THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE IN ASIA MINOR (412–405 B.C.E.)

Asia Minor was the most problematic part of the Athenian Empire. It was for the sake of its liberation and protection that the Delian League was originally founded; at that time (in 478 B.C.E.) it was still under Persian rule.[1] Moreover, even after the Greek victory over the expedition of Xerxes, and the successful campaigns of the Delian League against the Persians in the Aegean and at the Eurymedon, the liberty and independence of the Greeks in Asia Minor remained precarious. Notwithstanding its defeats in the struggle with the Greeks, the Persian Kingdom remained the greatest power in the area (and probably the greatest power in the world at that period), and its rulers, who had at their disposal unlimited manpower and financial resources, could allow themselves to wait years or decades until they found an occasion for reconquering the coast of Asia Minor that they had lost.

The situation of the cities on the mainland of Asia was different from that of the islands. Whereas the latter were adequately protected by the Athenian navy, the Greek cities of Asia Minor were exposed and defenceless in the face of a possible Persian attack, since at a short distance from the sea-shore (a three-days march, or a horse ride of one day) the rule of the Persian King remained intact, and he easily could muster large units of infantry and cavalry, and reach any Greek city on the sea-shore with such numbers of troops that the Greeks could not have any hope of successful resistance. Nevertheless, there is no evidence, during the whole period of the Athenian Empire, that any means was devised to meet such an eventuality.

The Delian League behaved as if it were exclusively an alliance of islands: its military organization and its financial institutions were

[1] It may be added that the first contest between the Athenians and the Persians was also about it, when together with Eretrians the Athenians sent 20 ships to help the Ionian revolt; cf. Hdt. 5.97.

essentially devised for the purpose of creating and maintaining sea-power.[2] The Athenians continually increased the number of their warships and trained their crews; they built and improved the docks (νεώσοικοι) where their triremes were sheltered and repaired; and they erected magnificent stores for keeping the tackle and gear of their ships (σκευοθῆκαι)[3]. At the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, they had at their disposal enough ships and well-trained crews to insure permanently their communications with every part of their Empire; they were also able to attack any target which could be reached by sea. No enemy fleet ever tried to hamper their freedom of travel by sea. The Athenians were well-prepared to cope with any attack coming by sea, and were able to protect their allies on the islands, but they had no means of protecting their allies on the mainland of Asia Minor in case of an attack by land. Neither could the Greeks in Asia defend themselves: In the eighth book of Thucydides, we read again and again that the various cities of Asia Minor had no fortifications (ἀτείχιστος).[4] It is also stated, on an earlier occasion, of the whole of Ionia: ἀτειχίστου γὰρ οὔσης τῆς Ἰωνίας (3.33.2). *Prima facie*, it is possible to interpret this as a sign that a stable peace existed in the area for many decades, so that no need was felt to make provision for any means of defence. But it is hardly necessary to point out that the Greeks of Asia did not live in the age of Kronos. In Asia, as elsewhere in the Greek world, peace and security had to be permanently protected by armies and fortifications,[5] and there must be another explanation for the lack of physical protection.

H. T. Wade-Gery[6] has suggested that the dismantling of the fortifications of Ionia was probably one of the clauses of the Peace of Kallias, and a reciprocal undertaking of the Athenians, in return of the

[2] Without entering into the controversy about the relation between ships and cash money at the beginning of the Delian League, and the way in which the total of 460 talents was reached, it is beyond any shadow of a doubt that in the eyes of the founders of the League the main means of policy and war was to be the allied fleet.

[3] Cf. my *Athens and the Sea*, pp. 18–26; 76–79.

[4] Th. 8.62.2 Lampsacos; 8.107.1 Kyzikos; 8.31.3. Clazomenae; 8.16.3 Theos.

[5] Cf. the rebuilding of the walls of Athens immediately after the retreat of the Persians from Greece: Th. 1.89–93.

[6] The Peace of Kallias, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* suppl. vol. I (1940) 132ff. = *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, 212 ff.

pledge of the Persians not to bring a land army West of the Halys.[7] On the other hand, the history of the Delian League provides many instances where cities — situated on islands — revolted from Athens, and had to be reduced after long sieges.[8] It became customary for the Athenians to compel allies whose revolts had been put down and cities brought into the Empire by force to pull down their fortifications. The Athenians based their demand on the reasoning that any fortification would be directed against them, since only a sea-power could organize an attack against islands. The situation was different when a city was on the mainland: in Thrace, the cities of the Athenian Empire did have fortifications.[9] According to R. Meiggs[10] the Athenians "faced with disaffection or potential disaffection might have ordered the Ionians to pull down their walls." We do not need to decide whether the cities of Ionia were without fortifications because it was one of the clauses of the treaty between the Athenians and the Persians, or because the Athenians thought that fortified cities were prone to revolt; what interests us is that the cities were unfortified, and that until 413 B.C.E. they were not molested by the Persians, although the Athenians had no army there. This, by itself, is an argument which strengthens the case of those scholars who maintain that there was a settlement of some kind which protected the Greeks of Asia, and that the Persians observed it until 413 B.C.E.

However, although the Greek cities of Asia Minor enjoyed a long

[7] The list of articles and special chapters in works devoted to broader subjects dealing with the Peace of Kallias increases every year; cf. the bibliography in R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire*, (Oxford 1972) and a summary of the question as it stands, pp. 127–151; 487–495. Although there are still a few scholars who continue to maintain that there was no settlement at all between the Athenians and the Persians, the majority of historians assume that an agreement was reached about 448 B.C.E., and that it was renewed in 424/3 B.C.E., when Darius II came to power.

[8] *e.g.* Thasos and Samos. We may also add Aegina, although it was not a member of the Athenian alliance who had revolted, but was part of the Peloponnesian League, and enrolled by force into the Athenian Empire; after their fleet had been destroyed, the Aeginetans sustained a long resistance because they were protected by city-walls; later a similar situation occured at Melos.

[9] This appears from the narrative of the expedition of Brasidas; cf. Th. 4.102ff.; also the order of the Athenians to the Potideans to destroy their walls when they suspected them of intending to revolt: Th. 1.56; 1.57.

[10] *The Athenian Empire*, p. 149.

period of relative security, their liberation from the Persian rule, and the formation of the Athenian Empire were not, from their point of view, an unmixed blessing. The tendency of historians, in dealing with the events of a given period, to focus on a particular state, city, or even a personality of prime importance,[11] slights those parts of the country and people which were not at the center of the events. Thus, the history of Greece in the fifth century B.C.E. is mainly the story of the struggle between Athens and Sparta, each of which represented a different aspect of the Greek genius and civilization. As for the Greeks in Asia, it is assumed, whether expressly or implicitly, that thanks to the formation of the Delian League, and its victories over the Persians, they were liberated, and "lived happily ever after". It is true that they lived quietly under Athenian hegemony, except in a few cases which it is possible to explain. But if someone examines the Greeks of Asia Minor in their own right, and not only as a part of the Greek world, and wants to inquire into their history during the fifth century, he cannot but feel awkward about admitting that almost nothing is known about the blessings which liberation from the Persian yoke brought to the Greeks of Asia. It is beyond question that the successful resistance to the Persian invasion and the victories which followed it brought the Classical Age to Athens; but what happened to Greek Asia Minor, which before its conquest by Persia was a center of civilisation of first rank, whose achievements in the fields of science, philosophy, poetry and art were unrivalled?

To this question, J. M. Cook[12] gave an unequivocal answer: "The fifth century, the period of liberty from the Persians was like a new dark age for the Greeks of Ionia. No new cities were founded in Ionia, no new temples were built." Cook who excavated in Asia Minor and especially in Smyrna reached this conclusion on the basis of the archaeological findings in the region. R. Meiggs whose subject was the Athenian Empire[13] warned against jumping to hasty conclusions because of the

[11] Cf. chapters of Greek history labelled: The Athenian Empire, The Age of Pericles, the Hegemony of Thebes, etc.

[12] The Problem of Classical Ionia, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* n. s. vii (1961) 9–18.

[13] *op. cit.* pp. 269–282.

limited area which has been excavated to date, but he himself collected evidence which confirms the assertions of Cook: The *Athenian tribute lists* unequivocally show the economy in decline; ancient cities which were centers of trade and industry paid a relatively low tribute. These two scholars give different explanations for this phenomenon: Cook thinks the principal cause of the economic decline which brought in its wake stagnation in other fields was the fact that the liberation and autonomy which the Greeks won in their campaigns against the Persians, and which the Athenians protected by their naval power and the diplomatic settlement they reached with Persia, did not extend beyond a narrow strip along the coast[14] and the urban communities situated therein. The fertile tracts of land in the valleys opening into the Aegean sea which made Western Asia Minor one of the richest agricultural regions of the whole region, and which were dependent on the Greek cities, were not "liberated," and they remained under Persian rule, continuing to pay taxes to the Persian King. Freedom and autonomy pertained to the citizens who lived in the towns on the sea-cost alone; *they* were out of the reach of the Persian King and his satraps. But the cities' land, the private property of the rich citizens, remained inside the Persian Empire. According to Cook, this peculiar political situation had two negative consequences: In the first place, the cities were practically cut off from their agricultural hinterland; in the second, the social differences between rich and poor which had already provoked polarity in politics, dividing people into oligarchs versus democrats, caused a rift in external politics also: the rich, with their oligarchic sympathies, owned the land, and paid taxes to the Persian authorities, and hence had close relations with land-owners from the interior of Asia Minor, and also with the Persian officials there, and were naturally pro-Persian; the poor, who were democrats, were also opposed to Persia because the return of Persian rule would mean constitutional change giving the power to the rich, the oligarchs. Thus the poor were partisan of Athens. But beyond the differences in the

[14] Not a continuous strip; although this is indicated in the maps of the Athenian Empire, it passes almost unnoticed that the whole Western shore of Asia Minor was *not* in Athenian power: a large part of the Propontis, most of the coast facing Mytilene remained always in Persian hands, and so did parts of the Gulf of Smyrna and the coast South of Ephesos.

outlook and sympathies of the various classes of the population, all suffered from the severance of the cities from their natural hinterland, which was the cause of economic decline.

The pauperization of the cities produced stagnation in their political development; gifted individuals did not find opportunities for active life in cities which had become backward provinces of Athens, and emigrated to Athens or to other parts of Greece. Meiggs[15] gives a different explanation of the decline: he considers that the decisive crushing of the Ionian revolt was the main reason of the decadence. The cities' strength and spirit were broken; moreover, during the revolt and its repression many Ionians fell in battle, many became prisoners and were exiled or relegated to deep inside the Persian Empire, and others went abroad, of their own will, to seek a new home. It is possible to discuss or reject various details of the explanations that these two scholars have given for the decline of Ionia (practically, the situation was similar in the whole Asia Minor), but their contribution to the elucidation of the history of the region, and their discovery of the decline is an outstanding contribution to Greek historical research.[16]

When the harsh fact of the Ionian decline is taken into account, the position of the Athenians in Asia Minor during the whole period appears to have been very precarious. Their rule endured for so long thanks to an uneasy equilibrium of opposing forces. On one occasion, at least, there was a serious danger that the Athenian Empire might break into pieces: In 440 B.C.E., at the time of the revolt of Samos, Pissuthnes, the satrap of Sardis, gave his support to the exiled oligarchs in their attempt to return to the island and take the power (Th. 3.115.4 ff.); at the same time, it looked as if a general uprising was on its way; Byzantion joined the revolt, and there were rumours of the forthcoming entry of a Phoenician fleet into the Aegean. It is not possible to

[15] *op. cit.* pp. 270; 282.

[16] The following sentences give a suitable summary of their opinions: Cook, p. 18: "The Ionian cities which in the sixth century had ranked as the leader in culture and material progress were now reduced almost to the status of villages; Meiggs, p. 282: "Through the 5th century Ionia was something of an intellectual backwater." These facts are not generally noticed by the scholars dealing with the Athenian Empire and they call for a new approach to the problem of "the Popularity of the Athenian Empire," at least regarding the cities of Asia Minor.

ascertain to what extent there was real danger of a general revolt backed by the Persians, since the energetic intervention of Pericles nipped the rebellion in the bud, before it had acquired any momentum. Byzantion returned to the Athenian fold, and no Phoenician ship entered the Aegean.

A cruise by the Phoenician fleet in the Aegean sea would have been a breach of one of the main clauses of the settlement between Athens and the Persians (Plu. *Per.* 25–26), and this could not be done without a decision at the highest level in the Persian court. Even if the Persians had thought that Athens' difficulties with Samos paved the way for them to recover their dominating position in the Aegean, and to cancel the concessions they had reluctantly made to Athens, when the revolt was crushed both parties found it convenient to behave as if no attempt had been made to break the settlement. Moreover, the treaty was renewed in 424 B.C.E. when Darius II rose to power.[17] But Pissuthnes, once more, was the cause of new tension between Athens and the Persians: he himself revolted against his master around 420 B.C.E., and enlisted Greek mercenaries under the command of an Athenian, Lycon (Ctesias, *F. GR. HIST.* 688, Fr. 15.53). But after Lycon, bribed by Tissaphernes, had betrayed his employer and surrendered him, there was, once more, a tacit understanding that the settlement between Athens and Persia was still valid, and Athens was not held responsible for the action of Lycon, just as on the former occasion, the help given by Pissuthnes to the Samians was not considered the Persian King's responsibility.

A few years later, a new crisis occurred in the relations between Athens and Persia: Amorges, the illegitimate son of Pissuthnes revolted in Caria, and this time, according to Andocides, there was an authoritative decision by the Athenians to back him.[18] At the same time, the King of Persia asked Tissaphernes to collect the tribute from the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and the satrap proposed an alliance to the Spartans who were at war with Athens; this meant that the agreement which had regulated the relations between Athens and Persia for more

[17] Cf. H. Bengtson, *Staatsverträge*, No. 183; And. 3.28–29; IG II², 8; SIG³, 118.

[18] And. 3.29 <μετὰ> ταῦτα. Ἀμόργῃ πειθόμενοι τῷ δούλῳ τῷ βασιλέως καὶ φυγάδι....τὴν δὲ Ἀμόργου φιλίαν εἰλόμεθα, κρείττω νομίσαντες εἶναι. It is true that Andocides was an orator who selected and interpreted past events in order to strengthen his arguments, and he is not reliable in every detail.

than forty years was no longer valid.[19] This agreement, whatever might have been its juridical form, stopped the war, but it did not end the competition between the Athenians and the Persians. In the following years, both were guilty of hostile operations, but each time the offended part chose to ignore them and peace continued. As a matter of fact neither side acted directly or openly: The King of Persia lived far away in Asia — in Susa or Persepolis — and it was the satraps who came in contact with the Greeks and implemented Persian policy towards them. In case of failure, or change of policy, it was always possible for the King to make them scapegoats, blame, dismiss or punish them.[20] The Athenians too, did not openly help Pissuthnes in his revolt; a commander of mercenaries was not a representative of his city.

But although the Athenians had no interest in reopening the question of Asia Minor, some politicians may well have thought that weakening of the Persian King was in Athens' interest. When the Persians reached the conclusion that Athens, having lost the greater part of her fleet in Sicily, was not in any position to exercise undisputed mastery over the sea, and that, in consequence, there was no longer any threat of a renewal of long range expeditions to the Eastern Mediterranean, such as those to Pamphylia, Cyprus and Egypt at the time of Kimon which had compelled them to come to terms with the Athenians, they saw no need to keep their part of the settlement, and looked for a means of taking back the part of Asia Minor they had reluctantly abandoned to Athenian hegemony. Although it is possible that the immediate cause of the split was the backing of Amorges by the Athenians, as Andocides affirms, the ideological base of the new Persian policy in Ionia had no connection with any Athenian breach of faith. Juridically, the Persians had never recognized the loss of any of the lands they had once possessed; now the time of *reconquista* had come, and no justification was required. This found its expression in the order sent to Tissaphernes to collect the tribute from the Greek cities, and in the first treaty between Persia and Sparta:. Th. 8.18. ὁπόσην χώραν καὶ πόλεις βασιλεὺς ἔχει καὶ οἱ πατέρες οἱ βασιλέως εἶχον, βασιλέως ἔστω. This

[19] Th. 8.5.5.

[20] Even a faithful and highly successful servant like Tissaphernes was later to pay with his life for the decision of the King to change his policy.

represented the Persian view, and as far as Asia Minor was concerned they did not make any concessions in the negotiations that took place later.[21] Two points deserve our attention: *a)* the Persians presented their claims as a one-sided declaration of rights which had no need to be approved by anyone; *b)* The Greeks of Asia Minor had no special rights in the eyes of the Persians; like other populations of Asia they "belonged" to the King.

The Persian aim when they offered their help to the Spartans was no secret to the Greeks of Asia Minor; naturally, they also knew that if the Athenians were compelled to retire from Asia they had not the faintest chance of keeping their independence. On the other hand, it is commonly agreed by students of ancient Greece that the Athenians saw to it that power in the cities under their hegemony was in the hands of their friends, mostly democrats. So we may logically expect that generally the Greek cities of Asia Minor would remain faithful to Athens, and that the Empire would have to be conquered from the Athenians by the Spartans and Persians. However, book 8 of Thucydides and book 1 of the *Hellenica* of Xenophon, which together cover period from the disaster of Sicily to the eve of Aigospotamoi, give a totally different impression: *It seems there was no Athenian Empire at all!* The Greek cities of Asia Minor had been allies of Athens for more than fifty years, but although they had collaborated with Athens in war as well as in peace no special relations or organization had grown up among them. It was in the interest of the Imperial city that each of its allies be more or less estranged from the other members of the alliance. Individually the Greek cities of Asia were allies of Athens, but they were not allied one with another. The institutions of the Delian League had long ago fallen into abeyance; the Empire was administered according to the decisions of the Athenian Assembly which were implemented by Athenian officials with the support of the Athenian navy. In Asia Minor this process went on literally under the eyes of the Persians who did not interfere. After the loss of a large part of the Athenian navy in Sicily, and the decision of the King of Persia, referred to above, to claim possession of Asia, the Greek cities were forced to

[21] On the treaties between Sparta and Persia cf. my article, A Peace Treaty between Sparta and Persia , *Rivista storica dell'Antichità*, 4 (1974) pp. 55-62.

make a choice about their future: Theoretically they could decide to keep their independence, but in actual fact this was beyond the power of each individual city: we have seen that the cities were without fortifications, and that their economic situation was far from satisfactory, so that they were not able to resist alone an attack by a major power. Thus, if they had any choice at all, it was not between liberty and subjection, but in selecting one of the powers which were ready to offer them protection, i.e. they could choose their master. A superficial view of the situation would suggest that it was natural for the Greeks to choose Athens as the power which had successfully protected them since the Persian wars, and that in this moment of crisis for Athens, the Greeks of Asia gladly would repay her for all she had done for them. But the sources at our disposal tell a different story; the attitude of the various cities may be summarized as follows: *a)* Some of the cities reached the conclusion that Athens had already lost the war, and it was wise and convenient to be on good terms with the rulers of to-morrow, the Persians, and the Spartans their allies; so they invited Spartan and Persian forces and proclaimed their allegiance to the Spartans and Persians; *b)* other cities — and those were the majority — did not take any initiative, but when Spartan or Persian forces appeared in the neighbourhood, they received them without offering any opposition; *c)* there were a few cases when Athenian troops or ships arrived at a city before or after the Spartans; the city then did not take any independent action but remained passive, and transferred its allegiance to the power who happened to be stronger in the region at the moment.

This is the situation that emerges clearly when we examine the sources on the peripeties of the Ionian war, from 413 B.C.E. onwards:

The first Greek city in Asia to revolt was Erythrae. Situated in the mainland opposite Chios, in the winter of 413/2 B.C.E. it sent a delegation to Sparta together with the Chians and Tissaphernes (Th. 8.5.4). Thanks to the inscription[22] on the conditions imposed on Erythrae after a revolt which probably occurred in 452–450 B.C.E., some of the measures taken by the Athenians to insure the loyalty of her allies are

[22] IG I², 10=Tod, 29=M.L. 40= *Staatsverträge*, No. 134; on the question of the conditions imposed on Erythrae after the revolt dating probably between 452–450 B.C.E. cf. Meiggs, *op. cit.* pp. 112–115.

known: the constitution was modelled upon that of Athens, with a βουλή as its main organ of government. The βουλευταί were compelled to take an oath of loyalty to democracy and to the Athenian alliance; moreover Athenian ἐπίσκοποι (overseers), and an Athenian garrison[23] provided that the oath was not broken. The inscription dates from the middle of the fifth century, and it is not known what happened later to the relations between Athens and Erythrae, especially during the Peloponnesian war. Anyway, according to Thucydides (8.5.4; 8.6.4) the Erythraeans decided to quit the Athenian alliance, and became allies of the Spartans. Nothing is heard about Athenian overseers, or an Athenian garrison; but neither is there any hint of a change in the constitution. Another question is the meaning of an alliance between Sparta and Asiatic Greeks, with a representative of the Persian King not far away! The wording of Thucydides about the alliance (*ibid.* 8.6.4 οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι...τούς τε Χίους καὶ τοὺς Ἐρυθραίους εὐθὺς ξυμμάχους ἐποιήσαντο) does not give any idea on the form of the compact. It is not necessary to assume that the cities which revolted from Athens were formally enrolled in the Peloponnesian League; it is more probable that an *ad hoc* agreement was concluded providing mutual assistance in the war against Athens, the question of relations with Persia being left aside by common consent. In any case, the alliance between Sparta and the two cities which had decided to revolt against Athens remained secret during the winter of 413/2 B.C.E., and became operative only after the celebration of the Isthmian Games (June 412 B.C.E.). Then, Chios and Erythrae revolted openly (Th. 8.14.2). The next step was the revolt of Clazomenae, to which the Chians and the Erythraeans sent three ships (*idem* 8.14.3). Although Clazomenae was built on an island, it may be considered one of the cities of the coast of Asia Minor; the island is well inside the Gulf of Smyrna and so close to the mainland that its fate was linked with the fortunes of the cities of Asia Minor.[24] The close ties of the Clazomenaeans with the mainland are further emphasized by the

[23] The presence of a φρούραρχος (supra n. 22 line 14) shows that there was an Athenian garrison in Erythrae.

[24] Clazomenae is the only island of the Aegean to return to Persian rule according to the King's Peace, together with the Greek cities of Asia and Cyprus, whose geographical situation in the Eastern corner of the Mediterranean led to its not being an integral part of the Greek world during the classical period; cf. X. *HG.* 5.1.31.

fact that when they revolted from Athens, they proceeded immediately to fortify Polichna on the mainland as a refuge in case of need.[25]

Clazomenae is one of the rare examples of a city which was reconquered after leaving the Athenian alliance. The return of the Athenians involved the abandonment of the stronghold that the Clazomenaeans had built on the mainland: Th. 8.23.6 οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι...Κλαζομενίων τὴν ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ Πολίχναν τειχιζομένην ἑλόντες διεκόμισαν πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐς τὴν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πόλιν. Although not stated, the impression is given that the Clazomenaeans had left the island well before an attack by the Athenians was launched or expected; it seems that at the same time they turned their backs on the Athenian alliance they also decided to settle on the mainland. But the Athenians attacked and conquered Polichna, and later compelled the Clazomenaeans to return to the island, making them once more islanders.

The characteristic feature of this episode is that it shows that there was direct contact with the sea and dependence on it maintained the unity between Athens and her allies. The abandoning of the alliance by the Clazomenaeans meant they had to assure themselves a future on the mainland. When the Athenians brought them back into their Empire, they made them resettle the island.

From Clazomenae the revolt spread to the southern part of the Erythraean peninsula, to the city of Teos. The Athenians knew beforehand this was about to happen, but they sent only a single ship. The Spartans came with twenty-three ships and a land army from Erythrae and Clazomenae; naturally, the Athenian commander, Strombichides, could consider himself lucky when he succeeded in getting

[25] Th. 8.14.3. διαβάντες τε εὐθὺς οἱ Κλαζομένιοι ἐς τὴν ἤπειρον τὴν Πολίχναν ἐτείχιζον εἴ τι δέοι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς νησῖδος ἐν ᾗ οἰκοῦσι πρὸς ἀναχώρησιν. The site of Polichna is a little problematical: from the text of Thucydides, it seems that it was somewhere on shore, south of the island; and since there *was* a suburb of Clazomenae on shore it is normal to identify it with Polichna. But this suburb was called Χυτόν ον Χύτρον, and not Πολίχνα. On the other hand, there was nearby a settlement called Πολίχνα Ἐρυθραίων or simply Πολίχνα, and since the Clazomenaeans were acting in close connexion with the Erythraeans, and Polichna was essentially a fort, built probably on a hill and easy to fortify, it might be that it was there that the Clazomenaeans thought to retire, if they were compelled to leave their city. On the question of the identification of Polichna cf. *A.T.L.* I. p. 486 (The Gazetter).

away unmolested. The Teians' attitude changed in accordance with the force present in the region. As long as they thought that the Athenians intended to remain there and to fight against the Spartans, they did not receive the invaders, but when the Athenians ran away, the Spartans were admitted (Th. 8.16). There is a reference to a defence wall in the narrative of Thucydides: the Teians were able to defend themselves from an attack on land, but still they did not oppose the Lacedaemonians; on the contrary, they themselves pulled their wall down, with the help of some barbarian (Persian) soldiers under the command of a lieutenant of Tissaphernes (*ibid.* 16.3). Since the wall had been built by the Athenians (τὸ τεῖχος ὃ ἀνῳκοδόμησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι) it is logical to assume that its construction was a recent undertaking meant to give the Teians some protection from a possible Persian raid. But when the Athenians left the Teians to their fate, they did not want to be accused of harboring hostile thoughts towards the Persians and gave up the fortifications. The presence of Persian troops nearby, and their collaboration in the destruction of the fortifications were unmistakable indications of the future of those Greeks who left the Athenian alliance.

The next city which abandoned the Athenian alliance, or more precisely perhaps, which opted for Sparta, was Miletus. Even when it was an ally of Athens, Miletus had an oligarchic government and its leading citizens were on personal relations with Alcibiades. The Athenians once again came late and with inadequate forces,[26] and Miletus went over to the Spartans. They had a somewhat rude awakening if they had imagined that by leaving the Athenian Empire they would obtain their freedom. The Persians arrived on the heels of the Spartans. Miletus was too important a city to be left without any safeguard and exposed to a counter attack by the Athenians.

Immediately after the narrative of the revolt of Miletus Thucydides gives the text of the first treaty between Persia and Sparta; the consequences for the Greeks of Asia of their changing allegiance from

[26] Although Thucydides gives no exact numbers for each operation, it is possible to get some idea of the ships involved: the Spartans had twenty-three ships that they used at Teos (8.16.1); these were now manned by Chian sailors; there were further twenty Chian ships (8.17.1), *i.e.* forty-three ships in all. The Athenians could count on the eight ships of Strombichides (8.16.1), plus twelve brought over from Athens by Thrasycles (8.17.3), *i.e.* twenty ships in all.

Athens to Sparta were embodied in a clear and unequivocal text. It is not known to what extent the fact of the conclusion of the treaty or its clauses were public knowledge; in any case, some of its practical consequences could not be concealed.[27] The true situation was illustrated by the events which occurred in Miletus one year later: telling about the dissension in the Spartan camp, caused by the irregular way Tissaphernes paid the promised subsidies to the Spartans, Thucydides abruptly introduces a sentence in which he well-nigh says that the Milesians, who thought that there had been an estrangement between Spartans and Persians, secretly prepared an attack on a fort built by Tissaphernes, conquered it, and expelled the garrison (Th. 8.83–84). The allies of the Lacedaemonians, and especially the Syracusans, approved the Milesian action, but Lichas the Spartan commander was not at all satisfied and gave the Milesians "a piece of his mind" which could not have been clearer, or easy to forget: Th. 8.84.5. ὁ μέντοι Λίχας οὔτε ἠρέσκετο αὐτοῖς ἔφη τε χρῆναι Τισσαφέρνει καὶ δουλεύειν Μιλησίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς ἐν τῇ βασιλέως τὰ μέτρια καὶ ἐπιθεραπεύειν ἕως ἂν τὸν πόλεμον εὖ θῶνται. "The Milesians (and all the others who are in the land of the King) must serve Tissaphernes as slaves (δουλεύειν), and court his favour (ἐπιθεραπεύειν)". Although the end of the sentence ("until they successfully complete the war") may be interpreted as limiting the subjection of the Asiatic Greeks to the duration of the war, it does not change the definition given by Lichas of the relative status of Greeks and Persians, as slaves and masters. This was one year after the liberation of Miletus from the Athenian yoke; such language could probably not be used, in public, at the time of the revolt, to which we now come back.

Thucydides reports (8.19.1) that the Chians sailed to Anaea with 10 triremes, in order to inquire about the events in Miletus. Anaea was a small settlement in the northern part of the peninsula of Mycale where some oligarchs from Samos had taken refuge in 439 B.C.E., after the rebellion in the island was crushed (*cf.* Th. 4.75.1). The Samian oligarchs managed to establish a defensive position at Anaea which allowed them

[27] The various redactions of the treaty between Sparta and Persia do not need to bother us here, since the limitation imposed on the territories recognized as the King's property did not apply to the Greeks of Asia whose fate it was to return to Persian rule. Cf. my article quoted above note 21.

to remain there for many years and cause continual trouble to the democratic government of Samos allied with Athens, and to the Athenians themselves: in 428 B.C.E., when the Athenians sent Lysicles with 12 ships to collect money, and he landed in Caria, he was attacked and killed along with many of his soldiers, by Carians and Anaeans, i.e. Samian oligarchs who had settled there (Th. 3.19.2). In 427 B.C.E., at the time of the revolt of Mytilene, the Spartan admiral Alcidas who was in command of a squadron of 40 Peloponnesian ships, failed to help the Mytilenaeans out of fear that he might be intercepted by the Athenian fleet, but nevertheless found it was easy to enter the ports of many Greek cities on the Ionian coast, such as Embata in the territory of Erythrae, Teos and Ephesos. In this last city, delegates from the Samians of Anaea came to protest the massacre of the prisoners that Alcidas had taken from Greek cities allied to Athens, and explained to him the plight of many of these Greeks who were allies of Athens not of their own free will. These Samians must have maintained relations with the Spartans earlier, for Alcidas accepted their advice, and changed his policy (Th. 3.32.2). Three years later, in 424 B.C.E., the Samian oligarchs were still there: betweeen the narrative of the campaigns of Megara and Boeotia, Thucydides inserts one chapter on the affairs of Asia Minor (4.75), and on the occasion of the attempt of Mytilenaean oligarchs to make Antandros their base in Asia Minor, he refers to the suspicion that a situation similar to that of Anaea might arise, and he sums up the situation in Anaea, at the moment: 4.75.1 ἔνθα οἱ φεύγοντες τῶν Σαμίων καταστάντες τούς τε Πελοποννησίους ὠφέλουν ἐς τὰ ναυτικὰ κυβερνήτας πέμποντες καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει Σαμίους ἐς ταραχὴν καθίστασαν καὶ τοὺς ἐξιόντας ἐδέχοντο. There is no further evidence about the Samian oligarchs in Anaea until 412 B.C.E. Probably they still held their own when the oligarchs once more came to power in Samos, some time before 412 B.C.E.[28] But for the time being, the

[28] The return to power of the oligarchs at Samos is not attested in the sources, but since there was a revolution of the demos in conjunction with the crews of three Athenian ships, against the δυνατοί (called further γεωμόροι), it is permitted to surmise that these δυνατοί - γεωμόροι held the power, and that they constituted some sort of oligarchy; cf. Meiggs, *op. cit.* p. 358: "by 412 they were back in power"; G. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* 3, 2, p. 1427 ff. advances the opinion that under the influence of Athens' catastrophy in Sicily, the oligarchs had secured the main offices in the city although the regime remained unchanged and democratic, in theory.

change of regime had not influenced the loyalty of Samos to the Athenian alliance; nevertheless, it appears from the text of Thucydides that the Chians who had revolted from Athens were able to land in Anaea in order to cross over to Miletus and see what was going on there. It is possible that the welcome given the rebelling Chians by Anaea provided the impetus for the democratic revolution at Samos, the initiative having been taken by the commander of the three Athenian ships which were stationed there. The overthrow of the oligarchy was perhaps precipitated further by rumours, reported by Diodorus (13.34.2), that the Samian oligarchs had applied to Sparta for help in order to leave the Athenian alliance.[29] At all events, after the democrats had seized power at Samos, and treated their opponents ruthlessly, there was no revolt, and Samos became the Athenians' main base in the Aegean for the rest of the Peloponnesian war.[30]

The Chians who had landed at Anaea did not go to Miletus, since they had received a message from Chalcideus that Amorges was at hand with a land force. They put to sea once again and proceeded to Dios Hieron, (Th. 8.19.2) a fortress between Lebedos and Colophon.[31] This means that they took the direction opposite to Miletus, sailing north. On the way, they were sighted by sixteen Athenian ships. The Chians' reaction was to run for their lives: one ship turned south to Ephesos, and the other nine sailed for Teos. Four fell into the hands of the Athenians, although their crews managed to escape to the mainland; and the remaining five took refuge in Teos which had already left the Athenian alliance (see above p. 49f.). These Chians, together with the land forces from Clazomenae and Erythrae which had helped the Spartans at Teos, brought about the secession from Athens of Lebedos and Erae; afterwards, the land forces and the ships returned to their bases (Th. 8.19). This episode is characteristic of the situation of the Athenian Empire during the Ionian war. The Athenians, who, at first, were unable to prevent the passage of the Peloponnesian ships to Asia

[29] Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.* p. 1428.

[30] There was, it is true, an attempt at an oligarchic coup, a year after but it was not directed against Athens, since it was linked with the establishment of an oligarchy in Athens, and was initiated in collaboration with Athenian oligarchs; in any case it failed; Th. 8.73.

[31] Stephanus Byzantius: Πολίχνιον Ἰωνίας μεταξὺ Λεβέδου καὶ Κολοφῶνος.

Minor, which provoked the revolt of the allies, quickly succeeded in launching enough ships to control the center of the Aegean, and thus insure the loyalty of most of the islands, with the important exceptions of Andros, Chios and later Rhodes. Notwithstanding the fact that the Athenians had suffered enormous losses in ships and sailors in their expedition to Sicily, they were able to throw into combat a fleet which was more than a match for the fleets of the other powers in the Aegean, and when there was not too great a disparity in the numbers of ships engaged, the Athenians always had the upper hand in any contest with the enemy. It is a fact that the Athenians were victorious in *all* the major sea-battles of the Ionian war, and that until Aigospotamoi, even Lysander had to his credit only the scuffle at Notion, and regularly refused to face the Athenian navy; the decisive victory of Aigospotamoi was, of course, not a naval victory. Thus, albeit their success in Chios, the Spartans were virtually besieged there, and their communications with other parts of the former Athenian Empire which had revolted were more than precarious.[32] On the mainland, the situation was completely different; the Athenians were almost powerless, and generally did not react when the various cities of their Empire went over, one by one, to their enemies.

One of the ports where the Chians wanting to escape the Athenian fleet found shelter was Ephesos. This is a sign that the city had already abandoned the Athenian alliance, although we do not know when and how this happened.[33] When the land army of Clazomenae and Erythrae left Teos, the city admitted Tissaphernes, who tore down what remained of the walls; later the Athenian Diomedon arrived with ten ships and was also admitted to the city (Th. 8.20.2). This is another illustration that the Greek cities, unfortified as they were, were compelled to accept the rule of any army or fleet which appeared in the region. But the Athenians did not remain in Teos; after an unsuccessful attempt to take Erae, Diomedon sailed back to Samos.

[32] Cf. The answer of Callicratides to the boasting of Lysander: X. *HG.* 1.6.2–3.

[33] Büchner, *PW, s.v.* Ephesos, advances the theory that Ephesos was already in the hand of Tissaphernes before the Sicilian expedition, since the Ephesians did not send any help to Sicily; K. J. Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* 2, 1, p. 378, n. 1 says that in 416 B.C.E., when Alcibiades was victor at Olympia, Ephesos was still allied with Athens; cf. Satyros frg. 1 *ap.* Ath. 12, 534b; Plu. *Alc.* 12.

Later, during the same summer, the Chians continued to press the revolt of other Athenian allies, and renewed the attempt on Lesbos where the Spartans had failed. This time, the expedition was two-pronged, by sea and by land. The land route was taken by the crews of the five Peloponnesian ships which had been replaced by Chian sailors, and by troops from Erythrae and Clazomenae. On their way, they passed through Kyme which appears for the first time as friendly to the Spartans and to the rebellious allies of Athens (*idem* 8.22.2). But the expedition ended in failure; the contest was mainly at sea, and once more the Athenians had the best of it. After some turns of fortune, the Athenians recovered all their losses at Lesbos, and even succeeded in bringing Clazomenae back to their allegiance (see above p. 48f.).

They then continued their drive southwards, and attacked the Spartans in the vicinity of Miletus. In these operations, Chalcideus, the first Spartan commander of the Peloponnesian fleet in Ionia was killed. Two details of the narrative of Thucydides on this attack (8.24.1) are symptomatic of the situation: a) the Athenians were based on the island of Lade off Miletus, but they were cut off from the mainland; b) their success at Panormos was due to a surprise attack, and they at once abandoned the mainland not staying even to erect a trophy to mark their victory; two days later, they came back in another surprise foray and set up the trophy, but the Milesians destroyed it since it had not been built by an army in control of the area (*idem* 8.24.1 οὐ μετὰ κράτου τῆς γῆς σταθέν).[34]

Towards the end of the summer of 412 B.C.E. (τοῦ αὐτοῦ θέρους τελευτῶντος) the Athenians decided to make a great effort to regain a foothold on the coast, and landed 3500 hoplites (one thousand Athenians, 1500 Argives, and one thousand other allies) near Miletus. They were not received as liberators. A peculiar coalition stood over

[34] It was a well-established custom to leave trophies untouched, even if the site where they were erected passed into the power of those over which the trophy marked a victory; *e.g.*, Agesilaus did not destroy the trophy erected by Iphicrates to celebrate the annihilation of the Spartan mora, although it was located in a spot generally held by the Spartans and their allies: X. *HG.* 4.5.10; Vitruvius 2.8.51–2 tells of a trophy built by Artemisia the widow of Mausollos in the city of Rhodes around which the Rhodians built a construction which was later covered, so that the trophy could not be seen by anyone, but still remained intact, *quod nefas est tropaea dedicata removeri.*

against them. The 'soft' Milesians put eight hundred hoplites in the field and presented the Argives, who had expected an easy victory over the effeminate Ionians with a show of strength; with them were Peloponnesians who had come with Chalcideus, and mercenaries in the service of Tissaphernes. (Probably some of these were Greeks from Asia Minor, and others, barbarians from the neighbouring regions, Phrygians, Mysians, etc.) Tissaphernes himself was also present with his cavalry, though he did not intervene in the fight.

The Athenians overpowered the Peloponnesians and the mercenaries, and the Milesians were compelled to shut themselves up in their city whereupon the Athenians prepared to build a circumvallation to isolate Miletus from the mainland. However, a squadron of fifty-five ships from the Peloponnese and Sicily came to the relief of the Peloponnesians, and Phrynichus, the Athenian commander, abandoned the plan of besieging Miletus, and sailed away to Samos; from there the remaining Argives left for home (Th. 8.25–27).

Although in this case the Athenians avoided a naval encounter with the Peloponnesians and their allies, it is necessary to add that the Peloponnesians for their part did not show any will to meet the Athenians either: the ships which came as reinforcements did not go straight to Miletus, but went first to the Iasic gulf, south of Miletus, whence they proceeded to Teichioussa, an anchorage in the territory of Miletus, where Alcibiades came to rouse them to attack the Athenians and so to thwart their plan of besieging Miletus. But, Phrynichus put an end to the Athenian operations, and so the Peloponnesians were able to enter the port of Miletus without having to fight.[35] They returned to Teichioussa where they had left part of their gear, and they probably intended to repair to their main base at Chios; but they were persuaded by Tissaphernes to attack Iasos where Amorges resided. The city was taken, and Amorges, who fell prisoner, was handed over to Tissaphernes, who thus realised one of his aims in concluding the alliance with Sparta.

[35] Although the decision of Phrynichus to avoid a hazardous fight might be taken as that of a cautious commander who did not want to take any unnecessary risk, his later record when he invited the Spartan Astyochos to capture the Athenian fleet by surprise (Th. 8.50) raises a serious suspicion that he may already have been engaged in traitorious manoeuvres before.

The details of the fate of Iasos call for some attention: Th. 8.28.3 καὶ τὴν" Ιασον Ιασον διεπόρθησαν καὶ χρήματα πάνυ πολλὰ ἡ στρατία ἔλαβεν: ... τούς τ' ἐπικούρους τοὺς περὶ τὸν 'Αμὸργην παρὰ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς κομίσαντες..ξυνέταξαν...τό τε πόλισμα Τισσαφέρνει παραδόντες καὶ τὰ ἀνδράποδα πάντα, καὶ δοῦλα καὶ ἐλεύθερα ὧν καθ' ἕκαστον στατῆρα δαρικὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ξυνέβησαν λαβεῖν. If we take this passage at its face value, we have to assume that Iasos was wiped off the map of Asia Minor: the city was destroyed (διεπόρθησαν); the army took much booty; the mercenaries were taken into Spartan service (and went away); the city was handed over to Tissaphernes, and the captive population (τὰ ἀνδράποδα πάντα) was also made over to Tissaphernes in exchange for a Daric a head.

Prima facie, it looks as if Tissaphernes bought the population of Iasos, which according to the customs of war was reduced to slavery.[36] But what was Tissaphernes' purpose in buying these slaves? Was he trafficking in a newly enslaved population just like those slave-dealers who regularly bought such captives in order to make a profit by taking them to suitable markets? Or did Tissaphernes want them for work on his own properties? My own opinion is that both these possibilities are out of the question, and Tissaphernes was in fact redeeming the Iasians, paying ransom to the Spartans in order that they might remain in their city. It is a little surprising to find Tissaphernes in the rôle of benefactor to a Greek city: in Xenophon's *Anabasis,* one of the first books read in Greek by many students, he is the villain, the enemy of the Younger Cyrus, the perfidious oriental who killed the Greek commanders by treachery; the *Hellenica* too, where Pharnabazos appears as a grandee whom the Greeks honoured even when they fought him, Tissaphernes remains the King's wily and unreliable emissary in whose fall everyone rejoices. Nevertheless, without attributing lofty motives to him, it is not difficult to understand that Tissaphernes, whose mission it was to bring back the Greek cities of Asia Minor to allegiance to the Persians, was occasionally concerned with making a show of generosity. It was not in his interest, or that of his master, the King, to make a desert of that part of the Persian Empire which had been under Athenian influence since

[36] All the commentators rightly note that τὰ ἀνδράποδα means τοὺς ἀνδραποδισθέντες.

the time of the Persian wars. In paying the Spartans a ransom for the Iasians, he expected a two-fold result: a) by taking money from Tissaphernes, the Spartans renounced any future claim on the basis of the fact that it was they who had conquered the city, and captured Amorges; b) the Iasians — and also the other Greeks of Asia Minor — learnt that in the situation created by the retreat of Athenian power their only hope was in submission to Persia; the Spartans were ready to treat them as slaves and sell them. The fact that the Iasians had been bought as slaves did not change their status towards the King: technically, all the inhabitants of the Persian Empire were the slaves of the King.[37]

In view of the fact that Iasos with its population were delivered into Tissaphernes' hands, διεπόρθησαν in the sentence quoted above must be interpreted as indicating not that the city had been destroyed, but that it was left to be looted by the soldiery; for the following words, καὶ χρημάτα πάνυ πολλὰ ἡ στρατιὰ ἔλαβε, explain the matter.[38] There remains one more question concerning the measures taken by Tissaphernes for the future of Iasos: Thucydides (8.29.1) writes: τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου χειμῶνος, ἐπειδὴ τὴν" Ιασον κατεστήσαντο ὁ Τισσαφέρνης ἐς φυλακήν. E. F. Poppo and I. M. Stahl following Herwerden delete ἐς thus giving the sentence the meaning found in S. T. Bloomfield's translation, i.e. "after having put a garrison into Iasos," whereas J. Classen keeps the text and understands: "He put it into a state of defence". Aside from the arguments put forward by Classen and Goodhart in defending the text from a linguistic point of view, it seems that the historical circumstances support the text as it stands: For Tissaphernes, big problem at the time was the lack of troops, which made him dependent on the Spartans and he could not afford to part from any of the few soldiers he had under his command and managed to keep with him in case of emergency; we saw him at the battle of Miletus refraining from intervention even though his allies were being defeated.

[37] Cf. above p. 51, the words of Lichas to the Milesians, an interesting detail of the story is that Tissaphernes paid the Spartans for the slaves as well as for the free citizens of Iasos. We are not told what happened to the slaves; they were probably given back to their masters.

[38] There is also a possibility that as in other cases the expression "destroying a city," meant only the pulling-down of the city-walls; cf. my *Athens and the Sea*, p. 91, n. 3

The conclusion is that Tissaphernes probably built (or rebuilt) the fortifications of Iasos, and put men whom he trusted into positions of power in the city.[39]

During the same winter (412/11 B.C.E.), the Spartans tried to recapture Clazomenae with a relatively strong force, but the Athenian strategy which had made the city into an insular democracy, abandoning the part on the mainland and expelling the anti-Athenian, anti-democratic citizens to Daphnous, was equal to the occasion. The Peloponnesians failed in their attempt and left Clazomenae, making for Phocaea and Kyme (*ibid.* 31). Kyme has already appeared (see above p. 55) as a station on the route a land force of the Peloponnesians and their allies took from Ionia to Lesbos. Once more Kyme admitted the Peloponnesians without resistance, but they did not remain there. Kyme was one of those unwalled cities of Asia Minor which played a double-faced role in the Ionian war; its citizens, having lost their nerve, along with any means of fighting for full independence, were as ready to welcome the Athenians as they were the Spartans, should they appear in force. They bought their safety by contributing their services to the invader in arms and money if necessary. The same goes for Phocaea.

[39] In all that has been said about Iasos, it has been considered to be a city on the coast of Asia; but according to Strabo and St. Byz. it was on an island: Str. 14.2.21 (658)Ἴασος ἐπὶ νήσῳ κεῖται προσκειμένη τῇ ἠπείρῳ. St. *s.v.* Ἴασος: ἐν ὁμωνύμῳ νήσῳ κειμένη. W. Judeich who has examined the place (*Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 15 (1890) 137 ff.) found there, two sets of fortifications, one on the mainland 'Old Iasos', and one on the island, 'New Iasos'. He advances the theory that Old Iasos was destroyed, not in 412 B.C.E. by the Lacedaemonians and Tissaphernes, but in 405/4 B.C.E. by Lysander, when he was in charge of the satrapy of Sardis, and the Younger Cyrus went off to his father's sick bed; Lysander did it, out of hate for both the Athenians and Tissaphernes; this destruction of Iasos is based on the authority of D.S. 13.104.7 (with Θάσον corrected to Ἴασον following Palmer). New Iasos was built after 394 B.C.E., on the island, after the battle of Knidos, for a much smaller population composed of the remnant of the Iasians. Judeich's theory has not been accepted (cf. Krischen, *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1913) p. 476; Guidi, *Annuario* 4/5 (1921/2) 349 ff. and 359), because no excavation has been conducted on the spot, but only the fortifications on the island and the neighbouring shore have been examined. According to *A.T.L.* I, pp. 491 ff. (The Gazetter), the fortifications on the mainland date from the end of the fifth century, and were probably erected by Amorges when he made Iasos his base, sometime before 412 B.C.E. As for a second destruction of Iasos, even if the correction of D.S. 13.104.7 (Ἴασον for Θάσον) is accepted, then Diodorus (or his source) confused the fate of Iasos with this of Kedreiai (cf. below p. 69).

Although bad weather limited their operations during the winter, the Spartans were able to send naval forces southwards. The whole coast of Ionia and the neighbouring areas of Caria and Aiolis from Iasos to Kyme were in the hands of the Persians or Lacedaemonians, with the exception of Clazomenae which had restored its allegiance to Athens, but as an insular *polis*. The only serious attempt by the Athenians to regain a foothold on the mainland was the attack upon Miletus, and that had ended in failure; the other cities of the Athenian alliance on the continent were easy prey to the Spartans: thus Knidos opened its gates to a squadron of ten Thurian, one Laconian and one Syracusan ships; Thucydides adds that it had already rebelled.[40] What was the meaning of revolt in the circumstances? Two possibilities may be suggested: either Athenian representatives asking for the tribute or some other services were expelled by the Knidians declaring that they no longer considered themselves members of the Athenian League, or the Knidians invited Spartans or Persians into their city.

The year ended[41] with twenty-seven ships from the Peloponnesos entering the port of Kaunos. The Lacedaemonians met ten Athenian ships near Melos, and although they succeeded in capturing three of them (without their crews), they were much afraid of the Athenians from Samos learning of their expedition to Asia Minor and sailing to intercept them; they therefore chose a route out of reach of the Athenian fleet, and went around Crete. When they put in at Kaunos, they felt safe (ὡς ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ ὄντες) and sent word to Miletus asking for a convoy to take them there. Practically, there seems to be no difference between Knidos which had already revolted, and Kaunos of which this is not stated. Both opened their port to Peloponnesian squadrons which came from Greece to join the fleet based at Chios and Miletus.

The Peloponnesian ships preferred to take the southern route to Asia Minor and unite with the main force by following the coast. It is necessary to point out, at this juncture, that the island of Chios, where the revolt against Athens started, had gradually become more of a liability to the Spartans than an asset in their struggle against the

[40] 8.35.2. ἡ δ' ἀφειστήκει ἤδη ὑπὸ Τισσαφέρνου. The mss. have here ἀπὸ Τισσ., but the emendation of Palmer ὑπὸ seems unavoidable, and is generally accepted.

[41] Th. 8.39.1 περὶ ἡλίου τροπάς: 21st December 412 B.C.E.

Athenians: The Spartans had not succeeded in establishing their rule over the whole island, and the Athenians had landed in various parts of the island and were harrassing the Lacedaemonians and their allies. Hence the main base of the Peloponnesians in their struggle against Athens was no longer Chios, but Miletus on the mainland. When the Lacedaemonians entered the ports of Knidos and Kaunos, they reached the most southerly cities where the Athenians had retained their influence during the last years. Although the Athenian Empire had once extended as far as Phaselis and Aspendos, it had long ago retired from Pamphylia and Lycia.[42] On the other hand, it would not be true to say that the whole coast was firmly in the hands of the Spartans and the Persians. Though they dominated the region they held only a few cities; most places were left to themselves, and probably reverted to paying tribute to the Persians. Thus when an Athenian force appeared, there were still places where it could receive shelter and other help. For example, after the engagement off Syme, the Athenians found a provisional refuge in Halicarnassos (*ibid.* 8.42.4) and later touched at Loryma (*ibid.* 43.1).[43]

The Spartans' occupation of Knidos gave them a base from which they could interfere with the Athenian ships coming from Egypt.[44] Off Knidos, and linked to it by membership in the Dorian Pentapolis was the island of Rhodes, at this date still divided into three *poleis*, Lindos, Ialysos and Kameiros. Possession of the island insured control of the southern gateway to the Aegean sea. The island had remained loyal to the Athenian alliance, outside of the turmoil of the Ionian war, but after

[42] Aspendos was the most western port of the Phoenician fleet, and Phaselis the limit beyond which the Persians warships were forbidden to go, according to the 'Peace of Kallias'.

[43] The weakness of the Spartans as regards any position they won on the islands is well illustrated by the account of their victory at Syme owing to their notable superiority, and to rain, cloudy weather and confusion among the Athenian commanders; the Spartans landed on the island of Syme and erected a trophy there, but they must have left as quickly as possible, since the Athenians who came back later found the gear and tackle that they had left there before, untouched: Th. 8.42.

[44] Th. 8.35.2. W. Arnold (*ad loc.*) infers from this sentence that Egypt was, at least, partly in revolt against Persia; also Poppo-Stahl: *sed obiecerit aliquis non verisimile esse ex Aegypto, quae Persarum regis imperio paruerit frumenta apportata Atheniensibus eiusdem regis hostibus. Ad hoc tempore Aegypti sub Amyrtaeo in libertatem se videntur vindicasse;* cf. D.S. 13.46.6.

the Athenians reestablished their domination of the center of the Aegean Sea from their base at Samos, and Peloponnesians ships were compelled to make the voyage to Asia Minor by way of the southern route, it was natural that Spartan interest in the island grew. Events followed the usual pattern: oligarchs from Rhodes applied to Sparta asking help in making a revolution and abandoning the Athenian alliance; the Peloponnesians entered Kameiros in strength (with ninety-four ships); thanks to a pre-arranged agreement with the δυνατώτατοι, they met no opposition; the common people who were not aware of the plot were panic-striken, and fled from the city; an Assembly of the three *poleis* was convened, and the *fait accompli* was confirmed (Th. 8.44).

The situation at Rhodes was, in many ways, similar to that of Chios: being an island, its withdrawal from the Athenian alliance did not automatically mean that it came under Persian domination;[45] on the other hand, it was exposed to attacks by the Athenian navy, but since it was even larger than Chios, the Athenians were not able to enforce a tight blockade and compel its surrender. Moreover, in view of the fact that the rival navies of Athens and the Peloponnesians were virtually equal in strength, (the number of their ships fluctuating around one hundred) they were compelled to keep their forces concentrated, and close to their bases. It was with the greatest reluctance that they sent out any part of their fleets far from its base; for they feared an encounter with the whole power of their adversaries, inasmuch as their own bases as well as those of their enemies were in the areas of their main interest: in the center of the Aegean, and along the coast of Ionia. The Athenians established a base at Chalke, a small island some eight miles off the western coast of Rhodes, and from there they raided the coast of the island unhindered by the Peloponnesians. But the Athenians' main effort was directed against Chios, and the Peloponnesians were compelled to transfer their forces there (Th. 8.44; 55; 60). Thus Rhodes, or rather the three Rhodian *poleis,* entered the Lacedaemonian camp, but for all practical purposes they remained neutral and did not play an important role in this stage of the war.[46]

[45] The final treaty between Sparta and Persia left the islands out of the Persian rule.

[46] Three years later, the *synoikismos* of Rhodes took place. From then onwards she became one of the most important factors in Aegean policy for many generations.

In the spring of 411 B.C.E., the whole coast of Ionia having fallen under Persian rule,[47] the enemies of Athens extended the war northwards to the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Bosphoros: Th. 8.61.1 τοῦ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένου θέρους ἅμα τῷ ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ Δερκυλίδας τε, ἀνὴρ Σπαρτιάτης, στρατιὰν ἔχων οὐ πολλὴν παρεπέμφθη πεζῇ...*ibid.* 62.1 Δερκυλίδου πεζῇ ἐκ τῆς Μιλήτου παρεξελθόντος Ἄβυδος ἐν τῷ Ἑλλησπόντῳ ἀφίσταται πρὸς Δερκυλίδαν καὶ Φαρνάβαζον. Some important inferences may be drawn: 1) The expedition was not made by a fresh military force coming from Greece and the Peloponnese; forces were taken from Ionia where the situation was considered as stabilized and the area well in hand. 2) Thucydides twice points out that the forces moved by foot (πεζῇ) from one theatre of war to the other – which shows that the sea route was closed to them. It is unnecessary to stress how difficult and tiresome it was for an army to cover the long distance (200-250 miles) from Ionia to the Hellespont on foot. 3) Abydos is said to have gone over to Dercylidas and Pharnabazos: although it may be that the two names are juxtaposed as commanders of the Spartan and Persian forces fighting together against a common enemy, it is much more probable that Thucydides is pointing to the fact that Abydos went over to Dercylidas who delivered it to Pharnabazos. Implementing the treaty which they had concluded with the Persians, the Lacedaemonians regularly handed over to the representatives of the King any part of Asia Minor they succeeded in detaching from Athens. The Persians did not have sufficient forces in the region; the Lacedaemonians and their allies bore the brunt of the military operations, but the ultimate beneficiaries of any success were the Persians who paid for the upkeep of the Lacedaemonian forces.

Two days after the secession of Abydos, Lampsakos followed suit, but soon the Athenians came back and retook the city which was unfortified. An attempt to recover Abydos too was unsuccessful, and the Athenian commander Strombichides went over to Sestos in the

[47] I think that we must accept the opinion of H. W. Parke (The Development of the Second Spartan Empire (405–371), *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 50 (1930), 47 ff.) that as a result of treaties with Persia, the Spartan harmosts were retired from those cities which had left the Athenian Empire and received the Spartans, and that the cities were handed over to the Persians.

Chersonesos, and there stationed a garrison to watch over the whole Hellespont (*ibid.* 62.3).

The oligarchic revolution at Athens, two months later, and its repercussions at Samos (inside the city of Samos and also among the crews of the Athenian ships anchored there) seemed to provide (June 411 B.C.E.) the Lacedaemonians with an opportunity to attack the Athenian navy especially since Strombichides was away at the Hellespont with a squadron of twenty-four ships (*ibid.* 62.2). But again, the Athenians reassembled their forces and the Spartans refused battle, realizing that they were not strong enough to face the full weight of the Athenians at sea. The Spartans' shrinking of meeting the Athenians at sea was again manifested when answering a call from Byzantion they despatched Clearchus to carry the revolt against Athens to the Bosphoros: they sent forth ships which they hoped would pass unnoticed by the Athenians (*ibid.* 80.3 ὅπως λάθοιεν ἐν τῷ πλῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους), but owing to bad weather, the ships went no further than Delos, and then returned to Miletus. The Lacedaemonians' plans were revealed, and so they did not sail even when the weather improved, but instead sent Clearchus by land (*ibid.* Κλέαρχος δὲ κατὰ γῆν αὖθις ἐς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον κομισθεὶς ἦρχεῖν); in the sequel Elixus the Megarian reached the Bosphoros with ten ships, and Byzantion went over to the Spartans.

The situation around the Propontis was now similar to that in Ionia during the preceding year, the main difference being that whereas in Ionia the Athenians controlled the islands with the important exception of Chios, in the Propontis they kept their hold on the European coast, except for Byzantion. In both areas the Persians, hand in hand with the Peloponnesians, had occupied the Asiatic coast. As in Ionia, in the region of the Propontis too the Persians did not have enough troops at their disposal to occupy every city and every point on the sea-shore, and so a great part of it remained open to incursions made by the Athenians with the aim of exacting money or supplies for their navy. Thucydides does not bother to inform his readers when and how the various cities which constituted the Hellespontine sector of the Athenian Empire returned to the Persian fold. Probably many remained free from any foreign intervention, paying tribute or subsidies whenever compelled to do so under the threat of force; they are mentioned when something

unusual happened to them, or near them: thus, on the fourth day after their victory at Kynossema, the Athenians hastened to Kyzikos, subdued the unfortified city and imposed upon it the payment of a sum of money.[48] The main military operations having moved to the Hellespont, Tissaphernes himself made a journey there; on his way, he stopped at Ephesos where he offered sacrifice to Artemis (Th. 8.109). The History of Thucydides ends at this point, and we must turn to the first book of Xenophon's *Hellenica* for further information: from his description of the operations in the Hellespont and the Propontis, it appears beyond doubt that the Athenians had no permanent foothold on the Asiatic shore: their principal base in the region was Sestos in the Chersonnese; they succeeded for some time in holding Proconnesos, an island off Kyzikos, and from there made some raids on the Asiatic shore; but they were not able to retain any of the territories which fell into their hands: they exacted money, and looted the cities and the countryside. This kind of behaviour was far from being compatible with the position of leader of an alliance of free cities, or even of ruler of an empire. Although it did help in providing the badly needed means for conducting the war, it could not be called a policy of any sort: it destroyed the allies' economy, and under no threat of compulsion could there be exacted from them further subsidies, later on; it was killing the goose that laid the golden eggs, apart from the fact that it made the Athenians quite unpopular.

The stakes of the war in the Hellespont[49] was not the domination of the region, as it was in Ionia; the Athenians were interested above all in insuring their control over the sea-route from Greece to the Black Sea and Scythia, their source of vital supplies, and since naval operations required great expenditures, they badly needed revenue, and were ready to obtain them by any and all means. Hence they devised a new strategy which was well adapted to their interests: they established a toll station on the Bosphoros. Since the European shore was in revolt, and was under the protection of a Spartan harmost, Clearchus, the Athenians landed in the territory of Chalcedon on the opposite shore; here they

[48] Th. 8.107.1. The revolt of Kyzikos is mentioned here for the first time, but as a past event.

[49] Although the Hellespont was only the name of the strait joining the Propontis with the Aegean, it is used in the literature concerning the Athenian Empire for the whole region of the Propontis, the Sea of Marmara, to-day.

conquered Chrysopolis, which they fortified, and where they built a customs house in order to levy a ten per-cent toll on the merchandise passing through the Bosphorus (X. *HG.* 1.1, 22; Plb. 4.44.2–3). A standing fleet of thirty triremes commanded by two *strategoi* insured Athenian domination over the straits and the collection of the toll.

At the beginning of the next campaign season (early summer 410 B.C.E.), Thrasyllos sailed to Samos with relatively numerous forces (one thousand hoplites, one hundred cavalry, fifty triremes: X. *HG.* 1.1.34), having equipped five thousand of his sailors as peltasts, and then landed at Pygela near Ephesos. This city was probably the expedition's ultimate destination; after petty fights around Notion and Colophon where the Athenians had some success, Thrasyllos attacked Ephesos. But surprisingly enough, Tissaphernes gathered a large army which rallied to his standard for the *protection of Artemis* (ἀπέστελλε πᾶσιν εἰς Ἔφεσον βοηθεῖν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι...), and the Athenians were defeated (*ibid.* 1.2, 1–11). The attempt to recover a foot-hold in Ionia having failed, Thrasyllos sailed north and joined Alcibiades in the Hellespont. With their combined forces they launched a successful campaign in which they fortified Lampsakos and routed Pharnabazos who tried to oppose them in the area; later they besieged Chalcedon and conquered Byzantion (*ibid.* 1.2.12–17; 3.1–8).

What happened around Chalcedon illustrates the Athenians' position in Asia Minor: when the Chalcedonians learned the Athenians were coming they transferred their movable property to the Bithynian Thracians who were under Persian rule. Alcibiades heard about these precautions of the Chalcedonians, and wrested their property away from the Bithynians. He then organized a full siege of Chalcedon building a wooden stockade from sea to sea. The siege of Chalcedon was successfully carried on, although the Spartans and the Persians attacked the Athenians. The Spartan harmost fell in the fight, and Pharnabazos was repulsed and gave up the idea of breaking the blockade. Since no more fighting was expected, Alcibiades left the area in order to collect money from the Hellespont and the Chersonesos; then the remaining strategoi made a pact[50] with Pharnabazos by which a cease-fire was

[50] On the questions linked with this agreement, cf. my paper, Le traité de Chalcédonie entre Pharnabaze et les stratèges Athéniens, *l'Antiquité Classique* 42 (1973) 436–457.

agreed upon; it stipulated an immediate payment of twenty Talents to the Athenians, and for Pharnabazos to promise that the ancient tribute of the Chalcedonians, including arrears, would be paid to the Athenians; the most important clause was an undertaking by Pharnabazos to supply an escort for an Athenaian embassy to the King in order to negotiate a settlement between Athens and Persia. Nothing came of this embassy, which spent the winter of 408/7 B.C.E. at Gordium in Phrygia and ended abruptly when, on their taking to the road again in the spring, they met another party coming from Susa with the Younger Cyrus who had been appointed *Caranos* of all the Western Asia Minor, and had received from his father, the King, instructions to help the Spartans and make war upon the Athenians (*ibid.* 1.4.2).

This fruitless embassy allows us to assess the situation of the Athenians at that moment: the war in Asia Minor was not simply another stage of the struggle between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, in a different field of battle; the secession and revolt of the Greek cities in Asia Minor were not of the same kind as the attempts of other subjects of Athens to leave the Empire with the help of Sparta. There were two important differences: a) The choice before a Greek city of Asia Minor considering revolt was not between liberty and subjection to Athens, or even between subjection to Athens and subjection to Sparta; it was between subjection to Athens or to Persia; and many Greek cities chose the Persian master. In the fiasco of Thrasyllos' attempt to reconquer in Ionia, the Greeks of Asia were among those fighting against the Athenians. Their behaviour arose either out of hatred towards Athens, or out of uncertainty whether the Athenians, even were they to succeed in this particular expedition, would be able to sustain the Persian counter-attack which was bound to be launched, sooner or later. The Chalcedonians forestalled an Athenian attempt to regain their city by handing over their precious property to their barbarian neighbours, Persian subjects. It is difficult to say that these Greeks were keen on being "liberated by their brethren". b) The other difference derived from the Persian involvement in the war; the decision of the King to intervene had swept away the settlement which had allowed the Athenians to keep their Empire without having to fight permanently against a power whose resources in money and manpower were, by Greek standards, inexhaustible. The Athenians were able to

fight and overcome the Persians in a defensive war in their own territory, to defeat them in a sea-battle, to protect the islands of the Aegean from attacks by sea, but in Asia Minor, whose whole hinterland was in Persian hands, the Athenians were incapable of obtaining any decisive and permanent success; Winning a battle or a campaign would not end the war. The Athenians were saddled with a war which they could not win; the greatest advantage of any military success was that it might convince the Persians to accept a compromise. After their victories in the Hellespont, and their successful siege of Chalcedon, they thought that the King of Persia would not reject an offer of negotiations. But as I have tried to show elsewhere,[51] any compromise which the King could reasonably be expected to accept involved the Athenians', admission that they could no longer pretend to rule over the Greek cities on the shore of Asia Minor. The settlement reached for Chalcedon could serve as a pattern for the kind of compromise which could be palatable to both the Athenians and the Persians: although the Athenians had a clear military superiority in the area, they did not recover Chalcedon which continued to be a part of the satrapy of Pharnabazos, but it was agreed that the Athenians would receive the tribute of Chalcedon, i.e. that Pharnabazos would hand over to the Athenians the tribute that he was entitled to exact from the city.

The Athenian embassy to Susa was intended as a milestone in the history of the Ionian war; it was truly so, but in a different way from that hoped by the Athenians: the King's decision not to receive the Athenians envoys, the commissioning of Cyrus the Younger, and, at the same time, Lysander's arrival in Ionia as the new Spartan admiral reinforced the alliance between Sparta and Persia, and Athenian hopes of a compromise with Persia were dashed. The importance of the set-back suffered by the Athenians with the rejection of the embassy was not at once fully understood. After having been held for some time the Athenian delegates were freed,[52] and Alcibiades made his way back to Athens. In the autumn of 407 B.C.E., he left the city at the head of considerable forces, went first to the island of Andros which had revolted, and after a dubious success there, sailed to Samos.[53] What

[51] *op. cit* supra n. 50 pp. 451–454.
[52] Cf. *op. cit.* supra n. 50 p. 452, n. 16.
[53] X. *HG.* 1.4.21.

were Alcibiades' plans for conducting the campaign? that he sailed through the center of the Aegean to Samos points to the shift of the main theatre of operations, once more, to Ionian waters; that he took with him a considerable force of hoplites suggests plans for a land campaign which was to be supported by the fleet. Alcibiades seems to have adopted the plans of Thrasyllos, two years before. Thrasybulos also was to bring his forces from the Hellespont and Thasos, and join in an enterprise whose aim was to secure a large area of the Ionian cost, to regain Chios, and to negotiate a new settlement with Persia. But this last and most serious attempt by the Athenians to turn the scales in Ionia came to nothing owing to various reasons and circumstances which I have examined elsewhere.[54] One point which is relevant to our theme, is that, once again, the Athenians did not receive any support from the Greeks on the spot. On the contrary, they had to fight them. Thrasybulos began the siege of Phocaea where neither Lacedaemonian nor Persian soldiers are mentioned. Later, the city gave shelter to the Lacedaemonians who reached the coast after being sunk at Arginusae (X. *HG.* 1.6.33). On the other hand, there was not, in the conduct of the Athenians, the faintest concern for the interests of the Greeks or of the Greek cities. For the Athenians, exactly as for the Persians, they were peoples and territories which they wanted to rule, and potential sources of taxes and other contributions. Even cities which still were loyal to the Athenian alliance were not given adequate protection: thus, Kedreiai was stormed by Lysander, and its population reduced to slavery, some time before Aigospotamoi (X. *HG.* 2.1.15). The war at sea became of primary importance for the Athenians; as long as they retained naval superiority, they could keep their hold on the islands, and above all, insure the passing of vital supplies to their homeland; but naval actions had ceased to have a direct impact on the fate of Asia Minor. Thus, the great victory of Arginusae did not make any difference to the Athenian position in Asia Minor: not a single town on the shore went over to the Athenians. The most they were able to do was to inflict some damage on the coast, and characteristically, that coast was then assumed by Xenophon to be the King's territory: X. *HG.* 2.1.16 οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐκ

[54] Cf. my article La campagne d'Ionie de 407/6 et la bataille de Notion, *Grazer Beiträge*, III (1975), 1-13.

τῆς Σάμου ὁρμώμενοι τὴν βασιλέως κακῶς ἐποίουν κτλ. When Lysander returned to the scene in 405 B.C.E., he mopped up what had remained of the Athenian posts and influence in Ionia and Caria, and proceeded to the Hellespont to do the same. There, the Athenians held still a few spots. By sailing along the coast the Spartans were able to reach the Hellespont by sea; the Athenians who were compelled to follow them sailed by the open seas, because Asia was hostile to them: X. *HG.* 2.1.18 ἡ γὰρ Ἀσία πολεμία αὐτοῖς ἦν.

This survey of the fate of the Athenian Empire in Asia Minor which began with the revolt of Chios and Erythrae, in 412/11 B.C.E., ends at this point, in 405 on the eve of Aigospotamoi. The results of our investigation may be summarized thus:

Aside from isolated cases, the Athenians kept their own at sea; they succeeded in building and manning enough ships, and with their long experience of sea warfare, managed to win most of the sea fights and to keep their communications open, although they no longer possessed the overwhelming mastery of the seas which they had enjoyed during some fifty years. Their margin of superiority was thinner but enough, most of the time, to shut the Lacedaemonian fleets up in their bases.

On the other hand, the Athenians were not able to undertake any serious land operation in Asia; most of their attempts were frustrated. The Greeks of Asia, whose freedom and protection from Persian aggression had been one of the first aims of the Delian alliance under Athenian hegemony, in this period showed no great interest in helping the Athenians in their struggle against Spartans and Persians. Although it became very quickly clear that liberation from Athens would mean reverting to Persian domination, they did not maintain their loyalty to the Athenians, either out of lack of confidence that the Athenians had a chance of overcoming their enemies, or because they had reached the conclusion that Persian rule could not be worse than Athenian, and might perhaps be better, especially from an economic point of view; in some cases, the Asiatic Greeks were frankly hostile to the Athenians, and fought against them alongside the Spartans and the Persians. The Greeks of Asia had not prospered under Athenian rule; their liberty was curtailed, and they suffered economic and cultural regression. As long as there was an agreement between Persia and Athens which prevented Persian intervention, the Asiatic Greeks were compelled to remain

inside the Athenian Empire, since they had virtually no military forces with which to oppose the Athenians, and their cities were unwalled. When the Persian King declared that he did not recognize the Athenian claim to hegemony over the Greek cities of Asia Minor any more, a new situation arose; if the Athenians wanted to keep their Empire, they had to organize its defense; this could be achieved by fortifying the cities, fostering the creation of local armies, and above all by sending substantial Athenian forces to the area. But nothing of this sort was done; the only tactic employed by the Athenians in the face of the situation was to try to reassert their naval superiority, which they expected would compel the Spartans to go home, but they had no military plans to deal with the Persians. When it became apparent that this crisis was not another of the transitory difficulties which had occured in their relations with Persia, Athenian Democracy was without a policy. The oligarchic conspirators of 412/11 B.C.E. put the prospect of a diplomatic settlement with Persia into their program, as an important item but their assumption that the King of Persia would come to an understanding with an oligarchic Athens was only a factionary slogan, and perhaps wishful thinking, being based solely on vague promises by Alcibiades who was then living in exile at Sardis and pretended to have won the full confidence of Tissaphernes. From the first contact between the Athenians and Tissaphernes, it appeared that a renewal of the *status quo ante* was out of the question, and that the Persians would not even discuss any proposal which did not provide that Asia Minor would return, one way or the other, to their rule. Nevertheless, the Athenians, oligarchs as well as democrats, endeavoured during the period up to the end of the war to seek contact with the Persian King and his satraps; they wanted to convince them that they could be better allies than the Spartans, naturally hoping to obtain special advantages for their country.[55] Under these cirumstances, the Athenian Empire collapsed of its own accord; it practically ceased to exist between 412 and 409 B.C.E., well before the end of the Peloponnesian war, and the final defeat of Athens.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM M. AMIT

[55] Concerning the probable conditions proposed by the Athenians, cf. above p. 66, and my article quoted there, n. 50.

Athenian Empire in Asia Minor