ON THE AINDRA SCHOOL OF SANSKRIT GRAMMARIANS, THEIR PLACE IN THE SANSKRIT AND SUBORDINATE LITERATURES

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649462964

On the Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians, Their Place in the Sanskrit and Subordinate Literatures by A. C. Burnell

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

www.triestepublishing.com

A. C. BURNELL

ON THE AINDRA SCHOOL OF SANSKRIT GRAMMARIANS, THEIR PLACE IN THE SANSKRIT AND SUBORDINATE LITERATURES

Trieste

ON

THE AINDRA SCHOOL OF SANSKRIT GRAMMARIANS

THEIR PLACE IN THE SANSKRIT AND SUBORDINATE LITERATURES

BY

A. C. BURNELL, Ph. D.

Saktum iva tita-unā punanto yatra dhīrā manasā vācam akrata |
atra.....bhadrai 'shāṃ laxmīr nihitā 'dhi vāci || Ṛ. V. x., 71, 2.

MANGALORE
BASEL MISSION BOOK & TRACT DEPOSITORY
LONDON 1875 BASEL
Trübner & Co. Missions-Buchhandlung

AN enquiry into the beginnings and history of Sanskrit Grammar is in itself an interesting subject, and has always been considered of importance since Profr. von Roth first opened the way[1], but it is at present imperatively necessary for several reasons, that something should be attempted, even if success be doubtful, and this must be my excuse for the present attempt.

Perhaps few will now assent to the late Profr. Goldstücker's claim on behalf of the Vedic commentators that they did not content themselves with copying their predecessors, but that they endeavoured to show "that the interpretations which they give are consistent with the grammatical requirements of the language itself"[2]. But whatever may be the value of the commentators application of Sanskrit Grammar to the interpretation of texts, the oldest treatises on that subject are the only remaining monuments of an important stage in the development of the Sanskrit language[3]. It is thus indispensable to the history of Indian thought, that it should be determined as ac-

1) By his "Zur Literatur und Geschichte des Weda" published in 1846. Since then our knowledge of this subject has been advanced in many ways by Weber, Benfey, Max Müller, Whitney, Regnier, Goldstücker, Kielhorn, Eggeling and others whose works I have quoted on nearly every page, and without which I could not have attempted this enquiry. Equally am I indebted to Senart's Pischel's and D'Alwis's works on Pali and Prakrit Grammar.

2) "Pāṇini's Place" (sep. imp.), p. 243.

3) Benfey ("Einleitung in die Grammatik der Vedischen Sprache" p. 3) says: "Dürfen wir unbedenklich die, wenn auch ziemlich grell klingende, Antithese aussprechen, dass uns von den Indern....auf der einen Seite die wunderbarste Sprache ohne eine sich auf sie stützende Grammatik hinterlassen ist, auf der andern dagegen die wunderbarste Grammatik ohne die Sprache, auf welche sie gestützt ist."

curately as possible, what is the condition of these texts, and under what influences they have been altered, if it cannot be assumed that they have been preserved intact. It then remains to see what principles guided the authors in their work.

Without a preliminary determination of these points it appears to me hazardous to use this great branch of Sanskrit literature as a means to solve historical problems, or for philological purposes. I have here attempted a new way of considering the problem—by examining what were the system and technical terms used before Pāṇini wrote his great work. It is well known that he was not the first, though he was the greatest of Indian grammarians, and chance having led me to discover a treatise which is said to be of the Aindra School, I soon found that the differences between the schools of Sanskrit Grammar must depend rather on system than on matter, and applying the scanty information which the Tolkāppiyam gave me, to the Sanskrit texts, I found that a number of hitherto unplaced works must represent the system or systems current before Pāṇini, though they cannot be in an intact condition. It cannot be for a moment supposed that Pāṇini's numerous predecessors did not differ in details of system, as well as in details of doctrine, but I think that, for the reasons I have given in this monograph, they all constitute a class which may be termed the Aindra School, as they agree among themselves in a marked way and equally differ from Pāṇini, as regards their system.

The historical value of Sanskrit texts being yet undetermined, I have thought it necessary to enquire briefly into this question, and have given my reasons for trusting, so far, the texts of grammatical works. This should logically come first, but briefly as I have treated the matter, it fills several pages, so I have put it as Appendix A.

The question I have enquired into in the first part, also requires an historical solution; a beginning is attempted in Appendix B.

Such enquiries as these are not only more necessary now than before, but are also possible at last. If the recollection of 1875 be rendered mournful to philologists by the loss of Ewald, Corssen, Bleek and Ebel, this year has seen the completion of grand works such as have never been done before—Böhtlingk and Roth's Sanskrit Dictionary and its necessary complement—Childers' Pali Dictionary. With these books at hand, Indian philologists must, and can, entertain larger views, and exercise a more fruitful activity than they have, as yet, ventured to do.

Tanjore,
1*st November* 1875.

A. B.

Transliteration.

For Sanskrit, I have used the system that I have always followed, and which is very near that used for Pali by Fausböll.

For Tamiḻ, I have used the following:

a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, ĕ, e (long), ŏ, o (long), ai, au.

k (g), ṅ; ś (j), ñ; ṭ (ḍ), ṇ; t (d), n; p (b), m; y, r, l, v, ḷ, ḻ, ṟ, ṉ.

CONTENTS.