

(imagination) of impossibility of A will cause a negative reaction. Reverse proposition, $A \Rightarrow \bar{A}$ in the terms of Dharmakīrti may be formulated as follows: "if an assumption about non-existence of A causes a negative reaction, then it is possible only if A has been perceived". $(A \rightarrow \bar{1}) \rightarrow \bar{1}) \Rightarrow (1 \rightarrow A)$. This proposition may seem "less evident" and indeed we cannot find it in the *Nyāyabindu* (that is in connection with modern variation of this law). (Literature: Stcherbatsky T., *Buddhist Logic*, Leningrad, 1932.

C/o Vostrepovahija
Moscow State University
Moscow - 117234
(U.S.S.R.)

M. SIMAKOV

BOOK - REVIEW

BILIMORIA, PURUSOTTAMA; *S'ABDAPRAMAṆĀ : WORD AND KNOWLEDGE*, Studies of Classical India, 10 Kluwer Academic Pub., The Netherlands, 1988, + 383, Price UK £ 69.00

This book is primarily a study of *Advaita Vedānta Paribhāṣā* of Dharmarājādharīndra (17th century) with cross reference to *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṃsā* and *Vyākaraṇa* on *Sābdaprāmāṇya* - the reliability of knowledge derived from the utterance of words. *Vedānta Paribhāṣā* is a primer-like book on *Vedānta* written in the *Navya Nyāya* Style, allotting more space to the consideration of the theory of knowledge than the other works on *Vedānta*. *Sābdaprāmāṇya* is the basis for religious and philosophical traditions of interpretation. It is very important except for Buddhism, Jainism and the *Lokāyata*. Hence, any contribution to the study of *sābdapramāṇa* is quite welcome. Moreover, all the spheres of human activities come under perview of language - no activity of human being is there where language is not involved (VP.I.118-131). The author draws upon the conceptual resources of contemporary analytical philosophies and phenomenological studies.

What are the conditions to be fulfilled in order that the sentence may convey convincingly the truth? This is the issue discussed. All the conditions according to different systems (*Nyāya*, *Mīmāṃsā* etc.) are considered and explained but without a preference for one or the other.

Three factors are involved in our understanding - language, reality and consciousness. The differences in opinion on all these will be based on the differences in understanding the nature of language, reality and the self. So also, there is no understanding of the language alone without reference to reality, and there is no understanding of the reality alone without reference to language. The nature of the self will affect both the understandings. The *Advaita*, *Mīmāṃsā*, *Nyāya* and *Vyākaraṇa* are not having the same understanding on all these matters. Moreover, the Analytic Philosophy will not admit any relationship of the internal to the external and the part to the whole but this relationship is basic to the Indian thought. A compromise with all these without violence does not seem