

1 Greek or Indian? The Questions of Menander and onomastic patterns in early Gandhāra

Stefan Baums

This chapter reconsiders the relationship between Hellenistic society and Buddhism in Bactria and Gandhāra between the third century BCE and the second century CE.¹ It does so with a dual focus: the question of the literary antecedents, authorship and audience of the *Milindapañha*/*Nāxiān bīqiū jīng* 那先比丘經 will be raised first; then it introduces new epigraphic evidence for the state of Hellenistic society and Buddhism in the period under consideration and presents a comprehensive analysis of the relevant onomastic data in the inscriptions; and finally, it concludes by bringing this epigraphic evidence to bear on the questions raised about the *Milindapañha* and its place in society.²

In briefest historical outline,³ Menander was a Bactrian Greek king who reigned around 150 BCE and conquered parts of India (up to Mathurā and, temporarily, Pāṭaliputra), leaving behind a very large coin issue, brief references in the works of the Alexander historians and – unique among Greek rulers – a literary echo as the interlocutor of the monk Nāgasena in the Buddhist scholastic dialogue preserved to us in Chinese translation as the *Nāxiān bīqiū jīng* 那先比丘經 (‘Sūtra of the Monk Nāgasena’) and in Pali translation as the *Milindapañha* (‘Questions of Menander’). The extant Chinese translation was prepared in the fourth century CE on the basis of an earlier translation of the third century CE and goes back to an Indian original in a language other than Pali, and possibly Gāndhārī.⁴ The Pali translation consists of an old core (pages 1–89 of Trenckner’s edition) corresponding to the Chinese translation (though itself incorporating several younger elements) and at least three later textual layers (pages 90–420 of Trenckner’s edition) that had been added to it by the time the Pali commentaries were composed in the fifth century CE.⁵ The dialogue of Menander and Nāgasena takes place over a period of two days. On the first day, Menander drives his chariot to visit Nāgasena in his

assembly, challenges him with a series of questions on the nature of the world and leaves on horseback, thoroughly convinced by Nāgasena on all points. On the second day, Nāgasena visits Menander in his palace and answers a further series of questions (occasionally interjecting questions of his own). The text ends on the morning of the third day when Menander and Nāgasena meet one last time to assure each other of their respect.⁶

In an early article on Hellenism in Bactria and India, the Scottish historian W. W. Tarn (1902: 272–274, following Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎) suggested that the dialogue between Menander and Nāgasena may have been based on an earlier dialogue between the Buddha and a king Nanda (a version of which is preserved in a Chinese avadāna collection) and that the legend, reported by Plutarch, of the division of Menander’s ashes into eight parts likewise appears to be based on the division of the Buddha’s relics into eight parts. Concerning the historical king Menander’s attitude to Buddhism, Tarn considers it likely that he was favorably disposed to the Indian religion for political expediency, although we have no positive evidence for any more active support (the title δίκαιος = *dhamika*, Skt. *dhārmika*, and the eight-spoked wheel on Menander’s coinage can refer to general Indian notions of just kingship and universal rule).⁷ Tarn further suggested that the author of the dialogue may have been attracted to Menander simply because he was the most powerful and famous of the Indo-Greek rulers. (I will return to the larger question of why a Greek ruler was chosen at all.)

Meanwhile, after Albrecht Weber’s early proposal that the *Milindapañha* could be a direct Indian response to the Socratic dialogues, Indological opinion had come to prefer the Upaniṣadic dialogues and other inner-Indian models as its most likely literary antecedents.⁸ But Tarn’s thoughts on this matter developed in the opposite direction, and in an excursus in his groundbreaking history of the Greeks in Bactria and India,⁹ he presented an elaborate theory that the familiarity with Greek customs in the old core of the *Milindapañha* presupposed an original written by a Greek in the Greek language soon after Menander’s time; this hypothetical original was in turn based on the legend of Alexander asking ten questions of Indian gymnosophists and the hypothetical Greek *Ur-Milindapañha* itself travelled to the West and there inspired an unknown Greek author to compose the core of the dialogue between King Ptolemy II and the seventy-two Jewish elders that is preserved in Aristeas’ letters to Philocrates. For Tarn, his theory of a Greek *Ur-Milindapañha* formed part of a larger postulate of a body of lost Bactrian Greek literature, for which he could

only adduce the evidence of one unusual city name 'Iomousa', which he explains as a nickname derived from the beginning of a hymn Ἰὸ Μοῦσα 'Hail, O Muse', and another slightly less unusual city name, 'Euthymedeia' (Εὐθυμέδεια), which he takes as a nickname plucked from a composition in hexameter verse (in which this name would scan).

Soon after the publication of Tarn's book, Jan Gonda devoted an entire article¹⁰ to justified criticism of Tarn's arguments for a Greek *Ur-Milindapañha*, favouring, like most of his fellow Indologists,¹¹ an Indian literary origin (and in particular Buddhist canonical dialogues like that between the Buddha and King Ajātaśatru in the *Śvāmānyaphalasūtra*), although Gonda cautiously adds that although he does not believe that Tarn's specific arguments carry weight, he cannot entirely rule out a Greek prototype for the *Milindapañha*. A. K. Narain in Appendix I of his 1957 book on the Indo-Greeks similarly argues against that part of Tarn's argument which hinges on a supposed underlying Greek distinction between the Indian variant word forms Yona and Yonaka (both meaning 'Greek' or 'Western foreigner' in general), but he does not address the larger question of a Bactrian Greek literature and a possible origin of the *Milindapañha* in it.

Tarn died in 1957, just one year before the first of an unbroken string of discoveries of Greek inscriptions from Bactria that support his theory of a living Greek literary tradition in this country in the third and second centuries BCE. This string of discoveries was foreshadowed by the single Greek phrase, διὰ Παλαμήδου, 'on behalf of Palamédēs', at the bottom of a Bactrian-language inscription discovered at Surkh Kotal and first published in 1954.¹² In 1958 this was followed by the discovery at Kandahar (Alexandria in Arachosia) of a bilingual Greek-Aramaic summary version of the Buddhist edicts of Emperor Aśoka, and in 1964 by the further discovery in the same city of a faithful Greek translation of Aśoka's Rock Edicts XII and XIII,¹³ both dated to the third century BCE.

One year later, French excavations started in Ai Khanum (maybe Alexandria on the Oxus), and between 1965 and 1978 these brought to light a total of four Greek stone inscriptions, ca. thirty financial records inscribed on pottery and the remains of two literary manuscripts. Of special significance for our purposes is an extract from the *Delphic Maxims* inscribed around the year 300 BCE by a certain Klérarkhos in the heroon of Kinéas),¹⁴ a papyrus manuscript containing a Greek philosophical treatise dating from ca. 250 BCE and a parchment manuscript preserving fragments of a Greek drama dating from ca. 200 BCE.¹⁵ A later find at Kandahar (first published in 1979) was

the statue of a hunting dog with a Greek verse inscription by its owner, the son of Aristōnaks, expressing his gratitude for having been saved from the attack of a wild animal (third century BCE).¹⁶ Most recently, an altar of Hestía was discovered in Kuliab (ca. 100 km northeast of Ai Khanum) with an epigram recording its dedication by a certain Hēliódotos to King Euthúdēmos and his son, the ‘glorious conqueror’ (of Gandhāra) Dēmétrios.¹⁷ The historical reference assigns this inscription to the beginning of the second century BCE. In addition to these literary monuments, over the years a sizeable number of non-literary Greek inscriptions, graffiti and papyri have been found at various sites in Bactria.¹⁸

Although the inscriptions mentioned so far, whether imported or produced locally (as predicted by Tarn), are purely Greek in form and content, one last important Greek inscription recently discovered, probably in Kandahar, has an author with an Indian name.¹⁹ In this funerary stele, Sōphutos (probably = Subhūti), son of Naratos (probably = Nārada), recounts in hexametric verse how, deprived of his family fortune but well trained in archery and the arts, he went abroad, earned a new fortune and returned in triumph to his hometown. The great importance of the stele of Subhūti lies in the fact that it attests at an early date, probably the second century BCE, the existence of thoroughly Hellenized Indian expatriates, considering the Greek towns of Bactria their home and engaging in the production of Greek literary art.

The inverse situation is presented by the well-known pillar of Hēliódōros in Vidiśā, dating from ca. 110 BCE.²⁰ In the inscription on this pillar Hēliódōros (Heliadora), son of Díōn (Diya) from Taxila and ambassador of the Bactrian king Antialkídas (Aṃtalikita), records its dedication to the supreme god Vāsudeva (i.e., Viṣṇu) and pays his respects to the local ruler Kāśīputra Bhāgabhadra. Just as in the early second century BCE some members of the Indian upper class had settled in Bactria and adopted Hellenistic culture, by the late second century BCE Bactrian Greeks had settled in India and engaged in Indian religious practices.

Apart from the coin legends and Hēliódōros’ pillar, nine Indian-language inscriptions produced by bearers of Greek names were known to Tarn.²¹ The two earliest of these, occurring in dated inscriptions, are Theódotos (Theuduta), the meridarch, dedicating a Buddhist reliquary in Swat in the early first century BCE (CKI²² 32) and Theódōros (Thaidora), son of Datia, donating a pond using a Buddhist formula in (probably) the year 73/72 BCE (CKI 57). The other seven inscriptions are undated, but five of them are likely to belong to the

late first century BCE or early first century CE: the seal ring of Theodámas (Theudama) from Bajaur (CKI 34), the seal ring of Dēmétrios (Timitra) from Vidiśā, the seal ring of Deinippos (Denipa) from Taxila (CKI 106) and two silver cups of Theódōros (Theutara), son of Theōrós (?) (Thavara), from Taxila (CKI 88, 89). The remaining two inscriptions belong to the Kuṣāṇa period: the training weight of the wrestler Ménandros (Miṇamdra, i.e., Menander) from an unknown findspot (CKI 143) and the dedication of a Buddha image by Sophé (Sapha) from Jamalgarhi (CKI 118). One Kuṣāṇa-period inscription not mentioned by Tarn is the Zeda well dedication of Hipeadhia (or, in Falk's (2009b) new reading, Hiperecaa) whose hybrid name may contain the Greek element Hippías or Hippo- (CKI 148). Likewise not mentioned by Tarn (because they were discovered and published just one year before his 1938 history) are two further inscriptions: the relic dedication of Macayemaṇa from Puṣkalāvātī honouring a king Avakhjhada whose name appears to be a hybrid of Greek Eukhē and Iranian -zāḍa 'son' (CKI 178), and the important and controversial Shinkot Casket from Bajaur (CKI 176). The latter contains a series of inscriptions recording the donation and reestablishment of relics of the Buddha, and the oldest of these inscriptions (if genuine) contains an incompletely preserved dating by regnal year of King Menander, which would make it the earliest (mid-second century BCE) Indian inscription after the Aśokan edicts (mid-third century BCE). Falk (2005)²³ has raised doubts about the authenticity of this particular inscription on the Shinkot Casket, but because part of his argument hinges on the unusual formulation of a separate passage on the casket, and because the apparent correction of the date from the eighth to the fourteenth day of the month (both customary days for relic installations) appears authentic, I am still inclined to accept this reference to Menander on the Shinkot Casket as genuine.²⁴

The years since 1938 have brought to light thirteen more Gāndhārī inscriptions by bearers of Greek names. In order of publication, these are (1) the Bajaur relic dedication of Śatruleka mentioning his son Ménandros (Menamdra) and dated to the year 19/20 CE (CKI 257); (2) the relic dedication of Saṭṣaṅka, son of Hermaĩos (Hirmaa), reinstalled by Aprakhaka, son of Hēlióphilos (Heliuphila), and dated to the year 98/99 CE (CKI 328); (3) a possibly spurious relic dedication from Hadda dating to 19/18 BCE and mentioning a Hermaĩos (Hirmaa), son of Mahomava, and another Hermaĩos (Hirmaa), son of Soṅakṣita, among the donors (CKI 455); (4) the ownership inscription of Theodámas (Theudama) on a silver vessel from a first-century CE Central Asian hoard (CKI 727); (5) the relic dedication of Helauṭa (see

later), son of Dēmétrios (Demetria), dated to 63/64 CE (CKI 564); (6) the dedicatory inscription on a silver vessel of the meridarch Kalliphōn (Kaliphōṇa) from the Mohmand Agency dating from the second or early first century BCE (CKI 552); and (7–13) seven seals, sealings and tokens from the Aman ur Rahman collection belonging to Eukratídēs (Evukratita, CKI 917), to a son of Ísandros (Isaṃdra, CKI 972), to a son of Zēnóphilos (Zenupila, CKI 987), to Theuta (see later, CKI 969), to Theodámas (Theudama, CKI 978), to Dionusódōros (Dinisidora, CKI 1000) and to Deinokrátēs (Denukrata, CKI 1030).²⁵ See Table 1.1 for an alphabetical overview of all Greek names attested in Gāndhārī inscriptions currently known.

Excluded both in Tarn's list and in my expanded list are the numerous Greek names of Gandhāran rulers attested on their coinage; the names of Macedonian months, used in parallel with the Indian system

Table 1.1 Greek names in Gāndhārī inscriptions

<i>Name</i>	<i>Inscription</i>
Aṃtikini, Aṃtekine (Antígonos)	CKI 13, 27 (Aśoka, rock edict)
Aṃtiyoka, Aṃtiyoga (Antiokhos)	CKI 2, 13, 16, 27 (Aśoka, rock edict)
Alikasudara (Aléksandros)	CKI 13, 27 (Aśoka, rock edict)
Avakha (Eukhē)	CKI 178 (relic donation)
Isaṃdra (Ísandros)	CKI 972 (sealing)
Evukratita (Eukratídēs)	CKI 917 (token)
Kaliphōṇa (Kalliphōn)	CKI 552 (phial)
Turamaya (Ptolemaíos)	CKI 13, 27 (Aśoka, rock edict)
Thavara (Theōrós?)	CKI 88, 89 (silver cups)
Theutara, Thaídōra, (*Theu)sora (Theódōros)	CKI 57 (pond donation), 88, 89 (silver cups), 955 (token)
Theudama (Theodámas)	CKI 34 (seal), 727 (silver vessel), 978 (sealing)
Theuduta (Theódotos)	CKI 32 (reliquary)
Dinisidora (Dionusódōros)	CKI 1000 (seal)
Denipa (Deínippos)	CKI 106 (seal)
Denukrata (Deinokrátēs)	CKI 1030 (seal)
Demetria (Dēmétrios)	CKI 564 (relic donation)
Maka (Mágas)	CKI 13, 27 (Aśoka, rock edict)
Menāṃdra, Mināṃdra, Minedra (Ménandros)	CKI 143 (weight), 176 (reliquary), 257 (reliquary)
Sapha (Sophē)	CKI 118 (image donation)
Hirmaa (Hermaíos)	CKI 328 (reliquary), 455 (gold leaf)
Heliuphila (Hēlióphilos)	CKI 328 (reliquary)
Zenupila (Zēnóphilos)	CKI 987 (token)

Source: Prepared by author

of months in Gāndhārī inscriptions; and the three Hellenistic administrative titles attested in Gandhāra: *stratega* (*stratēgós*), *meridarkha* (*meridárkhēs*) and *aṇamkaya* (*anagkaïos*). In particular, the ubiquitous and prestigious Greek names of rulers on coins will have served as an important vector for the adoption of Greek names in Gandhāra in general.

Considering only the epigraphic data, several observations can be made on the mechanisms whereby these Greek names were acculturated in their Gandhāran context. First of all, three of the inscriptions carry their names in parallel in Kharoṣṭhī and in Greek script. Although the token CKI 955 (*(*Theu)sorasa*, θεοδ(*ωρου)) and the sealing CKI 978 (*(*The)uda(*masa)*, Θε(*ο)δ(*α)μ(*ου)) contain just the names, a much more interesting case is presented by the inscription of Kalliphōn (CKI 552). Like the stele of Subhūti and the pillar of Hēliódōros, it illustrates a particular type of interaction between Hellenistic and Indian religious practices. The silver vessel in question belongs to a hoard of nine plates and bowls, three of which are inscribed: Kalliphōn's inscription is given in Greek (Καλλιφῶν μεριδάρχης ευξάμενος ανεθηκεν τῷ Χάοσει 'Kalliphōn, making a vow, dedicated [this] to Kháos') as well as in Gāndhārī (*Kaliphonena meridarkhena praṭisunita nirakate Boasa*), a second inscription is in Greek only and a third in Gāndhārī only. The inscriptions reveal that the whole set of vessels was dedicated in a Greek ritual in the sanctuary of a deity, but the deity in question was Indian rather than Greek. Its name is given as Boa in the Gāndhārī version of Kalliphōn's inscription (interpreted by Falk 2009a as Bhava, a primordial form of Śiva) and translated as Kháos into Greek in an instance of interpretational Graeca.²⁶

A second type of acculturation relates to those cases where the same person had both an Indian and a Greek name, two of which are attested in our corpus. Denukrata from the seal CKI 1030 was according to the inscription (*Denukratasa Sagharakṣidasa*) also known as Sagharakṣida, and Indravarma's bscript sealing CKI 1035 (*Imdravarmasa strategasa*, Αλεξανδρου στρατηγου) tells us that he had the Greek name Aléksandros.²⁷ One suspects that in the case of Imdravarma, his choice of Greek name was influenced by the assonance of Imdra- with -andros and by the semantic affinity of -varma, 'protection', and Aleks-, 'defending'. It is worth noting that the practice of double names in Indian and Greek was employed not just by rulers but, in the case of Saṃgharakṣida, even by somebody who appears to have been a Buddhist and possibly a monastic.

The final step in the Gandhāran intermingling of Greek and Indian onomastic systems is those names that appear to combine Greek and Indian elements. Both Helaiūta in the relic dedication CKI 564 and Theuta on the seal CKI 969 appear to share the same final element *-uta*, which is likely to correspond to the common Sanskrit name element *-gupta* ‘protected by (a deity)’. Here it is combined with two different Greek first elements, namely Hēlio- (the sun god) and Theo- (god). The creation of such bilingual portmanteau names was facilitated by the shared inheritance in India and Greece of the Indo-European aristocratic custom of compound names.²⁸

In the last part of this chapter, I would like to use data from the inscriptional corpus described earlier to examine what, if anything, the existence of Greek names in India tells us about the cultural identification of their bearers. The corpus contains ten bearers of Greek names and two bearers of Greek–non-Greek hybrid names that tell us something about their family relationships as part of identifying themselves or sharing the merit of a religious donation, summarized in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 Family relationships involving bearers of Greek names in Gāndhārī inscriptions (f = father, m = mother, w = wife, s = son, u = uncle, gm = grandmother, gs = grandson, gu = great-uncle)

<i>Century</i>	<i>Greek name</i>	<i>Family relations</i>	<i>CKI no.</i>
2 BCE	Hēliódōros (Vidišā)	Díōn (f)	–
1 BCE	Theódōros (Kaldarra)	Datia (f)	57
1 BCE – 1 CE	Theódōros (Taxila)	Theōrós? (f)	88, 89
1 CE	Ménandros	Subhūtikā (gm) Vijayamitra (gu) Śatruleka (f) Davili (m) Indrasena (u) Indrasena (b)	257
	Hermaĩos (Hadda)	Mahomava (f)	455
	Hermaĩos (Hadda)	Soṇakṣita (f)	455
	Theodámas (Central Asia)	Budhala (s)	727
	Helaiūta	Dēmētrios (f)	564
2 CE	Hiperecaa (Zeda)	Vasativaca (w) Leaka Sacaloka (s)	148
	Hermaĩos	Saṭṣaka (s) Mum̐ji (gs)	328
	Hēlióphilos	Aprakhaka (s)	328
unclear	Zēnóphilos	Raja (s)	987

Source: Prepared by author

The surprising result of this survey is that only one or two of these Greek-named persons had relatives that themselves bore Greek names, namely Hēliódōros, son of Díōn, and possibly Theódōros, son of Theōrós. (In addition, hybrid-named Helaiūta has a Greek-named father Dēmétrios.) In all other cases, the family members of the bearers of Greek names have Indian or foreign (including Scythian and Parthian) names. A particularly telling case in point is that of Ménandros, a scion of the well-known royal family of Apraca in Bajaur: whereas Ménandros himself has been given the name of the most famous foreign ruler of Gandhāra (living two centuries before him), half of his relatives have adopted Indian names (Subhūtikā, Vijayamitra, Indrasena) and the other half retain their foreign names (Śatruleka, Davili).²⁹

We have to conclude from this that although the use of Greek names in Gandhāra bespeaks the continuing historical memory and prestige of the Indo-Greek rulers (especially Menander), we can deduce nothing from it about the ethnicity or cultural self-identification of their bearers (unless we have positive evidence that the whole family bore Greek names), and we can make no more than guesses about the amount of Hellenism entering into the complex and eclectic cultural makeup of these foreign rulers of the Indian northwest that chose to bestow Greek names on some of their offspring.

At the end of this chapter I would like to return to the *Questions of Menander*, a product of precisely the complex cultural landscape of the first centuries BCE and CE that is exemplified in the epigraphic evidence. Are we able to formulate a clearer idea of its authorship and intended audience than before? Much of the century-long discussion of this question has operated with monolithic entities – Greek and Indian – for the one and the other: either the *Questions of Menander* were taken as a Greek text co-opted by Indian redactors for Buddhist proselytization or as an Indian text with Menander substituted for a generic Indian ruler to appeal to a Greek audience.

As we have seen, however, throughout the epigraphic record we have evidence of Indians adopting Hellenistic culture in the Greek city-states of Bactria (Subhūti), Greeks settling in India and practising Indian religion (Hēliódōros) and a community in the borderlands of Gandhāra producing bilingual records of donations to a god that offers an Indian and a Greek interpretation (Bhava and Khāos) at the same time. This cultural melding process reached its culmination when people who were by origin neither Greek nor Indian began to settle in and rule Gandhāra and freely adopted elements of either culture as they found them on the ground.

One recent analysis of the *Questions of Menander* arrives at nuanced results that appear commensurate with this cultural background. Vasil'kov (1993) argues that the *Questions* owe their overall literary form to an Indian culture of verbal challenge and contest (as elaborated by the Dutch Indologists Heesterman and Kuiper) that left its imprint on Buddhist as well as non-Buddhist literature. Under this interpretation, King Menander challenges Nāgasena in Nāgasena's assembly during their first encounter, is defeated and as a consequence has to leave the site of the verbal contest on horseback rather than on his chariot. On the second day, Nāgasena returns the challenge when in turn he visits Menander's royal assembly, and although the Buddhist context demanded that Menander be the one to receive answers to his doubts, Vasil'kov considers it significant that only on this second day are some questions also posed by Nāgasena to Menander.³⁰ Menander's repeated defeat and the acknowledgement of the superiority of the victor conclude the traditional Indian scheme of the verbal contest, which contrasts sharply with the impartial pursuit of truth that is the object of a Socratic dialogue.

Although the literary form of the *Questions* is thus purely Indian (with a Buddhist overlay of older patterns), Vasil'kov argues – to my mind convincingly – that the microstructure of the argument, with its innumerable appeals to natural phenomena and cultural objects (some of the latter specifically Greek), engages with Greek habits of debate that would have been prevalent in the Greek literary culture of Bactria (which, as we have seen, has been richly attested by recent archaeological discoveries) and were still current among the intended audience of the *Questions*.

Applying Vasil'kov's conclusions to the epigraphic data surveyed in this chapter, one may therefore propose that the author of the *Questions of Menander* in the form in which we have them was steeped in the age-old Indian tradition of verbal debate and its corresponding literary form; that the author of the *Questions* (like the authors of other Buddhist dialogues before him) modified this literary form to emphasize the superiority of the knowledge of the Buddhist sage Nāgasena; and that he intended the text for the conversion of an audience that was neither Indian nor Greek, but part of the cosmopolitan melting pot of Gandhāra that was Indianized enough for the literary form of the *Questions* to appeal to it, Hellenized enough to be persuaded by its Greek style of argumentation and worldly enough to identify with the figure of the most famous foreign ruler of Gandhāra as he undergoes conversion to Buddhism.

Notes

- 1 A first version of this chapter was presented at the 2011 meeting of the American Academy of Religion in a panel on ‘Greco-Roman Culture and Buddhism’ organized by Mariko Walter. The argument was updated and expanded for a presentation at the workshop ‘Rethinking the Greeks in Gandhāra’ at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (27–28 March 2014).
- 2 There is a noticeable absence of Greek names in the large number of Gāndhārī birch-bark manuscripts that have recently come to light (Baums 2014), in contrast to the contemporary Indo-Scythian rulers that figure in the Gāndhārī avadāna collections (Salomon 1999: 141–151). The only potential trace of a Greek cultural influence on Gāndhārī literature was noted by Brough 1962: 207–208 who suggested that in Khotan Dharmapada verse 97 *dharmatraka* contains a multilingual pun on Sanskrit *tarka* ‘thought’ and Greek τροχός ‘wheel’. If correct, this would imply that the intended audience of Gāndhārī literature included some with knowledge of Greek. Another noticeable absence is that of Greek names among the large cache of Gāndhārī administrative documents from Niya (cf. the onomasticon in Padwa 2007: 309–333), in spite of the well-known Hellenistic motifs in the seals of these documents. The only potential Classical name among the Gāndhārī sources from Central Asia is Tita in the Miran wall painting CKI 443 (if, in fact, it is a rendering of Latin Titus).
- 3 G. Fussman, L’Indo-Grec Ménandre ou Paul Demiéville revisité, *Journal asiatique*, 281, 1993: 63–66.
- 4 Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1996: 83.
- 5 Von Hinüber, *Handbook*: 83–86.
- 6 Y. Vasil’kov, Did East and West Really Meet in Milinda’s Questions?, *Культурология*, 1, 1993: 67, von Hinüber, *Handbook*: 83–84.
- 7 W.W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria & India*, University Press, Cambridge, 1938: 262–264.
- 8 M. Winternitz *A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II: Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature*, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1933: 176.
- 9 Tarn, *The Greeks*: 414–436.
- 10 J. Gonda, Tarn’s Hypothesis on the Origin of the Milindapañha, *Mnemosyne*, 2, 1949: 44–62.
- 11 More recently Fussman, L’Indo-Grec Ménandre, 1993.
- 12 P. Bernard, Langue et épigraphie grecques dans l’Asie Centrale à l’époque hellénistique, in Jan A. Todd, Dora Komini-Dialetti and Despina Hatzi-vassiliou (eds.), *Greek Archaeology without Frontiers*, “Open Science” Lecture Series, Athens, 2002: 86–92.
- 13 Bernard, Langue et épigraphie: 94–103.
- 14 Bernard, Langue et épigraphie: 75–78. This inscription is the point of departure for the general discussion of Hellenism in Bactria in Parker 2007.
- 15 Bernard, Langue et épigraphie: 81.
- 16 Bernard, Langue et épigraphie: 103.

- 17 Paul Bernard, Georges-Jean Pinault and Georges Rougemont, Deux nouvelles inscriptions grecques de l'Asie centrale, *Journal des savants*, 2004: 333–356.
- 18 Cf. Claude Rabin, *Fouilles d'Ai Khanoum, VIII: La trésorie du palais hellénistique d'Ai Khanoum: L'apogée et la chute du royaume grec de Bactriane*, De Boccard, Paris, 1992: 387–392 and Bernard, Langue et épigraphie, for overviews.
- 19 Paul Bernard, Georges-Jean Pinault and Georges Rougemont, Deux nouvelles inscriptions grecques de l'Asie centrale, *Journal des savants*, 2004: 227–332.
- 20 Tarn, *The Greeks*: 313–314, 388.
- 21 Tarn, *The Greeks*: 389–392.
- 22 CKI = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (Part II of Baums and Glass 2002 –).
- 23 Harry Falk, The Introduction of Stūpa-Worship in Bajaur, in Osmund Bopearachchi and Marie-Françoise Boussac (eds.), *Afghanistan: ancien carrefour entre l'Est et l'Ouest: actes du colloque international organisé par Christian Landes & Osmund Bopearachchi au Musée archéologique Henri-Prades-Lattes du 5 au 7 mai 2003*, Brepols, Turnhout, 2005: 347–358.
- 24 Stefan Baums, Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions, David Jongeward, Elizabeth Errington, Richard Salomon and Stefan Baums, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle: Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012: 202–203.
- 25 A fourteenth newly discovered inscription on a stone slab from Takht-i-bahi appears to record a donation by a certain Bhadraśīla, son of Iphaṇa (Nadiem 1989; revised reading by Andrew Glass, CKI 596). The name of the father sounds un-Indian and bears a certain resemblance to Greek names in Iphi-, but the similarity is not strong enough to include it in our list of Greek names.
- 26 A fourth inscription, the sealing CKI 940, likewise appears to preserve parallel names in Kharoṣṭhī (/// *nasa*) and in Greek script (/// εθραου), but both versions are too fragmentary to say whether a Greek name was intended. There is no match for the substring εθραυ in the online version of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (<http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk>). The inverse type of biscript inscription presents Indian or local names both in Kharoṣṭhī and in Greek script. Examples include *Budha(*dha)trasa* / Βοδῶατρασα (CKI 104), *Madeasa* / (*M)οδειου (CKI 933), *Śatralakasa* / Σατρολαιου (CKI 943), *a ma ?* / δαβο (CKI 962), *Naṃdasa* / Νανδου (as well as Brāhmī *Ṇadasa*, CKI 977) and *Mitrisāmapūtrasa* / Μιτρασαμπατασα (as well as Brāhmī *Mitrasāmapūtrasa*, CKI 1077). The examples including Brāhmī can be further compared with the biscript Kharoṣṭhī Brāhmī seal of Indravarma (CKI 364), giving his name in Kharoṣṭhī (*Imdravarmasa iśparasa*) and his title in Brāhmī (*Avajarajasa*).
- 27 Aman ur Rahman and Harry Falk, *Seals, Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*, Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2011: 179 read στρατεγου, but the expected η is clear on their photograph.
- 28 As mentioned earlier, Hipereca in the well donation CKI 148 may be a third such portmanteau name containing a Greek first element Hippias or Hippo-, but here the identity of the second element remains elusive and does not appear to be Indian.

- 29 Compare with this the epigraphic record of Ai Khanum in Bactria, which consists mostly of Greek names, but also contains one name in Aramaic and one in unclear script (Parker 2007: 175–176).
- 30 Yaroslav Vasil'kov, Did East and West Really Meet in Milinda's Questions?, *Культурология*, 1, 1993: 64–77.

References

- Baums, S. 2012. Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions, in D. Jongeward, E. Errington, R. Salomon, and S. Baums (eds.), *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*. Seattle: Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, pp. 200–251.
- Baums, S. 2014. Gandhāran Scrolls: Rediscovering an Ancient Manuscript Type, in J.B. Quenzer, D. Bondarev, and J.-U. Sobisch (eds.), *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 183–225.
- Baums, S., and A. Glass. 2002. *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*. <https://gandhari.org/catalog/> accessed on 3 March 2017.
- Bernard, P. 2002. Langue et épigraphie grecques dans l'Asie Centrale à l'époque hellénistique, in J.A. Todd, D. Komini-Dialeti, and D. Hatzivassiliou (eds.), *Greek Archaeology Without Frontiers*. Athens: "Open Science" Lecture Series, pp. 75–108.
- Bernard, P., G.-J. Pinault, and G. Rougemont. 2004. Deux nouvelles inscriptions grecques de l'Asie central. *Journal des savants* 227–356.
- Brough, J. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Falk, H. 2005. The Introduction of Stūpa-Worship in Bajaur, in O. Bopearachchi, and M.-F. Boussac (eds.), *Afghanistan: ancien carrefour entre l'Est et l'Ouest : actes du colloque international organisé par Christian Landes & Osmund Bopearachchi au Musée archéologique Henri-Prades-Lattes du 5 au 7 mai 2003*. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 347–358.
- Falk, H. 2009a. Greek Style Dedications to an Indian God in Gandhara. *Indo-Asiatische Zeitschrift* 13: 25–42.
- Falk, H. 2009b. The Pious Donation of Wells in Gandhara, in G. Mevissen, and A. Banerji (eds.), *Prajñādhara: Essays on Asian, History, Epigraphy and Culture in Honour of Gouriswar Bhattacharya*. New Delhi: Kaveri Books, pp. 23–36.
- Fussman, G. 1993. L'Indo-Grec Ménandre ou Paul Demiéville revisité. *Journal asiatique* 281: 61–138.
- Gonda, J. 1949. Tarn's Hypothesis on the Origin of the Milindapañha. *Mnemosyne* 2: 44–62.
- Hinüber, O. von. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Nadiem, I.H. 1989. A Fresh Kharoshthi Inscription from Takht-i-Bahi. *Journal of Central Asia* 12: 209–216.
- Narain, A.K. 1957. *The Indo-Greeks*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Padwa, M. 2007. *An Archaic Fabric: Culture and Landscape in an Early Inner Asian Oasis (3rd – 4th Century C.E. Niya)*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.
- Parker, G. 2007. Hellenism in an Afghan Context, in H.P. Ray and D.T. Potts (eds.), *Memory as History: The Legacy of Alexander in Asia*. New Delhi: Aryan Books International, pp. 170–191.
- Rahman, A., and H. Falk. 2011. *Seals, Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Rapin, C. 1992. *Fouilles d’Ai Khanoum, VIII: La trésorie du palais hellénistique d’Ai Khanoum : L’apogée et la chute du royaume grec de Bactriane*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Salomon, R. 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Tarn, W.W. 1902. Notes on Hellenism in Bactria and India. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 22: 268–293.
- Tarn, W.W. 1938. *The Greeks in Bactria & India*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Tarn, W.W. 1951. *The Greeks in Bactria & India*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: University Press.
- Trenckner, V. 1880. *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues Between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Vasil'kov, Y. 1993. Did East and West Really Meet in Milinda's Questions? *Культурология* 1: 64–77.
- Winternitz, M. 1933. *A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II: Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Archaeology and Religion in South Asia

Series Editor: **Himanshu Prabha Ray**

Ludwig Maximilian University Munich, Germany; former Chairperson of the National Monuments Authority, Ministry of Culture, Government of India and former Professor, Centre for Historical Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India



A RECOGNISED INDEPENDENT CENTRE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Editorial Board: Gavin Flood, Former Academic Director, Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies; Jessica Frazier, Academic Administrator, Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies; Julia Shaw, Institute of Archaeology, University College, London; Shailendra Bhandare, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; Devangana Desai, Asiatic Society, Mumbai; and Vidula Jaiswal, Jnana Pravaha, Varanasi, former Professor, Banaras Hindu University

This series, in association with the Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies, reflects on the complex relationship between religion and society through new perspectives and advances in archaeology. It looks at this critical interface to provide alternative understandings of communities, beliefs, cultural systems, sacred sites, ritual practices, food habits, dietary modifications, power and agents of political legitimisation. The books in the series underline the importance of archaeological evidence in the production of knowledge of the past. They also emphasise that a systematic study of religion requires engagement with a diverse range of sources such as inscriptions, iconography, numismatics and architectural remains.

Books in this Series

Women and Monastic Buddhism in Early South Asia

Garima Kaushik

Archaeology and Religion in Early Northwest India

History, Theory, Practice

Daniel Michon

Negotiating Cultural Identity

Landscapes in Early Medieval South Asian History

Edited by Himanshu Prabha Ray

For a full list of titles in this series, please visit www.routledge.com/Archaeology-and-Religion-in-South-Asia/book-series/AR

Buddhism and Gandhara

An Archaeology of Museum Collections

Edited by Himanshu Prabha Ray

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an
informa business*

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Himanshu Prabha Ray;
individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Himanshu Prabha Ray to be identified as the
authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their
individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with
sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act
1988.

Maps not to scale. The international boundaries, coastlines,
denominations, and other information shown in any map in
this work do not necessarily imply any judgement concerning
the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or
acceptance of such information. For current boundaries,
readers may refer to the Survey of India maps.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted
or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be
trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for
identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British
Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-89681-9 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-351-25276-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC