

## A MISSING YEAR IN THE HISTORY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT

IN the spring of 328 Alexander the Great was at a critical point in his career. During the previous summer he had pressed too far too quickly and underestimated the resistance of the local population to his authority. Consequently, when he was engaged with nomad hordes on the banks of the Iaxartes (Syr-Darya), the whole of the populous satrapy of Bactria–Sogdiana rose in rebellion, from the fringes of the Hindu Kush in the south to the frontier cities by the Iaxartes. His morale was moreover weakened by a compound fracture of the *fibula*, sustained near Maracanda and exacerbated by a severe bout of dysentery at the Iaxartes. By the end of the year he had recovered and operated successfully against the rebels of northern Sogdiana. Most of the satrapy, however, remained to be reconquered, and one would expect Alexander, his health restored by a winter's convalescence in Bactra, to have plunged into a furious punitive campaign. But our expectations are frustrated. There is a gap in the military history of the reign, and modern historians of Alexander, if they mention the campaigns at all, tend to speak in vague and general terms of sweeping the countryside,<sup>1</sup> before turning with relief to the period at Maracanda at the end of summer and the great set piece of the death of Cleitus.

This silence reflects the meagreness of the narrative supplied by our principal source, Arrian. Like his modern followers Arrian has taken the Cleitus episode out of its historical context and included it in an anticipatory digression illustrating Alexander's lack of moderation. It was one of a standard list of condemnatory *topoi*, and Arrian has taken the whole subject of Alexander's alleged moral decline and retailed the various episodes—adoption of Persian court dress and barbaric punishment, the murder of Cleitus, the introduction of *proskynesis*;<sup>2</sup> and characteristically he tends to shift the blame from Alexander to the other protagonists.<sup>3</sup> But the digression interrupts the military narrative, and, having extracted the murder of Cleitus from the year's report of 328, he is left with very little. On the other hand the so-called vulgate tradition, primarily represented by Curtius Rufus, gives a detailed account of the year's events which is rhetorically and romantically expressed, but provides a unitary and coherent narrative. It also contradicts Arrian on a number of fundamental matters of fact and for that reason is usually rejected or drawn upon only for subsidiary details. I contend that the Curtian narrative is fundamentally reliable and that by contrast there are major distortions in Arrian, caused by faulty manipulation of sources and by errors of fact in the sources themselves. In what follows I shall first take two relatively minor episodes, which illustrate the deficiencies of Arrian and the general reliability of Curtius, and then move to a more general consideration of the source tradition of 328. I shall end with a tentative reconstruction of the military history of the year, indicating the general line of march and strategy of containment. This is in fact a propaedeutic study, its object being to clarify the source picture, so that there are criteria for the identification of Alexander's routes and city settlements. Ultimately such identification can only be made by

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Sir W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great* i (Cambridge 1948) 72 [hereafter Tarn]; F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander der Grosse*, SÖAW Wien cclxxxv (1973) 348–54 [hereafter Schachermeyr]; R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 308, 314–16 [hereafter Lane Fox]; D. W. Engels, *Alexander the Great and the Logistics of the Macedonian Army* (Berkeley 1978) 104–6 [hereafter Engels]. The fullest modern account remains that of J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* i<sup>2</sup> (Gotha 1877) 2.68–70, 73–80, which is an extended paraphrase of Arrian; there is an interesting insert from Curtius Rufus (75) which details the siege of the rock of

Sisimithres, but it does not prevent him from retailing Arrian's version a few pages later as a separate event.

<sup>2</sup> Arr. iv 7.4–14.4. For the *topos* see most succinctly Livy ix 18.4: *referre in tanto rege piget superbam mutationem vestis et desideratas humi iacentium adulationes . . . et foeda supplicia et inter vinum et epulas caedes amicorum et vanitatem ementiendae stirpis*. The same conjunction of the episodes of Cleitus and *proskynesis* also occurs at great length in Plutarch (*Al.* 50–6), and it was probably unavoidable for anyone steeped in the rhetorical tradition of the early empire.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Arr. iv 9.1, 12.6–7.



scholars personally acquainted with the topography and archaeology of the area,<sup>4</sup> but the work can only be attempted if parameters are first established by study of the source tradition.

## I

After his punitive campaign into the west of the Zeravshan valley Alexander withdrew to Bactra (modern Balkh/Wazirabad) for the winter of 329/8.<sup>5</sup> There he received reinforcements in strength from Anatolia and the Syrian coast, reinforcements which are described in more or less similar terms by Arrian and Curtius Rufus.<sup>6</sup> Arrian, however, has one detail which has no correspondence in Curtius. During the stay at Bactra two satraps arrived at court, Stasanor of Areia and Phrataphernes of Parthyaea, each bringing captives; one was Arsaces, the previous satrap of Areia, and the other a certain Brazanes, who had been nominated by Bessus as rival satrap of Parthyaea. There is nothing about this event in Curtius, but his silence in itself implies nothing. What is more disturbing is that Stasanor and Phrataphernes recur in Arrian's account of the following winter, 328/7. They arrive after completing some unspecified task (*πεπραγμένων σφίσι πάντων ὅσα ἐξ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐτέτακτο*), and they are immediately dispatched on other missions—Stasanor to take over the satrapy of Drangiana (immediately south of Areia) and Phrataphernes to bring to court the recalcitrant satrap of Tapuria. This time Curtius has the same details as Arrian (although the names, as so often in this author, are badly corrupt) and he adds that the satrap replaced by Stasanor in Drangiana was named Arsames.<sup>7</sup> A dilemma results. If Arrian's details are all accepted, we must assume that Phrataphernes and Stasanor were sent on an independent mission during the campaigning season of 328, rather than returning to their troubled satrapies. If the hypothesis of an independent command is rejected, one of Arrian's reports of the satraps' arrival at winter quarters must be dismissed as unhistorical.<sup>8</sup> Both approaches have had their supporters, but the problem has been treated largely on *a priori* grounds. A more rigorous investigation is desirable, and in my opinion the solution is given by the troubled history of Areia between 330 and 328, a subject hitherto neglected in Alexander scholarship.<sup>9</sup>

In the autumn of 330, some six weeks after the death of Darius III, the regicide Bessus threw down a challenge to Alexander. He adopted the upright tiara, the traditional prerogative of

<sup>4</sup> The most authoritative work for the identification of Alexander's routes has been the survey by Franz von Schwarz, *Alexanders des Grossen Feldzüge in Turkestan*<sup>2</sup> (Stuttgart 1906) [hereafter von Schwarz]. This work has the merit of detailed acquaintance with the terrain, but it was written long before the advent of systematic archaeology and relied on impressionistic identifications based on the author's intimate knowledge of the country (*cf.* Engels 99 n.2). In the case of 328, von Schwarz begins on totally the wrong footing, since he denies the traditional equation of Zariaspa and Bactra (*cf.* P. A. Brunt, *Arrian* i [Loeb 1976] 503) and makes Alexander's campaign begin at Chardzou on the Oxus, far to the north-west of Bactra (von Schwarz 65 f.). The consequence is that he depicts Alexander merely retracing his steps back to Maracanda, and the whole of the work of pacification is deferred to the spring of 327.

<sup>5</sup> Arr. iv 6.5; Curt. vii 10.1–3. It is clear that the army covered the whole length of the Zeravshan as far as its disappearance into the desert sands some 45 km from the Oxus. Alexander certainly went from there to winter quarters at Bactra/Zariaspa (Arr. iv 7.1; Curt. vii 10.10—for the equation, see below p. 34), but it is not stated whether he retraced his steps to Maracanda or cut across the desert and took the more direct route along

the Oxus.

<sup>6</sup> Arr. iv 7.2; Curt. vii 10.10–12. Curtius adds troop numbers and lists fewer commanders, but the measure of agreement with Arrian is impressive (see further, Bosworth, *CQ* xxiv [1974] 61). There is one slip, which may be a textual corruption, in that Asander is made to come from Lycia (*Lytia* P) not Lydia (*cf.* H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich* [hereafter Berve] ii [Munich 1926] 87 no. 165), and one difference of nomenclature. *Μελαμνίδας* (Berve no. 493) in Arrian corresponds to *Maenidas* in Curtius: this divergence in nomenclature goes back to the original sources and, *pace* J. R. Hamilton, *CQ* v (1955) 217, it should not be emended out of the texts. *Melamnidas* may be a mistake, but, if so, he is a mistake of Arrian's source, not his copyists.

<sup>7</sup> Arr. iv 18.1–3; Curt. viii 3.17.

<sup>8</sup> Droysen i<sup>2</sup> 2.77 and Schachermeyr 349 n. 416 have argued for a separate expedition; Berve (nos 814, 719), following W. Geiger, *Alexanders des Grossen Feldzüge in Sogdiana* (Progr. Neustadt 1882/3—*non vidi*) 32 f., insists on a doublet in Arrian.

<sup>9</sup> See the brief notes by P. Jullien, *Zur Verwaltung der Satrapien unter Alexander dem Grossen* (Diss. Leipzig 1914) 37 f.; Berve i 265 f.; Schachermeyr 312 ff. (the best short narrative).

Persian royalty, and took on the regal name of Artaxerxes, so presenting himself as a focus for Iranian resistance to the Macedonian conquest.<sup>10</sup> Alexander's response was immediate. From the city of Susia (modern Tūs) he plunged directly towards Bessus' homeland of Bactria, heading across the Kopet Dag range towards the oasis of Merv/Margiana.<sup>11</sup> This movement took him directly away from Areia, where he had recently confirmed Satibarzanes as satrap with a minuscule garrison of cavalry. No sooner was he safely *en route* than Satibarzanes massacred the garrison and revolted openly.<sup>12</sup> This was the first satrapal revolt of the reign and, coming as it did so promptly upon the declaration of Bessus, it was a sombre indication how fragile was the loyalty of the eastern Iranians to Alexander. The king was forced to retrace his steps and fight a thirty-day campaign in Areia, driving Satibarzanes into the desert.<sup>13</sup> At the end of the campaign he had gained control of the main centres of population and he left the satrapy in the hands of another Persian, Arsaces,<sup>14</sup> while he himself moved south into Drangiana. He had now abandoned the northern route to Bactra and spent the next months securing the southern highway, which followed the great rivers Areius (Hari Rud) and Etymandrus (Helmand) into the Hindu Kush. The move left the satrapies of the north vulnerable to Bessus, who could pour cavalry and political agitators across the Kopet Dag watershed into Areia and Parthyaea.

Alexander moved from Drangiana to Arachosia in the first months of 329, and simultaneously Satibarzanes, strengthened by cavalry from Bessus, invaded Areia and unleashed a second revolt.<sup>15</sup> This time Alexander did not return in person but sent an expeditionary force under two Companions, Erigyus and Caranus, together with a native adviser, the venerable Artabazus. There ensued a skirmishing campaign with minor engagements, culminating in a major battle, in which Erigyus killed Satibarzanes in hand-to-hand combat and forced the opposing army to transfer its allegiance to Alexander.<sup>16</sup> We may, however, be justified in questioning the extent of the Areian capitulation. The final battle had been equally balanced,<sup>17</sup> and the Macedonian forces must have suffered severe casualties. In any case the commanders withdrew and they seem to have brought the news of their victory to Alexander in person. According to Curtius the victory was reported to Alexander during his first stay in Bactra, in the early summer of 329,<sup>18</sup> and all the commanders of the expeditionary force are subsequently attested in Alexander's entourage. Artabazus was appointed satrap of Bactria precisely in the early summer; Erigyus participated in the debate at the Iaxartes a little later, and Caranus was one of the commanders of the ill-fated expedition sent to raise the siege of Maracanda towards the end of the campaigning year.<sup>19</sup> They had rejoined Alexander victorious, but the satrapy they left was far from pacified. Significantly the king's first reaction was to replace its satrap. Before he crossed the Oxus (after leaving Bactra in summer 329) he sent his Cypriot Companion, Stasanor of Soli, to take over Areia and arrest its former satrap Arsaces, ὄτι ἐθελοκακεῖν αὐτῷ . . . ἔδοξεν.<sup>20</sup> Berve assumed that Arsaces, like Satibarzanes before him, had

<sup>10</sup> Arr. iii 25.3; Curt. vi 6.13; *Metz Epitome* [hereafter *ME*] 3. For the wide-ranging impact of Bessus' challenge, see Bosworth, *JHS* c (1980) 6 f.

<sup>11</sup> Arr. iii 25.4; Curt. vi 6.20. On the route see Engels 86 f.

<sup>12</sup> Arr. iii 25.5; Curt. vi 6.21; Diod. xvii 78.1. According to Arrian (iii 21.10) Satibarzanes had participated in the murder of Darius, a statement that Badian has queried (*CQ* viii [1958] 147 n. 1) because of the stark contrast of his treatment with that meted out to Bessus and Barsaentes.

<sup>13</sup> Diod. xvii 78.1–4; Curt. vi 6.20–34; Arr. iii 25.5–7. *Pace* Berve ii no. 697 the vulgate tradition is far fuller and more detailed than Arrian and must form the basis of any reconstruction (*cf.* Schachermeyr 313; Engels 87–91).

<sup>14</sup> Arr. iii 25.7; *cf.* Curt. vii 3.1. Justin xii 4.12 is hopelessly confused.

<sup>15</sup> Curt. vii 3.2 (dated to Alexander's fifth day in

Ariaspian territory—c. January 329); Diod. xvii 81.3; Arr. iii 28.2 (imprecisely dated to spring 329).

<sup>16</sup> Curt. vii 4.38: *et barbari duce amisso . . . arma Erigyio tradunt*; Diod. xvii 83.6; Arr. iii 28.3 speaks vaguely of a general flight.

<sup>17</sup> τῶν βαρβάρων ἰσόμαχον ποιούντων τὸν κίνδυνον (Diod. xvii 83.5; *cf.* Curt. vii 4.33; Arr. iii 28.3).

<sup>18</sup> *eodem tempore quae in gente Ariorum . . . gesserant perferuntur* (Curt. vii 4.32). Diodorus reports the episode at exactly the same point.

<sup>19</sup> Arr. iii 29.1; Curt. vii 5.1 (Artabazus installed at Bactra); Curt. vii 7.9, 21–4 (Erigyus at the Iaxartes; he dies in camp before the onset of winter 328/7 [Curt. viii 2.40]); Arr. iv 3.7, 5.7, 6.1 (Caranus at Maracanda).

<sup>20</sup> Arr. iii 29.5. Stasanor may have participated in the earlier expedition against Satibarzanes, for Diodorus xvii 81.3 makes him joint commander along with Erigyus. Curtius, however, makes Caranus joint com-

revolted against Alexander's royal authority.<sup>21</sup> Arrian's expression, however, tells against the theory. *ἔθελοκακεῖν*, like so much of Arrian's vocabulary, is borrowed from Herodotus, and its meaning is invariably 'to shirk battle deliberately'.<sup>22</sup> Arrian's implication is that Arsaces showed no enthusiasm in collaborating with the Macedonian expeditionary force and, without siding openly with the rebels, gave no positive assistance against them. Accordingly Alexander viewed his behaviour as treasonable and ordered his arrest. There was no guarantee that he would go quietly, and Stasanor could anticipate renewed warfare in Areia.

Further to the north-west in Parthyaea the confusion was much greater. The satrapy was equally menaced by the enemy in Bactria, and Phrataphernes had no expeditionary force to assist him.<sup>23</sup> Indeed Alexander had ordered him to join in the campaign against Satibarzanes. Not surprisingly we hear of no action by Phrataphernes; he had his own troubles with the invasion by Brazanes, Bessus' nominated satrap of Parthyaea.<sup>24</sup> Phrataphernes moreover had no large reserves apart from his satrapal army. The nearest major concentration of Greco-Macedonian forces was in Media, but the massive garrison of summer 330 had been weakened deliberately. The cavalry component had rejoined the main army in the autumn of 330 while the 6,000 phalanx infantry, left as guard for the bullion train, had overhauled Alexander in Arachosia in the early months of 329.<sup>25</sup> The remaining garrison consisted of Thracians and perhaps a nucleus of mercenaries, numerically strong but demoralised by the recent assassination of Parmenion.<sup>26</sup> Some of these troops were diverted to buttress Phrataphernes,<sup>27</sup> but the entire garrison could not be stripped from Media, which had troubles of its own. Its native satrap, Oxydates, was deposed in the winter of 328/7, again for deliberate shirking in battle (*ἔθελοκακεῖν* here recurs in Arrian).<sup>28</sup> One must again suppose that he sympathised with the resistance forces, either refusing to assist Phrataphernes in his hour of need or failing to combat adequately an invasion of Media itself.

The deposition of Oxydates, which certainly took place in winter 328/7, suggests that the disturbances in the central satrapies continued well into 328. That is reinforced by other considerations. The insurgents in the west must have been supported morally and materially by the continuing unrest in Bactria/Sogdiana. Bessus was captured in midsummer 329, but a few weeks later there was repeated insurrection throughout the great satrapy, from Bactra to Cyropolis.<sup>29</sup> Alexander was temporarily *in extremis*, faced simultaneously with the Saca threat

mander (vii 3.2, 4.32) and neither he nor Arrian knows anything of Stasanor in this context. Berve (no. 719) assumed that Diodorus was simply wrong and retrojected his later satrapal appointment; but it is hard to explain how the mistake arose.

<sup>21</sup> Berve i 266 'beide empören sich'. He is later rather more guarded; ii no. 146 'Abfallsgelüste zeigte'.

<sup>22</sup> Hdt. i 127.3; v 78; vi 15.1; viii 22, 69.2, 85.1; ix 67. Arrian elsewhere uses the expression twice—at iv 18.3 (an exact parallel) and *Tact.* 12.11 (where the meaning is unambiguous). For his linguistic dependence on Herodotus see H. R. Grundmann, *Quid in elocutione Arriani Herodoto debeatur*, Berliner Studien ii (1885) and, in brief, Bosworth, CQ xxiv (1974) 56.

<sup>23</sup> Phrataphernes (Berve no. 814) had been satrap of Hyrcania and Parthyaea under Darius (Arr. iii 8.4, 23.4) and had surrendered to Alexander in his Elburz campaign in 330. Amminapes (Berve no. 55) had originally been established as satrap of Parthyaea/Hyrcania earlier in summer 330 (Arr. iii 22.1; Curt. vi 4.23 f.). Nothing more is heard of Amminapes and he was replaced by Phrataphernes by the beginning of 329 (Arr. iii 28.2).

<sup>24</sup> Arr. iv 7.1, mentioning not only Brazanes but other rebels who had sided with Bessus. There were obviously several centres of insurrection in Parthyaea.

<sup>25</sup> For the Median garrison early in 330 see Arr. iii 19.7. Of these forces the cavalry component, mercenaries and Thessalian volunteers, reached Alexander in autumn 330 (Arr. iii 25.4); the infantry (6,000 phalangites and 5,000 mercenaries) arrived while Alexander was in Arachosia (Curt. vii 3.4), about the time of Satibarzanes' second Areian invasion. Of the original forces only Thracians remained. They are not attested again in Alexander's army, and, since two of the Median generals, Agathon and Sitalces (Berve nos 8, 712) are elsewhere described commanding Thracian detachments (Arr. iii 12.4), it is a fair assumption that they were left in command of their original forces, now the garrison of Media.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Curt. vii 2.28–32 for near-mutiny in Media after the murder. For the more widespread discontent in the army, see Diod. xvii 80.4; Curt. vii 2.35–8; Just. xii 5.5–8.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Arr. v 20.7, Phrataphernes brings to India (summer 326) the Thracians left in his command.

<sup>28</sup> Arr. iv 18.3; Curt. viii 3.17.

<sup>29</sup> Arr. iv 1.4–5; Curt. vii 6.13–15. The communities near the Iaxartes began the revolt by massacring their garrisons and the southern areas of Sogdiana and Bactria followed suit.

across the Iaxartes and the massacre of his expeditionary force in the Zeravshan valley. There followed a year of systematic massacre and repression before the insurgent leader Spitamenes was murdered by his supporters and the uprising could be said to have been contained. During that period Alexander's generals in the central satrapies were left unsupported, while the morale of the insurgents cannot have been seriously affected until late in 328. It seems incredible that Stasanor could have left Bactra in the early summer of 329, travelled the 1900 km journey to Areia, captured Arsaces, containing any local insurrection, and returned to Bactra by the following winter. It is far more likely that the difficulties in Areia and Parthyaea continued well into 328, before the two satraps were in a position to leave their provinces and report success to Alexander.

There is indirect corroboration of this view in Curtius. As we have seen, Curtius gives information similar to that in Arrian about the appointments of winter 328/7. His text is as usual corrupt, but the corruptions are easily explained—with one exception. When he mentions the replacement in Media he gives the name of the new satrap as *Arsaces*, not as Atropates: *Arsaces in Mediam missus, ut Oxydates inde discederet* (viii 3.17). Now this notice, like that in Arrian, immediately follows the report of Stasanor's mission to Drangiana, and there seems no reason for the substitution of Arsaces' name for Atropates unless there was something in the context to suggest it. I can only assume that Curtius' source mentioned Stasanor's successful arrest of Arsaces, and although Curtius excised the detail in his narrative, the name remained in his memory strongly enough for him to substitute it subconsciously for the vaguely familiar Atropates. Such substitutions are frequent enough, and one need only refer to the famous crux in Arrian where the name of Bessus has intruded from the surrounding context and displaced the name of the satrap of Syria.<sup>30</sup> Curtius' source in all probability noted the arrival of Stasanor with his prisoner Arsaces and dated it to winter 328/7. Curtius also referred to Stasanor replacing Arsames, the satrap of Drangiana, a notice which has been wrongly dismissed as confused.<sup>31</sup> In the Achaemenid period Drangiana, the populous territory around the lake system of modern Seistan, had been associated with Arachosia as a joint satrapy.<sup>32</sup> In the winter of 330/29 Alexander settled both areas and in the aftermath of the rebellion of Satibarzanes he may well have divided the two components of the earlier satrapy, attributing Drangiana to the Persian Arsames and Arachosia to the Macedonian Menon.<sup>33</sup> There is nothing suspicious in the names of Arsaces and Arsames occurring in neighbouring satrapies. Both are impeccable Persian names, cognate forms admittedly but distinct and different names.<sup>34</sup> Their homophony in modern

<sup>30</sup> Arr. iv 7.2 (on which see CQ xxiv [1974] 60 f.). See also Arr. iii 16.9, where the name of the previous Persian garrison commander is substituted for his Macedonian successor (CQ xxvi [1976] 121 f.). As for Curtius, the most likely explanation of his error in making Asander governor of Lycia (above n. 6) is that his source mentioned Nearchus in the same context, who actually was satrap of Lycia and Pamphylia (Arr. iii 6.6, 7.1) and brought troops to Bactra.

<sup>31</sup> *Arsami, Drangarum praefecto, substitutus est Stasanor* (Curt. viii 3.17). 'Arsames' has had a chequered history. Blancardus (1668) substituted his name for that of Arsaces as satrap of Areia in all three passages of Arrian, assuming his identity with the son of Artabazus (Berve no. 148), and Arsames appeared in that role in various standard compilations (e.g. Jullien [n. 9] 38). Roos then correctly restored the manuscript reading in all passages of Arrian, and Arsames disappeared from history as satrap of Areia. No one at any period recognised that an Arsames could have been satrap of Drangiana; 'das wurde erst Stasanor' says Berve (ii 81 n. 1), establishing a dogma with no basis in the sources.

<sup>32</sup> Arr. iii 8.4, 21.1. The satrap, Barsaentes, was one

of the principal regicides, and after Darius' death he had withdrawn to his satrapy (Arr. iii 25.8; Curt. vi 6.36), from which he withdrew to India in the face of Alexander's advance (*cf.* Berve no. 205).

<sup>33</sup> Menon's satrapy is firmly attested as Arachosia alone (Arr. iii 28.1; Curt. vii 3.5, ix 10.20). Gedrosia was settled at the same time and placed under Tiridates (Diod. xvii 81.2; *cf.* Berve no. 755). Now Arrian speaks in passing of the settlement of Drangiana and Gedrosia, and implies that they were dealt with individually (iii 28.1). Drangiana should have had a satrap like the Gedrosians.

<sup>34</sup> For the etymology see M. Mayrhofer, *Zur Namengut des Avesta*, SOAW Wien cccviii.5 (1977) 17, 43. Two other Persians named Arsames (Berve nos 148 f.) are attested in the Alexander period alone. As for Arsaces, it is well known as the pre-regnal name of Artaxerxes II (Ctesias, *FGrH* 688 F 15 [55 f.]; Deinon, *FGrH* 690 F 14). See also Thuc. viii 108.4 for the hyparch of Tissaphernes. There is a comparable coincidence in the Triparadeisus settlement when two Cypriots, Stasander and Stasanor, were given neighbouring satrapies (Diod. xviii 39.6; Arr. *Succ. fr.* 1.36).

European ears is misleading. There is nothing against Curtius' statement that Arsames was Alexander's satrap of Drangiana. He was presumably appointed in late 330 and retained his position until winter 328/7. At the time of his replacement Alexander had recent ugly memories of Iranian insurrection and had in the last months substituted the Macedonian Amyntas, son of Nicolaus, for Artabazus as satrap of Bactria.<sup>35</sup> Given Stasanor's proved ability it was a natural move to extend his satrapy to incorporate Drangiana.<sup>36</sup> The whole of the Central Asian river system from the borders of Parthyaea to the Hindu Kush was now to be administered by two satraps of Greco-Macedonian extraction.

Stasanor and Phrataphernes reported their success and brought their captives to Alexander in the winter of 328/7. Arrian's first dating of the event to winter 329/8 is mistaken; and the mistake must derive from his source which erroneously conflated their arrival with the many contingents of reinforcements which came from the western satrapies during that winter. The identification of the sources is too nebulous for certain conclusions, but there is one useful indicator. Arrian's text at iv 18.2 has several peculiarities of spelling, which are usually emended out of modern editions. The name of the satrap of Tapuria to be deposed by Phrataphernes is given as Phradates instead of Autophrades, the form previously attested in Arrian.<sup>37</sup> Phradates, however, is the form universally found in Curtius,<sup>38</sup> and it seems a genuine variant. The spelling of the Tapurians is again unique in Arrian, but the variations in the transmission of their name are such that no certain conclusion can be drawn.<sup>39</sup> What is slightly more significant is that the people of Drangiana are termed *Δράγγαι* not *Ζαράγγαι*, the older form found elsewhere in Arrian and which I have argued is characteristic of Ptolemy.<sup>40</sup> The argument is cumulative and indicates that the source for Arrian iv 18.2 was the subsidiary Aristobulus. In that case the earlier passage with its misdating of the arrival of Stasanor and Phrataphernes is derived from Ptolemy.

What is certain is that there is a doublet in Arrian, caused by his two principal sources reporting the same event at different points in the campaign narrative. This is a type of variation reasonably frequent in the Alexander tradition, particularly when the arrival or departure of troops is being chronicled. Such incidents were peripheral to the central history of Alexander and inserted at convenient pauses in the narrative.<sup>41</sup> It is dangerous therefore to base the dating of such routine events upon the evidence of a single text. In the present instance we have a variant between Ptolemy and Aristobulus which Arrian has patently failed to resolve, a variant which is revealed by the parallel narrative of Curtius Rufus and by the general historical context. It remains to be seen how reliably Curtius' general narrative can be used as a control source.

## II

The campaign of 328 began with a march from Bactra to the Oxus. Both Arrian and Curtius record the miraculous appearance of a spring of oil and/or water near the river Oxus, and they make the event the first of the campaigning year.<sup>42</sup> According to Arrian, Alexander's objective was to crush the Sogdian rebels who had returned to local strongholds, and Curtius' language implies the same: *ad ea, quae defectione turbata erant, componenda processit*. Then, however, Curtius

<sup>35</sup> Arr. iv 17.3; Curt. viii 2.14 (*cf.* viii 1.19).

<sup>36</sup> So Arr. iv 18.3. For his later position as satrap of both Arcia and Drangiana see Arr. vi 27.3; Diod. xviii 3.3; Dexippus, *FGrH* 100 F 8.6; Justin xiii 4.22.

<sup>37</sup> *Cf.* iii 23.7 (occurring twice); iii 24.3.

<sup>38</sup> Curt. iv 12.9, vi 4.25, 5.21, viii 3.17, x 1.39 (no textual variants attested).

<sup>39</sup> *Τόπειροι* (Arr. iii 8.4, 11.4); *Τάπουροι* (iii 23.1–2, 6–7, 24.3, vii 23.1); *Τάπυροι* (iv 18.3).

<sup>40</sup> For *Ζαράγγαι* see iii 25.8 (twice), vi 17.3, 27.3, vii 6.3; for *Δράγγαι* iii 21.1, 28.1, iv 18.3, vi 15.5, vii 10.6. Of these passages vi 15.5 is a doublet of vi 17.3 and iii

28.1 is a resumptive passage, referring back to iii 25.8. See further, Bosworth, *CQ* xxvi (1976) 128 f.

<sup>41</sup> For instances see *Phoenix* xxix (1975) 31 with n. 24. A good instance where a general's report of recent successes is given *in extenso* on his arrival in camp is Arr. iii 2.3–7 (Hegelochus in Egypt); Curtius iv 5.13–22 records the same events but places them before the siege of Gaza, rather nearer the time they occurred.

<sup>42</sup> Arr. iv 15.7–8; Curt. vii 10.13–14. See also Plut. *Al.* 57.5 (with Athen. ii 42f); Strabo xi 11.5 (518). The variant traditions of this event make an interesting study in their own right.

inserts a sentence which has provoked incredulity and outrage. After crossing the rivers Ochus and Oxus Alexander came to the city of Margiana. There he chose sites for six foundations, spaced at moderate intervals for mutual support and all sited on elevated positions (Curt. vii 10.15). The general line of march is confirmed by the *Metz Epitome*, which at this point follows the vulgate tradition, adding a certain number of details not found in Curtius, and replaces Diodorus as a control source for the period omitted in the great lacuna. According to the *Epitome* Alexander reached the Ochus eleven days out from Bactra and after crossing it moved on to the Oxus.<sup>43</sup> We have the same march first to the Ochus and then to the Oxus, but there is no reference to Margiana. There are two problems to resolve, the location of the river Ochus and the historicity of the march to Margiana. Both have provoked perplexed debate and general scholarly *aporia* but little systematic examination of the sources.

Curtius' notice is usually associated with the tradition of the foundation of Alexandria Margiana. According to Pliny, Alexander founded an Alexandria in the oasis of Margiana, which was destroyed by barbarians and later refounded by Antiochus I as the celebrated Antiochia Margiana.<sup>44</sup> Not surprisingly, there has been a tendency to argue that Margiana was settled with Macedonian colonists in 328, and a recent scholar has argued that Alexander supervised the foundation in person.<sup>45</sup> But an expedition in force to Margiana is difficult to explain in the military context of 328. Alexander was moving away from the main centres of rebellion. Margiana, the modern oasis of Merv, lies in the desert steppes of the Kara Kum, some 350 km west of Bactra.<sup>46</sup> To reach it would have involved a desert march vulnerable to attack from the marauding Massagetae, the principal allies of the rebel Sogdians, while leaving the garrisons in Bactria and Sogdiana exposed to the enemy. If he left the main area of hostilities there was a clear danger that the whole territory would erupt in renewed insurgency. That had been the unmistakable lesson of the campaign of 329 and Alexander after the disaster in the Zeravshan<sup>47</sup> is unlikely to have underestimated the danger from the Sogdian rebels. What is more, if Alexander had made an epic desert march in 328, it is strange that its memory is preserved by a single sentence of Curtius, the incident omitted by Arrian's sources, which are usually so eager to emphasise the heroic. Modern scholars have therefore in the main taken one of two approaches. Either the whole story is dismissed as apocryphal<sup>48</sup> or it is diluted—Alexander did not visit Margiana in person but sent a detachment to occupy the oasis and to found an Alexandria.<sup>49</sup> Schachermeyr<sup>50</sup> accordingly drew attention to Craterus' behaviour in 328. He is not reported by Arrian as sent on any mission but his arrival back at headquarters in winter 328/7 is duly noted.<sup>51</sup> He may therefore have been sent into Margiana. The hypothesis is seductive but impossible. Craterus is in fact attested in action near the Bactrian capital in 328, when he repelled a raid by Spitamenes. Schachermeyr suggested that he intercepted Spitamenes during the Massagetic retreat through Merv; but Arrian's detailed narrative makes it clear that Craterus was close enough to Bactra for Spitamenes' attack to be reported to him in person and that Craterus

<sup>43</sup> *ME* 14: *deinde post diem undecimum ad flumen Ochum pervenit, id transit. inde ad Oxum flumen devenit.*

<sup>44</sup> Pliny *NH* vi 47. The information is unique to Pliny.

<sup>45</sup> Engels 104 f. His restoration involves Alexander crossing the Oxus and campaigning in Sogdiana before returning to Bactra for the journey to Sogdiana; and he is forced to identify the R. Ochus with the Kashka Darya in southern Sogdiana, which, as we shall see, is an impossibility.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Brunt (n. 4) 506. Von Schwarz, who knew the terrain well, dismissed the idea of a desert march as an impossibility, even though he argued for Alexander wintering at Chardzou, far closer to Merv than Balkh (68 ff.).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Arr. iv 5.2–6.2; Curt. vii 7.31–9; *ME* 13.

<sup>48</sup> J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* i<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1927) 439 n. 3; von Schwarz and Brunt (n. 4); V. Tscherikower, *Die hellenistische Städtegründungen*, *Philologus Suppl.* xix.1 (1927) 105.

<sup>49</sup> E. Meyer, *Blute und Niedergang des Hellenismus in Asien* (Berlin 1925) 17 f.; Berve i 294; Tarn ii 234 f.

<sup>50</sup> Schachermeyr 349 n. 416, followed by J. R. Hamilton, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 100 and Lane Fox 308.

<sup>51</sup> Arr. iv 18.1. Schachermeyr suggests that the expedition to Margiana was the mysterious mission which occupied Phrataphernes and Stasanor during 328 (see above, p. 19); they were given their instructions at Bactra and led troops north from their satrapies. One wonders how the complicated logistics of this three-pronged campaign were arranged.



in fact pursued him into the desert.<sup>52</sup> There was no question of cutting Spitamenes' retreat. It looks as though Craterus had general responsibility for the area south of the Oxus. He was presumably left around Bactra when Alexander moved to the Oxus and was later reinforced by Polyperchon and the other generals mentioned by Arrian. There is no room for Craterus to have settled Margiana, and it is unlikely that Alexander with a wide-ranging guerilla war on his hands could have afforded to send any of his forces to such a distant theatre.

It is time to ask the question whether Curtius in fact states that Alexander went west to Margiana. He does not. The manuscripts at vii 10.15 read either *Marganiam* (P, FLV) or *Marginiam* (BM). The 'correction', *Margianam*, was made as early as the sixteenth century by Abraham Oertel, endorsed by the magisterial authority of Johannes Freinsheim, and has been accepted in almost all modern editions. There has been one exception. In his Paris edition of 1678 Michael Le Tellier included a note written with true Jesuit acumen in which he disputed the emendation on the grounds that the direct route from Bactra to Margiana does not cross the Oxus. Margania/Marginia, he argued, is an otherwise unattested place name in Sogdiana. That is certainly correct. Curtius' (and Arrian's) narrative of the Sogdian campaigns of Alexander is larded with strange place names uniquely attested. They may be corrupt, but in the absence of other evidence there is no justification for emendation and assimilation with other, better known, toponyms. The manuscript reading should be left unaltered and the temptation to emend resisted unless there is compelling reason to make an identification.

Other evidence confirms that Curtius' *Margania* is not the oasis of Margiana. In the first place his description of the foundation is not consistent. He speaks of six interrelated cities, whereas in Margiana there was only one substantial foundation. Isidorus of Charax, the Parthian historian of the Augustan era, mentioned only Antiochia Margiana and stated explicitly that there were no villages, and Strabo also limits his description to Antiochia.<sup>53</sup> If we retain the emendation in Curtius we are forced to the hypothesis that Alexander ringed the oasis with foundations which were destroyed by barbarians in the early third century B.C.,<sup>54</sup> and then the survivors were synoecised into one great foundation by Antiochus. Unfortunately Pliny also speaks of the single foundation by Alexander and Antiochus, and no source has any list of multiple settlements. Secondly Curtius says that all Alexander's foundations were established *in editis collibus*,<sup>55</sup> whereas the oasis of Merv is in the desert steppes, at the point where the R. Murghab splits into several streams and disappears into the sands of the Kara Kum. There are no elevated hills to provide sites such as Curtius describes, whereas there are any number of suitable sites in Sogdiana across the Oxus.

The rest of the vulgate tradition, though vague and scattered, acts as a control. As we have seen, the *Metz Epitome* confirms the data on Alexander's line of march. We can go further. Although Diodorus' continuous narrative is lacking at this point, the index remains and preserves in précis his narrative schema. There is a reference to a campaign of repression against Bactrian and Sogdian rebels and the foundation of cities well sited for the punishment of rebels.<sup>56</sup> The next chapter heading deals with the incident of the Rock, which is the next episode

<sup>52</sup> Arr. iv 17.1: οἱ δὲ ὡς ἐπύθοντο πλήσιον ἐπελαύνοντά σφισι Κρατερὸν, ἔφευγον . . . ὡς εἰς τὴν ἐρήμην. καὶ Κρατερὸς ἐχόμενος αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς τε ἐκείνοις περιπίπτει οὐ πόρρω τῆς ἐρήμης . . . Cf. also Curt. viii 1.6.

<sup>53</sup> Isidorus, *FGrH* 781 F 2 (14); Strabo xi 10.2 (516). Very much later Ptolemy vi 10.4 and Ammianus Marcellinus xxiii 6.54 mention a few other settlements, but they are most obscure, and it is doubtful whether they were all located in the oasis itself.

<sup>54</sup> There is a possibility that Alexandria Eschate in Sogdiana was destroyed in a Saca attack at roughly the same time; cf. Tarn, *JHS* lx (1940) 90–4; J. Wolski, *Klio*

xxxviii (1960) 113–15.

<sup>55</sup> Pliny, *NH* vi 46 (followed by Ammianus xxiii 6.54), talks of Margiana being surrounded by mountains with a circuit of 1,500 stades. Strabo xi 10.2 rightly describes the oasis as surrounded by deserts only. I suspect that Pliny has combined a description of the circumference of the oasis with a reference to the Kopet Dag massif to the south, so creating a wholly fictitious girdle of mountains.

<sup>56</sup> Diod. index xvii κδ: ὡς Βακτριανοὺς ἐκόλασε καὶ Σογδιανοὺς τὸ δεύτερον ἐχειρώσατο καὶ πόλεις ἔκτισεν εὐκαίρως πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀφισταμένων κολάσεις.

in Curtius after the foundations around Margania.<sup>57</sup> Both sources refer to the same foundations but Diodorus refers them explicitly to the rebellions in Bactria and Sogdiana. Justin also talks of twelve cities founded in Bactria and Sogdiana and distinguishes them from the earlier foundation of Alexandria Eschate.<sup>58</sup> There is no chronology given or implied, merely rough agreement with the Diodorus index on multiple foundations in Bactria and Sogdiana. There is one final and indirect piece of corroborative evidence in Arrian. Later in the campaign of 328 Alexander sent Hephaestion out with a separate army column and instructions *τὰς ἐν τῇ Σογδιανῇ πόλεις συνοικίζειν*.<sup>59</sup> There are problems, as we shall see, with this particular part of Arrian's narrative, but the undeniable fact remains that Arrian's source knew of cities founded in Sogdiana which needed to be supplied with settlers and referred to them as cities already in existence (*τὰς . . . πόλεις*). Curtius has a comparable report, placed after the surrender of the Rock of Ariamazes. After the surrender Alexander sent out Hephaestion and Coenus with separate army columns. Unlike Arrian Curtius gives no objectives, but he does state in the previous sentence that the Sogdians who surrendered on the Rock were distributed as slaves of the settlers in the new cities.<sup>60</sup> Hephaestion, one may assume, was sent to allocate the Sogdian prisoners-of-war as an unprivileged serf population under the Greco-Macedonian élite already established by Alexander. Both traditions, Arrian and the vulgate, know of city foundations in Sogdiana during the campaign of 328, and these are the foundations Curtius is describing in his note on 'Margania'.

The location of these foundations can be only roughly specified. The clue is given by Alexander's line of march, first to the bank of the Oxus, then across the Ochus, and finally across the Oxus itself. The crucial point is the identification of the river Ochus. Strabo repeatedly mentions the river, but places it at two different and inconsistent locations. The relevant passages are best listed schematically.

(a) xi 7.3 (509) Hyrcania is traversed by the rivers Oxus and Ochus as far as the Caspian. The Ochus flows through Nesaea, but some say that the Ochus discharges into the Oxus. . . . The Ochus is not mentioned by the ancient writers, but Apollodorus of Artemita (*FGrH* 779 F 4) refers to it constantly as flowing very close to the Parthyaean.

(b) xi 8.1 (511) The desert (the Kara Kum) is separated from Hyrcania by the R. Sarnius as one travels eastwards towards the Ochus.

(c) xi 9.2 (515) The Aparnians were nomads, living by the Ochus.

(d) xi 11.5 (518) Strabo begins with the tradition of oil being struck near the R. Ochus and adds a digression. Some say that the Ochus flows through Bactriane, others alongside it. Some say that it is a river separate from the Oxus, its course further to the south but discharging like the Oxus into the Caspian, others claim that its course combines with that of the Oxus.

(e) xi 7.4 (510) The Iaxartes rises in the same mountains as the Oxus and Ochus and flows like them (*ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις*) into the Caspian.

If all these passages are taken together, an irresolvable problem occurs. No river in either the ancient or modern world can have risen in the Pamirs and discharged into the Caspian south of the Oxus. There have been repeated attempts to attach all the data to a single river. The most popular identification is with the modern R. Tedzhen, the upper reaches of the Hari Rud, which

<sup>57</sup> Diod. index xvii κῆ: ἄλωσις τῶν εἰς τὴν Πέτραν καταφυγόντων. Cf. Curt. vii 11.1.

<sup>58</sup> Justin xii 5.13. The city foundations are the only aspect of the military history of Alexander in Sogdiana that Justin cares to stress. His information on Alexandria Eschate in the previous sentence, however, is reliable.

<sup>59</sup> Arr. iv 16.3. For the use of *συνοικίζειν* in the sense of adding settlers to newly founded cities, compare vi 17.4, where settlers are to be provided for newly

fortified cities (cf. vi 17.1).

<sup>60</sup> Curt. viii 1.1 (Hephaestion and Coenus); cf. vii 11.29, *multitudo deditorum incolis novarum urbium cum pecunia capta dono data est*. In the summer of 329 Alexander had first enslaved the rebels of Cyropolis but then liberated them to become *incolae* of the new foundation (Just. xii 5.12; Curt. vii 6.27; Arrian iv 4.1 speaks only of barbarian 'volunteers'). For the procedure see P. Briant, *Klio* lx (1978) 74-7.

loses itself in the Kara Kum to the west of Margiana.<sup>61</sup> This is an outrageous suggestion. The ancient sources were well aware of the existence of the Tedzhen; Aristobulus in a passage excerpted by Strabo and Arrian noted its disappearance into the sands and referred to it as the Areius.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore the Tedzhen is far to the west of any possible boundary of Bactria and never can have been envisaged flowing into the Caspian. The suggestion is the worst possible compromise. As a candidate for the ancient Ochus the Tedzhen fits all Strabo's specifications equally badly. It is neither parallel to the Oxus nor a tributary but flows at right angles to it, discharging into the desert, equally far from Bactria and the Caspian. Every one of Strabo's statements must be stretched or distorted if it is to apply to the Tedzhen.

Long ago Albert Herrmann argued that the data given by Strabo refer to two quite distinct rivers, and he was clearly right.<sup>63</sup> In passages (a) and (d) Strabo is explicitly contrasting and combining material from different sources. There are two strands to the tradition, one dealing with a River Ochus which passes through Hyrcania, discharging into the Caspian south of the Oxus, the other dealing with a tributary of the Oxus in Bactriane. Only once, in passage (e), has Strabo conflated the traditions, producing the hybrid monster which rises in the Pamirs and discharges into the Caspian. Elsewhere there is a clean break and the different traditions are explicitly signalled. Now in passage (a) Strabo refers to Apollodorus of Artemita as the source for his information about the Hyrcanian Ochus, and it is more than likely that all the references to the Hyrcanian Ochus come from Apollodorus, who seems to have been one of Strabo's principal sources for things Parthian.<sup>64</sup> I have no hesitation in ascribing the data of passages (a)–(c) to a single river, which Herrmann identified as the modern R. Atrek. This river rises in the Kopet Dag massif just south of the old Parthian capital of Nisa—see passage (a)—and discharges into the Caspian some 150 km south of the ancient mouth of the Oxus.<sup>65</sup>

What concerns us here is the identification of the Bactrian Ochus. Strabo here certainly obtained his information from the Alexander historians. His reference in passage (d) follows an excursus on the rivers of central Asia which is explicitly taken from Aristobulus.<sup>66</sup> And the starting point of the discussion of the Ochus is the discovery of the miraculous oil well, which was a feature of all descriptions of Alexander's Bactrian campaign.<sup>67</sup> The data given, however, are meagre. The Ochus flowed into the Caspian, and according to one source at least formed a boundary of the satrapy of Bactriane. Pliny also knows of the river as a boundary (*includitur flumine Ocho*) and along with the Oxus describes it as the principal river of the satrapy.<sup>68</sup> Herrmann followed earlier orthodoxy and identified it as the western river of Bactriane, the Ram Gul Tagao, which today disappears into the sands near the town of Andkhui.<sup>69</sup> The reason was that Ptolemy's *Geography* locates the river to the west of Zariaspa/Bactra, the westernmost

<sup>61</sup> Kiessling, *RE* ix (1914) 470 f., 483, 492 f.; Sturm, *RE* xvii (1937) 1768–70; Tarn ii 8 n. 1, 310 n. 4; *The Greeks in Bactria and India* 113 n. 4.

<sup>62</sup> Strabo xi 11.5 (518); Arr. iv 6.6 (= *FGrH* 139 F 28). See also Strabo xi 10.1 (515), differentiating the Areius from the Margus; Ptolemy *Geog.* vi 17.2; Amm. Marc. xxiii 6.69.

<sup>63</sup> A. Herrmann, *Alte Geographie des unteren Oxusgebietes*, Abh. kgl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen NF xv. 4 (1914) 30–5; so *RE* ii.A (1921) 29.

<sup>64</sup> All but two of the attested fragments of this author come from Strabo (cf. *FGrH* 779). See, in general, F. Altheim & R. Stiehl, *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum* (Berlin 1970) 359–79.

<sup>65</sup> This river, which enters the Caspian through the desert country north of Hyrcania, fits well with passage (c). The Aparnians, the tribe of Arsaces the conqueror of Parthia, are explicitly located by the Caspian immediately north of Hyrcania: cf. Strabo xi 7.1 (508), xi 8.2 (511) (the readings vary between *Πάρνοι* and

*Ἀπαρνοί*, but the same people are concerned in all cases). The objections of Altheim and Stiehl (see n. 64) 449 f. rest on the mistaken orthodoxy that the modern Tedzhen is the ancient Ochus.

<sup>66</sup> The excursus is garbled textually in Strabo, but the parallel passage of Arrian (iv 6.6) proves Aristobulus' authorship. Both authors begin with the Polyti-metus (Zeravshan) and follow with the Areius (Hari Rud); they emphasise different aspects of the excursus and make different selections, but there is clearly a common source.

<sup>67</sup> Strabo is unique in placing it near the Ochus; Arrian (iv 15.7–8) places it by the Oxus, as does Plutarch (*Al.* 57.5). Curtius records only a spring of fresh water near the Oxus (vii 10.13 f.).

<sup>68</sup> Pliny *NH* vi 49; cf. xxxi 75.

<sup>69</sup> Herrmann (n. 63) 31, following the identification of K. J. Neumann. He refers to the river as the Sangalak, whereas I give the nomenclature of *The Times Atlas*.

of the Bactrian rivers.<sup>70</sup> Unfortunately the reliability of Ptolemy's geographical coordinates is questionable when it comes to central Asia. There are notorious howlers such as the displacement of Maracanda from Sogdiana to the slopes of the Hindu Kush, and, in the matter of rivers, the intriguing statement that the Helmand is an offshoot of the Indus.<sup>71</sup> More seriously, the Ram Gul Tagao today disappears into the desert, and it must have done so in Alexander's day. The description of his death-march to the Oxus in summer 329 is eloquent testimony that there was waterless desert between Bactra and the great river.<sup>72</sup> It follows that the Zariaspa in antiquity terminated in the desert immediately south of Bactra (modern Balkh/Wazirabad), and *a fortiori* further to the west, where the desert belt between the foothills and the Oxus is wider, no watercourse can have forced its way north to the great river. If we accept the confluence with the Oxus as the basic criterion for identifying the Ochus, we must look further east, and, if the Ochus is a boundary river, the eastern boundary is more plausible; and we need a river large enough to be the second river of the satrapy.

An obvious candidate is the R. Surkhab, the largest present-day tributary of the Oxus, which joins its course with the R. Kunduz by the modern city of that name.<sup>73</sup> This forms the penultimate valley before the Oxus enters the mountains of the W. Pamir, which must always have been the natural boundary of Bactria to the east. Recently it has been argued on quite independent grounds that Kunduz marked the eastern limit of Bactriane and that the plain of the Kokcha formed a Transoxian exclave of Sogdiana. The evidence is scattered and diverse, the most significant that the lapis lazuli mines of the Upper Kokcha are regularly described as part of Sogdiana in Achaemenid documents; but at least it provides some corroboration for the identification of the Ochus as the boundary river of the east.<sup>74</sup>

In the spring of 328 the logical direction of Alexander's campaign was eastwards. During the previous summer he had been confronted with revolt throughout Bactria and Sogdiana. He had begun the repression with the Sogdian communities south west of Alexandria Eschate, in the far north of the satrapy.<sup>75</sup> Next had come the relief of Maracanda and the pacification of the Zeravshan to the western limit of the valley,<sup>76</sup> and finally he had cut south to Bactra for the winter.<sup>77</sup> The eastern portions of both Bactria and Sogdiana had been untouched, and in those areas would have gathered the remaining concentrations of rebels. Accordingly Alexander will have marched east from Bactra, fringing the desert and clearing any insurgent strongholds in the foothills. Curtius says that he first went to the Oxus and then crossed the Ochus and the Oxus itself. There is no suggestion of difficulties in the desert such as had occurred the previous year,<sup>78</sup> and that again suggests an eastward march. In the upper reaches of the Oxus there are abundant and fertile grasslands which turn abruptly to desert as the plain widens. It is worth quoting the ecstatic description of Capt. John Wood who visited the Kokcha valley at springtime in the late 1830s. 'West of Kulm the valley of the Oxus appears to be a desert; but in the opposite direction, eastwards to the rocky barriers of Darwaz, all the high-lying portion of the valley is at this season

<sup>70</sup> Ptolemy *Geog.* vi 11.2–4. He makes the Ochus form a confluence with the Dargamanes (so Amm. Marc. xxiii 6.57) and join the Oxus west of the Zariaspa and the Artamis.

<sup>71</sup> Ptolemy vi 11.9 (Maracanda), 20.2 (Helmand). Cf. J. A. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography* (Cambridge 1948) 294: 'He draws the Oxus badly, and joins to it several rivers which were really lost in deserts then as now . . . some (towns) are false doublets like Zariaspa–Bactra and others like Samarcand are so grossly misplaced that the text seems hardly credible.'

<sup>72</sup> Curt. vii 5.1–16, esp. 5.2: *per CCCC stadia ne modicus quidem humor existit*; Diod. xvii index *ib*. For the modern conditions see von Schwarz 30 ff.

<sup>73</sup> For full details, see L. W. Adamec, *Historical and Political Gazetteer of Afghanistan* i (Graz 1962) 169 ff. The only other choice is the Kokcha, the river next to the

east; but the Kokcha has no tributary that can be identified as Ptolemy's Dargamanes (above n. 70).

<sup>74</sup> P. Bernard, *Rev. Num.* xvii (1975) 58–69, promising a fuller study in the future. For the Achaemenid evidence see 68 n. 19.

<sup>75</sup> Arr. iv 2.1–3.5; Curt. vii 6.16–24.

<sup>76</sup> Arr. iv 6.3–5 (*ἐπῆλθε πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν ὄσπην ὁ ποταμός . . . ἐπέρχεται*); Curt. vii 9.21–10.9; Diod. xvii index *κγ*.

<sup>77</sup> Arr. iv 7.1; Curt. vii 10.10.

<sup>78</sup> Curt. vii 10.13; cf. Arr. iv 15.7; *ME* 14. The only hardship recorded (Curt. vii 10.14) was caused by the muddiness of the Oxus, a phenomenon well attested in other ages: cf. Polyb. x 48.4; R. Gonzales de Clavijo, *Embassy to the Court of Timour*, ed. C. R. Markham, Hakluyt Soc. 1st ser. xxvi (1859) 118:21 Aug. 1404.

a wild prairie of sweets, a verdant carpet enamelled with flowers.<sup>79</sup> Alexander presumably followed the desert edge to the Oxus and pressed eastwards along its south bank, enjoying the luxuriant grazing of its grasslands. He crossed the Ochus river somewhere to the north of Kunduz and penetrated into the valley of the Kokcha. This was the extremity of his satrapy to the east, and once he had cleared the territory of insurgents the next step was to cross the Oxus and continue the campaign in eastern Sogdiana.

If this reconstruction is correct, Alexander will have crossed the Oxus very close to the newly discovered Hellenistic site at Ai-Khanum.<sup>80</sup> Indeed he may have noted the site and marked it out for future settlement as a strategic position dominating the crossing. It cannot have been one of the six cities of 'Margania', for Curtius places them after the Oxus crossing. These sites should be found in the hill country of Tadzhikistan between Ai-Khanum and the Iron Gate pass, the main highway to Maracanda and central Sogdiana. The valleys of the Vakhsh and Kafirnigan, where Greco-Bactrian remains have been discovered,<sup>81</sup> are certainly a possibility, but no more than a possibility. The whole area between the Oxus and the Hissar range was strategically isolated from the rest of Sogdiana, and a network of military settlements such as Curtius describes was well adapted to ensure the security of the territory. But the range of choice is so wide that no single site can be identified as Curtius' *urbs Margania*.

### III

At the beginning of the campaign of 328 Arrian and the vulgate tradition are in relative agreement. Alexander moved against the rebels still under arms and marched eastwards along the Oxus, crossing into Sogdiana after traversing Bactriane to its eastern border. Subsequently the narratives diverge, and Arrian's narrative loses track of Alexander in a most peculiar fashion. First we have a very detailed discussion of the division of Alexander's army into five columns, to overrun the countryside as far as Maracanda (iv 16.3). At Maracanda there follows a second division of forces, this time into three columns operating from Maracanda. The spotlight then moves to Bactria, where Arrian gives a lengthy account of Spitamenes' unsuccessful attack on the Macedonian garrison forces (iv 16.4–17.2). Next we are back in Maracanda (although Arrian does not give the location) and winter is close at hand. Coenus is left with a large holding force to winter in Sogdiana (iv 17.3), but Alexander's own movements are not given. There follows another interlude, another unsuccessful invasion by Spitamenes which is repelled by Coenus (iv 17.4–7). Alexander only impinges when the Massagetae murder Spitamenes at the news that he is about to take the field (iv 17.4). It is not until midwinter that the main narrative rejoins Alexander, when he is firmly entrenched in winter quarters at Nautaca (iv 18.1–3). There is no other portion of Arrian where the king recedes so much into the background. Between the crossing of the Oxus and the advent of winter we hear only of two expeditions against unnamed rebels and no details are given. There is a lacuna of nearly six months in the chronicle of Alexander's campaigning.

If the annals of 328 are sparse, those of 327 are embarrassingly full. Arrian begins the record at the beginning of spring and launches into his description of the investment of what he calls the Rock of Sogdiana, a description full of details of heavy snowfall, appropriate to the beginning of the campaigning year.<sup>82</sup> There follows the siege of the Rock of Choriene and Alexander's withdrawal to Bactra, leaving Craterus to deal with the final repression of the rebels. There was

<sup>79</sup> J. Wood, *A Journey to the Source of the River Oxus*<sup>2</sup> (London 1872, repr. Karachi 1976) 268. Wood was able to ford the Oxus with relative comfort at Jan-Kila, a little upstream from Ai-Khanum (260 f.).

<sup>80</sup> For bibliography see J. Seibert, *Alexander der Grosse* (Darmstadt 1972) 145, to which add the successive reports by P. Bernard in *CRAI* 1974–6 and,

for the significant coin-hoard unearthed in 1973, C.-Y. Petitot-Biehler, *Rev. Num.* xvii (1975) 23 ff.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. G. Frumkin, *Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia* (Leiden/Köln 1970) 62 f., 66–8.

<sup>82</sup> Arr. iv 18.4 (ἀμα τῷ ἡρι ὑποφαίνοντι), 18.5 (χιῶν πολλή), 19.1–2 (omnipresent snow).

a fairly lengthy stay in Bactra during which the campaign of the Pages was suppressed, and then at the end of spring (ἐξήκοντος ἤδη τοῦ ἡρος) he recrossed the Hindu Kush back to Parapamisadae.<sup>83</sup> There is a lot of action to be fitted into a single spring—two major sieges, the marriage to Rhoxane, the long march south to Bactra and the wait there until the successful completion of Craterus' subsidiary expedition. Not surprisingly, there have been attempts to create a more elastic chronology. Tarn in his historical narrative took the sieges back into the winter of 328/7, while much earlier A. Fraenkel had resorted to emendation, arguing that Alexander left Bactra at the end of *summer* (θέρος for ἡρος).<sup>84</sup> The emendation was suggested partly because Strabo cites Aristobulus' account of the march into India, which was held to imply that Alexander did not leave Parapamisadae before the setting of the Pleiades, that is, November 327.<sup>85</sup> In that case there is a gap of nearly six months between the arrival in Parapamisadae and the departure for India, and there is no apparent reason for such a delay.<sup>86</sup> But Strabo is certainly not giving the setting of the Pleiades as the departure date from Parapamisadae; it is the point of reference for Alexander's campaign in the mountain country above Taxila.<sup>87</sup> The emendation may be misguided, but it is a significant indicator of the unreliability of Arrian's narrative, which makes Alexander's campaign progress in a set of unpredictable fits and starts.

When we move to the vulgate tradition the narrative becomes rather more coherent, and there are no awkward lacunae. The principal source is, of course, Curtius, but his narrative can be controlled against the *Metz Epitome* and the index to Diodorus. In the main it follows a single source, and there are few, if any, traces of contamination. After the foundations in 'Margania' Curtius moves directly to the siege of the rock of Arimazes and the famous episodes of the winged men, which Arrian places at the beginning of spring 327.<sup>88</sup> The surrender of the rock and the execution of the leading insurgents is followed by the missions of Coenus and Hephaestion with separate army columns and a digression on the Massagetic attack upon Bactra. The scene shifts to Alexander again, who moves to Maracanda and receives there the embassies from the Sacan and Chorasmian peoples, which Arrian apparently dates to the beginning of the year.<sup>89</sup> There follows the interlude of the hunt at Bazaira (or Basista, according to Diodorus) and the return to Maracanda where Curtius places the Cleitus night, the only one of our sources to give a precise location for the incident.<sup>90</sup> In the aftermath of the murder part of the army is sent with Hephaestion to Bactria to prepare supplies for the winter while Alexander himself engages with a nest of Bactrian exiles at Xenippa (Xenipta in the *Metz Epitome*).<sup>91</sup> From there he moves to *Nautaca* and invests the local chieftain, Sisimithres, in his mountain fortress. Thanks to the mediation of Oxyartes Sisimithres surrenders and is confirmed in his régime.<sup>92</sup> Next comes a cavalry campaign against the remaining rebels in the area, marked by the deaths of Lysimachus' brother, Philippus, and of Erigyus, and there follows the romantic story of the murder of Spitamenes at the hands of his wife.<sup>93</sup> After this we have the reports of satrapal appointments, and Alexander leaves his winter quarters after a three month stay. His departure is premature and his army nearly comes to grief in a violent snowstorm. Sisimithres sends relief supplies and Alexander is able to mount a small campaign.<sup>94</sup> Finally we have his reception by a

<sup>83</sup> Arr. iv 22.3.

<sup>84</sup> Tarn i 72–6 (cf. 72 n. 1: 'On this scheme it is impossible to get in all that happened at Bactra before he finally quitted it; he must have taken the two strongholds by mid-winter'); A. Fraenkel, *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker* (Breslau 1883) 186.

<sup>85</sup> Strabo xv 1.17 (691) = *FGrH* 139 F 35. The evening setting of the Pleiades must be at issue; the morning setting, in April, occurred while Alexander (on any chronology) was still north of the Hindu Kush.

<sup>86</sup> A. Anspach, *De Alexandri Magni Expeditione Indica* (Leipzig 1903) 8 n. 18, suggested that Alexander needed to reconquer Parapamisadae and was reluctant to move

before his envoys returned from India (Arr. iv 22.6). See also Brunt (n. 4) 507.

<sup>87</sup> For the interpretation of the passage see Appendix 1 below.

<sup>88</sup> Curt. vii 11.1–29; *ME* 15 ff.; Diod. xvii index κ̄ε̄.

<sup>89</sup> Curt. viii 1.1–9; cf. Arr. iv 15.1–6.

<sup>90</sup> Curt. viii 1.11–19 (cf. 19: *inde ad Maracanda reditum est*); Diod. 17 index κ̄ς̄.

<sup>91</sup> Curt. viii 2.13–19; *ME* 19; Diod. xvii index κ̄θ̄.

<sup>92</sup> Curt. viii 2.19–33; cf. *ME* 19.

<sup>93</sup> Curt. viii 2.33–3.16; *ME* 20–3.

<sup>94</sup> Curt. viii 4.1–20; *ME* 24–7; Diod. xvii index κ̄θ̄.

'Cohortandus', whom the *Metz Epitome* clearly names as Chorienes, and the feast at which Alexander was captivated by Rhoxane and married her.<sup>95</sup> At the very end comes the report of Craterus' campaign against Haustanes and Catanes mentioned by Arrian and a separate campaign by Polyperchon not mentioned by Arrian.<sup>96</sup> The lengthy account of the Pages' Conspiracy supervenes.

This narrative diverges very considerably from Arrian's. There is some common ground, such as the central role played by Maracanda at the end of the campaigns of 328, but the differences are far more striking. In particular the summer of 328 contains a full and coherent record of campaigning, not the few disjointed episodes recorded by Arrian. At the centre of the problem are the two great sieges. Arrian places both in the spring of 327 and names one citadel the Rock of Sogdiana and the other the Rock of Chorienes, whereas Curtius gives two commanders unknown to Arrian, Arimazes and Sisimithres, and places the sieges in the summer and late autumn of 328. This is a fundamental clash of evidence which can be resolved only by examination of the rest of the tradition and investigation of the internal coherency of the two major sources. The rest of the tradition is unfortunately sparse. Apart from Arrian and the vulgate the only source to mention the rock citadels is Strabo, who comments on the sieges in a series of brief and heterogeneous notes on Alexander's stay in Bactria and Sogdiana.<sup>97</sup> Some aspects of his discussion are unique and questionable. The two rocks are said to have been taken by treachery (*ἐκ προδοσίας*), and the marriage of Rhoxane and Alexander is located at the second fortress, not the first as in Arrian, nor at a feast held after both sieges, as in Curtius.<sup>98</sup> But, where there are similarities, the similarities are with the vulgate. The commanders of the two rocks are named Ariamazes and Sisimithres and the puzzling placing of Sisimithres' rock in Bactriane at least coheres with Alexander's direction of march in Curtius, which was south towards the Bactrian rebels.<sup>99</sup> The dimensions of the rock fortresses given by Strabo also agree with those in Curtius rather than Arrian.<sup>100</sup> The same is true of Plutarch, who refers to the sieges in a single illustrative passage, but refers to the rock of Sisimithres not Chorienes, and whose characterisation of the rebel leader fits Curtius' Sisimithres more aptly than Arrian's Chorienes.<sup>101</sup> There remains only Polyaeus, who devotes a paragraph of his *Strategemata* to the capture of the first rock.<sup>102</sup> It is typically foreshortened to throw the greatest emphasis on the

<sup>95</sup> Curt. viii 4.21–30; *ME* 28–31; Diod. xvii index λ. *Cohortandus* (Curt. viii 4.21) is traditionally emended to *Oxyartes*, on the grounds that Rhoxane is immediately presented as his daughter (*filia ipsius*, viii 4.23). The *Metz Epitome*, however, explicitly mentions Chorienes as the giver of the feast and adds that he introduced his own daughters together with the daughters of his friends, including Rhoxane, *Oxyartis filia*. Oxyartes is then named as present at the feast (*ME* 29). It is evident that Curtius has erroneously conflated Rhoxane with the daughters of Chorienes, and that the corrupt name *Cohortandus* should be emended to the palaeographically similar *Chorienes*. This was immediately recognised in O. Wagner's edition of the *Metz Epitome*, *Jb. klass. Phil. Suppl.* xxvi (1901), and the emendation has been largely accepted in German scholarship (cf. Berve ii 355 n. 2; Schachermeyr 353 n. 423). Tarn, however, refused to guess 'what weird error in transmission lies behind "Cohortandus"' (ii 103; cf. 341 n. 5).

<sup>96</sup> Curt. viii 5.2f.; cf. Arr. iv 22.1 f.

<sup>97</sup> Strabo xi 11.4 (517). The note is preceded by details on cities founded and destroyed by Alexander, including details not found elsewhere in the tradition (e.g. Callisthenes arrested at *Caryatae* in Bactria) and it is continued by a report of the massacre of the Branchidae. The source most recently quoted is Onesicritus (xi 11.3 (517) = *FGrH* 134 F 5).

<sup>98</sup> Arrian (iv 19.5 ff.) states that Rhoxane was

captured on the Sogdian rock and that Alexander fell in love at first sight. He goes on to report the wedding, but gives no indication how long after the capture it took place. Arrian also claims that Oxyartes surrendered to Alexander at the news of the favourable reception of his daughter (iv 20.4). Now all traditions mention Oxyartes' presence at the second great siege (Arr. iv 21.6 f.; Curt. viii 2.25 ff.; Plut. *Al.* 58.3), and it is reasonable to assume that his daughter had already come into Alexander's power, even if she were not yet married to him. It is a possibility at least that Rhoxane was captured at the first rock (Arrian) and married at a subsequent banquet (Curt. viii 4.23; *ME* 28; Plut. *Al.* 47.7). Strabo can be related to neither tradition; Rhoxane was neither captured nor married at the second rock: cf. J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch Alexander* (Oxford 1969) 129.

<sup>99</sup> τὴν τε ἐν τῇ Βακτριανῇ, τὴν Σισιμίθρου (Strabo): cf. Curt. viii 2.13–15; *ME* 19 (in *Bactros*).

<sup>100</sup> The Rock of Sisimithres is 15 stadia in height and 80 in circuit, that of Ariamazes is twice as high. Cf. Curt. vii 11.2: the Rock of Ariamazes is 30 stadia in height and 150 in circuit (cf. *ME* 15). Arrian makes the second rock 20 stades high and 60 in circuit (iv 21.2).

<sup>101</sup> Plut. *Al.* 58.3: Sisimithres, according to Oxyartes, is the most cowardly of men (cf. Curt. viii 2.27–8, 30).

<sup>102</sup> Polyaeus iv 3.29.

winged men, but the details on the whole support Curtius. His description of the rock is similar, although he mentions a dense forest covering not attested in any other source;<sup>103</sup> the commander is named Ariomazes, and he agrees that it was the shout of exultation from the army below that drove the barbarians to surrender.<sup>104</sup> Polyaeus may indeed represent a branch of the vulgate tradition, but the fact remains that there is a wide measure of agreement among all sources other than Arrian. Arrian stands alone and his account is intrinsically vulnerable.

Now for the internal coherency of the two main narratives. The most striking feature of Arrian's narrative is the vagueness of his descriptions. The Rock of Sogdiana is merely characterised as 'precipitous all round' (*πάντη ἀπότομος*), which is almost a formulaic epithet for strongholds in Arrian's narrative.<sup>105</sup> He is much more precise about the Rock of Choriene, stressing the deep cleft whose bridging was the main feature of the siege, but once again his language is rather vague and avoids precise topographical details. In both cases Curtius' description is much fuller and more vivid, and it was Curtius whom von Schwarz used primarily in his conjectural identifications of the two rocks.<sup>106</sup> Ariamazes' position was a broad cave or chasm (*specus*) with wide recesses, well watered by mountain streams which combined into a single river on the lower slopes. This chasm was roughly half-way up and was overtopped by the mountain proper. Arrian's description of the barbarian surrender presupposes this general picture, with the detachment of mountaineers arriving behind and above the barbarian forces, but it is never spelled out.<sup>107</sup> In the case of the Rock of Choriene Curtius has a detailed picture of a narrow river valley backed at the head by the rock, and he adds the interesting detail that the natives had cut an artificial passage leading to the plains below. The rock towered above as a natural acropolis. Arrian claims that the rock was surrounded by the ravine and there is no explicit description of water in it, but once again his detailed description of the siege mole presupposes Curtius' picture of a river in spate. The method of construction, piling trees and earth on a bed of stakes cantilevered over the narrowest part of the ravine, was quite superfluous if the problem was merely to fill in a dry bed.<sup>108</sup> In both cases the general details of Arrian's description support the specific topographical data in Curtius. Elsewhere there is a fair measure of agreement between the two sources, particularly in the second siege. Incidents omitted in the one tradition, such as the mission of Cophen (probably the son of Artabazus) to parley with Ariamazes can easily be inserted in the other tradition.<sup>109</sup>

There remain several irresolvable contradictions. Firstly the barbarian commander of the second rock is named Choriene by Arrian, Sisimithres by the rest of the tradition. This is not, as is usually argued, because the commander had two names, equally applicable,<sup>110</sup> for Curtius knows of Choriene as an independent ruler who surrendered to Alexander significantly later than the capture of the second rock.<sup>111</sup> Sisimithres and Choriene are clearly two separate figures in the vulgate tradition, and we have a clash of authority between Arrian and the rest of the tradition over the identity of the fortress commander. The contradictions are sharper in the first siege. In the first place no commander is mentioned by Arrian and nothing is said about the fate of the defenders, other than the family of Oxyartes. In Curtius the commander Arimazes is scourged and crucified along with thirty of the most prominent defenders, and the mass of the commons settled as serfs in the new foundations. That atrocity certainly is consistent with Alexander's general policy of massacre and enslavement of the Sogdian rebels, and one is tempted to argue that Arrian's sources have omitted this unknighly conduct along with so

<sup>103</sup> Arrian makes a feature of the mountain forest in his account of the *second* siege (iv 21.3; cf. Curt. viii 2.24).

<sup>104</sup> οἱ δὲ Μακεδόνες . . . ἠλάλαξαν· ὁ δὲ Ἀριόμαζης ἐκπλαγείς κτλ. (Cf. Curt. vii 11.25).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. i 17.5, 27.5 f., 29.1, ii 23.5, iii 30.10, iv 21.2, v 22.4.

<sup>106</sup> Von Schwarz 75–7, 85 f. In both cases he paraphrases references to caves in Curtius as mountain

clefts open to the sky (cf. Engels 106 n. 34).

<sup>107</sup> See the comparative analysis in Appendix 2.

<sup>108</sup> Arr. iv 21.4 f.; cf. Curt. viii 2.23 f.

<sup>109</sup> Arr. iv 19.3 (*πέμψας δὴ κήρυκα*) may reflect Curt. vii 11.23 ff. (cf. Berve no. 459).

<sup>110</sup> Von Schwarz 83 f.; Berve no. 708; Tarn ii 96; Hamilton (n. 98) 129.

<sup>111</sup> Curt. viii 4.21; *ME* 28 (see above, n. 95).



many other unsavoury episodes in Alexander's career.<sup>112</sup> Unfortunately the *Metz Epitome*, which otherwise retails Curtius' version, claims that Ariamazes was murdered by his own people before the surrender and Alexander in gratitude spared the rest of the defenders.<sup>113</sup> Either the epitomator has grotesquely misread his source (which is by no means impossible) or there was disagreement in the various branches of the vulgate tradition over the fate of Ariamazes. There is no reason for Curtius simply to have invented his version. Finally there is the snow in Arrian, which forms the consistent backdrop to his account in the first siege, whereas the rest of the tradition has no reference to any adverse weather conditions. This brings us back once again to the two irreconcilable chronologies. The snow suits Arrian's attribution of the siege to the very beginning of spring, whereas the rest of the tradition is dealing with summer conditions.

It should by now be obvious that Curtius' account is intrinsically preferable. It is self-consistent, agrees with the rest of the historical tradition and above all gives a reasonably spaced campaign narrative, whereas Arrian presents us with an inexplicably lacunose summer of 328 and an inexplicably crowded spring of 327. If, however, Arrian's chronology is rejected, there is an unpleasant problem to be faced. How could contemporary sources such as Ptolemy and Aristobulus, both eye-witnesses of the campaign, have misplaced so drastically two of the major engagements of the period? An answer, I think, can be given which is partly satisfactory; it involves simultaneous consideration of Arrian's methods of composition and Ptolemy's own movements in 328.

For his narrative of events in Sogdiana Arrian abandoned a straightforward annalistic scheme and divided his exposition into two portions dealing with the military events of 329 and 328 with a timeless excursus sandwiched between them. The excursus deals with Alexander's orientalism, followed by the murder of Cleitus and the episode of *proskynesis* and its tailpiece, the Pages' Conspiracy. Arrian begins with the punishment of Bessus in winter 329/8, jumps to the Cleitus affair in the late summer of 328 and ends with the Pages' Conspiracy in spring 327. He is well aware of the chronological dislocation and adds repeated notes that he is anticipating future events.<sup>114</sup> Even so there were inevitable difficulties of composition, if Arrian was imposing his own arrangement of material and following a chronological arrangement different from that of his sources. The difficulties would be exacerbated if he were combining material and drawing alternately upon his two principal sources.

In fact one can trace some oscillation between sources in Arrian's narrative. The most evident suture is at iv 16.3, for here there is a clear failure to adapt the two traditions. Arrian begins the chapter with details of the division of forces at the crossing of the Oxus. He mentions five columns operating in Sogdiana, one of which was commanded by Ptolemy himself. There seems little doubt that Ptolemy is the source here, giving emphasis, as usual, to his own command. Little is said about the experiences or objectives of the army columns, only a general statement that they captured rebel strongholds in the countryside and converged on Maracanda. Then two of the columns, those of Hephaestion and of Coenus and Artabazus, are sent out with specific commissions to populate the cities of Sogdiana and to campaign against the Saca nomads of the frontier (iv 16.3). Now these latter missions are mentioned by Curtius but dated somewhat differently; Coenus and Hephaestion are sent out immediately after the capture of the Rock of Ariamazes. He takes the subject up a few sentences later when he notes that Alexander lingered at Maracanda to await the return of Hephaestion and Artabazus.<sup>115</sup> There follows the hunt at Bazaira and the slaying of Cleitus. The murder is dated a mere ten days before Alexander began preparations for winter; and, according to Curtius, it was Hephaestion who was sent in

<sup>112</sup> For Alexander's policy of repression, see Arr. iv 1.4; Curt. vii 6.16, 9.22. Curtius' story of the death of Ariamazes is accepted by von Schwarz 78 n. 1; Berve no. 112; P. Briant, *Klio* lx (1978) 72 f., 76.

<sup>113</sup> *ME* 18: *Ariomazen interfecerunt. deinde ipsi se dediderunt.*

<sup>114</sup> Arr. iv 8.1 (*εἰ καὶ ὀλίγον ὕστερον ἐπράχθη*), 14.4, 22.2.

<sup>115</sup> Curt. viii 1.1: *Hephaestionem uni, Coenon alteri duces dederat*; viii 1.10: *Hephaestionem et Artabazum operiens stativa habuit.*

advance to amass provisions.<sup>116</sup> There is clearly no time in the few weeks available for Hephaestion to have been dispatched on his synoecising mission. The same is true of Artabazus. Curtius notes that he excused himself in person from the satrapy of Bactria immediately before the death of Cleitus, exactly when Arrian states that he was on an expedition against the nomads.<sup>117</sup> Arrian too mentions Artabazus' resignation without clarifying place or time, but it is perfectly clear from the context and comparison with Curtius that the location is at Maracanda,<sup>118</sup> the date autumn 328, immediately after the death of Cleitus. In other words Arrian himself has recorded Artabazus' presence at Alexander's court at a time when he should have been campaigning against the desert nomads. The report of the missions at iv 16.3 must therefore be anachronistic, and I would argue that the passage marks a doublet. Ptolemy mentioned the five-fold division of the army in general terms and reported their arrival in Maracanda. Arrian then reverted to Aristobulus, who reported the missions of Hephaestion and Artabazus in more specific terms. Aristobulus may well have reported their *arrival* at Maracanda and digressed to give a report of the object of their mission, as he seems to have done in the case of the arrival of Phrataphernes and Stasanor in winter 328/7. There are several other examples of this kind of retrospective reporting in Arrian.<sup>119</sup> Here, however, Arrian was transferring sources and at the moment of transition he may have been confused, wrongly assuming that Hephaestion and Artabazus were sent out from Maracanda instead of finishing the mission there.

There is further evidence that Arrian reverted to Aristobulus at this point. In the digression on Spitamenes' raid which follows immediately (iv 16.4 ff.) the Bactrian capital is twice referred to as Zariaspa. It is a well-known fact, emphasised by Strabo and Pliny, that Bactra and Zariaspa were alternative names, the one derived from the region, the other from the river passing through the city.<sup>120</sup> Unlike the vulgate tradition, which refers to the city without exception as Bactra, Arrian oscillates from one name to the other; and it seems most likely that his two sources used different nomenclature. Now Bactra occurs in a named fragment of Ptolemy,<sup>121</sup> and the conclusion imposes itself that Zariaspa was the name preferred by Aristobulus.<sup>122</sup> In that case the account of the Spitamenes' raid is taken from Aristobulus, and there is a fair probability that the entire narrative from iv 16.3 to the end of the report of the winter stay in Nautaca is a unitary extract from Aristobulus. The point of separation is Alexander's stay in Maracanda, the time of Cleitus' murder, which is precisely the point at which Arrian's manipulation of sources is most elaborate. Everything which concerned Cleitus was removed to the earlier digression; and a vacuum resulted, which has produced an artificially contracted narrative and an abrupt change of source. Presumably Arrian followed Ptolemy as far as the Cleitus affair and reverted to Aristobulus immediately after the break.

Ptolemy's own narrative at this period would have presented difficulties of its own. He himself recorded that he was sent on a separate mission during the summer, rejoining the main army at Maracanda later in the year.<sup>123</sup> He was not in Alexander's column and would have had

<sup>116</sup> Curt. viii 2.13: *cum parte exercitus Hephaestionem in regionem Bactrianam misit commeatus in hiemem paraturum*.

<sup>117</sup> Curt. viii 1.19 (dated to the second stay at Maracanda after the hunt at Bazaira).

<sup>118</sup> Arr. iv 17.3. The reference to the location could not be vaguer (*αὐτοῦ!*); but Arrian is resuming his main narrative after the interlude of Spitamenes' raid on Zariaspa, and the place previously mentioned in the narrative of Alexander's actions was Maracanda (iv 16.2). Curtius viii 2.14 mentions that Amyntas succeeded to his satrapy just before Alexander left Maracanda.

<sup>119</sup> E.g. ii 5.7; iii 2.3 ff. (above n. 41); vi 29.3.

<sup>120</sup> Strabo xi 11.2 (516), 8.9 (514) with Pliny *NH* vi 45 (= *FGrH* 119 F 2). Contrast Arr. iii 30.5 and iv 7.1–3; Arr. iv 7.1 and Curt. vii 10.10.

<sup>121</sup> Arr. iii 30.5 = *FGrH* 138 F 14; cf. iii 25.3 f., iv 22.1, 3.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Arr. iv 1.5, 16.5–6. At iv 7.1 the reference immediately follows a demonstrable extract from Aristobulus (*FGrH* 139 F 28b); it appears that Arrian digested his report on the Zeravshan campaign from Aristobulus and after taking his account to the winter's pause at Bactra/Zariaspa he turned to Ptolemy for the reports of reinforcements (above p. 23).

<sup>123</sup> Arr. iv 16.2–3. Ptolemy may have given an account of his own adventures which Arrian ignored, as he sometimes does. He says nothing, for instance, about Ptolemy's mission in India at the time of the siege of the Malli town, even though it involved several engagements with the enemy (cf. Arr. vi 11.8, *ἄλλας μάχεσθαι μάχας καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους βαρβάρους*; Curt. ix 5.21).

to reconstruct the king's actions later from eye-witness reports. It would moreover have been extremely difficult to have presented a strictly chronological account of the actions in the various sectors of Sogdiana. It is a possibility that Ptolemy first recorded the division of forces in which he participated and the general fact of the pacification of Sogdiana, and then moved to the stay at Maracanda and the fateful banquet which he personally witnessed.<sup>124</sup> After that he switched to Alexander's campaign narrative, highlighting the siege of the second rock in which he again commanded a troop detachment, but also recapitulating the earlier siege of the Rock of Sogdiana, which had similar heroic features. Now Ptolemy had no personal experience of this first siege, and he seems to have created a rather simplified picture of it, placing the emphasis squarely on the most sensational episode, that of the 'winged men'. There is a certain degree of romanticism, the mountaineers challenging nature by attacking the rock face at its most inaccessible, not at the easiest point of access, as in Curtius.<sup>125</sup> Most strikingly, as we have seen, the snow is omnipresent. It even becomes an element of romance, when the bodies of fallen climbers are buried so deeply as to be irretrievable—surely Ptolemy's fantasy, reminiscent of the corpse-filled ravines in the hinterland of Issus which provided human bridges for the Macedonian cavalry.<sup>126</sup> It is possible that his informants mentioned in passing the residual snow remaining on the mountain tops<sup>127</sup> and that Ptolemy, drawing on his later experiences at the second rock and the siege of Aornus in the following winter, both of which engagements were plagued by snow, made it a dramatic backdrop to the entire episode.<sup>128</sup> That goes some way to explaining the temporal dislocation in Arrian. He takes from Aristobulus his primary account of events from Cleitus' murder to the end of winter 328/7 and ends the extract with the advent of spring 327. Having noted the new campaigning season Arrian turned to Ptolemy,<sup>129</sup> his main military source, and found a detailed siege narrative following immediately upon the murder of Cleitus, a siege narrative marked by consistent snow fall. Not surprisingly he interpreted it as the first event of the new spring.

Ptolemy was not guilty of deliberate anachronism, but his account was romantically embellished in such a way as to mislead Arrian. That can inspire very little faith in Ptolemy's historical reliability, and one's suspicions are immediately alerted when he names Chorieneas as commander of the second rock instead of Sisimithres, who is unanimously named by the rest of the tradition. Now, as we have seen, the vulgate tradition mentions Chorieneas in a totally different context, as the independent prince who entertained Alexander's army after the disastrous spring snowstorm of 327 and was confirmed in his position in recognition of his services. The snowstorm, it is clear, was a standard feature of the vulgate tradition, but like so many other 'Strapazenberichte', there is no trace of it in Arrian.<sup>130</sup> As Hermann Strasburger demonstrated long ago, Arrian's sources are disinclined to retail episodes where the Macedonians suffered hardship and casualties through their leader's lack of foresight or preparation (in this instance Alexander left his winter quarters prematurely),<sup>131</sup> and the snowstorm and the numerous deaths from exposure have been totally excised.<sup>132</sup> Accordingly the entertainment by

<sup>124</sup> Arr. iv 8.9 (FGrH 139 F 29); Curt. viii 1.45–8. The details vary, but both traditions confirm Ptolemy's presence at Maracanda.

<sup>125</sup> Arr. iv 19.1, *κατὰ τὸ ἀποτομώτατον*; Curt. vii 11.14, *qua minime asper ac praeuruptus aditus videbatur*.

<sup>126</sup> Arr. iv 19.2, *ὥστε οὐδὲ τὰ σώματα . . . εὐρέθη*; cf. ii 11.8 (FGrH 138 F 6) on which see *Entr. sur l'ant. class.* xxii (Fondation Hardt 1976) 27.

<sup>127</sup> The peaks in the Hissar range retain their snow cover until summer, and snow has been known as late as July (cf. Engels 107).

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Arr. iv 21.10 (rock of 'Chorieneas'); the snow at Aornus is not attested in the campaign narrative, but it is amply attested by Aristobulus (cf. Appendix 1).

<sup>129</sup> The transition is at iv 18.4. On my analysis the reference to spring is the last detail from Aristobulus,

after which Arrian turns to Ptolemy.

<sup>130</sup> Curt. viii 4.1–20; *ME* 24–7; Diod. xvii index κθ.

<sup>131</sup> H. Strasburger, *Hermes* lxxx (1952) 470–3. As a result, recent histories have tended to accept the story of the snowstorm (cf. Schachermeyr 353; Lane Fox 314), but there has been no attempt to reconcile it with the general chronology of Arrian.

<sup>132</sup> Arr. iv 21.10 refers to hardships in the siege of the second rock citadel, which was relieved by provisions supplied by 'Chorieneas'. It is possible that this is a confused reference to the provisions which the vulgate tradition records were sent by Sisimithres after the snowstorm (Curt. viii 4.19; so Strasburger 472). More probably the Macedonians were twice relieved by the Sogdian dynast.

Chorienes at the journey's end disappeared also, but the name remained in Ptolemy's mind, so that he applied it erroneously to the commander of the second rock. As usual, his attention is directed to the Macedonian side and the problems of attacking the rock citadel which had occupied him personally. The identity of the Sogdian leader was a secondary issue, and Ptolemy has confused two different native leaders, who were both confirmed in their dominions by Alexander.<sup>133</sup> It is a disturbing testimonial to the erratic nature of this contemporary source, and Ptolemy's deficiencies are made worse by Arrian's method of switching from source to source without any critical discussion of variants or contradictions. The errors and exaggerations of the one are compounded by the uncritical and negligent approach of the other.

The result of this long and complex discussion has been to transfer far more action to the campaigning year of 328, and it is appropriate to give at least a summary of the revised history that results. Alexander began the year's campaign from Bactra, where he had spent the winter after intensive campaigns against insurgents in the hinterland of Alexandria Eschate (to the south and west of Khodzhen/Leninabad) and in the Zeravshan valley. Most of the countryside remained to be pacified, and Alexander's strategy was to divide his army into mobile columns, so as to contain the widest area of rebel territory simultaneously. He himself drove eastwards, following the valley of the Oxus to the eastern border of Bactriane, putting down resistance as he went. Somewhere in the vicinity of Ai-Khanum he crossed the river, leaving forces with Polyperchon, Attalus, Gorgias and Meleager to repress any remaining rebel strongholds. Alexander crossed into modern Tadzhikistan and established a nucleus of garrison settlements while Ptolemy and Perdicas at least went off with separate columns. Alexander moved gradually towards the Hissar Range, the great barrier separating east and west Sogdiana, occupying strongholds as he went. The most formidable resistance came from the Rock of Ariamazes, whose defenders were terrified into surrender by the stratagem of the 'flying men' and settled by Hephaestion as a subject population in the newly founded cities to the rear. At this point Artabazus and Coenus were sent out to the western border-lands to operate against the Saca nomads who were raiding the cultivated areas of Bactria and Sogdiana from the Kara Kum desert. Alexander himself continued his progress to Maracanda, and made his way across the Hissar Range using either the route via the Anzob Pass to the north of modern Dushanbe, or, less probably, the Iron Gate pass to the south-west. He reached Maracanda towards the end of summer and waited for the various columns active in Sogdiana to make their way to the rendezvous.

After the interlude at Maracanda and the tragedy of Cleitus autumn had arrived and preparations began for the winter. Alexander now moved southwards, leaving Coenus at the capital with a strong holding force. A nest of Bactrian rebels remained at Xenippa, whose location baffles speculation.<sup>134</sup> This Alexander dealt with before moving to winter quarters. His base is named by Arrian (Aristobulus) as Nautaca, and the vulgate tradition confirms, the *Metz Epitome* reading *Nautace* and Curtius *Nauta*.<sup>135</sup> Now Nautaca occurred fleetingly in the history of 329 as a temporary headquarters for Bessus; it is identified with some plausibility with the modern Shakhriyabz, on the headwaters of the Kashka Darya between Maracanda and the Oxus.<sup>136</sup> Alexander had passed that way briefly in the summer of 329 but had not lingered there, and his campaigns against the rebels in 329 and 328 had taken him on a roughly circular course by-passing the area of Nautaca. It was the last logical refuge of the rebels, and the local ruler, Sisimithres, took to his mountain citadel (towards the sources of the Kashka Darya), and,

<sup>133</sup> Curt. viii 2.32 f.; *ME* 19; Arr. iv 21.9 (Sisimithres); Curt. viii 4.21; *ME* 28 (Chorienes).

<sup>134</sup> See the lengthy but inconclusive article by H. Treidler, *RE* ix.A (1967) 1480-4.

<sup>135</sup> Arr. iv 18.1; Curt. viii 2.19; *ME* 19. Von Schwarz 83 (so Brunt [n. 4] 507) considered Curtius' *Nauta* to be a corruption of an otherwise unknown place

name, but *Nauta* is unquestionably the same as *Nautace* of the *Metz Epitome* and *Ναύτακας* in the Diodorus index κθ. What is more, Alexander's march route south from Maracanda took him inevitably to the vicinity of Nautaca proper.

<sup>136</sup> Arr. iii 28.9; cf. von Schwarz 74 f.; Sturm, *RE* xvi (1935) 2033.

as winter approached, Alexander forced the rebels to capitulation. It was the end of the rebellion, and only mopping-up operations remained for the spring of 327. The dispersion of forces had been a most effective strategy. Territory once overrun was now contained, and even the raids from the desert by Spitamenes and his Massagetic allies were more a nuisance than a threat. The attack on Bactra in summer 328 was easily repelled by Craterus and the winter invasion of northern Sogdiana came to an equally inglorious end at the hands of Coenus. By midwinter 328/7 Spitamenes was dead, his head formally delivered to Alexander, and his confederate Dataphernes was surrendered by the nomad Dahae. The spring of 327 saw the end of the Sogdian War. As the last insurgent leaders were hunted down by Craterus and Polyperchon, Alexander moved to Bactra for the last time and coordinated his forces for the invasion of India. Many of those troops were Bactrians and Sogdians, deliberately removed from their homeland, and the satrapy was relatively secure with a Macedonian satrap and garrison and an extended network of military settlements. Eighteen months of rebellion and repression had ended and a new chapter in the reign was about to begin.

A. B. BOSWORTH

*University of Western Australia*

APPENDIX I: STRABO XV I.17 (691)

κατανοηθῆναι δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων φησίν, ὠρμηκότων μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἀπὸ Παραπαμισαδῶν μετὰ δὲ<sup>1</sup> δυσμᾶς Πληιάδων καὶ διατριψάντων κατὰ τὴν ὄρεινὴν ἐν τῇ Ὑπασίων καὶ τῇ Μουσικανοῦ<sup>2</sup> γῆ τὸν χειμῶνα, τοῦ δὲ ἔαρος ἀρχομένου καταβεβηκότων εἰς τὰ πεδία καὶ πόλιν Τάξιλα . . .

1. δὲ *delevit* Jacoby      2. Μουσικανοῦ *codd.*: Ἀσσακανοῦ Corais

The context is Aristobulus' discussion of the monsoon rains (*FGrH* 139 F 35), which he claimed only occurred in the north of India. Snow falls in the mountains during the winter and the rains begin in the spring, contrasting with the south, where no rain was experienced during the entire ten months' voyage to Patala in 326/5. Our passage introduces the summary of the actual experience of Alexander's men, which is divided into segments described more specifically in the following sentence—the period in the mountains when snow fell and the period of the march from Taxila when there was continuous rain. In the introductory sentence the two periods are clearly contrasted by the perfect participles (ὠρμηκότων μὲν . . . τοῦ δὲ ἔαρος ἀρχομένου καταβεβηκότων), the first when Alexander was on his way to India and the second when he was on his descent to the plains via Taxila and the Hydaspes. The first period includes a subordinate clause, the actual winter in the mountain country; and the aorist participle makes it absolutely clear that a specific time is being delimited within the wider context of the perfect participle. The question remains whether the reference to the setting of the Pleiades goes with the departure from Parapamisadae or with the specific period of the winter pause. The latter is intrinsically more probable, for it is the weather conditions, the snow in the mountains, that Aristobulus is concerned to date and not the general itinerary of the Macedonians. Indeed, given the received text of Strabo, the connexion is explicit, and Jacoby's deletion of the δὲ is not only supererogatory but positively misleading. I would translate as follows: 'This phenomenon, Aristobulus says, was noticed by himself and the rest, firstly while they were on their way from Parapamisadae to India and in fact after the setting of the Pleiades spent the winter in the mountain country in the land of the Hypasii and Musicanus, and secondly while they were making their descent to the plains and the sizable city of Taxila.' It follows that the reference to the setting of the Pleiades is meant to denote the advent of the winter snows, not the departure from Parapamisadae, which may have occurred long before. Unfortunately the precise point of the march at which winter fell is impossible to specify, because of the difficulty of relating

Strabo's Hypasii and Musicanus with any names known from the rest of the Alexander tradition. What is certain, however, is that the passage presents no obstacle to Arrian's dating of the departure from Bactria to the end of spring, 327.

APPENDIX 2: THE TRADITION OF THE INVESTMENT OF THE ROCK OF SOGDIANA

Arrian iv 18.4 ff.

18.4 Al. advances to the Sogdian Rock, where many Sogdians have taken refuge including the family of Oxyartes.

5 The Rock is sheer all round and amply provisioned. Heavy snowfall makes the approach more difficult.

6 Even so, Al. decides to attack.

Al.'s mettle had been roused by an arrogant challenge. When offered terms of safe conduct the barbarians challenge him to find winged soldiers.

7 Al. proclaims rewards for scaling the cliff ranging from 12 talents to 300 Darics.

19.1 300 specialists trained in rock climbing in the sieges are equipped with iron tent pegs and strong ropes, to use in the compacted snow and exposed rock.

They attack the Rock by night at its sheerest point.

2 They haul themselves up, driving pegs into the rock and compacted snow. Up to 30 fall, and their bodies are buried irretrievably in the snow.

Curtius vii 11.1 ff. (ME 15 ff.)

11.1 Arimazes holds the Rock with 30,000 warriors and supplies for two years.

2 The Rock is 30 stades high (20 stades, ME) and 150 in circuit. It is sheer all round and approached by a narrow path. Half way to the summit is a *specus* with a narrow mouth but expanding widely in the interior. Springs flow through it and join in a stream.

4 Al. first decides to leave: *cupido deinde incessit animo naturam quoque fatigandi* (cf. Arr. iv 21.2).

5 Cophen is sent to negotiate and Arimazes challenges Al. to fly.

7 Al. asks his staff to bring 300 mountaineers, whom he offers rewards—10 talents for the first and one less for each of the next nine to the top.

13 The men prepare iron *cunei* to plant between the rocks and strong ropes.

14 Al. circumvents the Rock and sends them by the least precipitous approach. They start at the second watch, armed with swords and javelins, first walking, then rock-climbing. They pass the day in labour (15) and there are falls (16), but they reach the top, exhausted, by nightfall (17: ME 16 says only that they reached the top at night; Polyaeus that they were on the summit at dawn).

- 3 At dawn they occupy the summit and wave ribbons on their javelins, as commanded by Al.
- Al. sends a herald with an ultimatum to surrender, saying that the winged men were found and the peaks occupied. He points out the soldiers above them.
- 4 The barbarians are overwhelmed by the surprise and, guessing that there were more on the summit than appeared, they surrender.
- 5 Many wives and children of Sogdian nobles fall into Al.'s hands, including the children of Oxyartes. (The story of Rhoxane follows.)
- 18 At dawn they search out the location of the *specus* and raise the signal agreed upon (*cf.* 11). 32 men are discovered to have fallen.
- 20 Al. spends the day of the ascent in deep anxiety. Next day the signals are obscure in the dawn, and only discerned accurately when the light is clearer.
- 22 Copen is sent to parley again (*Dares, ME 17*). He is rejected more violently, and, taking Arimazes outside the *specus*, he shows the men on the peak, adding that Al.'s soldiers have wings.
- 25 There is a shout and blare of trumpets from the Macedonian camp, which impels the barbarians to surrender, since they could not guess the small numbers on the summit.
- 26 Copen is recalled, and the defenders send 30 *principes* to plead for safe conduct.
- 27 Al. insists on unconditional surrender.
- 28 Arimazes in despair goes down to Al.'s camp with his relatives and fellow nobles. They are scourged and crucified at the foot of the Rock, the majority of the defenders are settled in the new cities. (*ME 18*: the barbarians panic and kill Arimazes, then surrender. Al. spares the rest.)