A brief, and by no means exhaustive review of the views held by Sanskrit grammarians and logicians is attempted here, with specific reference to problems concerning deviance and grammaticality.

This has been done to show how these problems were treated, and what the attitude of Sanskrit grammarians and logicians was as compared with Generative Grammarians. This would then provide a further insight into the nature of grammaticality, by considering a viewpoint from an entirely different school of thought.

Panini's grammar can be called generative insofar as it is a finite set of rules which can generate infinite sentences. But, unlike the generative model of Chomsky, it does not attempt to generate all and only grammatical utterances. Panini is concerned with constructing a set of rules which will adequately describe actual recorded usage. The Sanskrit grammarians were more concerned with "correct and incorrect usage rather than how the internal mechanism actually functions". (Deshpande, M. 1979 : 5). Thus we find that Panini
"nowhere makes an attempt to prevent his grammar from generating sentences like "parvato vrksāt patati" (the mountain falls from the tree)." (Deshpande, M. 1979 : 3).

To quote Cardona (1976 : 182) : "The rules of grammar serve to derive forms which accord with correct usage ... Charudeva Shastri ... stressed a cardinal tenet of Paninīyas, namely, that the grammar follows correct usage: it is an explanation (anūvyākhāna) of such usage".

If the grammar explains all the recorded usages, and if these rules also generate some sentences which are not recorded, or do not exist, it is "not regarded as a potential problem." , and "Panini sees no reason to make provision in his rules to stop the production of these utterances." (Deshpande 1979 a : 5-6). According to Deshpande this principle is called anabhidāna.

This fundamental difference in the goals of Sanskrit grammarians is reflected in their attitude to deviance and semi-grammaticality. A whole range of problems is placed outside the purview of the grammarian by the principle of anabhidāna. This is also underlined by Patanjali in his Mahābhāṣya, by the recurrent
maxim "yathā-laksāṇam aprayukte". This can be interpreted as "Rules of grammar do not apply to derive unattested words". (Deshpande, M : forthcoming).

In Panini's system of rules, meanings are assigned to roots, to nominal stems, and to affixes. But "the analysis of meaning never overtakes the analysis of form, never goes beyond the concomitant analyzability of form, even where we might consider it possible, even necessary" (Hook, P. 1976). For the Sanskrit grammarian, the meaning of a sentence consists of the meaning of the words that constitute the sentence. The grammarian is not concerned with whether the sentence conveys true or false information, or whether it is logically valid.

Sentences like "vandhyā suta" (The son of a barren woman) or "agninā śiṅcati puṣpāni devaduttaḥ" (Devadutta sprinkles the flowers with fire) are grammatical according to the Sanskrit grammarians. There is no condition that, to convey meaning, a sentence should have "external verifiability". Nor can the Sanskrit grammarian prevent the grammar from generating these sentences. However, as has been said before - the Sanskrit grammarian is not concerned with this - he is only interested
in accounting for the correct observable usage.

This is then the difference between current generative theories and Pāṇinian grammar. Both are generative but Pāṇini has as his "input" attested sentences of recorded usage, on the basis of which he creates a set of rules. Unlike the generative grammarians, he is not trying to account for the ability or intuition of the speaker - there is no competence performance distinction.

It should, however, not be assumed that the problem of deviance was not recognised by the Sanskrit grammarian, "They claim that ultimately it is vivaksā - speakers's desire that prompts a speaker to use a particular group of words to express a particular meaning and the science of grammar can only judge the formal features of linguistic utterances". (Deshpande, M 1978 : 202). This then indirectly "makes an appeal to an extra-grammatical standard of acceptability, which Indian logicians (Nyāya) incorporate in their definition of sentence in the form of yogyatā". (Deshpande, M. 1978). The notion "yogyatā" has been translated as appropriateness or semantic compatibility "it is noteworthy that Pāṇini nowhere makes a provision to the effect that an
utterance derived by his rules must be semantically appropriate". (Cardona 1976 : 224).

The Naiyayikas or the followers of the Nyāya school of logic, were later to develop a different framework of categorizations and rules to deal with these problems, which are all attributed to vivakṣā by the Sanskrit grammarians. Paṇini, Patanjali and Candragomin have all dealt with this concept of "speaker's desire".

According to Joshi and Roodbergen - "We could say that by making vivakṣā responsible for the variety of syntactic construction Candragomin has introduced the symbol CONSULT THE SPEAKER in the program of his machine. That is to say the mechanical progress of the machine is interfered with every now and then ... Or to put it differently, vivakṣā is not a grammatical concept, but a stylistic one. It merely says that out of a number of modes of expression, the speaker may select any particular one". Deshpande (1979 : 6) does not agree with this view, in which he feels the analogy of Chomsky's "machine" has been carried too far". Panini's grammar presupposes a certain concept of vivakṣa "speaker's desire" and is not an automaton which can produce a
text of its own ... " The fact is that in Pāṇini's grammar certain operations are involuntary and do not require any input from the "users", while there are operations which tacitly require the voluntary decision and choice by the "user" ... it is "a grammatical concept referring to necessary voluntary input without which the involuntary operations of a grammar cannot operate". (M. Deshpande 1979 : 6).

Going on to the treatment of grammaticality and meaning in the Nyāya system we find that it is entirely different in its scope, and attitude.

The chief difference lies in the conception of vākya (sentence). Unlike the grammarians, the Naiyayikas do not consider a sentence as being the sum of the meanings of the words. The Nyāya definition of a sentence is "a group of words such that these words fulfill the conditions of (a) ākāṅksa (mutual expectancy); (b) yogyatā (Semantic or empirical compatibility) and (c) sannidhi (contiguity).

The concept of ākāṅksa needs some explanation here. It was also dealt with by Sanskrit grammarians. Patanjali called it vyāpeksa (meaning interdependence).
According to the Nyāya theory that part of the meaning of a sentence which cannot be perceived by adding the meanings of the words, is comprehended through the interrelation, which is mutual expectancy.

"The main concern of the school of Nyāya is not grammaticality of sentences. (In fact these logicians are quite famous for their contempt of grammar and grammarians). Their main concern is validity or logical and empirical validity". (Deshpande, M. 1978 : 201).

Therefore, we find that in the Indian tradition the logician and the grammarian had distinct and different roles. Acceptability for the grammarian depended strictly on the formal properties of the sentence. On the other hand, the logician demanded not only the required formal properties but logical validity as well as verifiability in the external world.

Thus, "aghinā sincati puspāni devaduttah" (Deva-
dutta sprinkles the flowers with fire) which is acceptable to the Sanskrit grammarian is not according to the Naiyayikas, as the word meanings are incompatible.

Current linguistic goals seem to, then incorporate the goals of the Sanskrit grammarian and Nyāya logician.
The Paninian attitude to deviance shares one aspect of the early Chomskyan concept of grammaticality, in that the stress was on the syntactic ordering of the elements in a sentence. However, as we have stressed earlier, there was no requirement that a grammar produce all and only grammatical sentences of a language. The concept of well-formedness includes not only syntactic ordering, but is concerned with the meaning and logical validity in terms of presuppositions implicature and entailment.