

EARLY

*Ch. Lamma
from the author*

HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN

Down to the Mahomedan Conquest.

BY

RAMKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDARKAR,
M.A., PH.D., C.I.E.,

HONORARY MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,
OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE ITALIAN ASIATIC SOCIETY;
CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE GERMAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY AND OF THE
IMPERIAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ST. PETERSBURG; FELLOW OF THE
UNIVERSITIES OF BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA; LATE PROFESSOR OF
ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, DEKKAN COLLEGE.

SECOND EDITION.

BOMBAY:
PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS.

1895.

Section III.

shown from a passage in the introduction to Patañjali's Mahābhāshya, that verbal forms such as those of the perfect which are taught by Pāṇini as found in the Bhāshā or current language, not the Chhāndasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, and participles had come to be used instead.¹ Professor Goldstucker has also given a list of words used by Pāṇini in his Sūtras in a sense which became obsolete in the time of Kātyāyana, and shown what portion of Sanskrit literature did not probably exist in Pāṇini's time but was known to Kātyāyana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that elapsed between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was so great that certain literary works which either did not exist in Pāṇini's time or were not old to him came to be considered by Kātyāyana to be as old as those which were old to Pāṇini. No less an interval of time than about three centuries can account for all these circumstances. Pāṇini, therefore, must have flourished in the beginning of the seventh century before the Christian era, if not earlier still; and against this conclusion I believe no argument has been or can be brought, except a vague prejudice. And now to our point, the Indian Āryas had thus no knowledge of Southern India previous to the seventh century before Christ; they had gone as far as the Northern Circars by the eastern route, but no farther; and the countries directly to the south of the Vindhya they were not familiar with. About that time, however, they must have begun to penetrate still further, since they had already settled in or had communication with the countries on the northern skirts of the Vindhya and Kalinga, and first settled in Vidarbha or Berār, approaching it still, it would appear, by the eastern route; but in the course of some time more they crossed the Vindhya and settled in Daṇḍakāraṇya along the banks of the Godāvārī, that is, in Mahārāshtra or the Dekkan. Before B.C. 350 they had become familiar with the whole country down to Tanjor and Madura.

The Āryas penetrated to the Dekkan after the beginning of about the seventh century B.C.

A chronological conclusion based on the occurrence of certain words or names in the great epics is not likely to be so safe. Though a Mahābhārata existed before Pāṇini and Āśvalāyana, it is highly questionable whether our present text is the same as that which existed in their times. On the contrary, the probability is that the work has been added to from time to time; and the text itself has undergone such corruption that no one can be positively certain that a particular word was not foisted into it in comparatively modern times. The text of the Rāmāyana also has become corrupt, though additions do not seem to have been made to it. Still the Bengali rescension of the poem like the Bengali rescensions of more recent works does contain additions. The text prevalent in this part of the country and in the south is more reliable; and though innumerable differences of reading exist in the different manuscripts even on this side, still there is hardly any material difference. But

Chronological value of the Epics.

¹ Jour. Bom. B. E. A. S., Vol. XVI., pp. 269-71.

Section III.

the date of the Rāmāyana is uncertain; the present Hindu belief based on the Purānas is that Rāma's incarnation is older than Krishna's, and consequently the Rāmāyana older than the Mahābhārata; but it is not a little curious that while there is an allusion to Vāsudeva and Arjuna and to Yudhishtira in Pāṇini, and Patañjali frequently brings in Mahābhārata characters in his illustrations and examples, there is not one allusion to Rāma or his brothers or their father Daśaratha in the works of those grammarians. Even a much later author, Amarasimha the lexicographer, in his list of the synonyms of Vishnu, gives a good many names derived from the Krishna incarnation; but the name of Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, does not occur, though Rāma or Balabhadra, the brother of Krishna, is mentioned. Still, whatever chronological value may be attached to the circumstance, the occurrence of the names of places in the Dekkan contained in those epics I have already to some extent noticed. Sahadeva is represented to have subdued the Pāṇdyas, Draviḍas, Uḍras, Keralas, and Andhras,¹ and also to have visited Kishkindhā, which was probably situated somewhere near Hampi, the site of the Pampā lake or river, where Rāma met Sugrīva the monkey chief, though the country Kaishkindha is placed by the Purānas among those near the Vindhya. He went also to S'ūrparaka, the modern Supārā near Bassein, Daṇḍaka, the same as Daṇḍakāranya but not mentioned as a forest, Karahāṭaka the modern Karhāḍa on the confluence of the Krishna and the Koinā, and to others. The countries mentioned in the passage in the Rāmāyana, alluded to above, as lying to the south are Utkala, probably the modern Ganjam, Kalīnga, Daśārṇa, Avantī, Vidarbha, and others. The district near Bhilsā must have been called Daśārṇa in ancient times; for its capital was Vidiśā, which was situated, as stated by Kālidāsa in the Meghadūta, on the Vetravatī or Betvā, and is thus to be identified with the modern Bhilsā. All these are thus in the vicinity of the Vindhya or nearly in the same line with it farther east. But between these and the southernmost countries of the Cholas, Pāṇdyas, and Keralas, the Rāmāyana mentions no other place or country but Daṇḍakāranya. This condition of the country, as observed before, is to be considered as previous to the Āryan settlements in the Dekkan, while that represented by the Mahābhārata in the place indicated seems subsequent; and herein we may see a reason for believing that the Rāmāyana is the older of the two epics. The name Mahārāshṭra does not occur in either of them.

In the middle of the third century before Christ, Aśoka, the great king of the Maurya dynasty reigning at Pātaliputra in Magadha, speaks in the fifth Edict of his rock-inscriptions, which are found at Girnār in Kāthiāvāḍ on the west, Dhaulī in Katak and Jaugaḍ in Ganjam on the eastern coast, at Khalsi in the Himālaya, Shahbaz-garhi in Afghanistan, and Mansehra on the northern frontier of the Panjab, of his having sent ministers of religion

Places in the Dekkan alluded to in the poems.

Names of peoples in the Dekkan in the inscriptions of Aśoka.

¹ Śābhya, Chap. 31.