

## Patterns of change in the traditional stocks of examples: evidence from the first *prakriyā* grammars

Maria Piera Candotti  
Université de Lausanne and EPHE, Paris

The importance of examples (*udāharaṇa*) in studying the history of grammatical tradition is widely acknowledged: they are somehow the distillate of the scholastic knowledge concerning a given rule and the language it is supposed to describe.

Now, here and there in secondary literature there are hints of the fact that the new or *prakriyā* pāṇinian grammars had a different approach to tradition also in this respect; already in 1966 Adya Prasada Mishra and in 1971 Mahesh Dutt Sharma had pointed out the usage of some ‘sectarian examples’ in the works respectively of Rāmacandra and Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita. Other authors (like Iyer in 1972 for Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa) worked to trace quotations from literary sources and non-pāṇinian grammatical traditions. It seems therefore that the traditional stocks of examples transmitted for centuries in the different traditions were experiencing some remarkable changes in those times, whose significance and import is yet to be determined. Recently, the publication of *La grammaire pāṇinéenne par ses exemples* by the French Institute in Pondichéry (2006) has offered both a stimulus and an instrument to investigate deeper in this area.

This communication will focus on data coming from the study of pāṇinian metarules in book 1 of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as they are accounted for in the first *prakriyā* authors, namely Rāmacandra, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa and Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita. The now tiny ‘metalinguistic’ sections of the *prakriyā* grammars register only a small number of rules and displace all the others in the context of specific *prakriyās* where the name is required. Each name (or *paribhāṣā*) is thus illustrated by one of its *pradeśa* or applications. I consider those as slightly different kind of ‘examples’, which, though not *udāharaṇa stricto sensu*, also pertain to well-established sets. Now the choice of the specific derivation pattern used to illustrate the usage of a name is significant, as it may be easily proved that the name is not invariably illustrated by the first rule to use it. And it is the arbitrariness of this placement (because after all widely used names or *paribhāṣās* like 1 1 4 may be illustrated by a huge number of rules) that makes it useful to understand the broader cultural framework and the scholastic bonds to which a given grammar is committed.