

CARMELA MASTRANGELO

HISTORY AND PEDAGOGY OF SANSKRIT GRAMMAR  
THROUGH THE WORKS OF WESTERN MISSIONARIES  
JOHANN ERNST HANXLEDEN  
AND PAULINUS A SANCTO BARTHOLOMAEO\*

This article focuses on the earliest Sanskrit grammars composed by Western missionaries during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and thus aims to cast light upon the local pedagogy of *vyākaraṇa* (meant as traditional grammar) in South-India. More specifically, it deals with the grammatical works of the Jesuit Father Johann Ernst Hanxleden<sup>1</sup> (1681-1732) and of the Austrian Carmelite of Croatian<sup>2</sup> origin Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo (1748-1806), who both settled in the South-Western coast of India, present day Kerala.<sup>3</sup>

---

\* The author would like to express her deepest thanks to Marianna Ferrara, Rich Freeman, Raffaele Torella, and Ines G. Županov for their precious suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> Born in Ostercappeln (Osnabrück, Lower Saxony), he moved to India at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. He never came back to Europe and eventually died in Pazhur, where he was buried in the church of St. Anthony. For a biographical sketch, see Mundadan 1988: 186-192; Van Hal & Vielle 2013: 3-5.

<sup>2</sup> In the world Johann Philip Wesdin, he was born in Hof am Leithaberge (Lower Austria). His actual origin was uncertain; 19<sup>th</sup> century scholars believed that he was German or Hungarian (cf. Teza 1888: 2-5 and Barone 1888: 17). In the last century, indologists from Zagreb University attentively researched on the original documents and on the church register in Hof, eventually concluding that his family was Croatian (see Jauk-Pinhak 1984: 129).

<sup>3</sup> Hanxleden moved from Goa to the Thrissur District in Central Kerala, which was the “heartland of his activity” (Van Hal & Vielle 2013: 4). Paulinus settled in the Archdiocese of Verapoly (Ernakulam District) from 1776 to 1789. See Teza 1888: 6-11; Barone 1888: 7-14, who referred to Paulinus’ *Viaggio alle Indie Orientali* (Roma, 1796).

Father Hanxleden, who was also a renowned author of Malayāḷam poems and became well known in South-India as Arnos Padiri (*arṇṇōsū pātiri*, Portuguese *Ernesto Padre*), wrote a manuscript Sanskrit grammar, called *Grammatica Grandonica*,<sup>4</sup> around the first quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Paulinus composed the first two Sanskrit grammars ever printed in Europe, namely *Sidharūbam seu Grammatica Samscrdamica*, Rome 1790, and *Vyàcarana seu locupletissima Samscrdamicae linguae institutio*, Rome 1804. The publication of these grammars was patronized by Cardinal Stefano Borgia (1731-1804), an antique and book collector, who supported missionaries and scholars of Oriental cultures.<sup>5</sup> Both Hanxleden and Paulinus studied Sanskrit with the help of South-Indian paṇḍits,<sup>6</sup> and also used Sanskrit manuals, which inspired their grammars and whose palm leaf manuscripts they found and copied – as Paulinus himself stated (see *infra* fn. 19) – in the “Academia Brahmanica Triciuriensis.”<sup>7</sup> The comparison of these three grammars could reasonably help us to understand the South-Indian background, in which their authors were given training in Sanskrit language. Furthermore, that could be useful to reconstruct the original Indian archetypes, from which the missionaries derived their grammars and which were probably the basic manuals traditionally employed for Sanskrit learning in Kerala. Of course, as Sylvain Auroux (1994: 87) pointed out,

<sup>4</sup> It has been recently found in the Carmelite monastery of Montecompatri near Rome (see Van Hal 2010) and diplomatically edited in 2013 (see Bibliographical references).

<sup>5</sup> Stefano Borgia collected all the manuscripts and the antiquities brought by missionaries in the Borgian Museum in Velletri. In 1817, the collection was dispersed in different museums; the manuscripts are now held in the Vatican Library. Paulinus catalogued thirty-two codices in *Musei Borgiani Velitris codices manuscripti Avenses, Peguani, Siamici, Malabarici, Indostani, animadversionibus historico-criticis castigati et illustrati* (Roma, 1793). As Županov (2009b: 210) pointed out, residing in India was a sort of “fieldwork” for missionaries, who did not have scholarly institutions in South Asia and could arrange all their material only when back to Rome.

<sup>6</sup> Hanxleden studied ten years with the Nambudiri Brahmins of Thrissur (see DMC p. 2; cf. Mundadan 1988: 188), whereas Paulinus approached Sanskrit with the help of Kṛṣṇa and Kuñjan from Aṅgamāly (cf. EHC p. 51 and VLS p. xx; see also Mastrangelo 2012: 261).

<sup>7</sup> According to Mackenzie (1901: 79), the Sanskrit Academy in Thrissur, where Hanxleden studied, was once famous, but it eventually became a “wretched hostel.” A few Sanskrit manuscripts are now held in the Vedic school of Brahmaswam Madam, founded in Thrissur around the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. *infra* fn. 35.

Western scholars represented Indian local tradition conforming to the methods of extended Latin grammar; in addition, missionaries also had to use Latin as the main language of their works.<sup>8</sup>

First of all, we should try to understand why Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo composed two different Sanskrit grammars<sup>9</sup> and how they can be connected to Hanxleden's work. Paulinus' first grammar, i.e. SGS, is to some extent a copy of Hanxleden's manuscript. Paulinus brought it to Europe in 1789 and used it for the composition of his own Sanskrit manual (EHC p. 51; cf. Muller 1985: 132). There are just some slight differences between the two works – in particular the Carmelite sometimes recasts Hanxleden's grammar in order to make it sound more familiar to his European audience.<sup>10</sup> Nonetheless, in spite of these differences, both grammars are kinds of *koṣa*, catalogues of the same inflected forms and simple Sanskrit sentences. The inflected forms are written in Grantha-Malayāḷam characters throughout Hanxleden's GG, while they are sometimes transliterated into Roman characters in Paulinus' SGS. These transliterations are thus evidence of the peculiar South-Indian pronunciation influenced by Dravidian languages, which, for instance, do not allow final stops and intervocalic voiceless sounds (see Mastrangelo 2012: 265-266). These influences were so pronounced that Paulinus' contemporaries – especially Englishmen at the Asiatic Society of Bengal, who were often attacked by the Friar<sup>11</sup> – believed that his grammars

---

<sup>8</sup> According to Rocher (1977: xvii), this is one of the reasons for the lack of interest in Paulinus' grammars among modern readers.

<sup>9</sup> Most scholars believed that VLS was just an expanded version of SGS and considered Paulinus a sort of compulsive writer, whose only aim was to show off his knowledge. See, for instance, Barone 1888: 212, who maintained that the study of VLS was a vain effort ("ozioso lavoro").

<sup>10</sup> More specifically, Hanxleden deals with sandhi rules and adverbial forms at the end of his grammar (ff° 40<sup>v</sup>-42<sup>v</sup>), whereas Paulinus deals with them in the second chapter of SGS (pp. 125-132). Immediately after, there is a list of the ten classes of verb roots (SGS p. 133), which is absent in GG – Hanxleden directly presents the conjugation patterns (ff° 18<sup>v</sup>-35<sup>v</sup>). Cf. Barone 1888: 157, who noticed the absence of the list in GG.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Rocher 1977: xii-xiii and xxiii. On Paulinus' peculiar attitude towards William Jones, founder and president of the Asiatic Society, who is never mentioned in SGS and, on

described some South-Indian vernacular rather than Sanskrit (cf. Rocher 1977: xviii). Now the question is: is it possible to find marks of Dravidian influences even in the morphology of Sanskrit, which is meant to be a synthetic and institutionally preserved language? It is important to note here that, when in medieval times a traditional poetic literature originated in Kerala, it was written in a literary language, which was actually a mixture of Malayāḷam<sup>12</sup> and Sanskrit, called *Maṇipravāḷam*<sup>13</sup> (“ruby-coral language”). This mixture could admit words of Sanskrit derivation declined as Malayāḷam, or conversely Malayāḷam words declined with Sanskrit suffixes; at the same time, *Maṇipravāḷam* stanzas could have whole lines purely in Sanskrit (cf. Freeman 2013: 208-226). Of course it is worthless to deal with *Maṇipravāḷam* here, since it is a poetic language used for literary purposes and not for manuals of grammar; but in medieval Kerala there could be many forms that interwove or borrowed from Dravidian and Sanskrit, with various levels of accommodation, especially in learned writing. A “*miśrabhāṣā*” of this kind is sometimes used by Paulinus in his SGS, while it is almost completely missing in VLS.<sup>14</sup> Obviously, these mixed forms are not found in the inflection patterns nor in the examples of sentence constructions provided in Paulinus’ grammar, otherwise this could not be considered a grammar of pure Sanskrit. Mixed forms can be actually found among the

---

the contrary, is often praised for his “*eruditae annotationes*” in VLS (p. xiv; see also pp. xviii, xx, and *passim*), cf. Rocher 1977: xxiii and Županov 2009a: 209.

<sup>12</sup> I conventionally use here the name “Malayāḷam,” by which the Portuguese referred to the local language in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. It came into use only in the 16<sup>th</sup> century; its original function was to denote alternately the land and the script of Southern Kerala. Even though works in the regional “*Kēraḷa-bhāṣā*” date back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the general name “*Tamiḷ*” designated the language of Kerala at that time and actually continued to overlap with “*Malayāḷam*” into the colonial period. See Freeman 2003: 441-443.

<sup>13</sup> The normative text of *Maṇipravāḷam* is the 14<sup>th</sup> century treatise called *Līlātilakam*. It was written in Sanskrit, which functioned as a trans-regional medium “against the hegemony of the neighboring Tamil grammatical and literary tradition” (Freeman 1998: 41). In the first quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the king Ravi Varma from Travancore conquered all of South-India establishing a celebrated even though brief sovereignty (see Freeman 1998: 42-43; 2013: 227-228) that stimulated the flourishing of a court literature in Sanskrit and started the process of legitimization of the local *bhāṣā* for the production of *Maṇipravāḷam*.

<sup>14</sup> See VLS p. 128, where *sanrdyantanyā paritschēta* should be the equivalent of Skt. *sanādyanta-pariccheda*, but *r* in the place of *ā* and the termination *-anyā* are not clear.

technical terms used by the Friar in order to explain the basics of traditional grammar. For example, “nominal stem”<sup>15</sup> is *prātipadika* – which is indeed Sanskrit – or *perikka*, the act of inflecting is *vibhaktikaḷecollannu* or *perikunnu* (SGS p. 86). Here *perikka* and *perikunnu* are Malayāḷam words,<sup>16</sup> while *vibhaktikaḷecollannu* is composed by the Sanskrit noun *vibhaktika* declined as a Malayāḷam noun in the accusative case, and by the Malayāḷam verb *collannu*.

We can compare this evidence with the modern printed versions of a text still circulating in Kerala, called *Siddharūpa*, which is a catalogue of Sanskrit inflection patterns. In recent times young Keralite Brahmins had to memorize *Siddharūpa* along with the dictionary *Amarakoṣa*, as the first step of their training in Sanskrit language.<sup>17</sup> *Amarakoṣa* is still used all over India at the beginning of the traditional śāstric Sanskrit education. Paulinus himself appended a Latin version of this dictionary to his second grammar (VLS pp. 154 ff.) and separately published the first section in his *Amarasinha. Sectio prima de caelo ex tribus codicibus Indicis manuscriptis* (1798), whereas Father Hanxleden probably used it in the composition of his manuscript Sanskrit-Malayāḷam-Portuguese dictionary (see DMC p. 5; cf. Van Hal & Vielle 2013: 7). Most likely, at the very basic level of their Sanskrit training students from the South-Indian linguistic background needed to learn not only a catalogue of Sanskrit lemmas but also a list of declension and conjugation patterns. Unlike the other Indian languages, Dravidian languages are non Indo-European, distinct from Sanskrit in phonology, morphology and syntax. Moreover, *Amarakoṣa* and *Siddharūpa* could work for Maṇipravāḷam as well. They actually provide Sanskrit words that can be combined with Malayāḷam morphemes and Sanskrit suffixes that can be added to Malayāḷam words. This is the reason why mixed forms sometimes appear in Paulinus’

<sup>15</sup> Actually, Paulinus translates “declinatio” (“nominal inflection”); cf. VLS p. 20.

<sup>16</sup> According to Paulinus (SGS p. 86), these forms are “usitato et vulgari sermone” (“in vernacular and common language”).

<sup>17</sup> On the traditional education of Nambudiri Brahmins in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century Kerala, see Wood 1985: 9, 33, 47, 48, 50. Cf. Mastrangelo 2012: 262.

*Sidharūbam*. They are evidence of the cross-function of *Siddharūpa* and *Amarakoṣa* in the well-educated contexts of Kerala.<sup>18</sup>

In that milieu, a purely Sanskrit grammar was subsequently needed in the higher Brahmanical education. Most probably, Paulinus' second work has been derived from this grammar. In his preface to VLS (p. xiv) the Carmelite refers to a codex<sup>19</sup> copied by Father Hanxleden from the palm leaf manuscripts of the "Academia Brahmanica Triciuriensis." It contained – he maintains elsewhere in his catalogue of Hanxleden's manuscripts (DMC p. 6) – the original Indian text of *Siddharūpa*, *Amarakoṣa*, and of a grammar generically called "Vyāgarnā." We could assume that these three texts were the basic manuals of Sanskrit language locally used in Kerala during the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Internal evidence in VLS strongly suggests that Paulinus derived it from a classical Pāṇinian commentary. The Carmelite himself directly refers to Pāṇini in many passages of the preface (see pp. xiv-xv, xvii). He also quotes a large number of Pāṇinian sūtras throughout his grammar, and makes use of Pāṇini's technical terminology (see Mastrangelo 2012: 262-264). Furthermore, he introduces the nine *lakāras* (verbal forms) through a śloka,<sup>20</sup> which is actually a recast of sūtras A 3.2.123 *varṭamāne laṭ* (on *laṭ*, i.e. present tense) and A 3.3.139 *liṅnimitte ṛṅ kriyātipattaṭ* (on *liṅ* and *ṛṅ*, i.e. optative and conditional moods). Ślokas help memorization of rules, and we can find comparable instances in well-known Pāṇinian

<sup>18</sup> Barone (1888: 148-149) remarked that Hanxleden and Paulinus chose actually two different titles for their grammars, the adjective "Grandonica" having a wider meaning that could generically refer to the literary language.

<sup>19</sup> See also ASP p. vi. Cf. Mastrangelo 2010: 260. After the suppression of religious corporations in 1873, all Paulinus' manuscripts and documents, which had been held in the library of Santa Maria della Scala in Rome, were brought to the Rome National Library, founded in 1875. The codex that Paulinus referred to is not there in the "S.M.Scala" Archive at the National Library; it is currently lost.

<sup>20</sup> It sounds: *laṭ varṭamāne laṅ liṭ luṅ bhūthe luṭ ṛṭ ca bhāvini | vidhyāḍau loḍliṅau ṛṅ ca kriyāṅiṣpa[d]<tt>yasambhave ||* i.e. "laṭ in the sense of present, laṅ liṭ luṅ in the sense of past, luṭ and ṛṭ in the sense of future, loṭ and liṅ in the sense of command, and ṛṅ in the sense of non-occurrence of the action." See VLS p. 73; cf. Mastrangelo 2012: 263 fn. 12.

grammars from Kerala, such as the 17<sup>th</sup> century *Prakriyāsarvasva* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (cf. Mastrangelo 2012: p. 264 fn. 13), and the *Praveśaka* of Acyuta Piṣāroṭi, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa’s teacher, which is entirely composed in verse (see Kunjunni Raja 1958: 122-123).

A novelty can be actually observed in a passage from the fifth chapter of VLS (pp. 127-128), where Paulinus states that case syntax is described in seven sections called *avatāra* (“manifestation”). He also maintains that the last part of the original Indian grammar describes verb syntax and is called “Rūbāvatāra.” There is actually a grammar called *Rūpāvatāra* consisting of two parts, *bhāga*, dealing with nouns and verbs, respectively.<sup>21</sup>

Another evidence is the verse quoted in SGS (p. 65) as the incipit of “Vyāgarna,” which sounds: *yenākṣara-samāmnāya adhigamya maheśvarāt kṛtsnam vyākaraṇam proktam*. The text of RA is actually prefaced by two verses, one śloka and one āryā; the first three pādas of the śloka are exactly the incipit given by Paulinus.<sup>22</sup> As for the second introductory verse in RA, it is:

---

<sup>21</sup> Rangacharya (1908) gives evidence that the two bhāgas, originally considered as two different texts, were parts of one single work known as *Rūpāvatāra*. The first bhāga is actually divided into eight *avatāras*, i.e. *Samjñāvatāra* (on technical terms), *Samhitāvatāra* (on sandhi rules), *Vibhaktiyavatāra* (on case terminations), *Kāraḥvatāra* (on case relations), *Avyayāvatāra* (on adverbs), *Strīpratyayāvatāra* (on feminine derivative stems), *Samāsāvatāra* (on nominal compounds), *Taddhitāvatāra* (on secondary suffixes); whereas Paulinus considers *Avyayāvatāra* and *Strīpratyayāvatāra* as two subsections of the same *avatāra* on *kāraḥ*, and the second bhāga on verbal forms as the seventh *avatāra* actually called *Rūpāvatāra*.

<sup>22</sup> Given the last pāda (*tasmai Pāṇinaye namaḥ*), the sense is: “praise to Pāṇini, who, having learnt the alphabet from Śiva, revealed the whole grammar.” Note that, when Paulinus quotes this śloka, he also specifically refers to p. 341 of the first issue of *Asiatick Researches*, where Caul (1789) reports of a “grammar, entitled *Pāṇiniya*, consisting of eight lectures or chapters.” Actually, this śloka also occurs in two recensions (i.e. the *Yajuṣ* and the *Ṛk*) of the treatise on Vedic phonetics known as *Pāṇinīya-śikṣā*, and have been commented on by the *Śikṣā-pañjikā* and the *Śikṣā-prakāśa* (see PŚ p. 79). We can assume it as an evidence of the fact that missionaries in Kerala and Englishmen in Bengal approached different reference texts, even though they were dealing with the same – and we can venture to say quite “fluid” – tradition.

*sarvajñam anantaguṇam praṇamya  
bālaprabodhanārtham imam |  
rūpāvatāram alpam sukalāpam ṛjum kariṣyāmi ||*<sup>23</sup>

It can be compared with a passage of the Latin preface to VLS (p. xiv), where we can read: *omnem operam navavi, ut haec grammatica locuples, pura, facilis, et concinna in lucem prodiret.*<sup>24</sup> This is to some extent a translation of the āryā verse, where the adjective *pura* is almost certainly the equivalent of *ṛjum*, *facilis* the equivalent of *bālaprabodhanārtham*, and *concinna* the equivalent of *alpam*; similarly, *locuples* could be an effective translation of *sukalāpa* in the sense of “well-ornate.” We can find other instances in many passages of VLS, where Paulinus quotes RA almost word-for-word.<sup>25</sup> It is therefore strongly possible that this text is related to the archetype copied by Father Hanxleden, which was in turn used by Paulinus to compose his VLS, and that Paulinus’ VLS is an abridged translation of RA.<sup>26</sup>

The circulation of RA was conceivably wide in Kerala. For instance, in the introduction of *Prakiyāsarvasva*, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa maintains that he was asked by the king of Amalappuḷa to compose a new grammar to emend the defects in the older eminent grammatical works such as the 7<sup>th</sup> century *Kāśikāvṛtti* and RA itself (see Kunjunni Raja 1958: 127). We can find quotations of RA in a few grammars from the 12<sup>th</sup> century, e.g. the *Durghaṭavṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva (see *infra* fn. 32), the *Siddhahemacandra* of the Jain author Hemacandra (flourished at the court of the Chalukya king Jayasimha Siddharāja), the

<sup>23</sup> “Having paid homage to the Omniscient, who has boundless excellencies, I will make this *Rūpāvatāra* brief, well-ornate, and correct for the sake of students.”

<sup>24</sup> “I did my best to make this grammar well-ornate, correct, easy and brief.”

<sup>25</sup> For instance, he introduces his dissertation on *kāraḥ* (VLS p. 127) with the same formula used at the beginning of *Kāraḥvatāra* in RA (p. 145) – *kim prātipadikam? arthavadadhāturapratyayaḥ* (A 1.2.45).

<sup>26</sup> We can take as a further evidence some manuscripts catalogued as “vyākaraṇa” in the Brahmawam Madam library. Most of these are in very bad conditions, but in manuscript marked n° 8 we can still read “rūpāvatāram” in the colophon. In the first leaf, it is possible to discern Pāṇini’s sūtras 1.3.2 (*upadeśe ’janunasika it*) and 1.1.68 (*svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā*), which are actually the first two sūtras commented upon in RA (I pp. 1-2).



*Dhātupradīpa* and the *Tantrapradīpa* both composed by Maitreya-rakṣita (see Cardona 1976: 285; cf. Renou 1940: 34).<sup>27</sup> The text should be earlier than the 11<sup>th</sup> century, since several Cōḷa inscriptions mentioned “Rūpāvatāra” as part of the curriculum of higher Sanskrit schools in Tamil Nadu (see Nilakantha Sastri 1934: 278). As for its *terminus post quem*, this should be the date of composition of the *Kāśikāvyṛtti*, since it is widely quoted throughout RA (see Rangacharya 1908: vii-viii). Considering this evidence, the grammar which Paulinus referred to should be conceivably dated from a period ranging from the 8<sup>th</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

With regard to the authorship of RA, this is attributed to a Ceylonese grammarian called Dharmakīrti, as the name appears in the colophons found in the Trivandrum Manuscripts Library and in the Pachaiyappa College in Madras (see Rangacharya 1908: ii-iii). This attribution is supported by the fact that one of the most consulted commentaries, along with the 13<sup>th</sup> century *Rūpasiddhi*, to the oldest known Pāli grammar – the *Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa* – is called *Bālāvatāra*, and its author is Dhammakitti. Nevertheless, *Bālāvatāra* was composed in the 14<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>28</sup> too late to somehow belong to the same background, in which RA originated. More probably, RA was composed by a South-Indian grammarian, some time in the last quarter of the first millennium. Later on, it was used as a main reference for teaching Sanskrit grammar in Tamil Nadu and Kerala, and conceivably influenced the emergence in nearby Ceylon of the more recent grammatical tradition of the language

<sup>27</sup> It is also quoted in a treatise on poetry, music and dance, the *Lakṣaṇadīpikā* (also known as *Prabandhadīpikā*) by Gauraṇārya, who probably flourished under the king Siṅghabhūpāla of Rachakonda in the first half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century (see Lalithambal 1995: 8).

<sup>28</sup> There were several authors known by the name Dhammakitti in Ceylon. The earliest lived during the reign of Parākramabāhu I (12<sup>th</sup> century), but he was not a grammarian; he was immediate disciple of Sāriputta – author of the *Vinaya-ṭīkā* called *Sāratthadīpanī* – and wrote the Pāli poem *Dhātāvamsa* on the tooth-relic of the Buddha (see Malalasekara 1928: 195). The grammarian Dhammakitti, author of the *Bālāvatāra*, was instead Saṅgharāja (“senior monk”) during the reigns of Bhuvaneka-Bāhu V and Vīrabāhu II (see *ibid.*: 242). Cf. Lalithambal 1995: 5-6.

of Buddhist canonical texts.<sup>29</sup> In this respect, we should also consider the following parallel: *Rūpasiddhi* and *Bālāvatāra* were main references for learning Pāli grammar in Ceylon, just as *Siddharūpa* and *Rūpāvatāra* were main references for learning Sanskrit grammar in the South of India.<sup>30</sup>

Therefore, on the basis of this evidence, should we “beyond any reasonable doubt” assign the author of RA to a Buddhist background?<sup>31</sup> The arguments of the scholars in favour of this conclusion are not completely persuasive. The use of *sarvajña* (“omniscient”) in the second introductory verse of the first bhāga is usually taken as the strongest; by *sarvajña* the author should actually pay homage to the Buddha (see Rangacharya 1908: i; Lalithambal 1995: 4).<sup>32</sup> Nonetheless, *sarvajña* (as the following *anantagūṇa*, in the same pāda) could refer to Śiva as well; in

<sup>29</sup> According to Walters (2000: 141-146), under Parākramabāhu I some divisions of the Canon were re-edited in order to unify Ceylonese Buddhism in the Mahāvihāran perspective. Consequently, there was also a revision of Pāli, the language of the Canon, on the basis of the classical Sanskrit grammatical tradition. For this reason, as soon as Parākramabāhu purged the *Sanḅha* of all heretical *bhikkus*, a new school of Pāli grammar was founded by the *thera* Mogallāna or Mogallāyana. Later on, the founding text of the earlier grammar school, that of Kaccāyana, strongly influenced by the *Kāśikā*, was also rearranged in new manuals, such as the *Rūpasiddhi* of Buddhappiya (or Dīpaṅkara) and Dhammakitti’s *Bālāvatāra*, which is the smallest abridgment of the *Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa*. See Norman 1983: 163-164; Malalasekara 1928: 243-244. According to Malalasekara, the most clear and extensive section in the *Bālāvatāra* is that on *kāraḅas*, case relations or syntax (cf. Cardona 1976: 215-221), which forms an important addition to the *Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa*. In this regard, consider that the *Kāraḅāvatāra* is actually the longest section of RA, and that Paulinus (SGS p. 65) states that the second and higher Sanskrit grammar “sintaxeos praecepta continet” (“it deals with syntax rules”).

<sup>30</sup> Similarly, it is possible that RA also served as a model for the *Prākṛtarūpāvatāra* of Siṃharāja, a grammar of literary Prakṛit, based on the *Vālmikisūtra* (see Nilakantha Sastrī 1934: 280).

<sup>31</sup> The colophon of the manuscript held in the Saraswatī Mahal Library in Thanjavur refers to one *Kṛṣṇadikṣita* as the author of RA. See Rangacharya 1908: i; cf. Lalithambal 1995: 7, who concludes that Dharmakīrti was at first a Brahmin, who later on became a Buddhist. Similarly, not all manuscripts of the Ceylonese *Bālāvatāra* assign its authorship to Dhammakitti. This name appears in the colophon of the 14<sup>th</sup> century *Saddharmāṅkāra* – it states that the author of *Saddharmāṅkāra* also wrote *Bālāvatāra* –; elsewhere, the name is Vāciṣsara. See Malalasekara 1928: 244.

<sup>32</sup> This is also the case of the *Durghaṭavṛtti*, whose author, Śaraṇadeva, dedicates his grammar to the Omniscient. Immediately after the dedication, he himself dates the composition to the year 1095 of the Śaka era (1172 AD); even though this is a relatively late date, he is traditionally considered as a Buddhist grammarian by scholars (see Renou 1940: 49).

this sense, it occurs many times, e.g. in the *Liṅgapurāṇa*, and Śiva is actually mentioned in the first śloka of RA by the name of *Maheśvara* (see *supra* fn. 22). Also consider that the introductory verse of the second bhāga<sup>33</sup> is devoted to *devī bālānām*, “the Goddess of students,” conceivably Sarasvatī or any other South-Indian Goddess. Most likely, RA originated as a kind of progressive compilation of the localized grammatical tradition of South-India, where different languages and philosophies could easily interact. It was probably compiled in a Buddhist context. This is particularly suggested by the fact that the sūtras dealing with Vedic and accentual rules are not commented on. And, even though the scholars so far have not taken it as a strong evidence, we should also consider that there are actually several works called *avatāra* and they all are purely Buddhist texts, such as the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*. Nonetheless, a more complex substrate influenced RA. This was actually one of the first *prakriyā* works – i.e. works giving examples of word formation in order to explain grammar rules – that recast Pāṇinian sūtras according to topics, much earlier than the *Siddhāntakaumudī*.<sup>34</sup>

To elaborate, Hanxleden’s GG and Paulinus’ SGS and VLS are documents of an ancient grammatical tradition, locally spread in Dravidian Southern India. In such a linguistic background a *miśrabhāṣa* could emerge and be used in well educated contexts. In the region of Kerala, in particular, the Sanskritization of the local language for literary purposes served as a cultural legitimization and a sort of enfranchisement from the hegemony of Tamil Nadu (cfr. *supra* fn. 13). Evidence of

<sup>33</sup> See RA II p. 1: *praṇamya śirasā devīm bālānām hitakāriṇīm | yathāsarām pravakṣyāmi dhātupratyayaṇcikām* || “Having bowed my head to the benevolent Goddess of students, I will reveal the section on roots and primary derivatives according to goodness.”

<sup>34</sup> Note also that in recasting Pāṇini, RA falls back on the same methodology as the *Kātantra*, the South-Indian and probably pre-Pāṇinian grammar, which is clearly related to the Tamil *Tolkāppiyam*, and strongly influenced the Pāli *Kāccayana-vyākaraṇa*. See Cardona 1976: 150-151. We can venture to recognize an influence of the *Kātantra* on the RA, also considering that the adjective *sukalāpa* (“well-ornate”) in the second introductory verse could probably refer to the name *Kalāpa-vyākaraṇa*, by which the *Kātantra* is also known.

this miśrabhāṣa can be found in Paulinus' first grammar, i.e. SGS, which was probably derived from a simple catalogue of inflected forms, i.e. *Siddharūpa*, that the learned Keralites had memorized at the very basic level of their Sanskrit training. Similarly, they memorized a catalogue of Sanskrit lemmas, i.e. *Amarakoṣa*. On the other hand, RA, a commentary on Pāṇini, was used in the higher purely Sanskrit education. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century this commentary was approached by missionaries,<sup>35</sup> and Paulinus derived his second Sanskrit grammar, i.e. VLS, from it. The cultural prestige of RA was pervasive enough that the text probably served as a model for the grammars of other standardized languages, such as Pāli. After a long period of great circulation, RA somehow declined, and we don't have reliable records about its author and its composition. In the contemporary era, Sanskrit students throughout India – including Kerala – learn, as their basic pedagogical manuals, the Sanskrit dictionary *Amarakoṣa*, and the grammar known as *Siddhāntakaumudī*, composed by the Marathi Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Just like RA, this is a *prakriyā* grammar and arranges Pāṇini's sūtras according to topics; furthermore, its style was considered *navya* "new" (see Cardona 1976: 287-288) in comparison to that of the other commentaries. Nevertheless, considering these modern pedagogical practices, it is also possible that cultural forces contributed to the decline of the regional grammatical tradition in Kerala.<sup>36</sup> We should maybe note that the standardization of education in Sanskrit language somehow dated back to the time of the stabilization of the British colonial presence in South Asia. The *Siddhāntakaumudī* had been attentively studied by William Jones himself and was

---

<sup>35</sup> They approached these texts in a Sanskrit Academy ("Academia Brahmanica Triciuriensis"), which conceivably trained students of "Humanities," not just Brahmin priests. In this respect, note that, at the present time, there are two versions of *Siddharūpa* circulating in Kerala; one, known as "orthodox," has the declension of *Rāmaḥ*, *Rāmau*, *Rāmāḥ* as the incipit of the catalogue, the other, known as "non-orthodox," has *ṽkṣaḥ*, *ṽkṣau*, *ṽkṣāḥ* ("tree"): both Hanxleden and Paulinus referred to the "non-orthodox" tradition (see GG f° 2°; SGS pp. 92-93; VLS pp. 22-23).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Renou 1940: 34. Similarly, between the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the non-Pāṇinian *Sārasvata* tradition, widely spread among the Śāṅkarians in Northern India, suddenly declined (see Filliozat 2012: 19).

the direct reference of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (see Staal 1972: 33-34), which had a great prestige among European scholars. On the other hand, when back to Rome, the missionaries lacked a scientific community; their lay colleagues preferred to go to London and Paris, which, according to Trautmann's definition (see Županov 2006: 101), quickly became the "hub" of new Orientalism. Nonetheless Hanxleden and Paulinus' grammars, though scarcely studied, bear witness to the fact that the constructed idea of Sanskrit as an eternal and self-identical language should give way to a different perspective in which Sanskrit could also work as an inflected and practical language for several purposes, such as literary and political as well.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

### Texts and abbreviations

- ASP Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, *Amarasinha. Sectio prima de caelo ex tribus ineditis codicibus Indicis manuscriptis*, Roma, 1798.
- DMC Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, *De manuscriptis codicibus indicis R.P. Joan Ernesti Hanxleden epistola ad. R.P. Alexium Mariam A.S. Joseph Carmelitam exalceatum*, Vienna, 1799.
- EHC Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, *Examen historico-criticum codicum Indicorum Bibliothecae Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*, Roma, 1792.
- GG *Grammatica Grandonica. The Sanskrit grammar of Johann Ernst Hanxleden S.J. (1681-1732)*, ed. by T. Van Hal, C. Vielle, with a photographic reproduction of the original manuscript by J.-C. Muller, Potsdam, 2013 (<https://publishup.uni-potsdam.de/opus4-ubp/frontdoor/index/index/docId/6251>).
- PŚ *Pāṇinīya-śikṣā or the Śikṣā-vedaṅga ascribed to Pāṇini*, ed. by M. Ghosh, Madras, 1938.

- RA Dharmakīrti, *Rūpāvatāra*. Pts. 1, 2, ed. by R.B.M. Rangacharya, Madras, Bangalore, 1908, 1927.
- SGS Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, *Sidharūbam seu grammatica Samscrdamica*, Roma, 1790.
- Siddharūpa*, ed. by K.K. Balakrishna Panicker, Ebenezer (Thrissur), 1973 (rpt. 2006).
- VLS Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, *Vyācarana seu locupletissima Samscrdamicae linguae institutio in usum Fidei praeconum in India Orientali, et virorum litteratorum in Europa adornata*, Roma, 1804.

### Secondary Sources

- Auroux, S. (1994) *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation*, Liège.
- Barone, G. (1888) *Vita precursori ed opere del P. Paolino da S. Bartollomeo*, Napoli.
- Cardona, G. (1976) *Pāṇini. A survey of research*, The Hague (1<sup>st</sup> Indian ed., Delhi, 1980).
- Caul, G. (1789) “On the literature of the Hindus, from the Sanscrit”, *Asiatick Researches* 1 (rpt. 1801), 340-355.
- Filliozat, P.-S. (2012) “L’approche scientifique du sanscrit et de la pensée indienne par Heinrich Roth, S.J. au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle”, in id., J. Leclant (eds.), *L’œuvre scientifique des missionnaires en Asie. Journée d’études (AIBL-Société asiatique, 9 janvier 2009)*, Paris, 17-30.
- Freeman, R. (1998) “Rubies and coral. The lapidary crafting of language in Kerala”, *The Journal of Asian Studies* 57/1, 38-65.
- Freeman R. (2003) “Genre and Society. The literary culture of premodern Kerala”, in S. Pollock (ed.), *Literary cultures in history. Reconstructions from South Asia*, Berkeley, 437-500.
- Freeman, R. (2013) “Caught in translation. Ideologies of literary language in the *Līlātilakam*”, in W. Cox, V. Vergiani (eds.), *Bilingual discourse and cross-cultural fertilisation. Sanskrit and Tamil in medieval India*, Pondicherry, 199-239.

- Jauk-Pinhak, M. (1984) "Some Notes on the Pioneer Indologist Filip Vesdin (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo)", *Indologica Taurinensia* 12, 129-137.
- Kunjunni Raja, K. (1958) *The contribution of Kerala to Sanskrit literature*, Madras.
- Lalithambal, K.S. (1995) *Dharmakīrti's Rūpāvatāra. A Critical Study*, Delhi.
- Mackenzie, G.T. (1901), *Christianity in Travancore*, Trivandrum.
- Malalasekara, G.P. (1928), *The Pāli literature of Ceylon*, London (Colombo, 1958).
- Mastrangelo C. (2012) "Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo and Sanskrit grammar", in G. Cardona, A. Akhujkar, H. Ogawa (eds.), *Studies in Sanskrit grammar*, New Delhi, 259-270.
- Muller, J.-C. (1985) "Recherches sur les premières grammaires manuscrites du sanskrit", *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 3, 125-144.
- Mundadan, A.M. (1988) "John Ernest Hanxleden (Arnos Pathiri): his contributions to the Sanskrit and Malayalam languages and literatures", in A. Amaladass (ed.), *Jesuit presence in Indian History. Commemorative volume on the occasion of the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the New Madurai Mission, 1838-1988*, Anand, 182-204.
- Nilakantha Sastri, K.A. (1934) "A note on the Rūpāvatāra", *The Journal of Oriental Research Madras* 8/3, 277-280.
- Norman, K.R. (1983) *Pāli literature. Including the canonical literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden.
- Rangacharya, R.B.M. (1908) "Granthaparakāśakasya vijñāpanā", in id. (ed.), *The Rūpāvatāra of Dharmakīrti*, vol. I, Madras, i-xix.
- Renou, L. (1940) *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva. Introduction*, vol. 1/1, Paris.
- Rocher, L. (1977) *Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo. Dissertation on the Sanskrit language*, Amsterdam.
- Staal, J.F. (1972) *A reader on the Sanskrit grammarians*, Cambridge (MA).
- Teza, E. (1888) *Di Paolino da San Bartolomeo la vita scritta da anonimo. Pubblicata dal prof. Emilio Teza*, Venezia.

- Van Hal, T. (2010) “À la recherche d’une grammaire perdue. Johann Ernst Hanxleden’s *Grammatica Grandonica* retrieved”, *Historiographia Linguistica* 37/3, 445-457.
- Van Hal, T. & C. Vielle (2013) “Introduction to the *editio princeps* of J.E. Hanxleden’s *Grammatica Grandonica*”, in T. Van Hal, C. Vielle (eds.), *Grammatica Grandonica. The Sanskrit grammar of Johann Ernst Hanxleden S.J. (1681-1732)*, Potsdam, 1-26 (<https://publishup.uni-potsdam.de/opus4-ubp/frontdoor/index/index/docId/6251>).
- Walters, J.S. (2000) “Buddhist history. The Sri Lankan Pāli Vamsas and their community”, in R. Inden, J. Walters, D. Ali (eds.), *Querying the Medieval. Texts and the history of practices in South Asia*, New York, 99-164.
- Wood, A. (1985) *Knowledge before printing and after. The Indian tradition in changing Kerala*, Delhi (electronic version by A. Wood, 2002, [www.advaitin.net/Ananda/KnowledgeBeforePrinting &After.pdf](http://www.advaitin.net/Ananda/KnowledgeBeforePrinting&After.pdf)).
- Županov, I.G. (2006) “Amateur naturalist and ‘professional’ Orientalist. Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo in Kerala and Rome (18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> c.)”, *Revista de cultura / Review of Culture* 20, *European travellers and the Asian natural world I*, ed. by Rui Manuel Loureiro, 77-101.
- Županov, I.G. (2009a) “Orientalist museum; Roman missionary collections and prints (Eighteenth century)”, in I. Banerjee-Dube, S. Dube (eds.), *Ancient to modern: religion, power and community*, New Delhi, 207-235.
- Županov, I.G. (2009b) “Professional missionary and Orientalist curator; Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo in India and Rome (18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century)”, in M.P. Paoli (ed.), *Saperi e confronto nell'Europa dei secoli XIII-XIX*, Pisa, 203-219.