

# NEW VOICES IN CLASSICAL RECEPTION STUDIES

## Issue 1 (2006)

### 'Hellenistic India'<sup>1</sup>

©Rachel R. Mairs, University of Cambridge (UK)

#### INTRODUCTION

Whilst the influence of post-colonialism may be seen in many aspects of modern Classical studies, one area of study in which the issues raised by reassessment of Europe's colonial past is of particular resonance is that of Hellenistic-period (c. 323–31 BCE) Greek settlement in India and Central Asia. The history of these regions under Greek rule has often, consciously or unconsciously, been compared to that of India under British rule. The way in which this is viewed—whether positively or negatively—has, however, changed according to the prevailing contemporary political and intellectual climate. This paper aims to assess the changing picture of Graeco-Indian historiography in this light, and also to examine the ways in which modern debates on colonialism might contribute towards developing a richer understanding of the Greek states in India. In particular, the use of the term 'Hellenistic'—still occasionally maligned for its supposed imperialist or cultural-chauvinist connotations—is argued to represent a productive paradigm in which to view the evidence.

The term 'Hellenistic India' is one which it is hardly safe to use without the semantic prophylactic of inverted commas. It is provocatively resonant of attempts made by scholars—mostly European, mostly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—to demonstrate considerable Graeco-Roman influence upon the culture and civilization of ancient India. Tarn (1938), in his ground-breaking work, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, stated his intentions quite explicitly: his goal was to reclaim the history of the easternmost Greek states for the discipline of Classics and have them designated as a 'fifth Hellenistic state'. Other historians of ancient Indian relations with the Classical world were less self-conscious about their motivations—at least in print—but their agenda is nevertheless clear. In their view, India had either taken or passively received Graeco-Roman ideas and artistic techniques, and these had been of critical importance in the development of Indian art, architecture and philosophy. The term 'Hellenistic', as originally used by Droysen (1836–43)<sup>2</sup> to designate a synthesis of Greek and 'Oriental' (with slightly derogatory overtones), could be applied to aspects of ancient Indian culture where Hellenic influence was supposed to have made itself felt.

Conversely—or perhaps perversely—the concept of 'Hellenistic India' is one to which I will return to later in this discussion and which I will argue *can* be applied in modern scholarship. Although 'Hellenistic' has come to be a loaded term in Indian historiography, with negative connotations of the imperialistic reduction of facets of Indian civilization to mere results of foreign influence, this is no longer the sense in which it is used in the study of the Mediterranean world. The modern usage of 'Hellenistic'—which has in many respects arisen from of post-colonialist reinterpretations of the ancient world—accepts the culture of the Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period as altogether more complex than the simple synthesis of Greek and Oriental. Ethnicity and cultural interaction are subtle phenomena, which manifested themselves in different ways in the ancient world and are subject to a range of possible modern analyses. What I would like to argue is that the issue of Greeks and Greek culture in India can be satisfactorily and productively dealt with within the academic framework established for the Hellenistic world.

Aside from the more abstract considerations of long-distance artistic or philosophical influence, the concrete evidence we have for direct contact between Greeks and Indians is

largely limited to the period between the third century BCE and first century CE.<sup>3</sup> The sources are extremely limited. There are a few relevant passages in Classical authors such as Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus and Ptolemy (see Holt 1999),<sup>4</sup> scattered and highly-contentious references in Indian texts and a small number of inscriptions (see Salomon 1998, Sharma 1980 and Rhys-Davids 1890 [2003]).<sup>5</sup> For many years, the major source of information on the Indo-Greeks was their coins, which preserve a large number of royal names unknown from the literary sources (see Guillaume 1990).<sup>6</sup> The excavation of cities (such as Ai Khanoum) and Buddhist monasteries in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Central Asia, providing new archaeological material, has revolutionized our knowledge of the Bactrian and Indo-Greeks,<sup>7</sup> and this is something which should be borne in mind when we come to look at works written before these discoveries.

Although the information is perhaps not as abundant as we would like, the basic history of the easternmost Greeks can be sketched in outline. In the late fourth century BCE, Alexander the Great established Greek cities and military colonies in Bactria (along the River Oxus in modern northern Afghanistan and southern Central Asia). Sometime in the mid-third century, these colonists ceased to pay even nominal allegiance to the Seleucid Empire and established their own kingdom under Diodotos I (see Holt 1988, Lerner 1999). As the excavations at Ai Khanoum have shown, this state possessed a dynamic and sophisticated Greek urban culture.<sup>8</sup> In the early to mid second century, the Bactrian Greeks crossed the Hindu Kush and invaded India, under Demetrios I and his general Menander (later a king in his own right), establishing states in the Panjab and perhaps penetrating as far as the old capital of the Mauryan Empire at Pataliputra (modern Patna). A disastrous combination of civil war, dynastic intrigue and nomadic invasions led to the collapse of the Greek kingdom of Bactria, leaving the states in India the last independent Greek kingdoms in the East. These too fell some time in the early first century CE.<sup>9</sup>

There is a great deal of ethnic and cultural ambiguity about the Indo-Greek kingdoms. Their coinage may have a Greek inscription on one side and a Prakrit one on the other, making the Greek-named monarch simultaneously *basileus* and *mahārājah*. While Greek texts laud the achievements of Menander, conqueror of India, an Indian text, the *Milindapañha*, makes him a patron of Buddhism. The artistic and architectural remains of the Bactrian and Indo-Greek cities at Ai Khanoum, Charsada and Taxila combine Classical Greek motifs with Indian and Central Asian ones.

The Indo-Greek states therefore present us with a rare opportunity to examine Graeco-Indian relations in microcosm, and address issues such as bilingualism, religious conversion, immigration and ethnic identity. These are, of course, issues with an almost inescapable modern resonance. When we consider the history of India since the eighteenth century—economic exploitation and then imperial control by an external power, the rise of nationalism and, later, independence—it is clear why historians have constantly sought parallels between the experience of the Indo-Greeks and that of contemporary Indians and Europeans. In this paper, I intend to discuss a few key examples of historical works which have been influenced by these perceived parallels.

#### THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

The first major academic treatments of the Indo-Greeks appear in the context of British India. Most eighteenth- and nineteenth-century colonial administrators had a Classical education, and this provided conscious or unconscious points of reference in their forays into the developing discipline of Oriental studies (Thapar 2002: 17). That investigations into non-Western cultures were undertaken from a Eurocentric perspective and produced correspondingly Eurocentric results was, as Edward Saïd argued in *Orientalism*, a product of European political and economic domination of the East (Saïd 2003). In addition, the

Classics-dominated framework of European intellectual life meant that, when a British official looked at the antiquities of India, his available repertoire of artistic or philosophical comparisons and reference points was almost exclusively Greek and Roman. Crucially, these Greek and Roman models were ones which he would have been taught to respect both as the products of a 'Golden Age', and as the basis of his own, Western, civilization (Narain 1992: 4). The past of India was doubly alien—not European, not Graeco-Roman—and consequently subject to critical analysis on these two, mutually-identified grounds.

Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historiography of ancient India maintains this constant relationship between the Indological and the Classical, but it was never a straightforward one. The intellectual pursuits of the British élite in Calcutta were diverse. On the one hand, there were figures such as Sir William Jones, founder of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and famous for highlighting the linguistic relationship between Sanskrit and Latin and Greek (Holes 2005). On the other, were those like Thomas Macaulay, whose interests were more exclusively Classical: 'while others read Sanskrit with pandits before breakfast, he read ancient Greek for pleasure at a prodigious rate' (Killingley 1997: 129). Nor were the intellectual background and preoccupations of Indian scholars uniform. There was, as often, an association between academic activity and politics—in this case, Indian nationalist politics. According to Romila Thapar (who is, it should be noted in this context, a Marxist historian): 'most of the Indian historians had either participated in the national movement for independence or had been influenced by it. Their contention was that the Golden Age in India had existed prior to the coming of the British and that the ancient past of India was a particularly glorious period of her history' (Thapar 2002: 17). Yet this politicized intelligentsia was working within a European-dominated, Classics-dominated context. Many works by Indian historians were self-consciously revisionist, reacting against British views of ancient India. They were also generally written in English by members of the (to whatever extent) Europeanized élite, in universities or other institutions based on European models. Although revisionist histories were a form of political protest, ironically: 'by assuming the forms of European historiography in order to contest history's pretensions to having captured "reality", Indian writers seemed to fall prey to the larger aims of colonization by reproducing the very narratives and ideologies that had stolen their past' (Schwarz 1997: 3–4).

This picture of colonialist historiography of ancient India is reflected in works on the Indo-Greek and Graeco-Roman influence in India. Especially notable is the way in which the appropriation of Graeco-Roman culture by European culture—and the consequent identification of the Indo-Greeks with the British—is accepted by almost all parties. Rajendralal Mitra, writing in 1875, makes an explicit connection between the Greeks and the English, both being cases where one can discuss the question of European cultural—and specifically artistic—influence in India. Mitra (1875: 9) seeks to strengthen his argument for minimal Greek architectural influence in India by citing the limited penetration of British architectural forms. Victor Smith, writing in 1889, also sees himself as a revisionist, but along different lines. Previous generations of Orientalists, he claims, were 'charmed' by Sanskrit literature and by Indian art and this favourable impression led them to credit Indian civilization with great antiquity and originality. He himself argues for considerable Graeco-Roman influence, and suggests that: 'the civilization of ancient India was not so indigenous and self-contained as, at first sight, it seemed to be' (Smith 1889: 196).

The basic problem with discussions such as Smith's and Mitra's (see Chakrabarti 1997: 195–199) is that they must look at external influence on ancient India in their own historical context. It is inevitably seen as 'European influence'. Viewed from this perspective, the Classically-educated British were, whether in a positive or in a negative way and with whatever degree of success, repeating the bringing of Classical civilization to India. British army officers on the North-West Frontier knew their Arrian and Quintus Curtius, and were all

too willing to see themselves as new Alexanders (James 1997: 136). Indians, in turn, might even refer to the British as 'yavanas' (Killingley 1997: 127–28),<sup>10</sup> the same term Sanskrit texts had used for the invading Greeks two thousand years before.

#### THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

When we turn to the mid-twentieth century, there is still a perceived polarity in Indo-Greek scholarship between British imperialist Classicists (who wanted the Indo-Greeks to be Greek) and Indian nationalist historians (who wanted them to be Indian). The classic opposition ought to be that of Sir William Woodthorpe Tarn and A. K. Narain, who wrote the first two major studies of the Indo-Greeks. Tarn's 1938 *The Greeks in Bactria and India* was, as already mentioned, his attempt to reclaim the eastern Greeks for the Hellenistic world. In 1957 Narain published *The Indo-Greeks*, which argued of the Greeks that: 'they came, they saw, but India conquered' (Narain 1957: 18). Both works are exhaustively researched and passionately argued, but the political implications of their authorship have sometimes detracted from discussion of their academic merit. Tarn was British, born in 1869; Narain, an Indian, was writing barely a decade post-independence. It is all too easy to slot them neatly into a wider scheme of imperialist versus nationalist, colonialist versus post-colonialist scholarship.

This is true, however, only in the simplest terms. Narain's neat inversion of *veni, vidi, vici* has lent itself to over-quotation and, although Tarn can no longer defend his position, Narain has a very clear sense of having been misinterpreted in some crucial respects. In a 1992 article, which he describes as: 'an essay in self-defence' (Narain 1992: 5), he reminds readers that the picture is not quite so straightforward as British classicist versus Indian nationalist historian. He is an admirer of Tarn's work, which inspired his own (Narain 1992: 10). He wrote his thesis in England, under English supervisors, and received his archaeological training under Sir Mortimer Wheeler. Although the British/Indian polarity is therefore not quite so clearly demarcated as some have argued it to be in the works of Tarn and Narain, read together, with an eye to historiographical rather than historical nuance, they offer an interesting overview of the state of play with regard to Indo-Greek studies in the mid-twentieth century.

#### MODERN TRENDS

The more recent application of post-colonialist historiography to the Hellenistic world has led to drastic reassessments of the relations between Greek and non-Greek peoples, but the basic repertoire of comparisons remains the same. Greeks are still Europeans, but where once, to a European writer, this gave a positive slant to their presence in the East, it has increasingly become something negative. The Greeks—like the British in India—were no longer bearers of civilization, but of exploitation and repression.

In Pierre Briant's 1978 study on 'Hellenistic colonisation and indigenous populations', the parallel with modern European colonialism is nowhere explicitly stated, nor is the post-colonialist historiographical milieu within which this work was patently produced discussed.<sup>11</sup> His choice of vocabulary is, however, ripe with the terminology of modern colonial exploitation. The Hellenistic settlement of Asia is: 'colonisation européenne' (Briant 1978: 59) and the Greeks themselves: 'colons européens' (Briant 1978: 69). The reader is almost invited to imagine an African plantation<sup>12</sup> or Indian cantonment.<sup>13</sup> Alexander's policy in the reorganization and settlement of Bactria-Sogdiana was designed to 'control' and 'exploit' land and people.<sup>14</sup> Briant makes a strong argument for division between: 'la nouvelle classe dominante impériale macédonno-iranienne' ['the new Macedonian-Iranian dominant imperial class'] (Briant 1978: 74) and local peoples in the spatial organization of the new cities, and the terminology he uses is that of 'segregation' (Briant 1978: 88) and even—in inverted

commas—'apartheid' (Briant 1978: 89). This brief review of vocabulary cannot, of course, do justice to Briant's argument—he is nowhere as stridently and emotively anti-colonialist as selective quotation may make him seem—but his choice of terminology is striking. His post-colonialist context influences his historical perspective and provides him with his intellectual points of reference and vocabulary of simile and allusion. Briant's concern—as shown by his subsequent publications (Briant 1982a and 1982b)—is the historical rehabilitation of groups, such as nomadic pastoralists and other non-literate peoples, which have been poorly served by traditional pre-post-colonialist histories. The influence of this concern on the study of Hellenistic Bactria and India can be seen in the works of Frank Holt (1988, 1999), which are notable for their introduction of a 'Bactrian perspective'.

Édouard Will, writing in 1985, is more self-conscious about his decision to apply the lessons of modern European colonialism to the Hellenistic world (see Bagnall 1995):<sup>15</sup>

'l'historien n'est pas une monade isolée hors du temps et de l'espace. De vivre dans une société donnée à une époque donnée inspire sa pensée, souvent sans qu'il en ait conscience et toujours plus qu'il n'en a conscience. Homme social, l'historien participe de l'esprit du temps et du lieu, et l'utilité de l'histoire de l'historiographie est de nous révéler à quel point la pensée des historiens est déterminée par celle de leur milieu'.

(Will 1985: 273)

[The historian is not an isolated monad, outside time and space. The fact of living in a given society at a given period inspires his thought—often without him realising it, and always more than he realises. As a social individual, the historian is caught up in the spirit of time and place, and the usefulness of the history of historiography is to reveal to us the points at which the thought of historians is determined by that of their *milieu*.]

(Author's translation)

Earlier historians of the Hellenistic period, such as Beloch and Rostovtzeff, were, according to Will's analysis, driven to concentrate on the economic and political aspects of Greek rule of conquered territories by their own perceptions and experiences of modern European empire and the way in which it was rationalized. Will's own agenda, while recognizing the fundamental differences between the Hellenistic world and modern capitalist, industrialized, imperial expansion (Will 1985: 288–9), is to seek out points of comparison between the two periods of colonization and use these to orient his research on the Hellenistic world (Will 1985: 282): 'le choc de la décolonisation nous a fait prendre conscience de ce qu'étaient les réalités coloniales ... il peut nous aider aussi à réviser certaines de nos perspectives sur le passé hellénistique' (Will 1985: 281). ['The shock of decolonization has made us develop an awareness of colonial realities ... it can also help us to revise certain of our perspectives on the Hellenistic past.']

Given the emphasis I placed above on the personal historical experience of individual historians, it is perhaps worth making a few brief points about the context of Briant's and Will's work. French decolonization came a generation later than Britain's withdrawal from most of her colonies and, to scholars writing in the 1970s and 1980s, was still a comparatively recent experience (see Morris-Jones and Fischer 1980).<sup>16</sup> It was also an exceptionally violent one, with long-term political and social effects. French North Africa was very different from British India, but it is interesting to note the same historiographical phenomenon at work: the writer's own memories or experiences of colonialism affect their perceptions of Hellenistic colonialism, and colour their moral and emotional responses to it.

Alongside this harsh judgement of colonialism, however, there persists in some discussions of the Indo-Greeks an incongruous sense of nostalgia. In the Western popular

imagination, there is still room for romanticization of the Raj in the very same breath as condemnation of its values. This popular image of British India is dangerously evocative, and its familiarity means that it is all too easy to invoke it without further consideration. Peter Green, for example, imagines local peoples Hellenizing and vying to join the gymnasium: 'like Indians under the British Raj angling for the *entrée* to European club membership' (Green 1990: 316). The Indo-Greek kings, on the other hand, are compared to Englishmen who: 'went native' (Green 1990: 320), and he notes that in coin portraits: 'many of these monarchs sport the solar topee (or a topee like helmet) latterly associated with the British Raj: colonialism breeds its own symbols of continuity' (Green 1990: 350). It is tempting to see these 'symbols of continuity' as existing principally in the historical consciousness of the writers who evoke them.<sup>17</sup>

#### CONCLUSION

But how, exactly, should reinterpretation of European colonialism influence our perspective on the Greeks in India? And can post-colonialist history of the Hellenistic period—and rejection of that old cliché, history written for and by élite 'dead white males'—provide us with a better understanding of the processes at work in Indo-Greek society, and dictate a better analytical framework within which to study them?

The first and most important point to be made here is that, whatever it meant in the past, 'Hellenistic' (in its non-temporal sense) now certainly does not mean 'Greek'. It means 'Greek and something else too', but how exactly the Greek and non-Greek<sup>18</sup> elements are related to each other depends to a great extent upon how relations between ethnic groups are viewed in the writer's own society and historical context. Before the Second World War, the term used might have been 'cosmopolitanism' (Rapson 1922, Rostovtzeff 1941), a positive judgement viewing a mixed society as vibrant and dynamic. The picture of isolation and division which emerged in reaction to 'cosmopolitanism' is, however, equally unrealistic, ignoring the role of native élites and the well-attested process of intermarriage and acculturation (Burstein 1997: 12–13). Recently, 'multiculturalism', with its recognition of separatism as well as co-existence, has taken the place formerly occupied by 'cosmopolitanism' in Hellenistic historiography, and it is a concept no less conditioned by prevailing political and social conditions (Cartledge et al. 1997: 5, see also Walbank 1991/1992<sup>19</sup>). There are a multiplicity of approaches to interpreting ethnic relations, and, so long as this is recognized, this debate ought to have a positive effect on study of the Indo-Greeks. Discussion of what 'Hellenistic' may be used to mean can help in interpreting Indo-Greeks society, and vice-versa. Crucially, it should not be seen as an imperialist, Eurocentric label: a proper awareness of modern interpretations of the Hellenistic world should mean that there is no need for the aversion still displayed by some to applying the word 'Hellenistic' to the Greek states in India (for example, see Narain 1992: 7).

As a comparative case study, we may cite the historiography of Hellenistic Egypt. Egypt, because of its abundant papyrological evidence, has long been the area of the Hellenistic world most open to the development of new debates about the nature of cultural identity and the relationship between Greeks and non-Greeks in this period.<sup>20</sup> Most of the debates discussed above on the nature of Hellenistic society in fact rely heavily on the Egyptian evidence. Current approaches are increasingly moving towards a closer engagement with the papyrological documentation itself, emphasizing the wealth of individual case studies for how people might conceive of and present their identity (for example, see Thompson 2001), and the lack of any over-arching model for inter-ethnic relationships. Although the evidence from Hellenistic India does not yet permit us to examine individual cases in such depth, I would suggest that the scholarly model of Hellenistic Egypt is a potentially very productive one. The issues we should be focusing on—the intricacies of the relationships between colonizers and colonized, the effects of intermarriage—are neatly brought out by the Egyptian

material, and deserve to be given further consideration with regard to areas of Greek colonization in Bactria and India.<sup>21</sup>

The second point I would like to emphasize in conclusion concerns the relationship between modern scholarship in India and in Europe and America. The removal of the old order of imperial control by an external European power induced something of an identity crisis in post-independence India: how should India view itself in relation to the rest of the world, and how should the rest of the world view India? This has certain implications in terms of the treatment of the Indo-Greeks both in Indian and in Western academia. India, and Pakistan, produce a large volume of academic literature on the history and archaeology of the Subcontinent, which does not always receive sufficient attention from Western scholars. Is this due to poor access to material—it can be difficult to persuade a departmental librarian working on a tight budget that he or she ought to order a crate-load of books from Delhi—or, as some would argue, does the West take a dismissive or even racist attitude towards Indian scholarship? Or are historians in India and in Europe and America simply working from such different perspectives that the comparison of their academic literature is unproductive? Whatever may be the case, Western ignorance of Indian scholarship can be a sore point among Indian historians, even to the point where it is perceived that: 'Euro-American "Indian Studies" exist quite independently of India and Indians' (Chakrabarti 2002: 388). Might this accusation even be levelled at scholarly industries such as post-colonial studies?

A third issue, perhaps of more immediate administrative than intellectual concern, is that within academia itself broader post-colonialist approaches to the Hellenistic world meet with certain obstacles. Should an historian of the Hellenistic period be a Classicist or an Orientalist? What academic department should they be attached to—since departmental affiliation is an inescapable part of academic life, for good or ill—and with which other departments should they seek to establish channels of communication? The changing historical approaches to the Indo-Greeks show how necessary a proper awareness of more than one region or discipline—and its associated historiographical baggage—has become.

The application of post-colonialist theory to 'Hellenistic India' needs to be seen in its context: as a product of its times, just as Hellenistic historiography has in the past been influenced by a number of perspectives which were products of their times. There is no simple colonialist–post-colonialist transition, but rather a constant dialogue between different interpretations, each of which—with due consideration of the contemporary circumstances which influence it—may provide a useful stimulus for debate and open interesting new avenues of approach to the subject. It is in this respect that the Indo-Greeks are perhaps best served by current debates on the Hellenistic period.

## REFERENCES

- Bagnall, R. S. (1995) *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*, Approaching the Ancient World (London; New York: Routledge).
- Bernard, P. (1973) (ed.) *Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum I (Campagnes 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968)*. (Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan 21) 2 vols (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Briant, P. (1982a) *Etat et Pasteurs au Moyen-Orient Ancien* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1982b) *Rois, Tributs et Paysans: Etudes sur les Formations Tributaires du Moyen-Orient Ancien* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- (1978) 'Colonisation Hellénistique et Populations Indigènes: La Phase d'Installation', *Klio* 60: 57–92.
- Burstein, S. M. (1997) 'The Hellenistic Age', in S. M. Burstein, R. MacMullen, K. A. Raaflaub and A. M. Ward, directed by C. G. Thomas, *Ancient History: Recent Work and New Directions* (Publications of the Association of Ancient Historians 5) (Claremont, CA: Regina Books) 37–54 .
- Cartledge, P., Garnsey, P., and Gruen, E. S. (1997) (eds) *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History and Historiography* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Chakrabarti, D. K. (2002) 'Further Notes on Colonial Indology', in C. Margabandhu, A. K. Sharma and R. S. Bisht (eds) *Puraratna: Emerging Trends in Archaeology, Art, Anthropology, Conservation and History* (Delhi: Agam Kala) 382–90.
- (1997) *Colonial Indology: Sociopolitics of the Ancient Indian Past* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- Droysen, J. G. (1836–1843) *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 2 vols (Berlin: Gebr. Ungar).
- Green, P. (1990) *Alexander To Actium: The Hellenistic Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Guillaume, O. (1990) *Analysis of Reasonings in Archaeology: The Case of Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek Numismatics*, tr. O. Bopearachchi, French Studies in the South Asian Culture and Society, 4 (Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- Holes, C. (2005) 'The Birth of Orientalism: Sir William Jones', in S. Gillespie and D. Hopkins (eds) *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English, vol. 3* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 443-455.
- Holt, F. L. (1999) *Thundering Zeus: The Making of Hellenistic Bactria* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- (1988) *Alexander the Great and Bactria: The Formation of a Greek Frontier in Central Asia* (Leiden: E. J. Brill).



- James, L. (1997) *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (London: Abacus).
- Karttunen, K. (1997) *India and the Hellenistic World*, *Studia Orientalia*, 83 (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society).
- Killingley, D. (1997) 'Mlecchas, Yavanas and Heathens: Interacting Xenologies in Early Nineteenth-Century Calcutta', in E. Franco and K. Presendanz (eds) *Beyond Orientalism: The Work of Wilhelm Halbfass and its Impact on Indian and Cross-Cultural Studies* (Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi) 123–140.
- Lerner, J. D. (1999) *The Impact of Seleucid Decline on the Eastern Iranian Plateau: The Foundations of Arsacid Parthia and Graeco-Bactria*, *Historia Einzelschriften*, 123 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner).
- Lewis, N. (1986) *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Litvinskii, B. A. (2001) *Храм Окса в Бактрии (Южный Таджикистан). Том 2: Бактрийское Вооружение в Древневосточном и Греческом Контексте* (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura). [*Khram Oksa v Baktrii (Yuzhnyi Tadzhikistan). Tom 2: Baktriiskoe Vooruzhenie v Drevhevostochnom i Grecheskom Kontekste.*] [*The Temple of the Oxus in Bactria (Southern Tadzhikistan). Vol. 2: Bactrian Arms in the Ancient Eastern and Greek Context.*]
- and Pichikyan, I. R. (2000) *Эллинистический Храм Окса в Бактрии (Южный Таджикистан). Том 1: Раскопки, Архитектура, Религиозная Жизнь* (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura). [*Ellinisticheskii Khram Oksa v Baktrii (Yuzhnyi Tadzhikistan). Tom 1: Raskopki, Arkhitektura, Religioznaya Zhizn.*] [*The Hellenistic Temple of the Oxus in Bactria (Southern Tadzhikistan). Vol. 1: Excavations, Architecture, Religious Life.*]
- (1981) 'The Temple of the Oxus', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 133–167.
- Mairs, R.R. (Forthcoming) 'Ethnicity and Identity in the Hellenistic Far East', PhD thesis (Faculty of Classics: University of Cambridge).
- Mitra, R. (1875–1880) *The Antiquities of Orissa*, 2 vols (Calcutta).
- Morris-Jones, W. H. and Fischer, G. (1980) (eds) *Decolonisation and After: The British and French Experience*, *Studies in Commonwealth Politics and History*, 7 (London: Cass).
- Narain, A. K. (1992) 'Approaches and Perspectives', *Yavanika*, 2, 5–34.
- (1957) *The Indo-Greeks* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Rapson, E. J. (1922) (ed.) *The Cambridge History of India. Vol. 1: Ancient India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (1890 [2003]) *The Questions of King Milinda*, 2 vols, *Sacred Books of the East* 35 and 36 (Oxford: Oxford University Press,). [Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass].
- Rostovtzeff, M. (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Saïd, E. W. (2003) *Orientalism*, 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition with new preface (New York: Vintage Books).

- Salomon, R. (1998) *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Schwarz, H. (1997) *Writing Cultural History in Colonial and Postcolonial India* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Sharma, G. R. (1980) *Reh Inscription of Menander and the Indo-Greeks Invasion of the Ganga Valley* (Allahabad: Abinash Prakashan).
- Smith, V. A. (1889) 'Graeco-Roman Influence on the Civilizations of Ancient India', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 58/1/3.
- Tarn, W.W. (1938) *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Thapar, R. (2002) *Early India: From the Origins to AD 1300* (London: Allen Lane)
- Thompson, D. J. (2001) 'Hellenistic Hellenes: The Case of Ptolemaic Egypt', in I. Malkin (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies; Trustees for Harvard University) 301–322.
- Vassiliades, D. Th. (2000) *The Greeks in India: A Survey in Philosophical Understanding* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- Walbank, F. W. (1991/1992) 'The Hellenistic World: New Trends and Directions', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 11, 90–113.
- Will, E. (1985) 'Pour une "anthropologie coloniale" du monde hellénistique', in W. J. Eadie and J. Ober (eds) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* (Lanham: University Press of America) 273–301.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Dr Dorothy J. Thompson (Girton College, University of Cambridge) for reading and commenting upon earlier drafts of this paper.
- <sup>2</sup> Droysen's thesis, in general, argues for a Hellenistic *Mischkultur*, and is teleologically oriented towards the development of the 'Judaeo-Greek' culture of Christianity.
- <sup>3</sup> General works on the theme include Tarn (1938), Narain (1957), Holt (1988) and (1999), Karttunen (1997) and Vassiliades (2000).
- <sup>4</sup> See the selection of texts reproduced in Holt (1999), Appendix D, especially Polybios, *Histories*, 11.34 and Strabo, *Geography*, 15.1.3.
- <sup>5</sup> See e.g. the new publication and commentary of the inscription of Heliodoros in Salomon (1998: 265–67), and the supposed 'Reh inscription of Menander' in Sharma (1980). Note that the latter is now considered not to be an inscription of Menander at all: Salomon (1998: 141), for references. The Milindapanha, a Pali Buddhist text, contains an account more firmly established as representing the historical Indo-Greeks king Menander: Rhys-Davids (1890).
- <sup>6</sup> On Indo-Greek coins and their use in historical reconstruction.
- <sup>7</sup> Note especially the work of the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan (1942-), published in the series *Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan*, and also Russian excavations in former Soviet Central Asia, continued by the various Academies of Science of the successor states.
- <sup>8</sup> The material from Ai Khanoum is published in the MDFAFA series, see endnote 7. For a more culturally and artistically diverse site, see the publications of the excavations at Takht-i Sangin, Litvinskii and Pichikyan (2000) and Litvinskii (2001) – a summary in English may be found in Litvinskii and Pichikiyan (1981).
- <sup>9</sup> For a more detailed outline of the history of the Bactrian and Indo-Greek states, see any of the works cited in endnote 3.
- <sup>10</sup> The term had early come to signify 'Westerners' in general and was also applied to Muslim invaders; note, however, that other terms for foreigners were in more common use.
- <sup>11</sup> Briant, it should be noted, has in subsequent works been more upfront about the source of his allusions. The expectation that writers should be publicly self-aware, explicitly confronting their influences and personal perspectives, is a relatively recent historiographical trend.
- <sup>12</sup> 'Les paysans entrèrent dans la dépendance des nouvelles populations européennes installées sur les terres conquises' (Briant 1978: 73). ['The people of the countryside entered into a relationship of dependence with the new European populations installed on these conquered territories.']
- <sup>13</sup> 'Un quartier peuplé d'Européens' (Briant 1978: 89). ['A quarter populated by Europeans.']
- <sup>14</sup> '...uniformiser en Sogdiane – Bactriane les statuts des terres et des personnes pour mieux les contrôler et les exploiter' (Briant 1978: 78). ['...to make uniform the status of lands and people in Sogdiana–Bactriana, in order to better control and exploit them.']
- <sup>15</sup> A critique of Will's methodology may be found in Bagnall (1995), 101ff.
- <sup>16</sup> For comparative material on British and French decolonization.
- <sup>17</sup> Green (1990: xxi), recognises his tendency to find modern relevance and resonance in the Hellenistic world.
- <sup>18</sup> Even the term 'non-Greek' is problematic, prioritizing the Greek element and grouping the diverse populations (Egyptian, Iranian, Semitic, etc.) of the Hellenistic empires together. I use it here for lack of a more straightforward alternative.

---

<sup>19</sup> On the influence of modern political trends on views the Hellenistic world.

<sup>20</sup> See Lewis (1986), for a selection of papyrological sources for Hellenistic Egypt; Bagnall (1995) provides insightful analysis of the issues involved in using this material.

<sup>21</sup> This question of ethnic identity and its various permutations and forms of expression in Hellenistic Bactria and India is the topic of my PhD research (Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge).