Strabo, Thucydides, Vitruvius, and Xenophon. For the *Suda*, a Byzantine-era lexicon, see G. Bernhardt's edition, Halle, 1853.

Other ancient sources: *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 2nd ed., ed. I. Kirchner, Berlin, 1913-40.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, 3rd ed., ed. W. Dittenberger, Leipzig, 1915.

Tituli Asiae Minoris, ed. E. Kalinka et al., Vienna, 1901.

Studies: E. Badian, "A Document of Artaxerxes IV?" in K. Kinzl, ed., *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Pre-History. Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr*, Berlin, 1977, pp. 40-50.

A. B. Bosworth, *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander I*, Oxford, 1980.

P. Briant, *L'Asie centrale et les royaumes proche-orientaux du premier*

millénaire (c. VIII^e-IV^e siècles avant n.è.), Paris, 1984 (material remains from Bactria). Idem, "Les iraniens d'Asie Mineure après la chute de l'empire Achéménide," *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 11, 1985, pp. 167-95.

J. Cargill, *The Second Athenian League. Empire or Free Alliance?*, Berkeley, 1981. W. Childs, "Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Re-Examined," *Anatolian Studies* 31, 1981, pp. 55-80.

J. Crampa, *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches III/2: The Greek Inscriptions*, pt. II: nos. 13-133, Stockholm, 1972 (Hornblower gives texts of the frequently cited nos. 40 and 42; the judicious comments by Robert, 1973, nos. 403-16, should also be consulted).

S. Hornblower, *Mausolus*, Oxford, 1982.

W. Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, Marburg, 1892. H. Metzger et al., *Fouilles de Xanthos VI: La stèle trilingue du Letoon*, Paris, 1979 (Greek text printed in Hornblower).

J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I*, Paris, 1983 (see also Briant).

L. Robert, *Le sanctuaire de Sinuri près de Mylasa*, pt. 1: *Les inscriptions grecques*, Paris, 1945 (Hornblower prints the text of the frequently cited no. 73).

Idem, "L'année épigraphique," *Revue des études grecques* 86, 1973, pp. 154-159.

Idem, "Une nouvelle inscription grecque de Sardes," *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1975, pp. 306-30.

Idem, "L'année épigraphique," *Revue des études grecques* 90, 1977, p. 413.

Idem, "L'année épigraphique," *Revue des études grecques* 95, 1982, p. 366.

M. Tod, *A. Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions II: From 403 to 323 B.C.*, Oxford, 1948 (his no. 138 = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd ed., no. 167; no. 155 = no. 168; no. 161 = no. 225).

E. Varinlioğlu, "Inscriptions from Erythrae," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 44, 1981, pp. 45-50 (cf. Robert, 1982).

M. Weiskopf, *Achaemenid Systems of Governing in Anatolia*, Ph.D. dissertation,



University of California, Berkeley, 1982.