CHAPTER III
ALEXANDER'S INVASION AND ITS CULTURAL IMPACT

India and Greece first came into contact of each other through Persia, but no direct connection was established until Alexander and his Macedonians successfully challenged the might of Persia towards the end of the fourth century B.C. Then the north-west part of India which formed the eastern most provinces of the Persian Empire quickly felt the sting of the Macedonian victory.\(^1\)

The Greeks and Indians did see each other as fighting foes in the year 480 B.C. when the Indian contingent fought a battle of the Hellas under Xerxes. These Indian troops who fought for the first time in Europe had to experience a terrible ordeal in storming the bloody defiles of Thermopylae.\(^2\)

Herodotus says that "the Indians clad in garments made of cotton, carried bows of cane and arrows of cane, the latter tipped with iron."\(^3\)

Next time the Greeks met the Indians with their elephants on the field of battle of Arbela in the year 331 B.C. Sykes informs that fifteen (Indian) elephants were marshalled in the fighting line, their first appearance in a historical battle.\(^4\) Arrian says that the Indians who lived this side of the Indus fought in the battle of Arbela.\(^5\) But such contact in battles were merely 'tough and go' they can hardly be regarded as real contacts. The invasion of India by Alexander opened the flood gates of this contact.

---
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Alexander III., King of Macedonia, surnamed the Great was the son of Philip II and Olympias belonging to the race of Epeiros, claiming descent from Achilles - the hero of the Iliad. An Akarnanian tutor named Lysimachos, taught him in the beginning and subsequently he was entrusted to Aristotle's wise care. He developed an austere and strong character and supreme valour in his youth.

On his father Philip's assassination, when he was preparing for an invasion of Persia to avenge the invasions of King Mardonios and Xerxes, Alexander succeeded the Macedonian throne in the year C. 336 B.C. when he was only 20. On his accession Alexander found himself surrounded by formidable foes from all sides. The young King proved equal to the task. After securing his position in his Kingdom, Alexander looked to the East and with a strong force of 30,000 foot and 4,500 horse marched towards Persia. Crossed over to Asia at the Hellespont in the spring of C. 334 B.C. first to settle account with the Achaemenians and then to conquer the distant India.

His first conflict with the Persians took place on the banks of the river Granikos in which his small and well trained army routed the vast horde of the Persian army. Shortly after he defeated the Persian King, Darius and made him flee.
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At Gordian, Alexander saw the Chariot of Gordius, founder of the Phygian monarchy and was informed of the oracle that any man who loosed the knot binding the yoke to pole would rule over Asia. Alexander succeeded where all had failed either by an impetuous sword cut or by pulling out the pole pin. Then crossing the river Euphrates in C. 331 B.C., Alexander, finally defeated Darius III again on the battlefield of Arbela. Darius III again fled for his dear life but he was killed by his own men. The Indian troops were present at the battle of Arbela when the fate of Iran under Darius Codomans was finally decided by the invincible sword of Alexander. Alexander took some time in his conquests in Northern Persia and Bactria and also in consolidation of conquests before invading India. In the year C. 329 B.C., the Macedonian army recrossed the Oxus and came to Zariaspa to spend the cold winter. The army was reinforced from Greece and regrouped for the invasion of India and in the Summer of C. 327 B.C. the Macedonian King left Bactra on his Indian expedition. Percy Sykes says that India had attracted Alexander with irresistible force just as it attracted the Portuguese, the French, on English some 19 centuries later.

1. H.O.G., p. 608
2. F.C. Davar * India & Iran through the Ages, p. 53
3. H.O.G., p. 252
4. Thomas Holdich, The Gates of India, Ch. IV & V.
ALEXANDER INVades INDIA

Alexander was approaching the bourne of the old Persian Empire and it was evident that he meant to press still onwards towards the sunrise. The Greek diviners announced that the omens were favourable. In the early dawn, one day in the spring of 326 B.C., the host began to defile over the bridge (of the Indus), the mingled line of many races streaming all day into the Indian world.1

WHY ALEXANDER INVADED INDIA

Alexander's misconceptions about Europe and Asia explain why he decided to invade India and took shipwrights and crews with his army. India gave no casus belli to him to attack her. The military expedition was an exploratory one, and a part of a grand design of the great conqueror.

If India jutted eastwards into the ocean, he could turn either northward by ocean to the rim of Europe or perhaps enter the Caspian Sea or else southwards to explore a route along the rim of Asia. He thought of India as a relatively small peninsula and of Arabia as similar.2 The urge to explore to see and to dominate the unknown lands might have brought the great adventurer to India.
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Secondly the belief rather than a tradition that Darius I had once held India, inspired Alexander to attempt a conquest which was also an exploration and would open up sea communication for his empire.

INDIA AT THE TIME OF ALEXANDER'S INVASION

Political condition There was no extensive kingdom in India of the fourth century B.C. except that of Magada—No paramount imperial power existed. In the Punjab and Sindh the two areas visited by the Macedonian forces, petty and independent States were numerous. The country between the Jhelum and the Beas alone was occupied by seven different tribal States. The Kingdoms of Taxila and Porus were ruled by Kings while territories like Malavas and Kshudrakas were administered as republics or oligarchies.

The statement made by Megasthenes twenty years or so after Alexander's invasion that 118 distinct nations or tribes were said to exist in the whole of India proves that the large number of distinct governments in the Punjab and Sind were in no way exceptional. Such States were engaged in unceasing wars among themselves by the dissensions of the Punjab rajacs.

The hold of the Achaemenian on the Indians in the various provinces on the frontier had, however, grown very feeble about this time and the whole of North Western India was parcelled out into innumerable kingdoms, and republics. Dr. May Choudhuri gives the list of some 28 important kingdoms.
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and tribes that existed in the areas overrun by Alexander. They were Aspacioi, Guraeans. Assakenos, Nysa, * Pukeloct * Taxila, Abhisara, Elder Poros, Glathoganai, Gaudaris, Adraista, Kathai, Sophytes, Hageles, Siboi, Agalassoi Oxydrakai, Malloi, Abastamoi, Xathroi, Ossadioi, sodrai, Massamoi, Mousikanos, Oxykanos, Sambos and Patalence. We shall presently deal with them generally. The nations which Alexander heard of beyond the Hyphases (Beas) were under aristocratic governments. Arrain and Strabo say that Prasii (Magadhas) were the most distinguished of all the Nations, but neither hints at their supremacy over others. We know that the great Kingdom of Magadha existed in the east (Frachi) or Greek Prasii with its capital at Pataliputra.

**INDIAN INVASION**

It was in the spring of 326 B.C. that Alexander first set foot on Indian soil from Greek point of view. His army crossed to the other side of the Sindhu, accompanied by an Indian contingent of 5000 from the King of Taxila and other chiefs.

The invading army was warmly welcomed by Ambhi, the King of Taxila. His kingdom lay between the Indus and the Jhelum. Alexander added more territory to the kingdom of Taxila and held a victorious felicitation in the capital. In this
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Durbar, he received homage and presents from the chiefs of the locality. These gifts were returned by Alexander on a lavish scale in the shape of vessels of gold and silver and embroideries which he had obtained in Persia\textsuperscript{1}, thus bringing not only both the Greece and India, but also Persia and India culturally nearer.

Beyond Taxila, between the rivers Jhelum and Chenab, lay the kingdom of Elder Poros (Puru or Paurava). True to the tradition of his ancient lineage, reaching back to the vedic period, he determined to defend, at all costs, the honour of his family and the independence of his kingdom\textsuperscript{2}. He heard with resentment of the submission of Taxila and other localities including another Paurva (Younger Porus) of his own kingmen ruling further east beyond the Chenab. Even the king of Abhisara (hilly tract of Kashmir), who offered to help him, was playing a double game, and sent his own brother to Taxila with presents to Alexander and offer of submission. But although hemmed in by enemies, cowards and traitors, both in front and rear, his undaunted spirit refused to submit. When the enemy's envoys came to summon him to meet Alexander, he proudly replied that would indeed meet him but at his own frontiers and in arms\textsuperscript{3}.
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Both sides now made active preparations for the inevitable war. Alexander did not wait till after the rains when the rivers would be fordable, probably because he was unwilling to give Poros time to strengthen his position by fresh alliances. Having left a Macedonian garrison and his Satrap Philip as a "Resident", in the Kingdom of Ambhi, he moved on to the banks of the Hydaspes, (Jhelum) which was then (May 326 B.C.) in flood.  

Porus was also ready with his full strength on the opposite bank to oppose his passage of the river. For some time the two armies watched each other. Alexander then took recourse to a strategem. He made his army move up and down the river in search of a convenient point for crossing and kept the Indians in dark about his movements. At last the crossing was effected one morning after a night of torrential rain and storm at point 27 km up the river from the original camp. A bridge of boats, which was moved up to that point and was kept hidden behind a wooded island enabled the Macedonian army to cross the river unobserved.  

---

1. A.l.U., p. 48  
2. According to Arrain, it was 150 Stadia distant from the Macedonian camp. (Anabasis Chapter XI).  
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The names of the Punjab rivers in ancient India:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern name</th>
<th>Ancient name</th>
<th>Greek name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indus or Sindh</td>
<td>Sindhu</td>
<td>Indus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhelum</td>
<td>Vitasta</td>
<td>Hydespes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenab</td>
<td>Chandrabhaga</td>
<td>Akesines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satluj</td>
<td>Vepasa</td>
<td>Hypasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satluj</td>
<td>Satadru</td>
<td>Hesidrus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alexander crossed over with only a small part of his army of about 11,000 men and cavalry. Porus sent his son to oppose him with 2000 mounted troops and 120 chariots. But these could not withstand the charge of the Macedonian Cavalry led personally by Alexander and the gallant son of Porus was killed in action. The Indian contingent was destroyed in a brief encounter.

**BATTLE AGAINST POROS**

Porus now offered battle with his whole army which Arrain estimates at 30,000 foot, 4000 horse, 300 chariots and 200 elephants. The elephants were placed in front flanked by infantry on both sides. The flanks of the infantry were again guarded by cavalry which was protected by chariots in front. Quintis Curtius records that an image of Herakles (Krishna) was carried in front of the army of Porus as he advanced against Alexander. This shows the Indians fought with religious fervour.

From the outset, the battle went against Porus. The rains over-night rendered the ground slipping and his war chariots kept sticking in the slush. The archers could not fix their long bows on the muddy ground.

Alexander began the battle with charge of 1000 mounted archers from Central Asia and picked Macedonian cavalry, making a breach in the lines of the Indian cavalry and infantry. The army of Porus was thrown into complete confusion.

Arrain says "Kraterus and the captains who were with him

---
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on the other side of the river, no sooner perceived the victory to incline to the Macedonians than they passed over and made a dreadful slaughter of the Indians.\footnote{I.I.A.G. p. 107}

Ultimately Porus was defeated on the field losing 20,000 infantry. Two sons of Porus were killed in the battle along with the governor of the region named Spitakes. All the Indian war elephants were also captured. The Greek writers claim that the loss of Macedonian forces was much less.\footnote{Diodoros says that there were 700 infantrymen; IIAG p. 103 fn}

Porus Defeated

Defeated Porus was conducted to the Macedonian conqueror who asked him how he should like to be treated. He made the famous reply which has become a classic, "Act as a King" when Alexander asked him to be more precise, he replied..."when I said, as a King" every thing was contained in that... It is said that Alexander was so much delighted with this reply that not only he appointed his former foe to govern his territory but also added other areas (15 republican peoples) to his charge. Porus proved himself faithful and devoted to his new ally.

After the battle, Alexander founded two cities, one on the battlefield and the other where he had crossed the river Hydespes (Jhelum) naming the first as Nikaia\footnote{A.I.U. p. 49} in honour of the victory over the Indians and the second...
Boukephala in memory of his horse Boukephalas\(^1\) which had died there.

But Alexander's further advance was now impeded by reports of revolts from regions conquered by him. Kandahar rose with the help of an Indian Chief Damarexus. The Assvakas rebelled killing the Satrap Nicamor. Sisi Kottos-(Sasigupta), then the Satrap of Assakenians (eastern Ass'vakas) asked for urgent reinforcements.\(^2\) The situation was somewhat improved by the arrival of Thranian reinforcements from Iran, with whom Alexander crossed the next river Ace Sines (Chenab).\(^3\)

Ptolemy says that Alexander advanced against the country called Glausd (Possibly Kalak tribe of Varaha Samhita).\(^4\) The people surrendered everywhere on the terms of capitulation and Alexander captured 37 cities.\(^5\)

**TOWARDS THE HYPHASIS (Beas)**

Beyond the river Acesines (Asikni - Chenab) lay the Kingdom of Porus II who left his realm to its fate and fled for shelter to the nation of Gandaridai. The whole region between the Chenab and the Navi (Hydroates) was annexed to the Kingdom of Paurav.\(^6\) According to Bay Chaudhri, Gandaris was the name of the Kingdom of younger Porus. It represented the easternmost part of old Gandhara.\(^7\)

---
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Alexander next marched up to the Ravi and beyond and invaded the territories of republican people. Of these, the Adraistai (Arattas) republicans offered submission to Alexander. But the Kathaioi (Kathas) defied him from the fortified town and Sangala (Samkala=Jandiala)\(^1\) (to the east of Amritsar), though without success and suffered terrible casualties.

Alexander then received submission of two neighbouring Kings named Sophytes (Sambhuti) ruling over a territory - east of the Jhelum and Phegelas (Bhagala) ruling over a territory between the Ravi and the Beas. He then came to the fifth river Hyphasis (Beas)\(^2\) with an idea to conquer the Indians who dwelt beyond this river. But to his war weary army there was no end to the fighting.

Would they fight all the way to the very end of the earth?

THE RETREAT

When Alexander was about the hurl his veterans towards the depth of India, they refused to advance. Their discontentment or hesitation was not sudden or abrupt. They were tired of the endless war far away from their homes since they crossed the Hellespont. Their enthusiasm was dampened by the dogged resistance which they faced after the Hydaspes. They knew that the land beyond the Hyphasis (Beas) was inhabited by some brave people and they were well governed. A far more

\(^{1}\) A.I.U., p. 50
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formidable army than the Porus forces, awaited their phalanx and cavalry and their victory was not fully assured. So Alexander was forced to retreat. He then ordered to build 12 altars very high to serve as thanks giving to the Gods and retraced his steps. He went back by the road by which he came up to the bank of Jhelum.

Then he sailed down the Jhelum and the Sindhu to the ocean in a fleet of 1000 boats made ready before hand, including "luggage boats" horse transport and war galleys. The Indians were surprised to see such war galleys and large transport boats. They must certainly have learnt something for their river transport, but nothing survives now to prove that the inland transport in India improved after this event.

THE LAST INDIAN RESISTANCE

Alexander started on his voyage in November 326 B.C. with troops protecting him on either bank of the river and his Satrap Philip following three days later to protect his rear. The armada, which could have taught India about the war transport in river, floated down the Jhelum and reached the confluence with the Chenab in 10 days.

Here Alexander had to face determined opposition organised by a confederacy of republican people led by the Malloi (Malavas) and the Oxydراكai (Eshudrakas) who between them mustered an allied army of 90,000 foot and 10,000 horse and 900 chariots. All the Malava cities became centres of resistance to defend their homes and culture. One of those was a town of Brahmans who exchanged pen for the sword and died fighting. They numbered about 1,111,129.

1 IIAG p.129
2 Ibid. p.50
3 Ibid.
4 A.I.U.p.50
5 Ibid Malloi (or Malava) seem to have occupied the right bank of the lower Ravi. According to Smith they formed part of the Kaurava host in the Mahabharat war (EMI p.94 n) Panini refers to the Malavas as living by the profession of arms (I.A.1915 p.200)
6 Ibid. actual name of the country Mousilkanos (Muchukarna) when Brahman exercised considerable influence according to Strabo XV i 66 (Arrain,p.319 cf)
7 Both Malloi and Oxydракai had even agreed to exchange 10000 of their young women for wives of the other caste in order to cement their alliance [Th. Walli, History of Greece, vii p. 54]
5000 of whom but few were taken prisoner. The Xshudrakas lost hear after the defeat of the Malavas and submitted to the forces of Alexander.\(^1\)

There were other republican peoples to resist Alexander. The Sibae (Sivis)\(^2\) submitted but not the Agalassoi\(^3\) (Arjunayanas?). In one of their towns, the citizens numbering about 20,000, after a brave fighting, cast themselves with their wives and children into the flames, anticipating the Mughal Janhar of later days.\(^4\)

This shows the spirit of the people to live free and die. Down the river Alexander passed by other tribes such as Abastanes, the Xatari (Kshatriyas IIAG - p. 156 n) and the Ossadi (Vasati of Mahabharat VII. 19-11). They did not choose to fight.\(^5\) Thus Alexander proceeded further without opposition.
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Alexander reached the last confluence of the Punjab rivers with the Sindhu in the winter at the beginning of 325 B.C. Further down the Sindhu he passed through the country of Sogdi also called Sogdri (Sudras which was then under the Brahmin supremacy, and of King Musikanos (King of the Mushikas?)² and of Oxyeanus also called Porticanus (from Sanskrit Partha?)³.

The Brahmins of this region who dominated its politics resolved upon opposition to the foreign invader as a part of their dharma, denounced the princes who submitted as traitors and goaded the republican peoples into resistance, Musicanus revoked his submission to Alexander. Oxyeanus also followed suit. They were all defeated by the Greek army and put to the sword together with the militant Brahmins⁴.

Alexander finally reached the large city of Patala when the Sindhu divided into two branches. It was then ruled by two Kings and a Council of Elders. It was deserted at the approach of Alexander⁵.

1 A.I.U. p. 31
2 Sudras were called Kshudrakas (Mahabharat, II. 52.15) most numerous and warlike of the Indian tribes in the Punjab.
3 A.I.U., p. 51
4 Ibid. The Brahmins are said to be Maushkara by Patanjali in Mahabharata (iv 1.4) vide PHI. p. 258
5 A.I.U., p. 51.
in September 325 B.C. Alexander left Patala on his homeward journey and proceeded towards Babylon through Gedrosia\(^1\) (Makron). Nearachus with his fleet sailed by sea. By then he had over-run the entire Indian land from the Hindukush to the Beas and the confluence of the Indus, the river which now lies in Pakistan.

Two years later he died suddenly at Babylon

THE LAST PHASE

Alexander appointed Nearachos to command the fleet during the journey back home. He himself took the command of the entire Greek army and set out towards Greece from Patala. While his admiral waited for favourable wind to set sail, the King reached the river Arabicos (now called Purali) in Sind, in 9 days. Here he turned southward for twin purposes, first to dig wells to provide drinking water for his expedition and secondly to punish an Indian tribe called Oreitai (Arbitai in South Baluchistan)\(^2\) for their contumacy. First of all Alexander attacked the tribe called Arabitai (Makran) as they did not submit to him on his approach. On hearing about the attack Arabitai fled into the desert and did not offer any resistance to the Macedonians.
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The people of Oreitai were attacked by the King as well as by his general Hephaestion who was in command of half the Greek forces. Some Oreitai offered resistance but were cut down and many were taken prisoners. The King left his general behind to colonise a suitable site called Rambakia (near modern Karachi) and advanced further toward the country of the Gadrosoi (Mekran in Modern Baluchistan). A combined force of Oreitai and Gadrosoi had taken up position in a narrow defile to attack the Greek forces but when Alexander reached the defile, most of them ran away. Thereafter, Oreitai surrendered to Alexander en masse and were asked to go back to their homes. Apollonipes was placed as Satrap of this area. He also left behind his general Leonnatos to enforce order and to protect the fleet when it sailed past its shores and then the conqueror plunged into the desert of Gedrosioi.

In the desert of Gedrosioi, the Greek army was faced with the colossal problem of collecting supplies. The problem was aggravated by lack of drinking water. The King despatched Thoas to find out the availability of fresh water near the seashore but he found only some miserable fishermen. However, in a Gedrosioi district sufficient corn was found out which was sent to the army and the fleet. But the difficulties encountered in the desert were terrible. Alexander almost faced the same misfortune which is said to have befallen Queen Semiramis when she fled from India or King Cyrus who had come to invade India.

1. Possibly am bugh- where the pilgrims assembled before starting for the Agor valley - in which the principal sacred places are connected with the story of Hama. (Cunningham. A.G.1- pp. 307-310)
2. IIAG, p. 171-172. These people were Ichthyo Shagol of whom Arrain makes -request mention when describing the voyage of Nearchus along the coast.
Many Greek soldiers died of thirst, hunger and sheer fatigue. Alexander faced the ordeal bravely and brought his army to the capital of Gadrosia. When he settled the affairs of his empire, by appointing new Satraps and punishing the others for misgovernment. It was here that Alexander learnt about the murder of his Satrap Philippus in India. He directed Eudemos and Taxiles to assume the Indian Satrapy. When the King reached Karmania (modern South East Persia), he was joined by many of his generals from various parts of his empire. Those from Media, Arianides, Parthyaians, Hyrkanians came with the Greek contingents. The King offered sacrifice in thanks giving to the gods for his victory over the Indians and the preservation of his army during its march through Gadrosioi. He celebrated also a musical and a gymnastic contest. Nearchos having sailed round the coast of Ora (near the mouth of the Indus Sindh) and Gadrosioi came to Alexander to report the safe arrival of his fleet.

1. I.I.A.G., pp. 175-177
2. Ibid., p. 179
3. Ibid., p. 180
When Alexander had reached Gedrosia, capital after his Indian adventure, he settled the affairs by appointing new Satraps and punishing others for their misgovernment. It was here that the King learnt about the murder of his Satrap Philippios in India. He directed Eudemos and Taxiles to assume the Indian Satrapy, but his arrangement proved temporary as a mighty empire of the Mauryas was to be born that would engulf his conquered territories within a few years.

ALEXANDER'S DEATH

When Alexander, invincible before all enemies save death, passed away at Babylon in June 323 B.C. and his generals assembled in council to divide the empire which no arm, but his could continue, they were compelled per force to decide that the distant Indian empire provinces should remain in the hands of the officers and princes to whom they had been entrusted by the King. Thus Indian possession came to the share of Seleucus who became King of Syria and entire eastern part of the empire. He founded a Seleucid dynasty which played an important role in the subsequent history of India.

1. V.A. Smith, Asoka (Third Ed.) p. 1

The climate of Babylon was malarious (Alexander was perhaps killed by the mosquitoes) I.I.A.G. p. 47
Two years after leaving India Alexander died. The empire collapsed like a pack of cards. At the same time a great national movement under Chandragupta united all Aryan India under a single leader and the Macedonian governors were glad to hurry away to the further side of the Hindu Kush with such booty as they could lay hands on. The departure of Eudemos (the Greek Satrap) marks the final collapse of the Macedonian attempt to establish a Greek empire in India.

By 321 B.C. Macedonian power was at an end in India, only those settlers remained who cared to throw in their lot with the people. The political effect of the great invasion was practically nil, unless the example of Alexander inspired the interregning Chandragupta with the idea of making himself master of Northern India.

The Macedonian campaign was not a political success for it did not result in any permanent Macedonian occupation of the Punjab. It did not leave any permanent mark on the government of the people.

Alexander had really no chance of permanent success against the inherent difficulties of the Indian situation. In any case his dream of including the Punjab and Sindh in his world empire was doomed to disappointment. It was not feasible owing to the lack of communications to prosecute campaign in lands to remote from the base of operations.

After his death the Indian threw off the foreign yoke under the leadership of Chandragupta Maurya.

1. H.G. Rawlinson Indian Historical Studies, p. 206
   PHAI p. 262
2. V.A. Smith Asoka, p. 1
3. Rawlinson, IHS, p. 207
4. A.I.U., p. 51
5. Ibid., p. 52.
ALEXANDER AS A CONQUEROR

Alexander has a unique place in the history of the world. He was the first and the last western conqueror of Afghanistan. The British did not succeed in completely subjugating Afghanistan in all the Afghan wars of the nineteenth century A.D. He was the first but not the last invader. He was the first European invader and conqueror of the regions beyond the Oxus, anticipating by more than two thousand years the conquests which had been achieved by an European power (The British) within our memory.

His next famous enterprise forestalled British conquest of north-western India. But England made her conquests from the South, Russia hers from the north. Alexander was the only European conqueror who marched straight from the west to the Indus and the Oxus.

To the Orient at all periods, Alexander of Romance has been the Alexander of Reality.... throughout Central Asia he is worshipped as Iskander, the founder of ancient cities.

1. J.B. Burry, History of Greece, p. 797
2. George Willis Bettsford, Hellenic History, p. 250

*The British did achieve some success in the Afghan wars but they never succeeded in conquering the whole of Afghanistan as was done by Alexander the Great, 2200 years earlier.
Though the invasion of India by Alexander the Great, lasted for less than two years, its indirect impact and Greek Indian contacts lasted for more than two centuries through Seleucid and Bactrian rulers. Alexander's empire almost at once broke up into several kingdoms, but its effects were lasting. The Celts in West based their coinage on its starters and in North India the impact created the Mauryan empire.  

Alexander's invasion, according to Eliot also, produced little direct effect and no allusion to it has been found in Indian literature. But indirectly it had a great influence on the political, artistic and religious development of Hindus by preparing the way for a series of later invasions from the north which brought with them a mixed culture containing Hellenic Persia, and other elements. During some centuries India as a political region was not delimited on the north-western side as it is at present and numerous principalities rose and fell which included Indian territory as well as parts of Afghanistan. 

There are other scholars who also hold similar views. Dr. Ray Chaudhuri acknowledges only one permanent effect i.e. the establishment of Yavana settlements. While Radha Kund Nookerji says that the only permanent result was opening up communication between Greece and India to Rawlinson's note supports the above assertions. He says that the Greeks had extended singularly little influence upon India. Alexander, so celebrated in Persian literature is unnoticed in Indian Books.

Alexander's impact on India is thus to be discussed not with the help of evidences which do not exist, but with pragmatic suggestions deduced after logical arguments.

1. Jack Lindsay A Short History of Culture, p. 214
2. George Eliot Hinduism and Buddhism, p. 22
3. PHAI, p. 262
4. A.I.I., p. 53
5. H.G. Rawlinson Indian Historical Studies, p. 53.
To sum up it can be said that Alexander was not only the greatest of all soldiers, he was a statesman whose plans were constantly successful and his love of exploration and knowledge of all kinds was a ruling passion throughout his life. In parting with perhaps the most famous man who ever trod this earth, Arrain says, "For my own part I think there was at that time no race of men, no city, nor even a single individual to whom Alexander's name and fame had not penetrated. For this reason it seems to me that a hero totally unlike any other human being could not have been born without the agency of the deity". ¹

Such a unique personality that influenced a major part of the ancient world was bound to influence India also.

A pupil of Aristotle, he conceived it to be his mission to westernise the East. He came with historians, scientists in his train to keep a careful record of his discoveries. His work was intended to be permanent, though India did not feel the impact of a permanent nature and most of Alexander's influence was passed on to his succeeding Indo-Greeks yet the originating force should not be lost sight of.

¹. H.O.P. p. 283
Alexander really opened the gates of India for the
West. He meant India to be the great military and commercial
highway of his Indian provinces and had he lived there is
little doubt that a second Alexander would have sprung up at
its mouth and in all probability the Punjab would have been
Hell on earth like Asia Minor or Egypt.1

His premature death dried up the sprouting seeds of
his impact on India, but the influence of India was also
showed up after passing away of this great man.

During succeeding ages, the closer inter course between India
and the West and consequent Indian influence in the field
of philosophy and religion was largely due to the stage
prepared by the Great Reformist.

Alexanders conquests were not conquests of arms only
but his were the conquests of ideas* and as such his long
term influence was felt on Indian art, architecture,
religion and philosophy, various sciences and literature,
even on games and sports. He was the pupil of a great
philosopher - Aristotle. He got thought of uniting the peoples
of the world into one brotherhood and launched a long
march to accomplish his ideal.2

His first aim was political unification of different
countries.

1. H.G. Rawlinson, A Short History of India, p. 62
2. Philip J. Furlong, The Old World and America, p. 124

*That there should be a united world politically and culturally under
the superior culture of Greece.
Rawlinson contends that it was surely the great example of the Alexander who inspired India with the ideal of Chakravarti Raja, "the King of Kings" which the Mauryas so nobly tried to realize. This being the case we cannot say that Alexander's influence upon India is a negligible factor in the history of her development. Vincent Smith holds a different view. He says that Chandragupta did not need Alexander's example to teach him what empire meant. He points out Achaemenian influence for this development. In fact, the concept of Chakravarti Sambat was already there in India much before the advent of Alexander. It has been mentioned in the Vedanyas. Therefore both Rawlinson and Smith are off the mark. The only point worth notice is that Chandragupta Maurya is the first Chakravartin in the documented Indian history. Alexander did not help in this unification indirectly.

The speedy and successful creation of an army of officials and their organisation into an orderly bureaucracy was no easy task, and the efficient performance of this task was perhaps another point of resemblance between the Mauryan State and the contemporary Hellenistic monarchies.

1. H.G. Rawlinson, Bactria, p. 141
2. V.A. Smith, Early History of India, p. 153
3. The Pauranie tradition enumerates sixteen Chakravartikings such as Nara, Harita, Aviksha, Prithu Vainya - even before Chandragupta Maurya (Parjitar, Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, p. 39)
4. K.A. Nilkanth Sastri, ACHOI, p. 38
Alexander's invasion prompted the political unification of the country. Smaller states which had enjoyed unity were now merged in the larger ones such as those of Paurva, Abhirara or Tanila. These conditions were favourable for the rise of an Indian Empire to be shortly founded by Chandragupta.\(^1\) If Ugrasena Kobe Padse was the precursor of Chandragupta Mauya in the East, Alexander was the forerunner of that emperor in the north-west.\(^2\)

There was no occupation of Indian territory: worth the name by the Greeks and what there was of it lasted only a few years.\(^3\)

The monarchies and tribal republics of North-West were much exhausted by their auxiliary conflict with the invader. This paved the way for the steady establishment of the Mauryan Empire in these lands by reducing their power of military resistance to the advance of the empire and possibly also by teaching them that submission to a strong state within the country was the best protection against the recurrence of danger from outside.

It emphasizes the necessity of a phenomenon mentioned among the six Ganas or proper sources of action prescribed for a King and foreign politics—viz., अनुष्ठान (alliance), धन (Puede) वान (march), ताल (halt), अभाय (strategem) गुप्तगांठ (double dealing); अनुष्ठान is sometimes substituted by अभाय (seeking protection of a powerful ally or big power.

---

1. Dr. A.C. Majumdar. An Advanced History of India, p. 69
2. BHAT, p. 253
3. K.A. Nilkanat Sastry, Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, p. 2.
The invader met with no such general confederacy of the native powers like the one formed by the East Indian States against Kunik Ajatsastra. On the contrary, he obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Ambhi of Taxila, Sangaes (Sanjaya?) of Pushkalavati, Kophaios, Assagetas and Sisikottos who got as his reward the Satrapy of the Assakenians. 1

The only people or provinces who thought of combining against the invader, were Pores and Abisares and the Malavas, Kshudrakas and the neighbouring autonomous tribes. 2 Even in the later case personal jealousies prevented any effective results and both the Malavas and Kshudrakas had to lose their independence. Alexander's invasion, according to Raychaudhri, produced one indirect result. It helped the cause of Indian unity by destroying the power of the petty states of north-west India. 3

Smith informs that their neighbours, the Cyclic (Sanskrit Kshudras) who dwelt on the banks of the upper course of the Hyphasis although ordinarily at war with the Naikol, had resolved to forget old enmities and to make common cause against the invader. The rival nations cemented their alliance by wholesale inter-marriage (each giving and taking ten thousand young women for wives. But personal jealousies such as in all ages, have reduced to futility political combinations in India, prevented the alliance from taking effect.

1. PMAI p. 260, IIAG p. 112
2. Ibid., p. 261
3. Ibid., p. 263.
These two races, says Thirwall, were composed of widely different elements for the names of one appears to have been derived from that of the Sudra caste, and it is certain that the Brahmins were predominant in the other. We can easily understand why they did not intermarry and were seldom at peace with each other.

Alexander's invasion prompted them to write, informs also Diodorus, that they had cemented an alliance by inter marriage, each nation taking and giving in exchange 10,000 of their young woman for wives. Such an example is unparalleled in history of political alliances.

One may notice first that nothing was further from Alexander's own thought than that his invasion of India was a mere raid. He left the Punjab and Sindh solidly attached to his world empire.

The Macedonian episode opened an era of some centuries during which Buddhism was to be the dominant factor of Government and civilization on the western confines of the Indian world.

Alexander came into relations with various Indian Kings and a large number of tribes not organized as a kingdom. The Kings

1. Thirwall, A History of Greece, VII, p. 40
2. E. J. Rapson, Cambridge History of India, p. 343
Throughout there was no trace of solidarity among the Indian rulers, at variance among themselves, each played for his own hand as was to be the ordinary rule in India for many centuries to come.

GAMES AND SPORTS

Mo Crindle describes in detail about Alexander organizing games and contests as a part of celebrations. It may be believed that the Indo-Greek contact might have introduced some new games and sports in India. Olympic games held in Olympia in honour of gods since 776 B.C. had become very popular. Alexander used to hold games and contests in his camp to keep his soldiers fit and smart. As the Greek retinue consisted of a large number of Indians, this must have influenced them to some extent. The Greek colonies and the cities founded by Alexander must have made this influence felt for a longer time. There is, however, no definite evidence available to prove this.

1. Moreland, History of India, p. 45
2. I.I.A.G., p. 92
The relations between the Mauryans and their western neighbours were of the most cordial kind. Chandragupta was an enthusiastic admirer of Greek customs.

Envoys from the west were in attendance at Pataliputra and the presence of a Greek Ranj must have enhanced the Hellenic tendencies of the court.

Yavana officials continued to serve the great King of Magadha as they had served the great King of Bactria and Perspolis and the Yavana adventurers carved out independent kingdoms in the north west when the sun of Magadha set.

1. K.G. Rawlinson, Indian Historical Studies, p. 208
2. J.C. Majumdar (Ed.) An Advanced History of India, p. 69
Radhakund Mukerji holds that the invasion of Alexander left no permanent mark on the literature, life or Government of the people of India. In fact this invasion went so much unnoticed that it has not even been mentioned in the Indian literature.

As regards the language, the same can be said "There is little evidence to suggest that the Greek colonies that remained in existence for more than two centuries (227 B.C. to 88 B.C. - Periplus) had in any way influenced the local language of the surrounding areas.

However the conversance with the Greek script introduced the word 'Yavana' into the Sanskrit language (as attested by Panini in his Astadhyayi (4.1.49) just as the words युधिष्ठिर and याज्ञवल्ल köz were introduced to denote the Greeks (originally the enemies) into the Prakrit and Sanskrit languages respectively.

Greek loan words in Sanskrit include several connected with mathematics and astronomy; of which some are common and have passed into Indian languages. E.g. Hora, Kendra, Koma, Drachma, dinara, saranga and Kanipana etc.

2. R.B.Pandey, India Palaeography, p.3.
3. Bhushan, The Wonder that was India, p. 230

Kahilova, Mahabhashya II p.220, Yavanaliya identical with Yavanami mentioned by Panini. (Yavanamiya also mentioned in Samvayang Sutra).
As Greek and India were both much advanced in philosophy at the time of the Macedonian invasion of India, it cannot be said with certainty as to which country influenced the other to a greater extent in that sphere. There had been many exchanges between the two countries earlier either directly or through the Persians. Even some Greek travellers crossing the formidable land barriers, might have reached India to know their ideas and way of life. Similarly some Indians visited Greece and Egypt in order to know of Greek philosophy and thinking.

According to a report by one Greek musician Aristoxenus (320–300 B.C.) preserved by historian Tzetzes, an Indian philosopher interviewed Socrates around 400 B.C. He told the Greek philosopher that if philosophy is ignorant of the divine, it should not concentrate on human affairs only.

When Alexander entered India, he was curious to know about the Indian sages and their philosophy. Plutarch tells us that Alexander sent one Sikritos, a great philosopher to the Indian seers named Kalamō and Dandamis (Dandavat) One Sikritos (Sukrītīs) who accompanied Alexander to India and belonged to the school of Diogenes, the cynic. He succeeded in interviewing these Indian sages staying in the jungles near Taxila.

---

1. Præparatio Evangelica, II, 3
2. Plutarch, Life of Alexander, LXV
3. Sukhi Raha "Be Happy"
Alexander put many riddles to the captive sages with the threat to execute should they be unable to answer. They were not very much impressed with the Greeks. They advised Alexander to control his empire from its centres and not wander away to its distant extremities. Then Taxiles succeeded in persuading Kalonos to visit Alexander. The other sage even rebuked Alexander for disturbing the peace of the world. (Witty conversation between Alexander and the Indian sage is given in [general notes].)

Megasthenes notes that Kalonos was persuaded to accompany Alexander back to Greece when he reached Susa, he put an end to his life by burning due to ill health. This was a sad experience for Alexander. Kalonos, before dying on the funeral pyre, presented his horse to his Greek pupil named Lysimachos. In fact, Ramayana also mentions the self immolation by Sarbhanga Rishi due to oldage and the trouble caused by the Rakshasas. He burnt himself in the presence of Lord Ram who was on way to exile. इति वर्चन्तते चक्रवर्तिः समाजित शान्तिस्य अजजेति इति

The practice of putting end to one's life in old age was in vogue among the jains. According to Jain tradition, it is said that Chandragupta, in true Jain fashion, fasted unto death.

1. I.I.A.3, p. 368
2. Arrian Anabasis VII -5.111
3. I I A G p. 46
4. Ramayana, Aranyakand, VIII. 38-44
5. A.I.U., p. 61
We have evidence to show that Indian philosophers learned of Greek philosophical systems from interpreters. It is suggested that Indians learnt a lot from Greek logic, the definitions of many logic terms and explanation of the various structure of the syllogism in the Nyaya Sutra were taken from Aristotle's Prior Analytics. The fact that Indian syllogism consists of five parts and that of the Greeks of 3 parts only, shows that the Indian system added two of its own after taking the three parts from Greek.

Indian author named Aksapada the founder of the Nyaya System on philosophy learnt Aristotelian logic. It is said that (Gautama) Aksapada got the Greek knowledge from Alexandria when Greek books were kept in the library. The Greek sophist Callimachus helped him in this. It cannot, however, be proved by any concrete piece of evidence.

1. I.I.A.G., p. 245
The Greeks were regularly indifferent to the literature or civilization of their contemporaries. They looked on them all as 'barbarians' and treated them with equal contempt. Pythagoras philosophy according to Rawlinson, owes nothing to India. The belief in re-incarnation appears first in India in the Chandra dogya upamisad and in Greek's Orphic schools. It appears that both acquired the doctrine from the primitive people with whom they came in contact - the Greeks from Thracians and Aryans from the local tribes of the Ganga valley. The belief in metempsychosis exists in many earlier races.

The closing episode of Plato's 'Republic' resembles closely with the doctrine of Karma. But we cannot agree with Burnet writing that every thing points to the conclusion that Indian philosophy came from Greece. Hellenism stopped short at Hindu Kush. Chandragupta was imbued with Persian ideas. Of Greek culture he or his successors exhibit hardly any trace.

Moreland holds somewhat different views. According to him in philosophy there are some obvious similarities between principles developed by Greek and Indian thinkers and it has

1. H.C. Rawlinson, India and the West, p. 157
2. Ibid, p. 161
3. Moreland, Indian History, p. 67
sometimes been suggested that this denote actual borrowing by one side or the other, but there is no evidence of the process and the facts can be explained sufficiently by the hypothesis of Parallel development. Greeks and Indians alike were thinking over problems which must present themselves to anyone who tries to think at all and it is no matter for surprise that both should on occasion reach similar results from consideration of similar data.  

RELIGION
In the matter of religion, there might have been some minor contacts between the victors and the vanquished. Seleucid ambassador Megasthenes seems to have been the first who began the practice of connecting or identifying the mystic gods or heroes of Indian tradition with the mythic heroes of Greek poetry. There is, however, not evidence to suggest any Greek influence on Indian religions.

---

1. Moreland, A Short History of India, p. 67
2. I.I.A.G., p. XXI
The colonies that the conquerors planted in the Indian border land do not appear to have been altogether wiped out by the Mauryas.

Breasted has pointed out that at important points along his line of march Alexander had founded Greek cities bearing his name and had set up Kingdoms which were to be the centres of Greek influence on the frontiers of India. From such centres Greek entered India to influence greatly Indian art down until modern times and Greek works of art especially coins from Alexander's communities penetrated even to China. Never before had East and West so interpenetrated as in these imaging marches and campaign of Alexander.¹

One of the important effects of Alexander's invasion was the establishment of a number of Greek settlements in India. The army of occupation did not long survive but the cities founded by him continued to flourish.² Of these the Greeks element in the population of Alexander sub-εἰκός Caucassum seems to have remained conspicuous even after its inclusion in Mauryan Empire.³ Some other colonies continued to influence the Indian culture for a long time in some way or the other.

1. H.D. Breasted, Conquest of Civilization, p. 419
2. Dr. S.S. Tripathi, History of Ancient India, p. 145
3. A.I.U. p. 102
Ray Chaudhuri has aptly described the importance of the Greek colonies. "The only permanent effect of Alexander's raid seems to have been the establishment of a number of Yavana settlements in the Uttarapatha. The most important of these settlements were (1) the city of Alexandria (modern Begram or Charikar (?) near Kabul) 2. Boukephala on the Jhelum not far from the modern city of Jhelum. Nikoria (on the Jhelum) where battle was fought 4. Alexandria on the confluence of the Chenab and the Indus and (5) Sogdian Alexandria below, the confluence of the Punjab rivers."

The impact of the Greek colonies could be felt even during the reigns of Asoka, though Hookerjee says that "some of the Greeks, whom Alexander settled in his new cities marking the path of his invasion, did not take kindly to a life of exile and were anxious to get back home at the earliest opportunity." But they did not run away and after half a century the colonies continued to flourish. As such Hookerjee's views are not supported by the facts of history. Asoka recognised the existence of Yona (Yavana) settlers on the north western fringe of his empire appointed some of them (e.g. the Yavana Raja Tushaaspaha) to high offices of State.

1. PHAI, p. 262-263
2. Λ.Ι.Ο., p. 52
In his edicts Asoka makes mention of a Vikarna province on the north west border of India. Its location round
Kandahar in Afghanistan is suggested by the recent discovery of a Greek inscription of Asoka. The place represents Alexandria founded by Alexander in Achaemenid.

Alexandria flourished as late as the time of the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea. One of the Alexandras (Alexanda) is mentioned in the Mahavamsa.

In the Greek invasion established the Greek colonies, it certainly dislocated the Indian habitation particularly in the areas of military operations.

SHIFTING OF POPULATION

Alexander's invasion must have caused considerable damage to the Indian population in general and due to large scale movement of troops and battles. There might have been cases of shifting of population from one place to another. One such instance cited can be that of the Abhiras.

1. Dr. H. G. Shastri Asoka Ane Ena Abhilekha p. 236
2. C. Sircar, Epic-geographic Indica, No. XXXII, Part IV pp. 333ff
3. S. B. Pendey, Asoka Fe Abhilekha p. 15
4. Schoffs, Trans of the Periplus p. 41
5. Waddington, Trans of Mahavamsa p. 194.
According to Greek historians, Aberias were on the Indus, north of the Suivihar, where they gave their name to the Greek Satrapy of Abeira. Patanjali located them in Sindhu desh with their settlements near the Saraswati.

McCrindle states that the country of the Abhiras lay to the east of the Indus when it bifurcates to form the delta. The Mahabharat had placed them near the sea shore and on the basis of the Saraswati a river near Somnath in Gujarat. If we examine them chronologically would it not appear that Abhira moved from Gujarat and Sindhu to the Aberias area for some reasons. Did they go there to give battle to the invader. We would not be able to prove. Similarly the Malavas' change of place of habitation of the right bank of the lower navi (Hydroates) at the time of the Invasion of Alexander cannot be answered satisfactorily. In later times they are found in Rajputana Avasti and the Malav Valley. In fact Malva (around Ujjain came to be known after the Malav people). Their movement suggests that they were uprooted and obliged to leave their country to safer place which might be away from the "Highway of the Invasion. But the turmoil caused by the devastating invasion must have caused dislocation in the Indian population to some extent.

*Malloi were located in the Punjab at the time of the invasion of Alexander, later on they are found in Rajasthan and thereafter in Malwa.

1. W.W. Tarn, "Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 170
2. PHAI, p. 104
3. McCrindle, India as described by Ptolemy, p. 140
Alexander encouraged intermarriages and possibly his general Seleucus followed his policy when he gave away his daughter in marriage to Chandragupta Maurya. Though women played no part in Alexander's life, yet he would not touch one without the sanction of marriage. About his own marriage with Persian Roxana, Rowson says that the barbarians placed great confidence in him—on account of that alliance and his chastity gained their affection. It delighted them to think that he would not approach the only woman he passionately loved without the sanction of marriage.

Alexander's cities and colonies must certainly have followed this practice of intermarriage for more than one reason. As a settled people coming from distant lands they were not accompanied by the women from their own country. They would have taken the Indian women as their wives and this must have caused a lot of mixture of blood not only within the colonies, but in the areas around them.

There can be hardly any evidence available on this point. It can only be surmised. On the basis biological necessities of the colonists, and the prevailing circumstances. Only one example is available to us. According to Justin, the queen Cleopatra (of Mazaga, west of Peshawar in Pakistan) bore a son whose paternity was ascribed to Alexander. In reference

1. J.C. Ravill, World History, p. 67
2. George Ville Botsford, Hellenic History, p. 250
3. H.G. Robinson, Bactria p. 39
4. I.T.A.G., p. 335
to this statement. Dr. Bellaw remarks that at the present
day several of the chiefs and ruling families in the neighbouring States
and Badakhshan boast a lineal descent from Alexander the
Great. This instance survived as it related to the King but
there must have been a large scale mixture of blood due to
Greek soldiers and the local women.

NEW CUSTOMS

It may also be noted that Alexander adopted the practice
of wearing Persian dress on State occasions and observe Persian
court etiquette and ceremonial. He also followed the custom
of prostrating before the King as an image of the God
(Proskynesis). We do not know whether the similar practice of
Sastanga pranama to the God and the King followed in India also
came from that region. On the other hand it can be argued
that the system of pranama originated from the vedic age.
There are references to Sastanga Pranama in the Ramayana
(Hanuman bowing down to Rama). It would, therefore, not be
appropriate to attribute the Indian practice of pranama to the
Greek practice of prostration which was done only in the
royal court whereas the Indian Sastanga was done in any prayer
or worship. In fact Kings in (Persia and) India even regarded
as of divine origin and hence people bowed to them as to Gods

No foreign influence can be traced in this.

1. i.e. A.D. p. 335
2. u.s. Tarn - Alexander the Great, p. 79
The fact that we do not know much about the early and later history of the Guptas shows that most of the history of the Mauryas who existed five centuries earlier was given us by the Greeks. It is equally interesting to note that the Guptas did not erect their own media for incising their inscriptions but wrote them on the pillars and rocks of the time of the Mauryas. They also used cave walls like the Mauryas to write the inscriptions. Unlike the Mauryas even used copper plates, yet there are dark spots in their history. 

Hansen has correctly opined that concerning the condition and organisation of the vast Mauryan empire the Greeks have provided us with a considerable body of valuable information. Alexander was accompanied by scholars and men of letters whose record gives us an account of not only about the Greeks but also of the Indians and their affairs. Indian history owes much to the Greek scholars. They have even helped Indian history in discovering itself by a process of synchronisation.

For a long time, the only approximately certain date in the early history of India was that of the accession of Chandragupta Maurya as determined by his identification with Sandrokottos, the contemporary of Aenukos Nikator, according to Greek authors. The identification of King 'Nanda' contemporary of Alexander, the Great, with Nanda King of Magadha provides us Nanda chronology.

1. ORIG, Vol., I p. 427
2. V.A. Smith, Early History of India, p. 21
The synchroism of Chandragupta's grandson Asoka with Antiochos Thoas, grandson of Seleukos and four other Hellenistic princes having been established subsequently in 1838 A.D. the chronology of the Mauryan dynasty was placed upon a firm basis. This was possible only due to Alexander's invasion of India.

HISTORY OF INVASION

It has already been mentioned why the invasion of India by Alexander the Great has left no traces whatever in the literature or in the institutions of India. Alexander finds no place in the writings of the then Indians, but the story of his conquest of India as related by his companions and other contemporaries, has been preserved by six authors in more or less detail - Diodorus, Siculus Arrain, Plutarh Curtius Itineraium Justin and the unknown author of the Itineraium Alexandri Magni, a work written for the guidance of the Emperor Constantius II in his war against Persia. Polyaenus in his strategems of war and Frontinuv who at one time the Roman Governor of Poutain, in his work on the same subject notice strategems employed by Alexander in his Indian campaigns.

Thus we notice that the history of India pertaining to the period of his invasion available by Alexander himself. Had his own historians not accompanied him, perhaps we would have never known the details of his Indian invasion.

It is curious that the Macedonian invasion of India is not mentioned anywhere in Indian literature while the later invasions of the Greeks from Bactria and the rule of Indo-Greeks in North India find some mention therein.

1. V.A. Smith, Early History of India, p.21
2. B.N. Puri, India as depicted in Classical Greek Works, p.7
Some credit may be given to the tradition initiated by Alexander that in course of time other works were also written, in which India has been given coverage. The compendium of geography by Pomponius Mela; compendium by Solinus, the Periegesis by Dionysius and the Periplus of the outer sea by Marcius of Herakleia are the books of geography which help us in tracing the ancient history of India.

INDIA BECAME KNOWN TO THE WORLD

The invasion of India by Alexander the Great, like the first voyage of Columbus to America, was the means of opening up a new world to the knowledge of mankind (in the West), according to Macruidle. Before the great conqueror visited the remote and sequestered country, which was then thought to be at the utmost ends of the earth, nothing was known regarding it beyond a few vague particulars mentioned by Herodotus and such grains of truth as could be sifted from the mass of fictions which formed the staple of the treatise on India written by Ktesias of Knidos. A comparison of this work with the Indika of Megasthnesse, which was written after the invasion will show how entirely all real knowledge of the country was due to that event.  

1. I.I.A.E., p. 1  
2. Ibid.
It may even be asserted that had that invasion
not taken place, the knowledge of India among the
nations of the west would not have advanced much
beyond when Ktesias left it, until the maritime passage
to the East by the cape of good Hope had been discovered.

Not a few of Alexander's officers and companions
were men of high attainments in literature and
science, and some of their number composed memoirs of
his wars, in the course of which they recorded their
impressions of India and the races by which they found
it inhabited. Ptolemy, Aristeion, Nearchus,
Megasympho, and others were writers of impeachable
veracity.

---

1 T.I.A.G., p. 1
2 Ibid. p. 7
India must remain grateful to the Greek writers for providing her with authoritative written history of the concerned period. Two Greek ambassadors of the Seleucid Kings, namely Megasthenes and then Daimachus lived in the Mauryan Court and wrote valuable accounts which though lost, still provide a reliable source of Indian history through quotations by others. Strabo says "Both of these men were sent to Palimbothra both Megasthenes to Saudro Kottos and Deichos to Allitrochodes and his son."

What became known of India was not left for its preservation at the mercy of mere oral tradition and was committed to safer custody of writing by the men who accompanied Alexanders. Being foreigners, they recorded much about the general, social and cultural life in India. They have hardly recorded political events of their current times. Their works throw light only on the administrative social and cultural history of India of their times.

1. Strabo, II i. 9; I.I.A.G., p. 405
Alexander's invasion demonstrated to Indians that there was something inherently wrong with their military organisation and strategy and that a drilled and disciplined army, though small, could accomplish wonders in face of odds. Alexander's military planning was superb. He had left a large detachment of his army in Bactria, but he had enrolled a still larger force - 30,000 - of the Asiatics of those regions - Bactrians, Sogdians Dahae and Sacks. The host with which he has now to descend upon India must have been at least twice as numerous as the (small) army with which he had crossed the Hellespont seven years before. It had increased as it rolled on and the augmentations far more than counter balanced the reductions caused by leaving detachments in each new province and losses due to warfare or disease. But from such planning India does not seem to have profited much.

According to his Grand design, part of the naval force of Alexander was to open up the sea route to India and colonise the coast and islands of the Persian gulf. For Alexander hoped to make this area a second Hellenism, an emporium between the Indus valley and Mesopotamia.

1. Dr. R.S. Tripathi, History of Ancient India, p. 145
2. J.B. Burgh, History of Greece p. 798
3. R.C.L. Hammond, A History of Greece, p. 20
Alexander had started the system of walling in villages by establishing fortified posts (throughout the areas over run by him). This might have been possibly followed by the Indians in protecting their villages of strategic importance, but there is hardly any evidence to prove this. We see numerous fortified villages in North Western India even in mediaeval times that continued to exist even to-day.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Indians had learnt any lessons either from the distant battle of Issus or the nearby battle of the Hydaspes. It appears that the great feat in the capture of the Sogdian Rock (Aornos) "which only winged men could take" did not produce any impact on the military mind of India.

BRIDGING OF RIVERS

Alexander had brought the technique of bridging the rivers which he was required to cross. This first bridge in India was on the Indus. Perhaps it was made of boats.

It appears that India did not learn the technique fully as the Indus Kings do not seem to have adopted this technique in their campaigns. At least this has not been mentioned in Indian literature. It is true that the word 'Satu', meaning embanking does occur in Ramayana, Raghuvamsha and Kumarsambhava, but this does not correspond with the technique of putting the bridges across the rivers.

1. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, p. 121
2. H.O.P., p. 269
3. I.I.A.G., p. 90
4. Ramayana, VII Lanka Kanda, 159 4-11
5. Raghuvamsha, 13.2: 4.38 and 12.70
6. Kumarsambhava, 7.53

*It is said that even in the 16th century A.D. Babar had still not bridged these rivers.
MAURYAN NAVY

While giving an account of Mauryan military administration, Megasthenes mentions a board to co-operate with the Admiral of Fleet. This testimony coupled with the similar mention in Kautilya's Arthashastra proves that the Mauryas had a sizeable navy. As we have no definite knowledge of their predecessor Nanda Kings having any Navy, we can presume that Chandra Gupta learnt the advantages of navy from his brief association with Alexander, who knows that Baudrakottos heard of this technique when the Greek boats were prepared to cross the Indus or when Nearchus prepared to set sail from the lower Sindh? The available evidence suggests that Alexander's naval plans must have sharpened the ideas of Chandragupta Maurya to some extent.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Paucity of evidence prevents scholars from assessing the impact of Alexander on the then economy of India. Such large scale military movements, battles in almost every contending State must have caused so much dislocation in the normal functioning of trade and commerce, agriculture and other economic functions of the society. Though it must have certainly happened in the north-western India, yet its indirect impact must have been felt far and wide.

1. K.A. Nilkanth Shastri, A Comprehensive History of India, p.13
AGRICULTURE

North Western India was then, as now famous for its
fine breed of Oxen of which Alexander captured 2,30,000
from the AspasiBian and then sent them to Macedonia for
use in agriculture. He further welcomed a gift of 300 'fat
oxen' and 10,000 sheep from Ambhi in Taxila area. Evidently
agriculture and cattle breeding were important occupations
of the people in the Punjab and the North West.

It appears that Alexander had rounded up all the bullocks
of this area and herded them to be sent to Macedonia,
leaving no bullock for the vanquished to till their land.
This must certainly have adversely affected agricultural
operations for a few years because in the absence of the
bullocks the Indian could not have ploughed their land
till the calves might have grown to take the place of
bullocks sent to far away Macedonia.

This and Ptolemy supports informs us that there were after the defeat
of the Assakenians, also captured more than 2,30,000
Oxen, from which Alexander chose out the best with a view
to send them to Macedonia to be employed in agriculture.

1. I.I.A.G. p. 65
2. Ibid.
3. Dr. K.S Tripathi. History of Ancient India, p. 145
4. I.I.A.G. p. 65
Alexander's nineteen month stay in India was too short a period to affect the coinage of India directly but his indirect influence was so great that we know almost the entire history of Indo-Greek Kings of Bactria through their coins only.

The coins of Sophytus, King of the Salt range in the Punjab, the contemporary of Alexander form a class by themselves and are not connected with subsequent development of coinage in India. These coins of Sophytus bore on the obverse the head of the King and on the reverse the figure of a [Greek] and caduceus and legend Sophytus in Greek. According to Smith the style is suggested probably by the "owls" of [E]thens,

The reverse also bears the caduceus and the legend 'Sophytus!'

FIGURINES OF PATALIPUTRA

Some figurines made of burnt clay were unearthed in the excavations at Pataliputra. Their dress and ornaments attracted wide attention of scholars, because of the fact that generally such figures are found naked and devoid of any ornaments. These ([terracotta]) figurines had a unique hair style and wore ear rings and garland around the neck. Though their breasts were uncovered, yet they were wearing Sari in a careful style below the waist.

Scholars like Sir John Marshall, Dr. Vasudeva Saran Agrawal, Dr. Moti Chandra and Dr. Bhawalikar opined that the dress of the figurines betrays Greek influence. Dr. Sankalia, after a careful examination of these figurines in 1973 A.D., has pointed out towards our own Indian style of dress and ornaments, saying that such objects are made by the local folks and are Indian to the core. Therefore, we should be very cautious and careful in examining the foreign influence where the Indian culture is clearly visible.

1. V.A. Smith, Coins of Ancient India, p. 4
2. Dr. H.G. Shastri, Bhartiyya Sikkha Shastra, p. 73
3. PHAI, p. 252
Many historians give importance to increased contacts between India and Greece due to Alexander's invasion. Moreland\(^1\) says "His (Alexander's) appearance in the country was merely an episode and its appearance for the history of India lies in the fact that for a time it established communication between Indian and Hellenic culture. Another scholar opines\(^2\) that as the roads to the East were open for intercourse of every kind, it is reasonable to suppose that the benefit power of commerce was stimulated and increased to an extent we cannot easily appreciate.\(^3\) At various points along his route he established a chain of fortified posts to keep open his communication. Many of these survive to-day. He meant Indus to be the great military and commercial highway of his Indian provinces and had he lived there is little doubt that a second Alexandria would have sprung up at its mouth and in all probability the Punjab would have been Hellenised like Asia Minor or Egypt.

---

\(^1\) Moreland, History of India, p. 45
\(^2\) H.G. Rawlinson, A Short Cultural History, p. 62
\(^3\) Percy Sykes, A History of Persia, p. 262

Smith rightly says that the unopposed march of Krateros from Sindh to Persia though Seiden opened up an alternative land route and solved the problem of easy overland communication with Europe.\(^4\)
After the Achaemenian attempt to open up sea route between India and Egypt, we have no definite knowledge of its use till the advent of Alexander the Great.

The Greek sailors are said to have mastered the secret of the times and tides. About the ceremony of opening the sea (where the Indus meets the sea) historian Bury writes . . . "Alexander fared out into the open sea. He sacrificed to Poseidon, he poured drink offerings from a golden cup to the Nereids and Nereid and to the Thetis, the mother of his ancestor Achilles and then hurled the cup into the waves. This ceremony inaugurated his plan of opening a sea-way for commerce between the west and the east. The enterprise of discovering this sea-way was entrusted to Nearchus — an officer who was an intimate companion of his own and possessed the confidence of the troops.\textsuperscript{1} He was Alexander's one of his best sailors.

The voyages and expeditions planned by Alexander widened the geographical horizon of his contemporaries and opened up new lines of communication and new routes for trade and maritime enterprise\textsuperscript{2}. Nearchus opened up the sea route from the mouth of the Indus to the Persia Gulf and the route from thence to the Red Sea, Egypt and beyond was already known. Therefore the link between India's Indus delta with Egypt was established at this time.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item J.B. Bury, A History of Greece, p. 812
  \item Dr. R.C. Majumdar, An Advanced History of India, p. 69
\end{enumerate}
The Hindus and the Greeks were the two gifted Aryan nations of the ancient world. If India boasts of greater originality, Greece is proud of a more perfect culture, a more practical and rational and comprehensive knowledge of things. In general, Greece obtained her Indian ideas through the Phoenicians, Persian courts, Buddhist preachings and other sources. With Alexander the area extended to philosophy and religion.

We should never look on the ancient world as a scene of stagnation.

Rapson suggests that Alexander, in fact, carried into practice the traditional Indian policy recommended by Manu (viii 202) and followed, whenever it has been possible or expedient by conquering Powers in India generally, that a kingdom which has submitted should be placed in the charge of some member of its ancient royal family. So both the King of Taxila who accepted Alexander's summons to submit and Porus who valiantly resisted, were made satraps over their own dominions. Though the suggestion is supported by the evidence of events, yet it would be difficult to agree with it. Alexander most probably followed this policy as it suited his schemes and plans for establishing a world empire. He had hardly any time to read Manu during hectic days of endless campaigns. It is also not sure that Manu existed prior to Alexander. His work is dated to have been compiled between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D.

1. E. H. Rapson, Ancient India, p. 96
2. A. K. Majumdar, The Hindu History, p. 189
We can imagine that the cotton cloth manufactured in India must have impressed the Greeks as it did Herodotus about two centuries earlier when the Indian soldiers fought in Greece. Indian cotton dress has also been referred to alike in the early Buddhist texts and in the writing of the Greek observers. No wonder then that among the presents offered by the Malavas and their allies to the victorious Alexander was included a large quantity of cotton cloth.

**Economic Condition**

While discussing economic condition of India Panini mentions agriculture, cultivators, land and fields survey of land, classification of soil, implements and actual agricultural operations. The Greeks in India were struck with the amazing fertility of the soil and the skill of the agriculturalists. Panini knows of deep ploughing and so the Greeks testify to the careful ploughing habits of the people of this country.

**Beauty of India**

The natural beauty of India had certainly impressed Alexander. He admired the greenery of India. Plutarch writes that the vast size of their rivers fills the mind with wonder. Impressed by the vastness of the Country the companions of Alexander have written that India was the third part of the world and that the multitude of its inhabitants was past reckoning. For this there was probably a good reason, since the Indians almost alone among the nations, have never emigrated from their own borders.

**What Greek Learned from India**

Whatever impact of the Greek invasion made on India it was largely due to superior force and initiation. On the other hand, the west learned something from India in consequence of the communication opened up by Alexander's adventure. Here Smith can again be quoted: 1. N. Desikacharya, K. P. Age of Nandas and Mauryas, p. 262 2. Agarwala V.S., India as known to Panini, p. 200 3. McCrindle, Ancient India as described in classical literature, p. 108 4. Ibid.
opened up by Alexander's adventure. Here Smith can again be quoted with advantage. He says "our knowledge of the facts is so scanty and fragmentary that it is difficult to make any positive assertions with confidence, but it is safe to say that the influence of Buddhist ideas on Christian doctrine may be traced in the Gnostic forms of Christianity, if not elsewhere. The notions of Indian philosophy and religion which filtered into Roman Empire flowed through channels opened by Alexander".

GENERAL SURVEY OF THE GREEK IMPACT

R.K. Mokkerji who has not recognized any worthwhile impact of Greek Invasion on India, admits saying "The only permanent result of Alexander's campaign was that it opened up communication between Greece and India and paved the way for a more intimate intercourse between the two. This is the first impact which has been described by Vincent Smith on priority.

Historian V.A. Smith may be quoted to sum up the impact of Alexander's invasion of India. He writes "Although the direct effects of Alexander's expedition on India appear to have been small, his proceedings had an appreciable influence on the history of the country. They broke down the wall of separation between the West and East and opened up four districts lines of communication, three by land and one by sea. The land routes which he proved to be practicable were those through Kabul, the Mulla Pass in Balochistan and Gedrosia. Nearchus demonstrated that the sea voyage around the coast of Makaran offered few difficulties to sailors, once the local information had been gained which he lacked.

"The immediate formation of Greek Kingdoms in Western Asia ensured from the first a certain amount of exchange of ideas between India and Europe. The establishment of the Graeco-Bactrian monarchy in the middle of the third century B.C. brought about the actual and subjugation of certain Indian districts by Greek Kings.

1. V.A. Smith, Ancient and Hindu India, p. 67
Though this surfaced during the later Indo-Greek period
Initial credit may be given to Alexander for opening up
direct communication with India.
Thus during a brief period, the Great conqueror left his
foot-prints on the 'sands of time'.

"Whatever Hellenistic elements in Indian civilization
can be detected were also direct consequence of Alexander's
invasion. In the end he adds "The Greek influence never
penetrated deeply Indian polity and the structure of society
resting on the caste basis remained substantially unchanged
and even in military science Indians showed no disposition
to learn the lessons taught by the sharp sword of Alexander.
The Kings of Hind preferred to go on in the old way, trusting
to their elephants and chariots supported by enormous hosts
of inferior infantry. They never mastered the shock tactics
of Alexander's cavalry which were repeated by Babar in the
Sixteenth century with equal success".¹

¹ V.A. Smith, Ancient & Hindu India, p. 67.