

SOME NOTES ON *KARANOS* IN THE ACHAEMENID EMPIRE*

BY

Eduard RUNG
(Kazan Federal University)

Abstract: The paper examines a question of *karanos* in the Achaemenid Empire. The prevailing view among those who write about the administrative system of the Achaemenid Empire and the military activities of Persian kings and satraps is that the word *karanos* designated a regional commander-in-chief of the Persian army. However the evidences having been considered in this paper show that the term *karanos* does not simply apply to a Persian regional commander-in-chief. Commanders of any rank could be called *karanoi*, and they were not equal in status: a *karanos* can be a regional commander, the commander of a campaign-army and even the commander of a detachment within a royal army.

Keywords: *karanos*, *Persians*, *Achaemenids*, *commanders*, *army*

The prevailing view among those who write about the administrative system of the Achaemenid Empire and the military activities of Persian kings and satraps is that the word *karanos* designated a regional commander-in-chief of the Persian army¹.

The author of one of the few works specifically devoted to the topic, T. Petit, considered the *karanos* to be the commander responsible for assembling and commanding an army from a particular territory, viz. a *toparchy*. He noted the important role of the *karanoi* in the territorial

* An earlier version of this paper has been read in the conference 'Iran and the Classical World: Political, cultural and economic contacts of two civilizations' at Kazan Federal University, 14–16 September of 2011 (Rung 2011: 19). I would like to express my sincere thanks to Professor C.J. Tuplin (University of Liverpool) for the most helpful comments of the draft of this paper and polishing of my English, but the possible errors and omissions are my own.

¹ J. Wiesehöfer 1994: 60; 1996: 61 considered *karanos* a commander of Western Asia Minor with special powers. S. Ruzicka 1985: 204 designates him as supreme military commander. According to P. Briant 2002: 321, 340, 878, the *karanos* was a satrap or higher official commissioned to command troops from a larger territory, and was therefore a military leader with exceptional powers.

expansion of the Persian Empire under Darius I and Xerxes, and maintained that their appearance was due to the fact that, after Darius I, the kings gave up commanding troops in person and instead handed the task over to trusted representatives, i.e. *karanoi*. Petit distinguished two periods in the evolution of the post of *karanos*. In the first period the reforms of Darius I led to a separation of the administrative system (provided by satraps) from the military one (represented by *karanoi*). In the second period, in the reign of Darius II, there was a concentration of both systems in the hands of one officer, and satraps could be appointed as *karanoi*. Petit also showed that the post of *karanos* was not a permanent one, but was only bestowed for the duration of a particular campaign². In a second study A. Keen argued that the *karanos* was a commander in the western part of the Persian Empire who was of higher status than the satrap. According to his view, the appointment of a *karanos* was caused by military necessity and was not accompanied by the replacement of existing satraps. Instead, Keen concludes, a «satrap could function within an area governed by a *karanos*»³.

The meaning of term *karanos*

In this paper it will be argued that *karanos* was not the name for a Persian commander-in-chief. The word itself did not define the extent of a general's powers: that required further specification.

The only ancient author to use the word *karanos* (κάρανος) is Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.4.3):

This Cyrus brought with him a letter, addressed to all the dwellers upon the sea and bearing the King's seal, which contained among other things these words: "I send down Cyrus as *karanos* of those whose mustering-place is Castolus"⁴ (tr. C.L. Brownson)

Xenophon explains *karanos* as κύριος or «head, chief» (the word can mean many different things⁵), but in two other passages (*Anab.* 1.1.1;

² Cf. Petit 1983: 35-45, 1990: 135-144.

³ Keen 1993: 88-95, esp. 91.

⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3: Καταπέμπω Κύρον κάρανον τῶν εἰς Καστωλὸν ἀθροισμένων. τὸ δὲ κάρανον ἔστι κύριον,

⁵ Cf. Liddell & Scott 1996 s.v. κύριος (having power or authority over; lord, master).

1.9.7) he uses the word *στρατηγός* as its equivalent⁶. On the other hand, he implicitly distinguishes the post of *strategos* from that of satrap when he writes that Darius II made his son Cyrus a satrap and appointed him a *strategos* (σατράπην ἐποίησε καὶ στρατηγὸν ... ἀπέδειξε). Keen's reaction to this statement was that Cyrus was only a *karanos* and not really a satrap, since all existing satraps were to retain their positions and to be directly subordinate to Cyrus as *karanos*⁷. By contrast Xenophon's understanding of the situation in the *Hellenica* (judging by his gloss of *karanos* as κύριος, not *στρατηγός*) was that the special title expressed that combination of function-types, i.e. satrap and *strategos* altogether. But, even if a *karanos* did not as such have satrapal authority, a satrap might nonetheless acquire additional military powers as a result of being appointed *karanos* (as it was in the case of Cyrus' appointment). At the same time, there certainly was a distinction between the position of commander / *strategos* and that of satrap. This is clear in pseudo-Aristotle's *De Mundo* (398a):

All the Empire of Asia, bounded on the west by the Hellespont and on the east by the Indus, was apportioned according to races among generals and satraps and subject-princes of the Great King (tr. E.S. Forster)

It is also clear in the work of Herodotus. He usually uses ὑπαρχος when speaking of satraps (seeing them primarily as subordinates of the king⁸) while the king's commanders are described with the word *στρατηγός*: they are also, of course, subordinates of the king (like everyone else), but

⁶ Xenophon (*Anab.* 1.1.1; 9.7) reports of Darius' appointment of his son Cyrus as satrap and general thus: σατράπην ἐποίησε, καὶ στρατηγὸν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀπέδειξε; κατεπέμφθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς σατράπης Λυδίας τε καὶ Φρυγίας τῆς μεγάλης καὶ Καππαδοκίας, στρατηγὸς δὲ καὶ πάντων ἀπεδείχθη οἷς καθήκει εἰς Καστωλοῦ πεδῖον ἀθροίζεσθαι. Tuplin 2007: 12 comments: «Attentive reading suggests that the *karanos* title corresponds to interpretation of Cyrus as “ruler over those on the sea” (so it may be relevant in some other cases where Greek sources use seaside-titles) and that the accumulation of satrapies is quite distinct: a *karanos* need not have these satrapies (to speak of Cyrus as *karanos* of Lydia etc. is incorrect)...».

⁷ Keen 1993: 91 notes that «satrap» can be used in Greek sources of officials of a lower rank; so in the case of Cyrus the term could designate a more senior officer than usual.

⁸ Σαρδίων ὑπαρχος: Oroites (3.120) and Artaphernes (5.25, 73, 123; 6.1, 30, 42); ἐν Δασκυλείῳ ὑπαρχος: Mitrobates (3.126) and Oibares (6.33); τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὑπαρχος: Aryandes (4.166); ὑπαρχος τῶν Βακτρίων: Masistes (9.113).

their military function is more important in the particular context, and so a more specifically military term is used. One may conclude that Herodotus distinguishes satraps from *strategoï* and suggest that, whenever Herodotus uses the word στρατηγός of a Persian army commander, he is actually referring to a *karanos*. One might add the argument here that the distinction between satraps and *strategoï* is in Arrian on the Granicus army (Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.8).

In order to confirm the suggestion that κάρανος was used by Persians as a generic word for a military commander, we turn to the semantics of the word.

Not all scholars have accepted a connection between κάρανος and Old Persian *kāra*. For example, P. Chantraine and Ch. Frisk in their etymological dictionaries of ancient Greek suggest that κάρανος is derived from Doric κάρα = «head»⁹. However, T. Petit objected to this view, arguing that (a) it would be strange for Xenophon to have translated the word for his readers if it was Greek in the first place, and (b) it would be inappropriate for a Greek term to appear in a letter addressed by the Great king to his officials¹⁰. These considerations suggest that *karanos* was of Persian origin, and the current orthodoxy is that it comes from Old Persian word *kāra* = «people» or «army» (a view apparently first expressed by H. Widengren¹¹). C. Haebler and D. Treten argued that a *karanos* was simply a commander of *kāra*; the word itself was formed from *kāra* by adding the suffix - *na* / *no* which is used in Indo-European languages to describe the person at the head of a social institution.¹² (Analogies include the Latin words *tribunus* originated from *tribus* and *dominus* from *domus*.)

An alternative derivation was suggested by N. Sekunda: noting that in Old Persian, as in Sanskrit, the verb *nay* means «to lead»¹³, he proposed that *karanos* represents **kāra-naya* – «leader of the army»¹⁴. This option cannot be excluded out of hand (even if the exact form of the second part of the compound is uncertain¹⁵), and an additional argument in its favour

⁹ Chantraine 1968: 496; Frisk 1960: 788. Cf. Epimerismi Homerici, s.v. κάρηνων: ἀπὸ τοῦ κάρα κάρανον καὶ κάρηνον.

¹⁰ Petit 1983: 35–36.

¹¹ Widengren 1969: 106.

¹² Haebler 1982: 85; Treten 1991: 174.

¹³ See Kent 1953: 193.

¹⁴ Sekunda 1988a: 74. For other terms derived from *kāra* see Tavernier 2007: 226, 277.

¹⁵ Sekunda 1988a: 74.

is that the precise etymological parallel with στρατηγός – also formed by combining a noun (στρατός) meaning «army» with a verb (ἄγω) meaning «lead» – might have encouraged Greek authors to interpret *karanos* as στρατηγός¹⁶. But for the purposes of the present argument I prefer the more orthodox view that *karanos* is a Greek equivalent of **kārana-*. Some scholars have noticed that κάρανος could also be connected with the Greek noun κοίρανος = «lord» and the Greek personal names Κάρανος, Κάρηνος and Κοίρανος.¹⁷ In the first case there is, of course, no question of direct borrowing, since the κοίρανος was already used in the *Iliad* (II. 204-205, 487, 760), but we might speculate about a common Indo-European origin. By contrast, Klinkott has suggested that the appearance of Κάρανος as the name of the supposed founder of the Macedonian royal house could be related to the Persian contacts with the Macedonians at the end of the VI century B.C.¹⁸

The word **kārana-* does not occur in Old Persian royal inscriptions, although the personal names *Kārana* and *Kārīna* (which derive from *kāra*) are found a number of times in Elamite form in the Persepolis Fortification archive.¹⁹ *Kāra-*, on the other hand, does appear in Old Persian texts, notably in the Behistun inscription, where it occurs more than 60 times with the meaning «people» or «army».²⁰ Nothing suggests that it should be considered a *terminus technicus* of Persian military terminology, and the same inscription's common designation for a military commander has no connection with *kāra-*. Instead we have the word *maθišta* (whose literal meaning is «greatest»²¹), applied both to commanders of the troops of

¹⁶ Sekunda 1988a: 74 proposes that the usual OP term for any military commander was *karapatiš*—«commander of *kāra*». *Karabattiš* (the Elamite form) occurs at least seven times in PFT and twice in PT. R. Hallock interpreted it as «the leader of the caravan» (though he was not entirely sure about this meaning of the term: PFT p.42), and Tavernier 2007: 426 (cf. 235) goes for a more non-committal «guide». *Karanaba*, recorded by Hinz & Koch 1987: 438 as perhaps meaning «general», is now read as *šakarabana* and interpreted as «satrap» (cf. e.g. Henkelman 2010: 706 n.147).

¹⁷ Haebler 1982: 88–90; Petit 1983: 37; Klinkott 2005: 322, Anm.42.

¹⁸ Klinkott 2005: 322, Anm. 42.

¹⁹ Tavernier 2007: 226 (4.2.940), 228 (4.2.949-950).

²⁰ DB. 18E, H, N; 19F, K; 24F; 25B, E, I, K, S, V; 26F, P, 27H; 28H; 29F, P; 30H; 31H, L; 33F, J, L, P; 35I, N; 36B, D, E, J; 38J, K, O; 41B, F, G, L, P, 42D, J; 45C, J, O; 46H; 47C, H; 50B, F, G; 71L; 74B; F. Here and elsewhere references to Old Persian inscriptions are given according to the latest edition of R. Schmitt (Schmitt 2009).

²¹ On the translation of this word, see Kent 1951: 201-202; Schmitt 2014: 213-214. It is assumed that *maθišta* is Indo-European origin and is the equivalent of Greek μέγιστος

Darius I (DB. 25E-G; 33F-H; 41B-E; 50B-D; 71J-K),²² and to the leaders of rebel armies (DB. 23E; 25O; 38E; 45F; 47C; 71H, P).

Why does the word **kārana-* not appear in the Behistun inscription? We must assume either that the term was not yet in existence at the beginning of the reign of Darius I (the date of inscription) or that *maθišta* was consciously intended as its equivalent. There is, however, no clear way to choose between these possibilities. The Babylonian version of the Behistun inscription (DB. I.73, 79) uses an Akkadian word, *rabû*, which has a wide range of applications²³, one of which is as the title of a military commander²⁴. This word, especially in the phrase *uqu rabû* (one that appears at DB. I.82),²⁵ serves as a translation of στρατηγός in Babylonian texts of the post-Achaemenid period²⁶.

(Taylor 2003: 52). *Maθišta* in the Achaemenid Empire could be used of the king's heir (Briant 2002: 520, 524; Kuhrt 2007: 244), as is clear from an inscription of Xerxes: «Other sons of Darius there were, (but) – thus to Ahuramazda was the desire – Darius my father made me the greatest after himself» (*Dārayavahauš pucā aniyaici āhantā / Auramazdām avaθā kāmā āha; / Dārayava.uš haya manā pītā / pāsa tanūm / mām maθišta akunauš*) (XpF 4E). But use of *maθišta* in this context does not exclude its use in other contexts, religious or military. There is an obvious connection between *maθišta* and the name of Masistes, son of Darius (Hdt. 7. 82).

²² The references to Darius' commanders are as follows (translations are those of R. Kent). § 25: «Thereupon I sent forth an army / A Persian named Hydarnes, my subject / I made him chief of them» (*pasāva adam kārām frāišayam / Vadaṇa nāma Pārsa, māna bandaka / avāmšam maθištam akunavam*). § 33: «Thereupon I sent off a Persian and Median army; / a Mede named Takhmaspada, my subject / I made him chief of them» (*pasāva adam kārām Pārsam utā Mādam frāišayam / Taxmaspāda nāma Pārsa, māna bandaka / avāmšam maθištam akunavam*). § 41: «Thereupon I sent forth the Persian and Median army / which was by me. / A Persian named Artavardiya, my subject / I made him chief of them» (*pasāva adam kārām Pārsam utā Mādam frāišayam / haya upā mām āha / Rtavardiya nāma Pārsa, māna bandaka / avāmšam maθištam akunavam*). § 50: «Thereupon I sent forth an army to Babylon. / A Persian named Intaphernes, my subject / him I made chief of them» (*pasāva adam kārām frāišayam Bābirum / Vindafarnā nāma Pārsa, māna bandaka / avāmšam maθištam akunavam*). § 71: «Thereupon I sent forth an army. / One man named Gobryas, a Persian, my subject -/ I made him chief of them» (*pasāva adam kārām frāišayam / a martiya Gaub(a)ruva nāma Pārsa, māna bandaka / avāmšam maθištam akunavam*).

²³ *Rabû* can be translated as «main, principal, chief, of first rank, elder, senior, great, grand, important, noble person» etc. (CAD s.v. *rabû*).

²⁴ Von Voigtlander 1978: 56, 58. In the Assyrian army *rabû* could designate a military commander (Reade 1972: 103; Dalley 1985: 32; Postgate 2000: 107)

²⁵ *Uqu* (people / army) is the Akkadian equivalent of the Old Persian word *kāra* in the Behistun inscription.

²⁶ Stolper 2006: 223–260.

In the Aramaic version of Behistun (DB. I.59), the phrase *rb 'l [hyl']* – «commander of the troops» – corresponds to the Akkadian *uqu rabû*²⁷. Both Semitic languages therefore use terminology that has more obvious specifically military resonances than *maθišta* and is therefore closer to the postulated **kārana-*. The Elamite version of DB, by contrast, uses *irsara* (Vallat 1977), which seems to be closer to *maθišta*: it is the word used e.g. in saying that Ahuramazda is greatest of the gods as well as for referring to military or other types of “chief”.

Despite the non-attestation of **kārana-* in the Behistun inscription this title possibly may be proposed in late Achaemenid and Hellenistic period in the Aramaic form *krny*: (a) it was attributed to some Persian Vištaspā in one of recently published documents from fourth century Bactria²⁸; (b) it appears on a drachma of Wahbarz / Oborzoz, the Seleucid governor (*frataraka*) in the form of legend *krny*²⁹; (c) this term is attested on a coin from Parthia³⁰.

What emerges from these semantic observations is at most that Old Persian **kārana-* was a specific military term that corresponded to the Greek word στρατηγός. Actually *karanos* simply designates someone in charge of *kara-* and is strictly speaking as ambiguous as *kara-* is. But that, as a matter of fact, it was used to denote someone in charge of military *kara* is perfectly possible. The only person we *know* to have had the title (assuming we trust Xenophon) is Cyrus the Younger, and he is represented as both the ruler of an area (a large one – sometimes described as consisting of a number of satrapies) and a military leader. The Behistun inscription avoids the word **kārana-* altogether and this allows (but does not compel) us to propose that use of the word in a military context only began after the date of this document (i.e. c. 519 B.C.). It is therefore not clear whether the term was applied to army commanders in the time of Darius and Xerxes (or at any point before Darius II's reign), and Petit's suggestion

²⁷ Greenfield & Porten 1982: 44–45; cf. Folmer 1995: 272, 319.

²⁸ Naveh & Shaked 2012: 190–191 transliterate it as *Karanya* and propose that Vištaspā was from Kāren family. John Hyland argued that it means rather the title of *karanos* (Hyland 2013: 1–7). On the general Hystaspes (Vištaspā) the Bactrian in the time of Alexander the Great see: Arr. *Anab.* 7.6.5; cf. Curt. 6.2.7; Heckel 2006: 142.

²⁹ Shaeygan 2011: 170–171, not. 533 accepts it as *kārān* or *kāren* (of Persis) = commander.

³⁰ See, for example, the legend *krny* (which replaces the earlier legend αὐτοκράτορος) on the drachma of Arsaces I: Sellwood 1983: 280.

that the post of *karanos* was established by Darius I in the course of his reforms remains unproven.

***Karanos* of coastal peoples of Asia**

If *karanos* was simply a general Persian word for a military commander (like *strategos* in Greek), it is clear that it cannot by itself designate a specific sort of commander: that will require additional information, either geographical (an indication of the place or area of command) or hierarchical (a reference to subordination of one Persian commander to another). A number of ancient authors speak of prominent Persian commanders as *strategoï* or satraps of the coastal peoples / regions of Asia. The information from these sources can be represented as follows:

Harpagus	ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάττης στρατηγός	Diod. 9.35.1
Otanes	στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν	Hdt. 5.25
Artaphernes	τῶν δ' ἐπιθαλασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ ἄρχει πάντων	Hdt. 5.30
Hydarnes	στρατηγὸς δὲ τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ	Hdt. 7.135
Artabazus	σατράπη βασιλέως ἐπὶ τοῖς πρὸς θαλάσση ἔθνεσιν	Them. <i>Epist.</i> 16
Tissaphernes	στρατηγὸς τῶν κάτω	Thuc. 8.5.5
	ὁ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττης τόπων ἔχων τὴν στρατηγίαν	Diod. 13.36.5
Cyrus the Younger	ἄρξων πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ	Xen. <i>Hell.</i> 1.4.3
	Λυδίας σατράπης καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάσση στρατηγός	Plut. <i>Artax.</i> 2.5
	ὁ τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττης σατραπειῶν ἡγούμενος	Diod. 14.19.2
	ἐπὶ θαλάττης ἦρχε σατραπειῶν	Diod. 14.26.4
Struthus	στρατηγὸς... ἐπὶ θάλατταν	Xen. <i>Hell.</i> 4.8.17; Diod. 14. 99.1
Orontes	(governor) τῆς παραθαλασίου πάσης ... σατραπείαν	Diod. 15.91.1
Mentor	ἐν τοῖς παραθαλαττίοις μέρεσι τῆς Ἀσίας ἡγεμὼν μέγιστος	Diod. 16.50.7
	σατράπης τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν παραλίας	Diod. 16.52.2

Memnon	τῆς τε κάτω Ἀσίας καὶ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ παντὸς ἡγεμόν	Arr. <i>Anab.</i> 1.20.2
	τοῦ τε ναυτικοῦ παντὸς ἡγεμόν ... καὶ τῆς παραλίου ξυμπάσης	Arr. <i>Anab.</i> 2.1.2

The reference here will be to people in western Asia Minor, and the terms in question can also be linked with an Old Persian phrase occurring in the royal inscriptions (*dahyāva*) *tayai drayahyā* – «the people who are on/by the sea» (DPe. § 2L; DSe. § 4I; XPh § 3Q). It is a generally held view that Old Persian *tayaiy drayahyā* refers to Hellespontine Phrygia, which (as R. Schmitt pointed out) entails that the word *draya* = designates the Propontis³¹. But it hardly seems likely that Persian royal inscriptions use «sea» with such a narrow geographical reference (as H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg argued³²), and it makes better sense to stress the similarity between *tayaiy drayahyā* and the Greek phrases describing the population of the coastal area of Asia Minor more generally³³. The position of «general of the coastal peoples» was not therefore intrinsically linked to a particular satrapal position, and it could be occupied as well by a satrap in Dascylium as by one in Sardis³⁴. That is clear from the fact that sources

³¹ Schmitt 1972: 522–527. Cf. Weiskopf 1982: 15; Sekunda 1988b: 176; Klinkott 2001: 111–112.

³² Sancisi-Weerdenburg 2001a: 2. Persian inscriptions include *tayaiy drayahyā* when listing the countries and peoples of the empire in the following terms: 1) *tyaiy drayahyā* (DB.6I); 2) *tyaiy uškahyā utā tyaiy drayahyā utā dahyāva tyā para draya*: «who are of the mainland and (those) who are by the sea, and countries which are across the sea» (DPe. 2K–M); 3) *tyaiy drayahyā utā tyaiy paradraya*: «those who dwell by the sea and those who dwell across the sea» (DSe. 4I–K; XPh. 3Q–R). In the last two examples these phrases relate to the *Yaunā* – «Ionians» (the Greeks). It is commonly held that the distinction of peoples as «on the mainland», «by the sea» and «across the sea» refers specifically to them, but this is not obviously so in the first example. We shall not go into the complicated and controversial problem of the geographical localization of the various categories of *Yaunā* (about which more details see: Seager & Tuplin 1980: 148–149; Sancisi-Weerdenburg 2001b: 323–346; Klinkott 2001: 107–148). If *tyaiy drayahyā* in DB.6I relates also to a particular ethnic group (the same *Yaunā*—the Greeks), the question arises: why are they not named in the text? H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg suggested that *tayaiy drayahyā* in DB.6I could relate to the peoples of the Middle East from Egypt to the coast of Asia Minor (Sancisi-Weerdenburg 2001a: 11).

³³ Sancisi-Weerdenburg 2001a: 11 questioned derivation of the Greek phrase from the Old Persian one, but I think that the link is quite obvious, given that there are other cases in which the Greeks adapt Old Persian terms to their own language.

³⁴ Herodotus (5.25, 30) defines Otanes, son-in-law of King Darius I, as στρατηγὸς τῶν παραθαλασσίων ἀνδρῶν, and says of Artaphernes, son of Hystaspes, satrap of

that speak of Persian officials as generals of the coastal peoples / on the coast sometimes refer to individuals who were satraps at Sardis (Artaphernes, Tissaphernes, Cyrus, Struthus) or at Dascylium (Artabazus). But there are other cases in which the satrapal status of the person involved is obscure (Harpagus, Otanes, Hydarnes, Mentor, Memnon) and even a matter of controversy³⁵.

The position of Tissaphernes creates something of a problem. Thucydides (8.5.5) calls him στρατηγὸς τῶν κάτω³⁶. A. Andrewes believed that τῶν κάτω meant «men by or near sea», and thus referred to people or troops in the coastal areas of Asia Minor. In taking this view he was effectively equating οἱ κάτω with παραθαλάσσιοι, ἐπιθαλάσσιοι, ἐπὶ θαλάσση, as well as with relevant Old Persian parallels³⁷. S. Hornblower translates στρατηγὸς τῶν κάτω «general of the west» (while noting that the literal translation of the last word is «of the men / things below»), but also interprets τῶν κάτω as a reference to the coast³⁸. Obviously these scholars are quite right interpreting the title of Tissaphernes in Thucydides as referring to the people on the coast. [a] Diodorus (13. 36. 5) uses such a phrase of him, [b] κάτω *can* obviously connote the western / seaboard parts of Asia Minor and Tissaphernes is, of course, indisputably located there, [c] it is economical to explain Tissaphernes' unusual title in terms of the more common trope of referring to the seaboard. He may therefore be seen as *strategos* / *karanos* of the seaboard region.

Herodotus supposes the whole of Asia (Hdt. 1.105, 107, 108; 1.192) was divided into two parts: the lower (κάτω) (1.72, 177) and upper (ἄνω) (1.95, 103; 4.1), the boundary being the River Halys (1.103). In

Sardis (Hdt. 5.25, 73, 123) that τῶν δ' ἐπιθαλασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ ἄρχει πάντων. The text of Herodotus (5.25) implies that Otanes and Artaphernes were appointed by the king at the same time: «... after appointing Artaphrenes, his father's son, to be viceroy of Sardis, he [Darius] rode away to Susa, taking Histiaeus with him. First, however, he made Otanes governor of the people on the coast...». So it is impossible that both were satraps in Sardis, and is thus likely Otanes was satrap of Dascylium (Debord 1999: 93).

³⁵ Hydarnes' position is the most controversial: (i) some scholars consider him as satrap of Dascylium (Olmsted 1950, 148; Debord 1999: 93); (ii) others believe that his residence was Sardis (Lewis 1977: 83–84); and, finally, (iii) there are the scholars who take it that he had no satrapal status at all, but was only a general (Petit 1990: 138 n.30).

³⁶ Some scholars believe that στρατηγός here is the equivalent of σατράπης (Keen 1998: 97; Keen 1993: 89). But there are well-founded objections to this: Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 16.

³⁷ Gomme, Andrewes & Dover 1981: 15.

³⁸ Hornblower 2008: 764, 766.

Darius I's letter to his subordinate Gadatas (the authenticity of which has been questioned by P. Briant³⁹) we find a reflection of this division of Asia. The king praises Gadatas for the fact that he cultivated trees that have been brought from beyond the Euphrates to the lower parts / regions / countries of Asia – ἐπ[ι] τὰ κάτω τῆς Ἀσίας μέ[ρ]η (ML. 12, lines 11–13). This is a purely Greek piece of geographic phraseology⁴⁰ and, since Gadatas' area of authority in this letter was evidently in (or included) Ionia,⁴¹ would be consistent with, and provide support for the view of those scholars who believe that τῶν κάτω in Thucydides corresponds to phrases describing the coastal peoples in other sources. An additional argument in favour of this identification is provided by Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.4.3) in his description of the status of Cyrus the Younger after his arrival in Asia Minor: the prince was appointed a governor of all in the coastal area (πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ), and carried with him a letter bearing the royal seal and addressed to the inhabitants of the coastal area – τοῖς κάτω πᾶσι.

But this equivalence would mean that Xenophon's «all people on the sea» region embraces Lydia, Phrygia and Cappadocia. Since Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.4.3) equates «all those on the sea» and οἱ κάτω one is inclined to think of the phrase in terms of Herodotus' division of Asia, in which οἱ κάτω means west of the Halys. There is no problem in Herodotus' οἱ κάτω embracing Lydia, Phrygia and Cappadocia (the Halys boundary is arguably in effect a Taurus-Antitaurus boundary⁴²). But the fact that Old Persian sea-phrases always refer to something that does not include Lydia (which itself implicitly includes Phrygia) or Cappadocia rather favours the view that all sea-related phrases (whether in Old Persian or Greek) relate to a more limited region than the Herodotean / Xenophontean «lower Asia». One might subsequently be required to maintain that in Tissaphernes' title the reference is to a more restricted group of people which might be included in a larger region.

³⁹ Briant 2003: 107–144.

⁴⁰ Tuplin 2009: 164, 166. Cf. Liddell & Scott 1996. s.v. κάτω

⁴¹ Cousin 1889: 534, note. 1; Syll³. I, 22, note 3; ML. 12; Hornblower 1982: 19, note. 109; Chaumont 1990: 588–590; Debord 1999: 118.

⁴² On the Halys boundary in the literary representation as well as in the historical-geographical aspect of Median and Achaemenid Empires see: Rollinger 2003: 305–307; Tuplin 2004: 238, 245–246.

Karanos of all peoples

At the time of Tissaphernes' initial appointment as στρατηγὸς τῶν κάτω, his area of command may have largely coincided with that implicit in his role as satrap of Sardis. But nearly a decade later things were certainly different, as is shown by Xenophon's remark (*Hell.* 3.2.13) that Pharnabazus came to the aid of Tissaphernes, because the latter had been appointed as «*strategos of all (peoples)*».

Now it chanced that at this time Pharnabazus had come to visit Tissaphernes, not only because Tissaphernes had been appointed general-in-chief (στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων), but also for the purpose of assuring him that he was ready to make war together with him, to be his ally, and to aid him in driving the Greeks out of the territory of the King; for he secretly envied Tissaphernes his position as general for various reasons, but in particular he took it hardly that he had been deprived of Aeolis (tr. C.L. Brownson).

The formula στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων is clearly another (and distinct) option for specifying / clarifying powers of a Persian general / *karanos*, and, like “*strategos / satrap of the coastal peoples of Asia*”⁴³, it was more in line with Old Persian usage than with Greek. A natural Greek equivalent would have been στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, i.e. plenipotentiary *strategos*, and it is in that light that one should interpret Diodorus' report (16.50.7; 52.3) that Mentor was appointed satrap on the coast of Asia (σατράπης τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν παραλίας), ἡγεμὼν μέγιστος (incidentally, μέγιστος recalls, indeed reproduces, *maθista* as used in the Behistun text) and plenipotentiary *strategos* (στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ) for the war against local rebels. This amounts to saying that Mentor was appointed στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων.

Meanwhile, in one of the Naqsh-e Rostam inscriptions Darius is called «king of countries containing all kinds of men» (*xšāyaθiya dahyūnām*

⁴³ The word πάντων occurs also twice in the description of position of some Persians as generals of *all* coastal peoples: Artaphernes τῶν δ' ἐπιθαλασσίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίῃ ἄρχει πάντων (Hdt. 5.30) and Cyrus was a governor of πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3). But these generals commanded the peoples in the coastal regions as these phrases make clear. Otherwise the title of στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων does not refer to any «command area», but points out to the superior position of the title's holder.

vispazanānām: DN^a 2D)⁴⁴, and Aeschines (3.132.5) says that, in his letters to the Greeks, Xerxes called himself «lord of all the peoples from the sunrise to the sunset» (δεσπότης ἐστὶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀφ' ἡλίου ἀνιόντος μέχρι δυσμέμου)⁴⁵. «Lord of all the people...» (δεσπότης... ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων) not only resembles the Old Persian phrase but is an obvious formal parallel for «*strategos* of all (people)» (στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων). To be στρατηγὸς τῶν πάντων was evidently something different from being στρατηγὸς τῶν κάτω, and represented a promotion. This is clear not only from the analogy with a *royal* title but also from the relationship between Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus. In 412 Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus were of similar status⁴⁶ (the latter was probably also a military leader / *karanos*⁴⁷), but in 397 Pharnabazus is Tissaphernes'

⁴⁴ According to Kent 1951: 208, the word *vispazanā* was of Median origin, and is formed from the combination of *vispa* = all and *zana* = people. A comparable phrase «king of countries / peoples containing many kinds of people» (*xšāyaθiya dahyūnām paruzanānām*) is found in the inscriptions of Xerxes and Darius II, and it replaces the previous one (XP^a 2D; XP^b 2D; XP^c 2D; XP^d 2D; XP^f 2D; XP^h 2D; XV^a 2D; DH^a 2D).

⁴⁵ Compare the proclamation of Darius I and Artaxerxes II that they are kings «in this great earth far and wide» (*xšāyaθiya ahyāyā būmiyā vazrkāyā*) (DN^a. 2E; A2Hc. 3C). In one of Darius I's Persepolis inscriptions the king speaks of the limits of its power from the Saka in Sogdiana, to Cush, and from India to Lydia (DPh. 2D-H). But «lord of all the peoples from the sunrise to the sunset» may reflect an Assyrian royal tradition surviving to Persian times through Babylonian bureaucracy. See, for example, Esarhaddon's accession treaty: «the men in his hands young and old, as many as there are from sunrise to sunset, those over whom Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, exercises kingship and lordship» (Parpola & Watanabe 1988: 28).

⁴⁶ In the opinion of S. Hornblower 2008: 768, Tissaphernes in 413 is both territorial satrap at Sardis, and simultaneously holder of a special western or military command, but this command related specifically to the Greek cities of the Ionian coast, broadly defined so as to include e.g. Caria. Only years later would he get the title 'general of all' with powers over Pharnabazus. Thucydides mentions some of Tissaphernes subordinates as ὑπαρχος, viz. Stages (8.16.3), Tamos, governor of Ionia (8.31.3), and Arsakes (8.108.4). That Caria was the responsibility of Tissaphernes may be inferred from the fact that he was instructed to suppress the rebellion of Amorges (Thuc. 8.5.5). D.M. Lewis believes that there is no trace of Pharnabazus being subordinate to Tissaphernes at this time (Lewis 1977: 86). On independent approaches by both satraps to Sparta see: Mitchell 1997: 115; Cawkwell 2005: 153.

⁴⁷ We can assume that, as satrap at Dascylium, Pharnabazus (like Tissaphernes further south) was also a general / *karanos* of the coastal peoples in the relevant territory, which included Aeolis under Zenis of Dardanus (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.10: ἡ δὲ Αἰολὶς αὕτη ἦν μὲν Φαρναβάζου, ἐσατράπευε δ' αὐτῷ ταύτης τῆς χώρας... Ζῆνις Δαρδανεύς), Hellenistic Phrygia, Bithynia and Paphlagonia (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.1-3).

subordinate (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.13). We may conclude, therefore, that, whereas the general / *karanos* of the coastal peoples might be a regional commander within part of Western Anatolia (in Sardis and / or Dascylium), the general / *karanos* of all peoples served as commander-in-chief for the whole region.

In some cases satrapal authority and military command did not coincide. This would arise if, for example, the general / *karanos* was not appointed from among the local satraps but was sent directly by the king as his personal representative. Such was presumably the case with Hydarnes, son of Hydarnes (Hdt. 7.135), the royal *chiliarch* (*hazārapatiš*), active in western Anatolia at some date after 486, and with Tithraustes (another *chiliarch*), whom the king sent to replace Tissaphernes as commander in 395 (Diod. 14.80.7). Herodotus (7.135) calls Hydarnes general (στρατηγός) of the coastal peoples in Asia, but Diodorus (14. 80. 7) does not apply the term στρατηγός to Tithraustes and uses instead the word ἡγεμών (Diod. 14.80.7). Since Tithraustes was replacing Tissaphernes, should we consider ἡγεμών as the equivalent of στρατηγός τῶν πάντων? The question is answered by two pieces of evidence. On the one hand, according to Diodorus (14.80.7), the Great King sent letters to Asia Minor, ordering all cities and satraps in this area to be Tithraustes' subordinates (καταστήσας οὖν Τιθραύστην ἡγεμόνα, τούτῳ μὲν παρήγγειλε συλλαμβάνειν Τισσαφέρην, πρὸς δὲ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς σατράπας ἔπεμψεν ἐπιστολάς ὅπως [ἂν] πάντες τούτῳ ποιῶσι τὸ προσταττόμενον) – which incidentally means that Pharnabazus would be Tithraustes' subordinate as he had been Tissaphernes' earlier⁴⁸. On the other hand, Xenophon's report of the negotiations between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus in the autumn of 395 (after Tithraustes had returned to the royal court) suggests that Pharnabazus hoped that the king would now appoint *him* as commander-in-chief (*Hell.* 4.1.37). The suggestion that Tithraustes was στρατηγός τῶν πάντων is thus well-founded, and it is perhaps further confirmed by the appearance of the word πάντων in the very fragmentary passage of the Oxyrhynchus historian that deals with Tithraustes' arrival in Asia Minor (13.1 Bartoletti = 16.1 Chambers).

⁴⁸ Rung 2004: 419.

Other karanoi

Another passage of the same historian (19.3 Bartoletti = 22.3 Chambers) states that, when Tithraustes returned to the king after a short stay in Sardis, he appointed Ariaeus and Pasiphernes στρατηγούς ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων. One cannot be sure that this formula is meant to be a *terminus technicus*. If it is, it may represent a translation or interpretation of some specific *karanos* title that expressed the two men's regional authority. But in any event it is one of a number of cases in which στρατηγός is plainly the equivalent of *karanos*.

Sometimes a single military leader is mentioned without further specification of his powers: such is the case with Mardonius, whom the king appointed general for the expedition against Greece in 492 (Hdt. 6.43).

In other instances a number of generals act together, with no clear statement being made about their hierarchical relationship one with another. This happens in a number of wars with rebels. During the Ionian revolt Daurises, Hymaios, Otanes, Sisimakes and Harpagus were at the head of the Persian troops in various theatres of war (Hdt. 5.110-113, 116, 121; 6.28). Military operations against the rebel satrap Pissuthnes were conducted by three generals, Tissaphernes, Spithradates and Parmises (Ctesias *FGrH* 688 15 § 53). Some of the armies sent to restore Persian control in Egypt were under multiple command: in the 450s Megabyzus and Artabazus led the army against Egypt, and also fought with Cimon in Cyprus (Diod. 11.74.6, 75.1, 77.4; 12.3.2, 4.5), while in the 380s the task was given to three generals, Abrocomas, Tithraustes and Pharnabazus (Isocr. 4.140). When Artaxerxes III prepared to re-conquer Egypt in 344/43 he divided his army into three parts under their own generals, Rhosaces, Bagoas and Mentor (Diod. 16.47.2-4). The Persian force that fought Alexander at Granicus also included the generals (στρατηγοί) Arsames, Rheomithres, Petines and Niphates, as well as satraps (Spithradates, satrap of Ionia and Lydia, and Arsites, satrap of Hellespontine Phrygia) (Arr. *Anab.* 1.12.8).

Sometimes there was the separation of land and sea command during military operations. Datis and Artaphernes led the fleet and army during the Marathon campaign in 490 (Hdt. 6.94; Ctesias *FGrH* 688 13 § 22). According to Ephorus, Tithraustes commanded the royal fleet and Pherendates led the land troops in the battle of Eurymedon (Ephor. *FGrH* 70. F. 192 = Plut. *Cim.* 12.5). And Autophradates and Hekatomnos (Theop.

FGrH 115. F. 103) were followed by Orontes and Tiribazus (Diod. 15.2.2) as leaders of the army and the fleet in the Cypriote war against Evagoras of Salamis in 390–380.

This is not a complete list of the Persian generals who took part in various military campaigns. What do they have in common? Obviously that some of them do not have a regional command or act outside of the regions to which they were appointed as commanders.

Karanoi in the king's army and the question of assembly-regions

In an army commanded by the Persian king himself, the generals / *karanoi* led ethnic contingents (as in the armies of Xerxes⁴⁹, Artaxerxes II or Darius III⁵⁰), but were subordinate not only to the Great King but also to army marshals appointed by the king. This is clear from Herodotus (7.82) and Xenophon (*Anab.* 1.7.11), who report that there were seven commanders-in-chief in Xerxes' land forces in 480 (Mardonius, Tritantaichmes, Smerdomenes, Masistes, Gergis, Megabyzos and Hydarnes) and four in Artaxerxes II's in 401 (Abrokomas, Tissaphernes, Gobryas and Arbakes). Some scholars infer from this information that the Achaemenid Empire was divided not only into satrapies, but also into larger military and administrative units headed by *karanoi*, which they call *toparchies* (seven under Xerxes, but only four under Artaxerxes II), and that one of these toparchies was in Asia Minor⁵¹.

The data in Herodotus (7.82) are not really consistent with such a view, as P.R. Barkworth noted⁵², since the marshals whom he mentions were only in command of infantry forces – τοῦ σύμπαντος στρατοῦ τοῦ πεζοῦ⁵³ – and there were three separate chiefs for cavalry (7.88), and four naval commanders (7.97). Whatever one thinks about the fleet, it does not

⁴⁹ This can be seen from the list of Persian commanders in Herodotus (7.61–83), who were at the head of various ethnic contingents in the army of Xerxes in 480 B.C. (see Barkworth 1993: 149–167). Herodotus (7.81) also provides information about the command structure of the Persian army.

⁵⁰ On the army of Darius III at the Battle of Gaugamela see Arr. *Anab.* 3.8.3–6.

⁵¹ Meyer 1954: 70; Ehtecham 1946: 70–73, 103; Dandamaev 2004: 221.

⁵² Barkworth 1993: 151.

⁵³ Moreover there would only be six *toparchies*, not seven, because Hydarnes led the ten thousand «Immortals», i.e. is not strictly speaking parallel to the other individuals involved.

make sense that a regional military commander should not command horsemen as well as foot-soldiers.

Xenophon's evidence (*Anab.* 1.7.12), on the other hand, is more supportive of the idea of territorial commands, at least in the world of the late fifth century BC. The historian states:

The King's army had four commanders, each at the head of three hundred thousand men, namely, Abrokomas, Tissaphernes, Gobryas, and Arbakes. But of the forces just enumerated only nine hundred thousand, with one hundred and fifty scythe-bearing chariots, were present at the battle; for Abrokomas, marching from Phoenicia, arrived five days too late for the engagement (tr. C.L. Brownson).

Each of the four generals / *karanoi* mentioned by Xenophon led military forces from one district: Abrokomas from Syria and Phoenicia (Cf. Xen. *Anab.* 1.4.5), Tissaphernes from Asia Minor, Arbakes possibly from Media (he may have been satrap of this region: Xen. *Anab.* 7.8.25) and Gobryas from Babylon (the man known as governor of Babylon in 420–417⁵⁴) and surrounding areas.

Moreover, the army of each *karanos* included both infantry and cavalry. This is evident not only from an allusion to the horsemen in white armor (Carians?) commanded by Tissaphernes in the battle of Cunaxa (Xen. *Anab.* 1.8.9), but also from the information that during the Spartan-Persian War Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus fielded an army of 20,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry in 397 (Diod. 14.39.4), and Tissaphernes one of 50,000 infantry and 10,000 cavalry (Diod. 14.80.1) at the battle of Sardis in the spring of 395. The figures given by Xenophon in *Anabasis* 1.7.11–12 are, of course, theoretical ones – the number of troops that each general / *karanos* was commissioned by the king to collect in his district, not the actual number brought to the battlefield. (It was impossible for Tissaphernes, *karanos* of the coastal areas in Western Asia Minor, to collect anything like the necessary number of troops in 401, since most of his region was still controlled by Cyrus⁵⁵). A similar principle would apply to the naval forces provided by two coastal districts, Asia Minor and Phoenicia: the

⁵⁴ Stolper 1994: 252.

⁵⁵ Rung 2012: 32–34.

sources suggest that each district theoretically supplied 300 ships, but forces actually assembled were often much less numerous⁵⁶.

Despite the implications of Xenophon's evidence, however, *toparchies* find little support in recent scholarship. More typical is the view of J.M. Cook that large concentrations of Persian military forces were not associated with standing territorial commands, but were the result of *ad hoc* levies for specific campaigns⁵⁷. I do not find this view convincing. Our investigation of Persian military command has shown that (a) while satraps exercised military leadership, not all Persian commanders had the status of the satrap, and (b) armies could be commanded by a combination of satraps and non-satrapal generals. But the appointment of a *karanos* for the purpose of a particular military expedition does not preclude the possibility that the *karanos* had to assemble his army from a certain territory, calling on the military forces of local dynasts and / or satraps. It should be remembered that a *karanos*' authority was determined not by the fact of his being called *karanos* but by the territorial designation that was added to his title.

Is there any reason to apply the term *toparchy* to the appropriate sort of *karanos*' area of command? The truth is that, although these troop-assembly regions certainly existed (if what Xenophon says in *Anabasis* 1.7.11-12 is to be trusted), their Old Persian description is not known and the word *toparchy* is not a properly attested authentic *terminus technicus*. The closest approach is Xenophon's use of the term *topos* in reference to the area of Sardis (*Hell.* 3.4.21: Σαρδιανὸς τόπος) and to western Armenia (*Anab.* 4.4.4: τόπος.... Ἀρμενία ἢ πρὸς ἑσπέραν). This may be a piece of quasi-technical language⁵⁸, but the regions involved are not of the same scale as the postulated *toparchies* – or, perhaps, as each other.

A different approach to assembly-regions comes from certain other passages of Xenophon. One of Xenophon's ways of defining Cyrus' position

⁵⁶ 300 ships is the usual size of the Phoenician fleets assembled at various times on the orders of the king (Hdt. 7.89.1; Diod. 12.3.2; 13.36.5; 37.4; 38.4; 41.4; 42.4; 46.6; Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.1). There is a general tendency for the size of Persian fleets to drop from the 600 ships encountered at the beginning of fifth century B.C. (Hdt. 6.9.1; Phanodem. *FGrH.* 325. F. 22) to 300 ships. For smaller actual numbers of ships cf. the 147 ships in 411 B.C. (Thuc. 8.87.3) and the 90 ships in 396 B.C. (Diod. 15.79.8; *Hell. Oxy.* 9.2 Bartoletti = 12.2 Chambers).

⁵⁷ Cook 1985: 268–269.

⁵⁸ Tuplin 2007: 12.

in 407 is in terms of the West Anatolian coastal region (ἄρξων πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ: Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3), and a similar view is found in Plutarch (*Artax.* 2.5) and Diodorus (14.19.2, 26.4). But he also describes his official status as *karanos* / *strategos* of those who gather in the valley of Castolos: τῶν εἰς Καστωλὸν ἀθροιζομένων (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3), πάντων ὅσοι ἐς Καστωλοῦ πεδῖον ἀθροίζονται (Xen. *Anab.* 1.1.1), πάντων ... οἷς καθήκει εἰς Καστωλοῦ πεδῖον ἀθροίσεσθαι (Xen. *Anab.* 1.9.7). This may be compared with Xenophon's comments about regional Persian military forces in *Oeconomicus* 4.5-7: these troops were to be convened by royal officials to a «meeting place» (σύλλογος), where they were inspected either by the king himself in person or by his authorized representatives (πιστοί). One might reasonably assume that the valley of Castolos in central Lydia (Steph. Byz. sv Καστώλου πεδῖον) was one of these «meeting places» and that troops came there under their individual commanders, including subordinate satraps within Cyrus' district of command⁵⁹.

Various questions then arise. Did these «meeting places» exist permanently or were they determined in each case by the orders of the king and / or *karanos*? What other «meeting places» are mentioned in connection with the activities of Persian generals? Unfortunately, the first question is impossible to answer with certainty. One could read Darius' letter (as cited in Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.4.3) as implying that the King himself appointed the «meeting place» for Cyrus, but (as we shall see in a moment) other instances may suggest that generals also had a right to choose the σύλλογος. As for other «meeting places», one of them may have been located somewhere on the coast of Cilicia (possibly in Tarsus), where Mardonius brought his land forces to meet the fleet on the eve of his Greek campaign in 492 (Hdt. 6.43) and Critalla (Hdt. 7.26) is sometimes imagined as a Cappadocia assembly-point for the army of Xerxes. Another example may be provided by Xenophon *Hellenica* 3.4.21. Before the battle of Sardis in 395 Tissaphernes assembled his infantry in Caria (καὶ τό τε πεζὸν καθάπερ τὸ πρόσθεν εἰς Καρίαν διεβίβασε) and his cavalry in the Maeander valley (τὸ ἵππικὸν εἰς τὸ Μαιάνδρου πεδῖον κατέστησεν). Perhaps, then, there were two «meeting places», one for infantry and another for cavalry. If we accept that these cases involve σύλλογοι in the

⁵⁹ A. Keen 1993: 88–95 argues that the appointment of Cyrus as satrap and *karanos* did not mean that the existing satraps, who were now subordinated to the prince, lost their positions.

sense defined by Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 4.5-7, we may also infer generals / *karanoi* could themselves determine the «meeting places» for their armies.

Conclusion

The evidence shows that the term *karanos* does not simply apply to a Persian commander-in-chief. In Greek sources all the king's commanders are described with the word στρατηγός. If *karanos* was simply a general Persian word for a military commander (like *strategos* in Greek), it is clear that it cannot by itself designate a specific sort of commander: that will require additional information, either geographical (an indication of the place or area of command) or hierarchical (a reference to subordination of one Persian commander to another). And whereas the general / *karanos* of the coastal peoples might be a regional commander within part of Western Anatolia (in Sardis and / or Dascylium), the general / *karanos* of all peoples served as commander-in-chief for the whole region. Sometimes a single military leader is mentioned without further specification of his powers; in other instances a number of generals act together, with no clear statement being made about their hierarchical relationship one with another. Obviously that some of them do not have a regional command or act outside of the regions to which they were appointed as commanders. In an army commanded by the Persian king himself, the generals / *karanoi* led ethnic contingents, but were subordinate not only to the Great King but also to army marshals (also surely *karanoi*) appointed by the king. Thus, commanders of any rank could be called *karanoi*, and they were not equal in status: a *karanos* can be an ethnic-contingent commander, an army marshall, an expedition commander, a regional commander (both smaller [τῶν κάτω]- and larger [τῶν πάντων]) etc.

Bibliography

- BARKWORTH, P. R., 1993. The Organization of Xerxes' army, *Iranica Antiqua* 27: 149–167.
- BRIANT, P., 2002. *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, tr. by P. T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Indiana).
- , 2003: Histoire et archéologie d'un texte. La Lettre de Darius à Gadatas entre Perses, Grecs et Romains, in: Giorgieri M. et al. (eds.). *Licia e Lidia prima dell'ellenizzazione: Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 11-12 ottobre*

- 1999, *Monografie scientifiche: Serie Scienze umane e sociali, Istituto di studi sulle civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente* (Roma): 107–144.
- CAWKWELL, G. L., 2005. *The Greek Wars. The Failure of Persia* (Oxford).
- CHANTRAINE, P., 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire de mots* (Paris).
- CHAUMONT, M.-L., 1990. Un nouveau gouverneur de Sardes achéménide d'après une inscription récemment découverte, *Syria* 67: 579–608.
- COOK, J. M., 1985. The Rise of the Achaemenids and the Establishment of Their Empire, *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 2: 200–291.
- COUSIN, G. & DESCHAMPS, G., 1889. Lettre de Darius, fils d'Hystaspes, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*: 529–542.
- DALLEY, S., 1985. Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Piliser III and Sargon II, *Iraq* 47: 31–48.
- DANDAMAEV, M. A. & LUKONIN, V. G., 2004. *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran*, tr. by Ph. L. Kohl & D. J. Dadson (Cambridge).
- DEBORD, P., 1999. *L'Asie Mineure au IV^e siècle (412–323 a.C.). Pouvoirs et jeux politiques* (Bordeaux).
- FOLMER, M. L., 1995. *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period. A Study in Linguistic Variation* (Leuven).
- FRISK, H., 1960. *Griechische Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band 1 (Heidelberg).
- GOMME, A. W., ANDREWES, A. & DOVER, K. J., 1981. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 5 (Oxford).
- GREENFIELD, J. C. & PORTEN, B., 1982. *The Bisitun inscription of Darius the Great. Aramaic Version. Text, Translation and Commentary* (London).
- EHTECHAM, M., 1946. *L'Iran sous les Achéménides* (Freiburg).
- HAEBLER, C., 1982. Κάρανος. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Betrachtung zu Xen. Hell. I. 4. 3, in: Tischer J. (Hrsg.), *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag* (Innsbruck).
- HENKELMANN, W., 2010. «Consumed before the King». The Table of Darius, that of Irdabama and Irtaštuna, and that of his satrap, Karkiš, in: Jacobs B. & Rollinger R. (eds), *Der Achämenidenhof – The Achaemenid Court / Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema «Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen»*. Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 23.–25. Mai 2007 (Wiesbaden): 667–775.
- HECKEL, W., 1996. *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great. Prosopography of Alexander's Empire* (Oxford).
- HINZ, W. & KOCH, H., 1987. *Elamische Wörterbuch (in 2 Teilen)* (Berlin).
- HORNBLOWER, S., 1982. *Mausolus* (Oxford).
- , 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 3 (Oxford).
- HYLAND, J., 2013. Vishtaspa Krny: An Achaemenid Military Official in 4th-century Bactria, *ARTA: Achaemenid Research on Texts and Archaeology* 002: 1–7 (<http://www.achemenet.com/document/2013.002-Hyland.pdf>)
- KEEN, A. G., 1993. Persian Karanoi and their Relationship to the Satrapal System, in: *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Macquarie University, 8–13 July, 1993*. vol. 1: 89–95.

- , 1998. Persian Policy in the Aegean, 412–386 B.C., *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 13: 93–110.
- KENT, R., 1950. *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon* (New Haven).
- KLINKOTT, H., 2001. Yauna – Die Griechen aus persischer Sicht?, in: Klinkott H. (Hrsg.), *Anatolien in Lichte kultureller Wechselwirkungen. Akkulturationsphänomene in Kleinasien und seinen Nachbarregionen während des 2. und 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (Tübingen): 107–148.
- , 2005. *Der Satrap. Ein achaimenidischer Amtsträger und seine Handlungsspielräume* (Frankfurt-am-Main).
- KUHRT, A., 2007. *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Sources from the Achaemenid Period*. vol. 1 (Oxford).
- LEWIS, D. M., 1977. *Sparta and Persia. Lectures delivered at the University of Cincinnati, autumn 1976 in memory of Donald W. Bradeen. Cincinnati Classical Studies 1* (Leiden).
- LIDDLE, H. G. & SCOTT, R. A., 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., with new supplement (Oxford).
- MEYER, E., 1954. *Geschichte des Altertums*, Band 3 (Stuttgart).
- MITCHELL, L. G., 1997. *Greek Bearing Gifts. The public use of private relationship in the Greek World, 435-323 BC* (Cambridge).
- NAVEH, J. & SHAKED, S., 2012. *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century BCE). From the Khalili Collections* (London).
- OLMSTEAD, A. T., 1950. *The History of the Persian Empire (Achaemenid Period)* (Chicago).
- PARPOLA, S. & WATANABE, K., 1988. *State Archives of Assyria 2. Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oath* (Helsinki).
- PETIT, T., 1983. Étude d'une fonction militaire sous la dynastie perse achéménide (Κάρναος: Xenophon, Helléniques, I, 4, 3), *Les Études classiques* 51: 35–45.
- , 1990. *Satrapes et satrapies dans l'empire achéménide de Cyrus le Grand à Xèrxes I^{er}* (Paris).
- POSTGATE, J. N., 2000. The Assyrian Army in Zamua, *Iraq* 62: 89–108.
- READE, J. F., 1972. The Neo-Assyrian Court and Army: Evidence from the Sculptures, *Iraq* 34: 87–112.
- REINER, E. & ROTH, M. T., 1999. *The Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 14 (Chicago).
- ROLLINGER, R., 2003: The Western Expansion of the Median 'Empire': A Re-Examination, in: Lanfranchi G. B., Roaf M. & Rollinger R. (eds.), *Continuity of Empire (?)*. *Assyria, Media, Persia* (History of the Ancient Near East / Monographs V) (Padova): 289–319.
- RUNG, E., 2004. Xenophon, the Oxyrhynchus Historian and the Mission of Timocrates to Greece, in: Tuplin C. J. (ed.), *Xenophon and His World (Historia Einzelschriften 172)* (Stuttgart): 413–425.
- , 2011. Κάρναος / Kārana in the Military and Administrative System of the Achaemenid Empire, in: Rung E. & Gabelko O. (eds.), *Iran and the Classical World: Political, Cultural and Economic Contacts of two Civilizations, Abstracts of papers of international conference* (Kazan): 19.

- , 2012. Tissaferm i Gidarnidi v kontekste politicheskoy istorii Ahemenidskoj derzhavi v V veke do n.e., *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 1: 16–39.
- RUZICKA, S., 1985. Cyrus and Tissaphernes, 407–401 B.C., *Classical Journal* 80: 204–211.
- SANCISI-WEERDENBURG, H., 2001a. The Problem of the Yaunā, in: Bakir T. (ed.), *Achaemenid Anatolia. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period, Bandirma 15–18 August 1997* (Leiden): 1–11.
- , 2001b. Yaunā by the Sea and across the Sea, in: Malkin I. (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge MA): 323–346.
- SCHMITT, R., 1972. Die achämenidische Satrapie «tayaïy drayahyā», *Historia* 21: 522–527.
- , 2009. *Die altpersischen Inschriften der Achaimeniden. Editio minor mit deutscher Übersetzung* (Wiesbaden).
- , 2014. *Wörterbuch der altpersischen Königsinschriften* (Wiesbaden).
- SEAGER, R. & TUPLIN, C. J., 1980. The Freedom of the Greeks of Asia: on the Origins of a Concept and the Creation of a Slogan, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100: 141–154.
- SEKUNDA, N., 1988a. Achaemenid Military Terminology, *Archaeologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 21: 69–77.
- , 1988b. Persian Settlement in Hellespontine Phrygia, in: Kuhrt A. & Sancisi-Weerdenburg H. (eds.), *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory, Proceedings of the London 1985 Achaemenid History Workshop* (Leiden): 175–195.
- SELLWOOD, D., 1983. Parthian Coins, in: *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 3: 279–298.
- SHAEYGAN, M. R., 2011. *Arsacids and Sasanians: Political Ideology in Post-Hellenistic and Late Antique Persia* (Cambridge).
- STOLPER, M. W., 1994. Mesopotamia, 482–330 B.C., in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. iv (Cambridge): 234–260.
- , 2006. Iranica in post-Achaemenid Babylonian Texts, in: Briant P. & Joannès F. (eds.), *La transition entre l'empire achéménide et les royaumes hellénistiques. Persika*, 9 (Paris): 223–260.
- TAVERNIER, J., 2007. *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550–330 B.C.). Lexicon of Old Iranian Proper Names and Loanwords, attested in Non-Iranian Texts* (Leuven).
- TRETEN, D., 1991. Κάρανος = κύριον, *Glotta* 69: 173–174.
- TUPLIN, C. J., 2004. Medes in Media, Mesopotamia, and Anatolia: Empire, Hegemony, Domination or Illusion?, *Ancient West and East* 3: 223–251.
- , 2007. A Foreigner's Perspective: Xenophon in Anatolia, in: Delemen I. (ed.), *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (Sixth-Fourth Centuries B.C.), Papers Presented at the International Workshop Istanbul 20–21 May 2005* (Ankara): 7–31.
- , 2009. The Gadatas Letter, in: Mitchell L. G. & Rubinstein L. (eds.), *Greek History and Epigraphy: Essays in Honor of P. J. Rhodes* (Swansea): 155–184.

- VALLAT, F. 1977: *Corpus des inscriptions royales en elamite achéménide* (Paris).
- VON VOIGTLANDER, E. N., 1978. *The Bisitun Inscription of Darius the Great. Babylonian Version* (London).
- WEISKOPF, M. N., 1982. *Achaemenid Systems of Governing in Anatolia* (PhD diss. Berkeley).
- WIDENGREN, G., 1969. *Der Feudalismus im alten Iran* (Köln–Opladen).
- WIESEHÖFER, J., 1994. *Das Frühe Persien. Geschichte eines antiken Weltreichs* (Zürich; München).
- , 1996. *Ancient Persia from 550 B.C. to 650 A.D.* (London).