

Analysis

0.1	Motive and purpose	1,2-3
0.2	Programmatic strophe: Definition of the logical reason	1,4-5
0.3	Explanation	1,6-34,6
1.	Definition of “subject” (<i>pakṣa</i>)	1,6-2,4
1.1	Against Īśvarasena’s objection to a metaphorical definition of the subject	1,6-2,2
1.2	The reason defined as a property of the subject is not uncommon.	2,2-4
2.	The meaning of “a member of the same”	2,5
3.	Definition of “pervasion”	2,6-5,14
3.1	The reason’s qualification as property of the subject and as pervaded by a part of the same implies an ascertainment of positive concomitance and negative concomitance	2,7-10
3.2	The ascertainment of the reason as a property of the subject	2,11-14
a.	Digression on these ascertainments	2,15-4,8
a.1	Only the first experience is a valid cognition.	2,15
a.2	Why memory is not a valid cognition	3,1-4,4

a.21	Denial of an undesired consequence for the phases of a perception after the first phase	4,4-7
(a.1)	Summary	4,7-8
3.3	Ascertainment of positive concomitance	4,9-5,6
3.31	in the case of essential property as reason	4,9-12
3.32	in the case of effect as reason	4,13-5,4
3.33	in the case of non-perception as reason	5,5-6
3.4	Ascertainment of negative concomitance	5,7-14
3.41	In the case of essential property and effect as reasons	5,7-12
3.42	in the case of non-perception as reason	5,13-14
4.	The three types of the logical reason	5,15-34,6
4.1	Essential property (<i>svabhāva</i>) as reason	6,3-23,10
4.10	Definition of essential property as reason	6,3
4.11	Explanation of this definition	6,3-8
4.111	Conceptual difference and factual identity	6,3-4
4.112	The purpose of the attribute “that co-occurs with the mere presence of the proving property”	6,4-8
4.12	Two kinds of formulation of the reason	6,9-13
4.13	No further members are needed in a proof.	6,14-8,2
4.131	The formulation of a thesis is superfluous.	6,14-7,15
4.1311	The formulation of a thesis has no purpose.	7,6-15
4.132	The formulation of application, conclusion, and other members of a proof are superfluous.	7,16-8,2

4.14	The sequence of the statements of the subject's property and its pervasion is not compulsory.	8,3-4
4.15	The statement of a pervasion differs only in its formulation, not in fact.	8,5-15
4.151	Refusal of Īśvarasena's demand for both formulations	8,13-15
b.	Digression: The cognition of the pervasion between the essential properties of existence and of being a ceasing nature in the proof of the momentariness of all entities	9,1-23,10
b.1	The unsuitability of external causes of cessation	9,2-23,3
b.11	The incapability of external causes	9,3-10
b.111	An external cause of cessation does not cause the nature of an entity.	9,3-4
b.112	An external cause of cessation does not cause another nature.	9,4-7
b.113	An external cause of cessation does not cause the absence of an entity.	9,7-10
b.12	The uselessness of external causes	9,11-22,16
b.121	An entity ceases due to its own nature.	9,11-10,2
b.122	In defence of the above position: The reason for the uselessness of an external cause is not inconclusive because only the final phase of an entity is the cause of another entity. The example of seed and sprout	10,3-21,11
b.1221	Refutation of objections based on the presence of several causes in a single causal complex	10,12-23,10

b.12211	The final phases of the different causes do not produce the effect alone.	10,12-13
b.12212	The contributing causes are active even if one alone is capable.	11.1-5
b.12213	The contributing causes do not each produce different effects.	11,6-8
b.12214	Different contributing causes cause different properties in a single effect. The example of a pot	11,9-13,12
b.122141	Refutation of a Vaiśeṣika explanation: Since the shape of a pot is different from its substance clay, the effects are different.	12,5-15
(b.12214)	Continuation: the example of visual cognition	13,1-12
b.12215	The contributory function of momentary causes	14,1-21,5
b.122151	Causes come about as capable due to their causes.	14,13-15,11
b.1221511	A cause is not capable in the absence of other causes.	14,13-15,2
(b.122151)	Continuing: Capable is a complex of causes.	15,3-11
b.1221512	Refutation of the position that something is capable but produces together with other causes, not alone	15.12-17
b.122152	Refutation of theorems regarding the occurrence of capability in non-momentary causes	16,1-18,10

- b.1221521 Introductory alternative: If a capable entity differs from an earlier incapable one, something new arises; if it does not differ, nothing arises. 16,1-3
- b.1221522 Refutation of the position: a lasting entity is capable by nature. 16,4-17,2
- b.1221523 Refutation of the position: A lasting entity is not capable on its own, but in connection with other entities. 17,3-10
- b.1221524 Refutation of the position: A lasting entity is capable, but its effect depends on the presence of other causes. 17,11-18,10
- (b.122152) Conclusion: Contribution is only possible for momentary entities that do not occur separately. 18,8-10
- b.122153 The contributory function with regard to continua 18,11-21,5
- b.1221531 Also in case of a continuum the contributory character consists in the production of one and the same effect by many causes. Explanation of the arising of specific properties 19,12-21,5
- (b.122) Conclusion: Non-momentary causes can have no contributory function. 21,6-11
- b.123 Summary of the arguments for the non-changeability of nature through external causes. Supplement: The melting of copper and other metals 21,12-22,16

b.1231	Refutation of the position: An entity is lasting and ceases through another. Cessation is not another nature, but the disappearance of the entity.	22,7-16
(b.1)	Conclusion of the establishment of the unsuitability of external causes of cessation	23,1-3
b.2	Summarizing the pervasion between the properties of existence (<i>sattva</i>) and of being a ceasing nature (<i>naśvarasvabhāvatva</i>)	23,4-10
b.21	The general validity of this pervasion in the proof from existence (<i>sattvānumāna</i>)	23,6-10
4.2	Effect (<i>kārya</i>) as reason	23,11-25,15
4.20	Definition of effect as reason	23,11
4.21	This relationship is restricted to certain properties of the cause and of the effect.	23,12-24,3
4.22	The pervasion between effect and cause is established through establishing the relationship between cause and effect.	24,4-25,15
4.221	Explanation of entities arising from some things different in kind, such as water lily-roots from cow dung	24,17-25,15
4.3	Non-perception (<i>anupalabdhi</i>) as reason	26,1-34,4
4.30	Definition of non-perception as reason	26,1-2
c.	Digression: What is non-perception?	26,3-33,11
c.1	Dharmakīrti's position	26,3-13

c.11	Definition of non-perception	26,3-13
c.111	As property of the perceiver non-perception is, with implicative negation (<i>paryudāsa</i>), a perception other than the perception of the absent entity.	26,3-5
c.112	As property of the perceived non-perception is, with implicative negation, the capacity for perception of an entity other than the absent entity.	26,5-7
c.113	The determination of otherness in this context	26,8-13
c.2	In defence of this position	27,1-33,11
c.21	Non-perception is absence as presence of something other or of another perception with implicative negation, not with simple negation.	27,1-5
c.22	The presence of what is other or of another perception does not prove the absence of something, but is the same.	27,6-33,8
c.221	The presence of what is other does not prove the absence of an entity,	28,1-32,16
c.2211	because the absence of something is not known as being different from the presence of what is other,	28,2-4
c.2212	and because there is no relation between the presence of what is other and the absence of something.	28,5-32,16
c.22121	The relation is not a relationship between object and subject (<i>viṣayaviṣayibhāva</i>) as between word and meaning.	28,9-29,13

- c.221211 In a proof of the absence of something through the presence of the what is other, the consequent would not be a compound of property and property-bearer. The absent entity and the spot cannot be a compound when the spot on the ground is the other. 28,16-29,13
- c.2212111 The relation is not possible on the basis of general and specific properties. 29,9-13
- c.22122 Also incompatibility (*virodha*) is not the relation. 29,14-30,2
- c.22123 The apprehension of the absence of something through apprehension of the presence of what is other is possible without a relation. 30,3-31,16
- c.221231 Absence is not cognized through non-perception. Refutation of Kumāriḷa's alternative to the position of HB 30,7f 30,13-31,2
- c.221232 Absence of the other is not known through the perception of an entity. 31,3-7
- c.221233 Defence of the theorem that the determination of the isolated entity excludes only that other entity which would be perceived if present 31,8-33,8
- c.222 The perception of the other does not prove the absence of an entity, because there is no relation, 32,17-33,8
- c.2221 since the absence of an entity is the case only together with the perception of the other. 32,19-33,8

c.23	Conclusion of the defence	33,9-11
4.31	There are three basic types of non-perception: of a cause, of a pervading property, and of an intrinsic nature.	33,12-34,4
4.311	The first two non-perceptions cannot be used as reasons with regard to entities beyond the range of perception. Rejection of Īśvarasena's theorem of "mere non-seeing" (<i>adarśanamātra</i>).	33,18-34,4
(4.)	Conclusion of the explanation of the three types of the logical reason	34,5-6
d.	Supplement: Critique of Īśvarasena's theorem of six characteristics for a logical reason	34,7-41,1
d.1	Refutation of the fourth characteristic: that its object has not been invalidated	34,9-36,15
d.11	Invalidation and invariable concomitance are incompatible.	34,9-36,8
d.111	Incompatibility cannot be avoided by referring to different property-bearers.	34,15-35,7
d.112	Incompatibility cannot be avoided by explaining non-invalidation as non-cognition of invalidation.	35,7-36,8
d.1121	Refutation of the position that the reason is incapable when an invalidation occurs.	35,18-19
d.1122	Refutation of the position that the reason is capable when invalidation is not perceived.	36,1-8

- d.12 Non-invalidation of a reason is impossible in the presence of invariable concomitance. Thus, faults of a thesis (*pratijñādoṣa*) are also impossible. 36,9-15
- d.2 Refutation of the fifth characteristic: that the singular of the reason is meant 36,16-38,10
- d.21 This characteristic is already refuted by the refutation of the fourth. 36,16-18
- d.22 Specific refutation of the fifth characteristic 36,19-38,10
- d.221 First alternative: if there is factually no counter-reason 37,1-14
- d.222 Second alternative: if a counter-reason has not been indicated 37,15-38,7
- d.2221 Rectification of the misplaced appeal to this statement by Dignāga 37,17-38,2
- d.2222 The correctness of a reason does not depend on the imagination of a counter-reason 38,4-7
- d.23 Conclusion: There is no counter-reason in case of essential property or effect as reason 38,8-10
- d.3 Refutation of the sixth characteristic: that it is known (*jñātatva*) 38,11-40,13
- d.31 Cognition does not satisfy the conditions of a reason's characteristic. 38,11-39,15
- d.311 Refutation of an objection against the use of the attribute "ascertained" (*niścita*) in the definition of a reason 38,18-39,15
- d.3111 The purpose of the attribute "ascertained" and the purpose of its insertion 39,1-15

d.32	Cognition is implied in the second and third characteristic of a reason.	40,1-13
d.321	Refuting the consequence that positive concomitance and negative concomitance would also not be separate characteristics	40,4-13
(d.)	Conclusion	41,1
0.4	Colophon	41,2-3

