

SURESH CHANDRA ON HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CIVILISATION: WITH REFERENCE TO DRAVIDIAN CIVILISATION

D. Balaganapathi
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Dravidian University, Kuppam 517 425
E-mail: balaganapathid@rediffmail.com

History is, minimally, three things: what happened in the past, what people believe happened in the past and what historians say happened in the past. Historiography is largely about the second and third of these definitions of history. It is in this sense an adventure in the history of ideas, the study of how a subject has been written about, how trends and interests in research have changed, how public events, world affairs and so simple a matter as the opening of an archive shapes the way in which writers explore the past. Historiography is also about how and why a people have come to comprehend themselves in a certain way. Historiography is thus more than the record of what has been written. It is also the examination of why a body of writing has taken the shape it has.

Robin W Winks:1999:xiii

This paper attempts to give a critical appraisal of Professor Suresh Chandra's views on Historiography of Civilization with reference to Dravidian Civilization. "Historiography of Indian Civilization: Harappans, Dravidians, Aryans and Gandhi's freedom struggle" (published in JICPR June 1996) and "Demythologizing History: Dravidians in Relation to Harappans and the Aryans" (presented in the seminar on Dravidian Philosophy organized by Dravidian University, Kuppam) are the two significant works which are devoted to Historiography of civilization by Prof. Suresh Chandra. This paper mainly confines to the first article since the second one, as the author himself stated, is an offshoot of the first.

Suresh Chandra's detective work, as he calls it, into the historiography of India attempts to bring back the past heritage from the western plunderers who left few clues in

their plundering. While detecting these clues he tried to construct the history of Indian civilization, by exploding the myth of Aryan invasion. He argued that Aryans and Dravidians are as much native as the Harappans, and in fact, Dravidian and Vedic civilizations have drawn their stimulus from the Harappans. He viewed Elamite civilization as Dravidian Civilization. This paper beginning with a discussion on the Historiography of Indian civilization, moves on to the views of Prof. Suresh Chandra on Dravidian Historiography and points out the limitations and ambiguities involved and concludes by appreciating the novelty and uniqueness of Suresh Chandra's Historiography.

I

Historiography of India has been attracting the attention of the scholars since the country's colonization.¹ Colonial rulers, whose aim is to suppress, both physically and mentally, the people of colonized countries, were astonished by the rich Vedic-Sanskrit literature that was found in India.² Such a kind of literature can be produced only by a magnificent civilization. Their own languages were inferior to Sanskrit, both in terms of

¹ Historiography of India can be classified into two periods, the dividing line between these two being the discovery of Indus civilization. The first period starts with the Europeans attempt to hijack the glory of Vedic civilization and the second part starts with the discovery of Indus civilization.

² Western scholars like Sir William James, Colebroke, Dr. H.H. Wilson, Burnouf, Humboldt, Roth, Lassen, Weber and Max Muller etc., have worked on the Vedic literature and brought out the jewels of Vedic India to the notice of the world from the early nineteenth century onwards.

historical priority and in terms of their grammatical forms.³ In order to establish their superiority over the Indians, colonizers argued that Aryans were foreigners to India, who migrated from a common home or a neutral zone, which is located in Europe through present Iran and Afghanistan. Consequently, Indian Historiography has become nothing but an offshoot of European historiography. The sweetness of the Sanskrit language, richness of its literature, the greatness of the Vedic civilization – everything has become a part of European civilization. The natives of India were projected as uncivilized barbarians.⁴ This view was accepted unquestionably by historiographers of India and West for a long time. Then unearthed were the remains of yet another great civilization of the country, i.e., Indus Valley or Harappa-Mohenjodaro civilization, the profundity of

³ According to Sir William Jones, “The Sanskrit Language, whatever be its antiquity, is of wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them strong affinity both in roots of verbs and the form of grammar.” (quoted by Suresh Chandra: 1996:153)

⁴ Following the Max Mullarian view, Rajendra Lal Mitra stated that when Aryans reached India the aborigines have been in a state of society in which leaves and barks supplied the place of clothing, the shades of trees served for boudoirs and hallows and caverns occupied the place of bedrooms. All this at a time when the Brahmins (Aryans) had lofty homes, fine clothing, gold ornaments, horses....in short, everything indicating a tolerably advanced state of civilization.” (quoted by Suresh Chandra in “Demythologizing History: Dravidians in relation to Harappans and Aryans” presented in the National seminar on Dravidian Philosophy organized by Dravidian University, Kuppam. Here onwards DDRHA. p.6)

which shocked the European scholars once again.⁵ The remains of this civilization exhibited the richness of culture, architecture and planning of Indus people, which goes against the earlier propagated view that they are barbarous and un-civilized.

Diverse opinions were expressed by scholars regarding the time, inhabitants, and the place in the historiography of India of the Indus civilization. Few scholars argued that Indus civilization is the native civilization and its inhabitants were Dravidians, hence it is appropriate to call it as Dravidian Civilization. Few others viewed Dravidians and Harappans to be different. Few scholars such as Michael Witzel argued that the Harappans were a para-Munda people related to the current aborigines of India and both the Aryans and the Dravidians are intruders from Central Asia. Few others like David Frawley (2001) tried to establish a link between the Indus and Vedic civilizations.⁶ Much debated issue regarding this link is the reason for the extinction of Indus civilization.

⁵ Sir John Marshall, the then Director General of Archaeology in India and his colleagues discovered Indus civilization in the 1920's. Rai Bahadur Dayaram Sahni (Harappa), R.D. Benerjee and K.N. Dikshit (Mohenjodaro) were also among the discoverers of this civilization. The ruins of Harappa were for the first time observed by Burnes and Massen, but they were professionally examined for the first time by Cunningham in 1873. (V.D. Mahajan: *Ancient India*. New Delhi. S. Chand & Company Ltd. 1997:54.

⁶ For the debate between David Frawley and Michael Wotzel on Hisoriography of Inida refer Open Page in The Hindu (Daily) from June – August 2002.

How did this great civilization come to an end? Various reasons were cited for this extinction, one of them being the Aryan invasion.⁷

The significance of the contribution of Suresh Chandra to the historiography of India lies in this context. He argued Harappans, Dravidians and Aryans to be three different aboriginal groups of India. He regarded Aryan invasion as a myth, which implies two things. One, that Aryans did not invade India and two, that Aryans were not foreigners to India. The argument that Aryans invaded India and caused the destruction of Indus civilization was unacceptable to him. This myth relating to Aryan invasion was invented in order to distort the history of India and make the minds of the Indian people crippled. The colonizers generated such myths which can paralyze the 'mind of Afro-Asian people towards their own cultural heritage, towards their own religion, Civic life and political system etc.' (1996:140) They were invented by the academic West as historical realities in order to bring Aryan-Dravidian conflict among the Indians. "Aryans," observes Suresh Chandra, "have been converted into totally different kind of beings from the Dravidians, as if they are coming from two different planets. Not only their languages differ, their cultural heritage too is different. In spite of its political diversity and diversity of kingdoms, India remained one nation throughout its history because of its cultural identity. That identity has been totally shattered by the Eurocentric historiography." (DDRHA: 3) With the intention of breaking the cultural unity and identity these myths were reinforced into the minds of the people and made them believe that the transition from their free past to their colonized present was descendance from

⁷ For a detailed discussion on this aspect refer Rajkumar's *Survey of Ancient India* Vol. 3. (New Delhi. Anmol publications pvt. Ltd. 1999), pp.145-56

hell to the heaven. This belief led to mental slavery along with the political slavery. Suresh Chandra rightly considers this mental slavery to be more dangerous than the political slavery, for even if political slavery is withdrawn the mental slavery continues. He finds clear evidence of this in the attitude of 'a whole regiment of Indian scholars' who endorse the opinion of the European scholars that Aryan invasion is responsible for the destruction of the Indus civilization. European historiographers, after passing the stage of discovering history, reached the stage of inventing history. Aryan invasion of India and the consequent Aryan-Dravidian conflict was the result of the inventive mind of the European historians.

After criticizing the euro-centric historiography, Suresh Chandra proposed his own historiography of India. A civilization takes birth only when nomadism is given up. A very large area of Indian subcontinent gave up nomadism around five thousand years ago and gave birth to the Harappan civilization. Stimulus from Harappa gave birth to the Aryans in the foothills of Himalayas and Dravidian civilization on the banks of Narmada. Rigveda was composed by Aryans in Punjab, after they came down from the foothills of Himalayas and pushed Harappans downwards to Sind and Gujarat. However, Dravidians blocked the spread of Harappans in the south and later forced Harappans to leave India by destroying Mohanjodaro and Lothal. Harappans migrated to Mesopotamia for shelter, evidence of which is found in the form of seals. Dravidians destroyed Indus civilization and chased them through Baluchistan and finally settled down in Elam to build a civilization there. Hence, Elamite civilization is Dravidian Civilization. Aryans were last to run the race of foreign adventures. They colonized Iran and *Avesta*, the sacred book of Iranians was produced as a protest against the Vedic Aryans. Because of this, *Avesta*

considers Vedic Gods as demons and Vedic demons as Gods. This hostility with Iranians lead Aryans to migrate to Mesopotamia, Asia Minor and Babylonia, and these migrants are the ancestors of Hittites, Kassites and Mitannis, worshippers of Vedic Gods Indra, Mitra and Varuna etc. When the Aryans started their adventure to foreign lands they did not have Sanskrit script but only the language since Sanskrit was in its oral stage of development. Because of this reason Hittite documents were produced in an adoption of the Sumerian script. Aryan migration in the oral state of the development of Sanskrit helped in the independent development of the so-called Indo-European languages like German, Celt, and Greek etc. All the Indo-European languages are not sister languages rather there is mother and daughter relationship between Sanskrit and other European languages. This is the historiography of India, according to Suresh Chandra in brief. Now let us discuss the historiography of Dravidian civilization.

II

Though the word 'Dravidian' has had a very long history as a referential term for the southern portion of India,⁸ it is Bishop Caldwell who first used it to denote South Indian people such as Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam and other allied groups. We find the use of *Dravidi*, *Damili*, *Dramida* and *Dravida* referring in broad geographical

⁸ Greek geographers knew the area as *Damirica* or *Limyrica*: 'Then came *Naura* and *Tyndis*, the first marts of *Damirica*' (Periplus 53: KA Nilakntha Sastry, Foreign Notices of South India. 57) '*Limyrike: Tyndis*, a city ...' (Ptolemy, Geography vii.I see JW McCrindle, Ancient India. pp. 48-9)

sense to South India in Sanskrit Sources. Whether these Dravidians are original inhabitants of South India is a much debated issue which is still unsettled.⁹

The relations that were maintained by the Dravidians with the world outside India will throw a significant light about the original homeland of the Dravidians. Nilakantha Sastry, while exposing the Dravidian elements in the world outside India states that, “Inheritance through Women which still survives in Dravidian India was in vogue among the Elamites, the earliest branch of the ‘Caspian’ to emerge into history. There is evidence of the prevalence of the snake cult in the earliest prehistoric stratum at Persepolis; Dravidian speaking India is the stronghold of snake worship at the present day. The worship of the mother-Goddess under the name ‘Lady of the Mountain’ and the annual celebration of her nuptials with the Moon-God of Ur closely resemble the Indian worship of Parvati in her various forms and the annual celebrations of the *tirukkalyanam* (divine Marriage) in South Indian Siva temples; in fact the resemblance is so close that, in spite of the absence of any direct proof of connection, it is difficult to believe that it is accidental” (1975:63-4) Further, the nature of worship offered in the temples of ancient Sumeria, and the organization and even the structure of the temple itself have much in common with what has prevailed in South India to this day. Nilakantha Sastry, further, states that a large number of ancient place names in Afghanistan, the highlands of Iran,

⁹ One is confronted with a bewildering mass of opinions and theories such as the Mongolian theory (Kanakasabhapati Pillai), the Semitic theory, the Mesopotamian theory (Col. Holdich), the Egyptian theory (Bruce Foote, Elliot Smith and Perry) and the Mediterranean Theory (Richards) regarding the homeland of Dravidians. A very useful discussion on the origin of Dravidians is given by T.R. Sessa Iyengar (1995:21-42).

the plains of the Euphrates and the Tigris and Mesopotamia generally have been shown to confirm to Dravidian forms, and the non-Semitic, non-Aryan pre-historic people of this region have been held to have been Dravidian speaking. These evidences, which prove the relation of Dravidians with the world outside India lead scholars to suppose that Dravidian or proto-Dravidian language speakers might have reached India from Western Asia. (1975:63).

Caldwell(1913) assigns Turanian homeland of Central Asia to be the birth place of Dravidians. According to him, Dravidian languages have got, in many respects, the features of the Scythian linguistic group. He sees a confirmation of this theory in translation of the Behistan Tablets. Caldwell, hence, lays great emphasis on the evidence to prove the immigration of the Dravidians from Central Asia through the North-West and Brahuis must be one of the numerous Dravidian tribes which found their way into India. However, Sessa Iyengar argued that the theory of Caldwell does not rest on sufficient data since there is no striking identity in the vocabulary of the Behistan Tablets and the South Indian languages. (1995:27) Scholars like Herbert Rinsley and MacCleave argued that Dravidians were the earliest inhabitants of India. Gilbert Slater in his “Dravidian Element in Indian culture” while accepting the operation of important external influences, argued that Dravidian culture was evolved in India and mainly under the stimulus of the Indian environment. (Sessa Iyengar:1995:31)

The establishment of linguistic affinities between Dravidian and Elamite languages led scholars to assume that the Elam (Iran), which is in the neighborhood of Sumer, is the birthplace of Dravidian languages. The available linguistic affinities and archeological evidences lead historians to use the data to establish that the languages of

both the Aryans and Dravidians are foreign to India. Suresh Chandra rejects this view as a myth invented by European scholars and argues that Dravidians and Aryans are as much Indian as the Harappans. He is very clear about the nature and the geographical location of these three people. Harappans, who are initially warriors later turned out to be businessmen and lived at the Indus basin. Dravidians, unlike Harappans, were high spirited people and were empire builders, and lived in Central India. Aryans, who were better equipped with the civilisational benefits than the Harappans and Dravidians, lived near the foothills of Himalayas and later moved to Punjab, where Rigveda was composed.

As stated above, the linguistic and archeological evidences lead the scholars to establish the Aryan and Dravidian immigration theories and to argue that the Indus civilization has taken its stimulus from the Sumerians. Suresh Chandra, without denying the relations of Harappans, Dravidians and Aryans with the Sumerians, Elamites and Iranians, and in fact advocating more closer relations, interestingly, reverses the process of migration that is advocated by the European scholars. India, which is the destination of these three groups according to European scholars has become the birthplace, whereas the birthplace (Europe) advocated by Europeans has become the destination in Suresh Chandra's historiography.

He argues that it is true that the archeological evidences that were found in Sumer prove its relation with Indus civilization but it cannot prove, as Toynbee inferred, that Indus civilization has drawn its stimulus from Sumer. And in fact, the archeological evidences that were found in Ur were argued to belong to the period when the Sumerian civilization was at its beginning stage. Hence, Suresh Chandra concludes, Indus

civilization is at least as old as the Sumerian, if not earlier. Harappans who were once warriors transformed themselves into businessmen and were thrown out of Mohenjodaro by the Dravidians only to reach Sumer in search of business and jobs. This Harappan migration to Sumer is responsible for the available linguistic similarities and archeological evidences between the two.

From central India one group of Dravidians have moved towards Southern India and the other group towards the Indus basin. After destroying Indus civilization they followed Harappans and reached Elam which is to the east of Sumeria. They settled down there and established a civilization. The very fact that Elamite civilization is very different from Sumerian, Egyptian and Harappan civilizations and possesses linguistic parallels with Dravidian languages proves that Elamite civilization is Dravidian. On their way to Elam, Dravidians must have passed through Baluchistan and left their imprint, Brahui. In this way, the immigration of Dravidians is not from central Asia to India, rather it is from India to Central Asia through Baluchistan. The spirit of the Dravidians did not die with the establishment of Elamite Civilization; they later on became so powerful to destroy the city of Ur and even the Sumero-Akkadian Empire which once conquered them.

Thus, Dravidians, according to Suresh Chandra, are high spirited people. They were endowed with the skills of building empires. With these skills, they were able to build civilizations in South India as well as Elam. They have overthrown Harappans from Indus basin but were defeated by Aryans. This defeat and the consequent loss of hold on Indus basin, which connected central India with Elam caused the break between

Dravidians of India and the Dravidian immigrants of Elam. The only link between these two that survived seems to be the linguistic parallel.

III

Having discussed the views of Suresh Chandra on Dravidian civilization, let us now examine different aspects of his historiography critically. The Harappan-Dravidian-Aryan Nativity theory (HDAN) propounded by Suresh Chandra has interesting implications which need to be studied carefully. His argument that Indus civilization is at least contemporary, if not earlier, to Sumerian Civilization and that the Dravidian and Aryan civilizations were contemporary to Indus civilization implies that Dravidian and Aryan along with Indus civilization were as old as Sumerian Civilization. This implication has no supporting archeological and anthropological evidences. There are no anthropological or Archeological evidences in India to prove the antiquity of Dravidian and Aryan civilizations around third millennium BC during which Indus and Sumerian Civilizations have flourished.

Further, the argument that Dravidians and Aryans have drawn their stimulus from Harappans should be given proper attention. The very term 'stimulation' itself need to be properly attended to. Stimulation can be understood with the help of its synonyms such as inspiration, encouragement and motivation, which leads us to the understanding that Indus civilization inspired the Dravidians and Aryans, who are two distinct groups living outside Indus basin, to establish their own civilizations. This implies that there were three

different groups, if not races, of people living in ancient India i.e., Harappans, Dravidians and Aryans. What is the nature of the stimulus that is given to the Dravidians and the Aryans by the Harappans? Is it a religious one; or a cultural one; or a linguistic one? Though there are religious similarities pointed out by scholars between Harappans and Dravidians, there is not much affinity that exposed in other areas among Harappans, Dravidians and Aryans. The nature and severity of the stimulation has been left without much clarity.

The effect of stimulation with regard to the languages cannot be decided until the Indus script is deciphered. The historical order in which the Indian languages have taken their birth, according to Suresh Chandra, seems to be that immediately after the Indus language, the Dravidian language took its birth followed by Sanskrit (1996:158). The linguistic situation that is projected during 2000 BC is that, Indus script is primitive and pictographic and Sanskrit is well developed but without script. Moreover, unfortunately there is no historical evidence on the prevalence of Dravidian literature during that time, which is said to have born before Sanskrit. Early Dravidian literature in India, i.e., Sangam literature can at the most be dated back to 4th century BC. In addition, the time and extent of proto-Dravidian, which is said to be the source of all Dravidian languages is still under debate. Hence, the amount of stimulation on Dravidians with regard to language is difficult to decide. Further, the linguistic parallel that is projected by scholars like Zograph between Dravidian and Elamite lead Suresh Chandra to assume that Elamite civilization is the Dravidian civilization. The date that he seems to be proposing for this civilization is something between 2300 to 2006 BC. Because according to him, Dravidians occupied Indus basin in 2300 BC and they conquered Ur in 2006 BC. The

establishment of Elamite civilization must be somewhere in between these two. But Susa, the capital city of Elam and *Anzanite*,¹⁰ the first language that is spoken in Elam, which has been deciphered, appears to be much earlier to the date proposed by Suresh Chandra. David McAlpin, while pointing out the strong genetic link between Dravidian languages and Elamite, argues that the recorded use of Elamite spans from 3000 to 4000 B.C.¹¹ This shows the antiquity of the Elamite civilization. Therefore, it cannot be conclusively established that the Dravidian migrants from India have established Elamite civilization. Moreover, the prevalence of linguistic parallel alone is not enough to prove the Dravidianness of the Elamite civilization. There are other primary aspects such as social, cultural, religious and economic, that are to be studied. Though Nilakantha sastry (quoted above) mentions the inheritance through women as the cultural link between the Dravidians and Elamites, this aspect is prevalent among many other groups and races and is not peculiar to any particular one. Hence, a more closer analysis need to be done in order to prove Elamite civilization as the Dravidian civilization.

¹⁰ Rane Grausset: *The Civilizations of the East*. Vol. 1. New Delhi. Aryan Books International. 1995:61.

¹¹ David MacAlpine in his article "Elamite and Dravidian, the implications of Cognition" states that "Elamite, along with Sumerian, was one of the first languages ever written, and continued in recorded use through the period of the Achaemenid Empire. Thus, it spans, although incompletely and with many lapses, the period from 3000 to 4000 B.C." Further, while pointing out that "The phonological correspondences are unexceptionable and largely similar to what is found within Dravidian" he states that "the morphology of Elamite is extremely sparse and that it is much older than most of Dravidian."

Another interesting aspect that needs a closer observation in Suresh Chandra's Historiography is the cause for the destruction of Indus civilization. He made both Aryans and Dravidians share the responsibility of destroying the civilization. Aryans captured Harappa and pushed Indus people towards Sind and Gujarat to establish Mohenjodaro and Lothal, which were to be later destroyed by the Dravidians. It means that Indus people, who have stimulated the Aryans and the Dravidians, were destroyed in their very hands. Interestingly, Harappa, which is said to be captured by Aryans, is known for its fortification. It is well fortified to prevent the invasions of foreigners. Mortimer Wheeler, after seeing the granaries, barracks and working platforms of Harappa, observed that they constitute "an example of cantonment-planning".¹² This description tells us that Harappans were in regular conflict with the foreigners. These foreigners could be Aryans. But what need to be brought to the light is whether there are any archeological evidences that can prove the existence of Aryan settlements in the neighborhood of Harappa. Bara, which is close to Rugar, is one place where Harappan occupation was not found in substantive sense. Rather, we find an effete culture with some of its antecedents traceable to the pre-Harappan tradition in Bara.¹³ However, whether these pre-Harappans are Aryans is not yet established. Moreover, the Aryans who captured Harappa, according to Suresh Chandra, were pre-Rgvedic and geographically confined to Himalayan foothills. These pre-Rgvedic Aryans cannot be

¹² Quoted by B.V. Rao in *World History* (1991:New Delhi: Sterling publishers pvt. Ltd.) pp53-4.

¹³ Dani A.H. & B.K. Thapar: 1999. "The Indus Civilization" in Dani A.H. & V.M. Masson ed. *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*. Vol. 1. New Delhi. Motilal Banarasi Dass publishers.

said to possess the knowledge of iron since it is not available in the Himalayan foothills. This being the case, it is surprising, how these Aryans can destroy Harappa which is well fortified and its people knowing the use of weapons like axes, spears, daggers, swords, bows and arrows made up of copper and bronze.¹⁴ With this background, it is difficult to convincingly prove the pre-Vedic Aryan conquest of Harappa unless the prevalence of Aryan culture is confirmed on the basis of historical evidence. Similar explanation has to be given to prove the Dravidian conquest of Mohenjodaro.

Further, it is to be discussed whether Dravidians have produced a significant civilization in India before leaving for Elam to establish a civilization. If they have established one, then its time will take us to the period before 2300 BC (since that is the time they conquered Indus basin to start their foreign adventures) and a probe need to be made to trace back Dravidian history to that period. If they have not established a civilization, then one has to presume them to be primitive tribal groups living outside the boundaries of Indus civilization.

These limitations, it must be noted, do not disprove the validity of the historiography proposed by Suresh Chandra. Rather, they only stress the need to probe much deeper into the history and gather supportive evidence from other sources such as social and cultural.

¹⁴ B.V. Rao observes that “a large number of weapons such as axes, spears, daggers, short maces, stings, swords, bows and arrows [the were found in excavation] indicate that they [Harappans] were acquainted with the art of warfare.” However, it should be noted that the weapons of war were made of copper and bronze” (1991:54)

Conclusion:

Suresh Chandra is not alone is arguing that Harappans, Dravidians and Aryans were three different groups of people and are natives of India. Number of scholars such as M.M. Ganganath Jha, D.K. Chakravarti, David Frawley, S.R. Rao, Subhash Kak, Srikant G. Talageri, Paramesh Choudhury, Jim Shaffer, Richard Thomson, Bhagawan singh etc.,¹⁵ have propounded their arguments in favor of Aryan nativity theory. However, Suresh Chandra's historiography of India is novel and unique for more than one reason. His arguments that Harppan civilization is earlier than Sumerian Civilization; Dravidians were responsible for the exodus of Harappans, and Elamite Civilization is Dravidian Civilization, though all these need much guarded argumentation, they prove the uniqueness of Suresh Chandra's historiography. His attempt to demythologize Indian historiography, reversing the migration proposed by the Western Scholars and depicting Aryans as the colonizers of Iran certainly prove his novel approach to the subject. Finally, Suresh Chandra's adventure into the history of ideas, and the study of how a subject like the historiography of India has been written about, how the invention of Aryan invasion myth has paved the way in which writers explore the past and the examination of this myth – all show the skills of a perfect historiographer and match the definition of historiography given by Robin Winks.

¹⁵ These scholars were mentioned by S.G. Talageri 2000:426.

Reference:

- Basham, AL. 1998. (ed.,) *A cultural History of India*. Delhi. Oxford University Press.
- Caldwell, Robert. 1913. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian family of Languages*. 3rd edn. London.
- Dani AH. & JP Mohen ed., 1996. *History of Humanity. Scientific and Cultural Development* Vol. II. UNESCO publications.
- Datt, R.C. 2000. *A History of Civilization in Ancient India*. Delhi. Cosmo publications.
- Flenley.F. & WN Weech. 1999. *World History* Vol. I. New Delhi. Mohit publications.
- Frawley, David. 2001. *The Rigveda and the History of India*. New Delhi. Aditya Prakashan.
- Kapoor, Subodh. Ed., 2000. *The Hindus. Encyclopaedia of Hinduism*. Vol. I. New Delhi. Cosmo publications.
- Mahajan, VD. 1997. *Ancient India*. New Delhi. S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- Nilakanthasastry. 1975. *A History of South India from prehistoric times to the Fall of Vijayanagar*. Delhi. Oxford University publications.
- Rajendra Lala Mitra. 1969. *Indo-Aryans*. Vol. II. Calcutta. Indological Book House.
- Rajkumar. 1999. *Survey of Ancient India*. New Delhi. Anmol publications pvt. Ltd.
- Rao.B.V. 1991. *World History*. New Delhi. Sterling publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Sesha Iyengar, T.R. 1995. *Dravidian India*. New Delhi. Asian Educational Services.
- Sharma, SP. 1996. *History of Ancient India*. New Delhi. Mohit publication.
- Srinivasa Iyengar, PT. 1991. *Life in Ancient India*. New Delhi. Asian Educational services.
- Talageri,SG. 2000. *The Rigveda: A Historical Analysis*. New Delhi. Aditya Prakashan.
- Toynbee, A. 1996. *Mankind and Mother Earth*. Oxford University press.
- Winks, Robin W. 1999. (ed.,) *Historiography* Vol. V. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

From

D. Balaganapathi
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Dravidian University,
Kuppam 517 425

To

Prof. R.C. Pradhan,
Member Secretary,
ICPR, New Delhi.

Sir,

I here with submit a copy of my revised paper entitled “SURESH CHANDRA ON HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CIVILISATION: WITH REFERENCE TO DRAVIDIAN CIVILISATION” along with floppy. Kindly let me know your comments. I would really glad to listen to your comments and make necessary modifications in my paper.

I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to present a paper in the seminar which is subsequently leading to its publication.

Thank you

With regards,

Yours sincerely

(Balaganapathi)