CONCLUSION

Use of language is always based on Vākya. Every discipline uses the language to communicate its view. So, it is inevitable to use vākya for every discipline. In addition to this practical purpose, a higher purpose was also guiding every discipline. That purpose was to discuss the valid means of knowing. That is why most of the disciplines elaborate their stand regarding verbal testimony while discussing valid sources of knowledge (pramāṇa). The discourse about vākya can be viewed in two ways. First way is to explain the contemporary language and second is to explain the use of language that conveys the meaning that is real. First way is the explanation of language in general that includes all kinds of sentences (Vākya) and second way is the explanation of that use of language which is focused to convey the knowledge as it is. Of these two ways, Vyākaraṇa analyzes the language in general and other disciplines like Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya and Vedānta etc discusses about the sentences conveying valid knowledge (śabda pramāṇa). Śāṅkya and Yoga call it āgama pramāṇa.

In the tradition of Vyākaraṇa Āṇiṇi seems to indicate about two types of use of language upadeśa and anupadeśa as he formulates the sūtra ād{o}nupadeśa (A 1.4.70). Upadeśa means to utter sentences to communicate to others and anupadeśa means to think himself or to utter sentences not to communicate. Patañjali opines that use of language happens to convey the knowledge to others. In this connection Patañjali underlines many differences between Vākya and samāsa. The notion of vākyya is also different in view of Āṇinī and Kātyāyana. Āṇinī indicates that more than one word with tiṇ ending may be used in a vākyya Kātyāyana opines that there should be only one word with tiṇ ending in a vākyya to serve some particular purposes. (nighatādīṁ). Barring these some

\(^1\) Arthagatyarthah śabdaprayogah-mbhon (A 2.1.1) Vol-2, p-53
\(^2\) Tiṇṇatinah (A. 8.1.28)
usages there is no difference regarding structure of vākya between Pāṇini and Kātyāyaṇa. Bhartṛhari brought the point of indivisibility of vākya to the focus of debate. Though he considers the vākya as integrated, he discusses about categories of sentence-structure in third chapter of his work Vākyapadīya. This discussion is justified by him as apoddhāra (separation) of words from vākya is necessary for learning language, though it is unreal. That is why he concludes second chapter of vākyapadīya by saying that my teacher has compiled this brief discussion of the tradition (āgamasangraha) after practicing the philosophy of grammar and doctrines of other philosophies as well. Thus he indicates that now the analysis of language as accepted in discipline of vyākaraṇa is to be presented: vartmanāmatra keśāncid vastumātramudāḥṛtam.

kāṇḍe ṭṛīye nyakṣeṇa bhaviṣyati vicāraṇā.¹

The entire description of Pāṇini and Patañjali was presented in brief by Bhartṛhari in vākyapadīya with the blend of philosophical and analytical aspects of grammar particularly in third kāṇḍa Nyāya philosophy considers vākya as collection of related words to convey the complete sense Vātsyāyana, the commentator of Gautama accepts two categories of sentence-structurenāma and ākhyāta Jagadīśa sabdaśaktiprakāśika classifies three categories: prakṛti, prayaya and nipāta. Jaimini mentions nāma and ākhyāla only. The structure of sentences and categories of sentences are discussed in three disciplines only: Vyākaraṇa, Nyāya and Mīmāṃsā. Other disciplines like vedānt Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Buddhist philosophy only debate on the issue of validity of verbal testimony. All accept verbal testimony but some philosophies like cārvāka and Buddhist philosophy do not accept the verbal testimony as a valid source of knowledge.

¹ VP (2.483)
In modern linguistics grammaticality and acceptability of sentence are issues attracting the attention of scholars. Chomski has proposed a test sufficient to claim ungrammaticality of a sentence:

If a native speaker reads a sentence with the same intonation given a list of unrelated words, then that sentence is ungrammatical.¹

Later he clarified, that notions of grammaticality and acceptability should not be confused and said 'that grammaticalness is only one of many factors that interact to determine acceptability.'²

The group of unrelated words cannot form a sentence. It is the view of Nyāya and Vyākaraṇa both. But to prescribe a test based on the intonation is a new experiment in this age of machines, differentiating minutely among various tones; though its theoretical base has been provided by Indian linguistic thought already.

¹ Syntactic structures, p. 16
² Aspects of the theory of syntax, p. 11