

ANCIENT CNIDUS AND ITS VICINITY (700-400 BC)

ANTİKÇAĞ'DA KNIDOS VE ÇEVRESİ (MÖ 700-400)

MUZAFFER DEMİR* ALİCAN DOĞAN**

Abstract: Scholars still debate the issue of the location of Cnidus. On contrary to the views of some scholars, it appears that Cnidus was not relocated from Burgaz to Tekir and that actually it lied just across the promontory of Triopium on the mainland at the tip of Cnidian Cherronesus from the colonial period onwards. It had surrendered to the Persian general Harpagus in 546 BC. It does not seem to have involved in Ionian revolt, even though most of the Carian cities supported it. After the establishment of the Delian League in 478 BC, its military leaders, Pausanias and Cimon, sailed to the coasts of Caria and Lycia to control over the cities there and then get their financial support, including Cnidus. Having extended her political hegemony over the seas, Athens secured the overall control of the League by 454 BC. Then, by this time onwards, she initiated to inscribe both the names and the payments of the League members on stone. In this study, we shall, first of all, concentrate on the issue of the location of Cnidus and then on the political relations of Cnidus with both the Persians and other Greek city-states during the first half of Vth century BC. Afterwards by taking into account the inscriptive evidence concerning the payments of Cnidus and the cities around her to the League as well as the other relevant literary sources, we shall try to make new inferences about the political circumstances around Cnidus and its vicinity within the context of Athenian struggle against Persia and Sparta until the end of Vth century BC.

Keywords: Cnidus • Athens • Persians • Spartans • Athenian Tribute Lists

Öz: Knidos'un lokalizasyonu konusunu hala tartışılmaktadır. Bazı bilim adamlarının görüşlerinin aksine Knidos'un Burgaz'dan Tekir'e taşınmadığı, aslında kolonizasyon döneminden itibaren Knidos Kherronesos'unun ucunda anakara üzerindeki Triopion Burnu'nun hemen karşısında uzandığı görülmektedir. Knidos, MÖ 546'da Pers generali Harpagos'un eline geçmişti. Karia kentlerinin çoğunun Ionia Ayaklanması'na destek vermesine rağmen Knidos isyana katılmamış gibi görünmektedir. Hatta isyan süreci ve sonrasında Persleri desteklemiş bile olabilirler. Pers tehdidine karşı MÖ 478 yılında Attika Delos Birliği kurulduktan sonra Pausanias ve Kimon gibi birliğin bazı askeri liderleri, kentleri hâkimiyet altına almak için Karia ve Lykia kıyılarına yelken açmışlar ve Knidos da dâhil olmak üzere onların maddi desteğini sağlamışlardır. Siyasi hâkimiyetini denizsarı yerlere genişleten Atina, MÖ 454'ten sonra birliğin kontrolünü tamamen ele geçirmiştir. Bu tarihten itibaren Atina, Knidos ve çevresindeki birlik üyelerinin isimlerini ve yaptıkları ödemeleri taş bloklar üzerine kaydetmeye başlamıştır. Bu çalışmada öncelikle Knidos'un lokalizasyonu konusuna ve ardından MÖ V. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Persler ve Hellen kent devletleriyle olan siyasi ilişkileri üzerine yoğunlaşılacaktır. Ardından Knidos ve çevresindeki kentlerin birliğe yaptığı epigrafik ödeme kayıtlarını ve ilgili edebi kaynakları dikkate alarak MÖ V. yüzyıl sonuna kadar Atinalıların Perslere ve Spartalılara karşı mücadelesi kapsamında Knidos ve çevresindeki siyasi koşullar hakkında yeni çıkarımlarda bulunmaya odaklanılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Knidos • Atina • Persler • Spartalılar • Atina Vergi Listeleri

The location of the city of Cnidus has still been a matter of great dispute. The present site of the ruins of Cnidus is at Tekir Burnu, on the tip of the Cnidian peninsula. The site consists of a large, steeply sloped island, which was joined to the peninsula mainland by a short artificial isthmus built in an

* Prof. Dr., Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Muğla. dmuzaffer@mu.edu.tr

** Arş. Gör., Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Muğla. alicandogan@mu.edu.tr
Bu çalışmada TÜBİTAK Bilim İnsanı Destekleme Daire Başkanlığı'nın katkılarından yararlanılmıştır.

unknown date. In the island section of the city, so far a very small scale of ancient settlements has been specified. Although some earlier finds too have been identified, in the mainland section of the city most of the remains have been dated to the IVth century BC and it is the same with the archaeological site of Burgaz¹. It has been suggested that the city of Cnidus had been relocated from Burgaz, near the present day Datça to its present site in Tekir². This Old and New Cnidus theory has long been taken seriously by scholars³. Yet none of the ancient literary and epigraphical sources seems to have mentioned such a re-location. Besides the presence of archaeological finds at Burgaz belonging to the period before the IVth century BC does not support the view for relocation. So the archaeological evidence seems to be insufficient to reach a definite conclusion in this matter. It is possible that two ancient settlements at the same time both at Burgaz and Tekir might have coexisted from the Archaic period onwards⁴, as it is certain that cities in both places possibly by different names continued to exist and flourish throughout the IVth century and beyond. We assume that especially both the literary and epigraphical evidence needs to be reconsidered to enlighten this issue. What appears obvious is that there was a settlement at Tekir during the Archaic period. The real problem requiring the enlightenment is that whether this settlement was called by the name, Cnidus or not (Fig. 1).

It is typical of Archaic colonial settlements that they were preferably founded at the tip of the peninsulas, and Triopium in this case. According to Diodorus (V. 53. 1-3), it is implied that the first settlers came from the island of Syme to this place; one of the first settlers of Syme was Triops which recalls the name of Triopas as we shall discuss below. At a later time its king was Nireus who had taken part with Agamemnon in the Trojan War both as ruler of Syme and “*as lord of a part of Cnidia*”. It is possible that Triops mentioned above was the same character with Triopas who was said to have fled from Thessaly together with his supporters and landed “*in the territory of Cnidus*”⁵. He founded Tri-

¹ At the site of Tekir, excavations so far revealed archaeological material dating from the VIIth century BC onwards (Doksanaltı 2007, 6-7). On the other hand, the archaeological site at Burgaz is 2 km northwest of modern city center of Datça. There are traces of buildings and paved streets dating to the Archaic and Classical periods, but most material originates from the Hellenistic period. A IVth century BC harbour has been located and a boundary stone (built into the mosque in Karaköy, not far from Burgaz) of the same century marked the harbour. The fortification walls, built in ashlar masonry, have been dated to the late Vth century BC. It appears that the irregular square and polygonal stone techniques were used. It has been argued that these walls surrounded the *acropolis* (Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1124-5).

² Based on archaeological evidence, especially on the rectangular layout scheme, the city is claimed to have been relocated to its present site around 360 or 330 BC, yet this sort of archaeological evidence is not strong enough to support such a view (Stronk 2010, 5). By taking into account the epigraphical and literary evidence, Bean and Cook’s hypothesis (Bean – Cook 1952) has been challenged that Cnidus did not really move and that the site of Cnidus before the late Classical period mainly was in the same place as it is nowadays (Demand 1989).

³ For these scholars and the ones who believed that Cnidus was located at Tekir from the outset see Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1123. The latest suggestion, that of Bresson (1999), is that that while there can be no doubt that there were two urban centres on the peninsula, the political centre was at Burgaz until the late IVth century BC, when it was moved to Tekir.

⁴ Pliny (*nat. V. 104*) states that Cnidus, a free town, is situated on a promontory called as Triopia and after that come the towns of Pegusa and Stadia which probably gave its name to modern Datça. So it appears that there were three different towns in Datça peninsula in Pliny’s time by the Ist century AD. Like Pliny, Hesychius (*Lexicon, s.v. Τρίπιον*) mentions Triopium together with Cnidus and he writes that this was a sacred place for worship.

⁵ In the above mentioned passage related to Triops, Diodorus does not mention his ancestry, but as regard to the



Fig. 1. Cnidus and its Vicinity

opium which was called after him⁶. This place was his base from where he made campaigns to win for himself “both the Cherronesus and a large part of neighbouring Caria”. It is possible to infer from these texts of Diodorus that the first settlers seem to have come from Thessaly in Greek mainland to Syme and that ‘the Cnidians’ were member of this colony (Diod. V. 53. 3). Thessalians may have come before the Lacedaemonians and the Argives who later on after the Trojan War colonized Syme (Diod. V. 53. 2)⁷. But the first settlement appears to have been established in the promontory of Triopium and then later on extended to the mainland just across this place. This first landing place, Triopium, became sacred for the Cnidians, being related to the cult of Apollon as overseer of the colonizers⁸.

Although Cnidus is not directly mentioned as a *polis* in these texts of Diodorus, its toponomic name, probably as a settlement in the mainland just across Triopium, goes as far back to the VIIth

one, Triopas, who landed in Triopium, he emphasizes on the confusion of his ancestry among the ancient historians and poets (Diod. V. 61. 3).

⁶ Zeno of Rhodes (Hist. fr. 2 line 29) writes that Triopas sailed to Caria and occupied the promontory of Triopium called after him.

⁷ This might be the reason for the contradiction in Herodotus that Cnidians were colonized by the Lacedaemonians (I. 174. 2), whereas Strabo (XIV. 2. 6) says that they came from Megara. For the other sources concerning the colonial period of Cnidus see Cook 1904, 76-7.

⁸ Pausanias (X. 11. 1) also mentions that the image of Triopas, ‘founder of Cnidus’ had been brought by ‘the Cnidians’ to Delphi. He also says that there was an image of Zeus at the city of Olympia in Greece and “the inscription on it says as that it was dedicated by the Chersonnesians of Cnidus from enemy spoils”. Apart from these, he (V. 24. 7) explains that “the greater part of the city of Cnidus is built on the Carian mainland, where are their most noteworthy possessions, but what is called Chersonnesus is an island lying near the mainland, to which it is joined by a bridge”. From this text it could be inferred that Chersonnesus is the promontory of Triopium. It appears that the city of Cnidus had extended to a large area in Pausanias’ time (ca. AD 110-ca. 180). He probably had not heard of the name, Triopium as mentioned in other ancient texts.

century BC. In Homeric Hymns to Delphi Apollo (43), it is mentioned as ‘steep Cnidus’. Starting from the last quarter of the VIIth century BC, Cnidus was also one of the Dorian *poleis* behind the *Hellenion* at Naucratis (Hdt. II. 178. 2). The Egythian king Amasis had enabled some Greek cities to use Naucratis as an *emporium*. So Cnidus as well established commercial posts in Naucratis. It certainly had a naval capability⁹. As being on the trade route from Egypt to the Levant and then along the southern coasts of Anatolia towards the Western Greece and up the Aegean to the Black Sea, it became richer as a result of commercial profits and started to mint its own coins in the VIth century BC. It also built a treasury house and several communal dedications at Delphi in the same century, which reflected its wealth¹⁰.

At the same time, other ancient sources imply that both Triopium and Cnidus were side by side. Pseudo-Scylax (99) in his *Periplus*, if dated to the VIth century BC, states that when returned to the mainland one comes to “*Triopium sacred promontory and the Greek city of Cnidus* (Ἀκρωτήριον ἱερὸν Τριόπιον, Κνίδος πόλις Ἑλληνίς)”¹¹. Herodotus (I. 144) mentions that Cnidus was one of the original members of the Dorian *hexapolis* (Lindus, Cameirus and Ialysus at Rhodes, Cos, Cnidus and Halicarnassus) probably established during the Geometric Period¹² and that these cities met together at the common Dorian amphictyony at Triopium¹³. Herodotus (I. 174) also states the following:

Neither the Carians nor any Greeks who dwell in this country did any thing notable before they were all enslaved by Harpagus. [2] Among those who inhabit it are certain Cnidians,

⁹ Cnidians founded a colony at Lipara in Sicily around 580-576 BC (Thuc. III. 88. 2; Strab. VI. 2. 10; Paus. X. 11. 3). Pausanias (*loc. cit.*) states that “*the leader of the colony is said to have been a Cnidian, whose name was Pentathlus*”. During the reign of Persian king, Darius I, both Cnidus and Tarentum were Dorian towns and based their relations on friendship, as Darius I needed the help of Cnidians to save some of their citizens from the hands of Tarentines. There must also have been commercial relations between these two cities at least starting from the second half of the VIth century BC (Hdt. III. 138). Strabo (VII. 5. 5) also narrates that Cnidians founded a city close to Pleraei in Dalmatian country, possibly around 315 BC.

¹⁰ The earliest dated to the middle of the VIth century BC. For the same period, the Cnidian dedicatory graffiti were also unearthed in the temple of Apollon Milasius at Naucratis, and in the temple of Athena at Lindus. For the inscription references see Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1125. Cnidus first struck silver coins on the Milesian and, then, the Aiginetan standard from the late VIth century BC onwards (Figueira 1998, 75-76; Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1125).

¹¹ Arrian (*anab.* II. 5. 7) also mentions Triopium as a promontory terminating the peninsula of Cnidus. As mentioned above Pliny relates that the city of Cnidus was situated on a promontory called Triopium. Stephanus Byzantium (s.v. *Triopion*) writes that its name derived from Erysichthonus’ father Triopos, called as Triopia and that the Greeks of Triopia said that it had taken the name from Triops and that it held a temple. In *Etym. Magnum* (s.v. *Τριόπιον*) Triopium is mentioned as a mount at the tip of Cnidus and takes its name from Triopas, the father of Erysichthonus. Triopia is also mentioned as a Carian city named after Triopas, father of Erysichthonus (Ael. Herod. et Pseu. Herod., vol. 3, 1 page 365 line 4). Triopium as the tip of Cnidus or Cnidian Cherronesus also see Hdt. I. 174. 2; Strab. XIV. 2. 15; Paus. V. 24. 7; Tib. II. 3. 57; Prop. I. 2. 1; II. 1. 5; Ael. Herod. et Pseu. Herod., vol. 3, 1 page 111 line 15; page 204 line 19; page 211 line 31; Steph. Byz., s.v. *Istros*, Steph. Byz. s.v. *Khios*, Steph. Byz. s.v. *Kherronesos*. *Schol. Theoc.* (Prolegomenon-anecdote-poem 17 section-verse 68/69 line 5) states that the name of Triopium derived from Triopos, the son of Abanthos and it was around Cnidia.

¹² Cnidian excavations revealed ceramic cups and terracotta figurines belonging to this period (Love 1978, 1111).

¹³ Strabo (XIV. 2. 6) states that the cities of Cnidus and Halicarnassus were built later, possibly during the middle of the VIIth century BC, than those in Rhodes and Cos. During the late VIth century, the city-ethnic is given as Cnidus and the word *politai* occurs in a late VIth century BC epigram. For the inscription references see Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1123.

colonists from Lacedaemon. Their country (it is called the Triopium) lies between the sea and that part of the peninsula which belongs to Bubassus, and all but a small part of the Cnidian territory is washed by the sea [3] (for it is bounded on the north by the gulf of Ceramicus, and on the south by the sea off Syme and Rhodes). Now while Harpagus was conquering Ionia, the Cnidians dug a trench across this little space, which is about two-thirds of a mile wide, in order that their country might be an island. So they brought it all within the entrenchment; for the frontier between the Cnidian country and the mainland is on the isthmus across which they dug. [4] Many of them were at this work; and seeing that the workers were injured when breaking stones more often and less naturally than usual, some in other ways, but most in the eyes, the Cnidians sent envoys to Delphi to inquire what it was that opposed them. [5] Then, as they themselves say, the priestess gave them this answer in iambic verse: "Do not wall or trench the isthmus: Zeus would have given you an island, if he had wanted to". [6] At this answer from the priestess, the Cnidians stopped their digging, and when Harpagus came against them with his army they surrendered to him without resistance.

When the accounts in this text are taken into account, it appears that Cnidians thought that they could devise a clever plan of defense not to be 'enslaved' by Persians in 546 BC by digging a deep trench across the narrow isthmus that attached the city's peninsula to the mainland. In this way they would create an island city that would be easier to defend. But they could not overcome this hard work. Due to the unusual and devastating number of serious injuries during this process, especially to the eyes, they decided to consult to the Delphic oracle. The answer from the oracle as to this story of the Cnidian ditch puts forward the most obvious illustration of a divine wish; their action was made impossible on the grounds of an omen carrying the message to stop digging. As a matter of fact, this story in Herodotus is based on the seriousness of the agency of the prophetess or divine intervention. If Zeus had wished, he would have created the peninsula as an island. To rule out this divine cause, would anyway have given no results. Any way, if they were real, the excavations had been stopped by a divine order¹⁴ and Cnidians were convinced to an immediate surrender to Harpagus. Cnidians might have had in their minds such an ambitious project, but it is impossible to determine whether they had really started this project unless a land surveying was made on the area where they are mentioned to have planned to excavate the ditch. Herodotus observes that Cnidian territory began from the Bybassian Chersonese, that is, the Loryma peninsula southwest of Marmaris¹⁵. Bybassus is now localized as Hisarönü, 20 km west of Marmaris¹⁶. So Cnidian chora ended at Bencik Bay near Hisarönü, the narrowest isthmus of the Datça peninsula, where this project might have taken place¹⁷. The Bybassian Chersonese was different from the Cnidian one, probably the promontory of Triopium. In the above-quoted text, Herodotus states that from here as far as Bybassus the whole Cnidian territory was attributed by the name, Triopium (τὸ δὲ Τριόπιον καλεῖται), though other

¹⁴ Similarly, Pausanias (II. 1. 5) mentions this project and emphasizes that "so difficult it is for man to alter by violence what Heaven has made".

¹⁵ The find of a VIth century inscription in the Cnidian alphabet on the Loryma peninsula may imply that there was a Cnidian influence over there. For the inscription reference see Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1123.

¹⁶ Diodoros (V. 62) speaks of Bybastus in the Chersonese; Pliny (*nat.* V. 104) uses the term, regio Bubassus; Mela (I. 84) says that the sinus Bybassius includes Cynrus; Stephanus Byzantius (s.v. *Bybassus*) calls it a *polis*.

¹⁷ Demand 1989, 231-232.

ancient sources mention it as a headland or treat it as a *polis* as mentioned above. However, the sentence in Herodotus I. 174. 2 could also be translated as “*their territory lies towards the sea, being called Triopium, beginning from the Chersonese of Bybassia*”. A commentary on this text states that “*τό is neuter from attraction of the predicate Τριόπιον. Properly Τριόπιον is the name only of the extreme point*”¹⁸. If this translation is taken as truth, it can be accepted that Herodotus I. 174. 2 does not contradict with other ancient sources.

Accordingly Thucydides states (VIII. 35. 2-4) that “*Triopium is a promontory of Cnidus and sacred to Apollo*”. As shall also be discussed below, Lacedaemonians in 412 BC cruised around Triopium and tried to capture all the merchantmen arriving from Egypt. When the Athenians attacked the unfortified city of Cnidus, the city defense was reinforced by the crews escaped from the ships at Triopium. “The reinforcement by the crews’ implies that the city of Cnidus lied on the mainland just across the promontory of Triopium. They could not have walked eight or nine hours during the day to Burgaz and prepared themselves in the morning to defend the city”¹⁹. Actually the sentences of Thucydides do not imply a great distance between Cnidus and Triopium promontory²⁰. Therefore, all of the ancient sources that we have discussed above lead us to assume that the city at Tekir by the name of Cnidus along with Triopium promontory was at the tip of Datça Peninsula from the beginning of its colonization period.

After the surrender to Harpagus, Caria became now part of the Persian satrapy of Sardeis. There is no direct evidence on the condition of Caria during the beginnings of Persian period. Herodotus (V. 117 ff) tells us about the attitude of Carians during the Ionian Revolt (499-493 BC). It appears that some Carian cities chose the Greek side when the Ionian revolt started. Herodotus does not give the names of all of the Carian cities joining the revolt. But Mylasa appears to be at the center²¹. Apart from Mylasa, it is known that numerous Carian cities were ruled by dynasties or tyrannies during this revolt and some of the names of these rulers supporting the revolt were given by Herodotus. Yet Herodotus prefers to keep silence concerning not only the attitude of Cnidus during this revolt but also the rule or rulers of Cnidus during the first half of the 5th century BC. His silence might imply that Cnidians supported the Persians. In the text mentioned above, Herodotus states that Cnidians were not courageous enough to fight against Harpagus, which may also lead us to assume that they did not dare to give support to the revolt under the leadership of Athens. This might also be due to the fact that they were Dorian colony and so acted under the influence of Sparta, but not Athens. Although this does not remove the fact that there must also have been anti-Persian factions as elsewhere in other

¹⁸ How – Wells 1912.

¹⁹ Demand 1989, 236.

²⁰ Strabo (XIV. 2. 15) writing during the time of Augustus (27 BC-14 AD), states that Cnidus was a city with two harbours and most of its citizens were living in the islet, Triopium. Some other evidence might also be relevant for the localization of Cnidus. But these belong to the 4th century BC. Writing around 350 BC, Aristotle (*Hist. an.* VI. 15) mentions a temporary pond “*in the neighbourhood of Cnidus*” and based on his observations from this temporary pond, he describes a spontaneous generation of a small fry grey mullet that proceeds from mud and sand. This pond is said to have on one occasion dried up at the time of the Dogstar. Strabo (II. 5. 14) quoting from Poseidonius mentions the observatory of Eudoxus at Cnidus which is “*not much higher than the dwelling-houses*”. As a mathematician, an astronomer, a lawgiver and a geographer, Eudoxus had occupied a distinguished position in the intellectual life of Greece in the 4th century BC.

²¹ Hdt. V. 121.

Carian cities, the oligarchy seems stronger in the city during this period²². Their rule must have been supported by the Spartans, as we know that both Spartans and Persians in general strove to interfere in the rule of cities in favour of oligarchs during the Classical Period. The same policy was likely to have been employed for the Cnidians at times of necessity.

After the Ionian revolt had been put down, Artaphernes, the satrap of Sardeis, made a settlement of Ionia based on resources in 493 BC. 'Ionia' must include Caria, both being included in satrapal Lydia. But there does not appear any evidence about the role of Carian cities including Cnidus after this date until the second Persian invasion of Greece by Xerxes I in 480/479 BC. Carian dynasties like Histiaeus son of Tymnes of Termera (Hdt. V. 37. 1), Pigres son of Hysseldomus of Syangela, and Damasithymus of Calynda (on the Carian-Lycian border) son of Candaules (Hdt. VII. 98) as well as Artemisia I of Halicarnassus joined in Xerxes I's expedition on behalf of Persians. She was the squadron-leader (*taxiarchos*) who commanded the men of Halicarnassus, Cos, Nisyros, Calydnus under the supreme admiralty of a Persian, Ariabignes²³. As seen, especially some of the coastal Carian cities gave support to the Persians in this expedition²⁴. On the other hand, Cnidus and the cities around it are not counted among the allies of Persians and Herodotus ranks many nations but not the Carians as among the ground forces of Xerxes I. They possibly did not maintain as a strong navy as the others to be able to participate in Xerxes I's expedition or it is more probably that Herodotus deliberately did not need to mention the participation of Cnidians in this expedition²⁵.

A new era for Caria started with the battle of Mycale. After the defeat of Persians at Mycale in 479 BC by the alliance of Greek city-states including Sparta, Athens and Corinth, Carians were ready to cut ties with Persia. Having the Delian League been established in 478 BC, the allied Lacedaemonians and Athenian naval forces under the leadership of Pausanias sailed to Cyprus and took the cities there under their control²⁶. These forces must also have sailed off the coasts of Caria and even stopped at several coastal cities there. Yet because of the lack of ancient sources in this regard, we have difficulties in detailing the Carian cities controlled by Pausanias, possibly including Cnidus on his way.

Since there is the scarcity of political evidence from the Persian point of view, it can not be safely

²² Oligarchy at Cnidus was ruled by a council of sixty Forgetfull (*amnemones*, the ones who were not accountable to anyone) appointed for life from among the aristocrats (*aristoi*) and functioning as *probouloi* (Plut. *mor.* 292 A-B). Aristotle mentions the Cnidian constitution in two different texts. He first (*Pol.* 1305b 12) reports that the oligarchy at Cnidus was overthrown by the people, as they (*hoi gnoroimoi*) were divided into two factions among themselves. Then he once again (*Pol.* 1306b 5) states that the citizens of Cnidus brought down a despotic oligarchy at Cnidus. Some believe that these were two different revolutions, the first took place during the Archaic, the second perhaps during the IVth century BC (Hornblower 1982, 117). Yet it is more probable that these two referred to the same revolution, though the exact date cannot be determined (Robinson 1997, 101-3). The democratic revolution must have been at a time when the Athenian influence was strong on the city. Hornblower (1982, 116) also assumes that an oligarchy during the first half of the IVth century BC was replaced by a democracy in the age of Alexander.

²³ Hdt. VII. 99. 1-2.

²⁴ Kent (1937, 296) claims that Xerxes ruled over the Carians. But this might not have been true especially for the inland Carian cities.

²⁵ Herodotus may have seen Cnidians as rival to his native city, Halicarnassus. As mentioned above, during the early VIth century BC, beside Rhodes and Halicarnassus, Cnidians also furnished overseers of the trading post in Naucratis; if any other cities advanced claims, they claimed what did not belong to them (Hdt. II. 178. 2-3).

²⁶ Aesch. *Pers.* 891-2; Thuc. I. 94. 2; Diod. XI. 44. 2-3; Nep. *Paus.* II. 1-2; Paus. III. 4. 9.

concluded that Persia lost interest in Asia Minor during the rest of the Vth century BC. Parts of Asia Minor owed double obligation, to Persia and Athens, is likely to be true. In other words, Persians never stopped their claim to the revenues in Asia Minor. Thus even those Carian cities which probably joined the Delian League at the beginning need not have broken their relations with Persia immediately or at all. The further inland the inquiry is taken, the likelier a Persian obligation will become. So it appears that most of the inland Carian settlements stayed out of the Delian League at first, original membership being confined to coastal or near-coastal cities possibly including Cnidus and Iasus²⁷.

Although there were pro-hellenic cities in Caria, it is likely that the Persian influence in most of the hinterland cities of Caria continued until the arrival of Cimon's fleet. Before his defeat of Persians in Eurymedon at the end of 470's or at the early years of 460's BC, some bilingual speaking cities of Caria and Lycia where also the Persians lived were persuaded by Cimon to revolt. Meanwhile some of these cities were taken out of Persian domination by force²⁸ and Cimon planned to subjugate more Carian communities. He applied force on bilingual places subjected to Persian garrisons and took them by siege. The added places which were mostly situated to the east of the Caric or Bybassian Chersonese might be a bit inland possibly including Cnidus. Cimon may have used Cnidus as his naval base during the operations in the region when necessitated. Therefore, it is almost certain that Cnidus became the member of the Delian League during these operations of Cimon.

After 454 BC, plenty of epigraphical evidence became available which would shed light on the financial and political relations of Athens with Carian city-states. These evidences have been named as the Athenian Tribute Lists, which started in 454 BC. Now we shall try to chart in detail the fluctuations in the payments of Cnidus and some of Carian settlements around it after 454 BC and make inferences about the altered political circumstances until the end of the Vth century BC²⁹ (Fig. 2).

It appears in the lists that very few Carian cities for the year 454 BC made payments in general. The second list (453/2), which begins with Carian names, shows that, after a demand for payment, Carian contributions arrived late for the year 454/3 BC. Its reason might derive from the fact that the Athenians had been defeated in Egypt in 454 BC. In the payment records starting in 454/3 BC, while the names of the settlements of Aul[a] and Chios appears, that of Cnidus is absent. After the Egyptian defeat, it is assumed that Athens seems to have taken important steps in controlling the coastal cities both in Cyprus and in Eastern Mediterranean including Carian and Lycian regions³⁰. When the second and the fourth quota lists, which were long and to which even the new cities hinterland were added, taken into account, an Athenian fleet was likely to have been active around the coast of Caria

²⁷ The attention of Greeks to Caria reflected itself in Greek literature to some degree as in the play of Aeschylus, "*Cares or Europe*" and in the stories of Herodotus about Artemisia I as mentioned above. For the other plays written about the Carians by the Greek writers see Demir 2005, 38, 54 dn. In Caria as a whole in the early Vth century BC, Greek influence seems to have been at margins (Hornblower 1982, 31).

²⁸ Thuc. I. 100. 1; Diod. XI. 60. 3-62; *Oxyrh. Pap.* XIII. 1610, fr. 6-13 = Ephorus *FGrHist* F 191. 56-61; Plut. *Cim.* 12; Frontin. *Strat.* III. 2. 5. On Eurymedon campaign, also see Meritt *et al.* 1950, 209-10; Meiggs 1972, 73-4; Bryce 1986, 103-104; Arslan 2008, 49 vdd.

²⁹ See figs 1-6.

³⁰ Meritt *et al.* 1950, 7-9; Meiggs 1972, 118. As regard to the growing pressure of Athens on members of the Delian League, see Meiggs 1963, 1-36. For the ultimate reaction of some citystates and the transfer of Delian League treasure from Delos to Athens in 454 BC, see *ibid.*

in 453 and 451 BC³¹. Cnidus first appears in lists in the year of 452/1 BC and makes its regular payment of 300 *drachmai*, from 452/1 to 451/0. But its payment increases to 500 *drachmai* in the next year, 450/49 BC (Fig. 3).

In the year 449/8 BC, Cnidus and the main cities around it that we have given in our lists do not appear in any of Carian panels concerning the payments. This might result from the Peace of Callias between Athens and Persia in the same year. The Peace of Callias provided autonomy to the Ionian states in Asia Minor, banned the encroachment of Persian satrapies within three days march of the Aegean coast and prevented the Persian ships from entering into the Aegean. Athens also accepted not to interfere with Persia's possessions in Asia Minor, Cyprus, Libya or Egypt (Diod. XII. 4). Actually the exact details of this agreement is not known. The part of the agreement might have concerned the payments of Athenian tributes. It might be that Persia no longer interfered with these payments to Athens after this date. After this agreement, there does not seem to have occurred any direct conflict between Athens and Persia for a certain period. What is certain is that Athenians did not get any tribute from the cities in the year of 450/49 BC probably as a favour stemmed from this agreement.

It is also possible that Athens might have needed time to make preparations for the implementation of Athenian Coinage Decree probably decided in the Athenian assembly after this agreement when she felt at ease. Meritt supports the date, 449/8 BC for this decree. According to his view, as there had occurred some partial payments in the list 8 (447/6 BC) and arrears (unpaid amounts) in the list 7 (448/7 BC), so that it must have taken some times to regulate and employ this decree effectively; so the decree's effective and full implementation took place two years later in the year 447/6 BC and seems to have continued to be effective for the next 15 years as long as its terms were put into action. Therefore, this decree prevented the Carian cities from issuing silver coins³² and Cnidus must have been one of these cities³³.

Cnidus continues to make its regular payments of 500 *drachmai* during both in 448/7 and 447/6 BC. However, likewise most of the cities around its vicinity, it does not appear on the lists during the years, 446/5 and 445/4 BC. While in 446/5, only the cities of Aulitai Cares (8 *drachmai* 2 *oboloi*) and Erines (16 *drachmai* 4 *oboloi*) make payments as given in our list, none of these cities makes any payment in the next year, 445/4 BC. The reason for this sharp decline would be due to the fact that the Athenian fleet was busy enough not to have been present at the waters of Carian coasts. Yet bad harvests or the decline of the harbour revenues of the cities of Carian coasts might have constituted other reasons. Cnidus restarts its payment in 444/3 BC and continues to make its regular payments of 300 *drachmai* until the suppression of Samian revolt in 439/8 BC. During the course of this revolt, Pericles, having heard that the Persian fleet was approaching, is reported to have sailed off to Caria

³¹ Again in 451 BC Cimon set out for an expedition in order to help the Athenian soldiers resisting in Egypt and to weaken the Persian naval resistance around Cyprus and he became successful in Salamis (Thuc. I. 112. 1-4; Plut. *Cim.* 18-19. 2 = Phanodemos *FGrHist* 325 F 23; Diod. XI. 60. 5; 62. 3; 12. 3-4). *ATL* Authors (III, 6-7, 211-2) state that during Cimon's campaign the hinterland and distant cities of Caria, which had not been so far seen on the quota lists, made payments.

³² Meritt 1975, 267-74. On the other hand, some scholars believe that although the date of this decree may be 420's, it does not seem possible to reach a concrete result (Hadji – Kontes 2005, 264).

³³ Cnidus again began to strike coins during the late 5th and early 4th centuries BC. "It was a member of a *symmachia* attested *exclusively* by the so-called ΣΥΝ coinage, whose legend abbreviates *synmachon*, *syn-machikon* or *symmachia*" (Flensted – Jensen 2004, 1124-5).

and Caunus with 60 warships in order to prevent the Persian support³⁴. Yet because of the lack of any other sources, we are not able to infer much about the consequences of this expedition (and that of Cimon as we have mentioned above) with regard to the political attitude of Carian cities at the time including Cnidus.

When reached the year, 440 BC, it appears that Athens threw off approximately 40 cities from the lists and that as a result of the decrease of these communities in the lists, the Ionian and Carian panels were consolidated in 438/7 BC. Despite the suppression of Samian revolt in 439/8 BC, the number of Carian settlements tended to decrease. In the well-preserved list of 442 BC, there appears 31 Ionian and 45 Carian settlements at the total of 76. When arrived at the year of 432, this total number declines to 51, and when looked at the lists, it appears that 21 of them were Carian settlements³⁵. At the same time Cnidus, having made its regular payments until the year of 440/9 BC in general (with the exceptions of 453/2, 449/8, 446/5 and 445/4 BC) stopped its payments after this year until 432/1 BC.

Although the political situation in Caria shifted in favour of Persia between the years 449-425 BC, the loyalty of Cnidus to Athens after the beginning of Peloponnesian War is an important variant in Athenian-Carian relations. Cnidus pays an unknown amount before the beginning of war in 432/1 BC and 200 *drachmai* in between 428/7-427/6 BC. After the beginning of war, Amioi only pays in 428/7 BC (37 *drachmai* 3 *oboloi*), while Aulitai Cares only in 433/2 BC (8 *drachmai* 2 *oboloi*), Cheronosioi between 433/2 and 432/1 BC (300 *drachmai*), Lerymnioi only in 428/7 BC (19 *drachmai* 2,5 *oboloi*). The island of Syme makes its regular payment of 30 *drachmai* from 434/3 to 429/8 BC. Therefore, it appears that only Cnidus and Syme make regular payments from the beginning of the Peloponnesian wars. In 431/0 BC, Thucydides counts the settlements along the Carian coasts and the Dorians, living as neighbours of Carians, among the allies of Athens and points out that the Carians supplied Athens with land forces and money³⁶. Especially the Carian tribute district beside that of Ionia was important for the revenues of Athens³⁷. So it appears that Cnidus as well must have been one of the Carian settlements which gave possibly a significant cash support to Athens during these years (Fig. 4-6).

Meanwhile Cnidus does not seem to have paid any tribute for a period of two years between 431/0 and 428/7 BC. The reason for this might result from the fact that, as we shall explain below, just as Halicarnassus, Cnidus was possibly one of the cities where the Athenian general Melesandrus and his fleet were welcomed. General (*strategos*) Melesandrus sailed to both Caria and Lycia regions in 430/29 BC. During his campaign, he also possibly stopped by Cnidus before passing to the coasts of Lycia. Cnidians might have provided financial and military support to him. As contrary to the view of Keen (1993), it appears that Athens planned to make this campaign in order to collect money as a part of *argurologia* activity stressed by Thucydides rather than controlling the cities in Caria and Lycia³⁸.

Again Thucydides states that Athens required money for the siege of Mytilene on Lesbos and that a campaign was set out for Caria in order to achieve this aim in summer of 428 BC under the com-

³⁴ Thuc. I. 116. 1-117. 1; Diod. XII. 28. 1; Plut. *Per.* 36. 1-2.

³⁵ Demir 2004, 78.

³⁶ Thuc. II. 9. 4-5.

³⁷ Demir 2004, 75-6.

³⁸ Demir 2004.

	454/3	453/2	452/1	451/0	450/19	449/8	448/7	447/6	446/5	445/4	444/3	443/2	442/1	441/0	440/39
Ἄμιοι															
Αὔλιαται Καρες	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.		8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.		8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.	8dr.2ob.
Ἐρινῆς		68dr.5ob.			54dr.				16dr.4ob.		16dr.4ob.				
Χερρονήσιοι			300dr.	300dr.	300dr.		300dr.	300dr.			270dr.	270dr.	270dr.	270dr.	270dr.
Χίοι Καρες	33dr.2ob.						33dr.2ob.	33dr.2ob.							
Ληρ[υμνιο]ι															
Κνίδιοι			300dr.	300dr.	500dr.		500dr.	500dr.			300dr.	300dr.	300dr.	300dr.	300dr.
Σύμη															

	439/8	438/7	437/6	436/5	435/4	434/3	433/2	432/1	431/0	430/29	429/8	428/7	427/6	426/5	425/4
Ἄμιοι												37dr. 3ob.			
Αὔλιαται Καρες							8dr.2ob.								
Ἐρινῆς															1 tal.
Χερρονήσιοι							300dr.	300dr.							
Χίοι Καρες															
Ληρ[υμνιο]ι												19dr.2,5ob.			
Κνίδιοι								---				200dr.	200dr		
Σύμη						30dr.	30dr.	30dr.			30dr.				

	424/3	423/2	422/1	421/0	420/19	419/8	418/7	417/6-415/4	414/3-411/0	410/9	409/8	408/7-406/5	425/4(A9)	421(A10)	418/7 (A11)	414/3 (A12)	410/9(A13)
Ἄμιοι																	
Αὔλιαται Καρες							8dr.2ob.										
Ἐρινῆς																	
Χερρονήσιοι																	
Χίοι Καρες													2tal+?				
Ληρ[υμνιο]ι																	
Κνίδιοι																	
Σύμη													3000dr.				

Fig. 4-6. *Cnidus and Some Cities Around her in Athenian Tribute Lists*

mand of Lysicles³⁹. Within this context, Cnidus appears to have paid 200 *drachmai* in the same year as a tribute. Similarly the reason for the reduction in its tribute at an amount of 100 *drachmai* as compared to the previous years might derive from the fact that Cnidus might have partially supported Lysicles during his expedition on Carian coasts. Lysicles and possibly Melesandrus first of all had proceeded to the Carian hinterland, that is alongside the Maiandrus Valley, a strategic and rich region but mixed in terms of population. It is possible that they expected to collect more money because of the richness of the region. Yet especially the elements in local population in the region appear to have strongly resisted the Athenians⁴⁰.

It is also interesting that in 428/7 BC, although the name of Cherronesioi does not appear on the lists, the settlements there appear to have made their payments as a *syntelia* (οἶδε τὸν πολέον Χερρόνησίοις συντελέσ ὄσαι ὑπέδοσαν). The assessment under the system of *syntelies* was made for islands and peninsulas with more than one *polis*. Under this *syntely*, one can only read the names of the settlements of Amioi and Ler[.....]i (Lerymnioi) as paying in sequence of 37 *drachmai* 3 *oboloi* and 19 *drachmai* 2,5 *oboloi*. There might be other settlements (at least one more) which made joint contributions in this year, but their names seem to have been fragmented and disappeared in time. The island

³⁹ Thuc. III. 19. 1-2.

⁴⁰ Demir 2004, 88 *ff.*

of Syme, which started to make payments in 434/3 BC, might also have been one of these cities belonged to the Cherronesian syntely⁴¹. We do not know why the settlements which made their payments under the name of Cherronesioi all of a sudden preferred to make their joint contributions under separate names in 428/7 BC. It is possible that the Athenian officials which joined to Lysicles' campaign in the region might have especially preferred to write the names of contributors separately rather than under the common name of Cherronesioi. The Athenians must have tried to increase their revenues of tribute because of the expenses of war by this means.

As we have stated above, after the expedition of Melesandrus Athenians continued to collect tributes from the Carian settlements including Cnidus, though their number appears not to have been many⁴². This is clear from the fact that as compared to the other districts from where Athens collected tributes, the Carian settlements appearing in the lists were very few; especially the ones in the Carian hinterland stopped paying.

On the other hand in the list of 425/4 BC, among the total of more than one hundred Carian settlements, fifty one of them appears on the lists, which is a massive increase. In addition, Cnidus makes its regular payment in this year, but the amount of its payment could not be read. As shown in our list, among the settlements around Cnidus, Erines pays 1 talanton; Syme 3000 *drachmai* and Chioi Cares 2 tal.+?. When looked at in general, as for the year of 425/4 BC, the number of settlements paying tribute does not only sharply increase in Caria but also in other regions including the northern coasts of Black Sea and reaches four hundred settlements at the total. It is assumed that the Athenians deliberately made an ideal list of the cities, which would pay tributes, but practically she would not be able to collect money from all of these cities⁴³. This thesis has gained strength, since even in cases of the expeditions of both Melesandrus and Lysicles Athens had had certain difficulties in collecting money for the war efforts.

Although Athens continued to collect tribute from Caria after 425/4 BC, the number of Carian cities paying tribute is very few and constantly in decline. As a matter of fact, the tribute records are not clear concerning this period. Cnidus as well moves out of the lists after 425 BC. Despite this, it seems to have supported the Athenians as much as possible during the first phase of the Peloponnesian War, called as the Archidamian War (431-424 BC)⁴⁴.

After the peace settlement of 424 BC between Athens and Sparta, there does not appear to have been much information concerning the military activities from both sides in Caria and Lycia for a period of about 10 years. Afterwards Athens gave support to the revolts in these regions to some extent towards the end of the peace process. After the unsuccessful operation of Sicily in 415 BC, she had lost most of her revenues and fleet⁴⁵. The Allied settlements in Asia Minor wished to benefit from this situation. Meanwhile the Persians stepped up their efforts to impose taxes on the cities of Asia Minor⁴⁶. Many settlements in Caria and elsewhere (Euboians, Lesbians, Chians, Erythraeans and

⁴¹ Meritt *et al.* 1939, 562; Fraser – Bean 1954, 96.

⁴² In the Athenian Tribute Lists of 430/9 BC, the number of restored Carian cities was 15. In 429/8 BC, it decreased to 7, but once again rose up to 15 in 428/7 BC. In 426 BC, the number of tribute paying cities dropped to 12.

⁴³ Bury – Meiggs 1975, 239; Sealey 1976, 336.

⁴⁴ There is an inscription (*IG I³ 91*) on the Athenian *proxenoi* in Cnidus in 416/5 BC, which may reflect that the relations between Athens and Cnidus were good at this period.

⁴⁵ For the purposes of the Sicilian Expedition see Thuc. VI. 15; III. 86; VII. 83-87.

⁴⁶ Xen. *Hell.* III. 1. 3.

Milesians) including Cnidus along with its peninsula had decided to sever their ties with Athens just at the beginning of the Ionian War (413-404 BC)⁴⁷. In this regard, Thucydides states that

The same winter the Lacedaemonian Hippocrates sailed out from Peloponnese with ten Thurian ships under the command of Dorieus, son of Diagoras, and two colleagues, one Laconian and one Syracusan vessel, and arrived at Cnidus, which had already revolted at the instigation of Tissaphernes. [2] When their arrival was known at Miletus, orders came to them to leave half their squadron to guard Cnidus, and with the rest to cruise round Triopium and seize all the merchantmen arriving from Egypt. Triopium is a promontory of Cnidus and sacred to Apollo. [3] This coming to the knowledge of the Athenians, they sailed from Samos and captured the six ships on the watch at Triopium, the crews escaping out of them. After this the Athenians sailed into Cnidus and made an assault upon the town, which was unfortified, and all but took it; [4] and the next day assaulted it again, but with less effect, as the inhabitants had improved their defences during the night, and had been reinforced by the crews escaped from the ships at Triopium. The Athenians now withdrew, and after plundering the Cnidian territory sailed back to Samos⁴⁸.

As seen in the text, Cnidians had already revolted against Athens as a result of the instigation of the Persian satrap, Tissaphernes. Meanwhile the Peloponnesians, the allies of Persia against Athens, were re-invading and also supporting the privateering at the coasts of Caria and Lycia in order to prevent the trade ships to go to Piraeus and so to force Athens to surrender. As in the example of a privateer, Milesian Theopompus, after 412 BC Peloponnesians intended to use the coastal cities in Caria such as Cnidus and Caunus as bases for privateering⁴⁹. Especially Cnidus seems to have given support to the privateering activities of the Peloponnesians in 412 BC. In response to this, as shown in the above-mentioned text, Athens used the island of Samos as her base to prevent privateering and to continue to collect revenues (both as tributes and taxes) from the cities around Caria and Lycia as for exigencies. From there they attacked Cnidus, which did not have the city walls. The Athenians did not prolong their attack on the city center and they withdrew having plundered the Cnidian territory. Because of its easily accessible coastal region, Cnidus was one of the most pillaged *polis* of its time, at times by pirates.

As we have mentioned above, Cnidians were very aware of the fact that Dorians or Spartans had established it as a colony⁵⁰. For this reason the partisans for Sparta may have been influential in Cnidus. Cook states that Cnidians were living in hard conditions as their peninsula was rocky and with cliffs; and one of their livelihoods was piracy for which they used the nearby lands⁵¹. It is also possible that Triopium was a pirate base on the northern part of Cnidus from where the merchant

⁴⁷ The Ionian revolt began first in Chios, then in Erythraea and Clazomenae (Thuc. VIII. 14. 2); afterwards spread over the other cities: Miletus: Thuc. VIII. 17; Iasus: Thuc. VIII. 28, 36; Rhodes: Thuc. VIII. 44. 2; Diod. XIII. 75. 1; Caunus: Thuc. VIII. 39. 3-4; 41. 1; 42. 2; 57. 1; 108. Cnidians seems to have followed Iasians in their revolt.

⁴⁸ Thuc. VIII. 35. 1-4.

⁴⁹ Thuc. VIII. 35; 38; 39-43; 57; 60; 109; Diod. XIII. 38. 5; see also Cook 1961, 67 ff. For a Spartan named Hippocrates in Phaselis in 411 BC, also see Thuc. VIII. 99. 1. For the privateering activities around Rhodes during the IVth century BC, see McKechnie 1989, 127.

⁵⁰ This is the reason why they were loyal to Sparta in the late Vth century BC (Cook 1975, 791 ff; Lewis 1977, 97).

⁵¹ Cook 1961, 67.

ships passed after sailing from Egypt along the coasts of Lycia and Caria towards the Aegean Sea⁵². The merchant ships, mentioned above (Thuc. VIII. 35. 2) were possibly transporting corn to Athens, which was under the siege by Peloponnesians. Therefore it appears that Peloponnesians were actively interfering with the merchant ships transporting corn to Athens. For this aim they may have used Triopium as a base under the authorization of Cnidians.

Under these circumstances, Athens was going to rally her forces at the coasts of Caria and Lycia in order to protect the Athenian-bound trade, which seemed essential for the survival of Athens. Within this context, it is mentioned that there were Athenian warships, which spied on the movements of Spartan fleet at the coasts of Caria and Lycia in 412 BC. While the Spartan general Astyochus used Caunus and Cnidus as his naval base, the Athenian general Charminus was especially spying upon Samos as well as “[4] around Syme, Chalke, Rhodes and Lycia”⁵³. Then Charminus was on the attack against them with a part of his fleet consisted of 20 warships. At the beginning he succeeded to sink three ships of Astyochus and rendered some of them unoperational. However, when confronted with the main naval forces of Peloponnesians, he was surrounded and lost six ships. He had to take refuge in Halicarnassus. Upon these developments, the Peloponnesian fleet along with 27 ships in Caunus mustered at Cnidus⁵⁴. Having heard about this sea war, Athenians moved with all of their forces from their main base, Samos to the island of Syme. Despite this, they did not attack on the Peloponnesian navy in Cnidus. While returning they stopped by Loryma on the mainland and then again withdrew their forces to Samos⁵⁵. As seen clearly, in the course of all of these operations, Spartans used Cnidus as a naval base. So, as the city was important in terms of the network of commerce, finance and strategy, Spartans utilized the strategic position of this city very well against the interests of Athenians in the region.

Both Athens and Sparta carried on dispatching campaigns to Caria and Lycia after 412/11 BC. This situation testifies that they were interested in the merchant traffic going to Greece passing along the southwestern coast of Asia Minor and kept on collecting money from the region, although both sides did not get involved in full-scale conflicts. The most significant of these campaigns were the ones of Athenian general Alcibiades and that of the Spartan general Lysandrus. After having sailed from Samos to Caria in 407 BC, Alcibiades arrived at the Gulf of Ceramicus and returned from here back to Samos by collecting a great amount of money in a short time. In response to this, two years later, Lysandrus, having taken support from the Persian king’s son Cyrus, again sailed off to the Gulf of Ceramicus. Here he attacked the islet of Cedriai allied to Athens. In the second day of his attack he is said to have brutally captured this place and enslaved its people. In this island a mixed population of Hellenes and barbarians were living⁵⁶. He may also have used Cnidus as his naval base for the military operations there, as he possibly attacked the other cities in the region allied to Athens. It is possible

⁵² The Spartans could observe the Athenian fleet, sailing off the island of Chalke, from the Triopium shores (Thuc. VIII. 60. 3).

⁵³ Thuc. VIII. 41. 1-4. According to Thucydides, it has been suggested that these *triremes* were referred at the Xanthus burial monument and that Athens might have intervened in the civil war in Lycia at this time (Keen 1998, 143-4).

⁵⁴ Thuc. VIII. 42.

⁵⁵ Thuc. VIII. 43. 1.

⁵⁶ Lysandrus also took the city of Iasos, the ally of Athens. He slaughtered the men who reached the age of military service, enslaved the women and children and then destroyed the city (Diod. XIII. 104. 7).

that the aim of Lysandrus was to strike a major blow to the financial sources of Athens in the region. He seems to have achieved this and controlled the sea traffic in the region with the support of his allies in the region such as Cnidus. Having stopped the flow of this sea traffic at the coasts of Caria, he turned his face to the Hellespontine region through which Athenians were bringing their corn supply from the Black Sea. Lysandrus achieved to impose a heavy blow on the Athenian navy across the city of Lampsacus at Aigospotamoi in Hellespontine region⁵⁷. Having the routes of their corn supply cut off and their navy lost, Athens was forced to surrender to Spartans. Upon this, Cnidus and the cities around it first came under the full control of Spartans and then that of the Hecatomnids.

Conclusion

As the archaeological evidence is inconclusive, what we can infer from literary and epigraphical evidence is that Cnidus from the outset of its establishment was at the site of Tekir, along with its promontory called as Triopium. The city was convinced to surrender to the Persians in 546 BC after the unsuccessful project of a ditch to make the peninsula an island to be able to defend it easily, most possibly at the location called as Bencik. From this period onwards, it seems to have taken side with the Persians even during the period of Ionian revolt. After the establishment of Delian League in 478 BC, it probably came under the control of Athenians. Being defeated in Egypt in 454 BC, Athens stepped up her efforts to control the coastal cities of Caria and Lycia. Especially as a result of the Athenian expeditions of 453 BC, which was strengthened by those of Cimon in 451 BC, many of the cities in these regions were forced to pay tributes to Athens. Cnidus started to make payments in 452/1 and 451/0 BC at the amount of 300 *drachmai* and a higher amount in 450/9 BC as 500 *drachmai* like many of the other Carian settlements. As given in our list of settlements around Cnidus, similarly Cherronesioi started to make the same amount of payment in the same year. One can infer that Cherronesioi were as rich as Cnidus, as they paid the same amount of tribute. The possible reason may derive from the fact that Cherronesioi made their payments as a Caric syntely consisting of more than one settlement.

In 449/8 BC, none of the cities around Cnidus is included in the tribute panels as this is also the general picture for all of the cities in Carian district and elsewhere. This might result from the fact that Athens and Persia made the peace settlement of Callias in 449 BC. After this year Cnidus continues to make the same amount of payments in 448/7 and 447/6 BC at the amount of 500 *drachmai*. The reason for this consequent increase was probably that the Athenians required more financial sources in the years after Cimon's expeditions, especially for the exigencies of Athenian naval operations and the war efforts in Egypt.

Again in 446/5 BC, Cnidus does not make any payment and the number of Carian settlements around Cnidus drops to 2. These two cities are Aulitai Cares and Erines. Just like the other settlements, Cnidus stops its payments in 445/4 BC. A bad harvest season or the lack of harbour revenues might give rise to this. Cnidus restarts to make its payments again at the amount of 300 *drachmai* until the suppression of Samic revolt in 439/8 BC. Although the Samic revolt was suppressed in 439/8 BC, it is clear that the tendency of decrease in Carian settlements in the lists kept on. In accordance with this, Cnidus as well, starting from 439/8 BC, stopped its payments until 432/1 BC.

On the other hand, although Cnidus did not make any payment at the beginning of the war, it

⁵⁷ Xen. *Hell.* II. 1. 15-30. At Delphi the statues of those who fought with Lysander at Aigospotamoi in 405 BC included one of Theodamus of Cnidus (Paus. X. 9. 9).

continued to give support to Athens afterwards. Cnidus restarts to make payment two years after the war, in 428/7 BC and the next year in 427/6 BC, but it drops the amount of payment to 200 *drachmai*. The reason for this reduction might be due to the fact that Cnidians hosted the navy of Athenian general Lysicles during his operations in Caria in 428/7 BC. Amioi, which had not appeared on the lists so far, started to pay for the first time in this year at the amount of 37 *drachmai* 3 *oboloi*. This might also be a consequence of Lysicles' expedition. The decrease in its payment at the amount of 100 *drachmai* (from 300 *drachmai* to 200 *drachmai*) would testify this. Besides, in the so-called list of 425/4 BC, the number of Carian settlements paying tribute reaches the highest level and Cnidus is naturally included in this list, but the amount of its payment could not be read because of the fragmentation of inscription.

Although Athens continued to collect tribute from Caria after 425 BC, the number of settlements making payments kept on decreasing. There is no record belonging to Cnidus after this year onwards, which lead us to assume that Cnidus took side with the Spartans especially during the Ionian War. During this war, Cnidus played a significant role in privateering activities to prevent the Athenian-bound merchant ships carrying the basic necessities to Athens, which was under the siege by Spartans at the time. Therefore, as a Dorian colony and with the change of the balance of power in favour of both Spartans and Persians, Cnidus revolted against Athens in 412 BC along with some other cities in the region such as Iasus. Yet the Athenians seem to have succeeded in controlling this city for a short period of time in 411 BC. However, these were difficult years for Athens to control the settlements in Caria. Alcibiades appears to have made another expedition to the Gulf of Ceramicus in 407 BC. He is said to have collected a great amount of tribute from the settlements there and Cnidus might have been one of these cities. However, after the defeat of Athens in 404 BC at Aigospotamoi, Cnidus reassumed to collaborate with Spartans and Persians. Afterwards it came under the rule of the Hecatomnids during the IVth century BC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Sources and Abbreviations

- Ael. Herod. et Pseu. Herod. (= Aelius Herodianus et Pseudo-Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica*)
Aelius Herodianus et Pseudo-Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica*, Ed. A. Lentz, Grammatici Graeci, vol. 3/1 Leipzig 1867 (repr. Hildesheim 1965) 3-547.
- Aesch. *Pers.* (= Aeschylus, *Persae*)
Aeschylus. Trans. H. W. Smyth, vol. I Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1926 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Arist. *Hist. an.* (= Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*)
The History of Animals. Trans. D'Archy Wentworth Thompson. London 1907.
- Arist. *Pol.* (= Aristotle, *Politica*)
Politics. Trans. H. Rackham. London – New York 1967 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Arr. *anab.* (= Arrian, *Anabasis*)
Arrian. vols. I-II. Trans. P. A. Brunt. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1976-1983 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Diod. (= Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*)
Diodorus of Sicily. Trans. C. H. Oldfather, vols. I-VI; C. H. Sherman, vols. VII; C. B. Welles, vols. VIII; R. M. Geer, vols. IX-X; F. R. Walton, vols. XI-XII. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1933-2004 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Etym. Magnum* (= *Etymologicum magnum genuinum*)
Etymologicum magnum genuinum: Symeonis etymologicum: una cum magna grammatica: etymologicum magnum auctum. Trans. F. Lasserre – N. Livadaras. Roma 1976.
- FGrHist.* *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, vols. I-XV. Ed. F. Jacoby. Berlin – Leiden 1923-1958.
- Frontin. *Strat.* (= Sextus Iulius Frontinus, *Strategemata*)
Frontinus, *Strategemata*, with an English translation by Charles E. Bennet. Edited and prepared for the press by M. B. McElwain. London – New York, Loeb Edition 1980.
- Hdt. (= Herodotus, *Historiai*)
Herodotus. Trans. A. D. Godley. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1920 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Hesych. (= Hesychius Alexandrinus, *Lexicon*)
Hesychius, *Lexicon*. Translated by J. Alberti – W. C. M. Schmidt. Amsterdam 1965.
- Mela (= Pomponius Mela, *De Chorographia*)
Pomponius Mela's Description of the World. With an English translation by F. E. Romer. Ann Arbor 1998.
- Nep. *Paus.* (= Cornelius Nepos, *Pausanias*)
Cornelius Nepos, *On the Great Generals of Foreign Nations*. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. Cambridge – Massachusetts 1966 (The Loeb Classical Library)

- Oxyrh. Pap.* XIII *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XIII. Ed., Trans. and Notes B. P. Grenfell – A. S. Hunt. London 1919.
- Paus. (= Pausanias, *Description of Greece*)
Pausanian Description of Greece. Trans. W. H. Jones, vols. I-V. London – New York 1918-1935 (The Loeb Classical Library)
- Plin. *nat.* (= Pliny, *Natural History*)
Pliny, *Natural History*. Trans. H. R. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones – D. E. Eichholz, vols. I-X. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1938-1971 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Plut. (= Plutarch, *Parallel Lives*)
Cim. (= *Cimon*) *Per.* (= *Pericles*)
Plutarch's Lives, vols. I-XI. Trans. B. Perrin. London – New York 1959 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Plut. *mor.* (= Plutarch, *Moralia*)
Plutarch's Moralia. Trans. F. C. Babbitt- W. C. Helmbold I-XIV. London – New York 1928-1967 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Prop. (= Propertius, *Elegiae*)
Propertius, *Elegies I-IV*. Ed. L. Richardson, University of Oklahoma Press 1976.
- Schol. Theoc.* (= *Scholia in Theocritum*)
Scholia in Theocritum (*scholia vetera*), ed. K. Wendel, *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*. Leipzig – Teubner 1914.
- Scyl. (= Scylax, *Periplous-Scylacis*)
Pseudo-Scylax, *Seyrüsefer*. Çev. M. Arslan. *Libri* II (2016) 246-307.
- Steph. Byz. (= Stephanus Byzantius, *Ethnica*)
Stephani Byzantii, Ethnikon. Ed. A. Westermann. Lipsae 1839.
Stephani Byzantii Ethnica, volumen I: alpha-gamma. Ed. W. De Grueter. Berlin 2006.
- Strabo (= Strabo, *Geographica*)
The Geography of Strabo. Ed. H. L. Jones. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1924 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Thuc. (= Thucydides)
Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War*. Trans. J. M. Dent – E. P. Dutton. London – New York 1910.
A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, V vols., Oxford 1945-1981.
- Tib. (= Tibullus, *Elegiae*)
Catullus Tibullus and Pervigilium Veneris. Trans. J. P. Postgate. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1914 (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Xen. *Hell.* (= Xenophon, *Hellenica*)
Xenophon, *Hellenica* Trans. W. Miller, vols. I-VII. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London 1914.
Ksenophon, *Hellenika* (Yunan Tarihi). Çev.: S. Sinanoğlu. Ankara 1999.
- Zeno of Rhodes (= Zeno, *Fragmenta*= *Fragmanlar*)
Fragmenta, ed. K. Müller, FHG 3. Paris (1841-1870) 175-182.

Modern Literature and Abbreviations

- Arslan 2008 M. Arslan "Eurymedon Muharebesi'nden Sonra Aspendos ve Genel Olarak Pamphylia'nın Durumuna Bir Bakış". *Adalya* XI (2008) 49 - 62.
- Bean – Cook 1952 G. E. Bean – J. M. Cook, "The Cnidia". *ABSA* 47 (1952) 171-213.
- Bresson 1999 A. Bresson, "Cnide a l'époque classique: la cité et ses villes". *Revue des Études Anciennes* 101 (1999) 83-114.
- Bryce 1986 T. R. Bryce, *The Lycians I, The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*. Copenhagen 1986.
- Bury – Meiggs 1975 J. B. Bury – R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*. London 1975.
- Cook 1904 A. B. Cook, "Zeus, Jupiter and the Oak. (Continued)" *Classical Review* 18/1 (1904) 75-89.
- Cook 1961 J. M. Cook, "Cnidian Peraea and Spartan Coins". *JHS* 81 (1961) 56-72.
- Cook 1975 J. M. Cook, "Greek Settlements in the Eastern Aegean and Asia Minor". *CAH* 3 (1975) 773-804.
- Demand 1989 N. Demand, "Did Knidos Really Move? The Literary and Epigraphical Evidence". *Classical Antiquity* 8/2 (1989) 224-237.
- Demir 2004 M. Demir, "Peloponnesos Savaşı (İ.Ö. 431-404) Sırasında Karia ve Likya'ya Yönelik Atina Seferlerinin Amaçları: Yeni Bir Gözden Geçirme". *Adalya* VII (2004) 69-100.
- Demir 2005 M. Demir, "Antik Dönem Atina Toplumunda Karyalı Köleler". *Olba* XI (2005) 25-48.
- Doksanaltı 2007 E. M. Doksanaltı, "Knidos-Kap Krio Yerleşim Alanı". *İdol: Arkeologlar Derneği Dergisi* 33 (2007) 8-17.
- Figueira 1998 T. J. Figueira, *Power of Money: Coinage and Politics in Athenian Empire*. Pennsylvania 1998.
- Flensted – Jensen 2004 P. Flensted – Jensen, "Karia". Eds. M. H. Hansen – T. H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford (2004) 1108-1137.
- Fraser – Bean 1954 P. M. Fraser – G. E. Bean, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands*. Oxford 1954.
- Hadji – Kontes 2005 A. Hadji – Z. Kontes, "The Athenian Coinage Decree: Inscriptions, Coins and Athenian Politics". *Actas del XIII Congreso Internacional de Numismática* 1. Madrid (2005) 263-7.
- Hornblower 1982 S. Hornblower, *Mausolos*. Oxford 1982.
- How – Wells 1912 W. W. How – J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Oxford 1912.
- IG (= *Inscriptiones Graecae*)
Inscriptiones Graecae (IG). Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Borussicae ed. maior: I-IV., VII., IX., XI., XII., XIV. Berlin 1873-1939.
- Keen 1993 A. G. Keen, "Athenian Campaigns in Karia and Lykia During the Peloponnesian War". *JHS* 113 (1993) 153-7.
- Keen 1998 A. G. Keen, *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with the Foreign Powers C.545-362 B.C.*. Brill 1998.
- Kent 1937 R. G. Kent, "The Daiva-Inscription of Xerxes". *Language* 13/4 (1937) 292-305.
- Lewis 1977 D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia*. Leiden 1977.
- Love 1978 I. C. Love, "A Brief Summary of Excavations at Knidos 1967-1973". Ed. E.

- Akurgal, *The Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology II*. Ankara – İzmir 23-30 Eylül 1973. Ankara (1978) 1111-1133.
- McKechnie 1989 P. McKechnie, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC*. London – New York 1989.
- Meiggs 1963 R. Meiggs, “The Crisis of Athenian Imperialism”. *HSCP* 67 (1963) 1-36.
- Meiggs 1972 R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford 1972.
- Meritt 1975 B. D. Meritt, “Perikles, the Athenian Mint, and the Hephaisteion”. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*. 119/4 (1975) 267-274.
- Meritt *et al.* 1939 B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade Gery – M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. vol. I. Cambridge, Mass 1939.
- Meritt *et al.* 1950 B. D. Meritt, H.T. Wade Gery – M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, Vol. III. Princeton 1950.
- Robinson 1997 E. W. Robinson, *The First Democracies: Early Popular Government Outside Athens*. Stuttgart 1997.
- Sealey 1976 R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City States, 700-338 B.C.*. Berkeley 1976.
- Stronk 2010 J. P. Stronk, *Ctesias' Persian History*. Düsseldorf 2010.
- Tafrahi 1913 O. Tafrahi, *Topographie De Thessalonique*. Paris 1913.