N.B. ~ this is the typescript for the chapter, repaginated to reflect the published version. Works cited in this chapter are included at the end of this typescript; those page numbers (138 ff.) do not reflect the original.

Matt Waters and John Lee used a wide variety of sources to reconsider particular periods of revolt or rebellion in the Achaemenid Empire that have hitherto been examined with a less subtle or inclusive lens. Their contributions to the conference, "In the Crucible of Empire," raised a series of significant questions about the use of evidence as well as the specific rebellions themselves.

Waters took the daring approach of considering Athens herself a rebel against her Persian imperial obligations, and offered a deeper understanding of the events that unfolded in the late sixth and early fifth centuries BCE by contextualizing them within Near Eastern history. The framework of universal empire — and expansionist empire — lets us see the Greek city-state of Athens from a Persian perspective. It was a vassal state soon-to-be-incorporated into the empire, as well as one currently offering tribute and seeking alliances on what would have to be Persian terms. As Waters says, "From 507, Athens became considered part of the broad earth ruled, as appropriate, by the Achaemenid king." The participation of Athens in the revolt of the Ionian city-states of Asia Minor in 499 was therefore, from an Achaemenid perspective, not just Athens helping her Ionian sister-cities, but the active revolt of a subject bound by specific rules and treaties. This was of particular significance because of the very long-standing tradition in Mesopotamia and Iran of universal empires, all-powerful kings, and long-established treaty phrasings and obligations.

This paper raised an essential conceptual point having to do with imperial boundaries and control. Revolts, rebellion, and resistance happen when people do not wish to be subject to a particular kind of control. How significant, or of what type, need that control be for actions to be considered rebellion? Waters' paper ultimately called into question the notion of a crucible of empire. A crucible provides a distinct hot spot with a clear boundary to it, even if sometimes the contents might boil over. Empires do not always work that way. An empire does not always have a clear and distinct boundary, within which it exerts pressure and control and outside of which it does not.

Thus Waters' paper did multiple things. It demonstrated the importance of understanding an empire's ideological and historical background. In this

case, the Persians were drawing on very longstanding traditions in the Near East, couching and framing their actions and ideologies within those frameworks. The fact we are reliant upon a few Greek men writing narrative histories for their fellow citizens to learn about interactions between Athenians and the Achaemenid Empire may make it harder for us to reconstruct imperial Achaemenid history, but it does not reduce the fundamental significance of Waters' point — indeed on the contrary.

Waters also made clear the basis for an Achaemenid understanding of the reach of Achaemenid imperial powers. That reach did not stop at a particular geographic point, akin to the wall of a crucible. It was a porous, expansionist, and omnipotent reach. The activities of a small and rabble-rousing tributary city-state that would certainly soon be absorbed into the empire might constitute a revolt, even as might the activities of already-absorbed Greek city-states in Asia Minor.

The question is thus: how important is a perceived boundary? Should we be thinking about drawing lines on the ground or on a map, when a sociopolitical border is essentially permeable? Whose definition of the extent of an empire matters most, and when?

Lee's paper delved into the historiography of Achaemenid studies, considering the revolt of Cyrus the Younger against his brother, King Artaxerxes II, not from a traditional perspective but by mining the historical sources to consider fundamental issues of imperial stability in the face of civil war and revolt. The questions of terminology he raised are important. When is a revolt a rebellion? When is it civil war? His succinct conclusion: participants in a revolt wish to break free from a power; a civil war aims to seize that power for a new ruler, not create a different government.

Lee also explored the significant question of why there were so many rebellions against the ruling king in the Achaemenid Empire in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. Here his emphasis on kinship was one with real importance for understanding rebellions in empires more generally. Is it a good idea for an empire to be governed through extensive family networks? Or does keeping power in the hands of the family and those closely related to them by marriage inspire desire for more power in those who feel they have an equal claim to the throne?

The role played by trained, experienced military troops in the eventual success of rebellion was also significant, as Lee demonstrated; and his emphasis on the presence in Achaemenid Persia of foreign mercenary troops is perhaps particularly important. How does it affect the frequency and success of revolt, when allegiance can readily be bought rather than needing to be fostered through generations? And, significantly, who are the other elite or powerful

people who join the instigator of a revolt — why do they participate and how much does their collaboration matter? Or when, and how, do they play both sides?

These papers were characterized by the investigation of an enormous variety of sources to understand the circumstances and results of two specific interactions. They offered new insights into ways we should use evidence, raised essential questions to consider as we move forward, and indeed both recast and re-established our understanding of the revolts they consider.

My small contribution to this discussion of dissent in Achaemenid Persia offers an additional kind of evidence to add to our melting pot of understanding. Archaeological evidence notoriously does not fit well with the kinds of political or military events described in literary sources. But material culture can provide telling examples of resistance to empire, particularly of resistance by non-elites or by other kinds of people who do not usually figure in historical accounts.

Although the Achaemenid elite of Anatolia tend to look and, apparently, act like the rest of the polyethnic elite across the empire, the picture of participation in or resistance to the imperial project is rather complex. The archaeological evidence suggests certain kinds of local resistance to behaving TOO "Persian" and shows continuity in behavioral patterns that are rooted in distinctly local traditions and ideas. The ceramic assemblages used by non-elites

Fig. 1: Achaemenid Empire, courtesy Karl Mueller. © Elspeth R. M. Dusinberre.

in daily life, for instance, show the continuation of local shapes and forms along with the introduction of imperially charged ones (Dusinberre, 2013: Chs. 2, 4). Intentionality can be difficult to detect archaeologically, but James Scott long ago opened ways to approach the issue that can and should be brought more fully to bear on the material record (Scott, 1987, 1992; for archaeological approaches to the study of hegemony see, e.g., Khatchadourian, 2013). The brief discussion presented here raises two distinct questions: one to do with determining resistance at or across the edges of an empire and one to do with tracking it within an empire's sociopolitical boundaries.

Can we use archaeological evidence to consider the question of resistance around or across porous imperial boundaries? The difficulty in determining the location and significance of imperial boundaries, and in determining resistance to empire in those porous borderlands and beyond, is complicated. Archaeological evidence, if anything, makes the difficulty yet more complicated. It may be relatively easy — and exceptionally illuminating — to determine the *presence* of imperial imports in areas somewhat or not at all controlled by an empire, to track their increase or decrease, to ascertain their social status or significance, and to document local imitations or adaptations of elite imperially charged items (for the phenomenon in relation to Achaemenid Persia see, e.g., Miller, 1997; Knauß, 2006; Babaev, Gagoshidze, and Knauß, 2007; Ristvet, Gopnik, et al, 2012; Khatchadourian, 2007, 2008a, 2008b, 2014; Dan, 2014). It can be tremendously challenging to understand the *meaning* of such things.

In areas where we have no textual documentation, determining the conscious will of those making or using items we might consider particularly semiotically significant can be difficult. Thus, for instance, the presence of stone column bases crafted in a style recognizably Achaemenid and used in hypostyle halls that apparently were used for public or political gatherings may indicate a degree of understanding and emulation of Achaemenid imperial practice, even in areas well beyond what we are accustomed to thinking of as being under direct Achaemenid hegemony. But although such a find has usually been heralded as emulation or participation in hegemonic signaling and behavior, such behavior or desire may extend only to part of a society.

Elites living by the fringe of an empire may enthusiastically adopt and adapt aspects of imperial elite expression. But they may use artifacts in a manner other than that for which they were intended within imperial constructs. Sometimes this may result from misunderstanding, sometimes from locally-determined practical concerns — and sometimes perhaps indeed it might demonstrate conscious resistance to an imperial idea (for power-structures used in a manner different than their original patterns, see, e.g., Woolf, 1998). Historically speaking, we tend to see elite concerns more frequently in textual evidence than the concerns of the non-elite. Until recently the same could be said of archaeological practice, which often in Achaemenid archaeology has focused

on high-status elite artifacts and behaviors. But this picture is now changing, and that raises still more complicated questions.

If we see elite practices and expressions that adapt Achaemenid elite or imperial expressions, combined with continued local traditions and no apparent shift in non-elite behavior or expression, does that constitute resistance? Resistance on the part of non-elites alone, or of a society more generally? And resistance against what aspects of the empire in question? This is an area ripe for detailed study. At its heart lies the need to determine the intentions of the people living in these areas, creating the artifacts and using them with what was no doubt a mixture of behaviors. What makes this challenging is that the archaeology of intentionality is a very difficult subject: it is often hard to tell what the intentions underlying people's behaviors were, based on the archaeological record.

The subject becomes even more difficult when we move to the porous border areas of an empire, or to the areas outside direct imperial hegemony. Overt or increased adherence to local traditions in situations where we also see obvious imports and local imitations of imperial objects might well let us consider local resistance to imperial domination — or at least local agency in appropriating or rejecting particular imperially charged behaviors and expressions. This is a rich area for future research that should particularly illuminate the actions and desires of precisely those people who do not usually figure in historical accounts.

The picture is rather less murky when we consider areas we know to have been encompassed within imperial bounds. The mortuary remains of Achaemenid Anatolia provide clear evidence for geographically based, apparently ethnic, identification with local traditions that predate the Achaemenid Empire. In the past, I have looked at this mortuary evidence to support notions of active elite participation in the imperial endeavor (e.g., Dusinberre, 2003, 2013), so it feels a little odd for me to re-couch it in these terms. But it is true that the evidence may at the same time suggest resistance to imperial domination: the scenario of human action and desire is a richly complex one, for hegemony and resistance weave together in variegated ways.

The mortuary assemblages of the elite — those artifacts buried with the dead — demonstrate wholesale adoption of an imperial idea in Achaemenid Anatolia; they show widescale participation in the imperial endeavor and enactment of imperial ideology. They display an almost astonishing conformity in visible, semiotically charged material (see also Dusinberre, 2013). The elite seemed much more concerned with demonstrating their social status than, for instance, their ethnicity. Thus they were buried with jewelry that looked alike, no matter how far apart they lived. Their garments were tricked out with gold

foil clothing appliqués that drew on imperial iconography. Banqueting vessels abounded, in both clay and precious metals, and the mortuary assemblages of the elite contained vessels of the same shapes, apparently used for the same purposes. Even horse trappings signaled prestige. And the sealstones with which the elite were buried drew on a focused iconography of imperial power.

Such display of status through wealth expenditure is common in human societies, and its uniformity of expression in Achaemenid Anatolia is significant. It demonstrates the cohesion of those displaying their membership in the authority-laden Achaemenid elite. Those of high status and authority in the Achaemenid empire were not strictly Persian in ethnicity. Indeed, it is difficult to ascertain the ethnicity of a given elite person based on mortuary inclusions (Dusinberre, 2013; Stein, 2014). "Being elite" seems to have mattered more to people to signal in their dress, dining, and funerary assemblages than "being Carian" or "being Phrygian" or "being Lycian." Unlike the mortuary inclusions of the elite, however, their mortuary structures add nuance and complexity to identity signaling. They give us a glimpse of possible resistance to imperial domination, couched in regional and ethnic behaviors.

The types of tomb structures we see in Anatolia vary significantly by region and very often refer to earlier, local, non-Persian forms. The visible markers of the dead tend to link the elite to local tradition rather than Achaemenid authority. Although mortuary structures may incorporate the visual ideology of the Achaemenid empire in their expression, through relief sculpture or other means, sometimes they emphatically do not. They demonstrate instead an adherence to specifically and overtly non-Persian ideas. Such blatant displays of cultural mixing on the part of the elite need not necessarily demonstrate elite-supported local resistance to imperial domination. But they do show the melting pot of ideas and expressions enabled by intercultural interaction, and the startlingly diverse forms that could emerge within this charged imperial context. The following discussion highlights just a few of the contexts of Achaemenid Anatolia where mortuary structures and behaviors seem to demonstrate active, conscious, intentional resistance to imperial authority.

Across Anatolia, mortuary treatment is tremendously variable. Some people are buried in rock-cut tombs carved into cliff faces (e.g., Butler, 1922; Greenewalt, 1972; Roos, 1972, 1985, 1989, 2006; McLauchlin, 1985; Ratté, 1989; Tarhan and Sevin, 1994; Tarhan, 1994, 2007; Dusinberre, 2003, 2013; Baughan, 2004; Dönmez 2007; Roosevelt, 2009; Johnson, 2010). Others are in simple unmarked cists (e.g., Moorey, 1980; Baughan, 2004; Tal, 2005; Tarhan, 2007; Dusinberre, 2013; Stein, 2014). Still others are interred in chambers or sarcophagi heaped over with tumuli (e.g., Young, 1951; Mellink, 1971, 1972, 1973,

Fig. 2: Achaemenid Anatolia, courtesy Karl Mueller. © Elspeth R. M. Dusinberre.

1974, 1975, 1978, 1979; Kohler, 1980; McLauchlin, 1985; Özsait and Özsait, 1990, 2007; Akbıyıkoğlu, 1991, 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 1996; Özgen and Öztürk, 1996; Kökten-Ersoy, 1998; Mellink, Bridges, and di Vignale, 1998; Roosevelt, 2006, 2008, 2009; Sevinç, Rose, et al., 2007; Summerer, 2007a, 2007b, 2010; Stinson, 2008; Özgen, 2010; Dusinberre, 2013). Some have elaborate grave stelae or other markers (e.g., Kahle and Sommer, 1927; Donner and Röllig, 1966-1969; Kurtz and Boardman, 1971; Comstock and Vermeule, 1976; Pfuhl and Möbius, 1977; Hanfmann and Ramage, 1978; Gusmani, 1986; Waelkens, 1986; von Graeve, 1989; Dusinberre, 1997, 2003, 2013; Roosevelt, 2006; Baughan, 2010). Some are entombed in temple-shaped mausolea or other distinctive structures built up above the ground (e.g., Akurgal, 1941; Tritsch, 1942; Hanfmann, 1974; Zahle, 1975, 1983; Borchhardt and Schiele, 1976; Waywell, 1978; Boschung, 1979; Childs, 1979; Hanfmann and Erhart, 1981; Jeppesen et al., 1981-2003; Jacobs, 1987; Borchhardt, 1999; Carstens, 2002; Marksteiner, 2002; Özhanlı, 2002; Rhodes and Osborne, 2003; Rudolph, 2003; Dusinberre, 2003, 2013; Froning, 2004; Gygax and Tietz, 2006; Jenkins, 2006; Draycott, 2007a, 2007b; Şare, 2013). Certain forms follow local traditions, while others demonstrate radical new departures. Indeed, the local variability suggests that mortuary structures might serve as a way for different people living in Anatolia to claim particular identities drawing on a very wide array of options. The fact that they often seem to cluster by type in particular regions may suggest they represent specifically local assertions of identity in ways that might demonstrate resistance to an externally imposed imperial Persian authority. I select a few examples as case studies to discuss here.

The tumulus tombs of Sardis in Lydia are well-known. The three largest of those in the great cemetery of Bin Tepe across the valley from Sardis date to the pre-Achaemenid Lydian Kingdom. In the Achaemenid period and probably in the Hellenistic, use of the tumulus cemetery at Bin Tepe increased dramatically, so that roughly 150 new smaller burial tumuli were constructed (Dusinberre, 2003). The explosion of tumulus tombs at Bin Tepe seems to be linked to a specific geographically-linked statement of social identity and social status, regardless of the ethnic origin of the person interred. It is paralleled by an explosion in the construction of small tumuli all over western Anatolia during the Achaemenid period, particularly in Lydia and Hellespontine Phrygia. Interestingly, the elite people who were buried under tumuli wore garments and behaved in ways that linked them to the Achaemenid elite across Anatolia and indeed the empire at large. But their mortuary structures may make a different claim.

Tumuli are not limited to western Anatolia in the Achaemenid period, but they are exceptionally common there — even as their use seems to end in highland Phrygia itself, at least at Gordion, by the last quarter of the sixth century (Kohler and Dusinberre, forthcoming). Their proliferation in a particular geographic area suggests a geographical association in the minds of those creating them. It is surely not coincidence that the tumuli at Sardis cluster around the knees of the great Lydian tumuli, including the enormous sepulchre of Alyattes, described by Herodotus (I.93) as the only human-made thing worth seeing in the entire land of Lydia. Other tumuli, built on ridges or outcrops,

Fig. 3: Tumuli at Bin Tepe. Photo author.

take advantage of the natural terrain to increase their visibility and apparent size. They become an overt visual statement of connection to a specific local pre-Persian past, with non-Persian associations and histories. This need not be an indication of resistance to imperial authority, but it may well be. It certainly adds nuance and layering to our understanding of identity and action within the (porous) imperial boundaries.

Inscribed grave stelae provide another example of possible resistance to imperial domination. A number of Achaemenid-period grave stelae were inscribed, in Lydian, Lycian, Phrygian, Greek, Aramaic, or bilingual (usually the local language together with Aramaic or sometimes Greek). If names of multiple generations in a single family are given, they do not necessarily adhere to a single ethnic or linguistic type. In this way the use of language in mortuary inscriptions emphasizes a rich iteration of intertwined ethnic heritages and social identities, a point that is made very clearly also in such non-mortuary evidence as the famous Sacrilege Inscription from Ephesus (Ephesus 1631, dating ca. 334-281) (Knibbe, 1961-1963; Robert, 1967; Hanfmann, 1987; Dusinberre, 2003, 2013).

What is particularly interesting is that in Lydia almost all of the funerary inscriptions are written in Lydian, and all the names they give are ethnically Lydian (Benveniste, 1965; Gusmani, 1985; Hanfmann, 1987; Dusinberre, 2003). These inscriptions are associated with rock-cut tombs and generally follow the same formula: "This is the [grave chamber, stele, etc.] of X, son of Y. If anybody damages [it, them], may [one or more gods] punish/destroy him." The gods named are local gods (especially Qldãns and Artemis of Ephesus — who had a sanctuary at Sardis — and of Koloe, a site on the Gygaean lake next to Bin Tepe). These stelae, continuing almost unchanged a linguistic formula developed in the pre-Persian Lydian period, adamant in their continued use of Lydian language and Lydian names, demonstrate a strikingly strong adherence to local tradition and a pre-Persian past. In their employment of a reusable past, they certainly show resistance to Persian notions of funerary practice, naming, and worship. This clear indication of Lydian continuity demonstrates the multiple strands of participation in or resistance to the imperial endeavor and imperial behavior. With this striking and incontrovertible form of resistance shown in funerary inscriptions, the likelihood that the tumuli of western Anatolia similarly shared something of a conscious connection to local, intentionally non-Persian, ideas and values increases.

A more straightforward story of identity is told by the Clazomenian sarcophagi, found at Clazomenae, Smyrna, Teos, Lebedus, and the eastern side of the Erythraea, with additional examples from "Larisa" and Pitane (Rumpf, 1933; Johansen, 1935, 1942; Åkerström, 1966; Cook, 1981; Tallon, 1992; Dusinberre,

2013). They were made with a flat foot so that they might stand upright as well as be laid flat, and many of them were painted around their rims with motifs ranging from simple wavy lines to elaborate scenes of animals and humans. They range in date from ca. 550 to sometime after 450; most of them date between 530 and 470 (ca. 50 between 530 and 500, over 70 between 500 and 470). These sarcophagi of Ionia while it was part of the Achaemenid empire show a mix of Greek and Near Eastern ornamental ideas. The visual language of masculine power is paramount on the sarcophagi, with their repeated themes of animal combat, divine control, and battle. The concepts of masculinity and power shown here connect the men of Ionia to the men of the rest of Anatolia; theirs is a message of authority embedded in horses and fighting. The sense of community through banqueting that is so prevalent in elite funerary art of the rest of Achaemenid Anatolia, however, is not portrayed on the sarcophagi. Their social signalling is emphatically Greek in style and iconography. These are not people who identify with their Persian conquerors, who eat the lotus blossom of harmonious participation in empire. They resist the very notion.

Some of the most complex tombs of Achaemenid Anatolia are found in Lycia and Caria. Lycia's famous pillar tombs are notoriously difficult to date, but at this point it seems likely that the earliest of them, at Isında, was built ca. 550 and thus predates the Persian conquest (Özhanlı, 2002; see also Marksteiner, 2002; Rudolph, 2003; Draycott, 2007b; Dusinberre, 2013; for the Lion Tomb at Xanthus (ca. 550-330), see, e.g., Pryce, 1928; Demargne, 1958; Rudolph, 2003). If this is true, it means that this striking and unusual tomb form is explicitly pre-Achaemenid Lycian in type. The pillar tombs consisted of a square limestone box perched atop a tall pillar, sometimes decorated with relief sculptures. The body was placed inside the upper chamber through a small opening on the side. The pillar on which the tomb rested might be inscribed or left plain; it is not clear if any of them were painted in antiquity. At least thirty-three pillar tombs are known, and there may be as many as forty-three: they range in date from the mid-sixth to the mid-fourth century and were probably made for local elites, most likely erected during the owner's lifetime (Keen, 1992). Their proliferation during the Achaemenid period may bear much the same meaning as the tumuli of Lydia, with explicit reference to a local, overtly non-Persian custom.

Two of the pillar tombs of Xanthus are particularly well known and may serve as case studies of the phenomenon. The Harpy Tomb was erected in Xanthus around 480 (Tritsch, 1942; Demargne, 1958; Berger, 1970; Zahle, 1975; Boschung, 1979; Jacobs, 1987; Keen, 1992, 1998; Borchhardt, 2000; Rudolph, 2003; Froning, 2004; Benda-Weber, 2005Jenkins, 2006; Draycott, 2007b; Thonemann, 2009; Dusinberre, 2013). Above the doorway on the west side is

Fig. 4: Reconstructed pillar tomb at Xanthus. Courtesy Peter Sommer Travel.

a cow suckling her calf, a strongly Assyrianizing image. The four sides all show scenes of seated figures receiving gifts from standing figures; that on the east side is arranged like the famous audience scene at Persepolis. The close resemblance to Persepolis provides an obvious reference to Persian kingly might, and it may be that the Assyrian cow and calf held similar meaning for a Lycian viewer. At the same time, a Greek-style warrior with helmet and panoply draws on a different tradition to demonstrate prowess and power. And the form is a clear citation of a specifically Lycian identity. The person who commissioned this mortuary sculpture took full advantage of multiple cultural options to construct and express his identity. And the expression is specifically Lycian. Is this resistance to imperial authority? It is certainly a nuanced proclamation of what it means to be elite at Achaemenid-period Xanthus in the aftermath of imperial skirmishes with European Greece.

The Inscribed Pillar at Xanthus belonged to what was once perhaps the most elaborate example of the Lycian pillar tomb (Childs, 1979; Gygax and Tietz, 2005; Draycott, 2007b). The battle reliefs that adorned its tomb chamber are now on display in London and Istanbul, while the tomb receives its name from the long trilingual inscription that marked its pillar. It probably dates around 400 and is widely considered to have been the funerary marker of a dynastic satrap. The inscription, in Lycian and Milyan with a twelve-line epigram in

Greek, is a historical narrative detailing various exploits of the Lycian ruler. The words of the Greek epigram reflect the military scenes shown also in the reliefs that once accompanied it (Jenkins, 2006):

"Since the time when the ocean separated Europe from Asia, no Lycian has ever yet raised such a stele to the Twelve Gods in the holy temenos of the agora, this immortal monument to his victories in war. It was Kheriga, the son of Harpagos, having excelled in all respects the youth of his day in his prowess at wrestling, who conquered many acropoleis with (the support of) Athene, sacker of cities, and distributed part of his kingdom amongst his kin. In recognition of this, the immortal (gods) made him just recompense. He killed seven Arkadian hoplites in a single day, he who of all mankind set up the most numerous trophies to Zeus and garlanded by his illustrious exploits the family of Karika."

This inscription takes the power statements of Achaemenid imperial authority and translates them into a Lycian context in interesting ways. The fact that it is trilingual, including local and other languages, recalls the Achaemenid imperial inscriptions of Persepolis, Susa, and Behistun. Darius's monument at Behistun, like this one, includes a visual representation of the verbal relation of events. The historical narrative of the Inscribed Pillar resonates with the Assyrian literary tradition of war annals. It claims a particularly close relationship with the gods, in terms of both the favor they showed the ruler and the honor the ruler showed them. It reflects the Persian royal inscriptions in asserting the excellence of the ruler in pursuits considered appropriate for young men. It even reflects Darius's inscription on the terrace at Persepolis in claiming this to be the first time someone has set up such a monument in this spot. But it is written in Greek and two local languages. It adopts and adapts a Persian notion but alters it to contextualize it within its specifically Lycian context. It may even demonstrate resistance in the form of one-upmanship, an iteration of power that sees the Achaemenid royal rhetoric and raises it one.

The notion of the temple tomb probably originated in Sardis, but its most famous expressions are in Lycia and Caria. One of the best-known Lycian tombs is the Nereid Monument, a temple tomb that dates perhaps 390-380 (Coupel an dDemargne, 1969; Cook, 1976; Demargne, 1976, 1979, 1989; Roos, 1989; Robinson, 1995; Rhodes and Osborne, 2003). It is thought to have been the tomb of the Lycian ruler Erbbina, who reunited eastern and western Lycia after a schism. Erbbina chose to have his tomb look like an Ionic Greek temple, a statement of grandeur and exalted self-image. Typical manly pursuits such as the mounted battle and mounted hunt shown in its sculptures connect him

Fig. 5: Inscribed Pillar. Courtesy Peter Sommer Travel.

to the Achaemenid elite elsewhere, even as the style of the images and the shape of the monument connect him to Greece. Particularly important, perhaps, is the relief showing an audience scene under a parasol, an image that links Erbbina as directly to portrayals of the Persian king as the tomb's form links him to Greek divinities. Indeed, the seated figure is shown wearing Persian military dress, while the suppliants appearing before him wear Greek garb, a reference specifically to the reliefs at Persepolis. The scene on the Nereid Monument demonstrates the reunification of Lycia as a province under the hegemony of its western elite. But it is rendered in a very Greek style. The bravado of the Inscribed Pillar is mirrored here but in the form of a temple tomb, its owner as self-aggrandizing as that of the other monument. Domination by another authority is certainly not signalled in these mortuary structures; the very idea would meet with resistance.

The Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the most famous of Achaemenid Anatolia's tombs, perhaps combines the statements made by the Nereid Monument and the Inscribed Pillar (Dusinberre, 2013). One of the seven wonders of the ancient world according to Antipater of Sidon, it was a vast temple tomb with freestanding sculptures atop an enormous pedestal, perhaps a stepped pillar with sculpted reliefs (Waywell, 1978). It was built between 353 and 350 for the ruling couple, Mausolus and Artemisia II, who were siblings as well as spouses. The building was said to have been built by Greek architects, Satyrus and Pythius, and the reliefs to have been carved by the four greatest Greek sculptors of the age, Leochares, Bryaxis, Scopas of Paros, and Timotheus, each of whom was responsible for one side of the pedestal. It represents the apogee of the Achaemenid Anatolian temple tomb and of the pillar tomb (Jeppesen et al., 1981-2004). As I have described elsewhere, and as Anne Marie Carstens has so eloquently demonstrated, here was a dynast who would be king – who fashioned himself on the model of the Great King, couched in the complex intercultural visual idiom of western Anatolia (Dusinberre, 2013). This form of portrayal, the degree of status declared, even though it drew on Persian notions to make the statement, were so extreme as to constitute resistance to the notion of a single king. Not an overt rebellion, the actions of Mausolus were nonetheless a flagrant form of resistance to imperial domination.

These monuments put in a different perspective the monument at Limyra constructed by the Lycian dynast Perikle around 360. Limyra is not far from the Eurymedon River, where the Athenian navy had delivered the Persians a significant defeat a century before. This tomb (like the name of its owner) made use of decorative schemes that very consciously drew on specific Persian adversaries for its inspiration — in this case, Athens (Şare, 2013). The heroon's sculpted program included cella friezes, caryatids, and acroteria; the sculptures

Fig. 6: The Heroon at Limyra, Model. Courtesy Franz Hnizdo.

reflect aspects of Persian iconography and overt association with the buildings of the Athenian acropolis, conveyed in a flagrantly and overtly Greek style like the great temple tombs of western Lycia and Caria. They emphasize Perikle's announcement of his status as the first military king of Lycia, one who ruled independently of both Persian and Greek authorities. His sculptures suggest he made use of mercenaries like the Persian king (drawing on wealth implied to be commensurate with the Persian king's), that his significance paralleled

that of the first king of Athens, Cecrops, and that he ruled by divine right. As Tuna Şare suggests, "the purpose behind the programme and the outcome are uniquely western Anatolian" (Şare, 2013). This tomb, in drawing on Persian, Greek, and Lycian expressions, trumpets its owner's resistance to imperial domination, to domination by the dynasts of western Lycia, and to Greek domination as well. It is interesting that Perikle is the last known dynast of Lycia: it is thought that his participation in one of the uprisings sometimes lumped together as the "satraps' revolt" contributed to the end of Lycian semi-autonomy and the increase of Achaemenid imperial control over this part of the empire (Borchhardt, 1976; Seyer, 2007).

I would like therefore to end with a few questions that outline possible areas for further consideration. How could we incorporate material evidence more fully into our historical discussions to increase our understanding of long-term low-level resistance to imperial endeavor, as well as the more spectacular and often transient revolts, rebellions, and civil wars detailed in textual sources? When can we determine intention in the behaviors represented in the archaeological record? And what are the various kinds of resistance this archaeological approach can distinguish? If we can find ways to answer these questions, our understanding not only of low-level resistance but also of the long paths leading to active revolt or rebellion will burgeon.

Works Cited

Akbıyıkoğlu, K. 1991. "Güre Basmacı Tümülüsleri Kurtarma Kazısı." *MKKS* 1: 1-23.

Akbıyıkoğlu, K. 1993. "Güre Velişin Tepe Tümülüsleri Kurtarma Kazısı," *MKKS* 3: 53-63.

Akbıyıkoğlu, K. 1994a. "Güre 'Basmacı Tümülüsü' Kurtarma Kazısı," *Arkeoloji ve Sanat* 64-65: 2-8.

Akbıyıkoğlu, K. 1994b. "Kayaağıl Tümülüsü Kurtarma Kazısı," *MKKS* 4: 69-82.

Akbıyıkoğlu, K. 1996. "1994 Güre İkiztepe Tümülüsü Kazısı," *MKKS* 6: 163-176.

Åkerström, Å. 1966. *Die Architektonischen Terrakotten Kleinasiens.* Lund.

Akurgal, E. 1941. *Griechische Reliefs des VI. Jahrhunderts aus Lykien. Schriften zur Kunst des Altertums* 3. Berlin.

Babaev, I., I. Gagoshidze, and F. Knauß. 2007. "An Achaemenid 'Palace' at Qarjamirli (Azerbaijan): Preliminary Report on the Excavations in 2006," in *Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatoia, Soutehrn Caucasus and Iran: New Discoveries*, ed. A. Ivantchik and V. Licheli: 31-45. Leiden.

Baughan, E. P. 2004. Anatolian Funerary Klinae: Tradition and Identity, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Benda-Weber, I. 2005. *Lykier und Karer: zwei autochthone Ethnien Kleinasiens zwischen Orient und Okzident*.

Benveniste, E. 1965. "Termes de parenté dans les langues indo-européennes," *L'Homme* 5: 5-16.

Berger, E. 1970. *Studien zum griechischen Grab- und Votivrelief um 500 v. Chr. und zur vorhippokratischen Medizin*, Veröffentlichungen des Antikenmuseums Basel I. 1970.

Borchhardt, J. 1976. *Die Bauskulptur des Heroons von Limyra. Das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles, IstForsch* 32. Berlin.

Borchhardt, J. 1999. "Die Bedeutung der lykischen Königshöfe für die Entstehung des Porträts," in *Antike Porträts: zum Gedächtnis von Helga von Heintze*, ed. H. von Steuben: 53-84. Möhnsee.

Borchhardt, J. 2000. "Dynasten und Beamte in Lykien während der persischen und attischen Herrschaft," in R. Dittman, B. Hrouda, et al. eds., *Vario Delectat. Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmeyer*: 73-140. Münster.

Borchhardt, J., and W. Schiele. 1976. *Die Bauskulptur des Heroons von Limyra: das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles*. Berlin.

Boschung D. 1979. "Ein Dämon und drei Götter. Zur Deutung des Harpyien-Monumentes," *Hefte des Archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 5: 10–15.

Boschung, D. 1979. "Ein Dämon und drei Götter - Zur Deutung des Harpyien-Monumentes." *Hefte des Archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 5: 10-15.

Butler, H. C. 1922. *Sardis* I. *The Excavations*. Leiden.

Carstens, A. M. 2002. "Tomb Cult on the Halikarnassos Peninsula," *AJA* 106: 391-409.

Childs, W. A. P. 1979. "The Authorship of the Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos," *AnatSt* 29: 97-102.

Comstock, M. B., and C. C. Vermeule. 1976. *Sculpture in Stone: The Greek, Roman, and Etruscan Collections of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.* Boston.

Cook, B. F. 1976. *Greek and Roman Art in the British Museum*. London.

Cook, S. A. 1981. *Clazomenian Sarcophagi*, Kerameus 3. Mainz.

Coupel, P., and P. Demargne. 1969. *Fouilles de Xanthos: Le monument de Néréides*. Istanbul.

Dan, R. 2014. "Inside the Empire: Some Remarks on the Urartian and Achaemenid Presence in the Autonomous Republic of Nakhchivan," *Iran and the Caucasus* 18.4: 327-344.

Demargne, P. 1958. Fouilles de Xanthos I: *Les piliers funéraires.* Paris.

Demargne, P. 1976. "L'iconographie dynastique au Monument des Néréides de Xanthos," *Recueil Plassart, Études sur l'antiquité grecque offertes à André Plassart par ses collègues de la Sorbonne.* Paris.

Demargne, P. 1979. "Recherches en Lycie d'après des publications nouvelles," *RA*: 291-296.

Demargne, P. 1989. *Xanthos: Le monument des néréides le décore sculpté* (2 vols). Klincksieck.

Dönmez, S. 2007. "The Achaemenid Impact on the Central Black Sea Region," in I. Delemen ed., *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.),* papers presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20-21 May 2005:107-116. Istanbul.

Donner, H., and W. Röllig. 1966-1969. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* III. Wiesbaden.

Draycott, C. 2007a. "Dynastic Definitions: Differentiating Status Claims in the Archaic Pillar Tomb Reliefs of Lycia," in *Anatolian Iron Ages 6: The Proceedings of the Sixth Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium held at Eskişehir, 16-20 August 2004*, Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 20, ed. A. Çilingiroğlu and A. Sagona: 103-134. Leuven.

Draycott, C. 2007b. Images and Identities in the Funerary Arts of Anatolia, 600-450 BC: Phrygia, Hellespontine Phrygia, Lydia, PhD dissertation, University of Oxford.

Dusinberre, E. R. M. 1997. "Imperial Style and Constructed Identity: A 'Graeco-Persian' Cylinder Seal from Sardis," *Ars Orientalis* 27: 99-129.

Dusinberre, E. R. M. 2013. *Empire, Autonomy, and Authority in Achaemenid Anatolia.* Cambridge.

Froning, H. 2004. "Das sogenannte Harpyien-Monument von Xanthos. Überlegungen zur Form und Funktion sowie zur Interpretation des Reliefschmucks," in *Anadolu'da doğdu. 60 yaşında Fahri Işık'a armağan. Festschrift für Fahri Işık zum 60. Geburtstag*: 315-360. Istanbul.

Greenewalt, C. H., jr. 1972. "Two Lydian Graves at Sardis." *CSCA* 5:114-145.

Gusmani, R. 1985. "Anthroponymie in den lydischen Inschriften," in *Gedenkschrift B. Schwartz*, ed. Y. Arbeitman: 179-196. New York.

Gusmani, R. 1986. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*, Ergänzungsband I. Heidelberg.

Gygax, M. D., and W. Tietz. 2005. "'He Who of All Mankind Set Up the Most Numerous Trophies to Zeus: The Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos Reconsidered." *AnatSt* 55: 89-98.

Hanfmann, G. M. A. 1974. "A Pediment of the Persian Era from Sardis," in *Mélanges Mansel*, ed. E. Akurgal and B. Alkım: 289-302. Ankara.

Hanfmann, G. M. A. 1987. "The Sacrilege Inscription: The Ethnic, Linguistic, Social and Religious Situation at Sardis at the End of the Persian Era," *BAI* 1: 1-8.

Hanfmann, G. M. A., and K. P. Erhart. 1981. "Pedimental Reliefs from a Mausoleum of the Persian Era at Sardis: A Funerary Meal," in *Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan*, ed. W. K. Simpson and W. M. Davis: 82-90. Boston.

Hanfmann, G. M. A., and N. H. Ramage. 1978. *Sculpture from Sardis: The Finds through 1975*. Cambridge, MA.

Jacobs, B. 1987. *Griechische und persische Elemente in der Grabkunst Lykiens zur Zeit der Achämenidenherrschaft*, SIMA 78. Jonsered.

Jenkins, I. 2006. *Greek Architecture and Its Sculpture.* Cambridge, MA.

Jeppesen, K., et al. 1981-2004. *The Maussolleion at Halikarnassos*, Vols. 1-7. Aarhus.

Johansen, K. F. 1935. "Fragmente klazomenischer Sarkophage in der Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek," *ActArch* 6**:** 167–213.

Johansen, K. F. 1942. "Clazomenian Sarcophagus Studies: The Earliest Sarcophagi," *ActArch* 14: 1–64.

Johnson, P. A. 2010. Landscapes of Achaemenid Paphlagonia, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Kahle, P., and F. Sommer. 1927. "Die lydisch-aramäische Bilingue," *KIF* 1/1: 18-86.

Keen, A. 1998. *Dynastic Lycia*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 178: 87-96. Leiden.

Keen, A. G. 1992. "The Dynastic Tombs of Xanthos: Who Was Buried Where?" *AnatSt* 42: 53–63.

Khatchadourian, L. 2008a. "Making Nations from the Ground Up: Traditions of Classical Archaeology in the South Caucasus," *AJA* 112: 247-278.

Khatchadourian, L. 2007. "Unforgettable Landscapes: Attachments to the Past in Hellenistic Armenia," *Negotiating the Past in the Past: Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*, ed. N. Yoffee: 43-75.

Khatchadourian, L. 2008b. Social Logics under Empire: The Armenian "Highland Satrapy" and Achaemenid Rule, ca. 600-300 BC. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor MI.

Khatchadourian, L. 2013. "Chapter 4: An Archaeology of Hegemony." *Empires and Diversity: On the Crossroads of Archaeology, Anthropology, and History*, ed. G. E. Areshyan: 108-45. Los Angeles.

Khatchadourian, L. 2014. "Empire in the Everyday: A Preliminary Report on the 2008–2011 Excavations at Tsaghkahovit, Armenia," *AJA* 118.1: 137-169.

Knauß, F. 2006. "Ancient Persia and the Caucasus," *IrAnt* 41: 79-118.

Knibbe, D. 1961-1963. "Ein religiöser Frevel und seine Sühne: Ein Todesurteil hellenistischer Zeit aus Ephesos," *OJh* 46: 175-82.

Kohler, E. L. 1980. "Cremations of the Middle Phrygian Period at Gordion," in K. DeVries ed., *From Athens to Gordion: The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young*: 65-89. Philadelphia.

Kohler, E. L., and E. R. M. Dusinberre. Forthcoming. *Gordion Excavations 1950-1973 Final Reports Volume (x): The Lesser Phrygian Tumuli*, Part II: *The Cremations*. Philadelphia.

Kökten-Ersoy, H. 1998. "Two Wheeled Vehicles from Lydia and Mysia," *IstMitt* 48: 107-133.

Kurtz, D. V., and J. Boardman. 1971. *Greek Burial Customs.* London.

Marksteiner, T. 2002. *Trysa, eine zentrallykische Niederlassung im Wandel der Zeit*, Wiener Forschungen zur Archäologie Band 5, ed. J. Borchhardt and F. Krinzinger: 246-291. Vienna.

McLauchlin, B. K. 1985. Lydian Graves and Burial Customs. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Mellink, M. J. 1079. "Fouilles d'Elmalı, en Lycie du Nord (Turquie). Découvertes préhistoriques et tombes à fresques," *CRAI*: 476-496.

Mellink, M. J. 1971. "Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmalı, Lycia, 1970," *AJA* 75: 245-255.

Mellink, M. J. 1972. "Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmalı, Lycia, 1971," *AJA* 76: 257-269.

Mellink, M. J. 1973. "Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmalı, Lycia, 1972," *AJA* 77: 293-303.

Mellink, M. J. 1974. "Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmalı, Lycia, 1973," *AJA* 78: 351-359.

Mellink, M. J. 1975. "Excavations at Karataş-Semayük and Elmalı, Lycia, 1974," *AJA* 79: 349-355.

Mellink, M. J. 1978. "Mural Paintings in Lycian Tombs," in *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology,* ed. E. Akurgal: 805-809. Ankara.

Mellink, M. J., R. A. Bridges, Jr., and F. C. di Vignale. 1998. *Kızılbel: An Archaic Painted Tomb Chamber in Northern Lycia.* Philadelphia.

Miller, M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC.* Cambridge.

Moorey, P. R. S. 1980. *Cemeteries of the First Millennium B.C. at Deve Hüyük, near Carchemish, Salvaged by T.E. Lawrence and C.L. Woolley in 1913*, BAR International Series 87. Oxford.

Özgen, I. 2010. "Lydian Treasure." In *The Lydians and Their World*, ed. N. D. Cahill: 305-338. Istanbul.

Özgen, I., and J. Öztürk. 1996. *Heritage Recovered: The Lydian Treasure*. Istanbul.

Özhanlı, M. 2002. "Isinda: The Isinda Pillar Tomb," *ADALYA* 5: 73-106.

Özsait, M., and N. Özsait. 1990. "1987 ve 1988 Yılı Senirkent Çevresi Tarihöncesi Araştırmaları," *7. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı*, Antalya 18-23 May 1989: 381-389. Ankara.

Özsait, M., and N. Özsait. 2007. "Delipınar Mezar Stelleri," in *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.)* Papers presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20-21 May 2005, ed. I. Delemen: 159-166. Istanbul.

Pfuhl, E., and H. Möbius. 1977. *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs*, Vol. 1. Mainz.

Pryce, F. N. 1928. *Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum* I/1: Prehellenic and Early Greek. London.

Ratté, C. J. 1989. Lydian Masonry and Monumental Architecture at Sardis, Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Rhodes, P. J., and R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC.* Oxford.

Ristvet, L., H. Gopnik, et al., 2012. "On the Edge of Empire: 2008 and 2009 excavations at Oğlanqala, Azerbaijan," *AJA* 116/2: 321-362.

Robert, L. 1967. "Sur des inscriptions d'Éphèse," *RevPhil* 41: 32-36.

Robinson, T. 1995. "The Nereid Monument at Xanthos or the Eliyana Monument at Arnna?" *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 14/3: 355-359.

Roos, P. 1972. *The Rock Tombs of Caunus*, SIMA 34 Göteborg.

Roos, P. 1985. *Survey of Rock-Cut Chamber Tombs in Caria I: South-Eastern Caria and the Lyco-Carian Borderland*, SIMA 72/1. Göteborg.

Roos, P. 1989. "Rock-Tombs in Hecatomnid Caria and Greek Architecture," in T. Linders and P. Hellstrøm eds., *Architecture and Society in Hecatomnid Caria*, Proc. Uppsala Symposium 1987, Boreas 17. Uppsala.

Roos, P. 2006. *Survey of Rock-Cut Chamber Tombs in Caria II: Central Caria*, SIMA 72/2. Göteborg.

Roosevelt, C. H. 2006. "Symbolic Door Stelae and Graveside Monuments in Western Anatolia," *AJA* 110/1: 65-91.

Roosevelt, C. H. 2008. "Lale Tepe: A Late Lydian Tumulus near Sardis. 1. Introduction, Excavation, and Finds." In *Love For Lydia: A Sardis Anniversary Volume Presented to Crawford H. Greenewalt, Jr.*, ed. N. D. Cahill:1-24. Cambridge, MA.

Roosevelt, C. H. 2009. *The Archaeology of Lydia, from Gyges to Alexander*. Cambridge.

Rudolph, C. 2003. *Das 'Harpyien-Monument' von Xanthos - Seine Bedeutung innerhalb der spätarchaischen Plastik,* BAR International Series 1108. Oxford.

Rumpf, A. 1933. "Zu den Klazomenischen Denkmälern," *JdI* 48: 55–83.

Şare, T. 2013. "The Sculpture of the Heroon of Perikle at Limyra: The Making of a Lycian King," *AnatSt* 63: 55-74.

Scott, J. C. 1987. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT.

Scott, J. C. 1992. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT.

Sevinç, N., C. B. Rose, et al. 2007. "The Dedetepe Tumulus," *Studia Troica* 8 (1998):305-327; C. B. Rose, "The Tombs of the Granicus Valley," in I. Delemen ed., *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.)* Papers presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20-21 May 2005: 247-264. Istanbul.

Seyer, M. ed. 2007. *Studien in Lykien*, *ErghÖJh* 8. Vienna.

Stein, G. L. 2014. "Persians on the Euphrates? Material Culture and Identity in Two Achaemenid Burials from Hacınebi, Southeast Turkey," in *Extraction and Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper*, ed. M. Kozuh, W. F. M. Henkelman, C. E. Jones, and C. Woods: 265-286. Chicago.

Stinson, P. T. 2008. "Lale Tepe: A Late Lydian Tumulus near Sardis. 2. Architecture and Painting." In *Love For Lydia: A Sardis Anniversary Volume Presented to Crawford H. Greenewalt, Jr.*, ed. N. D. Cahill: 25-48. Cambridge, MA.

Summerer, L. 2007a. "From Tatarlı to Munich: The Recovery of a Painted Wooden Tomb Chamber in Phrygia," in I. Delemen ed., *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.)* Papers presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20-21 May 2005 (Istanbul 2007): 131-158.

Summerer, L. 2007b. "Picturing Persian Victory: The Painted Battle Scene on the Munich Wood," in A. Ivantchik and V. Licheli eds., *Achaemenid Culture and Local Traditions in Anatolia, Southern Caucasus and Iran: New Discoveries*: 3-30. Leiden.

Summerer, L. 2010. *Tatarlı. Renklerin Dönüşü.* Istanbul.

Tal, O. 2005. "Some Remarks on the Coastal Plain of Palestine under Achaemenid Rule – an Archaeological Synopsis," in P. Briant and R. Boucharlat eds., *L'archéologie de l'empire achéménide: nouvelles recherches,* Persika 6: 71-96. Paris.

Tallon, F. 1992. "The Achaemenid Tomb on the Acropole," in *The Royal City of Susa: Ancient Near Eastern Treasures in the Louvre*, eds. P. O. Harper, J. Aruz, and F. Tallon: 242-252. New York.

Tarhan, M. T. 1994. "Recent Research at the Urartian Capital Tushpa." *Tel Aviv* 21/1:22-57.

Tarhan, M. T. 2007. "Median and Achaemenid Periods at Tushpa," in I. Delemen ed., *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.),* papers presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20-21 May 2005:117-130. Istanbul.

Tarhan, M. T., and V. Sevin. 1994. "Van Kalesi ve Eski Van Şehri Kazıları 1990 Yılı Çalışmaları," *Belleten* 22:843-861.

Thonemann, P. 2009. "Lycia, Athens and Amorges," in *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, ed. J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas and R. Parder: 167-194. London 2009.

Tritsch, F. J. 1942. "The Harpy Tomb at Xanthos." *JHS* 62: 39-50.

von Graeve, V. 1989. "Eine spätarchaische Anthemienstele aus Milet." *IstMitt* 39: 143-151.

Waelkens, M. 1986. *Die kleinasiatischen Türsteine. Typologische und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu kleinasiatischen Grabreliefs mit Scheintür.* Mainz.

Waywell, G. B. 1978. *The Free-Standing Sculptures of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus in the British Museum*. London.

Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge.

Young, R. S. 1951. "Gordion - 1950," *University Museum Bulletin* 16.1: 3-20.

Zahle, J. 1975. *Harypienmonument i Xanthos - En lykisk pillegrav*, Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning. Copenhagen.

Zahle, J. 1983. *Arkaeologiske studiere i lykiske klippgrave og deros relieffer fra c. 550-300 f. Kr. Sociale og religiøse aspekter*. Copenhagen.