

20 2017

ISSN 1301-2746

ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kırac Research Center
for Mediterranean Civilizations

(OFFPRINT)



AKMED

KOÇ UNIVERSITY

Suna & İnan Kırac

Research Center for

Mediterranean Civilizations

ADALYA

The Annual of the Koç University Suna & İnan Kırac Research Center
for Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)

<i>Mode of publication</i>	Worldwide periodical
<i>Publisher certificate number</i>	25840
ISSN	1301-2746
<i>Publisher management</i>	Koç University Rumelifeneri Yolu, 34450 Sariyer / İstanbul
<i>Publisher</i>	President Umran Savaş İnan on behalf of Koç University
<i>Editor-in-chief</i>	Oğuz Tekin
<i>Editor</i>	Tarkan Kahya
<i>Advisory Board</i>	Haluk Abbasoğlu, Jürgen Borchhardt, Thomas Corsten, Jacques des Courtils, Vedat Çelgin, Nevzat Çevik, İnci Delemen, Refik Duru, Serra Durugönül, Hansgerd Hellenkemper, Frank Kolb, Wolfram Martini, Mehmet Özdoğan, Mehmet Özsait, Urs Peschlow, Felix Pirson, Scott Redford, Denis Rousset, Christof Schuler, R. R. R. Smith, Oğuz Tekin, Gülsün Umurtak, Burhan Varkıvanç, Michael Wörrle, Martin Zimmerman
<i>English copyediting</i>	Mark Wilson
©	Koç University AKMED, 2017
	Adalya, a peer reviewed publication, is indexed in the A&HCI (Arts & Humanities Citation Index) and CC/A&H (Current Contents / Arts & Humanities).
<i>Production</i>	Zero Production Ltd. Abdullah Sok. No. 17 Taksim 34433 İstanbul Tel: +90 (212) 244 75 21 • Fax: +90 (212) 244 32 09 info@zerobooksonline.com ; www.zerobooksonline.com
<i>Printing</i>	Oksijen Basım ve Matbaacılık San. Tic. Ltd. Şti. 100. Yıl Mah. Matbaacılar Sit. 2. Cad. No: 202/A Bağcılar - İstanbul Tel: +90 (212) 325 71 25 • Fax: +90 (212) 325 61 99 Certificate number: 29487
<i>Mailing address</i>	Barbaros Mah. Kocatepe Sok. No. 25 Kaleiçi 07100 Antalya - TURKEY Tel: +90 (242) 243 42 74 • Fax: +90 (242) 243 80 13 https://akmed.ku.edu.tr
<i>E-mail address</i>	akmed@ku.edu.tr



KOÇ ÜNİVERSİTESİ



AKMED

KOÇ UNIVERSITY

Suna & İnan Kırac

Research Center for

Mediterranean Civilizations

Contents

Rana Özbal <i>Reconsidering Identity in the Halaf World: A Study of Coarse Wares in Sixth Millennium North Mesopotamia</i>	1
Abdullah Hacı <i>İlk Tunç Çağı'na Tarihlenen Anadolu Metalik Çanak Çömleğine İlişkin Yeni Bilgiler: Göltepe Buluntuları</i>	21
Bekir Özer <i>Pedasa Athena Kutsal Alanı Arkaik Dönem Kıbrıs Mortarları ve Bölgeler Arası Ticari İlişkilerdeki Rolü</i>	41
Elçin Doğan Gürbüz – Cennet Pişkin Ayvazoğlu <i>Klaros'tan Pişmiş Toprak Barbitoslu Figürinlerin İkonografisi</i>	69
Gökhan Çoşkun <i>A One-Edged Curved Sword from Seyitömer Höyük</i>	83
Sevgi Sarıkaya <i>The Diplomatic and Strategic Maneuvers of Tissaphernes, Satrap of Sardis</i>	111
Marko Kiessel <i>Hof- und Fassadengräber auf der Karpashalbinsel Zyperns? Bemerkungen zu Kammergräbern in der Flur „Spiliosus“ nahe Aphendrika</i>	135
Erkan Dünder – Ali Akın Akyol <i>Unguentarium Production at Patara and a New Unguentarium Form: Archaeological and Archaeometric Interpretation</i>	157
Hülya Kökmen Seyirci <i>Ksanthos Güney Kent Kapısı ve Evreleri</i>	181
Julian Bennett <i>“Becoming a Roman”: Anatolians in the Imperial Roman Navy</i>	213
Lisa Peloschek – Martin Seyer – Banu Yener-Marksteiner – Philip Bes <i>Limestone, Diorite and Radiolarite: First Petrographic Data of Fired Clay Objects from Limyra (Southwest Turkey)</i>	241
Burhan Varkıvanç <i>The Stone Architecture of the Proskene of the Theater in Kaunos</i>	267
Ümit Aydınöglü <i>Doğu Dağlık Kilikia'daki Kırsal Yerleşimlerde Peristyl Avlulu Konutlar</i>	291

Pınar Özlem-Aytaçlar <i>Some Inscriptions from Pisidia</i>	315
Guntram Koch <i>Überlegungen zum Ende der Sarkophag-Produktion in Kleinasien</i>	323
Gökçen Kurtuluş Öztaşkın – Sinan Sertel <i>Olympos Piskoposluk Kilisesi'ndeki Nef Ayırımı Düzenlemeleri ve Levha Yanı Uygulaması</i>	357
Peter Talloen – Ralf Vandam – Manuela Broisch – Jeroen Poblome <i>A Byzantine Church Discovered in the Village of Ağlasun (Burdur): Some More Light on Dark Age Pisidia</i>	375
İzzet Duyar – Derya Atamtürk <i>Tlos (Seydikemer, Muğla) Kazılarında Ortaya Çıkarılan Orta Bizans Dönemi İskeletlerinde Ağız ve Diş Sağlığı</i>	405
Ebru Fındık <i>Bir Güzellik Nesnesi Olarak Cam Bilezikler: Demre/Myra Aziz Nikolaos Kilisesi Buluntuları (1989-2016)</i>	423
Güven Dinç <i>The Social and Economic Status of the Rum (Greeks) of Antalya in the First Half of the 19th Century</i>	449
Book Review	
Netice Yıldız <i>A New Book about Kyrenia, the Harbor Town of Cyprus</i>	491

The Diplomatic and Strategic Maneuvers of Tissaphernes, Satrap of Sardis

Sevgi SARIKAYA*

Tissaphernes, son of Hydarnes and one of the Seven who with Darius I were the founders of the new Persian dynasty, apparently had his first official contact with Ionia and the Greeks during the revolt of Pissuthnes in 420-412 B.C. Due to the insufficiency of evidence, the reasons which led to the rebellion of Pissuthnes, son of Hystaspes, grandson of Darius I (Thuc. I.115), and satrap of Sardis along with his illegitimate son Amorges, today remain obscure. According to the narrative of Ctesias of Cnidus (FGrHist III C 1 688 F 15 (53)= Phot. Bib. 72. 41b38-43b2), King Darius II Ochus (424-405 B.C.) sent Tissaphernes, Spithradates, and Parmises to suppress this revolt. Pissuthnes, with the Greeks commanded by an Athenian named Lycon, showed great resistance to them. The generals of the king drew Lycon to their side by bribing him and separated him from Pissuthnes. Within a short time Pissuthnes was delivered, and accompanied by Tissaphernes, he was brought before the king. By the king's decree he was killed by being thrown into ashes, and Tissaphernes, as a result of his noteworthy success in this task, was given the satrapy of Sardis¹.

When Tissaphernes took over the satrapy in ca. 413 B.C., it was understood that both the security and financial state of the province were worsening due both to the rebellion of Pissuthnes and from the terms of the Peace of Callias² signed in 449/448 B.C. In accord with the treaty, the recognition of the liberty and autonomy of the coastal cities of western Asia Minor³ and their membership in the Delian League seems to have struck a heavy blow to the economic prosperity of Sardis and likewise to that of Dascylium. Once a year the satraps sent the king's share of the taxes and tribute payments collected in the provinces to the royal treasury

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sevgi Sarıkaya, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü, Kampüs, Sakarya.
E-mail: sevgisarkaya@gmail.com

¹ As a reward for his treachery, Lycon was given cities and land. On the subject also see Andoc. de Pac. III. 29; Gomme 1981, 12, 17; Andrewes 1971, 4-5; Lewis 1977, 81; Hornblower 2004², 423-424; Briant 2002, 591.

² FGrHist II B 124 F 16 "Callisthenes"= Plut. Cim. XIII. 5-6; also FGrHist II B 115 F 154 "Theopompus"; FGrHist III B 342 F 13 "Craterus"; Harpoc. lex. 66; Paus. I. 8. 2; Suda κ. 214 s.v. <Καλλίας= Callias>. For more detailed information and detailed literature analysis on the subject see Mattingly 1965, 273 ff.; Murison 1971, 12 ff.; Walsh 1981, 31 ff.; Meister 1982, 23-24; Fornara 1983, 97-100, n° 95; Meiggs 1984, 129 vd; 487 ff; Badian 1987, 1-39; Bosworth 1990, 1-13; Cawkwell 1997, 115-130; Arslan 2010, 96 ff.

³ The Athenians, thanks to their naval superiority, established long-lasting hegemonies especially over the coastal cities. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ant. I. 3. 2) records that the Athenians ruled only the sea coast during the space of sixty-eight years, nor did their sway extend even over all of that, but only when their naval supremacy was at its height to the area between the Euxine and the Pamphylian Seas.

Aristophanes, in (Vesp. 705-710; 1091-1100) satirized that many cities which were captured from the Persians paid *phoros* (tribute) to Athens, and its (tribute) was stolen by some Athenian young men.

in Susa or Persepolis, either accompanied by their own high ranking officials or by those who had been assigned by the royal center⁴. But the dominance of Athens, which became the most powerful state of the period, over the important coastal trading cities had been constantly hampering this practice, as a result of which Tissaphernes had been unable to pay the *phoros* (tribute) he had to send to the king, and this unpaid sum with interest had been accumulating (Thuc. VIII. 5-6; 18)⁵. Having this in mind, the satrap of Sardis realized that the king's share could only be sent regularly after the collapse of the Athenian dominance over the coastal cities, which were, with their large trading volume, the source of significant economic activity. In 413 B.C. the Athenians' disastrous defeat in Sicily gave the satrap of Sardis, Tissaphernes, and the satrap of Dascylium, Pharnabazus, the opportunity they had been waiting for. Then, in 412 B.C. the cities of Asia Minor, thinking that the battle of Sicily had weakened Athenian power and also taking the satraps' support and encouragement to heart, were in search of Lacedaemonian assistance in order to revolt⁶. In this respect, the peoples of the islands such as Chios, Lesbos, and Rhodes, and of the city states such as Erythrae, Cyzicus, Ephesus, Miletus, Iasos, Byzantium, and Chalcedon had inaugurated secret diplomatic negotiations with the Lacedaemonians⁷. Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus informed king Darius about the recent developments in Asia Minor and notified him concerning their future pro-Lacedaemonian strategy, and they received the king's approval and instructions. Darius expected Tissaphernes to fulfill this task successfully, and also to capture dead or alive Amorges⁸, who was actively rebelling in Caria, and Darius bestowed upon him – as is clear from the treaties Tissaphernes concluded with the Spartans on behalf of the king – full authority and supreme command over the region of western Asia Minor (στρατηγός ἦν τῶν κάτω)⁹. Consequently, Tissaphernes was faced with two fundamental duties. The first was to gain the favor of the king through forming an alliance between the Lacedaemonians and Darius II Ochus; the second was to suppress the revolt of Amorges as, despite the annihilation of Pissuthnes, his son was successfully rebelling against the king (Thuc. VIII. 5). For this reason, an alliance with the Spartans would be a significant step for the satrap of Sardis.

Tissaphernes sent his envoy with the delegation of Chios and Erythrae as a representative of the king. He asked the Peloponnesians not to refuse the offers of help coming from the western Asia Minor cities and stated that he would defray the expenses of the army's provisions (Thuc. VIII. 5). In the spring of 412 B.C., Tissaphernes with Chalcideus, the Spartan commander, made the first official treaty of alliance (*symmachia*) between the Lacedaemonians and the king. It was decreed that the two allies should act jointly in war and peace. The rights of the king were officially recognized through the following terms: all the territories and cities which

⁴ PFT 1357 (Hallock 1969, 383); also see PFT 1342 (Hallock 1969, 379); Koch 1992, 66; Klinkott 2005, 204.

⁵ The same is also true for the satrapy of Dascylium, which had lost its authority over the important trading cities along the seaboard of the Propontis. It is clear that the satrap of Dascylium, Pharnabazus, like Tissaphernes, regarded the Athenians as the greatest obstacle preventing them from collecting the requested *phoroi* (Thuc. VIII. 6). The first two articles among the terms of the treaty made between the Lacedaemonians and the Great King by Tissaphernes confirm this situation: 1) all the territories and the cities the king possesses or the king's ancestors possessed shall belong to the king, and 2) regarding the taxes the Athenians receive from these cities either as money or as any other advantages, the king, the Lacedaemonians and their allies shall jointly prevent the Athenians from collecting these taxes (Thuc. VIII. 18).

⁶ Thuc. VIII. 2; Diod. XIII. 36. 5.

⁷ Thuc. VIII. 5; Plut. Alc. XXIV. 1-3.

⁸ Harpoc. lex. 26. 12 <Αμόργης = Amorges>.

⁹ Thuc. VIII. 4-5; also see Diod. XIII. 36. 5: ὁ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττης τόπων ἔχων τὴν στρατηγίαν.

the king possesses or the king's ancestors possessed shall be the king's. Regarding the taxes the Athenians receive either as money or as any other thing, the king, the Lacedaemonians, and their allies shall jointly prevent the Athenians from collecting these taxes (Thuc. VIII. 18). The Athenians retaliated against the Persian-Lacedaemonian alliance by keeping their union, and their exchange of assistance with Amorges. They let Amorges use Iasos as his base, and they protected it by sea¹⁰. In the same year, due to the military collaboration he had formed with the Peloponnesians, Tissaphernes and his army of cavalry and mercenaries engaged in an indecisive battle with the Athenians at Miletus (Thuc. VIII. 25-27). Yet he managed to turn the odds to his advantage. He persuaded the Peloponnesians to make a surprise attack upon Iasos, controlled by Amorges, enemy of the king. Probably the Spartan navy attacked by sea, and Tissaphernes with the mercenaries, most of whom were Lycians, possibly mounted a co-ordinated attack by land. The city, which was accustomed to only Athenian ships, was caught off guard and was quickly captured through strong assaults. The military operation targeting Iasos produced profitable results for both sides as Tissaphernes captured Amorges and fulfilled the king's order, while the Peloponnesians plundered the wealthy city of Iasos and acquired a considerable amount of booty. In addition, in exchange for delivering to Tissaphernes the city, Amorges, and all the prisoners both bond and free, they received one Daric stater per person. Moreover, rather than treating Amorges' mercenaries with violence, they integrated them into their armies. Then they withdrew to Miletus¹¹.

When the Persian strategy during this expedition is considered, it is obvious that all the responsibility for the battle was borne by the Lacedaemonians and the Ionian cities, which took part in the rebellion. Essentially, the Persians were defraying the cost of subsistence and supply of the allied armies as well as paying the salaries of the soldiers of the allied forces in order to alleviate the heavy cost imposed on the state's finance by the expedition¹². Also, they were assisting their allies by sending additional land forces¹³. Moreover, the king was having a fleet consisting of about 147 Phoenician ships prepared to be sent to their assistance and to end the war immediately¹⁴. The Lacedaemonians, in their turn, submitted to and served one of the main aims of the Persians, which was to regain control over the coastal cities in western Asia Minor¹⁵. But during the battle, which was financed and fought by the Persian coalition, when the Lacedaemonians started to be noticeably successful and gradually took the initiative in the Aegean, their attempt to act independent of the Persians also became noticeable. The first small-scale dissension between Tissaphernes and the Peloponnesians broke out on the matter of the payment of salaries (Thuc. VIII. 29). The satrap of Sardis, in accord with what had been

¹⁰ Thuc. VIII. 19; 28; Andoc. de Pac. III. 29; also see Kagan 1987, 30-32.

¹¹ Thuc. VIII. 28; TAM I 44a52-55; on the subject also see Westlake 1977, 319-329; Westlake 1985, 48; Gomme 1981, 67-69; Childs 1981, 68; Kagan 1987, 64; Keen 1998, 136 ff.; Thonemann 2009, 173-178.

¹² Thuc. VIII. 5; 28; 29; Isoc. de Big. XVI. 18; Xen. Hell. I. 5. 4-5. Also in the two treaties signed between the Peloponnesians and the king in 411 B.C. this situation is clearly stated (Thuc. VIII. 37; 58).

¹³ Marching of Stages, Tissaphernes' *hyparchos* to Teos for help with an army under his command (Thuc. VIII. 16); the military support of Tamos, another *hyparchos* of the satrap to the Peloponnesians at Daphnus (Thuc. VIII. 31); Tissaphernes' provoking the Cnidians to revolt against the Athenians (Thuc. VIII. 35).

¹⁴ Thuc. VIII. 87. According to the narration of Isocrates (de Big. XVI. 18), the number of the dispatched fleets was 90; in Diodorus' narrative (XIII. 36. 5; 37. 4; 46. 6) this number is 300; for Plutarch (Alc. XXV. 3) it is 150.

¹⁵ This is apart from the other terms of the three treaties made between the years of 412 and 411 B.C., particularly the articles decreeing that "all the territories and cities which the king possesses or the king's ancestors possessed shall belong to the king" and "the King's country in Asia shall be the king's, and concerning his own country the king shall treat his own country as he pleases", which make this situation quite clear (Thuc. VIII. 18; 36; 58).

promised, distributed to all the ships a month's salary amounting to an Attic drachma¹⁶ a day per person. He said that for the remaining period until he had consulted the king, he could give only three obols and, if the king allowed, he would pay one drachma daily. Tissaphernes' decision must have resulted from several factors: he was unable to pay the yearly tribute to the king; he was covering the cost of the allied armies and their subsistence needs and paying the soldiers, as a result of which the financial state of the satrapy had been severely weakened; and/or he was taking Alcibiades' advice into consideration, as even the Athenians, who had proven their naval supremacy, paid three obols per day to their sailors¹⁷. Tissaphernes had drawn the *trierarchos* and the city *strategoí* to his side by bribing them¹⁸. For this reason, the only objection came from Hermocrates, the Syracusan general. So it was decided that the sailors of about five ships would receive a little more than three obols; for fifty-five ships the monthly salary would be thirty *talanta* (Thuc. VIII. 29). The Lacedaemonians had come from the plunder of Iasos with great gains; what's more, the Milesians were willingly covering the cost of war. For this reason, finding the first treaty with Tissaphernes insufficient for their benefit, they offered a second agreement to the satrap of Sardis (Thuc. VIII. 36).

The Peloponnesians, after their victory at a small-scale naval battle at Syme, withdrew to Cnidus. There a Lacedaemonian delegation of eleven men negotiated with Tissaphernes concerning the war. The incomplete and erroneous points of the current strategy were brought forward, and ways to conduct the expedition in the best and most profitable way were discussed. But during the meeting, Lichas objected to the treaties signed between the sides led by Chalcideus and Therimenes. So he demanded the dissolution of these treaties and asked for a new third treaty because it was scandalous that the king still claimed to rule all the territory that he and his ancestors ruled in the past. For that would mean that all the islands would again be enslaved by the king as well as Thessaly, Locris, and everything as far as Boeotia. In this sense, the Lacedaemonians would be putting the Greeks under the Persian yoke instead of liberating them. Tissaphernes was displeased with this talk, and the parties departed without reaching any kind of conciliation (Thuc. VIII. 43). The Spartan commander Lichas decided to defray the expenses of the ships' maintenance and the needs of the armies with the help of his allies, without receiving monetary support from Tissaphernes. To this end, the Peloponnesians now determined to sail to Rhodes upon the invitation of some of the principal men there, hoping to gain an island powerful by the number of its seamen and by its land forces. Then they gained the support of Rhodes and collected tax amounting to thirty-two *talanta* and they stayed in Rhodes for eighty days (Thuc. VIII. 44). It appears that this new political change of Lichas concerned the idea of liberating the Ionian cities from Persian sovereignty (Thuc. VIII. 52). The Persians had sided with the Lacedaemonians against the Athenians, seeing them as a loyal, alternative force who would not oppose Persian benefit. However, the Lacedaemonians' attempt to act without Persian monetary support was an indicator that the Lacedaemonian threat was

¹⁶ According to the Attica measures, 1 drachma = 6 oboloi; 1 stater = 2 drachma; 1 mna = 100 drachmae; 1 talanton = 60 mna.

¹⁷ Thuc. VIII. 45; Schol. Thuc. VIII. 45. The reason why the Athenians gave their mariners three obols did not stem from the lack of money. On the contrary, it was to prevent the men from falling into temptation with so much money in their hands, exhausting their health and energy spending excessively, or leaving the ships. They use the unpaid part of their wages as the guarantee (Thuc. VIII. 45). On this subject also see Kallet 2001, 253-255; 260-262. It was at first two obols per day but raised to three obols by Cleon in the 420s (Aristoph. Equ. 51; 797-800; Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 88; 300; Schol. Aristoph. Av. 1541). For assembly pay see Aristot. Ath. Pol. 41-43; see also Markle 2004, 95, n. 1.

¹⁸ Thuc. VIII. 45; 50; Schol. Thuc. VIII. 45. Astyochochus, the admiral of the Lacedaemonian navy, was their leader (Thuc. VIII. 50; Plut. Alc. XXV. 6-7).

becoming worrisome. What if the Lacedaemonians claimed the part vacated by the Athenians? And to crown it all, that would happen with the military and financial support of the empire, and the Persian plan of overall dominance over the western Asia Minor coastal cities might collapse. Tissaphernes, instead of giving full support to the Lacedaemonians and with the provocations of Alcibiades and his own foresight, adopted the pragmatic policy of wearing them out. His aim was to weaken them slowly, not letting them reach the peak of their power. According to the common opinion of the ancient Greek sources, this political move had been advised to the satrap by his mentor Alcibiades (διδάσκαλος πάντων γιγνόμενος)¹⁹. This diplomatic course, based upon “balance/equalization”, was as follows: the process of ending the war should be prosecuted slowly, neither by bringing the Phoenician fleet which he was gathering into action, nor providing pay for the Peloponnesians, in the attempt to prevent the possibility of one side obtaining supremacy over both land and sea. On the contrary, if the sovereignty over land and sea was divided between the two city states, one side could be instigated to attack the other which was acting against the interests of the empire. If both the land and naval supremacies were held by one side, the king, since he could know which alliance he would turn to in order to break this power, might have to be dragged into a costly war full of dangers. If the Hellenes were allowed to destroy each other, both the dangers and the expenses awaiting the king would decrease and his safety would be ensured. The Athenians and Lacedaemonians would be slowly impoverished and worn out; through weakening and exhausting each other, they would then fall into a situation where they could easily be defeated²⁰. During the subsequent period Tissaphernes stayed determinedly loyal to this strategy (Thuc. VIII. 56). The issue of resources, from which the Lacedaemonians had been suffering, was one of the most important dynamics which moved the Lacedaemonians to act together with the Great King. When they made a union with the Rhodians in order to free themselves from the financial dependencies forcing them to establish political collaborations with the Persians, Tissaphernes for some time withdrew his military and monetary support from the Lacedaemonians. He probably wished to see the real intention of the Lacedaemonians and wanted them to experience failure if they chose to act on their own. As a result of Tissaphernes’ choice of action, the Spartans realized that without Persian support their military victory against Athens would be unlikely, and the Athenians, encouraged by Alcibiades, discarded democracy and founded an oligarchic regime in order to gain the friendship and trust of Tissaphernes and the Great King²¹. Further, by inaugurating peace negotiations with the Athenians and creating an atmosphere where they would have no option, it appeared Tissaphernes was planning to isolate the Peloponnesians by putting them into a situation where they would have to accept his conditions. Ten representatives from Athens including Peisander assembled to sign a treaty with Tissaphernes. According to what Thucydides stated (VIII. 56), since Tissaphernes had no such plan to settle with the Athenians on any condition, he brought forward proposals which would be absolutely unacceptable to them²². Less than three months later, the Lacedaemonians had difficulty in paying

¹⁹ Thuc. VIII. 45-46; Xen. Hell. I. V. 9; Diod. XIII. 37. 2-6; Plut. Alc. XXV. 1-2; also see Westlake 1985, 45; Gribble 1999, 198; Hyland 2007, 5.

²⁰ Thuc. VIII. 46; 56; Xen. Hell. I. V. 9; Diod. XIII. 37. 2-6; Plut. Alc. XXV. 1-2.

²¹ Thuc. VIII. 47-48; 53-54; 63; 65; 76; Plut. Alc. XXVI. 1-3.

²² Since Alcibiades also knew that Tissaphernes would stay loyal to his attrition strategy and would not compromise with the Athenians, so as not to lose his respectability in the eyes of the Athenians and to prove that he had influence on the satrap, he rendered the terms of the treaty so demanding that they were unacceptable: Athens should leave Ionia and the neighboring islands; they should build warships on behalf of the king; and they should give the Persians the right of free navigation with as many ships as they wished along the coast (Thuc. VIII. 56).

the expenses of the fleet and the salaries of the soldiers, as a result of which some ships were left without sailors. If they engaged in a conflict with the Athenians, the probability of their defeat was simply a matter of time. But this situation caused Tissaphernes to be worried about the possibility that the Athenians might defeat them without needing his assistance, and that the Lacedaemonians might plunder the regions under his rule in their search for provisions. These reasons and his desire to keep the powers of the two Greek states in balance led Tissaphernes together with Pharnabazus, the satrap of Dascylium, to help the Peloponnesians and to conclude a third agreement with them in the plain of the Maeander (Thuc. VIII. 58). The most crucial article of this treaty was as follows: Tissaphernes would provide pay for the ships now present until the arrival of the Phoenician fleet. After the arrival of the king's ships, the Lacedaemonians and their allies could pay their own ships if they wished. If, however, they chose to receive pay from Tissaphernes, Tissaphernes would furnish it. But in this case, at the end of the war the Lacedaemonians and their allies would repay Tissaphernes the money which they had received.

Apparently, the fleet's failure to arrive before it was expected greatly fueled the tension and distrust between the sides involved (Thuc. VIII. 78). The Peloponnesians accused Tissaphernes of failing to bring the ships as well as paying irregularly and insufficiently, thereby harming the Peloponnesian fleet (Thuc. VIII. 78-79; 83). The Peloponnesians began to suspect the satrap due to the tactic Alcibiades had applied to show his strong influence upon Tissaphernes to accomplish his aim of returning to Athens (Thuc. VIII. 47; 56) and the perceptual operation he had deliberately created. His plots were effective in the emergence of these sentiments towards Tissaphernes (Thuc. VIII. 83). After Alcibiades was chosen *strategos* by the anti-oligarchic Athenians stationed at Samos, he went to see Tissaphernes. Rumors appeared that there would be a secret treaty between Tissaphernes and the Athenians, and that he would not bring the Phoenician fleet. Consequently diplomatic relations became more fragile (Thuc. VIII. 81-82), so much so that the Milesians, supported and instigated by the Syracusans, assaulted the fort that had been built by Tissaphernes in Miletus. They then drove out the Persian garrison that was in it. However Lichas, who at first openly objected to Tissaphernes and later had to step back by surrendering to the satrap's isolation strategy that Tissaphernes executed by withdrawing his aid, reproached this action of the Milesians. He stated that the Milesians, like all the other peoples under the yoke of the king, had to submit to Tissaphernes and carry out his commands until the day of victory (Thuc. VIII. 84).

In the summer of 411 B.C. Tissaphernes arrived at Aspendus with Lichas the Spartan via Phaselis and Caunus²³ in order to welcome the fleet, and there he met the Phoenicians. Yet he never brought the much-expected Phoenician fleet and excused this, stating that the number of the ships in the fleet fell short of the number designated by the king. Thucydides (VIII. 87) writes that behind this conduct of Tissaphernes were three rumors. First, he was weakening the Peloponnesian fleet by excusing the practice of his substitute Tamos of constantly decreasing the wages of the Peloponnesians instead of increasing them. Second, he had never planned to include the Phoenician fleet into the war so exacted extra money from the Phoenician mariners in return for them to be sent back to their homes. Third, he wished to create the impression that bringing the fleet was his real intention in order to acquit himself of the Spartans' charges against him. For Thucydides (VIII. 87; also see Plut. Alc. XXVI. 6-7) the real motive behind this was the satrap's strategy of "strategic balance"; in other words, the tactic of dismember, divide,

²³ Alcibiades who set sail for Aspendus to meet Tissaphernes followed this same route (Thuc. VIII. 88).

and rule, advised by Alcibiades to Tissaphernes. For if the Phoenician fleet came to reinforce the Peloponnesian fleet, the Athenians were sure to be defeated. Thucydides also said that keeping both states in an atmosphere of fear and minimizing the cost of war as much as possible were among the other aims of the satrap. According to Thucydides, Tissaphernes' sending of the Phoenician fleet decreased the imperial expenditure, thereby both gaining the favor of the king and obtaining the same end through less spending. However, Thucydides did not mention the version quoted by Diodorus, probably from Ephorus' thirty-book series *Historia/Historiai*. Although Ephorus and naturally Diodorus (XIII. 37. 4-5) accepted the argument expressed by Thucydides that the satrap of Sardis sent the Phoenician fleet due to the secret balance strategy he implemented between the Greek states, they give the reason employed in the satrap's justification in his own words in a different way. They state that Tissaphernes said he had to send the Phoenician fleet because he had received news that the kings of Egypt and Arabia were together hatching plots against Phoenicia²⁴. Some modern writers think that the revolt in Egypt, documented in Aramaic papyri dating to the spring and summer of ca. 410 B.C.²⁵, corresponds with the narration of Ephorus/Diodorus. They accept this explanation as the real reason of Tissaphernes' failure to perform the task of bringing the Phoenician ships²⁶. In contrast, it was also thought that it was because of the failures of the Phoenician fleet in battle, a risk that Tissaphernes did not want to take²⁷. So he sent back the royal fleet at Aspendus to prevent the expense from doubling, with the inclusion of the fleet siding with the Peloponnesians in the battle.

Thus, despite Alcibiades' boasting and the Spartans' accusations, Tissaphernes' conduct was not to the benefit of the Athenians. As Thucydides (VIII. 48) related in the words of the Athenian *strategos* Phrynichus: when the Peloponnesians had become as powerful as the Athenians on the seas and held possession of the chief cities in his empire, the Great King had no reason to unite with the Athenians. On the contrary, even though he did not trust the Athenians, he might make friends with the Peloponnesians who had never injured him. Tissaphernes, who was in charge of carrying out the decrees of the king, had only taken the interest of the Persians into consideration and did not feel the need to win the sympathy of both sides in the Greek wars²⁸. The Greek hatred of Tissaphernes must have originated from this conduct of the satrap²⁹. In fact, the ability to win a victory is the ability to change with the changing enemy and the ability to adapt to changed conditions. Rather than forcing the Greeks only through threats of military power or economic sanctions, winning their trust and friendship with a conciliatory policy was also another important parameter. It is obvious that

²⁴ Diod. XIII. 46. 6. Diodorus in his thirteenth book confuses the names of Pharnabazus, the satrap of Dascylium, and Tissaphernes, the satrap of Sardis.

²⁵ For the Aramaic inscriptions consisting of Arsames' letter on the unjust treatments during the revolt in Egypt, see Cowley 1923, 99-103, no. 27; Driver 1954, 25-31, nos. 5, 7-8; also see Lewis 1958, 393-395.

²⁶ Lewis 1958, 393-397; also see Hyland 2007, 12, n. 33.

²⁷ Lateiner 1976, 283-289, bases his argument on the defeat of the Phoenician fleet in the following naval battles: in 499 B.C. the Ionian fleet's great victory over the Phoenicians (Hdt. V. 109; 112); in 494 B.C. while the number of the Persian fleet was 600 at the start, their unwillingness to fight the 353 Greek ships at Lade (VI. 8-9); in 480 B.C., the defeat of the Phoenician fleet by the Athenians in the battle of Salamis (Hdt. VIII. 85-86; Aesch. *Pers.* 342-345); during the battle of Mycale the decision of the Phoenician fleet not to enter the naval battle because of their previous defeats (IX. 96); in ca. 468 B.C., in the battle of Eurymedon (Köprüçay) Athens and its allies captured nearly 200 Phoenician ships. See Thuc. I. 100; Plut. *Cim.* XII. 5; also Diod. XI. 60. 6-7.

²⁸ Hyland 2007, 11.

²⁹ Plutarch (*Ages.* X. 3-4) uses the expression "an abominable man, and most hateful to the Greek race" to describe Tissaphernes. For the prejudiced approach of the Greeks to Tissaphernes, see Danzing 2007, 27-50.

Tissaphernes could not create a diplomatic success with his strategy of strategic balance, which he tried to apply to the Greek states. On the contrary, he created an aversive effect towards him in both Sparta and Athens. In this context, the Lacedaemonians claimed that the real reason for their defeat by the Athenians was Tissaphernes' failure to provide full military, logistic, and financial support. And they probably submitted their accusations and aspersions to the Persian king Darius. In fact, in accord with Thucydides' appropriate evaluation of the Spartans (VIII. 96), the main factor in Athenian supremacy in the naval battles was Lacedaemonian procrastination in the war and their timidity when compared with their rivals. This was evidenced in 411 B.C. when Athens lost Euboia in a naval battle and was severely weakened by the threat of civil war after the Athenian army's rebellion at Samos because of the oligarchic regime. The Lacedaemonians were in a much more advantageous position than their rival and their chance of winning a decisive victory was almost inevitable, yet they did not even dare to attack the Piraeus. The annexation of the Piraeus meant seizing the whole country as far as the Hellespont, Ionia, the Islands, and Euboia: in other words almost the whole empire of the Athenians (Thuc. VIII. 96). Similarly, between the years 410 and 408 B.C., despite the full military and financial support of Pharnabazus and unlike Tissaphernes, they were unable to show an outstanding success with their defeats at Abydos, Cyzicus, Byzantium, and Chalcedon, thus confirming the evaluation of Thucydides.

As a matter of fact, the Persian-Peloponnesian alliance, established in 412-411 B.C. to break the naval supremacy of Athens in western Asia Minor, not only failed to reach the desired goal but also initiated frequently occurring small-scale battles that resulted in ever-increasing expenses for the satrapies. As a natural result of receiving full authority and the command over the western Asia Minor region, Tissaphernes was the one to be blamed for this failure. Yet, the satrap of Sardis kept the war away from the provincial center until 410 to 407 B.C. When Pharnabazus, the satrap of Dascylium, promised to cover all the expenses, he shifted the route of the battle from Ionia to the Hellespont, which was an important factor (Thuc. VIII. 99). His former friendship with Alcibiades, who had been appointed *strategos* of the Athenian army in western Anatolia, must have been another factor. During this period the military operation of the army commanded by Thrasyllus to Ionia in 409 B.C. is known to be only an exception (Xen. Hell. I. 2. 1-10). Thrasyllus arrived at Lydia via Miletus, Notion, and Colophon, and despite the interventions of Stages the Persian, *hyparchos* of Lydia, he organized plundering raids for seventeen days. Then he set sail for Ephesus. When Tissaphernes was informed of this, he attacked the enemy with land and seaborne forces at Ephesus and won two important victories that resulted in 400 casualties³⁰.

Apart from their treaties with the Spartans, the irregular and unsteady attempts of Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus proved to be unsuccessful. In 407 B.C. Darius II appointed his son Cyrus the Younger satrap of Sardis and furnished him with extraordinary rights. He did this to increase the effectiveness of Persian sovereignty and authority over Asia Minor again and to avert any strife for the throne, which would harm the power of the empire. Along with Lydia, he granted him considerable privileges: rule of Greater Phrygia and Cappadocia; authority as general (*strategos*) and *karanos*³¹ of all the troops who mustered in the plain of Castolus;

³⁰ Xen. Hell. I. 2. 2-10. On the subject also see Hornblower 1991², 149.

³¹ The word *kāra*, which meant "warrior unit" in the Persian language, passed into the Hellenic language as *κάρωνος*. In the ancient Persian language *kāra* is also used as an attribution for "people" with the expanded space of sovereignty. This army, which only consisted of the Persians, also began to include the Medes and the eastern Iranian tribes. The title of *karanos* (*κάρωνος*), which was used by the Greeks for Cyrus the Younger, meant

and deliverer of the *phoroi* collected from the cities in the province³². Tissaphernes handed over the satrapy of Sardis and naturally the right of command to Cyrus (Iust. V. 5. 1) with only the Ionia region left under his rule³³. In 405 B.C. with the full support of Cyrus the Younger to the Spartans, the Spartan commander Lysander defeated Athens and her allies catastrophically in the naval battle of Aigos Potamos (Keçi Dereleri). Tissaphernes, following the king's decrees, had submissively handed over his tasks to Cyrus the Younger. It also appears that he was friendly and sincerely served him by offering him his assistance³⁴. Shortly after the death of Darius II in the spring of 404 B.C., during the ceremony of Cyrus the Younger's accession to the throne at Pasargadae, he accused him of being involved in an assassination plot against his brother Artaxerxes II Mnemon, and they ceased to be on good terms³⁵. The obvious indicator of the enmity between Cyrus and Tissaphernes is the matter of Ionia. In 404/403 B.C. when they returned to western Anatolia, all the Ionian cities except Miletus, which the king had been given to rule as a sub-satrapy region, rebelled one by one against Tissaphernes after being openly incited and encouraged by Cyrus, thus siding with him³⁶. Thus, Tissaphernes and the Ionians fell out. In Miletus as well, probably the supporters of oligarchy³⁷ wanted to take sides with Cyrus. When Tissaphernes became aware of this, he killed some of them and banished others. Cyrus took the Milesian exiles under his protection and, with the excuse of resettling them into the city, prepared an army. Then he besieged Miletus by land and sea with an army of 500 heavy infantry commanded by Socrates of Akhaia, and 300 heavy infantry and 300 light infantry commanded by Pasion of Megara³⁸. While Cyrus was provoking the Ionians to revolt against Tissaphernes, on the other hand he was sending envoys to Artaxerxes demanding that these cities ruled by Tissaphernes be given to him as he was his brother. In reality, under the pretext of his conflict with Tissaphernes, he was creating excuses to raise an army to oust Artaxerxes without attracting suspicion. Apart from that, to avert the king's intervention, Cyrus was sending to him in advance the yearly *phoroi* collected from the cities Tissaphernes ruled and which he wanted to occupy³⁹. Tissaphernes, when compared with Cyrus the Younger, was in every respect – hereditary privileges and rights, number of the soldiers, political authority – in a disadvantageous position. However, he did not avoid fighting unflinchingly within the

the military commander-in-chief of western Asia Minor vested with full powers (*kyrios*); see Xen. Hell. I. 4. 3; Wiesehöfer 2003, 101; 140; also Haebler 1982, 81-90; Binder 2008, 90-91; Briant 2002, 340; 981.

³² Xen. Anab. I. 1. 2; 9. 7; Hell. I. 4. 3; II. 1. 14. Plutarch (Art. II. 3) relates that Cyrus Λυδίας σατράπης καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσῃ στρατηγός/Cyrus was assigned satrap of Lydia and strategos of the coastal cities.

³³ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 3; Anab. I. 1. 6; 8; Suda ξ. 48 <Ξενοφῶν = Xenophon>. On the subject also see Schaeffer 1940, 1591; Childs 1981, 66, n. 65; Ruzicka 1985, 204; Briant 2002, 600.

³⁴ When his father on his deathbed called Cyrus the Younger to his side, he asked Tissaphernes to accompany him as his friend (Xen. Anab. I. 1. 2).

³⁵ Xen. Anab. I. 1. 2; FGrHist III C 1 688 F 16 (59) "Ctesias" = Phot. Bib. 72. 43b3–44a19; Plut. Art. III. 1-5; Suda ξ. 48 <Ξενοφῶν = Xenophon>.

³⁶ Xen. Anab. I. 1. 6; Hell. III. 1. 3; Diod. XIV. 35. 6.

³⁷ According to Diodorus (XIII. 104. 5-6), the Milesian exiles in question must have been the supporters of the oligarchic regime who tried to topple the democratic regime and raided the city during the Dionysia festival, killing 300 people from the leading families. The pro-oligarchs were encouraged to make this assault by the assistance and instigations of Lysander, *barmostes* of Sparta, who was himself an enthusiastic pro-oligarch and the founder of "the rule of ten" (δεκαρχία) (Plut. Lys. VIII. 1-3; XIX. 2-3). Among the supporters of democracy, no less than 1000 respectable citizens became terrified of this violence and took shelter with the satrap Pharnabazus. They received the sincere hospitality of the satrap together with a gold *stater* given to each of them and were settled in Blauda/Blaundus, a fortress of Lydia. This event must have occurred either in 407-406 or 405-404 B.C. as Lysander had his command in western Asia Minor on these dates.

³⁸ Xen. Anab. I. 1. 7; 1. 11; 2. 2-3.

³⁹ Xen. Anab. I. 1. 6; 8; also see Plut. Art. IV. 1-2.

frame of his legal rights in order to protect his authority over the regions under his rule. He also disregarded the fact that Cyrus the Younger was the satrap of Sardis granted extraordinary rights and was the brother of the king. Cyrus, under the pretext of confronting Tissaphernes' assaults, advised the commanders of all the garrisons stationed in the Ionian cities to recruit as many competent Peloponnesian soldiers as possible and provide the necessary logistic support (Xen. Anab. 1. 1. 6). During the siege of Miletus Tissaphernes had most probably foreseen Cyrus' strategy. Cyrus, instead of taking the risk of clashing early with the huge and competent royal army of Artaxerxes, began to focus on increasing the number of soldiers in many regions but mainly in Anatolia. After having raised a huge army, he would then proceed towards Central Asia and defeat the king. But when Tissaphernes, who was watching every move of Cyrus carefully, received clear information about the army gathered at Sardis after the preparations for war, he immediately set out with his cavalry unit consisting of 500 soldiers and informed the king. After King Artaxerxes II received the news, he started the necessary preparations for war⁴⁰.

Artaxerxes II gave the satrapy of Sardis back to Tissaphernes as a reward for the exceptional service, loyalty, and devotion that he had displayed at the battle of Cunaxa in 401 B.C., which resulted in the death of Cyrus the Younger. Moreover, the king granted him the honor of becoming his son-in-law after wedding Tissaphernes to his daughter⁴¹. But he could not escape the hatred of the queen mother Parysatis known for her preferential love towards her younger son Cyrus⁴². The king also bestowed upon him the command which Cyrus had held over the satrapies on the sea (τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ὧν Κῦρος ἐπὶ θαλάττης ἤρχε σατραπειῶν; Diod. XIV. 26. 4). So the satraps and the cities which had allied with Cyrus became afraid of being punished for the crime they had committed against the king. All the satraps sent ambassadors to Tissaphernes and submitted their respect and devotion to him and in every way possible arranged their affairs to suit his wishes⁴³. Tissaphernes, expecting the Ionians to display the same conduct, demanded them to be his subjects. But the Ionians thought that since they had preferred Cyrus' sovereignty and started a war against Tissaphernes thus betraying the king, they would suffer punitive sanctions such as loss of their liberty and destruction of their cities. Because they were worried about retribution, they did not allow Tissaphernes to pass through the city walls. On the other hand, they sent envoys to the Lacedaemonians demanding that they not ignore the plundering of their territories and asking them to protect their fundamental rights and liberties⁴⁴. The Lacedaemonians in return not only gave the promise of help but also warned Tissaphernes on behalf of the Ionians not to commit any acts of aggression against the Greek cities (Diod. XIV. 35. 6). As a result of successive mistakes – not submitting their loyalty and devotion, not opening their city gates, defying the satrap through the Spartans to crown it all – Tissaphernes dissolved the freedom of the Ionians (Xen. Hell. III. 2. 12). In this context, to intimidate the cities he first proceeded towards Cyme and plundered the whole territory. He made many people captive and then besieged the city. With the winter approaching, he

⁴⁰ Xen. Anab. 1. 2. 4-5; Plut. Art. VI. 4.

⁴¹ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 3; Anab. II. 5. 1; Diod. XIV. 35. 2; For Artaxerxes' wedding him to his daughter, see Diod. XIV. 26. 4; Suda κ. 1495 s.v. <κῆδος = kedos>.

⁴² Diod. XIV. 80. 6-7; Plut. Art. XXIII. 1; Polyain. strat. VII. 16. 1 "Artaxerxes".

⁴³ Diod. XIV. 35. 1-5. Since Tamos, who was the commander of Ionia in the battle of Cunaxa, was terrified of Tissaphernes, he set sail for Egypt taking his sons and movable possessions with him to take shelter with Psammetichus, the king of the Egyptians. However, Tamos and his sons were put to the sword by the Egyptian king (Diod. XIV. 35. 1-5).

⁴⁴ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 3; Diod. XIV. 35. 6; Plut. Art. XX. 2.

realized the impossibility of occupying the city and, after demanding and receiving an exorbitant ransom, released the captives and raised the siege (Diod. XIV. 35. 7).

Tissaphernes' just judgment concerning the Spartans in 411 B.C. was confirmed by a series of wars they engaged in against the satraps of Sardis and then Dascylium from 400 B.C. onward by undertaking the protection of the Greek cities in Asia Minor. With the Ionians' call for help, the Spartans appointed Thibron *barmostes* and sent him to western Asia Minor with an army consisting of 1000 soldiers from *neodamodes*⁴⁵, 4000 men from the Peloponnesians, and 300 cavalry troops from the Athenians. After Thibron arrived in Asia, he gathered nearly 2000 more soldiers⁴⁶. Ephesus served as the central base of the Spartan army. At first, after confronting the strong cavalry of Tissaphernes, he did not dare to march down to the plain and only managed to avert the plunder of the region he held (Xen. Hell. III. 1. 5). He took the risk of fighting on the flat plains only after the remaining forces of the ten thousand commanded by Xenophon had joined his army (Xen. Hell. III. 1. 6). According to Diodorus (XIV. 36. 2-3), Thibron marched 120 *stadia* from Ephesus and arrived at Magnesia ad Maeandrum (Tekinköy), which was under Tissaphernes' rule. At the first assault he occupied the city, then without losing any time he advanced to Tralleis (Aydın) in Ionia. He laid siege to the city, but was unable to capture it so returned to Magnesia. Since Magnesia was not fortified by walls, he moved the old city to a neighboring hill called Thorax to ensure the safety of the inhabitants. Following several plundering raids in which Tissaphernes appeared with his strong cavalry forces, he immediately withdrew to Ephesus. He won a small-scale victory in the region of Aiolis, and Pergamon, Teuthrania, and Halisarna sided with Thibron with their own consent (Xen. Hell. III. 1. 6). As a matter of fact, the rulers of these cities, Eurysthenes and Procles, were descendants of Demaratus the Lacedaemonian (Hdt. VI. 70). Similarly, Gambrium and Palaigambrium joined him because of Gorgion and Gongylus, and Myrina and Gyrnium willingly opened their gates to the Spartans (Xen. Hell. III. 1. 6). However, as it is obvious from the examples of Tralleis and Larisa, though which defeat occurred first is not known for certain, Thibron was unsuccessful in field battles and sieges. This was because he neither had the sufficient number of cavalry nor the necessary logistical support nor qualified men. The Larisians had efficiently resisted the siege of Thibron and repulsed all kind of raids. For this reason, the *ephoroi* ordered him to raise the siege and change the direction of the military expedition towards Caria (Xen. Hell. III. 1. 6-7). In 399 B.C., when he arrived at Ephesus, Dercylidas came to take command of the army⁴⁷. After the complaints of the Ionians, the Spartans punished Thibron and sent him into exile. For they complained about his passivity in the war and for letting his army plunder the allied countries⁴⁸. Contrary to Thibron, Dercylidas temporarily ended the war with Tissaphernes and engaged in a battle with Pharnabazus, the satrap of Dascylium. But this action contradicted the Spartan position for they had conducted the war against the Persians to protect "the freedom of Ionians". As Xenophon (Hell. III. 2. 12) states in the words of the Ionian representative, freedom to the Ionians depended upon Tissaphernes' initiative. In this context, even though the ancient Greek sources do not express it explicitly, it is obvious that

⁴⁵ *Neodamodeis* (νεοδαμώδεις) were the *heilotes*, who were given their freedom as a reward of their service in war (Thuc. VII. 57; also see Willetts 1954, 27-32).

⁴⁶ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 4-5; According to Diodorus (XIV. 36. 1-2), the Spartans gave 1000 soldiers and ordered their allies to raise as many armies as they could. After Thibron went to Corinth and recruited soldiers from all the confederate cities, he set sail with a force of more than 5000 men for Ephesus. There, with his soldiers and about 2000 soldiers from other cities, the number of the soldiers reached more than 7000.

⁴⁷ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 8; FGtHist II A 70 F 71 "Ephorus" = Ath. Deip. XI. 101, 500c; Diod. XIV. 38. 2.

⁴⁸ Xen. Hell. III. 1. 8; 10; 2. 1; also see Westlake 1981, 259-260; Tuplin 1993, 48-49; Dillery 1995, 103-104.

in the first stage Dercylidas did not venture to fight with the satrap of Sardis. For Artaxerxes II, the satrap of Lydia was more efficient than Pharnabazus. In addition, since he had undertaken the command of Cyrus the Younger's army, he had strong and effective military forces⁴⁹. When Dercylidas noticed this issue of trust between Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus due to the former's enmity towards the satrap of Dascylium from earlier days, he compromised with Tissaphernes. He also did not want to take the risk of losing if he had to fight both satraps at the same time. From 399 until 397 B.C he dispatched his army into those territories under Pharnabazus' rule⁵⁰.

In 397 B.C. the Ionians sent envoys to Lacedaemonia, stating that it was Tissaphernes who would give the Greeks independence and that the satrap of Lydia could only be subdued when conflict also broke out in the region of Caria (Xen. Hell. III. 2. 12). Then the *ephoroi* ordered Dercylidas to dispatch his army towards Caria and Admiral Pharax to proceed along the coast with his ships⁵¹. In the same year Artaxerxes II appointed Tissaphernes general-in-chief of all the armies in Asia Minor (ἅμα μὲν ὄτι στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων ἀπεδέδεικτο Τισσαφέρνης). At that time Pharnabazus possibly went from Cyprus to Ionia to visit Tissaphernes⁵². He stated that he was ready to make war as an ally with him and to aid him in driving the Greeks out of the territory of the king. In fact, Pharnabazus envied Tissaphernes his position as general for various reasons and could not accept being deprived of the sub-satrapy region of Aiolis after Dercylidas' expedition in 399 B.C. He went to Caria with Tissaphernes; then, after stationing adequate garrisons in the fortresses, they returned to Ionia (Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 13-14). Most probably, Tissaphernes, taking the advantage of the defenselessness of the region, was planning to subdue the Ionians through a sudden plundering attack. When Dercylidas, who feared this, heard that the satraps of Dascylium and Lydia had returned from Caria to Ionia and crossed the Maeander (Menderes Irmađı), he too crossed the river (Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 14). While he was proceeding towards Ephesus, Persian scouts on the burial mounds were detected. Then he saw the white shields of the Carians stationed along the way. The entire Persian force in the region, all the Greek forces under the command of the satraps of Dascylium and Lydia, and a great number of horsemen were waiting in battle order. The cavalry of Tissaphernes had formed a line on the right wing and that of Pharnabazus on the left⁵³. Dercylidas immediately brought his army into battle readiness. However, some soldiers from Priene, Achilleium, the Islands, and other Ionian cities panicked at the sight of the great Persian army and ran away, leaving their arms in the standing grain. It was obvious that this line would not stand for very long in the battle (Xen. Hell. III. 2. 16). While the Persian armies were superior and in a more advantageous situation than their rivals – in number, quality, and tactical position – Tissaphernes' particular avoidance of combat is something difficult to understand. According to the ancient sources, Pharnabazus insisted on engaging in battle immediately, but Tissaphernes, remembering the bravery of the ten thousand who had fought in Cunaxa, was of the opinion that all the Greeks fought bravely. While a victory resulting in a catastrophic defeat of the enemy had

⁴⁹ Iust. VI. 1. 2-4; also see Diod. XIV. 35. 2-5.

⁵⁰ Xen. Hell. III. I. 9; Iust. VI. 1-4; also see Hyland 2008, 1-26.

⁵¹ In accordance with the decree he had received, Dercylidas passed from Chersonesus to Aiolis. After seizing Atarneus as a result of an eight-month siege, he marched towards Ephesus. Atarneus appointed Dracon of Pellene *harmostes*. Dracon raised an army of nearly 3000 light-armed soldiers from the neighboring areas and ravaged the plain of Mysia (Isoc. Paneg. IV. 144-145; also see Xen. Hell. III. 2. 11).

⁵² Xen. Hell. III. 2. 12-14; Diod. XIV. 39. 4-5.

⁵³ Xen. Hell. III. 2. 14-16. According to Diodorus (XIV. 39. 4), the Persian army consisted of 20,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry.

been inevitable, for the moment he decided that a provisional conciliation was more beneficial for providing political stability⁵⁴. So for a year the enemy was removed from the land of the king by a truce. In accord with the negotiations between the parties Dercylidas – on condition that the king of Persia should give autonomy to the Greek cities – and Pharnabazus and Tissaphernes as satraps of Dascylium and Sardis respectively – on condition that the Greek army should withdraw from Asia Minor and the *barmostes* of Sparta from the cities – made a provisional truce. The terms discussed during the truce meeting would be submitted to Sparta by Dercylidas and to the king by Tissaphernes for approval⁵⁵. This truce caused the already existing tension between Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus, who determinedly insisted on fighting and planned to retake the sub-satrapy region of Aiolis by placing it under his sovereignty (Xen. Hell. III. 2. 13), to increase⁵⁶.

In 396 B.C. Artaxerxes apparently did not approve the terms of the truce made with Sparta and her allies. It is argued that it was the “Tissaphernes factor” which played an effective role in this disapproval of the truce by the king. Artaxerxes II started to make preparations by equipping a big fleet consisting of Phoenicians and also recruiting soldiers, whose aim – whether against the Greeks or against the other peoples in Central Asia – remains uncertain⁵⁷. At that time the coastal cities of Asia Minor, whose residents could no longer bear the unjust and autocratic treatment of the Spartan administrators and *barmostes*, had begun to expel them from their countries (Plut. Ages. VI. 1). The Lacedaemonians, responding to this move, dispatched a large army commanded by the Spartan king Agesilaus to Anatolia in order to ensure a peace treaty with the Persian king, or if the Persians insisted on fighting, to render them too preoccupied to attack the Greeks (Xen. Ages. I. 7). Following the preparations, which took such a surprisingly short time that it left the Achaemenid navy and the satraps of western Asia Minor completely unprepared, Agesilaus arrived at Ephesus with 30 *Spartiates*, 2000 *neodamodes*, and a force of about 6000 allies under his command who were deployed there⁵⁸. Tissaphernes, who had been caught off guard, instead of fighting immediately offered a provisional agreement to gain time until he was prepared. Agesilaus accepted this offer on condition that Tissaphernes should swear an oath that he would not employ any deceptive tactics. The parties involved came to terms on the matter that would make the Persian king give freedom

⁵⁴ Xen. Hell. III. 2. 18. After the envoys were sent to Dercylidas and assurances and hostages were exchanged, the process of negotiation started. The Persian army withdrew to Tralleis (Ayдын) and the Spartan forces to Magnesia ad Maendrum at the place where the temple of Artemis Leucophryene was situated (Xen. Hell. III. 2. 19).

⁵⁵ Xen. Hell. III. 2. 20; Diod. XIV. 39. 4-6.

⁵⁶ According to Corn. Nepos (Con. III. 1-3; IV. 1-2), Tissaphernes in fact revolted against Artaxerxes II, but he did not do it explicitly as the others had done. Since Pharnabazus knew that Artaxerxes would not believe the treachery of Tissaphernes because of the effective performance he had displayed during Cyrus the Younger's revolt, he sent Conon the Athenian. When informed by Conon, Artaxerxes II declared Tissaphernes an enemy. The king bestowed upon Conon the responsibility for the war which would be conducted against the Spartans and also the right to chose the one who would cover the expenses of this war. With Conon's demand, Pharnabazus was assigned to assist him. According to Iustinus (VI. 1-9), in ca. 397 BC., after Tissaphernes had chosen to make peace with Dercylidas instead of making war with him, Pharnabazus submitted his complaint regarding this matter to the king stating: When the Spartans entered Asia Minor, he did not expel them with his army; on the contrary, he increased the king's expenses. Instead of fighting, he consistently procrastinated in the clashes. Instead of driving his army with full force upon the enemy and thus winning decisive victories, he was always buying them out through bribes, which was a disgrace for the kingdom. Thus Pharnabazus, by using such phrases, caused Artaxerxes II to change his feelings about Tissaphernes and thus ensured that the command of the naval battle was handed over to Conon the Athenian, who was in exile at that time in Cyprus.

⁵⁷ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 1; Ages. I. 6; Corn. Nep. Ages. II. 1; Plut. Ages. VI. 1.

⁵⁸ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 1-2; Ages. I. 7; Diod. XIV. 79. 1; Corn. Nep. Ages. II. 1; Plut. Ages. VI. 1-3; Lys. XXIII. 1-2; Art. XX. 2; Paus. III. 9. 1-3; also see Isoc. Euag. IX. 51-54; Phil. V. 62; 86-87; Epist. IX. 13-14; Ath. Deip. XII. 74.

and independence to the Greek cities in Asia Minor. A delegation designated by the satrap was to be sent to the king and until the messengers returned, there would be a three-month truce⁵⁹. When Tissaphernes increased the power of his army by the reinforcement of troops coming down from the king through the truce⁶⁰, he asked Agesilaus to withdraw from Asia Minor, or else he would declare war. Agesilaus sent ambassadors to the cities of Ionia, Aiolis, and Hellespont, asking them to gather reinforcements and send them to Ephesus⁶¹. The cavalry had never been powerful in the Spartan army as it was primarily an army of infantry. Since there was no cavalry under the command of Agesilaus and Caria's geographical location was not suitable for cavalry (also he had broken his oath of agreement), Tissaphernes foresaw that he was really going to march against his own residence in Caria. For this reason, he sent the whole of his infantry to Caria while leading his cavalry round into the plain of the Maeander, expecting to cut off the Greek troops there. Apparently Agesilaus, just like Dercylidas, did not dare at first to fight with the satrap of Sardis. While he was proceeding as if into Caria with his army of nearly 10,000 infantry and 400 cavalry⁶², suddenly Agesilaus changed direction and marched towards Hellespontine Phrygia, which was caught completely off guard⁶³. Because of the inadequacy of their cavalry force, the Spartans were in a very disadvantageous position against the Persians. For this reason, their general military tactics were, as much as possible, to avoid campaigning against the enemy in the plains – the favored ground for the cavalry – and to fight in mountainous, woody, or swampy terrain where the infantry had the advantage. Agesilaus took the chance of fighting with Tissaphernes after he compensated to a certain extent for this deficiency through assistance from his allies of horses, cavalry, and weapons⁶⁴.

Even though it is difficult to make a clear inference concerning Tissaphernes's military strategy – the ancient sources provide two different versions of the battle of Sardis in 395 B.C. – in both narrations Tissaphernes's considerable tactical mistakes draw one's attention. The two basic sources are Xenophon (Hell. III. 4. 21-25) and the Oxyrhynchus historian (P. XI (VI). 4-6). However, since Diodorus (XIV. 80. 1-8) has apparently used the same source as the Oxyrhynchus historian, these two texts complement each other. According to Xenophon (Hell. III. 4. 21-25; Ages. I. 29-30), in the spring of 395 B.C. Agesilaus declared that he would march on the most fertile parts of the country, Sardis. Tissaphernes thought that because of the insufficient number of the cavalry in the Spartan army, Agesilaus would in fact conduct an expedition

⁵⁹ Xen. Ages. I. 9-12; Hell. III. 4. 5; Corn. Nep. Ages. II. 3-5; Plut. Ages. IX. 1; mor. III. 209 a-b; Apophtheg. Lacon. 11; Polyain. strat. 2. 1. 8 "Agesilaus".

⁶⁰ According to Xenophon (Ages. I. 11-12), Tissaphernes, as he had done before, sent the envoys to the king not to ensure peace but to request him to send a large army.

⁶¹ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 11; Ages. I. 12-14; Corn. Nep. Ages. II. 4-5; Plut. Ages. IX. 1-2; mor. III. 209 a-b; Apophtheg. Lacon. 11.

⁶² According to Diodorus (XIV. 79. 1), when Agesilaus arrived at Ephesus, he recruited nearly 4000 more soldiers, raising the number to 10,000 infantry and 400 cavalry.

⁶³ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 12; Ages. I. 15-19; Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 1-3; Plut. Ages. IX. 2-3; mor. III. 209 b; Apophtheg. Lacon. 11; also see Diod. XIV. 79. 1-3; Polyain. strat. II. 1. 8-9 "Agesilaus"; Ael. Arist. XXVI. 17. The guide of Spithradates, the Lydian satrap's good and strong military force, and the presence of Pharnabazus, the satrap of Dascylium, in Caunus with most of his army, probably in order to assist Conon the Athenian, would have been the important factors in this sudden change in direction of the operation. For detailed information on Agesilaus' Dascylium campaign in 396 B.C., see Sankaya 2015, 201-203.

⁶⁴ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 15-17; Ages. I. 23-27; Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 3-6; Plut. Ages. IX. 3-5; mor. III. 209 b-c; Apophtheg. Lacon. 12-13. Agesilaus then appointed Xenocles and Adaios commanders of the cavalry, Scythes commander of the *neodamodes* hoplites, Herippidas commander of the soldiers of Cyrus, and Mygdon commander of the allied armies.

to Caria and that he had misguided him in order to catch him unawares⁶⁵. According to this narrative, Tissaphernes' biggest mistake was that instead of taking precautions through considering both of the possibilities, he deployed the greater part of the cavalry in the plain of Maeander and sent almost all of his army, especially the infantry to Caria. This left the choice of battlefield where the war would be decided to the enemy⁶⁶. In fact, the closely watched enemy could have been drawn to the most suitable predetermined area through harassing attacks and by employing the topographical features to the fullest extent. Thus they would have been forced to fight under these unfavorable conditions. The opposition would have had to take many possibilities into consideration at the same time, which would have prevented them from focusing their forces at one point and producing a divided army. According to Xenophon (Hell. III. 4. 21-24), Agesilaus proceeded towards Sardis organizing raids of plunder and without confronting the enemy for three days. On the fourth day, while Tissaphernes was passing to Sardis, the Persian cavalry crossed the Pactolus River (Sart Çayı) and encamped in the area. Then they attacked the enemy soldiers who had scattered for plunder and killed a large number of them. When Agesilaus was informed of this, he ordered his horsemen to go to their aid. The Persians entered into the fighting wings that extended inwards. Agesilaus took advantage of the current absence of the infantry and led his phalanx against the opposing line of horsemen. He ordered the first ten year-classes of hoplites (heavy infantry) to run to close quarters with the enemy, and bidding the peltastes (light infantry) to lead the way at double-quick. He sent messengers to his cavalry ordering them to attack, while he himself followed them with the main army. The Persians resisted the cavalry incursions, but when they confronted the other wings of the enemy, they could not withstand them. Some were thrown into the river while others ran away⁶⁷. However, the Oxyrhynchus historian (P. XI [VI]. 4-6) and Diodorus derived from Ephorus (XIV. 80. 1-8) fail to include information showing that Agesilaus revealed the route of his campaign to the enemy. Agesilaus proceeded with his army from Ephesus towards the territory around Sipylus, passing through the plain of Cayster⁶⁸. So Tissaphernes did not make the tactical mistake that Xenophon mentions, meaning he was not drawn into a war which would be fought in the place, time, and conditions determined by the enemy. On the contrary, he followed closely upon them with an army consisting of 10,000 cavalry and 50,000 infantry. He assigned the cavalry and light-armed soldiers as advance guards, commanding them to pursue the Spartans and harass them when they were on their way to reach their sources of provisions. Thereupon, Agesilaus chose to pass through high, mountainous, and woody areas where he was safe from the Persian cavalry and where his infantry was very effective, and there he encamped⁶⁹. On the other hand, he especially avoided engaging on the field of battle against the enemy that outnumbered him⁷⁰. Thus Tissaphernes was planning to wear out and gradually exhaust the vigor of his enemy's small army through the denial of resources. They could not receive reinforcements since they were marching within

⁶⁵ The ancient writers who have taken Xenophon's work as the fundamental source and summarized it naturally report the same narrative. On this subject see Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 4-6; Plut. Ages. X. 1-2; Polyain. strat. II. 1. 9 "Agesilaus".

⁶⁶ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 20-22; Ages. I. 28-30; Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 4-6; Plut. Ages. X. 1-2.

⁶⁷ Also see Xen. Ages. I. 30-32; Plut. Ages. X. 2-4: "during this battle, Tissaphernes was not at Sardis, he was at the head of his army".

⁶⁸ Diod. XIV. 80. 1. For the route Agesilaus followed from Ephesus to Lydia see Anderson 1974, 33 ff.; Botha 1988, 71-80; Dugas 1910, 63; Shipley 1997, 165-167.

⁶⁹ Diod. XIV. 80. 1; Hell. Oxy. P. XI (VI). 3; Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 6.

⁷⁰ Hell. Oxy. P. XI (VI). 3; Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 6.

the province. The same tactic against Agesilaus would later be applied by Pharnabazus who, unlike Tissaphernes, would be successful⁷¹. Agesilaus, who had the cunning of an experienced commander and strategist, must have understood Tissaphernes' tactic. Probably he decided to force his enemy to fight in every possible way. Agesilaus approached the center of the satrapy, having taken up fighting positions. Later, thinking that they would fight for the fruitful orchards and for the strategically important *paradeisos*, he moved towards them (Diod. XIV. 80. 2). But Tissaphernes allowed the plunder of the fields and farms. Then Agesilaus drew him into a trap. Midway between Sardis and Thybarnae at night, he dispatched Xenocles the Spartan with 1400 soldiers to a thickly wooded place to set an ambush for the Persians. At dawn Agesilaus marched with his army along the way. While he was passing through the place where the soldiers lay in wait and the barbarians were advancing upon him without being in battle order and harassing his rearguard, he suddenly turned towards the Persians. When a sharp battle followed, he signaled to his soldiers in ambush and they attacked the enemy chanting the battle song. When the Persians, thus besieged, got stuck between these forces, they became terrified and fled immediately (Diod. XIV. 80. 2-3)⁷². Then Agesilaus attacked the Persian camp and captured supplies, prisoners, and miscellaneous booty including the property of Tissaphernes himself⁷³. While Tissaphernes was retiring with his army to Sardis, Agesilaus could not take the risk of attacking the center of the satrapy. He only set up a trophy and plundered the countryside for three days, and on the fourth day led his army away towards Greater Phrygia⁷⁴. Possibly Agesilaus followed the same route Cyrus the Younger had taken a couple of years before. Passing through Lydia, he arrived at the Maeander River and from there must have returned to Ephesus⁷⁵. Although Sardis could not be besieged and occupied, this defeat and

⁷¹ For more detailed information on the subject, see Sankaya 2015, 208-209.

⁷² The narrative of Diodorus (XIV. 80. 2-4) differs from Hell. Oxy. P. in three aspects: Agesilaus attacked before Xenocles; the Persians, who were suddenly attacked, did not flee immediately and a severe battle broke out; the casualties of the Persians were not 600 but rather 6000 people were killed. The reason for this difference is explained by Diodorus' use of Ephorus as the main source and a slight mistake he has made in the quotation employed (Bruce 1967, 83-84). When Diodorus' description of the size of the Persian army as consisting of 60,000 soldiers was taken for granted, the number of the dead must have naturally seemed to be realistic to the writers (Dillery 1995, 110, n. 61). According to the Oxyrhynchus historian (P. XI [VI]. 4-6), Agesilaus woke the army at dawn and they marched on. As the Persians had been accustomed to, they followed and some of them attacked the Greek rearguard. Others rode around them, while others began to pursue them across the plain in an undisciplined attack. Xenocles considered the time opportune for the surprise attack and roused his soldiers from their ambush and charged on the double. The Persians, in no formation to give battle, fled all over the plain. When Agesilaus saw that they were terrified, he dispatched his cavalry and light-armed infantry in pursuit. But the Peloponnesians could not catch the enemy since most were cavalry and unarmed so could not chase them for a long time. After killing about 600 of the enemy, they broke off the pursuit.

⁷³ Hell. Oxy. P. XI (VI). 6; Diod. XIV. 80. 4-5. The ancient sources agree on the matter that they occupied the Persian encampment. On the Battle of Sardis see: Corn. Nep. Ages. III. 4-6; Plut. Art. XX. 2-3; mor. III. 209 d; Apophteg. Lacon. 14; Dio Chrys. Orat. 56. 7; Polyain. strat. II. 1. 9 "Agesilaus"; Paus. III. 9. 5-6; Frontin. strat. I. 8.12. Also see Busolt 1908, 255-285; Dugas 1910, 59-76; Bruce 1967, 150-156; Anderson 1974, 27-53; Gray 1979, 183-200; DeVoto 1988, 41-53; Botha 1988, 71-80; Wyle 1992, 118-130; Briant 2002, 637-638; Dillery 1995, 109-114; Shipley 1997, 167-169; Lafarga 2007, 433-475; Binder 2008, 280-281; Tüner Önen 2015, 121-123; Occhipinti 2016, 61-64; Lotz 2016, 126-154.

⁷⁴ According to the Oxyrhynchus historian (P. XII (VII) 2), Agesilaus, through allowing his army to plunder the areas they were passing through, marched on within Phrygia. When Tissaphernes learned of this, he pursued them with his army covering a distance of many stadia.

⁷⁵ Hell. Oxy.fr. Lond. XII (VII). 3: "journeying through the plain of Lydia, Agesilaus led the army.... Through the mountains lying between Lydia and Phrygia. When they had crossed these, he brought the Greeks down to Phrygia until they reached the Maeander River which is the greatest city in Phrygia, and flows out the sea near Priene and". On this subject see also, Bruce 1967, 86-87; 132-133. According to Diodorus (XIV. 80. 4) Agesilaus was about to attack the area extending ahead of the inner part of the satrapy. But when the sacrifices pointed out an ill omen, he instead drove his army towards the sea.

plunder of the most important territory of the satrapy cost the life of Tissaphernes together with the loss of prestige, what had been displayed through the fragility of Persian power to the Greeks. The Persians who had taken part in the battle accused Tissaphernes of betrayal and saw him as the person responsible to be blamed for the defeat at Sardis⁷⁶. Parysatis hated him because of the enmity between him and Cyrus the Younger and his role in the death of her son. Thinking that it was the right time to take revenge for Cyrus, she was constantly provoking the king⁷⁷. So Artaxerxes appointed Tithraustes commander of Lydia and assigned him the task of killing Tissaphernes. Tithraustes, aided by Ariaeus, strangled Tissaphernes, the satrap of Sardis, at Colossae (Honaz) in Phrygia, and after beheading him sent Tissaphernes's head to the king⁷⁸.

Consequently, despite the just diplomacy and strategy of Tissaphernes concerning Athens and the Spartans, his failure in the implementation of them is striking. He had strong and influential opponents at the Persian Court, such as Cyrus the Younger, Pharnabazus the satrap of Dascylium, and Parysatis, which apparently injured his relations with the Persian throne. Also, he had to fight with the best statesmen and commanders of his time such as Alcibiades the Athenian and the Spartan king Agesilaus. The series of his defeats against the Spartan king seems especially to have prepared the end of the satrap. Moreover, when the disaster of the plunder of the cities in and around the center of the satrapy and the devastation of the rural area by the Greeks are also been included, he drew the fury of Artaxerxes upon him. Thus, although Tissaphernes was once one of the prominent men to gain the Persian king's trust and granted important tasks, his strategic failure and tactical mistakes led to his fall from grace and to his loss of the satrapy and his life.

⁷⁶ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 25; Ages. I. 35; Diod. XIV. 80. 6-7.

⁷⁷ Diod. XIV. 80. 6-7; Plut. Art. XXIII. 1; Polyain. strat. VII. 16. 1 "Artaxerxes".

⁷⁸ Xen. Hell. III. 4. 25; Ages. I. 35; Diod. XIV. 80. 6-8; Paus. III. 9. 7-8; Polyain. strat. VII. 16. 1 "Artaxerxes"; Plut. Ages. X. 3-4; Art. XXIII. 1; also see Bruce 1967, 89-91; Westlake 1981, 268-279.

Özet

Bir Sardis Satrabı'nın Diplomatik ve Stratejik Manevraları: Tissaphernes

Tissaphernes'e ilişkin sınırlı sayıda çalışmalar olmakla birlikte, cursus honorum'undaki (kariyer) icraatları sayesinde Pers kralı II. Dareios ile II. Artakserkses'in dönemin satraplarına nadiren tanıdıkları büyük yetkilerle donatılmasındaki askeri, idari ve diplomatik başarıları; üst mertebeden alt statüye ve sonunu ölüme sürükleyen taktiksel hataları ile politik başarısızlıkları üzerinde durulmamıştır. Dolayısıyla bu makalede Tissaphernes'in askeri diplomasisi ve stratejisi ortaya konulmaya ve bu perspektifte Batı Anadolu'daki önemli tarihsel olaylar yeniden ele alınmaya çalışılmaktadır. Tissaphernes hakkında rasyonel bir değerlendirmenin önündeki aşılmaz engel, satraba ilişkin bilgilerin sadece Hellen antik yazarların başka kültürleri oldukları gibi değil; kendi algıları doğrultusunda duyumsayıp alımlayarak çizdikleri aktarımlarıyla sınırlı kalmasıdır. Bu nedenle konuya ilişkin bütün veriler derlenip büyük titizlikle analiz edilmeye çalışılmıştır.

MÖ yak. 413 yılında Pissuthnes Ayaklanması'ndaki başarısıyla Sardis satraplığına getirildi. Barış-savaş konusunda tam yetkiyle Atinalılara karşı kralın emirleri uyarınca Peloponnesos'lularla bağlaşıklık kurdu; ancak Spartalıların gerçek niyetini sezilmeyince MÖ 412-411 yıllarında günümüzde de geçerliliğini sürdüren her iki güç devletinin güçlenmesine fırsat tanımayan "denge" politikasını benimsedi. Bu haklı muhakemesinde taraflardan birini safına çekmeye yönelik yumuşak bir siyaset izleyememekten ötürü başarısız olduğu anlaşılır. Bir yandan da dönemin önde gelen Atina'lı devlet adamı Alkibiades'in yarattığı algı operasyonu Sparta'luların nefretini kazandığı gözlemlenir. Bu ve Thukydides'in haklı tespiti uyarınca Sparta'luların savaşı ağırdan almaları ve çekingenlikleri gibi nedenlerle Batı Anadolu'dan Atina'lıları defetmek için Sparta ittifakıyla başlatılan savaşlar çok uzun sürdü. Beklenen hedefin aksine imparatorluğa can ve para bakımından büyük zarar verdi. Dolayısıyla II. Dareios seferi sağlıklı ve hızlı bir şekilde yürütmesi için tam yetki verdiği Tissaphernes'i MÖ 407 yılında Sardis satraplık görevinden alıp alt satraplık bölgesi Ionia'nın yöneticiliğine (hyparkhos) getirmek suretiyle rütbesini düşürdü.

Tissaphernes sadece Spartalıların değil; aynı zamanda Genç Kyros'un amacını doğru tahmin edip görmekle gerçekten iyi yargı gücüne sahip olduğunu kanıtladı. MÖ 404 yılında Genç Kyros'un tahta çıkma planının ilk girişimine sekte vurdu. Buna misilleme olarak Genç Kyros, MÖ 403 yılında Ionia'luların büyük kısmını egemenliğine dahil edip onları Tissaphernes'e karşı kıskırttı; Tissaphernes ile Ionia'lular arasında uzun süreli mücadelenin bu suretle başladığı anlaşılır. Tissaphernes kralla sadakatle bağlı akıllı, disiplinli ve iyi bir idareciydi. Ancak zeki ve mükemmel bir yönetici olsa da, bir komutan olarak beceri ve deneyimden yoksundu. En büyük savaş deneyimi MÖ 401 yılındaki Kunaksa Savaşı'nda sol kanadı tutan birliğin komutasıydı (Ksen. Anab. I. 8. 8-9). Bunun da ötesinde Tissaphernes'in askeri uzmanlık

alanının savunma olduđu anlaşılır. Kyros'un tahtı gasp etme girişimini tam vaktinde bildirdiği ve Kunaksa Savaşı'nda sergilediği üstün komutanlık yeteneğinden ötürü Artakserkses'in takdir ve minnettarlığını kazandı. Tissaphernes MÖ 400 yılında Batı Anadolu'ya geri döndüğünde kariyerinin diğer evrelerinden çok daha fazla prestij elde etti. Ancak kendi sonunu felaketlerden koruyamadı. Sparta'lılar Ionia'lıları temsilen Batı Anadolu'ya girince Tissaphernes onları ordusuyla defetmedi; bilakis kralın masrafını artırdı. Orduyu tam güçle düşmanın üzerine salıp kesin başarılar kazanmaktansa, çarpışmaları sürekli erteledi. MÖ 397 yılında Tissaphernes'in Derkyllidas ordusuyla meydan muharebesine girdiğinde geri çekilmesi büyük hatalarından biriydi ve onun zafer şansını azalttı. Savaştan çekilmesi Daskyleion satrabı Pharnabazos'la arasının açılmasına ve kralla çeşitli şikayetlerin gitmesiyle gözden düşmesine neden oldu. Peloponnesosluları yakından tanıyan Tissaphernes düşmanın zayıf noktası olan süvari ve ikmal eksikliği üzerine odaklandı. Ancak asker olarak üstün bir yeteneğe sahip Sparta kralı Agesilaos'un taktik, özellikle şaşırtmaca, ustalığı Tissaphernes'inkiyle boy ölçüşemedi. Sardis Savaşı'na ilişkin ilk versiyonda en büyük hatası arazi seçimini düşmana bırakması; ikinci anlatıda ise, yakın takiple düşmanı ani akınlarla taciz edip yıpratma şeklinde başarılı bir strateji izlerken Agesilaos'un disiplinli ve tehlikeli olan ordusuyla pusuya yattığı alana çekip ordusunu kısıvrak yakalayabileceğini öngörememesidir. Pharnabazos'un şikayetlerine, bu yenilgiyle Sardis'teki önemli komutanların ithamları ve elbette en önemlisi Parysatis'in kışkırtmaları da eklenince Tissaphernes'in ölümünün imparator çıkarlarına daha uygun görüldüğü anlaşılmaktadır.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Ancient Sources

- Ael. Arist. P. Aelius Aristides, *The Complete Works*, vols. I-II. C. A. Behr (trans.) (1981, 1986).
- Aesch. Pers. Aeschylus, *Persae*, vols. I-II, H. W. Smyth (trans.) (1922, 1926).
- Andoc. de pac. Andocides, *de pace*; *Andocide: Discours*, G. Dalmeyda (ed.) (1930; 1966 repr.).
- Aristoph. Vesp. Aristophanes, *Vespae*, vol. III, B. B. Rogers (ed.) (1930).
- Aristoph. Equ. Aristophanes, "Equites", in: V. Coulon – M. van Daele (eds.), *Aristophane*, vol. 1 (1923) 80-141.
- Aristot. Ath. Pol. Aristotle, *Athenaion Politeia*. *The Athenian Constitution: The Eudemian Ethics; On Virtues and Vices*, H. Rackham (trans.) (1935).
- Ath. Deip. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophisticarum Epitome: The Deipnosophistis*, vols. I-VII, C. B. Gulick (trans.) (1927-1999).
- Corn. Nep. Cornelius Nepos, *Ages. (= Agesilaus), Con. (= Conon), On the Great Generals of Foreign Nations*, J. C. Rolfe (trans.) (1966).
- Diod. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historike*, vols. I-VI: C. H. Oldfather (trans.) (1933-1954); vol. VII: C. H. Sherman (trans.) (1952); vols. VIII: C. B. Welles (trans.) (1963); vols. IX-X: R. M. Geer (trans.) (1947, 1954); vols. XI-XII: F. R. Walton (1957, 1967).
- Dio Chrys. Orat. Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*, W. Cohoon – H. L. Crosby (trans.) (1932-1953).
- Dion. Hal. Ant. Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Antiquitates Romanae: The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, vols. I-IV, E. Cary (trans.) (1937-1950).
- FGrHist Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, vols. I-XV, F. Jacoby (ed.) (1923-1958).
- Frontin. strat. Sextus Iulius Frontinus, *Strategematon: The Strategems and the Aqueducts of Rome*, C. E. Bennett – M. B. McElwain (trans.) (1925).
- Harpoc. lex. Harpokration, *Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos, Harpocrationis lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, vol. I., W. Dindorf (ed.) (1853; 1969 repr.).
- Hdt. Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, vols. 1-IV, A. D. Godley (trans.) (1920-1925).
- Hell. Oxy. *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, P. R. McKechnie – S. J. Kern (trans.) (1993).
Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, V. Bartoletti (ed.) (1959) 6-37.
- Isoc. Paneg. Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, vol. I-II., G. Norlin (trans.) (1928-1929).
- Isoc. Isocrates, *de Big (= de Bigis), Epist. (= Epistula), Euag. (= Euagoras), Phil. (= Philippus)*, vol. III, L. R. Van Hook (trans.) (1945).
- Iust. Marcus Iulianus Iustinus, *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*, J. C. Yardley (trans.) (1994).
- Paus. Pausanias, *Periegesis tes Hellados: Description of Greece*, vols. I-V, W. H. Jones (trans.) (1918-1935).
- Phot. Bib. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, R. Henry (ed.) (1971).
Photius, *The Bibliotheca*, N. G. Wilson (trans.) (2002).
- Plut. (= Plutarkhos, *Bioi Paralleloi*)
Ages. (= Agesilaus) Art. (= Artaxerxes) Alc. (= Alcibiades)
Cim. (= Cimon) Lys. (= Lysandrus).
Plutarch's Lives, vols. I-XI, B. Perrin (trans.) (1914-1926).
- Plut. mor. Plutarch, *Moralia*, I-XIV, F. C. Babbitt – W. C. Helmbold et al. (trans.) (1927-1967).

- Polyain. strat. Polyainos, "Strategemata", in: E. Woelfflin – J. Melber (eds.), *Polyaeni strategematon libri viii* (1887, 1970 repr.) 2-301, 305-425.
- Schol. Aristoph. Av. Scholia in Aristophanem, Aves, "Aristophane", in: V. Coulon – M. van Daele (eds.), *Les Belles Lettres*, vol. 3 (1928, 1967 repr.) 23-108.
Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem, F. Dubner (ed.) (1877).
- Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. Scholia in Aristophanem, Vespae, "Wasps", in: D. M. MacDowell (ed.), *Aristophanes*. (1971) 48-122.
Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem, F. Dubner (ed.) (1877).
- Schol. Thuc. Scholia in Thucydidem: *Historiae*, vol. 2, H. S. Jones – J. E. Powell (ed.) (1942, 1970 repr.).
- Suda Suda-Suidas, *Suidae Lexicon I-IV*, A. Adler (ed.) (1928-1971).
- Thuc. Thucydides, *Historiae*, vols. I-II, H. S. Jones – J. E. Powell (eds.) (1942).
History of the Peloponnesian War, vols. I-IV, C. F. Smith (trans.) (1919-1923).
- Xen. Ages. Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, E. C. Marchant (trans.) (1925).
- Xen. Anab. Xenophon, *Anabasis Books 1-7*, C. L. Brownson (trans.) (1922).
- Xen. Hell. Xenophon, *Hellenica*, vols. I-II, C. L. Brownson (trans.) (1918, 1921).

Modern Literature

- Aclass Acta Classica. Verhandeling van die Klassieke Vereniging van Suid-Afrika = Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa.
- Anderson 1974 J. K. Anderson, "The Battle of Sardis in 395 B.C.", *CSCA* 7, 1974, 27-53.
- Andrewes 1971 A. Andrewes, "Thucydides and the Persians", *Historia* X, 1971, 1-18.
- Arslan 2010 M. Arslan, *İstanbul'un Antikçağ Tarihi: Klasik ve Hellenistik Dönemler* (2010).
- Arta Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology.
- Badian 1987 E. Badian, "The Peace of Callias", *JHS* CVII, 1987, 1-39.
- Binder 2008 C. Binder, *Plutarchs Vita des Artaxerxes Ein historischer Kommentar* (2008).
- Bosworth 1990 A. B. Bosworth, "Plutarch, Callisthenes and the Peace of Callias", *JHS* 110, 1990, 1-13.
- Botha 1988 L. Botha, "The Asiatic Campaign of Agesilaus the Topography of the Route from Ephesus to Sardis", *Aclass* 31, 1988, 71-8.
- Briant 2002 P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (2002).
- Busolt 1908 G. Busolt, "Der Neue Historiker und Xenophon", *Hermes* 43, 1908, 255-285.
- Bruce 1967 I. A. F. Bruce, *An Historical Commentary on the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* (1967).
- Cawkwell 1997 G. L. Cawkwell, "The Peace between Athens and Persia", *Phoenix* 51, 115-130.
- Childs 1981 W. A. P. Childs, "Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Re-examined", *AnatSt* 31, 1981, 55-80.
- CPh Classical Philology.
- CSCA California Studies in Classical Antiquity.
- CJ The Classical Journal.
- Cowley 1923 A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923).
- CQ Classical Quarterly.

- Danzing 2007 G. Danzing, "Xenophon's Wicked Persian, or What's Wrong with Tissaphernes? Xenophon's Views on Lying and Breaking Oaths", in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *In Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire* (2007) 27-50.
- DeVoto 1988 J. G. DeVoto, "Agesilaos and Tissaphernes near Sardis in 395 BC", *Hermes* 116, 1988, 41-53.
- Dillery 1995 J. Dillery, *Xenophon and The History of his Times* (1995).
- Driver 1954 G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century BC* (1954).
- Dugas 1910 C. Dugas, "La campagne d'Agésilas en Asie Mineure (395): Xénophon et l'Anonyme d'Oxyrynchos", *BCH* 34, 1910, 58-95.
- Gray 1979 V. J. Gray, "Two Different Approaches to the Battle of Sardis in 395 B.C. Xenophon *Hellenica* 3.4.20-24 and *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* 11 (6).4-6", *CSCA* 12, 1979, 183-200.
- Gribble 1999 D. Gribble, *Alcibiades and Athens: A Study in Literary Presentation* (1999).
- Gomme 1981 A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. V (1981).
- Fornara 1983 C. W. Fornara, *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War* (1983).
- Haebler 1982 C. Haebler, "Karanos: Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Betrachtung zu Xen. *Hell.* I 4,3", in: J. Tischler (ed.), *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift G. Neumann* (1982) 81-90.
- Hallock 1969 R. T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (1969).
- Hornblower 1991² S. Hornblower, *The Greek World, 479-323 BC*² (1991).
- Hornblower 2004² S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*², vols. II, VI-V (2004).
- Hyland 2007 J. Hyland, "Thucydides' Portrait of Tissaphernes Re-examined", in: C. Tuplin (ed.), *In Political and Cultural Interaction with(in) the Achaemenid Empire* (2007) 1-25.
- Hyland 2008 J. Hyland, "Pharnabazos, Cyrus' Rebellion, and the Spartan War of 399", *Arta* 2008, 1-26.
- Kagan 1987 D. Kagan, *The Fall of the Athenian Empire* (1987).
- Kallet 2001 L. Kallet, *Money and the Corrosion of Power in Thucydides: The Sicilian Expedition and its Aftermath* (2001).
- Keen 1998 A. G. Keen, *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and their Relations with Foreign Powers c. 545-362 B.C.* (1998).
- Klinkott 2005 H. Klinkott, *Der Satrap ein Achaimenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume* (2005).
- Koch 1992 H. Koch, *Es kündigt Dareios der König* (1992).
- Lafarga 2007 R. L. Lafarga, *Comentario histórico de las Helénicas de Oxirrinco* (2007).
- Lateiner 1976 D. Lateiner, "Tissaphernes and the Phoenician Fleet (Thucydides 8. 87)", *TAPhA* 106, 1976, 267-290.
- Lewis 1958 M. Lewis, "The Phoenician Fleet in 411", *Historia* 7, 1958, 392-397.
- Lewis 1977 D. M. Lewis, *Sparta and Persia* (1977).
- Lotz 2016 H. Lotz, "Die „Schlacht bei Sardeis“ 395 v. Chr.: Ein historiographisches Konstrukt?", *Historia* 65/2, 2016, 126-154.
- Markle 2004 M. M. Markle, "Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens", in: P. J. Rhodes (ed.), *Athenian Democracy* (2004) 95-131.
- Mattingly 1965 H. B. Mattingly, "The Peace of Kallias", *Historia* 14, 273-281.
- Meiggs 1984 R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (1984).

- Meister 1982 K. Meister, *Die Ungeschichtlichkeit des Kalliasfriedens und deren historische Folgen* (1982).
- Murison 1971 C. L. Murison, "The Peace of Callias: Its Historical Context", *Phoenix* 25, 1971, 12-31.
- Occhipinti 2016 E. Occhipinti, *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia and Historiography: New Research Perspectives* (2016).
- Phaselis Phaselis: Disiplinlerarası Akdeniz Arařtırmaları Dergisi / Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediterranean Studies.
- Phoenix The Phoenix: The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada.
- Ruzicka 1985 S. Ruzicka, "Cyrus and Tissaphernes, 407-401 B.C", *CJ* 80, 1985, 204-211.
- Sarıkaya 2015 S. Sarıkaya, "Agesilaos'un Daskyleion Seferleri (M.Ö. 396-395)", *Phaselis I*, 2015, 199-219.
- Schaeffer 1940 H. Schaeffer, "Tissaphernes", *RE Supp.* VII, 1940, 1579-1598.
- Shibley 1997 D. R. Shibley, *A Commentary on Plutarch's. Life of Agesilaos. Response to Sources in the Presentation of Character* (1997).
- TAPhA Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.
- Thonemann 2009 P. Thonemann, "Lycia, Athens and Amorges", in: J. Ma (ed.), *In Interpreting the Athenian Empire* (2009) 167-194.
- Tuplin 1993 C. Tuplin, *The Failings of Empire: A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11-7.5.27* (1993).
- Tüner Önen 2015 N. Tüner Önen, *Plutarkhos: Agesilaos & Pompeius. Giriş, Değerlendirme ve Açıklayıcı Notlar* (2015).
- Walsh 1981 J. Walsh, "The Authenticity and the Dates of the Peace of Callias and the Congress Decree", *Chiron* 11, 1981, 31-63.
- Westlake 1977 H. D. Westlake, "Athens and Amorges", *Phoenix* XXXI, 1977, 319-329.
- Westlake 1981 H. D. Westlake, "Decline and Fall of Tissaphernes", *Historia* 30, 1981, 257-279.
- Westlake 1985 H. D. Westlake, "Tissaphernes in Thucydides", *CQ* 35, 1985, 43-54.
- Wiesehöfer 2003 J. Wiesehöfer, *Antik Pers Tarihi*, M. A. İnci (trans.) (2003).
- Willetts 1954 R. F. Willetts, "The Neodamodeis", *CPh* 49, 1954, 27-32
- Wyle 1992 G. Wyle, "Agesilaus and the Battle of Sardis", *Klio* 74, 1992, 118-130.

