

## VI. GREEKS IN THE EAST

When Alexander died in June 323 B.C. with his plans only partially fulfilled, his empire was soon dissolved into separate units, and his generals commenced the struggle for his inheritance. After a few years Seleucus established himself as his successor in the eastern provinces.<sup>1</sup> In India his rule remained brief (if he ever did rule there), but even the ceding of all the southeastern provinces (certainly India and Arachosia, probably even more) in the treaty with Candragupta Maurya by no means brought an end to Hellenistic relations with India. In chapter III above I have already discussed the *Indica* of Megasthenes; now it is time to consider the history of Indo-Hellenistic relations in full.

Relations seem to have been most active in the late fourth and early third centuries B.C., when both the Seleucid and Mauryan empires were strong, but we cannot disregard the later period, either. The secession of Bactria and Parthia cut the Seleucids off from their Indian neighbours, but new means of communications were soon established. The Bactrian state (which then expanded to India and soon became many states) was Hellenistic, and had ties both to the southeast (India) and to the West.<sup>2</sup> Greek gods and institutions, Greek ways of life, Greek art and architecture, were brought to the East, and local, Indian and Iranian, customs and traditions intermingled with them. Commerce (see VII.2) went on through Parthian lands, and if it was impeded, there were other routes available. Near the end of our period a new factor arose, when the Chinese opened direct contact with Bactria.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the struggle for Alexander's heritage see e.g. Holt 1989, 87ff.

<sup>2</sup> The old question as to whether its history belongs to that of Hellenism (Tarn) or to that of India (Narain) seems to me wholly superfluous. A Hellenistic state within the confines of India naturally belongs to both as well. The viewpoint is in the mind of the historian, not in history. There are, of course, more viewpoints than only these two; Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history can be (and has been) also considered part of Iranian or Central Asian history.

## 1. The Seleucids and the East

We have already seen (in chapter II.1) that Northwest India was never fully pacified by Alexander and not really integrated into his planned empire. The political regime of the Macedonians in India was weak – the rulers were probably as unwilling to be there as the ruled were eager to rise up<sup>3</sup> – and it dissolved easily with the rise of the Mauryas.

We know by name all the satraps whom Alexander himself had nominated in the east, but very little about their successors.<sup>4</sup> According to the *Anabasis* of Arrianus, Nicanor ruled first to the west of the Indus (4, 28, 6), but soon (in autumn 326) we find Philippus also ruling to the west of the Indus (6, 2, 3). It might thus be that Nicanor was the unnamed Hyparch who was killed by the rebelling Assaceniens (5, 20, 7).<sup>5</sup> Philippus, the son of Mochatas, was first appointed the commandant of Peucelaotis (4, 28, 6), then the satrap of Gandhāra-Taxila (5, 8, 3), or of the country west of the Indus (above), as Taxiles still ruled in his own country. Later he was also given the lands of the Malloi (6, 14, 3, see also 6, 5, 5 and 6, 15, 2), but was then murdered by mercenaries in 325 B.C. (6, 27, 2).<sup>6</sup> After this, joint rule by Taxiles and Eudemus<sup>7</sup> was established in the area by Alexander, who received the message in Carmania (6, 27, 2). To the south of them, Peitho, son of Agenor, held the lands south of the confluence of the Indus and the Acesines (6, 15, 4, also 6, 17, 1f. and 6, 17, 4).

Several Indian princes and kings – Taxiles, Porus, Abisares,<sup>8</sup> and Phegeus – ruled their own lands, often considerably augmented by those whose rulers had not enjoyed the

<sup>3</sup> The situation was probably more or less similar to that in Bactria, where the Greek and other mercenaries revolted soon after Alexander's death. See Diodorus 18, 4f.; Bernard 1985a, 127ff., and Holt 1989, 87ff.; for the situation in India Schwarz 1970, 279f.

<sup>4</sup> This depends, of course, on the state of our sources. While several good, detailed histories on Alexander have been preserved (e.g. Curtius and especially Arrianus), the rich literature on his successors is mostly known only from fragments (see VII.1 below). On satraps and satrapies see Berve 1926 and Bosworth 1983, further Brunt on Arrianus, *Anab.* 5, 20, 7, Stein 1929, 364ff.

<sup>5</sup> Suggested by Niese, see Berve 1926, no. 556. Stein (1934, 79), who makes this Philip a different person from the one ruling to the east of the Indus, goes a little too far in taking "Nicanor's murder" to be an established fact (in Stein 1929, 365 still "apparently").

<sup>6</sup> The same in Curtius 10, 1, 20f. On Philippus see, in addition to Berve 1926, Stein 1934, 79f. Arrianus also recounted that Philippus' Macedonian bodyguards succeeded in killing the assassins. However, we cannot follow Bevan (1902, 294), who claimed that the incident was an outburst of national hatred, the Greek mercenaries conspiring against their hated Macedonian satrap; there is no ground for such an assumption. Patriotism was a rare motive among mercenaries, and not all mercenaries were Greeks. A more likely motivation might be sought in their unwillingness to remain in a distant country far from home.

<sup>7</sup> Eudemus (Εὐδήμιος) in Arrianus, Eudamus (Εὐδάμος) in Diodorus, and *Eudaemon* in Curtius 10, 1, 21. According to Curtius, he was a general of the Thracians (*dux Thracum*).

<sup>8</sup> The old Abisares died in 325 and was succeeded by his son, a new Abisares, who was still confirmed in his office by Alexander himself, but after this he and his country disappeared from Western histories.

favour of Alexander.<sup>9</sup> They were normally called kings, but according to Plutarch, Porus was given the title of satrap.<sup>10</sup>

To the northwest of India in Paropamisadae the first satrap appointed by Alexander in 329 had been the Persian Proexes, with Neiloxenus as Macedonian commandant (3, 28, 4). After his return from Bactria in 327 Alexander disposed of both and appointed Tyriespis (called Terioltes in Curtius 9, 8, 9) and Nicanor in their place (4, 22, 5). Nicanor was soon called to the east, and in 325 the incompetent Tyriespis was replaced by Alexander's father-in-law, the Bactrian Oxyartes<sup>11</sup> (6, 15, 3). According to Curtius, the former was sentenced to death, while Alexander was in the country of Musicanus.

During the last phase of Alexander's conquests in 325 B.C., on the sea coast, Apollophanes was for a while the satrap among the Oreitae, but was soon either killed by his rebellious subjects (*Indica* 23, 5) or deposed (6, 22, 2f. and 6, 27, 1). At the same time Leonnatus was the commandant at Ora (6, 22, 3).<sup>12</sup> Apollophanes' successor Thoas died soon, and was succeeded by Sibyrtilus, who also ruled Gedrosia and Arachosia (6, 27, 1).<sup>13</sup>

Diodorus allows us to follow the story a little further.<sup>14</sup> After Alexander's death, in 323 B.C., Perdikkas as regent confirmed Taxiles, Porus, Peitho, Oxyartes and Sibyrtilus in office (18, 3, 2f.).<sup>15</sup> In 321 B.C. (Triparadeisus) Antipater as Perdikkas' successor again confirmed Oxyartes, Peitho, Porus and Taxiles (18, 39, 6). However, Peitho was now said to rule the part of India bordering on the Paropamisadae. In any case, the account is not too reliable in detail as Taxiles and Porus seem to have changed places. According to Diodorus, Taxiles ruled the country along the Hydaspes, Porus along the Indus. This is plainly an error; there seems to be no reason why (and how) they should have been removed from their original lands. This is in fact stated by Diodorus himself, when he claimed that the two Indian kings were now confirmed in office as they could not be deposed without an army. It seems that they had become practically independent. But the fact that they *were* confirmed in office seems to show that they still formally recognized

<sup>9</sup> On Taxiles 5, 8, 28 and Curtius 8, 12, 14; on Porus 5, 19, 3 & 6, 2, 1; on Abisares 5, 29, 4f. and Curtius 10, 1, 20f.; on Phegeus Curtius 9, 1, 36-2, 2. and Diodorus 17, 93, 1f. See also Anspach 1903, 7f.

<sup>10</sup> *Al.* 60, 15 σατράπην καλούμενον.

<sup>11</sup> On him see Berve 1926, no. 587 and Tarn 1951, 100f.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Curtius 9, 10, 19. Apparently he did not remain there long, as we meet him later in the West, and after the death of Alexander he was given the satrapy of Phrygia Minor (Diodorus 18, 3, 1 & 14, 4; Curtius 10, 10, 2).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Curtius 9, 10, 20, where his predecessor is called Menon.

<sup>14</sup> His main source for the early history of Alexander's successor was Hieronymus of Cardia, who had himself participated in Eumenes' wars and defeat and thus was able to give some interesting details quoted below (such as the case of Ceteus).

<sup>15</sup> Without mentioning names, Curtius 10, 10, 4 also states that the satraps of India, Bactria, Sogdiana and on the sea coast were confirmed in office by Perdikkas. Justinus 13, 4, 20f. confirms Taxiles, Peitho, Oxyartes, and Sibyrtilus. See further Arrianus, *Succ.* and Dexippus in Roos 2, 252f. Wecker's claim (1916, 1292) that Peitho was already now transferred from the lower to the upper Indus is perhaps based on Diodorus 18, 3, 3, where he is called Taxiles' neighbour, but he was already this in his original satrapy south of the confluence of the Indus and the Pañjab rivers, and Diodorus also expressly said that Perdikkas made no changes in the eastern satrapies.

Macedonian suzerainty in order to avoid inviting a Western army to enforce it, at least not yet. Perhaps the Macedonian threat also worked in the other direction: Both kings ruled, in addition to their original realms, countries which had been independent before Alexander and perhaps would be quick to rise again, had the central authority been officially denounced. At this time, there was still a kind of central authority, and no one could have foreseen that the struggle for power in the West would drag on and on. Eudamus was probably still the commandant of a Macedonian garrison in Taxila.<sup>16</sup> When the general rising in the Indian provinces took place soon afterwards, it was probably due to the new power, the Maurya empire.<sup>17</sup>

Though Diodorus here (18, 39) passed over Sibyrtius in silence, he was also able to hold his satrapy in Arachosia (of Gedrosia we know nothing). Soon he was involved in the war between Eumenes and Antigonus (19, 14, 6; 19, 23, 4 and 19, 27, 1), and for a while Megasthenes stayed with him.

There were those who came back from the East. In spite of the silence of our sources we may suppose that Eudamus retained his position, as he was still there<sup>18</sup> in 317 B.C., when he killed Porus<sup>19</sup> and brought 120 elephants to Eumenes (19, 14, 7f.). It has been suggested that he had more or less to flee from India. This is not impossible, but there is no evidence to support it. He came in response to Eumenes' request to all the upper satrapies for military aid against Antigonus (18, 73, 7; 19, 12, 3 & 13, 7), an appeal which was responded to by other satrapies and commanders as well (including Oxyartes and Sibyrtius; 19, 14, 6). Eudamus was well paid by the general for these reinforcements (19, 15, 5), and with his elephants he participated in the war in Eumenes' army. In addition to elephants, Arachosian cavalry and soldiers from Paropamisadae and the Indian general Ceteus fought on the side of Eumenes (19, 27ff. and 19, 33). In the last battle (19, 37ff.) both Eumenes and Eudamus were slain by the victorious Antigonus (19, 44).

Antigonus now redistributed many satrapies to his friends, but left the Farther East intact, confirming Oxyartes and Sibyrtius in office (19, 48, 2f.). Peitho, too, had returned from India, and was made the satrap of Babylonia by Antigonus in 316 B.C. (19, 56, 4). Of India we hear no more. As the return of Eudamus and Peitho had apparently left the country without Macedonian authority, it has been suggested that Antigonus assigned the

<sup>16</sup> He had been appointed by Alexander (Arrianus, *Anab.* 6, 27, 2, where he is also given joint rule of the land with Taxiles) and he remained in India until 317.

<sup>17</sup> That the uprising was instigated by Candragupta is clearly stated by Justinus (15, 4). The continuing vassalage of Taxiles and Porus has been rightly emphasized by Bhattasali 1932, 282.

<sup>18</sup> The silence can be perhaps explained supposing that he was still primarily military commandant, not a satrap.

<sup>19</sup> Stein's hypothesis (1929, 366, again in Stein 1934) that the confusion of Diodorus in his account of Triparadeisus continued so that he here, too, confused Porus and Taxiles and that in fact it was the latter who was murdered, is interesting, but remains no more than a hypothesis. There is equally no certainty (with Bevan 1902, 294) that the murder of Porus was part of an attempt to unite all the Indian satrapies under Eudamus. Bernard 1985b ascribed to him the unnamed early Hellenistic elephant coins, formerly often combined with Alexander and the defeat of Porus. Being no numismatist I fail to discern in his plates some of the iconographical details he mentions in the text, but the hypothesis is quite possible.

Indian satrapies to Sibyrtius,<sup>20</sup> but this remains a hypothesis. It is rather likely that Candragupta had intervened and that nothing remained of the Indian satrapies for him to distribute.<sup>21</sup>

Peitho was killed at the battle of Gaza in 312 B.C. (19, 85, 2) and succeeded by his enemy Seleucus (who had originally obtained Babylonia as his share in Triparadeisus), who now began his rise to mastery of the eastern part of Alexander's empire.<sup>22</sup> Oxyartes and Sibyrtius had still ruled in the Paropamisadae and Arachosia under Antigonos and probably retained their positions under Seleucus.<sup>23</sup>

Seleucus established himself as the master of the East (an expedition to Bactria is mentioned by Justinus 15, 4), albeit not of India. There certainly were many Seleucid officers serving in the Farther East, though only a few names have come down to us. Among them are Patrocles and Demodamas. We have seen that Eratosthenes esteemed Patrocles highly and relied heavily on him in matters of eastern geography. Even from the few extant fragments we can see that he discussed Indian questions, but it is a matter of controversy whether he really gave a full account of the country.<sup>24</sup> Nothing shows that he had actually visited India, but the evidence is very defective. Patrocles is also known as an explorer of the Caspian. He must have broadened the extent of Greek geographical knowledge in the northeast, but he also propagated some queer and erroneous ideas (the Caspian as a gulf of the Northern Ocean, the Oxus and the Jaxartes flowing into it). The question of the North Route, as indicated by him, is taken up again in chapter VIII.2.

Demodamas,<sup>25</sup> an Ionian from Halicarnassus or Miletus, was *Seleuci et Antiochi regum dux*, and Pliny (*N. H.* 6, 18, 49) esteemed his book highly. He explored the country beyond the Jaxartes and described the altars there, but this is all we know of him. Further, we must include Megasthenes among the Seleucid officers serving in the East. He had been in Arachosia before his Indian mission, with the satrap Sibyrtius, who was probably still in office under Seleucus. The other satraps of the eastern provinces have been discussed above as far as they are known to us. Somewhat later Diodotus was the Seleucid satrap in Bactria, before he established his independence (see VI.3 below).

The most important new factor in eastern history, after the death of Alexander, was the rise to power of Candragupta Maurya.<sup>26</sup> It is frustrating that we have so little reliable information about this important figure of Indian history. And much of what we have, is

<sup>20</sup> Niese quoted by Beloch 1925, 141.

<sup>21</sup> So e.g. Holt 1989, 96.

<sup>22</sup> However, I most certainly fail to see how Seleucus as the successor of Peitho in Babylonia could therefore have had the slightest claim to Peitho's earlier Indian satrapy (as supposed by Stein 1929, 366). Of course, he claimed Northwest India, but as the successor of Alexander, not of Peitho.

<sup>23</sup> On Sibyrtius see also Brown 1957, 13f.

<sup>24</sup> As an important author with extensive knowledge about India he has been accepted e.g. by Delbrück 1958, 38f. See further Gisinger 1949.

<sup>25</sup> On Demodamas (*FGrH* 428), see Schwarz 1968, 230, note 55, Bernard 1985a, 38f., and Tam 1951, 83f.

<sup>26</sup> On Candragupta and his relations to the West see Schwarz 1968 & 1972b, and especially 1970, 268ff.

hopelessly shrouded in legend. On the other hand, he is the only Indian monarch of whom Western sources, too, give at least some idea, though this, too, is often of rather a legendary character. While it seems quite likely that Candragupta at the beginning of his career really lived in Northwest India (this is confirmed both by Western and by Indian sources), his supposed meeting with Alexander related by Plutarch is perhaps too plausible.<sup>27</sup> At least the two attempts to fit it into Alexander's history, making Candragupta Phegeus' informant<sup>28</sup> or identifying him with Sisicottus<sup>29</sup> are entirely unconvincing. Candragupta might have met Alexander, but probably this was not recorded in Alexander's histories. Such a story can so easily be of an apocryphal nature, but as such a meeting was quite possible, we cannot wholly deny it, either.

Candragupta's uprising started in the Northwest, which seems always to have been the origin of troubles even when there was no actual invasion from outside, as in the case of the Indo-Aryans, the Achaemenids, Alexander, the Bactrian Greeks, the Sakas, the Parthians, the Kushans and many later intruders. While Candragupta had his base for overthrowing the old dynasty in the Northwest, his grandson Aśoka again met with trouble in this direction. And if the legendary history is to be relied on, Aśoka himself came from the Northwest, where he had been a viceroy for his father, and dethroned his brother.<sup>30</sup>

The problem of the exact date of his rise to power has been a much discussed question.<sup>31</sup> Indian traditions, fixed to the dates of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, are not of much help. We cannot be sure of the reliability of the traditions themselves, and in any case the dates are questionable enough.<sup>32</sup> Fortunately, a little more is offered by classical literature.

Vincent Smith and some Indian historians have placed the uprising of Candragupta and the liberation of the Pañjab immediately after Alexander's death,<sup>33</sup> but this seems to

<sup>27</sup> Plutarch *Al.* 62, 9 Ἄνδρόκοτος δὲ μεράκιον ὄν αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον εἶδε. Opinions are divided, e.g. Brown 1957, 13, sees it as pure fiction and Lamotte 1958, 239, is sceptical, while Schwarz 1970, 273, and Eggermont 1975, 26f., believe in it.

<sup>28</sup> Stein 1929, 367, suggested that the information given by Phegeus about Nanda could hail from Candragupta, who had fled to Phegeus and thus had also seen Alexander. This is pure conjecture. Certainly a king of the eastern Pañjab had other information about the mighty eastern kingdom. When Stein further states that Candragupta "wished to utilize the army of Alexander for his own aims", I can only wonder in what way his supposed part in undermining the morals of Alexander's men, instead of inciting them against Nanda, served these aims.

<sup>29</sup> Even Lassen's old idea (1874, 131) that this Sisicottus, Alexander's commandant at Aornus (Arrianus, *Anab.* 4, 30, 4 & 5, 20, 7; Curtius 8, 11, 25) was Śaśigupta, at least in name identical with Candragupta (*śaśi* = *candra* 'moon'), is hardly tenable. Seth 1937b, 162f., went still further and made the direct identification. Śaśigupta was also accepted by Lamotte 1958, 122. Charpentier 1928 (apparently following Benfey 1840) suggested Śisugupta instead.

<sup>30</sup> That the Northwest has been a source of trouble for centralized governments also in more recent times is seen for example in the problems the Sikhs and the Afghans have caused Mughal, British and independent India and Pakistan, not to mention the Kashmir question.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. Stein 1929, and Bhattasali 1932.

<sup>32</sup> Stein 1929, 368f. For the dates of the Buddha and Mahāvīra see e.g. Bechert 1982, 1983 & 1986.

<sup>33</sup> Smith in his *Asoka* (1901), criticized by Bevan 1902, 295. An extreme case is Seth (1937b), who places this immediately after Alexander's return from India. Seth, however, seems to accept only the evidence which supports his own preconceived ideas. When Philippos was murdered, he says

be impossible. It hardly could have happened before 317 B.C. as otherwise Eudamus could not have had the occasion for murdering Porus (or even Taxiles, according to Stein's hypothesis) and for collecting the elephants he brought to Eumenes.<sup>34</sup> We have already seen that at least in 321 B.C. Porus and Taxiles were still strong rulers and till 317 Eudamus maintained his position.<sup>35</sup> The uprising of Candragupta in the Pañjab must necessarily be after these dates as he, according to Justinus, succeeded in expelling the Greeks from India.

On the other hand, Justinus<sup>36</sup> affirms that Candragupta already had India under his rule at the time when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his greatness, i.e. after 312 B.C. This gives the rather narrow limits for his rise to power of the period between 317 and 312 B.C. It seems that we can safely accept that his rise began in the Pañjab and perhaps it was originally an uprising directed against Macedonian rule,<sup>37</sup> though the overthrow of Nanda might well have been part of Candragupta's plans from the very beginning. This seems to be confirmed by Justinus, and several versions of Indian legendary tradition affirm that Candragupta began his conquest from the border (in one version the Himalayas are actually mentioned).

It is possible that the name *Maurya*, too, was known in the West. It has been suggested that young Candragupta is perhaps mentioned by Arrianus as Μερώνς.<sup>38</sup> But the ε is here very difficult to explain from OIA *Maurya* or MIA *Moriya*. This Meroes is said to have been an old friend of Porus. We have a much better case in the lemma Μωριεῖς in Hesychius' lexicon (here glossed as a name for Indian kings) and in Euphorion's fragment in Stephanus (here an ethnic name).<sup>39</sup> Both are apparently derived from the MIA form of the name (like *Moriyaputta* met in Jaina sources). Hesychius comes rather near to the point, but never is *Maurya* actually mentioned as a dynastic name in the extant

---

that all Alexander's satraps and commanders were murdered. According to him, "a highly improbable and fairy-like story is woven around Candragupta by the *modern* historians" (Seth 1937b, 161, emphasis mine). If he had also read the references of his modern historian, he would have known that this story, as fairy-like as it may be, was not woven by him, but quoted from Justinus. Even Narain 1965, 162, claims that Candragupta and Cānakya were liberating the Pañjab at the time when Alexander was dying in Mesopotamia. An intermediate position is taken by Lamotte 1958, 239ff., supposing that Candragupta started in the eastern Pañjab in 324/321 and moved to the Indus in 317/316. This is quite possible, but where is the evidence?

<sup>34</sup> This has been rightly emphasized by Stein 1929, 366 and Bhattasali 1932.

<sup>35</sup> We can only wonder how Vincent Smith (1904, quoted by Bhattasali 1932, 281) knew that he "had no adequate force at his command to enforce his authority, which must have been purely nominal." Without adequate forces he could hardly have been capable of leaving India safely with his elephants. Nevertheless, it seems rather likely that he left India once for all, without a thought of returning and very soon without any chance to do so. For a contrary opinion, see Bernard 1985b.

<sup>36</sup> 15, 4, 20 *Sic adquisito regno Sandrocottus ea tempestate, qua Seleucus futurae magnitudinis fundamenta iaciebat, Indian possidebat.*

<sup>37</sup> Still Wecker (1916, 1292) goes too far when he makes the murder of Porus its immediate cause. So also Bhattasali 1932, 283.

<sup>38</sup> *Anab.* 5, 18, 7f. Cf. Schwarz 1968, 225.

<sup>39</sup> Identified as MIA *Moriya* by Gray & Schuyler 1901, 199, see also Stein 1920, 118, and Karttunen 1989b.

Western sources. One further, but rather unlikely instance, suggested by Eggermont from Curtius (9, 8, 28), is King *Moeris* of Patala.<sup>40</sup>

In any case Candragupta was well known in Western sources under his personal name, in the Greek form Σανδρόκοττος (with some variants). This equation gave the first fixed point in Indian chronology. It was first noted by the French Sinologist Joseph de Guignes and then, we are not sure whether independently or not, by Sir William Jones.<sup>41</sup> The second part of the name, -κοττος for *-gupta*, is pure MIA form,<sup>42</sup> but the preserved *-vδρ-* seems rather archaic.

Traces of a Candragupta legend are preserved in the history of Justinus (15, 4). Schwarz supposes as his (*i. e.* Pompeius Trogus') original source a lost Indian Candraguptakathā, which is quite possible.<sup>43</sup> It is easy to find, with Schwarz, Indian parallels for various motives of this legend (the lion and elephant are both common as royal animals), but unfortunately the extant Indian versions of the Candragupta legend (as found especially in Buddhist and Jaina sources) are entirely different. They contain typical legendary embellishments such as dohadās of the pregnant mother,<sup>44</sup> the motif of the exposed baby (cf. Karmā, Cyrus, Moses, Oedipus, Romulus etc.), omens of the great future seen in the child Candragupta (cf. the Buddha) etc. A further Indian element, however, is totally missing in Western sources. This is the central role given to Kauṭalya (Cāṇakya), the famous minister of Candragupta, who holds all the strings and sometimes makes his royal patron a mere puppet. But our Indian sources on him are considerably later, and it is quite possible that the Kauṭalya tradition arose only later.

When Candragupta revolted and soon took the easternmost provinces of Alexander's empire, Seleucus was at first too busy with Western affairs to intervene. When he did, it was already too late. He was able to cross the Indus, which seems to have been his eastern boundary, but in the Pañjab Candragupta was firmly in power. It is a pity that we know so little of this eastern campaign of Seleucus and of his pact with Candragupta, but

<sup>40</sup> That Moeris could be Maurya was apparently suggested for the first time by Ritter. Now Eggermont 1975, 26f. Instead of Moeris, the Loeb edition prints Lassen's (1874, 190) emendation *Soeris*. We need hardly pay attention to the conjecture of Seth (1937b) that Candragupta as a supposed northwesterner (and identical with Sisicottus) would have derived his clan name Maurya from Mount Meros in the Paropamisadae.

<sup>41</sup> Jones 1798a, XIII f. The address was given in Calcutta in 1793. On de Guignes, see Renou 1950, 96f.

<sup>42</sup> Thus there is no need for an original Σανδράκουπτος, the restoration attempted by some early scholars (Schlegel 1820b) on the basis of Sanskrit. It is true that one MS. of Athenaeus gives this reading, but this is hardly enough to rule out the testimony of so many texts. Note also the name Sisicottus (Σισίκωττος), with the same MIA ending. The latter name was actually written by many 19th-century scholars (such as Droysen 1833 and Lassen 1852, 1874) as Sisikyptos without stating that this was a conjecture. One must wonder whether Greeks in the 4th century would really have rendered OIA (or MIA) *u* by plain ypsilon. For Indian (MIA) *c* > Greek *s* see Divatia 1931.

<sup>43</sup> Schwarz 1970, 272f. & 1978. I am not here suggesting that Indian literature was actually read in the West – of this we still have no evidence. The immediate source of Trogus or of his Greek source might still have been oral. On extant Indian legends on Candragupta, see Schwarz 1970, 1972 & 1978. Further, Breloer 1929, 291ff., Stein 1929, Bussagli 1956, and Bongard-Levin 1982.

<sup>44</sup> Not identified by Schwarz. See Bloomfield 1920 on the motif.

we have only brief references,<sup>45</sup> as no full history of the period has been preserved. In any case Tarn seems to have been right in supposing that Seleucus did not do so badly.<sup>46</sup> He ceded lands which he did not really possess or, at least, could not keep, and gained in exchange 500 elephants, which were a considerable force in successive wars in the West, where his opponents still had very few specimens of this new and for a while much appreciated weapon (cf. IV.4). What happened before this agreement we do not know. Of our sources only Appianus says so much as that there was war, but only the outcome is clear. Nevertheless some scholars have reached unwarranted conclusions. There are those who like to see Seleucus' position in a worse light and speak of his crushing defeat in battle against the Mauryan army.<sup>47</sup> But when such a defeat is not recounted in the sources, certainly the opinion held by some Western scholars, who talk of a victorious campaign of Seleucus interrupted only by the need to attend to his Hellenistic enemies (Antigonos) in the West, is pure speculation.<sup>48</sup> Although Appianus referred to war, this does not even indicate, as was noted by McCrindle (1896, 407), "whether the hostile armies came into actual conflict".

Be this as it may, by threat or by violence Seleucus was convinced that it was no longer profitable, probably not even possible for him to keep the eastern satrapies of Alexander. He probably knew that he had already lost them, and the best alternative was now to obtain some recompensation by negotiation. Thus a treaty was formulated and signed. The lands were ceded, the elephant force won. The treaty also included an agreement variously called κῆδος (Appianus) and ἐπιγαμία (Strabo) While the former word refers to a relationship achieved through marriage, especially to the relationship between father- and son-in-law, the latter has often been used for the right of intermarriage (*ius connubium*) between states, but also for actual cases of intermarriage.<sup>49</sup> What kind of marriage treaty was it here? The question has aroused much discussion. The primary sources are Strabo and Appianus, while Plutarch just briefly mentions the elephants.<sup>50</sup> A treaty between two countries being sealed by a marriage between the dynasties had been normal policy both in India and in the West. In the case of polygamous kings this was especially feasible as there was normally a good supply of daughters and there was enough

<sup>45</sup> Justinus 15, 4; Appianus 11, 9, 55; Strabo 15, 1, 10 & 15, 2, 9 (perhaps quoting Eratosthenes); Pliny, *N. H.* 6, 22–25; Plutarch, *Al.* 62, 4.

<sup>46</sup> Tarn 1940a, and before him Bunbury 1879, 555. See also Foucher 1947, 208f.

<sup>47</sup> Smith 1904 (cf. Scharfe 1971, 217), also Wecker 1916, 1293.

<sup>48</sup> So e.g. Bevan 1902, 296, Beloch 1925, 142, and Berve 1952, 230. We may in passing mention here the old idea of the early modern period, which made Seleucus penetrate as far as the Ganges. It was based on a wrong interpretation of the passage of Pliny (*N. H.* 6, 21, 63), probably referring to Megasthenes. It was still mentioned by Robertson 1819, 305f., Heeren 1821, 306f., and Benfey 1840, but disproved by Lassen 1826, 61, Schlegel 1829, 31, and Schwanbeck 1846, 12ff. See also McCrindle 1877, 10ff., Bunbury 1879, 555, Stein 1920, 4, and Timmer 1930, 7f. The problem was that Strabo (15, 1, 27) and Pliny (6, 21, 63) inform us of the "discovery" of India east of the Hypasis made under Seleucus. This passage was supposed to refer to Seleucus' eastern campaign against Sandrocottus, but now it is mostly connected with Megasthenes and other diplomats travelling in India.

<sup>49</sup> Examples in Liddell & Scott & Jones, ss vv. See also Tarn 1951, 174, note 3, and Sircar 1968.

<sup>50</sup> Strabo 15, 1, 10 (end) & 15, 2, 9; Appianus 11, 9, 55f.; Plutarch, *Alexander* 62, 4.

room in the harem for a few additional wives.<sup>51</sup> The problem arose with the hierarchical social system of India, which, at least in its later form, seems to have made such an alliance impossible in the case of a foreign monarch. Opinions have differed widely. While some scholars plainly stated that Seleucus gave his daughter in marriage to Sandrocottus (which is never stated in any text) and others have suggested a general agreement of a matrimonial right between the two peoples, some have tried to deny it altogether.<sup>52</sup>

It is true that no intermarriage was permitted between castes in the later sense. They were strictly endogamous, and therefore there could be no *ius connubium* within the caste society. But was the Indian caste society already evolved to the point of having strictly separated, endogamous castes? This is what seems to be stated by Megasthenes, whose seven classes were endogamous (see III.3 above). However, with the ancient varṇa system the incorporation of new elements was still easier than with the later jātis, and it could well be that the Greeks were granted the status of Kṣatriyas. It might also be that the Kṣatriyahood of Candragupta himself was still very new, and came from his position, not from his birth.<sup>53</sup> Despite Megasthenes, it has also been claimed that the caste hierarchy in its most rigid and most complicated form developed only much later as a reaction against Muslim rule.

In this connection it has often been pointed out that Brahmans certainly denied inter-caste marriages (caste here understood as varṇa). It seems rather unlikely that *they* would have easily granted the high status of a Kṣatriya to foreigners. True, but did they actually exercise an influence strong enough in a country where upstarts (like Mauryas) were still rapidly kṣatriyanized, and where various mendicant sects such as Buddhism, Jainism and Ājīvikas apparently enjoyed much greater royal support<sup>54</sup> than orthodox Brahmans, who often seemed to have an arrogant and irritating habit of introducing their religious beliefs and prejudices into politics?<sup>55</sup> Perhaps the *ius connubium* was granted without ever asking their opinion. And if it was not a general agreement, but only a marriage between

<sup>51</sup> Some scholars have pointed out that we do not know of a Seleucid princess who could have been given in such a marriage (see e.g. Stein 1920, 5f.), but (as Tam 1951, 174, rightly points out) we do not know the Seleucid genealogy so completely. Moreover, whilst a daughter is still possible, there is nothing unlikely about a niece. And instead of the Seleucid princess favoured by most scholars, it might also have been a Maurya princess marrying in the West.

<sup>52</sup> A daughter of Seleucus suggested by McCrindle 1896, 407 & 1901, 43f., note 1, more hesitatingly e.g. Bevan 1902, 296, Rawlinson 1926, 39, Seth 1937a, 651, Tam 1951, 174, and Sircar 1968. Thapar 1963, 20, seems to be the only scholar to consider the second alternative, a Maurya princess in the Seleucid court. The general right of matrimony or rather between the Greeks and the Kṣatriyas e.g. by F. W. Thomas in *The Cambridge History of India*, Foucher 1947, 313f., Skurzak 1964, Schwarz 1968, 226 & 1970, 281ff., Bernard 1985a, 92f., and Holt 1989, 101. While Stein 1920, 5f.; seems to accept neither position, Scharfe 1971, 217, left the question open.

<sup>53</sup> I would prefer not to discuss the various traditions about the origin of Candragupta. The evidence is legendary and rather hard to evaluate with any reliability. In any case, he *is* rather often ascribed a humble origin. See Schwarz 1972b & 1978.

<sup>54</sup> In the case of the Ājīvikas and especially of the Buddhist Sangha this is clearly seen in contemporary inscriptions. Jaina legendary history makes Candragupta their patron and lay follower, and Aśoka's great piety (after initial wickedness) is similarly remembered in Buddhist sources.

<sup>55</sup> Note here the many traditions of antagonism between Brahmans and Kṣatriyas found in Indian (mostly Brahman) literature. See Schwarz 1980, 83f.

the ruling houses, even they probably had little to which they could object. A Seleucid princess in the royal harem of Candragupta would have been only a case of an anuloma marriage, and as such no sacrilege, at least as far as one of her offspring was not to succeed his father on the throne.<sup>56</sup> So, farewell to the fascinating but unfounded hypothesis of Aśoka having Greek blood.<sup>57</sup>

A royal marriage is not impossible, but there is no clear evidence for it. The best way to explain the nature of the agreement seems to be that suggested by Foucher and Bernard.<sup>58</sup> With the lands ceded by Seleucus to Candragupta a number of Greek settlers came under Mauryan suzerainty and thus outside the sphere of Greek legislation. It is quite possible that the main intention of the *ἐπιγαμία* was to give them some guarantee of social status. For Seleucus as a Hellenistic monarch it would have been natural to be concerned about their position, and he could have made it a condition of ceding these lands. In this way he also cut short the criticism his Western antagonists otherwise would have inevitably directed at him. Perhaps the Greeks were now given the status of Kṣatriyas that they often have in Indian sources.<sup>59</sup>

Next we must consider the new boundary between the Mauryas and Seleucids. Early attempts to minimize the area ceded to the Mauryas (e.g. Krom 1909) have become somewhat antiquated with the finds of Aśokan inscriptions in Greek and Aramaic in Afghanistan. Tarn (1951, 100f.) still argued for the cessation of a small area first, and then further conquests made by Aśoka, but there is no evidence for this, and why not the larger area? Aśoka certainly ruled this larger area, as his western edicts were found at such places as Taxila, Kandahar (Arachosia), Laghman and Pul-e Darunta (Paropamisadae). Not all early scholars were as stingy in their allocation of the ceded lands. Senart allowed the whole country to the Hindukush together with Aria and Seistan, while Vincent Smith allowed the Paropamisadae, Aria, Arachosia and eastern Gedrosia.<sup>60</sup>

Unfortunately, we know very little about the Seleucids and Mauryas, and of their mutual relations.<sup>61</sup> A present of a strong Indian aphrodisiac given by Candragupta to Seleucus is mentioned by Phylarchus (F 35b in Athenaeus 1, 32, 18e). Relations may well have been friendly, as both evidently felt the importance of protecting their back. After Megasthenes (chapter III) there were further diplomatic contacts. We know of Dai-

<sup>56</sup> On anuloma and even pratiloma marriages in Indian royal houses as well as on numerous cases where a marriage was between an Indian and a foreign dynasty see Sircar 1968.

<sup>57</sup> Actually the amount of his "Greek blood" would have been thin indeed. We have seen that Seleucus kept his Iranian wife, while other followers of Alexander deserted theirs. This means that Antiochus I, too, was half-Bactrian, although this did not help him keep Bactria when Diodotus chose to revolt. See Holt 1989, 65f. note 63 and 100 on Seleucid marriages, Schwarz 1968, 226 on Aśoka. Further Tarn 1951, 152f.

<sup>58</sup> Foucher 1947, 313f., and Bernard 1985a, 92f.

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. *Mahābhārata* 13, 33, 19; Manu 10, 43f.; and several Purāṇas (*Pañcalakṣaṇa* 2).

<sup>60</sup> The minimalist position has been recently renewed by L. Schober, but convincingly criticized by Bernard 1985a, 85ff.

<sup>61</sup> I find rather unlikely the hypothesis of Scharfe (1971) that since the treaty Candragupta might have been a vassal of Seleucus. The same was apparently earlier suggested by Niese, but rightly rejected as speculative by Wecker 1916, 1293.

machus of Plataea sent by Antiochus and of Dionysius who came from Ptolemaic Egypt and therefore acted against Seleucid interests (see III.5 above).

Candragupta was succeeded by his rather little-known son Bindusāra.<sup>62</sup> In Greek sources he is called Ἀμιτροχάτης (by Athenaeus) or Ἀλλιτροχάδης (by Strabo, apparently with the common textual error ΛΛ < M). The name is clearly Indian (with *amitra* 'enemy!'), but has been variously explained as Amitrakhāda ('devouring enemies', attested as an epithet of Indra)<sup>63</sup> or rather Amitraghāta ('killer of enemies').<sup>64</sup> In the West we hear of him only twice; once when Antiochus sent Daimachus to his court, and a second time when he wrote a letter to Antiochus asking for a gift including sophists.<sup>65</sup> His son and successor, Aśoka, was again important enough to be discussed in a separate chapter (VI.2 below).

## 2. Aśoka and the West

Among early Indian monarchs the grandson of Candragupta certainly seems to be closest to us, thanks to his many inscriptions (so-called edicts) and their exceptionally personal tone. From these we also know well that he continued relations not only with the Seleucids but with all Hellenistic monarchs. He favoured Buddhism, and Buddhist literature has preserved his memory, but in Western sources he is never mentioned at all, a good example of how random our preserved Western evidence on India can be.<sup>66</sup>

Of his names and titles, King Devānampiya Piyadassi (Πιοδασσης of Greek inscriptions)<sup>67</sup> is the normal form, but occasionally the name Asoka (with *s* in MIA form instead of OIA *ś*) is also mentioned in the inscriptions (but not in the Greek ones). In literature he is mainly known as Aśoka. Both Piyadassi (OIA Priyadarśin) and Aśoka can be considered personal names, while Devānampiya (Devānāmpriya) is a title (Scharfe 1971). Without implying any further conclusion about priorities I am here following the practice of calling him by the OIA name Aśoka.

<sup>62</sup> On him see Strabo 2, 1, 9 and Athenaeus 14, 652f–653a, discussed e.g. by Schwarz 1968, 227f. & 1970, 297ff. & 1975a, 184f.

<sup>63</sup> Fleet 1909a and 1909b, and Charpentier 1928a.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Pāṇini 3, 2, 88, with Patañjali; supported e.g. by Schwanbeck 1846, Lassen 1852, 213, Keith 1909 (criticizing Fleet), and Lamotte 1958, 243.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. VII.1. Of course, this letter made such a good story for a Greek audience that it may well be fictitious.

<sup>66</sup> There is no end to literature on Aśoka, we mention here only Lamotte 1958, 244ff., Thapar 1963, and the relevant part of Schwarz 1970 (300ff.).

<sup>67</sup> For the benefit of my Indologist readers it is perhaps in order to explain that for a name attested in inscriptions only, and therefore without the evidence of the Byzantine manuscript tradition, we cannot always know the right position of the accent.

It seems clear that Aśoka himself was a Buddhist, but another question is, how Buddhist his policy actually was.<sup>68</sup> Some have made him a royal monk, but this is unlikely; probably he remained a layman. It is not so clear whether the politics proclaimed in his edicts actually meant propagating Buddhism or merely general religiosity. Generally speaking, religious feelings and measures taken by rulers are to a great extent dictated by political expediency. Legends are not a good source of history (though they have been frequently used, indeed),<sup>69</sup> therefore the inscriptions are all-important here.<sup>70</sup> But I have a feeling (and, of course, I am not the first to think so) that perhaps their seemingly personal and sincere tone has sometimes been overemphasized. They are, after all, not personal notes, but royal proclamations inscribed on stone. In spite of the religious and ethical considerations expressed in the inscriptions, tough realism was apparently always preserved in Aśoka's politics. Buddhism and Buddhist Sangha are often mentioned, but the royal favour also extended to other religious groups.<sup>71</sup> On the other hand, Aśoka had apparently made a pilgrimage to the birth-place of the Buddha.<sup>72</sup> Whilst this might have been politically wise, one is also bound to suspect some personal motives.

One problem closely connected with Aśoka is the origin of writing in India. Both Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī (in the Northwest) are for the first time attested only in Aśokan inscriptions. Was writing then an old tradition, perhaps only used on some perishable material (as Bühler 1895 and his many followers supposed), or was it just in its infancy? On an earlier occasion<sup>73</sup> I still stated my opinion somewhat too cautiously, and must correct it now in the light of recent studies.<sup>74</sup>

When we consider the origin of writing in India, one important starting-point is the incontestable fact that Kharoṣṭhī is a development of the Aramaic script. The origin of Brāhmī is more problematic. Among Indologists, Western scholars have tended to side with Bühler (1895) and derived it, too, from some form of Aramaic, while Indian scholars have been understandably fascinated with the possibility of an independent origin. The suggested Aramaic parallels of Brāhmī, however, are very early, and their number is rather small.<sup>75</sup>

Recently it has been suggested<sup>76</sup> that Kharoṣṭhī came first, in the northwest, and developed the semi-syllabic system afterwards characteristic of all Indian writing systems.

<sup>68</sup> See Thapar 1963, 137ff. and especially 144ff., also Lamotte 1958, 249ff.

<sup>69</sup> When Buddhists remember the king as a great patron of their religion, it is only natural that he was described as a pious Buddhist himself, especially in later sources of a legendary character (such as the *Aśokāvadāna* and even the Sinhala chronicles).

<sup>70</sup> Editions used are Bloch 1950, Schneider 1978, and Andersen 1990.

<sup>71</sup> Brahmins and Sramāṇas are often mentioned together, and the Barābar cave inscriptions contain donations to the Ājīvikas. Cf. Thapar 1963, 154.

<sup>72</sup> The Rummindei inscription (Bloch 1950, 157). Cf. Thapar 1963, 49f.

<sup>73</sup> Karttunen 1989a with further references, especially Goyal 1985.

<sup>74</sup> See Hinüber 1990, Daffinà 1992, and especially Falk 1993. Cf. III.2 above on Megasthenian evidence (F 32) of writing in India.

<sup>75</sup> Hinüber 1990, 12ff., Falk 1993, 112ff.

<sup>76</sup> Hinüber 1990, 59ff., Falk 1993, 337ff.

We might also note that a related system was already in use in Old Persian Cuneiform.<sup>77</sup> Brāhmī was then created on the same principle, but with entirely new, invented letters. And as there is no earlier evidence at all, perhaps this happened only during Aśoka's reign. There is a possibility that the Greek script, certainly known in the northwest since Alexander, contributed to this development.

Aśoka's missionaries or ambassadors were sent to the Western kings (Schwarz 1970, 307f.). These Greek (*yona*) kings, when their names were first read in the 1830s by James Prinsep, gave the first fixed point in ancient Indian history.<sup>78</sup> The kings were mostly easy to identify: Aṃtiyoka is Antiochus II Theos (261–246), Tulamaya is Ptolemaeus II Philadelphos (285–247), Aṃtekina is Antigonus Gonatas (276–239) and Maka is Magas of Cyrene (died before 250).<sup>79</sup> Only one problem remained and still remains: was the fifth Yona king, Alikasudala, Alexander of Epirus (272–255) or Alexander of Corinth (252–244)?<sup>80</sup> The latter seems to have been somewhat too insignificant, but certainty is not possible to attain.

These names certainly give us some help with the chronology of Aśoka. But it has been rarely noted<sup>81</sup> that this help is not as exact as many have supposed. Communications were so slow that a couple of years could well have elapsed before the news of the death of a distant and minor ruler, such as Magas and Alexander certainly were, was heard and noted in India.

There is no further evidence about these missions. Aśoka's affirmation that because of them his principles were followed everywhere<sup>82</sup> can be dismissed as mere rhetoric. Nevertheless, Wecker's (1916, 1324) suggestion that Aśoka's missionaries never went beyond frontier regions seems unnecessary (and what would it mean in the cases of Antigonus, Magas and Alexander?). There had now for quite a long time been contact between Mauryas and Hellenistic monarchs on an official level, and, at least later, in Buddhist countries monks were often entrusted with diplomatic missions. Probably Aśoka's monks, or some of them, reached their goals and, in addition to possible other, more

<sup>77</sup> The very word for writing, *lipi*, in northwestern MIA (Aśoka's Kharoṣṭhī) also *dipi*, is derived from OP *dipi(y)*. See Benveniste 1964, 140 and Mayrhofer, *EWA* s.v. Further, instead of the normal *likhita* 'written', the word *nipista*, *nipesita* (cf. OP *nipoīṣta*) was used at Shahbazgarhi (Benveniste, *ibid.*).

<sup>78</sup> This is a slight overstatement as it can be argued that the first fixed point of Indian history was the identification of Candragupta of the Purāṇas with the Sandrocottus of classical sources, but the importance of Prinsep's find lies in the fact that here was the first possibility to connect contemporary (epigraphical) evidence with Western sources.

<sup>79</sup> R. E. XIII Q (Schneider) *se [ca] mana ladhe devānaṃpiyasa hida ca savesu ca aṃtesu ā sasu [pi] yojanasatesu ata aṃtiyoke nāma yonalāja palam ca tenā aṃtiyokenā catāli lājāne tulamaye nāma (ca) aṃtekine nāma (ca) makā (-gā) nāma (ca) alikasudale nāma*, Antiochus also in R. E. II. For their identification, see e.g. Charpentier 1931, 303ff.

<sup>80</sup> Epirus: Charpentier 1931, 306, Thapar 1963, 41, Schwarz 1970, 308; on Corinth I have a reference to Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* 3:2, 105, but the edition I have used (Beloch 1927, 150) accepts Alexander of Epirus without comment; uncertain: Schwarz 1968, 229.

<sup>81</sup> At least by Bhattasali 1932, 287.

<sup>82</sup> R. E. II & XIII.

worldly commissions, also fulfilled their spiritual mission, which, however, was neither really understood, nor much appreciated, and therefore soon forgotten.

Buddhist chronicles and commentaries mention the Yona[ka]s as members of the Sangha in the time of Aśoka. Thera Yona Dhammarakkhita<sup>83</sup> carried Dhamma to western lands (Aparantaka, more or less corresponding to the modern Gujarat; Schwarz 1970, 308f.), and Thera Mahārakkhita went to the Greek country (called Yonakaratt̥ha or Yonakaloka). It is pity that the account of his journey<sup>84</sup> is so exclusively concerned with spreading Buddhism (he preached the *Kālakārāmasuttanta* there and made many converts) that no further details are included. We would really appreciate his vision of the Hellenistic world, if this really was the goal of his mission.

However, perhaps he went only to the Northwest, where some Greeks had been living at least since the days of Alexander. Additional colonisation during the early years after Alexander's death is possible, but the eastern satrapies were never left empty before they were ceded to Candragupta, and then the Greek population was already so rooted in the country that at least part remained under Mauryan government (when new colonization from the West seems hardly thinkable). The provenance of our two Greek edicts in Kandahar allows us to locate at least some of these people in Arachosia. In Indian sources this Greek population is often mentioned together with the Kambojas, who are mostly identified with the Iranian population. These Yonas and Kambojas of the Northwest were mentioned (separately from the Greek kings) in Aśoka's inscriptions.<sup>85</sup> A related account is found in the Pāli canon.<sup>86</sup> Both stress the lack of the Indian varṇa hierarchy among these two peoples, who knew only freemen and slaves.

A certain Yavandarāja Tuṣāspa is mentioned in Rudradāman's inscription as Aśoka's governor of Gujarat. His Iranian name (with Iranian *aspa* 'horse') points clearly to the Northwest. The fact that a man with an Iranian name was styled yavana (and moreover, a yavandarāja) has puzzled scholars, while others have used it as an argument in support of the opinion that the word *yavana* did not refer to Greeks. But this is not necessarily so difficult to explain. Firstly, we may note that a difference between the Macedonians and the Greeks, already then rapidly dissolving even among themselves, was hardly important enough to the Indians to make a distinction. After all, they were never too meticulous with names of peoples whom they in any case considered barbarian.

83 There was later another Yona Dhammarakkhita, who came from the city of Alasanda (probably Alexandria in the Caucasus) to Ceylon to celebrate Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's victory over Eḷāra. See *Mahāvamsa* 19, 39 (*yonanagarālasandā yonamahādhammarakkhito | thero tiṃsasaḥassāni bhikkhū ādāya āgamā*) and *Thūpavamsa* p. 224 (Law 72f.).

84 Both stories belong to the same tradition of the propagation of dharma after the council of Pāṭali-putra. They are found in various versions in the Vinaya Commentary I, p. 64 & 67, *Dīpavamsa* 8, 9, *Mahāvamsa* 12, 39, *Thūpavamsa* p. 192 (Law 43), and *Mahābodhivamsa* p. 113 & 114f.

85 Yonas alone in the R. E. XIII *nathī ca se janapade ata nathī ime nikāyā aṃnatā yonesu: bābhane ca samane ca*. Some northwestern peoples including the Yonas and the Kambojas enumerated in the R. E. V.

86 *Majjhimanikāya* 93 (vol. 2, p. 149): *yonakambojesu aññesu ca paccantimesu janapadesu dveva vaṇṇā, ayyo c'eva dāso ca; ayyo hutvā dāso hoti, dāso hutvā ayyo hoṭīti*.

Alexander's companions and successors were probably called *yavanas* and Macedonian rule a *yavanarājya*.<sup>87</sup> The Aśokan inscriptions in Western languages (Greek and Aramaic) discovered in the Northwest of the Mauryan Empire point to the conclusion that with the lands Seleucus had also ceded the administrative organization. And the administration had included Iranians since the days of Alexander. It is possible that Oxyartes was still the satrap of the Paropamisadae when the country fell to Candragupta, and perhaps he was also allowed to serve this new master in the same office. As for Tuṣāspa, *Yavanarāja* as his title should perhaps be translated as a Greek official, a (high) member of the Greek (originally Macedonian) local administration of the Mauryan *Yavana* land in Arachosia or Paropamisadae. He was thus a *Yavana* through his office, albeit Iranian by birth.

Several Greek and Aramaic edicts of Aśoka have been found in Afghanistan, in Kandahar and Laghman. Even before these, the Aramaic fragment of Taxila was found as early as 1914, and after more or less unsuccessful attempts at decipherment, it was shown by Humbach that it is not a document issued by a young viceroy, but merely a version of an edict, to be exact, a translation of the central portion of the R. E. IV.<sup>88</sup>

In 1932 a bilingual Aramaic and Aramaeo-Indian<sup>89</sup> fragment was found at Pol-e Darunta, near the confluence of the Laghman and the Kabul rivers. After a preliminary discussion by Birkeland (1938) it was deciphered by Henning (1950) as a series of quotations taken from Aśoka's edicts. The bilingual Greek and Aramaic fragment containing a free rendering of the short version of the R. E. IV was found at Old Kandahar in 1958 and independently published by French (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958) and Italian (Pugliese Carratelli *et al.* 1958) scholars.<sup>90</sup>

The second Greek version, containing the end of the R. E. XII and the beginning of the R. E. XIII was also found at Old Kandahar, in 1963, and published by Schlumberger and Benveniste (both 1964).<sup>91</sup> Again in Kandahar, a further Aramaic (or Aramaeo-Iranian) and Aramaeo-Indian fragment containing part of the P. E. VII was found in 1966 (Benveniste & Dupont-Sommer 1966). The Laghman valley in Afghanistan furnished two further Aramaic (or Aramaeo-Iranian) fragments, found in 1969 and 1973 (Humbach 1973 and Davary & Humbach 1974).

The language of the Greek edicts has attracted much attention.<sup>92</sup> Instead of making a servile reproduction of the MIA original the unknown translator has achieved an elaborate paraphrase. It is generally correct Greek showing some features of Hellenistic koiné and even some knowledge of Greek philosophical terminology, which is valuable for us. For instance, it is very interesting to know that εὐσεβεία was considered to be the proper

<sup>87</sup> The word is attested in a later inscription probably referring to Indo-Greeks. See VI.5 below.

<sup>88</sup> Humbach 1969ab & 1978a; for earlier interpretations see Cowley 1915 (with Barnett 1915), Herzfeld 1928, Andreas 1932, Bongard-Levin 1956, and Altheim & Stiehl 1958 & 1959.

<sup>89</sup> The terms Aramaeo-Indian and Aramaeo-Iranian refer to inscriptions which are written in Aramaic letters but contain Aramaic and MIA viz. Iranian words mixed, more or less in the same way as the later Book Pahlavi.

<sup>90</sup> See also e.g. Lamotte 1958, 789ff., Pugliese Carratelli *et al.* 1964, and Schwarz 1970, 309f.

<sup>91</sup> See also e.g. Schwarz 1970, 311f.

<sup>92</sup> See e.g. Robert 1958 (and again in notes to Schlumberger 1964, 136ff.), Benveniste 1964, Hammat 1966, Schwarz 1970, 312, Christol 1982, Gallavotti 1992.

equivalent of *dhamma*. Some two centuries later, on the coins of Indo-Greek kings, *dhramika* is translated as δίκαιος.<sup>93</sup> Another example is Greek διατριβή as a translation of *pāsamda* 'sect'.

A comparison with MIA versions shows clearly that the Greek and Aramaic edicts represent an abridged version.<sup>94</sup> The existence of longer and shorter versions is also attested in MIA. But the question which was the original of the Greek and Aramaic edicts has aroused much discussion. The problem is whether they belong together or not and whether the original(s) were written in Northwestern MIA (Kharoṣṭhī), Eastern MIA (Brāhmī) or even Sanskrit. The Aramaic is easily connected with Northwestern Kharoṣṭhī edicts, but as regards the Greek, opinions have differed. While Benveniste in 1958 compared the Greek with the Shahbazarhi Kharoṣṭhī edict, Alsdorf (1960) preferred Eastern versions representing the language of the capital, and Norman (1972) suggested the Yerraguḍi version, which he considers to be the best representative of the supposed original.

The name of the king, in Greek Πιοδασσης, in Aramaic *Prydrš*, is important. In the first place, it is noteworthy that it is not translated, and therefore must be taken as a personal name, unlike the title *devānamp(ri)ya*, which in Aramaic is rendered as *mārān*, while it is omitted in Greek.<sup>95</sup> Therefore both Piyadassi and Aśoka seem to be personal names.<sup>96</sup> Now the Aramaic form can be derived from Priyadraśi of the Kharoṣṭhī edicts (Shahbazarhi and Mansehra) and thus represents the Northwestern MIA, while the Greek is clearly derived from eastern *Piyadassi*.<sup>97</sup> But here we must note a difference in the position of the two languages.

The role of Aramaic as the chancellery language of the Achaemenid Empire also used in Northwestern India (where it was used as the model of the Kharoṣṭhī) and the number of evidently Iranian words in Aramaic edicts seem to prove that these were meant for the Iranian population.<sup>98</sup> But they did not speak Aramaic, which was probably still a kind of chancellery language. Therefore we can seek a literary model for everything mentioned in Aramaic edicts, including the king's name. With Greek the situation was different. The language was actually spoken by the people for whom the Greek edicts were inscribed, and certainly they had a name for their king even before there were any edicts. Thus the form Πιοδασσης, though otherwise interesting enough, says nothing of the actual translation of edicts into Greek.

<sup>93</sup> The question of the Greek language in the East is discussed in more detail below in chapter VI.5.

<sup>94</sup> The omissions of the Greek version have been analyzed by Norman (1972).

<sup>95</sup> Benveniste 1964, 143. The Aramaic title is also attested in the Achaemenid Aramaic of Egypt. That the Indian word is merely a title is also attested by the fact that it is once used in the plural referring to former kings.

<sup>96</sup> While a majority of scholars seem to prefer Aśoka as the original name and take Piyadassi/Priyadarsθi as a kind of additional, probably honorific, name, Benveniste (1964, 143ff.) argues for the opposite view (as did Senart much earlier, in 1886).

<sup>97</sup> On the Greek see Benveniste in Schlumberger *et alia* 1958, 37f.; on the Aramaic Benveniste 1964, 145.

<sup>98</sup> So e.g. Benveniste 1964, 141.

When Πιοδασσης cannot be used, we must probably follow Harmatta (1966, 83) and draw our conclusions from the fact that the words βραμεναι and σραμεναι in Greek are probably derived from Northwestern MIA, where the closely related forms *bramaṇa* and *śramaṇa* were used, while these words can be connected neither with the βραχμᾶνες and σαρμᾶνες of Alexander's historians nor with the *bamhana/baṃbhana/bābhana* and *sama-na* of the common MIA of Aśoka. However, we are not ready to accept Harmatta's further conclusion that the Aramaic translation was first made from the Northwestern MIA origin and that this Aramaic version was further translated into Greek.<sup>99</sup>

The fact that the Greek translator used what was then modern language (with koiné expressions) and that he was versed in philosophical terminology seems to rule out Narain's suggestion (1958) of an independent Greek population in the East going back to Achaemenid times. It has been pointed out by Harmatta (1966, 78f.) that such an isolated remnant could hardly have produced the Greek edicts in the form in which they are written. Therefore we must think of the colonies of Alexander and his immediate successors.

The Aramaic also offers its own problems, and I am not qualified to say much about them.<sup>100</sup> One problem is that of the language: was it real Aramaic (with local loans) or Aramaeo-Iranian and Aramaeo-Indian as has been claimed, apparently on good grounds, e.g. by Humbach and Ito? In Iran the Aramaic script was preserved, and later became the basis of Pahlavi script (where a great number of Aramaic ideograms were used). In the Farther East there is at least one Aramaic ostrakon (or Aramaeo-Iranian, it seems to be very difficult to say) from Ai Khanum.<sup>101</sup>

While Aśoka still maintained his relations with the Hellenistic West, it was also during his rule (albeit not through him) that the two worlds began drifting apart. In the second half of the third century the Parthians and the Graeco-Bactrians (who soon turned into Indo-Greeks) seceded and soon formed an important new political factor between the Mauryas and Seleucids. Our evidence is meagre, but it seems likely that the independence of Bactria and Parthia on the one hand, and the apparent weakening of the Mauryas, on the other hand, diminished the contact between East and West. For the Seleucids there were also other, and often more important and soon much more urgent interests in the West. In the end, the once so proud empire of Seleucus and Antiochus was reduced to a sad remnant between two powers, Rome and Parthia.

Only once do the sources mention a renewed contact before the opening of the direct sea route between Egypt and India. This was in connection with the Eastern campaigns of Antiochus III (as told by Polybius)<sup>102</sup> and his meeting in Paropamisadae with the Indian

<sup>99</sup> Harmatta 1966, 84. The Sanskrit hypothesis of Renou (in a note on Schlumberger 1964, 134) must be rejected as there is no further evidence for a Sanskrit version of the edicts and as the philosophical terminology of the Greek edicts does not really require such an intermediary. The MIA was certainly not incapable of expressing philosophical concepts.

<sup>100</sup> See e.g. Altheim & Stiehl 1958, 1959 etc., Humbach 1969ab, 1971 etc., Mukherjee 1984a and Ito 1977, 1979, 1981.

<sup>101</sup> Bernard 1972, 631f.

<sup>102</sup> Polybius 11, 39. On the Bactrian part of this campaign see VI.3.

king Sophagasenus (Σοφαγασήνος). Normally this name is explained as Subhagasena, but it can also be a MIA form for Saubhagasena (or Saubhāgyasena). He might have been a local ruler, but because Antiochus renewed the alliance with him (τήν τε φιλίαν ἀνε-  
νεώσατο) and because he was called the king of India(ns) (τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰνδῶν), like Candragupta before him, it has been commonly supposed that he was one of the later Mauryas.<sup>103</sup>

### 3. Between Two Cultures

Next we must consider the origin and development of Greek states in Bactria and India. There has been a controversy of viewpoints: Hellenistic in Tarn (1951): Indian in Narain (1957) – and both to excess. In fact both did rather well from their particular viewpoints. Tarn, however, in addition to his daring hypotheses, could not really understand Eastern history (and was much too sure that he did),<sup>104</sup> while Narain seems to have had an erroneous idea of the meaning of Hellenism. Both failed to see the importance of the Iranian element. Perhaps a more balanced approach is now possible, with so much new numismatic and archaeological evidence available. After Tarn and Narain, who, in addition to texts, mainly had to rely on evidence east of the Hindukush, the position of Bactria as the “kermland” is now re-established by archaeology.<sup>105</sup>

It is no wonder that it was Bactria, the land around the Oxus, that became the nucleus of the new state. When Alexander arrived there, the country already had a long and flourishing history going back to at least the second millennium B.C. This was due to two factors: trade and a well-developed irrigation system (which was destroyed only by the Mongols).<sup>106</sup> Ties with Northwestern India on the other side of the Hindukush were old and close. Archaeology has also shown that the “thousand cities of Bactria” were not a mere new development of the Greek period.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>103</sup> Originally suggested by Lassen 1827, 44f.; later e.g. Tarn 1951, 130, Narain 1957, 9, Thapar 1963, 190f., Schwarz 1970, 314f.

<sup>104</sup> I cannot refrain from quoting Tarn's own words, used in a review (in *JHS* 59, 1939) of a hypothesis proposed by another scholar, as it is often so perfectly applicable to his own work: “It is as exciting as any detective story; but it is true?”

<sup>105</sup> See now Holt 1989 on Bactria; also Bernard 1985a and Boppearachi 1991 and their many articles; earlier sources are listed in Holt 1984a & 1987.

<sup>106</sup> See e.g. Gardin & Gentelle 1976 and Gardin 1980.

<sup>107</sup> As suggested by Tarn 1951, 72 and 118f. Apparently he had not thought that in a society with an extensive irrigation system, villages necessarily tend to grow in size. For him, however, Bactria was still an archaeological *terra incognita*. This has now been completely changed by excavations carried out in the 1960s and 1970s at Surkh Kotal, Ai Khanum, Dilberjin and other sites in Afghanistan and until the present day in the Middle Asian Republics.

In the Achaemenid period, Bactria was an important part of the empire, but also a quite loosely ruled, often semi-independent vassal-state.<sup>108</sup> Alexander faced great difficulties there, when he, as the self-elected successor of the Achaemenids, tried to tighten the reins.<sup>109</sup> For a while, the Seleucids, who apparently had strong ties to Bactria (the Bactrian princess Apama was the wife of Seleucus Nicator and the mother of Antiochus Soter), succeeded in keeping Bactria, although Seleucus had to campaign there in order to secure his rule.<sup>110</sup> During his later years and those of his son Antiochus Seleucid rule in Bactria seems to have been secure,<sup>111</sup> though the literary sources do not say much about early Seleucid history and still less about Eastern affairs. It may well be that Bactria was always a source of trouble and that it was on the first possible occasion that the satrap Diodotus revolted in or soon after the middle of the third century and at a stroke successfully separated his satrapy from the rest of the Seleucid Empire. In this he was soon helped by the secession of Parthia, which virtually cut Bactria off from the remaining Seleucid state. From now on Bactria was an independent Hellenistic (and at the same time, Iranian) kingdom. It is a pity that we have so few details of Greek rule, but its mere length suggests some kind of partnership between Greeks and Bactrians.<sup>112</sup>

A summary of the few classical sources on them is given below (for Indian sources see VI.9 below). Our meagre Western evidence is mostly found in extant parts of the *History* of Polybius, in Strabo (going back to Apollodorus of Artemita) and in Justinus (going back to Pompeius Trogus).<sup>113</sup> In addition, there are some occasional references in Aelianus (*N. An.* 15, 8 and 16, 3), Pliny, the *Periplus* (chapter 47 on coins), and Plutarch (*Moralia* 821DE on Menander's funeral). In his criticism of historical writing Lucianus demanded that any war, be it Celts against Getans or Indians against Bactrians, must be described according to the same rules. The extant summary of the *Parthian stations* by Isidorus of Charax belongs to the late Indo-Greek era.

From a combination of numismatic evidence and these meagre literary sources we can only draw the barest outline of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history, though it can now to some extent be added to by archaeological and epigraphical evidence (see VI.4 and VI.5 below). Generally, much more than this outline is found in published studies – mostly from various interpretations of numismatic evidence, which often seems rather controversial. Being myself no numismatist, I hardly dare take any stand on the issues,

<sup>108</sup> On Bactria in the Achaemenid period see Holt 1989, 11ff., some notes also in Karttunen 1989a, 39ff.

<sup>109</sup> A good survey is found in Holt 1989, 52ff. (but see also Bernard 1990).

<sup>110</sup> Justinus 15, 4 *principio Babyloniam cepit; inde et auctis ex victoria viribus Bactrianos expugnavit. Transitum deinde in Indiam fecit...* This does not say much, but at least the mention of the subsequent Indian expedition provides a chronological framework. Apparently the Bactrians had risen in revolt just like the Indians, but in Bactria there was no Candragupta. For possible numismatic evidence of these Bactrian rebels see Bernard & Guillaume 1980, for a more general discussion Bernard 1985a, 127ff. and Holt 1989, 87ff., and on the role of Apama e.g. Bernard 1987b, 108.

<sup>111</sup> For archaeological evidence of Seleucid rule in Bactria see VI.4 below and Bernard 1994, 507ff.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Tarn 1951, 125.

<sup>113</sup> See Tarn (1951, 44ff.) on supposed Hellenistic sources: Apollodorus of Artemita (*FGrH* 244), Trogus' source (see also Bussagli 1947 & 1956), the Greek of Mesopotamia and Isidorus of Charax.

which seem to allow for so many different interpretations, but it is at least interesting to see what are the bones beneath them. I do not mean, however, that the following would be all that can be said with any certainty about the Graeco-Bactrians and the Indo-Greeks.

As was stated above, this history begins in or somewhat after the middle of the third century B.C., when the Seleucid satrap of Bactria, Diodotus, revolted and declared himself king.<sup>114</sup> A little later the western neighbour, Parthia, followed this example, first under the satrap Andragoras, soon under Iranian rulers. In Bactria Diodotus I was probably succeeded by his son, a second Diodotus, who made peace with Parthia,<sup>115</sup> but was then overthrown and probably killed by Euthydemus of Magnesia.<sup>116</sup> When during his eastern campaign Antiochus III invaded Bactria, Euthydemus was thus capable of claiming that he was no rebel; on the contrary, he had ousted the rebels from Bactria. There has been much speculation about the nature of the subsequent agreement between the two kings; in any case Antiochus gained elephants, and Euthydemus was allowed to continue to rule in Bactria.<sup>117</sup>

Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus, invaded India and ruled some part of it,<sup>118</sup> though opinions as to the extent of his rule differ widely. For Tam he was a great conqueror, comparable to Alexander, while some others (Narain) have allowed him only a

<sup>114</sup> The date has been recently discussed by Bopearachchi (1994, 514ff.). See also Bernard 1994.

<sup>115</sup> Justinus 41, 4, 5ff. *Eodem tempore etiam Theodotus*, (so edd., but the better form of the name *Diodotus* is actually given in two manuscripts and in the text of the *Prologues*) *mille urbium Bactrianarum praefectus, defecit regemque se appellari iussit...* 8. *Non magno deinde post tempore Hyrcanorum quoque regnum* (scil. Arsaces) *occupavit, atque ita duarum civitatum imperio praeditus grandem exercitum parat metu cum Seleuci et Theodoti, Bactrianorum regis*. 9. *Sed cito morte Theodoti metu liberatus cum filio eius, et ipso Theodoto, foedus ad pacem fecit...* That Diodotus I was an enemy of Arsaces is borne out by Strabo 11, 9, 3 ἀπὸ τούτων [τῶν Σκυθῶν] δ' οὖν ἔλκειν φασὶ τὸ γένος τὸν Ἀρσάκην, οἱ δὲ Βακτριανὴν λέγουσιν αὐτόν, φεύγοντα δὲ τὴν αὐξήσιν τῶν περὶ Διόδοτον ἀποστήναι τὴν Παρθυαίαν. Further Strabo 11, 11, 1 (at the beginning) τῆς δὲ Βακτρίας μέρη μὲν τινα τῇ Ἀρίᾳ παραβέβληται πρὸς ἄρκτον, τὰ πολλὰ δ' ὑπέρκειται πρὸς ἕω· πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ πάμφορος πλὴν ἐλαίου. τοσοῦτον δὲ ἴσχυσαν οἱ ἀποστήσαντες Ἕλληνες αὐτὴν διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν τῆς χώρας, ὥστε τῆς τε Ἀριανῆς ἐπεκράτουν καὶ τῶν Ἰνδῶν, ὡς φησὶν Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἀρτεμιτηνός. The name Diodotus (instead of Justinus' Theodotus) for the two kings is confirmed by their coins. See further Tam 1951, 74ff., Narain 1957, 12ff.

<sup>116</sup> There are two Hellenistic cities of this name, both in Asia Minor, cf. Tam 1951, 74f. Bernard 1985a, 131ff., & 1987b, 103f., argues convincingly for Magnesia on the Maeander.

<sup>117</sup> Polybius 10, 49 and 11, 39 (too long to be quoted), briefly in Strabo 11, 9, 2. On Euthydemus see also Tam 1951, 74ff., Narain 1957, 19ff. One is struck by the parallel. A hundred years earlier Seleucus campaigned against Candragupta, and after an apparent military failure accepted the force of 500 elephants as compensation for lands which he already had lost. Perhaps Antiochus repeated the trick, and the victorious campaign was not as successful as Tam would have us believe. In any case the result seems to have been exactly the same as with Seleucus and Candragupta. On a recent claim (by Sherwin-White and Kuhrt) that Seleucid suzerainty continued in Bactria until the death of Antiochus III see the criticism by Bernard 1994, 477ff.

<sup>118</sup> Strabo 11, 11, 1 (Apollodorus F 7a, the beginning is quoted below under Menander) τὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτός [Μένανδρος], τὰ δὲ Δημήτριος ὁ Εὐθυδήμου υἱός, τοῦ Βακτρῶν βασιλέως· οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν Παταλινὴν κατέσχον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἄλλης παραλίας τὴν τε Σαραόστου καλουμένην καὶ τὴν Σιγέρδιδος βασιλείαν. The Indian invasion is also mentioned (without the name of the invader) in Strabo 15, 1, 3 (Apollodorus F 7b). On Demetrius see Tam 1951, 130ff. (obs. 144, also 75ff.) and Narain 1957, 21ff.

small advance on the Indian frontier, and made Menander the main conqueror of India. Still, on the testimony of Apollodorus it seems clear that Demetrius conquered the Indus Delta and then advanced to the present-day Gujarat,<sup>119</sup> though Pāṭaliputra perhaps was not among his conquests. Unfortunately, the supposed Indian evidence on Demetrius is too controversial to be used.<sup>120</sup> Whatever his plans might have been, they were marred by Eucratides, who raised a revolt in Bactria. Tam gives a fascinating chain of evidence and conclusions in order to show that Eucratides was in fact a Seleucid general and a relative of Antiochus Epiphanes, but in the end he fails to convince his reader, as is often the case with his bolder hypotheses. At first the revolt seems to have been successful, although Eucratides had to fight hard, but in the end he was killed by his own son.<sup>121</sup> From Strabo (11, 9, 2) we further learn that Parthians took part of Bactria from Eucratides.

After this there were clearly two rival royal houses,<sup>122</sup> the Eucratids in Bactria and the Euthydemids in India. We know also that the former, too, had a foothold on the Indian side of the Hindukush, originally gained by Eucratides himself. He was succeeded by his son Heliocles (the parricide?), and numismatic sources offer us several further rulers of the same line. In Bactria their rule was ended by a nomad conquest, probably by the

<sup>119</sup> While Patalene is certainly in the Indus Delta, I also see no reason to doubt the identification of Saraostos and Sigerdis of Strabo (Apollodorus) with Surastrene (Συραστρηνή, i.e. Saurāṣṭra) of Ptolemy (7, 1, 55) and the *Periplus* (41) and Zigerus of Pliny (*N. H.* 6, 26, 101; cf. Μιλιζηνήρις in Ptolemy 7, 1, 95, and Μελιζειγάρα in the *Periplus* 53). The main argument of Narain (1957, 68f. & 93f.) against (perhaps not very long) Indo-Greek rule, that no Indo-Greek coins have been found in this region, is no longer true (Deyell 1984, on more recent finds oral information by MacDowall). These new finds also neatly bear out the testimony of the *Periplus* 47 on these coins used in Barygaza. At the same time, however, the conclusions must not be drawn too far. The Gogha hoard described by Deyell contains only coins of Apollodotus II and his successor Dionysius, that means the late Indo-Greek period, when Indo-Greek rule in Gujarat was no longer possible. When the *Periplus* mentioned Apollodotus and Menander, Apollodotus I as Menander's predecessor is most probably meant. Deyell (1984, 126f.) further mentions a few coins of Apollodotus and Menander as local finds in museums of Gujarat.

<sup>120</sup> On the *Yugapurāna* see Mitchiner 1986, on the Hāthigumpha inscription Tam 1951, 457ff. King Dattāmitra of the *Mahābhārata* is not pertinent (Johnston 1939, Mayrhofer 1991). See further Bagchi 1946 for the hypothesis that Demetrius is mentioned in Buddhist narrative literature.

<sup>121</sup> Justinus 41, 6, 4f. *Multa tamen Eucratides bella magna virtute gessit, quibus adritus, cum obsidionem Demetrii, regis Indorum, pateretur, cum CCC militibus LX milia hostium adsiduis eruptionibus vicit. Quinto itaque mense liberatus Indiam in potestatem redegit. 5. Unde cum se reciperet, a filio, quem socium regni fecerat, in itinere interficitur, qui non dissimulato parricidio, velut hostem, non patrem interfecisset, et per sanguinem eius currum egit et corpus abici inseputum iussit.* Tam 1951, 219ff. (followed by Smith 1978) suggested a corruption in the text of Justinus and thus made this son not a parricide, but a son of Demetrius or some other Euthydemid prince. Another, somewhat problematic account of the might of Eucratides is found in Strabo 15, 1, 3 (Εὐκρατίδαν γούν πόλις χιλίας ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ ἔχειν). Aelianus, *N. An.* 15, 8 might refer to (commercial) relations between Eucratides and South India (cf. Dihle 1974, 9f. & 1978, 554f.), and Lucianus' mention of war between India and Bactria perhaps refers to the war between Demetrius and Eucratides. On Eucratides in general, see Tam 1951, 196ff., Narain 1957, 53ff., and Bernard 1985a, 97ff.

<sup>122</sup> With the great number of rulers known from coins there is always the possibility of a third dynasty (so Narain 1957) as well as of the existence of some upstarts. Still I fail to see adequate grounds for supposing (with Oekonomides 1987) mercenary leaders producing their own coinage.

Yuezhi, in the second half of the second century B.C.;<sup>123</sup> in India they seem to have lasted some generations more.

As to the Euthydemids, they continued their line in India, where the Pañjab was probably their stronghold. Gandhāra's position between the rival lines is problematic. Western literary sources give us two further names, Apollodotus (reading uncertain) and Menander.<sup>124</sup> The latter was without doubt a great king; some echo of this has even reached classical literature.<sup>125</sup> The major conquest of India is often, and perhaps with reason, ascribed to him.

Thus far we can follow Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history from a combination of numismatic and literary evidence. After this, there was perhaps a century, and a great number of kings, of Greek rule in Northwest India, testified to solely by coins and a few short Indian inscriptions. Various reconstructions, widely differing dates, hot controversy about the question whether different series of coins with the same name belong to one, two or perhaps three kings – all this is a jungle I would not like, and do not feel myself competent, to enter. It is not made easier by the fact that the mere number of kings shows that there were probably many sub-kings. As to the question of several kings with the same name, in a Hellenistic royal line this was certainly very common, but it also does not make the reconstruction any easier.<sup>126</sup>

Because of all this I dare not say much on the later political history of Indo-Greek kings. At least there seems to be a consensus that Menander was followed by Strato, probably his son. Coins seem to bear out that he was a minor when he succeeded his father, and ruled at first jointly with his mother Agathocleia.

This led Tarn (1951, 226) to a somewhat questionable argument with regard to the death of Menander. He first takes what he calls extremes: that Menander married in 166 and that Strato was only twelve when his father died, or that Menander married in about 161 and that Strato was fifteen. Thus he produces the limits 153–145 B.C. for the death of Menander. This presupposes that Menander's queen Agathocleia was an Euthydemid princess and Menander himself only a general and a commoner. Both cases are possible, but not really proven by Tarn. And even if both are true, it is not necessary to wait for

<sup>123</sup> Strabo 11, 8, 2, Pompeius Trogus (Justinus), *Prologi* 41; cf. Tarn 1951, 270ff., Narain 1957, 101ff and 128ff. Both allow the Indo-Greeks a rump state in Badakshan on numismatic grounds, but see Bernard 1985a, 103ff.; further Dobbins 1971 and Bopparachchi 1990b, and the table at the end of this chapter. Some tombs of these nomad conquerors, with rich gold presents, have been found at Russo-Afghan excavations at Tillya Tepe (according to Sarianidi, Yuezhi, according to Pugačenkova and Rempel', Saka, see Bernard in *Abstracta Iranica* 10, 1987, 67ff.).

<sup>124</sup> Strabo 11, 11, 1 (Apollodorus F 7a) καὶ πλείω ἔθνη κατεστρέψαντο ἢ Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ μάλιστα Μένανδρος (εἶ γε καὶ τὸν Ὑπαννιν διέβη πρὸς ἔω, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰμάου [mss. better Ἰσάμου] προῆλθε) (the end quoted above on Demetrius); Pompeius Trogus, *Prol.* 41 *Indicae quoque res additae, gestae per Apollodotum et Menandrum, reges eorum*. To this can be added the rather legendary Indian evidence on Menander (Milinda) contained in the *Milindapañha*. On Apollodotus, see Tarn 1951, 140ff. and 162ff. (especially 165), further 317ff. on Apollodotus II. Narain 1957, 64ff. denied the existence of the first Apollodotus and criticized the emended text, but see Eggermont 1961, 173. On Menander, see Tarn 1951, 225ff., Narain 1957, 74ff. and Bopparachchi 1990a, on the *Milindapañha* most recently Fussman 1993.

<sup>125</sup> Plutarch, *Praecepta ger. reipublicae* 821DE.

<sup>126</sup> For the problems involved see also Guillaume 1990, 49f.

Menander to become a king first; there are many examples of Hellenistic princesses' marrying generals (Tarn himself mentions several). Therefore the upper limit is not valid.

As to the lower limit, Tarn supposes that Strato was born soon after the marriage. An interval of some years would, according to him, be "unlikely in that age". Why unlikely? While in a royal house the birth of a male heir was certainly desired, it was not always easy to achieve. It is quite possible that this heir, when at last born, already had several elder sisters. Furthermore, at that time there was no guarantee that the first prince would survive. Thus both limits vanish into thin air, and we have to find other means for establishing Menander's chronology. Unfortunately, this is not an easy task. To quote a recent author (Guillaume 1990, 77) "one will... have to come to terms with the idea that BIG [Bactrian-Indo-Greek] chronology cannot be known in detail."

Coins point to Agathocles' having occupied an important position,<sup>127</sup> though history completely ignores him. King Antialcidas is mentioned in the famous Besnagar Garuda Pillar inscription of Heliodorus of Taxila, his ambassador to Vidiśā.<sup>128</sup> On numismatic grounds Tarn makes the latter an Eucratid, and his rule seems indeed to have belonged to Gandhāra. A joint-coin seems to connect him with King Lysias (but see Narain).

With any certainty, we can hardly say more than that in the late period Greek rule was divided into two spheres, the Pañjab in the East, and Paropamisadae, for a while including Gandhāra, in the West. In the middle (Taxila) was already the Saka kingdom of Maues. Of the Greek rulers we have coins (e.g. the superb silver pieces of Amyntas), but no more. The kings are little more than mere names. Tarn and Narain agree in regarding Hippistratus as the last Greek king in the Pañjab or in Gandhāra,<sup>129</sup> and, somewhat later, Hermaeus (who was perhaps Hippistratus' son-in-law) in Paropamisadae.<sup>130</sup> The end, probably some time in the second half of the first century B.C. was brought by the Sakas and Parthians, who finally succeeded the Greek princes, and were then themselves succeeded by the mighty Kushans (Yuezhi). For their subjects the change was probably not particularly remarkable.

Without saying more, we shall here represent the widely differing ideas about the end of Greek rule in its various centres, in the form of a table:<sup>131</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Tarn 1951, 156ff. and Narain 1957, 59ff. On the much discussed issue of the so-called "pedigree coins", see now Holt 1984b.

<sup>128</sup> First published by Vogel 1909, see VI.5 below. On Antialcidas see e.g. Tarn 1951, 313ff., and Narain 1957, 116.

<sup>129</sup> Tarn 1951, 317ff., Narain 1957, 149f.

<sup>130</sup> Tarn 1951, 331ff., Narain 1957, 157ff. Oikonomides 1973 makes the nameless king, "Soter Megas", too, an Indo-Greek ruler, but fails to convince us of his point. Now Bopearachchi 1990b has changed this chronology (see table), and a recently found (1994) Hermaeus-Calliope coin overstruck by Artemidorus confirms the point (Bopearachchi 1995, 626).

<sup>131</sup> When not expressly stated otherwise, all dates are B.C.

VI. Greeks in the East

	Bactria	Paropamisadae	Gandhāra/ Taxila	Pañjab
Tarn 1951	Heliocles between 141/128	Hermaeus after 30	Archebius 80	Hippostratus & Nicias c. 40
Narain 1957	Eucratides II 130	Hermaeus 55 by Azes I	Telephus & Hippostratus 85	Strato II 75
Dobbins 1971	before 120	Hermaeus c. 115 (!)	Hippostratus c. 58	Zoilus, Apollo- phanes, Strato c. 35
Morton Smith 1978	?Heliocles 129	Hermaeus 29	Hippostratus 38	Strato II in Mathura 101/100
Bopearachchi 1991	Heliocles 129	Hermaeus 55 (?)	Archebius 85	Strato II 10/20 A.D.

Probably we should also pay some attention to the vexed question of the geographical extent of Greek rule in India. The widest extent for it was suggested by Tarn, who was consequently much criticized.<sup>132</sup> Narain and some other Indian scholars have tried to minimize its extent, again perhaps on insufficient evidence. In the East, Greek rule in the Pañjab seems certain, probably in Gujarat and Mathura too, but Pāṭaliputra was perhaps merely raided and then deserted.

4. Hellenism in the East

Now it is time to think about the position of the Graeco-Macedonian population and Hellenism in these Eastern kingdoms and their relations with the Iranian and Indian elements. There probably was an opposition between Greek *polis* (perhaps there were only a few! Ai Khanum is this far the only certain case) – the native *metropolis* (with Hellenistic influence; as in Taxila) – and the purely native countryside. We may well assume that interaction took place mainly in the cities, was reflected also in the metropolises, too, and resulted in a *Mischkultur* (and as such rightly styled Hellenistic, cf. the Introduction), while the countryside probably remained to a great extent intact.

The Greek element (including the Macedonian) in this Farther East was never very strong,<sup>133</sup> and, with the arrival of new waves from Central Asia, there soon began a

<sup>132</sup> Tarn 1951, 147ff. & 216 (in the southeast), 175f. (on Śuṅgas), 230ff. (on provinces).

<sup>133</sup> On the question of mixed population see Tarn 1951, 34ff.; on “hill Greeks” ib. 301f., on Indianization 387ff. Though Tarn was much influenced by the prejudiced, even racist ideas of his time, he

gradual process of de-Hellenization, which left only a few remaining influences of a more or less lasting character. They are seen especially in art and architecture. Gandhāran art can no longer be considered Indo-Roman, not after Surkh Kotal and other excavations in Bactria.<sup>134</sup> In the Kushan period the Greek alphabet was adapted to an Iranian language (so-called Bactrian) and thus had a long afterlife extending to the 9th century A.D., although the Greek language was soon wholly forgotten there. The system of government (of which we know very little) was apparently accepted, as we find some Greek titles (*strategos*, *meridarchos*, *anankaios*) still in use in the first century A.D.<sup>135</sup> Perhaps some religious elements were also accepted; due to the meagreness of the evidence it is rather difficult to say (see VI.7 below)

For a while, however, there were real Hellenistic cities in the Farther East. For some, at least, we have literary evidence.<sup>136</sup> For India there is not much direct evidence, but in Bactria the excavations have borne out what was surmised by Tarn (1951) and others from literary and numismatic evidence. The most important, and thus far only certain example of a Greek *polis* in Bactria is Ai Khanum on the left bank of the Oxus at the confluence of the Kokcha in Afghanistan. It seems to have contained all the requisite buildings and institutions of a Greek city.

In 1965–1978 French excavations uncovered the remains of Ai Khanum. The buildings have been roughly divided into two groups. Those specifically connected with Greek institutions and customs often closely follow Hellenistic models, while others are rather of an Iranian conception, often supplemented by Hellenistic columns.<sup>137</sup> The most important include a gymnasium (with a dedication to Hermes and Heracles)<sup>138</sup> and a Greek theatre,<sup>139</sup> both impossible to imagine without a considerable Greek population, further an acropolis and an arsenal,<sup>140</sup> a palace or administrative centre,<sup>141</sup> temples such as the

---

was right in assuming that intermarriage was widespread in Western Hellenism and therefore probably still more so in the distant East.

<sup>134</sup> Schlumberger 1961. Here it may be noted that Wheeler, who was one of the most authoritative proponents of the Indo-Roman hypothesis, yielded to the new evidence collected by Schlumberger. The clue given by Surkh Kotal was soon borne out by Ai Khanum, where early excavations rapidly yielded the first examples of pure Greek art in the Farther East. The whole question as well as his own viewpoint was summarized by Wheeler 1968, 149ff.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Tarn 1951, 358f. and VI.5 below.

<sup>136</sup> See Tarn 1951, 94, 118f., 159, 168, 243ff. On an erroneously surmised “Demetrias” in Sind (there was one in Afghanistan), see Tarn 1940b & 1951, 142 & 243, shown to be wrong by Johnston 1939. See also Mayrhofer 1991, who suggests an Iranian name (\*Dātamiθra alias \*Miθradāta) for the Mahābhāratan King Dattāmitra.

<sup>137</sup> These two types have been defined and the latter type analyzed by Bernard 1976b. See also the more general discussion of the architectural remains of Bactria and the relation between Hellenistic and Hellenizing types on the one hand and (the more important) Iranian/Bactrian type on the other hand, in Pichikyan 1996, 212ff.

<sup>138</sup> Bernard 1978, 421ff. & 1980a, 437, and especially Veuve 1987. To quote R. Boucharlat (note on Veuve 1987 in *Abstr. Ir.* 12, 1989, 51): “C’est l’un des meilleurs exemples de gymnase de tout le monde grec, par référence aux recommandations, postérieures, de Vitruve, et le plus sûr que l’on connaisse à l’est de l’Euphrate”.

<sup>139</sup> Bernard 1976a, 314ff. and 1978, 429ff. This find has led Bernard to re-open the old question of possible Western influence on Indian theatre (see also Tarn 1951, 381ff.).

<sup>140</sup> On both see Bernard 1980ab, on the acropolis and other fortifications also Leriche 1986.

Heroon of Kineas<sup>142</sup> and a temple of Iranian type,<sup>143</sup> further a necropolis outside the city (with Greek funerary inscriptions).<sup>144</sup> To these may be added a number of Greek inscriptions, Hellenistic-type pottery and Hellenistic works of art. Despite the criticism of Narain I agree with the French scholars that the site as an important centre of Hellenistic Bactria probably was the ancient Alexandria on the Oxus, originally founded by Alexander as a military colony, though the question seems to remain unresolved.<sup>145</sup> Its importance for the Graeco-Bactrian period is added to by the fact that it was destroyed during the nomad conquest and was only sparsely occupied in subsequent periods.

When we turn our attention to other excavated sites, the evidence of the Graeco-Bactrian period is much less, but still occasionally corroborates that of Ai Khanum. We begin the survey in ancient Bactria: The capital Bactra (modern Balkh, see Tam 1951, 114f.) has been excavated several times (the first archaeologist on the spot was Foucher in the 1920s), but has not been very rewarding. Much of ancient Bactra lies under the present city, and the finds are mostly from later periods. Qunduz to the south of Ai Khanum is famous for a major hoard of Graeco-Bactrian coins.<sup>146</sup> Several other famous sites of Afghanistan can here be passed over, as the finds are mainly from the Kushan period (or still later), so e.g. Bamiyan, Hadda, and Surkh Kotal.

To the west of Balkh lies Dilberjin, sometimes supposed to be the ancient Eucratidia of Ptolemy (6, 11, 8). Russian and Afghan archaeologists here unearthed in 1971–1977 a major temple of the Dioscuri. It was probably built in the late Graeco-Bactrian period, but subsequently enlarged and modified in Kushan times.<sup>147</sup> The “Great House” outside the (Kushan) walls of Dilberjin seems to have close parallels to some buildings of Ai Khanum.<sup>148</sup> As is often the case, the architecture here seems to be mainly Iranian, while a number of pieces of Hellenistic art have been found. At the neighbouring site of Djiga Tepe a Greek funerary inscription (see VI.5 below) and ceramic parallels prove that the first occupation here, too, belongs to the Greek period.<sup>149</sup>

Further interesting sites are known from former Soviet Middle Asia (Uzbekistan and Tadzhikistan). A site of special interest is Takht-i Sangin, situated on the right side of the

<sup>141</sup> Bernard et al. in Bernard 1973, 17ff., and Bernard 1976b, 252ff. & 1978, 444ff. & 1980a, 437ff. It is not Hellenistic (though ornated with Hellenistic columns), but has been compared to the Iranian palace in Susa and through it to Neo-Babylonian palaces.

<sup>142</sup> Bernard et al. in Bernard 1973, 85ff., cf. VI.8 below

<sup>143</sup> Various called the “temple à redans” and (since 1984) “temple à niches indentées”. Bernard 1972, 625ff., 1974, 295ff. & 1976b, 267ff., and on material finds Francfort 1984. Though furnished with Hellenistic columns and containing works of Hellenizing art, its closest parallels are found among Parthian temples in Dura-Europos and in Iran.

<sup>144</sup> Bernard 1972, 608ff.

<sup>145</sup> Narain 1987abc; Bernard 1982a & 1985a, 33ff.; Lyonnet 1996, 56f. Before Ai Khanum was found, Tam supposed that Termez was the site of Alexandria on the Oxus.

<sup>146</sup> Curiel & Fussman 1965.

<sup>147</sup> See e.g. Kruglikova 1977, and as the definitive publication Kruglikova 1986 (with notes by Bernard in *Abstr. Ir.* 10, 1987, 60ff.).

<sup>148</sup> Kruglikova & Pugačenkova, excavation report in 1977, according to Grenet, *Abstr. Ir.* 1, 1978, 24.

<sup>149</sup> Kruglikova 1977, 425f., on ceramics see Pidaev 1984.

Oxus (Amu Darya) at the confluence of its tributary Wakhsh (preserving the ancient name of the main river). Its remains were excavated by Russian archaeologists (B. A. Litvinskij and I. R. Pičikjan) in 1976–91.<sup>150</sup> The most important find here is the famous temple, testifying, with the votive statuette of Marsyas with a Greek inscription, to a cult of the river-god Oxus. The temple itself is entirely un-Greek in conception, but furnished with Greek architectural elements (such as Ionian columns and Greek altars). According to Pičikjan, it has actually contributed much to our understanding of Iranian fire temples. A river cult of the Oxus (Vaxšu) is probably local, Bactrian (Iranian), but it could easily have been adopted by the Greeks, too, who were convinced of the divine character of rivers.<sup>151</sup> The suggested dates of its foundation vary from the late fourth (Pičikjan) to the early third century B.C.,<sup>152</sup> and it was then used for many centuries. This magnificent edifice must therefore hail from the time of Seleucus I. Takht-i Sangin is an early site, which also gives a kind of archaeological context to the famous Oxus Treasure, found in the neighbourhood in the 19th century. In addition to the temple and the Hellenistic works of art found in it, the site has, however, yielded little, if anything, relating to Graeco-Bactrian history.<sup>153</sup>

Whilst most sites to the north of the Oxus (such as Termez, Saksan Okhur, Dalverzin Tepe and Khalčayan) have been extremely rich in Kushan antiquities, the share of Graeco-Bactrian finds has been rather meagre. Only recently have some ceramics similar to Ai Khanum been found at Termez.<sup>154</sup> Termez, on the right bank of the Oxus at the confluence of the Surkhan Darya, seems to be one of the ancient Antiochs.<sup>155</sup> Recent excavations in the far north, in ancient Sogdiana, at the site of Afrasiab or Old Samarkand have considerably added to our knowledge of the Hellenistic period.<sup>156</sup> The Hellenistic character of the mighty walls of Afrasiab is further proved by two Greek graffiti (see VI.5) and Ai Khanum-type ceramics. Hellenistic fortifications and Ai Khanum-type ceramics have been further reported from Khojent, the ancient Alexandria Eschate.<sup>157</sup>

<sup>150</sup> The excavations and their various finds have been described and discussed in several articles. See e.g. Litvinskij & Pichikyan 1980, 1981ab, Litvinskij & Vinogradov & Pičikjan 1985, Pichikyan 1987ab, 1996, and Bernard 1987b.

<sup>151</sup> For the most recent discussion see Pichikyan 1996, who, however, seems somewhat too positive about the complete absence of religious syncretism in Hellenistic Bactria. Such a view seems to be possible on the basis of the material evidence, but it seems inconceivable that the Greeks in Bactria would have ignored the Oxus. Even Alexander during his Indian campaigns did not neglect to worship local rivers. For the Hellenistic links of the cult see Bernard 1987b, 109f., for the altars Pichikyan 1987b, and for the characteristics of fire-temples Pichikyan 1987a. According to Grenet (*Abstr. Ir.* 14, 1991, 69), the temple of Ajrtam (18 km from Termez) has been compared with that of Takht-i Sangin.

<sup>152</sup> Bernard 1994, 507ff.

<sup>153</sup> As late as 1989, commenting on the 1988 season, Pičikjan (1989, 113ff.) had to state that Graeco-Bactrian remains still await discovery.

<sup>154</sup> Pidaev commented on by Bernard in *Abstr. Ir.* 11, 1988, 60f.

<sup>155</sup> Bernard 1982b, 235f.

<sup>156</sup> See e.g. Bernard 1985a, 138f. & 1990, 29ff., Chichkina 1986, and Rapin & Islamiddinov 1994.

<sup>157</sup> See Bernard in *Abstr. Ir.* 10, 1987, 56. In the 1980s the site was also known by its Soviet name Leninabad. See further *Abstr. Ir.* 11, 1988, 59 on Bokhara.

Turning to Arachosia, we may well suppose that Old Kandahar by the Arghandab River was the ancient Alexandria in Arachosia or the Alexandropolis of Stephanus and Isidorus,<sup>158</sup> founded on the site of an earlier Iranian settlement, which had been founded – according to archaeological evidence (including a fragment of an Elamite tablet) – in the first half of the first millennium B.C. Before the new foundation by Alexander it was probably called by an Iranian name corresponding to Arachotoi (Ἀραχωτοί), a name attested by Strabo (11, 8, 9), Pliny (*N. H.* 6, 25, 92) and Stephanus.<sup>159</sup> Its strategic location in a well-watered region in the middle of Arachosia and at the crossroads of ancient roads coming from Kabul and the Paropamisadae, from the Bolan Pass and Sind, and from Herat (Alexandria in Aria) and Seistan (Drangiana) has always added to its importance. Excavations carried out there have yielded Hellenistic buildings, such as temples, and some Greek epigraphy (see VI.5 below).<sup>160</sup> The Greek inscriptions of Aśoka found here prove that even so far to the east a considerable Greek population element existed from the days of Alexander on as there are no grounds for supposing colonization during the time of the immediate successors of Alexander, not to speak of the Mauryas. In the late 4th century it was probably the capital of the Arachosian satrap Sibyrtius. It seems likely that the Greeks occupied the place continuously until the Indo-Greek period, when its importance is testified to by finds of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek coins. In the first century B.C. Isidorus claimed that, though Arachosia as far as Alexandropolis and the Arachotos River (Arghandab) was under Parthian rule, the city was Hellenistic.<sup>161</sup> Isidorus further stated that the Parthians called Arachosia by the name “White India”, and the country seems always to have had close ties with the East as well as the West.<sup>162</sup>

The country of Paropamisadae was probably one of the most important Indo-Greek strongholds, especially after the fall of Bactria. Here Begram (Kapisa) on the plain of Kohdaman northeast of Kabul was an important centre with far-reaching trade relations (including the import of Hellenistic wares from the West as well as of Indian and Chinese trade articles).<sup>163</sup> It was the first major site excavated in Afghanistan, by Hackin and others in the 1930s. However, although we assume from literary evidence that the place was occupied as early as the early Achaemenid period, the excavated remains mainly belong to the Kushan period (including the import of Alexandrian wares) and very little from the Indo-Greek period has been found there (cf. II.5 above).<sup>164</sup>

<sup>158</sup> Tarn's hypothesis locating Alexandria in Arachosia in the region of Ghazni has been disproven by both archaeological and geographical evidence. See Wheeler 1967, 75ff., and Bernard 1974b.

<sup>159</sup> For the various names of ancient Kandahar see Bernard 1974b.

<sup>160</sup> About Kandahar and its excavations see Fischer 1967, Wheeler 1968, 75ff., and Vogelsang 1985. The English excavations in 1974–78 are summarized by Helms in *Afghan Studies* 3–4, 1982, 1–24 (not available to me, cf. Bernard in *Abstr. Ir.* 7, 1984, 37).

<sup>161</sup> Isidorus, *Mansiones Parthicae* 19 εἶτα Ἀλεξανδρόπολις, μητρόπολις Ἀραχωσίας· ἔστι δὲ Ἑλληνίς, καὶ παραρρεῖ αὐτὴν ποταμὸς Ἀραχωτὸς, ἄχρι τούτου ἔστιν ἡ τῶν Πάρθων ἐπικράτεια.

<sup>162</sup> See especially Vogelsang 1985.

<sup>163</sup> For Begram and its excavations see e.g. Hackin 1939 & 1954, Ghirshman 1946, Tarn 1951, 460ff., Wheeler 1954, 162ff. & 1968, 90ff., and Bernard 1982b.

<sup>164</sup> See Bernard 1974a, 1974b, 179ff. & 1982b for a somewhat different interpretation. Though denying the identity of Begram with Achaemenid Kapisa, he argued strongly for the site being

In present-day Pakistan the two best-known sites are Charsada and Taxila. Charsada was the ancient Puṣkalāvati, the Peucelaotis of Alexander (cf. II.5 above). It was excavated by Wheeler in 1958 and by Dani in 1963–64.<sup>165</sup> The site consists of several mounds, of which Bala Hisar has been identified as the Peucelaotis of Alexander and Shaikhan Deri as the Indo-Greek city, built according to a grid plan. The latter has yielded a number of Indo-Greek coins and some Hellenistic works of art. In the Kushan period the town was moved to a more eastern location. The neighbouring Peshawar (Puruṣapura) is a later (Kushan) foundation.

Taxila (Takṣaśilā), too, was visited by Alexander,<sup>166</sup> and excavations by Marshall and others have shown its continuous importance, which lasted long after the Indo-Greek period.<sup>167</sup> Though Taxila was never a Greek *polis*, it was nevertheless an important centre in the Indo-Greek period. Marshall's original interpretation of the different sites of Taxila as three successive towns – Achaemenid Bhir Mound, Hellenistic Sirkap and Kushan Sirkap – has been somewhat modified in more recent studies. While the beginning of occupation has been extended to a much earlier date by excavations of the Hathial mound, this new site, excavated in the 1980s, also seems to contain the remains of the Achaemenid Taxila, and the Bhir Mound belongs to the times of Alexander and the Mauryas and perhaps extends until the first century B.C. Sirkap is an Indo-Greek city with a Hellenistic town plan, fortifications, temples, architectural elements and material finds.<sup>168</sup> This was the city destroyed in the earthquake of 20/30 A.D. and described in the *Vita Apollonii* by Philostratus. As always, the change from Indo-Greek rule to Scythian and Parthian suzerainty is hardly noticeable in archaeological material, which remains Hellenistic or at least Hellenizing with a mixture of Iranian, Indian, and local elements.

The valley of Swat (cf. II.5 above) was a rich and flourishing land according to the historians of Alexander, and much later Chinese pilgrims testify to the same. The testimony of both groups of sources has also been amply proven by archaeology, even for a much earlier period. The Italian excavations were started here soon after the middle of the 1950s by G. Tucci, who also summarized their historical significance in his last major work (Tucci 1977). For a long time, however, the Swat excavations have been much more rewarding from the viewpoint of prehistoric (and Kushan) archaeology than of the Hellenistic and Indo-Greek period. But since the early 1980s we also have evidence for the period after Alexander. The few sherds with Greek letters will be discussed in VI.5 below. Here we may note the rampart of Bir-kot-Ghwindai (ancient Bazira), which, accord-

---

Alexandria and suggested that modern methods of excavation and analysis could have brought out more ancient levels.

<sup>165</sup> See Wheeler 1962 and 1968, 95ff., and for a recent summary Callieri 1995, 299f.

<sup>166</sup> See II.5 above and Callieri 1995, 302ff. The Greek name, Taxila, is discussed in II.3.

<sup>167</sup> On the position of Taxila and its excavations see e.g. Marshall 1951, Tarn 1951, 137, 179, 359ff., Wheeler 1968, 102ff., for a more recent interpretation Dar 1984, Dani 1986, Erdosy 1990, Karttunen 1990a and Callieri 1995, 294ff.

<sup>168</sup> On Sirkap in general, see Marshall 1951, 112ff. and Dani 1986, 88ff.; on Hellenistic elements Dar 1984 29ff., and Dani 1986 156ff. (all summarized in Karttunen 1990a, 91ff.).

ing to archaeologists, is of a purely Hellenistic type (cf. Afrasiab above). The site has also yielded some Western-type pottery and Indo-Greek coins.<sup>169</sup>

From literary and numismatic (and to some extent epigraphic) evidence we may surmise that there should be important Indo-Greek remains to the east of the Indus. Unfortunately, the Pañjab sites are still unexcavated, even unlocated. Here on a plain the rivers have often changed course, and the towns were mostly located by the rivers (as in the case of Alexander's Nicaea and Bucephala). Therefore we may sadly conclude that much valuable evidence has probably been washed away.

The most important Greek centre in the Pañjab was probably Śākala or Sāgala, the Greek Σάγαλα, Menander's capital.<sup>170</sup> Sāgala as the town of the Yonakas and Milinda's capital with its well-planned streets, crossroads and squares, its parks and waterworks, its strong walls, towers and moats is described at the beginning of the *Milindapañha*, although the description is rather formal and cannot be much relied on. The town is also mentioned in further Pāli, Sanskrit and Chinese sources. Ptolemy (7, 1, 46) located it at the Bidaspes and gave it an alternative name, which has called forth much discussion. The manuscript variants listed by Renou contain Εὐθύδη, Εὐθημία, Εὐθυμηδία, and Εὐθυμέδεια, the first hailing from what is commonly considered the best manuscript. Tarn argued strongly for Εὐθυμηδία, which he derived from a supposed original Εὐθυμέδεια, but his argument involving entirely conjectural Indo-Greek poetry is hard to accept.<sup>171</sup> Even though Euthydimeia in Nonnus 26, 338, is just a modern emendation for the Eristobareia (Ἐριστοβάρεια) of the manuscript tradition,<sup>172</sup> Bayer's emended form Euthydemia (Εὐθυδημία) for Ptolemy seems to me to have sufficient manuscript support to be accepted, as it is accepted by Renou in his edition.

In this connection we may note that there are perhaps some Western literary allusions to Indo-Greek art, which can be dated to the first century A.D. These are contained in the *Vita Apollonii* by Flavius Philostratus, and in spite of their possible fictitious nature they cannot be overlooked. Some coincidences with the archaeological evidence have been found in his description of Taxila.<sup>173</sup> These archaeological parallels are restricted to architecture, but Philostratus further described reliefs made of various metals on bronze plates in a temple, which are not preserved. The critical attitude of Smith<sup>174</sup> seems to me

<sup>169</sup> See II.5 above.

<sup>170</sup> II.5 above, Fleet 1906, Tarn 1951, 486ff., Narain 1957, 172f. and Law 1969

<sup>171</sup> Tarn 1951, 247f. & 486ff. Tarn's view (in his first edition of 1938) was well criticized by Keith 1940, 220f.

<sup>172</sup> The recent Budé edition of Nonnus by Vian does not even mention such an emendation, and the other editions available to me (Keydell, Ludwich, and Loeb) all read Ἐριστοβάρεια. In his note to this verse Vian approvingly notes Koechly's emendation Ἐριστοβάθρα and compares this to Ἐριστοβάθρα of Ptolemy 7, 1, 57 (in the Indus region). This latter has been identified by Dey (*Dict.*) with Ariṣṭapura (indicated in Pāṇini 6, 2, 100), Pāli (Jātaka) Ariṣṭhapura, the city of Sivi (or the Śibis).

<sup>173</sup> See Marshall 1951, 63f., 139f., 175f. & 227.

<sup>174</sup> Smith 1914, 336ff. He still supposed that the Hellenization of Northwest India was always extremely slight, but later archeological finds have shown his viewpoint to be more or less erroneous.

somewhat erroneous. These reliefs are said to describe Alexander's Indian campaigns,<sup>175</sup> and to be dedicated by Porus himself after the death of Alexander. Unlike Smith I think we can partly accept Philostratus' account without believing that they were actually made in the fourth century B.C. Alexander's exploits were certainly a familiar subject in easternmost Hellenism, and most probably the Indian campaigns were also depicted here. In the middle of the first century A.D., Indo-Greek reliefs in Taxila might have been as much as two centuries old. Their real origin might have been forgotten, and a still greater antiquity supposed instead. If this was the cause, Philostratus' source could sincerely have related that he saw such pictures. It is also possible that the part mentioning Porus himself was added by Philostratus, who certainly knew that his readers wished to hear reminiscences of Alexander and were not interested at all in the nearly forgotten Indo-Greeks.

A related error is made by Smith concerning the elephant Ajax living in Taxila.<sup>176</sup> It is quite possible that the elephant was indeed there, that it was *said* by the local people to be the elephant of Porus and therefore approx. 350 years old. As we have seen (V.3), elephants were often ascribed much too high an age, and while we may accuse Philostratus and his source of credulity, this does not mean that the apparent eye-witness account of Taxila is therefore false (as supposed by Smith). Philostratus himself knew from what he apparently had good reasons to consider a reliable and well-informed source that African elephants were supposed to reach an age of 400 years<sup>177</sup> and had therefore no reason to doubt his source about Ajax.

There seem to be further Hellenistic works of art mentioned in Philostratus' account of India. The battlefield of Alexander and Porus by the Hydaspes is said to be marked by triumphal arches or gates (πύλαι) with statues of Alexander and Porus. We are also told that the altars of Alexander were still to be seen by the Hyphasis,<sup>178</sup> and that they were accompanied by a brass column (στήλη) and two Greek inscriptions.<sup>179</sup>

All these could well be real, but without further evidence we must leave the question open. While it is certainly true that Philostratus derived much from existing literature on India, it is also quite clear that he had a strong tendency to depict his Indians (even the sages!) as totally Hellenized.<sup>180</sup> And in any case, the *Vita Apollonii* contains a suspiciously high proportion of material that cannot be true.

However, Philostratus is not our only textual authority on Hellenistic remains in the Farther East. The *Periplus* (41 and 47) refers to Greek remains in Ariake and even in Barygaza. In the former passage, old temples, foundations of camps and large wells are

---

Gandhāra art was certainly not produced only by artists imported by the Kushans from the Hellenistic Near East. See also Charpentier 1934, 49.

<sup>175</sup> *V. Ap.* 2, 20 χαλκοῖ γὰρ πίνακες... γεγραμμένοι τὰ Πόρου τε καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα.

<sup>176</sup> *V. Ap.* 2, 12, See further Tarn 1951, 164, with a note on p. 527, and Charpentier 1934, 45f.

<sup>177</sup> Juba F 50 quoted in *V. Ap.* 2, 13.

<sup>178</sup> Gates in *V. Ap.* 2, 42, altars 2, 43. On the original altars see II.4 above.

<sup>179</sup> Plutarch, *Al.* 62, 7f. claimed that Alexander's altars were still revered by the kings of the Praesii, who offered them sacrifices in the Hellenistic manner. Perhaps this was another reminiscence of the Indo-Greeks as it seems very unlikely that the Prasians were following Hellenistic cults and offering sacrifice to Alexander.

<sup>180</sup> See Hopfner 1934.

mentioned in the area of Minnagar, and they were thought to be memorials to Alexander's campaigns. This, of course, is unlikely, but in order to be interpreted in this way the remains probably must have been Hellenistic. Just as in Philostratus' description of Taxila we cannot here deny the possibility of Indo-Greek remains reinterpreted in this way. In Barygaza, says the *Periplus*, the old coins of Apollodotos and Menander were still in circulation.

In addition to Hellenistic art and coins, the Greeks in the East must necessarily have had Greek literature. Unfortunately, Tarn's so-called arguments for it in Menander's kingdom are, to say the least, highly doubtful.<sup>181</sup> Of *Indo-Greek* literature we still have no evidence at all,<sup>182</sup> but still I think Tarn would have been happy with the direct evidence we now have for Greek literature in Bactria. The excavations at Ai Khanum have shown that Greek literature existed in Hellenistic Bactria, and we may suppose that it was probably also read on the other side of the Hindukush. Two easily identifiable Gandhāra reliefs depict scenes of the Trojan War.<sup>183</sup> It is still possible that Dio's famous remark on Homer's being read in India might be a veiled account of the *Mahābhārata*, but it could as well refer to literary activities among Indo-Greeks.<sup>184</sup> We can hardly imagine a Greek library without a copy of Homer. And though we cannot follow Tarn in all his conclusions, Plutarch's reference to Sophocles and Euripides being read in Gedrosia,<sup>185</sup> brought together with the Greek theatre excavated at Ai Khanum and the remains of a manuscript of a Greek drama at the same site, may well be true.

Although all evidence of the Graeco-Bactrians and Indo-Greeks is meagre, we know that they had connections both with the Hellenistic West and with India. Much less is known in other directions. Strabo (11, 11, 1, from Apollodorus) claims that the Bactrian Greeks annexed the Seres and Phryni. It is, of course, impossible that the Seres here could denote the Chinese as in later classical literature. After all, the name Seres could perhaps merely denote people trading in silk, without any definite ethnic significance. Perhaps they were a people of Central Asia.<sup>186</sup>

<sup>181</sup> Tarn 1951, 245ff., criticism in Keith 1940, 220ff.

<sup>182</sup> For a *Graeco-Bactrian* literature we can at least note the funerary epigram at Djiga Tepe, though the works found in the manuscript remains of Ai Khanum were probably brought from the West.

<sup>183</sup> The first was originally published in the twenties (Hargreaves 1924) and successfully identified first by Vogel in an anonymous survey (in *ABIA* 2, 1929, 6f.), then by Allan (1946, independently also Hansen 1951). Despite Foucher 1950 and Rosu 1958 its content seems to me wholly clear. The second has only recently been published and analysed by Khan 1990. See further Bernard 1971, 433, for a plaster work with a Trojan theme found at Ai Khanum.

<sup>184</sup> Dio Chrysostomus 53, 6f. (with Aelianus, *V. H.* 12, 48). Indian epics suggested by Weber 1853. See also Tarn 1951, 379f. To be exact, both reliefs depict the last phase of the Trojan War (the stratagem with the wooden horse), which was not described in the *Iliad*, but in one of the Cyclic epics. A similar ruse with a wooden elephant is known in Indian literature.

<sup>185</sup> *De Alex. virt.* 1, 5, 328D. The place-name here is probably a general literary indication of the Farther East, not an exact geographical indication.

<sup>186</sup> Herrmann 1938 identified the Phryni (or Phauni) as Xiongnu (Hiung-nu, Huns), Seres as the inhabitants of the Tarim basin, who dealt in Chinese silk. See also Herrmann 1910, Tarn 1951, 84ff., 109ff. & 474ff., and Narain 1957, 170f.

For Tarn (1951, 79) it was still easy to see the frontier as a barrier of civilization against the hordes of barbarian nomads. Now we see that the relation was a more complicated one. There were wars, of course, but also peaceful contact, commerce and interaction. At the end of the second century B.C. a new factor interposed, when the first Chinese expedition arrived in Bactria (114 B.C.), then already ruled by the Yuezhi.<sup>187</sup> It is quite possible that the Indo-Greeks had made an attempt to extend their power to the northeast in order to gain control of what was later to become the famous Silk Route.<sup>188</sup> Even when direct connection with, and even knowledge of, China was still non-existent, trade was certainly flourishing through middlemen.

We see that around the first centuries B.C. and A.D. the knowledge of Central Asian geography contains some new elements (in Strabo, Mela, and Pliny).<sup>189</sup> In some cases (Strabo) this information is ascribed to Apollodorus, and it may be that more of it comes from him. In any case it rather originates in the Indo-Greek period than in the contemporary commercial ventures, which soon reached China proper and are only reflected in Ptolemy.<sup>190</sup>

The rule of the Indo-Greeks left very few visible traces, and soon their very existence was nearly forgotten in India as well as in the West. As we have seen, what is preserved, is only scanty references in a few history books. The most curious, however, is Chaucer's "grete Emetrëus, the kyng of Inde".<sup>191</sup> Could there really have survived until so late a period some tradition no longer known to us. At the opposite end Menander had as King Milinda conversing with the Buddhist saint Nāgasena a long afterlife in India and in Buddhist tradition.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Tarn 1951, 274ff., on the account of Bactria ib. 198f. Also Narain 1957, 135ff.

<sup>188</sup> On Chinese trade, Tarn 1951, 363f. As this extends well beyond the period dealt with in the present study, its full discussion is reserved for the next volume.

<sup>189</sup> On the two latter cf. Herrmann 1938, 46f.

<sup>190</sup> Some knowledge of China, however, must perhaps be allowed to Latin geographers, as I find it impossible to believe with Herrmann (1938, 33 & 47) that their *Oceanus Sericus* could be a confused account of Lake Issyk-kul. Who has ever heard of a lake with moderate dimensions having been mistaken for an ocean?

<sup>191</sup> See Tarn 1951, 154, Bivar 1950 (not wholly convincing) and Narain 1957, 37f.

<sup>192</sup> Tarn 1951, 267f., now Fussman 1993.

5. Easternmost Greek Epigraphy

The purpose of this chapter is to attempt a survey of the epigraphic evidence on Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history – Greek as well as Indian.<sup>193</sup> First we take the Greek (and other Western) inscriptions found in the easternmost regions, where the presence of Hellenism and of the Greek language was felt. Geographically this includes the Indo-Iranian borderlands and Central Asia, in modern terms, Afghanistan, Pakistan, easternmost Iran, Uzbekistan, and Tadzhikistan. Iran proper – including Parthia – is excluded.

In Greek epigraphy this area was for long a completely white speck. In 1938, when both literary and numismatic evidence for the history of Greeks in Bactria and India had already been known for two hundred years, Tam (in the first edition of Tam 1951) still had to conclude that not a single Greek inscription had been found. He lived long enough to see the first find, though only a small sherd, and could wisely point out that even at such an important Hellenistic site as Susa the excavations continued for years before Greek inscriptions were found. In the Farther East, the sensational finds at Ai Khanum have given entirely new dimensions to our idea of Hellenistic Bactria. And probably Ai Khanum was not the only place where the Greek presence was felt, though the epigraphic harvest of other sites is rather meagre. Still, our half-a-dozen finds in different parts of the Graeco-Bactrian/Indo-Greek area, chronologically extending from c. 300 B.C. to 200 or 300 A.D add considerably to our understanding of this chapter in history.

A particular point of interest in Greek epigraphy lies in the fact that it is (with the total lack of really significant literary sources) our only reliable means of tracing the extent to which the Greek language was used and understood in this Hellenistic Farther East. We know that artistic inspiration easily crosses linguistic boundaries, and nothing short of a full Hellenistic *polis* of the kind we actually have in Ai Khanum is of any value as evidence in this respect. Another source for the linguistic situation are coins, although one cannot always deduce from a coin legend that its language was in actual spoken use. However, the fact that the language in eastern coin legends develops from good Hellenistic usage into ungrammatical jargon before giving way to the Iranian Bactrian language, gives interesting hints for linguistic history (see VI.6 below).

The survey of GB/IG epigraphy is somewhat hampered by the fact that the material is not easily available. From the 6th volume of the *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum*<sup>194</sup> we learn that the edition prepared by Louis Robert for the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* is to be completed, after the death of Robert, by Bernard and Pouilloux, but for a while we are left with dispersed notes in various archaeological publications. I have tried to collect as many as I can find.<sup>195</sup>

<sup>193</sup> This chapter consists of revised versions of two papers both published in SAA, viz. Karttunen 1993 and 1994.

<sup>194</sup> Bernard 1987a, 112, note 1, and 1987b, 111.

<sup>195</sup> See also MacDowall & Taddei in Allchin & Hammond 1978, 191ff., Vinogradov in Litvinskij & Vinogradov & Pičikjan 1985, 94ff., and Schmitt 1990.

For the present purpose, it seems feasible to divide the material into four different categories: 1. Monumental and funerary inscriptions; 2. other inscriptions of a sedentary character; 3. inscriptions on easily movable objects; and 4. single sherds.

The most important, but also the rarest category thus consists of monumental and funerary inscriptions. It is in their nature that they were inscribed *in situ* and therefore can provide proof of a degree of linguistic knowledge at the time of their origin. There are some splendid examples of this kind which have become quite well known among scholars. First and foremost comes, of course, Ai Khanum, a regular Hellenistic *polis* with its municipal buildings and institutions, and consequently also with appropriate inscriptions. Robert's original dates in the middle of the third century B.C. have later met well-founded criticism, and perhaps some of these inscriptions belong only to the second century B.C.<sup>196</sup> Nevertheless, they testify in favour of a strong Greek presence in Ai Khanum, which well corresponds to the archaeological evidence. These monumental inscriptions include the Clearchus inscription with the fragmentary copy of the maxims originally inscribed at Delphi and also attested in the West both epigraphically and in literature. In his bold hypothesis Robert ascribed this to the well-known Peripatetic philosopher and traveller Clearchus of Soloi.<sup>197</sup> Another important inscription is the dedication by Strato's sons, Strato and Triballos.<sup>198</sup> From the necropolis outside the municipal area come a series of brief funerary inscriptions.<sup>199</sup>

But there are important inscriptions of this kind elsewhere, too. Ai Khanum was clearly a *polis* with Hellenistic government, and the use of Greek was somehow obvious there, but the same cannot be said of Arachosia, which was ruled by the Mauryas. However, as we have seen, it was thought useful enough to translate at least some of the Aśokan edicts into Greek and inscribe them on stone. Two Greek inscriptions by this Indian monarch have been found in Kandahar, and in addition, several in Aramaic, the old official language of the Achaemenid Empire (see VI.2 above). Even on the Indian (Arachosian) side of the Hindukush there were, even before the advent of Bactrian Hellenism, people who could read Aśoka's words in Greek, and also one or more persons who could translate these words into good Greek.

There is further one dedicatory inscription from Kandahar, which has been the cause of some speculation. Unfortunately, this metric piece is preserved in too poor a state to really justify the conclusion that it was dedicated to Alexander himself as the founder-hero of the Greek settlement. The hypothesis is a tempting one, but the emendations needed to

<sup>196</sup> Robert 1968 (also in Bernard 1973), Narain 1987a, b & c, Bernard 1987a.

<sup>197</sup> Published in Robert 1968 (also in Bernard 1973). Schmitt 1990, 56, accepts the Clearchus hypothesis "ohne Zweifel". The hypothesis of Yailenko 1990, supposing direct influence of the Delphic maxims on the ethics of Aśoka, I find quite unlikely and speculative.

<sup>198</sup> Robert 1968 (also in Bernard 1973). It is interesting to note that one of the brothers bears a Thracian name, Triballus, while the other is a namesake of the later Indo-Greek king. There were Thracians in the Farther East at the very beginning of the Hellenistic period. Arrianus, *Anab.* 6, 15, 2 tells us that Alexander left his Thracian troops to serve under Philip, the satrap of north-western India.

<sup>199</sup> Bernard 1972, 618 and 622. Bernard 1987b, 113 refers to an unpublished funerary epigram from Ai Khanum.

support it go much too far.<sup>200</sup> We do not know who the god was, and neither do we have the name of the dedicator, the son of Aristonax in the city (of Alexandria/Kandahar). The inscription has been dated somewhat earlier than those of Aśoka (c. 270 B.C.).

Another interesting metric inscription was found by the Soviet–Afghan joint excavations at the Djiga Tepe site near Dilberjin, 40 km to the northwest of Balkh. In the preliminary publication only a few words were explained of this fragmentary inscription,<sup>201</sup> and Robert in his *Bulletin épigraphique* only briefly noted its metric character. In fact, the good photograph published by Mrs. Kruglikova allowed us to read nearly everything that is preserved and showed clearly that it is most probably a funerary epigram. All this is now confirmed by the complete interpretation by Yu. Vinogradov, who dates it around 200 B.C.<sup>202</sup>

To these we may perhaps add two finds of rock inscriptions, which do not really belong to GB/IG epigraphy. A fragment of a monumental inscription in the magnificent Kushan temple at Surkh Kotal, in the Bactrian language, concludes with the Greek words δία Παλαμηδου.<sup>203</sup> We cannot really say who this Palamedes was. He seems to have been a Greek working for the Kushans; was he a Bactrian or Indian Greek (or at least bearing a Greek name) or had he come from the Hellenistic West?<sup>204</sup>

A recent find has revealed some new rock inscriptions from the northwestern corner of ancient Bactria, the Kara-Kamar caves in Uzbekistan, near the Turkmenian border. They include – in addition to later Arabic ones – several Bactrian, one short Greek and two Latin inscriptions. The importance of this find is enhanced by the fact that previously the easternmost Latin inscriptions were only found in the Caucasus. And in addition, these Kara Kamar inscriptions seem to have a clear and interesting historical context. One of the Latin inscriptions mentions the Roman XV or Apollinaris legion, and the other probably contains a dedication to Mithra. The fifteenth legion, which was otherwise too connected with the Mithra cult, was defeated by the Parthians in Armenia in 66 A.D., and many soldiers were taken prisoner. Perhaps some of them entered Bactria and bequeathed to us these Latin testimonies. The Greek inscription is very short and of the type met everywhere as graffiti. It states only “Ripos made (me)”.<sup>205</sup> Of the position of the Greek language in Bactria these inscriptions tell us nothing.

<sup>200</sup> Oikonomides 1984, criticized by Schmitt 1990, 51f. For another bold interpretation, see Peek 1985, who at least noted the metric character of the inscription.

<sup>201</sup> Kruglikova 1977.

<sup>202</sup> Litvinskij & Vinogradov & Pičikjan 1985, 99, also quoted in Bernard 1987b, 112f. Serdityh & Košelenko (1987, 246) refer to Kruglikova, who (in *Drevnjaja Baktirija* 2, 1979, 74f.) suggested that it was a dedication, but emphasize themselves its funerary character on the basis of external evidence. This seems to be confirmed by the text itself, where the first line can probably be restored as οἶος ἄνευ θα[νάτου...

<sup>203</sup> Curiel 1954, 194ff.

<sup>204</sup> See Bernard's notes in *Abstr. Ir.* 7, 1984, 35 on P. M. Fraser, “Palamedes at Baglan”, *Afghan Studies* 3–4, 1982, 77f. (unavailable to me).

<sup>205</sup> Published and discussed by Rtveldze 1990 and Ustinova 1990, but see also the sceptical notes by F. Grenet in *Abstr. Ir.* 14, 1991, 75.

Our second group includes so-called economic texts of Ai Khanum, and here also belong the important literary remains found at the same place. The latter contain remains of two manuscripts, one on papyrus and one on parchment, both found in a small room in the palace area. According to C. Rapin, the room must have been a library. The first is well enough preserved to allow an identification as a passage from a philosophical dialogue, although its exact nature cannot be defined. It would be tempting to think of it as Peripatetic – which is possible – and thus connect it with Clearchus of the Delphi inscription. Another, consisting of two fragments in a very poor state of preservation, seems to belong to some dramatic piece.<sup>206</sup> Together they splendidly corroborate the evidence of the Delphi inscription and show that even Greek literature was known and understood in this sole Hellenistic *polis* so far excavated in the area (or, at least, shown to be such by excavations). While the manuscripts themselves were perhaps imported from the West, they were evidently read and understood here. The conservation of these remains was a great feat of archaeological techniques and it is a source of great regret to hear that further similar remains were waiting for conservation when the political situation compelled all work at Ai Khanum to cease. These, like so much else at Ai Khanum and in Afghanistan in general, were later destroyed.<sup>207</sup>

The so-called economic texts of Ai Khanum offer valuable information about the trade, economy, metrology and onomastics (cf. VI.7) of Hellenistic Bactria, about the constant interrelationship between the various civilizations and ethnic elements represented here, but also about the strong position of Greek even on the level of everyday life.<sup>208</sup> On the other hand, there is no material at all belonging to this second group with certain provenance in sites other than Ai Khanum.

However, we must here note a piece of parchment found in Afghanistan (according to the seller in Sangcharak, west of Balkh) and sold on the black market to a collector, who kindly let P. Bernard examine and publish it. It is a document of a financial and religious character written in Greek and dated according to the Macedonian calendar in the month of Olôios. The year – 4 – Bernard dates according to the era of Eucratides (c. 170 B.C.). Five personal names are mentioned, all purely Greek: Antimachus (twice), Eumenes, Menodotus, Demonax, and Diodorus.<sup>209</sup>

Our third group is more difficult. Here we must first consider whether the objects bearing Greek inscriptions or labels were made, or at least inscribed, locally or just brought from the West by way of commerce. It is evident that we cannot pay much attention to such things as the pieces of jewellery found at the Tillya Tepe excavations and containing a Western-style image of Athena and Greek letters indicating the name.<sup>210</sup> Such finds can be and actually have been found in places where a Greek-speaking population is clearly out of the question.

<sup>206</sup> Rapin & Hadot 1987. It is one of the oldest extant manuscript remains on parchment.

<sup>207</sup> Bernard 1987b, 111, note 23.

<sup>208</sup> Edited by Rapin 1983. See also Bernard 1985a, 99ff., and Narain 1987bc.

<sup>209</sup> Announced in Bernard 1994, 509f., edited and discussed in Bernard & Rapin 1994, and again in Rea & Senior & Hollis 1994. The document is now kept in the Ashmolean Museum.

<sup>210</sup> Sarianidi 1985, 53.

There is only one example in this group that really matters: the inscribed statuette found at Takht-i Sangin in Northern Bactria, now Tadjikistan. The site is also otherwise remarkable for its Hellenistic remains. The statuette itself with its Silenus or Marsyas figure is Hellenistic and not particularly linked to its eastern place of discovery. The inscription, however, is a dedication to the river-god Oxus, and the dedicator bears the Iranian name Atrosoces. Otherwise the short inscription is in good Greek. Vinogradov dates it to the first half of the second century B.C., before the nomad conquest of Bactria, while Bernard argues for the possibility of a slightly later date.<sup>211</sup>

In the fourth group we meet the same difficulty as in the third one. In most cases it is still aggravated by the fragmentary state of the inscriptions, which in any case are mostly very short. Often we are not even able to say with certainty whether a particular inscription is written in Greek or in Bactrian. Another difficulty is to say whether a sherd with perhaps only a few letters contains the remains of an inscription belonging to the original vessel (like the Ai Khanum economic texts) or is part of a larger piece used as an ostrakon. On the other hand, our scanty list of places of discovery of easternmost Greek epigraphy is much enlarged by such sherds. Therefore they cannot be discarded.

The very first piece with Greek letters – in addition to coins – found in the Hellenistic Far East was the sherd found in 1947 at Nimlik Tepe, 35 km west of Balkh. It contains the Greek letters .]ATPOC.<sup>212</sup> At the beginning the remnant of a preceding letter is seen and the end is cut off abruptly. It could be anything, e.g. part of a name (Atrosoces would be too much to expect).

There are several sherds found at the Ai Khanum excavations which we may presently pass over, as there is so much more important evidence from the site.<sup>213</sup> From Afghanistan comes further a short fragment from Emshi Tepe containing the initial letters ΔΙΟ[,<sup>214</sup> perhaps of a Greek name.<sup>215</sup>

In the far north, at Afrasiab (Old Samarkand) in Sogdiana, a sherd with the name Nicias was found in the 1970s and a more recent find contains the letters KTHC, perhaps again part of a personal name.<sup>216</sup>

At the western end of our area, Italian excavations in Seistan have produced at least seven inscribed sherds, one with remnants of a long inscription. It contains some 12 or 13 lines but only six are partly legible. At least it is clearly written in Greek.<sup>217</sup>

In the east, Italian excavations (again) in Swat have brought to light, in the form of three short fragments, our only examples of Greek epigraphy from Pakistan (from India

<sup>211</sup> Litvinskiy & Pichikyan 1980, 1981a & b, Litvinskiy & Vinogradov & Pičikjan 1985, see also Bernard 1987b, 110ff., and Harmatta 1994, 407. The text (with accents added) runs Εὐχὴν ἀνέθηκεν Ἀτροσώκης Ὀξῆφ.

<sup>212</sup> Schlumberger 1947.

<sup>213</sup> See e.g. Schlumberger & Bernard 1965, 663f. (also Bernard 1973, 171ff.) and Bernard 1971, 432.

<sup>214</sup> See Rapin 1983, 316 (note 5).

<sup>215</sup> See Harmatta 1994, 408 for two sherds from the Kushan period found at Dilberjin, which he tentatively interprets as highly abbreviated accounts of the contents of the amphoras (sesame oil).

<sup>216</sup> Bernard 1985a, 139 & 1994, 510f.

<sup>217</sup> Pugliese Carratelli 1966, 34f.

there are none). One (from Bir-kot Ghwandai) contains just one letter,<sup>218</sup> another (from Udegram) the three letters NOY. This again might be part of a personal name; there is no reason, at least, to expect a philosophical term like νοῦς on a potsherd.<sup>219</sup> The third sherd, from the Bir-kot Ghwandai site, contains remnants of two lines, and though lacking whole words, it has a definitely Greek appearance (with ΔH and YNTA).<sup>220</sup>

Further to the east, India has virtually nothing to add to our survey. Her share in Western epigraphy consists only of stamps on imported Italian amphoras – at Arikamedu and Mathura<sup>221</sup> – and a few other imports.<sup>222</sup>

To round off our survey, there are a few rock-inscriptions reported further east in Central Asia that closely resemble Greek letters.<sup>223</sup> But as far as I can judge, they do not make any sense in Greek, and their location distant from any area of Hellenistic influence – in Kirghizistan, in Altai and perhaps even further into the northeast – makes it rather unlikely that we are here dealing with genuine Greek inscriptions.

From the Aramaic versions of Aśokan edicts found at various sites in Afghanistan (Laghman and Kandahar) and Pakistan (Taxila) as well as from the existence of the Kharoṣṭhī script clearly based on Aramaic a certain knowledge of this chancellery language of the Achaemenid Empire in Bactria and Northwest India in the Hellenistic period can be deduced. To this can be added at least one Aramaeo-Iranian ostrakon found at Ai Khanum (and apparently containing several Iranian names).<sup>224</sup>

Fifty years ago there was not a single inscription in Greek letters found in the area of easternmost Hellenism. Everything was open to speculation. Later, the splendid finds at Ai Khanum have in many ways revolutionized our conceptions. Epigraphically, too, it is by far the most important site, but we have seen that the Greek language was also used elsewhere, and future excavations are likely to enrich our epigraphic material.

There was a time when the whole of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history was viewed more or less from an Indian viewpoint, Bactria being still an archaeological *terra incognita*. Since then new finds have shifted the focus to Bactria, and this is also where

<sup>218</sup> Callieri in Faccenna et al. 1984, 488 and fig. 14 on p. 499. New figure in Callieri 1990, 678 (Fig. 1.7) shows it clearly as *N*.

<sup>219</sup> Pugliese Carratelli 1966, 35f.

<sup>220</sup> Callieri 1984. The tentative interpretation suggested by Harmatta 1994, 408 – [Εὐθου]δῆ[μω/ 'Αμ]ύντα[ς] – is possible, but far from certain.

<sup>221</sup> On Mathura see Džošī & Sinha 1990 and Joshi & Sinha 1991.

<sup>222</sup> Such as some Western terracottas with Greek inscriptions found in Bengal (Das Gupta 1960, 390). Unfortunately they have never been properly edited, and the notes of Das Gupta only convey his ignorance of Greek. Similar finds are reported further to the east (even in China), but as they are clearly imports, they have little relevance to our present discussion.

<sup>223</sup> In Kirghizistan (Amanžolov 1965), and in Altai (Nadeljajev 1984, 103). The short Kirghizian inscription was actually read in Greek (not very convincingly) by its editor, and the Altai inscription seems very much like Greek, but makes no sense. In any case Greek seems to be out of question for a third inscription reported from Siberia, west of Lake Baikal (Okładnikov & Zaporožkaja 1959, pl. xlii, n. 857). The latter one might also be in Cyrillic letters, but the Altai inscription is certainly not.

<sup>224</sup> Bernard 1971, 432 & 1972, 631f., Allchin & Hammond 1978, 199. For Aramaic used in Bactrian coin legends see Widemann 1989.

most of our epigraphic material originates. Beginning with the colonies founded by Alexander, ancient Bactria and Arachosia had, in addition to local ethnic groups, a considerable Greek (Hellenistic) population (including Macedonians, Thracians and other Hellenized elements from the West) following more or less traditional Greek ways of living but also exchanging ideas and accepting influence from local traditions in the good Hellenistic manner (which included intermarriage). But even here Greeks were an urban minority, and further to the east (which also means, later in history) their position (and number) grew still less. In accordance with this, our only Greek inscriptions from Pakistan come from Swat, and the country east of the Indus has yielded nothing relevant to our survey.<sup>225</sup>

\* \* \*

Now it is time to turn our attention to Indian epigraphy and give a summary of such testimonies in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions which deal with or are supposed to be dealing with Greeks. It seems reasonable to discuss all epigraphic evidence in a single chapter, though it does not always refer to the Indo-Greeks.

At the beginning comes, of course, Aśoka, but as the evidence has been well known for more than 150 years and as there is no end of studies discussing his inscriptions I can pass over him briefly (cf. also VI.2 above). In the R. E. II an *aṃṭiyoka yonalājā* is referred to, and the comparison with R. E. XIII shows beyond doubt that Antiochus must be meant. In this latter edict no fewer than five Western kings are mentioned, Antiochus and four others besides him: *aṃṭiyoke nāma yonalājā palaṃ ca tenā aṃṭiyokenā catāli lājāne tulamaye nāma (ca) aṃṭekine nāma (ca) makā nāma (ca) alikasudale nāma*. As early as the 1830s these names were identified by James Prinsep as Antiochus II Theos of the Seleucids, Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt, Antigonus of Macedonia, Magas of Cyrene, and Alexander of Epirus. It cannot be seriously questioned that these third-century Hellenistic rulers were meant.<sup>226</sup> It also seems clear that the title *yonalājā* can be translated as a Greek king or king of the Greeks.<sup>227</sup>

In another passage of the same R. E. XIII we learn that among the Yonas there are no other classes than the Brāhmaṇas and the Śramaṇas. As there are no such classes in the West, the Greek population of Arachosia must be meant, the same for whom the Greek edicts of Kandahar were written. In the R. E. V we find them again, mentioned together with the Kambojas, and both are said to have accepted Aśoka's Dhamma.<sup>228</sup>

<sup>225</sup> Here we may particularly note the absence of Greek epigraphy in Taxila, where many excavations have been conducted, and numerous remains of Hellenistic art and architecture were found.

<sup>226</sup> There is the possibility that instead of Alexander of Epirus, Alexander of Corinth was meant, though he was rather insignificant a ruler, but the chronological problems involved with these alternatives do not interest us at present. See also VI.2 above.

<sup>227</sup> Cf. Karttunen *forthcoming* on early uses of the words *yavana* and *yona*.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. Mukherjee 1984b.

Next we have to consider the Indo-Greeks and the Kharoṣṭhī epigraphy.<sup>229</sup> While numismatics gives ample evidence of Indo-Greek kingdoms, their epigraphic remains are much scarcer. Among Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, the only Indo-Greek king certainly mentioned by name is Menandros (Menander), on the lid of the Bajaur Casket.<sup>230</sup> The majority of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions seem in fact to belong to the Saka and Kushan periods, but even these can be considered here.

There is a group of inscriptions which apparently contain Greek personal names: the Meridarch Theodorus (*theūdorena*) in the Swat Relic Vase Inscription, a Theodamas (?) in a Bajaur Seal Inscription (*theūdamaśa*), another (?) Menander in a Peshawar sculpture (*miṇamdrasa*) and a third one in the Reliquary of Bhagamoya (*menamdreṇa*), and perhaps an Agesilaos (*agiśala*) in the Kaniška Casket.<sup>231</sup> To this may be added a few others which might be explained as Greek names but certainly in other ways, too.<sup>232</sup> Probably we should not be too quick to accept Greek derivations. The only certain cases seem to be Theodorus and Menander.

We may especially note the Menander of the Reliquary of Bhagamoya. He was the second son of Śatrolīka, son of Subhūtika, an officer of Vijayamitra, the king of Apraca or Avaca, a petty kingdom somewhere in the Northwest. He also had an uncle and a brother named Indrasena. Although Fussman's interpretation of some of these names might not be conclusive, at least we can see that our Menander belonged to a family in which Indian names were commonly used. Still, he himself had a Greek name. Was it that Greek and Indian names (and probably Iranian, too) were indiscriminately used in this period,<sup>233</sup> or had just Menander, the name of the famous king, who was the only one to be remembered in Indian (Buddhist) tradition, become Indianized?

More interesting are perhaps the Greek titles occasionally found in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions. Meridarch (μεριδάρχης), a local officer, is mentioned, in addition to the Swat Relic Vase (above; *meridarkhena*), on a Taxila copperplate (*meridakhena*),<sup>234</sup> and in the

<sup>229</sup> All Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions (with the exception of those by Aśoka) known until 1929 were published in Konow 1929. An older list with bibliographical notes is to be found in Majumdar 1924. For a similar list of Brāhmī inscriptions see Lüders 1912.

<sup>230</sup> As *Mine[m]drasa* (genitive, with an unwritten anusvāra), cf. the *Mena(m)drasa* of coins and the Pāli *Milinda* (for these see Fussman 1993, 72f.). On the Bajaur Casket see Konow 1939, 1940 and 1956, Majumdar 1942, Sircar 1952, Narain 1957, plate VI, and Fussman 1993, 95ff.

<sup>231</sup> The Swat Relic Vase Inscription is Konow 1929, number 1 (see also Thomas 1914), the Bajaur Seal Konow 1929, n. 3 (cf. Stein 1935a, 352f.), Peshawar sculpture Konow 1929, n. 70, for the Reliquary of Bhagamoya see Fussman 1984, 35 & 37 (also Salomon 1984) and the Kaniška Casket Konow 1929, n. 72. This Agiśala was an architect, but also a slave. See also Stein 1935, 355f. and Tarn 1951, 355 & 388ff. Rather problematic is the case of Theodamas in the Bajaur seal. The actual lection is *syTheodamas* with the same unexplained syllable as in the coins of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣ ΣΥ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ and of ΧΟΡΑΝ ΣΥ ΣΑΟΥΥ ΚΟΖΟΛΑ ΚΑΔΑΦΕΣ.

<sup>232</sup> The *dati putra thaidora* (Theodorus, son of Dates?, with a non-Greek patronymic) of the Kaldarra inscription of the year 113 (Konow 1929, n. 24), *theūtara* (Theodorus?) and *denipa* (Deinippus?) of Taxila inscriptions (Konow 1929, n. 37:1 and 7). These and a few others have been criticized by Stein 1935a, 352ff.

<sup>233</sup> According to Fussman 1984, 35, the inscription can be dated to 20 A.D.

<sup>234</sup> Taxila Copper Plate Konow 1929, n. 2 (see also Thomas 1916). The name of this Taxila meridarch is not preserved. On the Greek title meridarch and its Egyptian parallels see Thomas 1914 and

inscription of King Seṅavarma of Oḍi (line 14 *meriakheṇa*).<sup>235</sup> Anankaios (ἀναγκαῖος), a royal kinsman, is found at the bottom of the Bajaur Casket (above; *viṣpīlena aṇaṃkayeṇa* Konow, *-kateṇa* Majumdar), and twice in the inscription of King Seṅavarma (lines 9 & 13 *aṇakaena*); in all three cases the personal names are not Greek.<sup>236</sup> A strategos (στρατηγός) with the Irano-Indian name Aśpavarma is mentioned on a Taxila silver saucer, another (according to Fussman his grand-uncle) called Vaga in the Reliquary of Indravarma, the king of Apraca.<sup>237</sup> It is clear that at least some Greek titles were used long after the fall of the Indo-Greek principalities. To these we may add the Iranian title *kṣatrapa*, also imported into India. However, from the coins of the Indo-Greek kings themselves and their successors we know that quite a number of Greek titles and epithets were also customarily translated into Prākṛit (VI.6 below).

In addition, the Ārā inscription of Kaniṣka has been supposed to contain the Roman title Caesar, this, of course, not being of Indo-Greek origin.<sup>238</sup>

We may also briefly note that some Greek weights and measures, such as the stater, drachma, obol, and medimnos were used in northwestern South Asia. In many cases (e.g. in the Taxila inscriptions) abbreviations (*sa*, *dra*, *o*) only were used.<sup>239</sup> From here they were carried further to distant parts of Central Asia.

In the great majority of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions the date (if there is any) is given according to the Indian nakṣatra calendar, but sometimes we also find the months of the Macedonian calendar mentioned with their Greek names. These include the Panemos (*pa[ne]ma*), the Apellaios (*apela*), the Daisios (*daīsika*), the Artemisios (*arthamisiya*), the Audunaios (*avadunaka/ga*), and the Gorpaios (*gurppiya*).<sup>240</sup> The majority, if not all,

1916, and Tarn 1951, 241f. According to Konow, the palaeography of this inscription is early, but not as early as in the Swat relic vase. Tarn 1951, 358f., argues that he must have been Indian, as he conforms to the Buddhist usage of mentioning the mother before the father, but I see no reason why a Greek living in isolation in a far-off country could not conform to a Buddhist usage, especially if he was a Buddhist himself. And the inscription is, after all, in MIA and Kharoṣṭhī, and the order of parents might even be due to an Indian scribe.

<sup>235</sup> Bailey 1980 and Fussman 1982. The name of this Oḍi meridarch is Ṣaḍi'a, son of Sacaka.

<sup>236</sup> On the title see Konow 1939. Fussman (1993, 109) does not like the interpretation as ἀναγκαῖος 'royal kinsman' ("cela me paraît bizarre, mais je n'ai rien de mieux à proposer"), but thinking of the importance of kinsmen and titular brothers in the period after the Indo-Greeks (see e.g. Marshall 1951, 775f.), this seems not so bizarre at all. It is curious to note that the name of the Bajaur Anankaios, Viṣpīla, is found again in the *Brhatkathāślokaśaṅgraha* 5, 201ff., where a certain Viṣvīla living in Ujjayinī is either a Yavana himself or a pupil of the Yavanas. According to Konow 1956, 58 and Fussman 1993, 109, Viṣpīla might be Iranian (with *śp*), but in answer to my letter Professor von Hinüber gives his opinion that it might rather be Indian, an abbreviation of Viśvāmitra. In any case it is not Greek. The title-bearers of Oḍi (Swat) are called Suhasoma and Sanghamitra.

<sup>237</sup> For *aśpavarmasa strategasa* see Marshall 1930, 62f. & 1951, 613 & 777f., and Whitehead 1944. The man is also known from coins of Azes and Gondophares. For *vaga stratego* see Fussman 1980, 4 & 25, for both also Fussman 1980, 28f.

<sup>238</sup> Konow 1929, n. 85. Actually a greater part of the name is conjectured by the editor: *[ka]i[sa]rasa*.

<sup>239</sup> Prākṛit forms *satera* for στατήρ, *drakhma* for δραχμή. See Konow 1928, Konow 1929, no. 37, Marshall 1930 and Gupta 1978 for Pakistan (Taxila), for Middle Asia (Dalverzin-Tepe) Vorobjova-Desjatovskaja 1976 and on the long afterlife of these terms and for further references Karttunen 1990a, 95 (note 52).

<sup>240</sup> Panemos on the Taxila copper-plate of Patika of the year 78 (Konow 1929, n. 13), Apellaios in the Hidda (i.s. Haḍḍa) earthen jar inscription of the year 28 (Konow 1929, n. 82), Daisios on the Sui

hail from the Kushan period, more exactly from the time of Kaniška. As we have seen above, the first Greek testimony to this calendar in the Farther East has been found only recently, with the month Oloios).<sup>241</sup>

With Gorpaios we have arrived at the Brāhmī epigraphy, where quite a number of instances of the Yavanas and Yonas are found.

A recently discovered inscription from the neighbourhood of Mathura is dated according to the 116th year of the *yavanarājya*, the Greek kingdom. The editor of this inscription suggested an unknown era starting from the accession of Menander, as he was the most important Indo-Greek king, especially in the area of Mathura, but it seems somewhat doubtful to construct new eras on such meagre evidence. Against this, Mukherjee prefers the Old Śaka era (beginning from Azes and identical to the Vikrama era), thus giving the date some time in the middle of the first century A.D. Fussman adds that palaeographically it can as well be dated to the first century B.C. as to the first century A.D.<sup>242</sup>

The most famous Brāhmī testimony of the Indo-Greeks is, of course, the Besnagar inscription of the Yonadūta, the Greek ambassador, Heliodoros, son of Dio from Taxila, who represented King Antialcidas at the court of Vidiśā.<sup>243</sup> We are struck by the good transcription of Greek names, which well equals the coins. Thus we have the instrumental *heliodoreṇa* for Heliodoros, and the genitives *diyasa* and *aṃtalikitasa* (*antialikidasa* of coins) for Dio and Antialcidas. Here we also get a glimpse of the relations between Indo-Greek and Indian rulers, and of a Greek (or at least someone using a Greek name even in an Indian inscription) attending an Indian cult (of Vāsudeva).

Another direct Brāhmī testimony for an Indo-Greek ruler might be seen in the mysterious "Reh inscription of Menander" (*Minānadarasa*), which is, however, inaccessible to scholars, and has received some harsh criticism. The reading of the name Menander, only partially preserved on the stone, has been questioned as suspect, and cannot be re-examined.<sup>244</sup>

Vihar copper-plate of the year 11 (Konow 1929, n. 74), Artemisios on the box-lid of the year 18 (Konow 1929, n. 79) and in the Wardak Vase inscription of the year 51 (Konow 1929, n. 86), Audunaios on the Kurram Casket of the year 20 (Konow 1929, n. 80) and in the Spinwam inscription (Salomon 1981), Gorpaios in the Mathura Brāhmī (!) inscription of the year 28 (Konow 1933), in a Bactrian inscription from Dašt-e Nawur in Afghanistan (in Greek letters) and probably (as *gapiu(sa masasa)*) in a Kharoṣṭhī inscription from the same place. For these see Fussman 1972, 12f. and 20. A further Greek month, Heraion, is read by Fussman (1985, 39) in the dedication of Trasaka in Kharoṣṭhī *ireṃ*. According to Fussman, this same inscription also contains the intercalary Gorpaios as *gupriya yaṃbulima masa* (*yaṃbulima* < Greek ἐμβόλιμος = intercalary!), and the personal name Heliophilos (*hiliupila*).

<sup>241</sup> Bernard & Rapin 1994, 275ff. (Ὀλῶος being a variant, also attested elsewhere, of the more common Ἀῶος).

<sup>242</sup> Thakurel 1991, sided by Fussman 1993, 111ff.; Mukerdži 1992.

<sup>243</sup> Leaving out early discussions (cf. in the *JRAS* for 1909 and 1910, and Lüders 1912, n. 669), see e.g. Narain 1957, 118ff. & plate VI.

<sup>244</sup> See Sharma 1980, Mukherjee 1979 (1986 mostly repeats the same), Gupta 1985, 200f., and Fussman 1993, 117ff. The critics tend to ascribe this inscription to the Sakas (Mukherjee) or Kushans (Gupta to Wima Kadphises).

In the Nāsik inscription of Śrī Puṣumāvi (c. 149 A.D.) the Yavanas are mentioned together with the Śakas and Pahlavas (Parthians) among conquered peoples,<sup>245</sup> and the Hāthigumphā Cave inscription of Khāvela mentions a Yavānarāja, whose more or less illegible name has led to some controversy.<sup>246</sup>

Among the Nagarjunakonda cave inscriptions of the third century A.D. the Yavanas are mentioned among peoples having converted to Buddhism.<sup>247</sup> In another inscription from the same site there should be, according to Sircar's emendation, Yonarājas (in the plural) mentioned immediately before the Śaka Rudradāman (Sircar 1963). An inscription from Allaru (Krishna district) dated to the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. mentions Yavana-made lamps shaped like the mouth of a fish (Ray 1995, 81).

We must not forget the Yavānarāja Tuṣāspha, a governor of Aśoka according to the Yunāgaḍh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman.<sup>248</sup> This brings us to the problem of persons styled Yonas or Yavanas, but bearing Iranian or Indian names. We meet several such cases among the dedicatory inscriptions of Buddhist sites in Western India. In many cases they have also been given an Indian place of residence or origin.

A Nāsik cave inscription is dedicated by the Yonaka Indrāgnidatta, the son of Dhammadeva and the father of Dhammarakkhita, all purely Indian names.<sup>249</sup> He came from Dātāmiti or Dattāmitri, which was apparently in the Northwest, but the hypothesis that it was a Greek polis named after Demetrius has been definitely disproven,<sup>250</sup> and thus warrants no conclusions about his ethnic background. In Sāñcī a donation by an unnamed Yona is recorded.<sup>251</sup> In the Karle cave inscriptions no fewer than six Yavanas are mentioned, most, if not all, of them with Indian names.<sup>252</sup> More curious is the case of

<sup>245</sup> Senart 1906, n. 2 = Lüders 1912, n. 1123. See further Stein 1935a, 351, and Vasant 1989, 333f.

<sup>246</sup> Sircar 1965b, 213ff. (n. 91) = Lüders 1912, n. 1345. For the name *Dimitia* or *Ḍimita*, *Demetrius* (*dimetriyasa* of coins) has been suggested, but even if the reading is correct (and this is far from certain), the equation with Demetrius is doubtful. See Sircar's note *ad l.* On the other hand, Gupta 1985, 201, asserts that he was able to read the same name from the stone as *Vimaka*, which he equates with *Wima Kadphises*.

<sup>247</sup> The Second Apsidal Temple Inscription F of Vogel (1933, 22). This can be compared with the accounts of Buddhist mission in the Yonaraṭṭha or Yonaloka found in the Pāli canon, commentaries and chronicles.

<sup>248</sup> Kielhorn 1906 = Lüders 1912, n. 965; cf. VI.2 above. See further Stein 1935a, 343, Laeuchli 1984, 220 (note 44), and Vasant 1989, 332.

<sup>249</sup> Senart 1906, n. 2 = Lüders 1912, n. 1140. See further Stein 1935a, 351, and Vasant 1989, 333.

<sup>250</sup> Johnson 1939, and again Mayrhofer 1991.

<sup>251</sup> Bühler 1894, n. 364. See further Stein 1935a, 344.

<sup>252</sup> *Yavana Sihadhaya* from Dhenukākāṭa in Senart 1903, n. 7 (Lüders 1912, n. 1093), *Yavana Dhamma* (or perhaps just *Dhammayavana*, cf. Stein 1935a, 347) from Dhenukākāṭa in Senart n. 10 (n. 1096), *Yavana Cīṭasa(m)gata* (see below) from Umehānākāṭa in Vats 1926, n. 1, *Yavana Dhamadhaya* from Dhenukākāṭa in n. 4, *Yavana Chulayakha* from Dhenukākāṭa in Vats n. 6, same as Senart n. 7 in Vats n. 7, and *Yavana Yasavadhana* from Dhenukākāṭa in Vats n. 10. Obs. the gen. pl. of the personal name used with the sg. of the ethnic (*yavaṇasa sihadhayāna* etc.). Cf. Stein 1935a, 344ff., who interprets these plurals as family names or names of guilds and corporations. Laeuchli 1984, 209ff., takes them as personal names, the plural as honorific, and the yavanas themselves not as merchants or traders (the most common hypothesis), but as mercenaries and high officers of the Saka Kṣatrapas. This sounds somewhat speculative. See further Vasant 1989, 335f.

Junnar,<sup>253</sup> where only one of the three Yavanas has a conspicuously Indian name, Candra (*caṃda*). The two others are Ciṭa and Irila, of the Gatas, which has led some scholars to suggest even Goths. The same Ciṭa seems to be present in one Karle inscription, too.<sup>254</sup>

In a later age the word Yavana was used for the Muslims, and in this sense it is also found in some inscriptions, but these do not belong within the sphere of our present survey. In conclusion we may to some extent repeat what was said by Stein 60 years ago, but with some modification. It is still true that the harvest is meagre, but little by little our material seems to be increasing. It is also true that with confidence the Yona/Yavana can be only connected with the Greeks in the earliest inscriptions, but to me it seems quite likely that in all our cases the word is somehow related to the Greeks. For the Indo-Greeks the word is attested in literary sources, too. As to the "Indian Yavanas" of Buddhist caves some further consideration is needed.<sup>255</sup>

There are several possibilities as to how to explain them. It has been pointed out that, unlike in many other cave inscriptions, occupations are never indicated for these Yavanas. Perhaps it was obvious that a Yavana was a merchant.<sup>256</sup> Perhaps they were only Indian merchants involved in the then flourishing trade between India and Roman Egypt. In two cases at least we can even suppose Indian personal names containing the word *yavana*, Yavanacandra (Junnar) and Dharmayavana (Karle), comparable to a few known from literary tradition, such as Yavanasena and especially Vṛddhayavana and Yavaneśvara. These names of ancient astrologers are certainly connected with the Greeks or at least with Greek (pseudo-)science. Our inscriptional Yavanas may also have been Greeks, or Indo-Greeks, or at least Hellenized enough to identify themselves as Greeks. In the Hellenistic period it is often difficult to say who really were Greeks in the more or less narrow ethnic sense of the word. Many others participated in Greek culture, and in the Hellenistic Near East an increasing number of people of different ethnic origins adopted Greek ways and the Greek language. For the cave inscriptions it has been claimed that Greeks never took local names, but this is not entirely true. In the Semitic West (e.g. at Palmyra) there are bilingual inscriptions where the same men identify themselves as well as their gods by both a Greek and a Semitic name. In the Hellenistic world being Greek was more a social than an ethnic matter.

To return to the Indo-Greeks, we may here briefly note some possible linguistic evidence (loan-words). In addition to months, which were quickly forgotten, and weights,

<sup>253</sup> Lüders 1912, n. 1156, 1154, and 1182. Vasant 1989 suggests that Junnar, supposedly < Jīṃnagāra, would originally be < Yavananagāra. See also Laeuchli 1984, 215f.

<sup>254</sup> Vats n. 1, where *yavanasā ciṭasagatāna* can also be read as *yavanasā Ciṭasā gatāna*. Laeuchli eliminates Goths in Junnar, too, reading the names as Ciṭasagata and Irilasagata. For the Gothic hypothesis see Konow 1912, and again Mayrhofer 1958, for its criticism Stein 1935a, 349f. Personally I find this hypothesis rather doubtful, and therefore mention only in this footnote that perhaps *Agila*, mentioned in Karle, Vats n. 5, could then also be identified as a Goth. He might also be a Greek, if we emend to *Agī[sā]la*, but this kind of speculation could hardly lead us to any lasting conclusion. Another hypothesis (Ray 1995, 80) derived *gata* from *garta*, found in the OIA place-name Trigarta.

<sup>255</sup> See further the various explanations offered by Stein 1935a, Keith 1940, 228f., Tarn 1951, 254ff. & 371f. Laeuchli 1984, 209ff.

<sup>256</sup> Ray 1995, 80f., referring to V. Dehejia.

which were often established, some further words are quoted from Indian and Central Asian languages as probable western loans transmitted by the Indo-Greeks. But here it is often difficult to say what was actually part of the Indo-Greek heritage and what was imported by merchants from the West.<sup>257</sup>

### 6. Kings and Their Coins

It has already been clearly stated that the history of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek kingdoms is to a very great extent a history of coins.<sup>258</sup> For lack of other evidence (though this situation has already somewhat changed, with Ai Khanum and other archaeological finds) coins have occupied an exceptionally important position in attempts at reconstruction of the GB & IG history and civilization (e.g. in both classics, Tarn and Narain). In addition to the meagre 6 names (Diodotus, Euthydemus, Demetrius, Eucratides, Menander, Apollodotus) given in classical literature as Bactrian or Indo-Greek kings, Indian sources supply us with only two: Menander is mentioned in epigraphy and in Buddhist literature, and Antialcidas in the Besnagar inscription.<sup>259</sup> The coins, however, give no fewer than some 40 different rulers (the exact number is not certain, as there were sometimes several kings with the same name, and the evidence is not always conclusive).<sup>260</sup>

The study of these coins began very early, in the early 18th century with T. S. Bayer and his single coin, a tetradrachm of Eucratides.<sup>261</sup> At the beginning of the 19th century the corpus of GB & IG coins was still very meagre, but then it was soon substantially added to by travellers, collectors and archaeologists of British India. The first major

<sup>257</sup> On παρεμβολή see Tarn 1951, 86; on *campus* and κάμηλος Liebich 1924 & 1931; on σῶριγξ Stein 1925. Curtius 9, 8, 13f. tells that the underground passage, used by Alexander in the battle against Sambus, was unknown to the Indians. On a supposed χαίρε, see Weber 1890, 911 and Tarn 1951, 235 & 530.

<sup>258</sup> Being no numismatist I have not used earlier corpuses and only occasionally Mitchiner 1975–1976 (unfortunately the much-used Lahiri 1965 was unavailable to me). Three recent works, Bernard 1985a, Bopearachchi 1991, and Bopearachchi & Rahman 1995, are mines of information (and the last-mentioned with very high quality illustrations of every coin described). On the methodological side Guillaume 1990 is extremely instructive.

<sup>259</sup> Further literary references in Indian sources with supposed Greek kings, such as Demetrius and Apollodotus as Dattāmitra and Bhagadatta in the *Mahābhārata* (so e.g. Weber 1890, 906f., but see Johnston 1939 and Mayrhofer 1991) and Demetrius in the *Yugapurāṇa* (so e.g. Jayaswal and Sircar, but see Narain 1957 and Mitchiner 1986), are only misinterpretations.

<sup>260</sup> Cf. Tarn 1951, 312, where 36 names are listed.

<sup>261</sup> As Eucratides was also mentioned in literary sources, this single coin was already enough for the basic concordance. In some sources Bayer is erroneously attributed with two coins, see Babinger 1915, 47.

collection was formed by James Tod, and in the 1830s French officers in Lahore (e.g. Court) and British travellers (e.g. Masson) made numerous additions. Many finds were published (e.g. in the *JASB* and *NC*) and the reconstruction of history started soon (e.g. by Lassen and Wilson), supported by the decipherment of Kharoṣṭhī legends by Prinsep. The work went on, and little by little the picture gained more details. But all the time it was seriously one-sided. Until World War II most finds came from the area of present-day Pakistan, some also from Afghanistan south of the Hindukush. Until the great Qunduz Hoard (in 1946) and subsequent finds in northern Afghanistan and in the Middle Asian republics,<sup>262</sup> Graeco-Bactrian numismatics, and consequently history, was known only from occasional stray finds. This situation lasted long enough, the Qunduz Hoard being properly published only in 1965, seriously to hamper the views of Tarn and Narain.

The history of Hellenistic numismatics in the GB & IG lands begins, so to say, before Hellenism itself. During the Achaemenid period Greek coins, especially Athenian owls, circulated in every corner of the empire, including Afghanistan, though their monetary character was probably not always completely understood.<sup>263</sup> In the next stage, with and after Alexander's campaigns, coins of Alexander and Seleucus have been found, and those of Antiochus I are quite numerous at Ai Khanum and some other sites,<sup>264</sup> testifying to the continuous presence of the Seleucids in Bactria. Diodotus appears first together with Antiochus, then on his own. The first kind of coins were probably minted when he still accepted his satrapal status and the overlordship of Antiochus.<sup>265</sup>

Before we go further it must be pointed out that Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek are two different conceptions of numismatics and art history. While both represent a mixed type of Hellenism, the partner in the former was Iran (Bactria), in the latter (northwest) India. In numismatics, Graeco-Bactrian coinage is more or less purely Hellenistic. It used the Attic standard, legends are given only in Greek, and the religious and royal symbolism is Greek, too. On Indo-Greek coins we can see, in addition to a deterioration in the remarkable portrait art,<sup>266</sup> the introduction of a new standard and of bilingual legends in Greek and MIA, and an occasional use of Indian or mixed religious symbols.

In art history, more styles have been suggested.<sup>267</sup> As we can see e.g. in the case of Ai Khanum, in Greek cities of Bactria there was more or less purely Greek as well as purely Iranian (Bactrian) art to be seen, but at the same time there also existed a mixed Graeco-Iranian (Hellenizing) style, which continued well into Kushan times (e.g. in Surkh Kotal). In India, on the other hand, recent finds have shown that a mixed Graeco-Indian art was probably established with Indo-Greek rule. For the early period, the evidence is scanty, but parallels with Bactrian art are clear, and there seems to be no really contra-

<sup>262</sup> In the early 1980s it was stated that local museums in then Soviet Middle Asia already had hundreds of GB coins (Bernard in *Abstr. Ir.* 6, 1983, 40).

<sup>263</sup> Schlumberger 1953 and Allchin & Hammonds 1978, 201ff.

<sup>264</sup> See Bernard 1985a, 35ff. for Seleucid coins found at Ai Khanum, Bopearachchi & Rahman 1995, 24ff. for both.

<sup>265</sup> See e.g. Guillaume 1990, 53ff., and Bopearachchi 1994.

<sup>266</sup> With exceptions, such as the superb medallions of Amyntas.

<sup>267</sup> See e.g. Schlumberger 1960, Wheeler 1968, 149ff, and Pichikyan 1996.

dictory evidence. Later, this art led to the well-known Gandhāran art, which can no longer be (and probably never should have been) called Romano-Indian, although trade and imported Roman artefacts might have occasionally influenced it.<sup>268</sup>

Two different standards were used for GB and IG coins. While the so-called Attic standard (a drachm of 4.20 g) was still used in Bactria, as elsewhere in Hellenism, a new one was introduced for Greek coinage in India with a drachm of 2.45 g.<sup>269</sup> It is not quite clear what relation this standard has to the Indian *kārsāpaṇa*,<sup>270</sup> a weight that is attested even in Bactria, in Ai Khanum inscriptions. This new coinage was struck to the southeast of the Hindukush, though in the Paropamisadae and Arachosia GB coins, too, were used. The great innovator was Agathocles or Antimachus.<sup>271</sup> Both used the Indian standard as well as Indian-type square coins. Indian legends were introduced by Agathocles or Demetrius (II).<sup>272</sup> The Greek legend was moved to the obverse, and on the reverse was struck a corresponding Indian legend. For these, both Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī were used by Agathocles (as well as Brāhmī by Pantaleon, who is supposed to have been his brother). These Brāhmī legends thus belong to the very beginning of Indo-Greek coinage and never appear again. All later kings used Kharoṣṭhī. We may further point out that the only identifiable Indian gods in Indo-Greek numismatics, Vasudeva and Saṃkarṣana, are found on the Indian-style coins of Agathocles.

For a while all seemed simple and clear: the Attic standard and Greek legends for Bactria, the Indian standard and bilingual legends for lands south of the Hindukush. But since the publication of the Qunduz Hoard scholars have been puzzled by the fact that the hoard contains a great number of Attic standard coins with Greek legends only, but minted by Indo-Greek kings who hardly could have ruled north of the Hindukush. The problem has been recently discussed by Bopearachchi (1990b), who has analyzed all such coins, including a number of previously unpublished pieces. With the help of monograms, which are the same as in the Indo-Greek issues of the same kings, and with an analysis of the provenance of Bactrian finds he claims that these coins were actually minted south of the Hindukush, though rarely found there. Leaving aside the unhappy suggestion of mere commemorative medallions, he suggests two reasons for these coins. They were either struck to be used in trade with the new nomad masters of Bactria or given as tribute to them to dissuade them from attacking the relatively weak principalities south of the Hindukush (exactly as a little earlier the Gauls were paid such tribute in Asia Minor). While Bopearachchi leaves open the choice between these two alternatives, we can only add, why not both?

---

268 See Taddei 1993 for a recent summary.

269 Bopearachchi 1991, 27.

270 It was Indian in this period, although the word (the first part of it) was earlier borrowed from Achaemenid Old Persian.

271 It depends on the reconstruction of their respective chronology. For Narain (1957, 48) Antimachus was the first, for Bopearachchi (1991) Agathocles.

272 Demetrius according to Tam 1951, 138f., obs. 160 & 162; Narain 1957, 50; Agathocles according to Bopearachchi (1991).

The use of different metals (on metals cf. V.6 above) in coins is interesting. The rarity of gold issues is significant (cf. Tarn 1951, 104ff.). Nickel<sup>273</sup> and other curiosities were sometimes used. The use of both gold and nickel was restricted to Bactria, while at the very end of Indo-Greek rule in the Pañjab some coins were also struck of lead.<sup>274</sup> The common metals of coins, however, were silver and copper (bronze). While silver (and occasionally gold) commonly had wide distribution (in both the geographical and chronological senses), the base metal issues generally had a restricted circulation and rarely crossed the boundaries of the state where they had been issued.

It is also interesting to note that the largest denominations ever found in Greek numismatics were struck here. In gold, we have the twenty-stater medallion of Eucratides; in silver, the double decadrachm of Amyntas.<sup>275</sup> Both are Graeco-Bactrian coins using the Attic standard. The most common silver coins were drachms (= 6 obols) and tetradrachms, and twenty silver drachms corresponded to one gold stater. In the Attic standard eight copper chalkoi made one obol.

We come to the question of mint marks and mint cities. When correctly identified, they could be of great help in reconstructing the urban structure. That the great number of Greek (and occasionally Kharoṣṭhī) monograms found in GB & IG coins actually refers to mints was first suggested by Prinsep as early as 1836 (for the history, see Thakur 1991, 27). A new analysis has been provided by Bopearachchi (1991), who groups similar monographs (a total of more than 400 is too much for individual mints) and attempts to distribute them among different mints. The problem is that we do not know the mint cities; their identification (attempted e.g. by Tarn and Mitchiner) remains speculative.<sup>276</sup>

Special importance must be given to overstrucks as a source of history. They have offered great help for reconstructing the relative chronology between GB & IG kings.<sup>277</sup> Especially the coins of the last kings of Bactria and Paropamisadae, Eucratides, Heliocles (these numerous at Qunduz Hoard), and Hermaeus, were often imitated by later Iranian rulers.<sup>278</sup>

In one respect the Indo-Greek kingdoms are unique. As far as we know, in other parts of the Hellenistic world bilingual coins were hardly ever minted.<sup>279</sup> In Indo-Greek numismatics bilingualism is encountered in exceptionally large measure (and supported by other evidence such as epigraphy). Coins minted in India generally also contain, in addition to the Greek, Indian legends.

<sup>273</sup> Tarn 1951, 87 imported from China, cf. Guillaume 1990, 70f.

<sup>274</sup> On metals see also Guillaume 1990, 27.

<sup>275</sup> Eucratides: série 4 in Bopearachchi 1991, 202; Amyntas: séries 1–2 *ibid.* 299. Cf. Narain 1957, 62 & 156 and Bopearachchi 1990a, 90ff. On weights also Guillaume 1990, 28ff.

<sup>276</sup> See, however, Bernard 1985a, 12ff. and more generally Guillaume 1990, 99ff.

<sup>277</sup> See e.g. Bopearachchi 1989 and Guillaume 1990, 56ff. & 72ff.

<sup>278</sup> For Eucratides and Heliocles see Bopearachchi 1991, 75, and Bopearachchi & Rahman 1995, 31, for Hermaeus Bopearachchi 1991, 118ff., and Bopearachchi & Rahman 1995, 37ff.

<sup>279</sup> The bilingual (Greek and Parthian) issues of the Parthians begin only in the middle of the first century A.D. (Boyce in Yarshater 1983, 1153); before this we only meet an occasional Aramaic title (Sellwood in Yarshater 1983, 280). On bilingual coins see further Tarn 1951, 181.

The bilingual coin legends lead us to the question of bilingualism in Hellenistic states. Certainly it was not unknown elsewhere in the Hellenistic world: in Ptolemaic Egypt there were Egyptian inscriptions (or bi- or even trilingual ones, e.g. the famous Rosetta stone), but not coins. In Mesopotamia, both Cuneiform and Greek script were used (Greek script also for the Akkadian language),<sup>280</sup> but only by Mesopotamians. However, there are no official bilingual inscriptions and no bilingual coins here. Examples of bilingual epigraphy can also be quoted from Italy, although the situation is there somewhat different.<sup>281</sup> In the later period, in the Roman east there were even trilingual inscriptions, but probably few were able to read all the versions (Latin, Greek and Aramaic).

In Parthia bilingual inscriptions and Greek (later bilingual) coins as well as literary allusions point to the conclusion that Graeco-Iranian bilingualism must have been common, and the curious system of Pahlavi writing points to a similar situation between Iranian and Aramaic in Sasanid times.<sup>282</sup> Parthian kings were often known for their Hellenistic sympathies. They favoured Greek literature and even styled themselves *φιλέλληνοι* on their coins.

The coins of the Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek kings contain an imposing collection of Greek royal titles or epithets, most of which are also known in Western Hellenism.<sup>283</sup> For most of them we also have Indian equivalents on bilingual coins. In particularly early kings also minted coins without a title (Euthydemus always), but even at the very beginning Diodotus used the title Soter, and these epithets were in use until the end of the Greek kingdoms. As these titles also testify to Eastern Hellenism, we shall make a brief survey of them, based on the material in Boppearachchi 1991.<sup>284</sup>

To begin with, most kings bear on their coins the normal Hellenistic title for king, Greek *basileus* (*βασιλεύς*, mostly, but not always, in the genitive *βασιλέως*, occasionally also the participle *βασιλεύοντος*), in MIA genitive *rajasa* or more often *maharajasa* (in Brāhmī *rajane*).<sup>285</sup> In the period before Alexander the title of king had been very unfashionable in Greece (with the exception of Sparta), where kings had been expelled two to four centuries earlier. But Alexander as a Macedonian was a king, and for the wide new lands of the former Persian Empire (in Greek terminology also then subject to a king, *βασιλεύς*) his royal title was granted so that all his successors took this royal title in 306/305 B.C. Other titles were soon added, Ptolemaeus becoming Soter, Seleucus Nicator. As

<sup>280</sup> Tarn 1951, 56.

<sup>281</sup> For these see Leiwo 1994.

<sup>282</sup> Five centuries earlier the Irano-Aramaic and Indo-Aramaic inscriptions of Aśoka offer an early parallel to Book Pahlavi. I must leave it to Iranian scholars to say whether there is any connection.

<sup>283</sup> Soter was first used by Ptolemaeus I (ruled 323–283/2) of Egypt, Nicator by Seleucus I (322–280), Philadelphus by Ptolemaeus II (282–246), Theos by Antiochus II (261–247), Euergetes by Ptolemaeus III (246–221), Philopator by Ptolemaeus IV (221–205), Megas by Antiochus III (223–187), and Epiphanes by Antiochus IV (175–163). An interesting case is the title Autocrator, which was first adopted by Arsaces of Parthia in the third century B.C. (cf. Sellwood in Yarshater 1983, 279). In the Roman East *αὐτοκράτωρ* was used as an equivalent to Latin *imperator* (emperor).

<sup>284</sup> For Tam's and Narain's attempts to interpret some of these epithets see Guillaume 1990, 96ff.

<sup>285</sup> *rajasa* is formed from the secondary a-stem *raja-*, while *rajane* comes from the original n-stem *rajan-* (OIA *rājan-*). On the Greek forms see also Guillaume 1990, 51ff.

in the West, the GB and IG titles were personal and their variety has been one of the means of distinguishing between several kings with the same personal name (e.g. Zoilus Dikaios and Zoilus Soter).

Greek	King	MIA <sup>286</sup>
Aniketos (ἀνίκητος) <sup>287</sup>	Artemidorus	apadihata
	Demetrius	aparajita
	Lysias	apadihata
	Philoxenus	— ” —
Autokrator (αὐτοκράτωρ) Dikaios (δίκαιος) <sup>288</sup>	Theophilus	
	Agathocles	
	Archebius	dhramika
	Heliocles	— ” —
	Menander	— ” —
	Peucolaos	— ” —
	Strato	— ” —
	Theophilus	— ” —
Eiphanes (ἐπιφανής)	Zoilus	— ” —
	Plato	
	Polyxenus	pracacha
Euergetes (εὐεργέτης) Megas (μέγας)	Strato	— ” —
	Telephus	kalanakrama
Nicator (νικάτωρ) Nicephorus (νικηφόρος)	Apollodotus	
	Eucratides	mahataka
	[Hermaeus] <sup>289</sup>	mahata
	Hippostratus	— ” —
	Thraso	— ” —
	Amyntas	jayadhara
Philopator (φιλοπάτωρ)	Antialcidas	jayadhara
	Antimachus	— ” —
	Archebius	— ” —
	Epander	— ” —
	Apollodotus	
	Strato	priyapita <sup>290</sup>

<sup>286</sup> The *-sa* of the genitive is left out.

<sup>287</sup> Tarn 1951, 132, notes a connection to Alexander in this title.

<sup>288</sup> This seems to be, as an equivalent of *dhramika* (*dhārmika*), a specifically Indian title.

<sup>289</sup> On a posthumous coin Greek ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΥ: Prakrit *mahata*. Bopearachchi 1991, 124 (in the historical introduction, in his catalogue p. 343 the legend is, probably erroneously, given as ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΣΥ).

<sup>290</sup> In Greek only the abbreviation φιλ, in Prakrit *putrasa casa priyapitasa*. The earlier lection *potrasa* 'of grandson', originally suggested by Rapson and accepted e.g. by Tarn and Narain, has been substituted by *putrasa* 'of son' by Mitchiner and accepted by Bopearachchi (1991, 139f.).

Soter (σωτήρ)	Apollodotus	tratarā
	Apollophanes	— ” —
	Diodotus	
	Diomedes	— ” —
	Dionysius	— ” —
	Eucratides <sup>291</sup>	
	Hermaeus & Calliope	— ” —
	Hermaeus	— ” —
	Hippostratus	— ” —
	Menander	— ” —
	Nicias	— ” —
	(Pantaleon) <sup>292</sup>	
	Peucolaos	— ” —
	Polyxenus	— ” —
	Strato & Agathocleia	— ” —
	Strato	— ” —
	Zoilus	— ” —
Theos (θεός)	Antimachus	
	(Diodotus) <sup>293</sup>	
Theotropos (θεότροπος)	(Strato &) Agathocleia	

While the kings originally had, in the West as well as in the East, only one royal epithet, later rulers on both sides often took several titles. Thus Strato is not only Strato Soter, but Strato Soter Dikaios (*tratarasa dhramikasa Stratasa*) or Strato Epiphanes Soter. Epiphanes Soter is also Polyxenus, while Peucolaos is known as Dikaios Soter and Archebius as Dikaios Nicephorus. Apollodotus is known as Soter, Soter Philopator and Megas Soter Philopator, Hippostratus as Soter or Megas Soter, in MIA also as *tratarasa mahatasa jayaṃtasa (!) Hipustratasa*.

In addition to Indian legends, we also meet Indian religion on Indo-Greek coins (see VI.8 below). While Greek gods sometimes show features of Indianization, some purely Indian gods, too, are depicted on coins. But they are always Hindu gods, in spite of Graeco-Buddhist epigraphic records; there are never clearly Buddhist symbols on Indo-Greek coins. These come only in the Kushan period.<sup>294</sup>

There was a kind of numismatic afterlife of the Greek language in the Farther East. Sakas and Parthians – in India as well as in Iran – used Greek in their coin legends.<sup>295</sup>

<sup>291</sup> According to Bopearachchi 1991, 216 (série 25) posthumous.

<sup>292</sup> On a commemorative coin of Agathocles (Bopearachchi 1991, 179, série 18).

<sup>293</sup> On a commemorative coin of Agathocles (Bopearachchi 1991, 178, série 15).

<sup>294</sup> Tarn 1951, 176. It has been suggested that the wheel on Menander's coins could be the Buddhist dharmacakra (Narain 1957, 97ff.), but see Tarn 1951, 262; and Bopearachchi 1991, 87f.

<sup>295</sup> Transition to Iranian dominion is immediately reflected in titles in coin legends. Even the last Indo-Greeks were merely basileis (maharaja), but the Iranian rulers immediately introduced into their Greek legends the Old Iranian formula (known e.g. from Achaemenid inscriptions) "great king of kings". For instance ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΑΖΟΥ / *maharajasa rajarajasa maṇa-*

It is still found on early Kushan coins, but now no longer in correct language.<sup>296</sup> The last examples are said to be found among the early coins of Kaniška, but then Greek is substituted by Bactrian (written in Greek script), and disappears from eastern numismatics.

### 7. Graeco-Bactrian & Indo-Greek Onomastics: A Survey

One purpose of our discussion of eastern Hellenism is to ascertain in what respect it can be styled Hellenism. The reconstruction of history we leave for scholars better acquainted with the possibilities of numismatic evidence. An important part of Hellenism in our sense is the use of the Greek language. In the two preceding chapters we have surveyed the evidence of Greek in epigraphy and numismatics. It remains to discuss the great number of Greek names found in these two sources.

The first list contains all the names of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek rulers known from numismatics.<sup>297</sup> The list is composed following Bopearachchi (1991). An asterisk indicates that the king is also mentioned in Western literary sources.

Greek	MIA <sup>298</sup>	
<u>Kings:</u>		
Agathocles (Ἀγαθοκλῆς)	Agathukreya	(Brāhmī) Agathuklaya
Amyntas (Ἀμύντας)	Amita	Note the missing nasal (cf. Epander)
Antialcidas (Ἀντιαλκίδας)	Ἀντιάλκιδα	Antalikita of the Besnagar inscription
Antimachus (Ἀντίμαχος)	Ἀντιμακχα	Name also found in the new parchment
Antiochus (Ἀντίοχος) <sup>299</sup>		Aśoka's Antiyoka
*Apollodotus (Ἀπολλόδοτος)	Apaladata	
Apollophanes (Ἀπολλοφάνης)	Apalaphana	
Archebius (Ἀρχέβιος)	Arkhebiya	
Artemidorus (Ἀρτεμίδωρος) <sup>300</sup>	Artemitora	Late and ephemeral king

---

*tasa ayasa*. But the change was expressed in Greek, and perhaps it was not just a piece of fiction when Philostratus made the Parthian king of Taxila converse with Apollonius and Damis in good Greek. According to Nicolaus Damascenus (F 100 in Strabo 15, 1, 73), the Indian embassy delivered to Augustus a letter written in Greek.

<sup>296</sup> Tam 1951, 352ff. (obs. 355 ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ (nom.) ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΝΕΡΚΟΥ (gen.))! See also Davidovich 1980, 160ff. The arguments of Kennedy 1913 for Greek being a living language in the Kushan empire are hardly convincing.

<sup>297</sup> A possible further case is the early Kushan king Herais (?), whose name could be explained as a Greek theophoric name (from Hera). See Davidovich 1980.

<sup>298</sup> The ending *-sa* of the genitive is left out. In feminine names the ending is given in brackets.

<sup>299</sup> According to Bopearachchi 1991, all Antiochus coins hail from the Seleucids.

VI. Greeks in the East

*Demetrius (Δημήτριος) <sup>301</sup>	Dimetriya	Suggested Indian references
*Diodotus (Διόδοτος)		Literary variant Theodotus (Θεόδοτος)
Diomedes (Διομήδης)	Diyumeta	
Dionysius (-sus) (Διονύσιος)	Diyanisiya	
Erander (Ἐπανδρος)	Epadra	Note the missing nasal (cf. Amyntas)
*Eucratides (Εὐκρατίδης)	Evukratida	
*Euthydemus (Εὐθύδημος)		
Heliocles (Ἡλιοκλῆς) (-krea, -kresa)	Heliyakreya	
Hermaeus (Ἑρμαῖος)	Heramaya	Name earlier attested in Ai Khanum
Hippostratus (Ἱππόστρατος)	Hipustrata	
Lysias (Λυσίας)	Lisia (Lisika)	
Menander (Μένανδρος)	Menamdra	Epigr. Minemdra, Minamdra, lit. Milinda
Nicias (Νικίας)	Nikia	Name also attested in Afrasiab
Pantaleon (Πανταλέων)		(Brāhmī) Pamtaleva
Peucolaos (Πευκόλαος)	Piukulaa <sup>302</sup>	
Philoxenus (Φιλόξενος)	Philasina	Name earlier attested in Ai Khanum
Plato (Πλάτων)		
Polyxenus (Πολύξενος)	Palasina	
Strato (Στράτων)	Strata	Name earlier attested in Ai Khanum
Telephus (Τήλεφος)	Telipha	
[Theodamas (Θεοδάμας)]		Theudama of Kharoṣṭhī inscription
Theophilus (Θεόφιλος)	Theuphila	
Thraso (Θράσων) <sup>303</sup>	Thrasa	
Zoilus (Ζωΐλος)	Jhoila	
<u>Queens:</u>		
Agathocleia (Ἀγαθοκλεΐα)	Agathukria(e)	
Calliope (Καλλιόπη)	Kaliyapa(ya)	
Laodice (Λαοδίκη)		

After the kings come the commoners. Thirty years ago this second list was still more or less non-existent; now the epigraphic finds from Ai Khanum and elsewhere have furnished us with a long list of names. From Ai Khanum we know some 20 Greek (or at least Western) names:

<sup>300</sup> Boppearachchi 1991, 316ff. reads ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΟΡΟΣ, but the omega of -ΔΩΡΟΣ is clearly seen in his plates 49f. The same error is repeated in Boppearachchi & Rahman 1995, 140ff.

<sup>301</sup> Boppearachchi 1991, 287 reads ΔΕΜΗΤΡΙΥΣ for the late King Demetrius III Anicetus, but the eta of ΔΗ- is clearly seen in his plate 43. The Kharoṣṭhī form Dimetriya is attested only for the last one and it is interesting to note that the unaccented η is rendered as *i*, accented ῆ as *e*.

<sup>302</sup> See Boppearachchi 1991, 309, note 1.

<sup>303</sup> A new king found only in 1982 and thus unknown to Tam and Narain. See Boppearachchi 1991, 106f. & 310.

Apo[llο... ('Απολλο-)	many common theophoric names
Aryandes ('Αρύανδης)	
Callisth[enes] (Καλλισθένης)	
Cineas (Κινέας)	
Clearchus (Κλέαρχος)	the philosopher?
Cosmus (or -es,) (Κόσμος, Κόσμης)	twice, hardly Cosmas (Κοσμάς)
Hermæus ('Ερμαιος)	3 times; also a late king
Hippias ('Ιππίας)	
Isidora (Ισιδώρα)	Egyptian theophoric name from the goddess Isis
Lysanias (Λυσανίας)	
Molossus (Μολοσσός)	
Niceratus (Νικήρατος)	perhaps twice
Philiscus (Φίλισκος)	
Philoxene (Φιλοξένη)	female
Sin[...]tus (Σιν[.φω]τος)	might also be Iranian
Sosipa[ter] (Σωσίπατρως)	
Strato (Στράτων)	3 times; also a royal name
Theophras[tus] (Θεόφραστος)	
Timodemus (Τιμόδημος)	
Triballus (Τριβαλλός)	Thracian
Zeno (Ζήνων)	

Nineteen males, three of them also occurring in our list of 33 kings (+ three queens), and two females. Among them Lysanias, Molossus and Triballus were familiar in Macedonia; the rest are Greek.<sup>304</sup> In addition, the Greek inscriptions of Ai Khanum contain some Iranian names, such as Oxēboaces ('Οξηβοακης), Oxybazus ('Οξυβαζος), Tartzus (Ταρζος), Umanus (Ούμανος) and Xatrannus (Ξατραννος).<sup>305</sup>

The new parchment fragment of Sangcharak contains no fewer than five names (six persons), which are all Greek: Antimachus (twice), Eumenes (Εὐμένης), Menodotus (Μηνόδοτος), Demonax (Δημώναξ), and Diodorus (Διόδωρος).

Other sites offer only a few additions to these lists. While Atrosoces ('Ατροσώκης) of Takht-i Sangin is clearly an Iranian,<sup>306</sup> the deceased of the Djiga Tepe funerary epigram has the good Greek name Diogenes (Διογένης). An ostrakon from Afrasiab contains the name Nicias. Ripos ('Ρίπος) of Kara Kamar, Aristonax ('Αριστόναξ) of Kandahar and Palamedes (Παλαμήδης) of Surkh Kotal conclude the list of names from Greek epigraphy.

To this can be still added some names from Indian inscriptions, though their identification is often uncertain. In addition to King Antialcidas, the Besnagar inscription furnishes us with Heliodorus ('Ηλιόδωρος, Heliodora) and his father Dion (Δίων, Diya).

<sup>304</sup> Holt 1989, 65.

<sup>305</sup> For Iranian names see Grenet 1983. I have not added Greek accents to these names not attested in accented texts.

<sup>306</sup> On his name see Litvinskij in Litvinskij & Vinogradov & Pičikjan 1985, 103ff., and Bernard 1987b, 113f.

While Theodorus (Θεόδωρος, as Theudora) of the Swat Relic Vase Inscription seems rather clear, we cannot be certain that Thaïdora (Datiaputra, perhaps son of Dates [Δατης], with an Iranian name) and Theutara really represent different transcriptions of the same name. Further, Agisála could be Agesilaos (Ἀγησίλαος) and Denipa is perhaps Deinippus (Δείνιππος).<sup>307</sup>

All in all, from rather meagre evidence we have around 60 names, all Greek or Hellenistic (Thracian Triballus), representing different types of Greek nomenclature. The great majority of them are attested in Greek script, in inscriptions and coin legends. I think this is a rather imposing testimony to Hellenism in Bactria, though the rarity of Indian inscriptions farther in the east diminishes its importance for Northwest India. Here we have only coins, and in particular late coin legends show occasionally incorrect forms. On the other hand, until the very end of the line of Indo-Greek kings they also bear Greek titles, and some Greek names of offices are found in Indian inscriptions even in the Kushan period. Perhaps there were not so many Greeks in India and perhaps they finally became Indianized (or Iranized), but their existence we cannot deny.

### 8. Greek Gods Abroad

Though our knowledge of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek history is so slight, there is one further field where numismatic and archaeological evidence gives some information we must briefly discuss. This is the question of religion, of the relation and interaction between Greek gods and cults (often connected with Greek city government) on the one hand, and Iranian (with Central Asian elements) and Indian religions on the other hand.<sup>308</sup> Much religious evidence is given by coins. In GB coins the obverse normally contains the portrait of the king, while the reverse is reserved for the legend and for a god or religious symbol. On bilingual coins legends appear on both sides, Greek on the obverse and Indian on the reverse. In some cases the legends, too, contain religious information, but normally they only give the title and the name of the king. Additional evidence is now offered by archaeology. The Yavanas that are quite often mentioned in Indian

<sup>307</sup> For these and some further possibilities see VI.5 above and Tarn 1951, 392.

<sup>308</sup> While Tarn (1951) and others (see e.g. Foucher 1947, 254ff.) have had much to say on this subject, a special discussion is found in Singh 1971. Bopearachchi 1991, 377ff., gives an index of motifs, but does not discuss them. Jash 1991 seems to think, without knowing Singh's article, that he is opening fresh ground, but instead of constructive analysis he mainly gives no more than rhetoric about the importance of this kind of study. We hardly need expect much from him. He seems, for instance, to think that already on Bactrian coins Greek gods were interpreted according to Indian religion and he even explains the owl as Athena's symbol from Indian mythology (Jash 1991, 46). Even if a local (though he says Indian) species of owl was used on some coins, we would like to have some evidence for his claim that Lakṣmī really was theriomorphically represented as an owl (like Durgā later in her Cāmuṇḍā form) and that she, an Indian goddess, was known and worshipped in Iranian Bactria at an early date.

epigraphy (and not only in the Northwest) were generally Buddhists, with the exception of Heliiodorus, who gave his devotion to Vāsudeva. On Indo-Greek coins we sometimes meet Indian religious symbols, but not Buddhist ones.

In chapter VI.4 above we have mentioned temples found in excavations at such sites as Ai Khanum, Dilberjin, Kandahar, and Taxila. While the architecture is often Iranian, though Hellenizing, there is often epigraphic and iconographical evidence for Greek cults. The inscriptions in the temenos of Kineas at Ai Khanum, as well as the dedicatory inscription from Kandahar, testify to Greek religion, apparently accompanying other common institutions of Greek city life (such as the gymnasium and theatre at Ai Khanum). The great temple of Dilberjin was originally built in the late Graeco-Bactrian period (excavations have also revealed some remains of murals of this age) as a temple of Dioscuri, and converted in the Kushan period into what seems to have been a dynastic temple.<sup>309</sup> At the same time there are also clear traces of flourishing Iranian religion in ancient Bactria, and temples such as the great temple of Surkh Kotal apparently had nothing to do with Greek religion.

There are remains of some Greek-style temples found in Pakistan (e. g. at Taxila), but with them we cannot be sure that a Greek cult was practised in them. Greek cults were practised in Greek cities, but, with the possible exception of Kandahar, there is not a single place south of the Hindukush that we could point out and say: This, at least, was a Greek city. Tarn suggested many, probably too many, and even at best they remain hypotheses. In any case, the majority of the population evidently remained Hindus or Buddhists, and it is very possible that some of the Indo-Greeks adopted new cults, too (like Heliiodorus). The parallel of the Greek and Hellenistic usages of other regions, such as Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor and Rome, makes it likely that Greek gods and goddesses were habitually identified with local ones, but in the Farther East we rarely have good evidence for actual cases of such identification.

Beyond the chronological limits of our study, Hellenistic religious art gave formal inspiration to the Buddhist art called Gandhāran, according to the earliest finds of this art. As such it was later carried far to Central Asia, but its Hellenism was confined to the form, while the content was clearly Buddhist.<sup>310</sup>

Many Greek gods are attested on coins, and we may suppose that their cult was to some extent practised in Greek cities of the Farther East, though we can hardly reach any definite conclusions. A list of Greek gods attested on coins is given here in the following pages.<sup>311</sup> These gods as well as other figures depicted on coins (such as the king on a

<sup>309</sup> A fragmentary Bactrian inscription seems to account for this restoration (Kruglikova 1977, 412). It has been suggested that this site could be the ancient Eucratidia (Εὐκρατιδία) of Ptolemy 6, 11, 8.

<sup>310</sup> I should like to quote here the words of Gnoli (1992, 32) referring to this very question: "It is obvious that, while iconography is certainly useful to the history of religions (and to other studies as well), we must always bear in mind that the diffusion of iconographical motifs does not in itself mean a parallel spreading of the religious ideas that form their background in different historical and cultural contexts."

<sup>311</sup> The list is mainly founded on materials in Singh 1971 and Bopearachchi 1991, 377ff. (Index des types monétaires). Another survey by Jash (1988) did not add much.

prancing horse, elephants, hump-backed bulls and other animals) have been much used as evidence in historical reconstruction. They have been variously interpreted as dynastic arms, local emblems, or as commemorative of a particular situation, but as the individual interpretations have been widely differing and quite speculative in nature we mention them only occasionally.<sup>312</sup>

**Zeus**, as the main god of the Greek pantheon, was naturally found everywhere in Hellenistic countries where Greek cults were practised at all. In GB and IG numismatics, too, he is the most frequently represented god, from Diodotus to late IG kings. He is depicted standing and enthroned, occasionally holding a goddess (Nike, Athena or Hecate). Iranian symbolism (Mithra) has been suggested in Hermaeus' Zeus coins.

Tarn seems to have been making up his own mythology when he suggested that Zeus was locally identified with the "elephant-god of Kapisa". With reason it has been asked, who was this elephant-god? The gods in India (or in Iran as to that) were generally not animals. Was he thinking of Gaṇapati<sup>313</sup> or a cult of Airāvata, the mount of Indra? Probably he was just misinterpreting the evidence. The Chinese evidence of Xuanzang for a local god Pīlusāra is more than a half millennium later and not too convincing.<sup>314</sup> In more recent studies some of Tarn's Kapisan coins have been accepted as depicting Zeus, but not necessarily connected with Kapisa, while the curious bronze of Eucratides (Série 24 of Bopearachchi) with the bust and name of the king on the obverse and the figure and Kharoṣṭhī inscription *kavisiye nagara devata* 'the city god(dess) of Kapisa' is no longer interpreted as Zeus.<sup>315</sup>

Another type which has caused much speculation is the Antialcidas type of Zeus holding Nike and an elephant, with a wreath depicted in various types as held by Nike, by the elephant, or by both. Zeus holding Nike is clearly connected with the king, who called himself Nikephorus. These coins have often been explained as reflecting some kind of conflict between rival kings or religious parties,<sup>316</sup> but, as Narain (1957, 121f.) noted, the elephant is Indra's mount and, as an identification of Zeus with Indra is very natural, there is no reason to take the elephant as representing an opposite party.

**Apollo** was always a major god in Greece, and in the East his cult was important in the Seleucid Empire (Tarn 1951, 191). Even farther in the East his image is quite often found on coins. Various Apollo coins were struck by at least eight GB and IG kings, the most numerous types being naturally those of Apollodotus. Some influence of Apollo has been suggested in the Gandhāran Buddha and also in Vajrapāṇi, though Heracles seems to be more important as a model here.<sup>317</sup>

<sup>312</sup> See the criticism of such interpretation in Guillaume 1990, 78ff.

<sup>313</sup> See Dhavalikar 1981.

<sup>314</sup> Tarn 1951, 97 & 212f. See criticism in Burn 1941, 63f., and Narain 1957, 62f. & 120ff. On Zeus also Tarn 1951, 138, 202, Singh 1971, 14f. and Lahiri 1980.

<sup>315</sup> Narain 1957, 62f., Bopearachchi 1991, 216. Kundu 1982, 132, accepts the god as Zeus and identifies him with Indra.

<sup>316</sup> Tarn 1951, 314f., Lahiri 1980, 62ff.

<sup>317</sup> Tarn 1951, 405, and Roberts 1959, 110. For Apollo on coins see Singh 1971, 9.

Tarn (1951, 68) emphasized that, unlike many other Greek gods or goddesses, **Athena** was never equated with Asiatic cults in the Hellenistic East. In Kushan times, however, this was done. In the famous mural of the Dilberjin temple of the Dioscuri Athena is depicted as a syncretistic figure, clearly identifiable as an Iranian goddess, too.<sup>318</sup> In any case, in GB and IG numismatics Athena was one of the most popular gods or goddesses. Several types of her are found on coins struck by a number of kings ranging from Diodotus to late IG rulers. In a few cases she is holding Nike. Her familiar little owl is depicted on coins of Menander and Archebius<sup>319</sup>

Even in the West **Artemis** was worshipped in two different forms. Beside the chaste virgin of Greek tradition there was always the fertility goddess of Asia Minor, the Artemis of Ephesus with her hundred breasts. In the Iranian world she was often identified with Anāhita/Anaitis. In the Farther East only five kings struck coins with her image, beginning with Diodotus.<sup>320</sup> The third major goddess of Greek religion, **Aphrodite**, was never depicted on GB and IG coins.<sup>321</sup>

To return to male gods we shall next take **Poseidon**. Poseidon coins are known from two or three Indo-Greek rulers.<sup>322</sup> Tarn took all Poseidon coins as evidence of naval victories. These are supposed to have taken place even on rivers, like the Jhelam, where a naval battle is said to have been hardly possible (and never attempted in later history). For this he was rightly criticized by Burn.<sup>323</sup> Poseidon as the god of horses is perhaps an important aspect here and Burn also refers to the possibility of these coins commemorating Alexander's river voyage.

Though the **Dioscuri** were not so important religiously, they were useful as a symbolic figure for joint kings. A real cult in Bactria is suggested by their excavated temple in Dilberjin, for which see above. However, only two kings, Eucratides and Diomedes, used them on their coins (Singh 1971, 11f.).

**Dionysus** with his supposed Indian campaign is a god one would suppose to be often found in the east. The countries ruled by GB and IG kingdoms also had an old tradition of viticulture and cults connected with it, which could be easily identified with Dionysus (as actually happened to Alexander's men in Nysa).<sup>324</sup> Nevertheless, the only certain Dionysus coins were struck by Pantaleon and Agathocles, who occupy an exceptional position in Indo-Greek numismatics.<sup>325</sup> On their coins the god is depicted with a leopard, an animal closely connected (together with the tiger) with the god, for instance in

<sup>318</sup> See Grenet 1987, who identifies her as Arštāt.

<sup>319</sup> Singh 1971, 10f. For the influence of Athena in Gandhāran art see Roberts 1959, 114ff.

<sup>320</sup> Singh 1971, 9f. For Anahita, see Tarn 1951, 135.

<sup>321</sup> For possible Aphroditean elements in Gandhāran art see Roberts 1959, 117f.

<sup>322</sup> According to Boppearachchi 1991, Nicias and Antimachus. See also Singh 1971, 14.

<sup>323</sup> Tarn 1951, 90, 322, 328 & 349, Burn 1941, 64f. (further Narain 1957, index).

<sup>324</sup> See Pugačenkova 1967 for Dionysiac cults in Bactria and Middle Asia.

<sup>325</sup> They were probably the first to mint coins in the Indian standard and to use Indian legends. Theirs were the only Brāhmī legends known as well as the only identifiable Indian gods.

Latin poetry.<sup>326</sup> The *Vita Apollonii* of Philostratus contains a possible reference (2, 9) to a cult of Dionysus in Northwest India.<sup>327</sup>

**Heracles** was the second "Indian" god of Western tradition, and closely connected with Alexander, who counted the hero as his ancestor. Therefore he is quite often represented in eastern numismatics, by more than ten different rulers.<sup>328</sup> There is also archaeological evidence for Heracles in ancient Bactria. A head of young Heracles has been found at Takht-i Sangin and several other figures have been quoted from other sites.<sup>329</sup> In Gandhāran art Heracles influenced the common figure of Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi.

Though one of the major gods of the Greek pantheon, **Hermes** seems to be very secondary in the Farther East. No coins with his picture are found among Indo-Greek issues, but in the early period he was depicted by Bactrian Diodoti (probably both).<sup>330</sup>

The sun is understandably important nearly everywhere, and we thus meet Greek **Helios** in the Farther East, too, where he seems to be connected with local (probably Iranian) sun cults. Nevertheless, he is not common at all. Helios coins are known from Plato, Philoxenus and Telephus (here together with his female counterpart **Selene**).<sup>331</sup>

Even in the West, the old goddess **Demeter** tended to lose importance as the fertility aspect she originally represented was so well served by more fascinating cults, such as those of Dionysus and Artemis. In the case of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek coins it is uncertain whether she is represented at all, though a group of late coins commonly identified as portraying city goddesses have also been identified with her (Singh 1971, 11.).

The ancient chthonic goddess **Hecate** was even in the West often confused with Artemis and Selene. She was never depicted alone on Indo-Greek coins, but on three types of Pantaleon (and on the commemorative issue of Pantaleon by Agathocles) she is seen together with Zeus.<sup>332</sup>

<sup>326</sup> Singh 1971, 11. The panther (Tarn 1951, 158f.) was explained by Narain (1957, 59) as a maneless lion, but is again accepted as a panther by Singh and Bopearachchi. Chaudhary 1983 tries to identify the Dionysus of these coins with Indian Balarāma. This is not impossible, but some of his arguments are completely unacceptable. It is serious mistake to accept Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* as a historical source, and though it is formally true that Dionysus and Heracles were brothers (as sons of Zeus), this brotherhood had no theological significance. Tarn (*l. c.*) noted that as these coins are not bilingual, there is no need for an Indian identification (though he was thinking of Śiva).

<sup>327</sup> It derives partly from the history of Alexander, but some of its details might be from another source. In any case, it is remarkable that Philostratus claims different cults and myths in different regions.

<sup>328</sup> Singh 1971, 12f. Chaudhury 1983, 129 suggested an identification of Heracles on Agathocles' coins with Vāsudeva. The problem of identification of Heracles and Dionysus in India has been discussed by me from another angle, that of Alexander's history and Megasthenes, in Karttunen 1989a, 210ff.

<sup>329</sup> For Takht-i Sangin see Pičikjan in *SA* 1983:1, 80–90 with F. Grenet in *Abstr. Ir.* 7, 1984, 40. by F. G.); on a late sanctuary of Heracles (3rd/4th century A.D.) at Dilberjin Pugačenkova 1977 (with important criticism by F. Grenet in *Abstr. Ir.* 1, 26), and on a further Heracles figure *Abstr. Ir.* 12, 1989, 35f.

<sup>330</sup> Singh 1971, 13.

<sup>331</sup> Singh 1971, 12.

<sup>332</sup> Tarn 1951, 158f., Singh 1971, 12.

**Nike** as the symbol of victory was perhaps more important politically than religiously. She was used to celebrate a real victory, but probably also the desire for it. Accordingly, quite a number of Indo-Greek kings represented her on their coins. Alone with a victory wreath she is depicted by 8 to 10 kings, and in some further cases she is held by Zeus or by Athena (Singh 1971, 13f.).

Possible Alexandrian cults are suggested by several figurines of **Sarapis** and **Harpocrates** and on a coin of the Kushan King Huvishka (with the legend "Sara-po").<sup>333</sup> Most of these belong only to the Kushan period, but the name Isidora ("gift of **Isis**") is found on an Ai Khanum funerary inscription.<sup>334</sup>

In the life of a Greek city, the cult of its founder hero was important. It seems likely that there were some local heroes in Greek style revered in some towns of the Farther East. **Alexander** himself, with his many foundations, might have been one, but the Kandahar inscription is inconclusive (cf. II.5). But even if the illegible name in this inscription was something else, the cult probably existed there. Perhaps **Kineas** in Ai Khanum was also such a hero, and in cities with Greek cults there were probably more such heroes. We can only hope that archaeologists will be able to offer us some in the future.

Literary evidence for Western cults in the East is generally not very convincing, but might still contain a kernel of truth. We have seen that Greek cults *were* to some extent practised in the Indo-Greek principalities. Thus, if there is any truth in Plutarch's account of Greek-style offerings given by local people on Alexander's altars, it hardly refers to any Hellenistic influence in Mauryan India,<sup>335</sup> but to the Indo-Greek period. A cult connected with Alexander is easily understood among Indo-Greeks. On another occasion Plutarch<sup>336</sup> asserted that Greek gods were revered in Bactria and the Caucasus (Hindu-kush). While Plutarch thought that this happened "thanks to Alexander", it might still refer to the Indo-Greek period. Philostratus' account of Greek temples and cults in Taxila in the first century A.D. shortly after the Indo-Greek period can also be interpreted in this way.

Local gods were sometimes represented in Greek form. The river-god **Oxus** is mentioned on the votive statuette of Marsyas dedicated by Atrosoces and found at Takht-i Sangin. It is a remarkable testimony to the mixed Hellenistic culture in ancient Bactria. The donor, Atrosoces, bears an Iranian name, while the name of the god is given in Greek form (and in the masculine gender). The shift between Greek and Iranian was an easy one, as we see from the Iranian form Vaxšu (Oxus) found in Kushan coins. The cult may always have been clearly Iranian, but local cults only slightly Hellenized were a common feature of Hellenistic society in the West, too.<sup>337</sup> In the case of the Oxus the Hellenization

<sup>333</sup> Grenet 1982. Maillard 1975 described Sarapis and Harpocrates figurines found in the region of Khotan in Central Asia.

<sup>334</sup> In the popular syncretistic religion of Egyptian origin, but also with many Hellenistic elements, the main gods were Sarapis (Osiris-Apis), Isis, and their son Harpocrates (Horus). See Tarn & Griffith 1952, 355ff.

<sup>335</sup> So Schwarz 1970, 273. See Tarn 1951, 380.

<sup>336</sup> *De Alex. virt.* 1, 5, 328D.

<sup>337</sup> Think e.g. of Isis, Sarapis, Nanaia and the great mother-goddess of Asia Minor.

seems to have included an analogy to the Maeandrus in Asia Minor (intimately connected with Marsyas), perhaps the country of origin of many settlers of Bactria. King Euthydemus himself came from Magnesia on the Maeandrus.<sup>338</sup>

Other river cults are mentioned in literature. Philostratus (*V. Ap.* 2, 19) refers to a cult of the Indus. The Greeks were accustomed to honouring rivers and we are told that Alexander offered sacrifice to Indian rivers.<sup>339</sup> This might be the explanation of the Philostratus passage, too, but, as we have seen, many other details in his description of Taxila were derived from a source describing a much later period.

Two city god(desse)s are named in coin legends. In the already-mentioned coin of Eucratides depicting a goddess with a palm the Indian legend (the Greek is the name of the king) states: *kavisiye nagara devata*, 'the city goddess of Kapisa', i.e. Begram. From Puṣkalāvātī (Charsada) comes a local coin (probably minted only after the Indo-Greeks) with the legend: *pukhalavati devata aṃbi*. Who is this Ambi? A local Gandhāran god(dess)? Perhaps we have here a new explanation for Omphis/Mophis, the personal name of King Taxiles. Boppearachchi (1991, 380f.) lists some local goddesses on late Indo-Greek coins, depicted with a cornucopia (Philoxenus and Hippostratus), with a palm (Peucolaos and Hippostratus), enthroned (Amyntas) etc. Agathocles and Pantaleon depict a goddess in Indian costume, and we have seen that several Greek gods and goddesses were probably identified with local cults, but the only certainly identified Indian gods in the whole GB/IG coinage are the famous Vāsudeva and Saṃkarṣana coins of Agathocles found at Ai Khanum.<sup>340</sup>

While the archaeological evidence gives us testimony of popular Hellenistic cults as well as of local Iranian and Indian religions and mixed phenomena, the general appearance of coins is different. Leaving aside exceptional and rare cases, the old Greek gods like Zeus, Apollo and Athena were mostly represented in a traditional way. We can well believe that these Greek cults were not so important religiously, but elsewhere, too, they were useful as a symbol of Greek identity. We can surmise that the official Greek state cult was continued here, too, until the very end of the Indo-Greek period, though the majority of the population (including many Greeks or people Hellenized enough to have Greek names) adhered to local Indian and Iranian cults.

Greek gods were localized and Greek elements were traded to local cults. In much later (so-called Gandhāran) art – but we do not really know how early it began – the inspiration of Greek (i.e. Hellenistic) art gave Hellenistic form to many Buddhist saints.

<sup>338</sup> For the cult of the Oxus and for possible parallels with the Maeandrus see Bernard 1987b. Pichikyan 1996, 218, mentions a brief dedication in Aramaic "to Vakhs" found among the Oxus treasure.

<sup>339</sup> A sacrifice on the banks of the Indus, but not to the river in Arrianus, *Anab.* 5, 3, 6; but at the beginning of the naval voyage both Hydaspes and Acesines were invoked (*Anab.* 6, 3, 1).

<sup>340</sup> Narain 1973, Kundu 1982. On the supposed Gaṇeṣa on a coin of Hermaeus see Boppearachchi 1992b & 1993a.

## 9. Yavanas in Indian Sources

A possible, but also difficult, source for the Indo-Greeks are the many (but mostly very short) passages of ancient Indian literature dealing with Yavanas or Yonas. For these Sylvain Lévi's old survey (1890a) is still useful, but much new evidence has turned up. Now it is also necessary to take into account such important works as the critical editions of the *Mahābhārata* (Lévi still quoted the old Calcutta edition of the 1830s) and *Rāmāyaṇa*. In this chapter I cannot keep to the chronological limits otherwise followed in this study, and defined purely from a Western perspective. The full account of Indian material will be published elsewhere; at present my intention is only to give a summary of the matter.

In my earlier book I already stated that I consider the evidence both for the etymology OIA *yavana* < MIA *yona*<sup>341</sup> < OP *yauna* < Ionian and for the identification Yavana = Greek (or somebody considered as Hellenized)<sup>342</sup> to be conclusive for the early period of Indo-Western contacts.<sup>343</sup> The word was used both of the Bactrian Greeks living in the Northwest of India, and of those living in the Hellenistic West, and even, as in Tamil literature, of the merchants sailing to the harbours of South India. Later, when there were no more real Yavanas in the neighbourhood, the name was used for all westerners, especially for Arabs.

The most numerous references come from the great Indian epics, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Very often the Yavanas and their kings (*yavanādhipa[ti]*) are here mentioned together with other more or less foreign northwesterners, especially with the Sakas.<sup>344</sup> Like other northwesterners they bred excellent horses, were good archers, and in the great battle they fought on the side of the Kauravas.<sup>345</sup> As in other sources, their social status remained somewhat unclear.<sup>346</sup> In a curious verse the omniscient Yavanas (perhaps astrologers) are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>347</sup>

<sup>341</sup> In later MIA dialects also *javaṇa*, *joṇa*.

<sup>342</sup> Of course, Greek was the exact meaning of Yavana only in principle. Without doubt, many Indians did not bother to distinguish between various northwestern barbarians.

<sup>343</sup> Karttunen 1989a & forthcoming, see further Tóttösy 1955. The material is also briefly surveyed by Ray 1995, 76ff.

<sup>344</sup> Together with the Śakas in the *Mbh.* 3, 48, 20; 3, 186, 30; 5, 19, 21; 5, 196, 7; 6, 20, 13; 6, 71, 20; 7, 6, 5; 7, 10, 18; 7, 19, 7; 7, 68, 41; 7, 97, 13; 8, 31, 15; 8, 40, 108; 8, 64, 16; 9, 2, 18; 9, 7, 24; 13, 33, 19; *Rām* 1, 53, 20f.; *yavanādhipa(ti)* in *Mbh.* 2, 4, 22 & 2, 13, 13.

<sup>345</sup> Horses in *Mbh.* 2, 47, 12 & 8, 64, 16; archers *Mbh.* 7, 95, 12; on the battle see e.g. *Mbh.* 6, 20, 13; 6, 83, 10; and especially 7, 95, 12ff.

<sup>346</sup> Kṣatriyas born of Turvasu in *Mbh.* 1, 80, 26; Kṣatriyas fallen into a low status (*vṛṣalatva*) because of the absence of Brāhmaṇas in *Mbh.* 13, 33, 19 & 13, 35, 18; created by Vasiṣṭha from the urine of Kāmadhenu in *Mbh.* 1, 165, 35 & *Rām* 1, 53, 20f.; one of the sinful Mleccha tribes of the accursed Kali age in *Mbh.* 12, 65, 13.

<sup>347</sup> *Mbh.* 8, 30, 80: *sarvajñā yavanā rājañ śūrāś caiva viśeṣataḥ | mlecchāḥ svasamjñāniyatā nānukta itaro janaḥ ||*

According to Roy (*ad l.*), "Nilakantha makes a desperate attempt to explain away the force of the passage, but fails miserably."

In the *Arthaśāstra* we find a mention of northwestern Mlecchas, but not of the Yavanas. The import of western (Alexandrian) red coral is mentioned there (2, 11, 42 *pravāla-kam ālasandakam*), and is further attested by Pliny and in the *Periplus* 49 (cf. V.6 above).

A few law books comment briefly on the social status of the Yavanas. According to the *Gautamadharmasūtra* 4, 21, they were a kind of Śūdras, and the *Mānavadharmasūtra* (10, 43f.) included them among fallen Kṣatriyas.

*Grammatical literature* contains some very old evidence, although not necessarily going back to the time before Alexander.<sup>348</sup> Greek writing is mentioned by Kātyāyana (Vārttika on P. 4, 1, 49), and Indo-Greek conquests in India are referred to in the famous passage of Patañjali (on P. 3, 2, 111). Further, their social status (not impure Śūdras) is stated by Kātyāyana (Vārttika on P. 2, 4, 10). Yavana eating habits are referred to in a late source,<sup>349</sup> and the bald Yavanas (*yavanamuṇḍa*) in the *Gaṇapatha* 178 give an early parallel for an *aitia* story found in several Purāṇas.<sup>350</sup>

Among the *Sanskrit classics* some dramas show Yavana girls serving as bodyguards in the royal palace (their export to Barygaza is mentioned in the *Periplus* 49 and apparently in the *Mahābhārata*; see III.4 above). In the *Mudrārākṣasa* (Act 2) Śakas and Yavanas are mentioned among the allies of Candragupta. In the famous passage of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* often connected with the Indo-Greeks Vasumitra Śuṅga fights the Yavanas at the Indus, while during his Digvijaya Raghu fights the Yavanas in the confines of Persia (Pārasīka) and disapproves of the wine-drinking habit of Yavana women.<sup>351</sup> In story literature we meet Yavanas as a seafaring people,<sup>352</sup> and we hear of merchants with Yavana names.<sup>353</sup> Skilful Greek engineers with their artificial servants and flying machines were much lauded in narrative literature.<sup>354</sup>

Even more than as artisans and engineers the Yavanas were famous in the fields of *astronomy and astrology*.<sup>355</sup> At least from the first century A.D. onwards the Greeks were known as great masters of astrology. Names such as Yavana, Vṛddhayavana, Yavaneśvara and Yavanācārya have been often quoted as authorities in astrology.<sup>356</sup> As

<sup>348</sup> See chapter I above and Karttunen 1989a, 142ff.

<sup>349</sup> *Kāśikā* on P. 3, 2, 126: *śayānā bhujjate yavanāḥ* 'the Yavanas eat lying down'.

<sup>350</sup> See e.g. Kirfel, *Pañcalakṣaṇa* 2, I B, 28ff. The Purāṇas contain a number of Yavana passages, but as these texts are mostly assigned dates much later than any fresh memory of the Indo-Greeks, they are not included in the present survey.

<sup>351</sup> *Mālavikāgnimitra* Act 5; *Raghuvamśa* 4, 61.

<sup>352</sup> *Daśakumāracarita* 6, p. 155f. Kale. A trade expedition to Yavanadvīpa (*Javanadvīva*) is mentioned in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* p. 148 (Alsdorf 1935, 282f.), but this may also refer to Java.

<sup>353</sup> Yavanasena in the *Kathāsaritāgāra* 7, 36, 73, and the merchant's wife Yāvanī, who came from the Yavana country, in Buddhasvāmin's *Bṛhatathāślokaśaṅgraha* 18, 277 (another Yāvanī *ibid.* 17, 53).

<sup>354</sup> E.g. in the *Harṣacarita* p. 269 Führer; Buddhasvāmin's *Bṛhatathāślokaśaṅgraha* 5, 196ff.; *Vasudevahiṇḍi* p. 62 (Alsdorf 1935, 298); and Tibetan Kanjur in Ralston 1988, 361f.

<sup>355</sup> Varāhamihira: *BS* 2, 32:

*mlecchā hi yavanās teṣu samyak śāstram idaṃ sthitam |*  
*ṛṣivat te 'pi pūjyate kiṃ punar daivavid dvijaḥ ||*

<sup>356</sup> According to Pingree (1963 & 1981, 81ff.), a certain Yavaneśvara translated a Greek astrological work into Sanskrit c. 150 A.D. A versified version of this lost work was the *Yavanajātaka* by

the evidence of these early Yavana scholars seems to be concentrated in Gujarat, it seems plausible to think of the commercial relations of the early centuries A.D. as their origin. However, as an earlier Indo-Greek presence in Gujarat seems likely, we cannot leave them out of the picture. Two sun-dials were found during excavations at Ai Khanum.<sup>357</sup> Among the five classical Siddhāntas of Indian astronomy, two, Paulīśa and Romaka, are probably of Western origin.<sup>358</sup>

An early work on divination, the *Gargasamhitā*, contains an important section called the *Yugapurāna*, which includes an interesting, but also problematic, reference to Indo-Greek history.<sup>359</sup> It seems to mention a Yavana attack on Pāṭaliputra (called Kusumadhvaja) from Sāketa<sup>360</sup> and that they soon had to withdraw because of internal wars. A detailed study of the text has led Mitchiner to dismiss the earlier interpretation, claiming that the name Demetrius was actually mentioned in the text.

Although a number of Indian medicines were imported into the West and although contacts between the *Āyurveda* and Hippocratic medicine have been suggested by scholars (V.5 above), in Indian medical literature the Yavanas are hardly mentioned at all.<sup>361</sup>

In *Buddhist literature* the early canon of the Theravāda school offers little (just one reference to Yavanas in the Northwest),<sup>362</sup> but the Pāli commentaries contain quite a number of references. The Pāli chronicles, too, contain some interesting notes. There is even an account of a missionary expedition undertaken by Mahārakkhitatthera, who was sent by Moggaliputta from Aśoka's council to the Greek country (Yonakaloka, -raṭṭha), but unfortunately our sources are interested only in details of Buddhist religion.<sup>363</sup> Greek

---

Yavanarāja Sphujidhvaja. This and another work translated from Greek were used by a certain Satya in the third century. On Sphujidhvaja and on Satya's lost work was based Mīnarāja's extant *Vṛddhayavanajātaka*. Yavana as an authority e.g. in Varāhamihira's *Brhājātaka* 7, 1; 8, 9; 11, 1; 12, 1; 21, 3; 27, 2, 19, 21; Yavaneśvara, Yavanavṛddha and Sphujidhvaja in Utpala's commentary and many later works.

<sup>357</sup> See Veuve in *BCH* 106, 1982, 23ff. with *Abstr. Iran.* 6, 43f.

<sup>358</sup> Varāhamihira's *Pañcasiddhāntika* 1, 3f. In both schools the location of Yavanapura (Thibaut: Alexandria), in the latter also Romakaviṣaya, is used as a basis for reckoning.

<sup>359</sup> On the *Gargasamhitā* see Pingree 1981, 69ff., of the *Yugapurāna* a critical edition, translation and study is given in Mitchiner 1986. The Yavana incursion is mentioned in verses 47f. and 56f., and discussed in Mitchiner 1986, 55ff. See also Fussman 1993, 84f.

<sup>360</sup> Cf. the *Mahābhāṣya* on P. 3, 2, 111 *aruṇad yavanaḥ saketam* 'the Yavana was besieging Sāketa'.

<sup>361</sup> I have come across no references in the *Carakasamhitā*, and only one in the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (*Sūtra* 13, 13 those of the Yavana country as one of the non-poisonous kinds of leech).

<sup>362</sup> The *Majjhimanikāya* 93 (*Assalāyana sutta*) stating that among the Yonas and Kambojas and in neighbouring countries there are only two castes, the master and the slave, and that it was possible for a master to become a slave and *vice versa* (*yonakambojesu aññesu ca paccantimesu janapadesu dveva vaṇṇā, ayyo c'eva dāso ca; ayyo hutvā dāso hoti, dāso hutvā ayyo hotīti*). A late canonical text of commentarial character (the *Mahāniddesa*) contains an itinerary (p. 154f., cf. Lévi 1925) including Yona, Paramayona (could these refer to the Indo-Greek Northwest and the Near East? or perhaps to Arabia and the Mediterranean Near East) and Allasanda (Alexandria). The last addition to the canon, the *Apadāna*, too, mentions the Yonakas and the Alasandakas in a geographical list (406, p. 357).

<sup>363</sup> The *Vinaya Commentary* 1, p. 63f. & 67; the *Dīpavaṃsa* 8, 7ff; the *Mahāvaṃsa* 12, 4f. & 39f.; and later chronicles such as the *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, the *Thūpavaṃsa*, and the modern *Sāsanavaṃsa*. Another Buddhist missionary mentioned in the same account is called Yonaka(mahā)dhamma-

is sometimes included in a list of languages.<sup>364</sup> In much later times there was another Yavana country in Thailand, but this has nothing to do with the Greeks or any Westerners.<sup>365</sup>

An extremely important but also problematic source is the *Milindapañha* (extant versions in Pāli and Chinese), a Buddhist dialogue between the Indo-Greek king Menander and the Buddhist saint Nāgasena.<sup>366</sup> It forms a nice parallel to the Western tradition of Alexander and the Brahmans,<sup>367</sup> although the scholarly and dialectic ambitions of a king are very much an Indian feature, too. Tarn sees too much Greek influence in it, but still there are some interesting details to be found (such as the mention of the birthplace of Menander)<sup>368</sup> Some thought has also been given to the names of Menander's four counsellors, but the Greek interpretations are rather speculative and they seem to remain Indian.<sup>369</sup>

*Buddhist Sanskrit sources* are not very rich in passages mentioning the Yavanas. In the remains of the canonical literature only a few stories are to be found.<sup>370</sup> Greek writing is mentioned among other systems of writing in the *Mahāvastu* (p. 135 Senart) and in the Tibetan *Lalitavistara*.

The *Jaina literature* is mainly written in MIA Prākṛit dialects. Early MIA *yona(ka)* has here become later MIA *joṇa(ka)*, but the form *javaṇa* corresponding directly to OIA *yavana* is also common. With both these names Yavanas are mentioned in lists of foreign

---

rakkhitatthera. He was sent to Aparantaka in Western India. Cf. Fussman 1993, 69f. For another legend connected with him see the *Vinaya Commentary* 1, p. 55; the *Itivuttaka Commentary* 2, p. 1554 (on Vagga 1, 5); the *Theragāthā Commentary* 2, p. 227f. (on 10, 2, 537ff.). See also *Mahāvamsa* 29, 39.

<sup>364</sup> See the *Dīghanikāya Commentary* 1, p. 176 (on DN 2, 40); the *Aṅuttaranikāya Commentary* 2, p. 289 (on AN 3, 7, 3); and the *Vibhaṅga Commentary* p. 388.

<sup>365</sup> See e.g. the *Jinakālamālī* of Ratanapañña, p. 81ff.

<sup>366</sup> See e.g. Tarn 1951, 414ff., Gonda 1949, Foucher 1941 & 1951, Schwarz 1966, 82f. & 1983, 31ff., Vasil'kov 1989 & 1993, and Fussman 1993 (referring to the extensive study of Demiéville in *BEFEO* 24, 1924).

<sup>367</sup> An actual connection seen by Festugière 1943, Tarn 1951, 428ff., and Schwarz 1980, 92. The genuine Indian character of the dialogue of the *Milindapañha* is rightly emphasized by Gonda 1949, Fussman 1963, 68f., and Vasil'kov 1989 & 1993.

<sup>368</sup> Pāli Alasanda, Chinese A-li-san (Fussman 1993, 76). It has been variously identified as Alexandria sub Caucaso (Kapisa) and Alexandria in Egypt. The first possibility (Rapson, Foucher 1941, Boppearachchi 1990a, 42ff.) is historically more acceptable, but the second better explains the text (Demiéville, Lévi 1934 = 1937, 417f., Fussman 1993, 77ff.). Defending Egypt, Fussman remarks (*ibid.* 81) that the tradition may not necessarily be true, though it is also possible to conjecture an explanation that Menander was actually born in Egypt. To this can be added another conjecture combining the two theories. It is possible that Menander was born in Alexandria-Kapisa, but after the end of Indo-Greek rule this city was no longer known as Alexandria and when the original of the *Milindapañha* was written, Alexandria in Egypt, now much more famous even in India because of the sea trade, was substituted.

<sup>369</sup> For the Greek see Tarn 1951, 422, explaining Devamantiya and Anantakāya, as Demetrius and Antiochus, Mankura as Parthian Pacorus, and leaves Sabbadinna open. All can be explained as MIA names (cf. Fussman 1993, 70ff.).

<sup>370</sup> The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* p. 166ff. (Dutt), and the *Bhikṣunīvinaya* 162, p. 141 (Roth).

peoples (*milakkhas*), of foreign (slave) women, and of foreign conquests.<sup>371</sup> Several references are also found in Jaina narrative literature.

The only Western place-name mentioned in Indian sources, even with some frequency, is Alexandria.<sup>372</sup> We have seen that the name is mentioned in Pāli literature (*Mahāniddesa*, *Apadāna*, *Mahāvamsa*, *Thūpavamsa*, *Milindapañha*) and in the *Arthasāstra* (see above); it is further met with in Jaina sources and in a few Purāṇas. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to say with certainty whether an Indo-Greek Alexandria or Alexandria in Egypt is meant.

It is possible that even Rome is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* (according to Edgerton's conjecture [1938]) and in the *Garuḍapurāṇa*. Several geographical lists contain names of peoples such as the Romaka, but the possible Sanskrit derivation ('hairy') makes identification difficult. We have seen that in astronomy the Romakasiddhānta referred to Rome.

Yavanas were also mentioned in the classics of Tamil literature.<sup>373</sup> While Sanskrit sources generally connect them with the Northwest (i.e. Indo-Greeks), here they arrive in their fast ships from the West. This clearly refers to the trade between South India and Hellenistic Egypt, and will be discussed in the next chapter (see VI.2). This trade is perhaps also reflected in late lexicographical works where names such as *yavanapriya* 'dear to yavanas', *yavaneṣṭa* 'wished by Yavanas', *yavanadviṣṭa* 'hated by Yavanas', and *yavanadeśaja* 'born in the Yavana country' are given to various products.

---

<sup>371</sup> Material summarized by Weber 1883 and Jain 1979. In addition to Yavanas, even Arabs are included in some of these lists.

<sup>372</sup> See the summary in Lévi 1934 = 1937, 413ff., and Mayrhofer, *EWA* 2, s.v. *alasāndra*.

<sup>373</sup> See e.g. Meile 1941 and Zvelebil 1956.